



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

14 DAYS
BOOK

Philol 99



Harvard College Library

FROM

By Exchange

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University

VOL. XXII

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.
PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING LEIPSIK: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1901

Philol 99

By Exchange



The Friedenwald Company
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXII.

No. 85.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By M. C. SUTPHEN,	1
II.—A Study of the Leyden MS of Nonius Marcellus. By W. M. LINDSAY,	29
III.—The <i>Ἰέπειαι</i> of Hellanicus and the Burning of the Argive Heraeum. By B. PERRIN,	39
IV.— <i>Mutare Pulices</i> . By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH,	44
V.—The Parentage of Juvenal. By FRANK IVAN MERCHANT,	51
VI.—An Epic Fragment from Oxyrhynchus. By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING,	63
VII.—Manuscript Copies of Printed German Bibles. By W. KURRELMAYER,	70
NOTES:	77
Soph. Ajax 143. By HENRY N. SANDERS.—An Aesopic Fable in Old French Prose. By GEORGE C. KEIDEL.	
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	80
Clement's Prohibitives in Silver Latin.—Elmer's Treatment of the Prohibitive—A Rejoinder.	
REPORTS:	97
Englische Studien.—Romania.	
BRIEF MENTION,	105
NECROLOGY,	113
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	115
BOOKS RECEIVED,	118

No. 86.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN,	121
II.—Aristotle's <i>de Anima</i> . By PAUL SHOREY,	149
III.—Some Irregular Forms of the Elegiac Distich. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH,	165
IV.—Indian Glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychios. By LOUIS H. GRAY and MONTGOMERY SCHUYLER, JR.,	195
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	203
<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i> .—Einführung in die Papyruskunde von Otto Gradenwitz.—Sedgefield's Outlines of the History of the English Language.—Toller's King Alfred's Version of the Consolations of Boethius.	
REPORTS:	217
Romania.—Hermes.	
BRIEF MENTION,	227
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	234
BOOKS RECEIVED,	238

No. 87.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN,	241
II.—On the Association of Numerals. By HANNS ORTEL,	261
III.—The Bodleian Fragments of Juvenal. By HARRY LANGFORD WIL- SON,	268
IV.—On the Form of Horace's Lesser Asclepiads. By LEON J. RICH- ARDSON,	283
V.—The Unreal Conditional Sentence in Plautus. By H. C. NUTTING,	297
NOTES:	
A Note on the Achaemenian Inscription. By TRUMAN MICHELSON,	317
Notes on the Septuagint Text of II Sam. By JOHN WESLEY RICE,	318
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	321
Schulze's <i>Römische Elegiker</i> .—Seaton's <i>Argonautica recognovit</i> .— Apollonius <i>Lexique Étymologique</i> .—Victor Henry's <i>du Breton</i> <i>Moderne</i> .	
REPORTS:	335
<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i> .— <i>Revue de Philologie</i> .	
BRIEF MENTION,	344
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	351
BOOKS RECEIVED,	356

CONTENTS.

v

No. 88.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN,	361
II.—The Torch-Race. By J. R. SITLINGTON STERRETT,	393
III.—The Pomerium and Roma Quadrata. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER,	420
IV.—Etymologies. By GEORGE HEMPL,	426
V.—Zarathushtra and the Lógos. By L. H. MILLS,	432
NOTES:	438
Cicero's Judgment of Lucretius. By G. L. HENDRICKSON.—Cicero ad Atticum. By LOUISE DODGE.—MAMATPAI. By J. S. SPEYER.	
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	442
Harper's Assyrian and Babylonian Letters.—Cumont's Textes et Monuments Figurés Retalifs aux Mystères de Mithra.—Osiander's Hannibalweg.	
REPORTS:	456
The Journal of Germanic Philology.—Beiträge zur Assyriologie.—Rheinisches Museum.	
BRIEF MENTION,	467
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	473
BOOKS RECEIVED,	477
INDEX,	481

VOL. XXII, 1

WHOLE No. 85

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.

PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING LEIPSIK: F. A. BROCKHAUS

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH

1901

CONTENTS.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By M. C. SUTPHEN,	I
II.—A Study of the Leyden MS of Nonius Marcellus. By W. M. LINDSAY,	29
III.—The <i>Ἱεραία</i> of Hellanicus and the Burning of the Argive Heraeum. By B. PERRIN,	39
IV.—Mutare Pulices. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH,	44
V.—The Parentage of Juvenal. By FRANK IVAN MERCHANT,	51
VI.—An Epic Fragment from Oxyrhynchus. By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING,	63
VII.—Manuscript Copies of Printed German Bibles. By W. KURRELMAYER,	70
NOTES:	77
Soph. Ajax 143. By HENRY N. SANDERS.—An Aesopic Fable in Old French Prose. By GEORGE C. KEIDEL.	
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	80
Prohibitives in Silver Latin.—Elmer's Treatment of the Prohibitive—A Rejoinder.	
REPORTS:	97
Englische Studien, herausgegeben von Eugen Kölbing.—Romania.	
BRIEF MENTION,	105
NECROLOGY,	113
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	115
BOOKS RECEIVED,	118

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price \$3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, \$1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page.....	\$16 00	\$30 00	\$40 00	\$50 00
Half page.....	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page.....	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page.....	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of **THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY** has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, \$63 for the twenty-one volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, \$3; single numbers, \$1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Vol. XXII, 1.

WHOLE No. 85.

I.—A FURTHER COLLECTION OF LATIN PROVERBS.

The additions to Otto, *Die sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig, 1890, by Victor Szelinski, *Nachträge und ergänzungen zu Otto*, Jena, 1892, and by C. Weyman and A. Sonny in the *Archiv für lateinische lexicographie*, vols. 8 and 9, make a second edition of this valuable work a matter of necessity. To these extensive collections I have added a few more proverbs taken from the whole range of Latin literature, with especial attention to writers of late and mediaeval times.

Particular stress should be laid on the citations from Apuleius as an author who worked in the field of proverbial literature (*Charis.* I, 240, Keil). We would naturally expect to find proverbs not infrequently used in his other works. Otto cites over one hundred instances from this author; further additions have about doubled the number, making the percentage in his pages a heavy one. A more careful survey of Latin satire has also greatly increased the number of Otto's citations.

Regarding late and mediaeval authors, it has been quite impossible to collect all the material that might come to light by a more extended investigation of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. I have therefore restricted myself, in general, to the epistolary literature in those volumes. Particular authors, among whom I may mention Alcuin, Petrus Damianus, Abelard, Thomas of Canterbury, Gilbert Foliot, John of Salisbury, Nicolaus of Clairvaux, and Stephanus Tornacensis, make frequent use of proverbs the great majority of which are strictly classical. In mediaeval Latin the

usage is literary to a great extent, and, undoubtedly, many of the proverbs cited were no longer current. The value of these citations, however, lies in the fact that we often find expressions that are proverbial in character, but not actually so designated in classical Latin literature, introduced by *ut aiunt*, *ut dicitur*, *ut dici solet*, or *ut vetus proverbium est*. These may now be fairly put on our lists. The importance of such collections as the *monosticha* of Columbanus, the *liber proverbiorum* of Othlo, and the collections which go under the names of Wippo and Baeda, must also not be disregarded, and weight should be given to Alanus Insulensis, who has woven many classical proverbs into his *liber paraboliarum* (Migne, 210, 585 ff.). Manitius very justly remarks (Philol. 55, 573) that proverbs cited by mediaeval writers as 'vetera proverbia' may go back to a respectable antiquity, and the vast number of popular proverbs in mediaeval and modern Spanish and Italian may lead us to a similar conclusion.

Following the lead of Otto, I have not infrequently added a phrase that 'klingt sprichwörtlich' to my collection. Further investigation may result in the discovery of parallel passages which will strengthen its position in our lists. Though I might often agree with others and disagree with Otto regarding the strictly proverbial nature of many of his citations, I have felt justified in adding further examples in the hope that such collections may be useful in the annotation of various authors. It is only fair to call attention to the double title of Otto's book and to add that the expression 'proverbial phraseology' may often approach our English term 'slang.'

The longed-for revision of the Greek paroemiographers by Crusius will soon, I trust, make the addition of further parallels from Greek literature unnecessary.

[ABIRE. The well-known words of Cicero, Cat. 2, 1, 1 abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit, appear again as a stock quotation in Hier. ep. 109, 2; compare Otto, *venire*, p. 303.]

ACCEDERE, p. 2. See Heraeus, p. 32.¹

ACCUSARE, p. 2. Augustin. ep. 148, 4 (M. 33, 624), again brings the two verbs together; hoc non excuso, sed accuso.

ACETUM, p. 2. Compare Theokr. 15, 148 $\chi\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\rho\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\pi\alpha\rho.$ ²

¹ W. Heraeus, Die sprache des Petronius und die glossen, Leipzig, 1899.

² P. Tribukait, De proverbiiis vulgaribusque aliis locutionibus apud bucolicos Graecos obviis, Königsberg, 1889, p. 37.

ACHERON, p. 3. Change Plaut. Amphitr. 627 to Mil. glor. 627, and see Lorenz on Pseud. 392. Note also the use of *sepulchrum* Pseud. 412, ex hoc sepulchro vetere; Lucil. sat. 30, 81 (M.) plauta unast, pedibus cariosis, mers Libiteinai.

ACHILLES, p. 3. Propert. 2, 22, 34 hic ego Pelides, hic ferus Hector ego.

ADAMAS, p. 4. Ioh. Sar. ep. 183 (M. 199, 183 B) frons adamante durior; enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 383 B) frons adamante tibi sit durior; Anthol. Pal. 5, 246, 3 ψυχὴ δ' ἐξ ἀδάμαντος ἀπειθεός.¹

[AEDES 2. Plaut. Most. 80 periere et aedis et ager, sounds proverbial.]

AEGROTUS, p. 5. Terence, Andr. 309 is cited by Hincmar (M. 124, 1062 B), by Thom. Cant. ep. 100 (M. 190, 576 C), and by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, prol. (M. 199, 635 C).

AER 3, p. 6. Alcuin, vit. S. Richar. 1, 177 (M. 101, 684) aerem verberans; Petr. Damian. ep. 6, 23, 217 (M. 144, 412) sic curro non quasi in incertum, sic pugno non quasi aerem verberans; Petr. Blesensis, ep. 124 (M. 207, 370 A), and frequently in Steph. Tornacensis. Compare for Greek, Suidas ἀέρα δαίρειν.²

AES 2, p. 7. Symmach. ep. 3, 14, 1 in meo aere duco; compare Seneca, ep. 87, 17 virtus . . . suo aere censetur.

AES 4. As a lasting substance; Hor. c. 3, 30, 1 exegi monumentum aere perennius; Ennod., p. 476, 2 (H.) mansuro perenniter aere; p. 465, 25 (H.) perenni aere formatus; compare Ovid, trist. 1, 5, 53 pectus mihi firmitus aere, and Hor. c. 1, 3, 9 aes triplex | circa pectus erat. Note the similar use of *triplex* to denote strength under *duo* 3, p. 122, n., Otto.

AES ALIENUM. Sen. ep. 19, 11 leve aes alienum debitorem facit, grave inimicum; cf. Tac. ann. 4, 18 beneficia eo usque laeta sunt, dum videntur exsolvi posse; ubi multum antevenere, pro gratia odium redditur. The expression of Seneca sounds proverbial.

AETNA 1, p. 7. With Plaut. Mil. 1065 compare Lucil. sat. 3, 7 (M.) ἀγίλοις montes, Aetnae omnes, asperi Athones.

AFRICA 2, p. 8. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 15, 8 Africa quot seges; Stat. silv. 3, 3, 91 aestiferi quicquid terit area Nili. Compare Iuvenal 5, 119 O Libye, disiunge boves, dum tubera mittas.

¹For Greek parallels see O. Schmidt, Metapher und gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians, Winterthur, 1897, p. 123.

²See Kurtz, Philol. Suppl.-bd. 6, p. 308.

Claudian. 22, 394 ut mihi vel Massyla Ceres vel Gallica prosit fertilitas; 1, 60; Sicily is referred to in a similar way, Ovid, met. 5, 481 fertilitas terrae latum vulgata per orbem.

AGER 1, p. 8. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 8, 2 agrum si mediocriter colas, possides; si nimium, possideris.

AGERE 2, p. 9. Plaut. Rud. 19 iterum ille eam rem iudicatam iudicat; Cic. ad fam. 14, 1, 5 vide, ne puerum perditum perdamus. Compare the Greek proverb *κύνα δέρειν δεδαρμένην* Diogen. 5, 85.

AGERE 2, p. 9, n. Add Ter. Eun. 717, Andr. 465, Adelph. 325, Heaut. 456, 584, Plaut. Trin. 308.

AGERE 3, p. 9. Add Plaut. Casin. 401 hoc age; Cist. 693, Mil. glor. 1114; Pers. 583; Poen. 761, 1407; Pseud. 152; Hor. ep. 1, 6, 31; Sen. ben. 3, 36, 2; Sulla cited clem. 1, 12, 2; ep. 108, 27; epigr. 93, 8 (PLM. 4 Baehr.); Iuven. 7, 20; Suet. Calig. 58. Compare also Plaut. Stich. 710 bibe, si bibis; Poen. 1236 ite, si itis; Casin. 765 quin datis, si quid datis; Poen. 511 si ituri hodie estis, ite; Casin. 831 date ergo, daturae si umquam estis hodie uxorem; Mil. glor. 1186; Capt. 183; Most. 1100 with Lorenz' note; Brix to Capt. 441; Barta, p. 21, n. 4¹; Crusius, p. 137.²

[AGMEN. Sen. d. 5, 2, 3 saepe in iram uno agmine itum est; n. q. 3, 27, 1; Dracont. 5, 245 omnes uno agmine cives; Livy 6, 9, 10; 9, 30, 5; 27, 49, 8. So *agmine facto* Sen. ep. 104, 19; Iuven. 3, 163; 10, 218; Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 59 (M. 201, 90 A) omnes fere quasi agmine facto.]

AIAX. Plaut. Capt. 615 Aiacem, hunc quom vides, ipsum vides; compare *Achilles*, p. 3, Otto.

ALCEDONIA, p. 11. Fulgent. 1, p. 4, 13 (Helm) Alcione niduli placidam serenitatem. See Kurtz, p. 308, for the Greek proverb *ἀλκωνίδες ἡμέραι* in Eustathius.

ALCINOUS, p. 12. CIL. 14, 2773 hortulus hic Vari, | est opus Alcinoi. See Bücheler's note, Carm. Epigr. 886. I do not adopt Bücheler's view that Alcinoous was the name of the landscape-gardener, as the connection with *hortus* appears obvious.

ALEA. For the metaphorical use of *alea* compare Sen. ben. 3, 11, 1 ut aequiore animo adirent aleam; Cassiod. var. 3, 1, 1 cavete subito in aleam mittere; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 4, 6, 3 intra iactum tantae aleae; Petrus Blesensis, ep. 42 (M. 207, 123 B) in alea tanti discri-

¹ F. Barta, Sprachliche studien zu den satiren des Horaz, Linz, 1881.

² O. Crusius, Untersuch. zu Herondas, Leipzig, 1892.

minis diutius ludere. For the Greek form of the proverb see Meleager, Anthol. Pal. 12, 117, 1, and Peter, JJ. 155, 858.

ALGA, p. 13. Aldhelm aenigm. 14 (M. 89, 198) spretis vilior algis.

ALIENUS 1, p. 13. Ter. Phorm. 173 itaque plerique omnes sumus ingenio: nostri nosmet paenitet; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 3, 13, 3 quemque non pascit tam panis bonus quam panis alienus; compare Sen. d. 7, 6, 2 contentus amicusque rebus suis.¹

ALIENUS 1, n., p. 13. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 57 is cited by Othlo lib. prov. 9 (M. 146, 315 D).

ALIENUS 2, p. 13. Ioh. Sar. metal. prol. (M. 199, 823 A) qui malunt aliena carpere quam sua respicere; compare also ep. 254 (298 A) oculum non quaerat caecum qui curare debuerat lippientem. Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1629 A) cites Cic. Tusc. 3, 30, 73.

ALIENUS 5, p. 14. Compare Sen. ep. 77, 8 liberalis, etiam cum de suo fieret.

ALIENUS 6, p. 15. Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 B) tu econtra velut graculus Aesopius superbia tumidus; see Schmidt, l. c., p. 83.

ALIENUS 8. Plin. ep. 1, 17, 4 scias ipsum plurimis virtutibus abundare, qui alienas sic amat; append. sent. 110 (Ribb.) virtutes habet abunde qui alienas amat.

ALTER 1, p. 15. Gruter inscr. 928, 9 (Carm. Epigr. 192, 3 B.) ab alio speres, altero quod feceris; Orelli inscr. 4876 quod si nocueris, noceberis ab alio; 4802 quod feceris, et tibi alius faciet. See Haupt, Philol. 3, 378, no. 51.

ALTER 2, p. 16. Columban. monost. 86 (M. 80, 289) quod tibi vis fieri, hoc alii praestare memento; 88 quod tibi non optes, alii ne feceris ulli. The form, quod tibi non vis fieri, alteri ne feceris, is cited as a proverb by Othlo lib. prov. 16 (M. 146, 327 B) and by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 4, 7 (M. 199, 527 B).

ALTER 5, p. 16. For Greek parallels see H. Koch, II, p. 22.

ALTER 5, n. 2, p. 16. See Sen. apoc. 14; Cic. ad Attic. 7, 18, 4 cites the Greek proverb *μηδὲ δίκην*.

ALTUS, p. 17. Bachar. de repar. laps. 22 (M. 20, 1061 B) quia eius qui de humili labitur, levior est ruina; Paul. Rom. ad Licent. 15 (M. 33, 128) si titubes, summa peius ab arce cades; Maxim. Taur. hom. 101 (M. 57, 489) ut tanto altius caderet, quanto sublimius volitasset; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1107) quanto altior

¹ For Greek parallels see H. Koch, p. 21, Quaestionum de proverbiis apud Aesch. Soph. Eurip. caput alterum, Bartenstein, 1892.

gradus, tanto profundior casus; Alcuin ep. 56, 64 (M. 100, 223) cavere debet ne cadat, quia ruina altioris loci periculosior esse dignoscitur; ep. 72 (245 A) si gaudendum est de ascensu, timendum est de lapsu, quia de altiori loco periculosior est lapsus; moral. 23, 140 (M. 101, 630) tantoque profundius labitur, quanto excelsius elevatur; Fulgent. Rusp. ep. 3, 25 (M. 65, 333) ut graviore lapsu de alto possit deicere; Rather. Veron. praeloq. 2, 5 (M. 136, 199 C); Hildebert. carm. misc. 1345 (M. 171, 1419 B) et venit a summo summa ruina gradu; Petr. Bles. ep. 90 (M. 207, 284 B) semper in altum nititur, ut gravius cadat; compare Cic. or. 28, 98 medius (orator) . . . magnum tamen periculum non adibit—alte enim cadere non potest; cf. Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 584 A) qui iacet in terra, non habet unde cadat; Vagell. frag. 1 (Baehr., Frag. Poet. Rom.) si mihi sorte cadendum est, | e caelo cecidisse velim; Sen. d. 11, 15, 1 quem fortuna in hoc evexerat, ne minus alte eum deiceret quam patrem deiecerat.

AMARE 1, p. 17. Propert. 1, 19, 12 traicit et fati litora magnus amor; Cic. or. 10, 33 is cited by Petr. Dam. serm. 29 (M. 144, 665 D) nihil enim amanti difficile esse videtur; Petr. Bles. ep. 86 (M. 207, 272 A), compare Claudian. 22, 412; Verg. ecl. 10, 69 is cited by Alcuin ep. 100 (M. 100, 313 A) omnia vincit amor; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 308 (M. 199, 971 D) si divinus omnia vincit amor; Petr. Chrys. serm. 40 (M. 52, 313 A) si amor est, vincit omnia; Nicol. Clar. ep. 3 (M. 196, 1596 D) nihil esse debuit amori invium; compare Gualbert. act. 374 (M. 146, 954) virtus omnia vincere; Ovid ex Pont. 2, 7, 75 animus tamen omnia vincit. See *labor* 2.

AMARE 2, p. 17. Mart. Dum. form. hon. vit. 5, 2 (Seneca, vol. III, p. 473 H.) ama deum, ut ameris a deo; Hrosuitha Mon. com. Gallicanus, act 1, sc. 7 (M. 137, 982 B) nam vulgo dicitur: qui dilectis obsequitur, et ipse sit dilectus; Sen. ep. 9, 6 is also quoted by Richard. Vict. ep. 7 (M. 196, 1228 B): cerno . . . quam amatorium illud Catonis tenaci memoriae prudentia vestra commendavit: si etc.; Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 384 A) regula fida nimis: quisquis amandus, amet. The word *regula* in mediæval Latin not infrequently introduces a classic proverb.

AMARE 3, p. 17. Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 582 A) post inimicitias clarior est et amor.

AMARE 4, p. 17. See Greg. Cypr. Leid. 1, 1 Ἀφροδίσιος ἔρκος: οὐκ ἐμπολνίμος, and Leutsch's note; compare also Ovid, am. 1, 8, 86 commodat in lusus numina surda Venus.

AMARE 6, p. 18. Hildebert. de excid. Troiae (M. 171, 1449 D) hic amor est amens; Nicol. Clar. ep. 40 (M. 196, 1639 B) tam

amans quam amens; Ioh. Sar. ep. 206 (M. 199, 229 D) amentis est, non amantis; note also Serv. on Verg. ecl. 8, 66 amantes insanos vocamus; Ter. Andr. 218 is cited by Diomedes ars. gram. II (p. 446, 13 K.) under the term *paronomasia*.

AMARE 8. Sen. ep. 3, 2 isti praepostero officia permiscunt, qui contra praecepta Theophrasti, cum amaverunt, iudicant, et non amant, cum iudicaverunt; Caecil. Balb. sent. 5 ames probatos, non amatos post probes; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 11 (F.) ames iudicio, non amore iudices; for the reference to Theophrastus as the author of this sentiment see Stob. flor. Π Δ, 14 (= Plutarch. de frat. am. 8)¹; compare Petr. Cellensis ep. 95 (M. 207, 302 B) apud antiquos, teste Cicerone, proverbialiter dicitur; exuit personam iudicis quisquis amicum induit; Cic. de off. 3, 43 ponit enim personam amici, cum induit iudicis; Gillebert. ep. 1 (M. 184, 289 B) tam vero quam veteri uteris . . . proverbio, omnia cum amico deliberanda esse, de ipso tamen prius; cf. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 5, 11, 1 est enim consuetudinis meae, ut eligam ante, post diligam.

AMICITIA 2, p. 19. This proverb is frequently met with in mediaeval Latin. Columban. ep. 4 (M. 80, 270) alioqui si non unum velle et unum nolle habetis, melius est ut non simul habitetis; Orest. trag. 293 velle fuit commune viris et nolle duobus; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1096 B) and Othlo lib. prov. 5 (M. 146, 309 D) cite Sall. Cat. 20, 4; Hrosuitha Mon. com. Abraham (M. 137, 1013 C) si unum cor unaque anima iubetur esse, idem velle, idem cogimur nolle; Gualbert. act. 72 (M. 146, 842 B) Mariam itaque virginem sanctosque Christi Iesu omnes eadem velle, eadem nolle; Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 106 (M. 141, 252) quae te cum Domino, quantum homini datur, idem velle atque nolle confido; Petr. Venerab. ep. 2, 22 (M. 189, 236 D) verae amicitiae diffinitionem . . . idem scilicet velle et idem nolle; Nic. Clar. ep. 6 (M. 196, 1600 C) idem velle atque idem nolle; Ioh. Sar. ep. 78 (M. 199, 64 C) vel urgente familiaritatis amicae stimulo idem velle et idem nolle necesse sit vobis; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 241, 355 (M. 211, 511) oblitus fueras regulae qua dicitur, amicorum idem est velle et nolle; CIL. 3, 754 (Carm. Epigr. 492, 14 B.) vellet quod vellem, nollet quoque ac si ego nollem. The expression becomes quite formulaic in mediaeval Latin.

AMICITIA 4, p. 19. Ps.-Publil. Syr. 380 (F.) ut fidus, cum amico multos simul edas modios salis.

¹ Haupt, Herm. 5, 322.

AMICUS 1, p. 20. Sen. ben. 7, 12, 5 quicquid habet amicus, commune est nobis; ep. 48, 3 omnia enim communia cum amico habebit, qui multa cum homine; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 203 multa cui hominis, illi amici cuncta sunt communia; see for Greek examples Diogen. 2, 94 and Koch, II, p. 11.

AMICUS 2, p. 20. Anthol. Pal. 10, 39, 1 *θησαυρὸς μέγας ἔστ' ἀγαθὸς φίλος.*

AMICUS 6, p. 21. Append. sent. 241 (R.) probare amicos in re adversa facilius; Othlo lib. prov. 1 (M. 146, 301 D) amicus in necessitate probatur; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1091); Odo ad Rich. Pict. ap. Foliot. ep. 422 (M. 190, 1005 B) illud proverbium in te verum experiemur; in necessitate probatur amicus; Ioh. Sar. ep. 267 (M. 199, 308 B) est enim proverbium sapientiae; amicus non cognoscetur in bonis, et in malis non abscondetur inimicus; ep. 272 (311, D) amicitiae titulus radiat clarius in adversis; Apost. 12, 81 b *ἄνομα γὰρ, ἔργον δ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν οἱ φίλοι, οἱ μὴ 'πὶ ταῖς <ε> συμφοραῖς ὄντες φίλοι;* Planud. 34 *φίλε μου ἐν τῇ ἀνάγκῃ μου καὶ μὴ ἐν τῇ σπατάλῃ μου.*¹

AMICUS 7, p. 22. Plaut. Pers. 655 nam etsi res sunt fractae, amici sunt tamen; Hor. c. 1, 35, 26 diffugiunt cadis | cum faece siccatis amici; Ovid ex Pont. 2, 3, 10 et cum Fortuna statque caditque fides; ex Pont. 3, 2, 8; 4, 3, 7; Sen. ep. 9, 9 circa eversos solitudo est, et inde amici fugiunt, ubi probantur; Boeth. consol. phil. 3, 5 sed quem felicitas amicum fecit, infortunium faciet inimicum; append. sent. 182 (R.) res parant secundae amicos optime, adversae probant; Othlo lib. prov. 1 (M. 146, 303 B); Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1091); Alcuin ep. 58, 67 (M. 100, 226 C) multi sunt in prosperitate amici, in adversitate rari; Henric. Rem. ep. 5 (M. 196, 1567 C) vera est nimis illa sententia, quia vos divites coluerunt, pauperes respicere dedignantur; Ioh. Sar. ep. 186 (M. 199, 196 D) amici obsurdescunt qui . . . fidem umbratilem . . . ponunt et deponunt ad arbitrium Fortunae; CIL. 12, 955 (Carm. Epigr. 470, 1 B.) quat valeas, abeas, pascas, multos tu habebes amicos; Marc. Argent. Anthol. Pal. 5, 113, 6 *ἢ μόλις ἔγνωσ | τοῦτ' ἔπος, ὡς οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἔχοντι φίλος;* 10, 35, 3 *ἦν πταισις, οὐδεὶς ἔτι σοὶ φίλος.*²

AMICUS 11, p. 23. Plaut. Bacch. 386 homini amico quist amicus; notiz. d. scavi 1893, p. 422 (Carm. Epigr. 689, 2 B.) cum amicis amicus; CIL. 6, 6275 amicus amico; Bormann inscrip. lat. nov., p. 11 (Carm. Epigr. 1000, 1 B.) amicus amicis.

¹ Crusius, Rhein. Mus. 42, 402.

² H. Koch, II, p. 11.

AMICUS 12, p. 23. Columban. monost. 41 (M. 80, 288) ignotum noto numquam praeponas amico; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 41 (M. 89, 740) memorem te esse . . . desidero sapientis cuiusdam sententiae qui dixit; serva antiquum amicum; compare Fronto, p. 162, 10 (Nab.) nam vulgo dicitur quod potius sit, antiquius esse.

AMICUS 13. Sen. ep. 19, 11 errat autem, qui amicum in atrio quaerit, in convivio probat, sounds proverbial.

AMICUS 14. Hier. ep. 3, 6 (M. 22, 335) obsecro te ne amicum qui diu quaeritur, vix invenitur, difficile servatur . . . amittat; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 30 (M. 89, 729) amicus diu quaeritur, vix invenitur, difficile servatur; Alcuin ep. 84 (M. 100, 275 C) veterum igitur proverbialis fulget sententia, amicus diu etc.; ep. 89 (287 A) iuxta antiquitatis proverbium etc. The proverb may go back to a much earlier period than these citations indicate.

AMOR 1, p. 23. Plaut. Mil. 1258 caeca amorest; Propert. 3, 14, 32 caecum versat amator iter; cf. Theokr. 6, 18 ἡ γὰρ ἔρασι | πολ-
λάκις . . . τὰ μὴ καλὰ καλὰ πέφανται.¹ With the last part of Otto's note compare Sen. d. 7, 10, 2 amorem rerum suarum caecum; 7, 14, 2 amore caeco rei; see *fortuna* 1, Otto.²

AMOR 3, p. 23. Ovid rem. am. 44 una manus vobis vulnus opemque feret; trist. 1, 1, 99 vel qui mihi vulnera fecit | solus Achilleo tollere more potest; trist. 2, 20; her. 20 (21), 184 pro-sint, quae nocuere, manus; compare Propert. 2, 1, 63; Apul. met. 2, 7. The Greek proverb ὁ πρόσωπος καὶ ἰδέσθαι is cited by Suet. Claud. 43; see also Kurtz, p. 316,³ for examples from Eustathius.

AMOR 4. Petron. 108, v. 5 sed contemptus amor vires habet; compare Iuven. 10, 328 mulier saevissima tunc est, | cum stimulos odio pudor admovet.

AMOR 5. Venant. Fortun. c. 5, 6, 12 amor blandus tyrannus est, sounds proverbial.

AMOR 6. Richar. Vict. (M. 196, 10 A) ubi amor, ibi oculus; Ioh. Sar. ep. 167 (M. 199, 158 A) nam ubi amor, ibi oculus; ep. 202 (225 D); Polycrat. 3, 12 (501 B) certe vetus proverbium est quia ubi amor, ibi oculus. The proverb may go back to a respectable antiquity; compare Otto, *oculus* 8.

AMPULLA. Hor. a. p. 97 proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 16 (M. 199, 611 D); Fulco ad

¹ Tribukait, p. 6.

² *Ambitio*, like *amor* and *Fortuna*, is also spoken of as blind. Sen. ben. 7, 26, 4; Gualbert. (M. 146, 893 B); Ioh. Sar. ep. 147 (M. 199, 140 A).

³ Philol., suppl.-bd. 6.

Abaelard. ep. 16 (M. 178, 376 A) verba ampullosa; cf. Diogen. 3, 41 ἀμαξία ῥήματα.

AMUSSIS, p. 24. Apul. met. 2, 30 examussim; 10, 2; 11, 27; Placid. gloss., p. 42 (D) emussitatos, ad amussim exactos; p. 37 (D) examussim, integre, sine fraude; Aldhelm ep. 4 (M. 89, 96 B) ut scias tanta rerum arcana examussim non posse intellegi.

AMUSSIS, p. 24, n. Ennod., p. 359, 10 (H.) cuius integritatem velut fabrilibus lineis ad perpendicularum mentis emensus est.

ANGUILLA, p. 25. Hier. adv. Helvid. 14 (M. 23, 207 C) sed ne in aliquo cavilleris et te quasi lubricus anguis evolvas; Lucian anach. 1; see Schmidt, l. c., p. 116, for Greek parallels.

ANGUIS 2, Szelinski, p. 8. Ovid fast. 2, 342 attonitusque metu rediit, ut saepe viator | turbatum viso rettulit angue pedem.

ANGUIS 3. Otto in his note to *anguis*, p. 25, says that Verg. ecl. 3, 93 latet anguis in herba, is not a proverb. But our modern proverb was in use in mediaeval times, for a friend writes to Thomas of Canterbury ep. 368 (M. 190, 700 B) nos autem verebatur ut aliquid magis sublateret: latet enim anguis in herba; Petr. Cell. ep. 154 (M. 202, 597 D) qui latet ut anguis in herba; compare Otto, *vipera* 3.

ANIMUS 1, p. 25. Ovid ex P. 3, 4, 69 magnaue pars animae mecum vixistis, amici; trist. 4, 10, 32 cum perit, et coepi parte carere mei; her. 17 (18), 126; met. 8, 406 pars animae consistere meae; met. 3, 473 nunc duo concordēs anima moriemur in una; Stat. silv. 5, 1, 177 pars animae victura meae; Cypr. ep. 60, 1 dum apud vos unus animus et una vox est; Hier. ep. 105, 2 sic cum amico quasi cum altero se est loquendum; Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 589 C) non alter, at idem fiat ego; Rossi inscr. chr. Rom. 2, 79, 6 (Carm. Epigr. 1432, 4 B.) nec solum caro sed spiritus unus erat; CIL. 5, 6729 (Carm. Epigr. 706, 5 B.) una domus, mens una fuit; CIL. 6, 30140 (1296, 4 B) par nobis aet[er]na unaque m[ens] inerat; Columban. ep. 4 (M. 80, 270 C) sed videte ut unum cor et anima una sitis; Ambros. ep. 6, 1 quasi animae portionem convenio meae; Braulio ep. 23 (M. 80, 672 D) imo sit in Christo una anima tua et mea; ep. 25 (M. 80, 674 B) partem animae meae te esse non dubito; Hrosuitha Mon. Abr. (M. 137, 1013 C) unum cor unaque anima; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1329 (M. 171, 1402 D) mens sumus una duo; Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1632 D) cor unum et animam unam; Gualbert. act. 120 (M. 146, 807 A) unum cor et animam habentes; Ioh. Sar. ep. 81 (M. 199, 68 B) cor unum et anima una; ep. 184 (M. 199, 189 A). Horace's phrase,

animae dimidium meae, was freely used by mediaeval writers, so that Thom. Cant. even employs it as a salutation in two of his letters, ep. 100 and 101 (M. 190, 577 B); for other examples see Petr. Ven. ep. 5 (M. 189, 73 A); Thom. Cant. ep. 144 (M. 190, 621 B); Foliot. ep. 130 (M. 190, 839 B); Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1628 B); Gaufrid. ep. 15 (M. 205, 841 D); see also Eustath. on Hom. II. 1359, 61,¹ ἄλλος αὐτός.

ANIMUS 5 (Sonny, ALL. 8, 485). Compare Apost. 12, 13 σοῦς ὄρα καὶ σοῦς ἀκούει with Leutsch's note; Kaibel, Com. Dorica, p. 137.

ANNUS, p. 27. Ovid her. 17 (18), 25 spatium mihi longius anno; Gualbert. act. 217 (M. 146, 895) non dies, ut aiunt, sed annus me deficeret; Nicol. Clar. ep. 45 (M. 196, 1646 A) tantoque affectus sum desiderio ut diem pro anno computaverim mihi. Note the similar use of *aetas*, Ter. Eun. 734 iam dudum, aetatem; Plaut. Truc. 22 non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum sat est | amanti; Asin. 274 and 284; Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 38 (p. 79, 4 Reiff.) quibus enumerandis omnis aetas angusta est.

[ANTEFERRE. Verg. Aen. 4, 371 became a stock quotation; Ennod., p. 292, 16 (H.) sed nunc, ut quidam fertur dixisse, quae quibus anteferam; compare Iuven. 9, 81.]

ANTIQUUS. Fronto, p. 162, 10 (Nab.) nam volgo dicitur quod potius sit, antiquius esse.

ANULUS, p. 27. Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1264) consumitur anulus usu; Ovid ex Pont. 4, 10, 6 atteritur pressa vomer aduncus humo; a. a. 1, 474 interit adsidua vomer aduncus humo.

ANUS 1, p. 28. Sen. ep. 94, 2 anilia habentem praecepta (Hense); Prudent. perist. 10, 250 ineptias | quas vinolentae sompniis fingunt anus; 6, 40 dampnes, si sapias, anile dogma; Min. Fel. Oct. 13, 5 anilis . . . superstitio; Lactant. instit. 5, 13, 3 muliebrem aut anilem superstitionem; 5, 1, 14 anilia, inepta, vulgaria; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 32, 227 (M. 144, 422) nescio quos vestrum aniles nugas et otiosa deliramenta perpendit profundere.

ANUS 2, p. 28. Apul. met. 4, 27 lepidis anilibusque fabulis; Fulgent. m. prooem. 1, 3 tibi rugosam sulcis anilibus ordior fabulam; Prudent. perist. 9, 18 non est inanis aut anilis fabula; Petr. Dam. ep. 5, 13, 162 (M. 144, 359) anilis ineptiae naenias conspuatis.

APIS, p. 30. Sen. ep. 84, 3 is cited by Macrobr. sat. 1, praef. 5, and later by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 10 (M. 199, 660 A) and by Petr. Bles. ep. 92 (M. 207, 289 C); compare Auson. Bissul. 6, 2 aemula Cecropias ars imitetur apes.

¹ Kurtz, p. 308.

APOLLO, p. 30. Placid. gloss., p. 19 (D.) Cirrhearum, quod aiunt inspirationum.

APOLLODORUS. See *Phalaris*.

AQUA 5, p. 31. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 7 (M. 199, 650 A) ac si . . . quis . . . scribat in fluminis lapsu; Meleagr. Anthol. Pal. 5, 8, 5 *νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν ὄρνια φησὶν ἐν ὕδατι κείνα φέρεσθαι*; Eustath. on Odys. 349, 23.¹

AQUA 12, p. 32. Pers. 2, 19 an scilicet haeres? Iuven. 6, 281 haeremus; cf. Apul. met. 10, 3 ut in quodam vado dubitationis haerens.

AQUILA 2, p. 32. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, p. 114.

AQUILA 4, p. 33. Compare Hor. c. 4, 4, 29 fortes creantur fortibus et bonis.

AQUILA 5. Aldhelm. de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 198) plus pernix aquilis.

ARA, p. 33. Fronto, p. 133, 6 (Nab.) foculos, aras; Flor. 2, 1, 2 aris ac focus.²

ARABS, p. 33. Tibull. 4, 2, 18 dives Arabs; Lact. de ave phoen. 80 opulentus Arabs.

ARBOR 1, p. 35. Caecil. Stat. 210 (R.) serit arbores, quae saeclo prosint alteri; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 53.

ARCADICUS, p. 35. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 662 C) et asino Arcadiae te dicet tardiolem; metal. 1, 3 (829 B) asello Arcadiae tardior.

ARCUS 1, p. 36. Othlo lib. prov. 1 (M. 146, 303 B) arcum nimia frangit intensio; Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1264) absque modo tractus saepissime frangitur arcus.

ARGUS, p. 37. Ovid ars am. 3, 618 quot fuerant Argo lumina, verba dabis; Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1629 B) videbis illic et oculos Argi (= Apoll. Sidon. ep. 5, 7, 5); see Schmidt, p. 52, for Greek parallels.

[ARMA 2. Ovid her. 6, 140 quamlibet infirmis iste dat arma dolor; Verg. Aen. 1, 150 furor arma ministrat.]

ARS 1, p. 37. Compare Macar. 8, 39 *τὸν φρουρὸν χρὴ φρουρεῖν, τὸν ἐρῶντα δ' ἐρᾶν*; for Greek parallels see Tribukait, l. c., p. 18.

ARS 3, p. 38. Cic. Tusc. 1, 2, 4 honos alit artes, is cited also by Servat. Lup. ep. 1, 2 (M. 119, 433) and by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8,

¹ Kurtz, p. 313. See further, Koch, J., p. 29, De proverbiis apud Aesch. Soph. Eurip., Königsberg, 1887.

² Preuss, p. 77, De bimestris dissoluti apud scriptores Romanos usu sollemni, Edenkoben, 1881.

5 (M. 199, 722 A); cf. Cassiod. var. 7, 5, 6 manus larga artium nutrit ingenia.

ARS 4, p. 38. Ovid trist. 2, 450 seque sua miserum nunc ait arte premi; Ovid her. 12, 18 ut caderet cultu cultor ab ipse suo; ex Pont. 2, 9, 44 quive repertorem torruit arte sua; compare her. 11, 72 et indicio proditur ille suo; Hier. ep. 133, 11 qui si iratus fuerit atque rescripserit, suo quasi mus prodetur indicio; Ovid her. 12, 38; Ambros. ep. 2, 13 maledicus autem suis artibus praecipitatur.

ARS 6. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 10, 1 Symmachianum illud te cogitare par fuerat: ut vera laus ornat, ita falsa castigat; Caes. Arelat. hom. 25 illam sententiam saecularem . . . ut vera laus ornat, ita falsa castigat; Pelag. pap. ep. 8; Henr. Rem. ep. 20 (M. 196, 1577 A) illud philosophicum quia, sicut vera laus ornat, ita falsa castigat.

ARTICULUS 2, Szel., p. 19. Cic. Quinct. 19 in ipso articulo temporis; Ammian. Marcell. 16, 12, 37 in ipso proeliorum articulo; Symmach. ep. 2, 76, 2 sub ipso articulo muneris indigemus; Eugipp. vit. S. Sev. 1, 5 in ipso discriminis articulo; Innocent. pap. ep. 43 (M. 20, 612) ipso temporis articulo; Petr. Dam. ep. 4, 8, 111 (M. 144, 310) ipso temporis articulo. Hier. ep. 11, 25 (M. 22, 345) says, in hoc necessitatis articulo, an expression that is very common in the Patrologia, especially in Ioh. Sar. and Steph. Torn.

AS 1, p. 39. Sen. ep. 95, 59 sestertio nummo aestimanda sint.

AS 2, p. 39. Sidon. Apoll. c. 14, pref. 2 non ad assem . . . hinc posse disserere; ep. 1, 11, 7 ex asse persolvo; ep. 3, 14, 2; 4, 18, 1; 6, 11, 1; 6, 12, 8; 7, 2, 9; 8, 6, 9; 9, 2, 1; 9, 3, 7; 9, 14, 2; Avit. Vienn. ep. 83, p. 241, 10 (Chev.) vobis porro si cordi est, facta de nobis ex asse iactura; Servat. Lup. ep. 3, 6 (M. 119, 438 A) expectationem nostram ex asse frustrata est.

ASINUS 1, p. 40. Boeth. consol. phil. 4, 3, 61 (Peip.) stupidus torpit? asinum vivit. Diogen. 6, 73 *Midas δρου βρα*, the Greek proverb removed from Persius' satire by Cornutus; see schol. to sat. 1, 121; Hier. ep. 125, 18.

ASINUS 5, p. 41. Petr. Cell. ep. 165 (M. 202, 608 C) mihi merito illud proverbium ascribatur, quo dicitur, onos lyras, id est, asinus ad lyram; Varro Sat. Menipp., p. 179, 6 (Riese) *δρος λύρα*; testam. 4, p. 229, 2 (R.); Hier. ep. 61, 4 verum est illud apud Graecos proverbium, *δρος λύρα*.

ASINUS 7, p. 41. See Crusius, Herondas, p. 65.

ASINUS 9, p. 42. Mart. 1, 79, 3 *si res et causae desunt, agis, Attale, mulas.* These words of Martial should be taken in connection with Cic. de orat. 2, 64, 258, where Scipio tells Asellus, after his boast, 'agas asellum.' Otto seems to be at a loss for an explanation that will give complete satisfaction. By comparing the two passages, we note that the proverb is applied in each instance to men who have done a little of everything. But one task reminds—a difficult one for anybody—to drive asses; compare Hor. sat. 1, 1, 90 *infelix operam perdes, ut siquis asellum | in campo doceat parentem currere frenis*; Ovid am. 2, 7, 15 *ut auritus miserandae sortis asellus | adsiduo domitus verbere lentus eat.* Asellus has travelled with 'adoria plena' through all provinces—his last and greatest task is to learn to control an ass—himself. Attalus is so very clever that he can even drive asses—the only thing left for him to do is 'animam agere.' See also the remarks of Crusius, Herondas, p. 60.

[**ASPIS.** Commod. instruc. 2, 9, 19 *facti vel ut aspides surdi, 'deaf as an adder'*; Ennod., p. 72, 25 (Vog.) *credo more aspidis clausa, ut aiunt, aure transivit*; Hier. ep. 139, 1.]

ATTICUS 1, p. 44. Symmach. ep. 1, 23, 1 *Atticis salibus*; Fulgent. M. 1, 3, p. 3, 17 (Helm) *Attica saporante salsura*; Verg. catal. 9 (11), 62 *Graios sales*; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 855 D) *vel ut Atticis salibus sint aspersae.* To Otto's note add Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 2, 6 *elegantiam Graecam*; Hier. adv. Rufin. 2, 11 *mira eloquentia et Attico flore variata.*

ATTICUS 3. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 6, 9 *Athenis loquacior*; see Woelfflin, ALL. 7, 144.

ATTONDERE, p. 45. For Greek examples see Schmidt, p. 109; compare also Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 9 (M. 199, 562 B) *sed nec istud ad unguem resecandum est*; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 9, 5 (v. 26) *crinibus ad cutem recisis.*

AUDIRE, p. 45. Petr. Blesen. ep. 92 (M. 207, 289 D) *nam si pergit dicere quae vult, audiet quae non vult* (cf. Ter. Andr. 920).

AURA 2. Ovid rem. am. 808 *lenis alit flammas, grandior aura necat*, cited by Phil. ad. Thom. Cant., Foliot ep. 480 (M. 190, 1045 D), sounds proverbial.

AUREUS, p. 46. Commod. instruc. 1, 34, 18 *aurea post fata veniet tibi saecula*; Ennod. ep. 9, 27, p. 249, 5 (H.) *rem aurei saeculi . . . nescirem*; p. 286, 13 *aurei bona saeculi . . . amplificet*; Symmach. orat. in Grat. 3, 9 *iamdudum aureum saeculum currunt fusa Parcarum*; CIL. 3, 735 (Carm. Epigr. 285, 2 B.) *aurea saecula*

gerit, qui portam construit auro; Claudian. 3, 51 en aurea nascitur aetas; incert. in Caes. Rom. 6, 2 (Frag. Poet. Rom., Baehr., p. 379) aurea saecula volens; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 762 (M. 199, 981 D) et redeunt aurea secla patrum; Adam. Pers. ep. 8 (M. 211, 605) ubi enim coelestis sapientiae splendor rutilat . . . aurea sunt ibi saecula; for Greek parallels see Tribukait, p. 44.

AURIS 1, p. 47. Nicol. Clar. ep. 15 (M. 196, 1610 A) si in utramque aurem valeas obdormire.

AURIS 2, p. 47. Hor. epod. 17, 53 quid obseratis auribus fundis preces? Ovid ex Pont. 2, 9, 25 Iuppiter oranti surdas si praebeat auris; Orest. trag. 778 surdis tamen auribus inquit; Paulin. Nol. c. 10, 114 surda vocas et nulla rogas; Gaudent. Brix. serm. 13, 317 (M. 20, 938) surdis auribus precantem pauperem praeterit; Aesch. sept. 202 *ἡκουσας ἢ οὐκ ἡκουσας ἢ κωφῇ λέγω*; Greg. Cypr. 3, 32 *παρὰ κωφῆ διαλέγη*; see Leutsch's note and J. Koch, p. 28, for further Greek parallels; compare also Sen. ep. 29, 1 si quis surdos obiurget.

AURIS 4, p. 48. Paulin. Nol. ep. 49, 3 vellicata blande auricula; ep. 49, 7 aurem vellit; ep. 49, 14.

AURIS 5, p. 49. Plaut. Rud. 1293 suo mihi hic sermone arrexit auris; Sen. ep. 108, 39 auribus erectis curiosisque audienda; d. 7, 23, 5; ep. 68, 9; Sidon. Apoll. c. 16, 4 auritos erexit carmine muros; Cypr. ep. ad Fortun. 4 (M. 4, 680 A) inde aures erigantur; Diogen. Vindob. 3, 97 *ὡς ἐν ἰστῶσι*, and Leutsch's note.

AURIS 7, Sonny, ALL. 8, 485. Calp. ecl. 4, 148 obesis auribus apta.

[AURIS 9. Plaut. Mil. 774 perpurigatis damus tibi ambo operam auribus; Pers. 5, 63 iuvenum purgatas inseris aures; Hor. ep. 1, 1, 7 est mihi purgatam crebro qui personet aurem; compare Pers. 1, 126 vaporata aure, and see Leutsch to Macar. 5, 37.]

AURUM 1, p. 49. Ovid a. a. 2, 299 pretiosior auro; am. 3, 8, 3; Sen. ep. 73, 5 auro pensanda; Claudian. 26, 607; Maxim. eleg. 1, 19 virtus fulvo pretiosior auro; schol. Pers. 1, 53 citrum pretiosum notabatur et auro comparandum. The simile is very frequently employed in mediaeval Latin; Maxim. Taur. hom. 82 (M. 57, 432) quae bona omnia auro magis sunt pretiosa; Columban. mon. 189 (M. 80, 291) amor est pretiosior auro; Alcuin ep. 175 (M. 100, 445); poet. Carol. 1, p. 281, N. 62, 187, and 1, p. 304, N. 86, 11; Petr. Dam. serm. 12, 58 (M. 144, 566); Othlo dial. 50 (M. 146, 131 B); lib. prov. 5 (309 D); Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 3 (M. 189, 190 A); 3, 17 (321 D); 4, 35 (365 D); Foliot ep. 197 (M. 190, 906 D);

ep. 212 (968 A); Petr. Cell. ep. 159 (M. 202, 604 B); Philip. Harv. ep. 14 (M. 203, 121 D). Plin. ep. 10, 39 (48), 6 substitutes *pecunia*, omni pecunia pretiosius; similarly *thesauro*, Apul. d. Plat. 2, 21; Cassiod. var. 5, 4, 2; Petr. Ven. ep. 4, 39 (M. 189, 373 A); with *gaza*, poet. Carol. 2, p. 359, D. 10, 3;¹ for Greek parallels see J. Koch, p. 30, and cf. *gemma*.

AURUM 5, p. 49. Valerian. hom. 6 (M. 52, 117 D) auri fames; Alcuin ep. 121 (M. 100, 356 A) sed quid non efficit auri sacra fames; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 15 (M. 199, 774 C) auri sacra fames; for Gregor. Turon. see Bonnet, p. 50, n. 3²; compare Maxim. eleg. 3, 73 auri caecus amor; Columban. c. 3, 32 (M. 80, 292) auri dira cupido; Alcuin ep. 35 (M. 100, 192 B) quid enim auri insana cupido non subvertit boni? cf. Prudent. ham. 149 improba mors, quid non mortalia pectora cogis?

AURUM 6, p. 50. Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 21, 46 (M. 144, 249) habens enim, ut aiunt rustici, pugillum aureum frangis murum ferreum; compare Ovid am. 3, 8, 29 nihil esse potentius auro; for a similar idea in Greek, Diogen. 4, 21 *δάρπα θεοῦς κείθει*; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 2, 83, with Leutsch's note; Macar. 3, 43; Eustath. Il. 708, 61.³

AURUM 7. Venant. Fort. c. 4, 4, 14 pulchrius est auro corde probatus homo; Orest. trag. 330 pulchrum sane aurum, sed femina pulchrior auro. See *aurum* 1.

AVARUS 3, p. 51. Boeth. consol. phil. 3, 3 taceo quod naturae minimum, quod avaritiae nihil satis est; compare Varro, Eumen. 20 (Riese); Ps.-Baeda prov. lib. (M. 90, 1110) semper avarus eget, hunc nulla pecunia replet.

AVIS 1, p. 51. Plin. n. h. 9, 20 ocior volucre; Angilbert. de Car. Magn., v. 295 (Poet. Carol. 1, p. 373 D.) ocior aligeris avibus; Auson. ep. 35 (21), 22; Sil. Ital. 15, 413; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 457.

AVIS 2, p. 51. Columban. ep. 5 (M. 80, 274 C) rara avis; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 11 (M. 199, 751 B) suavis uxor, quae tamen rara avis est (citing Hieronymus); Polycrat. 1, 6 (403 C) quandoquidem haec rara avis est; 8, 11 (753 B), quoting Iuven. 6, 165; Petr. Bles. ep. 175 (M. 207, 470 A); Hildebert. carm. misc. 1322 (M. 171, 1394 C) mulier corvo sit rarior albo.

BALAENA. Aldhelm de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 199) grandior quam ballena. Such a simile may have existed easily in earlier

¹ Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 459.

² Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, Paris, 1890.

³ Kurtz, p. 311.

times; compare Iuv. 10, 14 quanto delphinis ballaena Britannica maior.

BELLEROPHON 2, as a type of horseman. Hor. c. 3, 12, 8 eques ipso melior Bellerophonte; Apul. met. 7, 26 meum vero Bellerophontem.¹

BELLUM 1, p. 54. Caecil. Balb. 141 o beatam civitatem, pace quae bellum timet; compare Cassiod. var. 1, 40 discat miles in otio quod perficere possit in bello; Sen. ep. 18, 6 quem in ipsa re trepidare nolueris, ante rem exerceas.

BENEFICIUM 1, p. 55. Caecil. Balb. sent. 48 dat gratius beneficium, qui dat celerius; Augustin. ep. 150, 1 (M. 33, 645) tanto gratius, quanto citius; compare Ioh. Sar. ep. 260 (M. 199, 301 D) ut philosophus testis est, bis emitur, cum rogatur; sent. Varr. 15 (Riese) extorquere est plus quam semel rogare; compare Sen. ben. 3, 8, 4 ut plus praestaturus fuerit, si cito negasset.

BENEFICIUM 3. Nicol. Clar. ep. 11 (M. 196, 1608) vetus proverbium est et veterum ore celebrata sententia: beneficiorum memoria labilis est, iniuriarum vero tenax.

BESTIA 1, p. 55. Ps.-Lactant. de mort. persec. 2, 7 mala bestia; 25, 1; for *belua* as a term of reproach see Plaut. Most. 607, Liv. 7, 10, 3; Sen. d. 5, 19, 3; cf. Oros. 7, 4, 7.

BESTIA 4. Claudian. 11, 26 quis beluarum corde furentior? 18, 183; Arnob. adv. nat. 7, 9, p. 244, 2 (Reiff.) ferocitate transiliunt beluas; Paulin. Aquil. ep. ad Heist. (M. 99, 183 A) crudelior omni bestia; Alcuin vit. S. Will. 9, 187 (M. 101, 699 C) homo omni fera crudelior; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 159, 243 (M. 211, 447) atrociores omni bestia; compare Sen. ep. 107, 7 homo perniciosior feris omnibus; Anthol. Pal. 11, 348, 1 *θηρῶν βροτῆ μάλλον ἀνήμερε*.

BESTIA 5. Prudent. c. Symmach. 2, 816 sed tantum distant Romana et barbara, quantum | quadrupes abiuncta est bipedi; Nicol. Clar. ep. 56 (M. 196, 1651 B) vetus enim proverbium est et ore veterum celebrata sententia: quantum a belluis homines, tantum distant a laicis litterati.

BIPES, p. 56. Iuven. 9, 92 alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum.

[BIS. Plaut. Truc. 46 bis perit amator; Phaedr. 1, 21, 12 quod ferre cogor, certe bis videor mori; Ioh. Sar. ep. 91 (M. 199, 83 B) bis exsulat, qui domi exsulat; Publil. Syr. 50 (F.) bis una in morte alieno est arbitrio mori; 66 bis interimitur qui suis armis

¹For the use of the name in Greek proverbs see M. Wiesenthal, p. 14, De nominibus propriis quae Graecis in proverbii fuerunt, Barmen, 1895; Schmidt, p. 51.

perit; act. inst. arch. Rom. 1876, p. 233 (Carm. Epigr. 945, 2 B.) quis] quis amat, valeat, pereat qui nescit amare, | bis tanto pereat quisquis amare vetat; CIL. 4, 1173 (Carm. Epigr. 946 B.). This hyperbole appears to have been quasi-proverbial; see also Plaut. Most. 375 PHIL. disperii. CA. bis peristi? qui potest?]

BONUS 4. Ovid her. 20 (21), 38 et proprio vulneror ipsa bono; fast. 5, 6 Copiaque ipsa nocet; Ovid a. a. 3, 584 saepe perit ventis obruta cumba suis; cf. *ager* 1.

BOS 4, p. 58. Weyman, ALL. 8, 25, cites Dümmler. The passages in Alcuin are ep. 75 (M. 100, 253 A); ep. 169 (441 D).

BRITANNIA, as remote. Mart. 11, 3, 5 dicitur et nostros cantare Britannia versus; Claudian. 5, 149 extremos ultra volitat gens si qua Britannos; compare *Thyle*, Otto, p. 348.

BRUMA, p. 59. Ovid rem. am. 492 frigidior glacie; her. 1, 22; ex Pont. 3, 4, 33; Petron. epigr. 107, 3 (PLM. 4, 101 Baehr.) quid nive frigidius? Aldh. de sept. et de metr. 14 D (M. 89, 198) frigidior brumis; Anselm Cant. ep. 1, 76 (M. 158, 1145 C) cor . . . glacie frigidius; Leonidas of Tarentum, Anthol. Pal. 16, 230, 6 *ῥάμα, βορειαίης ψυχρότερον νιφάδος*.

BRUTUS. The consulship of Brutus was a symbol of antiquity; Mart. 10, 39, 1 consule te Bruto . . . natam; 11, 44, 1 Bruto consule natus; compare *Numa*.

BUCCA 1, p. 59. Petr. Dam. ep. 5, 1, 139 (M. 144, 336) rustice proloquar et, ut ipsi dicunt, quicquid in buccam venerit, negliger enter effundam; Gelas. I. adv. Androm. 1, p. 453, 21 (Günther).

BUCCA 2. Lucian, Icarom. 25¹; Fritsche on Hor. sat. 1, 1, 21.

BULLA, p. 59. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, p. 126.

BUXUM. Ovid met. 4, 134 oraque buxo | pallidiora; met. 11, 417; Mart. 12, 32, 8 pallidus magis buxo; Priap. 32, 2; Apul. met. 8, 21 buxanti pallore; 9, 30 lurere buxero; Nemes. ecl. 2, 41 pallidior buxo; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 458.

CACOETHES. Juvenal's *scribendi cacoethes* appears as a citation in Ioh. Sar. ep. 247 (M. 199, 291 B); enthet. 1501 (997 B).

CACUMEN. Sen. ep. 124, 8 cacumen radice loco ponis; compare ben. 4, 2, 3 ista vero confusio est . . . primis postrema praeferre. The expression may have been proverbial.

CAECUS 1, p. 60. Sen. ep. 81, 25 manifestum etiam coniventi; Augustin. ep. 51, 5 (M. 33, 193) ea quae oculos etiam caecos

¹ E. Rowe, p. 16, Quaeritur quo iure Horatius in satiris Menippum imitatus esse dicatur, Halle, 1888.

feriunt, intuere; cf. Plat. symp. 204 B δῆλον, εἶφη, τοῦτό γε ἦδη καὶ παιδί; Euthyd. 279 D; Eustath. Il. 1591, 46.¹

CAECUS 2, p. 60. Alan. Insul. lib. par. 4 (M. 210, 589 B) caecus prohibetur ducere caecum; Planud. 254 (252) χειραγωγεί ὁ τυφλὸς τὸν μὴ βλέποντα; see Crusius, Rhein. Mus. 42, 423.

CAECUS 4. Commod. carm. apol. 76 et lumen offerimus caecis sine causa praebentes; Ruric. ep. 2, 26, p. 410, 23 (Eng.) sine causa enim solis ortum caecus expectat; cf. Paul. Emerit. vit. patr. 12 (M. 80, 147) sed quid caeco prodesse poterat iubar splendidissimum solis?

CAECUS 5. Avit. Vienn. ep. 87, p. 267, 20 (Chev.) curari non potest quem caecum ire delectat; compare our English proverb, 'There are none so blind as those who won't see'; cf. Hier. ep. 48, 5 rogo, quae est ista contentio claudere oculos nec apertissimum lumen aspicere?

CAELUM 1, p. 60. Sulpic. 11, 3 (PLM. 5, 100 B.) et summa in imum vertit ac versa erigit.

CAELUM 3, p. 61. Petr. Bles. ep. 88 (M. 207, 276 C) de caelo in caenum; cf. Ps. Venant. Fort. de laud. Mar. 342 de limo in caelum.

CAELUM 3, p. 61, n. Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1636 A) partem animae meae receptam in caelum, partem relictam in caeno; Ioh. Sar. ep. 81 (M. 199, 68 C) caput quod in caelum erigitur, non aspernatur pedem, qui versatur in caeno.

CAELUM 6, p. 61. Hor. ep. 1, 11, 27 is cited frequently in mediaeval Latin; Othlo lib. prov. 3 (M. 146, 306 D); Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1094); Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 44 (M. 189, 267 A); ep. 6, 47 (470 A).

CAELUM 7, p. 61. Compare with Hor. c. 3, 3, 7, Symmach. ep. 1, 3, 4 sed fractae opes infractos animos repererunt; Byzant. prov. 45 ὁ κόσμος ἐποντίζετο, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ στολίζετο.² Hor. c. 3, 3, 7 is cited by Hier. ep. 118, 2.

CAELUM 8, p. 62. Tibull. 4, 13, 13 nunc licet e caelo mittatur amica Tibullo, | mittetur frustra; Liv. 22, 29, 3 Fabiana se acies repente velut caelo demissa . . . ostendit (ALL. 7, 611); Cassiod. var. 2, 40, 11 loquamur de illo lapsa caelo psalterio; Ioh. Sar. ep. 297 (M. 199, 345 D) de caelo siquidem, ut aiunt, descendit γῶπι σαυρόν; Polycrat. 7, 12 (662 C) tertium Catonem e caelo miraberis cecidisse.

¹ Kurtz, p. 311.

² Krumbacher, Sitzber. Münch. Akad. phil. hist., 1887, II, p. 70.

CAELUM 9, p. 62. Ennod. ep. 8, 5, p. 203, 23 (H.) si tales pascat, in caelis est; Placid. gloss., p. 18 (D.) caelebs enim dicitur, qui sine uxore est, quasi caelo beatus; Stat. silv. 1, 2, 213 ire polo nitidosque errare per axes | visus.

CAELUM 10, p. 63. Aetn. 227 caputque attollere caelo; Ovid ex Pont. 2, 2, 10 non ego concepi | clara mea tangi sidera posse manu; Ennod. dict. 8, p. 450, 5 (H.) in summa, ut dixi, caelum pulsat magistri opinio perfectione discipuli; Venant. Fort. vit. Hilar. 2, 3 ut pene mihi videatur aequale tam istud posse dicere quam digito caelum tangere; CIL. 8, 211 (Carm. Epigr. 1552 a, 78 B.) stat sublimis honor vicinaque nubila pulsat; Alan. Insul. praef. Anticlaud. (M. 210, 487 B) qui coelum philosophiae vertice pulsant; Theokr. 5, 144 ἐς ὄρανὸν ἔμιν ἀλεῦμαι.¹

CAELUM 11, p. 63. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 4, 5 (M. 199, 521 C) quo facto, se caelum Iovis tenere arbitratus est; compare *caelum* 9.

CAELUM 12. Hor. c. 1, 3, 38 nil mortalibus ardui est; | caelum ipsum petimus stultitia; Curt. 4, 10, 3 caelum vanis cogitationibus petere; Apul. de mund. pref., p. 287 (H.) peregrinari ausi sunt per coeli plagas; Min. Fel. Oct. 5, 6 caelum ipsum et ipsa sidera audaci cupiditate transcendimus; Iuven. 3, 78 (compare Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 662 C)) Graeculus esuriens: in caelum, iusseris, ibit; Verg. Aen. 11, 351 caelum territat armis (see Ladewig's note); Tibull. 1, 10, 60 e caelo deripit ille deos (see Wunderlich ad loc.); Propert. 2, 32, 50 tu prius et fluctus poteris siccare marinos | altaque mortali deripere astra manu; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 56, 73 (M. 211, 351) de numero sunt eorum qui violenti diripiunt caelum. Crusius, Herondas, p. 96, cites the Greek proverb ἐς οὐρανὸν τοξεύειν (Zenob. 3, 46) as a symbol of useless daring; compare Sen. d. 7, 27, 1 nam cum in caelum insanitis . . . operam perditis; d. 6, 18, 7 videbis nihil humanae audaciae intemptatum.

CAELUM 13. Optat. Mil. ep. 3, 3, p. 80, 7 (Ziwsa) illud enim, quod ab eo petebatur, adhuc in caelo erat, et insipientis esset huius rei quasi mercedem accipere, quam nondum habuit in potestate; compare *aer* 1, Otto, p. 6.

CAELUM 14. Macrobr. sat. 5, 13, 32 cum res aliqua a terra in caelum nota sit; compare Paulin. Nol. ep. 8, 3, p. 50, v. 63 (H.) quanta etenim caelo ac terris distantia.

¹ A. Baar, p. 10, Sprichwörter und sentenzen aus den griech. idyllendichtern, Götz, 1887.

CAELUM 15. Ovid fast. 2, 138 quodcumque est alto sub Iove, Caesar habet; Apul. flor. 22, 102 quicquid sub caelo divitiarum est; Euseb. Pamphil. vit. Constant. 2, 22 (M. 8, 44 A) quale nulla umquam sub caelo vidisset aetas; Petr. Cell. ep. 156 (M. 202, 599 D) de omni gente quae sub caelo est; Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 584 D) nihil est quod sit sub caelo carius emptum; compare Prudent. cath. 915 quaque in his vigeat sub alto solis et lunae globo; Hrosuitha Mon. com. Gall. 2, 1 (M. 137, 989 C) in aestimatione aeternae vitae flocci facio quicquid habetur sub sole.

CAELUM 16. Gell. 13, 31, 1 homo inepte gloriosus, tamquam unus esset in omni caelo saturarum M. Varronis enarrator.¹

CAENUM 2, p. 63. Alcuin ep. 118 (M. 100, 352 C) qui te de stercore erexit; Commodian. instruc. 2, 20, 1 de cloaca levatus. With the Greek phrase *ἐν βορβόρῳ κείσθαι* compare Sen. ep. 94, 58 involuta caeno suo iacent; Hier. ep. 51, 7 per has in caenum demersi sunt peccatorum; ep. 147, 9 totus in caeno iaces.

CALCARE, p. 64. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 3, 27 sed et insultare iacenti te mihi fama refert; trist. 2, 571 nec mihi credibile est, quemquam insultasse iacenti; CIL. 6, 28695 (Carm. Epigr. 1145, 1 B.) te rogo, praeteries, ut parcas calcare iacente; CIL. 6, 29947; Meleagr. Anthol. Pal. 12, 48, 1 *κείμαι· λὰξ ἐπίβαινε κατ' αὐχένος, ἄγριε δαίμων*; with the thought compare Petron. 128 noli suggillare miserias, 'Don't hit a man when he's down.' See *iacere*.

CALCHAS, as a stock name for a soothsayer. Plaut. Merc. 945 Calchas iste quidem Zacynthiust; Anth. Pal. 7, 688, 1 *δύο κάλχαρες*; see further Wiesenthal, p. 51.

[CALCHAS 2. Plaut. Men. 748 novi cum Calcha simul; | eodem die illum vidi quo te ante hunc diem.]

CALCULUS 1, p. 64. Petr. Bles. ep. 151 (M. 207, 442 C) omnes dies meos meliore lapillo . . . computabam. On the general idea see Tibull. 1, 3, 93 aurora candida; Petron. 127, v. 7 candidiorque dies secreto favit amori; Ovid ex Pont. 4, 4, 18 candidus et felix proximus annus erit; Stat. silv. 1, 2, 24 ergo dies aderat Parcarum conditus albo | vellere; Sidon. Apoll. c. 14, 1 prosper conubio dies coruscat, | quem Clotho niveis benigna pensis | . . . signet; Ovid a. a. 1, 418 atra dies; compare Macar. 5, 51 *λευκή ἡμέρα*; see H. Koch, II, p. 24, for Greek parallels.

[CALIDUS 1, p. 65. For a similar use of the adjective compare Plaut. Mil. 226. cedo calidum consilium cito; Epid. 141 quadriginta minis | celeriter calidis; 283 tum tu igitur calide, quicquid

¹O. Gorges, p. 70, De sermonis Gelliani proprietatibus, Halle, 1883.

acturu's, age; Cic. offic. 1, 24, 82 calida consilia; de invent. 2, 9, 28.]

CALX 2, p. 66. Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 7 (M. 23, 484 B) velut si quis pugnis aliquem calcibusque collidens . . . dicat ei; Sangall. gloss. 912, M. 145 (Warren) mulcat: pugnis vel calcibus cedit (= caedit).

CALX 3, p. 66. Ennod. ep. 1, 14, p. 25, 2 (H.) quis ad calcem perductas anxietates suas reparat? Boeth. contr. Eutychn. et Nest. pref., p. 188, 49 (Peiper) ubi ad calcem ducta constiterint; Eustath. Il. 802, 14 *ἐκ βαλβίδων*.¹ For life as a race-course see Crusius, Herond., p. 165.

CAMELUS 2. Apul. met. 7, 14 faenumque camelo Bactrinae sufficiens apponi, sounds proverbial.

CAMILLUS, p. 68. Propert. 3, 9, 31 magnos aequabunt ista Camillos | iudicia; Sid. Apoll. ep. 8, 8, 2 Serranorum aemulus et Camillorum; Ennod., p. 327, 15 (H.); Hier. ep. 58, 5 Camillos, Fabricios.

CANIS 1, p. 68. Hor. sat. 1, 7, 25 Canem illum, with a play on the word as in *Regem*, v. 35; Paulin. Nol. ep. 13, 17, p. 98, 12 (H.) isti verius dicendi canes; for Greek parallels, J. Koch, p. 16.

CANIS 3, p. 69. Hier. adv. Helv. 22 (M. 23, 216 B) caninam facundiam; ep. 144, 1; Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 D); 12 (658 D) ac secundum Appium caninam videamur exercere facundiam; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 28 (M. 199, 634 D) et me in eos velle, ut dici solet, caninam facundiam exercere.

CANIS 9, p. 70. Iuven. 15, 159 parcit | cognatis maculis similis fera; schol. ad loc. id est, nec serpens serpentem comedit; Hor. epod. 7, 11 neque hic lupis mos nec fuit leonibus, | numquam nisi in dispar feris (cited by Otto, *ursus* 3); Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 21, 49 (M. 144, 252) strix malefica, etiamsi alienam sanguinem fundit, suis tamen pignoribus parcit; Macar. 5, 36; for Greek parallels, J. Koch, p. 20.

CANIS 11, p. 71. Mart. 5, 44, 8 captus es unctiore mensa | et maior rapuit canem culina, according to Friedländer is a probable reminiscence of Hor. sat. 2, 5, 83, which is also cited by Petr. Bles. ep. 15 (M. 207, 55 B); Alan. de Insul. (M. 210, 581 C) non leviter corio canis abstrahetur ab uncto; Alciphr. 3, 47 *οὐδὲ γὰρ κύων σκοτοτραγεῖν μαθοῦσα τῆς τέχνης ἐπιλήσεται*; see Barta, l. c., p. 24; Schmidt, p. 82; Tribukait, p. 31.

¹ Kurtz, p. 311.

CANOPUS, as a place of loose morals. Iuven. 15, 46 sed luxuria, quantum ipse notavi, | barbara famoso non cedit turba Canopo; 6, 84 et mores urbis damnante Canopo; Sen. ep. 51, 3 quamvis neminem Canopus esse frugi vetet.

CAPER 2, p. 73. Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 382 B) ne foveat litem lana caprina diu; Polycrat. 7, 9 (653 D) paratus et de lana caprina contendere, credens inopinabile; enthet. 182 (969 B) cui longam litem lana caprina facit.

CAPILLUS 2, p. 74. Crusius, Herond., p. 102, connects the remark with the wiping of hands on the hair spoken of in Petron. 27 and 57.

CAPITOL. Verg. Aen. 9, 448 dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum | accolet (cited by Sen. ep. 21, 5); Stat. silv. 1, 6, 101 dum stabit tua Roma dumque terris | quod reddis Capitolium manebit; cf. Iuven. 9, 131 numquam . . . derit amicus | stantibus et salvis his collibus.

CAPUT 4, p. 75. Plaut. Rud. 885 isti capiti dicito; Sen. ben. 4, 31, 4 quicquid, inquit, mali dixi, mihi et capiti meo; cf. d. 6, 9, 4.

CAPUT 5. Flav. Vopsic. Tac. 5, 2 Severus dixit, caput imperare non pedes, has the sound of a proverbial expression.

CAR, p. 75. For the contempt in which the Carians were held compare Diogen. 6, 24 Ἄνδοι πονηροί, δεύτεροι δ' Αἰγύπτιοι, τρίτοι δὲ πάντων Κάρης ἕξωλίστατοι; Plat. Lach. 187 B; Euthyd. 285 B¹; see J. Koch, p. 38.

CARDO, p. 76. Sen. ben. 4, 22, 1 in illo tamen cardine positi; compare *articulus* 2.

CATILINA (compare *Cato*). Sid. Apoll. ep. 2, 1, 1 rediit iste Catilina saeculi nostri; Sen. d. 6, 20, 5 tantum Catilinarum; d. 10, 5, 1 M. Cicero inter Catilinas²; Prudent. in Symmach. 1, 529 multos Catilinas | ille domo pepulit; Hier. ep. 138, 1.

CATO 1, p. 78. Sen. d. 6, 25, 2 excipit illum coetus sacer, Scipiones Catonesque; Sen. rhet. controv. 10, 1, 8 innocentior Catone; Augurinus in Plin. ep. 4, 27, 4 ille, o, Plinius, ille quot Catones; Sid. Apoll. c. 2, 474 pugnaces ego pauper laudo Catones; Fulgent. M. 1, 15 Catonum rigores; Cassiod. var. 1, 27, 4; 2, 3, 4 fuit quidam nostrorum temporum Cato; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 21 (M. 199, 691 B) Catone rigidior; Alan. Insul. (M. 210, 583 C) si Cato sis, et vis in candida vertere nigra, | curia sit curae.

¹ E. Grünwald, p. 8, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche redensarten bei Plato, Berlin, 1893.

² See also Woelfflin, ALL. 9, 458.

CENA, p. 80. Theokr. 7, 24 ἢ μετὰ δαῖτ' ἀκλῆτος ἐπειγεις; see Tribukait, p. 56.

CENSORIUS, p. 80. Ammian. Marcell. 18, 1, 4 inusitato censorio vigore; Sid. Apoll. ep. 8, 3, 5 inter alabastra censorium. For a similar use in Greek of Ἀρεσπαγίτης see Schmidt, p. 101.

CENTO, p. 80. See Crusius, Herond., p. 149.

CERA 1, p. 80. Iuven. 7, 237 mores teneros ceu pollice ducat, | ut si quis cera voltum facit; Ovid met. 10, 284 ut . . . sole | cera remollescit.

CERA 4, as a symbol of whiteness. Ovid ex Pont. 1, 10, 28 membraque sunt cera pallidiora nova; Hor. c. 1, 13, 2 cerea Telephi | laudas bracchia; see Crusius, Herond., p. 133.

CERTUS 1, p. 81. Lucan epigr. Saturn. (Baehr., Frag. Poet. Rom., p. 367) nemo nimis cupide sibi rem desideret ullam, | ne, cum plus cupiat, perdat et hoc quod habet; Eumen. panegr. Constant. 15 (M. 8, 633 C) ut praesentibus careant, dum futura prospectant; Walter Burley de vit. et mor. phil. et poet. plurimi sua amittunt dum aliena appetunt (Haupt, Philol. 3, 377, No. 26); compare Sen. d. 10, 9, 1 expectatio, quae pendit ex crastino, perdit hodiernum, where the alliteration should be noted; append. prov. 4, 7; Stob. flor. 10, 69 Δημοκρίτου τοῦ πλείονος ἐπιθυμίη, τὸ παρὲν ἀπόλλυσι; schol. Theokr. 11, 75.¹

CERTUS 2, p. 81. Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 48, p. 85, 28 (Reiff.) omni vero verissimum est certoque certissimum²; dig. 42, 8, 10, 14; Ambros. ep. ad Ephes. 5; sermo Leoni Magn. adscript. 20, 3; Thom. Cant. ep. 25 (M. 190, 477 A) certo certius est; Ioh. Sar. ep. 222 (M. 199, 250 A) certo autem certius est; Script. Lango-bard., p. 455, 26 certo certius teneant; 456, 12. Such expressions are merely due to colloquial intensity; compare Plaut. Poen. 991 Nullus mest hodie Poenus Poenior; 1290 atritate atrior multo ut siet; Capt. 150 tibi ille unicus, mi etiam unico magis unicus; see further Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 449.

CERVUS 1, p. 81. Compare Auson. ecl. 5, 4, p. 93 (Peiper) et quater egreditur cornicis, saecula cervus; compare *cornix* 1.

CERVUS 2, p. 81. Hor. c. 2, 16, 23 ocior cervis; Ennod., p. 504, 14 (H.) qui cervam velocitate praecessit; Paulin. Nol. ep. 9, 4, p. 55, 17 (H.) alacritate cervorum; Ioh. Sar. ep. 194 (M. 199, 214 B)

¹ P. Martin, p. 34, Studien auf dem gebiete des griech. sprichwortes, Plauen, 1889.

² For the use of the superlative as a comparative see Reifferscheid's index, p. 307.

Ashael velocitate cervos . . . anteibat; compare Sen. ep. 76, 8 commendat . . . velocitas cervum; Cassiod. var. 4, 1, 3. To Weyman, ALL. 8, 401, add Ps.-Cypr., p. 149, 13 (H., vol. III) clodos currere fecisti velut cervos; Ioh. Sar. ep. 250 (M. 199, 294 C) saliat sicut cervus claudus.

CHARYBDIS, p. 82. Sen. suas. 6, 5 quae Charybdis est tam vorax? append. sent. 173 (R.) Charybdis inplacata est iracundia; Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 20, 38 (M. 144, 240) postquam te huic periculoso negotio tamquam Scyllaeae voraginis fluctibus immersisti; serm. 15, 74 (583) et non, quod absit, vorago nos Syllaeae profunditatis absorbeat; Abaelard. ep. 5 (M. 178, 206 B) a quantae Charybdis voragine . . . extraxerit; ep. 1 (132 B) ne te praecipitem haec Charybdis absorbeat; Ioh. Sar. carm. de membr. (M. 199, 1006 A) dicite, quid tantam possit satiare Charybdin? ep. 322 (373 D) inter Syllam et Charybdim periculosius navigantes; Polycrat. 5, 12 (572 D) sed neminem vidi qui Syllam vitaret et Charybdim, nisi debilem aut propitium sustinuerit hostem; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 189, 291 (M. 211, 474); compare Braulio ep. 21 (M. 80, 670 B) inter scopulos tentationum et Charybdim voluptatum; for Greek parallels see J. Koch, p. 51.

CICADA 1, p. 83. Apost. 16, 37 τέττιγος εὐφωνότερος; see Tribukait, p. 21; Schmidt, p. 118.

CIMMERII, p. 83. Compare Anthol. Pal. 5, 283, 6 εἴ τις Ἐρώτων | λάτρης, νύκτας ἔχειν ἄφελε Κιμμερίων, referring to the length of the night; cf. 5, 223, 6.

CIRCE 1, p. 84. Compare Claudian. c. 22, 134 membraque Circaeis effeminat acrius herbis; 26, 441 non sine Circaeis Latonia reddidit herbis.

CIRCE 2, as a stock enchantress. Plaut. Epid. 604 hanc adserva Circam, Solis filiam; see Suidas under Κίρκη, and Wiesenthal, p. 58. The old explanation which is given to the passage in Gray's edition of the Epidicus, 'quia nec patrem nec matrem novit,' does not appear to me satisfactory. Acropolistis is a 'witch' who has skilfully conducted a very successful metamorphosis.

CLAVUS 2, p. 85. Helois. ad Abael. ep. 6 (M. 178, 213 B) ut enim insertum clavum alius expellit, sic cogitatio nova priorem excludit; Apost. 8, 52; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 3, 60 with Leutsch's note, Martin., p. 33.

CLEOPATRA. Sid. Apoll. ep. 8, 12, 8 dapes Cleopatricas; compare Otto under *Apicius*.

CLIVUS, p. 86. For the metaphorical use of the word compare

Sen. d. 7, 15, 5 illius gradu clivus iste frangendus est; Ovid rem. am. 394 is cited by Hildebert. ep. 1, 11 (M. 171, 168 C).

COLERE. Arnob. adv. nat. 3, 11, p. 119, 20 (Reiff.) quos vident et sentiunt neque se colere neque deridere, quod dicitur.

COLUMBA 1, p. 88. Ovid met. 5, 605 ut fugere accipitrem penna trepidante columbae.

COLUMBA 2, p. 88. Maecen. in Sen. ep. 114, 5 labris columbat; Petr. Cell. ep. 134 (M. 202, 579 C) praebeant columbina oscula; compare Propert. 2, 15, 27 exemplo iunctae tibi sint in amore columbae; 1, 9, 5 non me Chaoniae vincant in amore columbae.

CONFIDERE. Caecil. 248 (R.) si confidentiam adhibes, confide omnia; Sen. ep. 3, 2 si aliquem amicum existimas, cui non tantumdem credis quantum tibi, vehementer erras.

CORBIS (compare Otto under *modius*). Plaut. Bacch. 712 si id capso, geritote amicis vestris aurum corribus.

CORINTHUS. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 23 (M. 199, 622 B) frequens illud proverbium apud Graecos; frustra quis Corinthum tendit ad Laidem nisi queat, aut velit dare quae poscitur. This corresponds to the view taken of this proverb in Zenob. 5, 37 and Diogen. 7, 16; see, in general, Otto's discussion.

[CORNIX 1, p. 93. Regarding the long life of the crow see Sen. ben. 2, 29, 1 nos vincant . . . spatio aetatis corvi; Macrob. sat. 7, 5, 11; Auson. ecl. 5, 3; Friedländer on Mart. 10, 67, 5; Phaedr. append. 24, 7.]

CORNU 1, p. 93. Ovid fast. 2, 346 cornu durius; Sid. Apoll. ep. 1, 2, 3 corneum femur; ep. 3, 13, 9.

CORNU 2, p. 93. Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 C) quia et nos iuxta Flaccum didicimus litterulas . . . et de nobis dici potest; fenum habet in cornu, longe fuge; Anselm. Cant. ep. 2, 2 (M. 158, 1066 C) non habet fenum in cornu . . . sed posteriora videte; fenum habet in cauda; cauda ferit ille, cavete.

CORNU 4, p. 94. Thom. Cant. ep. 7 (M. 190, 448 D) hi sunt, pater, qui dant cornua peccatori; amic. ap. Thom. Cant. ep. 390 (730 B) cornua attulit peccatori.

CORVUS 5, Szel., p. 18. Compare Eurip. fr. 273 (N.) πτηνὰς διώκεις, ὃ τέκνον, τὰς ἑλπίδας (Apost. 12, 100); Plat. Euthyph. 4 A πτόμερόν τινα διώκεις; Aristot. metaph. 3, 5; see J. Koch, p. 20; Gildersleeve on Pers. 3, 61.

COTHURNUS 1, p. 95. H. Gölzer, p. iv,¹ cites the proverb,

¹ Gram. in Sulpic. Sev. observationes, Paris, 1883.

Gallicanus cothurnus, from Hier. ep. 58, 10, in reference to the overloaded style of Gallic writers.

CRAS 2, p. 96. Cf. Ps.-Plin. 1, 4 hodie quod est, cras non est; see Tribukait, p. 12; Baar, p. 9; Heraeus Petr., p. 37.

CRASSUS, p. 96. Cic. ad Attic. 1, 4, 3 quod si adsequor, supero Crassum divitiis; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 1171 (M. 199, 990 D) captat opes Crassus.

CREDERE 3, p. 97. Ps.-Publil. Syr. 381 (F.) utrumque vitium est nulli et credere omnibus (see Friedrich ad loc.); Hildebert. ep. 3, 34 (M. 171, 309 A) Sicut Seneca testatur, et omni et nulli credere vitium est.

CREPIDA, p. 97. Paulin. Nol. ep. 12, 3, p. 75, 18 (H.) figulo tantum in argillam suam ius est; the same idea seems to be present in Anthol. Pal. 10, 48, 1 μήποτε δουλεύσασα γυνή δέσπονα γένοιτο, | ἴστί παροϊμακόν.

CRETA, p. 98. Anthol. Pal. 7, 275, 6 Κρήτες . . . ψεύσται.

CROESUS, p. 98. Sid. Apoll. c. 9, 33 cuius non valuit rapacitatem | vel Lydi satiare gaza Croesi; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 664 C) plus effusum pecuniae, quam in omnibus divitiis suis possiderit Croesus; Phil. Harv. ep. 4 (M. 203, 33 B) divitiiae Croesi; Anth. Pal. 11, 3, 1 ἤθελον ἂν πλουτεῖν, ὡς πλούσιος ἦν ποτε Κροῖσος; for citations from Lucian see Schmidt, p. 102.

CUCURBITA 2, p. 100. See Hildebrand on Apul. m. 5, 9.

CUNABULA, p. 101. Venant. Fort. vit. S. Hilar. 1, 2 ab ipsis cunabulis; Hier. ep. 52, 4 ab incunabulis fidei; Cassiod. var. 1, 21, 1 ubi ab ipsis cunabulis commoratur; 12, 15, 2; 6, 21, 1 quanto melius in ipsis cunabulis adhuc mollia reprimere; 5, 15, 2 dum in ipsis cunabulis scelera . . . resecantur; Ethelw. to Aldh. ep. 6 (M. 89, 98 A) ab ipsis tenerrimae cunabulis infantiae; Benedict. Crisp. prooem. poem. (M. 89, 369 B) pene ab ipsis cunabulis educavi; Dud. Dec. (M. 141, 610 B) ab ipsa cunabulari vita; Foliot ep. 157 (M. 190, 861 D) notum quippe . . . satis ab ipsis fere cunabulis; Petr. Bles. ep. 94 (M. 207, 294 A) a pueritiae cunabulis; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 101, 146 (M. 211, 392) a cunabulis semper dilexistis; compare Hier. de vir. illustr. II, p. 8, 2 (Herding) hic de utero matris sanctus fuit; Paulin. to Augustin. ep. 25, 4 (M. 33, 102) segregare me ab utero matris meae; Nicol. Clar. ep. 16 (M. 196, 611 D) fere enim ab uberibus matris tuae collocatus es in sanctuarium; note also Petr. Ven. ep. 1, 34 (M. 189, 166 D) a primo, ut dicitur, foundationis lapide; ep. 4, 26 (M. 189, 357 B).

CUNEUS, p. 102. The proverb is cited by Abbo Flor. ep. 14 (M. 139, 443 A) recordare proverbii; malo arboris etc.

CURIA. Verg. Aen. 11, 380 non replenda est curia verbis; for a discussion of the proverb see Crusius, Herond., p. 137; Herond. 7, 49 ἀλλ' οὐ λόγων γάρ, φασίν, ἡ ἀγορὰ δέϊται.

CURIUS, p. 102. Add Sen. ep. 120, 19; Ennod., p. 327, 15 (H.); Claudian. c. 15, 111.

CURRERE, p. 102.¹ Sen. ep. 34, 2 sed iam currentem hortor; ep. 109, 6 nihilominus adiuvant etiam currentem hortaturi; Ennod. ep. 8, 40, p. 226, 2 (H.) stimulare currentem; Symmach. ep. 4, 20, 2 proximis facundiae calcibus urguet parentem; Novat. 19 (ALL. 11, 226) incitem paratos; Eustath. Il. 713, 59 σπείδομαι δὲ γρόνους; 1033, 4²; cf. Symmach. ep. 5, 94, 1 bona voluntas . . . non sit agitanda calcaribus; Ennod. ep. 9, 30, p. 252, 16 (H.) qui volentem coegerit, non laborat.

[CURRERE 2. Propert. 4, 7, 84 sed breve, quod currens vector ab urbe legat, sounds proverbial.]

CUTIS 1, p. 104. Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 132 Zmyrnaeae cute doctus officinae; Pers. 3, 30 is cited by Gualbert. act. 52 (M. 146, 834 B), and by Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1629 B).

CUTIS 1, n., p. 104. Sen. ep. 72, 5 sed id leve et quod summam cutem stringat; Prudent. psych. 506 vix in cute summa | praestringens paucos tenui de vulnere laedit | cuspis Avaritiae.

CUTIS 3, p. 104. Theobald. Stamp. ep. 4 (M. 163, 766 B) cuti curandae curiose studentes; Petr. Bles. ep. 94 (M. 207, 296 A) cites Hor. ep. 1, 2, 29.

CYCNUS 1, p. 104. Verg. ecl. 7, 38 Galatea . . . candidior cynnis (ALL. 6, 457).

CYCNUS 2, p. 104. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 6 (M. 199, 552 C) inter congarrientes perstrepat, veluti rabulus anser admistus oloribus; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 856 B) sed parumper in auribus vestris liceat inter olores anserem strepere; see Tribukait, p. 29.

CYCNUS 3, p. 105. With the thought compare Ovid trist. 5, 1, 11 utque iacens ripa deflere Caystrius ales | dicitur ore suam deficiente necem; Stat. silv. 2, 4, 10 non soli celebrant sua funera cygni; Lucian Tim. 47 φδικώτερον εἶναι τῶν κύκνων; Anthol. Pal. 7, 12, 2 κυκνείφ . . . στόματι; 9, 92, 2.

M. C. SUTPHEN.

¹ See O. Hauschild, De proprietatibus sermonis quae in Philippicis Ciceronis orationibus inveniuntur, dissert. Hal. VI, p. 275.

² Kurtz, p. 318.

II.—A STUDY OF THE LEYDEN MS OF NONIUS MARCELLUS.

Following the example of Mr. T. W. Allen and others, who have recently published careful studies of the chief MSS of Plato, Sophocles and Aristophanes, I will in this article attempt a detailed examination of the 'codex optimus' (L) of Nonius Marcellus, with the object of glean~~ing~~ some information about the archetype and the history of the transmission of the text.

The Leyden MS (Voss. Lat., fol. 73), of the ninth century, written in Caroline minuscules on 253 leaves, with two columns (each of 22 lines) to the page, comes from the Monastery of St. Martin at Tours and is one of the MSS selected by M. Delisle (Mém. Acad. Inscr. XXXII 29 sqq.) as a specimen of the calligraphy of Tours—that is to say, of the best work produced in the best scriptorium of all Europe. The care bestowed on this copy of the *Compendiosa Doctrina* of Nonius Marcellus is seen in the fact that the whole work, from beginning to end, has been revised by two correctors (L² and L³), who have not been content with punctuation and emendation of the text and with correction of the spelling. In the division of words between the lines they have interfered whenever Priscian's rules of syllable-division were broken. Thus on fol. 11 r. i *rec|ta* has been changed by L² to *re|ta* and on fol. 14 r. i *pub|lica* by L³ to *pu|blica*. And even, a rare example of careful calligraphy, the correct division of consonant-groups in words at other parts of the line has been indicated by subscript commas throughout the volume, e. g. (fol. 1 r.) *inhone,stis; di,ctis; indi,cretis; si,gnificatione; di,ctum; o,mnibus; sene,ctutem*, etc.

The scribes too have done their work well. All editors allow L¹—i. e. the uncorrected transcript—to be the closest reproduction of the lost archetype. The only MS that can stand beside it is the Geneva MS (Gen.), which contains only book IV, and which belongs to the end of the ninth century. The consensus of L¹ and Gen.¹ gives us unmistakably the actual text of the original, with its barbarous spellings (e. g. 382 M(ercier) 24 Hecyra] hequira L¹Gen.¹; 241 M. 33-34 absinti . . . acerbum]

absenthi . . . acervum L¹Gen.; 246 M. 31 Zephyrumque] zefeurumque L¹Gen.¹) and illiterate word-division (e. g. 258 M. 7 satin astu] saginas tu), the unemended, or not fully emended, form in which the text of our author passed from the Dark Ages into the hands of Carolingian scholars. L¹ and L² aim at adapting this to the standard of correct Latinity, but in so doing often suppress a genuine form or its trace, e. g. 443. 23 nomen habet] nominavet L¹, nominavit L corr.

It is therefore to L¹ (and in book IV to Gen.¹ also) that we must look for light on the nature and composition of the archetype of our MSS. That all MSS of Nonius come from one archetype has long been recognized from their transposition of a passage of book IV (406 M. 12—409 M. 15) to near the beginning of book I (3 M. 13). This passage of book IV appears to have filled a single leaf of the archetype. The leaf became loose and dropped out, and, instead of being put back in its proper place, was slipped in after the first leaf of the whole work. We can thus estimate the size of a page of our archetype as about a page and a half of Mercier's edition. Now we get a clue to the size of the page of the immediate original of L from a mistake by the scribe of L at 379 M. 17. After the words *iam tum religio* there follow 380 M. 41 sqq. *Verg. lib. XI multa dies* etc. The most natural explanation of this mistake, a mistake not shared by the other MSS, is that the scribe had 'skipped' a page (or leaf) of his original. The amount omitted corresponds to what we have found to be the content of a page of the archetype. This suggests at least the possibility of our archetype, which had a leaf of book IV loose, having been also the immediate original from which L was transcribed.

It is well known that the pagination of an archetype is often reproduced in a copy. Thus the Pithoean MS (P) of Juvenal is assumed to reproduce the pagination of the archetype of all the minuscule MSS, because XVI 60, the line immediately preceding the lacuna which characterized that archetype, is also in P the last line of the last page.¹ This practice was found convenient when the task of transcription was distributed among several

¹ It is a strong argument for the genuineness of the passage discovered by Mr. Winstedt in a Bodleian MS (Class. Rev. XIII 201) that its content suits the theory of its absence from our MSS being due to the accidental loss of a leaf from the archetype and not to any doubt about the authenticity of the lines.

scribes who worked simultaneously at different parts of the text. Suppose the original, of which a copy was desired, consisted of 80 pages (i. e. of 40 leaves or folia, i. e. of 5 quaternions), the first and fourth quaternions might be assigned to one monk, the second and fifth to another, the third to another; and the most certain way of ensuring that each transcriber should not find himself inconvenienced by having too much or too little parchment for his task, would be to make the three transcribe each and every page of their original exactly on one page of their transcript. This practice, more available for transcribers of poetry than of prose, has clearly not been followed by the scribe of L, if L was transcribed immediately from the archetype; for the transposed passage from book IV occupies in L not a single leaf, but three pages and one column, and the preceding part of book I, along with the index of contents and title-heading, takes up the same amount. Fol. 2 r. i ends *pausimachomum IN* and fol. 3 v. ii ends *nascitur leat*. Indeed, the calligraphic nature of L, with its large, uncramped, regular script, is inconsistent with a slavish reproduction of the form of, let us say, a Merovingian original. But that the transcription of the various parts of the original by the scribes of the Leyden MS was simultaneous there is some indication. Just before fol. 147 r., where a new hand appears, the writing of the concluding portion of the previous gathering is spaced out and straggling, so as to cover as much ground and leave as little of the page blank as possible.

The *Compendiosa Doctrina* of Nonius is, in accordance with the fashion that prevailed in works of this class in ancient times, divided into twenty books. But several of these books (or rather chapters) are of very limited extent, and one (the fourth) is of exceptional length. If divided according to bulk, the work falls naturally into three parts, the first containing books I-III, the second, book IV; the third, books V-XX. And a division of this kind, possibly due to the mere breaking up of an archetype into these three sections, is traceable in our MSS; for some (e. g. the Geneva MS) contain only book IV, others (e. g. the Florence MS) only books I-III; while others that contain the whole are clearly transcripts from different originals in these three portions (e. g. the Harleian (H) is in books I-III a transcript of the Florence MS; in book IV, of the Geneva MS; in books V-XX, of some lost original), or even (as in the case of the Paris Nonius) are, in reality, mere accidental combinations of originally distinct MSS.

It is one of the merits of the Leyden Codex that it is in all probability a whole transcript of a whole original. The transcription has been apportioned among three scribes and in this fashion:

1st scribe: foll. 1-94 r. (= pp. 1-170 M. 22 *M. Tullius*), 167 r.—252 (= pp. 365 M. 18—557 M.).

2d scribe: foll. 94 v.—146 v. (= 170 M. 22—314 M. 14 *multum*).

3d scribe: foll. 147 r.—166 v. (= 314 M. 14—364 M. 18 *conpertum est*).

In other words, the first scribe wrote book I and nearly the whole of book II (occupying some twelve quaternions), the second finished book II and wrote book III and the first half of book IV, the third wrote the third quarter of book IV; the first scribe then finished the volume. The lion's share of the work has thus been effected by the first scribe.¹ He made a separate numbering of the quaternions used by him in the second part of his task, but his numbers i, ii, iii, etc., have been altered later (by L³?), so that i becomes xxii, ii becomes xxiii, iii becomes xxiv, and so on. Near the end of the first quaternion in this second half of his labours, he omitted accidentally, through homoeoteleuton, a long passage of his original (379. 16 *Virg.*—380. 41 *libro XI*). To supply the deficiency a broad sheet (i. e. two leaves) was utilized, which had been discarded from some transcript of Priscian's Institutes, and which bore on one leaf the title-heading in gold letters: PRISCIANVS GRAMMATICVS | CVM OMNIS. On its other leaf the omitted passage of Nonius was written (in a new handwriting), and inserted in the gathering, so that the quaternion becomes a quinion, with 10 leaves instead of 8, the blank leaf being fol. 168 and the written leaf fol. 175 of our MS. I have been unable to ascertain whether this Priscian MS is still in existence.

For the sake of completeness it may be as well to give here an account of the arrangement of our MS in quaternions, although this was a mere affair of the supply of material to the scribes, and does not throw light on the nature of the archetype. (I follow the account entered by the Leyden librarian on the fly-leaf):—

Foll. 1-8 quaternio,

9-14 ternio,

¹ I think that 364 M. 18—366 M. 14 *adfigebatur*, occupying four columns, i. e. one leaf, is in the handwriting of the first scribe. But it may be in a fourth handwriting.

- Fol. 15-118 quaterniones,
 119-129 quinio + 1 fol.,
 130-137 quaternio,
 138-146 quaternio, cui unum folium (139) additum est,
 scilicet ut textus congrueret cum sequentis quaternionis contextu, qui iam conscribi coeptus erat,
 147-154 quaternio,
 155-164 quinio,
 165-166 duo folia,
 167-176 quinio,
 177 sqq. quaterniones,
 253 vacuum.

More important for us is an examination of the procedure followed in the correction of the transcript. There were, as has been mentioned, two separate correctors whose services were given to our MS. In Prof. Lucian Mueller's critical apparatus they are merged under the symbol L^2 ; and even corrections by the scribe himself are often included under this designation. Where the correction consists of a single stroke or dot or an erasure, it is often hardly possible to assign it with certainty to L^1 or L^2 or L^3 . But in the majority of cases we can distinguish fairly enough between the two correctors and keep their emendations separate from the mere correction by the scribe at the moment of transcription. The corrector, whom I call L^2 , has left us a good specimen of his handwriting on fol. 181 r. and fol. 220 v. His revision was prior to that of L^3 , for L^3 often confirms (by a dot or the like) the corrections of L^2 (e. g. 298 M. 8 *implere* L^1 , *implere* L^2 , confirmed by L^3), and in the passage added by L^2 on fol. 188 r. ii (p. 405 M. 29) L^3 changes *ho* to *hoc*.

Both are later than the rubricator, as we see from fol. 178 v., where the word *Aequales* was written *quale* by the scribe, with space left for the initial. The rubricator has supplied an initial *E* (i. e. *Equale*); but L^2 has put *A* before this, so as to make the word *Aequale*. L^3 has added a final *s*, producing *Aequales*. At 225 M. 32 L^3 has stroked out the rubricated initial *S* of *segetem* and has replaced it with a small *s*. A good specimen of the handwriting of L^3 is seen in his lengthy addition in the upper margin of fol. 202 v.

A corrector would, of course, make many emendations by his own impulse, but in the main would follow some text of the

author, either the actual text of which a transcript had been made, or another text. Our correctors seem to have taken down from the library-shelves two other copies of the text of Nonius to help them in emending the transcript which they had to revise. L² availed himself of a text like that of the Extract MSS (ACXDMO), L² of what has been called the 'doctored' text of Nonius, the text exhibited in the Wolfenbüttel Codex (V) and used by the correctors of a large number of other MSS (H² throughout, E² in IV-XX, Cant.², etc.).

The original of the Extract MSS had adapted Nonius to use as a Latin dictionary for the monastery-library, and so had provided explanations of some words which Nonius left unexplained. These additions, peculiar to the Extract MSS, are inserted in L by L²; e. g.

167. 20 Reda [vehiculum]

167. 22 Recentiorum [novorum].

In 177. 17 *Sportas*, which stood without addition in the archetype, as attested by F²VL¹, has in the Extract MSS an etymology attached: *Sportas*, aut ab spartu quasi sparteas aut ab sportando. This is added in L by L².

In 439 M. lines 18-28 *decreverint* were omitted, owing to the homoeoteleuton, by L¹. The corrector (L²) has supplied only so much of the missing passage as is found in the Extract MSS, viz. 22 *Simulare*—28 *decreverint*. Other examples of the relation between L² and the Extract MSS are:

456. 30 vivoque] uiuoque L¹ : uiuo L² (with the Extract MSS)

461. 29 amnis] amnis L¹V, etc. : animis L² (with the Extract MSS and H¹PE).

The 'doctored' text of Nonius is probably the work of some Carolingian abbot who tried to provide a readable version, altering our archetype sometimes rightly, more often wrongly, but rarely reproducing the 'ipsae litterae' of its unintelligible parts. Most of the peculiarities of this text are mere conjectures, but some are clerical errors, and a few are the result of more faithful transcription of the archetype.

In 162 M. 15 the true reading is *libro I* (so F²), but the reading of the 'doctored' text of Nonius, as represented by the Wolfenbüttel MS (V), was *libro XI*. L¹ has merely *libro*, L² has changed this to *libro XI*.

In 256 M. 1 *iuniorem* was omitted in the archetype, as is shewn by the consensus of L¹ and the Geneva MS. It is omitted also in the Extract MSS (DMO). But it was inserted in the 'doctored' text (through conjecture, apparently, for the title of Cicero's book of correspondence "ad Caesarem iuniorem" is very often mentioned). L³ has inserted the word.

In 233 M. 19 the words *iracundiam vel furorem* had been miswritten in the archetype *iracundum vel furorem* (possibly *furorum*, as the word is written by L¹). The Extract MSS rightly changed *iracundum* to *iracundiam*, the 'doctored' text changed *furorem* to *furiosum*. L¹ has *iracundum vel furorum*, L³ corrects *iracundum vel furiosum*. Other examples are:

248. 7 alescit] alescit L¹Gen., etc. : adolescit L³V, etc.

293. 49 exacuta] exacuta L¹Gen., etc. : ex hac vita VH¹ : ex ac vita L¹.

The combination, therefore, of L³ with ACXDMO or of L³ with VH¹ adds nothing of corroboration to a reading. Rather L³ should be included with ACXDMO as a group whose combined evidence gives us the reading of one original; and L³ similarly should be reckoned with VH² and (in parts) E³Cant.² as evidence for the original 'doctored' text.

That these correctors did not also use the actual original of which L is a copy can neither be proved nor disproved. L³ certainly emends and supplies omissions in parts not included in the Extract MSS; but, on the other hand, these Extract MSS may quite well have come from an original which exhibited a complete text. Indeed, there is a curious feature of our MS which suggests this.

From book VIII (fol. 221 v.) onwards the practice is followed of separating the definition from the examples by superscript symbols. These marks have been erased as far as fol. 233 v., but they are clearly seen in the subsequent pages. Now, this is the peculiarity of the Extract MSS, that, for the purpose of adapting the work of Nonius to dictionary-form, the explanation of the word is reproduced, while the examples are wholly (or mostly) omitted. In one group of MSS of this family DMO this practice of curtailment is maintained throughout, although at places (notably in the first half of book VI, where the whole text is given) the curtailment is reduced to a minimum. In the other group the whole text is presented from book VI to the end (also

at the opening of book I). If the common original was marked in some way like the Leyden MS, we can well understand how the two divergent groups arose. We thus obtain from our MS a valuable hint for the history of the transmission of the text of our author.

Another point in which L throws light on the nature of the original MS is the treatment of the lemmas, the method of indicating that a new word was subject of discussion in a new paragraph. If these head-words had been indicated by initials (rubricated or not) in the original, we can hardly imagine a calligraphic copy like L ignoring this treatment. But it is not till fol. 15 r. in L that the use of rubricated initials begins. In the earlier pages a horizontal stroke is drawn above the lemma-word by the corrector, e. g. fol. 5 r., above *Inlicere* 6 M. 15. Traces of the (at least occasional) absence of indication of the lemma in the archetype are seen in corruptions, shared by all MSS of Nonius, like *cintinnire* for *tintinnire* 40 M. 12, *tibicidas* for *cibicidas* 88 M. 8, for it is in their minuscule, not their majuscule or initial, form that the letters *c* and *t* are liable to confusion. There is one miswriting of a lemma which points to majuscule script—the corruption *gladatores* for *glaratores* (*gralatores* 'walkers on stilts'), 115 M. 18, with D for R. It may date from some proto-archetype whose whole text was in majuscules.¹

The omission of lemmas in the Extract MSS is often due to the absence of an explanation of the word treated, e. g. *adsestrix* 73 M. 29, although sometimes, as we have seen, the compiler of the original of the Extract-group has added an explanation of his own; e. g. 167. 20 Reda [vehiculum]. But undoubtedly another cause lay in the absence in the archetype of any indication of the new lemma. Thus 33 M. 10 *Pedetentim* has a small *p* and no indication of a new paragraph in L¹, and presumably this indication was lacking also in the archetype. The lemma is passed over in the Extract MSS.

(On traces in L of the use in the archetype of *c* or *caput* to indicate a new paragraph see Philologus, LV 167.)

Some peculiarities of the spelling of the archetype which are revealed to us by L¹ (and Gen.¹) have been already mentioned, such as the use of *e* for *y*. This barbarism is the cause of the erroneous reading *rex* for *Eryx* in 302 M. 33, where L¹ has *erex*,

¹ The form *glaratores* may be the form of the word actually used by Nonius, a popular form like *Phrygio* for *Phrygia*, etc.

and was probably already corrected in the archetype in 237 M. 8, where the *quid dante tyranno* of our MSS, instead of *quiddam tyranno*, seems due to a suprascript correction, ^{ty}*tyranno*. The late Latin use of *ui* for *y*, from which our name for the letter is derived, we have already found in the archetype. It has led to the corruption *virum* for *gyrum* in 252. 18, where L¹ reproduces the spelling of the archetype, *guirum*.

That the script of the archetype was minuscule we see from the confusion of letters like *cl* and *d* (e. g. 361. 6 hercle] haec de L¹, herde Gen.¹), *a* and *u* (e. g. *maliorem* L¹ for *mulierum*).

We may safely assign to the archetype some peculiar contractions, which are reproduced by L¹ and Gen.¹ (e. g. *supl* with horizontal line above for *suppliciis* in references to Cicero's Verrine oration *de suppliciis*, e. g. 271 M. 25), or of which we find clear trace in these transcripts. For example, the curious reading of L¹, *sati* for *senati*, 130 M. 10, which the corrector 'corrects' to *satis*, suggests that in the archetype the unusual contraction *s* with horizontal stroke above was used for *sen*, just as *m* with horizontal stroke above is the common contraction of *men*. And this suggestion is supported by the corruption in our MSS at 312 M. 38 sensu iacerent] sed subiacerent H¹, subiacerent LVH². Similarly *ostari* for *ostentari* in our MSS at 539 M. 2 may be due to a like contraction of the syllable *ten*. In 269 M. 35 *consentire* appears in certain MSS as *consistere*; in 392 M. 29 *evenit* appears as *evit*. In an article in *Philologus*, already referred to, I have mentioned some other contractions which may with more or less probability be ascribed to the archetype (LV 168).

I will conclude this paper by pointing out a possible feature of the archetype of which we seem to find traces in L: I mean the indication of a word by its initial letter or its first syllable merely, in cases of repetition. At 353 M. 5 sqq. we have the verb *niti* exhibited in its various meanings: *niti est conari . . . niti, fultum esse*, etc. At the second occurrence of *niti* we find merely *ni* in Gen.¹, while the verb is omitted by L¹. At 162 M. 1 we have the lemma *Permittere*, with two examples of the verb from Sisenna. In the second example: *multi praemissis armis ex summo se permitterent*, we find *perm* representing *permitterent* in L. Again at 93 M. 24 (lemma *Continuari*) L omits the verb *continuatur* in the example from Sisenna, I fancy, because *c* stood for *continuatur* in the archetype. In this way I would explain the corruption at 66 M. 4 *Excordes concordesve* (vae L¹) *ex corde*, where the

example from Cicero includes *vecordes* (vaecordes L) as well as *excordes* and *concordes*. The archetype had: *excordes concordes vae* (i. e. vaecordes). Similarly at 175. 25 sqq. the words, *Subsivum positum succedens succidaneum*, had been misinterpreted as *Subsivum, positum. Succedens, succidaneum*. In the appended example from Cicero *subsivis*, written, presumably, *s. or su.* in the archetype, has become *succedens* in our MSS. The omission of *sumet* in the Lucilius example in the lemma *Sumere* 395. 31 sqq. may be accounted for in like fashion. If this brief indication of a repeated word was really a feature of the archetype, light is thrown on the corrupt readings of our MSS in 167. 6 and 229. 13. At 408. 37, where *tangere* (with Acc. of person, Abl. of thing) in the sense of *circumvenire* 'to cheat' is illustrated by an iambic trimeter passage of Turpilus (129 Ribb.):

hoc quaero; ignoscere
istic solentne eas minoris noxias,
terum si forte quasi alias res vini cauo,

the verb *tangere* does not appear in the example. Editors have found a place for it by changing *cavo* to *tago*, although this second aorist form of *tango* is certain only in the subjunctive mood (*ne attigas, attigat*, etc.).

It may be that the omission of the verb is due to its having been represented in the archetype by its initial letter merely, in which case *cavo* may be regarded as a corruption of *cado*. The true reading may be

erum si forte, quasi alias, vini cado
tangam,

the word *res* being a gloss on *alias*, which, however, is really the adverb, 'on other occasions.'

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

W. M. LINDSAY.

III.—THE *IEPEIAI* OF HELLANICUS AND THE BURNING OF THE ARGIVE HERAEUM.¹

The testimony of Pamphila in Aulus Gellius, XV 23, to the relative ages of Hellanicus, Herodotus, and Thucydides, even though based on Apollodorus, the pupil of Aristarchus and Panaetius, may be, and probably is, factitious in its exact figures. It may have been a mnemonic device of some helpfulness to have Hellanicus sixty-five, Herodotus fifty-three, and Thucydides forty years of age at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, giving those who stop to reckon the problem out the years 496, 484, and 471 respectively as the natal years of the three great historians; but the mnemonic device must not be made to serve, and probably was never intended to serve, as an exact chronological canon, especially when authentic literary remains of the historians (such, for instance, as those preserved for us in the Scholia on Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 694 and 720) give distinct and clear chronological evidence which is at least difficult, though not impossible, to bring into harmony with the exact figures of the canon. There can be no reasonable doubt that Hellanicus described with considerable detail the events of the year 407/6 B. C., when Antigenes was Archon Eponymous at Athens, and that he did this in his *Atthis*. If we cling to the date 496 as that of his birth, then we must be prepared to allow that he was productive as a historian when past his ninetieth year. This, to be sure, is no more incredible than that Isocrates should finish his *Panathenaicus* in his ninety-seventh year, and is by no means a fatal demand upon

¹ LITERATURE.—Mueller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* I, pp. xxiii-xxxiii, 45-69.

1876: Diels, *Chronologische Untersuchungen über Apollodors Chronika*, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXI, pp. 48-54.

1876: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, in criticism of the above, *Hermes*, XI, pp. 291-4.

1888: Niese, *Die Chronik des Hellanikos*, *Hermes*, XXIII, pp. 81 ff.

1892: Eduard Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, I, pp. 117-21.

1893: Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, pp. 316-26.

1893: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen*, I, pp. 260-90; II, pp. 19 f.

1893: Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, I², pp. 151 ff.

1895: Wachsmuth, *Alte Geschichte*, pp. 510 f., 555 f.

our credulity. But it is not at all necessary to fix upon the year 496 as the exact year of his birth. The testimony of Pamphila may be not exactly, but generally true; in the words of Aulus Gellius, "Hellanicus, Herodotus, Thucydides, historiae scriptores, in isdem temporibus laude ingenti floruerunt et *non nimis longe distantibus fuerunt aetatibus.*"

Grant to Hellanicus, then, a length of days much less than that of Isocrates, and he may have been a slightly older contemporary of Herodotus, a much older contemporary of Thucydides, and may have survived even the latter, as he undoubtedly did the former. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ad Pomp. 3; de Thuc. iud. 5), whom Diels calls "der genaueste Kenner der Logographie," and Plutarch (de mal. Herod. 36; Theseus 26) thought of him as preceding Herodotus; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff insists on ranking him after Herodotus. Both views may be in a measure right. Such a work as the Persica of Hellanicus may well have been composed before Herodotus had published his history; the Atthis of Hellanicus must have been published, at least in its ultimate form, long after the death of Herodotus. Thucydides certainly, and Herodotus probably, drew much material from prior works of Hellanicus, though both looked down upon his methods as far inferior to their own.

The multiplicity of the works of Hellanicus, even after subtitles have been merged as far as possible under main titles, bespeaks a literary career of extraordinary length; so does the great variety in form and method employed by this historian. He never attained the art of throwing mythical and historical material into progressive and climactic epic form, as Herodotus did; or into progressive and climactic dramatic and rhetorical form, as Thucydides did. But it is clear from the fragments of his works now before us that he passed through the horographical, chorographical, and genealogical methods of composing sectional history, up to the method of the general Hellenic chronicle and annal. Beyond the last method, in spite of the brilliant example of Herodotus, he never advanced.

The horographical Lesbiaca naturally precedes and merges into the chorographical Aeolica, and this into the chorographical and genealogical Troica. Of the ten larger works that are with certainty to be attributed to Hellanicus, none is wholly exclusive of the others either in method or material. It is clear that he worked over again much of his material as he passed from one predominating method of composition to another, or

from a complex to a more simple method. Thus, the story of Electra, the daughter of Atlas and mother of Dardanus, is told in the chorographical and genealogical Troica, and also in the purely genealogical Atlantis. So the story of Niobe is told in the genealogical Atlantis, and also in the chronological Hiereiai. The cupbearer whose accidental murder by Heracles caused that hero's banishment from Calydon and brought in its train the final catastrophe on Mount Oeta, is named Cherias in the genealogical Phoronis, but Archias in what Athenaeus (IX, p. 419 F) calls "the histories," probably the Hiereiai, or the Atthis, or both. This is not surprising on the theory of an advance from lower to higher methods of composition.

It is surprising, however, to find that the two great chronological works of Hellanicus, the works most deserving of the name of histories, the Hiereiai and the Atthis, cover much the same ground, and follow the same method. Both chronicles began with a mythical and legendary period, where the chronology was reckoned by generations, an arbitrary unit of forty years; both had next a period covering events from about the time of the Trojan war down through the Persian wars and the *Pentekontaëtie*, where the earlier chronology was reckoned either by generations or by mythical lines of kings; and both, finally, a period covering more or less of the Peloponnesian war, where, as well as in the later parts of the previous period, the chronology was reckoned on the basis of archive lists of public officials. In the case of the Hiereiai, the official was the priestess of Hera at the Argive Heraeum; in that of the Atthis, it was the annual archon at Athens.

While both works included more recent events of the Peloponnesian war, we notice this striking difference between them. The Hiereiai gives us no fragment (i. e. is not cited by later writers) for any event later than the opening years of the war (Frag. 49 = Thuc. I 113 = 447 B. C.; and Frag. 52 = Thuc. II 81, 4 = 429 B. C.), but the Atthis gives us fragments describing much later events, such as the affair of the *Hermæ* at the beginning of the Sicilian expedition (Frag. 78; cf. Thuc. VI 60, 2; Andocides, *de myst.* 48; Plutarch, Alcibiades, 21) in 415 B. C. and the battle of Arginusæ (Frag. 80) in 406 B. C.

To all appearances, then, on the evidence before us, the Hiereiai was discontinued, and superseded by the Atthis. With due consideration of the great freedom of excursus which Hellanicus, in common with all the "logographers," allowed him-

self, even in his more strictly chorographical works, and also of the increasingly imperial relations of Athens, it is not necessary to assume any more local and narrow scope for the Atthis than for the Hieresai. Here we must not be misled by the narrower patriotism of the later antiquarian writers of Atthides, like Philochorus above all, with whom Hellanicus is sometimes ranked, much more because he wrote a work which he called 'Atthis' than because his Atthis was like that of Philochorus. When Hellanicus wrote his Atthis the Athenians were still making history. The reigning literary spirit was creative and imperialistic, not antiquarian and particularistic. Both the Hieresai and the Atthis of Hellanicus were national Hellenic chronicles. Therefore the mystery of their community of form and matter becomes all the deeper, and tempts to explanation.

The catastrophic burning of the Argive Heraeum in November of 423 B. C. furnishes a reasonable explanation. Thucydides describes the disaster with remarkable detail (IV 133, 2, 3): "During the same summer the temple of Hera at Argos was burnt down; Chrysis the priestess had put a light too near the sacred garlands, and had then gone to sleep, so that the whole place took fire and was consumed. In her fear of the people Chrysis fled that very night to Phlius; and the Argives, as the law provided, appointed another priestess named Phaeinis. Chrysis had been priestess during eight years of the war and half of the ninth when she fled." There is no good reason to doubt that Thucydides, when he thus wrote, knew the Hieresai of Hellanicus and had drawn material from it. His words take on added significance if he realized, as he doubtless did, that the chronological basis of a notable rival's history was thus forever and irremediably swept away. There was no immediate prospect, certainly, that it could become imperially current. How Thucydides felt towards this system of chronology which his rival had adopted may, I think, be seen from his words in V 20, 2, where the translation of Jowett is changed slightly, but fairly, as any one would grant: "I would have a person reckon the actual periods of time, and not rely upon lists of archons or other officials whose names may be used in different places to mark the dates of past events. For whether an event occurred in the beginning, or in the middle, or whatever might be the exact point, of these officials' term of office is left uncertain by such a mode of reckoning." And acquaintance, at least, with the system of Hellanicus in the Hieresai may fairly be inferred from the words of Thucy-

dides in II 2, 1, where he attempts to fix the date of the opening of the Peloponnesian war by all the received systems of chronology: "For fourteen years the thirty-years peace which was concluded after the recovery of Euboea remained unbroken. But in the fifteenth year, when Chrysis the high-priestess of Argos was in the forty-eighth year of her priesthood, Ainesias being Ephor at Sparta, and at Athens Pythodorus having two months of his archonship to run, in the sixth month after the engagement at Potidaea, and at the beginning of spring, about the first watch of the night, an armed force of somewhat more than three hundred Thebans entered Plataea, a city of Boeotia, which was an ally of Athens." Here speaks a historian conscious of a method of chronology far superior to that of any rival. The consciousness vents itself in controversy in the passage cited above from book V.

The destruction of the Argive Heraeum certainly made it natural for Hellanicus to abandon the chronological thread for his Hellenic history which had been supplied but could be supplied no longer by the archive lists of temple priestesses. Furthermore, the boundless prestige of Athens during the years between her great triumph over Sparta at Sphacteria (425) and the Peace of Nicias (421) made it equally natural for him to select, as a new chronological thread on which to rearrange the old material of the Hierieiai and arrange the new material brought by the advancing years, the archive lists of annual archons at Athens. No basis of chronology bade fair to have more national currency than this.

In the chronological passages already cited from Thucydides we may, on this explanation, see veiled reference to both the Hierieiai and the Atthis of Hellanicus. The passage which he wrote later, I 97, 2, is more familiar to all: "I have gone out of my way to speak of this period (the *Pentekontaëtie*) because the writers who have preceded me treat either of Hellenic affairs previous to the Persian invasion or of that invasion itself; the intervening portion of history has been omitted by all of them, with the exception of Hellanicus; and he, where he has touched upon it in his Attic history (*ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἐν γυραφῇ*), is very brief, and inaccurate in his chronology." Here the reference is clearly to the Atthis alone, which was now recognized as the final form of the great national chronicle. For neither Atthis nor Hierieiai has Thucydides a kindly word.

B. PERRIN.

IV.—MUTARE PULICES.

A COMMENT ON LUCILIUS, NON. 351, M.

As far as it is safe to infer from the few single lines now surviving, most of which are due to Nonius, the theme of Lucilius in his twenty-sixth book was not unlike that of the first satire of the second book of Horace. Among other matters, the poet certainly specified the readers whose approbation he most desired, perhaps dilated on the nature of his satire, and, apparently in a dialogue with some acquaintance, explained and defended his reasons for not following the usual public career of a Roman in his position. He also seems to have told why he did not choose to marry and rear a family, duties which, as Marx has shown, had recently been brought home to the Roman citizen by the law of Metellus Macedonicus. A fragment quoted by Nonius (351, M.) to illustrate *mutare* in what he conceived to be the sense of *derelinquere* is generally connected with this discussion.

In the best manuscripts of Nonius, the Berne and Geneva, Xth century; the first hand of the Harleian 2719, IXth century, and the second hand of the Paris 7667, Xth century, a MS copied from the Harleian, the line runs :

Mihi quidem non persuadetur, *pulices* mutem meos.

This text was adopted by Dousa and afterwards, without comment, by Quicherat (edit. of Nonius, 1872, p. 401).

The reading of the Harleian, second hand; of the Paris, first hand; of the Leiden and Wolfenbüttel MSS, and, according to Lachmann's critical note (Lucil. 599), of the Basel edition, is *publices*. Without some emendation, *publices* is, of course, impossible. The Aldine of 1513; H. Junius, Antwerp, 1565, and Lachmann (Lucilius, Berlin, 1876) emend to *publice ut* mutem. Mercier, the first great editor of Nonius, in the Paris edition of 1614, writes *publice* mutem. According to this emendation of the text, *publice* is to be taken in its not unusual sense of 'in the service' or 'on

behalf, of the state,' and with *meos* some word like *amicos* or *familiares* might be either understood or supposed to occur in the following line. We should therefore translate: 'You won't induce me at least to change my friends for the benefit of the state,' and should agree, for example, with Sellar, Roman Poets of the Republic, p. 230, that we have here one of the poet's reasons for preferring a private life.

In his edition of Lucilius (1872, XXVI 13) Müller made the very simple emendation to *publicis* (i. e. *publiceis*) mutem, explaining the word (p. 246) by *τελωνία*, and supplying *familiares* with *meos*. This makes the fragment differ slightly in meaning, but it would be used in the same connection as before. If, however, we are to believe Nonius, the difficulty with the text after Müller's emendation is that *mutare* does not mean *derelinquere*, but is used in its ordinary sense. It was apparently for this reason that Müller gave up *publicis* and, in his edition of Nonius, I, p. 568 (1888), wrote *Publi, utei* mutem, just as his vessel of wrath, Francken—neither seems to have ever mentioned the other in this connection—proposed, Mnemos. XVI 396, to read *Public ut* mutem, supporting his form of the vocative by Priscian, 301, K. and supplying *lares* with *meos*. In both cases the connection of thought appears to be about the same as before.

If we except Dousa and Quicherat, there are certainly two objections to all the texts so far mentioned. First, they are emendations, and, speaking in general, these should be the last resort; and second, *publices*, upon which they are all founded and from which successive editors take us farther away, is itself not the reading of the best MSS. It is clear, as Stowasser well observes (Wiener Stud. V 262), that "the text-tradition calls for something else." The best MS reading for this flea-bitten line is, without a doubt, *pulices*. But Stowasser thinks that *paelices* was the text of the archetype. Being derived from a single reading (*pullices*, Paris 7667, M²), the emendation has the peculiarity of being as easy from the side of palaeography as it is unlikely from all other points of view. Having adopted the word, we must either change *meos* to *meas* or suppose that *paelices* here was exceptionally masculine. Stowasser chooses the second alternative, and supports it by Sueton., Caes. 49; Martial, XII 97, 3 (96, 3, Fr.), and Festus, 222, M. But these examples do not impress me as having any bearing on the gender of *paalex*. They simply show that the word was sometimes applied to males.

Professor Stowasser then proceeds to associate with his emended fragment XXVI 22, M. and XXVII 28, M.—Arcades ambo—and adds: “Lucilius war ja stark in der *μοῦσα παιδική*.”

It was evidently the same train of thought that led Baehrens, FPR. 1886, Lucil. 503, to print *podices*. Francken, l. c., claimed not to understand this emendation, but *podices* can hardly fail to be clear enough to a more worldly mind.¹ Surely neither the great satirist nor his text deserves such revision as this.

As we review this long discussion it is interesting to observe how completely every one seems to have forgotten that perhaps the best text, just as it stands, may mean something. While Dousa and Quicherat adopted *pulices*, each did so without comment.

The only suggestion from this point of view, and it seems to me the best, comes from Birt, *Zwei politische Satiren*, etc., Marburg, 1888, p. 121. He makes this line belong to the speech of some man who is not only dirty but remains so from choice, and reads:

Mihi quidem non persuadetur. Pulices mutem meos?

“Ich soll mich von meinem Ungeziefer trennen? Das redet mir keiner ein!”

Certainly Birt's interpretation has some marked advantages over all the others proposed. The greatest of them are that it preserves the best text unaltered and, at the same time, gives good sense. Moreover, the insertion of a period disposes of the subjunctive without *ut* after *persuadetur*, which, although Sall. Jug. 35, 2, gives one undoubted example, I have not found elsewhere. This interpretation also gives us *mutare* in the sense of *derelinquere*, which, it is true, is in conformity with the lemma of Nonius. But for that very reason, may we not object to the possible truth of Birt's view?

Was *mutare* ever used in the literal sense of ‘trennen,’ ‘part with,’ *derelinquere*, as Nonius puts it? Except in his own statement, I have been quite unable to find a shred of testimony for it. It is unfortunate that every other example he may have quoted under this head has been lost, otherwise we might be in a better position to test his view. But while I can not find a single undoubted case in which *mutare* is equivalent to *derelinquere*, it is perhaps worth noting that there are those in which to translate *mutare* by *dere-*

¹ Though Baehrens would hardly have been able to find examples for his figurative use of *podex*.

linguere not only gives good sense but, as far as it goes, the right sense. Such a case is Vergil, *Aen.* 3, 161 *mutandae sedes*, which, as Müller observes in his note to Nonius, l. c., and, as I proved by an examination of Vergil's usage, is the only example that Nonius could have consistently quoted from this author. That he did quote one from him is not certain, but it is rendered probable by the fact that, although the reference itself has dropped out, the name of Vergil, as shown by Müller's text and his critical note, was, in some way, connected with the passage.

Now, without wishing to cast any further aspersion on the memory of a well-meaning old gentleman who has been vilified often enough, and sometimes without cause, by generations of impatient scholars, it is not going too far to say that he would be quite capable of translating Vergil's sentence *mutandae sedes* by *sedes derelinquendae sunt*. This is good sense, and half of the right sense. The other half is something like *et aliae* [sedes] *petendae*.

In short, I can not find any example of *mutare* in which the equivalent of the thing changed, i. e. the thing changed for, is not either expressed or implied. If the equivalent is of the same sort, it is regular both in Latin and English not to mention it. Hence the common use of *mutare* 'change' with a direct object alone: *mutare consilium, vestem, solum, testamentum, propositum*, etc., etc., 'to change one's plans,' sc. for plans, i. e. other plans, 'one's clothes,' of course, for other clothes, etc.

Certainly Nonius is hardly strong enough—unless propped with good examples, and in this case he is not—to support one against what seems a universal law of usage. Until, therefore, we have something more than his own statement supported—as far as we are concerned—by a single example which, it is more than likely, he did not understand and had never seen in its original setting, I see no reason why we should not include the fragment before us in a category which ought to apply to the whole language. Let us translate *mutare pulices meos* as we translate *mutare vestem, consilium*, and every other case in which the thing for which the change is made, being of the same sort as the thing changed, is not expressed. By so doing we have :

Mihi quidem non persuadetur pulices mutem meos :

'You won't induce me, anyhow, to change my fleas' (that is, of course, 'for other fleas').

Does any one at all familiar with the temperament of the flea, especially one whose memory is still vivid of the first few nights he spent in an Italian hotel, fail to perceive what is meant here by the metaphor of 'changing fleas'? If so, let me, by way of a brief excursus in Natural History, remind him and all those who have never sojourned in a flea-bitten latitude that the *Pulex Irritans* has a marked fondness for strangers. New blood rouses him to what, even for him, is supernatural activity. If one changes his fleas—and in Italy this seems to be the only difference in one's relations with them that he can hope to bring about—one is certain to be worse off, because, for the time being, he is the palatable stranger. This fact is not only perfectly well known, but has doubtless been known ever since the prehistoric beginning of this association between the eater and the eaten.

In other words, *mutare pulices* is a vulgar but expressive metaphor characteristic of both Lucilius and his department, and corresponds to our proverbial "out of the frying-pan into the fire."

Thus interpreted, the general import of the fragment is perfectly clear, although it is not certain who was the speaker, nor in which of several quite possible connections the remark was made. One is tempted, however, to suggest the time-honored theme of marriage *versus* single-blessedness which we know to have been discussed in this book. If so, let us suppose, by way of illustration, that the *dramatis personae* here were Lucilius and some friend, perhaps a married man, or, at least, an admirer of the new law, who has been trying to convert the poet by descanting at large on the disadvantages of his single life. Could we have an answer more pointed and, at the same time, more characteristic of the confirmed old bachelor Lucilius than

Mihi quidem non persuadetur pulices mutem meos?

The import of the expression *pulices mutare* is not disturbed by the fact that the illustration just given is only one from a number of possible situations.

We may be sure, of course, that Lucilius was not the first to use a metaphor suggested by pests that both in Greece and Italy

Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona
multi.

The character of the phrase, which is clearly popular, gives one good reason to suspect that it may be the proverbial short-hand statement of some old story belonging, by preference, to the realm

of the fable. Such a fable, attributed, in so many words, to Aesop, is found in Aristotle, Rhet. II 20, 6 f. (Halm, 36). Apropos of the use which the orator may make of the fable as a *παράδειγμα* or illustration, Aristotle quotes two as examples; first the famous fable which Stesichoros applied to Phalaris, and, second, the following:

"A popular leader at Samos was being tried for his life. Aesop, in the course of a speech to the people, said:

'Once on a time, a Fox, while fording a Stream, was swept away into a Gorge. Not being able to get out, she was for a long time in a sorry plight, and Dog-ticks in great numbers fastened upon her. Finally, a Hedgehog, while wandering about, saw her and, taking pity, asked whether he should not get the Ticks off. But she said "No," and being asked why, replied: "These are now full of me and draw but little blood. If you drive them off, Others will come, who are famished, and drink out of me what blood there is left." And so in your case, men of Samos, this man will do no further injury—he is rich—but if you put this one to death, others will come who are poor. They will steal what you have left.'"¹

For our purpose, the literary *milieu* of this Aesopic fable is interesting and significant. If the fable of the Fox and Dog-ticks was established in the rhetorical tradition as early as Aristotle and sanctioned by so great an authority, we may be tolerably certain that it remained there, and was familiar to many generations of boys as a stock example. In fact, Plutarch, 790 C (An Seni gerenda etc.) does quote a portion of it, though, perhaps, directly from Aristotle. Certainly, the following passage from Josephus,

¹ It was undoubtedly from this passage that Vanbrugh drew the following scene (Aesop, act II, vol. I, p. 200, Ward). Two tradesmen of Samos are petitioning Aesop for a new governor:

Aesop. Why, what's the matter with your old one?

2d Tra. What's the matter? Why, he grows rich; that's the matter; and he that's rich can't be innocent; that's all.

Aesop. Does he use any of you harshly? or punish you without a fault?

2d Tra. No, but he grows as rich as a miser; his purse is so crammed, it's ready to burst again.

Aesop. When 'tis full 'twill hold no more. A new governor will have an empty one.

2d Tra. 'Fore Gad, neighbour, the little gentleman's in the right on't!

1st Tra. Why, truly I don't know but he may. For now it comes in my head, it cost me more money to fat my hog, than to keep him fat when he was so. Prithee, tell him we'll e'en keep our old governor."

Arch. 18, 6, 5, the reference to which I owe to Professor Warren, has every appearance of being a garbled version of it. The passage is one referring to the well-known provincial policy of Tiberius, which, in fact, was quite in line with the method recommended by Aesop. After telling why he never "turned the rascals out," the emperor, "by way of illustration, told this story :

'A certain man was lying sorely hurt and the flies gathered about his wounds in swarms. Somebody who happened upon him, pitying his evil case and thinking that he could not help himself, stood by and had nearly succeeded in scaring them off, when the man begged of him to stop. When asked why he was so indifferent about escaping from the pest he replied: 'Why, you would do me great harm by driving these flies away. They are already full of blood and no longer so eager to trouble me; indeed, they even hold up now and then. But the others are fresh and hungry—if they fastened on me, exhausted as I am already, they would soon make an end of me.'"

Unless we count our Lucilian fragment, I find no other trace of this fable in Latin. But this does not prove that there was none. In fact, it is not impossible that this very line is a fragment of the fable itself. We know that Lucilius, like Ennius and Horace, told fables, and that they were characteristic of satire. The principal objection to the theory that Lucilius was actually retelling the Aesopic fable, as related by Aristotle, or that his *mutare pulices* was drawn directly from it, is the fact that the Latin equivalent given for Aesop's dog-tick, *κυροπαϊστής*, is *ricinus*, not *pulex*. But it is perhaps worth noting that in the Italian version of Aesop's fable, to which Dr. Shaw has called my attention, the word employed for *κυροπαϊστής*, although *ricino* is still found in the lexicons, is the regular modern Italian *pulci* (*pulices*), and such may have been the popular usage even in Lucilius' time, just as in the ordinary speech of this country dogs have 'fleas.' 'Dog-ticks' infest only the Latin and Greek lexicons.

But whether Lucilius' expression in this line is a metaphor drawn from the simple observation of ordinary life, whether it is derived from an old fable, or whether it is actually a portion of that old fable, is not a question of vital importance, since in all those cases the point, so far as interpretation is concerned, is the same. It is the flea himself who tells us in no uncertain terms that *pulices mutare* is the equivalent of our popular phrase: "Out of the frying-pan into the fire."

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

V.—THE PARENTAGE OF JUVENAL.

The ancient biography appended to the Montpellier manuscript of Juvenal contains in its opening sentence an interesting and, if worthy of belief, not unimportant reference to the poet's father: Iunius Iuvenalis, libertini locupletis incertum filius an alumnus, ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit animi magis causa quam quod scholae se aut foro praepararet.¹ The statements here made, though ignored or rejected by some writers on Juvenal,² have been repeated again and again without qualification as unquestionable facts.³ In the biography of a later period, discov-

¹ J. Dürr, *Das Leben Juvenals*, Ulm, 1888, S. 22, Vita I a.

Cf. I b: Iunius Iuvenalis, libertini locupletis incertum filius an alumnus, ex Aquinio Volscorum oppido oriundus temporibus Claudii Neronis, ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit animi magis causa quam quod scholae se aut foro praepararet;

II a: Iunius Iuvenalis Aquinas id est de Aquino oppido oriundus et natus, qui ad mediam fere aetatem satirice declamavit . . . ;

II c: Iuvenalis fuit Aquinas id est de Aquino oppido. Incertum est, an fuerit filius liberti locupletis an alumnus ;

III a, b: Prima aetate siluit, ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit ;

III c: Prima aetate tacuit, media vero declamavit temporibus Claudii Neronis imperatoris ;

IV: . . . ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit ;

V: M. Iunius Iuvenalis ex municipio Aquinati, ordinis ut fertur libertinorum, Romae literis operam dedit. Declamavit non mediocri fama, ut ipse scribit: "et nos consilium dedimus Syllae."

² Weidner, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, 2. Aufl., Leipzig, 1889, S. x ; Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, 2. Theil, München, 1892, S. 337 ff.; Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*, Bd. III, Stuttgart, 1892, S. 294.

³ C. F. Hermann, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Satirarum Libri Quinque*, Lipsiae, 1854 (Ed. Teub. 1883, p. viii) ; C. Synnerberg, *De Temporibus Vitae Carminumque D. Iunii Iuvenalis Rite Constituendis*, Helsingforsiae, 1866, p. 53 sq.; E. Strube, *De Rhetorica Iuvenalis Disciplina*, Brandenburg a. d. H., 1875, p. 1 ; D. Naguiewski, *De Iuvenalis Vita Observationes*, Rigae, 1883, p. 65 ; Dürr, l. c., S. 11 f.; H. Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays*, second series, Oxford, 1895, p. 139 ; E. Hübner, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1889, No. 49, Sp. 1342 ; H. J. de Dompierre de Chaufepié, *De Titulo I. R. N. 4312 ad Iuvenalem Poetam Perperam Relato*, Hagae Comitum, 1889, p. 15 ; R. Y. Tyrrell, *Latin Poetry*, Boston and New York, 1895, p. 237 ; L. Friedlaender, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturarum Libri V*, Leipzig, 1895, Bd. I, S. 4.

ered and published within recent years by Dürr from a manuscript in the library of the Palazzo Barberini at Rome, while no allusion is made, as in the other memoirs, to the social condition of Juvenal's father, both parents as well as a sister are mentioned by name, Aquinum being designated as their native place: Iunius Iuvenalis Aquinas Iunio Iuvenale patre, matre vero Septumeleia ex Aquinati municipio Claudio Nerone et L. Antistio consulibus natus est. Sororem habuit Septumeleiam, quae Fuscino nupsit.¹ The judgment of Dürr, who accepts these explicit details as a remnant of genuine old tradition, has met with approval² and with dissent³ on the part of eminent Juvenalian scholars. In no case, however, has the parentage of the satirist been made the subject of thorough investigation. A reexamination, accordingly, of the sources of our information concerning the poet's origin recommends itself as having an important bearing not only on our attitude toward the numerous biographies of Juvenal, the real character of which, in spite of the discussions of a century, is still in question, but also to some extent on our estimate of the poet himself.

The age and authorship of the first twelve biographies of Dürr's collection (the younger biography will be considered separately) have not been and perhaps never can be definitely determined. But whether the original life was composed at the same time as the oldest of the scholia and by the same author, or was an earlier or later production than that commentary; whether one of the lives is the basis of all the rest or was derived, together with the others or a part of them, from a still more ancient life which has not been preserved; what relation exists between these sketches and the supposed allusion of Sidonius Apollinaris to the banishment of Juvenal, and other similar questions, it is not necessary for our present purpose to decide. It can be shown more satisfactorily in other ways how much trustworthiness the memoirs have.

If at the outset we undertake to remove from them what could easily be inferred from the Satires, what is in conflict with known facts of history, what is made incredible by mutual contradiction, and what must be condemned on the ground of inherent improbability, even conservative criticism will permit the retention of but

¹ Dürr, S. 28.

² Hübner, l. c., Sp. 1341; Schanz, l. c., S. 339.

³ Friedlaender, S. 15.

a fragment. Thus the various and conflicting accounts of the place to which the poet was banished destroy each other; the circumstance assigned as the cause of his banishment has been shown to be a myth,¹ so that no foundation is left for belief in the banishment at all²; what is said of the manner in which he made his first appearance as a satirist is an inseparable part of the same legend; and the statement regarding his age is a possible inference from his own words.³

And yet it is a commonly cherished belief that imbedded in this rubbish is a nucleus of truth handed down from the time of Juvenal independently of his poems. The rejection, however, of manifestly worthless elements brings into view as the only tangible support of such a belief the statements concerning Juvenal's parentage and practice of declamation. With these statements the theory of the kernel of truth must stand or fall.

A criterion for dealing with the residue in question is not difficult to find. The demonstrated character of all other matter in the biographies obviously demands that we accept no part as derived from reliable tradition unless it is something intrinsically probable which could not have been suggested by what Juvenal himself says and for the arbitrary fabrication of which no reason can be seen.⁴ This, however, is not enough. We are bound to reject, not perhaps everything that lacks express corroboration in the Satires, but, at all events, whatever is not in complete harmony with the evidence which they contain.

Junius Juvenal, as the memoir runs, the son or foster son, it is uncertain which, of a rich freedman, declaimed till middle life for pleasure rather than because he was preparing himself for school or forum. The two thoughts of the sentence are logically as well as grammatically connected. It was his father's wealth that enabled him to devote so much time to rhetorical study merely to satisfy his bent. His circumstances were such that he was not obliged to look forward to the serious business of teaching or practising law. The implied relation between the two statements is intimate, and our confidence in the first will be confirmed or shaken by our judgment of the second.

¹ J. Vahlen, 'Juvenal und Paris,' *Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Akademie*, 1883, S. 1175 ff.

² Hübner, l. c., No. 50, Sp. 1374 ff.; Schanz, S. 339 f.

³ Vahlen, l. c., S. 1190.

⁴ Schanz, S. 339; Friedlaender, S. 4.

It is customary to point to the pronounced rhetorical character of much that Juvenal has written as proof of his long practice of declamation. The disposition of the subject-matter, the connection of the parts, the lack of unity, the commonplaces and examples, the abrupt digressions, the fullness of expression, the figures of speech, the strong colors, and other features of the Satires are passed in review and explained as the work of a poetical declaimer, a rhetorician from top to toe, whose writings show throughout that the ways and habits of the schools of rhetoric had become to him a second nature. The statement, to be sure, of Juvenal himself, that he attended a school of rhetoric (1, 15 sqq.), is abundantly corroborated. But what Juvenal says and what we read in the biography are widely different things. Assuming the correctness of the latter, we seek in vain a natural and satisfactory explanation of certain facts.

In depicting the inadequate remuneration of lawyers (7, 106 sqq.) he says that Aemilius, who lives in the pomp of wealth, will receive as large a fee as the law allows, and adds: *et melius nos egimus*. The pronoun, which the commentators leave unnoticed, should be understood of Juvenal alone, as in the similar allusion to his education (1, 15 sqq.):

*et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos
consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum
dormiret.*

If it is taken in a broader sense, it must at the farthest be referred to a class to which Juvenal had belonged. That he was no longer a member of it is implied in the tone of the whole passage, and especially of the conclusion, in which he bids those who expect pay for their eloquence to betake themselves to Gaul or to Africa. He was, then, at one time an advocate of slender means. It was not as an outsider that he became so thoroughly acquainted with all the trials of a poor lawyer. It was the eloquent but struggling pleader of causes, not a poet or rhetorician, whom Martial described as anxiously visiting in his sweaty toga the palaces of the rich (12, 18) and to whom he applied that much vexed epithet *facundus* (7, 91), a term which Juvenal also uses of lawyers, with allusion, perhaps, to himself:

8, 48

*tamen ima plebe Quiritem
facundum invenies, solet hic defendere causas
nobilis indocti;*

7, 145

rara in tenui facundia panno,

designating, at any rate, a quality which he was conscious of possessing (*et melius nos egimus*). From the Epigrams in which Juvenal is mentioned by Martial, published about 91 A. D. and 100 A. D., it appears, in the light of what has been said, that Juvenal was a lawyer all the last decade of the first century and probably before that time—at least a decade before the publication of the first book of the Satires, with its allusion to an event of 100 A. D. (1, 47 sqq.). Of his straitened circumstances in this part of his career—it was subsequent acquisitions of one kind or another that brought him enough to make him comfortable and contented in later years—still other indications are not wanting. In describing the scenes connected with the distribution of the sportula (1, 99 sqq.) he may possibly not imply that he is himself a recipient of the favor,¹ yet he certainly does place himself in the same class with the poor people who must stand back till the rich are served. That Juvenal was poor has often been pointed out² on the basis of indirect evidence, which, indecisive by itself, is nevertheless strongly corroborative. His deep sympathy for the poor, to whom he devotes so much attention in the earlier Satires, and his full knowledge of their troubles are best understood as an outgrowth of his experience. He had himself suffered the ills from which he drew his philosophy of life (13, 20):

*ducimus autem
hos quoque felices, qui ferre incommoda vitæ
nec iactare iugum vita didicere magistra.*

It is in the earliest Satires that Juvenal's touch with life is closest. He introduces himself at once as a keen and intensely interested observer of all that is going on in the great city. And he is not a mere looker-on, himself untouched. This man, whose first greeting to us is an outburst of indignation over what he sees, must have been for no inconsiderable time personally affected in some serious way by the life which he describes. In the earliest Satires, too, as every reader of Juvenal has noticed, the faulty rhetorical element, of which so much is wont to be made, is less conspicuous and offensive than elsewhere. The great difference between this part of his work and most of his later productions has found various explanations. We can not, indeed, but feel to some extent with the acute amputator of the

¹Friedlaender, S. 19.

²Nettleship, p. 144; De Dompierre de Chaufepié, p. 27 sqq.; Friedlaender, S. 19.

poet, that we possess the writings of two Juvenals. That he tried at first to produce real works of art, but finally abandoned the futile effort and consciously surrendered himself to rhetorical mannerism,¹ and that his fire was but the blaze of rhetoric, and, being artificial, soon died down,² are views resting on the hypothesis that he was nothing but a rhetorician. From his change of manner may be drawn at least one certain conclusion: that in writing the first *Satires* he was decidedly less under the influence of the schools of rhetoric than later.

We have now, it is clear, the elements of a picture with which the Juvenal of the biography does not harmonize. The man who, in taking up his pen to castigate the vices of his time, came to his task with full knowledge gained by long personal contact with the world, who for ten years or more had been an advocate competent but handicapped by poverty, who as he assumed his new rôle had only a slur for the declamation of the schools and was far less under their universal influence than afterwards, when he had given vent to his wrath and accomplished, in the main, his original purpose—was not a gentleman of leisure, well-to-do and aimless, declaiming till middle life for self-gratification, and then turning directly from artificial themes and thoughts to the successful cultivation of satire. Beyond the simple fact stated by Juvenal himself, that he once practised declamation, there is not one word of truth in the statement of the biography: *ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit animi magis causa quam quod scholae se aut foro praepararet.*

A false notion of the rhetorical studies of Juvenal, due largely to the fictions of the biography, has led to an equally false judgment of his character, a judgment vitally connected with the subject under consideration. It is not strange that the indignation of a purposeless declaimer should be regarded as more or less artificial, that he should be suspected of insincerity, and that his plainness of speech, measured by the standards of a different age, should be taken as a sign of prurience. When, however, we recognize in Juvenal the lawyer who had studied, it is true, in the schools of rhetoric, but for the purpose of fitting himself for active life, and who, in following his chosen calling, had battled with untoward circumstances and unjust conditions, what he says has quite a different force. We hear him speak in the manner in

¹ Teuffel, *Studien und Charakteristiken*, Leipzig, 1889, S. 547.

² Schanz, S. 344 f.

which we should expect an advocate-poet to speak. We feel the genuineness of his indignation whether he is dealing with the present or with the past. We see before us a man who, in the spirit of an advocate, gives us one side of a picture, but whose sincerity and honesty we have no reason whatever to impugn.

Having cleared the way by our discussion of the account of Juvenal's rhetorical studies, we may approach the associated question of his relationship to a rich freedman. On the threshold of our inquiry attention is arrested by the form of statement employed in the memoir. The biographer admits that he is uncertain whether Juvenal was the man's son or foster son. It has been thought¹ that this admission points to a conscientious spirit on the part of the writer. The inference is charitable rather than plausible. We wonder why all traces of this remarkable scrupulosity are so conspicuously absent from the rest of the memoir, judging from which we have much greater reason to infer a wavering between two conjectures and lack of all definite information on the subject.

But dependence is not to be placed in divination. As before, it is only by recourse to the Satires that we can get solid ground beneath our feet. Fortunately, Juvenal has not left us in the dark concerning his sentiments toward rich freedmen. He has made this the most prominent type in his sketch of the company accustomed to gather at the rich man's door to receive the sportula. The patron bids his crier summon first the nobles, but a freedman blocks the way (1, 99 sqq.):

iubet a praecone vocari
 ipsos Troiugenas, nam vexant limen et ipsi
 nobiscum. 'da praetori, da deinde tribuno.'
 sed libertinus prior est. 'prior' inquit 'ego adsum.
 cur timeam dubitemve locum defendere, quamvis
 natus ad Euphraten, molles quod in aure fenestras
 arguerint, licet ipse negem? sed quinque tabernae
 quadringenta parant. quid confert purpura maior
 optandum, si Laurenti custodit in agro
 conductas Corvinus oves, ego possideo plus
 Pallante et Licinis?' expectent ergo tribuni,
 vincant divitiae, sacro ne cedat honori
 nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui venerat albis,
 quandoquidem inter nos sanctissima divitiarum
 maiestas, etsi funesta pecunia templo
 nondum habitat, nullas nummorum creximus aras.

¹ Dürr, S. 11.

Here Juvenal has taken pains, at the expense of symmetry and unity, to indicate by a detailed description his aversion for a class brought to the front by the power of wealth. That citizens of noble stock, that magistrates holding sacred office in the Roman state should be compelled to yield precedence to such persons offends him. And it is the class as such that he has in mind. He does not by a word assail the character of the freedman. Nor can we doubt his sincerity. He is not elaborating a theme of the schools, but introducing himself to the public in his first book, in which, if anywhere, he speaks from the heart.

What is set forth in a general way in the passage quoted is illustrated by particular instances. If there was a man in all the world whom Juvenal hated, it was Crispinus the rich freedman. And he hated him as a freedman. He does not mention him without reference to his Egyptian origin (1, 26 sq.; 4, 32 sq.). It is also not improbable that the rich upstart (1, 3; 10, 226), once his barber, and the gladiators and criers, whose very sons excited his displeasure (3, 153 sqq.), are to be referred to the same class. His hostility to the rich, whoever they were, is a matter of common observation.¹

A clear conception of the fixed sentiments of a man like Juvenal furnishes a basis for criticism. Conceding to him, as we have, sincerity and honesty, we must also regard him as a man of honor and justice, who had Roman ideas with respect to social distinctions, but hated hypocrites (Sat. 2), and believed in a proper return for services rendered and favors received (Sat. 7). If, now, as we are told in the memoir, he was the son of a rich freedman, or the foster son, in which case he may have been a freedman himself,² we encounter the startling anomaly, that he looked with especial aversion upon the very class from which he sprang, or to which he belonged, and to a member of which he owed his education and, in the view of the biographer, easy circumstances for half his life. This can not be attributed to Juvenal. It will not suffice to say that he was ashamed of his birth and tried to conceal it. That might be true of a snob. But Juvenal has none of the characteristics of a snob. It is not permissible to cite as parallel the case of Horace, the son of a freedman, who makes a fierce attack upon a freedman (Epode 4). Horace has in mind a particular individual personally detestable (v. 11 sqq.). He nowhere attacks freedmen as a class. Nor can

¹ Friedlaender, S. 20 ff.

² Dürr, S. 12.

we entertain the view that Juvenal was the son or adopted son of a rich freedman, but, not having been provided for by his father,¹ had on that account reason for hating him and all freedmen. The fact that he received from his father an inheritance (6, 57) makes such a supposition anything but probable.

We have found what we should have been surprised not to find in a statement that is part and parcel of the story about the poet's declamation. We should have been still further surprised to have gained the conviction that Juvenal's father, a freedman of wealth, contrary to custom (3, 153) and human nature, instead of wishing the man who bore his name to enjoy as high a social position as possible, allowed him to carry on for years, without assistance, a losing fight with poverty, and finally bequeathed to him but an insignificant estate.²

But it has been maintained³ that these statements, which we have rejected, bear the stamp of truth because they could not have been inferred from the Satires and because there is no conceivable reason why they should have been arbitrarily invented. And yet occasion enough for such inference and invention is easily discovered. It appears from the first Satire that Juvenal studied rhetoric in the schools (1, 15 sqq.) and that he had reached middle life at least (1, 25). The biographer, having no information of any military or professional career preceding that of satirist, inferred from this fact, it may be, and in a manner quite in keeping with his way of reasoning as revealed in the rest of the memoir, that Juvenal declaimed till middle life for pleasure. In that case he must have been in easy circumstances. Nothing more was needed to assign to him a rich father. But nothing was known about his father. It would follow, of course, that he was a nobody, perhaps a freedman. Had not Horace the satirist been a freedman's son? Had not the satirist Turnus been a freedman himself (Schol. ad 1, 20)? To be sure, he might just as well have been an adopted son. Between the two possibilities a decision was not made. Exactly this line of thought may not have been followed in detail, but that it was easy enough for the biographer to base his fancies on the subject-matter of the first Satire is manifest.

¹ De Dompierre de Chauffepié, p. 29.

² Cf. 6, 57 :

 vivat Gabiis, ut vixit in agro,
 vivat Fidenis, et AGELLO cedo paterno.

³ Friedlaender, S. 4.

The biography of younger date, betraying plainly its character, presents an easier problem. According to this biography the father, as we have seen, was named Junius Juvenal; the mother, Septumeleia. They were from Aquinum, and their son was born in the consulship of Claudius Nero and Lucius Antistius (55 A. D.). Dürr himself admits, what is quite evident, that almost everything in this life is invented or derived from the Satires, or taken from other sources and arbitrarily referred to Juvenal, and aptly concludes from the general tone and character of the production that it is the work of some humanist of the fifteenth century.¹ To this extent the matter is not in controversy. The father's name also, it is plain, could have been transferred from that of the son. The name of the mother and sister, however, and the year of birth, it is thought, must have come from an old biography and had their source in good tradition. But first of all, though granting it as a remote possibility, we must nevertheless consider it strange that an old life containing these definite and important particulars should be in existence till the fifteenth century and not be known or used by any of the writers or revisers of the other lives. The chief characteristic of the memoir awakens still further suspicion. It shows clearly the tendency to designate by name all the prominent persons with whom Juvenal was in any way personally connected. In addition to his father, mother, sister, brother-in-law, and the consuls under whom he was born, are mentioned as his teachers or otherwise Probus of Berytus, Marcus Antonius Liberalis, Palaemon, Fronto, Lucius Gallus, and Volusius Bithynicus. That the Satires, Jerome, Martial, Macrobius or Gellius,² and the other lives furnish the material for these details is evident from the thought and expression. It is clear, too, that the writer, in seeking to connect Juvenal with these men, repeatedly states as a fact what is, as he must have been fully aware, an absolute falsification. Under such circumstances we are justified in surmising that what is said of Juvenal's mother and sister and the year of his birth may be of the same character. Only one thing stands in the way. It is declared that the date of birth harmonizes admirably with all else that we know of Juvenal's life,³ though this has been denied,⁴ and that nothing can be discovered in the Satires or elsewhere from which that date could have been inferred or which could have occasioned its adoption. But, in fact, it is not necessary to look far to discover what is

¹ Dürr, S. 29.² *Ib.*, S. 30.³ *Ib.*, S. 30.⁴ Friedlaender, S. 15.

amply sufficient to have suggested to the uncritical and unscrupulous author of the memoir those very consuls. The first Satire contains a reference to an event of the year 100 A. D. (1, 49 sq.). When writing that Satire, Juvenal had ceased to be a *iuvenis* (1, 25). The age of the *iuvenis* extended, according to Varro,¹ to the forty-fifth year, and, if Juvenal ceased to be a *iuvenis* in 100 A. D., which was apparently the unwarranted interpretation of the biographer, he was born in 55 A. D., in the consulship of Claudius Nero and Lucius Antistius. We do not know the source of the name Septumeleia. It may have been seen associated in some way with Aquinum. But without ascertaining how the writer came by it, we are compelled, by what we know of everything else in the memoir, to ascribe the use of this name also to combination or falsification.

By our examination, then, of the only parts of the biographies, older or younger, which have any appearance of being based on reliable tradition independent of the Satires, it has been shown that these parts are no more trustworthy than the rest. Nothing but blind credulity remains to support the theory of a kernel of truth. There is, indeed, an old nucleus in the memoirs, but it is a nucleus of old conjecture. The author of the original biography undertook to write a life of Juvenal in imitation, it seems, of Suetonius' lives of the poets. He did it, but his own conjectures and combinations furnished all his material. He had learned nothing at all from genuine tradition.

If we search, as we should, in Juvenal's own words for information concerning his parentage, we shall find again that in his settled views of men and things are plain hints for our guidance. It is involved in the conclusions which we have already reached that he was the son of freeborn parents. His strong antipathy to foreigners, whose presence in the city made it in his eyes well-nigh unbearable (3, 60 sqq.) and whose customs brought in by wealth had undermined the old Roman virtue (6, 298 sqq.), precludes the idea that he and his parents were other than Roman citizens. They did not, however, belong to the aristocracy. Juvenal, in what he says about the sportula (1, 99 sqq.), expressly distinguishes himself from the Roman nobles of old extraction, and in his imaginary conversation with the noble Rubellius (8, 39 sqq.) he makes the latter address him and those of similar descent as men of low birth, and in reply recounts the valuable

¹ Censorinus 14, 2.

services rendered by the plebs, leaving no room for doubt that he belongs to this class of citizens. The tone in general of his extended laudation of worth over against birth, in which this conversation occurs, points in the same direction. Aquinum, which Juvenal mentions as his native place (3, 319), was accordingly the home of his parents. That they had moderate means, but were not rich, we have already seen in our discussion of the son's education, inheritance, and professional career. The Satires, then, should be interpreted as the utterances of a thorough Roman of humble birth but proud of his Roman nationality, educated by his parents but not freed by their wealth from the necessity of taking, as soon as he was able, a serious part in the affairs of life.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

FRANK IVAN MERCHANT.

VI.—AN EPIC FRAGMENT FROM OXYRHYNCHUS.

A negative indication of the value of the recent discoveries at Oxyrhynchus may be seen in the fact that the interesting epic fragment No. CCXIV seems to have escaped notice in the mass of comments that the publication of the Oxyrhynchus papyri has called forth. The papyrus which is referred by the editors "with little hesitation to the third century," contains parts of forty-three hexameters, and is, unfortunately, much mutilated. The editors translate only vv. 1-5, though the restoration of 10-13 is also complete.

The editor's restoration of vv. 1-5 is sufficiently certain to permit the printing of the text in the usual manner, with indications of only the chief supplements at the end of each line :

- 1 *ἔξαπίνης ἐπέθησεν ἀνώϊστο[ισι κλάδοισι
οὐ κεν ἐτι ζώοντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον [Ἄχαιοί·
ἔνθα δὲ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο, ἐνθ' Ἄγαμέμνων
ἔλετο, καὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοις [Ἀχιλλῆα*
5 *Τήλεφος ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἐκτο[ρος ἀτίον ἰλθεῖν*

The remaining verses to v. 16 as published in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. II, p. 28, are as follows :

- ἀλλ ὅποσον μοι καὶ τ[ο] ἀμυρεμεν ε[
χραισμησαι δε μοι α[. . . .]. α[
ἠ καὶ ἀπ ἀργεῖοι <ο> λαχεν γε[ος] ἠρακλῆος
[τ]ηλεφον ἐν θαλαμοῖς πολεμῶν ἀπαγε[υθε
- 10 [κλ]υτε μοι ἀθανάτοι [ξ]εὺς δ[ε π]λεον ὄν γενετηρα
δαρδανου ἠμετεροῖο καὶ ἠ[ρα]κλῆος ἀκουω
καὶ τούτων φρασσασθε μαχῶν λυσιν ἴσα δε μυθοῖς
[σ]υνθεσι τρωεσσι καὶ α[ργ]εῖοισι γε[ν]εσθω
[ο]υδε ἀργεῖοις θανε[ε]ιν [.]ησομαι αὐτη
- 15 ξανθου φοινιξαττες ε[. . .]με . . χεῦμα καιου
τηλεφου εἰφι το[.]ου]κετι θωρηχθεντες

For the first two of these lines I have no suggestion to make, except that perhaps we should read in v. 7 *χραισμησαι δὲ μοι*

'Α[ργείους] α[. The supplement, if miswritten *αργίους*—cf. *εἰφι* in v. 16 and the frequent interchange of *ει*—*ι* in the Homer papyrus No. CCXXIII "of the same period"—will contain exactly the number of letters required. The remainder I would restore as follows:

- εἰ καὶ ἀπ' Ἀργείοιο λάχεν γένος Ἡρακλῆος*
[Τηλέφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνευθεν ἰόντα]
- 10 *κλυτὴ μοι ἀθάνατοι Ζεὺς δὲ πλεόν ὄν γενετῆρα*
Δαρδάνου ἡμετέροιο καὶ Ἡρακλῆος ἀκούω
καὶ τούτων φράσσασθε μαχῶν λύσιν· ἴσα δὲ μύθοις
συνθεσίῃ Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἀργείοισι γενέσθω.
οὐδὲ <γάρ> Ἀργείους θανέειν ἀρήσομαι ἀντὶ
- 15 *ξανθοῦ φοινίξαντας ἐν αἵματι χεῦμα Καΐκου*
Τηλέφου ἱφὶ θαμέντας· ὅτ' οὐκέτι θωρηχθέντες

To this I would add the following commentary:—That the word at the beginning of line 8 means 'if' admits of but little doubt. Merkel in his preface to the minor edition of Apollonius Rhodius, p. v, speaks of the use of *ἤ* for *εἰ*, but it seems to me more probable that we have here merely a mistake of the scribe; cf. the similar Homer papyrus No. CCXXIII, E 128, *εἰμεν* for *ἡμεν*, and v. 64, *ἤδει* for *ἕδη*, though the latter may not be wholly due to phonetic causes. As long as vv. 6–7 are unrestored, it must remain uncertain whether v. 8 is to be connected with them or with vv. 10 ff.; but at present I prefer the latter alternative. For if Telephus is actually (*καὶ*) the descendant of Herakles, then the speaker, Astyoche, has a double claim upon Zeus: *ὄν γενετῆρα | Δαρδάνου ἡμετέροιο καὶ Ἡρακλῆος ἀκούω*. For the thought cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus, 10. 40, 319, and 8. 431 ff.: *Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἰ θεόν γε τῆς ἕξ εἰμι γενέθλης . . . τῆ μὲν νῦν ἐσάκουσον*, which affords also a parallel for the arrangement of the clauses—contrast, e. g., the prayer of the Cyclops, *ι* 528 ff. In this connection it may be noted that the author shows a similar unconventionality in his treatment of the unreal conditional sentence. In Homer, in unreal conditions of the past, the apodosis frequently, though not invariably (e. g. *Ψ* 526) precedes; cf. the examples cited GMT., §§435, 440. However, this is not the case in the present unreal condition; cf. GMT., §438, for the examples. This order seems to have impressed the later imitators of Homeric poetry as characteristic, and they have imitated it with great consistency, just as they show a marked tendency to employ *πῶς* as far as possible for *πρός*; cf. La Roche, Wiener Studien,

XXII 49. So in Apollonius Rhodius the apodosis precedes in I 1298; II 284, 626, 866, 987-995; III 584, 1139; IV 20, 901. The only exception is III 377 ff., which is practically an unreal condition of the present, and so conforms to the Homeric usage. So in the first seven books of Quintus we have this order: in I 447, 689, 775; II 507; III 26, 366, 514, 752; IV 301, 329, 563; V 359; VI 503, 542, 570, 644; VII 28, 142, as opposed to but two exceptions: III 444; V 583. Another departure from epic conventions is to be found in the use of the plural *αὐτε* in a prayer for which I know of no parallel, the citing of Il. 8. 5 by Liddell and Scott being a blunder. Besides, the singular when used in prayer, and the plural in addresses to men, is almost (cf. Quintus, 9. 9) invariably the first word of the speech. For the phrase *λαχίην γένος* cf. Musaios 30 *διοτρεφέες αἷμα λαχούσα* and Quintus 2. 434 *Ζητὸς ὑπερθύμιοι λαχῶν ἀριδείκτεον αἷμα*.

But whether v. 8 be connected with what precedes or what follows, in neither case can v. 9 stand in its present position unless indeed *τηλεφον* be emended to *Τήλεφος*, in which case I do not see how a satisfactory close for the line can be obtained. The restitution suggested follows P 426 *μάχης ἀπάνευθεν ἴοντες*; a possible but less probable ending would have been *ἀπάνευθε μένοντα*. The occurrence of interpolated lines in the Homeric papyri is not uncommon, and the present instance is no more absurd than, e. g., the insertion after E 83 (O. P., vol. II, p. 101). I would offer the following explanation of its origin. The legend tells how the Greeks were at first successful, while Telephus was absent from the battle, but how he afterwards appeared and swept all before him, until finally he was wounded by Achilles. This crisis may very well have been introduced by some such lines as

*οὐδ' ἰαχὴ κρατεροῖο¹ λάθεν γένος Ἑρακλῆος
Τήλεφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνευθεν ἴοντα*

For the general situation compare the opening of the fourteenth book of the Iliad; for the concrete use of *γένος*, Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1412, and Quintus 6. 120 *Εὐρύπυλον κρατεροῦ γένος Ἑρακλῆος*. If this line is an interpolation coming from a source of this sort, it follows that the speech before us is embedded in a narrative of the landing of the Greeks in Mysia. And if this is the case, there can

¹Of course I do not mean to insist on the verbal exactness of the first half of this line. Another possibility would be, cf. Δ 456: *οὐδ' ἰαχὴ τε πόνος τε*.

hardly be any doubt that the poem was a working over of the material of the *Κύπρια*, bearing a relation to that poem similar to that which the *Τὰ μεθ' Ὀμηρον* of Quintus bear to the rest of the epic cycle. A further consequence is that the time of the delivery of this speech must be anterior to the situation in the *Iliad*. Now, this is in direct opposition to the conclusion which the editors draw from their translation of vv. 1-5. "The situation is therefore posterior to that in the *Iliad*," and as my restitution of vv. 14-16 turns in part on the same point, it is necessary to inquire into the cogency of this conclusion.

The editors evidently can not have based their conclusion upon the unreal condition in v. 2 *ὅθ' κεν ἔτι ζώοντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί*, for the most that it could have been cited to prove would have been that the Greeks had landed in the Troas—a time ten years before the situation in the *Iliad*. As a fact, however, it does not prove even that much, for it is merely a case—of a type familiar to us all in English—where the speaker, under the stress of emotion, regards as already accomplished that which now seems certain to happen when, had it not been for something, it might have been placed once for all beyond the bounds of possibility. The editors must therefore have drawn their inference from their translation of vv. 4-5: "and Telephus would have slain Achilles, the best warrior among the Argives before he met Hector." "Before he met Hector" in English warrants the conclusion, but *πρὶν Ἐκτορος ἀντίον ἰλθεῖν* in Greek does not. This doctrine should at the present time need no proof, as it has long since been distinctly stated; cf. e. g. Foerster apud Sturm, *Die Entwicklung der Constructionen mit ΠΙΠΙΝ*, p. 7: "dass der Infinitiv nach *πρὶν* den Begriff einer reinen Handlung bezeichne ohne weitere Angabe, ob eine solche wirklich eingetreten sei oder nicht"; and especially Gildersleeve, *A. J. P.* 2. 468, n.: "*Πρὶν* is an *ὀπω*. The 'not yet' may come later, may never come. As I have said of *antequam* with the subjunctive, the antecedence is necessary, not so the consequence, *Ἀπέδρασαν πρὶν κριθῆναι*, Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 35. They never came to trial." And p. 474: "In Attic it [*πρὶν* with inf.] . . . is necessary . . . when the action does not take place or is not to take place (= *ὥστε μή*)."
After this it seems unnecessary to cite examples, but Apollonius Rhodius, III 374, 660 (*πάρος*), 800, 1395 are all instructive, and Eur. *Rhesos* 59 ff. (cf. Alc. 362) may be quoted in full: *εἰ γὰρ φαενοὶ μὴ ξυνῆσχον ἡλίου | λαμπτήρες, οὐκ ἂν ἔσχον εὐτυχοῦν δόρυ, | πρὶν*

ταῖς πυρῶσαι καὶ διὰ σκερῶν μολαῖν | κτείνων Ἀχαιοὺς τῆδε πολυφώνῃ χειρί.
So that the only inference that can be drawn is that the situation is anterior to the first meeting of Hector and Achilles and anterior to the landing of the Greeks in Troy, i. e. that the author followed a version of the legend different from that of the source of Tzetzes; cf. his τὰ πρὸ Ὀμήρου, 260 ff.

Since this is the case, no objection can be brought to bear on the restitution of ἀρ]ήσομαι in line 14. At the beginning of this line the editors suggest οὐδέ <κεν>, I prefer, however, οὐδέ <γάρ>, not only because it makes a better connection with what precedes, but also because the omission of γάρ before Ἀργεῖους is more easily explained.

In line 15, φωνίζαντες must, as the syntax shows, be either a misreading or miswriting for φωνίζαντας. Against ε[ν αἰ]μα[τι] may be brought objections of both a palaeographical and syntactical nature. In the first place the editors indicate that the lacuna is large enough to hold four letters; but Ν and Α are letters that take a great deal of space, and, in the absence of a facsimile of this fragment, a comparison of the space occupied by ΝΑΙ in τὸν δ' ἴδεν Διείας—No. CCXXIII, plate I, l. 13—which is equal to that sometimes occupied by four letters, will show that these letters may probably be considered as sufficient to fill the gap. The editors give the next two letters as με, which forces the assumption of a mistake on the part of the scribe, a difficulty that is lessened by his other mistakes—η, ἀργεῖοις, omission of <γάρ> and εἰφε—and to my mind is outweighed by the fact that the proposed reading fits both metre and sense, if it be admitted that the author would use ἐν with the dative as the equivalent of the instrumental.

This construction originates in the fact that frequently the same object may be considered either as the instrument or as the place in which an action happens. Hence we find, e. g., both πυρὶ κάειν and ἐν πυρὶ κάειν, the consequence of which is to efface the distinction that originally existed, and to extend the same duality of construction to other verbs where it is no longer logically justified. The beginnings of this encroachment of ἐν with the dative upon the instrumental dative go back to classical times; cf. Kühner-Gerth³, II 1, p. 464 f.; Lutz, Die Praepositionen bei den attischen Rednern, p. 36; Sobolewski, De praepositionum usu Aristoph., p. 26 f.; that it spread in post-classical times is recognized; cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gr. Gram., §1562, and for Polybius, Krebs, Schanz,

Beiträge, I, p. 71 f.; but the extent of its use in late epic poetry, in the absence of a monograph, is difficult to determine. From Apollonius I have noted: 2. 44 *φαιδρὸς ἐν δμμασι*, rendered by Lehrs *alacer oculis*; contrast Arist. Knights 550 *φαιδρὸς λάμποντι μετώπῳ*; 4. 904 *ἐν χερσὶν εἰς φόρμιγγα ταύσσας* = *manibus suis citharam intendens*. Compare also Musaios 159 *θυμὸν ἐρωτοσόκοισι παραπλάγξας ἐνὶ μύθοις* = *animum amorem-parientibus seducens* (in) *verbis*; Quintus I. 343 *ἔβριμον ἐν στέρνοισι ἀναπνέοντες Ἄρρη* = *pectore spirantes*; I. 400 *τὰ δ' ἐν ποσὶν ἡμάλδυνεν* = *alias pedibus conculcat*; 4. 18 *τὸν δ' ἐν πυρὶ δηωθέντα* = *igni consumptum*; contrast Soph. O. C. 1319 *ἄστῃ δηώσῃ πυρὶ*; 4. 225 *συνέμαρψεν ἐνὶ στιβαρῆσι χερσῖσι* (?) = *corripuit robustis manibus*; and especially 4. 341 *μίξαι ἐν αἵματι χεῖρας ἀειράας* = *ut-tingerent sanguine manus invictas*. Furthermore, it may be noted that the MSS read in Eur. El. 1172 *ἀλλ' οἶδε μητρὸς νεοφόνους ἐν αἵμασι | πεφυρμένοι . . . πόδα*, and that the Laurentianus reads in Soph. O. T. 821 *λέχη δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ἐν χεροῖν ἐμαῖν | χραίνω*. Both passages have been corrected, but the errors, if errors they be, are not without significance for the later Greek usage. The above facts may, I think, warrant us in accepting for this poem the construction of *φονίσσειν ἐν αἵματι* instead of the usual *φονίσσειν αἵματι*, for which compare the examples cited in Liddell and Scott, and Quintus 9. 179.

The use of *ἴφι* in l. 16 in a periphrasis is without parallel, in Homer or Apollonius, nor do I know of an example from Quintus. The restitution of the next word is suggested by the frequent combination of *ἴφι δαμῆναι*; cf. also Quintus 6. 251 *βίη ροπάλοιο δαμέντα—βίη : ἴς = βίη : ἴφι*. The supplement proposed has exactly the number of letters indicated by the editors and accounts, besides, for the change to the nominative in *θωρηχθέντες*. For it to have been miswritten *ταμεντας* would have been nothing unusual, as the interchange of *τ* and *δ* in Egypt is very frequent; cf. No. CCXXIII, *passim*; Blass, *Aussprache*, p. 106.

In general style the poem seems to stand much nearer to the level of Quintus than of Apollonius, and I should not for that reason be inclined to place the time of its composition much before that of the writing of the papyrus.

A correspondence in mythology with Quintus remains to be noticed. The speaker is Astyoche, the wife of Telephus and daughter or granddaughter of Dardanus; the time is between the wounding of Telephus and the departure of the Greeks; everything would indicate also a time of truce, and hence there

can be little doubt that this poet's version of the healing of Telephus was the same as that followed by Quintus 4. 172 ff.:

(ἵππους) τοὺς πρόσθεν ἐυμμελίη Ἀχιλῆι
 Τηλεφὸς ἄπασε δῶρον ἐπὶ προχοῇσι Καΐκου
 εὐτέ εἰ μοχθίζοντα κακῶ περι ἔλκει θυμὸν
 ἠέσατ' ἐγχείη τῆ μιν βάλε δηριώοντα
 αὐτὸς ἔσω μηροῖο.

which Welcker, *Kleine Schriften*, III, p. 30, n., regarded as an invention of the Smyrnaean poet.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, Feb. 4, 1901.

VII.—MANUSCRIPT COPIES OF PRINTED GERMAN BIBLES.

I. *Wolfenbüttel MS Aug. fol. 1 A, 1 B.*

This MS, consisting of two folio volumes of 367 and 362 leaves respectively, was completed by *Martin Huber Tütscher schulmaister zu Memmingen*, on Saint Otmar's Day, 1481, as is stated in the inscription at the end. Walther¹ describes the MS, the text of which was taken from the Mentel Bible of 1466 and from another one belonging to the group headed by the Zainer Bible of 1473.

The dialect is Suabian throughout, as the name of the town, *Memmingen*, might lead one to expect. Accordingly, the new Bavarian diphthongs of the printed Bibles were regularly changed back to the old undiphthongized long vowels, except in a few instances, such as Gen. 34, 9 *geleiche*; Jos. 22, 26 *euch, gezeug*; I Ezra 4, 2 *euch, ewern*; etc. The diphthong *eu* is more frequent than *ei, au*, and occurs more especially in the word *euch*. Middle High German *â* is uniformly replaced by the Suabian *au*, which is expressed by *au, ă* or *ǎ*. Both of the latter signs are of frequent occurrence in Suabian MSS of this period, but Walther is undecided whether these "peculiar marks" over *a* and *o* are to serve as marks of length or to represent the letter *u*. MHG. *ou* and *û* are also represented by these signs: *öch, öch, höpt, trämer, wiröch, versämen*. Instances in which *au, ă, ǎ* correspond to MHG. *â* are found on every page: *gän, gän, läss, laussen, fragen, fraugen, uffstän, ufstaun, ständ, schlauff, rautfrauen, gedauchten*, etc.

We now pass to the discussion of the immediate origin of the text of the MS. Walther has correctly stated that the beginning, from Genesis to Judges 6, was taken from Mentel. The curious error of Mentel in Exod. 15, 1, *das rose* instead of *das ross*, is also found here. Leaf 12 of the MS has been torn out, causing a gap from Gen. 9, 17 to 11, 26; f. 11 ends: *gelübtes dz ich hab geord-*

¹ Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters, dargestellt von W. Walther, Braunschweig, 1889-92.

net zwischen, and f. 13 begins: *und gebar sün und töchter und thare lebt . . .*

In the sixth chapter of Judges both of the printed Bibles were before the scribe, as will appear from the following agreements: V. 1: Wolfenbüttel and Mentel have *wan*, Zainer has *aber*; W and Z have *angesicht*, M has *bescheud*; v. 3: W and M have *oster*, Z has *auffgang der sun*; v. 4: W, M have *mit all*, Z has *gantz*; v. 5: W, M have *kemel*, Z has *kamel tier*; v. 9: W, M have *quellen*, Z has *peinigten*; v. 11: W, M have *frucht*, Z has *getreyd*; v. 15: W, Z have *ingesind*, M has *geschlecht*; v. 16: W, Z have *du wirst schlagen*, M has *du schlechst*. From here on the text of Zainer is followed to the end of chapter 48 of Jeremiah. This is in the second volume, which begins with Ecclesiastes. On f. 71r. of volume 2 a new scribe sets in at the words *ich ging nit hinder sich*, Is. 50, 5. This second scribe continues to f. 104v., third line, ending at Jer. 38, 23, *und alle dine wib*. The first scribe here resumes his task in the middle of the sentence, at the words *und dine sune*.

Throughout these changes the text followed is that of the Zainer Bible. In Jer. 48 there are no traces of Mentel. At the beginning of the next chapter, however, the text follows first Mentel, then Zainer. The writing here is smaller, though the scribe is the same. He probably made a pause here, and when he resumed work had both texts before him, as is shown by the following readings: Jer. 49, 1, W, M have *besiczt*, Z has *hat besessen*, W, Z have *hant gewonet*, M has *entwelt*; v. 2: W, Z have *verwuset und zerstört in aim ufflauff*, M has *verwuset in eim wuffe*; v. 3: W, M have *rüffet*, Z has *schreiend*, W, Z have *klaidern, priester*, M has *klayt, pfaffen*; v. 4: W, Z have *glorierstu*, M has *wunniglichstu*; v. 5: W, M have *ich zu für*, Z has *ich will einfure*, W, Z have *umschwaif*, M has *umbhaltung*.

This state of affairs continues through the chapter, and into the following one: Jer. 50, 2, W has *geschent*, Z *geschendet*, M *geschemlicht*, W, M have *uberkomen, ir gegossen*, Z has *uberwunden, ir gehaune*; v. 3: W, M have *staig uff wider sy von aquilon*, Z has *wirt aufsteigen wider sy von mitnacht*. From this point on the text of Mentel is followed, until in the second chapter of Jonah, Zainer's text is again adopted: Jon. 1, 11, W, M have *mer hort uff*, Z has *möre auffhöre*; v. 14: W has *die man rüfften*, M has *die man rieffen*, Z has *sy schryen*; Jon. 2, 1, W, Z have *hett vorderait*, M has *furbereyt*; v. 3: W, Z have *ich hab geschrien*,

M has *ich rieff*; v. 5: W, Z have *wird ich sechen*, M has *sich ich*. Beginning with Jon. 2, therefore, the text of Zainer is again followed, continuing into the New Testament.

A third scribe sets in at the top of f. 182v. of volume 2: *Caspor und Mageth und Carnaim* (I Mac. 5, 28). This scribe completed the two books of the Maccabees. The New Testament, which begins on f. 211r., was written entirely by the first scribe. Traces of Mentel's text reappear in I Peter 2, 6: W, M have *erwelt und edel*, Z has *bewäret ausserwölt kostber*; v. 7: W, M have *wan, vorsprachen*, Z has *aber, verwarffen*. From the ninth verse on there is no further trace of Zainer. Walther states that Mentel's text sets in at the third chapter of I Peter, continuing to Rev. 18, while from Rev. 19 to the end the text is that of Zainer. Both of these statements are inaccurate; Zainer's text reappears only in the last chapter. The last verse of chapter 21 is given as follows in W, M: *kain ding entzübert gait in sy dz da tüt die verbannenschaft und die luge nun (M neur) allain die da sind geschriben in dem buch des lebens und des lambs*. In Z this is quite different: *noch nichts vermeyligets wirt eingeen in ir oder das da thue ain verflücht ding oder luge. nur allain die da seind geschriben in dem büch des lebens und des lambs*. In chapter 22, 1, however, W, Z have *schinbar*, M has *leuchtent*, W, Z have *stül*, M has *gesess*; v. 2: W, Z have *in der mitt, frücht*, M has *in miczt, wucher*. From here on to the end the text is that of Zainer.

What is this later Bible which we have styled *Zainer*? Walther, col. 131, states that it is either the Zainer edition of 1473, Zainer of 1477, Sorg of 1477 or Sorg of 1480. Later on he surmises that it is "*eine revidierte, vermutlich die 4. Bibel*" (Zainer, 1473). This latter conjecture is correct, as will appear from the readings given below. The so-called *Schweizer Bibel* is out of the question on account of its many variants, as I have shown elsewhere (Journal of Germanic Phil. III 238-47). The Sorg 1477 edition is excluded by its variants: Ps. 73, 8 *das geschlächt*; Jer. 35, 11 *antlucz der syrier*; I Mac. 4, 36 *aussgen*; 6, 59 *setzten*: the Wolfenbüttel MS and all the other printed texts here have *ir geschlächt, antlucz des höres, aufgan, seczen*. In addition Sorg 1477 alone omits *im*, Ps. 94, 2; *unser*, I Mac. 3, 43; inserts *uncz*, Is. 7, 6. The editions of Zainer 1477 and Sorg 1480 are excluded by their readings of *zú uns*, I Reg. 4, 3; *unbeschnitten*, 14, 6; *genachnet*, Mat. 26, 46; *grosse*, Joh. 6, 2; *iob sprach*, Job 34, 4: the Wolfenbüttel MS and Zainer 1473 here read *uns*

zu, umbeschnitten, genahet, michel, iob der sprach. Instances from I Cor. 5, 8 and Ps. 33, 4, where Zainer 1473 and the Wolfenbüttel MS vary from all the other texts, might also be cited. The presence of the words *der welt*, Hab. 3, 6, shows further that the text which I have elsewhere designated 1473^b was used.

There is only one reading which seems to go counter to the above conclusion that Zainer 1473 was used, but this is an important one. In I Mac. 9, 44 the Latin imperative *surgamus* is rendered *wir wollen uffsten* in the Wolfenbüttel MS, in accordance with Zainer 1477 and Sorg 1480. Zainer 1473 and Sorg 1477 here have *wir sollen aufsten*. Out of more than 250 instances of the first person plural imperative in these texts, this is the only one where a variant occurs. The change was made by Zainer 1477 and copied by Sorg 1480. It is manifestly impossible that the Wolfenbüttel scribe should have made this change by mere chance just at the same place where Zainer 1477 made it, the more so since this is the only change of the kind which was made by either.

We are therefore forced to the conclusion that in this passage the scribe of the Wolfenbüttel MS copied from Zainer 1477 or Sorg 1480. But how far does this dependence extend? Since noting the above variant in the Book of Maccabees I have had no further opportunity of comparing the texts concerned, and a number of additional passages from Maccabees yield no result, as in them Zainer 1473 and 1477 agree. It will be remembered, however, that the work of the third scribe was confined to the portion extending from I Mac. 5, 28 to the end of II Mac. We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that the edition of Zainer 1477 or Sorg 1480 was used only in this part, for at the beginning of the New Testament, where the first scribe sets in again, the text follows that of Zainer 1473. It is to be noted, further, that all the changes from Mentel to Zainer and from Zainer to Mentel were made by the first scribe, who completed the work, signing his name as *Martin Huber Tütscher schulmaister*. Of these changes of text Walther notes only the first, fourth and fifth, the two latter being put at the wrong place. The scribes are not mentioned at all by him.

II. *Codex Germanicus Monacensis 204, 205.*

This MS, which is in two large folio volumes, is mentioned by Walther, cols. 134, 135. The text agrees very closely with that

of Mentel's Bible, which was printed at Strassburg about the year 1466. Errors of Mentel, such as *edeum* for *e denn*, Gen. 11, 4; *und* for *uncz*, II Esdr. 4, 21; *doch* for *dich*, II Ezra 6, 10, are all shared by Cgm. 204-5. But such agreements do not prove absolutely that this MS is a copy of the printed Bible, as long as the original from which the latter copied is unknown. This MS might have contained the errors in question, transmitting them to Mentel's Bible and to Cgm. 204-5 independently. But the following circumstance proves indisputably that Cgm. 204-5 is a direct copy of Mentel's Bible.

On f. 362v. of Cgm. 204, about four inches from the bottom of the second column, are the words *wirt guot den die got rechte*. The remainder of the column contains only the words *gaissen und dem hindenkalt der hirschen auff den bergen arometen* (end of page). The next page, f. 363r., contains an illustration, and the text begins: *Incipit prologus in libro sapientiae*.

The first of the above quotations is from Ecclesiastes 8, 12 (*bonum timentibus Deum*), while the words after the break, which do not fit in at all, are from Cantic. 8, 14, the last verse of that book (*capreae hinnuloque cervorum super montes aromatum*). Consequently, the latter part of the Book of Ecclesiastes (from 8, 12 to the end) and all of Solomon's Song except a part of the last verse, are omitted in Cgm. 204. This gap can not be due to the loss of a number of leaves in Cgm. 204, as the MS shows no defect and the gap does not occur at the end of a leaf. A comparison with the Mentel Bible, however, fully explains the omission.

Here f. 204v. ends *wirt güt den die got*, and f. 205r. correctly continues *furchtē: die do furchtent sein anlutz*. Folio 207r. begins *rech gaissen und dem hindenkalt der hirschen auf den bergen aromathen* (end of Solomon's Song). It is evident that the portion of the text omitted in Cgm. 204 corresponds exactly to the contents of ff. 205, 206 of Mentel, and this coincidence shows conclusively that the MS is a direct copy from Mentel.

Several other features of the MS deserve mention. First of all the scribes. The first one generally copied the text of Mentel without change, except in the case of the words *aus*, *auf*, which he changed uniformly to *us*, *uff*. In a few cases an old *i* replaced the new diphthong *ei* of Mentel, and the word *haus* was generally changed to *hus*. In all other cases the new diphthongs of Mentel were reproduced. In a number of instances this scribe even changed an old *ei* of Mentel to *ai*; for example, *ainen*, Gen. 1, 26;

ainen, allain, Gen. 2, 18; *ainer, stain, laimig*, Gen. 11, 3; *getailt*, Gen. 11, 4. It may even be said that this change is regular with this scribe. The form *geen*, 1st p. pl. pres. ind. and imperative, was also frequently supplanted by *gangen*, as in Exod. 5, 8, 17; Deut. 13, 6, 13; 1 Reg. 11, 4. The scribe therefore was most probably a Suabian living near the Bavarian border. He continued to IV Reg. 23, 8, ending with the word *fursten*. With the following words, *der stat*, another scribe began. This is on f. 183v., col. 1, l. 25 of Cgm. 204. Immediately before the change we find numerous instances of *uff, uf, uswurffen, hus*, while in the portion written by the second scribe we find only *auff, aus*, the forms which occur in Mentel; instances may be found as early as l. 28, col. 1, f. 183v. The second scribe continued to substitute *ai* for *ei*, but he did not introduce the form *gangen*. He was, however, also a Suabian, for there are numerous instances of forms such as *aubent, schlauf, schläf, gethän, rät, wären, jür, äss, schäffen, nämen, wäffen, wäppen, lägen*, where Middle High German *â* has been changed to *au*. This is one of the chief characteristics of the Suabian dialect in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. That the sign *ä* is equivalent to *au* is proved by parallel forms such as *schlauff, schläf*. The old diphthong *ou* is also represented by this sign, as in *weyrächs*, Luc. 1, 11; also the new diphthong *au* in *täben*, Jer. 46, 16.

A further indication of the dialect of the scribe is found in I Cor. 10, 9, where the number *XXIII. M* of Mentel is written out: *drew und czwaintzig tusent*. This is half Bavarian and half Suabian, *drew* being decidedly Bavarian, while *tusent* is the undiphthongized Suabian form. This scribe wrote the rest of the work.

At the end of the first volume, Cgm. 204, there is the inscription: *1473 ward daz | buoch gantz aussgemacht nach den obresten* (= Epiphany). The second volume, Cgm. 205, has at the end this inscription: *Finis huius libri | 1472/3 mittichen vor wihnachten alz auss | gemacht Ihs marya*. Walther, col. 134, reads this as follows: *1472 | 3 wuchē vā wihnchtē alz auss | gemacht Jh's murger* [?]. He advisedly adds a question-mark, for the last two words are beyond doubt *Jesus Maria*, and not the name of the scribe, as conjectured by Walther. The word *mittichen*, which is a variant form of *Mittwoch*, is not as distinct as the rest, but Dr. Riezler, Librarian at Munich, confirms my interpretation.

With regard to Walther's *3 wuchen*, it may be noted that it is entirely foreign to mediaeval usage to write dates in this fashion,

three weeks, or even one week, before a given festival or saint's day. The invariable usage is to write the saint's day on which an event occurred, or else name the day of the week before or after the nearest festival or prominent saint's day.

We have therefore the strange phenomenon that the first volume bears a later date than the second. This is due to the fact that the last two leaves of the first volume were inserted subsequent to the writing of the second volume. These two leaves contain the latter part of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, from chap. 50, 8 to the end, beginning with the words *schmeckent in den tagen des sumers . . .* The ink is much darker than that of the preceding pages, and the watermark of the paper is an eight-pointed star in a circle, while all the other leaves of this volume have a crown and a triangle joined by a bar.

The scribe commenced with a stock of the crown-and-triangle paper, which lasted as far as f. 292 of the second volume. The remainder of this volume consists of the paper with the star watermark. The scribe completed the second volume, on the Wednesday before Christmas, 1472/3, which date was December 23. Subsequently the last two leaves of the first volume were replaced, and the date of this final completion was after Epiphany (Jan. 6), 1473.

The former last leaf of the first volume I discovered pasted to the front inside cover of the second volume. Only the first page had been written upon, the other side being blank with the exception of the rubric *ysaias* at the top, corresponding to *ppheta* on the first page of the second volume. This shows that originally the scribe had expected to make one volume out of his MS, as the Mentel Bible was in one volume. But later, on account of the bulk of the MS, a division was made between Ecclesiasticus and Isaiah, the regular division of the Vulgate. Then, however, the last leaf of the first volume contained the rubric *ysaias*, and therefore it was replaced, together with the preceding one, the volume being of folio size. The old leaf has no inscription containing the date. The text agrees with that of the new leaf, except that the latter omits the phrase *zu im und du hast sie geredt*. The preceding clause also ends with *geredt*, and the scribe jumped from one to the other. On the old leaf the word *geredt* stands at the beginning of a line in both instances, hence the omission was the more readily made.

NOTES.

SOPH. AJAX 143.

In Mr. Edwin W. Fay's article on 'The Aryan God of Lightning' (A. J. P. XVII 1-29), it will be remembered, allusion is made to a possible "primitive confusion of the stems *ekwe* 'horse' and *aga-* 'water' (perhaps **akwa*) in the Aryan Period, with the added semasiotic interpretation of both stems by 'run,' a *nomen agentis* to the stem *ǎk* 'sharp, swift'" (p. 3). This was supported in a way by names of rivers cited by Sibree, such as Sk. *aḡṡavati*, Gr. Pers. *Hyd-aspes*, Gk. *Μελανίππιον*, *Ἀγανίππη*. Reference was further made to the *aḡvatthá*-tree, it being "characteristic of the fig genus 'to abound in milky juice.'" Homer was then adduced, Δ 500:

ὄς οἱ Ἀβυδόθεν ἦλθε παρ' ἵππων ὠκειάων, (ἱπῶν?)

'from beside the swift waters.'

Mr. Fay also has called attention to *ikkos*, and the "certainty of a stem *ik-* in Greek as testified by *ikmós* 'moisture' and *izei* 'δηθήσαι' (Hesych)."

If we turn to Soph. Ajax 1206 we see the picture of the encampment by night:

κείμαι δ' ἀμέριμος οὕτως
 ἀεὶ πυκναῖς δρόσοις τεγγόμενος κόμας
 λυγρᾶς μνήματα Τροίας.

Thus the Salaminian mariner whose bones seafogs alone would not have caused to ache.

Now, Ajax' midnight adventure is described by this rheumatic squire 143:

σὲ τὸν ἵππομανῆ
 λειμῶν' ἐπιβάντ' ὀλέσαι Δαναῶν
 βοτὰ καὶ λείαν . . .

The Greek's fondness for etymologizing—fostered perhaps by the Mysteries, for may not Aischylos have been on the point of an etymological disclosure when his audience refused to allow him to proceed?—is apparent in Sophokles, although more artis-

tically applied than in Euripides, who must have been spoiled by Sokrates. It would not be an injustice to the passage under consideration to convey into *ἵππομανῆ* a meaning in accordance with Mr. Fay's *ἵππη*, and suiting the ethos of the speaker and the genius of the poet. *ἵππομανῆ λειμῶνα* then I would translate 'the meadow with its mad rills,' or (referring to Jebb ad loc.) comparing Fr. 591 *καρπομανῆς*, 'abounding in water.' *λειμῶνα* incidentally suggests the etymology.

Theok. Id. 2, 48 (quoted by Jebb, Soph. Aj., Appendix) has

Ἴππομανές φυτόν ἐστὶ παρ' Ἀρκάσι, τῆ δ' ἐπι πᾶσαι
καὶ πῶλοι μαίρονται ἀν' ὄρεα καὶ θοαὶ ἵπποι.

For *Ἴππομανές* cf. Sk. *afvatthā* of the fig-tree as indicative of its succulence, and with Theok. cf. the derivation thereof, "*ἴθα* = *stha*, under which horses stand."

It is significant that in Aj. 601 ΛΕΙΜΩΝΙΑΙΤΟΙΑΙ has not yet been satisfactorily reconstructed.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.

HENRY N. SANDERS.

AN AESOPIC FABLE IN OLD FRENCH PROSE.

Although Aesop's Fables were great favorites in France during the Middle Ages, it is very rarely that they are met with in the manuscripts in any other than a metrical form. The following prose text is an isolated instance found in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 435, fo. 46 vo, col. 1, to fo. 46 vo, col. 2.

It is a well-known fact that fable collections in France during the earlier centuries went by the name of *ysopet*, a diminutive of Aesop's very name, but the present instance appears to be a more sporadic use of this term to denote the supposed author himself.

As the text here given has never before appeared in print, and as it possesses the two points of special interest noted above, its publication may perhaps not prove unwelcome as an addition to our knowledge of popular literature in Europe before the Renaissance.

Exemple au propos de flacter.

Ysopet raconte en ses fables morales de deux hommes dont l'un estoit veritable et l'autre flacteur. Ilz alerent vne foiz en la regnon des cinges et les trouerent assemblez en vng lieu. Le

maistre des cinges qui seoit en son trosne audessus des autres appella le flacteur et luy demanda : "Qui suis je," dist il, "et qui sont ceulx qui me seruent?" "Tu es," dist celluy, "vng empeureur, et ceulx cy sont tes princes, tes ducs et tes barons." Icelluy fist le maistre singe grant honneur et luy feist moult de biens. Quant celluy qui ne sauoit flater ne mentir vit ainsi honorer son compaignon pour mentir, il dist en luy mesmes : "Ce mon compaignon pour flacter et mentir a este ainsi honore. O! comme le seray je haultement pour dire verite." Le maistre singe l'appella et luy demanda qu'il luy sembloit de luy et de ses gens. "Tu es," dist il, "vng cinge, et tous ceulx d'entour toy sont cinges." Lors tout incontinent le cinge et ses subgetz luy rovirent sus et fut tout desclue, esgratigne et malmene.

Par lequel exemple nous est donc a entendre que la verite n'est pas tousiours bonne a dire ; car les prelatz et les princes ne veulent ouyr dire que li choses qui leur plaisent. Bien sont singes ceulx qui font ou seussient faire les cingeries en leurs maisons, et qui croient plus tost vng flacteur que vng homme veritable.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Prohibitives in Silver Latin. By WILLARD K. CLEMENT. Reprint from A. J. P., vol. XXI 2. 1900.

I did not suppose that I could be tempted into writing anything more on the subject of the Latin Prohibitive, but Professor Clement's method of criticism is so unusual, and his comments would be so utterly misleading to the casual reader, that I must, in justice to myself, say one word more. It is unfortunate that Clement did not devote greater care to the preparation of his article, as he has undoubtedly collected much valuable material. In its present form, however, the article is, in most respects, quite without value, so far as its criticism of my own views is concerned, on account of its numerous inaccuracies and its utter lack of discrimination between relevant and irrelevant matter.

In my articles on the Latin Prohibitive I made the claim that, *prior to the time of Livy*, the perfect tense in prohibitions differed from the present in being a more energetic form of expression. Clement's method of combating this claim is to cite some instances *from Silver Latin* which he does not think in harmony with it. One might as well try to refute the grammar-rule that *quamquam* takes the indicative in classical prose by citing from Silver Latin the numerous instances of the subjunctive.

Whatever might have been shown to be the usage of Silver Latin, my claim as to earlier times would have remained quite unaffected. However, after examining such of Clement's statistics as really have a bearing upon my theory, I am now quite ready to assert, as I could not have done when I wrote my Latin Prohibitive, that the claim I made for earlier times holds also, in all its essential features, for Silver Latin, and to treat Clement's article as though my claim had originally been framed in such a way as to cover the latter period also.

The distinction I made between the two tenses was made solely with reference to independent prohibitions introduced by *ne* (*neve*) and *cave*. In attempting to prove false this distinction, Clement cites a curious mixture of subordinate clauses, undoubted contingent-future ('potential') subjunctives, mere conjectural readings, and subjunctives with *nec*, *minime*, *nullus*, *nemo*, *nihil*, *numquam*, *non*, and *vide*. When Clement professes to discuss a certain claim of mine, I surely have a right to insist that he shall take that claim as it stands, without any additions or modifications. In that part of the Latin Prohibitive which prompted Clement's

paper, not a word was said by me regarding the subjunctive uses with *nec, nihil, numquam*, etc., except an emphatic statement to the effect that they lay entirely outside of my theory and had characteristics very different from those of the instances I was going to discuss. What possible objection can Clement have to doing in reality what he professes to be doing? What possible objection can he have to separating (at least temporarily, for the purpose of testing my claim), in his discussion as he does in his headings, the instances of *ne (neve)* and *cave* from those of *nec, nihil, numquam*, etc.? Such a separation could not by any possibility affect his discussion or his conclusions in any way detrimental to the truth. If the instances with the latter words present the same general characteristics as those with the former, then his conclusions would not be affected at all by the fact that he had temporarily separated the two sorts of instances. On the other hand, if the two classes of instances are found to show important differences in usage (differences that can not be accounted for by mere chance), then surely it would be quite inexcusable in any one not to recognize the justice of treating the two sorts of clauses separately. In either case, then, such a method of procedure as I suggest would have been perfectly fair to Clement's side of the case, and it would have had the additional advantage of being fair to mine.

In the following discussion I will confine myself, as I did in my original article, exclusively to the instances of *ne (neve)* and *cave*. Clement cites 25 such instances of the perfect tense (pp. 156 ff.). Of these 25 instances, he admits at the outset that 17 are in accord with the distinction I made. At first he classifies all of the remaining 8 instances as being not in accord with my theory; but a little later he decides (pp. 164-5) that 5 of these 8 instances are not necessarily against it, after all. In other words, he finds, according to his own admission, only 3, out of a total of 25 instances, which he considers as distinctly opposed to my theory that the perfect tense indicates energetic utterance, prompted by alarm due to fear that the prohibited act will be performed. Let us examine these 3 alleged exceptions:

Phaedr. App. 26, 3 *ne timueris*. Just as I was on the point of admitting that this is a clear violation of my theory, I discovered that *ne timueris* is merely one of several conjectures, and has not the slightest authority of any kind whatever. All the other conjectures have the present tense, which would be in complete accord with my theory.

Tac. Ann. VI 8 *ne ultimum Seiani diem, sed sedecim annos cogitaveritis*. Here I fear that Clement neglected to read the context. Failure to heed this prohibition will inevitably result in the speaker's condemnation and death. The speaker is on trial, charged with being a friend and accomplice of Sejanus. He says, in effect, to his judges: 'Do not think of

me as intimate with Sejanus on his last day, and for that reason condemn me as implicated in his crimes; but think of me rather as his friend of former years, when all men were proud to claim Sejanus as their friend.'

Mart. II 68, 3. If this prohibition is not complied with, the speaker's former *rex* and *dominus* will call him insolent, an act which might or might not prompt energetic prohibition, according to the speaker's feelings regarding it.

These are the 3 instances upon which Clement depends for the refutation of my claim that the perfect tense with *ne* (*neve*) and *cave* indicates energetic utterance! Surely, further comment is unnecessary on this part of his paper.

The most unfortunate part of Clement's discussion is his treatment of the present subjunctive. He has here classified his instances in a hit-or-miss way, sometimes apparently without even so much as testing a given expression to see whether it can be construed as a prohibition or not. He has included in his list of prohibitions instances which no amount of violence could distort into prohibitions. This statement may be verified by a mere glance at pages 161 and 163, for example, where instances of *nec possis* are repeatedly cited as prohibitions. Who ever heard of such a prohibition as 'And do not be able' (as though 'being able' were something that could be ordered or prohibited)? Similarly *nec adsequare*, cited (p. 163) from Tac. Ann. 6, 8, is not a prohibition and is not regarded as such by any editor or commentator. Again, cases of the subjunctive introduced by *neque enim* are classed by Clement as prohibitions. They have, of course, the same modal force as that illustrated in *nec enim numeraverim* (Cic. Brut. 47, 173), *neque enim fugerim* (de orat. III 38, 153), etc. *Neque enim* is confined to explanatory and illustrative statements, and is not used with a prohibitive subjunctive for the same reason that it is not used with the imperative mood.

Further evidence of inexcusable carelessness will be noticed in Clement's free intermixture of subordinate clauses (*oro ne facias*, etc.) with prohibitions proper. If Clement read my own discussion as carefully as he ought to have done before attempting to criticise me, he must have noticed that I said on pp. 135 (3) and 149 (17) of The Latin Prohibitive that clauses of the type *oro ne facias* were, as a matter of course, excluded from my discussion (with the exception of some four or five instances in which an accompanying imperative, the order of words, or some other consideration made it probable that the *ne*-clause was independent), and that I had not even attempted to collect the very numerous instances of this use. And if he did notice this, I am surprised that it did not seem to him quite unjust to me to cite against me all the numerous instances of such a usage in Silver Latin, and thus to give the impression that they belong to the phenomena

that I myself discussed. In discussing the distinction between tenses in prohibitions, the type of expression represented by *oro ne facias* should not enter into consideration, for the reason that one can never say that the *ne*-clause is not a subordinate clause. Indeed, all such clauses in Cicero (and he is full of them) have almost uniformly been regarded as subordinate. If a single one of them could be positively proved to be independent, the theory that *ne* with the present subjunctive in prohibitions is foreign to Ciceronian prose (except when addressed to an indefinite second person) would be dead without further discussion. It is a grammatical commonplace that, in the process of subordination, distinctions observed in independent clauses are very frequently obliterated. Such an obliteration of tense-distinctions has occurred in the type *oro ne facias*. Many such instances of the present in Cicero are full of emotion and involve acts that are regarded with great alarm. But what has all this to do with my distinction between tenses? The perfect tense is, as far as I am aware, quite unknown in clauses of this type, with the exception of a few cases in early Latin, where they may have been felt as *quasi*-independent clauses.

It may be that the levelling influences of subordination are discernible even in the *cave*-constructions. At any rate, *cave* was used in early Latin with both tenses. But before the time of Cicero, the use of the perfect tense with *cave* had practically disappeared. The only instances I know of after Terence are Hor. Sat. 2, 3, 38 and Curt. Ruf. 5, 2, 21.

The subordinate clauses which must be excluded from Clement's collection of instances are the following: Phaedr. App. 26, 3-4; Curt. Ruf. 6, 3, 12 ('I say this, lest, etc.');

9, 2, 28; Il. Lat. 330; 724; Apul. Met. 22 (19, 3); 8, 8 (169, 24-26; this is of course a clause of proviso introduced, as frequently, by *modo* (= *dummodo*)); Dracont. 5, 276 ('lest');

Sil. Ital. 17, 367 (*oro* occasionally takes subjunctive without *ut* at all periods); Incert. (Baehrens 3, p. 273). Most of the remaining instances of *ne* and *cave* with the present, that are cited against me by Clement, support my theory so conspicuously that I can not account for his classification of them except by supposing that, through some oversight, they got into the wrong column. Certainly no one could seriously regard the acts prohibited by them as being of an alarming character that would in any way be likely to call forth vigorous utterance. That each reader may convince himself of the truth of this statement, I cite below all the instances of *ne* (*neve*) and *cave* with the present, adding after each reference the result that will follow a failure to comply with the prohibition. It will be seen that the result in the following instances will never be disastrous:

Pers. 3, 96: the speaker's life will or may be saved by his friend's insisting that he shall care for his illness.

- Pers. 5, 170: Chaerestratus will attempt to free himself from a disreputable life (see Gildersleeve's translation of lines 161-175).
- Stat. Theb. 3, 241 *neu me temptare precando certetis*: the speaker will have a request addressed to him (*ne pugnate* is the usual reading earlier in the verse, and is probably correct).
- Stat. Silv. 4, 9, 55: a friend, having received some of the speaker's verses, will send some of his own in reply (in a spirit of fun).
- Mart. 11, 55, 2: Urbicus will have an own child to inherit his property rather than a scheming pretended friend.
- Pseud.-Quint. 201, 9: the speaker himself indicates the insignificant result of non-compliance, by the following *ne videaris*, etc.
- Vespa 62: the speaker, a cook, will lose a debate on the relative merits of his own calling as compared with that of a baker.
- Auson. 296, 83: } no one will ever so much as know
 Sen. Troad. 553 (562): } whether these prohibitions are complied with or not.
- Apul. 7, 5 (146, 3): the speaker will not be recognized as the famous robber he claims to be.
- Curt. Ruf. 4, 1, 22 (reading uncertain): the person addressed will forget that he was once poor.
- Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 26: the person addressed will spare the speaker's feelings so far as possible in narrating what has happened.
- Apul. 2, 10 (30, 6): a mere jest, disregarded (and meant to be disregarded) alike by the speaker and the person addressed (to the ecstatic happiness of both of them).
- Auson., p. 301, l. 190 (Peiper): the speaker will be blamed, but he considers such blame of too little account to cause any change in his manner of living.

It should be remembered that the cases above cited are *only those that are, according to Clement, least favorable to my theory*. I am passing by unnoticed the much larger number of those that are admitted by Clement himself to support the theory. It will be seen, then, that out of the total of 63 instances of *ne (neve)* and *cave* with the present subjunctive, cited by Clement, there remain only 7 in which the result would be disastrous, if the prohibition were not to be heeded. One of these—Baehrens 3, p. 300 (*ne referas*)—can hardly be regarded as having any weight, as this is a perfectly formal prayer of the cheeriest kind. The assurance of safety and divine favor breathes through the entire prayer. There is therefore nothing to call forth energetic utterance. In the remaining 6 instances (Avian. 9, 23; Dracont. 5, 273; Stat. Theb. 3, 665; 6, 893; Mart. 6, 78, 3; Curt. 7, 8, 28) the acts prohibited are of such a character as naturally to call forth energetic utterance. But two of these are instances of *cave*, and can therefore hardly have as much weight as similar instances in Plautus, as the perfect with *cave* had, generally speaking, long

since gone out of use (see above). Our examination of the present tense has, then, resulted in showing that over 90 per cent. (93 per cent.?) of the instances (57 (59?) out of a total of 63) are in perfect accord with my theory. Of the 6 (4?) exceptions it is enough to say that, when a man is alarmed at a threatening danger he does not always use the most energetic expression that a language affords.

On p. 165 Clement takes "at random" numerous examples of the present tense and states what the disastrous results would be in case of a failure to comply with the prohibition. An examination of the passages referred to (one has to search for them, as citations are omitted) will disclose the fact (a surprising one, no doubt, to Clement) that only 3 of them belong to the phenomena under discussion (i. e. are introduced by *ne* (*neve*) or *cave*; and of these 3 instances, one (Stat. Theb. 3, 241) assumes as correct an uncertain reading (*ne pugnare*) that *is rejected by nearly all editors*, and in another (Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 26 *cave auribus parcas*) a failure to comply would be quite the opposite of disastrous. In other words, he cites against me only one instance (Mart. 6, 78, 3 *bibas caveto*) out of a total of 63 instances, and this is with *cave*, which, as seen above, had before the time of Martial come to be used only with the present tense. And still Clement apparently thinks that he is making out a strong case against my theory!

It is, I hope, clear from the above discussion that the distinction I drew for classical times between *ne feceris* and *ne facias* still holds perfectly good (with rare exceptions) in Silver Latin. Whether a similar distinction will hold good for the genuine prohibitions with *neque* (*nec*), *nihil*, *numquam*, *nullus*, *minime*, etc., I can not say. Whether it will or not, is immaterial to the justification of my claim, and I have not therefore examined this part of Clement's collection with this point in view. If it should break down when applied to these instances, this would be a very remarkable fact, and suggestions of the reason for such a state of things would then be in order. The conditions of the problem in this period are very different from those confronting us in the Golden Age. It is beyond all dispute that *neque* (*nec*), for instance, had in Silver Latin come to be regarded often as an exact equivalent of *neve* (*neu*) and could be used for it at any time and in any sort of clause. But while it is true that the types *nec feceris* and *nec facias* are freely used in Silver Latin as prohibitions, it is also true, and quite as undeniably true, that they are in Silver Latin, just as in earlier times, not infrequently used as expressions of mere contingent futurity. As instances of this latter use may be cited Tac. Germ. 14, 5 *nec tam facile persuaseris quam*, etc. ('nor would you so easily persuade,' etc.); ib. 18, 1 *severa illic matrimonia, nec ullam morum partem magis laudaveris*. In such cases *nec* with the perfect would yield no sense whatever, if treated as a prohibition; such expressions are in modal force exactly like *nec crediderim* (Tibull. III 4, 83), *nec*

facile dixerim (Cic. Brut. 41, 151), *neque reprehenderim* (Cic. orat. 47, 157), etc. Numerous instances might be cited also of *nec* with the present tense where the only interpretation that makes sense is the one that regards the subjunctive as one of contingent futurity, e. g. Mart. 4, 20, 3 *ferre nec hanc possis, Colline*; Stat. Silv. 10, 70, 11 *nec possis*; Tac. Ann. 6, 8 *nec adsequare*; Liv. 35, 16 *nihil aliud profecto dicatis*; and often (see Part II of my 'Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses'). It follows from these facts that, even in Silver Latin, wherever it makes as satisfactory sense to interpret such expressions as *nec putaveris* and *nec dicas* as meaning 'nor would you think,' 'nor would you say,' as it does to interpret them as prohibitions, no one can properly criticise such an interpretation as impossible. I can not see how any one has a right to say that every instance that makes good sense when interpreted as a prohibition *must* be so interpreted, and only those that can not be made to yield good sense when interpreted as prohibitions may be regarded as expressions of contingent futurity. Where either one of these interpretations makes as good sense as the other, it is in Silver Latin difficult to decide how the expressions were felt by the Romans themselves. Possibly the two sorts of expressions had by this time become somewhat confused in the Roman consciousness. Such a supposition would, at any rate, account for the remarkable extension in the use of both *non* and *nec* in Silver Latin and the inroads they are admitted to have made upon the territory of *ne* and *neve*.

In one or two details, the use of *ne* with the perfect in Silver Latin is shown by Clement to differ from that of earlier times, but my own casual observation had convinced me that such differences exist, and I called attention to them in The Latin Prohibitive (p. 326 (49)), a fact, by the way, which Clement forgets to mention. In early times it was never used in deferential address. In Silver Latin, on the other hand, it is used once in addressing the *patres conscripti* and in a few other instances where deferential address would, under ordinary circumstances, be expected. It will be noticed, however, that every such case, without exception (see Clement's own classification), is one in which failure to comply will entail a disastrous result. Even in Tac. Ann. 6, 8 (the only instance not so classified by Clement), failure to comply with the prohibition will result in the speaker's condemnation and death. When a man's life depends upon the non-performance of the act prohibited, as it does here, he can hardly be expected to retain perfect composure and observe all the forms of politeness.

It is true that the proportion of verbs of mental activity among prohibitions expressed by *ne* (*neve*) and the perfect is somewhat larger in Silver Latin than in earlier times. But this fact is not in the least unfavorable to my theory, if only these particular prohibitions are of such a sort that failure to comply with them will lead to disastrous results. And we have already seen that they are, as admitted in nearly all cases by Clement himself.

One other point should be briefly touched upon. On p. 165 Clement refers to passages in which he says the present and perfect tenses occur side by side in a way to show that no difference was felt between the tenses. Even if *ne* with the present and *ne* with the perfect did occur in these passages side by side, I can not see that it would necessarily tend to prove my theory to be false. Why is it necessary to suppose that a man can not prohibit one act with unusual energy, without using the same energy in every other prohibition uttered at about the same time? I should expect that the manner of utterance in each case would ordinarily depend upon the character of the act prohibited, as it appeared to the speaker. However, there is no such instance of the two tenses with *ne* in prohibitions in any of the passages cited by Clement. In Curt. Ruf. 9, 2, 28 and 29 the first *ne*-clause is subordinate (*oro quaesoque ne deseratis*). In Tac. Ann. 6, 8, Clement thinks that *nec adsequere* is an emotional prohibition, and *ne cogitaveritis*, "the reverse." As a matter of fact, *nec adsequere* is not a prohibition at all (see above). On the other hand, *ne cogitaveritis*, as has been shown, is a prohibition of an act which, if performed, would involve as great a disaster as could well be conceived of. None of the other passages cited contains any instance of *ne* or *cave* except Curt. Ruf. 7, 8, 28 f., where *ne credideris* and *cave credas* occur in two neighboring sentences. Attention has already been called to the virtual disappearance of the perfect tense with *cave*.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

H. C. ELMER.

ELMER'S TREATMENT OF THE PROHIBITIVE—A REJOINER.

The editor of the Journal has asked me to reply to Professor Elmer's criticism of my paper, ending the discussion of the prohibitive in these pages. The manner in which Elmer has treated my article makes it possible to discuss his original paper more incisively than the scope of my original investigation permitted.

In his original article (A. J. P. XV 326; 49¹), Elmer said: "My examination of these (i. e. certain Silver Latin) authors leads me to think it probable that the principles I have laid down for classical times will, in the main, hold also for Silver Latin." This inspired my investigation. I made no attempt to prove the incorrectness of Elmer's distinction for the use of the tenses in prohibitions in the period before Livy, but only its incorrectness for the period I was considering.² As Elmer (A. J. P. XX 80, note) commended my "careful examination" of the period when I had spent only a few weeks upon it, instead of the year and a half

¹ The first number gives the page of the original article, the second the same page in the reprint.

² For the usage in Terence, see my paper in C. R. XV 157-159 (April, 1901).

devoted to the final paper, and as he encouraged me to continue, I can not believe that he is entirely serious in his present criticism of my method of treatment.

One of his first complaints (I shall treat them as they appear in his reply) is that I have brought other things into my discussion, beside "independent prohibitions introduced by *ne* (*neve*) and *cave*"—for example, clauses introduced by *vide ne*. Here, at the start, we have a lack of exactness in his terminology. He uses the unmodified word "prohibitions," when he ought constantly and consistently to say "independent prohibitions, together with one class of dependent prohibitions, namely those with *cave*" (for of the dependence of the subjunctive in the latter class there can be no question). *Why* does Elmer choose to confine himself to the dependent prohibitions introduced by *cave*? He is bound to state *why* the phenomena with *vide ne* are not the same as with *cave*. It will not do, as a scientific matter, to say that he *chooses* to confine himself to the construction with *cave*. If he can make out the case for *cave*, that fact is interesting, but he can not arrest the interest of *other* students of Latin at this point. One wants to know not simply what the underlying feeling of Latin usage was in independent prohibitions and dependent prohibitions with *cave*, but what the Latin feeling was in prohibitions in general.

The same holds true of the subjunctive constructions with *nec*, *nihil*, etc. The fact that Elmer regards them as belonging to a different class is no reason why others, who do not so believe, should be debarred from considering them in endeavoring to settle the general question. While he does not mention these subjunctive uses in his first paper on the prohibitive, his treatment of certain passages in that paper and in Cornell Studies, VI is so inconsistent and arbitrary that it is impossible to be certain what his real position is. I will cite a few passages as illustrations.

In the review in the present number of the Journal, he says that I discuss, among other things, "subjunctives with *nec*, *minime*, *nullus*, *nemo*, *nihil*, *numquam*, *non* and *vide*," and a little later, "in that part of the Latin Prohibitive which prompted Clement's paper . . . not a word was said by me regarding the subjunctive uses with *nec*, *nihil*, *numquam*, etc., except an emphatic statement that they lay entirely outside of my theory and had characteristics very different from those of the instances I was going to discuss." Then they are *not* prohibitive. Very good. Let us see how Elmer himself classifies some of the examples: (1) *Ne . . . quidem*. In Cic. Tusc. I, 41, 98 *ne vos quidem mortem timueritis* is, so Elmer implies (323; 46), not a prohibition; but *ne mittas quidem* in Ter. Hec. 342 (146; 14) and *hoc . . . ne Apellae quidem dixeris* in Cic. Fam. 7, 25, 2 (150; 18) are placed by him among examples of the prohibitive. (2) *Nullus*. In Ter. Hec. 79 *nullus dixeris* is implied to be probably not prohibitive (323; 46); but *nullam severis* in Hor. Carm. I, 18, 1 is classed (Studies, VI 26) with the prohibitives (it is plainly a translation of

Alc. fr. 44 *μηδὲν φυνεύσης*). (3) *Numquam*. In Plaut. Capt. 149 *numquam istuc dixis* is ruled out from the prohibitives (323; 46), but *numquam . . . quisquam . . . dixerit* in Plaut. Rud. 790 (Studies, VI 26) is counted in. (4) *Nihil*. *Nihil ignoveris*, Cic. Mur. 31, 65 (322; 45), and other examples are ruled out, but *nil fuerit*, Hor. Sat. 1, 2, 57 (Studies, VI 26), is apparently included in the prohibitives (and is so regarded by most editors). (5) *Nemo*. Elmer objects to the instance of *nemo* which I cite, *neminem riseris*, Cato, Coll. 1, 31; but in Studies, VI 26-7 he gives *dederit nemini*, Cato, Agr. 5; *nemo habessit*, Cic. Leg. 2, 8, 19; *moratus sit nemo*, Liv. 9, 11, 13; and *nemo quemquam deceperit*, Liv. 9, 11, 4; of which last example he remarks: "this is from a very impassioned speech at the time of a grave military crisis." (6) *Nec*. Elmer rules out all my examples for Silver Latin. Yet he himself (Studies, VI 26-7) has included two examples from early and classical Latin in his list—namely, *nec temptaris*, Hor. Carm. 1, 18, 2, and *nec me ille sirit Iuppiter* (for *sirit* of the MSS), Plaut. Curc. 27.¹

Passing to his consideration of my examples of *ne* and *cave* with the perfect, I wish to restate a principle which he endeavors to use against me. I maintained that in prohibitions addressed to an indefinite second person (general precepts), be they perfect or present, there is no means of determining with certainty the presence or absence of emotion in a given case, for the simple reason that they *are* general. They certainly can not be counted for Elmer's theory; and the fairest course to pursue is to leave all of them out of consideration. Supposing, however, for the sake of argument, that one could determine the presence or absence of emotion, the presents, in fact, far exceed the perfects in number, so that in advancing this view I was aiding Elmer rather than myself. Excluding these cases, I gave three instances of non-emotional perfects. Of one of these, Phaedr. App. 26, 5, Elmer says: "*ne timueris* is merely one of several conjectures and has not the slightest authority of any kind whatever" (the italics are mine). The case would perhaps seem to call for the strong language which it evoked. But Elmer must share with me the rebuke; for in his original paper (326; 49) he himself gives the example with the same reading and without mention of its being a conjecture. Evidently we both used the Teubner text, which in its enumeration of the more important conjectures adopted makes no mention of this passage. That Tac. Ann. 6, 8 *ne cogitaveritis*, a passage whose context I carefully considered at the time, is emotional, I am not yet convinced. On the third instance, Mart. 2, 68, 3 *ne dixeris*, one should read Elmer's later comments on Auson. 296, 83 and Sen. Troad. 553, to see how he treats perfects which he wishes to retain and presents which he desires to exclude. Although Elmer (137; 5) cites Liv. 22, 39, 2

¹ *Sirit* here is certainly an optative, but if *nec* can be used with the optative, it is absurd to say that it can not be used with the volitive.

sis, neque . . . desis, neque . . . des, remarking: "Livy and later writers frequently use *neque* for *neve*," he admits no instance of the perfect (pp. 156-7) or present (162-3) in my paper of a similar character.

In his closing words on the perfect he evidently fails to grasp what are the two things requisite to establish the validity of his theory, and without which the theory is untenable. Not merely must the majority of the perfects be emotional, but the largest part of the presents must be the reverse. In Silver Latin the proportion of emotional perfects is much larger than in Plautus, as readers of Bennett's critique (*Studies*, IX) will recall. In Cicero's Letters Elmer himself does not claim "great earnestness, either real or assumed," for all the perfects (150; 18). Supposing all the examples I cited were clearly emotional (and even Elmer does not claim this), the theory would not be proved, if there were any considerable number of emotional presents. That this last is the case in the period discussed I am convinced, despite Elmer's efforts to remove the examples.

In my treatment of the present I made several mistakes in classification and interpretation. These are frankly to be admitted, though I am glad to say they are far less numerous than Elmer would have his readers believe. Whatever their cause, they were *not* due to hasty work; for each subjunctive passage was carefully considered at least six times, sometimes after intervals of weeks or even months.

On pages 161 and 163 I cited five instances of *nec possis* as prohibitions. The interpretation is doubtless incorrect, but when Elmer asks: "Who ever heard of such a prohibition as 'And do not be able'?" I would refer him to Giles' note on 'Latin Negatives and Their Use in Prohibitions' (*Cambridge Philological Society's Proceedings*, 1901, pp. 12-13), which Professor Gildersleeve very courteously brought to my attention. There an Oscan prohibition is given, the Latin translation of which reads as follows: *nec dicere nec fari possit*. (Giles points out that *nep*, the Oscan equivalent for *neque*, is used *only* in prohibitions.) In *Ov. Art. Am.* 1, 668 and *Ex Ponto* 2, 4, 31 *cave ne possit* occurs. *Nec adsequare*, *Tac. Ann.* 6, 8, is not a prohibition. "*Neque enim*," continues Elmer (I quoted two instances with the perfect, *Ps.-Quint.* 22, 3 and 50, 6), "is not used with a prohibitive subjunctive for the same reason that it is not used with the imperative mood." The fact that *enim* can be used with the imperative (*Ter. Eun.* 751 and *Cic. de Sen.* 19, 69 are examples) and that *nec* can be used with the imperative makes it impossible to rule out *neque enim* with the volitive.

"Another evidence of inexcusable carelessness will be noticed in Clement's free intermixture of subordinate clauses (*oro ne facias*, etc.) with prohibitions proper." As Elmer has been a serious offender in this regard, though in simpler clauses (Bennett, *Studies*, IX, pp. 51, 52, 58-60), it is interesting to get such an

unbiased opinion of his own work. I shall be obliged to refer to the original article on the prohibitive and an instance or two from Studies, VI to show Elmer's theory and practice. It will be most convenient to consider each verb separately: (1) *Obsecro*. Plaut. Amph. 924 te, Alcumena, oro, obsecro te, da mi hanc veniam, irata ne sies; Mil. 862 ne dixeritis, obsecro; Most. 1083. On page 140 (8), Elmer says: "Many of these are accompanied by expressions which betray the speaker's earnestness"; and he includes the word *obsecro*. This shows clearly that in effect he recognizes the construction with *obsecro* as prohibitive. Yet he omits Ter. H. T. 292 Syre mi, obsecro, ne me . . . conicias, and H. T. 1028, 1029 and Phorm. 945,¹ without a word of explanation. Again (135; 3): "the orations of Cicero alone contain 81 prohibitions (or probably twice that number, if we include such expressions as *quaeso ne facias, obsecro ne*, etc.)." His statement shows that he recognizes the feeling to be prohibitive in all these constructions. Why does he include some and exclude others? (2) *Obtestor*. Studies, VI 27, he cites Plaut. Capt. 320 te obtestor, ne faxint as "perhaps" dependent. On the other hand, he does not mention Ter. And. 291 te oro, . . . te obtestor, ne . . . segreges neu deseras,¹ and rejects Il. Lat. 724 vos . . . obtestor, ne . . . velitis. And. 291 and Amph. 924 (which he accepts) are almost identical, *obtestor* in the first being represented by *obsecro* in the second. Elmer certainly would not advance the theory that clauses with *obsecro* are independent, but are not with *obtestor*. (3) *Quaeso*. Plaut. Mil. 1333 ne interveneris, quaeso (141; 9) is a prohibition; Cic. ad Att. 14, 1, 2 quaeso, ne pigrere (151; 19) "might well be explained as" among "instances of the same use" (i. e. prohibitions), and de Rep. 6, 12, 12 (136; 4), but Curt. Ruf. 9, 2, 28 oro quaesoque, ne . . . deseratis is not a prohibition. (4) *Dico*. Plaut. Trin. 501 dico, ne . . . siris is independent (the clause is plainly substantive, as I believe one of Elmer's pupils has shown [Durham, Substantive Clauses in Plautus, p. 18]), while Ter. And. 205 sed dico tibi: ne temere facias; neque haud dices tibi non praedictum; cave is omitted. Here the indicative and imperative point to the independent character of *ne facias*. (5) *Oro*. Elmer accepts an instance in Plaut. Amph. 924, cited above, and rejects instances like *Expectes oro neve interimas me*, Incert. 3, 273, 15, which one of our two greatest authorities on Latin syntax pronounces independent. (6) *Peto, rogo*, etc. "Next to *noli* (149; 17) the most common form of prohibition in Cicero is, I should say, some circumlocution like *peto, rogo, oro*, etc., followed by *ne* with the subjunctive, but I have made no attempt to collect the examples." Elmer cites Cic. ad Fam. 16, 9, 4 petam, ne . . . naviges as "probably independent" (it seems to me almost parallel with Sil. Ital. 17, 367, which he rejects), and excludes Apul. 19, 3 ne spernas, peto. What principles Elmer follows I can not make out. He rejects some instances where the verb precedes *ne* and the subjunctive,

¹ These passages are given in full, C. R. XV 158.

accepts others, and pursues the same inconsistent course when the verb follows or is thrown in parenthetically. It can not be a question of position or verb or tense, for there is no consistency in his use of any of the three. It will be seen that I have tried to follow him as faithfully as the tangle of contradictions would permit, only to be censured for my carelessness and failure to read and profit by his words.

It is clear that the grammarians are far from harmonious in their treatment of independent and dependent clauses. One phenomenon deserves more consideration than it appears to have received. From Plautus on there are numerous instances where an imperative occurs with various verbs, in the same position as subjunctive clauses with *ne*. In some instances an imperative and a *ne* prohibition are used in exact parallelism (e. g. Amph. 924). Is it not possible that all such clauses were felt as paratactic?

Curt. Ruf. 6, 3, 12 and Dracont. 5, 148, 276 are plainly subordinate. Apul. 19, 3 is a proviso (I recognized this too late to prevent the appearance of the example). All other examples of alleged subordination have, I think, been discussed.

Let us consider some of the examples of the present with *ne* and *cave*, which I regarded as emotional and where disaster would follow disregard of the prohibition. I will take up only a few representative cases as illustrative of the whole.—Pers. 3, 96. It is true that the friend's help may save the invalid's life. Many invalids, however, regard any interference with them as a distinct injury to their feelings or interests, and often express themselves vigorously.—Stat. Theb. 3, 243. Elmer objects to my reading *pugnare* for *pugnate*. It does not change in any way the prohibition *ne certetis*.—Stat. Silv. 4, 9, 55; Mart. 11, 102, 7, and Apul. 30, 6 (the last two with *cave*) are in a spirit of fun. One can employ vigorous expressions or a vigorous tone even in jest.—Vespa 62. The loss of a debate is often regarded and felt as a disaster.—Apul. 146, 3. Not to be recognized, as a noted robber would doubtless be a serious shock to a bandit chief's feelings.—Curt. Ruf. 4, 1, 22. Should a poor man, suddenly raised to power, forget his humble origin, his reign would in all probability be tyrannical.—Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 26. Darius urges a messenger not to spare him. Failure to comply with the prohibition would at first sight seem a kindness, but he shows it would not be by adding: "it is often a solace in calamity to know your fate."—Stat. Theb. 11, 111 is certainly emotional. (Elmer, having cited the only instance in Plautus (Men. 994) of *cave* with the third person of the perfect, seems to shun all other instances of the first and third persons with *cave* as religiously as those of *ne*. They certainly should receive the same consideration.) There are various other examples, but as Elmer has not attacked them, it is not necessary to defend them. It has been shown conclusively, I think, that, confining the investigation to the lines Elmer would insist on (*ne* with the subjunctive and *cave* with the subjunctive), that there is a large proportion of emotional presents.

The most trifling objection Elmer urges against my treatment is to be found in his criticism of the examples given on page 165 of my paper of the disasters resulting from non-compliance with the prohibitions: "one has to search for them, as citations are omitted." All the passages referred to were given on the three pages preceding, properly labelled. One appreciates the full value of the criticism when he discovers that, owing to omissions and the absence of citations, he must read over 8000 pages of Teubner text to secure the examples of *cave* in the period Elmer claims to cover.

If it be true, as Elmer admits, that "the types *nec feceris* and *nec facias* are freely used in Silver Latin in prohibitions," why he should be unwilling to consider examples of such usage is a mystery. It is interesting in connection with his statement: "It is beyond all dispute that *neque* (*nec*) had in Silver Latin come to be regarded often as an exact equivalent of *neve* (*neu*)" to read Giles' note, in which he shows that, in Oscan *nep*, the equivalent of Latin *neque*, is used only in prohibitions, and "the form with *-que*, therefore, is not an usurper in the territory of *neve*; *neve* itself is the usurper." That being the case, what becomes of the subjunctive of obligation or propriety with *nec*?

I am perfectly willing to admit that there are instances in Silver Latin where the perfect or the present with *nec* can not be translated as a prohibition. The instances which Elmer cites I treated as he did. On the other hand, I do not see why, when subjunctives with *nec* make perfectly good sense as prohibitions, they should be regarded as anything else, especially since a number of them follow a subjunctive with *ne* or an imperative.

To lists previously given where the present and perfect occur side by side should be added Plaut. Trin. 1011, 1012 *Cave ne crepent; ne destiteris*; Cic. Att. 10, 13, 1 (150; 18) *ne demiseris; pertimescas cave*, and Prop. 1, 10, 20, 23, 24 *Cave ne capias, neu negaris, neu cadant*.

To Elmer's "complete" list of perfects in Cicero's Letters (150; 18) should be added Quint. Frat. 2, 5, 3 *ne omiseris*.

It will be admitted, without citations from Elmer's original article, that the use of dependent prohibitions introduced by *cave* was one of the two parts of the theory which he aimed to establish for the period prior to Livy. It will also be admitted by all scholars that it is absolutely essential for the demonstration of any theory's validity that *all* the examples of the usage within the period covered be collected, that the citations be given, and that the instances be properly classified so that any one desiring to test the theory for himself can do so with comparative ease. Elmer's frequent references to *cave* led me to compare the statistics he gives with my own collections. The following table will best present the results:

		Instances said to occur.	Actual number.	Passages cited.	Text cited.	Omissions.
Plaut.,	Perf.	29	33	29	0	4
	Pres.	9	18	9	0	9
Ter.,	Perf.	4	4	4	0	0
	Pres.	5	9	5	0	4
Cato,	Pres.	17	17	1	1	0
Catull.,	Pres.	0	3	0	0	3
Cicero,	Pres.	30	32	17	1	2
Sallust.,	Pres.	1	1	0	0	0
Nepos,	Pres.	1	1	0	0	0
	Perf.	0	1	0	0	1
Horace,	Perf.	0	6	0	0	6
	Pres.	0	1	0	0	1
Vergil,	Pres.	0	6	0	0	6
Tibull.,	Pres.	0	2	0	0	2
Prop.,	Perf.	0	5	0	0	5
	Pres.	0	1	0	0	1
Ovid,	Perf.	0	16	0	0	16
	Pres.	—	—	—	—	—
		96	156	64	2	60

Elmer says (142; 10) there are 18 (19?) examples of the present in Plautus and Terence, but (146; 14) cites only the number given above. It will be seen that even my statistics are incomplete, as I have noted only the instances met with in my reading since my interest in the subject was aroused. A number of authors are missing, while for Cicero my collections are only for the Letters. Others may be able to extend the list still farther.¹ I give a list of the omissions (except the Plautine perfects, on which see Bennett, *Studies*, VI 57), which may prove serviceable for reference, verbs other than those of the second person being indicated in parentheses, thus (1), (3): Plaut. *Aul.* 660 (1); *Bacch.* 1033 (3); *Curc.* 461 (3); *Most.* 324, 326; *Pseud.* 1296 (1); *Rud.* 704; *Stich.* 38 (1); *Trin.* 1011 (3); *Ter. And.* 403 (3); *H. T.* 1031 (1), 1032 (1); *Phor.* 764 (3); *Catull.* 50, 18, 19; 61, 152; *Cic. Att.* 1, 10, 4; 1, 11, 3; 13, 33, a. 1; *Fam.* 5, 20, 6; 6, 12, 5; 10, 5, 3; 10, 12, 1; 16, 12, 6 (bis); *Hor. Sat.* 2, 3, 38; 2, 3, 177 (bis); 2, 5, 75 (3); *Ep.* 1, 6, 32 (3); 1, 13, 19 (bis); *Verg. Aen.* 11, 293 (3); *Tibull.* 1, 6, 17 (3), 18 (3), 19 (3), 20 (bis) (3); 4, 2, 3 (3); *Prop.* 1, 7, 25; 1, 10, 20, 23, 24 (3); 3 (2), 13, 41; 5 (4), 8, 77, 78 (3); *Ov. Am.* 1, 8, 72 (3), 95 (3); *Art. Am.* 1, 667 (3), 668 (3); 3, 237, 801; *Rem. Am.* 689, 717; *Metam.* 2, 89 (1); *Trist.* 1, 1, 25, 104; 5, 13, 26; *Ex Ponto* 1, 9, 32 (3); 2, 4, 31 (3); 2, 8, 64 (3); *Fast.* 1, 58, 684 (3). Elmer says in his criticism that he knows of no instance of *cave* with the perfect after Terence, except *Hor. Sat.* 2, 3, 38 and *Curt. Ruf.* 5, 2, 21. He will find three

¹ Thus Ribbeck, in the indices of his *Scenic Fragments*, gives eight additional examples, all presents but one.

more instances in the above list: Prop. 1, 10, 23; 3 (2), 13, 41; Ov. ex Ponto 1, 9, 32.

From the foregoing it will be seen that there are 41 perfects as compared with 115 presents; 37 of these perfects (90 per cent.) occur in Plautus and Terence; from Terence on the proportion of perfects to presents is 4 to 88, or about 4 per cent.; to prove Elmer's theory the large majority of these presents must be non-emotional. What had become of Roman emotion after Terence?

From Plautus on, *cave* with the present is often used in expressions of emotion, more or less strong, thus (I cite only a few typical cases, as I have neither desire nor space for an extended discussion): Plaut. Capt. 439; Most. 324; Ter. H. T. 1031; Phor. 793; Catull. 61, 152; Cic. Att. 1, 10, 4; Tibull. 4, 2, 3; Prop. 1, 10, 24; Ov. Met. 2, 89; Sall. Cat. 59. In Plautus fully one fourth of the examples are emotional, in Terence nearly every instance.¹ In later authors the proportion varies, averaging probably 40 per cent. to 60 per cent. Thus, without 40 per cent. of the examples of the usage which he claims to discuss, without an adequate statement or exposition of the instances in even the three authors upon whom he apparently bases his discussion, Elmer asserts the validity of a theory which is not even tenable in the authors where the percentage of perfects is the highest. That he ventured to advance a theory so important without an adequate basis of statistics, and practically without any argument in its support, seems almost incredible. It is a mystery why its utter weakness was not discovered at once.

The same omissions occur in his treatment of *ne* with the present subjunctive, only the instances in Plautus, Terence and Cicero being given; but in this case, like Elmer, "I have made no attempt to collect the examples." Thus only one of the four divisions of his theme (*ne* with the perfect subjunctive) has been adequately treated.

On pages 149-150 (17-18) Elmer presents some statistics as to the use of different forms of prohibition in Cicero's Letters which are certainly interesting. After mentioning the recipients of the letters where *ne* with the perfect was used—Atticus, Quintus Cicero, Trebatius, and Fadius Gallus—he says: "To his other correspondents he uses *noli* or in two instances *cave* with the present subjunctive." But Cicero has *eleven* examples of *cave* outside of the letters to Atticus, *seven* of which certainly are to persons other than those whom Elmer mentions: to Rufus (Fam. 5, 20, 6), Ampius (Fam. 6, 12, 5), Paetus (Fam. 9, 24, 4), Plancus (Fam. 10, 5, 3; 10, 12, 1), Tiro (Fam. 16, 12, 6). A little later Elmer states: "Except the passionate remonstrance referred to in a letter written by Brutus (Brut. 1, 16, 6), the correspondents of Cicero use only *noli* in addressing him." But Balbus (Att. 8, 15, a. 2) uses *cave*, and Caelius (Fam. 8, 16, 2) and Brutus (Fam. 11, 20, 3 and Brut. 1, 16, 7) use *vide*.

¹ See C. R. XV 158.

In my 'Prohibitives in Silver Latin' (A. J. P. XXI 166), I remarked: "it is interesting to note that the critics and later writers on the prohibitive regard Professor Elmer as the original overthrower of Madvig's theory, either ignorant or forgetful of the fact that Professor Hale (A. J. P. IX 162) six years before the appearance of Elmer's papers had shown that Madvig's theory did not apply to Plautus." I am rather surprised to see that Elmer takes no notice of this remark. The case becomes still more striking in view of the complete parallelism between Hale's statement of the force of the perfect subjunctive (pp. 161 and 162) and that of Elmer in several places. Thus, in the year 1888 (op. cit.), Hale, laying down the general distinction between the present subjunctive and the perfect, says: "the feeling of the finished tense in the independent jussive is that of peremptoriness. The speaker, using it, expresses himself with a certain amount of authoritative impatience"; . . . "the *be-it-done-and-done-with* perfect"; while Elmer, in the year 1898 (Studies, VI 16), says: "in my papers on the Latin Prohibitive (A. J. P. XV, 1894) I have shown that the only important distinction to be made between the two tenses is that the perfect tense is impatient and emotional, while the present tense is common-place." It was in immediate connection with his statement as given above that Hale said (in clear opposition, so far as the ground covered by the statement is concerned, to the dominant theory of Madvig): "Plautus freely uses the present subjunctive in prohibitions addressed to a particular person." If such a phrase of censure as Elmer's "inexcusable carelessness" is to be used at all in philological discussion, it certainly might be charitably employed of Elmer's silence in this matter. In the passages quoted above Hale had supplied all the elements for an investigation of Madvig's doctrine, which it looked as if he had begun upon himself.

It will be noted that, in the foregoing, every reference to Elmer's original paper has been by page, often verbatim, when the accuracy of such reference could otherwise be disputed. I hope I have made every point of my position plain, frankly acknowledged every mistake, and shown some small part at least of the weaknesses, inconsistencies, omissions and mistakes in Elmer's treatment of the prohibitive. With these before him for consideration, I trust his criticisms of others in the future will be tempered by more of the spirit of comity and fair play than has characterized them in the past.

WILLARD K. CLEMENT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, ILL.

REPORTS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, herausgegeben von EUGEN KÖLBING.
XXV. Band, 1898.

I.—A. Schade, On the relation of Pope's *January and May* and *The Wife of Bath* to the corresponding portions of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. By way of preface the testimony of Pope himself is cited to show that his estimate of Chaucer as a poet varied from time to time, and was never high. Then follows a discussion of the origin and history of the story told by Chaucer's merchant—chiefly a résumé of studies by Varnhagen and others, with some criticism of minor points in their work. Schade favors the theory that Chaucer was indebted, at least for the episode of the pear-tree, to a fabliau no longer extant. Pope's *January and May* is simply one of his youthful exercises in adaptation. Conclusive evidence shows that he used the text of Chaucer printed in 1687. By a laborious process of comparison, which deals not only with Pope's omissions, additions, and alterations in relating the story, but also with differences in syntax and metre between the two versions, Schade arrives at results that are instructive, though quite easily anticipated. Pope in adapting the tale to his own times suppresses none of its indecency. He is less outspoken, to be sure, but the euphemisms with which his obscenity is covered are both suggestive and vicious. He is on the whole less concrete and picturesque than Chaucer. While Chaucer betrays some sympathy and tenderness of regard for the aged victim of a mean intrigue, and at times even appreciates the tragic aspect of his plight, Pope only sneers at his discomfiture. "With Pope the thought without its embellishment is nought," says the author. "With Chaucer it is nearly everything: the latter stands for Nature, the former for Art." This opinion seems to be rather the conventional than the correct one. Even the present study affords some help to a deeper appreciation of Chaucer's exquisite art. Incidentally Schade deals with the influence of other English poets, chiefly Dryden, upon Pope's early style. The article is continued in volume XXVI.

E. Kölbing, *Ten Byroniana*, with notes. Among other letters are here printed several of Byron's written from various localities abroad to Hanson, his banker, showing something of the condition of his estate in the years 1809-1811; a letter from his mother to Hanson, written three weeks before her death, revealing great distress over financial matters; a letter from Byron to Mme. de

Staël in 1816, protesting that the reconciliation between him and Lady Byron which she had endeavored to effect was impossible.

H. Klinghardt, *The Value of Phonetics in Teaching the Mother-tongue and Foreign Languages*. This article reports the discussion which followed a paper on the value of phonetics in elementary teaching of modern languages, read by O. Jespersen before the Association of Danish Grammar Schools. A full report of the paper was given in the preceding volume of *Englische Studien*. Among other opinions expressed were the following: The utility of the phonetic method in teaching the native language would vary widely in different countries. The use of a phonetic alphabet in teaching English, for example, valuable as it might be in acquiring a correct pronunciation, encourages incorrect spelling. The first aim in studying a foreign language should be to gain access to its literature. The practical advantage that lies in the power to speak a language should always be of secondary importance. The phonetic method, however, makes this latter its chief object. On the other hand, it is shown that by this method the usual difficulties have been mastered as easily as by any other, with the added advantage of a correct pronunciation. The value of the phonetic method is not great enough to warrant the introduction of a phonetic alphabet and the study of the speech-organs. Its virtue lies in requiring the teacher to correct the mistakes in pronunciation which, under the old method, escaped his notice.

II.—K. Horst, *Contribution to the Study of the Old English Annals*. The author continues from the preceding volume his classification of MSS.

H. B. Baildon, Robert Louis Stevenson. This article, compiled in part from the *Dictionary of National Biography*, is intended primarily for German readers, but contains matter which must be interesting to those among whom Stevenson is better known than he is on the Continent. Baildon was his intimate friend when both were boys at Dr. Thompson's school in Edinburgh, and the attachment continued to the end of Stevenson's life. The writer has noticed several parallels between the youthful experiences of his friend and those of Goethe, especially his attempt to practice law, and his difference with his parents in choosing a career. A similar case, not mentioned by the author, is that of Carlyle. The French qualities of Stevenson's style have for some time been apparent to many. In school, though he was not studious, he had a distinct preference for French, Geometry, and Latin, but never did much with Greek. The writer says: "Some of the care and finish of his style and its frequent felicities may be traced back to his early love for Cicero and Horace, Ovid and Virgil." And again, Stevenson is styled "a prose Horace, for to Horace has been attributed the quality of a *curiosa felicitas*, and

in Stevenson these singular felicities of phrase are very numerous and striking."

Ph. Aronstein, *The English Use of Proper Nouns as Common Nouns*. For example, the word 'Micawber' is coming to denote simply a mendicant borrower, and Micawberism is the name for his practice. Aronstein's list is long, and in many cases interesting. A great number of the proper names cited derive their significance from English prose fiction, especially from Dickens. In mentioning Mrs. Malaprop, and incidentally such of her associates in failing as Fielding's Mrs. Slipslop, Smollet's Winifred Jenkins, and Mrs. Partington, the author omits the earlier Dame Quickly with her "honey-suckle villain" and "honey-seed rogue." The notable Dogberry and Verges hardly need to be cited.

Reviews.—J. E. Wülfing criticizes Constance Pessel's *Study of the Present and Past Periphrastic Tenses in Anglo-Saxon* chiefly for its typographical shortcomings. This is indeed a matter to which too little attention is paid on both sides of the Atlantic, not less with regard to the reader's convenience, than to the final artistic appearance of the work.—Jantzen's comment upon the second edition of Heyne's translation of Beowulf into German contains matter of interest to those who are concerned with the problem of successfully rendering Old English poetry in modern form.—Kölbinger, apropos of Gollancz's *editio princeps* of *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, an alliterative poem of the fourteenth century, finds some evidence to show that it was written by the same poet who composed *Winnere and Wastoure*, which is also printed for the first time in the appendix of Gollancz's edition.—In his review of E. Koeppel's *Quellen-studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, etc.*, Boyle says that the author does not speak with the confidence that his discoveries would warrant. The author confines himself chiefly to the historical plays, but his results go to convince the reader that Chapman was a much more formidable rival of Shakespeare than is commonly supposed. Chapman is unique in seeking his material in French and Classical sources, rather than in Italian and Spanish.—An essay on the prose of Milton by J. Vodoz is condemned by W. Franz as defective and inadequate.—Tovey's edition of Thomson is said by Schnabel to be pleasing, though the editor betrays no especial predilection for the poet.—The same reviewer characterizes Dowden's *French Revolution and English Literature* as "a spirited sketch from a master hand." Both Dowden's point of view and his opinions are said to be new and suggestive.—Robert de la Sizeranne's *Ruskin et la Religion de la Beauté* is recommended by Schnabel as an excellent statement of Ruskin's doctrine of Beauty.—The other reviews deal for the most part with German studies of the school-systems of other nations, chiefly England.

The Miscellanea include a few notes from C. Stoffel on Storm's *Englische Philologie*, and a severe criticism from H. Schröder of Wendt's *Encyclopädie des englischen Unterrichtes*.

III.—O. Bischoff, *On the Disyllabic Thesis and the Epic Caesura in Chaucer*. The author's chief inquiry may be stated thus: In Chaucer's heroic verse (ten syllables, five stresses), where the caesura would ordinarily occur between two unstressed syllables (the so-called epic caesura), ought it to be observed by a pause, or be avoided by slurring or elision? In volume XXIV Bischoff found that in all parts of the verse, except at the caesura, the poet certainly preferred syncope or elision to a thesis of two syllables. By a detailed examination of all possible cases of the epic caesura in Chaucer's heroic verses he now discovers that out of more than 4400, above 4300 will admit of syncope or elision, and this therefore indicates Chaucer's method of reading them. He then proceeds to discuss the usage in this respect not only of the poet's predecessors and models in English and French, but of his successors as well, and in the course of his discussion to refute the adverse views of Schipper and Skeat. The investigation is painstaking to the last degree, but seems after all like the defense of a prejudice. The author is too much occupied with details to regard the fact that the apparent irregularity in Chaucer which he tries to explain away is not an irregularity, but a characteristic of English metre from *Beowulf* to the present. The variation in length of unstressed intervals, and the wide variations in degrees of stress within a single line, are among the most important sources of beauty and vigor in English verse.

M. S. Leather, *Pope as a Student of Milton*. The influence of Milton over Pope—apparent in nearly all the works of the latter—is an influence rather of style than of thought. Both the early and the late poems of Milton were closely studied by Pope, and his chief model of style in translating the *Iliad* was *Paradise Lost*. In her discussion of *Satires of Donne*, IV 186:

Where Contemplation prunes her ruffled wings,

the author might have added *L'Allegro* 6:

Where brooding Darkness spreads his jealous wings.

J. Ellinger, *On the Linguistic Interpretation of English Prose Texts in the Higher Schools*. An attempt to define the proper extent and limit of such interpretation.

Reviews.—A second edition of Kluge's *Angelsächsisches Lesebuch* is recommended both for work in the class-room and for private study.—G. Binz criticizes Lindelöf's glossary of the *Rushworth Gospels* for the omission of indexes, and for the failure to provide the context of the words glossed.—Spies's *Studien zur Geschichte des englischen Pronomens im XV. und XVI. Jahrhundert* is said by Franz to be an important contribution to the study of syntax during early modern period.—Conrad's theory, set forth in his book on *Shakespeare's Selbstbekenntnisse*, that the poet not only addressed his sonnets to the Earl of Essex, but

made him the original of the character of Hamlet, is disputed by Sarrazin, who enumerates his objections.—Lindner and Bobertag discuss respectively R. Fürst's *Die Vorläufer der modernen Novelle im XVIII. Jahrhundert*, and C. H. Clarke's *Fielding und der deutsche Sturm und Drang*.—Swaen speaks of D. Schmid's study of Congreve, sein Leben und seine Lustspiele as one of the best books on this dramatist. Dametz's similar study of Vanbrugh is not up to date. Both works appear as *Wiener Beiträge*. The reviewer calls attention to several subjects under the general head of the Restoration Drama which urge the attention of scholars.

In the *Miscellanea W. von Wurzbach* compares Byron's *Parisina* with earlier versions of the story by Bandello and Lope de Vega, and with the historical events in Ferrara upon which they are based. With these accounts Byron was not acquainted, but founded his narrative upon a brief recital in Gibbon's *Antiquities of the House of Brunswick*.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXVII (1898).

Janvier.

F. Lot. *Gormond et Isembard : recherches sur les fondements historiques de cette épopée.* 54 pages. I. Le Roi Louis. II. Isembard. III. Gormond. IV. Huelin. V. Personnages épiques ; Date de la composition du fragment de Bruxelles ; Conclusions. The conclusions reached are that : 1. the epic *Gormond et Isembard* is founded on the battle of Saucourt in 881, and Louis III is the king referred to ; 2. *Gormond* himself is a fusion of the characters of the vikings *Vurm* and *Guthorm* ; 3. *Isembard* must have been an obscure baron of Pontieu who joined the Norsemen about the end of the ninth century ; 4. *Huelin* can not be identified ; and 5. the poem itself was composed in Pontieu between the years 1060 and 1070.

A. Piaget. *Le Chapel des Fleurs de Lis par Philippe de Vitri.* 38 pages. Publication of the text with an introduction.

P. Meyer. *La traduction provençale de la légende dorée.* 45 pages. A comparative study with two facsimiles of the manuscripts, which are divided into three groups of successive development. The eighty-four legends are each treated separately.

F. Novati. *Poesie musicali francesi de' sec. XIV e XV tratte da mss. italiani.*

Mélanges. A. Mussafia. *Enclisi o proclisi del pronome personale atono qual oggetto.*—Em. Walberg. *Est : me(s)t.*—A. Jeanroy. *Une imitation d'Albert de Sisteron par Mahieu le Juif.*

Comptes rendus. *Miscellanea nuziale Rossi-Teiss* (G. Paris).—Theodor Maxeiner, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Wörter im Mittelhochdeutschen* (F. Piquet).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.* XXI 4, numerous etymologies discussed (G. Paris).—*Giornale Dantesco* IV, synopsis of articles (Paget Toynbee).

Chronique. Items of interest, especially concerning the *Société des anciens textes français*, the *Revue des traditions populaires*, and M. Brunetière's *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française*.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 12 titles. O. Densusianu, *La Prise de Cordres et de Seville*. "Nous espérons que le jeune philologue, actuellement professeur à l'université de Bucarest, répandra dans sa patrie le goût et la méthode de la philologie française."

Avril.

E. G. Parodi. *Del passaggio di V in B e di certe perturbazioni delle leggi fonetiche nel Latino Volgare*. I. 64 pages.—C. Voretzsch. *Sur Anseïs de Cartage: Supplément de l'édition de M. Alton*. II. *Le roman en prose*. III. *Le traducteur*. 29 pages.—L. Gauchat. *Encore Manducatum = Manducatum*. 17 pages.

Mélanges. E. Galtier; J. D. M. Ford; A. Mussafia (*ter*).

Comptes rendus. Carl Voretzsch. *Das Merovingerepos und die fränkische Heldensage* (H. Yvon).—*Mémoires de la Société néo-philologique à Helsingfors* (G. Paris).—Mathias Friedwagner. *Meraugis von Portlesguez* (G. Paris). 11 pages.—L. Vuilhorgne. *Raoul de Houdenc, sa vie et ses œuvres* (M. Friedwagner).—*Child Memorial Volume* (G. Paris): E. S. Sheldon, *On Anglo-French and Middle English au for French a before a Nasal*; Ph. B. Marcou, *The French Historical Infinitive*; G. L. Kittredge, *Who was Sir Thomas Malory?* R. Weeks, *The Messenger in Aliscans*; H. Schofield, *The Lay of Guingamor*. "Nous voyons avec plaisir M. Schofield continuer sur notre ancienne littérature poétique les recherches qu'il a si bien inaugurées, et en général les études de philologie romane prendre pied aux États-Unis comme elles commencent à le faire depuis quelques années."—Schwan-Behrens, *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen* (Mario Roques).—Victor Chauvin. *Pacolet et les Mille et une Nuits* (G. Paris).

Chronique. Death of M. Jean Passy. "C'est là qu'il composa, en collaboration avec M. Alfred Rambeau, professeur à Baltimore, une *Chrestomathie française* avec la prononciation figurée, à l'usage des étrangers (Paris et New-York, 1897), que précède une introduction, riche en idées et en faits, sur la méthode

phonétique."—Controversy between Profs. Fr. Hanssen and E. Porebovicz.—"*Créole*. Poyen-Bellisle (254-260)," in *Krit. Jahresbericht*, t. II.—"M. A. Matzke, reprenant un projet qu'avait jadis formé M. Jos. Herz, a l'intention de publier les deux poèmes de Simon de Fresne, le *Roman de Philosophie* et la *Vie de saint Georges*."

Livres annoncés sommairement. 19 titles.

Juillet.

P. Meyer. Documents linguistiques des Basses-Alpes. 105 pages. "J'ai commencé de bonne heure—en fait, depuis ma première année d'École des chartes, il y a quarante ans—à recueillir et à classer, selon un ordre à la fois géographique et chronologique, des textes de langue provençale." "Si je parviens à faire pour trente-cinq départements ce que je viens de faire pour les Basses-Alpes, la philologie provençale reposera sur une base solide."

P. Savj-Lopez. Il Filostrato di G. Boccaccio. 28 pages. "Così per un certo rispetto può dirsi, che il *Filostrato* dove pure non sono cavalieri giostranti e viaggi d'avventura e miracoli d'incantamenti, sia fra' primi poemi della letteratura italiana che innalzino alla suprema dignità dell'arte la materia cavalleresca."

Mélanges. Fr. Wulff; Gaston Paris (*bis*).

Comptes rendus. Alfred Jeanroy et Henri Guy, Chanson et dits artésiens du XIII^e siècle (G. Paris). 19 pages.

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXII 2, numerous etymologies discussed (G. Paris).—Giornale storico della Lett. Ital. XXVII, XXVIII, list of contents (P. Meyer).—Bulletin de la Soc. des anciens textes franç. 1897.

Chronique. Death of M. Auguste Brachet, known for his *Grammaire historique de la langue française*.—Appreciative notice of long list of works by M. Paul Meyer.—Account by M. A. Morel-Fatio of the investigations of the *Poema del Cid* by Profs. J. Cornu, Ed. Lidforss, A. M. Huntington, and Fernando Araujo.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 16 titles. Works concerning Marie de France (K. Warnke), Lope de Vega (A. Ludwig), Geoffrey Chaucer (A. W. Pollard, etc.), Alfonso el Sabio (E. Cotarelo y Morí), etc.

Octobre.

F. Lot. Nouvelles études sur la provenance du Cycle Arthurien. I. Glastonbury et Avalon. 45 pages. This article is noteworthy for the unusual extent of its footnotes, to which in many instances the main text serves as a mere framework.

G. Mazzone, A. Jeanroy. Un nouveau manuscrit du Roman de Troie et de l'Histoire ancienne avant César. 8 pages. The

manuscript in question belonged to Sig. Grigolli of Desenzano, in the province of Brescia, and has recently been acquired by the Bibliothèque nationale of Paris. The manuscript and Old French text are both in poor condition.

A. Piaget. *Le Chemin de Vaillance de Jean de Courcy et l'hiatus de l'e final des polysyllabes aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles.* 26 pages. This tedious poem of forty thousand verses is modeled upon the *Roman de la Rose* and similar works.

Comptes rendus. Wilhelm Röttiger, *Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung* (Ernest Muret). 12 pages. "Parmi la foule des récits divergents qui étaient colportés en Angleterre et sur le continent par des conteurs en prose, les deux principales versions de la légende de Tristan se seraient constituées par les préférences de deux éminents poètes. L'œuvre de Thomas était peut-être plus belle, mais celle de Chrétien semble être plus ancienne en date. Aussi bien que le roi Arthur et les compagnons de la Table Ronde, que le Chevalier au Lionet Perceval, que Lancelot et Guenièvre, Tristan et Iseut ont probablement été introduits dans la littérature française et européenne par le célèbre poète champenois. Si Thomas était une âme plus poétique, plus sensible et plus profonde, nous reconnaissons toujours mieux en Chrétien de Troyes l'un de ces heureux génies qui ont su révéler aux autres hommes des sources cachées de joie et d'émotion."—Alfred Linder, *Plainte de la Vierge en vieux vénitien* (Alfred Pillet).—Gustave Maccon, *Note sur le mystère de la résurrection attribué à Jean Michel* (G. Paris).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.* XXII 3, summary of contents and discussion of etymologies (G. Paris).—*Revue de philologie franç. et prov.* IX, X, XI, summary of contents.

Chronique. *Festschrift zum VIII. allgemeinen deutschen Neuphilologentage, verfasst von Mitgliedern der österreichischen Universitäten und des Wiener neuphilologischen Vereines, herausgegeben von J. Schipper.* Contains a number of articles of interest to Romance scholars.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 3 titles. Franz Xaver Kraus, *Dante: Sein Leben und sein Werk, sein Verhältniss zur Kunst und Politik.*

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

BRIEF MENTION.

Translation is a fertile theme; for the problems it involves are as numberless as the phenomena of language. And they are problems that no practical teacher can escape. I venture to say that any one who has been engaged in the work of giving instruction in any language could write out of his own experience essay after essay on the different ways of making bad translations, with ample illustrations from the performances of his pupils, and, if he would be candid, from his own. The positive side of the art is far more difficult, but there is no lack of tracts by which scholars have vainly endeavored to impart correct principles. Tycho Mommsen's book was reviewed in this Journal fourteen years ago (VIII 231), and mention was made of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's brilliant essay on the same theme (XIII 517), and now CAUER'S *Die Kunst des Uebersetzens* has been found so suggestive by Professor TOLMAN that he has been prompted to put forth a slender volume of some 80 pages on *The Art of Translating* (Sanborn), which follows the lines of Cauer's book. It is not a translation of Cauer's book, for that would be absurd on the face of it. True, there is a body of doctrine that abides on account of the modern character of both English and German, but the difference between the two languages over against Latin and Greek is very great, although it has not been taken into account sufficiently by those who translate German manuals into English.

In the hands of a master the German language, as is well known, lends itself to translation much more readily than English, not simply because of its various virtues on which I need not expatiate, but because of its comparative freedom from reminiscential phraseology. Into the text of our literary language have been woven threads from five hundred years of continuous tissue; and despite the 'decay of literary allusion' over which great lamentation has been made of late, no one can write English like a native without enriching his discourse with the filaments of earlier fabrics, distinctly the products of individual looms. Now, a language that is stiffened with such embroidery is hard to translate from, because so much is lost; it is hard to translate into, because it can not wrap itself so closely round a foreign original as a language which, if one excepts Luther's Bible—to which our Authorized Version is more than an offset—has only a century and a half of phrase-makers to supply the fibre. However that may be, the temptation of the

ready-made locution is ever present in English, and, the worst of it is, that to yield to the seduction is to earn applause. The judicious may be supposed to grieve. But the judges are bribed. There is no one to protest against the incongruity. There is no one to consider the warning which Frere gives in his review of Mitchell's Aristophanes. Theoretically the translation ought to be achromatic. It may be nothing but an etching, but, in the name of the Muses, do not color an etching. Now, some of the translations that Professor TOLMAN admires are of this very reminiscential order, and, as Professor Shorey says in his memorable review of Jowett's Plato (XIII 351), a distinct charm of that much lauded performance is the interweaving of familiar quotations and literary allusions. But there is really no defence of these *dulcia vitia*. Vergil and Tennyson are near akin, and when the eagle 'clasps the crag with hooked hands' there is a certain satisfaction in recalling Palinurus, 'prensantem uncis manibus capita aspera montis'; but it ought not to work the other way, and yet when Professor Tyrrell translates Ennius' famous line: *Moribus antiquis stat res Romana virisque* by

Broad-based upon her men and principles
Standeth the state of Rome,

Professor TOLMAN applauds the Tennysonianism. When Walter Savage Landor puts into the mouth of one of his Greek characters the Ovidian reminiscence 'rude and undigested mass,' one is tempted to cry out: 'A gross anachronism!' Not more so than 'broad-based' in translating Ennius. And yet, who can withstand the temptation to applaud despite the incongruous association of Republican Rome with Constitutional Victoria? My own sins in this line are ever before me, but 'You're another' has lost its terrors for me, and when Dr. HEMPHILL translates Persius, II 71 *magna lance* by 'lordly dish,' I object to the association of Sisera with Messalla, just as if my own diction were not penetrated with the Biblical phraseology on which I was nurtured. In my edition of Persius—a task to which I was impelled not so much by my admiration of that poet, as by the *ingeni largitor*, which is responsible for so much of my published work—I have frequently found myself obliged to comment on the false picturesqueness of Conington's version, who has often overdone what was already overdone; and yet I have laid myself open to another charge. Persius is the most reminiscential of all poets, and therefore I ventured to sow reminiscences of English poetry up and down my summaries, which are often half translations. But Persius' range of reminiscences was very narrow, and I ought to have kept myself mainly to Pope, who would have been a manner of analogue to Horace; but I did not conceive my task in so purely artistic a spirit, though I am very glad that I haven't it to do over again, and it is very much more pleasant to study the results that have been reached by others. So, for instance, a comparison of Dr. HEMP-

HILL's *Translation of Persius* (London, George Bell) with that of Conington can not fail to interest and instruct any student of that 'crabbed coxcomb,' as a character in Ben Jonson calls the youthful satirist 'who will come after the king?' True, Conington has been considered one of the kings of the translating world, and the old question recurs, 'who will come after the king?'; and yet, though Dr. HEMPHILL has been under Conington's influence to some extent and has followed him at points about which I have taken the pains to protest, still his careful and spirited version is a distinct addition to our apparatus and his introduction has gone far to reconcile me to the memory of the year that I spent in the company of an uncongenial prig, whom I have liked better since I have not been obliged to live with him.

A word more on this interminable subject of translations. The reproduction of the effect of the style has its limits. Professor TOLMAN says: 'Don't make the translation more elegant than the original.' But if the style of the original is perverse or awkward, it falls outside of the artistic category, and the original is not worth translating except for the contents. Who but Professor Tolman would find fault with Mr. Frazer for not reproducing what I have called the string-halt of Pausanias' style? Who would blame Dr. White for not giving us painful parallels to Appian's diction? Take Xenophon. Xenophon is not a Pausanias, nor an Appian; he is a classic, and whatever faults modern Hellenists have found with his language, an old Greek writer, on rhetoric—Aristeides or another—has left us an elaborate study of his style as a model of artistic ἀφέλεια. Such a style, then, might challenge artistic reproduction. And yet Mr. Dakyns in his admirable version has not undertaken to bring out consistently the American tang which he has discovered in the honey of the Attic bee. There are cases in which one is privileged to improve on the original. Swinburne has said that Byron is much better reading in French prose than in the original English verse, and Swinburne, by his own command of poetic rhythm, has earned a right to quarrel with the original and to enjoy the translation. Let us read Amyot's Plutarch and North's Plutarch without asking whether they are not better than the original. And let us remember that there is a serious side to this hyperaestheticism. How much fewer fastidious souls would have been saved, if the Greek of the New Testament had not been transposed into the organ notes of the Authorized Version. Only the robust sort can forgive εἰς with the indicative and associate with the riff-raff of worse than plebeian names that figure in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

Persius seems to haunt this batch of *Brief Mention*. In reading a recent edition of Juvenal I was struck by the scant mention of a satirist to whom Juvenal may indeed have owed little, but who, for all that, furnishes apt illustrations to Juvenal's text. In my boyhood both Persius and Juvenal were read *ante pilos*, at an age when many youngsters of to-day are still wrestling with the *Bellum Gallicum*, and while our vision may have been vague, some of the moral lessons did not fail to strike deep, and I did not have to wait until I became an editor of Persius to learn the moral of

usque adeone

Scire tuum nihil est nisi te scire hoc sciat alter?

and many a formula picked up in reading or gained by observation had become part of my being before I thought fit to put it in print. The philological world, especially the grammatical section of it, is full of claimants, some of them Roger Tichborne claimants, some of them unfamiliar with the records of research. In his very readable *Grammatica Militans*, PAUL CAUER (p. 15) attributes to Kern the formula of the Accusative of the Object Affected and of the Object Effected. Where I got it from I do not remember, but Object Affected and Object Effected figure in my Latin Grammar of 1867. The same scholar records his pleasure at the cleverness of a young boy who, instead of giving the current whence-case explanation of the than-ablative with the comparative, called the said ablative an instrumental. Was the boy really clever or had he been reading an old copy of Madvig? "Der Ablativ scheint eigentlich zu bezeichnen dass der höhere Grad durch das Andere, welches mit zum Vergleiche gezogen wird, zum Vorschein kommt" (Madvig, §271. Anm.). To think that the doctrines of such a light as Madvig should have already fallen into the thick darkness of oblivion! To a survivor like myself these rediscoveries are a perpetual source of amusement.

How any one born to the English language or furnished with a decent knowledge of Greek, even if unacquainted with Krüger (43, 3, 6), should ever have interpreted *εις διδασκάλου* as an ellipsis for *εις διδασκάλου οίκου* (leg. *οικίαν*) has been a matter of amused wonder to me for fifty years. Tom's is Tom's house or Tom's shop or Tom's barroom, Tom's characteristic locality. So *έν διδασκάλου*, so *έκ διδασκάλου*. Cf. Ar. Pl. 84: *έκ Πατροκλέους έρχομαι*. The genitive depends on the idea of locality contained in the local adverb. There is no ellipsis whatever, though, to be sure, it is more common to use *παρά* of the characteristic locality with the appropriate case. It is to me an old story. Imagine, then, my surprise to find in a recent number of the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* (Dec. 19, 1900) that Herr MEISTER claims this as his discovery and points triumphantly to his *Griech*.

Dialekte, Bd. II, S. 298, where the subject is treated at length. The extension of the principle on which *εἰς διδασκαλίαν* is explained to other prepositions with the non-ablatival genitive is very natural (A. J. P. XVIII 120), and while I have never committed myself to the doctrine, I have not failed to present that point of view to my students for many years. To reduce these floating theories into crystallized formulae takes all the life out of teaching, and I recognize that in the first line I am a teacher, and to be a teacher I must be to some extent an explorer. 'This sensible warm motion to become a kneaded clod,' that is to die before you are dead. Hence my reluctance to publish any system of Greek syntax, and in what I have thus far published the collection of examples figures far more than the theory, as it is worth more.

The *Meno* of Plato is an attractive dialogue even to the unmetaphysical soul, even to the least of the *ναρθηκοφόροι*. It has the true Platonic charm that appeals to the *ἄλογος αἴσθησις*, on which the schoolmasterly Dionysios always falls back, when he has nothing more to say. The athetizers have not been very successful in their assaults on it. In certain moods one wishes the athetizers well, and there have been days when on purely selfish grounds I should have rejoiced in the alienation of the Philebus, the very dialogue that the same inevitable Dionysios has seen fit to pick out as an admirable specimen of Plato's Socratic style (Dem. 1025 R.). But the *Meno*, though hardly a general favorite, has much to recommend it even to the novice in Plato. Apart from the geometrical puzzles, it ought not to present any very serious difficulty to the young student. It is one of the feline dialogues, if I may be pardoned for using the expression, in which Plato plays with his game and finally dismisses it with a scratch, which will enable one to recognize it when it comes up again. Just where to place it in the canon is a question that can be made interesting, both in regard to form and in regard to substance or, to use the phrases of the latest editor, both *stylo-metrically* and '*hylometrically*.' Then it is a great point gained to have characters in which the young student has invested a certain amount of Greek. This is one of the delights of taking an excursion party through the private speeches of the Attic orators and showing them the big-wigs in undress. So here *Meno* steps out of the picture-frame of the *Anabasis*, and Anytus, already known from the *Apology*, becomes a more vivid personality, and his final growl is a muttering of doom that appeals to a young scholar. Now this islet, as it may be called in comparison with the *Gorgias*, among the Fortunate Islands of the Platonic world, Mr. E. SEYMER THOMPSON (Macmillan & Co.) has seen fit to use as a dumping-ground for the Platonic lore which he has gathered from time to time during twelve years of study. When Karl Friedrich Hermann, whose *Geschichte und*

System der platonischen Philosophie Mr. THOMPSON has quoted in a Latin version, lectured on Lucian, he used to call his own edition of the *De historia conscribenda*, 'ein Muster von einem überladenen Kommentar,' and perhaps in after days Mr. THOMPSON will say the same thing of his sixty-four pages of introduction and two hundred and fifty of commentary, appendices and excursuses to fifty-six pages of text, the text being in large type. No irrelevance is surprising in such a book, and the greatest shock I have experienced in reading it was the recognition of a limit, as when the editor says on page 76 C: This is not the place for a full discussion of the erotic philosophy of Plato. But the worst of it is that Mr. THOMPSON is already fully aware of the tumultuous character of his work or, to put it in his own words, fears 'it is something of a farrago.' Yet with that lack of sympathy which is the most conspicuous characteristic of the Briton, instead of giving us as he might have done a model edition, he presents us with the unsorted accumulation of twelve years and says practically: 'Take it or leave it.' If the beginner is wise, he will leave it; but the unfortunate student of Plato has no choice and must rake over the pile in quest of articles of value. The grammatical side is perfectly exasperating. What does any one want with extracts from Riddell and Goodwin and Kühner, text-books that every student of Plato has at his elbow? And while the long lists of examples may have a certain value, the prolix discussions of grammatical points fail, in every instance I have examined, to help the student to clearer vision. To cite but one instance of Mr. THOMPSON'S lack of grammatical insight, in 84 A: ἐννοεῖς οὐ ἐστὶν ἤδη βαδίζων τοῦ ἀναμνησκεισθαι, he treats ἐστὶν βαδίζων as a periphrastic tense just as if he had never read Ar. Ran. 36: καὶ γὰρ ἐγγύς τῆς θύρας | ἤδη βαδίζων εἰμί, when Kock has the right explanation.

It is spring. In the bookshop of the Sosii a voice is heard of one reading aloud a poem to the scrivener. It is a new poem by Vergil—the Georgics, to wit. The head of the house is putting the last touches to a MS. A stranger, attracted by the sound, looks into the shop, scans the titles of the books for sale, is especially struck by one, *Quinti Flacci Horatii Sermones*. This book he takes from its case and asks an old man whom he finds sitting in the shop what is the price of it. The person addressed was not the shopman, but the poet *Furius Bibaculus*, the stout gentleman who 'bespat the wintry Alps with hoary snow' (*Sat.* II 5, 41), no friend of Horace, as may be imagined, and the question is referred to an aged man, *Orbilius of the Tawse*. He too has not a good word to waste on Horace. 'Lucilius is the only master of the satire,' and Horace's 'protest and programme' (*A. J. P.* XXI 121) finds no favor in his eyes. But a newcomer interrupts him, *Valerius Cato*, who, like Horace, considers *Lucilius* 'durior componere versus,' as he has found out by his editorship

of the 'magnus Auruncae alumnus.' Thereupon ensues a pretty quarrel, and the two old men depart grumbling, each taking his own way, and both followed by the jeers of Furius, a famous wit in his day. While the buyer is left to bargain with Lucius Sosius himself, Horace enters, and the stranger, who is none other than Pompeius Varus of Carm. II 7, and the poet fall into each other's arms and there is much talk of the old war-times, with their hardships and horrors and hasty pleasures. To fit their converse, the voice of the reader is heard from within :

paribus concurrere pilis
Romanas acies iterum videre Philippi.

But the verses that recall so much to the two old soldiers are soon followed by these others :

scilicet et tempus veniet, cum finibus illis
agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro
exesa inveniet scabra robigine pila,
aut gravibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanes,
grandiaque effosis mirabitur ossa sepulcris

and the scene closes with a prayer for peace by the poet of the abandoned targe.

I have given above a rough outline of the poem *Sosii Fratres Bibliopolae*, carmen Iohannis Pascoli ex Castro Sancti Mauri (Amsterdam, Muller), which has recently taken the Hoeufft prize for Latin verse-composition. The conception is not bad, and by giving it a place in *Brief Mention* I gain an opportunity to call attention to the fact that the art of Latin versification still buds and brings forth boughs like a plant, through the scent of the waters of Pactolus.

M. W.: Under the title *De emendando Differentiarum Libro* (Paris, Thorin), M. ALCIDES MACÉ has published a treatise of 170 pages, which constitutes the Prolegomena to a new edition of the *De Proprietate Sermonum* attributed to Isidore of Seville, which the author is preparing and for which there is certainly need, as the editions since 1602 have not essentially improved the text. For emending the work Macé has found material in Varro, Festus, Gellius, Nonius, Servius, Isidorus, and the Grammarians of the Corpus. He points out much confusion on the part of earlier editors. In the earliest editions the work was wrongly assigned to Cicero. The author has collated nine MSS (the earliest being of the ninth century), which he divides into three classes. In fifteen columns, occupying twenty-five pages, he compares the lemmata in his own edition with those found in other collections and grammarians. With the bibliography of his subject he shows an intimate acquaintance, and in an era so devoted to lexical investigation as the present, the new edition will be very welcome to scholars.

M. W.: The first edition of the second part of SCHANZ'S *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* in the Müller Handbook Series appeared in 1892 (Munich, Beck). This new edition appears before the work itself is finished, but the fourth and concluding part is announced to appear shortly. The revision shows a great increase in volume, devoting 408 pages to the period which in the first edition occupied pp. 236-476. A useful Alphabetisches Register for this part alone is added at the end. The general lines of the treatment are the same, but there is much more abundance of detail and greater fulness in the citation of literature. Thus, double the space is allotted to the attitude of the various emperors from Tiberius to Trajan toward literature, and a similar proportion prevails throughout the work. The treatment of Germanicus and the Aratea, which was very meagre in the first edition, is here much more satisfactory; so too of Manilius, in whom as a writer a new interest has been shown in the last decade. The same is true of Statius, due in part to Vollmer's excellent edition of the *Silvae*. The discussion of Juvenal's life and works shows a marked advance. In the first edition no scepticism was shown as to the famous Juvenal inscription; now it is definitely referred to another Juvenal. The new fragment of Juvenal is not accepted as genuine, but the literature upon the subject is fully given, and its importance for the history of the text-tradition is recognized. The treatment of the more important authors, as Tacitus, Martial and Pliny, is very broad and suggestive, but the minor authors receive the same conscientious consideration; and our thanks are due to the author, whose unflagging industry has made this new edition so fully abreast of the times.

K. F. S.: Complete and trustworthy books of reference like FABIA'S *Onomasticon Taciteum* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1900) involve a tedium in the making which fully entitles their energetic authors to the reward of knowing that, whatever the "nutations" of Classical Philology, their work, once for all, has a real and permanent value to every student. A few moments spent in collating the *Index Historicus*, for example, of Halm, which has been reprinted again and again in the Teubner text, will dissipate any doubts as to the necessity of Fabia's compilation. In the single case of Achaia I observe that nearly a dozen references have been added. The list of over a hundred entries under the head of *Corrigenda* becomes far less formidable when examined, and does not affect our feelings of gratitude for a work which, taken with Greef's *Lexicon*, will, for the first time, put the entire text of Tacitus at our command.

NECROLOGY.

EMIL HÜBNER,

*July 7, 1834—February 21, 1901.*¹

The recent death of EMIL HÜBNER, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Berlin, has brought personal sorrow to many American scholars, to none more poignant grief than to the writer of this tribute to a friendship which had lasted unbroken and unclouded for nearly fifty years. No scholar ever had more friends, none deserved them better. In Italy, where he studied in his young manhood, in Spain and Portugal, where he sojourned for a long time while making his epigraphical collections, in England, which he visited for the like purpose, he was as well known as he was in Germany; and though he declined a pressing invitation to the Chicago Exposition in 1893, there are Americans enough who have shared his generous hospitality at his charming house in Berlin to join those who are mourning the loss of a man whose winning personality and ready sympathy, moral and intellectual, gave a human interest to his encyclopaedic learning. Born on the seventh of July, 1834, the son of an eminent painter of the Düsseldorf school, Julius Hübner, and the nephew of another great artist, Eduard Bendemann, he belonged to a family of rare culture in art and letters; and his receptive nature blossomed into early maturity. He was only twenty years old when he received his Doctor's degree at the University of Bonn, where Ritschl determined his course of life, and thenceforth his career was one of rapid advancement. His chief line of work was Latin epigraphy, in which he rose to eminence as a collaborator in the Berlin Corpus, as a master of all the varieties of inscriptional forms. Most of his published works are in this line, but he was also a special student of Greek and Latin grammar, as is evinced by his extremely valuable bibliographical manuals on these subjects; and his wide range of interest is shown not only by his 'Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die Geschichte und Encyclopädie der klassischen Philologie,' but by numerous contributions to German periodicals such as the *Deutsche Rundschau* and the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*. He was at home in many languages and had a keen appreciation of the recent productions of the English and American press. It is not every one who can turn from writing a searching review of a work on the Keltic element

¹ Reproduced from the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 151.

in Latin to inditing a sympathetic notice of Ian Maclaren's 'Country Doctor.' What he was to me personally, as the comrade of my youth, as the link that bound me to the period of revelation and aspiration, as the constant, generous friend of riper years, I will not trust myself to say. 'Ueber alles Glück geht doch der Freund, Der's fühlend erst erschafft, der's theilend mehrt.' But I can not close this imperfect notice without some reference to the work which Hübner did for the Johns Hopkins University. It will be remembered that in 1888-9 the Latin Department, owing to the protracted illness of Professor Warren, was without a head, and at my instance the authorities had recourse to Professor Hübner, who prepared a valuable bibliography of Cicero's Letters, with hints for study (J. H. U. Circulars, No. 72), which served to bridge over the chasm; and the reports on the dissertations submitted to his judgment were remarkable for their fulness, their conscientiousness, their discrimination.

Hübner died suddenly, as his younger brother, the successor of Wöhler at Göttingen, had died, called away from the fulness of an active and vigorous life. He was spared the pitifulness of slow senescence. He was alert to the end, such an end as he would doubtless have wished for himself. True, he had a great work on the stocks, a work which was to crown his life, but work unfinished is also a bequest.

When his highly gifted wife died, he had carved on her tomb a line from her father's translation of Aeschylus, 'Du bist vollbracht, Nachtwache meines Lebens.' It is a good epitaph for a scholar that watches on the outposts of scientific life. It is far better than the sigh which one hears from Heyne's Vergilian inscription, 'Vixi et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi.' But even Droysen could not rival the terseness of the Greek original. There are but two words, *Διαπεφρούρηται βίος*.

A valued correspondent, M. JOSEPH KEELHOFF, Professor at the Athénée Royal of Antwerp, who had furnished for years the summaries of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY to the *Revue des Revues* and who had shown a lively and intelligent interest in all American philological work, as was evinced by his translation of Professor HALE'S *Art of Reading Latin*, has recently succumbed to a long and painful malady. Born April 20, 1860, M. KEELHOFF, who died February 28, 1901, had not yet completed his forty-first year. His latest letters show that he was working bravely to the end.

B. L. G.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Bennett (C. E.) and Bristol (G. P.) Teaching of Latin and Greek in the Secondary School. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1901. 16 + 336 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.50.

Cicero, Letters of; in chronological order; tr. into English by E. S. Shuckburgh. In 4 v. V. 4, B. C. 44-43. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 46 + 386 pp. 12mo, cl., net \$1.50.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The Three Literary Letters (ep. ad Ammaeum I; ep. ad Pompeium; ep. ad Ammaeum II); the Greek text ed., with English tr., by W. Rhys Roberts. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 11 + 232 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$2.50.

Ecclesiasticus. The Fragments hitherto recovered of the Hebrew Text in Facsimile. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. Net \$7.

Giles (P.) Short Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students. 2d ed., rev. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 11 + 619 pp. 12mo, cl., net \$3.25.

Gomperz (Theodor). Greek Thinkers: A History of Ancient Philosophy. Authorized ed. In 3 v. V. 1, tr. by Laurie Magnus. New York, *Scribner*, 1901. 15 + 610 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$4.

Nepos (Cornelius). Lives of Miltiades and Epaminondas; ed. by G. H. Nall. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 24 + 89 pp. 32mo, cl., net 40 cts.

Seneca (Lucius Annaeus). The Medea of Seneca; with introd. and notes by H. M. Kingery. Rev. ed. Crawfordsville, Ind., *The Author*, 1900. c. 71 pp. 8vo, pap., 25 cts.

Sophocles. Plays and Fragments. By Sir R. C. Jebb. Pt. 3. The Antigone. 3d ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 85 + 288 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$3.25.

ENGLISH.

Acvghosha. Discourse of Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana. Translated by T. Suzuki. London, 1900. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Grenfell (B. P.) and others. Egypt Exploration Fund. Graeco-Roman Branch: Fayûm Towns and Their Papyri. London, 1900. 8vo. £1 5s.

Lambros (S. P.) Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos. Vol. II. London, 1900. 8vo. 21s.

Newberry (P. E.) and Crum (W. E.) Amherst Papyri (Egyptian) at Diddington Hall, Norfolk. London, 1900. 4to, 61 pp. With 24 Plates. £2 2s.

Rhys (J.) Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx. 2 vols. London, 1900. 8vo, 768 pp. 21s.

Tregear (E.) Dictionary of Mangarcoa (or Gambier Islands). London, 1900. 8vo. 6d.

FRENCH.

Daremberg (Ch.) et Saglio (E.) Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. Fasc. 29. Paris, 1900. 4to. 5 fr.

Godefroy (F.) Lexique de l'ancien français. Paris, 1900. 8vo. 20 fr.

Riemann (O.) et Goelzer (H.) Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin. Phonétique et étude des formes grecques et latines. Paris, 1900. 8vo, 600 pp. 20 fr.

GERMAN.

Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, begründet v. Chrn. W. M. Grein. Fortgesetzt v. Rich. Paul Wülker. 5. Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *G. H. Wigand*.—5. Waerferth v. Worcester (Bisch.) Uebersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen. Hrsg. v. Hans Hecht. xiii, 374 S. m. 20.

— assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. XII 3. gr. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—XII 3. Zimmern (Heinr.) Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion. 3. (Schluss-)Lfg. 2. Hälfte. xii u. S. 129-226 m. 40 autogr. Taf. 1900. m. 30.

— — XVI. Delitzsch (Frdr.) Assyrische Lesestücke. 4. Aufl. xii, 193 S. Kart., m. 18.

Bienkowski (Pet.) De simulacris barbararum gentium apud Romanos. (In deutscher u. poln. Sprache.) gr. 4. 101 S. m. Abbildgn. Cracoviae, 1900. Wien, *Gerald & Co. in Komm.* m. 10.

Birt (Thdr.) Der Hiatus bei Plautus u. die lateinische Aspiration bis zum X. Jhd. nach Chr. gr. 8. iv, 375 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 9.60.

Corpus glossariorum latinorum a Gust. Loewe inchoatum, composuit, recensuit, ed. Geo. Goetz. Vol. VII. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.—VII. Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum confecit Geo. Goetz. Pars II. Accedit index graecus Guil. Heraei. 438 S. 1901. m. 24.

Demetrii Cydonii de contemnenda morte oratio, ex codicibus ed. Henr. Deckelmann. 8. xii, 47 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.

Dittenberger (Guilelm.) Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum. Iterum ed. D. Vol. III. gr. 8. 462 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel*. m. 14.

Euripidis fabulae, edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. III, pars 4. Phoenissae, ed. N. Wecklein. gr. 8. 107 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.80.

Favonii Eulogii disputatio de somnio Scipionis. Ed. Alfr. Holder. 8. x, 48 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.40.

Gismondi (Henr.) Linguae syriacae grammatica et chrestomathia. Ed. II. gr. 8. 83, 169 u. 67 S. Roma, *Via del seminario* 120. m. 6.

Guidi (I.) Tables alphabétiques du Kitâb "al Agâni." Fasc. II. Lex. 8. xi u. S. 361-769. Leiden, 1900, *E. J. Brill*. m. 18.

Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. II. Fasc. I. Herons v. Alexandria Mechanik u. Katoptrik. Hrsg. u. übers. v. L. Nix u. W. Schmidt. Mit 101 Fig. 8. xlv, 415 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Ibn Kutaiba's Adab-al-kâtib. Hrsg. v. Max Grünert. gr. 8. x, 704 S. Leiden, 1900, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 20.

- Karst (Jos.) Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen. gr. 8. xxiii, 444 S. m. 2 Tab. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 15.
- Körting (Gust.) Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch. 2. Ausg. Lex. 8. vii S. u. 1252 Sp. Paderborn, 1901, *F. Schöningh*. m. 22.
- Lysiae orationes. Recensuit Thdr. Thalheim. Ed. maior. 8. 1, 400 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.
- Panzer (Frdr.) Hilde-Gudrun. gr. 8. xv, 451 S. Halle, 1901, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 12.
- Praetorius (Frz.) Ueber die Herkunft der hebräischen Accente. gr. 8. v, 54 S. Berlin, 1901, *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 4.
- Procli Diadochi in Platonis rem publicam commentarii. Ed. Guil. Kroll. Vol. II. 8. ix, 476 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.
- Quellenwerke der altindischen Lexicographie. IV. (Schluss-)Bd. gr. 8. Wien, *A. Hölder*.—IV. Hemachandra: Dhätupāṭha. Mit dem selbstverfassten Commentare des Autors. Hrsg. v. Joh. Kirste. 10, 288, 122 u. 34 S. 1899. m. 16.
- Reitzenstein (R.) M. Terentius Varro u. Johannes Mauropus v. Euchaita. gr. 8. v, 97 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.60.
- Schreiner (Jos.) Homers Odysee. Elementar-Skizzen der drei wichtigsten Oertlichkeiten Ὀδυσσέως, Σχερίων, Ἰθάκη. gr. 8. iii, 103 S. Braunschweig, 1901, *R. Sattler*. m. 2.
- 'Umar Ibn Abi Rebi'a. Der Diwan. Hrsg. v. Paul Schwarz. 1. Hälfte. 4. viii, 67 u. 130 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 16.
- Valaori (J.) Der delphische Dialekt. gr. 8. x, 83 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 2.60.

ITALIAN.

- Aristotele. La Costituzione di Atene, a cura di Cosattini. Testo e commento con figure e un facsimile. L. 3.
- Platone. La Repubblica. Libro I, a cura di V. Brugnola. Testo e commento, figurato. Firenze. L. 2.
- Plinio. Lettere scelte. Commento a cura di Longhi e Piovano. Firenze. Con figure e una tavola. L. 3.25.
- Zaccaria (Enrico). L'elemento germanico nella lingua italiana. Bologna. 16mo, pagine 560. L. 6.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- American Ethnology, Bureau of. Seventeenth Annual Report, 1895-6, by J. W. Powell. Part 2. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1898.
- American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. The Journal of the Archaeological Institute of America. Vol. IV. No. 4. 1900.
- Supplement to vol. IV, 1900. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.
- Ancient East (The). No. 1. The Realms of the Egyptian Dead. London, *David Nutt*, 1901. 1s.
- Aristote. Traité de l'âme. Traduit et annoté par G. Rodier. Tome I: Texte et traduction. Tome II: Notes (XVI 259, 582). Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1900.
- Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum. By Robert Francis Harper. Part V. *The University of Chicago Press*. London, *Lusac & Co.*, 1900. 25s.
- 'Αθηνά. Τόμος IB'. Τεύχος Δ'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1900.
- Τόμος II'. Τεύχος Α'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1901.
- Blaisdell (E. A. and M. F.) The Child Life Primer. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901.
- Brugmann (Karl). Griechisch *ἄθροπος*. (Separat-Abdruck.)
- Ueber das Wesen der sog. Wortzusammensetzung. Eine sprach-psychologische Studie. (Abdruck aus den 'Berichten der Königl.-Sächs. G. der Wissenschaften,' 14. Nov. 1900.)
- Büttner-Wobst (Theodor). Beiträge zu Polybios. (Beig. 3. Jahrsb. d. Gymn. zum heiligen Kreuz, Dresden.) 1901.
- Chaucer. The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales. The Knights Tale. The Nonnes prestes Tale. Ed., a critical text, with grammatical introduction, notes and glossary, by Mark H. Liddell. New York, *The Macmillan Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.*, 1901. 60 cts.
- Ciaceri. La Alessandra di Licofrone. Teste, traduzione e commento. Catania, *Niccolò Giannotto*, 1901. L. 8.
- Collitz (Hermann). The Home of the Heliand. (Reprint from 'Publications of the Modern Language Association,' vol. XIV, no. 1.)
- Demosthenes on the Crown. With critical and explanatory notes, an historical sketch, and essays. By W. W. Goodwin. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1901.
- Dodgson (E. S.) The Verb in the Second Book in Gipuskora Bask. Hertford (England), *Stephen Austin & Sons*, 1901. 2s.
- English Dictionary (The Oxford). Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. GREEN-GIZZARD (vol. IV). INVALID-JEW (vol. V). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1891. Double sections @ 5s. \$1.25.
- Forman (L. L.) Selections from Plato. With introduction and notes. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1900.

Foucart (P.) Les grands mystères d'Éleusis Personnel. Cérémonies. (Extrait des 'Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres,' Tome XXXVII.) Paris, *C. Klincksieck*, 1890. 6 fr. 50 c.

Gaertringen (Hiller v.) Ausgrabungen in Griechenland. Vortrag. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1901.

Gray (Louis H.) Contributions to Avestan Syntax, the Preterite Tenses of the Indicative. (Reprint from 'J. A. Or. S.' XXI.) 1900.

Griswold (H. De W. G.) Brahman. A Study in the History of Indian Philosophy. (Cornell Studies in Philosophy, no. 2.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.

Harre-Giercke. Lateinisches Uebungsbuch. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 2 m. 40 pf.

Huddilston (J. H.) Die griechische Tragödie im Lichte der Vasenmalerei. Neue durchgesehene Ausg. übersetzt von Marie Hense. Freiburg i./B., *Fehsenfeld*, 1900.

Hunter (Thomas). History of Philosophy. (Science Primer.) New York, *American Book Co.*, 1901.

Hyde (Mary F.) Two-Book Course in English. Book I: Lessons in the Use of English. Introd. price, 35 cts.—Book II: Practical English Grammar. Introd. price, 50 cts. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1901.

Jackson (A. V. Williams). The Religion of the Achaemenian Kings. First Series. The Religion according to the Inscriptions. With an Appendix by Dr. Louis H. Gray. (Reprint from 'J. Am. Or. Soc.' XXI.) 1900.

Juvenal. Edited with introduction, notes on thirteen satires, and indices by Henry Parks Wright. Boston, *Ginn & Co.* New York, 1901.

— The New Fragments of. A lecture delivered at Corpus Christi College on Tuesday, February 5, 1901. By Robinson Ellis. London, *Henry Frowde*. 1s.

Lebreton (Julius). Caesariana syntaxis quatenus a Ciceroniana differat. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1901.

— Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.* 10 fr.

Little (Charles Edgar). A Grammatical Index to the Chāndogya-upaniṣad. (Vanderbilt Oriental Series.) New York, *American Book Co.*, 1901.

Modern Language Association, Publications of the. Ed. by James W. Bright. Vol. XVI, No. 1. N. S., Vol. IX, No. 1. I. Fuller (H. De W.) The Sources of Titus Andronicus.—II. Baker (G. P.) 'Titus and Vespacia' and 'Titus and Andronicus.'—IV. Faust (A. B.) The Problematic Hero in German Fiction.—V. Carruther (W. H.) Lessing's Treatment of the Story of the Ring and the Teaching.—VI. Hatfield (J. T.) A Note on the Prison-Scene in Goethe's Faust.—VII. Collitz (H.) The Home of the Heliand. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1901.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 20: Seifen-Stimmen. Lfg. 21: Stimmen-tröpfeln. New York, *The International News Co.*, 1901. @ 1 m. 50 pf.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Johannes Ilberg u. Richard Richter. III. Jahrg. 1900. V. u. VI. Bände, 10. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1900.

Persius, The Satires of. Translated with an introduction and some notes by Samuel Hemphill, D. D., LL. D. Dublin, *Hodges, Figgis & Co.* London, *George Bell & Sons*, 1901.

Popular Studies in Mythology, Romance and Folklore. No. 10. The Romance Cycle of Charlemagne and His Peers, by Jessie L. Weston. London, *David Nutt*, 1901. 6d.

Porto Rico, Census of, Report on the. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1900.

Powell (J. W.) Philology as the Science of Activities designed for Expression. (American Anthropologist, N. S., vol. II, Oct.-Dec. 1900.) New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1900.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1899. Ἀθήνησιν, 1900.

Puchstein (Otto). Die griechische Bühne. E. architektonische Untersuchung. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1901. 8 m.

Rheinisches Museum. Herausg. v. Franz Buecheler u. Hermann Usener. N. F. LVI 1. Frankfurt, *Sauerländer*, 1901.

Rizzo (Gaetano). Le tavole finanziarie di Taormina. Parte III. Messina, 1901.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.

Caesaris commentarii de bello civili, etc. Recens. Renatus du Pontet. 75 cts.

Ciceronis orationes pro Milone, Caesarianae, Philippicae I-XIV. Recogn. A. C. Clark. 75 cts.

Q. Horati Flacci opera. Recogn. E. C. Wickham. 75 cts.

Thucydidis Historiae. Libri V-VII. Recogn. H. Stuart Jones. 90 cts. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901.

Sophocles, The Oedipus Tyrannus of. Ed. by Mortimer Lamson Earle. New York, *American Book Co.* (1901).

Thucydides. Histories. Book III. Edited with notes for the use of schools. By Herbert F. Fox. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1901.

Tolman (H. C.) The Art of Translating. With special reference to Cauer's Die Kunst des Uebersetzens. Boston, *Benj. H. Sanborn*, 1901. 70 cts.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (U. v.) Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyrik. (Abhandlungen der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-histor. Klasse. N. F. Bd. IV, No. 3.) Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1900. 8 m.

VOL. XXII, 2

WHOLE No 86

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.
PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING LEIPSIK: F. A. BROCKHAUS

APRIL, MAY, JUNE

1901

CONTENTS.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.	121
II.—Aristotle's de Anima. By PAUL SHOREY.	149
III.—Some Irregular Forms of the Elegiac Distich. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.	165
IV.—Indian Glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychios. By LOUIS H. GRAY and MONTGOMERY SCHUYLER, JR.,	195
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	203
Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Editus Auctoritate et Consilio Academicarum Quinque Germanicarum Berolinensis Gottingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vindobonensis.—Einführung in die Papyrskunde von Otto Gradenwitz.—Outlines of the History of the English Language.—King Alfred's Version of the Consolations of Boethius. Done into Modern English, with an Introduction.	
REPORTS:	217
Romania.—Hermes.	
BRIEF MENTION,	227
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	234
BOOKS RECEIVED,	238

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price \$3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, \$1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page.....	\$16 00	\$30 00	\$40 00	\$50 00
Half page.....	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page.....	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page.....	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of **THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY** has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, \$63 for the twenty-one volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, \$3; single numbers, \$1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXII, 2.

WHOLE No. 86.

I.—A FURTHER COLLECTION OF LATIN PROVERBS.

II.

DAEDALUS, p. 105. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 662 C) Daedalo doctior; for Greek parallels see Wiesenthal, p. 51.

DARE 2, p. 106. Acta inst. Arch. Rom. 1861, p. 37 (Carm. Epigr. 190, 5 B.) dederunt, acceperunt, dum essent, fruniti sunt; Diogen. 2, 77^a *ἅμα δίδου καὶ λάμβανε*: *ὅταν πρὸς ἄπιστον συναλλάσσωμεν* Eustath. opusc. 152, 54; 315, 10 *δός τι καὶ λαβέ τι*, cited by Varro sat. 498 (B.); compare the English 'give and take.'

DEBERE, Szel., p. 32. Braulio ep. 5 (M. 80, 653 A) redde, redde, quos debes; Maxim. eleg. 5, 52 debita redde mihi; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 51, 68 (M. 211, 348) redde quod debes.

DECANTARE, p. 106. Compare Plaut. Pseud. 1082 verba quae in comoediis | solent lenoni dici, quae pueri sciunt; Plat. symp. 204 B.

DECET 1, p. 106. Tibull. 1, 4, 77 gloria cuique suast.

DEDUCTIO. Sen. ben. 2, 4, 3 sine ulla, quod aiunt, deductione; ep. 58, 31 sine ulla deductione; cf. CIL. 2, 1474.

DELIRARE. Lactant. instit. 3, 17, 29 de homine, quo sano ac vigente nullus aeger ineptius deliravit; de ira 10, 3 qui profecto solus omnium caecus et excors fuit qui ea loqueretur quae nec aeger quisquam delirare nec dormiens posset somniare; see Brandt-Laubmann's index s. v. *proverbia*; cf. *somnium*, p. 328, Otto.

DENS 1, p. 107. Sidon. Apoll. c. 4, 15 non ego mordaci fodiam modo dente Maronem; compare Sen. d. 7, 20, 6 citius multo frangetis dentes quam imprimetis; Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 C)

posse genuinum laesus infigere; Petr. Dam. ep. 5, 1, 142 (M. 144, 339) Gregorium mordeant et in eum dentes amarissimi livoris infligant; cf. Hildebert. de quat. vir. (M. 171, 1060 D) dente sales careant; Petr. Cell. ep. 69 (M. 202, 515 A) sales tui sine dente sunt; Mart. Dum. form. hon. vit. 22, 8; note for a similar use of *dens* Ruric. ep. 2, 40, p. 425, 5 (Eng.) qualiter me et quam adsiduae dilectionis dente ruminetis.

DEUCALION. Lucan 1, 653 Deucalionis fudisset Aquarius imbres.

DEUS 1, p. 108. Baeda ep. 2 (M. 94, 662 D) sed quia huiusmodi maxima et plurima sunt loca quae, ut volgo dici solet, neque Deo neque hominibus utilia sunt.

DEUS 5, p. 109. Plaut. Pers. 100 O mi Iuppiter | terrestris; Poen. 1219 si sim Iuppiter, | iam hercle ego illam uxorem ducam; CIL. IV 1928 (Carm. Epigr. 937, 2 B.) peream, sine te si deus esse velim; compare Tibull. 2, 3, 32 fabula sit mavolt quam sine amore deus; Iul. Val. 2, 33, p. 104, 24 (K.) nec si quid blandius fortuna promiserit, idcirco te coeli compotem arbitrare; Optat. Mil. 3, 3, p. 77, 13 (Z.) in quo si unus quisque hominum erravit, ipse prohibere debuerat, cum non prohibuit, deus sibi visus est; p. 78, 16 quod extulit cor suum et deus sibi fuisse videbatur; Pythag. spr. 4¹ *ἄξιός ἀνθρώπου θεῶν θεός ἂν εἴη ἐν ἀνθρώποις*; compare Cic. de orat. 3, 14, 53 quem deum, ut ita dicam, inter homines putant.

DEUS 9, p. 110. Compare Petron. 134 malo astro natus est; Stat. silv. 3, 4, 63 o sidere dextro | edite.

DEUS 11, p. 111. Acro ad Hor. c. 3, 2, 31 tamquam raro poena deserat scelestum et quamvis tarde, tamen puniat; Eurip. frag. 979, 3 (N.) *ἡ Δίκη . . . σίγα καὶ βραδεί ποδι | στείχουσα μάρψαι τοὺς κακοὺς, ὄταν τύχη*; see Koch, II, p. 5.

DEXTERA 1, p. 111. Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 101, 145 (M. 211, 392) in consiliis nostris oculus vigilans, in negotiis dextera manus.

DEXTERA 2. Incert. auct. epigr. 132 (PLM. 4, p. 120, 9 Baehr.) nullus ubique potest felici ludere dextra, has a proverbial sound.

DEXTERA 3 (compare Otto, *dextera* 1). Paulin. Nol. ep. 1, 5, p. 4, 20 (H.) sit licet frater et amicus iunctor tibi dextera tua.

DICERE 2, p. 112. Plaut. Truc. 644 verbum sat est; Braulio ep. 21 (M. 80, 670 A) sapienti enim viro pauca dicta sufficiunt; Augustin. ep. 180, 2 satis existimo sapienti esse quod dixi; Fulbert. Carm. ep. 22 (M. 141, 210 B) sapienti pauca; Anselm. Cant.

¹Schenkl, Wien. Stud. 8, 264.

ep. 2, 13 (M. 158, 1163 C) quia sapientiae vestrae pauca verba sufficere non ignoramus; Wilhelm apud Thom. Cant. ep. 357 (M. 190, 690 C) sapienti sat dictum est; ep. 173 (646 D) satis, credo, dictum est sapienti; Foliot ep. 40 (M. 190, 775 A) quia sapiens docetur paucis; Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 22 (M. 202, 425 B) satis dictum est sapienti.

DICERE 5, p. 112. Ps.-Cypr. c. 6, 56, p. 310, 56 (H., vol. III) dicto citius; Orient. com. 1, 265; Severus rhet. bucol. 49 (M. 19, 799 A); Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 198); Alcuin de pontif. 1109 (M. 101, 834 D); Hrosuitha Mon. com. Callimach. (M. 137, 1008 B); Dud. Dec. de gest. Norm. duc. epist. (M. 141, 610 B); Gualb. ep. 310 (M. 146, 935 C) velocius dictis; compare Stat. Theb. 7, 27 dicto ocius; 4, 679 dicto prius¹; Hier. ep. 29, 1 celerius dicto; Eustath. opusc. 330, 60 *θᾶλλον ἢ λόγος*.² Note also the expression used more than once by Nicol. Clar. ep. 33 (M. 196, 1623 D) ad nutum nutu citius.

DICERE 6, p. 112. Plaut. Pseud. 629 dum tu sternuas, | res erit soluta, with which compare Theokr. 29, 27 *χᾶρι γηραλίοι πέλομεσ πρὶν ἀποπτύσαι*; Paulin. Nol. ep. 31, 11, p. 273, 11 (H.) nec mora: verbum factum; Ps.-Cypr. c. 2, 61, p. 292, 4 (H., vol. III) dicta et facta simul; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 19, 207 (M. 144, 402) dictum factumque est; with Horace's 'dum loquimur' (c. 1, 11, 7) compare Ovid am. 1, 11, 15 dum loquor, hora fugit; ex Pont. 4, 3, 58 dum loqueris, fieri tristia posse puta; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1345 (M. 171, 1419 B) et modo, dum loqueris, desinit esse tuum; Eustath. Il. 724, 48 *ἄμ' ἔπος, ἄμ' ἔργον*³; see further Preuss, p. 37.

DICERE 6, n., p. 112. Add further Sen. d. 2, 10, 2; 5, 36, 3; 6, 5, 2; 7, 20, 5; 11, 18, 8; clem. 1, 3, 2; 1, 8, 1; ep. 34, 4; 95, 45; Curt. 7, 1, 36; Tac. ann. 3, 65; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 7, 2, 4; 9, 9, 16; Symmach. ep. 1, 78, 1.

DIES 1, p. 112. Hor. c. 2, 5, 13 currit enim ferox | aetas; 3, 29, 47 infectumque reddet | quod fugiens semel hora vexit; Octav. Aug. (PLM. 4, p. 110, epigr. 122, 5 Baehr.) fugit hora, iocemur; CIL. 5, 6134 (Carm. Epigr. 1309, 1 B.) siste gradum, fugiat quamvis brevis hora, viator; Licent. ad Augustin. ep. 26, 3 (M. 33, 104) tempus enim, nisi me mortalia fallunt, labitur; Columban. c. 1, 24 (M. 80, 285) tempus et hora volat; Alcuin ep. 43, 52 (M. 100, 208 A) tempus huius vitae velociter currit, fugit et non revertitur.

DIES 2, p. 113. Alcuin ep. 115 (M. 100, 345 B) nec semper

¹ Woelflin, ALL. 6, 463.

² Kurtz, p. 313.

³ Kurtz, p. 309.

nox, nec semper dies, . . . hodie tempestas imminet, sed cras serenitas arridet; ep. 111 (336 C) nox et dies vices suas peragunt . . . tempestas serenitatis tranquillitate mitigatur; Menand. monost. 751 (IV, p. 361, M.) χειμὼν μεταβάλλει ῥαδίως εἰς εὐρίαν; Pind. Isth. 6 (7), 38 εὐρίαν ἔπασσεν ἐκ χειμῶνος; Pyth. 5, 10; Herond. 1, 44 (see Crusius, p. 14); compare Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 581 C) clarior est solito, post nubila plurima Phoebus.

DIES 6, p. 113. Sen. d. 6, 8, 1 dolorem dies longa consumit; Ovid a. a. 2, 647 multa vetustas | lenit; ex Pont. 4, 11, 14 finitumque tuum, si non ratione, dolorem | ipsa iam pridem suspicor esse mora, with which compare incert. auct. Agam. 131 quod ratio non quit, saepe sanavit mora; Hier. ep. 97, 2 rogo, quis est iste dolor qui nec tempore, nec ratione curatur; Alcuin ep. 106 (M. 100, 321) saepe dolor tempore sanabitur, qui ratione non poterit; Sen. d. 6, 1, 6 illud ipsum naturale remedium temporis; Symmach. ep. 1, 100, 1 ne fortunae vulnera, quae cicatricem processu temporis ducunt; Publil. Syr. 422 nil non aut lenit aut domat diuturnitas; Mantiss. 1, 100 λύπησιν δὲ πάσης γίνετ' ἰατρὸς χρόνος; see Leutsch's note.

DIES 7, p. 114. Ennod., p. 361, 16 (H.) diem putabant perisse, qui illos sine facinore . . . fugisset; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 14 (M. 199, 510 D) cites the anecdote from Suetonius.

DIES 8, p. 114. Sen. rem. fort. 10, 1 pecora in diem vivunt; CIL. 1, 1010 (Carm. Epigr. 185 B.) vive in dies et horas, nam proprium est nihil.

[DIES 11. Plaut. Aulul. 380 festo die si quid prodegeris, profesto egere liceat, nisi peperceris; Afran. 262 (R.) aequae profesto <ac festo> concelebras focum. This thought may have been the basis of some homely proverb.]

DIES 12. Venant. Fort. 4, 26, 131 quantum nocte dies distat, sol lampade lunae; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 500 D) quantum lux distat a tenebris.

DIES 13. The expression, dies me deficiet, became formulaic and quasi-proverbial. Gualbert. (M. 146, 895) non dies, ut aiunt, sed annus me deficeret; Ovid m. 15, 418 desinet ante dies; Verg. Aen. 1, 373; Cic. nat. deor. 3, 32, 81; Tusc. 5, 35, 102; Cael. 29; Sen. ben. 3, 12, 4; Apul. mag. 54, p. 516 (with Hildebrand's note); Hier. ep. 69, 7; compare Plaut. Trin. 885 si ante lucem ire occipias a meo primo nomine, | concubium sit noctis prius quam ad postremum veneris.

DIES 14. Sen. ep. 12, 8 itaque sic ordinandus est dies omnis, tamquam cogat agmen et consummet atque expleat vitam; Hor. ep.

1, 4, 13 omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum. This thought was not infrequently quoted in mediaeval Latin. Othlo lib. prov. 14 (see also d. 50, col. 133) in Migne 146, 323 A says: *omnis dies velut ultimus tractandus est*; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1104); Alcuin ep. 182, 200 (M. 100, 453 B) *omnis dies quasi ultimus habendus*; Herveus ad Thom. Cant. ep. 365 (M. 190, 696 B) cites Hor. ep. 1, 4, 13.

DIGITUS 3, p. 115. Plaut. Poen. 1308 *quid tibi hanc digito tactiost*; Rud. 720 *tange utramvis digitulo minumo modo*; Phaedr. append. 15, 4 *nec inveniret digito qui se tangeret*; Bochar. de rep. laps. 17 (M. 20, 1054) *et ipse digito meo nolim contingere ea*; Petr. Cell. ep. 118 (M. 202, 568 C) *digito autem suo nec quaeque modica tangentes*; see S. Matth. 23, 4.

DIGITUS 4, p. 115. Ps.-Cypr. de rebapt. 19, p. 92, 13 (H.) *ne qui putet nos unico articulo praesentem altercationem suscitare*; Alan. Insul. lib. parab. 3 (M. 210, 587 A) *non bene firmus erat, digito qui solvitur uno | nodus*.

DIGITUS 5, p. 115. Lactant. instit. 1, 20, 26 *colunt enim ture ac summis digitis, contrasted with 'sensibus intimis'*; Fronto ad Ver. 2, 1, p. 128, 18 (Nab.) *loricas partim eorum digitis primoribus scinderet*; Hier. ep. 14, 5 *non est tantum in eo servitus idoli si quis duobus digitulis thura in bustum arae iaciat*; Anthol. Pal. 15, 13, 2 *εἰ δὲ γε Μούσης | δακτύλῳ ἀκροτάτῳ ἀπεγέυσαο*.

DIGITUS 8, p. 116. Ovid a. a. 2, 629 *ne desint, quas tu digitis ostendere possis*; Apul. met. 3, 12 *manibus denotatus*; 11, 16 *digitis hominum nutibusque notabilis*; Hier. ep. 27, 2 *cunctorum digitis notor*; Ennod. vit. S. Epiph., p. 345, 24 (H.) *fama quae absentem illum notum fecerat, digito coepit ostendere*; incert. auct. dial. de caus. corr. eloq. 7 *quos . . . hic populus transeuntes nomine vocat et digito demonstrat*; Mart. Dum. de form. hon. vit. 6, 3 *monstraberis digito*; Hildebert. de quat. vir. (M. 171, 1063 C) *protenso digito plenus monstraberis astu*; Abaelard. ep. 1, 8 (M. 178, 135 B) *omnium digitis demonstrandus*; Steph. Torn. suppl. ep. 11 (M. 211, 550) *ostendimur digito*; serm. (573) *sed quem Ioannes digito demonstrat*; Lucian, Anach. 36, 917; for further Greek parallels see Koch, II, p. 25.

DIGITUS 12, p. 116. Compare Plutarch. Iul. Caes. 4 *τὴν κόμην . . . ἴθω κάκεινον ἐνὶ δακτύλῳ κνώμενον*; see further T. Eichtmeyer, p. 38.¹

¹ Proben aus einer abhandlung über namen und symbolische bedeutung der finger bei Griech. und Röm., Halle, 1835.

DIGITUS 14, p. 117. Sen. suas. 2, 17 insistens summis digitis . . . exclamat, gaudeo, gaudeo.

DIGNUS, p. 117. Verg. Aen. 9, 595 digna atque indigna relatu; append. prov. 1, 100 δουλε, δεσποτων ακουε και δικαια κ̄δικα, or in the other form κρεισσόνων γάρ και δικαια κ̄δικ' εστ' ακούειν, with which compare Plaut. Capt. 199 indigna digna habenda sunt erus quae fecit; see also Preuss, p. 43.

DIGNUS 2, Sonny, ALL. 8, 486. Add Crusius, Herond., p. 148.

DIMIDIUM, p. 117. Plaut. Mil. 916 bene lineatam si semel carinam conlocavit, | facile esse navem facere; dig. 1, 2, 1 et certe cuiusque rei potissima pars principium est; Abbo Floriac. ep. 9 (M. 139, 432 B), Petr. Bles. ep. 11 (M. 207, 33 C), and Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 590 C) cite Hor. ep. 1, 2, 20; compare also Ovid rem. am. 120 difficiles aditus impetus omnis habet; Sen. rem. fort. 10, 9 difficiles habet aditus primos; cetera prona, iucunda, facilia (compare Hor. sat. 1, 9, 55); Plat. resp. 377 A; see Grünwald, p. 9.

DIMIDIUS, p. 118. Ovid fast. 5, 718 dimidium toto munere maius erit.

DISCERE 2, p. 118. Petr. Dam. ep. 2, 1, 51 (M. 144, 254) saepe namque melius ipsi discimus, dum docemus.

DISCERE 3, p. 118. Sen. d. 10, 7, 4 vivere tota vita discendum est; Augustin. ep. 166, 1 (M. 33, 720) sed ad discendum quod opus est nulla mihi aetas sera videri potest; Alcuin ep. 84 (M. 100, 277 C) nulla aetas, ut ait comicus, sera debet esse ad sapientiam discendam; Zenob. 3, 4 γηράσκω δ' αλει πολλά διδασκόμενος (Solon).

DISCERE 5. Cassiod. var. 7, 23, 1 in parvis enim discitur cui potiora praestentur; 7, 29, 2 ut in parvis agnoscere possimus cui maiora credere debeamus; cf. Ovid a. a. 3, 525 quis vetat a magnis ad res exempla minores | sumere?

DOCERE 1, p. 119. Phaedr. 5, 9, 5 qui doctiorem emendat, sibi dici putet; Sen. ep. 94, 11 quid ista praecepta proficiunt, quae eruditum docent? Novatian. de cib. Iud. (ALL. 11, p. 226, 19) instruum iam eruditos; Petr. Dam. ep. 2, 11 (M. 144, 276) et hoc sit meum pungere, doctiorem velle docere; see Koch, II, p. 25.

DOMESTICUS, Sonny, ALL. 8, 487. Paulin. Nol. ep. 47, 9, p. 397, 26 (H.) domesticis utamur exemplis; Ioh. Sar. metal. 3, 10 (M. 199, 911 D) domestica namque exempla magis movent.

DOMINUS 1, p. 119. Compare Diogen. 5, 93 αι κύνες την δέσποιναν μιμούμεναι; Plat. resp. 563 C αι κύνες . . . οίαιπερ αι δέσποινας.

DOMINUS 2. Sen. ep. 5, 6 qui domum intraverit, nos potius

miretur quam suppellectilem nostram; Ps.-Sen. de mor. 121 (Haase, III 466) sic habita ut potius laudetur dominus quam domus; sent. Varr. 53 (Riese) illum elige eruditorem, quem magis mireris in suis quam in alienis; Martin. Dum. form. hon. vit. 4, 5, p. 7, 1 (Weid.) si continentiae studes, habita non amoene sed salubriter nec dominum notum velis a domo sed domum a domino¹; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 583 B) non domus, at dominus laudetur, si bonus is sit.

DOMUS 3, p. 120. Sen. ep. 72, 4 domestica illi felicitas . . . ibi nascitur; Iuven. 11, 118 domi natas . . . mensas; see Heraeus Petron., p. 11, N. 1; note also Petron. 44 domi gaudere; corp. gloss. 4, 86, 49 hilarens, apud se gaudens; Heraeus, p. 31.

DOMUS 6. Apul. met. 7, 16 scilicet ut, quod aiunt, domi forisque fortibus factis adoriae plenae gloriarer; see Hildebrand's note.

DOMUS 7. Iul. Cap., Anton. Pius 11, 8 cum in domum alienam veneris, et mutus et surdus esto, sounds proverbial.

DONUM, p. 120. Verg. Aen. 2, 49 is cited by Thom. Cant. ep. 24 (M. 190, 473 D), with the remark, 'sed proverbium est'; also by Ivo Carnot. ep. 128 (M. 162, 139 A); for Greek parallels compare Eustath. opusc. 317, 86²; Greg. Cypr. Leid. 2, 15 (with Leutsch's note); append. prov. 2, 94; see further Koch, II, p. 12.

DORMIRE 1, p. 121. Apul. met. 3, 22 vigilans somniabar; cf. Plaut. Cist. 291 utrum deliras, quaeso, an astans somnias?

DOS, p. 121. Compare Ovid a. a. 3, 258 est illis sua dos, forma sine arte potens.

DUO 1, p. 122. Rufin. Anth. Pal. 5, 93, 4 *τί μόνος πρὸς δὲ ἐγὼ δύναιμι*; Eustath. Il. 583, 4³; see further Grünwald, p. 7.

DUO 2, p. 122. Ovid a. a. 3, 358 unus cum gemino calculus hoste perit; compare her. 7, 138 poenaque conexos auferet una duos; 19 (20), 234 quid dubitas unam ferre duobus opem?

DUO 3, p. 122. Compare Ovid rem. am. 449 qui sibi iam pridem solacia bina paravit, | iam pridem summa victor in arce fuit; ex Pont. 3, 2, 6 tu laceratae remanes ancora sola rati; Sen. epigr. 15, 1 (PLM. 4, p. 60 B.) Crispe, meae vires lapsarumque ancora rerum; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 42 (F.) bonum est duabus fundari navem ancoris.

DUO 3, n., p. 122. Hier. ep. 76, 1 funiculus triplex non facile

¹ Woelfflin, Philol. 9, 683, No. 35.

² Kurtz, p. 312.

³ Kurtz, p. 318.

rumpitur; Rath. Ver. phren. 17 (M. 136, 386 B); Othlo lib. prov. 19 (M. 146, 333 C); Bernard. Clar. (M. 183, 491 D); Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 3 (M. 199, 543 D) funiculus triplex . . . qui facile solvi non potest; Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 31 (M. 202, 439 D) hic triplici filo contorquendus est dilectionis funiculus ne facile rumpatur; ep. 1, 37 (450 A) a laqueo sic contorto triplici funiculo, cave tibi; ep. 2, 148 (592 B). Cf. Eccl. 4, 12.

EDERE, p. 123. Caecil. Balb. 60 edas ut vivas; ut edas, noli vivere; Walter Burley de vit. et mor. phil. et poet. 62 edas, bibas ut bene vivas, non vivas ut tantum edas et bibas¹; Petr. Bles. ep. 85 (M. 207, 261 A) Socrates dicebat, quosdam vivere ut comederent et biberent, se autem comedere et bibere, ut naturae satisfaceret et excursum vitae . . . sustentaret. Compare Iuv. 11, 11 et quibus in solo vivendi causa palato est.

ENDYMION 2, of a beautiful boy. Iuv. 10, 318, sed tuus Endymion . . . fiet adulter; Apul. met. 1, 12, hic est, soror Panthia, carus Endymion.

EQUUS 6, p. 126. Add Flor. 1, 13 (18), 6; see further Preuss, pp. 70 and 91.

ERROR. Othlo lib. prov. 5 (M. 146, 310 A) error erit nimius cum praetores simul errant. The proverb may go back to classic times.

ERROR 2. Veget. 1, 13 deinde in aliis rebus, sicut ait Cato, si quid erratum est, potest postmodum corrigi; proeliorum delicta emendationem non recipiunt. This is the latinized form of the Greek proverb, Apost. 2, 64 *ἀμαρτείν οὐκ ἔνεστι δις ἐν πολέμῳ*.

EURYBATUS, p. 126. For Greek references see Wiesenthal, p. 56.

EXPERTUS 1, p. 127. Avit. Vienn. ep. 3, p. 127, 9 (Chev.) experto credite; Hier. ep. 22, 8 si experto creditur; ep. 52, 8; Ioh. Sar. ep. 228 (M. 199, 256 C); Polycrat. prol. 1 (386 A); Polycrat. 5, 10 (564 A); 8, 23 (814 C); Petr. Cell. ep. 102 (M. 202, 553 D) experto credendum est.

EXPERTUS 2, p. 127. Gualbert. act. 216 (M. 146, 894 D) expertus loquor; Ioh. Sar. ep. 186 (M. 199, 196 D) expertus hoc loquor; ep. 236 (266 C) expertus experto loquor; append. anthol. Pal. 2, 424, 4 *ἐγὼ λέγω σοι ταῦθ' ἀπαντα πειράσας*.

EXTRA. Sen. d. 2, 1, 1 qui adeo extra omnem teli iactum sur-rexit, ut supra fortunam emineat; rem. fort. 13, 2 nemo extra

¹Haupt, Philol. 3, 378.

ictum vulneris positus est; compare Zenob. 3, 89 *ἰζω βελῶν καθῆσθαι*; Eustath. II. 972, 8¹; Woelfflin,² p. 210.

FABA 3, p. 128. Ioh. Sar. ep. 299 (M. 199, 348 A) et in surdos, ut veteri proverbio dici solet, faba cudatur.

FACERE 2, p. 129. Hor. c. 3, 29, 44 non tamen irritum, | quodcumque retrost, efficiet neque | diffinget infectumque reddet | quod fugiens semel hora vexit; cf. Stat. silv. 4 praef. primum supervacuum est dissuadere rem factam.

FACERE 4. See Preuss, l. c., p. 110.

FACIES 1, p. 130. Hier. ep. 52, 5 illi verbositas, attrita frons; ep. 52, 8; Petr. Bles. ep. 119 (M. 207, 350 D) attritae frontis homo et verecundiae prodigus; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 147, 221 (M. 211, 435) confidentiam assumpsimus . . . et attrita, ut aiunt, fronte.

FAMA, p. 131. Plaut. frag. inc. fab. 7 (21) (G.-S.) nullam ego rem citiorem apud homines quam famam reor.

FARI 1, p. 132. Liv. 10, 41, 3 fando nefandoque sanguine; see Preuss, p. 43, Jungblut Rhein. Mus. 38, 405.

FARI 2. Plaut. Pers. 174 quom interim tu meum ingenium fans atque infans nondum etiam edidicisti.

FARINA, p. 132. Cassius Parmensis ap. Suet. Aug. 4 materna tibi farinast, 'You are of your mother's kidney,' with a play on the word. The use of *nota* cited in this connection by Otto occurs very often in Seneca; n. q. 2, 21, 4 eiusdem notae ac naturae; ep. 15, 3, pessimae notae mancipia; 24, 23; 42, 1; 52, 3; 110, 1; d. 2, 3, 3, etc; Ovid am. 2, 5, 54 ex hac nota; compare also Sen. ben. 3, 35, 1 quaedam ex nostra, ut ita dicam, moneta proferri; Symmach. ep. 3, 11, 2 spectator tibi veteris monetae solus super-sum; append. prov. 2, 47 *ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ψιμίου γεγονώς* (compare LUTUM 4, Otto); see also Crusius, Herond. p. 30, n. 2.

FAS, p. 132 (see also Weyman ALL. 8, 28). Ovid a. a. 1, 739 an moneam mixtum fas omne nefasque? met. 6, 585 sed fasque nefasque | confusura ruit; met. 9, 551 Sen. d. 4, 9, 2 ad fas nefasque miscendum coorti sunt; Prudent. cath. 3, 134 fasque nefasque simul glomerans.

FAUCES 2, p. 133. Licin. Crass. apud Cic. de orat. 1, 52, 225 eripite nos ex miseriis, eripite ex faucibus eorum quorum crudelitas . . . non potest expleri; Claudian. 26, 449 totaque Tartareis e faucibus oppida traxit; Coripp. Ioh. 3, 281; 6, 12; Boeth. consol. phil. 1, 4, 43 (Peiper) Paulinum consularem virum . . . ab ipsis

¹ Kurtz, p. 312.

² Sitzungsb. Münch. Akad. phil.-hist. class. I, 1888.

hiantium faucibus traxi; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 165, 255 (M. 211, 454) de mortis faucibus ereptum; compare Sen. d. 6, 22, 6 quod e faucibus avidissimorum luporum educeretur praeda.

FAX. Sulpic. Sev. chron. 2, 46, 9, p. 100, 10 (H.) facem quandam nascenti incendio subdidit; compare OLEUM 2, Otto.

FEMINA. Verg. Aen. 1, 364 dux femina facti, is perhaps an echo of the Greek proverb γυνή στρατηγεί: ἐπὶ τῶν δειλῶν, Diogen. 4, 1.

FERA. Ovid trist. 5, 8, 6 mala . . . | nostra, quibus possint inlacrimare ferae; compare Verg. ecl. 5, 27 and Otto, LAPIS 1.

FERMENTUM 1, p. 133. Compare Plaut. Most. 699 tota turget mihi uxor, scio, domi; Apul. met. 10, 24 . . . quodque frustra paellicatus indignatione bulliret.

FERRE 1, p. 134. Ps.-Sen. ep. ad Paul. 12 feramus aequo animo et utamur foro, quod sors concessit.

FERRE 2, p. 134. Plaut. Rud. 402 ergo animus aequos optimumst aerumnae condimentum; Publil. Syr. 96 cuivis dolori remedium est patientia; cf. Propert. 2, 5, 16; Hor. c. 1, 24, 19 is cited by Adalberon ep. 10 (M. 137, 509 A) and by Foliot ep. 79 (M. 190, 798 D).

FERRUM 1, p. 134. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 12, 31 duro tibi pectora ferro | esse clausa . . . putem; her. 20 (21), 229 durius et ferro cum sit tibi pectus; as an epithet used with *cor*, Ovid her. 12, 183 praecordia ferrea; Claudian. 26, 303 nec ferro sic corda rigent; Augustin. ep. 26, 4 (M. 33, 106); Aldh. carm. (M. 89, 282 C); Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 262, 379 (M. 211, 524); with *mens*, Othlo lib. prov. 6 (M. 146, 310 D) ferreas mentes; (311 D) ferrea mens; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1353 (M. 171, 1428 B) mens tua . . . ferrea; Licin. Crass. ap. Suet. Ner. 2 cui os ferreum, cf. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 14 (M. 199, 510 C); Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 (M. 89, 199 A) durior . . . ferro. The simple adjective, *ferreus*, in this metaphorical sense occurs very frequently in Ovid, met. 13, 515; 14, 721; Cic. Phil. 8, 25 ferrei sumus; 12, 19; Cael. 37; in Pis. 63¹; Propert. 2, 8, 12; Tibull. 1, 2, 67; 2, 3, 2; Mart. 11, 27, 1; Fronto, p. 236, 15 (Nab.); Augustin. ep. 101, 1 (M. 33, 368); Bonif. Mogunt. ep. 63 (M. 89, 766 B) ferrei pectoris; Eustath. Od. 1940, 56 ἀνασχυντος καὶ σιδηροῦς ἄνθρωπος²; see Blaydes on Aristoph. Acharn. 491 and A. Zingerle, p. 43,³ for further examples.

¹See Straub, p. 47, de tropis et figuris quae inveniuntur in orationibus Demosthenis et Ciceronis.

²Kurtz, p. 309.

³Ovid und sein verhältniss zu den vorgängern, Innsbruck, 1869.

FERRUM 4. Liv. 1, 59, 1 ferro, igni, quacumque dehinc vi possim; 2, 10, 4 ferro, igni, quacumque vi possint; Preuss, l. c., p. 35, considers these expressions proverbial.

FERULA, p. 135. Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 C) quia et nos iuxta Flaccum didicimus litterulas, et saepe manum ferulae subtraximus; compare Paulin. Aquil. apol. pro carm. (M. 99, 471) videris ob id forte meretriculam indignari Carmentem manumque ad ferulam mittere; Phil. Harv. ep. 13 (M. 203, 98 B) sub magistrali ferula teneremur.

FICTUS, p. 135. Lactant. inst. 6, 20, 7 picta et ficta et gemmis distincta.

FILIUS. Sid. Apoll. ep. 7, 14, 7 unde illud simile vulgatum est, quod ait quidam in causa dispari, sententia pari: filium Marci Ciceronis populus Romanus non agnoscebat loquentem.

FILIX, p. 136. The passage from Horace is cited by Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 5 (M. 210, 592 A).

FILUM, p. 136. Coripp. Ioh. 3, 338 cur, Lachesis, hominum tenui pendentia filo | fata tenes? Hildebert. carm. misc. 1349 (M. 171, 1424 B) cites Ovid ex Pont. 4, 3, 35.

FLAMMA 1, p. 137. To Woelfflin's collection in the Sitzungsbd. d. Münch. Akad. phil.-hist., 1881, II, p. 55 and 57, and ALL. 3, 446, add Ovid met. 12, 551; 15, 441; Sidon. Apoll. c. 7, 249; Leo Magn. serm. 18, 56 (M. 54, 183 B); incert. Sax. poet. annal. gest. Car. Magn. 2 (M. 99, 703 B); compare Auson. ecl. 25, 2 (Peiper) ferro et face.

FLERE. Ennod. vit. Epiph., p. 382, 23 (H.) numquam ad flentem flens bene veniat consolator; Hier. ep. 39, 2 (M. 22, 466) non est optimus consolator quem proprii vincunt gemitus; Braulio ep. 30 (M. 80, 677 A); cf. Plaut. Epid. 111 nil agit qui diffidentem verbis solatur suis.

FLUCTUS, p. 138. Plaut. Mil. 513 dedecoris pleniorum erum faciam tuom, | quam magno vento plenumst undarum mare; Ovid trist. 5, 2, 28 quae si comprehendere coner, | Icariae numerum dicere coner aquae; Coripp. Ioh. 6, 201 numeres aut aequoris undas; Claudian. c. 18, 32 si pelagi fluctus, Libyae si discis harenas, | Eutropii numerabis eros; Apoll. Rhod. 4, 214; cf. Stat. silv. 3, 3, 97 hibernas citius numeraveris imbres | silvarumque comas.

FLUMEN 1, p. 138. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 5, 6 in medio undarum sitiebamus.

FLUMEN 2, p. 139. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 42 is cited by Ioh. Sar.

ep. 263 (M. 199, 305 D). The meaning of the proverb seems to be most closely connected with Apost. 1, 90 Ἀκετσαίου σελήη or Ἡροδότου σκιά.¹

FLUMEN 3, p. 139. Ovid trist. 5, 11, 27 sed ut in mare flumina vastum, | sic solet exiguae currere rivus aquae; Stat. silv. 1, 4, 37 et in oceanum rivi cecidere minores; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 3 (M. 210, 586 A) ad vada Neptuni fontes et flumina currunt.

FLUMEN 5, p. 139. Ovid met. 13, 324 ante retro Simois fluet; Sil. Ital. 5, 253 Thrasymennus in altos | ascendet citius colles; Claud. c. 18, 353 prona petunt retro fluvii iuga; in Rufin. 1, 159; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 28 with Leutsch's note; Eustath. Il. 1067, 27¹; J. Koch, p. 26.

FLUMEN 7, p. 139. Ovid ex Pont. 3, 7, 8 ne totiens contra, quam rapit amnis, eam; Ioh. Sar. ep. 179 (M. 199, 176 B) nec hoc dixerim quod eum velim aut suadeam dirigere bracchia contra torrentem (= Iuven. 4, 89); Mantiss. 1, 15 ἀνὰ ῥοῦν χωρεῖν (see Leutsch's note); for the opposite idea, compare Diogen. 5, 82 κατὰ ῥοῦν φέρεται: ἐπὶ τῶν εὐπλοούντων.

FLUMEN 9, as a type of speed; Sedat. ep. ad Ruric. 8, p. 450, 14 (Eng.) celeritate ventos et flumina praecursum; Verg. Aen. 1, 317 Harpalyce volucremque fuga praeventitur Hebrum (Eurum, Ribb.); Serv. ad loc., unde et flumina dicitur celeritate transisse; Sil. Ital. 3, 307 cui sonipes cursu, cui cesserit incitus amnis, | tanta fuga est; 2, 73 Threiciae | . . . cursuque fatigant | Hebrum innupta manus, which is an evident imitation of the Vergilian passage.

FOLIUM 1, p. 140. Diomed. ars. gram. 2, p. 461, 23 (K.) cites the expression, leviorque foliis, as an example of hyperbole.

FOLIUM 4. Ovid met. 11, 615 quot . . . | silva gerit frondes; Stat. silv. 3, 3, 97 citius numeraveris imbres | silvarumque comas.

FONS 1, p. 140. Hier. praef. de spir. sanc. (M. 23, 104 A) et contemnet rivulos, cum coeperit haurire de fontibus; Maxim. Taur. homil. 84 (M. 57, 441 B) quis enim contentus est potare de rivulo, cum possit haurire de fontibus? Abaelard. ep. 10 (M. 178, 336 B) de ipso fonte Matthaeus, de rivulo fontis Lucas est potatus; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1348 (M. 171, 1422 D) cites Ovid ex Pont. 3, 5, 18.

FORMA 1, p. 141. See Kaibel, Hermes 17, 419.

[FORMA 3. Tibull. 1, 8, 24 forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis,

¹ Wiesenthal, p. 20.

² Kurtz, p. 309.

Propert. 1, 2, 8 nudus amor formae non amat artificem; compare 2, 18, 25 ut natura dedit, sic omnis recta figurast; Ovid. rem. am. 350 forma sine arte decens; compare our English proverb 'Beauty unadorned.']

FORMICA 1, p. 141. Sid. Apoll. ep. 7, 14, 5 an industriam? cui pro suo modulo comparari nec formica formidat.

FORTUNA 1, p. 141. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 8, 16 praeter fortunam, quae mihi caeca fuit; Adalberon ep. 10 (M. 137, 508 D) caeca fortuna; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 8 (M. 199, 490 B) cites the words noli fortunam, quae non est, dicere caecam; enthet. in Polycrat. (381 C) referring to Fortuna he says, 'dea caeca.'

FORTUNA 2, p. 142. Aper ap. Tac. dial. 23, 1 nolo, inridere rotam Fortunae¹; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 11, 4 quo rerum volubilitatis humanae rota ducitur; c. 2, 348 fregit in illo | imperii fortuna rotas; Claud. ad lunam (PLM. III, p. 164, 16 Baehr.) ut volvat fortuna rotam; Ven. Hildebert. carm. misc. 1349 (M. 171, 1423 D) tempus, amor, fortuna rotam comitatur euntem; Petr. Cell. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 335 (M. 190, 678 A) irridet fortunam cum inversione rotae suae; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 255 (M. 199, 970 C) rota fortunae; compare Iul. Val. 2, 38, p. 109, 8 (K.) in illa versura Fortunae.

FORTUNA 5, p. 142. Curt. 4, 5, 2 numquam diu eodem vestigio stare Fortunam; 4, 14, 21 iactamur invicem varietate fortunae; compare Sen. ep. 98, 8 oblitus huius petauri quo humana iactantur; Ovid trist. 3, 11, 67 humanaeque memor sortis, quae tollit eosdem | et premit; Iul. Val. 1, 11, p. 21, 23 (K.) non enim vides, ut stare fortuna hominum nesciat; 2, 28, p. 98, 8 (K.); Sen. ep. 44, 4; Ioh. Sar. ep. 285 (M. 199, 321 B) alternat fortuna rerum vices; enthet. in Polycrat. (381 C) quod fortuna dedit, et quod dabit, est alienum, | auferet hoc totum, cum volet illa, tibi.

FORTUNA 9, p. 144. Coripp. Ioh. 1, 561 nam timidos fortuna premet, cautosque iuvabit | audacesque simul; 7, 57; incert. poet. annal. de gest. Car. Magn. II (M. 99, 698 A) virtutem, sicut solet, est fortuna secuta; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 18 (M. 199, 684 D) audentes fortuna iuvat; Alan. de Insul. parab. 5 (M. 210, 590 D) audaces fortuna iuvat; for citations from Greek tragic poets, see H. Koch II, p. 5.

FORTUNA 13, p. 145. See H. Koch II, p. 5, for Greek citations.

FORTUNATUS. The Isles of the Blest appear to have formed

¹ See Gudeman's note.

the basis of proverbial expressions; Plaut. Trin. 549 sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas; compare Asin. 33 apud fustitudinas, ferricrepinas insulas; Cassiod. var. 12, 15, 7 alii dicant insulas, ego habitationes tuas appellem potius Fortunatas; Eumen. panegy. Constant. 7 (M. 8, 627 B) nec Thulen ultimam, nec ipsas, si quae sunt, Fortunatorum insulas dignabatur acquirere; Macar. 5, 81 *μακάρων νήσοι*; Zenob. 3, 86, Cic. ad Att. 12, 3, 1, par. 1, 78, Plato symp. 179 E, 180 B, Hesiod *ἔργ. καὶ ἡμ.* 170; see A. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 22, n. 2.

FORUM 1, p. 145. Cf. Ps.-Sen. ep. ad Paul. 12 feramus aequo animo et utamur foro, quod sors concessit.

FOVEA, p. 146. Prudent. apoth. praef. 13 scrobis latentis pronus in foveam ruet; Gelas. I adv. Pelag. haer. p. 412, 18 (Günther) foveas hostilis persuasionis incurrit.

FRAUS. Ovid a. a. 3, 491 iudice me fraus est concessa repellere fraudem; compare Publil. Syr. 582 remedium fraudem est contra vulpem quaerere; Zenob. 1, 70 *ἀλωπεκίζειν πρὸς ἑτέραν ἀλώπεκα*; see Leutsch-Schneidewin's note.

FRONS 2, p. 147. Ovid a. a. 3, 553 nec prima fronte rapaces | este; Cassiod. var. 7, 18, 1 errores . . . possumus prima fronte deprehendere; Ennod. ep. 5, 26, p. 146, 8 (H.) non urunt memoriam prima fronte negata beneficia; Phaedr. 4, 2, 6 decipit | frons prima multos; Maxim. Taur. hom. 109 (M. 57, 507 B) granum sinapis prima fronte specie sui est parvum; Ioan. Pict. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 467 (M. 190, 1034 B); Herv. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 366 (697 C) prima facie; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, prol. (M. 199, 637 A); Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 34 (M. 201, 62 D); Steph. Torn. ep. 200, (M. 211, 482 A) and ep. 224 (496 C); cf. Sen. d. 2, 3, 2 prima specie pulchrum; Curt. 9, 8, 20. These citations seem to indicate that the modern expression *prima facie* soon crowds out the late Latin *prima fronte*; compare the similar tendency in *toto pectore* and *toto corde*.

FULMEN 1, p. 148. Maecen. ap. Sen. ep. 19, 9 ipsa enim altitudo attonat summa; Macrob. sat. 7, 8, 6 vento nimio abies aut quercus avellitur, cannam nulla facile frangit procella; Dracont. 5, 312 gramina non tangunt, feriunt sed fulmina quercus; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 584 A) impetus et venti, tonitrus et fulmina tures | flatibus evertunt; praef. Anticlaud. (485) cum fulminis impetus vires suas expendere dedignetur in virgula, verum audaces provectarum arborum expugnet casus; schol. ad Lucan. 1, 81 and Abaelard. ep. 1, 9 (M. 178, 148 C) cite Hor. c. 2, 10, 11

FULMEN 2, p. 148. Ovid rem. am. 369 is cited by Abaelard. ep. 1 (M. 178, 120 B); incert. auct. vit. myst. (M. 184, 668 D); Petr. Bles. ep. 80 (M. 207, 249 A).

FULMEN 3, Szel., p. 5. Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 342 effundit celeres in arva currus; | non sic fulminis impetus trisulci | umquam sic . . . poli meatus | rupit; Ovid. am. 3, 4, 14 equum . . . | fulminis ire modo; Apul. met. 8, 4 impetu saevo frementis oris . . . totus fulmineus; Nazar. pan. Constant. 7 fulmineus miles; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 23 (M. 144, 412 C) in medios hostium cuneos, velut emissus caelitus fulgor, irrumpe; 8, 1, (463 D) fulmineus in hostes irruere; see further the citations given by Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 456 (Plin. n. h. 2, 142; Verg. Aen. 5, 319; Lucan 5, 405; Stat. 11, 483; Auson. epist. 25 (21) v. 5; Claud. Eutrop. 2. 271 ocior sidere.)

FULMENTUM, p. 148. See Crusius, Herond., p. 33.

FUMUS 1, n., p. 149. With Pers. 5, 20 cf. Fronto, p. 211, 2 (Nab.) nihil serium potuisse fieri de fumo et pulvere; p. 228, 3 (Nab.) cum illa olim nugalia conscripsi, laudem fumi et pulveris; cf. Eustath. Il. 757, 31 τᾶλλ' ἐγὼ κεννοῦ σκυῖας οὐκ ἂν πρῆαιμην¹; Soph. Antig. 1170.

FUMUS 3. Augustin. ep. 56, 2 (M. 33, 223) huius fumi vel vaporis temporalis, quae vita humana dicitur; Braulio ep. 34 (M. 80, 679 C) vita ista fugitiva et fumea; Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 20 (M. 144, 247 B) fumea vita volat; cf. Ioh. Sar. metal. 4, 35 (M. 199, 938 B) sed, ut fumus, evanescant; Hier. ep. 100, 1 instar fumi resolvuntur in nihilum.

FUNDUS 2, p. 149. Macrob. sat. 7, 12, 13, citing Hesiod, cum ad medium dolii perventum est, compercendum; Sen. ep. 1, 5 is cited by Foliot ep. 130 (M. 190, 838 D) and by Petr. Bles. ep. 14 (M. 207, 45 A).

FURCA, p. 151. Hor. ep. 1, 10, 24 is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 8 (M. 199, 489 C).

FURERE 1, p. 151. Boeth. p. 187, 30 (Peiper) contr. Eutyech. et Nest. ne iure viderer insanus, si sanus inter furiosos haberi conderem.

[GABII. Gabii and Fidenae are often mentioned as types of small and old-fashioned places; Hor. ep. 2, 1, 25 vel Gabiis vel cum rigidis aequata Sabinis; Iuven. 6, 57 vivat Gabiis, ut vixit in agro, | vivat Fidenis; Hor. ep. 1, 11, 7 Gabiis desertior atque | Fidenis vicus; the places are also mentioned together by Iuven. 10, 100 Fidenarum Gabiorumque . . . potestas].

¹ Kurtz, p. 319. .

GADES, as one of the ends of the earth; Hor. c. 2, 2, 11 *Libyam remotis* | *Gadibus iungas*; c. 2, 6, 1 *Septimi, Gadis aditure mecum*; Iuven. 10, 1 *omnibus in terris, quae sunt a Gadibus usque* | *Auroram et Gangem*; Sen. n. q. 1 prol. 13 *ab ultimis litoribus Hispaniae usque ad Indos*; Sil. Ital. 1, 141 *hominum finem Gades*; Claudian. 8, 43 *quantum distant a Tigride Gades*; 3, 293 *sed Latia quicquid ditione subactum* | *vivit, et a primis Ganges horrebat Hiberis*; Stephan. Torn. ep. 22, (M. 211, 326 A) *haec . . . Gades Oceano . . . commercio foederavit*; Anacreontea 13, 25 (Bergk) *καὶ τοὺς Γαδείρων ἐκτός, | τῶν Βακτρῶν τε κινδῶν . . . ἔρωτας*; Apost. 16, 19 *τὰ γὰρ Γαδείρων οὐ περατὰ* and Leutsch's note; Anthol. Pal. 11, 201, 2 *ἐκτοθεν ἂν στηλῶν Ἡρακλείους ἔφυγον*; 11, 209, 1; append. 1, 120, 2. In like manner note the use of *Tanais* in Propert. 2, 30, 2 *tu licet usque* | *ad Tanain fugias, usque sequetur amor*; Hor. c. 3, 10, 1 *extremum Tanain si biberes*, Lyce; Claudian. c. 8, 44.

GALLINA 1, p. 152. Eustath. Od. 1485, 30 *γάλα ὀρνίθων*; see Kurtz, p. 310, for Greek citations.

GALLUS 2. Sulpic. Sev. speaks several times of the gluttony of the Gauls; d. 1, 13, 4 *etiam ad Gallorum pulmenta sufficiat*; d. 1, 20, 4; 2, 8, 2 *cum edacitatis argueris, Galli sumus*; compare the remarks of Ammian. Marcell. 15, 12, 4 on their intemperance in the use of wine.

GALLUS 1, p. 152. Compare append. prov. 3, 53 *κύων ἐν προθύρῃ: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς δικαίοις τολμηρῶν*; see Leutsch-Schneidewin's note.

GARGARA. Ovid a. a. 1, 57 *Gargara quot seges*; Verg. georg. 1, 103 *ipsa suas mirantur Gargara messes*; cf. AFRICA 2, p. 8, Otto.

GEMMA. Mart. 1, 109, 4 *carior Indicis lapillis*; Sp. Ven. Fort. in laud. Mar. 349 *pulchra super gemmas*; Augustin. serm. 37, 3 (M. 38, 223 A); Poet. Carol. II, p. 77; Alcuin ep. 175 (M. 100, 445); Cassiod. (M. 70, 1038 A) *pretiosiores omnibus margaritis*; Ioh. Sar. ep. 234 (M. 199, 263 B) *omni topazio pretiosior*; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 459 and cf. AURUM 1.

GERERE. Fronto ad Ant. 5, p. 102, 4 (Nab.) *ante gestum, post relatum, aiunt qui tabulas sedulo conficiunt, is an expression cast in proverbial form*; see Cic. de orat. 2, 280 and compare DEDUCTIO.

GERRAE, p. 153. Placid. gloss., p. 49 (D.) *gerras, nugas ineptiasque*; see ALL. 10, 378.

GLADIUS 2, p. 153. Wibald. Stab. ep. 22 (M. 189, 1144 B) insanis clavam porrigere; cf. Petr. Bles. ep. 18 (M. 207, 67 A) honor fatui, gladius in manus insani.

GLADIUS 3, p. 154. Columban. serm. 11, 2 (M. 80, 251 B) quando enim unusquisque mentitur, . . . seipsum proprio gladio iugulat; Ioh. Sar. ep. 99 (M. 199, 90 B) quia nihil turpius est quam suis armis expugnari, et quasi mucrone proprio iugulari; Polycrat. 5, 7 (554 D) vel eum suo mucrone iugules; Petr. Chrys. serm. 157 (M. 52, 615 C) hostem proprio mucrone turbare singulare est insigne virtutis; Lucian bis acc. 29 ἐπ' ἐμὴ τὴν ἐμὴν μάχαιραν ἀκονᾶν; compare Macar. 3, 85 ἐν τοῖς ἐμῶν δικτύοις ἀλώσομαι (with Leutsch's note), Schmidt, l. c., p. 98; compare also Lact. instit. 5, 19, 1 primum quod se ipsos iugulant.¹

GRACULUS, p. 155. See Martin, l. c., p. 24, no. 32 a.

GRADUS, p. 155. Commod. instr. 2, 7, 9 aut ferro ligatus aut de suo gradu deiectus; cf. Hor. ep. 2, 2, 30 praesidium regale loco deiecit, ut aiunt; Sen. ep. 67, 10 illic est constantia, quae deici loco non potest.

GRAECUS 2, p. 156. Compare Verg. Aen. 2, 106 ignari . . . artisque Pelasgae; Maxim. eleg. 5, 39 Graiae tunc nescius artis.

GRAMEN. Ovid trist. 5, 1, 32 mollia quot Martis gramina campus habet; Alcuin ep. 134 (M. 100, 374 A) gramina quot tellus habeat, vel littus arenas.

GRANDO. Ovid met. 5, 158 tela volant hiberna grandine plura.

GRANUM. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 15, 8 quot . . . | Punica sub lento cortice grana rubent; trist. 5, 2, 24; cf. Hildebert. carm. misc. 1130 (M. 171, 1403 C) habet . . . non tot grana seges, crimina quot species.

GUBERNATOR, p. 156. Sen. d. 1, 4, 5 gubernatorem in tempestate, in acie militem intellegas; 6, 5, 5 ne gubernatoris quidem artem tranquillum mare et obsequens ventus ostendit; Cypr. de mortal. 12 gubernator in tempestate dinoscitur, in acie miles probatur; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 368 tranquillo quivis est gubernator mari; compare Othlo lib. prov. 12 (M. 146, 319 A) militis cuiuslibet fortitudo non agnoscitur nisi in bello (cf. Sen. d. 1, 4, 5 above); Ovid trist. 3, 11, 21 in causa facili cuivis licet esse disertum; Plin. ep. 9, 26, 4 ideo nequaquam par gubernatoris est virtus, cum placido et cum turbato mari vehitur.

GUTTA 1, p. 156. Plaut. Rud. 435 quem nisi oras, guttam non

¹ See Brandt-Laubmann's index under *proverbia*.

feres; 437; Ennod. ep. 3, 24, p. 89, 22 (H.) vix arentis gutta fundatur eloquii; Augustin. ep. 110, 5 (M. 33, 421) vix mihi paucissimae guttae temporis stillantur; Sen. clem. 1, 11, 3 nullam te . . . stillam cruoris humani misisse; compare Lact. instit. 5, 2, 9 ad veritatem, cuius ille ne scintillam quidem unam vidisset aliquando.

GUTTA 1, n. 2, p. 156. Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 49, p. 87, 6 (Reiff.) nec mare continuo dulce est, si mitioris aquae guttas alicuius adieceris; Pacian. ep. 3, 25 (M. 13, 1080 B) nonne ut stillicidia fontibus magnis? nonne, ut ab oceano quaedam gutta, sorberis?

GUTTA 2, p. 156. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 10, 5 is cited by Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1264).

GUTTA 4. Coripp. Ioh. 6, 202 numeres . . . | nimborum aut guttas; in laud. Iust. 3, 358; Cassiod. var. 1, 10, 4 quantitate innumerabili harena maris, guttae pluviarum, stellae lucidae concluduntur; compare GRANDO.

HABERE 1, p. 157. Ioh. Sar. ep. 237 (M. 199, 267 A) percelebre est: quantum quisque sua nummorum fundit ab arca, | tantum habet et fidei; in Polycrat. 4, 5 (521 D) he cites Ovid f. 1, 217; with the general thought compare Hor. sat. 2, 5, 8 et genus et virtus, nisi cum re, vilior alga est; Sen. ep. 115, 10 quaerimus non quale sit quidque, sed quanti; Pind. Isth. 2, 11 *χρήματα, χρήματ' ἀνήρ*.

HABERE 3, p. 157. Medea trag. 374 (PLM. 4, 234 Baehr.) hoc habet; Prudent. psych. 53 'hoc habet,' exclamat victrix regina.

HABERE 4, p. 157. Plaut. Amphitr. 927 tibi habeas res tuas, reddas meas; Ennod. ep. 2, 12, p. 52, 14 (H.) tibi habe facetias tuas; Arnob. adv. nat. 5, 7; tibi haec habe 5, 13.

HAMUS 1, p. 158. Evagr. sent. (M. 20, 1184 B) quem ad modum enim si quis glutiat hamum, sic abstrahetur anima tua; see Rowe, l. c., p. 18, Schmidt, l. c., pp. 86 and 88.

HARENA 1, p. 159. Coripp. Ioh. 6, 201 numeres . . . | quantas litus harenas | alluit; in laud. Iust. 3, 358; incert. Sax. poet. (M. 99, 731 C) amplior est numero, quam sit harena maris; Alcuin ep. 134 (M. 100, 374 A) quot . . . habeat littus arenas; compare Pind. Olymp. 2, 108 *ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφενγες*; Diogen. 2, 27 *ἄμμον μετρέειν*; Varro *ταφή Μενίππου 12, φαρμακόσσιοι*; incert. frag. 7 (Riese); cf. also Macrob. sat. 5, 20, 13; see Blaydes' note on Aristoph. Acharn. 3.

HARENA 4, p. 159. Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 15 (M. 144, 233 C) divinam imploro clementiam ut . . . sterile arenosi littoris aratrum mihi de

manibus tollas; Gillebert. ep. 1 (M. 184, 289 B) inutile siquidem arenae mandare semina; Steph. Torn. suppl. ep. 10 (M. 211, 548 D) tamquam laterem lavantes, et seminantes in arena; cf. Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 581 B) in sterili steriles aratrum facit aggere sulcos; de planc. nat. (431 B). Duff on Iuven. 1, 155 et latum media sulcum deducis harena, gives this interpretation but, it seems to me, incorrectly.

HARENA 5, p. 160. See Leutsch on Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 3, 46; Apost. 7, 50, and Martin, p. 23.

HERBA 3. Plaut. Trin. 31 mores mali | quasi herba inrigua succrevere uberrume, sounds proverbial.

HERCULES 1, p. 162. Coripp. Ioh. 7, 378 Herculeis . . . viribus; Anthol. Pal. 9, 281, 4 δίξημαι δεύτερον Ἡρακλῆα; 11, 95, 4; Eustath. Il. 589, 42 ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς¹; see Wiesenthal, p. 46 and cf. the expression in Iuven. 2, 20 verbis | Herculis, used in reference to the doctrines of the stoics.

HERCULES 1, n., p. 162. See Wiesenthal, p. 58, for Greek references.

HERCULES 5, p. 163. Hildebert. ep. 2, 22 (M. 171, 234 C) et tanquam Herculi clavam de manibus extorquentes; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 13 (M. 199, 667 A) longe maius quam, ut fabularum utamur verbis, clavam eripere de manu Herculis; Petr. Bles. ep. 141 (M. 207, 423 B) leviusque profecto extorquerem clavam de manu Herculis.²

[HERCULES 7. Steph. Torn. uses frequently the alliterative proverb commisit tamquam Hylam Herculi iungens, ep. 2, 114 (M. 211, 404 A), which probably goes back to earlier times; compare ep. 2, 121 (409 B) ubi tanquam Hylas mirabar Herculem; ep. 2, 148, (435 C) nam sicut Hylas Herculem, non aequis eos passibus consecamur; Ioh. Sar. Metal. 1, 3 (M. 199, 829 A) Hylam . . . ab Hercule.]

HERCULES 8. Ovid ex Pont. 3, 3, 100 pectus et Herculeae simplicitatis habes, points to a possible proverb.

HERCULES 9. The *termini* (or *vestigia*) *Herculis et Liberi patris* appears to be a quasi-proverbial phrase denoting wide extent and remote distance; see Curt. 3, 10, 5; 9, 4, 21; Sen. ben. 7, 3, 1; ep. 94, 63; compare GADES.

¹ Kurtz, p. 308.

² Compare Prudent. ham. 402 hinc gerit Herculeam vilis sapientia clavam; Hier. ep. 70, 3 rabidum canem . . . Herculis clava percutiam; Thom. Cant. ep. 19 (M. 190, 466 A) quasi clava Herculea percussi et repulsi.

HERMUS. Claudian. 3, 103 stagna rubentis | aurea Pactoli; totumque exhausit Hermum; 18, 214 ut eunucho flueret Pactolus et Hermus? 20, 172 Hermus et aurata Pactolus inhorruit urna; 24, 232; compare PACTOLUS and TAGUS.

HESPERIDES, Sonny ALL. 8, 487. Ovid met. 11, 114 demptum tenet arbore pomum, | Hesperides donasse putes; cf. Claudian. c. 29, 177.

HIPPOLYTUS, p. 164. For Greek parallels, see Wiesenthal, p. 55.

HOMO 2, p. 165. Suet. citing Vespasian, Vesp. 13 ego tamen vir sum; Salv. de gubn. dei 3, 1, 3, p. 42, 12 (Pauly) homo sum, non intellego secreta dei; CIL. 11, 856 (Carm. Epigr. 191, 7 B.) sumus mortales, immortales non sumus; Sen. ep. 116, 7 nos homunciones sumus, omnia nobis negare non possumus: see Crusius, Herond. pp. 101 and 111.

HOMO 3, p. 165. Augustin. serm. 164 (M. 38, 901 D) humanum fuit errare; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1098) humanum est peccare; Petr. Dam. serm. 17, 90 (M. 144, 599 D) peccare quippe humanum est; Othlo lib. prov. 8 (M. 146, 313 B) humanum est peccare; Ter. Adel. 579 censen hominem me esse? erravi; for Greek parallels, see H. Koch II, p. 20; cf. append. anthol. Pal. 2, 52, 9 μηδὲν ἀμαρτεῖν ἴστι θεῶν. Cf. Dem. 18, 289.

HOMO 4, p. 165. Ter. Heaut. 77 is cited by Augustin. ep. 155, 14 (M. 33, 672); Ioh. Sar. ep. 206 (M. 199, 229 D) humanum, teste comico, nihil charitas a se reputat alienum; ep. 281 (317 B); Polycrat. 3, prol. (477 B).

HOMO 6, p. 166. Optat. Mil. 3, 3, p. 78, 15 (Z) nec homo inter homines esse voluit; see Crusius, Herond. p. 100; cf. Tac. h. 4, 64 liberi inter liberos eritis.

HOMO 7, p. 166. With Petron. 38, phantasia, non homo, compare Zacchaeus Christ. consult. 1, 9 (M. 20, 1078 B) nec praestigiorum more phantasia pro homine monstrari.

HOMO 9, p. 166. Ioh. Sar. metal. 2, 18 (M. 199, 876 C) ut verbo comico utar: fere quot homines, tot sententiae; compare Mart. 6, 56, 5 scis multos dicere multa; anthol. Pal. 11, 283, 1 πολλοὶ πολλὰ λέγουσιν.

HONOS 1, p. 167. Ovid trist. 5, 14, 16 ad te non parvi venit honoris onus; Iulian. Pom. 1, 25, 1 non honorari sed onerari (see C. Blümlein, ALL. 8, 586, also Woelfflin, ALL. 1, 578); Foliot ep. 43 (M. 190, 777 A) mihi nec onus augeretur, nec vobis honor . . . minueretur; Nicol. Clar. ep. 40 (M. 196, 1639 C)

oneri, non honori; Petr. Bles. ep. 242 (M. 207, 554 C) hanc onus reputa, non honorem; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 267 (M. 211, 528 A) annexum est onus honori; ep. 2, 146 (432 D) sic honorastis et onerastis ut et honor non deficiat ex onere et onus proficiat ex honore.

HORA 1, p. 167.¹ Ter. Phorm. 514 unam praeterea horam ne oppertus sies; Hor. sat. 2, 7, 112 adde quod idem | non horam tecum esse potes; Hier. ep. 54, 9 unius horae spatio commutatur; for the phrase *horae momento*, see Hor. sat. 1, 1, 8; Liv. 5, 7, 3; Plin. n. h. 7, 51, 172.²

HOSTIS 1, p. 168. Incert. Sax. poet. (M. 99, 691 A) est dictum: dolus an virtus, quis in hoste requirat?

HOSTIS 2, p. 168. Ovid met. 4, 428 is cited by Abaelard. ep. 8 (M. 178, 284 D); Petr. Ven. ep. 4, 21 (M. 189, 349 B) verum est quod dicitur, etc.; and by Petr. Bles. ep. 91 (M. 207, 286 B).

HYACINTHUS. Iuven. 6, 110 facit hoc illos Hyacinthos; compare ENDYMION.

HYBLA 1, p. 168. Claudian. 14, 8 Hyblaeos latebris nec spoliat favos.

HYBLA 2, p. 168. Claudian. rapt. Proserp. 2, 125 Hyblaenum . . . thymum.

HYMETTUS, p. 169. Anthol. Pal. 7, 36, 4 Ὑμηττίερ λειβόμενος μέλιτι; II, 341, 2 ἀλλὰ κακῶς εἰπεῖν, Ἄττικόν ἐστι μέλι.

HYPERBOREUS. To Sonny ALL. 8, 487 add Hor. c. 2, 20, 16 Hyperboreosque campos; for the Hyperborean cold, compare Sidon. Apoll. c. 11, 96 Hyperboreis . . . pruinis; Val. Flacc. 8, 210; Claudian. 24, 256; 5, 240 vel Hyperboreo damnatam sidere Thylen.

IACERE, p. 169. Sen. ep. 105, 2 etiam in acie iacens praeteritur, cum stante pugnatur; compare Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 15, 25 (M. 144, 228) et fortis ac ingenuus quisque bellator, vitat inermem, impetit adversum se tela vibrantem; Dracont. 5, 311 et praedam rabies contemnit fulva iacentem; see Otto, CALCARE, p. 64.

ICTUS 1. Sil. Ital. 8, 309 stat campis acies, exspectaturque sub ictu | alter Flaminius; Cypr. ep. 57, 1 pacem sub ictu mortis acciperent; Augustin. ep. 137, 8 (M. 33, 519) in ictu temporis; Paulin. Nol. ep. 13, 14, p. 96, 4 (H): in ictu oculi; Theobald. Stamp. ep. 1 (M. 163, 760 A) in ictu oculi; Petr. Bles. ep. 153

¹ See Rhodius II, p. 5, de L. Munati Planci sermone, Bautzen, 1896.

² For the use of *hora* to express length of time, see Ter. Eun. 341 dum haec dicit, abiit hora; Hor. sat. 1, 5, 14 with Fritzsche's note.

(M. 207, 447 C) sub ictu oculi; Aldh. ep. 4 (M. 89, 96 A) momentaneo ictu apprehendi; Petr. Dam. serm. 6, 26 (M. 144, 532 B) in brevissimi temporis ictu; Nicol. Clar. ep. 7 (M. 196, 1602 A) in uno capillulo et ocelluli scintillatione; Eustath. opusc. 6, 7 *τάχιον ἢ ἀραμύσαίτινα*; Kurtz, p. 319.

ICTUS 2. Claudian. 18, 50 unoque sub ictu | eripit officium patris nomenque mariti; Ps.-Cypr. de sing. cler. 19, p. 195, 14 (H.) utrumque semel uno ictu mortificat; Boeth. consol. phil. 5, 6, p. 144 (Peiper) uno ictu; compare Otto, DUO 2.

IGNIS 2, p. 170. Evagr. sent. (M. 20, 1183 B) sicut enim aurum et argentum probat ignis; Columban. monost. 179 (M. 80, 291) aurum flamma probat, homines tentatio iustos; Othlo lib. prov. 19 (M. 146, 334 C) tamquam fornacis rutilans aurum probat ignis; Petr. Pap. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 459 (M. 190, 1021 D) Christi miles tamquam aurum in fornace probatur.

IGNIS 3. Ovid a. a. 1, 244 is cited by Helois. ad Abaelard. ep. 6 (M. 178, 214 B); anthol. Pal. 9, 749, 2 *μη πυρὶ πῦρ ἔπαγε*; append. 3, 171, 6 *ἔστι τὸ σὺν τούτῳ τῷ πυρὶ πῦρ ἕτερον*.

IGNIS 5, p. 171. Anthol. Pal. 12, 139, 2 *πῦρ ὑπὸ τῇ σποδῆ*.

IGNIS 6, p. 171. Stat. Theb. 2, 455 nil tela nec ignes | obstiterint; Curt. 4, 1, 18 quod alii per ignes ferrumque peterent; Petr. Dam. serm. 32 (M. 144, 676) per gladios, per tela, per ignes; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1330 (M. 171, 1403 D) ruens per tela, per ignes; Ioh. Sar. ep. 247 (M. 199, 292 B) per tela, et per ignes et ultimae vitae discrimina; Polycrat. 7, 9 (656 C) per tela, per ignes.

IGNIS 9. Fronto, p. 202, 3 (Nab.) sicut ignem, quamvis magnum, vel levis aura si adflaverit, adiuverit, sounds proverbial.

ILIAS, p. 171. Add Eustath. Il. 1, 22 *Ἰλιάς κακῶν*; Kurtz, p. 313.

INCENDIUM, 5. Hor. ep. 1, 18, 85 et neglecta solent incendia sumere viris.

INCITUS, p. 173. See further Tribukait, p. 55, n. 2.

INCUBARE, p. 173. Maxim. Taur. homil. 82 (M. 57, 431 C) nec ipsis bene est qui recondito auro incubant.

INDIA, p. 174. Add Mart. 1, 109, 4 Issa est carior Indicis lapillis; 10, 38, 5 Propert. 2, 22, 10; 3, 4, 2; 3, 13, 6; Coripp. in laud. Iust. 3, 15; Soph. Antig. 1038; Eustath. opusc. 61, 75 *τὰ Ἰνδικὰ χρυσία*; see Kurtz, p. 311.

INGENIUM. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 15 (M. 199, 673 A) nam, ut dici solet, amor ingenii numquam hominem divitem fecit, is perhaps a much older proverb.

INNOCENTIA. Caecil. in Apul. apol. 5, p. 390 (H.) innocentiam

eloquentiam esse; Tac. dial. 11 nam statum cuiusque ac securitatem melius innocentia tuetur quam eloquentia; compare Diogen. 7, 87 *προφάσεως δείται μόνον ἡ ποτηρία*; Sen. ep. 49, 12 veritatis simplex oratio est (= Eurip. Phoen. 469 *ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ*).

INVIDIA, p. 176. Fronto, p. 209, 19 (Nab.) sed profecto sicut arborum altissimas vehementius ventis quati videmus, ita virtutes maximas invidia criminosis insectatur; cf. Curt. 4, 5, 2 semperque homines, quantamcunque felicitatem habeant, invidiam tamen sentire maiorem (Mützell ad loc.); Othlo lib. prov. 19 (M. 146, 336 B) virtus semper invidiae patet; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1112).

IOCUS, p. 176. Sen. d. 7, 12, 2 miscent . . . et interponunt vitae ut ludum iocumque inter seria; Rufin. Aquil. apol. 1, 313 (M. 21, 546 A) ut ei mos est, miscuit seriis ridicula et ludicra; Mart. Dum. de form. hon. vit. 4, 7 miscebis interdum seriis iocos; Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 381 B) sic aptes seria ludis; Petr. Cell. ep. 69 (M. 202, 515 A) miscuisti siquidem iocos seriis; see ALL. 9, 65.

IRUS, p. 177. Epictetus in Macrob. sat. 1, 11, 45 *καὶ περιήν Ἴρος*; under Diogen. 8, 53 Schneidewin cites Liban. ep. 487 *θεοῦ τιμῶν δέξεται ἂν Ἴρος γενέσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ μὴ τιμῶν Κινύρας*; see Wiesenthal, p. 49.

IUPPITER 1, p. 178. Hor. c. 1, 12, 13 quid prius dicam solitis parentis | laudibus; Aratus cited in Macrob. sat. 1, 18, 15 *ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα*; Pind. Nem. 2, 3; Eurip. Hel. 1024; Terpan. frag. 1 (Bergk) *Ζεῦ, πάντων ἀρχά, | πάντων ἀγήτωρ, | Ζεῦ, σοὶ σπένδω | ταύτων ὕμνων ἀρχάν.*¹

IUPPITER 3, p. 179. Ioh. Sar. Metal. 1, 3 (M. 199, 828 D) audienda quidem felicibus et, ut dici solet, auribus Iovis.

IUPPITER 7. Plaut. Merc. 956 tam propitiam reddam quam quom propitias Iuno Iovi, sounds proverbial.

IUPPITER 8. Jove as the embodiment of wealth; Plaut. Pseud. 628 si . . . promptas thensauros Iovis, | tibi libellam argenti numquam credam; cf. anthol. Pal. 5, 34, 1-2 *ὁ Ζεὺς τὴν Δανάην χρυσοῦ, κἀγὼ δὲ σὲ χρυσοῦ*; | *πλείονα γὰρ δοῦναι τοῦ Διὸς οὐ δύναμαι*, of happiness; Sen. ep. 110, 18 Iovi ipsi controversiam de felicitate faciamus; ep. 25, 4 cum ipso Iove de felicitate contendat; cf. Otto, DEUS 5.

IUS 1, p. 179. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 11 (M. 199, 499 C) eontra in praetorio saepe summum ius summa iniuria est.

¹ Linde, p. 26, de proverborum apud tragicos Graecos usu, Gotha, 1896.

IUS 2, p. 180. Solon (?) frag. 30 (Bergk) ἀρχῶν ἄκουε καὶ δικαίως κἀδικῶς; see H. Koch II, p. 23; compare Propert. 2, 4, 6 dehinc domiti post haec aequa et iniqua ferunt; cf. DIGNUS.

LABES. Verg. Aen. 2, 97 hinc mihi prima mali labes, appears to have become a proverbial quotation; Justin. 17, 1, 5 haec illi prima mali labes. It also occurs twice in Gualbert. act. 285 (M. 146, 921 B) and 272 (917 A).

LABOR 2, p. 181. Verg. georg. 1, 145 is cited by Ioh. Sar. metal. 1, 6 (M. 199, 833 D); compare AMARE 1.

LABOR 3, p. 181. Hier. ep. 14, 10 at nemo athleta sine sudore coronatur.

LABRUM 2, p. 182. Incert. auct. paneg. Messall. 202 vel bene sit notus, summo vel inhaereat ore; Auson. ep. 14, 98 nil quaero, nisi quod labris tenetur, Zosim. pap. de reb. Pelag. 45, 3 nec hoc contenti, utrum haec, quae scripsisset, corde loqueretur an labiis; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 855 D) nolo enim litteras de summo ore stillantes; cf. Rufin. anthol. Pal. 5, 14, 3 ψαύει δ' οὐκ ἄκροις τοῖς χεῖλεσιν. On Otto's note 1, p. 182, see Crusius, Herond., p. 182.

LABYRINTHUS, p. 183. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, l. c., p. 48.

LAC 1, p. 183. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 2, 3 lactea cutis; anthol. Lat. N. 727 R. (II, 185, 4) albi lacte magis; see further Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 457.

LAC 2, p. 183. Compare the Greek proverb σῦκφ . . . σῦκον οὐδὲ ἐν | οὔτως ὁμοιον γέγονεν cited by Cic. ad Attic. 4, 8a, 1.

LAC 5. Varro sat. Menipp. Prom. lib. 10 (B.) Chrysandalos locat sibi amiculam de lacte et cera Tarentina quam apes Milesiae coegerint; Apul. met. 10, 22 lacte et melle confecta membra. The joining of *lac* and *mel* was very common in late and medieval Latin because of the biblical parallel; note the phrase, lac et mel sub lingua; Petr. Cell. ep. 69 (M. 202, 515 A); Gaufrid. ep. 23 (M. 205, 849 D); Steph. Torn. serm. (M. 211, 569 A); with Orient. common. 2, 156 lacte et melle simul flumina plena, compare Ovid met. 1, 111 flumina iam lactis, iam flumina nectaris ibant.

[LAC 6. Plaut. Bacch. 1134 quae nec lac[tem] nec lanam ullam habent, is a proverb according to Hartung, p. 17 (Ueber die sprichwörter, besonders die lateinischen), whose view is favored by the alliteration.]

LACONICUS, p. 184. Compare Theokr. 18, 47 Δωπιονί; see Tribukait, p. 41.

LAPIS 1, p. 185. Steph. pap. II, ep. 7 (M. 89, 1012 B) ipsi lapides, si dici potest, tribulationem nostram . . . flerent; Paul. pap. I, ep. 1 (M. 89, 1136 C) et ipsi lapides, si dici potest, nobis conflentes lacrymaverunt; anthol. Pal. 7, 599, 5 *τις λίθος ουκ ἐγύθησεν, ὅτ' ἐξήρπαξεν ἐκαίσην | ἐρυθρίης Ἀίδης.*

LAPIS 2, p. 185. Sid. Apoll. ep. 2, 8, 2 sufficit saxo carmen saxeum contineri; Paulin. Nol. ep. 12, 2, p. 74, 12 (H.) sum enim et ego unus de lapidibus vel iumentis illis quorum praefiguratione asina tunc locuta est; Paulin. Petr. vit. Mart. 1, 31 si quem recipit mens saxea sensum; Firm. Mat., p. 112, 14 (Halm) tu insensibile corrigis saxum; Ioh. Sar. metal. 1, 3 (M. 199, 829 C) obtusior plumbo vel lapide; Plat. Gorg. 494 A τὸ ὡσπερ λίθον ζῆν; see Schmidt, p. 122.

LAPIS 8. Foliot Ep. 137 (M. 190, 845 A) quod equidem obtinere sapienti non erit difficile, qui lapidem noverit omnem movere; compare the Greek proverb πάντα λίθον κινῶ (Zenob. 5, 63; Macar. 7, 4) which is cited by Pliny, ep. 1, 20, 16; anthol. Pal. 5, 40, 5.

LAPIS 9. Apul. flor. 1, 9, p. 36 gemmam et aurum iuxta ac plumbum et lapillos nulli aestimare; Zacch. Christ. consult. 3, 9, (M. 20, 1164 D) gemma pro lapide est; compare Otto, LUTUM 5.

LAPIS 10. Lactant. instit. 2, 3, 3 quid eo facias, qui cum errare se sentiat, ultro ipse in lapides inpingat; see Brandt-Laubmann's index under *proverbia*.

LAQUEUS 1, p. 187. Plaut. Truc. 671 conlapsus est hic in corruptelam suam; incert. auct. trag. Agam. 633 et licuit dolos | versare, ut ipsi | fraude sua caderent Pelasgi; Euseb. Pamph. vit. Constant. 1, 38 (M. 8, 26 A) scrobem aperuit atque effodit, et in foveam quam fecit ipse incidet; compare Prov. 26, 27; Maxim. Taur. homil. 87 (M. 57, 452 C) dum aliena fraudulenter diripiunt, foveam suae perditionis effodiunt; Gualbert. act. 211 (M. 146, 893 B) nobis laqueum foveamque paramus.

LAQUEUS 1, n., p. 187. Ovid her. 20 (21) 206 qui mihi tendebas retia.

LAQUEUS 2, p. 187. Sen. ep. 22, 3 sed illud idem existimo, leni eundum via, ut, quod male implicuisti, solvas potius quam abrumpas, dummodo, si alia solvendi ratio non erit, vel abrumpas; Avit. Vienn. ep. 1, p. 118, 1 (Chev.) sed rumpenda sunt interdum vincula necessitatum; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. prol. 1 (M. 199, 386 B) aut rumpo funem, si alias solvi non potest; ep. 292 (336 D) funem, si alias solvi non potest, rumpens.

LAQUEUS 3. Flav. Charis., p. 33, 20 (Keil) in retes meas inci-

disti, adding, in consuetudine dicimus; cf. Gualbert. act. 65 (M. 146, 790 A) in captionis laqueo deprehensum.

LATER, p. 187. Paulin. Nol. ep. 32, 23, p. 298, 9 ne luteis aedificiis operum sordidorum laterem, ut aiunt, lavemus; Hildebert. (M. 171, 1453 C) et later ablutus non erit absque luto; Petr. Bles. ep. 123 (M. 207, 362 C) sic lavo laterem; Steph. Torn. suppl. ep. 10 (M. 211, 548) tamquam laterem lavantes et seminantes in arena; Eustath. opusc. 11, 92 *πλῖθον πλύνειν*; see Kurtz, p. 318.

LEO 2, p. 189. Compare Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1628 C) illos duos loquor, vulpes astu, fastu leones; Cic. offic. 1, 13, 41 is cited by Pacianus ep. 2 (M. 13, 1058 B); cf. Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 83.

LEO 3, p. 189. Compare append. sent. 274 (Ribb.) domi tyranni saepe servi sunt foris; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 6, 2 cum sis alacer domi, in aggredienda peregrinatione trepidum; Eustath. Il. 1349, 25 *οἴκοι λείοντες*, see Kurtz, p. 316; Leutsch on Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 83; Blaydes on Aristoph. Pax 1189; on the use of *λείων* in Greek for a brave man, see J. Koch, l. c., p. 23.

LEPUS 5, as swift; Plaut. Pers. 436 citius extemplo foro | fugiunt quam ex porta ludis quom emissust lepus; Phaedr. 1, 9, 4 leporem obiurgabat passer: ubi pernicitas | nota? Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 383 A) leporesque fugaces.

LETHE, p. 192. Ovid a. a. 3, 340 nec mea Lethaeis scripta dabuntur aquis; trist. 1, 8, 36 cunctane Lethaeis mersa feruntur aquis? 4, 1, 47 utque soporiferae biberem si pocula Lethes; ex Pont. 4, 1, 17; Prudent. cath. 6, 15 totis bibit medullis | obliviale poculum. | serpit per omne corpus | Lethaea vis.

LEX 1, p. 192. Compare Tac. ann. 3, 27 et corruptissima re publica plurimae leges; Germ. 19 plusque ibi boni mores valent quam alibi bonae leges.

LICET 1, p. 193. Publil. Syr. 393 nil magis amat cupiditas, quam quod non licet; Ovid am. 3, 4, 17 is a favorite quotation in Ioh. Sar. ep. 68 (M. 199, 54 D); ep. 249 (293 D) fidem habendam esse proverbio: nitimur etc.; Polycrat. 1, 6 (403 B); 8, 24 (819 B); Abaelard. ep. 8 (M. 178, 293 D); Ovid am. 2, 19, 3 is also cited by Ioh. Sar. ep. 273 (M. 199, 312 B); compare his remark, Polycrat. 1, 6 (403 B), aquae furtivae dulciores Prov. 9, 17 with Greg. Cypr. 1, 98 *γλυκεῖ ὀπώρα φύλακος ἐκλελοιπότες*.

LIGNUM. Cato de suo sump., p. 37, 18 (Jord.) enim vero usque istuc ad lignum dele, quoted by Fronto ep. ad Ant. 1, 2, p.

100, 17 (Nab.); cf. Hier. ep. 9, 1 imis, ut aiunt, ceris eraseris; see ATTONDERE, Otto, p. 45.

LINEA 3, p. 194. With Otto's remarks compare Placid. gloss., p. 28 (D.) conspicillo, ita ut conspici possunt, quod aiunt 'longis lineis'; see Sonny, ALL. 9, 67-8; with the note cf. Eurip. Antig. frag. 169 (N.) ἐπ' ἄκραν ἤκομεν γραμμὴν κακῶν; Prudent. apoth. 812 manet virtus, cui linea deficit | ultima.

LILIUM, p. 193. Herond. 7, 27; see Crusius, p. 133.

LINGUA 1, p. 195. To Jahn's citations in his note on Pers. 5, 1, add Caecil. 128 (Ribb.) si linguas decem habeam; Ovid trist. 1, 5, 53; met. 8, 532; Apul. met. 11, 25; Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 459; Sedul. carm. pasch. 1, 99, p. 23 (Huem.); 1, 2, p. 181, 8; Ennod. ep. 9, 29; Claudian. c. 28, 436; Orient. 1, 387; cited by Hier. ep. 66, 5; 123, 17; Licent. ad Augustin. ep. 263 (M. 33, 106); Alcuin ep. 186 (M. 100, 458 A); Gualbert. act. 34 (M. 146, 779 B); Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 28 (M. 199, 636 A).

LINGUA 2, p. 195. Petr. Dam. serm. 36, 180 (M. 144, 695) tunc deinde probatum est verum esse quod dicitur; vox populi, vox Dei.

LUCRETIA, Szel. p. 12, as a prude; Mart. 1, 90, 5 esse videbaris, fateor, Lucretia nobis.

LUCRUM 3, p. 197. Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1100 D) lucrum sine damno alterius fieri non potest; Othlo lib. prov. 11 (M. 146, 317 A).

LUPUS 1, p. 198. See Schmidt, p. 112 for Greek parallels.

LUPUS 3, p. 198. Cf. Licent. apud. Augustin. ep. 26, 3 (M. 33, 105) esuriens vitulos alet ante leaena sequaces | atque impasta diu teneros lupa nutriet agnos; Cassiod. var. 2, 40, 6 iuxta praedonem suum praeda gaudebat; Claud. rapt. Proserp. 2, prol. 26 vicinumque lupo praebuit agna latus; see Tribukait, p. 25; Apost. 14, 96 πρὶν κεν λύκος δὲν ποιμαῖνοι; see also Martin, p. 28, no. 70.

LUPUS 3, n., p. 198. Ovid met. 1, 505 sic agna lupum | . . . fugiunt; a. a. 1, 118 utque fugit visos agna novella lupos.

LUPUS 5, p. 198. Ennod. vit. Ant., p. 389, 23 (H.) ne lupum ovibus, agnis viperam negligens aestimator adiungas; Pacian. ep. 3, 19 (M. 13, 1076 B) dicis, ex lege coelesti . . . nec communicare lupis agnos; Synod. Chalcedon. ad Leo. Magn. ep. 98, 2 (M. 54, 953) eos vero qui lupi demonstrati sunt super oves imposuit (τοὺς δὲ λύκους ἀποδοθειγμένους τοῖς προβάτοις ἐπέστησε); Abaelard. ep. 1 (M. 178, 127 C): non minus . . . obstupui quam si agnam teneram

famelico lupo committeret; Herodot. 4, 149 *τοιγαρῶν ἔφη αὐτὸν καταλείψειν δὲν ἐν λύκοισι*; Diogen. 7, 62 *προβάλλοντες κυσὶν ἄρνας*.

LUPUS 9, p. 199. Alvar. Cordub. ep. 20 (M. 121, 513 A) atque, ut fabulae ferunt, lupum auribus retinens nec tenere potes, nec vales dimittere.

LUPUS 10, p. 199. Alcuin ep. 99 (M. 100, 310 A) passer aures habet apertas sed, ut video, proverbialis in fabula lupus gallo tulit vocem; Apost. 10, 89; see Tribukait, p. 26.

LUPUS 11. For discussion, see Tribukait, p. 26; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 13 (M. 199, 412 A) cites and explains Verg. Ecl. 9, 53.

LUPUS 13. Hor. epod. 4, 1 *lupis et agnis quanta sortito obtigit, | tecum mihi discordia est*; Ovid ib. 43 *pax erit haec nobis . . . | cum pecore infirmo quae solet esse lupis*; Hom. Il. 22, 263 *οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ἀμύφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν*; Diogen. 7, 63, *πρὶν κε λύκος δὲν ποιμαῖνοι*.

LUPUS 14. Lact. instit. 5, 3, 23 videlicet homo subdolos voluit lupum sub ovis pelle celare, ut fallaci titulo posset inretire lectorem; Hier. ep. 147, 11 *sub vestitu ovium latebas lupus*; ep. 22, 38 *sub ovium pellibus lupos tegunt*.

LUTUM 1, p. 201. Leo Magn. ep. 34 (M. 54, 802 B) si vero in eodem insipientiae suae luto iacere delegerit.

LUTUM 2, p. 201. Avit. Vienn. ep. 34, p. 184, 2 (Chev.) non se studuerunt de caeno, quo . . . tenentur, evolvere; Aesch. choeph. 697 *ἔξω . . . πηλοῦ πόδα*; see J. Koch, p. 33.

MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.

II.—ARISTOTLE'S DE ANIMA.¹

We may repeat of French Platonists and Aristotelians what Plato said of the Athenians—when they are good they are most excellent. Mr. Rodier's laborious edition of the *de Anima* not only supersedes but swallows and assimilates its German and English predecessors, Trendelenburg and Wallace. On every doubtful point he reproduces the opinions of all the ancient commentators, Alexander, Themistius, Simplicius, Philoponos, Sophonias, Priscianus, and the views of all moderns accessible through Zeller or Bursian's *Jahresbericht*. His own judicial summing up is almost always sane and right, and, where erroneous, can always be checked by the evidence which he supplies.

The constitution of the text is conservative. Mr. Rodier reprints with some interpolations of his own to bring it down to date the critical apparatus of Biehl in the Teubner text. He discusses with inexhaustible patience the emendations of Bonitz, Torstrik, Essen, Bywater, Christ, Kampe, Susemihl, Barco, Wilson, Freudenthal and others, but whenever they involve extensive alterations of the text or venturesome theories of double recensions or interpolation, he finally waves them aside. To minor corrections that seem to restore the sense by a change of punctuation or the altering of a letter or word, he is more favorable, and contributes a few such of his own suggestion. He has made a new collation of E without gleaning much. Following are the chief points of interest in his text :

403, b 17, he retains with E and Biehl the impossible *ὄντι ὡς χωριστά*. Cf. p. 152.

404, a 19, he deletes comma after *εἰρηται*, which he renders strangely 'on fait remarquer.'

404, b 10-11, he inserts commas before *ταύτας* and *ταύτην* to the improvement of the sense.

407, b 28, he retains in spite of Bernays *λόγους δ' ὥσπερ εὐθύνας δεδωκυία* which he tries to justify by the translation 'qui a déjà eu à fournir ses raisons pour ainsi dire en guise de châtiment.'

¹ *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ψυχῆς*. 'Aristote Traité De L'Âme.' Traduit et Annoté par G. Rodier. Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1900.

409, b 20-24, he incloses *οί . . . σχεδόν* in parentheses and inserts a colon after *ἄλλων*.

410, a 29, he separates *καὶ πρὸς* by commas, translating 'en outre.' Cf. *infra* p. 153. The inserted footnote calling attention to this has got mixed with Biehl's note on Torstrik's emendation so as to make it appear that this punctuation and not Torstrik's reading rests on Sophonias.

412, a 16, he retains the perhaps unnecessarily explicit reading *ἐπεὶ δ' ἴστί σῶμα καὶ τοιοῦδι τοῦτο*.

417, b 6, he keeps *εἰς αὐτὸ* where *εἰς αὐτὸ* is better suited to the sense. In actualization the thing moves, if it can be said to move, to its (real) self. Mr. Rodier's 'en lui' can hardly be got out of his text.

426, a 27, he reads with Simplicius and Plutarch *εἰ δὲ συμφωνία φωνῆ τίς ἐστίν* for *εἰ δ' ἡ* and renders strangely 'comme une certaine espèce de voix est accord.' Cf. *infra*, p. 159.

427, a 10, he keeps with Biehl *ἢ μία ἢ δύο*, suggesting, however, *ἢ μία ἢ δύο* which, though harsh, gives the required sense.

428, a 24, *φανερὸν τοίνυν ὅτι οὐδὲ δόξα μετ' αἰσθήσεως . . . φαντασία ἂν εἴη διὰ τε ταῦτα καὶ δῆλον ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλου τινός ἐστιν ἢ δόξα ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον ἐστὶν οὐ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησις*. So Mr. Rodier prints, connecting *διὰ τε ταῦτα* with what precedes. The lack of any construction for *τε* seems to give him no concern, though he lightly remarks that we might read *γε*. Something is wrong. If one cared to emend, the whole could be smoothed out either by dropping *δῆλον* or reading *ὅτι δῆλον ὅτι*, and, though this is not indispensable, changing *ἐστὶν* to *ἴσται*. Two reasons will then be alleged against the identification of *δόξα* and *αἴσθησις*, the foregoing *διὰ τε ταῦτα*, and also the fact that it involves the (intolerable) supposition that the object of *δόξα* and *αἴσθησις* is the same, which he proceeds to refute. Below, 428, b 8, Mr. Rodier retains the vexatious parenthesis *ἀλλὰ ψευδοῦς ἐγίνετο, ὅτε λάθοι μεταπεσὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα* of which he gives precisely the explanation tentatively proposed at the end of Wallace's note, remarking at the same time that Wallace's corrections are unnecessary.

429, b 7, he accepts Bywater's excellent suggestion *δι' αὐτοῦ*.

429, b 13, cf. *infra*, p. 155.

430, b 17, in place of *ἀλλ' ἢ ἀδιαίρετα* he proposes and reads *ἀλλῃ ἀδιαίρετα*, which makes the sentence read smoothly, but leaves the connection with the following hopelessly obscure, a fact which he tries to disguise by a long explanatory parenthesis in the translation. The general meaning of Aristotle is plain enough, but the

wording is desperate and can be cured only by rewriting the passage.

430, b 25, he retains τῶν αἰτίων which Zeller (Aristotle, Trans. vol. II, p. 105) plausibly explains as a blundering dittography of ἐναντίον.

The not infrequent anacolutha of the *de Anima* and the hopeless passages which could be cured only by extensive changes, Mr. Rodier generally leaves, after discussion, translating them defiantly according to his final judgment of the general meaning.

The translation which accompanies the text is almost always right, and in precision and definiteness is, barring a few slips, a great improvement on Wallace. An extensive use of the bracket disfigures the page, but distinguishes most helpfully the literal version from the additions demanded by French idiom, or inserted to bring out the sequence of thought as conceived by Mr. Rodier. The following are the chief passages where he seems to have erred, or where at least difference of opinion is permissible: 402, b 8, ὁμοίως δὲ κἀν εἴ τι κοινὸν ἄλλο κατηγοροῖτο—'et de même tout autre attribut commun que l'on pourrait en affirmer.' *En* is misleading. The question, as Alexander rightly takes it, relates to any predicate that is used as a general term, not merely to any other general predicate of ζῆον.

402, b 22, ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ἔχουμεν ἀποδιδόναι κατὰ τὴν φαντασίαν περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων, ἢ πάντων ἢ τῶν πλείστων, τότε καὶ περὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἔξομέν τι λέγειν κάλλιστα. Here κατὰ τὴν φαντασίαν does not mean 'd'une façon conforme à ce que l'expérience manifeste,' but simply 'in sensuous presentation.' Wallace's 'to the mind's eye' is substantially right, though it errs in implying that the presentation must be always representation. Κατὰ is probably used somewhat as in καθ' ἑαυτὸν (*apud animam*) ζητεῖν; or as in 427, b 23, κατὰ δὲ τὴν φαντασίαν ὡσαύτως ἔχουμεν ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ θεώμενοι. Mr. Rodier argues that the logic requires his rendering. Aristotle, he thinks, could not mean to say that the essence can be inferred from the συμβεβηκότα. He means that the possibility of explaining (ἀποδιδόναι) the συμβεβηκότα καθ' αὐτὰ from the essence is an *a posteriori* confirmation that the essence has been correctly defined. Otherwise, too, the following γὰρ is pointless. This is hypercritical. The passage is one of many in which Aristotle states that the definition is often best approached through a survey of particulars. (Zeller, Eng. Trans. I. 172). This process is virtually if not strictly induction (Zeller, I. 269). The καὶ of τότε καὶ and the future ἔξομεν are inex-

plicable on Mr. Rodier's interpretation. The γὰρ that follows in πάσης γὰρ ἀποδείξεως ἀρχὴ τὸ τί ἐστίν did not trouble Simplicius (15. 9) and need not us. It loosely assigns the reason for the emphasis laid on κάλλιστα. The sequence is: (and it is important to define οὐσία well) *for the what is it* is the starting point of all proofs and (here we have Mr. Rodier's idea) definitions that are not accompanied by concrete knowledge of the accidents, are empty and verbal. There is no real difficulty in the unprecise use of ἀποδοῦναι (cf. 406, a 27), and we need not introduce the distinction between συμβεβηκότα and καθ' αὐτὰ συμβεβηκότα.

403, b 17, ἐλέγμεν δ' ὅτι τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς οὐτε ὡς χωριστὰ τῆς φυσικῆς ὕλης τῶν ζῴων, ἢ δὴ τοιαῦθ' ὑπάρχει, θυμὸς καὶ φόβος, καὶ οὐχ ὡς περ γραμμῆ καὶ ἐπίπεδον. It is a pity that Mr. Rodier follows Biehl's text here which drives him to a forced unnatural translation inconsistent with his punctuation. Οὐτε ὡς and καὶ οὐχ are impossible correlates here. Obviously we must read with the majority of MSS and editors οὐ χωριστὰ or ἀχώριστα. The meaning is that the πάθη, *qua* such; i. e. *qua*, e. g., θυμὸς and φόβος, are ἀχώριστα, inseparable, even in thought from their material embodiment, and not like the line which *qua* line is separable in thought from physical matter. This is the interpretation of Simplicius (whose reference of τοιαῦτα Mr. Rodier misunderstands), and of Themistius. It is easy, though not necessary, to read γε, instead of δὴ, with U and Simplicius.

404, b 21, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως: 'Platon dit aussi.' The name of Plato should not be mentioned in connection with these fooleries of Xenocrates except where Aristotle explicitly attributes them to him.—405, a 16 γυν: 'en conséquence'; rather: at any rate.—405, b 26, διὸ καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀκολουθοῦσιν. May not this mean not that they 'raisonnent d'après les noms,' but that they etymologize to suit their respective theories? The phrasing of Cratylus, 436, b, εἴ τις . . . ἀκολουθοῖ τοῖς ὀνόμασι seems against it, but the general tenor of the discussion in the Cratylus favors it, and διὸ καὶ is certainly clearer so. Their physical theories are no reason for their etymologizing, but do explain the particular etymologies in which they seek support for the respective doctrines.

406, b 2, ὥστε καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μεταβάλλοι ἀν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα: in spite of the Greek commentators may this not mean 'within the body' rather than 'comme le corps'? This gives point to the following antithesis: (if it can move *in* the body) it would follow that it can also, καὶ, go forth from the body and return. The same thought

seems to be implied in the comparison on the next page with the quicksilver which the Daedalus of Philippos poured into his wooden Aphrodite.—407, b 1, *εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἡ κίνησις αὐτῆς μὴ οὐσία* can not of course be construed 'si le mouvement est la negation de l'essence de l'âme,' but in loose writing 'if movement is *not* its essence' may be treated as the logical equivalent of Mr. Rodier's version.

409, a 21, *εἰ μὲν οὖν εἰσὶν ἴτεροι αἱ ἐν τῷ σώματι μονάδες καὶ αἱ στιγμαί*—'si en outre, l'on prétend que les unités [psychiques qui résident] dans le corps sont différentes des points,' etc., *αἱ ἐν τῷ σώματι μονάδες* are not the psychic unities but the spatial points, as Themistius clearly explains. It is much more credible that Aristotle should have used *μονάδες* and *στιγμαί* interchangeably as he appears to do throughout the passage, than that he should repeatedly employ *ἐν τῷ σώματι* in contrary senses.—410, a 29, *καὶ πρὸς τὸ ὅμοιον μαρτυρεῖ τὸ νῦν λεχθέν*. Mr. Rodier's solution of this *στιγμαί* is to place a comma after *καὶ πρὸς* which he renders 'en outre.' This is ingenious but very abrupt and harsh, though Mr. Rodier might have quoted Plato *Repub.* 559 A for a similar position of *καὶ πρὸς*. The note affirms that the expression *προσ-μαρτυρεῖν* (sic) *τινα* is Greek in the sense 'témoigner avec quelqu'un.' One would like to see his authority.

411, a 18, *καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὁμοιοῦσθαι τοῖς μορίοις εἶναι*: 'que l'âme qui réside dans les parties est (dans chacune d'elles) de même nature.' Rather: that the soul (the general soul of the air, etc.) is homogeneous with its parts (as they are found in animals, etc.). See the explanation of Themistius who apparently claims to be the first to understand the passage: *ταύτης τῆς λέξεως ὅτι μὴ κατεκράτησαν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν*.

411, a 19, *ὁ μὲν ἀὴρ διασπόμενος* is not 'l'air respiré,' but, as Wallace correctly renders, 'air when divided.'

412, b 15, *νῦν δ' ἐστὶ πέλεκυς* the interpretation of Simplicius followed by Mr. Rodier 'mais, en fait, la hache existe' seems to yield the more plausible sequence. But the natural construction of the Greek makes rather for that of Themistius and Alexander: 'but in point of fact it's only an axe'—not an organic body.—

414, b 25, *διὸ γελοιὸν ζητεῖν τὸν κοινὸν λόγον καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρων, δε οὐδενὸς ἔσται τῶν ὄντων ἴδιος λόγος οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ οἰκείον καὶ τὸ ἄτομον εἶδος, ἀφάντας τὸν τοιοῦτον*. The Greek commentators differ and the text will always be doubtful. But the general interpretation of Themistius and Pacius is surely right that Aristotle means: 'it is absurd to seek (any other) general definition of souls or triangles

if you reject the type of general definition that I have given of the soul—*τὸν τοιοῦτον*.' It is impossible to construe with Mr. Rodier *οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ αἰκίον*, etc., 'et de ne pas s'attacher a ce qui appartient en propre et à l'espèce indivisible.' Mr. Rodier's argument that this phrase must point to *ὅστε καθ' ἕκαστον ζητητίον* below is not convincing. The intervening sentence, *παρὰ πηλίσω δ' ἔχει*, etc., opens a new aspect of the question.

424, b 13, animés is by inadvertence for inanimés.—425, a 15, *ὡν ἑκάστη αἰσθήσει αἰσθανόμεθα κατὰ συμβεβηκός*. Mr. Rodier rightly rejects Torstrik's *οὐ* before *κατὰ*, and follows the Greek commentators in understanding the words to express not Aristotle's opinion but a part of the objection. Below, *ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα κινήσει αἰσθανόμεθα*, he interprets *κινήσει* 'par le mouvement qu'elle provoque en nous.' This, the explanation of Themistius and Simplicius, yields the smoothest sequence of thought, but strains the arts of interpretation to carry through consistently. Mr. Rodier shows that the Greek commentators agree with him, and that Physics 211, a 12, cited by Trendelenburg is irrelevant. But when it comes to *τὸ δ' ἡρεμαῖν τῷ μὴ κινεῖσθαι* he inconsistently rejects the explanation of Philoponos that *τῷ μὴ κινεῖσθαι* means 'by the unaltered persistence of the subjective state', and, reverting to the view which he has just rejected for the passage as a whole, says, 'peut-être Aristote veut-il dire plus simplement que le repos est perçu comme privation du mouvement.' It is a difficult question. The unanimity of the Greek commentators counts heavily. And it is true that Aristotle does not elsewhere deduce all the common sensibles from motion. But there is no inconsistency in supposing *κίνησις* to be the *ratio cognoscendi* of concepts, some of which are ontologically prior to it. The view of the Greek commentators may be due to the attempt to find here an explicit proof of what Aristotle merely asserts below that our perception of the *κοινά* is not accidental. Certainly the natural construction of the Greek is to take *κίνησις* as meaning simply (perception of) motion.

425, b 12, sqq. The difficult passage on consciousness of perception is in the main rightly explained, Zeller's misinterpretation (Trans. 2. 69 n. 3) being silently corrected. Mr. Rodier perfunctorily repeats from Bonitz and Trendelenburg at 425, b 22, the reference to Charmides 168 DE, but does not seem to perceive the indebtedness of the entire passage to Plato. Its two leading thoughts are: (1) the paradox of a faculty exercised upon itself (Charmides 167 sqq.); (2) the psychological regress *ad infinitum*

Theaetet. 200 C). In one point this oversight affects the interpretation: *ἡ εἰς ἀπειρον εἶσω ἢ αὐτὴ τις ἴσται αὐτῆς* is rendered, 'ou bien ce second sens devra se sentir elle-même.' And in the notes (p. 265) Mr. Rodier objects to Philoponos' *ἀτοπον τὸ αὐτὴν ἑαυτῆς αἰσθησθαι εἶναι* on the ground that it is not a second *ἀτοπον*, but the real opinion of Aristotle. But the Charmides passage would have made him feel more fully the force of *τις* and the future *ἴσται*. It is an *ἀτοπον* that we should have to admit a faculty that perceives itself, but it is better to accept this *ἀτοπον* at the beginning of the series than later, since we can escape it only by an infinite regress.

427, b 17, Mr. Rodier's solution of the *εἴτις ἐτι δ' οὐκ ἴστω* [ἡ] *αὐτὴ νόησις καὶ ὑπόληψις* is to bracket *ἡ* with Schneider and render 'qu'elle (sc. *φαντασία*) ne soit ni la pensée ni la croyance.' This is impossible. The one thing certain is that Aristotle here means to distinguish *φαντασία* from *ὑπόληψις*. We have the choice of dropping *νόησις* and inserting *φαντασία* from the margin of U, or of taking *νόησις* as a loose synonym of *φαντασία*. The latter is by no means impossible. For *ὑπόληψις* here is not, as often, used of the higher intellect generally, but of belief as opposed to mere presentation. Now, much as *φαντασία* and *νόησις* differ for other purposes, for this argument they are alike, in that both are mere representations which, unlike belief, can be summoned up at will. It is thus careless writing to substitute *νόησις* for *φαντασία*, but not too careless for Aristotle perhaps. But it is incredible that *νόησις* and *ὑπόληψις* should be virtually identified in opposition to *φαντασία* in a passage which emphasizes the aspect of *ὑπόληψις* that is antithetic to *φαντασία* and *νόησις* alike. It is no objection that later *φαντασία* in another sense is treated as a state that admits both truth and error.

429, b 13, *τὸ σαρκὶ εἶναι καὶ σάρκα καὶ ἡ ἄλλῃ ἢ ἄλλως ἔχοντι κρίνει*. Mr. Rodier follows Biehl in retaining *καὶ*, the impossibility of which he vainly disguises by the rendering 'c'est aussi par des facultés différentes.' In what follows he assumes that Aristotle is speaking of three things: (1) sense to judge sensibles; (2) intellect in one attitude for concepts involving matter; (3) intellect otherwise modified for pure concepts. But Aristotle has not yet decided, if he ever does decide, that the pure intellect is separable. The alternative of *ἄλλῃ* and *ἄλλως ἔχοντι*, then, applies to the cognition of sensibles and intelligibles as well as to the two kinds of intelligibles. We have not three choices, but two repeated in two planes. Zeller (Trans. 2. 93) has shown that there is no

objection to speaking of *νοῦς* as in a certain sense apprehending *αἰσθητά*.

429, b 29, ἡ τὸ μὲν πάσχειν κατὰ κοινόν τι διήρηται πρότερον, ὅτι δυνάμει πῶς ἴσται τὰ νοητά ὁ νοῦς, etc.—'que nous avons distingué plus haut la passion qui s'exerce grâce à une communauté [entre l'agent et le patient de celle qu'on peut attribuer à l'intellect.]' This perhaps roughly gives the sense for practical purposes, but *διήρηται* can hardly be so used of distinguishing one thing from another. Render rather: or have we distinguished two senses of *πάσχειν κατὰ κοινόν τι*, etc. The reference is to 417, b 1-17. Here instead of explicitly naming the two senses: (1) the proper sense; (2) the passage from *δύναμις* to *ἐνέργεια*, he merely reminds us that the *πάσχειν* of *νοῦς* in relation to *νοητά* falls under the second head in that the *νοῦς* is potentially the *νοητά*. This is virtually the interpretation of Brentano, that of Simplicius which Mr. Rodier supposes to be different, and of Themistius. For the *κοινόν τι* cf. 405, b 20, and 433, a 22.—431, b 8, *καὶ ὅταν εἴπῃ ὡς ἐκεῖ τὸ ἡδὺ ἢ λυπηρόν, ἐνταῦθα φεύγει ἢ διώκει*—'et lorsqu'il a prononcé que là est l'agréable,' etc. This is a very forced and un-Aristotelian construction of the Greek. *ὡς ἐκεῖ*, as Simplicius takes it, plainly means 'as there,' in the field of sense perception, as contrasted with *ἐνταῦθα*, where thought is dealing with representative images. In view of Aristotle's elliptic style, Torstrik's addition of *τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν* after *ἐνταῦθα* is unnecessary though it gives the sense.—432, b 4, *καὶ ἄριστον δὴ τὸ τοῦτο διασπᾶν* does not mean 'de séparer . . . des autres,' but 'to split up, divide up.'—435, b 12, *ἂ τῇ ἀφῆ φθοίρει*, not 'qui seraient pernicieuses pour le toucher,' 'but which destroy by contact.'

The purpose of the commentary is to elucidate Aristotle's meaning and justify the translation, sentence by sentence. Its two chief features are the extensive illustration of Aristotle's terminology and the full presentation of the views of other commentators, ancient and modern. In the first respect Mr. Rodier, like the generality of modern interpreters, has been tempted by the convenience of Bonitz' index into an excess of merely lexicographical illustration, where a brief reference to Zeller or Bonitz would have sufficed. The citations from the Greek commentators are interesting and helpful, especially those from Alexander and Themistius, who were very sensible, intelligent fellows. But one grudges the space assigned to the moderns, and regrets that Mr. Rodier could not have devoted to the discussion of the

philosophic problems involved in his text, some of the pages wasted in rejecting with sad civility the wanton emendations of Torstrik, for example. It is true Mr. Rodier explicitly disavows the purpose of dealing with the larger philosophic problems of the book, but in a commentary of nearly six hundred pages on a philosophical text there should surely be some room for philosophy. The *de Anima* is a treatise on psychology. Its difficulties are by no means exclusively philological, caused by the uncertainty of the text, the loss of much contemporary literature, the peculiarities of Aristotle's terminology, the exasperating carelessness of his style. They are due quite as much to the fact that Aristotle did not and could not know his own mind—that he was struggling with problems that have not yet been solved, and to which he was precluded from giving a coherent answer by the fundamental inconsistency that runs through his entire system. The purely empiric conception of knowledge and the origin of general ideas employed in the *Organon* and as a basis for the polemic against Plato was from the start hopelessly irreconcilable with the transcendental presuppositions that were to find their ultimate expression in the doctrine of a definition that expresses the metaphysical unity of essence, of forms somehow separable from matter, of energy divorced from all taint of potentiality, of an agent that does not touch, though the patient is touched, of a motor that does not move, of a passive intellect that is the mere potentiality of thought, and yet is neither sense nor imagination, of an active reason that thinks always in pure forms and yet operates to actualize the passive reason of a finite mind inseparable from the bodily organism. Again and again as Aristotle finds himself on the verge of this gulf of inconsistencies he shies off violently, postpones his decision, and resumes the interminable discussion of *ἀπορία*. This is probably the reason why he never completed his system in the direction to which all the lines inevitably converge by distinctly identifying the *νοῦς ποιητικός* with the divine mind regarded as the abode and sum of all Platonic ideas. Mr. Rodier, like Zeller, admits in general terms the rift of inconsistency that runs through the Aristotelian philosophy.¹ But, like Zeller, he is apt to deal with each particular passage as if it were unaffected by this fundamental fact. In each case he is so bent upon smoothing away difficulties and showing the essential reasonableness of the Aristotelian standpoint that he often

¹ See Preface, and the note on the *νοῦς* problem, pp. 28–30.

leaves the impression that there is no final insoluble residuum of inconsistency and confusion. This is notably the case in his remarks on the reality of the general notion (pp. 18-19), on the problem of the unity of the definition (177, 475), on the identity of a thing and its *τί ἦν εἶναι*,¹ on the reconciliation of the doctrine of a separable soul with the dependence of thought upon imagination (453), on the relation of the *νοῦς ποιητικός* to God and the Platonic ideas. In these and many other cases the only adequate commentary would be one that related Aristotle to Plato on the one hand, and to modern psychology on the other. The explicit references to Plato, as e. g. that to the *ψυχογονία*, are amply illustrated by Mr. Rodier. A few examples of less obvious connections of thought may be given here. The discussion of the relation of matter and form in the definition in 403, b, and 412, should be illustrated by Cratylus 389, which is the chief source of this important Aristotelian idea, as will appear also by a comparison of *de part. an.* 640 b. The entire substance of the doctrine is already in Plato—the determination of the essence by the function or use, the equivocal use of form to denote both logical essence and physical shape, the necessity that such a form or essence should find its embodiment in a particular and appropriate matter.—In 405, a 4, *τό τε γὰρ κινητικὸν τὴν φύσιν τῶν πρώτων ὑπελήφασιν, οὐκ ἀλόγως. ὅθεν ἔδοξέ τισι πῦρ εἶναι* probably refers to the discussion in *Leges* 892, and particularly to the words (892 C), *φύσιν βούλονται λέγειν γένεσιν τὴν περὶ τὰ πρῶτα. εἰ δὲ φανήσεται ψυχὴ πρῶτον οὐ πῦρ*, etc. In 409, b 31, *ἀλλὰ τὸ σύνολον τίτι γγνωριεῖ ἢ αισθήσεται*; the thought that knowledge of the elements of a thing will not by simple mechanical addition yield knowledge of the composite whole goes back to the discussion of the syllable and its *στοιχεῖα* in *Theaet.* 203 sqq. This passage made a strong impression upon Aristotle as appears from many veiled and some explicit allusions in his writings: e. g. *Met.* 1043, b 5, *οὐ φαίνεται δὴ ζητοῦσιν ἢ συλλαβὴ ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων οὐσα καὶ συνθέσεως*. The whole is more than the sum of its parts in the case of qualities or psychological states. As Professor James says (*Psychology* 1. 160), "There would be a hundred and first feeling then, if when a group or series were set a consciousness belonging to the group as such should emerge."—The statement in 414, b 20, that a general definition of soul is as void as a general definition of *σχῆμα*

¹ P. 443, in citing *Met.* 1032, a 8, *καὶ εἰ ταῦτὸ Σωκράτης καὶ Σωκράτει εἶναι*, he omits *καὶ εἰ!*

was probably suggested by Meno 74 E, *τί ἐστι τοῦτο . . . ὁ δὲ ὀνομάζει σχῆμα καὶ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον φῆς τὸ στρογγύλον σχῆμα εἶναι ἢ τὸ εὐθύ.*—In 415, a 29, the idea that generation is a striving of the mortal to put on immortality *ἵνα τοῦ ἀεὶ καὶ τοῦ θείου μετέχωσιν ἢ δύνανται* needs illustration from its source, Symp. 207 D, 208 B. In 418, a 20, and 425, a 26, the apparent reversal of the normal use of *κατὰ συμβεβηκός* by which a substance is made the accident of a distantly perceived quality, *τούτω δὲ συμβέβηκεν εἰς Κλέωνος εἶναι*, was probably suggested by the psychological analysis in Philebus 38 D of the errors that arise in the perception of a distant object.—In 418, a 30, the peculiar use of *καθ' αὐτό*, not in its logical sense, but of an object the color of which belongs to it, is probably to be traced in the last resort to the discussion in Lysis 217 CD of the cases in which the *παρουσία* of the color does or does not imply real coloring. Cf. *καθὸ* in Met. 1022, a 15–18, and *καθ' αὐτό ὡς ἐπιφάνεια λευκόν* in Met. 1029, b 17.—In 420, b 19, the distinction between the *ἀναγκαῖον* of taste and the *εἶδ* of speech comes from Timaeus 75 E.

In the difficult passage 426, b 3, sqq. a reference to the Philebus is needed, not merely for illustration, but to give the true meaning. Aristotle apparently argues that *αἴσθησις* is a proportion or ratio (*λόγος*) for the reason (1) that certain forms of sensation are evidently so as e. g. the sensation of a *συμφωνία*, and (2) because excess destroys the sensation. He adds, speaking of various qualities of sight, smell and taste: *διὸ καὶ ἡδέα μὲν ὅταν εἰλικρινῆ καὶ ἀμυγῆ ὄντα ἀγγηται εἰς τὸν λόγον, ὅλον τὸ ὀξύ ἢ γλυκὺ ἢ ἀλμυρόν, ἡδέα γὰρ τότε ὄλωσ' ἔδωκε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸ μικτόν συμφωνία ἢ τὸ ὀξύ ἢ τὸ βαρὺ. ἀφῆ δὲ τὸ θερμαντὸν ἢ ψυκτόν. ἢ δ' αἴσθησις ὁ λόγος. ὑπερβάλλοντα δὲ λυπεῖ ἢ φθείρει.* I do not think that certainty is attainable with regard to the last three lines. But the general meaning of the passage, and the special force of *ἡδέα μὲν* which has been generally misunderstood appear only by comparison with Philebus 51 C–53 B. There Plato argues that there is a natural pleasure attached to pure unmixed sensations of tone, color, and the like, employing the terms *καθαρόν, εἰλικρινές*, etc. As compared with these he disparages 'mixed' sensations, purposely perhaps confounding the mixture of pleasure and pain with the mixture of different qualities of sense. Alluding to this Aristotle says: 'the sensations are, it is true (*μὲν* concessive), pleasurable when they are presented *εἰλικρινῆ καὶ ἀμυγῆ* to the sense which being itself a *λόγος* perceives and judges their purity; but in general *ὄλωσ' ἔδωκε δὲ* there is more pleasure in a harmoniously mixed sensation, the ratios and pro-

portions of which are perceived by sense as it perceives a *συμφωνία*. The correlate of *ἡδέα μὲν* is *δλας δέ* not *ὑπερβάλλοντα δέ* as Mr. Rodier seems to say, p. 377. *ἀγγηται εἰς τὸν λόγον* means 'are presented to the sense' (which is a *λόγος*), not 'elles sont amenées à s'unir dans la proportion voulue.' Wallace so far misapprehends the thought that he actually cites to prove that *ἀλμυρόν* is a mixture, a passage (*Meteorolog.* 358-9) in which Aristotle says that the salt taste of sea water is due to an intermixture of solid particles with the water. It is idle to dogmatize about the last three lines. The sentence begins as if Aristotle meant to say: 'but generally speaking the mixed is more pleasurable.' *συμφωνία* may be an interpolation, or we may read something like *εἰ συμφωνία οἱ ἐν συμφωνίᾳ ὄν οἱ ὥσπερ συμφωνία*. The words *ἢ τὸ ὀξύ ἢ τὸ βαρύ* may mean than the (unmixed) acute or grave, or possibly, which better suits the required sense, they and the following *τὸ θερμαντὸν ἢ ψυκτὸν* may be loosely appended alternative examples of the constituents of pleasurable mixtures. In any case the key to the whole is (1) the Philebus passage; (2) the idea that sense is a kind of *λόγος*, both in the pleasurable perception of the purity of pure qualities, and, despite Plato, in the still more pleasurable perception of the proportions of a harmonious blend.—In 428, a 12, the, to a modern, surprising statement *αἱ δὲ φαντασίαι γίνονται αἱ πλείους ψευδεῖς* is due to a reminiscence of Philebus 40 AB, where *φαντάσματα* is used of imaginative pictures of hope and desire, and it is added that for the wicked such pictures are generally false, i. e. not destined to be realized.

Many other minor illustrations might be drawn from the psychological parts of the Philebus, Theaetetus, Phaedo, Republic, Sophist and Timaeus. But I prefer to give the space that remains to a typical *ἀπορία* that originating in certain passages of the Parmenides and Charmides¹ runs all through the *de Anima*. It is the ever-recurring metaphysical problem of devising any theory of communication between matter and a totally disparate mind, that does not break down the distinction between them.

The first hint of it appears in the criticism of Anaxagoras' *νοῦς ἀμυγής* 405, b 22. It is employed somewhat sophistically in the polemic against the psychology of the world soul of the Timaeus interpreted with matter of fact literalness 407, a 10-12. In 409, b 5, it is invoked against the theory that the soul is a monad or a point. If such points are identical with those of the body all

¹ Parmen. 132 C, Charm. 167-8.

bodies must possess souls. In 410, a 16-18, it is again touched upon in the discussion of the general theory that the soul is made up of the elements of things. It is repeated again against Empedocles in 410, b 8, and lurks in the objection that his god, the Sphaeros, will be more ignorant than the finite beings that are acquainted with strife, an objection which, as Mr. Rodier observes, applies with equal force to Aristotle's God, and which, he does not observe, was suggested by the Parmenides. [134 D'Αρ' οὐν οἷός τε αὐτὸς ἔσται ὁ θεὸς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν γινώσκειν;] It reappears 425, b 19, in the question whether if there is a sense that sees (is conscious of) sight, sight itself must not be colored, and in the problem, 427 a, of how unity can be aware of multiplicity and difference. Lastly, it culminates in the ἀπορία of 429, b 26 sqq., where Aristotle raises the question, what is the relation of νοῦς conceived as itself intelligible (νοητός) to things, to *cognita*. If it is νοητός solely in virtue of being νοῦς, then all νοητά must possess νοῦς. If it is νοητός in virtue of some other quality which it possesses in common with other νοητά, then it is no longer "gesondert ungemischt und nur sich selber gleich." His solution is that *cognita* and νοητά are of two kinds: (1) pure forms in the case of which thought and its object coincide and the question disappears; (2) forms immersed in matter. In the latter the νοητόν has only a potential existence before the realizing activity of νοῦς, and such a potential νοητόν does not involve the presence of νοῦς. Thought, therefore, may be an intelligible, though all intelligibles need not possess thought.

This purely verbal evasion Mr. Rodier seems to accept as satisfactory and requiring no further comment. But the problem, as we have seen, has a history, and Aristotle's failure to solve it has a reason. It is substantially identical with and was probably suggested by the cavil against the Platonic ideas put in the mouth of Parmenides. 132 C, οὐκ ἀνάγκη, εἰ τὰλλα φῆς τῶν εἰδῶν μετέχειν, ἢ δοκεῖν σοὶ ἐκ νοημάτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ πάντα νοεῖν, ἢ νοήματα ὄντα ἀνόητα εἶναι; On the surface this is a mere sophistical quibble, but it distinctly raises the epistemological problem of the Aristotelian passage. Aristotle's pure forms, whether he knows it or not, are Platonic ideas, and he has the further embarrassment that they are not like the Platonic ideas, all-inclusive, but leave outside their circle an indeterminate and inexplicable residuum of forms or ideas more or less universal in matter, the psychological and ontological status of which his system was unable to define. If thought

is conceived in pure isolation and qualitative distinction from 'things,' how can it in any way apprehend them? And if there is a qualitative likeness or partial identity, then must not all things think in some degree, and is not the absolute barrier broken down? Monistic, hylozoistic, pantheistic philosophies frankly accept the second alternative. They boldly affirm with Diogenes of Apollonia that the air thinks, with Parmenides that the corpse is aware of darkness and silence, with Empedocles that all things have a part in knowledge and perception, with Shelley that 'every grain is sentient.' This is repugnant to common sense. But philosophers who appeal to common sense find the line very hard to draw. Wundt and Riehl, for example, in our own day, after accepting the parallelism of the two aspect theory for the relation of mind and body, extend it to animals, then in a sense to plants, and so are finally confronted with the question whether there may not be a subjective 'side' to every atom. Aristotle, always a champion of common sense, could not entertain such a thought. Yet his incoherent system provided him with no real defense against it. The Platonic ideas banished in the *Organon* were returning in the shape of a dimly conceived, active, intellect or divine mind, identical with its own thoughts. The only consistent issue would have been to make these thoughts include all general notions, the abstract reflection or duplication of everything, and to make the divine mind immanent in the universe. Just as Plato rejected the notion that there was anything too lowly to have an idea, so Aristotle was logically bound to admit that the most trivial reality or transient relation was capable of verbal formulation, and consequently of intelligible conception as mere essence and *τί ἦν εἶναι*. And on this view the divine mind identical with its own thoughts would be thinking in everything. I attribute no such doctrine to Aristotle. I am merely showing that the distinctions by which he sought to evade it were either purely verbal or implied a psychology which he would not accept and could not consistently apply. He undoubtedly endeavored to limit the pure ideas or essences by a theory akin to Mill's doctrine of 'natural kinds.' He would admit logical essence, *τί ἦν εἶναι*, and definition in the strict sense only of natural species or (for on this point neither he nor his disciples have ever been clear), of the individuals belonging to them. But this limitation inevitably breaks down. Events, as eclipses, e. g. are more significant for the theory of the definition than the things of

natural kinds. Abstract nouns expressive of relations and qualities are for many purposes quite as pure ideas as those that express the essence of a species. To say that they are εἶδός ὅπερ ὄν τι is a mere evasion of the final question as to their ontological status. So of the distinction between pure forms and those that involve matter. The real and the verbal classification constantly cross one another. It is a mere accident of language that in σιμός the implication of a particular matter is thrust upon the attention more prominently than in κοῖλος or καμπυλότης. But if, as Aristotle repeatedly says, the mind can never think ἀνευ φαντάσματος, the implication of the matter is always present. And as a matter of fact Aristotle was never able to specify the ideas that can be thought as pure form, or to determine the content of the divine, self-thinking thought. If the divine mind could only think 'natural kinds' its range of knowledge would be far more limited than that of the Empedoclean god which Aristotle censured on this score. And if the νοῦς ποιητικός could think only 'natural kinds' how on Aristotelian principles could it actualize in the passive mind the potentiality of thinking all other abstractions? There is no escape on these lines from a reinstatement of all Platonic ideas in a universal and immanent mind.

Even if we waive all this, the second half of Aristotle's explanation brings back the puzzle in another form. Ideas involving matter have only a potential existence in the material things, he says. This is absolutely satisfactory to common sense, but the convenient evasion 'potentially' will not bear analysis. The problem is: if thought thinks all things must it not be in some sense coextensive with all things? No, replies Aristotle, for the *abstracta* (the Forms) of mere qualities and mathematical relations (as distinguished from essences proper) do not dwell in the material object except potentially. It is the active mind that educes them and makes them actual. But waiving the point already made that the active mind can not actualize thoughts which by hypothesis it does not itself think, we still ask how is the contact effected. 'The stone is not in the soul' (οὐ γὰρ ὁ λίθος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ). Neither is the νοῦς in the stone. If the νοῦς enters the stone, or the stone, in Platonic phrase, μετέχει, participates in the νοῦς; why does not the stone think? If, on the other hand, the stone, or the Form of the stone, finds its way into the mind by the psychological process described in *Analytica Posteriora* II 15, then we have the purely sensualistic psychology which Hobbes

learned from Aristotle, 'physics becomes first philosophy,' all talk of a separable *νοῦς*, of pure forms, and of an 'active mind' becomes meaningless, and the alternative before us is as in modern times materialism or some form of Berkeleian idealism. 'Potential' is a good word to conjure with, but it explains nothing, as Aristotle himself sometimes appears to be uneasily aware. And it is time that the historians of Greek philosophy abandoned the habit of breaking Plato's metaphors on the logical wheel, while at the same time they allow 'common sense' to select a plausible body of Aristotelian doctrine from two inconsistent and irreconcilable psychologies.

However metaphysical and remote from the solid ground of philological method such considerations may appear, they are indispensable to the interpretation of either Plato or Aristotle. And we cannot escape them by Sprachstatistik, collation of manuscripts, or respectful discussion of the emendations of Torstrik.

PAUL SHOREY.

III.—SOME IRREGULAR FORMS OF THE ELEGIAC DISTICH.

The elegiac distich consists, in its regular form, of four dactylic cola; two tripodies, uniting in the usual way to form an hexameter, followed by two catalectic tripodies uniting, according to rules of their own, to form the so-called pentameter.¹ The independence of the elegiac hexameter is clearly indicated by hiatus and syllaba anceps.² Exceptions are very rare. Gleditsch, l. c., quotes Simonides, 120 (Cr.) for the division of a word between the two lines of the distich. The word, however, is a proper name, the epigram an *ἀνάθημα* and bracketed by Crusius.³ At any rate this license must have been as uncommon as the same thing in ottava rima.⁴

In the pentameter, both Latin and Greek, the rule that the two dactyls of the second hemistich must be kept pure is practically unbroken. Exceptions to the rule of diaeresis between the two hemistichs are also very rare. Hephaestion, p. 53, W., quotes:

Ἴερά, νῦν δὲ Διοσκοουρίδew γενηί (Kallim. 192, Schn.)

It will be observed that the word here is a compound proper name and that the pause occurs between the parts⁵. Euripides,

¹ Everyone now is aware that "pentameter" is a misnomer. The verse has six feet, not five. The word, however, is not only convenient but was a common designation of it as early as Hermesianax. See Athenaeus XIII, 598, A and Weil, *JJ*, 1865, p. 655. But see G. Schultz, *Hermes* 35, pp. 308 ff.

² See Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*, par. 245 and ref., H. Gleditsch, par. 38 (Müller's Handb., vol. II), Rossbach and Westphal³, III 2, p. 80.

³ Two other cases are quoted by Rossbach, l. c.

⁴ Ariosto 41, 32, 1-2; 43, 105, 3-4, both compound words, are the only cases in the *Orl. Furioso* (4832 stanzas). 42, 14, 3 should not be included since the device is meant to represent the last word (a compound proper name) of Brandimarte cut short by death. No cases occur in Boiardo or in Tasso's *Ger. Lib.* The effect of this device in English is comic. Comp. Canning's famous song, "Eleven Years in Prison," and Saxe's "Rhyme of the Rail."

⁵ Christ, 244, cites another verse from Mar. Victorinus, 256t. But comp. the remarks of Victorinus himself and the text of Schneider, Kallim. *Frag. Anon.* 392, Hiller-Cr., *Frag. eleg. adesp.* 13, and Bergk, *Frag. adesp.* 13.

Kyklops, 74, generally quoted by writers on metric, is without this excuse. But I shall discuss the line later.

Even elision between the two hemistichs of the pentameter, which is not especially infrequent in Greek, is very rare in Latin.

But, on the other hand, the unity of the pentameter, the strict conception of it as a single verse, is emphasized, in Latin, by the avoidance of hiatus between hemistichs and, in both Latin and Greek, by the avoidance of a short syllable at the end of the first hemistich.¹

It is a commonplace of criticism that the distich is capable of reproducing practically every tone and semi-tone in the gamut of human feeling. The truth of Schiller's famous description has been strenuously attacked but, at all events, the pentameter stands for the emotional side of the combination. In these brief hemistichs and, particularly, in the abrupt medial catalexis the imaginative reader may perhaps be pardoned for finding, by turns, the pause which points the preacher's moral or precedes the sting of the epigram, the sob which chokes the song of the bereaved, the cry to arms, the hiccup that tells of dining not wisely, the incoherence of the happy lover or, again, the sigh of one who knows too well that to him neither youth nor beauty nor happy love shall ever come again.

So it came to pass that the distich was found equally suitable whether wrought to the temper and genius of Archilochos, the war-songs of Kallinos and Tyrtaios, the laments of Mimnermos, the politics and moral saws of Solon and Theognis, or the literary epigrams of Simonides and the long line of his distinguished successors. Euripides, *Androm.* 103 f. appears to anticipate the Alexandrian elegists in their return to the old Ionian type of Mimnermos. I find no other cases in the drama. With the Alexandrians the use of the distich was varied and extensive. Through them it reached the Romans. Here it was perfected for the epigram by Catullus and Martial, and for the elegy by Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid.

During the last twenty or thirty years much minute and searching study has been devoted to the technical art of the elegiac distich in its regular form, and we are gradually being lifted to a

¹ It was held by some metricians under the Empire that—in accord with their theory of origins—this syllable might be short. But even in later times we find few traces of its occurrence. See Christ, p. 207; Rossbach, l. c., p. 81.

more intelligent conception of the grace and delicacy as well as the versatility and power of a form which, with the single exception of the hexameter itself, may claim to be at once the most artistic, the oldest, the most widely used, and the longest to live, of all the metrical forms of classical antiquity.

When one considers the long life and popularity of the distich as well as the variety of talent still represented in what remains of it, the permanence of the regular form is remarkable. Radical deviations are rare, although a complete survey of literature and inscriptions for a dozen or more centuries reveals a number large enough to deserve more attention than hitherto seems to have been given them. Christ and Rossbach, in their excellent works, have devoted as much attention to them as could be expected in practical hand-books. Usener, in his thoughtful and convincing *Altgriechischer Versbau* has pointed out and explained the importance of some of these deviations on the side of metre in its historical development. Otherwise I find very little reference to the subject besides an editorial comment here and there, which usually begins and ends with the mere citation of a parallel or two and the observation that such forms are characteristic of uneducated people. That the ancient metricians did nothing with the subject is not surprising. Their purpose was to describe not so much how the distich had been written as how it should be written. Hence their chief concern was the normal type as presented by the great masters.¹

While accepting in full the views of Usener regarding the ultimate origin of these forms it has seemed to me that some of them deserve a more detailed examination of their sphere and character. They betray, if not an artistic, at least a conscious, theory of composition that should partly account for their survival to the latest times. Moreover, it is certain that, in some cases, their authors are beyond the suspicion of either ignorance or inability.²

¹ See Rossbach, l. c., p. 81, for references to the ancient metricians on this subject.

The preliminary collection of material, which would otherwise be very tedious, is much simplified by the fact that not only certain bulky departments, like the epic, may be passed over at once, but that the vast field of inscriptions has already been gleaned for all poetical forms by Kaibel, *Carmina ex lapidibus collecta*, etc., 1878, and by Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, 1898. See also F. D. Allen, *Papers of the Amer. School at Athens*, IV (1888),

I.

Those cases in which the pentameter occurs outside of the distich and is not associated with the hexameter. These may be classed as:

A. The use of the pentameter with verses other than the hexameter.

B. The use of the pentameter as a monostich.

C. The use of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*.

A. The pentameter with verses other than the hexameter.

Under this head the most noteworthy examples are the "dramatic pentameters" mentioned by Christ, p. 211, Gleditsch, p. 718, and others. A rapid survey of the Greek drama, including the fragments found in the editions of Koch, Kaibel and Nauck, reveals the following cases. For purposes of discussion, I quote them in full:

Aischylos, *Suppl.* 541-2,

οἶστρω ἔρεσσομένα
φεύγει ἀμαρτίνοος

= 550-1,

Λύδια τ' <ἀγ> γύαλα
καὶ δι' ὁρῶν Κιλίκων

Agam. 1005,

καὶ πτόμος εἰθνοπόρων
(second half lost)

= 1022-3,

οὐδὲ τὸν ὀρθοδαῆ
τῶν φθιμένων ἀνάγειν

Choeph. 380-1,

τοῦτο διαμπερές οὖς
ἴκεθ' ἄπερ τι βέλος,

p. 37. For Greek literature we have Bergk's *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*⁴, to which should be added the later *Editio Minor* by Crusius, Leipzig, 1897, and Preger's *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae ex Scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam collectae*, Leipzig, 1891. Müller's *De Re Metrica* contains a tolerably complete survey of Latin literature from this point of view. In addition I have made a rapid examination, on the one side, to Gregory Nazianzen, on the other, to Boethius, inclusive, of those authors in whom such forms were at all likely to occur. My collection cannot claim to be exhaustive. It seems sufficient, however, for the purpose of this investigation.

= 394-5,

καὶ πότε ἂν ἀμφιθαλῆς
Ζεὺς ἐπὶ χεῖρα βάλοι;

Eumenid. 962-3,

ματροκασσιγῆται,
δαίμονες ὀρθονόμοι,

= 982-3,

ἀντιφόνους ἄτας
ἄρπαλίσαι πόλιως

Euripides, I. T. 1235-6,

ὅν ποτε Δηλιάσιν
καρποφόροις γυάλαις

= 1260-1,

παῖδ' ἀπενάσσατο Λα-
τφος ἀπὸ ζαθέων¹

Rhesos, 245-6,

λήματος ἢ σπανία
τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὄταν ἴ'

= 256-7,

μῖμον ἔχων ἐπὶ γᾶν
θηρός; ἔλοι Μενέλαν

Troades, 822-3,

Λαομεδόντιε παῖ,
Ζανὸς ἔχεις κυλίκων

= 842-3,

οὐρανίδασι μέλων
ὡς τότε μὲν μεγάλως

Kyklops, 74,

ὦ φίλος, ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, ποῖ οἰσπολεῖς;

Orestes, 1436,

φάρεα πορφύρεα, δῶρα Κλυταιμνήστρα

Helena, 1479-80 (quoted by Christ, l. c.),

γενοίμεθα Δίβνες (corrupt)
οἰωνοὶ στολάδες

= 1496-7,

δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι
παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι²

¹ But see Bruhn's critical note on these lines.

² I have omitted Eurip. *Suppl.* 280, quoted by Christ, l. c. The text is very troublesome. See Wecklein's critical note and appendix.

Aristoph., *Nubes*, 1158,

οἶος ἔμοι γρέφεται
 τοῖσδ' ἐνὶ δόμασι παῖς

It will be observed that in eight of these nineteen cases strophe corresponds to antistrophe in the usual way, hence, we really have but eleven to consider.

A comparison of these "dramatic pentameters" with the average elegiac pentameter reveals differences that, it seems to me, are sufficiently marked to render a change in terminology desirable. For example:

In the first hemistich of the elegiac pentameter the general rule is that either or both of the dactyls may be replaced by spondees. It may be added, however, that, in a large majority of cases, one of the dactyls *is* replaced by a spondee. This is especially true of the Roman poets, as might be expected, but, with varying strictness, the rule applies to the distich throughout its entire history. Of course, the reason for it is plain enough. In this connection I examined the Greek distich previous to and contemporary with the drama, obviously the only period of its history to be considered, and found that only about twenty per cent. of the pentameters—one case in five—had two pure dactyls in the first hemistich.

If now we turn to our dramatic examples we find that no less than ten of the eleven cases keep two dactyls in the first hemistich. Now, of course, the question of monotony does not have to be taken into consideration here. These 'dramatic pentameters' always occur alone and are very rare, whereas the regular elegiac pentameter recurs every second verse as long as the poem goes on. But after all possible allowances are made this explanation still seems insufficient to account for a difference so marked.

And this is not all. Turning to Euripides, *Orestes*, 1436 and *Helena*, 1479 = 1496 (quoted by Christ) we find that the rigid and universal rule of pure dactyls in the second hemistich is not observed.

Thirdly, we may consider the quantity of the last syllable in the first hemistich. We have already seen¹ that under the Empire it was held by some metricians that this syllable might be either long or short. But previous to that time, indeed, by the best authors, as a rule, of that period, this syllable is kept

¹ See p. 166, note 1,

long. This rule of the elegiac pentameter is very rarely broken. Christ, p. 207, notes Theognis 2, 440, 478, 1066 and 1232. These are all in one author, and I observed no other cases in the pre-dramatic distich (about 1200 pentameters). But no less than two of our nineteen¹ 'dramatic pentameters,' Aisch., *Suppl.* 550, and Eurip., *Orestes* 1436, exhibit the exceptional short syllable at the close of the first hemistich. *Helena* 1479, as noted above, is corrupt.

Finally, if we follow Christ and include among our examples *Helena* 1479-80 = 1496-7, the result is not only two pentameters which, as we have said above, have a spondee in the second hemistich, but, if the text of the antistrophe is correct, both pentameters must have been read with anacrusis. I confess that, except for Christ, I should not have thought of these lines as pentameters. The antistrophe begins:

μόλοιτέ ποθ' ἱππιον οἶμα
 δι' αἰθέρος ἕμενοι
 παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι

I scanned these as two prosodiaci followed by one dactylic tripod catalectic as a clausula, which is its most common use.²

But at all events, even if we drop out this example, and also Eurip. *I. T.* 1235-6 = 1260-1 which, as shown by Bruhn's critical note, is more than doubtful for purposes of metre, it still seems clear to me that the peculiarities we have noted point, one and all, to the conclusion that these "dramatic pentameters," which even in the time of Euripides have the air of being old-fashioned, are not pentameters at all and were never intended to be, but rather pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic. When compared with the regular elegiac pentameter both their freedoms and their restrictions suggest it. The elegiac pentameter, though originally a compound verse, is very distinctly an unity. The difference between this verse and a pair of verses, especially in this discussion, is important. If we consider these examples as pairs of verses all the peculiarities observed are amply explained and justified.

¹ I say nineteen instead of eleven because strophe does not match antistrophe in a peculiarity of this sort, and hence the pair should not be counted as one.

² See 693, 1499, 1508 of the same play, *Hippol.* 59, etc., and Christ, p. 151. For this use of prosodiaci in pairs, which is not unusual, comp. Aisch. *S. T.* 751-2 = 759-60, Soph. *Antig.* 353-4 = 365-6, and Christ, p. 214.

Taken as pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic the occurrence of spondees would be exceptional anyhow, but not more so in one line than in the other. Conversely, pure dactyls are just as desirable in one as in the other.

So, too, whether the dactylic tripod catalectic is used singly, or as a clausula, which is its most common application, or in pairs, as in the examples before us, or in a series, as Eurip. *Troad.* 1094, *l.*, the final syllable of it is long. Exceptions though rare are not more so in one than in another verse of a given series. In our dramatic examples, as it happens, all the exceptions were found in the first verse, which reverses the occasional license discovered in the elegiac pentameter of a short syllable at the end, not of the first, but of the second hemistich. In other words, in a pair of dactylic tripodies catalectic the two verses practically stand on the same footing.

Finally, we saw that at *Kyklops* 74 and, if we accept the text, *I. T.* 1260-1, Euripides divided a proper noun, which was not a compound, between two tripodies. If these lines are really pentameters the author has given us the only two genuine exceptions to the rule of diaeresis that I find quoted.¹ If, however, as seems clear, they are not pentameters, but pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic, Euripides was quite within his rights in availing himself of a license for which there are parallels on almost any page of Greek lyric poetry.

If I am right in believing that these dramatic verses are really pairs of tripodies, the pentameter with verses other than the hexameter, so far as I have observed, is confined to a single case. This is an epitaph of four lines from Ithaka and belonging to the Macedonian period.² The pentameter takes the place of the usual iambic trimeter catalectic to form a distich with the Fourth Archilochian. The regular combination is best known from Horace, *Odes*, I 4, 1, *l.*, 'Solvitur acris hiems grata,' etc.

The form of this epitaph was evidently *ad hoc*. The poet really desired to write elegiac distichs but, like some other tombstone bards, found himself confronted not by a theory but by a condition. This was the corpse's name,³ *Ebbidaspos*, which will

¹ It has already been seen that the compound name in the example quoted by Hephæstion stands on a different footing.

² Kaibel, 187 = CIG, 1925: Allen, 'Greek Versification in Inscriptions,' Papers of the Am. School at Athens, vol. IV, p. 44.

³ For similar difficulties compare Kaibel, 211 (hex. + iamb. trim. + two distichs), and 117 (same + three distichs).

not submit to the distich because it contains a cretic. The nearest approach to the hexameter was the Archilochian, while for the second line the poet returned to the pentameter because, from their character and associations, iambic verses are repugnant to the solemnity of the epitaph.

B. Use of the pentameter as a monostich.

Here the material collected is considerable and yields interesting results.

The two¹ oldest and most famous are the composition of Hipparchos and, therefore, may be dated in the sixth century before Christ. They are quoted by Plato, *Hipparch.* 228, D f. He says that Hipparchos set up Hermae along the roads, etc., and after selecting the wisest sayings he could discover or devise, 'ταῦτα αὐτὸς ἐρείνας εἰς ἡλεγείων,' had them inscribed on these Hermae for the instruction of the travelling public. There are two of these inscriptions, says Plato. On the left of each Hermes he is made to say, *ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἔστηκεν*²; on the right, he is made to say, *Μνήμα τὸδ' Ἰππάρχου· σταίχε δίκαια φρονῶν.*

As one of the 'many fine poems' of Hipparchos on other Hermae, Plato also quotes :

Μνήμα τὸδ' Ἰππάρχου μὴ φίλον ἔξαπάτα.

Preger writes these two pentameters in such a way as to show that, in his opinion, they really form a distich with the hexameter which Plato is supposed to be quoting indirectly. Of course, this is not impossible, but I should prefer to follow Bergk and (probably) Crusius; first, because this use of the pentameter is well attested by other undoubted examples throughout antiquity; second, because not only were the supposed hexameter and the pentameter inscribed in different places but, also, because I fail to discover any connection in thought between them.³ It should also be observed that Plato's word *ηλεγείων* is not infrequently applied to the pentameter alone.⁴

The sphere, content and purpose of these two verses are distinctly such as we might expect of a monostich. They actually

¹ Bergk, PLG⁴, II, p. 237; Crus., p. 123, and *adnot.* p. xxxv; Preger, p. 157; Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen*, I, p. 498, II, p. 391; Bergk, *Gr. Lit.* II, p. 175.

² For the various more or less futile attempts to restore these words to a hexameter, see the authorities quoted in note 16, with references.

³ Comp. for example, the 'restorations' mentioned in Wachsmuth, l. c.

⁴ So Plutarch, 1141 A; Schol. Arist. *Pax*, 1199.

were inscriptions. Moreover, we are safe in assuming that, although only these two examples happen to have survived, such single pentameters were an ordinary thing, especially in this very period when, as Bergk, *GL.* II 175, has observed, the tendency to versify popular wisdom was so marked. Plato himself speaks of the 'many other beautiful poems' of Hipparchos and expressly states that they were meant to offset, if not replace, rival wisdom at Delphi, γνάθι σαντόν, μηδὲν ἄγαν, and the like. In that case the political object and significance of μῆμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου is clear enough. Why the most natural and most common form of the monostich, the hexameter, was not used is a question to which I shall return later.

Other cases which I noted in Greek literature were, for the most part, more doubtful. Though a given pentameter may have been quoted singly, and also contain an independent gnome, we cannot be certain that it was written as a monostich unless so stated by the author who quotes it. Cases of this sort are:

Solon, 6, Cr.; 7, B.,

ἐργασιν ἐν μεγάλοις πᾶσιν ἄδειν χαλεπὸν

Kritias, 4, Cr.; 6, B.,

ἐκ μελέτης πλείους ἢ φύσεως ἀγαθαί

Frag. Eleg. Adesp., 12 Cr.

τὸν φρουρὸν φρουρεῖν χρή, τὸν ἐρώντα δ' ἐράν.

Simonid., 70, Cr.; 87, B.,

Ζεὺς πάντων αὐτὸς φάρμακα μῖνος ἔχει.

In all such cases as these the difficulty of reaching a definite conclusion is still further increased by the fact that in the distich the gnome, if there is one, is always found, naturally and historically, in the pentameter.

A better case is a line of Evenos, quoted by Plutarch, 497, A (Comp. Cr. 6, B. II 271, Preger, 50):

*Ὅστε ἐπαινέσθαι καὶ μνημονεῖσθαι τοῦ Εὐήνου τοῦτο μόνον ὡς ἐπέγραψεν
ἢ δόος ἢ λίπη καὶς πατρι πάντα χρόνον.*

Doehner, says Bergk, emended to τοῦτο τὸ μονόστιχον ἐπίγραμμα, after Hecker, who thought the verse sepulchral. According to this Plutarch expressly stated that the pentameter of Evenos was a monostich. But the emendation is not called for. We must, therefore, leave the question unanswered—which seems safer than to assume with Preger that the verse was *not* a monostich.

A still better example occurs in the life of Aischylos found in some MSS.¹ Here the author says, in conclusion :

ἐπιγέγραπται τῷ τάφῳ αὐτοῦ·
αἰετοῦ ἐξ ὀνύχων βρέγμα τυπείξ θνανον,

referring, of course, to the famous story of the death of Aischylos.²

This,³ and the fragment of Evenos quoted by Plutarch, *Mor.* 497, A, seem to me tolerably clear cases of the pentameter used as a monostich. Moreover, though the other four are by no means attested, they are quite possible.

Turning now to Greek inscriptions I find that, although in many cases their dates can not be fixed, single pentameters are found all the way from the fifth century before Christ.

Pausan., 5, 27, 2; Preger, 55:

Φόρμις ἀνέθηκεν
Ἀρκὰς Μαινάλιος, νῦν δὲ Συρακόσιος.

This was the inscription on the bronze horses dedicated at Olympia by Phormis, the general of Hiero and Gelo.⁴

Exactly parallel is one set up by Herodes Atticus some centuries later. Comp. Kaibel, 1090; Philostratos, II, p. 66 (K): CIG, I, 989:

*Ἡρώς Πολυδευκίαν,
ταῖσδέ ποτ' ἐν τριβόδοις σὺν σοὶ ἐπεστρεφόμην.

A third is found on a lamp in the British Museum :⁵

εἰμὶ δὲ Πανσανίου τοῦ καταπυγοτάτου,

where, although I find only the single line quoted in Kaibel, and the Arch. Zeit. for 1873 is not available to me, the δέ evidently implies some preceding statement regarding the maker.⁶

¹ For the text of this life, see Weil, *Aeschylus*, Teubner, 1891, p. 312; Sedgwick, *Aeschylus*, Oxford, s. d. end; Preger, p. 205; Westermann's *Biographi Graeci*, Brunswick, 1845, p. 122.

² Discussed by E. Rohde, *JJ*, 121, p. 22, f.

³ "Apparently a fragment of some late epigram on the poet, though I grant that some one may have composed this single pentameter." Preger, p. 205. Comp. Preger, No. 39, and Westermann, *Biographi Graeci*, Brunswick, 1845, p. 120.

⁴ Comp. Gurlitt on *Pausan.* 5, 27, 2. Bergk, *Opusc.* II, p. 400, attempted to write as three verses. But comp. Preger, p. 45.

⁵ Kaibel, 1131; Allen, p. 43; Hirschfeld, *Arch. Zeit.*, 1873, p. 109.

⁶ *καταπυγοτάτου* is a pleasantry which was to be expected of any antique lamp as the confidant of the small hours. Comp. Arist. *Eccles.* 1, f.; *Anth. Gr.* V. 3, 4, 6, 7, etc.

A different type is represented by Kaibel, 759; Hirschfeld, Arch. Zeit., 1873, p. 108:

Πέθων Ἐρμῆι δαγλίμα Ἐρμοστράτου Ἀβδηρίτης
 ἑστησεμπολλὰς θησάμενος πόληας.
 Εὐφρων ἐξεποίησ' οὐκ ἄδαξ Πάριος.

Here the distich is the real inscription. The following pentameter is independent, since it is the artist's signature. To the same category belongs Allen, LXXXII; Löwy, 88; CIG, 2984. In Kaibel, 806, the pentameter really forms an independent inscription.

Lastly, the two following *dedicationes* consist each of merely a single pentameter and, with requisite changes, were, doubtless, often repeated:

CIA, IV, 2, p. 262 (1558, L),

Πιεθοὶ Καλλιμα[χος] τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε Σολεύς.

This was found on the Eleusinian way and one hemistich is written above the other.

The second is from Posidonia and written to the left (Allen, p. 200; IGA. 542; Curtius, Arch. Zeit. 38, p. 27):

Τάθαναι Φιλλῶ Σαρμυλίδα δεκάτα[ν].

A survey of poetical inscriptions on the Roman side reveals a considerable number of single pentameters.¹ I may quote:

Buech., 886; CIL, XIV, 2773 (comp. Kaib. 829):

Hortulus hic Vari est opus Alcinoi.

On a Hermes. The hemistichs are separated.

Buech., 921:

Crux est vita mihi, mors, inimice, tibi.

On a golden cross in the grave of a Christian buried in the Basilica di San Lorenzo.

Buech., 933; CIL, IV, 1880:

At quem non ceno, barbarus ille mihi est.

Preceded by *L. Istacidi* (vocative). A Pompeian *graffito* in which *at quem* belongs to the same sphere of Latinity as the *foras cenat* of Petron. 30.

¹Buecheler, Carm. Epig. Nos. 886; 921; 933; 952; 962(?); 1451 f.; 1491; 1492 (a quotation from *Mart.* 2, 59, 4); 1493; 1501 f.; 1124 (probably belongs to a longer epitaph); 1291.

Buech., 952; CIL, IV, 1118, *add.* p. 203. Another Pompeian *graffito* founded on Propertius, 3 (4), 23, 6:

Iam docui silices verba [benigna] loqui.

Buech., 962; CIL, X, 1284. At Nola:

Nardu poeta pudens hoc tegitur tumulo.

Buech., 1452; CIL, II, *suppl.* 5241, Hübner:

Dic rogo qui transis sit tibi terra levis.

The important part of this pentameter, 'sit tibi terra levis,' is, deservedly, a great favorite with the epitaphs. In the form 'dic rogo praeteriens sit tibi,' etc. (B. 1453), and 'praeteriens dicas sit tibi,' etc. (B. 1454), it is so common as to be abbreviated to *s t t l*. Sometimes (1452-5) a pentameter containing these words is added, as a *clausula*, to prose. Again (1456-7) it is added to a hexameter and we have a sort of distich by aggregation. So, too, such an irregular combination as Buech. 1451; CIL, II 558:

Tu qui carpis iter gressu properante viator
Siste gradum quaeso, quod peto parva mora est,
Oro ut praeteriens dicas: s. t. t. l.

is merely due to the aggregation of a distich with the favorite line of the bereaved. A large majority of irregularities in the epitaphs and other inscriptions are clearly due to similar processes of construction and, of course, call for no discussion here. Again the *s t t l* is preceded by *optamus cuncti* (1460), *omnis optamus* (1461), *et tu qui dederis* (1462).

Other, probably conventional, pentameters are Buech. 1464-5, 1491 and 1493. Buech. 1492; Hübner, *Insc. Brit. Christ.* 134, is a quotation of Martial, II 59, 4. Buech. 1503 may also be mentioned. But 1124 probably belongs to a longer epitaph. Finally some others might be added which, at first sight, would appear to belong in other categories.

A survey of these examples collected from both Latin and Greek is attended, it seems to me, with some interesting results. Omitting those which perhaps may be considered as favorite quotations from a pattern distich and, at times, still found in a distich, we still have about a score of pentameters which can hardly be termed anything but monostichs. It is true that this seems a small number to glean from so long a period of poetical activity. But the tradition of them is unbroken and their nature and use imply the existence in antiquity of many others like them.

The usual verse to be employed as a monostich is the hexameter. Why use the pentameter, which from a very early period and, one might say, more than any other verse in all antiquity, was identified with one form and one only?

Adopting the generally accepted theory of origin for both hexameter and pentameter, with which I see no reason for disagreeing, it seems not unreasonable to look for an answer in the consideration of the shorter dactylic verses which are older than either of them. The dactylic tripod catalectic, for example, is certainly one of the oldest of all Greek verses.¹ Proverbs, sayings, brief votive inscriptions and the like primitive types of formal composition ought to be among the first to appear in metre and, as a matter of fact, whatever its origin and other uses, the tripod, in its employment as a single verse, lies, to a marked degree, within this sphere. That it was frequently and naturally used in pairs at a very early period is suggested, for example, by the fact that the regular pentameter itself was afterwards derived from that combination.

Now, when we observe that the regular elegiac pentameter, until, as in the dramatic examples, we pause to examine details, bears so close a resemblance to the double tripodies from which it developed; also, that, in this use as a monostich, the pentameter is so distinctly confined to proverbs and old said sooth, *ex-votis* and similar primitive themes of composition; may we not believe that after it rose and developed in connection with the hexameter, the pentameter, as an inevitable result of its wider fame as well as its close resemblance, finally absorbed the somewhat humble and contracted sphere in which the use of a pair of tripodies had survived from a remote antiquity? In the earliest times the real distinction, in form and sphere, between these single pairs of tripodies and the regular elegiac pentameter would, naturally, be recognized. Indeed, all the way down, it was never altogether forgotten. Compare, for instance, the notably strong pause between hemistichs as well as their independence in such ancient examples as the lines of Hipparchos.² Centuries later, the strong hiatus in such a case as,

Hortulus hic Vari est opus Alcinoi,

leads to the same conclusion. Even the conservatism, observed

¹ See Christ, par. 190.

² Bergk, *Opusc.* II 400, does write as three verses the Phormis inscription (*Paus.* 5, 27, 2) which belongs to the fifth century B. C.

in some of these inscriptions, of writing one tripod above the other—although not always demanded by the shape of the object—is not without some weight in the same connection. On the other hand, the fact that Plato calls the verse of Hipparchos an *ελεγείον* needs mean no more than that, in this particular sphere, the confusion of tripodies and pentameter was already accomplished. But although the original form may have become completely identified with that found in the better known distich, yet the process lingered in the persistent tradition that in some way or other it was entirely proper to use the elegiac pentameter as a monostich within the limits of the sphere originally occupied by the double tripod.

When, therefore, in the fourth century after Christ we find Professor Ausonius choosing to put seven saws of Anacharsis¹ into as many pentameters, we may assert that he is following a well established tradition which, in examples still surviving, can be traced back to an exactly parallel use of Hipparchos, nearly a thousand years before. In all that period the sphere of the pentameter as a monostich coincides exactly with that of the form which it absorbed. I know of no surviving example which transgresses the rule.

C. The pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* is very rarely used. The earliest is an old votive inscription quoted by Aristotle, *Ἀθην. Πολ.*, 7, 4 :

*Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίον τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς,
θητικού ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππῶδ' ἀμεψάμενος.²*

Three more cases are found in Kaibel (326, 510 and 605). The first is an epitaph of the third or fourth century A. D. found in Thasos. The writer is one Aurelius Philippos of Abdera. His style betrays several marked Latinisms, and the two pentameters standing in the midst of his prose are unusually bad. The second is also late and not much better. 605 (CIG, 6209) is the best. It is the epitaph of a comic actor buried at Messina :

*Παφίανδς Πάφιος τῆδ' ὑπὸ γῆ λέλυμε,
κυμωδὸς λυθθεῖς τὸν βίβτον στέφανον.*

Neither this nor the ancient verses quoted by Aristotle belong to the stage of culture represented by Aurelius and the “two worthy heroes” of Kaibel, 510.

¹ Auson., p. 249, Schenkl. This form should not be cited as a case of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. It is a mere bundle of monostichs.

² See Herwerden and Kenyon here. Also quoted by Pollux, VIII 131.

On the literary side the most interesting example is the *Anthologia Graeca*, XIII 1, an epigram, and apparently the introductory epigram, of Philippos who lived near the time of Tiberius and was the compiler of the second anthology.¹ The poem consists of five pentameters. The first is pure, the second has a spondee in the first place, the third, a spondee in the first two places, and so on in regular succession until the last line which has nothing but spondees, as the first had nothing but dactyls. The period was one in which, as we learn from several sources,² all sorts of experiments in metre were being tried, but whether this form was a special creation of Philippos I cannot say. At any rate the observed use of the pentameter, or what was taken for the pentameter, *κατὰ στίχον* was probably the suggestion of it, and the appearance of it in literature tends to show that it was more common than the scanty remains might, otherwise, have led one to suppose.³

The Latin inscriptions yield no examples of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. But from the literature three cases are cited by Müller, *de Re Met.*, p. 103:

Lampridius, *vita Diadum. Hist. Aug. XVI 7, 3*:

“Commodus Herculeum nomen habere cupit,
Antoninorum non putat esse bonum,
Expers humani iuris et imperii,
Sperans quin etiam clarius esse deum,
Quam si sit princeps nominis egregii.
Non erit iste deus nec tamen ullus homo,

Hi versus a Graeco nescio quo compositi a malo poeta in Latinum translati sunt, etc.”

It would appear to be the form of these verses which prompted the criticism of Lampridius. If so, the opinion of it, even as late as the third century and from a man no better educated than Lampridius, is of interest. Doubtless the tendency, now and then, to write just such verses as these is what called forth the statement of Atilius Fortunatianus, VI 291, 18, K, that the pentameter ‘seorsum ac solitarium carmen facere non potest.’⁴

The second case belongs to the time of Honorius and is the

¹ See Christ, *GL*, p. 620 (Müller's Handb. vol. VII).

² See, for example, Teuffel-Schwabe, *Röm. Lit.* 282, 3 (Remmius Palaemon).

³ Compare Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.* 38, III and the *πεντάμετρον ἐπικόν* (pure spondees) of Helios, *Stud.*, p. 145, and *Tract. Harl. Stud.*, p. 17, 24.

⁴ Hephaist., p. 52, W.; Schol., p. 171 f.; Aristid., p. 52; Terent. Maur. 1721 f.

composition of Martianus Capella (907, p. 339, Eyss.). It consists of 27 pentameters. The technique, on the whole, is correct enough, although the worthy African evidently found nothing to displease him in a succession of three verses like these,

Quo fertur rabidas perdomuisse feras,
 Quo vidit rigidas glandibus ire comas
 Ismaros et silvas currere monte suas.

From the same period and the same part of the world comes a Greek *φδῆ* composed by Heliodoros (Aethiopica, 3, 2, p. 79, Bekk.) and supposed to be sung in honor of Peleus and Thetis at a Thessalian festival and sacrifice :

Τᾶν Θέτιν αἰείδω, χρυσοθέουρα Θέτιν,
 Νηρέος ἀθανάτων εἰναλίοιο κόραν
 Τᾶν Διὸς ἐννεσίῃ Πηλεῖ γημαμέναν,
 Τᾶν ἄλλος ἀγλαίαν, ἀμετέραν Παφίην

and so on for thirteen lines with a goodly sprinkling of Doric and ending with a repetition of the first line.

The third case¹ quoted by Müller is Ausonius, 11 (Sch. p. 63), a laudatory poem addressed to his colleagues in the University of Bordeaux. But, although the text tradition is very unsatisfactory, a moment's examination of these lines will show that they were never intended for anything but dactylic tripodies catalectic, and so, in fact, Schenkl arranges them. If we arrange as pentameters the first hemistich contains pure dactyls in every case but three. There are, also, two cases of hiatus after the final syllable of the first hemistich. These facts are the more significant because Ausonius makes a large use of the distich elsewhere and writes it well. The poem does not belong to the same type as those quoted from Capella and Heliodoros.

The well known verses of the Vergilian tradition, 'Sic vos non vobis,' etc. (Vita Verg. 69-70, Heyne-Wag, p. xcix, etc.) are not to be included here since, as Müller, l. c. observes (comp. Hermann, El. d. met., p. 360), the hexameter

Hos ego versiculos feci; tulit alter honores;

was to be supplied with each one of the four 'sic vos non vobis'

¹ Müller does not give the reference, but he can hardly refer to the monostichs of Anacharsis, and 11 is the only other piece that could have been meant.

after they had been filled out by the missing words, thus making four complete distichs.¹

These are all the cases of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* in Greek and Latin which I have happened to discover. Examples are much more rare than those of the pentameter as a monostich and the usage never rose to the same plane of culture. Nevertheless, it also began in the early period, continued to occur with considerable frequency, was even developed for literary purposes and, as we have seen, finally ran out in the theory of an epic form consisting entirely of spondees. This ought to imply many more examples than we now possess. Especially interesting is the type given by Heliodoros.

Such an enormous prolongation of life for this weakly change-ling seems, in itself, to betray the tonic effects of some sort of secondary theorizing. The pentameter as a monostich may have been the analogy in part, but I am inclined to think that the persistency of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* was, also, partly due to a confusion of it with the tripod used in multiples of two. It is quite true that, as far as extant literature is concerned, the use of the dactylic tripod catalectic more than twice in succession is extremely rare. Still, no less a poet than Euripides (*Troad.* 1094) used it so once, nor is the testimony of Ausonius, eight centuries later, to be despised, since it doubtless rests on ancient tradition now lost to us.

The hymn of Heliodoros to Peleus and Thetis, one of the latest manifestations of this subject so long popular,² was undoubtedly intended for pentameters. Like the verses of Capella it seems to belong to the period of late African culture. I cannot discover that it has any roots, so far as form is concerned, in an earlier choral literature, Greek or Latin.

¹ *Quamobrem [Bathyllus] donatus honoratusque a Caesare fuit, quod aequo animo non ferens Vergilius, iisdem valvis affixit quater hoc principium: sic vos non vobis; postulabat Augustus ut hi versus complerentur; quod cum frustra aliqui conati essent, Vergilius praeposito disticho sic subiunxit:*

Hos ego versiculos feci; tulit alter honores:
Sic vos non vobis nidificatis aves.
Sic vos non vobis vellera fertis oves.
Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.
Sic vos non vobis fertis aratra boves.

² See Ellis, *Introd. to Catullus LXIV*, p. 278: Reitzenstein, *Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis*, Hermes, XXXV, 73 f.

II.

Cases in which the pentameter occurs with the hexameter, but irregularly. The most notable of these is the one in which we find :

A. The usual position of hexameter and pentameter reversed.

Our information regarding this form and, to a large extent, our best examples of it are due to Athenaios. In connection with a story which smacks strongly of later times Athenaios, 602, C, tells us that some persons who proposed to make away with Phalaris, the famous tyrant of Agrigentum, 570-550, B. C., consulted the oracle on the subject and received the following reply :

*Εὐδαίμων Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος ἔφν,
θείας ἀγηγῆρες ἑφαμερίους φιλότατος.¹*

"In later times," adds Athenaios, "this form was used by Dionysios Chalkus, the Athenian,² in his elegies." Dionysios belonged to the fifth century B. C. and led a colony to Thurii (Plut. Nik. 6). The rest of his history, so far as we know it, is largely preserved in his nickname of *ὁ Χαλκοῦς*, the "Copperite," derived, as Athenaios (669, D) also tells us, from his advocacy of a financial system based on the same principles as that advocated by the Honorable William Jennings Bryan. His poetry seems to have been about as much below par as the coin which his policy contemplated. Owing to accident of quotation, only the first two fragments happen to begin with pentameters. An examination of these, especially the first, which apparently formed a portion of his dedication, tends to show that Dennis Cheap-money did not alter the usual pauses and sentence construction of the regular distich to fit his new scheme. For example, a majority of his pentameters coincide, at the close, with a distinct pause in sense. If these peculiarities were carried through his work the result would be that little else but the first and last line of an elegy could remind us that the form was abnormal, and we should fail to get the effect—inartistic but curious—which, otherwise, might have been produced. It would be interesting to know whether the mental attitude which prompted the deliberate choice of such a form was reflected in oddities of literary style,

¹ Also quoted by Eusebios, Praep. Evang. V 35, 2.

² Osann, Beiträge, etc., 1835, I, pp. 79-140; Christ, *GL.*, p. 133; Bergk, *GL.* II 511; Welcker, *Kl. Schr.* II, p. 220. Fragments in Crusius, p. 129; Bergk, *PLG.*⁴ II, p. 262.

but the fragments are too scanty to judge. There is nothing to show that either in Greek or Latin literature this form was ever attempted again. Moreover, it is worth noting that Dionysios' experiment belongs in the period after the art of the old Ionian masters had, to a certain extent, been lost and before its attempted recovery by the Alexandrian poets. Whether he found his suggestion in forms like the oracle quoted by Athenaios or was simply moved to turn the distich bottom side up as an experiment it is impossible to say. But primitive forms like the oracle are probably due to accident and to be considered ancient folk variations of the hexameter rather than of the distich.¹ Kaibel's collection yields no further examples of this form, and Buech. 1202 and 1308, the two cases found among Latin inscriptions, are too irregular and corrupt to be of any importance.

B. Among the cases in which one or more regular distichs are followed by some irregularity at the end of the piece may be mentioned: One distich followed by one pentameter.

Kaibel, 589, 759 and 806. The irregularity of 759 and 806 is more apparent than real. The third line is the artist's inscription and, therefore, to be counted as a single pentameter. 589 is the result of collocation, that is, the third line appears to be a favorite sentiment from another source tacked on at the end.

In the same manner Buech. 1020, 1039, 1082, 1193, 1220, 1326, 1482 are the result of collocation merely. Buech. 880, the one example remaining, was scratched on the Memnon Statue, May 21, 134 A. D.:

Horam cum primam cumque horam sole secundam
proluta Oceano lumnat alma dies,
Vox audita mihi est ter bene Memnonia,

where the third line betrays the amateur. Underneath is written: ". . . epistr]ategus Thebaidos fecit cum audit Memnonem XI Kal. Iun. Serviano III cos. cum Asidonia Galla uxore." This type is not found in literature.

Cases of two or more distichs followed by a pentameter are found only in Latin inscriptions. These are Buech. 1085, 1121, 1123 and 1124, all bad, and all the result of collocation.

Of those cases in which one or more distichs are followed by one or more hexameters only one variety seems to deserve mention. This is: One distich followed by one hexameter, or one distich and a half.

¹ See Usener, *Altg. Versbau*, p. 99.

Kaibel, 34, 75, 140, 172 (mutilated), 273, 296, 468, 697a (indexed 597a, by mistake), 750 (frag.), 1007. The best are Kaibel, 75, CIG, 749:

Πολλὰ μὲθ' ἡλικίας δημοῦλικος ἤδεα παῖσας
ἐκ γαίας βλαστῶν γαῖα πάλιν γέγονα·
εἰμὶ δὲ Ἀριστοκλῆς Πειραιεύς, παῖς δὲ Μένωνος.

Fourth or third century. For the second line K. quotes Theog. 878, Eurip. Frag. 757 (N). K. 35 and 273 belongs to the same type.

Kaibel, 1007, CIG, Add. III 4761 c. (on the Memnon Statue):

Εἰ καὶ λωβητῆρες ἐλυμῆναντο δέμας σόν,
ἀλλὰ σὺ γ' αἰδέσθεις, ὡς κλύον αὐτὸς ἐγώ.
Μέττιος, ὦ Μένων, Παιῶν τὰδ' ἔγραψε Σιδήτης.

The cases found in the Latin inscriptions are Buecheler, 1010, 1089, 1090, 1092, 1146, 1267, 1489. The best is 1489; CIL. II 4426; AL. Burm. IV 14:

Aspice quam subito marcet quod floruit ante,
aspice quam subito quod stetit ante cadit,
nascentes morimur finisque ab origine pendet.

Here the third line is a quotation from Manilius IV 14.

No cases occur in Latin literature. But in Greek literature I found two interesting examples:

Krates¹ Παιγνα, Anth. Gr. X 104:

Χαῖρε, θεὰ δέσποινα, σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀγάπημα,
Ἐντελιη, κλεινῆς ἐγγονε Σωφροσύνης·
σὴν ἀρετὴν τιμῶσιν, ἔσοι τὰ δίκαι' ἀσκοῦσιν.

Ammonios,² Anthol. Pal. IX 827:

Εἰμὶ μὲν εὐκεράοιο φίλος θεράπων Διονύσου,
λείβω δ' ἀργυρέων ὕδατα Ναϊάδων,
θέλω δ' ἠρεμέοντα νέον περὶ κόματι παῖδα.

To a Satyr standing by a spring and watching a Cupid asleep.

Without doubt there were many more cases of this form which we no longer possess. Some are the result of mere collocation or inexperience, but others are complete and deliberate. The form rose to literature, but only in the inscriptional sphere, so far

¹ See Christ, *GL*, p. 133; Susemihl, vol. I, p. 29 f.

² Jacobs, Anth. XIII 841; Christ, *GL*, p. 784. But esp. Reitzenstein, Pauly-Wiss. I, p. 1862, no. 11.

as one may judge from the two surviving examples just quoted. The suitable length for inscriptions had something to do with the popularity of this pattern. But the principal cause of its frequency and rise to a higher plane of culture as well as of its longevity was its quasi balance and symmetry. From this point of view the form is rather to be considered a single stanza than a distich followed by a pentameter. Forms which are cognate but not symmetrical in the same way never rose and were never popular. Such are the cases of one distich followed by two hexameters (K. 90, 490, 522, 545a; Buech. 922, 947), or by three hexameters (K. 277, 291, 386, 452c), or two or more distichs followed by one hexameter (Buech. 949, 1012, 1107, 1302).

C. Finally, we may consider those cases in which a single pentameter has been used to conclude a series of two or more hexameters. On the whole, this forms one of the most interesting and important of the aberrant types considered. The principle of composition is clear and, as far as it goes, logical. Moreover, it is artistic enough to have a certain literary value. The most striking as well as the most frequent of these types and the one which first called my attention to the subject is:

Two hexameters followed by one pentameter. Nine examples are found in Latin inscriptions. These are Buecheler, 1105, 1179, 1260, 1292, 1324, 1328, [1158, 1173, 1190].

Buech. 1105, CIL, XIV 316:

Hic sum positus qui semper sine crimine vixi,
Et quem mi dederat cursum Fortuna peregit,
Cuius ossua et cineres hic lapis intus habet.

This epitaph doubtless occurred, with slight changes, scores of times on gravestones of the period, not only because the sentiment is often repeated elsewhere, but, also, because this particular stone, which comes from Ostia, was put up in honor of one Epaphroditus, a *Sevir Augustalis* and a *Quinquennialis*, by his quondam associates in those offices. These were men whose knowledge of literature and whose ideas of an appropriate epitaph would be about the same as those possessed by an average city council of to-day. No doubt, on that occasion, the committee resorted to a source not unlike that which supplies metrical consolation to the bereaved relatives of the obituary column maintained by the morning paper. Rearrangement to *hic positus sum* would make the first line metrical. The verse is conven-

tional for epitaphs. For the second line compare Vergil, *A.* IV 653 and Buech. l. c. 385 and 814. *Peregit* for *peregi* is explained by *Fortuna* and is probably due to the stone-cutter.

Buecheler, 1179, CIL, 8553 is perhaps the result of collocation :

Hic iacet ille situs M[arcus] formonsior ullo.
quod meruit vivus, moriens quot et ipse rogavit,
Coniugi sue gratæ præstitit ecce fides.

The first line is the usual 'hic iacet,' etc. plus a reminiscent cadence. The second and third lines, i. e. the distich, are the common property of epitaphs. Compare B 1180 and 1181, also the first line of 1182. These explain how the bereaved Ulpia Veneria came to compose the epitaph in its present form. She indicated the place of her husband's burial and told how handsome he was.¹ She then desired a sentiment and the choice was a distich which she had read on other gravestones and which had struck her fancy. It will be seen, therefore, that in this case the form was not intended, but due, simply, to the juxtaposition of favorite sentiments. Indeed a large proportion of the irregularities of the elegiac distich is due to this method of composition. *Hoc* for *sue* would have improved the pentameter, but the fact that she was *his* wife was more important to Ulpia Veneria than a mere detail of metre.

In the same way B. 1260 is the result of collocation. B. 1292 is conventional. B. 1324 and 1328 belong to a lower sphere. B. 1158, 1173 and 1190 are attached to other distichs and therefore should not be counted here.

So far the sphere and social position of this form are clearly indicated. Moreover, the character as well as the frequency of surviving examples suggest how abundant it must have been and therefore how familiar to every Roman in the days when the roads leading out of any Italian town were lined with tombs.

Two cases, only, occur in Latin literature, but they are the stock examples of aberrancy in the form of the elegiac distich. Both are the composition of Trimalchio, who, among his many accomplishments, derived great comfort from courting the muse (comp. 41).

¹ The reference to personal beauty in ancient epitaphs is frequent and eminently characteristic. Comp. the epitaph of Scipio, B. 7 (CIL, I, 30); B. 52, 75, 80, 98, 237, 454, 969, 989, 995, 1033, 1035, 1038, 1040, 1044, 1057, 1061, 1136, 1137, 1151, 1188, 1240, 1307, 1329. Kaibel, 132, 151, 152, 169, 174.

Petron. 35: "While we were drinking . . . a slave brought in a silver skeleton so constructed that the joints and vertebrae could be turned in every direction. After he had thrown it down on the table a few times and the mechanism had struck several different attitudes, Trimalchio added :

'ehen nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est.
Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus.
Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.¹'"

As one might say in doggerel not much worse :

' Poor wretches we—alack, the thought
That man, weak man, all told, is naught!
When Death has claw'd us with his clutch
Most certain 'tis that even such
As this is now we all shall be,
So let us live as best we may
Until that day!'

Of course, Burmann, Friedlaender and others are entirely correct in their observation that this form is characteristic of uneducated people and that in using it here Petronius meant to display Trimalchio's lack of training as compared with his pretensions in the polite accomplishment of turning a distich.

But this is not all. We have already seen that this form suggests the epitaph, the freedman's epitaph. We even have something very much like the favorite juxtaposition of sentiments. Here are three independent separable verses in a row. Nor is it alone in form that this 'poem' of Trimalchio suggests the epitaph. In its content also it is an epitaph pure and simple. Is it going too far to suggest that in actually making it an epitaph, in inserting the stock phrases and reflections so dear to the monumental songsters of Trimalchio's class, Petronius may have meant to imply that he was practically palming off a time-honored roadside friend as his own composition? As though some modern Trimalchio, under the same circumstances, should remark: "By the way, that reminds me of a little poem of my own :

' Stay traveller as you pass by,
As you are now so once was I;
As I am now so you must be,
Prepare for death and follow me, "'

lines familiar to any one who has ever seen a country grave-yard.

¹ The attempts of the old commentators quoted in Burmann's note to emend these verses illustrate the value of epigraphical study.

At any rate, in using this form Petronius certainly had in mind just such *obiter dicta* as we have been considering and as were perfectly familiar to all his readers.

The second example (Petron. 55) which Trimalchio calls an *inscriptio* and Sam Weller would, no doubt, describe as "a verse," belongs in the same category :

"We applauded his course and . . . fell into a discussion, illustrated by various examples, on the sudden changes to which human affairs are subjected. 'Yes,' said Trimalchio, 'it wont do to let this chance go by without a verse on it.' So saying, he at once called for his tablets, and without any long thought read out these :

"Quod non expectes, ex transverso fit,
et supra nos Fortuna negotio curat,
quare da nobis vina Falerna, puer,

(You're certain to be crost
When you least expect it most.
Fortune rules the roast
We find it to our cost,
So come, boy, pass the wine
I prefer Falernian)."

This composition which, in the line following, Petronius properly terms an *epigramma* is called by Trimalchio an *inscriptio*. The difference is worth noting and again suggests the monumental sphere and inspiration of Trimalchio's muse. Whether in poetry, in the rhetorical schools, in popular phrase, and above all, of course, in epitaphs, scarcely another theme in antiquity was so frequently taken up as the mutability of Fortune.¹ Trimalchio's ideas and expression regarding this subject are eminently those of the tombstone. As before, the lines are independent and separable. The imperfection of the first two lines is, without doubt, original and intentional. Moreover, the inexperience of the writer is clearly portrayed in the heavy spondees and neglect of 'conflict.'

These two examples from Petronius appear to be the only specimens of this form now surviving in Roman literature. They are interesting, too, because we indirectly get the point of view of an educated man on them. This form clearly suggested epitaphs to cultivated Romans of the first century, and the remains as far as discovered have given the same impression to us.

¹ Juvenal, Sat. X ; Iustinus, I 7, 14 ; Dio Chrys. *Orat.* LXIV, etc.

On the Greek side Kaibel's index notes ten cases,¹ beginning with 52, fourth century B. C., showing remains of the pre-Euclidean alphabet and apparently from a lower sphere of life. All but two are epitaphs and on a level with the Roman examples already quoted. K. 1008 is inscribed on the left thigh of the Memnon Statue, and the writer has copied his first verse badly from a neighboring inscription (K. 1007). K. 823, CI, 6012c is perhaps the most interesting. The inscription, which is before 370 A. D. is on an altar to Rhea raised by Crescens and Leontius and written as two stanzas.

But one of the most interesting cases is found in Appian, B. C. I 97, who tells us that Sulla, the dictator, in response to an oracle, sent as offerings to his patron deity Venus a crown of gold and a battle-axe accompanied by an inscription :

“ ἐπεμψε δὲ καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν καὶ πέλεκον, ἐπιγράψας τάδε·

‘ τόνδε σοι αὐτοκράτωρ Σύλλας ἀνέθηκε, Ἀφροδίτη,
ὡς εἶδον κατ’ ὄνειρον ἀνὰ στρατιῶν διεκρούσαν
τεύχεσι τοῖς Ἄρεος μαρναμένην ἔνοπλον.’ ”

Zeiss in his translation of Appian, Leipzig, 1837, thought that a pentameter had fallen out, but, as we have already seen, this is worth no more than similar emendations of Trimalchio's verses. There is no sign here that the text is corrupt, and no reason for questioning Appian's statement that these verses were the composition of the great dictator and for the purpose described.

It is hardly necessary to say that L. Cornelius Sulla was the antipodes of a Trimalchio. He was a man of cultivated tastes and varied accomplishments. His knowledge of Greek was practical and extensive, and his love of literature was no less genuine and active than his love of wine and women. The Romans had known and used the elegiac distich for a century. It was particularly affected by the contemporary school of Catulus and Licinus, and the movement destined shortly to produce the first great epigrammatist of Rome was already well under way.

Not only then was the distich well understood in general, but Sulla was the man of all men to understand it. He did not write his inscription in this form because he knew no better, but because he had good reason to think it proper for an *ex-voto*. So far, then, as Greek is concerned we must believe that this form, even

¹ Nos. 52, 132, 171, 370, 400, 662, 666, 687, 1008, 823.

at a tolerably early period, had more nearly attained a genuine literary position than it ever did in Latin, and had therefore occurred with much greater frequency than the remains would have suggested.¹ Another of the same form and intended for the titulus of a statue is Anthol. Pal. XIII 16. The author is not known.

Of the form, three hexameters followed by one pentameter, two cases, both well written, are found in Latin inscriptions:

B. 914; CIL, V, p. 617. In the church of St. Thecla, Milan. Attila destroyed the old church in 452. These verses refer to its restoration by Eusebius, 452-460.

B. 1188; CIL, VIII *Suppl.* 13110. In a tomb at Carthage belonging to the Caesars (Hadrian, etc.).

The Greek inscriptions yield ten cases.² They range from the first century B. C., but afford nothing striking.

The epigram attributed to Sophokles by Athenaios, 604 F, is doubtful both in form and authorship. See Crus. Soph. [3], p. 125.

Plutarch, Aem. Paul. 15 is followed by a regular distich and therefore does not belong here.

The form, four hexameters followed by one pentameter, is represented by one case in Greek, K. 708, and one in Latin, B. 1329.

Five hexameters + one pentameter is found only in K. 614 (CIG. 6260), an excellent and characteristic epitaph from Rome belonging to the second century.

Six hexameters + one pentameter is found in B. 1088 (very bad), K. 610 and Gregory Naz. (epitaph), *Anth. Pal.* VIII 29 (Migne, Patr. Graeca, XXXVIII, p. 49, no. 70). K. 609 is the only case of seven hexameters + one pentameter.

Further combinations of hexameters and pentameters sufficiently regular to imply design are all late and from the Greek. Such are:

Two hex. + two pentam., K. 278. Three hex. + three pentam., K. 933 (240 A. D.).

The considerable number of irregular forms still remaining are

¹ On the famous epigram of the fifth century B. C. quoted by Plutarch, *Arist.* 19, as two hexameters and a pentameter, but in *Mor.* 873 B, and in other authors as two regular distichs, see Preger, p. 65; Crusius, Simonid. [126], p. 259.

² Kaibel, 156, 309, 316, 356, 357, 598, 683, 844, 850, 909.

not taken up here because, although their ultimate origin may be explained by a theory like that propounded by Usener, they do not, in themselves, display any deliberate plan of composition and, consequently, are repeated only by accident.¹

To sum up, then, what seem to me to be the results of our investigation :

In the extant literature there is no such thing as the so-called 'dramatic pentameter.' These lines have every appearance of being pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic, so constructed and known to be such by the poets themselves. The reappearance of these old-fashioned verses in Euripides is perhaps one of the marks of the influence of Aischylos upon him. The recognition of their real nature effectually disposes of some exceptional usage hitherto considered by some metricians under the head of the regular pentameter. In so far, then, the discussion of the regular pentameter has been considerably simplified. The pentameter clings closely to the hexameter. It is rarely found in the company of other verses, never unless chaperoned, so to speak, by the hexameter. The one exception is an epitaph of the Macedonian period which was plainly constructed *ad hoc* and in which the poet chose a verse as near the hexameter as the improper name of his subject would allow.

The pentameter as a monostich did not derive from a theory that the verse might be cut out of the distich and used by itself. It is due to an inevitable but false analogy with verses which it closely resembled and from which, in fact, the elegiac pentameter had originally sprung, the double dactylic tripody catalectic. It was not until it had usurped and thereby inherited the use of these verses in the contracted sphere in which they had moved from a remote antiquity that the right of the pentameter to be used as a monostich was established. It is impossible to say when this confusion took place. In fact it is a question whether it ever did altogether take place. The idea that these verses are really pentameters is more modern than ancient. At any rate, down to

¹ So, too, the combination of the distich with other verses was not taken up in this investigation, since no such combination may be called a form of the distich itself, either regular or irregular. Perhaps the most frequent and interesting of these combinations are those with the iambic trimeter. Compare, for example, Anthol. Pal. XIII 13; Simonides, 106 (Cr., p. 256); Krinagoras, Anthol. Pal. IX 239; Diog. Laert. IV 2, 12 (AP, VII 102); Greg. Naz. AP. VIII 85.

the very end of antiquity, the pentameter as a monostich has a definite and continuous tradition of artistic use. Not once in all that time does it occur outside its inherited sphere of *ex-votis*, proverbs, old said sooth and the like.

The pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* is also old. It may be due—though this is by no means as clear—to a similar false analogy and consequent usurpation of the tripod used in a series. This use of the tripod is rare. So is the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. But although the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*—with special variations—rose to the height of literary use, it never held nor deserved the position of the single pentameter, and at the end of all things ran off and out into a so-called *πεντάμετρον ἐπικόν*. The one really artistic example of it is the epigram of Philippos (AP. 13, 1). That this should be a *dedicatio* in intent is also significant.

The deliberate reversal of the distich is associated with the name of Dionysios Chalkus, but apparently his experiment went no further than the merely mechanical interchange of hexameter and pentameter. He does not seem to have had the discernment even to realize that, for example, the system of pauses usual in the distich should have been reversed as well as the order of the lines if any notable effect was to be produced. It is probable that, like Yvon in the old fairy tale, "this trick never came out of his own head." We have one oracle of two lines in this form. If such were his source he misunderstood the evidence. The oracle regarding Phalaris, for example, if genuine is not a deliberate case of the distich reversed. Oracles are not delivered in distichs at all. Such cases as Apuleius, Met. IV 33, Heliod. Aethiop. II 26, II 35, are purely literary. Indeed the oracle regarding Phalaris may well be of the same sort, merely part of a story which certainly smacks of later days and was designed by its form to suggest the irregularities of ancient folk verse. The idea underlying the other forms discussed is clear enough.

In every case, irregular forms of the distich are either confined to, or clearly derived from, the inscriptional sphere. This is due to the extreme antiquity of the sphere, to the conservatism of tradition, the variety of talent necessarily found there and the shape and limitations of the object inscribed. In a large number of cases the form is the result of mere juxtaposition of favorite sentiments and is, therefore, irregular only in appearance. There were a great many examples of these irregular forms. The frequency of inscriptions, their intimate connection with every

phase of public and private life is one of the most characteristic features of the ancient world as compared with our own. In the time of Sulla, for example, many travellers and investigators had already collected and published them in large numbers. These collections are now lost but must be reckoned with by those who would study the sources of Pausanias, the Greek Anthology, etc.

To select a frequent and characteristic peculiarity and constitute it a canon of literary art within the department in which it was found seems an easy and natural step, especially for the Greeks, with whom literary traditions were conservative and genetic and the distinctive, inherited peculiarities of department so carefully observed. When the epigram developed from its original office of a practical *inscriptio* into a regular branch of literature it dropped all its irregularities as a matter of course. But the original department went on as before, and if the poet returned to it he recognized the freedom of form as a departmental peculiarity and adopted it while moving in that department. The artistic limitations of the freedom which he allowed himself are clearly marked by the examples which we have been considering. The irregular forms of the distich which rose to literary rank, one and all, have a certain symmetry and betray a deliberate theory of composition. This is why they were selected for literary purposes in distinction from the rest, and down to the latest period their original sphere was rarely, if ever, forgotten or transgressed.

Finally, when we contrast the Greek and Roman treatment of these forms the difference is characteristic and national. Rome speaks in the mouth of Petronius. With her imperious temper, her passion for the exact, the fact that with her the distich began as a scholastic tradition, not as a national growth, we should naturally expect her to relegate all infringements of the one proper form to the obscurity which, in her opinion, they deserved.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

IV.—INDIAN GLOSSES IN THE LEXICON OF HESYCHIOS.

The Greek lexicon of Hesychios contains, as is well known, a number of glosses from the Indo-Iranian dialects. The Persian words found in this Alexandrine lexicographer have been fully discussed by Lagarde in his treatise on 'Die persischen Glossen der Alten' (Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 147-242), but the Indian vocabulary of the Hesychian thesaurus has as yet received little attention. It is true that Reland, in his discussion 'De veteri lingua Indica' (Diss. VI of his Diss. Misc. I 207-32), has devoted considerable space to the Indian glosses of Hesychios. Reland, however, does not seem to have been acquainted with Sanskrit, for he etymologized the Indian words on the theory that they were of Persian origin. This view of Reland's, however natural two centuries ago when he wrote, fatally vitiates his results. The Indian words found in the Greek and Latin authors imperatively demand study anew. Such an investigation should possess some value as casting additional light upon the current pronunciation of the Sanskrit and Prakrit during the period when India was known to the Graeco-Roman world. The present paper, however, is confined to the Indian glosses in Hesychios. These glosses are arranged here in their alphabetic order. For the sake of brevity, remarks on the words considered are confined to the smallest space consistent with clearness. The identifications suggested for some of the glosses must be regarded as merely tentative. Notwithstanding this, they are advanced in the hope that, if they themselves are incorrect, they may nevertheless furnish some clue for a future investigator.

ἀποκολοκαΐτωσις· παρ' Ἰνδοῖς ἢ συνουσία. οἱ δὲ π^α φαβλαγόσι τινῶν χρισμένων τὰ αἰδοῖα δονεῖν παρέχει.

The Indian word *ἀποκολοκαΐτωσις* seems to be derived from Skt. *apa + kāla + √khuḍ*. The meaning would then be *συνουσία παρά χρόνον*. The exact mode of *συνουσία* is not easy to determine. Two passages of the Kāmasūtra may perhaps be cited as throwing some light upon this gloss. Of these two the second seems to be the one to be preferred as an explanation of the word.

The first passage is as follows: *saṃvāhanē pariṣvajamānēva gātrāir ūrūnāyakasya mṛdnyāt | prasṭaparicayā cōrumūlam sajanghanam iti saṃspṛśēt | tatra sthiraśiṅgatām upalabhya cāsyā pāñimanthēna parighatṭayēt | cāpalam asya kutsayantīva hasēt ||* (Kāmasūtra, ed. Durgaprasada, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, p. 166; see R. Schmidt's translation, p. 206).

The second, and apparently the preferable, passage runs thus: *ēvam vṛkṣajānām jantūnām śūkāir upalīptam liṅgam daśarātram tāilēna mṛditam punaḥpunar upalīptam punaḥ pramṛditam iti jātasōpham khaṭvāyām adhōmukhas tadantarē lambayēt | tatah śīlāih kaṣṭhyāih kṛtavedanānigraham sōpakramēna niṣpādayēt | sa yāvajjivam śūkajō nāma sōphō viṣānām ||* (Kāmasūtra, p. 369; see Schmidt, p. 471).

If the explanation of the gloss ἀποκολοκαίτωσις here suggested be correct, it would show that the Sanskrit *√kḥud*, which occurs but seldom in the literature, was used more frequently in popular speech than is generally supposed. In the Kāmasūtra *kāla* is frequently used in the sense of χρόνος συνουσίας (e. g. pp. 76, 101 of the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition).

[It is possible that π' παφλαγόσι may be from φλίγω in the sense of *amore urere*.—M. S., Jr.]

[Professor Lanman, private letter of Nov. 15, 1900, suggests that ἀποκολοκαίτωσις may be 'a Greek name for an Indian method' (cf. the discussion on περυγούρανος). In this case ἀποκολοκύντωσις might be miswritten, as he says, for ἀποκολοκύντωσις. A possible explanation of the phrase *vṛkṣajānām jantūnām śūkāir upalīptam liṅgam* Kāmasūtra, p. 166, may thus be gained. The gloss is beset with difficulties. The whole appearance of the word is Greek, not Indian, and the termination can be nothing but Greek. Our suggested explanation of the gloss, assuming it to be Indian, as συνουσία παρὰ χρόνον (*apa* 'away' + *kāla* 'time' + *√kḥud* 'fuit') is very doubtful and it must be considered as merely tentative.]

βαισηης· παρ' Ἰνδοῖς τὸ στρατόπεδον (cf. also βαισηνος· ὁ στρατός).

It is possible that βαισηης may be the representative of the Sanskrit *abhiṣēṇa*, which occurs in RV. 6, 44, 17, where it is thus glossed by Sāyaṇa: *asmān pratyabhigatāh sēnā yēṣām tādṛśān* (cf. AK. ii 8, 94: *yat sēnayā 'bhigamanam arāu tad abhiṣēṇanam*). The meaning of *abhiṣēṇa* would thus be 'a hostile advancing force' (hardly, as the PWb. says, 'Geschosse richtend'), which answers fairly well to the signification assigned by Hesychios to

Βαισίηης. As a reverse analogy to the loss of initial Sanskrit *a* in a Greek loan-word, we may cite Greek *ἐπαναφορά* 'repetition,' which is borrowed in Sanskrit in the form *प्राणपारा* 'astrological term. tech.' (Uhlenbeck, Etymol. Wtb. 153). [Prof. Lanman, private letter, Aug. 18, 1900, queries whether *Βαισίηης* is not Prāk. *ḥaiśēnā* from *ḥaiśēnā*, Skt. *ḥaiśēnā* 'hostile army,' Harivaṃśa 6018. For the phonology involved see Hēmacandra Prāk. Gramm., ed. Pischel, I 206; Pischel, Gramm. der Prākṛit-Sprachen, §220.]

Βραχμῆνες· οἱ παρ' Ἰνδοῖς γυμνοσοφισταὶ καλούμενοι.

This gloss is plainly the Skt. *brahmāṇaḥ* 'Brahmans.'

γάνδαρος· ὁ ταυροκράτης παρ' Ἰνδοῖς.

The word *γάνδαρος* is evidently the Skt. *gandharva*, Māhār. Prāk. *gandhanva* 'a semi-divine being.' The Greek transcription would seem to presuppose a Prāk. **gandharra*. (Reland, I 221, derived *γάνδαρος* from the Persian *kundāvar* 'bold champion.')

γανσαλίτης· ὄρνειον παρὰ Ἰνδοῖς.

It is barely possible that *γανσαλίτης* may be a Greek recollection of the Skt. *kāśika* 'owl.' But this identification is by no means certain. [Professor Lanman, private letter of Aug. 11, 1900, suggests that *γανσαλίτης* stands for Skt. *kāusala* 'a Kosala (bird)'; cf. Skt. *sāindhava* 'Sindhi (horse).'] The phonology and the semantics are so excellent that it is far preferable to the identification with *kāśika*. At the same time, I have not yet met with any substantiation of the meaning 'bird' in the Sanskrit lexicographers. The only signification which I have thus far found for *kāusala* beside being a proper name is 'bow'; cf. *kāusalaṃ gāṇḍivō*, Vāijayantī, p. 118, l. 347, ed. Oppert. Reland, I 222-3, derived *γανσαλίτης* from the Persian *kajalah* 'magpie.'—L. H. G.]

Γενοί· οἱ γυμνοσοφισταί.

M. Schmidt, in his edition of Hesychios, correctly recognized in this gloss the Skt. word *jaina* 'Jain.' This form *Γενοί* shows Prākṛitic influence in the doubling of an original single consonant, with resultant shortening of the Sanskrit diphthong *āi* to *i*, *ē* (cf. also *jina* in Mahāvastu, passim, and Māhār. *jina*).

Δορσάνης· ὁ Ἡρακλῆς παρ' Ἰνδοῖς.

With the gloss *Δορσάνης* we may perhaps compare the Sanskrit

δηξημικα 'bold,' the name of a prince in the Harivaṃśa. The Iranian *Daršiniḱa*, the name of an enemy of Viśtāspa (Yt. 9. 30; 17. 50), may also be quoted (Justi, Iran. Namenb. 80). Some suspicion is cast upon the accuracy of Δορσάνης as a transcription of a Sanskrit word by the fact that the gloss is alphabetized by Hesychios between *δορχελοί* and Δοσάδης, so that the form Δορσάνης has been evidently corrupted in the manuscripts of the lexicon. (Reland, I 221, supposed that Δορσάνης was the Persian Rustam.)

εἰάν· ὁ κισσὸς ὑπὸ Ἰνδῶν.

The identification of the Indian word of which εἰάν is the Greek transcription is very uncertain. It is barely possible that εἰάν is to be referred to the Sanskrit *vayā* 'creeper.' The exact Indian form would accordingly be **vayāna*, Prāk. **va(y)āṇa*. For a similar case in which the existence of a *-na*-derivative (Lindner, Altind. Nominalbild. 136) is to be inferred from a Greek lexicographer, although the Sanskrit word with the termination *-na* is not found, we may compare the sole Indian gloss of the Etymologicum Magnum, ed. Gaisford, 259, 32; 277, 38: *κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰνδῶν φωνὴν δεῦνος ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγεται*. In the citation before us it is evident that δεῦνος stands for *dēvana* (cf. Skt. *dēva* in the sense of 'my lord, the king'). The Viṣṇu Purāṇa 422 has the proper name *dēvanakṣatra* as a variant reading for *dēvakṣatra*. (Reland, 219-20, derives δεῦνος, which he thinks may be Malay instead of Indian, from the Persian *tuān* 'able, powerful'.)

κάγκαμον· παρ' Ἰνδοῖς ξύλον δάκρυον, καὶ θυμίαμα.

Uhlenbeck (Etymol. Wtb. 56) rightly identifies *κάγκαμον* with the Sanskrit *kuḷkuma* 'saffron,' which is a loan-word from the Semitic. (Reland's reading, I 214, *κάγκαλον* and his derivation of the word from the Persian *kanḱar* 'herba quadam spinosa, unde resina mastiches instar paratur' is, of course, untenable.)

μαί· μέγα, Ἰνδοί.

The gloss *μαί* evidently represents the Sanskrit adverb *mahi* 'greatly, very much.' (Reland, I 223, connected *μαί* with the Persian *mih* 'great'.)

μαίσωλος· ζῶον τετράπουν, γενόμενον ἐν τῇ Ἰνδικῇ, ὅμοιον μόσχῳ.

The gloss *μαίσωλος* is to be connected with the Sanskrit *mēṣa* 'ram.' This presupposes the existence of a Sanskrit **mēṣala* (cf. Lindner, Altind. Nominalb. 145), Prāk. **mēsala*.

μαμάτραι· οἱ στρατηγοί, παρ' Ἰνδοῖς.

The word *μαμάτραι* probably corresponds to the rare Sanskrit *marmatra* 'breastplate' (according to PWB. sub voc.), which might also mean 'general' (i. e. 'protector of the vital parts'), if one is to insist on the accuracy of the definition given by Hesychios. The Prakrit form of Skt. *marmatra* should be **mammatta* or **māmatta*. If the identification here suggested be correct, the Greek gloss presents a curious combination of a Prakritized stem with a pure Sanskrit formative suffix.

μορσική· ἡ Ἰνδική.

M. Schmidt in his edition of Hesychios already saw that this gloss is to be considered a derivative of the following word, *Μωριεῖς*.

Μωριεῖς· οἱ τῶν Ἰνδῶν βασιλεῖς.

The gloss *Μωριεῖς* represents the Sanskrit dynastic name *māurya*. Owing to the prominence of this royal house in Magadha, and owing more immediately to their close contact with the Greek invaders under Alexander, their name seems to have become synonymous to the Hellenes with 'king.' The transcription of Sanskrit *āu* by *ω* points to the Prakrit change to *ḍ* of the Sanskrit *āu*; cf. Prak. *mōriyaputta*, Sthavirāvalī I in Jacobi's edition of the Kalpasūtra, p. 77. (Reland's view, I 224-5, concerning the gloss *Μωριεῖς* is very unclear and it is no longer tenable.)

περυγοτύραννος· ὄρνις ποῦδος ἐν Ἰνδικῇ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δοθεῖς.

It is evident that the Greek word *περυγοτύραννος* as an Indian gloss is a translation of some Sanskrit word. The exact Indian term in question is not certain. The Sanskrit *pakṣirāj(an)* 'bird-king,' which is used as an epithet of Garuḍa and Jaṭayu, may be suggested (cf. also *pakṣisvāmin garuḍa*, Hitōpadēśa, II 12). Perhaps this 'king of birds' may have been the peacock, which became known in Greece by importation from India. The peacock was a royal pet in India, and it was much admired and securely protected by Alexander the Great during his invasion of the country (McCrinkle, Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, 362-3 [but see also 186, note 3; 189, note 1]; Reland, I 231-2). It is barely possible that the parrot may be meant by Hesychios in this gloss, instead of the peacock. According to the Pseudo-Kallisthenes, III 18, Queen Kandake, who ruled the country of her great-grandmother Semiramis (i. e. Persia), sent

Alexander, among other presents, six parrots. The location of the country under Kandake's sway is very uncertain in the Pseudo-Kallisthenes (see also Valerius Maximus, III 28 seqq.; History of Alexander the Great, tr. Budge, 117 seqq.; Spiegel, *Erän. Alterthumsk.* II 590). Kandake was the throne-name of the queens of Ethiopia (cf. Acts viii. 27), but the Pseudo-Kallisthenes seems to regard her as ruler of Persia, although she speaks of 'our India.' At any rate, some such legend as that told by the Pseudo-Kallisthenes may have been in the mind of Hesychios when he wrote of 'a certain bird given to Alexander in India.' No such epithet as 'king of birds' seems to have been applied by the Ancient Indian poets either to the peacock or to the parrot, although both birds are still sacred in Northern India (Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India*, II 250-2). On the Greek knowledge of birds in India see Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumsk.* III 319-22. An Iranian parallel, in which an Avestan word not found in the extant texts is translated into Greek by Hesychios, is: *δωροφορικὴ ἐσθῆς οὕτω λέγεται, ἣν βασιλεὺς Περσῶν δωρεῖται.* In this gloss *δωροφορικὴ* evidently is the equivalent of the Iranian **dāθrabāra* 'gift-bearing.' A personal friend very kindly cites as English parallels for Indian compound words imitatively translated into another language the terms Poison People 'serpents,' Red Flower 'fire,' Hunger Dance, and Man Pack from Kipling's *Jungle Book*.

σάκταρον· τοῦτο ἐμφερές ἐστι κόμμι, γεννώμενον ἐν τῇ Ἰνδικῇ, διαλυτικόν.

The gloss has been correctly explained by Uhlenbeck, *Etym. Wtb.* 305, s. v. *śarkarā*: "gr. *σάκχαρ*, *σάκχαρον* zucker ist aus pāli *sakkharā* entlehnt." (Kruse, *Indiens alte Geschichte*, p. 402, Leipzig, 1856, reads *κοιλίας λυτικόν* instead of *διαλυτικόν*. M. Schmidt, like Kruse, in his *editio maior* of Hesychios says rightly that *σάκταρον* stands for *σάκχαρον*.)

σάμμα· ὄργανον μουσικόν παρὰ Ἰνδοῖς.

The word *σάμμα* is undoubtedly the Sanskrit *sāman* 'song.' This gloss, like the preceding one, shows Prakritic influence in the doubling of a consonant with resulting corruption of a preceding long vowel (Prāk. **samma*). The meaning attached to *σάμμα* by Hesychios is hardly to be pressed too closely. (Reland, I 228, derived *σάμμα* from the Persian *šamāmah* 'fistula inaequalibus calamis compacta.' This etymology is, of course, quite untenable.)

The Indian glosses in Hesychios seem to be derived both from Sanskrit and from Prakrit, since the words γάνδαρος, Γεννοί, μαμάτραι, Μωριείς, σάκχαρον, σάμμα, and probably βαισήνης, are plainly Middle Indian forms. On the other hand, ἀποκολοκαύτωσις, βραχμᾶνες, Δορσάνης, and probably γουσαλίτης and εὐάν, seem to represent Sanskrit forms. Whether κάγκαμον, μαιί, and μαισώλος are to be referred to Sanskrit or to Prakrit cannot be determined. In this respect the Hesychian lexicon differs from the Indian words found in the great India of al-Birūnī. The famous Persian traveller endeavored to transcribe Sanskrit words into Arabic script, but he did not record Prakritisms (Sachau, Indo-arabische Studien, 5-6: "Die betreffenden Wörter sind ihm (al-B.) ohne Zweifel aus Büchern vorgelesen worden. . . . Die dictirenden Pandits haben das Sanskrit nachlässig ausgesprochen und standen hierin unter dem Einfluss der indischen Umgangssprache ihrer Zeit und Umgebung"). The Greek transcription of the Indian words in the Hesychian lexicon is in general very accurate. The principal deviations from exact transcription (so far as the Greek alphabet was able to reproduce faithfully the Indian sounds) are as follows.

a. *Vowels*.—Indian *ā* is represented by *o* in ἀποκολοκαύτωσις. Indian *i* is represented by *ai* in βαισήνης (?), but *ai* also stands for Sanskrit *ī* in μαισώλος. The representation of Sanskrit *u* by *a* in κάγκαμον is probably due to the influence of the following gutturals. Sanskrit *r* is represented by *op* in Δορσάνης. Sanskrit *āi*, *āu* are represented by *ε*, *ω* (Prakritisms), respectively, in Γεννοί and Μωριείς. The prothetic *ε* in εὐάν = **ε*Ψάν should be noted. In this latter word analogy with εὐ- has perhaps been at work.

b. *Consonants*.—Possibly *k* is represented by *γ* in γουσαλίτης, although such a change of initial *k* to *g* is extremely rare in Prakrit (Gray, Indo-Iran. Phonol., §120). Sanskrit *j* is represented by *γ* in Γεννοί. Sanskrit *ṣ* is represented, of course, by *σ* as in Δορσάνης, μαισώλος (possibly *ś* also is represented by *σ* in γουσαλίτης). Sanskrit *h* is transcribed by *χ* in βραχμᾶνες, but between vowels it is not represented by Hesychios, for we have μαιί, not *μαχί. The Sanskrit mediae aspiratae are represented, as we should expect, by the Greek mediae, in βαισήνης (?), γάνδαρος, Δορσάνης. The tenuis aspirata *kh* is represented by *κ* in ἀποκολοκαύτωσις, but *kḥh* is transcribed by *κχ* in σάκχαρον.

On the lexicographical side the Hesychian glosses are not altogether valueless. The rare Sanskrit root *kḥud* 'fuit' seems

to be found in ἀποκολοκαύτωσις, and the very uncommon Sanskrit *abhiṣṭhā* 'having a hostile army' or *pratiṣṭhā* 'hostile army' in βασιήνης, as well as the almost unknown *marmatra* 'protector of the vital parts' in μαμάτραι. The existence of a form **vayāna* 'creeping plant' beside *vayā* may possibly be inferred from the gloss εἰάν.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, N. J.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY.

MONTGOMERY SCHUYLER, JR.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Editus Auctoritate et Consilio Academicarum Quinque Germanicarum Berolinensis Gottingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vindobonensis. Vol. I, Fasc. I. Leipzig, Teubner, 1900. 7 marks.

It was inevitable that the laudatory epithets commonly affected by literary criticism in these days of systematic over-valuation should become as empty and colorless as the books which they ought never to have been forced to describe. But classical scholars may take pride in the thought that the much abused 'monumental' resumes all its proper value and significance in being applied to this great work of their department. The title itself, in its severe classical simplicity, indeed, in its very typography, has every right to suggest prototypes in marble and bronze. It is inscribed on a work truly monumental whether we consider its growth, proportions, importance or permanence. Nor do I now recall any single achievement of scholarship so utterly beyond the possibility of accomplishment by any one man and, at the same time, so distinctly and literally the work of a nation.

The Thesaurus was dreamed of, even cast in outline, by Friedrich August Wolf in the closing hours of the eighteenth century. One hundred years later, in the closing hours of the nineteenth century his dream begins to assume reality in the first section of a work which had already lingered for nearly half a generation in the sphere of the more vivid future. An account¹ of Wolf's plans and views was published in 1820, four years before his death. If their realization then would have prevented their realization now, we may be thankful that he met the usual disappointment of those whose ideas are so far in advance of their time. Comparative philology, historical grammar and syntax, scientific criticism of texts, epigraphy—all that makes the foundation and value of a great thesaurus as we understand it—were in their infancy. Thousands of inscriptions were yet to see the light, the riddle of Plautus was yet to be solved, critical editions did not exist. But, although it bore no fruit at the time, the great idea of the founder of modern scholarship was never forgotten, and with the rapid advance of philology the need of its realization became more and more urgent.

¹ See his *Kleine Schriften* II, p. 1192 f.

The second attempt¹ came when Maximilian II of Bavaria offered ten thousand gulden to defray the expenses of such a publication. Karl Halm of Munich then invited Ritschl of Bonn and Fleckeisen of Frankfort to join with him in a committee of arrangements. Buecheler, whose ability and scholarship were supplemented by youth—an indispensable qualification for a task which could not be finished in less than twenty years—was selected as the future editor. The committee met at Bonn to discuss and mature their plans on the first of April, 1857. Unfortunately, the traditional associations with that particular day of April were ominous of the fate of those plans in the immediate future. The next year Halm embodied the matter in a paper read before the Philological Association in Vienna.² The character and scope of the work as he then presented them were, in the main, those which are now adopted. The plan was received with marked approval, competent scholars rapidly presented themselves as co-workers, in many cases, even the business arrangements with Teubner had been made for the complete lexicons of single authors. These were the necessary preliminary and foundation of a thesaurus, as Wolf himself had pointed out sixty years before. But unexpected difficulties encountered by the committee were followed by political complications. The approaching war with Italy forced Maximilian to withdraw the promised financial support, and the projected work had to be abandoned. Again it was well. Migne's *Patrologia* would have been the basis of Christian Latinity, the corpus of inscriptions had not been begun, the Latin glossaries were not available, and how many really critical texts of even the standard Latin authors can be dated prior to 1860?

The third, and finally successful, struggle for the Thesaurus did not begin until 1882, the year that von Woelfflin succeeded Halm and Halm's ambitions at Munich. In that year Professor Woelfflin published his *Aufgaben der lateinischen Lexikographie* (*Rhein. Mus.* 37, 83-123). Its immediate result in the fall of 1883 was the first number of his *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik mit Einschluss des älteren Mittellateins*, als Vorarbeit zu einem Thesaurus Linguae Latinae mit Unterstützung der k. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften herausgegeben. This well-known journal has had the greatest influence in promoting and crystallizing the plan of the Thesaurus as now adopted.

It was felt to begin with³ that as a private enterprise the Thesaurus was an impossibility. It also became clear that the combined financial resources available to the Berlin and Munich

¹ M. Hertz, *Verhand. der Philologenversammlung zu Görlitz*, vol. 40 (1889), p. 1 f.; *Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1891, p. 671 f.; Woelfflin, *Arch.* 1, 2; 2, 485; 7, 509; Heerdegen, *Lat. Lex.*,³ p. 520 (Müller's *Hdb.*, vol. 2).

² *Verhand. der Philologenvers.* 18 (1859), p. 6; Heerdegen, l. c.

³ See Woelfflin, *Archiv* 7, 507.

academies would be insufficient. Finally, in 1889, Martin Hertz, in his opening address before the Philological Association at Görlitz¹ suggested the plan of enlisting in the enterprise not only the three great academies of Berlin, Munich, and Vienna, but also other learned societies. It seems to have been partly in consequence of Hertz's suggestions that the Prussian minister of education held a conference at Berlin on the 15th of February, 1891, to which Hertz, Mommsen, Vahlen, and Diels were invited. It was the general impression then that the Prussian government would supply the necessary means and Hertz was delegated to prepare a memorial of the significance, history, organization, and probable expense, of the Thesaurus. His results were presented after consultation with Buecheler, Dziatzko, von Hartel, H. Keil, C. F. W. Müller, von Woelfflin and Teubner. They appeared in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 1891, p. 671 f. and form an important document in the case.

The next two years were spent in discussion and preparation. Late in 1893 a plan based upon the outline presented to the committee by Professors Buecheler and Woelfflin was finally agreed upon. It was estimated that the Thesaurus would be completed in twenty years. Of this period, five to seven years had to be set aside for the collection of material, before an article could be written or a line published. The net expense, reckoned at about five hundred thousand marks, was assumed by the five great learned academies of Berlin, Göttingen, Leipzig, Munich, and Vienna. These are represented by a joint committee of management and supervision, consisting of Diels, von Wilamowitz, Leo, Ribbeck—and after Ribbeck's death in 1898, Brugmann—von Woelfflin, von Hartel, and afterwards, by co-optation, Buecheler. The last details were settled at the Göttingen conference of 1894, and in July of the same year the actual collection of material began.

The so-called Meusel system was the one adopted. A slip containing ten to fourteen lines of text was mechanically reproduced as many times as there were words in the passage. In number one, the first word was underlined, in number two, the second, and so on. When the entire text was exhausted the slips were arranged alphabetically in drawers and the result was a complete *index verborum et locorum* of the author. Moreover, not only the best texts were used, but all texts were revised and, whenever necessary, were furnished with brief marginal annotations by competent authorities.

In this way was compiled a complete index of all Latinity, including inscriptions, down to the Antonines. From that period until the seventh century, which is about the time when the oral tradition of cultivated Latin was finally broken,² only certain authors, for example, Apuleius, Commodianus, the Vulgate, and part of Tertullian, have a complete index. To these should be

¹ *Verhandl. der Philologenvers.*, vol. 40, p. 1.

² Gröber, *Archiv*, I, p. 35 f.

added all the poetical inscriptions and the Latin glossaries published by Loewe and Goetz. Others, for example, Ammianus Marcellinus, have a complete index of words but not of instances. The remainder were "excerpiert," that is, examined by the most competent authorities and an index made of whatever, in their best judgment, would be of any value for lexical purposes. Not only usage but, which is equally important, non-usage, was noted. The committee was, of course, the first to acknowledge that contraction to "excerpts," even for the latest period of Latinity is to be regretted. To err is human, and no human learning may foresee which words can become all-important in some future investigation. But time as well as money have their limitations. Finally, some "excerpts" were made from the usage of scholastic Latin in modern times.

Enthusiasm, industry, and an excellent organization made it possible to complete this stage of the great task in the fall of 1899, within six months of the estimated minimum of time. The two centres of storage and arrangement had been Göttingen and Munich, but it now became clear that, as long as the material was divided, the purpose of it would, in large measure, be defeated. The Göttingen half was therefore transported to Munich and the whole placed in the "Bureau of the Thesaurus," four rooms in the third story of the Munich Academy. The slips, of which there are more than four and a half millions, are arranged alphabetically by authors. The authors are arranged in chronological order. Three thousand drawers, each containing fifteen hundred slips, are required.

The second stage, compilation and publication, formally began on the first of October, 1900. The editor in chief is Dr. F. Vollmer, already known for his edition of the *Silvae* of Statius. He will devote his entire attention to the work until it is through the press. He and his associate Dr. Oscar Hey, former secretary of the managing committee, are assisted by Doctors G. Dittmann, W. Banner, W. Otto, A. Klotz, E. Lommatsch, P. Rabbow, E. Diehl, G. Lehnert, A. von Mess, H. Oertel, K. Prinz and E. Bickel. Etymology and derivation are in the hands of R. Thurneysen and W. Schulze, Romance relations and connections, in those of W. Meyer-Lübke.

Volume I, part 1, and volume II, part 1, have already appeared¹ and others will follow regularly and as rapidly as possible. When completed, which cannot be earlier than 1915, the work will consist of one hundred and twenty-five of these parts, forming altogether twelve volumes of about a thousand pages each.²

¹ It was decided to publish the volumes in pairs in order to avoid the delay otherwise certain to be caused by the length and difficulty of some articles as compared with others. Dr. Lommatsch, for example, had to give eight months to the compilation of *Ab*.

² The mathematically inclined may be interested to learn that, as each folio contains 83,000 letters and each part will average fifteen folios, Teubner's outlay, in the matter of type-setting alone, will have been upwards of 160,000,000 letters, by the time the Thesaurus is completed.

In the brief but sufficient introduction of two pages giving an account of the work and signed by the five academies one seems to recognize the elegant Latin of Professor Buecheler who, officially at least, is the one surviving link with the gallant attempt of 1858. Next follows an alphabetical list of Latin authors together with the editions used and the roll of scholars who prepared them for the card-index. The text is handsomely printed in double columns and, for convenience of reference, the lines are numbered. One observes with pleasure that the articles are signed by their compilers and that the honor of the first article, a *prima littera*, was given to Professor Woelfflin.

The method of arrangement and development followed by the compilers, which is the final result of years of discussion¹ will be better understood by the quotation of a sample article than by description. Within the space at my command, perhaps the best for this purpose is Prinz's treatment (vol. 2, pp. 238 and 239) of *apiscor*.

"**apiscor**, aptus sum, apisci. [*cf. c. ind. ἀπῶτι 'adipiscitur,' med. apayeti 'contingit, adipiscitur,' fortasse c. apio apere. Th.]* PAUL. FEST. 11 aptus cum propria significatione intellegatur, poni tamen solet pro adepto, sicut apisci pro adipisci. NON. 74 apisci : adipisci. 68 apisci : invenire. GLOSS. apiscitur : consequitur; apisci : adipisci; apiscendae τοῦ ἐπιτοχῆν. *Schmalz, Zeitschr. f. d. Gymnasialw., 1881, p. 104. Kalb, Juristenlatein, p. 11 sqq. Vox adamata Tacito, qui ea tamen nusquam usus est nisi in annalibus.* TER. Phorm. 406 apiscier sine iusta causa legitur ex Benlleii coniectura pro tradita forma adipiscier.

I deponens: I proprie: ACC. trag. 436 obviam ense it (ens. id *codd.*), quem (que *codd.*) advorsum aptus alter in promptu occupat. PLAVT. Epid. 668 sine me hominem apisci. SIS. hist. 94 postero die legatos Iguvium redeuntis apiscitur. LVCR. 6, 1235 nullo cessabant tempore apisci[t] ex aliis alios avidi contagia morbi. LVCR. 5, 808 crescebant uteri terram radicibus apti. CIC. Att. 8, 14, 3 eum nescio quo penetrasse itineribus occultandi sui causa an maris apiscendi (adipiscendi *M*). **2 translate:** EPIGR. inc. Gell. 1, 24, 3 (*Plauto tribuit Gellius*) postquam est mortem aptus Plautus, Comoedia luget. TITIN. com. 2 prius quam auro privatae purpuramque aptae simus (abtesimus, subtesimus *codd.*; purpuraque ap te *Buecheler*). PACVV. trag. 168 (NON. 234 aptus pro adeptus) quod ego in acie † celebri obiectans vitam bellando aptus sum. PLAVT. Rud. 17 litem apisci postulant peiurio. Capt. 775 hereditatem sum aptus. TER. Haut. 693 deorum vitam apti sumus. LVCIL. 542 ut ego effugiam quod te inprimis cupere apisci intellego. 757 si id quod concupisset non aptus <foret>. CIC. leg. 1, 52 ad finem bonorum, . . . quous

¹ Heerdegen, o. c.: W. Streitberg, Indog. Forsch., vol. XI, Anz., p. 272 Brugmann, id., vol. X, Anz., p. 371; Diels, Elementum, etc.

apiscendi causa sunt facienda omnia. SERV. SVLP. Cic. epist. 4, 5, 6 magnam ex ea re te laudem apisci (adipisci *pars codd.*). CAT. 64, 145 aliquid cupiens animus praegestit apisci. LIV. 4, 3, 7 spes apiscendi summi honoris (*cf.* 4, 6, 10 *ubi codd. plerique* apiscendi). 44, 25, 2 tantas apisci opes tantamque gloriam. MANIL. 3, 146 rebus apiscendis labor est. VAL. MAX. 9, 7, 3 facultas apiscendae potestatis. PLIN. nat. 35, 78 regnum apiscens. TAC. ann. 3, 31 praebuit iuveni materiem apiscendi favoris (*cf.* 3, 31. 4, 1. 4, 59. 15, 12. 15, 43). 4, 16 qui id flamonium apisceretur. 14, 27 Puteoli ius coloniae et cognomentum a Nerone apiscuntur (6, 3). PLIN. epist. 4, 6, 8 illud . . . apisci . . . arduum est. CORP. V 532, 7 civitatem Romanam apiscerentur. MARCIAN. (LEX Corn.) dig. 48, 8, 3, 4 is cuius familia sciente eo apiscendae recipiendae possessionis causa arma sumpserit . . . ex senatus consulto poena legis Corneliae punitur. VLP. dig. 24, 1, 40 apiscendae dignitatis gratia. 2, 14, 18 libertatem et hereditatem. 50, 4, 6 magistratum. IAV. dig. 41, 2, 51 possessionem (CELS. dig. 47, 2, 68. VLP. dig. 43, 2, 2 *et sic saepe apud* ICT.). *cogitatione*: LVCR. I, 448 nec ratione animi quam quisquam possit apisci *naturam*. TAC. ann. 6, 20 scientia Chaldaeorum artis, cuius apiscendae otium apud Rhodum, magistrum Thrasullum habuit.

II *passive*: PLAVT. Trin. 367 non aetate, verum ingenio apiscitur (adipiscitur P) sapientia. FAB. MAX. hist. 8 amitti quam apisci. FANN. or. Prisc. gramm. II 380, 9 haec apiscuntur *ἐπιτυχάσματα*.

structurae: apisci *aliquid*: *passim*; *aliquid ex aliqua re*: v. p. 239, 21 (i. e. the one example in Cic. epist. 4, 5, 6 where part of the Mss have adipiscendi); *aliquid ab aliquo*: TAC. ann. 14, 27; *alicuius rei*: TAC. ann. 6, 45 nihil abnuentem dum dominationis apisceretur. *synonyma*: adipiscor, consequor, adsequor, acquiror, comparo, *sim*. *derivata*: adipiscor, indipiscor, redipiscor.—Prinz."

The method and arrangement followed here are too evident to require further comment. The reader has before him the whole history of *apiscor* in a form as complete as it is clear and concise, indeed he literally has the autobiography of *apiscor*, since the phenomena have been so disposed as to make the word tell its own story. In an article of nearly five hundred words less than a score, setting aside mere headings, textual notes, and references to modern treatises, may be said to come from the compiler himself. In a work primarily intended for scholars this admirable method of stating the actual record in its completeness, but with a studied reserve of personal comment or deduction, is directly calculated to insure the undiminished value of the Thesaurus for the longest time possible. Scholarship becomes antiquated—fortunately. But references do not—even though they may tell a different story to a different generation—and the references are all here. Interpret them 'according to your lights.' Hence, although they must blame themselves if they do not know more

Latin than we, it is certain that our great grandchildren ought to derive much profit from perusing this great work of their thorough and methodical, even if misguided, ancestors. Moreover, while in the mere matter of size, the Thesaurus is likely to be eight or ten times as large as our largest Latin-English lexicons, the difference is still further increased by the compactness insured by this method.

The unique value of the Thesaurus to students of late Latin and the Romance languages is not well illustrated by the article on *apiscor*. The word had already become archaic as early as the time of Lucretius. But if we turn, for example, to the article on *Ab* (40 columns) we shall find that under "Recentiora" Dr. Lommatsch has given two columns to late uses of his preposition; such as *ab* for *quam* with comparatives, *ab* with the accusative, with the genitive, for the genitive, with adverbs and prepositions, for *sine*, *apud*, *ex*, etc.

The matter of proper names cannot be taken up exhaustively in a Thesaurus. This really belongs to a separate work and has already been done for a definite portion of Roman life and history in the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*. All names seem to have been considered in the Thesaurus, and with copious, but not necessarily exhaustive, references, inscriptional and otherwise. With Klebs-Dessau, Roscher's *Lexikon* and Pauly-Wissowa we hardly have a right to complain if the Thesaurus does not go over the same ground in the same way. Good examples of the method pursued in this line are Dr. Otto's articles on the names derived from *Ann.*, on Anna the goddess, and on Dido's "Sister Ann."

Nor can the Thesaurus enter into an exhaustive discussion of the 'Realien,' of the arts and sciences in all their causes and effects as regards language. It is primarily a complete record of word-usage. The student of those matters should consult special treatises or else work them out from the material before him. Here again the policy of reserve in personal comment was well chosen.

I should institute a comparison with standard lexicons, like those of Georges and Lewis and Short, if I thought it would be of any interest or value. But the Thesaurus stands on its own merits and would gain nothing, while the usefulness of these works would not be affected, since they were compiled in a different way and serve a different purpose.

All things considered, the work impresses me as a marvel of clarity, completeness and precision. Opinions may vary—theories of lexicography are many—as to whether the compilers are following the best order and method of development, or whether it might not have been better to lay more or less emphasis on this or that lexical specialty. Others—and those whose interest in the work is most intense—warn us, very properly, not to expect too much. No one should expect too

much. But it is not my purpose to discuss these points here. Whatever faults might be discovered by the most searching criticism the Thesaurus, beyond any doubt, begins by being immeasurably superior to anything which, hitherto, we could have even dared to hope for.

Objections to the Thesaurus, whatever they may be, are largely met by the fact that the four and a half millions of cards upon which it stands will be permanently preserved and available for consultation. Moreover, while it is true that time and money curtailed this part of the work in 1900, it would be quite possible, with intelligent co-operation, to fill in the missing portions of the card-catalogue, so that by 1915 the Bureau of the Thesaurus might actually have in its archives a complete index *totius Latinitatis* down to the seventh century. This might be consulted in person or, in case the scholar lived at too great a distance, by correspondence with an officer in charge who should be entitled to a reasonable fee for whatever statistics or other information he was asked to furnish. At any rate the receptacle, wherever it may be finally, of this priceless collection, must become the common temple of the modern Latin League. Here is its treasure; here, too, its oracle, like the Sibyl, but much more methodical, has inscribed her *responsa* on leaves for the perusal of every *impiger* (if not *pius*) Aeneas who would scale the walls of lofty Rome.

Organization and combination are the watch-words of the age, the unmeasured and immeasurable powers of the future. The Thesaurus is a living proof that the great idea is just as effective in the scholastic as in the industrial world. As such the Thesaurus is an earnest of what may yet be accomplished in time to come. Moreover, this superb monument, more enduring than bronze, will have been raised by and in honor of Latin scholarship at a net expense of less than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, thirty thousand pounds. What a mere trifle for organized subscription to undertake, especially in these days when there are so many men in Europe and America who, if it came to the mere measurement of their incomes alone would have to reject as irksome, if not insufficient, that historic labor-saving device employed by Ummidius and Ali Baba. With such an outlook, may we not hope that a trifling percentage of this surplus gold may be so transmuted as to reappear—'salvum sit quod tangam'—in a similar Thesaurus of the Greek Language and Literature?

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

Einführung in die Papyruskunde von OTTO GRADENWITZ.
S. Hirzel, Leipzig, 1900.

Those who have followed the progress of the papyri-studies and are acquainted with the results which have been given out in rapid succession during the past decade, have not failed to recog-

nize the importance of these studies to several branches of learning. The contributions of the Greek papyri from the ancient cities of Arsinoë, Hermopolis, Oxyrhynchos, and numerous villages of the Fayûm are of exceedingly great value to historical jurisprudence and to the students of Roman law. Ancient legal sources are being rapidly augmented and supplemented in a variety of details. Some of the darkest periods in the history of legal life and institutions in the Roman provinces during the second and third centuries of the Empire are beginning to be illuminated. The possibilities are by no means beyond realization, that the works of a classical jurist may yet come to light from the wreckage of ancient Egypt. In the interpretation of the Greek papyri, philologist and jurist must co-operate. So far, the jurists have been slow to recognize the importance of these investigations to their science. Of the considerable number of distinguished papyrologists at work to-day, trained jurists form a very small minority; and as the prince of jurist-philologists, Theodore Mommsen, has expressed the wish that he had been born fifty years later in order that he might begin anew his investigations in the history of the Empire in the light of these incomparable sources, others can not afford to be indifferent to their significance. The Egyptian papyri, as is well known, fall into two main groups, literary and documentary. Of the latter, those of a strictly legal character are the more numerous and form the more important class. Of the published papyri a large part has been indictments, pleadings, court proceedings, wills, marriage certificates, bills of divorce, leases, deeds of conveyance, mortgages, and numerous other documents of public and private character. All of these are of concern not only to the Roman law, but to the Greek, and to some extent to the Egyptian law.

It may be well to indicate briefly some of the results of a legal character which have been drawn from selected Greek papyri. The assertion of Mitteis in 1892 (*Reichsrecht und Volksrecht*), that there was a unity of law throughout the entire Graeco-Macedonian Empire, can no longer be contested, as is abundantly proved by evidence from the papyri. The importance of this fact to the proper understanding and estimation of the relation of Greek and Roman law to each other is not to be undervalued. According to a statute of the Alexandrian Greeks (to mention an interesting detail), descendants of descendants (i. e. grandchildren) have no right of inheritance by representation in the event of surviving descendants of the first degree. In other words, contrary to the Justinianian law of intestate succession, *successio per stirpes* was barred, should there be surviving children of the first degree. Further, a daughter has no further claim upon the estate of an intestate father beyond the amount of her *dos*, should there be sons surviving.

In the realm of Roman law there are fundamental contributions of many kinds. To mention one of general significance, it has

always been a question how Greek subjects, after the edict of Caracalla, could construct their testaments, which by Roman law must be in the Latin language. A recently disclosed papyrus of the year 235 very conveniently reveals the fact that the obstacle presented by the Caracallan *constitutio* was removed soon afterward by Alexander Severus.

The uncertain date of Caracalla's general order, ranging hitherto from 212-217, has by the papyri been narrowed down to months in the year 212. Many institutions regarded historically as post-Constantinian because first encountered in the Theodosian Code, are by the papyri set back to the first and second centuries. This extension of horizon is of incalculable value to the legal history of the Roman Empire.

Those who wish to be led into the study of the Greek papyri from the legal side will receive this book of Prof. Gradenwitz with satisfaction. The author has limited his studies in this volume to the consideration of problems within the realm of the private law, and especially to contracts.

Apart from papyri, bronze, stone and wax-tablets have transmitted public ordinances, statutes, and legal documents. Wax-tablets and papyri form one group, of which the papyri are by far the more numerous; bronze and stone another group, these latter being used for publication, while the former were used for safekeeping. *Lex* in its broadest sense was entrusted to the more dignified and enduring bronze or stone, papyrus fulfilled the humbler task of recording the fleeting events of daily life. The legal papyri show us how the injunctions of the statutes were executed, they reveal the application of the law to the concrete case, the contest of the parties at issue, the judgment, and ensuing execution—legal snapshots, so to speak—all with great exactness and in a great abundance of examples. The expressed purpose of the author is to put before the philologist the legal, and before the jurist the philological, rudiments of the papyri-study.

The undertaking is unique in the science of papyrology, and this volume is the outcome of practical work with students in the class-room in the restoration and interpretation of selected papyri. It is worthy of note that Gradenwitz, a jurist, is during the present semester offering a course to students of all faculties in the University at Königsberg, in the interpretation of selected papyri.

The volume falls into three main parts: I. On the theory of decipherment; II. Roman and Greek contract-types; III. Characteristic elements entering into the individual transaction.

The theory of decipherment and restoration presents very little that was not known to those who possess already published collections of papyri. The author has chosen as his working-model No. 613 from the Berlin collection. The document is printed first in the original and then as restored by the process of analysis and dismemberment, as a result of the author's method of analyzing first the document in its legal aspect and then with reference

to its grammatical form. A badly mutilated document may be restored by a comparison with analogous cases, by due regard to the sequence of time entering into the legal transaction, and by the assistance derived from words of style in similar instruments. It is the second part which presents matter of a different character from previous publications.

Types of contract from Greek and Roman law have been taken, such as the Greek sale of domestic animals and slaves, the Roman sale of slaves, loans and mortgage. The comparison of Greek and Roman contracts of sale reveals a noteworthy difference between the Roman conception and that of the Greek papyri. The Roman written document proceeds, as in the primitive *mancipatio*, from the standpoint of the buyer: *emit mancipioque accipit—pro eo homine pretium eius accepisse et habere se dixit* (i. e. *is qui vendidit*).

The Greek document proceeds from the standpoint of the seller, in the form of a declaration or acknowledgment that three things have happened—that is, the seller *ὁμολογῶ* that he has sold (*πεπρακέναι*), that he has received the price (*ἀπέχειν*), and that he stands ready to warrant undisturbed possession against eviction by a third party (*βεβαιώσσειν*).

The Roman document distinguishes between the creation of the *jus in personam* and the *jus in rem*—that is, there is a separation of obligation and ownership.

The Greek document is a declaration of the party relinquishing rights and assuming duties, and the idea of a transfer of ownership does not appear in this threefold declaration of the seller.

Of loans, the most frequently occurring type is the *χειρόγραφον*, a note of hand in the form of a statement of indebtedness addressed to the creditor. Less frequent is the *ὁμολογία* form, an instrument drawn by a notary containing a minute personal description of the debtor. It is noteworthy that in the autograph documents (*χειρόγραφα*) this description is always lacking, while in the notarial instruments (*ὁμολογίαι*) it is always present. The purport of this is to protect an illiterate person (*ἀγράμματος*) who binds himself through an instrument written by another whom he has called to his assistance, against the possibility of being presented with a note for payment which was not drawn by his order—a circumstance which might easily occur where the same name frequently occurs. Identification of the parties is attained through *signalement* giving the names of ancestors, age, physical description, scars, etc. The Greek papyri give evidence of the fact that the Greeks inclined to written documents in transactions which were usually oral among the Romans. The transactions which the Romans called *mancipatio*, the papyri show were written among the Greeks in the case of *res mancipi* (slaves, domestic animals, and land).

It remains to speak of one important feature of this book which Prof. Gradenwitz calls a new mechanical expedient for the

restoration of mutilated papyri—that is, a ‘contrary-index’; in other words, an index of words arranged in alphabetic order reading from right to left. Since the final letters only of many words are transmitted, it happens that the process of restoration must proceed in the reverse from the usual order. Following out his idea of the value of such a contrivance, the author has added a vocabulary of some 5000 words of those found to recur most frequently in the papyri.

Viewed as a whole, this volume of Prof. Gradenwitz is exceedingly valuable as an introduction to the study of legal papyri, but we venture to predict that those who have had no legal training will find it difficult to follow the author through his discussions of the larger part of the volume.

LEIPZIG, GERMANY.

JAMES J. ROBINSON.

Outlines of the History of the English Language. By T. N. TOLLER, M. A., Professor of English in the Owens College, Manchester. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1900.

King Alfred’s Version of the Consolations of Boethius. Done into Modern English, with an Introduction. By WALTER JOHN SEDGEFIELD, Litt. D., Editor of King Alfred’s Old English Version of the ‘De Consolatione.’ Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, MDCCCC.

The first work, whose title is given above, is one of the Cambridge Series for Schools and Training Colleges, and it is evidently well fitted for the purpose for which it was written. It is devoted chiefly to the history of the language in its oldest period, ten of its thirteen chapters being given to the Oldest English, English before the Norman Conquest, or Anglo-Saxon, as some prefer to call it. Prof. Toller’s view as to the use of this term may be seen in the last section of the tenth chapter (p. 202), and, while granting that “the term Anglo-Saxon may be of use,” he thinks that “it is not without its disadvantages,” for “it tends to obscure the continuity in the life of the language, and to give to one stage of it the character almost of a foreign speech;” so “it is certainly better to speak of Old or Oldest English.” There is now a consensus of scholars as to the use of this term, which certainly preserves the continuity, while to those who know, there is no danger of an obscuration of meaning in still referring to this period of the language as Anglo-Saxon.

The first chapter is merely introductory; the following nine chapters treat the language, with competent insight and greater fullness than is usual in such works, down to the coming of the Normans.

The sixth chapter treats the so-called Latin of the Second Period with particular fullness, and a long list of Latin words is given “that made their way into English before about the middle

of the eleventh century" (p. 79 et seqq.). Certain Old English poems and their vocabulary follow, and an investigation of the Scandinavian element is made in the eighth chapter.

The works of King Alfred and of Aelfric are next considered, and a synopsis of the grammar of Old English is given in the tenth chapter. It is doubtful, however, whether this will be well understood by those entirely ignorant of Old English. It is hard for a scholar to realize that, at this stage of instruction, such things must be treated as milk for babes, boiled down to the comprehension of young students. These chapters comprise two hundred of the less than three hundred pages of the work.

The eleventh chapter treats the Norman-French element (Anglo-Norman, or Anglo-French, as some prefer to call it), and the English from the Conquest to Chaucer inclusive. The work seems to have grown under the author's hands, with the result that the last two chapters are much compressed. The twelfth chapter, in some thirty pages, covers the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a period that deserves a more careful and thorough treatment.

In the extract from Occleve in this chapter (p. 242) the author takes *wote* in *men wote* as plural, but it is possible that *men* here may be the indefinite, and hence *wote* is singular, although Chaucer himself has several times *ye woot*, showing that the old distinction between singular and plural forms was being disregarded. The last chapter is very meagre, only fourteen pages, and we miss all mention of Ben Jonson as a representative of "the language of the early part of the seventeenth century," but every prominent writer could not be included, even if Ben Jonson's "Discoveries" will bear mention in any treatise on the language of this period. His remark that "Spenser, in affecting the ancients, writ no language" is, however, twice quoted. We miss titles to the several chapters and an index, which would have increased the convenience of reference, and we have noted some misprints, which it seems impossible to avoid in the best-regulated printing-office. More exact references to works quoted would also have been helpful. We have, however, much to be thankful for.

Dr. Sedgefield's edition of King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (Oxford, 1899) was briefly noticed in this Journal (Vol. XX, No. 4), and now we are indebted to him for a modern English version of the prose text, and a metrical version of the *Metra*, or *Lays*, of Boethius, but why it should appear as "Consolations," we are nowhere informed. The Introduction treats of King Alfred's reforms and his zeal for learning, enumerating his translations of Orosius, Bede, the Dialogues and the Pastoral Care of Pope Gregory the Great, Boethius, and the Soliloquies of St. Augustine. The editor thinks that the Orosius, Boethius, Pastoral Care, and Soliloquies

"were put into English by the King himself," the Dialogues, perhaps, by Bishop Werfrith, and the Bede, "in its original form, was also the work of one of the King's learned priests." This has been one of the mooted questions in Old English literature.

The introduction treats, further, of the work of Boethius and his fate, King Alfred's method of translation, which he has himself described for us, the MSS of the Old English version, discussed more fully in Sedgfield's edition of the Old English, the prose and the poetic version of the metres, *both* of which the editor now thinks were made by King Alfred—another disputed question,—King Alfred's own comments and additions, and lastly the later English versions of the "Consolations." This last section is a distinct addition. We know of no English version between King Alfred and Chaucer, but after Chaucer's well-known Boëce, we have a metrical version made by a certain Johannes Capellanus, i. e. John Walton, *circa* 1410, "printed for the first and only time in 1525, in *The Boke of Comfort* at the monastery of Tavistock;" one in prose made by George Colvile, or Coldewel, and dedicated to Queen Mary in 1556; a partial one of the *carmina* in a variety of metres, made about 1563 by Sir Thomas Challoner; one made by no less a personage than Queen Elizabeth herself in 1593, said to be "fairly accurate and very literal;" one in *terza rima* by a certain "J. T." in 1609; a metrical version by Harry Coningsby in 1664; an anonymous one by "A Lover of Truth and Virtue" in 1674, at Oxford; and one in 1695 by Richard Lord Viscount Preston, the *Metra* in metre and the *Prosa* in prose.

Four versions are mentioned from the eighteenth century, of which, as of the preceding, short specimens are printed, one in heroic couplets by William Causton, in 1730; a second in the octosyllabic couplet by the Rev. Philip Ridpath, in 1785; a third by a Scotchman, Robert Duncan, in blank verse, in 1789; and an anonymous translation of the *Metra* in octosyllabic quatrains, with the Latin opposite, in 1792. The only translation mentioned of the nineteenth century is one by H. R. James, London, 1897. These various translations show the continued popularity of the work. Dr. Sedgfield has translated into prose the five books of the prose version, and into thirty-one Lays the *Metra*. The metre used is an imitation of the Old English alliterative line, four accents to the verse, which the present writer has long since concluded to be the best measure for the translation of Old English poetry. Success in handling this measure depends of course upon the skill of the translator, to whom should be charged any defects in attaining the ideal and not to the measure itself.

The present translation is approximately line-for-line, and, on a cursory examination, appears to be very fairly done. I hope it may induce others to give us similar translations of Old English poems.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REPORTS.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXVIII (1899).

Janvier.

F. Lot. Nouveaux essais sur la provenance du cycle arthurien. II. La patrie des "Lais Bretons." 48 pages. "La théorie de la provenance exclusivement armoricaine des récits dits de la Table Ronde vient de faire, avec M. Brugger, une rentrée bruyante. L'auteur, reprenant la thèse de M. Zimmer, soutient particulièrement que tous les *lais* sans exception sont originaires de la Bretagne continentale. Ceux qui ont cru qu'une partie, au moins, de ces petits poèmes pouvait provenir de la Grande-Bretagne (du pays de Galles) sont dénoncés comme des gens sans cervelle et même sans moralité."

G. Raynaud. Le dit des outils de l'hôtel (ms. du Musée Condé). 12 pages. Critical edition of the text, with introduction and glossary.

Ov. Densusianu. Étymologies romanes. 9 pages.

Giacomo de Gregorio. Ultima parola sulla varia origine del Sanfratellano, Nicosiano e Piazzese. 21 pages.

C. Salvioni. Note etimologiche e lessicali. 21 pages.

Mélanges. Ad. Mussafia; G. Paris; A. Thomas; E. Trojel; S. Berger.

Comptes rendus. Wesselofsky, Quelques nouvelles versions orientales du roman d'Alexandre (J. Anitchkoff). Ph. Aug. Becker, Der Quellenwert der Storie Nerbonesi (Raymond Weeks). Remarques sur le compte rendu de Maxeiner Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Wörter im Mittelhochdeutschen (Theodor Maxeiner). Réponse à Maxeiner (F. Piquet). Université de Paris: Bibliothèque de la Faculté des lettres III-IV (P. Meyer).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXII 4, discussion of etymologies (G. Paris). Bulletin de géographie historique et descriptive, 1897 (P. Meyer).

Chronique. "Rapport de M. V.-H. Friedel sur sa mission en Espagne."

Livres annoncés sommairement. 51 titles. The historical syntax of the atonic personal pronoun in Italian, by Oliver Martin Johnston. A study of the romance of the Seven Sages, by Killis Campbell.

Avril.

A. Thomas. Variétés étymologiques. 45 pages.

G. Paris. Caradoc et le serpent. 18 pages. "Dans le numéro de novembre 1898 des *Modern Language Notes*, Miss Carrie A. Harper, de Bryn Mawr College (États-Unis), a publié un très intéressant article sur la belle histoire de Caradoc, lequel fut délivré, par le dévouement d'une femme, d'un serpent qui s'était attaché à son bras." "L'intérêt de cette étude est de montrer clairement la pénétration de thèmes purement celtiques—armoricains ou gallois—dans la poésie française du xii^e siècle et de faire entrevoir, par delà cette pénétration, celle de la mythologie irlandaise dans la tradition brittonique."

A. Jeanroy. Notes sur le Tournoiement des Dames. 13 pages.

P. Meyer. Trois nouveaux manuscrits des sermons français de Maurice de Sully. 24 pages. "Je désespère de jamais parvenir à dresser une liste complète des manuscrits qui nous ont conservé la totalité ou des extraits des sermons français de Maurice de Sully. Voici la quatrième fois que je reprends cette tâche toujours inachevée, et, instruit par l'expérience, je n'ose pas assurer que ce soit la dernière."

Mélanges. L. Katona; E. Teichmann; Ferdinand Lot; P. Meyer; G. Paris; J. Calmette.

Comptes rendus. Studier i modern sprakvetenskap. I. (Johan Vising). Kate Oelzner Petersen, On the sources of the Nonne Prestes Tale (Lucien Foulet). Catálogo de la Real Biblioteca—Manuscritos: Crónicas de España descritas por Ramon Menéndez Pidal (Alfred Morel-Fatio). Vierter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig (Mario Roques). Gustav Weigand, Samosch- und Theiss-Dialekte (Mario Roques). Gustav Weigand, Linguistischer Atlas des dacorumänischen Sprachgebietes (Mario Roques). Bibliografia românească veche, 1508—1830 (Mario Roques). Studii de filologie română (Mario Roques).

Chronique. Death of Dr. Wilhelm Rüdow.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 8 titres. Hermann Piatt, Neuter II in Old French.

Juillet.

F. Lot. Nouvelles études sur la provenance du cycle arthurien. III. Morgue la Fée et Morgan-Tud. IV. Melvas. V. Guillaume de Rennes, auteur des *Gesta Regum Britanniae*. VI. L'épisode des Larmes d'Énide dans Érec. VII. Le Chevalier Alban. VIII. Bledericus de Cornwall. IX. Dinas Emreys. X. La table et la chaire d'Arthur en Cornwall. 27 pages.

G. Huet. Sur l'origine de Floire et Blanchefleur. 12 pages.

"Depuis le travail d'Édéléstand du Ménil (1855), il est généralement admis que le conte de *Floire et Blanchefleur* est d'origine byzantine." "Je crois cependant qu'il y a quelque chose à dire en faveur de la thèse d'une origine orientale ou, pour parler plus nettement, *arabe*, de la légende."

S. Berger. Les bibles castillanes. Introduction. I. L'Histoire Générale d'Alphonse X. II. Traductions d'après le texte Latin: §1. Manuscrit aragonais de la première moitié de la Bible, avec les psaumes d'Herman l'Allemand; §2. Seconde moitié de la Bible; §3. Ancien Testament; §4. Versions perdues du Nouveau Testament. 49 pages.

C. Salvioni. Ancora dei Gallo-Itali di Sicilia (Replica al Signor G. de Gregorio). 12 pages.

Mélanges. A.-G. Krüger; P. Meyer; G. Paris; George Doncieux (*bis*).

Comptes rendus. Vincenzo Crescini, Il Cantare di Florio e Biancafiore (G. Paris). 9 pages. A. J. Botermans, Die hystorie van die seuen wijse mannen van Rome (G. Paris). H. P. B. Plomp, De middelnederlandsche bewerking van het gedicht van den VII vroeden van binnen Rome (G. Paris). Wilhelm Cloëtta, Die Enances Vivien: ihre Ueberlieferung, ihre cykliche Stellung (Raymond Weeks).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXIII 1-2, discussion by A. Jeanroy and G. Paris. Revue de phil. franç. et de litt. XII, contents by P. Meyer. Bull. de la soc. des anc. textes franç. 1898. Zeitschrift für französ. Sprache und Litt. XIII-XIX.

Chronique. Death of M. Charles Marty-Laveaux.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 17 titles. Cornell University Library: Catalogue of the Dante Collection presented by Willard Fiske, Part I.

Octobre.

L. Brandin. Le manuscrit de Hanovre de la Destruction de Rome et de Fierabras. 19 pages, with double facsimile.

S. Berger. Les bibles castillanes. III. Revisions d'après l'Hébreu. IV. La Bible du Grand Maître. V. La Bible de Ferrare. (Appendice: Note sur les bibles portugaises, par Mme. C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos et S. Berger). 60 pages.

F. Lot. Caradoc et Saint Patern. 11 pages.

J. Vising. L'Amuissement de l'R finale en Français. 19 pages (including discussion with Herman Andersson).

J. Leite de Vasconcellos. Phonologia Mirandesa. 23 pages.

Comptes rendus. Giovanni Mari, I trattati medievali di ritmica

latina (G. Paris). E. Stengel, Die altprovenzalische Lieder-sammlung C der Laurenziana in Florenz (Louis Brandin). M. Pelaez, Il canzoniere provenzale C Laurenziano (Louis Brandin). Edward Moore, Studies in Dante (Paget Toynbee). 9 pages.

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXIII 3, discussion of etymologies by G. Paris. Literaturblatt für german. und rom. Phil. XVIII-XIX, list of contents.

Chronique. Death of Eugène Kölbing. Homenaje á Menéndez Pelayo en el año vigesimo de su profesorado. K. Vollmöller, Gesellschaft für romanische Litteratur.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 21 titles. Hermann Suchier, Aucassin und Nicolette: vierte Auflage. Samuel Paul Molenaer, Li livres du Gouvernement des rois. Thomas Edward Oliver, Jacques Milet's Drama "La Destruction de Troye la Grant," its principal source, its dramatic structure. Arsène Darmesteter, A historical French grammar: authorized English edition by Alphonse Hartog. Frederick Henry Sykes, French elements in Middle English.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

HERMES, XXXV.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Asianismus und Atticismus. Modern scholars differ as to the meaning of the term Asiatic style, but they are unanimous in condemning this style as a whole. Cicero, whose judgment on this matter is incomparably the best that we can get, uses the term somewhat elastically, and though he denounces certain characteristics of this style, he does not engage in a sweeping condemnation of the *Asiatici* and the *genus Asiaticae dictionis*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus is responsible for the fact that some scholars regard the expression Asiatic as synonymous with Hellenistic, and that others look upon Asiatic oratory as identical with *corrupta eloquentia*. The later rhetoric was not a revival of the old, for from Gorgias to Philostratus there was an unbroken succession of Sophists whose influence on Roman literature was great. But their power was ephemeral, and only the classic writers were remembered, the Asiatics were forgotten. The florid style of later times was merely one of the fixed types, which an orator was obliged to follow, if he chose that mode of treatment, and the artificiality of the period made it popular. Its faults, which were Hellenistic rather than Asiatic, were the combination of musical and rhythmical elements and the use of periphrases and fine words. Atticism finally triumphed, because of the influence of the grammarian and the philosopher and the need of a lofty model for the Roman who would learn Greek.

B. Niese, Zur Geschichte des Hellenismus, constructs Achaean

chronology from Polyb. II 41-43 by beginning with the founding of the league and reckoning the fourth and eighth years as four and eight (not three and seven); dates the battle of Sellasia 222 by the authority of Polyb. IV 35 and by the death of Ptolemy III before 221; and makes Adaeus, mentioned by Damoxenus, a Thracian prince conquered by Ptolemy III.

R. Reitzenstein, *Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis*. Apollodorus takes from an early epic poem, which Aeschylus and Pindar (Isthm. VII) also followed, the oracle, the struggle with Thetis, the feast on Pelion and the gifts, and from the Cypria the wrath of Zeus and intervention of Hera. Hesiod's epithalamium (Fr. 38, 102 Rz., pap. gr. 55 of Strassburg) is the source of Pindar (Nem. V), Euripides (I. A.) and Catullus. However, the likeness of Catullus' description to Theocritus XV and the burning love of the bridal pair show that he follows more immediately an Alexandrian poem, which described also the marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne. The praise of marriage in Gregory Nazianzen (Migne III 522) belongs to a rhetorical poem of the same class and period.

E. Schwartz, *Kallisthenes Hellenika*. The denial of Athens' treaty with Persia in 449 was taken in 333 from Theopompus, who had then published 25 volumes. His error in dating the treaty in 467 (for 449) is due to Ephorus, whose account of the two expeditions is so similar that Lycurgus made them into one. This combination in the Menexenus proves that the dialogue is not Platonic. The latter half of the epigram in Ephorus is spurious.

C. Robert, *Die Ordnung der olympischen Spiele und die Sieger der 75.-83. Olympiade*. The Oxyrhynchus papyri compared with Phlegon and others show that after Ol. 78 the games lasted five days: I. 1. στάδιον. 2. δίαυλος. 3. δόλιχος. II. 4. πέπταθλον. III. 5. πάλη. 6. πύξ. 7. παγκράτιον. IV. 8. παίδων στάδιον. 9. παίδων πάλη. 10. παίδων πύξ. 11. σπλίτης. V. 12. τέθριππον. 13. κέλης. In earlier times there were only three days, Nos. 4-7, 12, 13 coming on the second day, Nos. 8-11 on the third. The papyri not only complete the list of victors, but date sculptors and epinikia. Thus we learn that Pythagoras of Rhegium (b. 510) was active as late as 448, that Polycleitus worked as early as 460, his brother, Naucydes, in 448. The Xenocles statue is probably the work of the younger Polycleitus, and Daedalus the grandson of Polycleitus the elder. We can also date two statues of Myron (456 and 448). Bacch. VI and VII are set at 452, Pind. O. I-III, X, XI at 476, and IX at 468. It appears that O. IV celebrates a chariot-race, and that O. V. belongs to 448, O. XIV probably to 488.

H. Diels reads in Laertius' *Parmenides* Ἀμεινία Διοχαίρα. Sotion drew from Timaeus.—G. Kaibel reads in Apul. XI 24 *Osiriacam stolam*, 5 *Ortygiam Proserpinam*, 10 *auxillas id est altaria*.—J.

Vahlen reads in Cic. ad Att. I 14. 3 *utrum <crederet>* Crassum inire and defends *excepisse laudem*; in Cic. de leg. II 26. 66 defends *paratissimus*, reads I 23. 61 *suis circumdatus moenibus*, Gell. 1. 9. 3 *idoneusque <inventus>*, 17. 15. 5 *vivendi est <amittantur>*.

E. Fabricius, *Zum Stadtrecht von Urso*. The first part of the law was made by Caesar, when he planned to found the colony, the second part (c. 123-134) was drawn up after his death by Antony, who presumed to change the regulations regarding *patroni*. The whole was hastily put together by a careless secretary, who copied corrections as well as the part corrected without regard to consistency.

J. Kromayer, *Zum griechischen und römischen Heerwesen*. In the Macedonian phalanx the distance between the lines as well as the space allotted each man was three feet, and the spear was 21 feet long. These intervals gave elasticity and allowed light-armed troops to pass through, and the space for each man was not too great, since his shield and the spears of the back rows needed room for play. Nor would the spear be too heavy, since, with three feet between the hands, the pressure is barely 6 kg. Moreover, these figures from Polybius agree exactly with mediæval practice in Europe. In the Roman *acies* the spaces were six feet in each direction, since more room was needed for the attack with the sword and for the spring forward or back, whatever might be the weapons of the enemy, but the back rows stood closer together.

J. Beloch, *Zur Geschichte des Eurypontidenhauses*. All but *two* of Laotychidas' ancestors (Hdt. VIII 131) must have been kings, else he would hardly have succeeded to the throne; the second Messenian War belongs to the time of the elder Laotychidas, the seventh century, and is the subject of Tyrtæus' poems. It was not King Agis who fell at Mantinea (between 250 and 245 B. C.), but the regent Agis, his cousin. Pausanias' account (VIII 10. 6) of the Arcadian league is consistent with the history and archaeology of the period.

B. Niese, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher*. The introduction to 2 Mac. is genuine, for it cannot be separated from the body of the work, nor divided; it does not refer to Antiochus IV, but to Antiochus VII, though with fictitious details, and there was trouble under Demetrius II, as it says. So 2 Mac., which was used by 3 and 4 Mac., was written 125/4 B. C., and is older than 1 Mac. The style of Jason, from whom 2 Mac. was taken, and who wrote about 161-153, is very rhetorical and prone to exaggeration, yet he has the authority of a contemporary. The epitomator increases the religious and marvelous elements, and alters some statements, but shows no enmity to Judas' brothers. 1 Mac. consists of two parts; the first is drawn from Jason, the second (c. 8-15), which is less full and more conversant with Greek sources, is largely

dependent on a chronicle of the Seleucidae. 1 Mac. imitates very well the style of the Old Testament, and thus gained respect, but it condones or omits all that is discreditable to the Jews, changes the right order of events to give a religious impression, and distorts history to strengthen the Asmonean claim to the high priesthood by omitting Jason and Menelaus and emphasizing the importance of Mattathias and Simon. So 2 Mac. is generally more reliable, as in Judas' victories (3. 38, 14. 31 ff.) and the purification of the temple (10. 1 ff.). Antiochus IV died in 165/4, as 2 Mac. tells us, and the error in Eusebius, which was not original but is redactional, came from giving Antiochus III one year too many. The letters in 2 Mac. and the close of 1 Mac. are both genuine, the documents in the latter may be spurious, but are not interpolated. Josephus used Jason or 2 Mac., perhaps not directly.

G. Schultz, Zur Theorie der antiken Metrik. Ancient poetry had no verse accent and often neglected equality of time, in order to avoid the monotonous succession of alternate long and short syllables. Thus the substitution of an iambus in trochaic verse gives variety to the measure, and a similar result is gained in the hexameter by the omission of the second half of the third and sixth feet. Since this left only five whole feet, the elegiac poets rightly called the metre pentameter.

F. Bechtel shows that ἵππος occurs very often in Eretrian names, and in Oxyr. Pap. II 29 reads θακοθαλπάδος.—H. Dessau. The fact that the Asiatic leap-year gave 32 days to March accounts for Galen's statement (XVII 1. 22 K.) that the Roman leap-year was thus constituted, and dates Ps.-Chrysostom's Easter address 387 A. D.—F. Blass extracts verses of Menander from Clem. Alex. I pp. 342 and 399 Ddf. (perhaps pp. 238, 352, 353), and shows that, when poetry was written without notes, the thesis (stress) was marked by a dot beneath, but, when the notes were added, the arsis received the dot above.—M. Conrat proves Hieronymus to be the author of the *Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanorum* by his respect for Papinian, his theological attitude, and his ascription of the constitution of 390 to Theodosius.—Th. Mommsen holds that *praetorium* in the *limes* inscriptions means "the governor's dwelling," and shows from a papyrus that the Roman soldiers of the Empire were not paid in cash, but were supplied with necessaries, which were charged to their account.

M. Wellmann, Zur Geschichte der Medicin im Alterthum. The source of Athenaeus' medical citations in Books I-III was a critic of Hippocrates, who lived before Varro, but later than Hikesius, as his views on the hygiene of water and wine indicate. This must have been Heraclides of Tarentum, whose Symposium was a compilation of rules for eating and drinking.—Chrysippus' cure for spitting blood by binding the limbs to prevent inflam-

mation shows that he knew Praxagoras' theory that the veins contained the blood, the arteries only air. It was also from Praxagoras that he learned his observation of fever from the pulse. So he flourished about 300 B. C., and his pupil Erasistratus about 260 as physician to Ptolemy II and III. It was Erasistratus' father, Cleombrotus, who lived at the court of Seleucus I and cured Antiochus I in 293.

P. Natorp, *Platos Phaedrus*. The language of the *Phaedrus* places it in the middle period, but it cannot come after the *Republic*, which rejects poetic diction, nor the *Symposium*, which puts Socrates in the background. It was written 392-390, soon after *Isoc.* 13, since it praises the orator's adoption of Platonic doctrines, emphasizes and extends the arguments of the oration, while the attack on Isocrates in the *Euthydemus* excludes any long interval. It also stands close to the *Gorgias*, which was written 394; its milder tone is for contrast and for conciliation. Its presentation of the doctrine of ideas in somewhat vague language and as a novel conception puts it earlier than the middle dialogues; its positive tone marks a new epoch. Since dialectic appears as a strange term, the *Phaedrus* is earlier than the *Euthydemus* and *Cratylus*, which use the word freely, while its method and cosmology show only a slight advance upon the *Gorgias*. It lacks the fundamental notions of the *Theaetetus*, and the principles (*ἀρχαί*) of the *Phaedo*. The strong contrast that it makes between being and becoming is a further reason for assigning the *Phaedrus* to an earlier date than that of the *Phaedo*, the *Phaedo* showing greater freedom from Eleatic influence. The *Phaedo* also uses closer reasoning to prove immortality from spontaneous motion, and gives a clearer argument for the separation of the physical and the spiritual. Though the punishment of the damned may seem severer in the *Phaedrus*, this is no indication of a later date, for such details are artistic, not philosophic.

M. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Lesefrüchte*, reads *Lys.* 32. 7 *τέως μὲν τῆν θυγατέρα* and *ib.* 20 brackets *ἰμάρια*; publishes the decree of *BCH XX* 124, which is later than 20 A. D., marking the rhythms and noting the periphrases as characteristic of the Asiatic style; shows in *BCH IV* 352 that the *Myrinus* and *Dioscurides* who are already known, lived as late as Augustus, and so are not the persons mentioned in this inscription; reads *Pl. Soph.* 221 *ῥάβδους καὶ τεράμους*, denies any reference to a women's rights movement in the *Medea*, since abstract philosophy is often put in the mouth of the chorus, and holds that the stories regarding *Aspasia's* culture are fictitious; *Thuc.* II 6. 2-3 is a later addition by the author, in order to free the Athenians from guilt, but ch. 7-24, speeches and all, were written at the beginning of the war, while *Archidamus* and *Pericles* were still prominent; *Il. XIX* 369-424 is a late addition derived from *XVI* 130-154 and *XVII* 426-440.

G. Busolt, Zur Chronologie des peloponnesischen Kriegen. We must put the first invasion of Attica in June, when we consider that the precession of equinoxes made the harvest twelve days later in Hesiod's time (Works 383) than now, that the farmer regards an early season as the norm, and that the enemy were on this occasion delayed two weeks beyond the time they had originally intended to make their invasion. Moreover, Italian harvests are now a month earlier than in antiquity. The treasury decrees and the time of the Lesbian revolt confirm this date.

D. Detlefsen, Die Werthangaben in der Naturalis Historia des Plinius. The order of values compiled by Pliny was: diamond, pearl, emerald, citrus-wood, myrrhines, crystal, amber, cinnamon, balsam, gold, ivory, silk, purple, nard, silphium, silver, cochineal, tortoise-shell, ostrich-feathers. In giving the prices of perfumes and condiments he follows tradesmen's lists. He also gives prices for slaves, animals, wines and food-stuffs.

R. Reitzenstein, Aus der Strassburger Papyrussammlung, publishes a fragment of Ar. Nub. (1371-91, 1407-28), which shows that R and V are by no means to be trusted to the exclusion of the other MSS. He also publishes fragments of Apollonius Rhodius (3. 145-161), Favorinus and scholia to Iliad I, and reads in *pap. gr.* 53. l. 12 *καὶ ἀπει]σιν*. This last document shows the prototype from which the Greek originals of Terence's prologues developed.

C. F. Lehmann, Weiteres zu Aristoteles 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία X. Solon introduced the Euboean talent to supplant the Aeginetan, and to help the poor, who could get more for their money and discharge obligations with the new coinage. The stater here is the double mina. The error regarding measures may be due to a provision that heaped-up measure should be used in certain cases. Pheidon flourished 754 B. C., and Hdt. VI 127 is taken from Hecataeus without regard to chronology.

C. Robert, Archaeologische Nachlese. The Capitoline head (Helbig 478) is an ideal portrait of Hesiod; this type like the common type of blind Homer, was invented by the Rhodian school, while the type in the mosaic of Monnus belongs to the fourth century, like the blind Homer of Silanion (Helbig 283). The scene of the Aldobrandini marriage is the maiden's chamber, the male figure is Hymenaeus, the musician is hired for the procession, and beside her is the *nymphetria* with a servant, while at the left the mother prepares to sprinkle the bride with holy water. The frieze of the Meidias vase represents Attic heroes living with Medea in the garden of the Hesperides. In the cameo de la Sainte Chapelle the suppliant is Vonones, the bearer of the globe is Phraatakes, both Parthian kings, and the rider of the winged horse is C. Caesar entering Hades and receiving the homage of Phraatakes. The prince on the Brunswick onyx vase is also C. Caesar.

A. Stein dates the fall of Commodus' favorite Perennis in 185 by CIL III Supp. 14137, which mentions Longaeus Rufus as *praefectus praetorio* in Nov. 185.—M. Lehnerdt shows that the 14th century possessed no more of Tacitus' *Historiae* than we do.—P. Stengel calls attention to the fact that the winds were not regularly worshipped till the thank-offerings of the Persian War were instituted, but very early the evil winds were propitiated by chthonic sacrifices, which indicate that like the Harpies, they were originally conceived as ghosts.—G. Kaibel shows how Latin epitaphs often imitate Greek elegies (as Call. XXVI, Anth. Pal. VII 461, 500) and unite distichs of diverse origin and doubtful suitability.—A. Wilhelm reads in an inscription cited by Plutarch (p. 1033 e R.) *τὸν νέκρον*.—W. Frantz extracts a fragment of the comedian Philipides from Plut. Demetr. 12.

BARKER NEWHALL.

BRIEF MENTION.

I have no apology to make for the syntactical notes with which I am apt to befreckle the pages of *Brief Mention*. Doubtless to many readers of the Journal they are so many impertinences, but long before Blass began to write I had learned the truth of what he told us some years ago about our ignorance of the most elementary matters in Greek syntax¹; and, as I take up the new editions of various Greek authors I am glad to note the tokens of a quickened conscience and to observe, besides references to the well-known manuals, the efforts that are made to put the phenomena in a new light. This is one of the characteristics of Professor EARLE'S work, and this is one of the features of his *Oedipus Tyrannus* (American Book Co.) which is evidently the fruit of independent study. So when he comes to v. 68: ἦν δ' εὖ σκοπῶν ἠύρισκον ἴασιν μόνην | ταύτην ἐπραξα, he is careful to warn the young student against translating ἠύρισκον by 'was finding' or 'kept finding,' and gives what he evidently considers a new reason for Jebb's translation 'could find.' 'The imperfect of frustrated effort,' says Professor EARLE, 'in such a phrase as οὐχ ἠύρισκον ἴασιν ἄλλην is extended by false analogy to the phrase ταύτην ἠύρισκον μόνην.' This is the way in which the late Gustav Fischer, a man who studied Latin at first hand, used to account for *sunt qui* with the subjunctive as a manner of 'false analogy' to *non sunt qui* with the subjunctive. But Fischer's and EARLE'S way of working backward from negative to positive is not necessary here for μόνην involves a negative and ἠύρισκον μόνην is = οὐχ ἠύρισκον εἰ μὴ μίαν. And after all 'kept finding' is not so bad. The translation is poor but the conception is correct. 'The more I kept considering the more I kept finding' shows the inevitableness of the conclusion which was borne in upon the seeker by the search. In Dionys. Hal. Dem. 47 (p. 1100 R.) we read ἐζήτει, εὕρισκε used in just this way of seeking and finding. 'But Dionysios is a *Graeculus*.' True! But much Greek is to be learned from those who had to learn it themselves, or at all events, had to acquire the secrets of classical expression and when a Greek of the Atticizing period, when a Greek of the Renaissance makes a grammatical point he is apt to have some reason for it. So everyone has a shy at Philostratus, or rather the Philostrati, but I am grateful to Philostratus for his anecdote of Herodes Atticus which shows that the difference between μή and the present imperative and μή with the aorist subjunctive, lives with full

¹ Rh. Mus. XLIV (1889), 7: So weit sind wir im Verständniss der gewöhnlichen griechischen Prosa noch zurück, dass wir nicht einmal dies elementarste Ding, den Artikel, verstehen.

vigor in the final clause (A. J. P. IV 426 N.). As for 'frustrated effort' I have been petitioned by many teachers to remove 'Resistance to Pressure' from the place it has occupied in my syntactical system for thirty odd years, but that is a pressure which I have steadily resisted and the efforts of my well-meaning advisers have been frustrated. 'Frustrated effort' does not represent both 'would' and 'could,' and 'frustrated effort' produces the effect of a finality. Not so 'Resistance to Pressure.'

Writing of Dionysios I am tempted to cite a passage which bears on the aoristic use of ἔξω . That the proper aoristic future is σχήσω I freely grant. Blass insists on it at length in his well-known article, Rh. M. XLVII (1892), 285. In fact how natural the distinction between ἔξω and σχήσω is, comes out very distinctly in the medical use of ἔξω and σχήσις , which Blass ought to have cited. But E. R. Schulze showed long ago in Fleckeisen's Jahrb., 1883, p. 163 foll. that in the whole body of the Attic orators the uncompounded σχήσω is used only in seven places, and these in the genuine orations of Demosthenes, against 211 ἔξω 's, a clear indication that the form had become bookish and that ἔξω had to carry both the durative and the aoristic significance just as ἄρξω does. The distinction is a true distinction, a basic distinction, but for all that it may lie dormant; and so when Dionys. Hal. Dem. 19 (p. 1010 R.) undertakes to improve on Isokrates he substitutes for $\text{εἰ μὴ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνοις τιμὴν ἔξομεν}$ the shorter version $\text{εἰ μὴ τῶν ἰσῶν τευξόμεθα}$.

In 1826 Bremi brought the French scholar Auger up with a round turn for translating οὐχ ὅπως (Lys. 19, 31) by *non solum* instead of *tantum aberat ut*, but the lesson does not seem to have been heeded as it should have been except by the editors of Lysias, who have meekly followed Bremi's suit. The blunder, if one dare call it blunder now, inherited from Reiske has been propagated by Kühner II³, p. 801, and the *non solum* version reappears in the latest edition of *Demosthenes de Corona*, one which has been justly received with universal acclaim by the philological world. On §131 Professor Goodwin the *Doctor irrefragabilis* of Greek Syntax sticks to the view presented in his *Moods and Tenses*, 707, and translates οὐχ ὅπως in the Lysianic passage by *not only*. The meaning of the passage is not evident on the face of it, but Bremi seems to have made *not only not* plain enough by his reference to Meier, and if Bremi is wrong, the war must be carried into the domain of Attic antiquities.

HILLER V. GÄRTRINGEN'S lecture on *Ausgrabungen in Griechenland* (Berlin, Reimer) shows how fascinating the subject of excavations can be made without a parade of lantern

slides. Archaeologists, who have no camera in their brains are a tiresome lot to outsiders, and I have heard in my time many archaeological 'talks' which would have gained immensely if the lecturer had gone to the school of the story-teller and learned how to draw a mental picture. The impression that many hearers, or rather spectators, carry away from discourses on ancient ruins is that of a shipwrecked landlubber scrambling over rocks. One knows that he is going to be saved, but one actually resents it.

In the last twelvemonth much has happened to recall the years of my German apprenticeship. Of my German fellow students during my one semester in Berlin (1850-1851) I saw little and remember less, which is not always the case with writers of memoirs. But of my Göttingen contemporaries, Baumeister and Wölfflin, both destined to wide repute and wide influence, stand out distinctly in my memory, and of the Ritschelians, next to my nearest friend, Emil Hübner, the figure of VAHLEN with whom I have not exchanged a word in all these years is as present to my mind's eye as if we were both still listening to the voice of the great scholar whom we called master. I know that this is no place for personal reminiscence, but *Brief Mention* is rather lawless in these latter years, on satanic principles, and a personal reminiscence may be pardoned even by the most severe in the notice of a personal tribute that has recently been paid to an illustrious scholar, the *Festschrift Johannes Vahlen zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet von seinen Schülern* (Berlin, Reimer); and none of the contributors will take it amiss, if I say that nothing in the weighty volume of 692 pages with all its wealth of learning and its variety of contents has interested me so much as VON HARTEL's brief prefacé, which summarizes a career in which fulfilment has met the prophecy of all VAHLEN's fellow students of that distant day. He was a man of mark even then; and as students are apt to take the professor for granted as *hors concours* and to reserve their enthusiasm for their own fugleman, so VAHLEN had his full share of our homage, such as our immediate predecessors seem to have paid to Ribbeck who had recently left a trail of glory behind him. At all events, I remember how VAHLEN's *Ennius* was welcomed by those who had sat on the same benches; and with what awe we watched the young critic step boldly into a field that is studded with caltrops for unwary feet, a field in which he has shown from that day to this a mastery in the handling of his art, which has evoked admiration everywhere. Emulation? That is a different matter; and in those who are less gifted, the reserve which his example has taught may have degenerated into despair, so that owing to VAHLEN the scholarly world is possibly the poorer by a number of 'convincing emendations,' of 'evident restorations.' But any one who has had to consider the hosts of clever and

semi-clever and wholly absurd conjectures, that rush to the front as first aids to the wounded whenever a text presents any appearance of damage or gets into any appreciable difficulty, will be grateful to a man who has steadily put aside the fancies of the moment, and the guesses that do not satisfy the guesser himself, a man in short, who has carried out the rule: 'First exhaust interpretation.' But that does not mean the glorification of absolute nonsense, and in order to get the positive results that VAHLEN has achieved, one must have VAHLEN'S endowments. 'Es setzt,' says VON HARTEL, after characterizing VAHLEN'S success, 'es setzt liebevolle Vertiefung in den Sprachgebrauch, welche weder Grammatik noch Lexikon noch die eifrigste Statistik zu vermitteln vermag, feine Empfindung für die Form, verständnisvolles Eingehen in die Eigentümlichkeiten des Schriftstellers, ein Mitleben und Mitempfinden des vom Schriftsteller Erlebten und Empfundnen, also Vorzüge voraus, welche durch unablässige Uebung zwar geschärft, aber durch sie allein nicht erworben werden.' τὸ δὲ φησὶ κρᾶτιστον ἄπαν.

There are thirty-five pieces in the volume; and a summary of each of them would require too much space for the limited area of *Brief Mention*, as a criticism would demand a range of knowledge to which few could pretend. The first article, by OTTO RUBENSOHN, gives an extremely interesting account of the *Sign of an Interpreter of Dreams*, the last a discussion of the *Object, Occasion and Date of the Phaedrus of Plato*, by CARL VON HOLZINGER, which deals with Lutoslawski's view of this dialogue in a fashion that shows no dread of the new-comer's stylistic investigations and logical developments. Perhaps these two will serve as well as any other two to stake out the field. One of the articles that will be likely to attract especial attention is RUDOLF HELM'S *De metamorphoseon Ovidianarum locis duplici recensione servatis* in which the *duplex recensio* is carried back to the poet himself, so that we are not forced to decide which is more Ovidian than which; and very timely is KARL BRANDT'S *De Horatii studiis Bacchylideis* in which the writer follows the busy Matinian bee as he rifles the clover field that gracious Fortune has recently thrown open to Greek scholars. The more Greek one finds, the more Greek one learns, the less 'originality' will be left in Horace. As if 'originality' mattered!

À propos of VAHLEN'S seventieth birthday, and I may add, WÖLFFLIN'S seventieth birthday also recently celebrated by an elaborate address, I hope that it will not be considered beneath the dignity of a philological journal, if I cite from the *Berliner Zeitschrift für Gymnasialwesen*, April, 1900, a charming little poem of PAUL HEYSE'S written in commemoration of another

distinguished scholar who a few years ago reached the snow line, which so few are permitted to pass.

Wem ein freundlich Geschick Fülle der Gaben lieh,
Helles Auge, zu schau'n weit in der Zeiten Lauf,
Weisheit, Adel der Seele,
Sinn für jegliches Musenwerk,

Wohl unalternd empor klimmt er des Lebens Höh,'
Neu allmorgendlich tagt Sonne des Wirkens ihm,
Und es blühen ihm Rosen
Unterm silbernen Winterschnee.

V. WILAMOWITZ MOELLENDORFF'S collection of *Reden und Vorträge* (Berlin, Weidmann) is dedicated to five of his old teachers at Schulpforte, all of whom have passed away since he left the famous school now more than thirty-three years ago; and the words of the dedication are well worth the consideration of those who are apt to repine, when they leave the studies of the university for what they deem the drudgery of secondary education. It is precisely in the upper class of the boys' school that WILAMOWITZ sees the manifestation of the true glory of the teacher's vocation. In his judgment the university professor is in this respect quite subordinate to the real teacher of the higher forms. 'If the university man treats his *commilitones* as pupils, he is worth precious little. At best he is a *θιασάρχης* of fellow-learners and fellow-investigators. But the teacher who wakes the slumbering Psyche or guides the first wavings of the wings of the awaking spirit, he is the bearer of the divine power of that Eros, who is the mediator between men and gods.' That is eloquently said and a man who can look back with gratitude and loyalty on such teachers as Carl Peter and Carl Steinhart and Wilhelm Corssen can always look up to them, whatever he himself may have attained. But the conditions in America are different from those which obtain in Germany or rather which obtained in Germany, and the university professors here need not renounce the Eros rôle. Even at a time when the preparation for the German university seems to have been more thorough than it is now, the Eros teacher had his part to play, as I well remember. The principle 'Be not called masters' will always abide for the highest instruction, but the great university teachers are after all not mere *θιασάρχαι*, and the domination of genius will make itself felt.

These *Discourses and Praelections* go back more than twenty years—the earliest date seems to be 1877—and in his character of *θιασάρχης* WILAMOWITZ has not hesitated to point out here and there the errors and limitations of his treatment wherever new light had come to him meanwhile. But the form he has left substantially unchanged and any one who has made a collection of old

papers will sympathize with him when he says that the frame of mind in each case determined the style and cannot be reproduced. The leading article is a revision of his memorable essay 'Was ist Uebersetzen?' (A. J. P. XIII 517), the longest and earliest is the discourse 'On the Glory of the Athenian Empire', which has naturally undergone a number of changes. The lapse of time and the recovery from the panegyric mood have brought with them much reconsideration, and it is refreshing to find that in 1901 the author allows the Peloponnesians their right to live their own life and acknowledges that in 1879 he did not understand Pindar. The tone reminds one of a certain condescension of Prussians toward Hanoverians of which I was witness fifty years ago. That the volume is full of manifold incitement to thought and rebellion is a matter of course, for this is WILAMOWITZ'S *rolle* in the world of classical philology and I, for one, am grateful to him for the animation he has given to our studies; and yet to me the most attractive of all these papers is that in which there is least of the 'Rough Rider,' and the final essay, 'An den Quellen des Clitumnus,' begun in 1879, and recently finished, has a peaceful charm that tempts the reader to reread.

In an interesting article on Nietzsche, published in the *Neue Jahrbücher* of last year, R. M. MEYER says: <Ein Kunstwerk> ist das Wort von 'der blonden Bestie' oder das andere vom 'lachen den Löwen.' Whatever the source of the 'blond beast' may be, the source of the 'laughing lion' is perfectly known to every classical scholar. It is the *ὁ λέων ἐγέλασεν* of the scholiast on Thukydidēs I, 126, which no one that has read Thukydidēs as a philologist reads him, as Nietzsche read him, is likely to forget. In another paper in the same volume the same writer has taken up a theme which is as dangerous as it is fascinating, 'Das Alter einiger Schlagworte.' As the author has made German literature of the nineteenth century his special domain, a foreigner would not like to enter the lists with him, but it may be said that there is nothing more fallacious than watching the emergence of a phrase in print. Of course, the best of the dictionaries in use leave one in the lurch. The only authority cited for 'neck and crop' by the Century Dictionary is my contemporary, George Augustus Sala, and the Oxford Dictionary bids us wait for NECK—which I shall never live to see. Some of Herr Meyer's 'Schlagworte,' whatever their age in German, are very ancient in English, and most people will be astounded to find 'rechte Hand' set down as a German neologism and to learn that 'Drohne' in a 'sociological' sense has just come into general use. The chapter on the compounds in 'hoch' has a painful interest for me inasmuch as in the first edition of my Pindar, p. x, I was betrayed into the Teutonism 'high poetic,' which was at once and justly pounced upon by the critics. True, I might have defended my-

self by Shakespeare's 'high-fantastical,' but I was not thinking of Shakespeare so much as of 'hochpoetisch,' and there was no honest course except to submit and withdraw.

K. F. S.: In his youth Dr. J. Börner suffered constantly from the nightmare. But having an enquiring mind he utilized his affliction for the purposes of a dissertation which made him famous. His results, derived from a long series of careful experiments on himself and others, were afterwards fully verified by later investigators. Among other things he showed that, in a healthy person, nightmare is usually due to partial suffocation caused by burying one's head in the pillow, coverlet, etc., that the rapidity with which the Alp appears to approach his victim is always measured by the rate of suffocation, but, above all, that the appearance of the Alp himself is, to a surprising extent, determined by the sleeper's surroundings, especially by the material and texture of his coverings.

No student of the classics and certainly no student who has had the courage to 'sit it out' with Sprenger, Nicholas Remy and Pierre de l'Ancre, 'Conseiller du Roy,' at their horrid assizes of blood and fire, can have failed to be struck by the fact that the Incubi, Succubi, Striges, Vampires and all their monstrous brood must have entered this world in the first place by the Ivory Gate. If so, it is certain that some of our most cherished legends, our best and most thrilling stories, our finest poetry are, literally, the stuff that dreams are made of, although Laistner's theory that the Uralptraum was the father of all mythology is an unwarrantable extension of his prototype

Quippe etenim iam tum divum mortalia saecula
 Egregias animo facies vigilante videbant
 Et magis in somnis mirando corporis auctu.

Nevertheless, it may be that as the Jinni rose from the smoke of the Fisherman's bottle so Merlin's famous pedigree rose from the fumes of too much haggis. Armed with the results of Börner we might now suspect with ROSCHER (*Ephialtes, eine pathologische-mythologische Abhandlung über die Alpträume und Alpdämonen des klassischen Altertums*, Teubner) that Pan's legs were the natural result of the style of bed-quilts used by his primaevial worshippers. Compare Latinus's method of securing an interview with Faunus (Aen. VII 81 f.). We might even agree that, in discussing the event which led to the change of Jacob's name, it is worth while to consider the heavy dews of the Orient and the fact that he may again have 'taken of stones of that place, and put them for his pillows.' However that may be, the name of ROSCHER attached to any treatise connected with his lifelong specialty is sufficient guarantee of sound scholarship and of pleasure and profit in the reading.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Durham (C. L.) The subjunctive substantive clauses in Plautus, not including indirect questions. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. c. 6 + 120 pp. 8vo, net, 80 cts.

Green (S. G.) Handbook to the grammar of the Greek Testament. Rev. imp. ed. New York and Chicago, *Revell*, 1901. 564 pp. 12mo, cl., \$2.

Meador (Clarence Linton). The Latin pronouns, is, hic, iste, ipse. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. c. 16 + 222 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.40.

Plato. The Meno of Plato; ed., with introd., notes and excursions, by E. Seymer Thompson. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 66 + 319 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.10.

Studies in classical philology. v. 1. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1901. 250 pp. 12mo, bds., net, \$1.50.

Tyrrell (R. Y.) Anthology of Latin poetry. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 8 + 310 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.50.

ENGLISH.

Abbot (L.) Life and Literature of the ancient Hebrews. London, 1901. 8vo, 422 pp. 6s.

Browne (H.) Triglot Dictionary of Scriptural representative Words in Hebrew, Greek and English. London, 1901. 8vo. 21s.

Demosthenes. On the Crown. With critical and explanatory Notes, a historical Sketch and Essays by W. W. Goodwin. London, 1901. 8vo, IX, 368 pp. 12s. 6d.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Three literary Letters (ad Ammaeum 1, 2, ad Pompeium). Greek Text edited with English Translation, by W. Rhys Roberts. London, 1901. 8vo, 232 pp. 9s.

Ellis (R.) New Fragments of Juvenal. A Lecture. London, 1901. 8vo. 1s.

Hinde (H.) Masai Language, grammatical Notes and Vocabulary. London, 1901. 8vo, 76 pp. 3s. 6d.

The Jataka, or Stories of the Buddha's former Births. Translated from Pali under Editorship of E. B. Cowell. Vol. IV. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse. London, 1901. 8vo, 320 pp. 12s. 6d.

Kennett (R. H.) Short Account of the Hebrew Tenses. London, 1901. 8vo, 104 pp. 3s.

Ridgeway (W.) Early Age of Greece. Vol. I. London, 1901. 8vo, 684 pp. 21s.

St. Clair (G.) Myths of Greece explained and dated. 2 vols. London, 1901. 8vo, 798 pp. 16s.

Tyrrell (R. Y.) and L. C. Purser. Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero. Vol. VII. London and New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1901. 5 + 167 pp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Whittaker (T.) Neo-Platonists. Study in History of Hellenism. London, 1901. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Dufour (M.) Études de métrique et de rythmique sur le Prométhée enchainé d'Eschyle. *Tallandier*. 2 fr. 50.

Dussaud (R.) et F. Macler. Voyage archéologique au Saffâ et dans le Djebel ed Druz. Paris, 1901. 8vo, 227 pp. 10 fr.

Gautier (V.) La Langue, les noms et le droit des anciens Germains (283 pp.), in-8vo. *Fischbacher*. 9 fr. 50.

Largeau (V.) Encyclopédie pahouine (Congo français). Paris, 1901. 8vo, 700 pp. 12 fr.

Toscane (P.) Inscriptions cunéiformes du Musée du Louvre. Paris, 1901. 4to. 12 fr.

Yve-Plessis (R.) Bibliographie raisonnée de l'Argot et de la langue verte en France du XV^e au XX^e siècle. Paris, 1901. 8vo, 180 pp. 7 fr. 50 c.

GERMAN.

Aischylos: Perser. Erklärt v. W. S. Teuffel. 4. Aufl., bearb. v. N. Wecklein. gr. 8. vi, 104 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.50.

Bibliothek, keilinschriftliche. Sammlung v. assyr. u. babylon. Texten. Hrsg. v. Eberh. Schrader. gr. 8. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*.—VI, 1. Jensen, P.: Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen u. Epen. II. Hälfte. 1. Lfg. (S. 321-464). 1901. m. 9.

Briefe aus der Frühzeit der deutschen Philologie an Georg Friedrich Benecke. Hrsg. v. Dr. Rud. Baier. gr. 8. x, 173 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 3.60.

Cicero's Rede üb. das Imperium des Cn. Pompeius. Erklärt v. Fr. Richter u. Alfr. Eberhard. 5. Aufl. gr. 8. 105 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. —75.

Codices graeci et latini photographice depicti duce Scatone de Vries. Tom. VI. gr. Fol. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*. Geb. in Halblidr.—VI. Homerii Ilias cum scholiis. Codex Venetus A, Marcianus 454 phototypice editus. Praefatus est Domin. Comparetti. (XIV S. u. 641 S. in Phototyp.) 1901. m. 310.

Dionis Cocceiani, Cassii, historiarum romanarum quae supersunt, edidit Ursulus Phpp. Boissevain. Vol. III. gr. 8. xviii, 800 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 32.

Gabelentz (Geo. v. der). Die Sprachwissenschaft, ihre Aufgaben, Methoden u. bisherigen Ergebnisse. 2. Aufl. Hrsg. von Albr. Graf v. der Schulenburg. Lex. 8. xxi, 520 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Ch. H. Tauchnitz*. m. 15.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. II. Bd., 3. Abtlg. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck*.—II, 3. Rhetorik u. Metrik der Griechen u. Römer. 3. Aufl.

Volkman, Dr. Rich.: Rhetorik. 3. Aufl., besorgt v. Casp. Hammer.—Gleditsch, H.: Metrik, nebst e. Anh. üb. die Musik der Griechen, m. 2 Notentaf. x, 336 S. 1901. m. 8.80; geb., m. 10.60.

Herakleitos v. Ephesos. Griechisch u. deutsch v. Herm. Diels. gr. 8. xii, 56 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 2.40.

Herondae mimiambi. Tertium ed. Otto Crusius. Ed. minor. Exemplar emendatum. 8. iii, 96 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Kallenberg (Herm.) Textkritik u. Sprachgebrauch Diodors. I. Progr. 4. 23 S. Berlin, 1901, *R. Gaertner*. m. 1.

Klausing (Gust.) Die Schicksale der lateinischen Proparoxytona im Französischen. gr. 8. 90 S. Kiel, 1900, *R. Cordes* in Komm. m. 2.

König (Ed.) Hebräisch u. Semitisch. Prolegomena u. Grundlinien e. Geschichte der semit. Sprachen. gr. 8. vii, 128 S. Berlin, 1901, *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 4.

Kröll (Mich.) Die Beziehungen des klassischen Alterthums zu den hl. Schriften des Alten u. Neuen Testamentes. gr. 8. ix, 66 S. Trier, 1901, *Paulinius-Druckerei*. m. 1.20.

Landberg (Comte de). Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabie méridionale. Vol. I: Ḥadramôut. gr. 8. xxi, 774 S. Leiden, 1901, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 20.

Litteraturdenkmäler, lateinische, des XV. u. XVI. Jahrh. Hrsg. v. Max Herrmann. 15. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*.—15. Veterator (Maistre Paletina) u. Advocatus. Zwei Pariser Studentenkommödien aus den J. 1512 u. 1532. Hrsg. v. Johs. Bolte. xxxii, 122 S. 1901. m. 3.

Meyer (Leo). Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie. 1. Bd. Wörter m. dem Anlaut *a, e, o, η, ω*. gr. 8. 656 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel*. m. 14.

Meyer-Lübke (Wilh.) Die Betonung im Gallischen. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 8. 71 S. Wien, 1901, *C. Gerold's Sohn* in Komm. m. 1.60.

Minos (Johs.) Ein neuentdecktes Geheimschriftsystem der Alten. gr. 8. viii, 64 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Buchh. G. Fock* in Komm. m. 2.40.

Quellen u. Forschungen zur Sprach- u. Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl, Ernst Martin, Erich Schmidt. 87. Hft. gr. 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*.—87. Kock (Axel): Die alt- u. neuschwedische Accentuierung unter Berücksicht. der andern nordischen Sprachen. xii, 298 S. 1901. m. 7.50.

Rauschen (Gerh.) Das griechisch-römische Schulwesen zur Zeit des ausgehenden Heidentums. 8. vi, 86 S. m. 1 Abbildg. Bonn, 1901, *F. Cohen*. m. 1.60.

Rhousopoulos (Rhousos A.) Wörterbuch der neugriechischen u. deutschen Sprache, m. e. Verzeichnisse griech. Eigennamen. 8. viii, 1080 S. Athen, 1900. Leipzig, *E. Haberland* in Komm. m. 10.

Rohde (Erwin). Kleine Schriften. 2 Bde. gr. 8. Tübingen, 1901, *J. C. B. Mohr*. m. 24.—1. Beiträge zur Chronologie, Quellenkunde u. Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur. xxxi, 436 S. 2. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Romans u. der Novelle, zur Sagen-, Märchen- u. Alterthumskunde. iii, 481 S.

Saga-Bibliothek, altnordische. Hrsg. v. Gust. Cederschild, Hugo Gering u. Eug. Mogk. 9 Hft. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*.—9. Friepjófs saga ins froekna. Hrsg. v. Ludv. Larsson. xxiv, 56 S. 1901. m. 2.

Schäfer (Heinr.) Die äthiopische Königsinschrift des Berliner Museums, neu hrsg. u. erklärt. Mit 4 Lichtdr.-Taf. u. 1 Textabbildg. gr. 4. vii S. u. 136 S. in Autogr. Leipzig, 1901, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 22.

Schrader (O.) Realexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde. 2. Halbbd. gr. 8. xl u. S. 561-1048. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner.* m. 13; kplt., m. 27; geb. in Halbfrz., m. 30.

Schwally (Frdr.) Semitische Kriegeraltertümer. 1. Hft. Der hl. Krieg im alten Israel. gr. 8. viii, 111 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich.* m. 3.

Solmsen (Felix). Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- u. Verslehre. gr. 8. ix, 322 S. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner.* m. 8.

Tacitus: Germania. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Dr. Geo. v. Kobylinski. Text u. Anmerkgn. gr. 8. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann.* Geb., m. 1.80.—Text. (28 S. m. 1 Karte.) Geb., m.—60; Anmerkungen. (100 S.) Geb., m. 1.20.

Thesaurus linguae latinae. Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque germanicarum. Vol. II. Fasc. 1. Imp. 4. (Sp. 1-240.) Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* Subskr.-Pr., m. 7.20.

Thiel (Aug.) Iuvenalis graecissans sive de vocibus graecis apud Iuvenalem. gr. 8. x, 152 S. Breslau, 1901, *Preuss & Jünger.* m. 4.

Tituli Asiae Minoris. Conlecti et ed. auspiciis caesareae academiae litterarum Vindobonensis. Vol. I. Tituli Lyciae Lingua Lycia conscripti, enarravit Ernest. Kalinka. Tabulam ad Henrici Kiepert exemplum redactam adiecit Rud. Heberdey. gr. Fol. vi, 136 S. m. fig. Wien, 1901, *A. Hölder.* Geb. in Halbpergament, m. 40.

Werner (Jak.) Notkers Sequenzen. gr. 8. iv, 130 S. Aarau, 1901, *H. R. Sauerländer & Co.* m. 2.50.

Zell (Th.) Polyphem e. Gorilla. (Odyssee Buch IX, V. 105 ffge.) gr. 8. vi, 184 S. Berlin, 1901, *W. Junk.* m. 2.50.

ITALIAN.

Aristotele. La costituzione di Atene. Testo e commento per cura di Achille Cosattini. Firenze. 8vo, p. 262 e facsimile. L. 3.

Licofrone. La Alessandra di Licofrone. Testo, traduzione e commento per cura di Emanuele Ciaceri. Catania. 8vo, p. 387. L. 8.

Miscellanea linguistica in onore di Graziadio Ascoli. Torino. 4to, p. 634 e ritratto. L. 40.

Rossi (F.) Grammatica egizia nelle tre scritture: geroglifica, demotica e copta. Torino. 8vo, p. 314. L. 6.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Adler (Cyrus) and Casanowicz (I. M.) Descriptive Catalogue of Objects of Jewish Ceremonial (Smithsonian Institution). Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1901.

American Bureau of Ethnology. Seventeenth Annual Report. Part I, 1895-96. Eighteenth Annual Report. Part I, 1896-97. J. W. Powell, Director. Washington, *Government Printing Office*.

American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. Vol. I, No. 1. January-March. New York, *The Macmillan Co.* \$1.50. \$5 per annum.

Babcock (Clinton L.) A Study in Case Rivalry, being an investigation regarding the use of the Genitive and Accusative in Latin with Verbs of Remembering and Forgetting (Cornell Studies, No. XIV). New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 60 cts.

Bennett (C. E.) The Stipulative Subjunctive in Latin. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. Vol. XXXI. 1900.

Callaway (Morgan). The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon. *Modern Language Association*. Vol. XVI, No. 2. Baltimore, 1901.

Capps (Edward). Studies in Greek Agonistic inscriptions. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* Vol. XXXI. 1900.

Cicero's Second Philippic. Ed. with introduction and commentary by E. G. Sihler. New York, *Un. Publ. Co.*, 1901. 80 cts.

Ciceronis (M. T.) De Officiis. Liber I. Ed. with introd. and commentary. New York, *University Publ. Co.*, 1901. 90 cts.

Collar (W. C.) and Daniell (M. G.) First Year Latin. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901.

Demoulin (Hubert). Épiménide de Crète (Mémoire couronné). Bruxelles, *Lamertin*, 1901. 4 fr.

Diels (Hermann). Herakleitos von Ephesos Griechisch u. Deutsch. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1901. 2 m. 40 pf.

Durham (Charles L.) The subjunctive substantive clauses in Plautus, not including indirect questions. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. XIII). New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 80 cts.

Easby-Smith (James S.) The Songs of Alcaeus. Memoir and Text with literal and verse translations and notes. Washington, *W. H. Lowdermilk & Co.*, 1901.

Educational Extension in the United States. Chapter V of Report of Commissioner of Education, 1899-1900. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1901.

English Dictionary (Oxford). Ed. by I. A. H. Murray. L-LAP. Commencing Vol. VI, by Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. 60 cts.

Fraser (H. W.) and Squair (J.) A French Grammar for Schools and Colleges. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1901. \$1.12.

- Gerth (Bernhard). Griechische Schulgrammatik. 6. Auflage. Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1901. 2 m. 50 pf.
- Guzman el Bueno por Gil y Zárato Zárate. Ed. by Sylvester Primer. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901.
- Hanssen (Federico). Notas á la prosodia castellana (Anales de la Universidad). *Santiago de Chile*, 1900.
- Heidel (W. A.) On Plato's Euthyphro. *Transactions A. P. A.* Vol. XXXI. 1900.
- Hermes. Herausg. v. Georg Kaibel u. Carl Robert. XXXVI. Band. 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1901.
- Kalbfleisch (Carolus). Papyri Argentoratenses Graecae ed. C. K. *Rosstock Program*, 1901.
- Laing (Mary E.) Reading, A Manual for Teachers (Heath's Pedagogical Library, 37). Boston, *D. C. Heath*, 1901.
- Lawton (W. C.) The Rise of the Greek Drama. *Sewanee Review*, April, 1901.
- Maryland Geological Survey. Eocene. Director: William Bullock Clark. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*.
- Maximianus, The Elegies of. Ed. by Richard Webster. Princeton, *The Princeton Press*, 1900.
- Meador (C. L.) The Latin Pronouns Is: Hic: Iste: Ipse. A semasiological study. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901.
- Modern Language Association of America, Publications of the. Ed. by James W. Bright. Vol. XVI, No. 2. N. S., Vol. IX, No. 2. Contents: Morgan Callaway, Jr. The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1901.
- Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II. Deutsch-English. Lfg. 22: Tropfen-verdienen. Vollständig in 24 Lfgn. @ 1 m. 50. New York, *The International News Co.*
- Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Olberg u. Richard Richter. Vierter Jahrg., 1901. VII. u. VIII. Bdes. 2-3. u. 4. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1901.
- Niebuhr (Carl). The Ancient East. No. II. The Tell el Amarna Period. London, *David Nutt*, 1901.
- Owen (Ed. T.) A revision of the pronouns with special examination of relatives and relative clauses. Reprinted from the *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters*. Vol. XIII.
- Plato, The Meno of. Ed. with introduction, notes and excursuses by E. Seymer Thompson. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1901.
- Powell (J. W.) Sophiology or the Science of activities designed to give instruction. From the American Anthropologist. Vol. 3. January-March. 1901. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*.
- Rand (Edward Kennard). Der dem Boethius zugeschriebene Traktat *De fide catholica*. Besonderer Abdruck aus Jahrbücher f. klassische Philologie—XXVI. Supplementband. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1901.
- Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von F. Bücheler u. H. Usener. N. F. LVI 2. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer*, 1901.
- Robert (Carl). Studien zur Ilias. Mit Beiträgen von Friedrich Bechtel. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1901. 16 m.

Sallust. The Conspiracy of Catiline. Allen and Greenough. Revised by J. B. Greenough and M. G. Daniell. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901.

Smith (Clement L.) A Preliminary Study of Certain MSS of Suetonius' Lives of the Caesars. (Reprint from *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XII.)

Terenti (P.) Afri Andria with introduction and notes. By H. R. Fairclough. *Allyn & Bacon*, 1901. \$1.25.

West (Andrew Fleming). Roman Autobiography, particularly Augustine's Confessions. A lecture. *The De Vinne Press*, 1901.

Wilson (Harry Langford). The use of the Simple for the Compound verb in Juvenal. (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, vol. XXXI, 1900.)

Vol. XXII, 3

WHOLE No. 87

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.
PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING LEIPSIK: F. A. BROCKHAUS

JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER

1901

CONTENTS.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN, 241
 II.—On the Association of Numerals. By HANNS OERTEL, 261
 III.—The Bodleian Fragments of Juvenal. By HARRY LANGFORD WILSON, 268
 IV.—On the Form of Horace's Lesser Asclepiads. By LEON J. RICHARDSON, 283
 V.—The Unreal Conditional Sentence in Plautus. By H. C. NUTTING, 297

NOTES:

A Note on the Achaemenian Inscription. By TRUMAN MICHELSON, . . 317
 Notes on the Septuagint Text of II Sam. By JOHN WESLEY RICE, . . 318

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES: 321

Römische Elegiker. Eine Auswahl aus Catull, Tibull, Propert, und Ovid. Für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von K. P. Schulze.—Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica recognovit brevisque adnotatione critica instruxit R. C. Seaton, M. A.—Lexique Étymologique des termes les plus usuels du Breton Moderne.

REPORTS: 335
 Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.—Revue de Philologie.

BRIEF MENTION, 344

RECENT PUBLICATIONS, 351

BOOKS RECEIVED, 356

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price \$3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, \$1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page.....	\$16 00	\$30 00	\$40 00	\$50 00
Half page.....	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page.....	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page.....	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of **THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY** has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, \$63 for the twenty-one volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, \$3; single numbers, \$1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXII, 3.

WHOLE No. 87.

I.—A FURTHER COLLECTION OF LATIN PROVERBS.

III

LUTUM 5, p. 202. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 4, 5 (M. 199, 521 C) aurum et argentum vilescerent, quasi lutum; ep. 170 (163 C) nam haec omnia contempsisti ut stercorea; cf. Phil. 3, 8: arbitror ut stercorea; Petr. Cell. ep. 74 (M. 202, 521 A) emolumenti lucra . . . pro vilissimo stercore habiturus sum; Gaufrid. ep. 12 (M. 205, 839 B) et dignitates reputentur ut stercorea; serm. 11 (639 B) ea quae vos quasi sterces respuistis; cf. Nicol. Clar. ep. 56 (M. 196, 1651 C) porro pecuniam sicut paleam reputas, quae fere indifferenter spargitur et universis.

LUTUM 7, p. 202. Apost. 9, 72 *κεραμὲς ἀνθρώπος*; see Leutsch's note; see Wyss, p. 102.¹

LUX 1, p. 203. Plaut. Mil. 1 splendor meo sit clupear clarior | quam solis radii esse . . . solent; Boeth. consol. phil. 3, 11, v. 8 lucebit ipso perspicacius Phoebus; Cypr. ep. 6, 1, p. 481, 1 (H.) o tenebras lucidiores sole ipso; Hier. ep. 98, 1 splendore suo iubar solis exsuperans; Drepan. Flor. de cereo pasch. 42 nox claro magis clara die (ALL. 6, 452); Iuven. 2, 668; Claud. Mam. (M. 53, 702 and 732); Constant. ep. 3 ad Anast. (M. 8, 556 C) quae res ipsa luce lucidior est (*αὐτοῦ τοῦ φωτός ἐστίν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τηλαυγίστερον*); Aldh. de sept. Aenig. 14 (M. 89, 199 A) limpida sum, fateor, Titanis clarior orbe; Hor. c. 3, 1, 42 sidere clarior; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1315 (M. 171, 1386 C) clarior astro; Alcuin vit. S. Rich. 3, 181 (M. 101, 691 B) solis luce clariorem. The phrase,

¹ Die Sprüchwörter bei den römischen Komikern, Zürich 1889.

luce clarius, which, as Otto's citations show, was very rare in classic literature becomes perfectly formulaic in late and mediaeval Latin; Optat. Mil. 2, 5, p. 42, 6 (Z.) luce sit clarius; Vigil. ep. ad Iust. 303, p. 317, 17 (Günther); Paulin. Aquil. contr. Fel. 1, 2 (M. 99, 352 B); Alcuin vit. S. Rich. 1, 176 (M. 101, 684); Nicol. pap. ep. 9 (M. 119, 782 B); ep. 25 (808 D); Alvar. Cordub. ep. 18 (M. 121, 494 B); Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 8 (M. 144, 213); ep. 6, 5 (381 A); 6, 12 (394 D); 6, 12 (396 A); serm. 32 (677 A); lib. Gom. 3 (M. 145, 163 C), etc.

LUX 2. Lucif. Car. de non conviv. cum haer. 1 (M. 13, 781 C) cum tantum intersit . . . quantum inter lucem atque tenebras; cf. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 500 D) quantum lux distat a tenebris.

LYNCEUS, p. 203. Gaufrid. ep. 40 (M. 205, 873 A) utinam cor meum lynceis, ut aiunt, oculis videretis; Lucian Icarom. 12, Tim. 25; Apost. 10, 79; see Schmidt, p. 49; Wiesenthal, p. 45.

MAECENAS, as a type of literary patron; Iuven. 7, 94 quis tibi Maecenas? Mart. 8, 56, 5 sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones; Sid. Apoll. c. 3, 5 at mihi Petrus erit Maecenas temporis huius.

MAECENAS 2, as a type of luxury and effeminacy; Iuven. 12, 39 vestem | purpuream teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam; Mart. 10, 73, 3 qua . . . vellet Apicius uti, | vellet Maecenas; compare Sen. ep. 120, 19 Maecenatem deliciis provocant; Iuven. 1, 66, imitated by Phil. Harv. ep. 13 (M. 203, 98 C), et multum referens de Maecenate supino.

MAGNUS 1, p. 204. Orient. common. 1, 607 si parvis cupias componere magna; Ennod. c. 1, 9, 134 nam si fanda ferunt sociant qui maxima parvis; Mart. Dum. de form. hon. vit. 2, 10 (Haase, Sen. III, p. 470) aestimat ex parvulis magna.

MAGNUS 2, p. 205. Ovid trist. 5, 3, 29 illo nec levius cecidi, quem magna locutum | reppulit a Thebis Iuppiter; met. 1, 751 quem quondam magna loquentem | nec sibi cedentem; met. 13, 222 non erat hoc nimium numquam nisi magna loquenti; Sen. d. 2, 3, 1 ingentia locuti; ps-Cypr. de bon. pat. 2 (M. 4, 647 C) qui non loquimur magna sed vivimus (= Minuc. Fel. Oct. 38, 6); Prudent. psych. 285 desine grande loqui; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 23 (M. 144, 407 D) iam armis accinctum, iam magna spirantem; Ioh. Sar. ep. 238 (M. 199, 269 A) loquuntur grandia, minis tument; cf. Pers. 1, 14 scribimus . . . grande aliquid and Bentley, A. J. P. II, 24; Theokr. 10, 20; see Tribukait p. 17, Crusius, Herond. p. 63; compare our expressions 'talk big,' 'tall talk.'

MAGNUS 3, p. 205. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 7, 9, 19 civi, clerico, peregrino, minimo maximoque.

MALUM 1, p. 207. Arnob. adv. nat. 7, 39 dies adderet malum malo; Eustath. Il. 842, 30 *κακὸν ἐπὶ κακῷ*.¹

MALUM 2, p. 207. Plaut. Aulul. 801 ita mihi ad malum malae res plurimae se adglutinant, is perhaps a play on the proverb; Sen. Herc. Fur. 208 finis alterius mali | gradus est futuri; Braulio ep. 18 (M. 80, 664 C) ecce alia afflictio saepe super afflictionem venit.

MALUM 5, p. 208. Compare Publil. Syr. 198 (F.) grave est malum omne quod sub aspectu latet; 447 (F.) o pessimum periculum, quod opertum latet; see PRAEMEDITARI.

MALUM 6, p. 208. Anthol. Pal. 11, 286, 3 *ἀναγκαίων κακῶν*.

MALUM 7, p. 208. Pseud.-Sen. de mer. 139 numquam scelus scelere vincendum est; append. sent. 18 (Ribb.); numquam homini scelere vindicandum ullum scelus; Rath. Ver. praeloq. 4, 124 (M. 136, 270 B) numquam vero scelus scelere vindicandum testatur sapientis proverbium.

MANTICA, p. 209. Pers. 4, 24 is cited by Petr. Bles. ep. 45 (M. 207, 132 B).

MANUS 1, p. 210. Hier. adv. Ioh. Hier. 3, 3 (M. 23, 401 C) manibus pedibusque constringitur ne recumbat in convivio; Abbo Floriac. ep. 8 (M. 139, 432 A) aut manibus et pedibus ad malum quasi serpens reptit; see Preuss, p. 71. Compare Apost. 12, 63 *ὄλεθρον ποδῶν* and Leutsch's note, also Otto PES 3, p. 275.

MANUS 2, p. 210. Eustath. Il. 773, 64, Kurtz, p. 318; Greg. Cypr. Leid. 2, 95 with Leutsch's note.

MANUS 3, p. 210. See Crusius, Herond., p. 47; compare Otto, DARE 2.

MANUS 4. Sen. ep. 111, 4 quidni contentus sit eo usque crevisse, quo manus Fortuna non porrigit? Hildebert. carm. misc. 1364 (M. 171, 1442 A) longa manus morti; Ioh. Sar. ep. 253 (M. 199, 297 B) non longas, credas, solis regibus esse manus (cf. Ovid her. 16 (17), 166); Petr. Cell. ep. 160 (M. 207, 456 B) quis nescit longas praesulis esse manus? cf. ep. 102 (320 B) rapio enim, etsi non manu propria, sed aliena, et quasi longa manu.

MANUS 5, p. 210. Compare Varro Prometheus lib., Sat. Menipp. 429 (B.) cum sumere coepisset, voluptas detineret, cum sat haberet, satias manum de mensa tolleret.

¹ Kurtz, l. c., p. 313.

MANUS 7, p. 211. Ovid her. 16 (17) 260 et dabo cunctas tempore victa manus; fast. 3, 688 evictas precibus vix dedit illa manus; trist. 1, 3, 88 vixque dedit victas utilitate manus; Boeth. consol. phil. 2, 4 (p. 34, Peiper) dederit impatientiae manus; Fronto ep. 2, 2 p. 26, 17 (Nab.): manus do, vicisti; Ennod. ep. 2, 16, p. 57, 21 (H.); ep. 3, 6, p. 76, 1 (H); Commod. instruc. 2, 9, 9; Columban. ep. 5, 6 (M. 80, 277); Theobald. Stamp. ep. 1 (M. 163, 759 A) manus suas poenitentiae dederit.

MANUS 9, p. 211. Cic. Phil. 13, 7, 15 extorqueri e manibus arma non possunt; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 11 (M. 199, 498 D) beneficium meritis etiam a manu extranea, ut vulgo dici solet, extorquet; Nicol. Clar. ep. 43 (M. 196, 1643 D) difficillime extorsi illud de manibus illius; compare Curt. 4, 16, 3 eripi sibi victoriam e manibus; 3, 5, 10; 6, 7, 24.

MANUS 10, p. 211. Sen. ben. 7, 10, 4 nihil est, quod subici oculis, quod teneri manu possit, inanis avaritiae somnia; ben. 1, 5, 2 non potest beneficium manu tangi: res animo geritur.

MANUS 13, p. 211. Eustath. Il. 641, 14 ἀνίπρους χερσὶ; see Kurtz, p. 309.

MANUS 16, p. 212. Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 29 (M. 202, 438 B) et obviis, ut dicitur, bracchiis . . . sustentet; compare ep. 155 (598 D) totis ulnis misericordiae exciperet.

MANUS 17, p. 212. Stat. silv. 3, 4, 54 plena . . . dextra; Alcuin c. 65, 38 porto . . . plenis manibus; anthol. Pal. 12, 42, 1 πλήρεις χερσὶ.

MANUS 18, p. 212. Ovid rem. am. 114 supremam bellis inposuisse manum; a. a 3, 226 aptius a summa conspiciere manu: trist. 1, 7, 28; 3, 14, 22 certius a summa nomen habere manu; ex Pont. 2, 10, 14 ne careant summa Troica bella manu; Lucan 5, 483. So ultima manus; Ovid trist. 2, 555; her. 15 (16) 117 impositast factae postquam manus ultima classi; met. 8, 200; 13, 403; compare trist. 1, 7, 30 defuit et scriptis ultima lima meis.

MANUS 19, p. 212. Sen. ben. 1, 15, 3 tunc iuvat accepisse beneficium et supinis quidem manibus.

MANUS 21, p. 212. Sulpic. Sev. d. 1, 1, 5 me autem utraque manu complectebatur, Alcuin ep. 40, 47 (M. 100, 200 B) hanc (paginam) laetus ambabus accipiebam manibus, et toto amplectebam pectore; Nicol. Clar. ep. 16 (M. 196, 1611 B) et ambabus, ut dicitur, manibus traho et retraho te ad cor meum.

MANUS 23, p. 213. Curt. 4, 14, 7 iter in patriam et penates manu esse faciendum; cf. Lact. instit. 4, 13, 4 ut . . . hanc fragilem

inbecillamque naturam quasi manu ad immortalitatem posset educere.

MARE 3, p. 214. Compare Plaut. Aulul. 558 quae mi inter-bibere sola, si vino scatat, | Corinthiensem fontem Pirenam potest.

MARE 5. Cypr. ad Dem. I, p. 352, 1 (H.) quando facilius esset et levius turbulenti maris concitos fluctus clamoribus retundere quam tuam rabiem tractatibus coercere; compare Ovid met. 13, 804 (improperly cited under SCOPULUS 1 by Otto) surdior aequoribus; her. 8, 9 surdior ille freto; Hildebert. (M. 171, 1386 B) surdior aequore; Ovid her. 17 (18), 211 nec faciam surdis convicia fluctibus ulla; rem. am. 597 surdas clamabat ad undas; Propert. 3 (4), 7, 18 non habet unda deos; Eurip. Androm. 537 ἡ κύμα λιταῖς ὡς ἱκετεύων; Med. 28; Eustath. Il. 1622, 44,¹ πρὸς κύματα λαλεῖν; Zenob. I, 38 αἰγιαλῷ λαλεῖς with note; see further, J. Koch, l. c., pp. 26 and 28.

[MARE 6. Verg. ecl. 8, 58 omnia vel medium fiat mare; schol. Bern. ad loc. prius diluvium optat, deinde vel medietatem mundi perire, vel omnia, inquit, confundantur; satius enim mihi est mori quam haec perpeti; compare Suet. Ner. 38 ἐμοῦ θανάτος γαῖα μχθήτω πυρί; compare also Cic. fin. 3, 19, 64 qui negant se recusare quo minus, ipsis mortuis, terrarum omnium deflagratio consequatur, quod vulgari quodam versu Graeco pronuntiari solet (see Madvig's note); Sen. clem. 2, 2, 2 cui Graecus versus similis est [eius], qui se mortuo terram misceri ignibus iubet; append. prov. 2, 56; trag. Gr. frag. adesp. 513, N.: 'After me the deluge.']

MARE 7. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 7, 3, 1 hac enim fronte possemus fluminibus aquas, silvis ligna transmittere; Alcuin ep. 41, 49 (M. 100, 203 C) quod facio insipiens contra philosophicum proverbium, ligna in silvam ferens, stillicidiis flumina irrigans; Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 3 (M. 141, 193 B) ligna in silvam vel aquas in mare comportare; Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 12 (M. 189, 202 A) secundum vulgare proverbium, stolidissimum videatur humeris ligna ad silvam deferre et aqua urceo allata mare infundere; ep. 4, 17 (337 D) ut volgo dicitur, . . . ligna ad silvam vel aquam ad flumina sive mare deferre; ep. 4, 43 (382 A) videor, ut dicitur, . . . ligna ad silvam convehere, videor flumen maximum lagena aquae infundere; Greg. Cypr. 2, 67 θαλάττη ἐκ χαράδρας ὕδωρ. These citations, coupled so frequently with the phrase ligna in silvam deferre, express the idea of fruitless endeavour. Compare Ovid am. 2, 10, 14 in freta

¹ Kurtz, p. 318.

collectas alta quid addis aquas? and trist. 5, 6, 44 in mare fundat aquas; See Otto, GUTTA 1, n. and MARE 1.

MARE 8. Plaut. Epid. 678 dum sine me quaeras, quaeras mea causa vel medio in mari; Truc. 527 si plane ex medio mari | savium tuom petere iubeas, petere hau pigeat; cf. Ovid a. a. 1, 747 si quis idem sperat, iacturas poma myricas | speret et e medio flumine mella petat.

MARMOR, white as marble. Catull. 81, 4 hospes inaurata pallidior statua; especially Parian marble; Hor. c. 1, 19, 5 urit me Glycerae nitor | splendentis Pario marmore purius; Ovid am. 1, 7, 51 adstitit illa amens albo et sine sanguine vultu, | caeduntur Pariis qualia saxa iugis; Petron. 126 pedum candor . . . Parium marmor extinxerat; incert. auct. epigr. 318 (PLM. IV, p. 302 Baehr.) et vibret Parium nitens colorem. Note the use of the adjective, Ovid fast. 4, 135 marmoreo collo; Lucil. sat. 29, 80 (M.) pectore marmoreo; Mart. 8, 56, 14 marmorea fundens nigra Falerna manu; Ovid am. 2, 11, 15 marmoreis pedibus; see C. H. Müller, p. 37.

MARSUS. Appian b. c. 1, 46 *λεγόμενον πρότερον, ὅτε κατὰ Μάρσων ὅτε ἀνευ Μάρσων, γενέσθαι θρίαμβον*. The citation must belong to a Latin and not to a Greek proverb.

MEDIOCRITAS, p. 216. Compare Mart. epigr. 129, 12 (PLM. 4, p. 117 Baehr.) nec volo me summis Fortuna nec adplicet imis, | sed medium vitae temperet illa gradum; anthol. Pal. 10, 51, 5 ἡ μεσότης γὰρ ἄριστον; 10, 102, 3.

MEL 1, p. 216. Venant. Fort. c. 4, 7, 10 dulcior et melli lingua sepulta iacet; inscript. Christ. Mus. Lateran. Gal. lap. XVII, n. 9 (ALL. 6, 452) Laurentia melis dulcior; Alcuin ep. 40 (M. 100, 200 A) omni melle palato meo dulcior; ep. 40 (200 C) omni favo dulciora; ep. 92 (296 C); ep. 86 (281 D); Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 41 (M. 202, 457 C); ep. 162 (605 D) Hildebert. carm. misc. 1315 (M. 171, 1386 C); the expression is Homeric (cf. Otto NESTOR 2), but it is also biblical (cf. Psalms 19, 10); see further, Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 454.

MEL 3, p. 217. Auson. ep. 30, 6 (p. 289, Peiper) amara paternis | admiscere velis ceu melle absinthia verbis; PLM. 5, 60, 24 (p. 362, Baehr.) mellaque cum fellis sint modo mixta malis; Paulin. Aquil. lib. sacrosyllab. 1 (M. 99, 153 B) tristia laetis, dulcia permiscere amaris, veneni poculum mellis sapore temperare; Alcuin c. 9, 7 fatali cursu miscentur tristia laetis; c. 11, 9; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1349 (M. 171, 1423 C) nulli dispensant mel

sine felle suum; Iuven. 6, 181 plus aloes quam mellis, is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 501 D), by Petr. Bles. ep. 60 (M. 207, 180 B), and by Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 3 (M. 210, 586 A); compare Ioh. Sar. ep. 82 (M. 199, 69 A) ne amara . . . dulcibus misceam; anthol. Pal. 16, 16, 1-2 (Dübner), *ἐπεὶ λόγος ἐστὶ παλαιός, | ὡς καὶ τοῦ μέλιτος τὸ πλέον ἐστὶ χολή.*

MEL 3, n., p. 217. Plaut. Casin. 223 fel quod amarumst, id mel faciet.

MENDAX, p. 219. Alvar. Cordub. ep. 18 (M. 121, 499 B) oblitus veteris proverbii . . . mendaces memores debere.

[MENS. Mens conscia recti became a stock phrase, Ovid fast. 4, 311 conscia mens recti; Ennod., p. 413, 17 (H.); Lactant de opific. dei 1, 4 p. 4, 22 (Brandt); Alcuin c. 69, 11; slightly changed in Stat. Theb. 1, 466 mens sibi conscia fati.]

MERCURIUS 2, Szel. p. 14. Compare Diogen. 5, 38 κοινὸς Ἐρμῆς; Varro Sexag. 15 (8) κοινὸν Ἐρμῆν; anthol. Pal. 5, 127, 6.

MERCURIUS 3. Ioh. Saris. Polycrat. 5, 7 (M. 199, 554 B) quasi, inquit qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii, sic qui dat insipienti honorem; Petr. Bles. ep. 18 (M. 207, 67 A) qui insipienti honorem, sicut qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii; compare Ioh. Saris. prol. Polycrat. (M. 199, 386 C) librum hunc velut lapillum in acervo praeconiorum tuorum conieci. The proverb is, in all probability, of a much earlier date than these citations indicate. The meaning, fruitless and foolish endeavour, is quite evident from the last citation. John of Salisbury in Polycrat. 5, 7 does indeed give an entirely different explanation—the upsetting of all calculation—but it is evident that he is forcing this meaning on the proverb, since he excuses his position, sapientiorum venia impetrata.

METERE 1, p. 221. See Grünwald, l. c. p. 5; J. Koch, p. 74, for Greek citations.

METIRI, p. 221. Compare Sen. d. 4, 21, 7 non pro fastigio te tuo metiris.

MENTUM, Sonny ALL. 8, 488. Compare Ovid ex Pont. 2, 6, 13 brachia da lasso potius prendenda natanti, | nec pigeat mento supposuisse manum; 2, 3, 39 mitius est lasso digitum supponere mento, | mergere quam liquidis ora natantis aquis; m. 14, 560 (of the ships of Aeneas turned into nymphs); Prop. 3 (4), 7, 69 vos decuit lasso supponere brachia mento (cf. v. 58). So in Eng. we have 'The salt waters bare up her clothes, | Our Ladye bare up her chinne' (Percy's Reliques 3, 1, 9).

MIDAS 1, p. 222; for Greek parallels, see Schmidt, p. 53. Wiesenthal, p. 48.

MIDAS 2, p. 222. See Wiesenthal, p. 22; Petr. Bles. ep. 227 (M. 207, 518 A) auriculas asini, referring to Pers. 1, 121; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 502 B) auriculas asini Midas habet.

MILLE, p. 222. Thom. Cant. ep. 335 (M. 190, 678 A) vir est in millibus unus; Petr. Cell. ep. 114 (M. 202, 565 C); cf. Hildebert. carm. misc. 1346 (M. 171, 1421 A) non facile invenies multis in millibus unum; Hier. adv. Pelag. 2, 11 esto, unus de mille inveniatur; anthol. Pal. 7, 128, 3 εἰς ἑμοὶ ἄνθρωπος τρισμύριοι.

[MIMUS, Szel., p. 32. Sen. ep. 80, 7 hic humanae vitae mimus; Augustus cited in Suet. Aug. 99 ecquid iis videretur mimus vitae commode transegisse; Orelli inscrip. 4813 mox vestra agetur fabula, valete et plaudite; Plat. Phileb. 50 B; Pallad., anthol. Pal. 10, 72, 1 σκηνὴ πᾶς ὁ βίος καὶ παίγιον; cf. Hier. ep. 22, 3 stadium est haec vita mortalibus, and anthol. Pal. 10, 65, 1 πλοῦς σφαλέρως τὸ ζῆν.]

MINERVA 1, p. 224. Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 3 (M. 141, 193 B) aut Minervam, ut aiunt, velle docere; Ivo Carnot. ep. 40 (M. 162, 51 D) Minervam quidem non doceo; ep. 279 (280 D) sed quia non est meum aut Minervae sapientiam instruere aut Mercurii facundiam exornare; Petr. Ven. ep. 6, 4 (M. 189, 404 D) videor, ut dicitur, docere Minervam; ep. 4, 43 (382 A); 4, 17 (337 D) ut vulgo dicitur, Minervam docere; ep. 2, 35 (257 D) sed insipiens ego, qui praesumo docere Minervam; incert. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 518 (M. 190, 1066 B); Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 29 (M. 201, 50 A) non ut Minervam, ut aiunt, litteras doceam; Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 52 (M. 202, 479 B) nec enim praesumo docere Minervam; Apost. 17, 73; see Tribukait, p. 29.

MINERVA 3, p. 224. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 2, 22 (M. 199, 449 B) nos pingui, ut dicitur, Minerva agentes; 3, 8 (490 D); compare Symmach. ep. 1, 89 (83), 1 hi, quorum Minerva rancidior est.

MINERVA 4, p. 225. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 13 (M. 199, 666 D) sic, ut dici solet, invita Minerva nihil recte aggredimur.

MINERVA 6. Incert. auct. de fig. vel schem. (PLM. 3, p. 277, 69 Baehr.) tu vere sapiens, vere tu immo ipsa Minerva; compare Szel., VENUS, p. 12; Otto, APOLLO, p. 30.

MINERVA 7. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 9 (M. 199, 562 B) benigniori potius, ut dicitur, Minerva, equally with the similar expressions cited, belongs, in all probability, to an earlier period.

MODIUS, p. 225. Varro Marcip. 5 (B.) altera exorat patrem

libram ocellatorum, altera virum semimodium margaritarum; Iul. Capitol. Ver. 6, 6 ei a populo prasinianorum saepe modius aureorum postularetur.

MODUS, p. 226. Varro hebd. frag. 6 (Baehr.), 'optimus est' Cleobulus ait 'modus'; Sid. Apoll. c. 15, 45 Lindie tu Cleobule iubes, modus optimus ut sit; Cassiod. var. 1, 19, 1 modus ubique laudandus est; Petr. Cell. ep. 99 (M. 202, 549 C) est modus in rebus; ne quid nimis; see Fritzsche to Hor. sat. 1, 1, 106 and cf. Sen. d. 9, 9, 6 vitiosum est ubique, quod nimium est.

MONS 1, p. 227. Gualbert. act. 281 (M. 146, 919 D) pollicitus est, ceu montem aureum.

MONS 2, p. 227. Prudent. perist. 2, 55 fulgidae | montes monetae conditos; Alcuin ep. 102 (M. 100, 316 B) nonne unus panis esurienti melior est quam mons aureus; Petr. Ven. ep. 1, 14 (M. 189, 83 C) numquid montes, ut dicitur, aureos praestolatur; Ioh. Saris. Polycrat. 5, 10 (M. 199, 566 A) possideant quantum Pacuvius, montibus aurum exaequent (cf. Juv. 12, 128-30).

MONS 3, p. 227. Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 3 (M. 23, 480 B) qui parturis mihi montes criminum.

MORA 1, p. 227. The Greek proverb, *σπεῦδε βραδέως*, occurs in Suet. Aug. 25; Plat. Polit. 264 B; see Grünwald, p. 14.

MORBOVIA, p. 228. Compare the Greek expression *βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν*, Plat. Hipp. mai. 293 A; see Grünwald, p. 8, and Blaydes on Aristoph. Equit. 1151.

MORS 1, p. 228. Sen. n. q. 2, 59, 4 mors omnes aequae vocat; Ovid met. 10, 33 serius aut citius sedem properamus ad unam; compare Hor. c. 2, 14, 9; a. p. 63, debemur morti nos nostraque; Simon. 122 (B.), *θανάτῳ πάντες ὀφειλόμεθα*; anthol. Pal. 7, 389, 6 *κοινὴ που νύξ μία πάντας ἔχει*; 7, 335, 6; 7, 342, 2.

MORS 3, p. 229. Hier. adv. Pelag. 2, 5 ne beatum dixeris quempiam ante mortem; Alcuin. c. 62, 81 ante diem mortis nullus laudabilis extat; Soph. frag. 596 *μή πω μέγ' εἴπησ, πρὶν τελευτήσαντ' ἰδῆσ*; see H. Koch, II, p. 20.

MORS 5. Hor. c. 4, 9, 50 peiusque leto flagitium timet; Sen. ep. 30, 18 peius quam mortem oderis; cf. anthol. Pal. 5, 247, 2 *σὺ δέ μοι πικροτέρη θανάτου*; compare Otto, ANGLIS, p. 25.

MORS 6. Plaut. Capt. 732 non moriri certius; Sen. ep. 99, 9 nihil cuiquam nisi mors certum est; Nicol. Clar ep. 38 (M. 196, 1634 D) sed nihil morte certius; ep. 35 (1629 C) nihil enim mortalibus morte certius; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 2, 27 (M. 199, 471 A).

MORTUUS 1, p. 229. Apul. met. 3, 29 nihil a mortuo differebam;

Plaut. Bacch. 630 mortuos pluris pretist quam ego sum ; Amphitr. 1074 nam pro Iuppiter, sepultust quasi sit mortuos ; cf. Mart. 3, 12, 5 qui non cenat et unguitur, Fabulle, | hic vero mihi mortuus videtur ; Cassiod. var. 5, 26, 1 nam paene similis est mortuo qui a suo dominante nescitur.

MORTUUS 3, p. 230. Plaut. Truc. 162 dum vivit, hominem noveris : ubi mortuost, quiescat ; Prudent. perist. 5, 386 illud ultimum | inferre poenam mortuo.

MORTUUS 4, Sonny, ALL. 8, 489. Compare Plin. ep. 1, 5, 3 quid tibi cum meis mortuis ?

MOS 2, Sonny, ALL. 8, 489. Petr. Bles. ep. 15 (M. 207, 54 B.) vulgariter dicitur quod honores mutant mores, sed raro in meliores ; ep. 134 (398 C) vulgare est, quod honores mutant, aut potius monstrant mores ; Steph. Tornac. ep. 2, 46 (M. 211, 345 B) vivat in aliis illud vulgare proverbium : honores mutant mores ; ep. 2, 147 (435 A) non credimus in vobis honores mutasse mores ; all of these are perhaps the partial registration of a leonine hexameter.

MU, p. 230. Plaut. Most. 401 cave muttire quemquam siveris ; Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 6 (M. 23, 483 A) cunctis nobis, qui aliquid scire volumus, muttire non liceat. Thom. Cant. ep. 7 (M. 190, 447 D) quis enim auderes muttire de cetero ; corp. gloss. 5, 663, 19 nec muttire potest ; see Heraeus, l. c., p. 15.

MULIER 1, p. 231. Poen. 876 rectius | tacitas tibi res sistam quam quod dictumst mutae mulieri ; Plaut. Trin. 801 (uxor) pol tacere numquam quicquamst quod queat ; Sen. controv. 2, 5 (13), 12 muliebri garrulitati ; compare Juven. 6, 439 turba tacet, nec causidicus nec praeco loquetur, altera nec mulier ; Eustath. Odys. 85, 65 ἀνδρῶν μὲν τὸ ποιεῖν, γυναικῶν δὲ τὸ λαλεῖν¹ ; Menand. ἀλλήρης frag. 3 (M.).

MULIER 3, p. 231. Plaut. Amphit. 836 mulier es, audacter iuras ; Menand. monost. 161 (Meineke) ἐν γὰρ γυναιξὶ πίστιν οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἰδεῖν ; Greg. Cypr. 2, 8 ; compare Hor. c. 2, 8, 5.

MULIER 5. Plaut. Mil. 486 non hercle hisce homines me marem, sed feminam | vicini rentur esse servi militis ; Bacch. 845 non me arbitratur militem, sed mulierem ; cf. Othlo lib. prov. 12 (M. 146, 319 A) mollis et dissolutus, non vir, sed mulier dicendus est ; Ps.-Beda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1102 A) ; Herond. 5, 13 παράδειγμα θῶ, μᾶ, μὴ με θῆς γυναικ' εἶναι ; see Crusius, Herondas p. 100, and compare Otto, VIR, p. 373.

¹ Kurtz, p. 309.

MULUS 5, p. 233. Frontinus is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 11 (M. 199, 603 C) with the remark, unde proverbium natum est; multi milites Mariani.

MUNUS, p. 233. See Koch, II, p. 21.

MUS 3, p. 234. Pliny, n. h. 8, 222 Theophrastus auctor est in Gyara insula cum incolas fugaverunt, ferrum quoque rosisse eos (mures); compare Ael. h. a. 5, 14 ἐν τῇ Γυάρῳ τῇ νήσῳ Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει μὲς εἶναι καὶ μίτροι καὶ τὴν γῆν σιτεῖσθαι τὴν σιδηρίτιν; Theophr. frag. 174 ὅτι οἱ μὲς ἰστοροῦνται καὶ σίδηρον κατασθίειν καὶ χρυσίον. Otto, on Sen. apoc. 7, says, 'hier giebt es keine Ausflucht.' From the fact that Gyarus was used as one of Rome's political prisons, which were not unknown to Seneca, particularly in connection with Claudius, it seems to me that a special significance lies in the remark, venisti huc, ubi mures ferrum rodunt. There is poetic justice in bringing Claudius to the Gyarus of the other world. Even if favor is shown to Crusius' view (Herondas, p. 72) that the phrase denotes Topsy-turvy Land, a *double entente* still lurks in the words.

MUS 8. Hor. a. p. 139 is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 13 (M. 199, 415 A), and by Petr. Cell. ep. 89 (M. 202, 537 B).

MUSICA, p. 236. Ovid a. a. 3, 397 quod latet, ignotumst; ignoti nulla cupido. Pers. 1, 27 is cited by Augustin. ep. 118, 3 (M. 33, 433); Anselm. Cant. ep. 1, 16 (M. 158, 1062 C).

MYSUS, p. 237. Plat. Theat. 209 B; compare Gorg. 521 B; see Grünwald, p. 8.

NASCI 1, p. 237. Sen. a. d. 11, 11, 3 quisquis ad vitam editur, ad mortem destinatur; ep. 99, 8 cui contigit nasci, mori restat; Ps.-Sen. rem. fort. 2, 6; CIL. 6, 11, 252; Quint. 5, 10, 79 deficit omne quod nascitur; Sen. epigr. 1, 7 (PLM. 4, 55 Baehr.); Alcuin ep. 106 (M. 100, 321 C) nascimur ut moriamur; ep. 107 (323 C); Petr. Cell. ep. 178 (M. 207, 472 B) omne quod nascitur, moritur; see Hosius, Rhein. Mus. 47, 463.

NASCI 2, p. 238. Mart. 11, 12, 2 dum matrem nemo det tibi, nemo patrem; Plaut. Epid. 336 nec mihi plus adiumenti ades quam ille qui numquam etiam natust; Trin. 850 neque novi neque natus necne is fuerit id solide scio; Pseud. 589 metum et fugam perduellibus meis med ut sciant natum.

NASCI 3. Plaut. Poen. 1077 iterum mihi gnatus videor, quom te repperi; compare Otto, AQUA 7.

NASCI 4. Cic. Tusc. 1, 48, 114 non nasci homini longe optimum est, proximum autem quam primum mori. Sen. d. 6, 22, 3 si

felicissimum est non nasci proximum est, puto, brevi aetate defunctos cito in integrum restitui; Auson. ecl. ex Graeco Pythag. p. 89, 49 (Peiper) optima Graiorum sententia: quippe homini aiunt | non nasci esse bonum aut natum cito morte potiri; compare Theog. 425, Soph. Oed. Col. 1225-8 (see Jebb's note); Posidippus anthol. Pal. 9, 359, 9.

[NASCI 5. Hor. c. 4, 4, 29 fortes creantur fortibus et bonis; Sen. Troad. 536 generosa in ortus semina surgunt suos; Eurip. Alc. frag. 76 (N.) ἰσθλῶν ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν ἰσθλὰ γίγνεσθαι τέκνα; Pind. Pyth. 8, 64 φυῆ τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει | ἐκ πατέρων παισὶν λῆμα; compare Otto, AQUILA 4, p. 33.]

NASUS 1, p. 238. Pers. 1, 40 is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 2, 26 (M. 199, 460 A).

NASUS 2, p. 238. See Crusius, Herond., p. 54.

NAUFRAGIUM 2, p. 239. Orient. common. 1, 500 saevas flare procellas | securus tuto litore prospicies.

NAUFRAGIUM 3, p. 239. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 11 (M. 199, 751 D) quia improbe Neptunum accusat qui iterum naufragium fecit; compare Ovid am. 2, 14, 44 peccasse semel concedite tuto | et satis est, poenam | culpa secunda ferat; Publil. Syr. 303 lapsus semel fit culpa si iterum cecideris.

NAUFRAGUS. Ovid ex. Pont. 2, 7, 8 tranquillās etiam naufragus horret aquas; 2, 2, 128 timeo naufragus omne fretum; compare Otto, EXPERTUS 3.

NAVIS 4, p. 240. Steph. Torn. Suppl. ep. 10 (M. 211, 548) tamquam laterem lavantes . . . iacientesque anchoram in abyssum.

NAVIS 6. Ovid ex Pont. 2, 7, 83 coepta tene quaeso neque in aequore desere navem; 2, 6, 22 turpe laborantem deseruisse ratem; cf. the passage in Cic. de invent. 2, 51, 153 ff.

NEBULA 3, p. 240. Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 31 (M. 201, 53 C) sed humanum favorem prae omnibus auspicantes auras et inanes ventos studiis fallacibus amplectuntur; compare Zenob. 3, 17 δικτύφ ἀνεμον θηρῆς: ἐπὶ τῶν μάτην καὶ ἀνοίτως τι ποιοῦντων.

NECESSITAS 5. Optat. Milev. 6, 7, p. 166, 20 (Ziwsa) impedit igitur necessitas vires suas; compare Otto, PIGER, p. 279.

NECTAR, p. 241. Claud. 44, 99 Jeep (carm. min. 27 Birt.) nectare dulcior aura; Licent. ad Augustin. ep. 26, 3 (M. 33, 104) nectare dulcior omni; Columban. c. 3, 143 (M. 80, 293) nectare nobis | dulcior omni; Aldh. de sept. et de metr. 14 D (M. 89, 198) dulcior in palato quam lenti nectaris haustu.

NENIA, p. 241. Compare Plaut. Poen. 231 neque umquam . . . scimus facere neniam.

NEPTUNUS, p. 241. See especially R. Wünsch, *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom*, Leipzig, 1898, p. 7, n. on v. 17.

NERO as a type of a tyrant; Iuven. 8, 193 *vendunt nullo cogente Nerone*, cf. 4, 38; as a contrast to Cato, Hier. ep. 125, 18 *intus Nero, foris Cato*.

NESTOR 1, p. 242. Ovid fast. 3, 533 *invenies illic, qui Nestoris ebibat annos*; Stat. silv. 1, 4, 127 *transcendere . . . | Nestoreosque situs*; Iuven. 6, 325 *quibus incendi iam frigidus aevo | Laomedontiades et Nestoris hirnea possit*; Mart. 9, 29, 1 *saecula Nestoreae permensa, Philaeni, senectae*, 10, 67, 1 *Pyrrhae filia, Nestoris noverca*; 11, 56, 13 *o quam tu cupies ter vivere Nestoris annos*; Priap. 76, 4 *depressos ego perforare possum | Tithonum Priamumque Nestoremque*; anthol. Pal. 11, 72, 2 *γῆρα, δι' ἧν Νέστορα οὐκέτι πρεσβύτατος*.

NESTOR 2, p. 242. Plaut. Men. 935 *immo Nestor nunc quidemst de verbis*; Hier. ep. 52, 3 *de lingua Nestoris . . . dulcior melle oratio fluxerit*; Ennod. p. 338, 21 (H.) *ex ore ipsius dulciora favis verba fluxerunt*; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 855 D) *sive Nestorea, ut ita dicam, manu* (compare Symmach. ep. 3, 11, 1).

NICTUS. Laber. 129 (Ribb^s) *nictu citius decidas*; cf. Otto, DICERE 5, p. 112.

NIGER, p. 243. Nicol. Clar. ep. 9 (M. 196, 1605 C) *qui fecit album de nigro, novum quid fecit et mirabile?* Iuven. 3, 30 is cited by Ioh. Saris. Polycrat. 3, 7 (M. 199, 487 A), and by Petr. Cell. ep. 93 (M. 207, 293 B).

NILUS, Szel. p. 13. Claudian. 5, 244 *si calcare Notum secretaque noscere Nili | nascentis iubeas*.

NIMIS, p. 243. Varro hebd. 6, 7 (Baehr.) *nequid nimis*; incert. apud Auson., p. 408, 49 (Peiper) *nil nimium*; sept. sap. sent. (PLM. 3, p. 162, 49 (Baehr.) *nil nimium*; Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1260) proverbium: 'ne quid nimis' *laudatur inprimis*; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 4 (M. 199, 398 A) *ut mandato comici acquiescas*; ne quid nimis; Petr. Cell. ep. 99 (M. 202, 549 C) *ne quid nimis*; ep. 102 (554 A); Plat. Menex 247 E *μηδὲν ἄγαν*; Prot. 343 B; Phil. 45 E; anthol. Pal. 5, 299, 1; 7, 683, 1; 9, 110, 4; see Grünwald, p. 10, H. Koch, II, p. 19.

NIREUS, p. 243. Phil. Harv. ep. 4 (M. 203, 33 B) *non admiranda Nirei pulchritudo*; see Wiesenthal, p. 44, Schmidt, p. 49.

NIX 1, p. 244. Claudian. 28, 476 (Jeep) *excessit . . . candorque pruinas*; Diomed ars gram. 2, p. 461, 22 (K.); Valer. (M. 87, 449 A) *splendidiora nive*; poet. Carol. 1, p. 71, 39, 2 *candidiorque*

nive; CIL. 5, p. 617, 2 (Carm. Epigr. 908, 12 B.) abscedet candidior nivibus; Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 D. (M. 89, 199 B) candidior nivibus; Ps.-Venant. Fort. in laud. mar. 351 vellere candidior niveo; anthol. Pal. 14, 26, 2; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 457.¹

NIX 2, p. 244. Liv. Andron. trag. 17 (Ribb.) praestatur laus virtuti, sed multo ocius | verno gelu tabescit; Ovid. met. 2, 808 liquitur, ut glacies inserto saucia sole; ex Pont. 1, 1, 68 de nive manantis more liquescit aquae; 2, 3, 89 exemploque nivis, quam mollit aquaticus Auster | gutta per attonitas ibat oborta genas; cf. C. H. Müller, l. c., p. 27.

NIX 3. Ovid trist. 4, 1, 58 numerabis | . . . frigoribusque nives; compare GRANDO.

NOCTUA 2. Cic. ad Q. fr. 2, 15, 4 Athenas noctuam mittam; the Greek form occurs in ad fam. 6, 3, 4; 9, 3, 2; cf. Zenob. 3, 6; Otto, SILVA 1.

NODUS, p. 244. Sen. d. 7, 16, 3 dum nodum illum exsolvit; Rufin. Aquil. apol. 1, 11 (M. 21, 548) nodos suae haesitationis absolveret.

NOLLE. Cleanthes in Sen. ep. 107, 11 ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt²; Ovid am. 1, 2, 17 acrius invitos multoque ferocius urget | quam qui servitium ferre fatentur, amor; Tibull. 1, 8, 7 deus crudelius urit | quos videt invitos succubuisse sibi.

NOMEN 1, p. 244. Compare Eustath. Odys. 138, 91 εἰδέναι τι κάλλιον ἢ περ ἕκαστος τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ὄνομα.³

NOMEN 2, p. 245. See Crusius, Herond., p. 120.

NOSCERE 1, p. 245. Varro frag. hebd. 6 (Baehr.) 'nosce' inquit 'tete' Chilon Lacedaemone cretus; Ioh. Sar. ep. 297 (M. 199, 345 D) de caelo siquidem, ut aiunt, descendit γῆθη σεαυτόν, id est, scito teipsum; Polycrat. 3, 1 (480 A); Phil. Harv. ep. 21 (M. 203, 169 D) scito teipsum, homo; the Greek form is cited by Auson. de her. 19 (Peiper); compare Plaut. Pseud. 972 nam in foro vix decumus quisquest, qui ipsus sese noverit.

NOVERCA 1, p. 245. Tac. ann. 1, 6 novercalibus odiis; Treb. Poll. trig. tyr. 16, 3 erat circa eum Zenobia novercali animo; schol. Stat. Achill. 65 novercali odio; Fulgent. m. 1, praef., p. 4, 18 (Helm) felicitatisque noverca Fortuna; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 1

¹ C. H. Müller, p. 27, De similitudinibus imaginibusque apud veteres poetas elegiacos, Bremen, 1897.

² Cited by Otto under FERRE 2, p. 134, n. See Epictet. Man. 53 (Sch.).

³ Kurtz, p. 311.

(M. 199, 389 B) *noverca siquidem virtutis prosperitas*; cf. Claud. de rapt. Proserp. 3, 40 *se iam, quae genetrix mortalibus ante fuisset, | in dirae subito mores transisse novercae.*

NOX 1, p. 246. Prudent. perist. 5, 242 *tenebris nigrior.*

NUDUS 3, p. 247. Hier. vit. Hilar. 12 (M. 23, 34 B) *quibus ille respondit: nudus latrones non timet*; Alan de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 591 A) *nec latro . . . insidiatur, | dum carpit sumptas absque timore vias (of the poor man)*; Iuven. 10, 22 is cited by Gaufrid. ep. 31 (M. 205, 858 D); compare Sen. ep. 68, 4 *vile videtur, quicquid patet: aperta effractarius praeterit.* See Mayor on Juv. 10, 22.

NUMA as a type of morality; Mart. 11, 104, 2 *non sum ego nec Curius nec Numa nec Tadius*; as a type of antiquity, Mart. 10, 76, 4 *de plebe Remi Numaeque verna*; so his reign, 3, 62, 2 *sub rege Numa condita vina bibis*; 10, 39, 2 *nata es, Lesbia, rege Numa.*

NUMERUS 1, p. 247. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 27 is cited by incert. auct. vit. myst. (M. 184, 719 B).

NUMERUS 2. Plaut. Men. 182 PE. *quid ego?* ER. extra *numerum es mihi*; compare Theokr. 14, 48 *ἄμμες δ' ὅσπε λόγῳ τινὸς ἀξιοὶ ὄντ' ἀριθμητοί*; Agathias, anth. Pal. 5, 280, 4; 14, 73, 7 *ὑμεῖς δ', ἃ Μεγαρεῖς, οὐδὲ τρίτοι οὐδὲ τέταρτοι | οὐδὲ δωδέκατοι, ὄντ' ἐν λόγῳ ὄντ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ*; Callimach. anthol. Pal. 5, 6, 6 *οὐ λόγος οὐδ' ἀριθμός.*

OCCASIO, p. 249. Caecil. Balb. 166 *rapienda, non capienda agendi occasio est*; Hier. ep. 54, 6 *arripe, quaeso, occasionem.*

OCCASIO 2.¹ Planc. in Cic. ad Fam. 10, 4, 4 *ne inter aliena vitia hae gentes nostra mala suam putent occasionem*; Liv. 4, 58, 2 *tantum afruit, ut ex incommodo alieno sua occasio peteretur*; Publil. Syr. 621 *seditio civium hostium est occasio.*

OCEANUS, as a type of distance, Szel., p. 15; Liv. 21, 43, 13 *ab Herculis columnis, ab Oceano terminisque ultimis terrarum*; Sen. ep. 94, 63 *it tamen ultra oceanum solemque*; Nazar. panegy. Constant. 17 (M. 8, 594 C) *vis . . . ultra ipsum Oceanum aestu furoris evecta*; Prudent. ham. 882 *Oceani fines atque ultima litora Thulae | transadigit.*

OCULUS 1, p. 249. Paulin. Nol. ep. 1, 5, p. 4, 20 (H.) *iunctior tibi dextera tua et carior lumine*; Plaut. frag. Cornic. 5 *qui amant ancillam meam . . . oculitus*; Paul. ex Fest., p. 179 (M.) *oculissimum, carissimum*; see Otto's note, and ALL. 2, 321; compare

¹ See Bergmüller, p. 91, *Ueber die Latinität der Briefe des L. Munatius Plancus*, Erlangen, 1897.

Nebrid. ad Augustin. ep. 6, 1 (M. 33, 67) epistolas tuas perplacet ita servare ut oculos meos.

OCULUS 2, p. 249. Sen. ep. 49, 1 totus mihi in oculis es.

OCULUS 7, p. 250. Augustin. ep. 93, 7 (M. 33, 324) nec clausis oculis calumniemur; Petr. Dam. ep. 4, 13 (M. 144, 325 A) ad aeterni ignis incendium quotidie clausis oculis . . . properare.

OCULUS 8, p. 250. Anselm. Cant. ep. 1, 66 (M. 158, 1137 C) non sicut vulgo dici solet, quia quod longe est ab oculis, longe est a corde; 'Out of sight, out of mind.'

OLERE, p. 252. Compare Sen. ep. 108, 16 optimus odor in corpore est nullus.

OLEUM 2, p. 253. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 6 (M. 199, 403 D) igni stipulam addere, oleum camino . . . nonne dementia est?

OLEUM 3, p. 253. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 8 (M. 199, 736 D) ut paterfamilias cui impensa perit et opera, damnificetur; Petr. Cell. ep. 2, 103 (M. 202, 554 C) perit opera et impensa; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 61 (M. 211, 354 C) operam perdit et impensam; compare Sen. ep. 80, 3 opus est multo oleo, longa denique opera.

OLLA 1, p. 254. Eustath. Il. 125, 20; ζεῖ χύτρα, ζῆ φιλία¹; see Crusius, Herond., p. 140.

OLYMPUS. Ennod. c. 1, 17, 24 lux tunc Olympi luce serenior; cf. Hom. Od. 6, 43 ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἴθρη | πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη; Lucret. 3, 18 ff.

OMNIS 1, p. 254. Verg. ecl. 8, 63 is cited by Rath. Ver. phren. 10 (M. 136, 377).

OMNIS 5, p. 255. Symmach. ep. 8, 27, 2 nihil hominibus aeternum est; volvunt mortalia vices crebrae; Alcuin. de clade Lind. 11 nil manet aeternum | omnia vertuntur temporibus variis; c. 23, 24; c. 11, 12 nil est perpetuum, cuncta perire queunt.

OMNIS 6, p. 255. Orelli inscrip. 4816 D. M. T. Claudii Secundi. Hic secum habet omnia; incert. anthol. Pal. puts the remark in the mouth of Diogenes, δσσα γὰρ εἶχον, | πάντα φέρω σὺν ἐμοί.

ORATIO, p. 257. Sen. ep. 115, 2 oratio cultus animi est; Paulin. Nol. ep. 13, 2, p. 85, 30 (H.) sermo enim viri mentis est speculum; Cassiod. var. pref. 10 oratio dispar moribus vix potest inveniri. append. sent. 156 (Ribb.) sermo animi imagost: ut vir, sic oratio; Apost. 5, 53 Β γλώσσα βλάσφημος διανοίας κακῆς ἔλεγχος.

ORBIS 2. Sidon. Apoll. c. 7, 556 captivus, ut aiunt, orbis in urbi iacet; Ovid. a. 1, 174 atque ingens orbis in urbe fuit; see Woelfflin, das Wortspiel im lat., p. 193.²

¹ Kurtz, p. 312.

² Sitz.-ber. München Akad., II, 1887.

ORCUS 2, p. 258. Artem. 55, p. 153, 18 (H.) φαρὲν . . . τὸν παρὰ προσδοκίαν σωθέντα ἐξ Ἑλίου ἀναβεβηκέναι.

ORESTES 1, p. 258. Ovid am. 2, 6, 15 quod fuit Argolico iuvenis Phoeceus Orestae; ex Pont. 2, 3, 45 adfuit iusano iuvenis Phoeceus Orestae; 3, 2, 69 par fuit his aetas et amor, quorum alter Orestes, | ast Pylades alter. nomina fama tenet; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1329 (M. 171, 1403 A) quis fratri frater nunc est? Pylades quod Oresti? For similar proverbial friendships, Achilles-Patroclus, etc., see Tribukait, p. 45, Wiesenthal, p. 55.

OS 2, p. 259. Ennod. ep. 5, 26, p. 146, 6 (H.) a labiorum proximitate cupita subtrahuntur.

OS 3, p. 259. Placid. gloss., p. 81 (D.) sublitum mihi os est.

OS 4, p. 259. Ovid met. 12, 241 uno ore; Iuven. 7, 167; Ennod., p. 344, 19 (H.); p. 456, 3 (H.); Constant. ep. ad eccl. Alex. (M. 8, 508 C); Henric. ad Wibald. Stab. ep. 25 (M. 189, 1147 B); Gualbert. act. 222 (M. 146, 897 B); compare una voce, Ennod., p. 372, 2 (H.); Eumen. grat. act. Constant. 1 (M. 8, 642 A); Augustin. ep. 89, 4 (M. 33, 311); Liv. 21, 45, 9; consona voce, Apul. met. 3, 2; 4, 16; 11, 13; Leo magn. serm. 3, 11 (M. 54, 145 A); Aldh. ep. 14 (M. 89, 102 D).

OVIS 1, p. 260. Lactant. de ira dei 22, 2 stultitia pecudibus adaequamur; 12, 3, ad stultitiam pecudum amissa ratione devolvimur; Maxim. Taur. homil. 90 (M. 57, 462 A) nisi quod stolidior pecude est; see PECUS.

OVUM 1, p. 261. See Crusius, Herond., p. 122.

PACTOLUS, p. 261. Sidon. Apoll. c. 11, 100 Midam, qui pauper in auro | ditavit versis Pactoli flumina votis; Claudian. 24, 61 quae sic aurifero Pactoli fonte tumescit | Lydia; 3, 103 (Jeep); 18, 214; 20, 172; Fulgent. m. 1, prael., p. 5, 5 (Helm) Pactoli ipsius fluenta . . . desiccassem; Eumen. act. grat. Constant. 14 (M. 8, 652 B) quis Tagus quisve Pactolus tanto fluxerunt auro; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1330 (M. 171, 1404 B) hunc auribibulum Pactolus et Hermus inundent.

PAESTUM, Sonny, ALL. 8, 489. Incert. auct. epigr. 320, 4 (PLM. 4, p. 302 Baehr.) Paestanis lucent floridiora rosis; incert. poet. apud Auson., p. 410, 11 (Peiper) vidi Paestano gaudere rosaria cultu.

PALINODIA, p. 262. Foliot ep. 109 (M. 190, 819 B) nam, si quid in vos diximus, hoc ipsum palinodiam in nos conscribendo . . . recantamus; Ivo Carnot. ep. 7 (M. 162, 17 D) restat igitur ut palinodiam scribas.

PALLIUM 1, p. 262. The Greek proverb is cited in Sen. apoc. 10; see Tribukait, p. 15.

PALLIUM 3, p. 262. Compare Sen. ep. 66, 1 posse ingenium fortissimum ac beatissimum sub qualibet cute latere; Hor. sat. 1, 3, 34 at ingenium ingens | inculto latet hoc sub corpore; Phaedr. 3, 4, 6 et turpi facie multos cognovi optimos; Plaut. Poen. 307 lepidi mores turpem ornatum facile factis comprobant.

PALUS 2. Plaut. Men. 404 palus palo proxumust.

PANNUS. Novius 86 (Ribb.²) qui habet uxorem sine dote, pannum positum in purpura est. The alliteration gives a proverbial form to the thought; cf. Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 5 ut quicquid tollere volueris vel addere, quasi pannus in vestimento statim appareat, cf. Hor. a. p. 15.

PAR 1, p. 264. Chalcid. (M. 33, 21) si quidem paria paribus congregentur; Eustath. ὁμοιος ὁμοίῳ,¹ Krumbacher, p. 69,² πᾶν ζῷον τὸ ὅμοιον ἑαυτῷ ἀγαπήσει; Greg. Cypr. 1, 15; see Crusius JJ. 135, 249, no. 15; Schenkl Wien. Stud. 8, p. 267, no. 20; Tribukait, p. 14.

PAR 3, p. 264. C. Gracch. in Charis 2, p. 240, 17 (K.) videte quam par pari sim; Fronto ad amic. 1, 14, p. 184, 2 (Nab.) non ut par pari compares; Hier. adv. Pelag. 1, 13 par pari referam; see Landgraf ALL. 5, 179.

PARIES 2, p. 266. Thom. Cant. ep. 130 (M. 190, 606 D) Luccalegon trepidat, paries cum proximus ardet (cf. Iuv. 3, 199); ep. 180 (655 C) Rex, proverbialiter celebre est, castigatus de alterius infortuniis: melius sibi prospicit; nam tua res agitur, paries dum proximus ardet; cf. Ovid rem. am. 625 proximus a tectis ignis defenditur aegre.

PARTHENOPAEUS (compare HYACINTHUS); Mart. 6, 77, 2 tam iuvenis, quam nec Parthenopaeus erat; see Friedländer on 9, 56, 8.

PARTHUS 1. Claudian. 11, 2 (Jeep) Parthis sagittas tendere certior; Stat. silv. 1, 4, 78 arcuque horrenda fugaci | Armenia. Comment on the skill of the Parthian archers occurs frequently in Latin literature; see Orelli on Hor. c. 2, 13, 17.

PARTHUS 2. Connected probably with their skill in military stratagems arises another proverb, Hor. ep. 2, 1, 112 Parthis mendacior; cf. c. 4, 15, 23 Seres infidive Persae; see Orelli on ep. 2, 1, 112.

¹ Kurtz, pp. 308 and 316.

² Byzant. Sprichw., Sitzber. München. Akad. phil. hist. Cl., II, 1887.

PATAVIUM, as a symbol for morality; Plin. ep. 1, 14, 6 Serrana tamen Patavinis quoque severitatis exemplum est; Mart. 11, 16, 8 uda puella legas, sis Patavina licet.

PATI. Hor. c. 1, 7, 30 o fortes peioraque passi; sat. 2, 5, 21 et quondam maiora tuli; Verg. Aen. 1, 198; Ovid ex Pont. 3, 7, 13; Eustath. Od. 1880, 53 τέτλαθι <δή> καρδίη· και κύντερον άλλο πόντ' ἔτλης; Odyss. 20, 18.¹

PATRIA, p. 268. Ps. Sen. Rem. fort. 3, 2 nulla terra aliena mortuo; Sen. d. 12, 9, 7 ut scires omnem locum sapienti viro patriam esse; Nic. Clar. ep. 43 (M. 196, 1643 C) non patriam, sed locum mutasti (see the context); Aristoph. Plut. 1151 πατρίς γάρ ἐστί πᾶσ' ἰν' ἂν πράττη τις εἶδ'; see Blaydes ad loc., trag. Gr. frag. adesp. 318 (N), and cf. Eustath.² Il. 1578, 8. Petr. Cell. ad Thom. Cant. cites Ovid fast. 1, 493 in ep. 335 (M. 190, 673 A).

PAUPERTAS 1, p. 268. Eurip. Electr. 377; see F. Goldmann, p. 17.³

PECTUS 4, p. 270. Catull. 64, 69 toto ex te pectore, Theseu, | toto animo; 66, 24; Tibull. (Lygdam.) 3, 1, 20 (M.) si nostri mutua cura est | an minor, an toto pectore deciderim; Ovid a. a. 2, 536 toto pectore, vulgus, ades! fast. 6, 509 o toto pectore captae; met. 10, 443 infelix non toto pectore sentit | laetitiam virgo; 9, 244 totoque libens mihi pectore grator; ex Pont. 3, 1, 39 pectore te toto cunctisque incumbere nervis; Stat. silv. 2, 2, 70 quos toto pectore sentis; 4, 5, 26 conisus omni pectore tolleres; Achill. 1, 642 toto pectore; Petron. 91 toto pectore adstrinxit; CIL. 8, 211 (Carm. Epigr. 1552 a, 72 (B.)) toto pectore dives; Maxim. eleg. 4, 41 toto pectore; Prisc. carm. de laud. Anast. 191 (PLM. 5, p. 271 Baehr.); schol. Iuven. sat. 6 (Beldame, Rev. Phil. 6, 93); Constant. ep. ad eccl. Alex. (M. 8, 508 D) toto pectore, ut dicitur, revertamur (σπουδῇ πάσῃ); Augustin. ep. 27, 5 (M. 33, 110) quem toto pectore amplecteris; Othlo lib. prov. 7 (M. 146, 312 D); Alcuin c. 11, 13 and 16. It may be noted that this phrase is rare in late and mediaeval Latin, being almost completely superseded by toto corde which does not occur in Cicero (according to Merguet) or Seneca, but is found in Cypr. de laps. 1, p. 237, 9 (H.); 263, 13; de op. 17 (386, 5); ep. 6, 4 (484, 4); 55, 23 (641, 20); Ps.-Sulpic. Sev., p. 245, 8 (Halm); Orient. common. 1, 98; Cassiod. var. 6, 5, 1; Paulin. Pell. Euchar. 591;

¹ Kurtz, p. 319.

² Kurtz, p. 317.

³ Ueber die poet. Personifik. bei Plaut., Halle, 1887.

Paulin. Nol. ep. 24, 6; Claudian. 5, 327 (Jeep); and especially in Alcuin.¹

PEIUS. Petron. 44 heu heu, cotidie peius; Sen. Phaedr. 775 horaque | semper praeterita deterior subit; Publil. Syr. 103 cotidie est deterior posterior dies; compare Greg. Cypr. Leid. 1, 17 ἀεὶ τὰ πέρους βελτίω; Diogen. 2, 54.

MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.

¹Other variations of the phrase are *totis visceribus*, Stat. silv. 5, 1, 47 visceribus totis . . . amplexa fovebat; Venant. Fort. vit. S. Hilar. 8, 30 totis visceribus diligebat; Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 2 (M. 189, 188 D) totis visceribus amplectandam; *totis medullis*, Orient. common. 1, 97; *totis membris*, Sen. n. q. 7, 32, 4 si hoc totis membris premeremus; *totis animis*, Ps.-Cypr. c. 5, 60 (III, p. 307, 60 (H.)); *totis sensibus*, Arnob. adv. nat. 1, 25 totis, ut ita dixerim, sensibus amplexari; *toto mente*, Ovid a. a. 3, 424; trist. 1, 9, 53; Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 60; note the strengthened form *toto corde*, *tota mente*, *totis viribus* which occurs in ps.-Cypr., p. 235, 17 (H.), Gualbert. act. 158 (M. 146, 873); Foliot ep. 174 (M. 190, 877 D); and elsewhere frequently in ecclesiastical Latin. *Toto animo* and *totis viribus* often occur in late Latin; Claudian. 26, 274 (Jeep) says, *toto nunc robore niti*.

II.—ON THE ASSOCIATION OF NUMERALS.

In their interesting *Experimentelle Untersuchungen über die psychologischen Grundlagen der sprachlichen Analogiebildung* (Leipzig, W. Engelmann, 1901) Thumb, the Freiburg philologist, and Marbe, the psychologist at Würzburg, discuss, among other things, the association of numerals (pp. 34 and 54).

In August and December 1899 I undertook a series of experiments along similar lines. My main purpose was to see if an examination of a fairly large number of associations would yield material for the illustration of the psychical process which leads to 'functional' associations, which, in grammar, appear as a certain type of analogy-formations, the third group in B. I. Wheeler's classification (*Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language*, in *Cornell University Studies in Classical Philology*, 1887), in which words affect each other, not because they are similar in sound, nor because they are similar in root-meaning, but because they play the same part in the sentence-architecture.¹ (Thumb and Marbe call them *grammatische Analogiebildungen*, p. 61 ff.; cf. also my *Lectures on the Study of Language* (1901) p. 156). In this particular respect the results were not satisfactory enough to warrant publication, and the experiments were discontinued until a better method could be devised. Incidentally, however, I collected a number of data concerning the association of numerals which now appear of interest because the results of my experiments differ so widely from those obtained by Thumb and Marbe.

My experiments were made on ten persons (nine men and one woman); of these three (Fl., Bas., and Bun.) were graduate

¹ It may be noted here that Scripture in his *Elements of Experimental Phonetics* (soon to be published by Charles Scribner's Sons) denies the existence of 'functional associations.'

students in the Classics, one (Miss Ha.) a graduate student in English, one (Bo.) a law student, one (Ro.) an instructor in English, two (In. and Ingh.) instructors in Latin, one (Go.) a professor of Greek, and one (Bu.) an instructor in Physics. They entered the experiments with a perfectly unbiased mind, and I took pains to ascertain in each case at the end, if during the experiment they had in any way guessed its purpose. The answer was always in the negative.

For the experiment I used English words, printed in Latin capitals half an inch high on a white background. This is the list of words used in the order in which they were shown: PAPER, BLUE, MET, CORK, STAR, SEVEN, BAD, WINE, SAID, RAIN, SILK, BRUSH, GOING, HIDE, FEET, HUNT, SAND, LOVED, HEART, TIGER, PEN, HORSE, LIVER, WATER, TWO, BOOK, SHIP, MICE, SOLID, SAW, CARRY, BLACK, RAN, POUR, HIGH, BETTER, FLED, GRIND, WAS, MOST, DONE, BIGGER, OLD, WISELY, FIVE, HOPE, BADLY. The quick opening of a shutter exposed one word at a time. The time of exposure was five seconds. No record of the reaction time was taken. Twenty seconds from the opening of the shutter, were allowed for the formation of associations. Their number varied in the different individuals. At the end of that time each person was requested to give the series of associations he or she had formed. It was understood that the series of associations should be continued only so long as associations would suggest themselves *easily and without any conscious effort*; otherwise the chain of associations was to terminate at once, even though the twenty seconds had not expired. Purposely no further restrictions of any kind were imposed, for it was feared that they might interfere with the freedom of associations and set the mind, as it were, in a definite direction, (cf. e. g. Jodl, *Lehrbuch der Psychologie*, p. 503; Kries, in *Zt. f. Psychol. u. Physiol. d. Sinnesorgane*, VIII (1895), p. 1, on '*connective Einstellung*'). As a necessary consequence of this perfect freedom the associations would occasionally (and more frequently than was desirable) drift away from the printed word which was intended to call them up, and these secondary and tertiary associations were, of course, useless for my purpose. Of such character is Bu.'s second association in the series called forth by SEVEN, and the second and third associations in the series called forth by TWO:

CALL-WORD.	PRIMARY ASSOCIATIONS.	SECONDARY ASSOCIATIONS.	TERTIARY ASSOCIATIONS.
SEVEN	(1) It is a sacred number. (3) "Seven and Eleven." (4) It is a prime number.	(2) Because there are seven days in the week.	
TWO	(1) It is mathematical.	(2) It is too low a number to be mathematical.	(3) This is a foolish thought.

Of the one hundred and thirteen associations with numerals twenty nine were of this kind and therefore had to be discarded. In the following the remaining eighty-four are tabulated.

I. *The numeral is set in a phrase.*

A. Set phrases, titles etc:

TWO: (1)¹ "Two is company" [Ingh.].—(3) "We two" [In.].—(2) "We two in Europe" [In.].—(2) "Two in a tower" [Go.].—(1) Mixed notion of contents and title of Hardy's "Two in a tower" [In.].

FIVE: (8) "Five o'clock" [Fl.].—(5) "Five minutes" [Fl.].—(1) "Five little blackbirds sitting on a fence" [Ha.].—(3) "Five Points" [Go.].—(7) "Lend me five shillings" [In.].—(1) Saw "High Five," printed and in quotation marks, without remembering where or when he had read it [In.].—(2) "Five senses" [Ro.].

SEVEN: (1) "We are seven" [Fl.].—(1) *do.* [Ha.].—(1) *do.* [Go.].—(5) *do.* [Ingh.].—(3) *do.* [In.].—(3) "Seven wise men" [Bo.].—(4) "The seven wise men of Greece" [Fl.].—(10) "Seven o'clock" [Ingh.].—(9) "Seven up"

¹The numbers in parentheses denote the place which each association occupied in its series. Thus, "Two is company" was the *first* association of Ingh., "We two" was the *third* association of In. in the respective series called up by two.

[Ingh.].—(5) "The seven hills of Rome;" auditory recollection of the phrase as uttered by Professor P. [Fl.].—

(1) "Seven against Thebes" [Ingh.].—(2) "There are seven pillars of Gothic mould" [Bun.].—(4) "The Seven Sleepers" [In.].—(4) "Seven candlesticks" [Bo.].

In a few of such phrases other numerals may accidentally appear:

TWO: (2) "One, two, three, four, five I caught a hare alive" [Bu.]—

FIVE: (3) "Five times five is twenty-five" [Bu.].

SEVEN: (3) "Seven and eleven" [Bu.].

B. Made-up phrases:

TWO: (1) "We are two" [Fl.].

FIVE: (3) Saw a child with bare feet and heard it say: "I am five" [Ingh.].

Here belongs also an unsuccessful attempt of Miss Ha. When shown TWO, she tried to remember the title of a book beginning with *Two*, but failed to recall one.

In the following two cases it is not quite clear whether they belong here or rather under nos. II and III respectively. For FIVE Go.'s first association was "Five fingers," primarily as he himself stated, as a phrase. The case is on the border line between nos. I and III. Again, for FIVE Bo.'s first association was "Five cents." It could not be determined whether this was merely a phrase or belonged with many similar cases enumerated under no. II.

Including Miss Ha.'s unsuccessful attempt and these two doubtful cases the sum total of associations in group I is thirty-four.

II. *The numeral suggests the figure-sign.*

SEVEN: (1) Sees the figure 7 in about the same type as the printed word [Bas.].—(1) Figure 7 [Bo.].

TWO: (4) Sees the figure 2 on the green background of a two-dollar bill [Ingh.]—

FIVE: (1) Sees a nickel with the figure V on it [Ingh.].—

(2) Sees the figure V on a five-cent piece [Bo.].

Here belong also the following associations in which the figure-sign, without entering the focus of consciousness, mediated between the printed words and the associated objects (Mediate Association; Wundt, *Grundzüge der physiolog. Psychologie*, 4th ed. (1893) II., p. 459; *Grundriss der Psychologie*, 4th ed. (1901) p. 292.).

FIVE: (4) Sees a five-dollar bill, given in cashing a check

[Fl.]—(3) Sees a number of five-dollar bills [Fl.]—(2) Sees the green back of a five-dollar bill [Ingh.]—(1) Sees a five-cent piece [Ro.].

The sum total of the associations in group II is nine.

III. *The numeral is associated with certain objects.*

TWO: (2) Sees a two-spot of cards [Bun.]—(1) Thinks of himself and his wife, as a couple [Go.]—(1) Sees a man and a woman with their backs turned toward him [Bas.]—(1) Thinks of himself and myself as being the only two in the room [Bun.]—(2) Thinks of the two sisters who married Coleridge and Wordsworth [Fl.].

FIVE: (1) Sees a five-spot of cards [Bun.]—(1) Thinks of his five fingers and five finger exercises on the piano [Bas.]—(1) Sees his five fingers [Bu.]. (2) Five toes [Go.].

In regard to the last case my record does not show whether it was also a visual impression, as Bu.'s 'Five Fingers' or a phrase, as Go.'s "Five Fingers" (above, end of group I).

SEVEN: (1) Sees the outlines of seven women, as in the star map picture of the constellation of the Pleiades [In.]—(2)

Seven days, as making up a week, with the visual impression of a calendar at his home [In.].

The sum total of associations in group III is eleven.

IV. *Something is predicated of the number.*

TWO: (1) It is mathematical [Bu.].

SEVEN: (1) It is a Biblical number [Bun.]—(3) It is a mystic number [Ha.]—(8) It is a common number [Ingh.]—(4) It is a prime number [Bu.]—(1) It is a sacred number [Bu.]—(6) Recollects a statement made by Professor P. that 'seven' was a favorite number with the Romans [Fl.]—(7) The seven is the perfect number [Ingh.].

My record shows that the last case was felt as a phrase, and thus stands on the border line between I and IV.

The sum total of the associations in group IV is eight.

V. *The numeral is associated with its equivalent in a foreign language.*

TWO: (5) δύο [In.]—(6) duo [In.]—(7) zwei [In.].

FIVE: (2) έπτά [Fl.].

Upon inquiry I learn that Fl. habitually confuses Greek πέντε and έπτά. While saying έπτά he really meant πέντε.

SEVEN: (1) sibun [Ro.]—(2) έπτά, hears himself pronouncing it [Fl.]—(2) sieben, acoustic image [Ha.].

The associations in this class number seven.

VI. *Association of homonyms (by sound)*. The following cases show complete phonetic identity.

TWO: (9) 'to' [In.].—(10) 'too' [In.].

Here belongs also an association of Ro. His second association in the series called forth by TWO was "The Big Four" (a phrase in New Haven city politics). With this *Four* he then associated the OE. *fōr*, past tense of *faran*.

In the following cases there is only partial similarity:

SEVEN: (2) 'Severn' [Go.].—(3) 'Severa' [Fl.].

FIVE: (3) 'Fife' (proper name) [Ro.].

The total number of associations in group VI is six.

VII. *Other numerals are associated*. There are only two cases in which the persons who tried the experiment began to count:

TWO: (1) 'Two', 'Three', 'Four' [Ro.].

SEVEN: (11) 'Eight', 'Nine' [Ingh].

Three other cases in which numerals play a part (omitting, of course, the *phrases*, group I, in which numerals happen to occur) are as follows. When FIVE was shown Fl. at once remembered having had 'seven' and another numeral which he could not recall in the experiment of the previous day. Similar is the following case of Bun.:

FIVE: (3) Remembers having just been asked in the Library (before coming to the Psychological Laboratory) what 'fifteen' is in French.

Finally In. associated with FIVE

(1) 'High Five' (as printed, and in quotation marks) (2)

What does this mean? (3) It is probably a game, and was thus led to associate

(4) 'Seven-up', as a game of probably the same character as 'High-Five'.

These last three cases do not then properly belong to group VII.

VIII. A few scattered cases remain. Twice the numeral suggested, in a general way, its meaning; rather abstractly to Bo.:

two: (1) Thought of its meaning.

More concretely to In.:

two: (4) Had a general idea of duality, as of two persons. The addition "as of two persons" shows that this case is related to those of group III.

Once, to Bun., FIVE suggested an indistinct series of numerals as they are printed in grammars. This was a visual impression; he did not count, but saw the printed page. (It was his second association in the series).

And finally *Bo.* associated with *SEVEN* a general notion of baseball. This was the second association in the series. The connection here is obscure to me.

During my experiments I had an opportunity of testing a Japanese student. I showed him the Japanese-Chinese signs for 'nine' and 'seven' respectively. His associations were as follows:

Japanese-Chinese Sign for *NINE*: (1) *ku* (the Japanese word for 'nine') (2) "nine" [association with English equivalent, group V above] (3) *ku*ge (the Japanese name of the ancient nobility of Japan, attached to the Mikado's court and residing in Kyōto) [association by sound, group VI above].³

Japanese-Chinese Sign for *SEVEN*: (1) "seven" (2) "sieben" [These first two associations with the English and German equivalents belong to group V above] (3) *h'chi nin otoko* (*h'chi* the Yēdo pronunciation for *s(i)chi*, which in turn is the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese numeral for "seven"; *nin*, literally "man", here used as numerative, as in English "a loaf of bread", "nine head of cattle, *otoko* = "man".) [The whole is a made-up phrase, = "seven men" and belongs to group I, B.].

The striking point in these data is the scarcity of cases in which one numeral suggests another. Only two such associations occur; Of these, one is the eleventh in its series. Contrast this with the *thirty-five* cases (including the Japanese case) where the numeral was imbedded in a phrase, with the *eleven* cases in which it was joined to some object, with the *ten* instances of association of the foreign equivalents (including the three Japanese cases), with the *nine* cases in which the figure-sign was associated with the numeral, with the *eight* cases in which something was predicated of the numeral, and with the *seven* cases of purely external association by sound (including one Japanese case).

These figures differ so materially from those obtained by Thumb and Marbe that a renewed examination of the associations with numerals seems advisable. In this especial care should be taken not to interfere in any way whatsoever with the freedom of associations.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

HANNIS OERTEL.

³This is an instance of what Aschaffenburg (*Psychologische Arbeiten* herausg. von E. Kraepelin, Leipzig, 1896, I., p. 240) calls *Wortergänzungen*. A similar case is Bu.'s first association under *MET*, viz., *Metellus Cimber*.

III.—THE BODLEIAN FRAGMENTS OF JUVENAL.¹

The last decade has witnessed the discovery of several important Greek and Latin manuscripts, some of which, like the papyrus of Bacchylides, are the only known representatives of their authors, and others, as the codex Romanus of Catullus, take more or less important places among the sources of the text already in our possession. To the latter class belongs the Bodleian manuscript of Juvenal (Canon. Lat. XLI), which recently sprang from obscurity and neglect to a position not only prominent but, among manuscripts of this author, unique. While glancing at disputed readings in this hitherto disregarded codex, Mr. E. O. Winstedt observed not only that the accepted emendation of 15, 75, *instantibus Ombis*, at last received manuscript support, but that in the body of the sixth satire were two passages, one of two verses, the other of thirty-four verses, the existence of which modern editors of Juvenal had never suspected. The codex is a small folio, written in a Lombardic hand of the eleventh century, and contains marginal scholia of the Cornutus class on a few satires together with interlinear glosses in the original and in a later hand. More than thirteen years ago a partial collation was made for C. Hosius,² but only the readings of the seventh satire were examined. A glance at the collation now before us³ shows that Canon. Lat. XLI belongs to the inferior class of manuscripts (ω), but that like the rest of its group it is often in agreement with the Montepessulanus (*P*) or its corrector (*p*). Oftener, perhaps, than any other of the corrupt class, it has read-

¹The appearance of a lecture by Professor Robinson Ellis on "The New Fragments of Juvenal" (Feb. 5, 1901) seemed to mark a suitable time for giving to readers of this Journal an account of the recent discovery of hitherto unpublished verses in the sixth satire. I have therefore attempted, at the request of the editor, to set down the main facts and results, making free use of the suggestions offered by others, and adding some illustrations from my own reading.

²*Apparatus Criticus ad Iuvenalem*, Bonn, 1888, p. 20.

³*Class. Review* for May, 1899, pp. 202 ff.

ings peculiar to itself. Some of these are quite new, and must be carefully weighed by future editors. For the present passing over these details, we desire to consider the most interesting and important feature of the manuscript, its additions to the traditional text of Juvenal. The two fragments in their context are sub-joined together with a brief commentary.

atque utinam ritus veteres et publica saltem	335
his intacta malis agerentur sacra, sed omnes	
noverunt Mauri atque Indi quae psalteria penem	
maiolem, quam sunt duo Caesaris Anticatones,	
illuc, testiculi sibi conscius unde fugit mus,	
intulerit, ubi velari pictura iubetur	340
quaecumque alterius sexus imitata figuras.	
et quis tunc hominum contemptor numinis? aut quis	
simpivium ridere Numae nigrumque catinum	
et Vaticano fragiles de monte patellas	
ausus erat? sed nunc ad quas non Clodius aras?	345
audio quid veteres olim moneatis amici:	
'pone seram, prohibe.' sed quis custodiet ipsos	
custodes? cauta est et ab illis incipit uxor.	
iamque eadem summis pariter minimisque libido,	
nec melior, silicem pedibus quae conterit atrum,	350
quam quae longorum vehitur cervice Syrorum.	
ut spectet ludos, conducit Ogulnia vestem,	
conducit comites sellam cervical amicas	
nutricem et flavam cui det mandata puellam.	
haec tamen argenti superest quodcumque paterni,	355
levibus athletic et vasa novissima donat:	
multis res angusta domi, sed nulla pudorem	
paupertatis habet nec se metitur ad illum	
quem dedit haec posuitque modum. tamen utile quid sit,	
prospiciunt aliquando viri, frigusque famemque	360
formica tandem quidam expavere magistra:	
prodiga non sentit pereuntem femina censum.	
ac velut exhausta redivivus pullulet arca	
nummus et e pleno tollatur semper acervo,	
non usquam reputant, quanti sibi gaudia constant.	365

- VI A. in quacumque domo vivit luditque professus
 obscaenum tremula promittit et omnia dextra:
 invenes omnis turpes similesque cinaedis.
 his violare cibos sacraeque adsistere mensae
 5 permittunt et vasa iubent frangenda lavari,

^a Obscaenum B et tremula promittit B, corr. Housman promittens Winterfeld omnia] crimina Postgate ibi omnia Owen munia malit Buscheier somnia Ellis
 3 cinaedis B

- cum colocyntha bibit vel cum barbata chelidon.
 purior ergo tuis laribus meliorque lanista,
 in cuius numero longe migrare iubetur
 Psyllus ab Eupholio. quid quod nec retia turpi
 10 iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem
 munimenta umeri pulsantemque arma tridentem
 qui nudus pugnare solet? pars ultima ludi
 accipit has animas aliusque in carcere nervos.
 sed tibi communem calicem facit uxor et illis,
 15 cum quibus Albanum Surrentinumque recusat
 flava ruinosi lupa degustare sepulchri.
 horum consiliis nubunt subitaeque recedunt,
 his languentem animum servant et seria vitae,
 his clunem atque latus discunt vibrare magistris,
 20 quicquid praeterea scit qui docet. haud tamen illi
 semper habenda fides. oculos fuligine pascit,
 distinctus croceis et reticulatus adulter.
 suspectus tibi sit, quanto vox mollior et quo
 saepius in teneris haerebit dextera lumbis.
 25 hic erit in lecto fortissimus; exiit illic
 personam docili Thais saltata Triphallo.
 quem rides? aliis hunc mimum! sponsio fiat:
 purum te contendo virum, contendo. fateris?
 an vocat ancillas tortoris pergula? novi
 30 consilia et veteres quaecumque monetis amici:
 'pone seram, cohibes.' sed quis custodiat ipsos
 custodes, qui nunc lascivae furta puellae
 hac mercede silent? crimen commune tacetur.
 prospicit hoc prudens et ab illis incipit uxor.

sunt quas eunuchi inbelles ac mollia semper 366
 oscula delectent et desperatio barbae
 et quod abortivo non est opus. illa voluptas
 summa tamen, quod iam calida matura iuventa
 inguina traduntur medicis, iam pectine nigro; 370
 ergo spectatos ac iussos crescere primum

6 colocyntha B 9 Psyllus Postgate Psillus B psellus Housman eupholio]
 euphono Housman Euphronio Owen Eupolemo (?) Buecheler et post turpi add.
 Housman 11 humeri B pulsantemque Postgate paulatamque B pulsatumque
 Jackson et Ellis qui legi posse pulsaturumque tridentem putat pulsata hastamque Housman
 sulcatum, arma, Rosbach pulsantemque aere Reinack tridentem? Thomas 13 has
 Housman et Buecheler as B aliusque Housman allosque B Ramorino nervus (5a) Owen
 Reinack 15 Ccum B recuset Platt 16 sepulcri B 18 servant] soluant
 Housman ad seria Richards animum servant languentem ad seria Postgate et tedia
 Reinack 20 preterea B illi] Idae (ide) aut illi Postgate 22 reticulatus?
 Adulter Reinack 24 Saepius B herebit B 25 lecto Postgate tecto B
 26 docilis B sed 2 deleta est Triphallo Postgate tripallo B 27 rides? aliis
 hunc mimum! Housman, non distinxit B rides aliis, hunc mimum—Buecheler rides facilis
 nunc mimum Thomas 29 pergula B, superscriptum r 31 cohibe Postgate
 cf. b, 347 33 comune B

testiculos, postquam coeperunt esse bilibres,
tonsoris damno tantum rapit Heliodorus. 373

VI B. magonum pueros vera ac miserabilis urit
debilitas follisque pudet cicerisque relict.

conspicuis longe cunctisque notabilis intrat
balnea nec dubie custodem vitis et horti 375
provocat a domina factus spado. dormiat ille
cum domina, sed tu iam durum, Postume, iamque
tondendum eunucho Bromium committere noli.

NOTES ON VI A.

1. *quacumque* = *qualibet*; so P. Thomas and R. Ellis; Housman, on the other hand, followed by Owen, Postgate, Maas, Ramorino and Reinach regard it as relative. But *quicumque* is never relative in Juvenal after prepositions except 8, 60 (*de*). Cf. 6, 412 quocumque in trivio . . . narrat; 14, 42 (*in, sub*); 3, 156 (*ex*); 8, 27. 134 (*de*); 3, 230; 13, 56; 14, 210.

luditque: 7, 239 ne turpia ludant.

professus: schol. on 2, 16 qui publice inpudicitiam professus est; Hor. *Epist.* 1, 18, 2 professus amicum.

2. *obscaenum*: masc. also 2, 9 and 6, 513; cf. Mart. 6, 50, 3 obscaenos cinaedos and Claud. *Bell. Gild.* 1, 166 thalamis obscaenus adulter.

tremula . . . *dextra*: 11, 164 tremulo . . . clune. An interesting parallel is the *double entente* in Claud. *in Eutrop.* 1, 365 ff. nil negat . . . ; quidquid amas, dabit illa manus; . . . accipit et trabeas argutae praemia dextrae; cf. id. *ib.* 2, 61 non bene Gradivo lenonia dextera servit.

promittit . . . *omnia*: Mart. 12, 12 omnia promittis, cum tota nocte bibisti; 11, 174 omnique libidinis arte; 3, 77 omnia novit.

et: though found four times in postposition, *et* never stands in the third place in Juvenal, unless it be accepted here. *Qui*, however, takes this position in 1, 43 and 13, 86, and examples of *et* so situated may be seen in Hor. *Epod.* 16, 40 and Lucan, 1, 224.

3. *omnis*: same form in 1, 24; 12, 90; 6, 592; 10, 47; 15, 99. The reference is to the class indicated by *professus obscaenum*.

turpes: so *turpi* below (9); cf. 2, 9. 111 and Hor. *C.* 1, 37, 9.

4. *violare*: of polluting what is sacred, e. g., Sen. *Epist.* 97, 2 (the case of Clodius and Caesar's wife) *violatis religionibus eius sacrificii, quod pro populo fieri dicitur*. So in Juvenal 15, 9. 84.

sacrae . . . mensae: 2, 110 *reverentia mensae*; Claud. *in Rufin.* 1, 229 *nusquam reverentia mensae*.

5. *frangenda*: 8, 18 *frangenda . . . imagine*.

6. *colocyntha* and *chelidon* should not be understood as proper names, but as common nouns suggestive of the *os impurum* of the *obscaenus*. *colocyntha* (κολοκύνθη) seems to be used in the sense of *σικία*; cf. Hippoc. 581, 37 and 680, 43 (ed. Foësius). In Latin *cucurbita* probably had this meaning (*lasanum*), for Pliny says that *cucurbitae* were used in the baths, and it may be, as Maas suggests, for this purpose (*N. H.* 19, 71).¹ The use of *matella*, then, in Petron. 45 for the *domina cum servo deprehensa* throws light on the significance of *colocyntha* in the present instance. *Chelidon* was the name of Verres' mistress, often mentioned by Cicero (*Verr.* 1, 40, 104; 2, 47, 116, etc.), and of Cleopatra's eunuch (Sen. *Epist.* 87, 16). Here, however, it seems to signify *pudendum muliebre*, for, according to Suidas, one of the meanings of the word was τῶν γυναικῶν τὸ μόριον. For *barbatus*, cf. *Priap.* 12, 14.

bibit: used absolutely also 1, 49 *ab octava Marius bibit*.

7. *ergo*: so regularly in Juvenal except *ergo* 3, 281 and 9, 82 (Friedl. on 3, 281).

tuis: the sudden change from 3d to 2d person, seen also below in ll. 14, 23 and 27, is characteristic of Juvenal; see e. g., 1, 50 and 7, 90.

laribus: in the plural for only one home also 15, 153; this is regular in Martial (Friedländer on 9, 18, 2). The use of a word which suggests the domestic religious rites, sets the impurity of the household in higher relief.

lanista = lares lanistae, a compendiarly use of the substantive which is common in the satires, especially after comparatives, e. g., 3, 74 (*sermo*) *Isaeo torrentior, i. e. Isaei sermone* (Friedl. ad loc.). The *lanista*, together with the *leno*, is with Juvenal a standing type for the social scum; cf. 3, 156-8 and 6, 216.

¹ If this were accepted as one signification in Petron. 39 in *aquario copones et cucurbitae* (sc. nascuntur), the appropriateness of *cucurbitae* in connection with *aquario* would be apparent. All that Pliny says, however, is that *cucurbitae* were used 'urceolorum vice.'

8. *numero*: Tac. *Agr.* 18, 3 sparsi per provinciam numeri. The organization of the *ludus* was similar to that of the *castra*; hence this post-Augustan military term.

9. *Psyllus*: Plin. *N. H.* 25, 123 sunt et ranis venena, rubetis maxime, vidimusque Psyllos in certamen e patinis candefactis admittentes, ociore etiam quam aspidum pernicie. Whatever may be the special significance of these names, it seems evident that they are used typically, to indicate gladiators, one of whom is *mollis*.

quid quod: also 3, 86 and 147; as a formula of transition common in Silver Latin.

nec = ne . . . quidem, as 2, 152; 3, 90; 14, 246. This use of *nec* occurs in early Latin and is common in the Silver period; cf. Madvig on Cic. *Fin.*³, Excurs. III, pp. 803 ff.

10. *tunicae*: of the *retiarius*; cf. 2, 143 tunicati fuscina Gracchi, and 8, 203 ff. with notes of Friedländer. Even among the *retiarii* there is a sharp distinction drawn. Prof. Housman adds *et* after *turpi* (9) and takes *tunicae* as nom. plur., and *turpi* as equivalent to τοῖς τοῦ ἀρχοῦ just as *lanista* (7) means *lares lanistae*. While this addition undeniably improves the passage, it seems unnecessary in an author like Juvenal.

eadem: i. e. with the *molles*. Prof. Ellis, on the other hand, understands "with his superior."

11. *munimenta umeri*: the *galerus* of the *retiarius* which is mentioned in 8, 208; cf. Mr. Duff's note and the scholiast on that passage, 'galerus est umero inpositus gladiatoris.'

arma: the shield of the *murmillo* or *secutor*, the usual antagonists of the *retiarius*; 8, 200 f. nec murmillonis in armis nec clipeo Gracchum pugnantem. If the reading of the MS (with the slightest possible change) be retained, *arma* must be regarded as in apposition with *pulsatum tridentem*, unless with Mr. Jackson we take *pulsatum* as supine with *arma* for its object. In either case, as Prof. Postgate has suggested, *quassatum* would be a better word. Some support, however, for *pulsantem* comes from Prudent. *c. Symm.* 2, 1109 f. spectant aeratam faciem quam crebra tridenti impactu quatiant hastilia. Prof. Housman argues with some probability that *arma* was added to fill the gap made by the accidental omission of *hasta*. He therefore reads *pulsata <hasta>* mque tridentem and compares Priscian GLK II 343, 16 lectum est tridenti hasta et telo, and Sil. 17, 242 telo tridenti.

12. *nudus*: still with reference to the *retiarius*; 8, 203 ff. nec

galea faciem abscondit, movet ecce tridentem, | postquam vibrata pendentia retia dextra | nequiquam effudit, nudum ad spectacula voltum | erigit. Suet. *Claud.* 34 (gladiatores) etiam forte prolapsos iugulari iubebat, maxime retiarios, ut expirantium facies videret.

pars ultima: the reference is here to a locality, though *pars* is used of a person in 1, 26 *pars Niliacae plebis*, and 8, 44 *volgi pars ultima nostri*; cf. the reminiscence in *Claud. in Eutrop.* 1, 153 *obscurae latuit pars ignotissima turbae*. These passages support the punctuation of Buecheler, who connects the phrase with what precedes. The interpretation given above, however, is confirmed by a passage in Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* VII 31, 3 *alius genitalia excidit, alius in obscaenam partem ludi fugit*.

ludi: of the gladiatorial school also 6, 82; 8, 199; 11, 20.

13. *animas*: 4, 152 *inlustresque animas*; 8, 254 *plebeiae Deciorum animae*.

aliosque: thus it seems better to read with Prof. Housman than to retain *aliosque* of the MS, which is due to a scribe who mistook *nervos* for the accusative plural. Those who prefer to keep *aliosque* may translate, 'Such creatures and others are visited with the stocks in prison' (Owen).

carcere: the guardroom of the gladiators; cf. 6, 561 *castrorum in carcere*, and 14, 24 *for carcer* as a place of durance for slaves.

nervos: the stocks. At Pompeii may still be seen the remains of stocks found in the guardroom of the barracks of the gladiatorial school; cf. A. Mau, *Pompeii, Its Life and Art*, translated by Kelsey, New York, 1899, p. 157. In comedy *nervus* seems usually to refer to the stocks; Donatus on *Ter. Ph.* 325 *quia saepe in nervum coniciebantur ex aliquo maleficio in carcerem missi*.

14. *communem calicem*: 8, 177 *communia pocula*.

15. *Albanum*: again 13, 214; mentioned in connection with *Surrentinum* in *Plin. N. H.* 14, 64, *Mart.* 13, 109. 110, *Athen.* 1, 26 d, and in the medical writers, *Galen* and *Cael. Aurelianus*. For a similar comparison see 11, 172 f. *verbis, nudum olido stans fornice mancipium quibus abstinet*, in which the indicative mood lends some support to *recusat*, against Mr. Platt's emendation.

recusat: 14, 134 *invitatus ad haec aliquis de ponte negabit*.

16. *flava*: 6, 354 *flavam puellam*. This was the usual color of hair for the meretrix; hence *Messalina* went on her midnight jaunt 'nigrum flavo crinem abscondente galero' (6, 120), on which

the scholiast comments 'ideo flavo, nigro nam crine matronae utebantur.'

lupa: 3, 66 lupa barbara.

sepulchri: a *bustuaria moecha* (Mart. 3, 93, 15); cf. Mart. 1, 34, 8 abscondunt spurcas et monumenta lupas.

17. *recedunt*: i. e., a viris; cf. 6, 130. The usual compound in this connection is *discedere*; Cael. in Cic. *Fam.* 8, 6, 1 fin., uxor a Dolabella discessit.

18. *languentem animum*: Quint. (?) *decl.* 291 p. 160 Ritter dicentibus medicis animi esse languorem.

seria: again 11, 93. In hours of ennui the *mollis* is there to entertain, in times of earnest purpose, to advise. Prof. Postgate, accepting the emendation of Mr. Richards, translates: "For these creatures they keep the soul which is sickened for life's serious work."

19. *clunem*: 2, 21 clunem agitant, 11, 164 tremulo . . . clune.

latus: cf. 6, 37.

vibrare: Mart. 5, 78, 26 f. nec de Gadibus improbis puellae | vibrabunt sine fine prurientes | lascivos docili tremore lumbos; Claud. in *Eutrop.* 2, 359 f. quis melius vibrata puer vertigine molli membra rotet, verrat quis marmora crine supino.

discunt . . . magistris: Claud. in *Eutrop.* 2, 157 et molli didicit parere magistro.

20. *quicquid . . . docet*: clauses introduced by *quidquid* to avoid going into further detail are characteristic of Juvenal; a good example is 13, 78-83 where a list of the weapons of the gods is closed by *quidquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli*. Others are given by Prof. Ellis *l. l.*, p. 10.

tamen: i. e. in spite of his apparent effeminacy.

21. *pascit*: the eyes are thus made to appear larger. Each detail of this and the following verse is fully explained by 2, 93-97 with the notes of Friedländer.

22. *croceis*: sc. vestimentis: cf. 2, 97 galbina rasa. So the Gallus in Verg. *Aen.* 11, 775 wears *croceam chlamydem*, for the use of this color was a mark of effeminacy; hence Mart. 1, 96, 9 galbini mores.

reticulatus: 2, 96 reticulumque comis auratum ingentibus implet.

23. *suspectus tibi sit*: 12, 93 nec suspecta tibi sint haec. Cf. Sen. (Haase, III, p. 429) *de matr.*, fr. 51 (honorandus) et in longam securamque libidinem exsectus spado, sub quibus nominibus adulteri delitescunt.

quanto: to be taken with what precedes; in a large majority of cases (21: 6) Juvenal omits *tantus* before *quantus*, e. g. 10, 13 f. . . . cuncta exuperans patrimonia census quanto delphinis ballaena Britannica maior.

vox mollior: 2, 111 *fracta voce*, Phaed. 6, 9, 2 *fracte loquendo* . . . *famam cinaedi traxerat certissimam*, Quintil. 11, 3, 23 *mollis teneraque vox*, Claud. in *Eutrop.* 1, 340 f. *vocis acutae mollities*.

24. *teneris* . . . *lumbis*: 8, 16 (of a pathic) *tenerum lumbum*. Pers. 4, 35 *arcana lumbi*. To disarm the husband's suspicion, the *mollis* assumes an interest in boys; this regularly indicated indifference to women. Notwithstanding Prof. Housman's positive assertion "*teneris h. d. lumbis* (ipsius of course)," I still believe that *teneris lumbis* by a device common in Juvenal (e. g., 3, 275; Friedl. on 2, 170) is equivalent to *tenerorum lumbis*. Otherwise we lose the point of the passage, viz., the attempt on the part of the *obscaenus* to conceal from the husband his real character. In v. 25, however, he strips off the disguise.

haerebit for *inhaerebit*: so 3, 248 in *digito clavus mihi militis haeret*.

dextera: trisyllabic form also in 6, 560.

25. *fortissimus*: 4, 3f. *aegrae solaque libidine fortes deliciae*.

26. *docili*: cf. Martial quoted on 19 (*vibrare*).

Thais: a common name for a meretrix, found, for example, in the Eunuchus of Terence and several times in Martial.

Triphallo: Priapus is addressed by this name in *Priap.* 82, 9. In the present instance the *mollis* is compared to a Triphallus qui Thaida sustinet (3, 93).

27. *aliis hunc mimum*: sc. para; cf. 6, 608 *sibi mimum parat*. A good parallel is Pers. 3, 30 *ad populum phaleras!*

sponsio fiat: 11, 201 f. (in the circus) *audax sponsio*. The rhetorical wager is quite in the manner of Juvenal; examples are 6, 56 f. and 7, 165 f. The final *o* of *sponsio*, as of *contendo* in the next verse, is quite regular for Juvenal, who in such cases considered the vowel long only when it fell under the ictus.

28. *purum*: i. e. *purum putum*; cf. Lorenz on Plaut. *Pseud.* 972 (989).

contendo: similar use of *contendere* in a wager, Catull. 44, 4.

29. *vocat*: the present indicative in deliberative questions is common in early Latin and appears later in poetry and in prose which displays a strong colloquial element; examples in Juvenal are 3, 296; 4, 130; 14, 17.

pergula: in 11, 137 the headquarters of the school of carving.

31. *cohibes*: it seems unnecessary on account of *prohibe* in 6, 347 to read *cohibe* here. *Cohibes* is the apodosis of a conditional sentence with *pone seram* as protasis; examples of the imperative as a substitute for protasis in Juvenal are 1, 155 and 7, 175.

32. *qui nunc*: this and the following verse are quoted by the scholiast on 6, 348: see the discussion below.

33. *mercede*: for a different method, cf. 6, 234 f. *decipit illa custodes aut aere domat*.

silent: elsewhere in Juvenal intransitive, 3, 304; 6, 238; 7, 169.

tacetur: usually intransitive in Juvenal, but cf. 9, 26 *quodque taces*, and the gerundive in 3, 50 and 4, 105. A good parallel is Ovid, *Am.* 2, 18, *36 aureus in medio Marte tacetur amor*.

NOTES ON VI B.

2. *debilitas*: Claud. in *Etrop.* 1, 45 f. *rapitur castrandus ab ipso ubere*.

cicericisque: cf. scholiast on Aristoph. *ran.* 545 τοῦ ἐρεβίνθου τοῦ αἰδοίου. . . ἢ κυρίως ἐρεβίνθου, εἰώθασι γὰρ οἱ δούλοι ἐν τοῖς τῶν δεσποτῶν πότοις εἰς παραμυθίαν ἑαυτῶν τοιαῦτα περιφέρειν.

relicti: cf. 16, 12 *oculum medico nil promittente relictum*. M. Louis Havet interprets: "Les malheureux enfants rougissent des organes diminués qui leur restent, tandis que le spado, qui testiculos perdidit, penem integrum servavit."¹ More literally Messrs. Jackson and Platt: "They are ashamed of the bag (scrotum) and the pod (penis) which alone remain to them." Prof. Ellis paraphrases: "they are ashamed to think of the poor purse and cheap fare they have left for a better feed, but not so respectable life," but this attempt to rescue the verse from indecency is quite out of harmony with the context and will hardly meet with approval.²

The discovery of these verses draws renewed attention to the question of a double recension in the satires of Juvenal. The presence of verses and paragraphs not in harmony with the train of thought, and of contiguous parallel passages was recognized by Ribbeck in his famous *Der echte und unechte Juvenal* and discussed at length by Teuffel.³ Such verses, for example, as 11, 99, which produces a dislocation of the most violent character,

¹ *Revue Arch.* XXXIV, 1899, p. 449, note.

² *l. l.*, p. 19.

³ *Studien u. Charakteristiken*,³ pp. 549-560; for other literature on the subject, see the edition of Friedländer, p. 56, N. 3.

2, 53; 3, 296; 12, 50-51 and many more, would never be missed from the context in which they stand: in fact, the connection is in some cases very much improved by their removal. Longer passages, too, such as 1, 127-131 and 3, 113-118, apparently with no logical right to the place they occupy, have given rise to tiresome discussions and mechanical transpositions. While we have no good reason to suppose that these verses were added by a later hand, it seems quite possible that the satires were revised by the author himself in later life and additions made either as amplifications or as substitutions for longer or shorter passages of the original. Moreover, some verses, which were never intended to have a place in the published form of the satires, but were written down for use, by way of parenthesis, at a recitation, may have crept into the text from the margin. Apart from the number of highly probable examples discussed in detail by Teuffel¹ and recently recalled to mind and emphasized by W. v. Christ,² there is indisputable evidence of a double recension in the sixth satire. The passage 630-633 in our editions reads as follows:

custodite animas et nulli credite mensae,	630
livida materno fervent adipata veneno.	
mordeat ante aliquis quidquid porrexerit illa	
quae peperit, timidus praegustet pocula pappas.	

Verses 632 and 633, however, are not found in the original hand of P but were added at a later date. Valla comments; 'mordeat — pappas. hi duo, inquit Probus, versiculi in aliis non sunt.' Though regarded by Jahn as spurious, these verses have been accepted as genuine by all recent editors and given a place in the text. Again, in the scholion of Valla on 614 we find three verses, which do not now stand in our text, together with the remark 'sed hi tres versiculi in multis non sunt codicibus. quos in antiquissimo legimus codice et Probus etiam refert.' In his very old manuscript, if he reported it correctly, the passage in its connection was as follows:

tamen hoc tolerabile, si non	614
semper aquam portes rimosa ad dolia, semper	
istud onus subeas ipsis manantibus urnis	
quo rabidus nostro Phalarim de rege dedisti.	
et furere incipias ut avunculus ille Neronis,	615

¹ *l. l.*; the passages are 1, 73-80; 5, 92-102; 6, 166-183; 6, 582-591; 9, 118-123.

² *Sitzungsberichte d. philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl. d. bayr. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1897, p. 155.

These verses were seen also by Achaintre and Jahn in several codices of the tenth and eleventh centuries, in at least one instance after verse 601 instead of after verse 614, and with many variants. Of course, these circumstances arouse suspicion of the authenticity of the passage, which in its present form is not intelligible and is excluded from the text by all editors.¹

In the *scholia Pithoeana* (6, 348) are found the following verses:

qui nunc lascivae furta puellae
hac mercede silent : crimen commune tacetur.

These were formerly regarded as a quotation from some old poet,² but are now seen to be an independent witness to a double recension in this passage, and that the recension embodied in the recently discovered fragment. Though the new verses stand in the manuscript after v. 365, it seems clear from the connection that they were intended to stand after v. 345.³ In his comment on the latter verse Valla's Probus reports the variant reading *sed non ad quas nunc ludius aras*, which may easily have resulted from the eye of a copyist falling on the verse immediately following, that is, the first of the Bodleian fragment, in *quacumque domo vivit ludique professus*. If this inference be correct, we must suppose that when the paragraph dealing with the corrupting influence of the *mollis* in the home was removed from the text, the last five verses were condensed to three and used to introduce a new section on the subject of the extravagance of women. And it must be acknowledged that by the removal of verses 346 to 365 and the substitution of the thirty-four verses preserved in Canon. Lat. XLI, the sequence of thought is far more natural and easier to follow. In many copies, doubtless, the earlier recension was preserved, either in the text or on the margin; if the former, we should expect to find it in the very position which it occupies in the Bodleian manuscript, at the end of the section which was written to take its place.⁴ On the whole, then, if the literary

¹ R. Ellis, *l. l.*, p. 15. But compare A. E. Housman's attempt to emend and explain the verses, *Class. Rev.* XV, 1901, pp. 265 f.

² F. Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.* 54, 1899, p. 488.

³ For other views see M. Maas, *Arch. f. lat. Lex. u. Gram.*, XI, p. 422; F. Ramorino, *Atene e Roma*, 3, 1899, col. 60; A. E. Housman, *l. l.* p. 265.

⁴ See also *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1899, p. 896, where P. von Winterfeld, who believes that VI A was intended to stand between 345 and 349, offers a most ingenious explanation not only of the position of the new verses but also of the origin of the manuscript itself.

methods of the author and the weakness of the satires from the point of view of rhetorical structure are taken into consideration, there seems to be nothing improbable in the statement of one of the *vitae*, that in later life 'ampliavit satiras et pleraque mutavit.'¹

Up to this point the genuineness of the new fragment has been assumed. This, after all, is the chief question and one on which it does not become us to speak with too great confidence. In the brief commentary given above I have attempted to show that there is here presented no stylistic peculiarity or metrical irregularity which does not find a parallel in the best of Juvenal's work. The rhetorical coloring as well as the subject and general tone of the passage are precisely what we should expect of Juvenal, and even his most ordinary tricks of style are to be observed. Up to the present time only one voice has been raised in denial of the genuineness of the verses, and that a voice to which all Latinists are accustomed to listen with the greatest respect. Professor Buecheler thinks that the author must be sought in the fourth century among those contemporaries of Ammianus Marcellinus² who were so zealous in their study of Juvenal. His chief objections to the assumption of Juvenalian authorship may be briefly summarized as follows: 1) weakness of some verses, e. g., v. 20; 2) vagueness of expression, e. g., v. 24; 3) faults of syntax and structure, e. g., a) the apposition of *arma* in v. 11, b) the construction of *rides aliis*, and c) anacoluthon in v. 27 (as he punctuates); 4) false position of the passage in the manuscript. As far as 1) and 2) are concerned, the same is true of almost any thirty verses of Juvenal which could be selected; in 3) a) the passage is without doubt corrupt, while the difficulties of b) and c) are removed by a better punctuation; with regard to 4) I have tried above to show that there is no real cause for objection in the location of the verses. But the most important point to which he calls attention and the one which militates most strongly against recognition of the passage as genuine is the presence of the trochee instead of the spondee before the bucolic caesura in verse 2, as it appears in the manuscript, *promittit omnia dextra*. This phenomenon occurs not rarely in metrical inscriptions³ as early as the second century, and from the fourth century is found in

¹ Jahn's number IV; Dürr, Das Leben Juvenals, Ulm, 1888, p. 25.

² 28, 4, 14.

³ Buecheler, Carmina Epigraphica, 448, 3; 474, 7.

Christian poetry. Now while the transposition of Prof. Housman easily disposes of the difficulty, it leaves one with the uneasy feeling that after all he had perhaps no right to alter the transmitted text on such grounds. But notwithstanding Prof. Buecheler's emphatic position,¹ the conviction has grown steadily deeper in the minds of students of Juvenal, as far as they have expressed themselves, that in these verses we have a genuine product of antiquity and the work of Juvenal's own hand.² Though we cannot fully share the enthusiasm of Prof. Reinach and cry "indubitament authentiques," we can scarcely believe that the new fragment could have been written by any known author of the first four centuries except Juvenal, or that the author of such verses would have remained in obscurity.

In conclusion, it may be useful to append the bibliography of this question up to the present time.

1. E. O. Winstedt, A Bodleian MS of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, pp. 201-205.

2. J. P. Postgate, On the new fragments of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, pp. 206-208.

3. A. E. Housman, Notes in *Athenaeum* of May 13, 1899 p. 604.

4. A. E. Housman, S. G. Owen, H. Jackson, J. P. Postgate, J. D. Duff, The New Fragment of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, pp. 266-268.

5. Paul v. Winterfeld, Zu den Oxforder Juvenalversen, in *Berl. Ph. Woch.* XIX, 1899, col. 793-4.

6. F. Buecheler, Der echte oder der unechte Juvenal, in *Rhein. Mus.* LIV, 1899, pp. 484-488.

7. Max Maas, Die neuen Juvenalverse, in *Archiv f. lat. Lex. u. Gram.* XI, 1899, pp. 419-423.

8. E. O. Winstedt, Juvenalis ad satiram sextam in codice Bodl. Canon. XLI additi versus XXXVI, exscripsit E. O. W. Accedit simulacrum photographicum, Oxonii, MDCCCXCIX.

9. J. P. Postgate and H. J(ackson), On the new fragments of Juvenal, in *Class. Rev.* XIII, 1899, p. 401.

10. P. Thomas, Notes sur un passage, récemment découvert,

¹ "Sind die Verse echt, von Juvenal selbst? Hr. Postgate ist geneigt daran zu glauben, ich ganz und gar nicht," *l. l.*, p. 487.

² Of course, the quotation in the *scholia Pithoeana* (6, 348) shows that they must have been in existence as early as about A. D. 400.

de Juvénal, in Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique (classe de lettres), 1899, No. 7, pp. 576-581.

11. S. Reinach, Une tirade inédite de Juvénal, in Rev. Archéologique, XXXIV, 1899, pp. 448-454. Read before the Academy of Inscriptions on June 16, 1899; cf. *compte-rendu* for that date.

12. Paul v. Winterfeld, in Gött. gel. Anz. for November, 1899, pp. 895-897.

13. F. Ramorino, Dei nuovi versi di Giovenale recentemente scoperti, in Atene e Roma III, 1900, col. 54-61.

14. O. Rossbach, in Berl. Ph. Woch. XX, 1900, col. 747-8.

15. R. Ellis, The New Fragments of Juvenal; a lecture delivered at Corpus Christi College on Feb. 5, 1901, published by Frowde, London.

16. A. E. Housman, The New Fragment of Juvenal, in Class. Rev. XV, 1901, pp. 263-266.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

IV.—ON THE FORM OF HORACE'S LESSER ASCLEPIADS.

A Lesser Asclepiadean verse ($-> | -\omega | | -\omega | -\cup | -\wedge$) is a logaoedic period composed of two cola, which are separated from each other by a fixed diaeresis. Each colon has three feet—the first: *irrational trochee, cyclic dactyl, triseme syllable*; and the second: *cyclic dactyl, trochee, catalectic trochee*. Substitutions are not permitted. Therefore, the verse invariably has twelve syllables, the quantities running in a fixed order. In the Odes of Horace 86 Lesser Asclepiads are found under the form of strophe I, 164 under strophe II, 189 under strophe III, and 70 under strophe IV. Total, 509 verses. Of these, 185 are in Book I, 21 in Book II, 172 in Book III, and 131 in Book IV.

It would at first seem that when these verses are indefinitely repeated, such uniformity of structure could result only in monotony and flat sameness. Yet the fact turns out quite otherwise. A large variety of sound-effects is produced through the poet's management of the following elements: I. Diaereses and Caesuras. II. Sense-Pauses. III. Elision and Echthipsis. IV. Word-Accent as related to Ictus. V. Word-Order. VI. Other Sound-Effects. Let us examine these several phases of the verse.

I. *Diaereses and Caesuras.*

(a) *The verse shows in its parts unequal compactness.* This term is here used to describe the sound-effect of any part of a verse as determined by the number of diaereses and caesuras contained in that part. A verse, for example, whose initial two feet show more diaereses and caesuras than the final two feet, may be said to be more 'compact' in the latter than in the former part. The above thesis is established as follows.

Among Horace's Lesser Asclepiads, diaeresis or caesura as the case may be is found in:

29	per cent of the verses after the	1st syl.
48	“ “ “ “ “ “	2d “
54	“ “ “ “ “ “	3d “

28	per cent of the verses after the	4th syl.
8	" " " " " "	5th "
99 $\frac{1}{2}$	" " " " " "	6th "
25	" " " " " "	7th "
25	" " " " " "	8th "
56 $\frac{1}{2}$	" " " " " "	9th "
33	" " " " " "	10th "
1	" " " " " "	11th "
100	" " " " " "	12th "

(b) *The second colon tends to be more compact than the first.* Four points may be adduced to show this: (1) 2579 words occur all told (each word is counted as many times as it occurs); of these 1354 are in the first colon, but 1225 (viz. 129 less) in the second colon. (2) The total number of hexasyllables used is 6 and all of them stand in the second colon. (3) The total number of pentasyllables used is 19, of which all but 7 stand in the second colon. (4) The total number of monosyllables used 423. If our thesis is true, the proportions as compared with the foregoing should here be reversed, and this turns out to be the fact, for 293 stand in the first colon and only 130 in the second. A Lesser Asclepiad then, despite its fixed sequence of feet, accords with other kinds of verse, which as a rule exhibit greater compactness, less opportunity for substitutions, and more regular sound-effects in the final part. The poet's feeling as revealed in Lesser Asclepiads accords with the feeling of the ancients about the arrangement and relative length of cola in a well constructed oration. See Cicero *De Or.* III, 48 *fn.* 50.

(c) *The compactness of the verse as a whole varies somewhat according to the structure of the strophe into which it enters.* Two points of evidence will make this clear. (1) Sense-pauses, so far as they are revealed by punctuation (see p. 290), occur after the 1st syl. of the verse only in those kinds of strophes where three or more Lesser Asclepiads come in succession, viz. in strophes I and III. (2) Strophe I shows Lesser Asclepiads that are more compact than those figuring in strophes II, III, or IV. The Lesser Asclepiads in strophe IV, for example, when compared with those forming strophe I, show relatively

10	per cent more cases where a word ends with the	1st syl.
4	" " " " " " " " " "	4th "
5	" " " " " " " " " "	7th "

2 per cent more cases where a word ends with the 9th syl.
 3 " " " " " " " " " 10th "
 4 " " " " " " " " " 11th "

Only the 3d syl. shows a decrease and that a slight one. The above thesis is explained, in part, by the fact that into the said three strophes there enters a variety of verses, as regards the number and arrangement of feet, whereas strophe I is composed exclusively of Lesser Asclepiads, complex and intricate metrical demands being most readily satisfied with short words. Contrast for example the elegiac couplet and the heroic verse: the preponderance of long words is generally to be found in the latter.

(d) *The compactness of the verse varies according to the period in Horace's life when it was composed.* It becomes gradually less compact, the change affecting first the forward colon (viz. in Book III) and finally the second colon (viz. in Book IV).

The Lesser Asclepiads in Book III, when compared with those in Book I, show an appreciable tendency to have words end *more* frequently with the

2d syl. (increase: 9 per cent) 8th syl. (increase: 2 per cent)
 4th " (" 9 ")

This more than offsets the fact that words end *less* frequently in the

1st syl. (decrease: 4 per cent) 7th syl. (decrease: 1 per cent)
 3d " (" 7 ") 10th " (" 1 ")

The change, then, from Book I to Book III is toward a less compact verse, especially in the first colon, diaereses and caesuras increasing particularly after the 2d and 4th syllables.

The Lesser Asclepiads in Book IV, when compared with those in Book III, show an appreciable tendency to have words end *more* frequently with the

1st syl. (increase: 7 per cent) 10th syl. (increase: 4 per cent)
 7th " (" 5 ") 11th " (" 2 ")
 9th " (" 3 ")

This far more than offsets the fact that words end *less* frequently with the 8th syl. (decrease: 8 per cent). The change, then, from Book III to Book IV is toward a less compact verse, especially in the second colon, diaereses and caesuras increasing particularly in

the 7th, 9th, 10th, and 11th syllables. This thesis may properly be considered in locating an ode of doubtful date.

(e) *Taking into account all possible arrangements of diaereses and caesuras in a Lesser Asclepiad, we find that Horace chose to employ but few of them.* The first colon, for example, in the form *monosyllable, quadrisyllable, monosyllable* was avoided. (For the reason, see p. 292). Only three of the 509 verses begin with a monosyllable followed by a quadrisyllable, and in two of these Horace does not write another monosyllable as the third word but—a thing that nowhere else occurs in his Lesser Asclepiads—he omits the diaeresis between the cola. These two cases are in II, 12, 25 and IV, 8, 17. The latter verse is by many regarded as spurious, and the former is partly justified by the fact that the place for the diaeresis corresponds to the division between the parts of a prepositional compound word (*de-torquet*).

The fact is, 2048 different arrangements of diaereses and caesuras are possible in any verse of twelve syllables. (The formula for finding this number in the case of any verse is 2^{n-1} , n being the number of syllables in the given verse). Yet Horace among 509 verses chose to employ simply 142 out of the 2048, confining himself indeed, as a rule, to the use of only 12. For convenience, we shall represent this aspect of the subject as follows. "3-6-9-12" designates a verse whose diaereses and caesuras, as the case may be, fall after the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth syllables. Horace's favorite arrangements are:

3-6-9-12	occurring	45	times.	1-3-6-9-12	occurring	16	times.
2-3-6-9-12	"	23	"	3-6-7-9-12	"	14	"
2-6-9-12	"	21	"	2-6-7-9-12	"	12	"
3-6-8-12	"	18	"	1-3-6-8-12	"	12	"
2-4-6-9-12	"	16	"	1-3-6-7-10-12	"	11	"
4-6-9-12	"	16	"	3-6-10-12	"	10	"

Examples of these twelve types are:

Maecenas atavis edite regibus.
 quicquid de Libycis verritur areis.
 late conspicuum tollere verticem.
 obstrictis aliis praeter Iapyga.
 ignem fraude mala gentibus intulit.
 iracunda diem proferet Ilio.
 sic fratres Helenae lucida sidera.

mittamus, scelerum si bene paenitet.
 numquam demoveas, ut trabe Cypria.
 qui semper vacuum semper amabilem.
 nec tristis Hyadas nec rabiem Noti.
 turparunt umeros immodicae mero.

(f) *Why were these arrangements preferred?* They seem to embody word-groups easily enunciated by the reader, symmetry in the divisions of the verse, the requisite variety of sound, and a certain subtle word-rhythm that plays, now within, now without the rhythm of the feet. To express it negatively, they avoid unwieldy and unbeautiful word-lengths and word-combinations; they avoid weak and unmusical verse-endings, unpleasant monotony, such as a verse composed exclusively of monosyllables or of dissyllables or one wherein the diaereses are relatively too numerous or one wherein ictus too often coincides with word-accent.

(g) *The ends of words fall so that they do not generally coincide with ends of feet; otherwise expressed, caesura is more common than diaeresis.* The degree in which this is true may be gathered from the following facts. The word sequence wherein a single word builds each foot is indicated by the scheme 2-5-6-9-11-12. This form, however, nowhere occurs. Somewhat similar to it though are the following six forms, each occurring but once: 2-5-6-12, 2-5-6-10-12, 2-5-6-8-10-12, 2-5-6-8-12, 2-5-6-8-9-12, 2-5-6-9-10-12. Even in these rarely occurring forms it is to be observed that when the poet allows coincidence in the first colon, he generally avoids it in the second—a phase of the subject that is more fully treated below.

(h) *Monosyllabic words are not evenly distributed throughout the verse.* A monosyllabic word stands in

30	per cent of the verses as the	1st syl.
8	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	2d “
11	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	3d “
1½	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	4th “
½	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	5th “
7	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	6th “
19	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	7th “
½	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	8th “
2¾	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	9th “
2½	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	10th “
½	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	11th “
1	“ “ “ “ “ “ “	12th “

Five of the verses have a monosyllable standing in the twelfth place, but three of these are strengthened by an elided *est* or *et*; so only two out-and-out cases remain and these are in IV, 13, where Horace's work seems less careful than in the general level of Book III. In only one of these five cases is the final monosyllable preceded by another monosyllable.

The table shows that monosyllables are more numerous in the first than in the second colon. They are massed in each case in the forward part. In a general way, each colon becomes more and more compact, as the reader moves from the beginning to the end of it. A colon accordingly takes on, to some extent, the characteristics of a verse. This is confirmed by other features that are common to the Lesser Asclepiadean verse and colon: the end of either regularly coincides with the end of a word; the rhythmic pause after either is often made the place for a sense pause. On the whole, the position and relative frequency of monosyllables harmonize with the foregoing theses.

There are certain points in the verse where monosyllables do not often occur, for the reason that the presence there of one monosyllable necessarily entails another in adjacent position. Such are the 2d, 5th, 8th, and 11th places. The poet generally avoided a heaping up of monosyllables, except for some special effect of sense or sound, the reason being that a series of monosyllables does not carry the rhythm well and besides produces monotony.

What is the prevailing quantity of the monosyllables? We find that the ratio between the total number of long and the total number of short monosyllables used by Horace does not correspond to the ratio between the total number of long and the total number of short monosyllables commonly occurring in Latin prose. In choice and arrangement of monosyllables he shows a strong preference for those fulfilling the conditions of *long* quantity. The underlying reason seems to be that monosyllables, for purposes of versification, are wanting in fluent and rhythmic properties, particularly so when they are short in quantity. In the latter case, each word lasts only one *mora* of time and is not reinforced by an ictus.

The heaping up of monosyllables at the outset of the cola is partially accounted for by the idiom of the Latin language, whereby many a common collocation of words begins with a monosyllable. The explanation, however, probably lies in part

also in the varying prominence belonging to the several ictuses of the verse. There is ground for believing that the first ictus of each colon was more definitely marked by the ancient reader than the other two. The evidence is somewhat as follows: (1) A similar effect is found in certain other kinds of verse, such as iambic trimeter, where the first foot in each dipody is characterized by a primary ictus and the other by a secondary ictus. (2) In order to make the rhythm plain to a hearer, one has generally less and less need of an ictus as he proceeds through the colon; after passing over a foot or two the swing of the rhythm is established, so to speak, and the differentiations of quantity alone, or almost alone, are able to sustain the movement. (3) Within the first colon the favorite place for punctuation is after the second syllable (p. 291), and the favorite places for a word to end are with the second and third syllables (p. 283); within the second colon, the favorite places for punctuation are after the seventh and eighth syllables of the verse, and the favorite place for a word to end is with the ninth syllable; the broken part, then, the part needing an ictus to reinforce the quantities in pointing the rhythm, is the forward portion of each colon. (4) Long words, which always have less need of an ictus than short ones for producing a rhythmic effect, gravitate as we have seen to the latter part both of a colon and of a verse. (5) In all kinds of verse the sound-effects become progressively more regular, as one approaches the conclusion of a colon and particularly the conclusion of a verse. (6) Compare in this connection the iambic dipody, whose first foot is loosely formed either by an iambus or by an irrational spondee, while the final foot must conform strictly to the law of the meter. On the whole, therefore, monosyllables were not only generally reinforced in the rhythm by having long quantity and the ictus, but they seem to have been most acceptable to the poet's feeling when they formed those syllables which had the most prominent ictus.

(i) *The caesuras falling within the cyclic dactyls are more frequently masculine than feminine.* This thesis bears on the question whether the cyclic dactyl should be represented $-\omega$ or $-\omega$. Within the cyclic dactyl of the first colon occur 417 cases of caesura, of which 144 are feminine and 273 are masculine. It is to be noted also that the masculine is relatively more numerous in those forms of the verse which the poet employs over and over again (p. 286). Within the cyclic dactyl of the

second colon occur 255 cases of caesura, of which 129 are feminine and 126 are masculine. The evidence of the second colon does not mean that the feminine caesura in the cyclic dactyl is in itself preferred. A special circumstance here tends to multiply the feminine caesura beyond its normal frequency. The proximity of the main diaeresis makes a monosyllable necessary at the outset of the second colon every time a masculine caesura is used in the cyclic dactyl. But monotony would result if a monosyllable frequently began the second colon. To obviate this, therefore, the poet resorts to a feminine caesura more often than would otherwise happen. The facts on the whole seem to point, in the case of the Lesser Asclepiads at least, to a cyclic dactyl in the form —ω.

II. Sense-Pauses.

Kiessling's edition of Horace has been made the basis of the following observations. Punctuation appears in

	per cent of the verses after the						1st syl.
$6\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	2d "
$3\frac{1}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	3d "
$2\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	4th "
$1\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	5th "
24	"	"	"	"	"	"	6th "
4	"	"	"	"	"	"	7th "
4	"	"	"	"	"	"	8th "
$3\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	9th "
2	"	"	"	"	"	"	10th "
$\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	11th "
40	"	"	"	"	"	"	12th "

The foregoing theses are in general confirmed by the above *data*. Touching thesis (b), for example: *within* the first colon there occur 59 commas, 8 colons and semicolons, and 12 full stops (total, 79), while within the second colon there occur only 29 commas, 2 colons and semicolons, and 2 full stops (total, 33). Again, touching thesis (c): Among the Lesser Asclepiads that enter into strophe I, viz. 86 in number, there are within the verses 23 commas, 6 colons and semicolons, and 4 full stops (total, 33), while within those that enter into strophe IV, viz. 70 in number, there are 23 commas, 6 colons and semicolons, and 9 full stops (total, 38).

Within the first colon the favorite place for punctuation is after the second syllable, whereas the favorite place for the end of a word is with the third syllable. Within the second colon the favorite place for punctuation is after the seventh or eighth place, whereas the favorite place for the end of a word is with the ninth syllable. Why this is, we are unable to explain.

III. *Elision and Ecthlipsis.*

The cases of elision and ecthlipsis as they occur throughout the twelve syllables of the verse are indicated in the following table:

	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.	syl.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Elision,	0	1	9	4	3	8	6	1	6	5	2	2 = 47
Ecthlipsis,	0	1	12	2	1	3	5	5	1	3	1	1 = 35
Total,	0	2	21	6	4	11	11	6	7	8	3	3 = 82

There are then 82 cases among 509 verses; 25 fall in Book I (185 vv.), 3 in Book II (21 vv.), 44 in Book III (172 vv.), and 10 in Book IV (131 vv.). The *data* here, and elsewhere in this paper, indicate that the Lesser Asclepiads of Book III are later than those of Book I. This table offers further evidence for the statement that the sound-effects become more regular as one approaches the end of a verse. We have seen that a colon and a verse are similar in nature; that they are not identical appears, among several reasons, from the fact that elision and ecthlipsis may take place freely at the close of the forward colon but not of the verse. Conformably to theses already laid down, this table shows that the two cola are differentiated as regards sound-effects.

IV. *Word-Accent as related to Ictus.*

At the end of the verse word-accent coincides with ictus in the case of (1) a final word having three or more syllables (337 such cases occur); (2) the last two words when they are trisyllables (169 cases); (3) the last two words when the verse closes with a monosyllable preceded by a word of two or more syllables (4 cases); (4) and the last word when the verse closes with two monosyllables (1 case). But in the cases included under (1) and (2) an ictus falls on the final syllable of the verse, where there is no word-accent.

Word-accent and ictus do not coincide in the last two words, when the verse closes with a dissyllable (167 cases).

At the *ouset* of the verse word-accent and ictus coincide in the case of the first two words, when they are a monosyllable followed by a trisyllable (21 cases), also in the case of the first three words, when they occur in the sequence monosyllable, quadrisyllable, monosyllable (1 case; p. 286) or dissyllable, trisyllable, monosyllable (7 cases).

Not a single case occurs where a word-accent coincides with every ictus in the verse. Nine cases occur where word-accents (5 in number) coincide with the first five ictuses of the verse. In all kinds of verse there is a certain part of the line where coincidence of word-accent and ictus is generally bound to occur. The location of this place varies according to the structure of the verse. Being forced then to admit this sound-effect at one place, the poet generally takes pains to avoid it elsewhere in the verse. In Lesser Asclepiads coincidence regularly takes place throughout the second colon up to, but not including, the final syllable. This effect is generally counterbalanced, as we should expect, by non-coincidence elsewhere.

V. *Word-Order.*

Lesser Asclepiads have such length, sequence of quantities, and location of rhythmic pauses, that they are specially adapted for containing balanced and symmetrical expressions, the contrasted and coordinate words being thrown into relief by the verse-form. Examples are:

(a) Chiasmus.

<i>luctantem Icaris fluctibus Africum</i>	(I, 1, 15).
stratus nunc ad <i>aquae lene caput sacrae</i>	(I, 1, 22).
seu rupit <i>teretes Marsus aper plagas</i>	(I, 1, 28).

(b) Agreement of the first and last words in a verse.

<i>Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare</i>	(I, 1, 14).
<i>mactata veniet lenior hostia</i>	(I, 19, 16).

(c) Corresponding inflectional endings at the close of the two cola.

quidquid de <i>Libycis</i> verritur <i>areis</i>	(I, 1, 10).
--	-------------

(d) Interlocked word-order.

Maecenas atavis edite regibus (I, 1, 1).

(e) Each colon of a verse occupied by a word group.

obstrictis aliis praeter Iapyga (I, 3, 4).

(f) Anaphora.

nec tristis Hyadas, nec rabiem Noti (I, 3, 14).

(g) Variety is given to the verse, among other ways, by having it composed, now of a few, now of many words.

agros Attalicis condicionibus (I, 1, 12).

quo fugit Venus, heu, quove color? decens (IV, 13, 17).

(h) Variety is also given by having some verses show no marked balance or symmetry in the arrangement of their words.

possent ut iuvenes visere fervidi (IV, 13, 26).

quo motus? quid habes illius, illius (IV, 13, 18).

(i) A pair of coordinate monosyllables, each standing properly in an emphatic place, may be placed: (1) one at the outset of the first colon, and one at the outset of the second colon. These cola may belong to the same verse or to two successive verses. See example under (f) and

me doctorum ederae praemia frontium
dis miscent superis: *me* gelidum nemus (I, 1, 29 and 30).

(2) At the outset of the first or second colon of two successive verses.

seu visa est catulis cerva fidelibus,
seu rupit teretes Marsus aper plagas (I, 1, 27 and 28).

digne scripserit, *aut* pulvere Troico
nigrum Merionen, *aut* ope Palladis (I, 6, 14 and 15).

(3) In the first and last places of a colon.

nos convivia, *nos* proelia virginum (I, 6, 17).

audivere, Lyce, *di* mea vota, *di* (IV, 13, 1).

(4) In the middle of the first colon of two successive verses.

spernit, *nunc* viridi membra sub arbuto
stratus, *nunc* ad aquae lene caput sacrae (I, 1, 22 and 23).

(5) In the middle of the first and second cola.

sollers *nunc* hominem ponere *nunc* deum (IV, 8, 8).

quas *aut* Parrhasius protulit *aut* Scopas (IV, 8, 6).

(j) Verses arranged symmetrically, as regards the number of syllables in the words and the order of the words, are indicated in part on p. 286. Other examples are:

votiva paries indicat uvida (3 syl., 3 syl., 3 syl., 3 syl.), (I, 5, 14).
est qui nec veteris pocula Massici (1 syl., 1 syl., 1 syl., 3 syl.,
 3 syl., 3 syl.), (I, 1, 19).

prudens Oceano dissociabili (2 syl., 4 syl., 6 syl.), (I, 3, 22).

quam lentis penitus macerer ignibus (1 syl., 2 syl., 3 syl., 3 syl.,
 3 syl.), (I, 13, 8).

certat tergeminis tollere honoribus (2 syl., 4 syl., 2 syl., 4 syl.),
 (I, 1, 8).

quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati (2 syl., 4 syl., 4 syl., 2 syl.),
 (I, 1, 18).

Censorine meis aera sodalibus (4 syl., 2 syl., 2 syl., 4 syl.), (IV,
 8, 2).

sollers nunc hominem ponere nunc deum (2 syl., 1 syl., 3 syl.,
 3 syl., 1 syl., 2 syl.), (IV, 8, 8).

VI. Other Sound-Effects.

A. *Inter-verse hiatus*. When one verse ends with a vowel or *m* and the next verse begins with a vowel or *h*, there results what may be termed inter-verse hiatus. Although Horace seems in general to have avoided this sound-effect in his best lyrical work, still 36 times it occurs between a Lesser Asclepiad and a following verse, affecting

5½	per cent of the Lesser Asclepiads in	I, 1.
15	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 3.
0	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 5.
0	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 6.
0	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 13.
10	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 14.
11	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 15.
12½	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 19.
12½	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 21.
0	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 23.
6½	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 24.
16½	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 33.
10	“ “ “ “ “ “	I, 36.
0	“ “ “ “ “ “	II, 12.
6	“ “ “ “ “ “	III, 7.

8	per cent of the Lesser Asclepiads in III, 9.
0	" " " " " " III, 10.
0	" " " " " " III, 13.
25	" " " " " " III, 15.
3	" " " " " " III, 16.
7	" " " " " " III, 19.
9	" " " " " " III, 24.
0	" " " " " " III, 25.
12½	" " " " " " III, 28.
0	" " " " " " III, 30.
30	" " " " " " IV, 1.
8	" " " " " " IV, 3.
3	" " " " " " IV, 5.
5½	" " " " " " IV, 8.
0	" " " " " " IV, 12.
7	" " " " " " IV, 13.

In a general way the poems having much inter-verse hiatus show signs of early workmanship, carelessness, or want of recent practise in writing lyric poetry. Horace indirectly states the last named fact in IV, 1 and inter-verse hiatus is there abundant. Much inter-verse hiatus marks I, 3, which is one reason for assigning it to an early period. In the same direction points *perrupit* (v. 36) with the last syllable long by diastole—a trait that is wanting in his later work. Where much inter-verse hiatus appears we generally find remarks like the following among the commentators: I, 15—"In this perhaps youthful experiment Horace attempts, as Quintilian says of Stesichorus, to support the weight of an epic theme on the lyre." I, 21—"The poem may be a sketch for a *carmen seculare*." In fact, the metrical art of a Greek or Roman poet sometimes undergoes such orderly and systematic development, that having plotted the curve of his growth, so to speak, we are able to locate chronologically a selection from his poetry simply by noting the characteristics of its form. III, 15 for example shows so much inter-verse hiatus that one is led to suspect the poem is an early effort. This view receives confirmation in Kiessling, who from another point of view says it "gehört mit I, 25 und IV, 13, sowie den Epoden 5 und 8 zusammen, den der alexandrinischen Dichtung geläufigen Typus der alten noch immer mannstollen Vettel zu zeichnen."

B. The question arises, why the second syllable of a Lesser

Asclepiad is irrational. The answer may be in part as follows. The part of a word used to fill this place was already familiar to the ancient in its *long* form. When he heard this sound compressed into the time of a short standing between two long syllables at the outset of the verse, a peculiar musical effect—rich and full—was produced. A trochee beginning the verse would have given quite a different effect.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

LEON J. RICHARDSON.

V.—THE UNREAL CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN PLAUTUS.

I.

THE USE OF THE IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE FOR THE PRESENT UNREAL.

It is assumed with reason that the present subjunctive was the main, if not exclusive, expression for the present unreal sentence at some time in the pre-literary period of the Latin language, and that the imperfect subjunctive, at this early period, had its normal past-tense force, and shared with the pluperfect subjunctive the province of the past unreal conditional sentence.¹ This view is supported by the actually existing state of affairs in Homeric Greek; for there the present optative is used for the present unreal, while the past unreal finds expression in the imperfect and aorist indicative (with sporadic cases of the optative). Goodwin² denies that the imperfect indicative has yet begun to take on the function of the present unreal condition, which is its province at a later period. Further evidence looking in the same direction may be found in the development of the idiom in Latin. After Plautus, the present subjunctive rapidly drops out of use as the expression of the present unreal condition, and is replaced by the imperfect subjunctive, which, in turn, gives up the hold that in the early writers, it still has on the past unreal condition. This development seems to imply that Plautus is in a stage of transition—that, before his time, the present subjunctive was used more, and the imperfect less, as the expression for the present unreal conditional sentence. Finally, the Homeric use of the present optative³ and the Sanskrit use of both that mode and the subjunctive⁴ for this type of sentence would seem to indicate that the present subjunctive was the most natural speech-form at the command of the early Roman for the expression of the present unreal condition.

¹ Cf. H. Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis* (Erlangen, 1888), p. 1.

² *Greek Moods and Tenses*, §435.

³ Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, §438.

⁴ Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §581, and b.

The change of function on the part of the imperfect subjunctive in Latin, and of the imperfect indicative in Greek, presents an interesting and perplexing problem, and one for which, I think, no final answer has yet been proposed.¹ At least a part of the trouble with the solutions that have been advanced is the neglect of one or more of the following indispensable conditions of a satisfactory theory:

(1). It is absolutely essential to clear thinking on this subject that the *grammatical* and the *psychological* aspects of the question be sharply distinguished in the mind of the investigator. It is one thing to determine when and how men came to *think* in the unreal form, and quite another to explain the history of the *form of words* used in the expression of that class of conditional thought. As I have elsewhere² shown, the Romans were *thinking* their unreal conditions clearly enough, and were able to make the hearer catch the meaning even when the present subjunctive was used, long before the imperfect subjunctive was settled upon as the exclusive *speech-form* of the present unreal condition. Aside from the proof there given, the same thing may be assumed on general principles, for the adaptation of these past tense-forms to this type of conditional sentence is a late process in language, and we can hardly assume that thought was crude and undeveloped at the time the change took place. It is probable then that, in attempting to answer the question under discussion, we should think of the present and past unreal thought-forms as fixed, and of the imperfect subjunctive as leaving to the pluperfect the old function which it had shared with it, and passing over to the expression of the present unreal conditional sentence. Any theory that attempts to explain the new use of this mode and tense by a concomitant evolution of the unreal thought categories, stands upon a very unstable base, for Latin at any rate.

(2). In proposing a theory to explain the change in the use of the imperfect subjunctive in Latin, some attention must be paid to the similar change found in Greek and in the Germanic

¹ Cf. Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*; Greenough, *Harvard Studies*, Vol. VII; E. H. Miles, *Comparative Syntax of Greek and Latin* (Cambridge, 1893), additional note, p. cxxvii. A summary of other views may be found in an article on the Spanish conditional sentence by E. Gessner, *Zeit. für Roman. Phil.*, xiv. p. 23 ff.

² *Class. Rev.*, xv., p. 51.

languages. That these three branches of the I. E. stock should have, late and (apparently) independently, worked out this process so similarly, creates a strong feeling that there may be a fundamental underlying cause that holds good for them all. Hence a theory that seems to explain the facts of Latin very well, but breaks down utterly when applied to Greek, needs very strong proof of its validity before it can be received with confidence.

(3). The theory advanced must be in accord with the laws of simple unconscious growth in language. Upon this rock has split many a brilliant hypothesis. The validity of any theory is in doubt if it cannot bear the scrutiny of the question: Is the process here assumed conceivably a description of what might actually take place in language growth, and are there any simple well-established parallels in which such a process has actually taken place? I feel that we sometimes expect the true explanation to be so abstruse and far to seek that there is danger of overlooking a simple (and perhaps true) one lying close at hand; in actual fact, the secret of some changes may be found in a thing so simple as phonetic decay or a leveling by analogy. A striking case of this last appears in the subsequent history of the unreal speech-form, when the indicative in Old French takes the place of the Latin subjunctive in the *si*-clause. The entrance of the indicative into the protasis of the unreal conditional sentence seems due to the analogy of the many *si*-clauses that use that mode, for in cases where *si* is omitted or repeated by *que* the original subjunctive is still retained in the unreal condition.¹

Keeping in mind the above necessary conditions of a valid theory, it now remains to find some way of explaining the change by which the imperfect subjunctive in Latin came to leave its early function and finally became the accepted expression for the present unreal conditional sentence. If an explanation is to be sought which may apply to Greek and the Germanic languages as well as to Latin, it must be sought in something common to all these languages. The obviously common factor is the unreal thought-form. If the key to an explanation does lie in the unreal thought-form, it is to the *past* rather than to the *present* unreal

¹ O. M. Johnston, *Modern Language Notes*, xiv, p. 270 ff. Compare what Sweet has to say of the history of the speech-form in English; *New English Grammar*, §§2280-2.

that attention should be first directed.¹ I hope to show that there is a peculiarity of this past thought-form which may serve to explain how its original speech-form (imperfect subjunctive) first became *associated* with the present idea, and, later, *identified* with it. The past unreal conditional sentence, strictly speaking, has no tense-force of its own, but it is opposed to, or reflects, the time of various past realities. In the nature of things, the time of past events is not all of one kind; sometimes it concerns only one point (aorist), at others it is continuous (imperfect); sometimes it implies a present result or continuance (perfect definite). The past unreal conditional sentence can reflect any of these time aspects.² For instance, one man might say to another, 'You are very hard on that foster child,' and the other reply, 'If he had not deceived me on the day he entered my home, I should have loved him as a son.' In this sentence the protasis is opposed to a reality of the aoristic variety, but the apodosis is opposed to a reality that extends all the way from that point of time up to, and including, the present. In fact, the same sentence might perfectly well be used in reply, if the first speaker's remark be taken

¹At this point I part company with other investigators. Partly as the result of the unclearness arising from a failure to differentiate speech-form and thought-form, many have tried to account for the use of a past tense-form as the expression of the present unreal thought-form either by stretching the present unreal thought-form a little or by finding in it some implication which might be brought out by the use of a past tense-form. For the first of these see Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*, p. 16; Dittmar, *Studien zur Latein. Moduslehre* (Leipzig, 1897), §300, takes almost the same view, 'Wer einen Irrealis ausspricht, versetzt sich nämlich jedesmal in die Vergangenheit, wenn auch in eine, die nur um ein paar Sekunden zurückliegt.' On the other hand, it is sometimes claimed that there is an implication of *impossibility* in the unreal thought, and that this justifies the use of a past tense-form, since a past tense implies impossibility of fulfillment. (See Blase, l. c. p. 14). I trust that the method of attacking this question which I am about to outline above, may appeal to the reader as more in accord with the working of the laws of language growth, and hence, more likely to be correct.

²Examples of the perfect definite variety are of special interest for this discussion, Cicero, *Phil.* II. 36. 90; *Qui tu vir, di immortales, et quantus fuisses, si illius diei mentem servare potuisses!* *Phil.* X. 4. 9; *Si enim C. Antonius, quod animo intenderat, perficere potuisset, . . . Macedoniam . . . perdidissemus.* p. *Mur.* 13. 29; *In qua (defensione oratoris) si satis profecissem, parcius de eius laude dicerem.* In the first two cases the thought so clearly includes the present that the author resumes with the imperfect subjunctive in the clause that follows. Cf. *Livy XXI.* 40. 1 (*supersedissem*), *Tac. Agr.* 34 (*constitisset*); *A. J. P.* XXI. p. 268 ff.

as referring strictly to some special instance of harshness *in the present* (rather than to the attitude in general); in that case the reply is a defence of the *present* position primarily, and its present force is very clear.

This is the open door through which the imperfect subjunctive in Latin may have first become associated, and then identified, with the present unreal thought-form. Even as late as Plautus, past tense usage in general is not very sharply differentiated, and it is very likely that, at the time the imperfect and the pluperfect subjunctive were the accepted expression for the past unreal condition, these tenses were used more or less interchangeably. In certain cases the imperfect or the pluperfect chanced to be opposed to a past reality of such a nature that there was nothing to keep the hearer from thinking of the present as well as the past. The next step would be to use these past tense-forms when *consciously* including both past and present. In the stages following, as the past speech-form came to be used as the expression of an opposition to realities whose past aspect was less prominent than the present, and, finally, to those whose thought was purely present, the imperfect gained upon the pluperfect and became the chosen expression for the present unreal conditional sentence. That the imperfect rather than the pluperfect should make good its claim on the present meaning is not to be wondered at in view of the fact that the imperfect and the pluperfect naturally form a pair—the pluperfect is, 'so to speak, the perfect of the imperfect.'¹ In Greek, the choice of the imperfect indicative rather than the aorist may have to do with the fact that the imperfect is more closely bound to the present, being made on the same stem.

That this development of meaning outlined for past tense-forms is quite possible and in accord with the laws of language growth is shown by the quite parallel and well-established process by which a perfect form like *novi* takes on present meaning. The perfect definite meaning 'I have become acquainted with', implies the present result 'I know'; this associates that past form with a present meaning, thus opening the door to the use of that form *when only the present result* is thought of, i. e. *novi* comes to be used freely like a present, with a loss of feeling that it is properly

¹Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Grammar, §241.

a past.¹ To the Latin student, it would be very interesting to examine the earliest cases of the imperfect subjunctive which show a distinctly present meaning, but this is denied us. In Plautus the process is so far advanced that few cases can be found where the old proper past meaning surely occurs—the imperfect subjunctive is pretty well established in its new function. Homer, however, seems to be just at the critical point of change in the function of the imperfect indicative, and the theory above proposed may be examined in the light of his usage.

There seems a general agreement among Greek scholars that the imperfect indicative in this idiom refers to continued or repeated past action.² It is possible that it does more than this, as may appear from the following examples :

Od. iv. 178-9 ;

καί κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ' εὐντες ἐμσγόμεθ'· οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας
ἄλλο δικάρην φιλιόντέ τε τερπομένω τε.

On this passage Goodwin³ quotes Monro as saying 'the imperfect ἐμσγόμεθα takes in the present time, *we should* (from that time till now) *have been meeting*.' In criticism of this he adds, 'It seems to me that, according to the Homeric usage, we can find no more

¹ The fact that the perfect definite in general allows a primary sequence shows how inherent is present force in this tense-use.

² I can hardly refrain from noting that it seems to me a mistake to insist, as Ameis does, that, in so early an author as Homer, this tense is always sharply differentiated from the aorist, that is, is always restricted to continued or repeated past action. Certainly such a claim is unreasonable in the case of ἦν, for there is no aorist form to use. See also Od. iv. 732 ff. ;

εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ πυθόμην ταύτην ὁδὸν ὁρμαίνοντα·
τῷ κε μάλ' ἢ κεν ἔμεινε καὶ ἐσσύμενός περ ὁδοῖο,
ἢ κέ με τεθνηκυῖαν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλειπεν.

Ameis explains the imperfect ἔλειπεν ('he would have left me dead') as denoting continued action ; but what of the aorist ἔμεινε ('he would have remained')? I think that a person with no prepossession for either meaning would have settled on ἔμεινε rather than ἔλειπεν as an expression denoting continuance. I am aware that this is not an altogether simple case, for the verb meaning of μένω implies continuance, and in the following line the unreality lies not in ἔλειπεν but in τεθνηκυῖαν. But even so, I am not satisfied by Ameis' explanation of ἔλειπεν. If early Greek usage is anything like that found in Latin, I should not be surprised to find aorist and imperfect in this idiom not so far differentiated but that Homer could use as suited his verse either ἔμεινε or ἔμεινε, ἔλειπε or ἔλειπε.

³ Greek Moods and Tenses, §435, foot-note.

in *θάμα ἰμοσγόμεθά κε* than *we should have had frequent meetings*, and the rest comes from the context.¹ Goodwin denies (l. c.) that the imperfect in Homer is ever used in the present unreal conditional sentence, but even he admits that, in this case, there is nothing to prevent the hearer from thinking of the present as well as of the past ('and the rest comes from the context'). This is the first step in the development outlined above for a past unreal form to take on present meaning. Monro seems to have felt (and I am not at all sure but that the feeling was right) that Homer has taken a second step—that Menelaus is here represented as *consciously* expressing opposition to a reality of the perfect definite type, and intends to include the present as well as the past.²

Od. v. 311;

τῷ κ' ἔλαχον κτερέων, καὶ μὲν κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί·

Here Odysseus, in fear of perishing in the sea, has just expressed the wish that he had fallen in the battle over Achilles' body; line 311 tells what would have happened in that case (τῷ). The first clause of the line is apparently opposed to a reality of the aoristic variety 'I should have enjoyed funeral honors,' but the case of ἦγον seems different. Odysseus may well have been thinking of the present as well as the past. Perrin, in his school edition, feels the present force so strongly here that he renders in his note '*would be carrying, wherever they went, i. e., spreading or cherishing.*' In any case, this too is a situation in which the hearer would be justified in feeling a present force, even granting that the original speaker was not thinking of this especially himself.

Od. xiv. 61-2;

ἧ γὰρ τοῦ γε θεοὶ κατὰ νόστον ἔδησαν,
ὅς κεν ἔμ' ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει καὶ κτῆσιν ὄπασσεν.

In this passage the swine-herd Eumaeus is talking to (the unrecognized) Odysseus, expressing the opinion that the gods

¹ In the second edition of his Homeric Grammar (§324) Monro adopts Goodwin's statement of the usage in this idiom.

² At the end of his foot-note Goodwin adds 'a nearer approach to the later usage perhaps appears in Il. xxiv. 220; *εἰ μὲν γὰρ τις μ' ἄλλος ἐκέλευεν, ἴφ any other (had?) commanded me.*' In this passage Priam means to emphasize the fact that the command is from Zeus and must be obeyed. The unreality lies not in *ἐκέλευεν* (for he *has* been ordered), but in *ἄλλος*; a fair rendering might be 'if it *were* some other that *had bidden* me.' In such a case I should not care to insist on present force for the imperfect.

are keeping his master from returning home, and telling how different is the treatment he would have received at the hands of Odysseus, had he remained at home, from that which he has received and is receiving at the hands of the suitors (l. 58 ff.). The question is, what is the meaning to be assigned to ἐφίλαε? Eumaeus is apologizing because he cannot offer his guest better cheer (ll. 58-9), and it is hard to believe that he is not contrasting his *present* evil plight with what would have been (*i. e.*, would be) his favored position, if his master had not gone away. At any rate, there is nothing to prevent the hearer from feeling that the present is included.

I trust that these examples serve to help make clear my meaning. If we are willing to go no further than Goodwin, insisting that Homer never uses the imperfect indicative for the present unreal condition, still there are certain cases in which the circumstances are such that there is nothing to keep the hearer from thinking of a present continuance; in the last case cited the circumstances are such as to almost compel the hearer to a consciousness of that aspect of the meaning. Possibly Homer has gone one stage further, and the speakers are to be thought of as using a past tense-form in certain cases with a conscious inclusion of the present. In either case, the fact that some passages wake doubt in us, the late-born readers, as to the precise time intended, is evidence that these passages must have been more or less ambiguous to the Homeric hearers, and that the door was open for a shift of meaning which developed a specific speech-form for an important class of conditional sentences. For the theory I have proposed no sweeping claim is made. It may turn out to be only a partial explanation. But in any case it is worthy of careful consideration in view of the principles and the method which underlie it.

II.

A COMPARISON OF THE USES OF THE PRESENT AND IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

As noted in the first part of this paper, the present subjunctive in the time of Plautus was still largely used for the present unreal conditional sentence, though the imperfect subjunctive was rapidly moving up and relieving it of that function, thus tending to restrict it to the ideal (or less vivid future). In this part of the paper I shall examine rather carefully the cases that use the present sub-

conjunctive, with a view to determining the underlying thought-form in a given case, and, at the end, make a comparison of Plautus' use of this tense (as contrasted with the imperfect) for the unreal conditional sentence. This will involve a study of two special varieties of this type of conditional thought.

As a preliminary consideration, it is necessary to make clear what is understood by the terms 'ideal' and 'present unreal.' The fundamental difference is, I think, one of *time*. The present unreal deals with a *fancied existent*¹ *with implication of unreality*, and the ideal with a *fancied future*.² In addition to this, two idiomatic uses need to be noted.

Capt. 307-9;³

Et quidem si proinde ut ipse fui imperator familiae
Habeam dominum, non verear ne iniuste aut graviter mi imperet.
Hegio, hoc te monitum nisi forte non vis volueram.

In this passage I think that most English readers would feel it natural to interpret *si . . . habeam* as unreal, if for no other reason than that (according to my own definition) it is hard to detect any future force in the phrase. But there is an idiomatic use of the Latin future that might find an exact parallel here.

Ep. 646-7;

hic sunt quadraginta minae.
Siquid *erit* dubium, immutabo.

The sense is 'If any of it *proves* (i. e. shall prove) doubtful', looking ahead to the time when the money will be examined.

Men. 799-800;

si ille quid *deliquerit*,
Multo tanto illum accusabo quam te accusavi amplius.

Here Menaechmus' *past* deeds are in question, and the meaning is 'If he *shall prove* to have committed any wrong.' This use of the future indicative is well established, and there seems noth-

¹ 'Existent' rather than 'present,' because the latter term is so apt to be understood in this connection as referring to only a moment of time. How inadequate the definition, so interpreted, would be, can be seen from such a phrase as 'If black were white.'

² I reserve, for the present, the question of the distinction between the ideal and the simple future conditional sentence. By the definition given above possibility, objective or subjective, is rejected as the distinguishing feature of this class of conditional sentence. The definition is intended to be purely *psychological*—not a description of anything and everything that finds expression in the *present subjunctive*.

³ References throughout are to the text of Goetz and Schoell.

ing to hinder the same interpretation for a subjunctive that refers to the future. Thus *si . . . habeam* might mean in the passage above 'If I *should prove* to have such a master as I myself was.' This interpretation is more in accord with the conciliatory tone of the whole passage than to take the sentence as unreal. This latter sense would make Tyndarus imply that Hegio is not as good as he himself was, and is somewhat inconsistent with Hegio's cordial attitude (*loquere audacter*, l. 310.) It is possible, then, that in a case like this, an instinctive drawing toward the unreal form may be misleading, and due to the influence of idiomatic tense use on the part of the Latin.¹

The second point concerns the English preference for verbs that denote a state in the unreal condition, and for those that denote action in the ideal. Thus we say 'If you *knew*,' but hardly 'If you *should know*'; in the ideal, 'If you *should learn*' comes much more readily to the lips.² In the same way, but less strongly, we pair 'If I had' and 'If I should obtain (get.)' One with this feeling, meeting *si scias* in Plautus, wants to interpret it as unreal simply because he shrinks from 'If you should know;' the real alternative is 'If you should learn.'

Mil. 309-10 ;

hocine si miles sciat,

Credo hercle has sustollat aedis totas atque hunc in crucem.

This is spoken by a slave pondering whether or not to tell, hence 'If the soldier *should learn* of this,' cf. Poen. 885 and

Cicero, Phil. II, 30. 76 ;

ne tu iam mecum in gratiam redeas, *si scias* quam me pudeat.³

si sapias is another phrase that suggests the unreal form readily, but seems shut away from the ideal. 'If you should be wise' or 'If you shall be wise' are intolerable, but the Romans evidently had no such feeling.

Rud. 1391 ;

si sapias, tacebis.

cf. Bacch. 1001-2, Tri. 559 ; Terence, Heaut. 594.

We seem to use 'If you *are* wise' rather loosely with a future sense in certain connections.

¹ Cf. Cicero, p. Cael. I. 1.

² That Latin had no such feeling on the case of *scio* is shown by the use of future forms ; Aul. 773, Mil. 860.

³ Cf. Livy, Praef. §1, *si sciam*. Conversely, the Latin use of verbs of action in unreal sentences seems to us a little harsh. A. J. P. XXI, p. 272.

A. *Uses of the Present Subjunctive.*

In Plautus there are about eighty¹ examples of conditional sentences containing the present subjunctive in protasis and apodosis. Of these, a certain number are of course ideal. Their futurity is indicated in various ways, ranging from the use of temporal particles to the general situation.

Capt. 203-5;

TYN. At nos pudet quia cum catenis sumus. LOR. At pigeat *postea*
Nostrum erum, si + vos eximat vinculis
Aut solutos sinat quos argento emerit.

Aul. 233;

Neutrubi habeam stabile stabulum, siquid divorti fuit.

Here marriage is being contemplated. Any *separation* must be in the future.

Cf. Capt. 416-7;

Si ego autem memorem quae me erga multa fecisti bene,
nox diem adimat.

More or less obviously ideal are Asin. 458-9, Bacch. 57, 697, Ep. 451-2, Men. 1023, Merc. 405-6, Mil. 309-10, Pers. 206, 374-5, Tri. 885-6, Truc. 767; Ps. 338-9 contains a perfect form.

A second group of sentences are those whose thought-form it is impossible to determine. I even go so far as to think that in some of these cases the speaker himself may not have made a conscious use of one thought-form rather than the other, for, at times, there is nothing at stake to force a distinction either in the mind of the speaker or of the hearer. Our use of 'would' and 'should' in the apodosis of both ideal and unreal sentences may serve to put us in touch with the feeling of the Roman for his ambiguous speech-form—the present subjunctive in both members. Suppose an orator should say 'A great navy *would* be a great advantage to this nation.' If he were stopped at that point and asked whether he meant that the country would be better off, if it had the navy *at the time of speaking* or that it would be better off if it should procure one *at some future time*, I can conceive the original being spoken under circumstances

¹ This number could be largely increased by including doubtful cases, i. e., such as have forms in *-am* and *-ar* in one or both members, and those whose apodoses may have some subjunctive value apart from the conditional idea of the sentence in which they stand, e. g., *velim* and interrogative sentences.

such that the man himself would not know which he did mean; as a matter of fact he would not be forced to a choice, for the real thought he wished to convey to his hearers may be no more than 'This country is in need of a great navy.' But he makes use of a rhetorical device—a conditional speech-form—which he has heard used in like connections, to convey his thought, and, whether the sentence be interpreted as ideal or unreal, the thought *is* conveyed. The complexity of the process that would lead a person in a case like this to make use of such a conditional speech-form to convey his thought seems to indicate that the connection between thought and language is not as exact and direct as some have supposed. In Plautus there is a little group of moralizing passages in which the speaker voices his discontent with the present state of morals or the like. All of these take the present subjunctive, and most of them could be interpreted either as ideal or unreal without loss to the thought; perhaps the speaker and his hearers were a little misty about the precise conditional thought-form.

Tri. 217-20;

Quod si exquiratur usque ab stirpe auctoritas,
Unde quidquid auditum dicant: nisi id appareat,
Famigeratori res sit cum damno et malo:
Hoc ita si fiat, publico fiat bono.

Ps. 427-8;

Homines qui gestant quique auscultant crimina
Si meo arbitratu liceat, omnes pendeant.

Merc. 823, 826, 828-9;

Utinam lex *esset* eadem quae uxoris viro.
Ecastor faxim, si itidem plectantur viri,
Ut illae exiguntur quae in se culpam commiserunt,
Plures viri sint vidui quam *nunc* mulieres.

In the first of these passages the speaker conveys the thought 'Gossips should be punished,' whether we interpret the conditional sentence to mean 'If we *had* such a law' or 'If we *should pass* such a law, it would be a blessing to the state.' Cf. Aul. 478 ff., Mil. 1436 ff., Pers. 73 ff. and perhaps, Truc. 324-5.

The second case quoted in full is like the first except that the getting of the power (*si . . . liceat*) is so improbable that it is hardly likely to be looked at as a future possibility. This, in a way, shuts the case up to the unreal form, and the speaker may have been more or less conscious of that fact. The third case, on the

other hand, the speaker perhaps felt as ideal. The evidence for this is found in the contrast afforded by *esset* (823) and by *nunc* (829.)

Besides these moralizing passages there are several other cases of the present subjunctive in which the speaker's essential thought is conveyed whether the sentence be interpreted as ideal or unreal. The speaker may have felt these cases as definitely one or the other, but there seems no way of getting at the thought, if that be true. It is possible that the spoken language afforded some help we do not find on the written page. Amph. 904-7, Aul. 539-40, Capt. 632, Curc. 223-4, Ep. 589, Merc. 874, Mil. 293, 1429, Tri. 474, Truc. 616-7.

The unreal sentences form the last and (for this discussion) most interesting group. It seems to be taken for granted that the presence of *nunc* is sure evidence that the present subjunctive is the expression of the unreal thought-form; but *nunc* as well as *iam* sometimes refers to the future.¹ In protasis its force is hard to determine.

Ps. 415-7;²

Si damnoseis aut si de amatoribus
Dictator fiat *nunc* Athenis Atticis,
Nemo anteveniat filio credo meo.

This might mean 'If a dictator should now be appointed' (future.)

Tri. 63-4;

Habeas ut nactus: nota mala res optumast.
Nam ego *nunc* si ignotam capiam, quid agam nesciam.

Here a proposition to trade wives is being rejected. Why not 'If I should now take?'

Asin. 188-9;

Si ecastor *nunc* habeas quod des, alia verba praehibeas.
Nunc quia nil habes, maledictis te eam ductare postulas.

In this passage it is the second *nunc* that proves the unreality of line 188; for that line standing alone would bear either interpretation. This becomes perfectly clear when it is remembered that the idiomatic rendering of the *si*-clause in the ideal form would be 'If you should now get.' Cf. Most. 912-4. In one case a pronoun seems to compel a reference to the present rather than to the future.

¹ Undoubted cases are Tri. 156, 859, Merc. 927.

² See Blase, Geschichte des Irrealis, p. 15.

Bacch. 1039-40:

Verum, ut ego opinor, si ego in istoc sim loco,
Dem potius aurum quam *illum* corrumpi sinam.

The use of *illum* shows that the *si*-clause means 'If I *were* in your place' and not 'If I *should be* in (i. e., get into) such a predicament as yours'; in this latter case some general expression like *filium meum* would be in order.

Still another test has been hinted at. Sometimes a contingency is so unlikely that we can hardly conceive of the speaker as regarding it among the future possibilities; this, in a way, shuts up a given sentence to the unreal form. But even when these tests have done all they can, there still remain cases which do not answer to them, and which we yet instinctively (and rightly) feel are unreal. This feeling has its root in some special uses of the unreal conditional sentence, and I now turn to a consideration of these.

The gist of many conditional sentences is, 'If this takes place, something follows.' In the unreal form this becomes a speculation or assertion as to what would happen, if things *were* or *had been* so.

Cas. 811;

Edepol, ne tu si equos esses, esses indomabilis.

Bacch. 496;

Melius esset me quoque una si cum illo relinqueres.

However, all present unreal conditional sentences are not of this type; for the unreal conditional sentence, by its very nature, implies the reality of the facts to which its protasis and apodosis are opposed, and language generally has availed itself of this peculiarity to make the unreal conditional sentence the vehicle of a thought that is no longer primarily conditional, but whose essence lies in the realities opposed and the relation they sustain to each other.

1. *The Explanatory Use.*

St. 592-3;

EP. Edepol te vocem lubenter, si superfiat locus.
GE. Quin tum stans obstrusero aliquid strenue.

So far as form goes l. 592 could mean either 'I should be very glad to invite you, if there should prove to be a place to spare, or 'I should be very glad to invite you, if I had a place to spare. The reply in l. 593 leaves no doubt that the unreal sense is the one communicated to the hearer, for he replies, 'Oh, if that's the

case (*tum*), I shall be quite content to bolt something *standing*.¹ To attempt to fit this reply to the first interpretation makes nonsense of the passage. In the remark of the first speaker the apodosis and protasis are opposed to, and imply, the realities 'I do not invite you' and 'I have no place to spare.' The obvious relation between these two is 'I do not invite you *because* I have no place to spare.'¹ The conditional sentence as such is not the thing of primary importance here—Gelasimus does not care what Epignomus *would* do if the present state of affairs did not exist; but what the conditional sentence implies—that Epignomus is excusing himself from inviting him to dinner on the ground that his table is full—this touches him very closely, and to this he addresses his reply, in which he shows that the lack of a place at the table is no good reason (in his case) for withholding the invitation to dinner. As a description of its function, I have applied the name 'Explanatory' to this sub-type of the unreal conditional sentence.

Inasmuch as this peculiar use of the conditional sentence arises because it is unreal, we may assume as unreal those conditional sentences which we feel perform a like function, i. e., sentences (like the one above), which stand in such a context that they are manifestly an explanation of, or apology for, an existing state of affairs.

Bacch 46;

Nam si haec habeat aurum quod illi renumeret, faciat lubens.

Bacch. 635;

Si mihi sit, pollicear.

Ep. 331;

Si hercle habeam, pollicear lubens.

Merc. 591;

Ni ex oculis lacrumae defendant, iam ardeat, credo, caput.²

¹ Or, 'The only reason I do not invite you is that I have no place to spare.' This type of sentence is much used (as in the present passage) to excuse someone from doing what he is asked or expected to do. The reason implied for not doing is intended by the speaker to be a sufficient one. Hence the full implication is 'I *cannot* invite you, because, etc.' I give the more general interpretation above not to obscure the fundamental by the incidental. The general situation, the speaker's tone of apology and the presence of such defining words as *lubenter*, are the outward expression of this added moment.

² Of course, humorous. Charinus has just said that he is on fire with love within, and adds that he supposes that the only thing that keeps his head from burning is his tears.

Pa. 274;

Misereat, si familiam alere possim misericordia.

St. 190;

Vocem te ad cenam, nisi egomet cenem foris.

St. 479;

Non graver, si possiem.

Bacch. 636 a, Capt. 238, Cist. 45, Mil. 1371, Rud. 1418-20.

2. *The Inferential Use.*

Mil. 1254-6;

MI. cur non pultas?

AC. Quia non est intus quem ego volo. MI. Qui scis? AC.

Scio edepol + facio:

Nam odore nasum sentiat, si intus sit.

In l. 1256 the realities opposed are 'My nose catches no perfume' and 'He is not within.' The obvious connection is 'My nose catches no perfume; *therefore*, he is not within'; for Acroteleutium is telling how she *comes to the knowledge* that the soldier is not in the house. This is another sub-type of the unreal conditional sentence in which the primary value lies not in the conditional thought-form itself, but in the realities implied by protasis and apodosis and their relation. This relation in the case of the explanatory was one of *cause and effect*; here it is one of *ground and inference*, hence the name 'Inferential.' In this type of unreal conditional sentence the unreality of the apodosis is treated as unquestioned, and from it is inferred the unreality of the protasis; e. g., (in the passage quoted above), the speaker is proving that the soldier is *not* within from the *lack* of the smell of perfume that always accompanies him. This readily falls into the form of a syllogism. 'The soldier scatters perfume wherever he goes—I do not detect it here—Therefore he is not within.'¹ This use affords a more clear-cut test of the unreal thought-form than does the explanatory use.

Cist. 96-7;

Nam si ames, extempulo

Melius illi multo quem ames consulas quam rei tuae.

Perhaps to be included are Men. 110-1, 504,² Pers. 215.

I hope that this description of the Explanatory and Inferential will make more tangible the ground for the feeling that certain of

¹ See further A. J. P. XXI. pp. 264 ff.² Uses a perfect form (*noverim*) with present meaning.

the cases that use the present subjunctive are unreal to speaker and hearer.

B. Uses of the Imperfect Subjunctive.

Omitting doubtful cases, as was done in the discussion of the present subjunctive, there are 27 examples of conditional sentences in Plautus which have the imperfect subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis. It was found that a large number of the present subjunctive cases had to be classed as doubtful because of the difficulty of deciding between ideal and unreal, either interpretation expressing well enough the speaker's essential thought. In only three or four cases does Plautus make his conditional thought-form clear in such situations by the use of the imperfect subjunctive.

Bacch. 496;

Melius esset me quoque una si cum illo relinqueres.

Asin. 592;

Aliquanto amplius valerem, si hic maneres.

In either of these examples had Plautus made use of the present subjunctive, it would have been very hard to determine the thought-form. Cf. Aul. 286, Ps. 1236.

The presence of *nunc* in the apodosis of Rud. 801-2, and the unlikelihood that the protasis of Cas. 811 would be viewed as a future possibility, would perhaps stamp these cases as unreal even though the present subjunctive had been used. Bacch. 486 ff., 916 ff. seem to refer to the past. The remaining cases (19), with perhaps two exceptions, are Explanatory and Inferential.

1. Explanatory.

Asin. 196-7;

AR. Ubi illaec quae dedi ante? CL. Abusa; nam si ea durarent mihi Mulier mitteretur ad te, numquam quicquam poscerem.

Asin. 674-5;

et si hoc meum esset, hodie Numquam me orares quin darem, illum te orare meliust.

Mil. 1262;

MI. Non video, ubist? AC. Videres pol, si amares.

Most. 844;

Nam egomet ductarem, nisi mi esset apud forum negotium.

Pers. 45;

Si id domi esset mihi, iam pollicerer.

Ps. 640;

Si intus esset, evocarem.

Bacch. 554-5, Ps. 1320. This last example is somewhat complicated, but evidently is an explanation of Pseudolus' present attitude, and hence falls under this heading. Verging toward the explanatory sense are Rud. 202-3, 552-3. Asin. 678 and Aul. 439-40 are explanatory, but may refer to the past.

2. *Inferential.*

Asin. 860;

Pol ni vera ista essent, numquam faceret ea quae nunc facit.

Merc. 382-3;

Res adhuc quidem hercle in tutost. nam hunc nescire sat scio
De illa amica: quod si sciret, esset alia oratio.

In two cases it is impossible to tell whether the reference is to the present or the past.

Cas. 555-6.

Verum autem altrovorsum quom eam mecum rationem puto,
Siquid eius esset, esset mecum postulatio.

Tri. 115;

Haec, si mi inimicus esset, credo haud crederet.

Referring to the past are Amph. 525-6, Aul. 742, Poen. 691-2. Cf. Cas. 910.

Perhaps the most interesting result of this examination of Plautus' use of the present and imperfect subjunctive is the bringing to light the fact that, in the use of the imperfect tense, about two-thirds of the cases are either explanatory or inferential, whether we deal with those only which refer to the present or include those also that refer to the past. It is impossible to divide into clear-cut classes the cases that use the present subjunctive, and say that so many are ideal and so many unreal. If that could be done, it would be possible to determine the proportion of explanatory and inferential in the sum total of the unreal, and thus make a comparison with the proportion found to exist in the use of the imperfect subjunctive. Though this exact comparison cannot be made, still a survey of the field leaves a strong impression that the proportion for the present subjunctive is less

than that for the imperfect. If this be true, the reason is not far to seek. The present subjunctive had been and still was, to a large extent, the accepted speech-form for the unreal as well as the ideal conditional sentence. Accordingly, in cases where the speaker was not forced to a conscious choice of a conditional thought-form, or his audience would arrive at his essential thought whether his words suggested to them the ideal or the unreal thought-form, he naturally chose the old familiar speech-form. In only three (possibly five) cases does the speaker, in a situation of this sort, make clear by the use of the imperfect subjunctive that he is thinking in the unreal form. With the explanatory and inferential uses the case is different. Here the very essence of the meaning consists in the sentence being understood as unreal; hence the desirability of a speech-form to make this clear—the imperfect subjunctive was such a speech-form, now coming into use and ready to hand. It would be little wonder if it should prove to be true that there was a tendency to take advantage of it in cases of this sort, though the old speech-form, spoken in the proper tone of voice, could make the meaning clear. Interesting in this connection as showing the tendency to use an unambiguous speech-form for these special unreal uses is Men. 195;

Nam si amabas, iam oportebat nasum abreptum mordicus.

This is inferential, tending to show that Erotium affection is only simulated. Similar, but referring perhaps to the past, are Ps. 286, Rud. 379-80.

Another matter of interest is to determine to what extent Plautus has adopted the imperfect subjunctive as the speech-form of the present unreal conditional sentence. This can be done roughly by comparing the absolute number of explanatory and inferential cases which find expression in the present and imperfect respectively, making some allowance for the possibility that these types appear insomewhat larger proportion in the imperfect. In the present subjunctive 13 explanatory cases were found; to these must be added, in this comparison, 12 examples¹ that use forms in *-am* or *-ar*. Of the inferential there are 2 (or 5) cases; to these 2 are to be added for the same reason as above (Merc. 489, Men. 640.)

¹ Asin. 393, Curc. 58, Merc. 286, Mil. 878-80, 1284-6, Poen. 877 (*noverim*), 971, Ps. 377, Rud. 196-7, St. 508, Tri. 628-9, Truc. 299.

In the imperfect subjunctive were found 8 (or 10) explanatory and 2 (or 4) inferential. Combining these, the present subjunctive shows 29 (or 32), and the imperfect 10 (or 14) cases. From this we may assume that the present subjunctive is used by Plautus for the present unreal conditional sentence three times, where the imperfect is used once. With such a foot-hold as this, doubtless the imperfect subjunctive made rapid progress in displacing the present.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

H. C. NUTTING.

NOTES.

A NOTE ON THE ACHAEMENIAN INSCRIPTION,

Bh. I, §18, lines 86-87.

Dr. Louis Gray, A. J. P. XXI, page 21, reports a suggestion of Professor Jackson that the reading *uša-bārim*, adopted by Weissbach and Bang, should be retained; and adds that Jackson would render the epithet as 'borne by oxen,' and would equate *uša-* with Sanskrit *ukṣan* and Avestan *uxšan*. We should, however, expect to find in Old Persian **uxša-* rather than *uša-*, in accordance with the established law that in Av. and OPers. an Indo-European *ks̄* gives a *š*, and IE. *q^(s)* gives a *xš*. (See for examples Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I² §§616, 641, 819). To explain away this difficulty is the purpose of this note.

This may, I think, be done by a reference to Pischel's law¹ concerning the representation of *ks̄* and *q^(s)* in Prakrit, namely by *cch* and *kḥh* respectively. Examples cited in his Grammar for *ks̄* are: M., AMg., J. M. *chuhā* = Av. *šuda* = Skt. *kṣudhā*; AMg., JM., S'² *acchi* = Av. *aši*, Skt. *akṣi*; and, for *q^(s)*: AMg., JM. *khīra* = Av. *xšīra*, Skt. *kṣīra*. Pischel, *ibidem*, §320, further points out that Prakrit *cch* occasionally corresponds to Avesta *xš*. (But this is apparently not in conformity with phonetic law). As an example he cites *uccha-* = Av. *uḥšan* [that is *uxšan*]; but he adds that there is another form *ukḥha-*, which is authorized by the Prakrit grammarian Mārkaṇḍeya.

This seems to me to explain the apparently anomalous equation, OPers. *uša-* = Av. *uxšan* = Skt. *ukṣan*. For just as *uccha-* goes back to **uḥs-* so does OPers. *uša-* go back to the same group; and as *ukḥha-* goes back to **uḥs-*, so also does Av. *uxšan*. Whether Skt. *ukṣan* goes back to **uḥs-* or to **uḡs-* is impossible to

¹ GGA., 1881, p. 1322. Doubts are expressed by Johansson, *Shāhbāgarhi*, II 20 ff. See, however, Pischel's *Gram. der Prakrit Sprachen*, §§319, 318 et passim.

² We have IE. *kṣ* not *ks̄* in *acchi* etc., but this is not important as IE. *kṣ* and *ks̄* fell together in Aryan. See Brugmann, *loc. cit.*

say; both IE. *k̄s* and *qs* alike become Skt. *kṣ*. We must therefore assume a "variation" of *k̄* and *q*, and that the "variation" was of Indo-European date. This occurs frequently. See Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I' §597, 2, and the literature there cited; and also Wackernagel, *Ai. Gr.* I, page 228. Probably here IE. *k̄* was the more original, and the form with apparent *q* came as a loanword from the "*centum*-branch" to the "*satəm*-branch." I close with the remark that Prof. Jackson's interpretation of the passage in question appears to be entirely justified.

HARVARD COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
Feb. 16, 1901.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

NOTES ON THE SEPTUAGINT TEXT OF II Sam. 7: 22 and Isa. 42: 21.

II Sam. 7: 22.

For *ἕνεκεν τοῦ μεγαλῦναι σε* (Cod. B)
or *ἕνεκεν τοῦ μεγαλυθῆναι σε* (Cod. A)
read *ἕνεκεν τούτου ἐμεγαλύνθης*.

וְלָכֵן יְהוָה: 'Wherefore thou art great, O Lord.' The Septuagint rendering for וְלָכֵן is usually διὰ τούτου, but in Gen. 2: 24, 20: 6, and Hos. 136, it is *ἕνεκεν τούτου*. For the Hebrew original of *ἕνεκεν τοῦ*, one would expect *לְכַבֵּד* (Ex. 20: 20; II Sam. 14: 20), *כַּבְּדָה* (II Sam. 18: 18), or *לְשׂוֹבֵל* with infinitive (I Sam. 17: 28†; Ezek. 40: 4). It should be noted that *כַּבְּדָה* with a noun, 'for thy word's sake,' appears in the preceding verse. It is therefore barely possible that the translator's eye may have rested on *כַּבְּדָה* in vs. 21 when he wrote *ἕνεκεν τοῦ* in vs. 22; it is more probable, however, that if this be the true reading, the Hebrew text was different from what we have now,—perhaps *לְכַבֵּד* or *לְשׂוֹבֵל*. On the whole it seems better to correct the Septuagint from the Hebrew. The present reading can then be accounted for as follows. The original accurate rendering of the present Hebrew text, *ἕνεκεν τούτου ἐμεγαλύνθης*, was transmitted until a careless scribe wrote *τοῦ* for *τούτου*. Then someone, possibly the scribe himself, in order to provide *ἕνεκεν* with an object, changed the indicative to an infinitive, and added *σε*. Cf. I Sam. 26: 4 and Ps. 91: 6 (Heb. 92: 6) for other cases of *ἐμεγαλύνθην* for *לְכַבֵּד*.

Isaiah 42: 21.

For *ἔβουλεύσατο ἵνα δικαιωθῆ* (Codd. B \aleph A Γ)
 read *ἔβούλετο ἵνα δικαιωθῆ* (Cod. Q).

The Revised Version translates the verse thus: It pleased the Lord, for his righteousness' sake, to magnify the law, and make it honorable (margin, to make the teaching great and glorious).

יְהוָה יִתְּנֵנוּ יְהוָה יִתְּנֵנוּ
 יְהוָה יִתְּנֵנוּ יְהוָה יִתְּנֵנוּ

The entire verse reads thus in the Septuagint: *Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐβουλεύσατο ἵνα δικαιωθῆ καὶ μεγαλύνῃ αἶνεσιν.* 'The Lord God took counsel that he might be justified and might magnify his praise.'

The *ἵνα* clause undoubtedly arose from the fact that the translator took קָצַח for an infinitive. He further supposed that this infinitive was continued by the imperfect (לִיְהִי?). Doubtless he was misled by the unusual construction with יִתְּנֵנוּ of the imperfect instead of the regular infinitive with לֵ. On the analogy of Isa. 45: 4; 49: 7, etc. (יִתְּנֵנוּ with a noun), one would expect *ἐνεκεν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ* in place of *ἵνα δικαιωθῆ*. Cf. for *יִתְּנֵנוּ*, *ἐνεκεν τοῦ ἰμοῦ ὀνόματος*, Isa. 48: 9, and *ἵνα τὸ ὄνομα*, 66: 5; similarly *ὅπως τὸ ὄνομα*, Ezek. 20: 9, 14, 22, 44. Cf. also Ezek. 21: 28 (33), *ὅπως σταβῆς* for קָצַח יִתְּנֵנוּ (Cornill, קָצַח).

It is clear that *ἵνα δικαιωθῆ* was the original Septuagint reading, being occasioned by a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. The only question is whether to read *ἔβουλεύσατο* with Codd. B \aleph A and Γ , or *ἔβούλετο* with Cod. Q. The following considerations seem to show that Cod. Marchalianus (Q) has preserved the correct reading.

In the first place, the regular equivalents for יִתְּנֵנוּ are *βούλομαι* and *θέλω* (*βούλομαι* 35 times, *θέλω* 20, *εὐδοκέω* 4). There are but two instances of *βουλεύομαι*, in each of which *βούλομαι* appears as a variant reading. In Isa. 42: 21,—the case under discussion, *ἔβούλετο* is supported by Q, an excellent MS of the sixth century, while in the other passage, Jer. 49 (42): 22, all the MSS but A, viz: B \aleph and Q, read *βούλεσθε*.

The noun יִתְּנֵנוּ is usually rendered by *θέλημα*, e. g. Ps. 1: 2; Eccles. 5: 3. Cf. *θελητόν* I Sam. 15: 22, and *ἤθελον* I Kgs. 10: 13. In Isa. 46: 10, for *יִתְּנֵנוּ* the Septuagint has *πάντα ὅσα βεβούλευμαι*, but it is not improbable that here *βεβούλημαι* should be read. Cf., for the same expression, *πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου* Isa. 44: 28. Cf. also

Isa. 53: 10, where *βούλομαι* stands for $\Upsilon\Phi\Upsilon$ in the first part of the verse, and in the second part for $\Upsilon\Phi\Upsilon$. Moreover, the usual rendering for $\Upsilon\Phi\Upsilon$ with the infinitive is *βούλομαι* with the infinitive (e. g. Deut. 25: 7, 8; Job 9: 3; Isa. 53: 10; *θίλω* is so used but two or three times, e. g., I Kgs. 9: 1).

On the other hand, the regular equivalent for *βουλεύομαι*, a verb especially common in Isaiah, is $\Upsilon\Upsilon$. Cf. II Sam. 16: 23; Ps. 70: 10; Mic. 6: 5; Isa. 7: 5; 14: 24, 26, 27; 23: 9, etc. Furthermore, the verbal object of *βουλεύομαι* is regularly the infinitive,—either alone (15) e. g. Ps. 61: 5; Isa. 23: 9; (cf. 32: 7); I Mac. 8: 9, 30; or with *τοῦ* (6) e. g. Ps. 30: 14; Isa. 51: 13; I Mac. 3: 31. There is no case in the Septuagint—unless *ἔβουλεύσατο* can be proved to be the correct reading in Isa. 42: 21—where *βουλεύομαι* is followed by *ἵνα*. In the New Testament, on the other hand, both constructions are found, (the infinitive, Acts 27: 39, a *ἵνα* clause, Jn. 11: 53 and 12: 10). Cf. *βουλή ἐγένετο ἵνα* Acts 27: 42, and *συμβουλεύομαι ἵνα* Mt. 26: 4.

The foregoing evidence constitutes a strong antecedent probability in favor of *ἔβουλετο*. The probability that it was actually written instead of *ἔβουλεύσατο* is increased when it is remembered that scribes often wrote one verb for the other. Cf., besides Jer. 49 (42): 22, I Kgs. 12: 6; II Chr. 10: 6, 9; Esd. B 4: 5; Acts 5: 33; 15: 37. The reading *ἔβουλεύσατο* may have been due to carelessness, but more probably it was purposely substituted for *ἔβουλετο* by a scribe who was familiar with the use of *ἵνα* after *βουλεύομαι* but not with *βούλομαι ἵνα*. The New Testament contains no instance of *βούλομαι ἵνα*, though *θίλω ἵνα* is common. The latter never appears in the Septuagint, and *βούλομαι ἵνα* only in the passage under consideration. The only case in the Greek Bible of *βούλομαι* with an interrogative subjunctive is John 18: 39. The reading which it is here attempted to establish, cannot properly be considered an illustration of the use of *ἵνα* after *βούλομαι*,—an idiom which is found occasionally in late classical and ecclesiastical writers. It is rather a word for word translation of $\Upsilon\Upsilon\Upsilon$? $\Upsilon\Phi\Upsilon$. If the usual Υ had followed $\Upsilon\Phi\Upsilon$, *ἔβουλετο*, we may be sure, would have been followed by an infinitive.

JOHN WESLEY RICE.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Römische Elegiker. Eine Auswahl aus Catull, Tibull, Propertius, und Ovid. Für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von K. P. SCHULZE. Vierte Auflage. Berlin, Weidmann, 1900, 354 pages.

The third edition of Schulze's excellent book of selections from Catullus and the Elegy appeared in 1890. The increase of nearly seventy pages in the fourth edition is, for the most part, due to expansion of the old commentary. This has been much enriched and improved by a more copious citation of illustrations, and shows the beneficial effects of a wider reading in prose than editors of the Roman poets are wont, as a rule, to allow themselves.

The introduction, dealing with the history of the Elegy etc., is practically unchanged. Indeed the survival from former editions of the dates, '234-149 v. Chr.,' attached to the name of Porcius Licinus (p. 1, n. 1), shows that he—or was it the editor?—is still haunted by the memory of M. Porcius (Cato the Elder).

Schulze's grouping of his Catullian poems under categories—'Lesbiallyer,' 'An die Freunde,' 'An die Widersacher' etc.—is a matter of taste and, perhaps, of expediency. It has always been my own experience, however, that the traditional arrangement, based on the principle of variation, is just as welcome to the average American boy—who cares no more for categories in his poetry than the author did—as it was to the Roman reader for whom it was first devised. The worst of it is that categories involve us in chronology. By studies in chronology the evil wrought by these women of Catullus and the Elegy lives after them, and the teeth of innocent scholars are set on edge. The chronology of any love-affair—even your own—is difficult. How much more so that of a love-affair known to you only from the occasional poems of one of the participants, who was neither on his oath nor interested in that phase of the subject. If, therefore, Schulze has changed the order of his 'Lesbiallyer' since the census of 1890 it is no matter for surprise. *Incerta certa facere ratione postulat.* Schulze's commentary on the episode of Ariadne, which is his excellent selection from the difficult LXIVth, is considerably enlarged and improved.

As a matter of fact, did Catullus ever intend this for an episode except in appearance? So far as I now recall them the many theories of construction for the LXIVth assume the Ariadne as strictly episodical, therein encountering their most serious

difficulty, since, as such, the Ariadne is out of all proportion to the rest of this piece, for that matter, of any piece in which it might occur. Hence, it does not help matters much to suppose that LXIV was either left incomplete by the author or has reached us in that state. The old scribe christened the poem 'Argonautica,' probably on account of the first line. One wonders whether we have improved matters much by calling it the 'Marriage of Peleus and Thetis', and whether 'Ariadne at Dia' would not be preferable. In that case, whatever difficulties might ensue, the otherwise inordinate length of the Ariadne would at least be best accounted for. Moreover, the method of construction, which consists, so to speak, in giving a frame to the picture, is familiar enough in Alexandrian as well as in modern literary art.

In the first elegy of Tibullus, the substance of which, Aristophanically stated, is

μὰ Δι' ἄλλ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ διαγαγεῖν τὸν βίον,
ἔχονθ' ἑταίραν καὶ σκαλεῦοντ' ἄνθρακας,

the rare but normal construction *vita traducat* (5) for the first time receives adequate notice in a commentary.

Classica pulsa (4) is a phrase which should have troubled commentators more than, in some cases, it seems to have done. Schulze is certainly correct in his explanation. But while the transfer to wind-instruments of a word proper only of stringed-instruments is well attested in Greek, indeed, was especially noted by Plutarch, Pollux and Suidas, I, for one, have found no exact parallel in Latin to this use of *pulsa*. Huschke quoted Claudian, Cons. Theod., 313,

cui tibia flatu,
Cui plectro pulsanda chelys etc.

but this may be explained by zeugma. At all events it seems clear that Tibullus's use of *pello* in this sense is a reflection of the Greek idiom¹ which, as its occurrence in the Comic fragments shows, was perfectly ordinary. Such seems not infrequently to have been the literary method of Tibullus. His general knowledge of the Greek language and style was apparently remarkable but, in distinction from all of his contemporaries, he betrays few traces of any one Greek poet now existing.

Lehnert's article on *annus* in the new Thesaurus shows that Schulze ought to reconsider his theory that in line 13,

Et quodcumque mihi pomum novus educat annus,

novus annus means Spring. His *ver novum*, *aestas nova* are not parallels. Indeed, simply from a plain farmer's point of view—

¹ Doubtless Tibullus himself, who had seen service, knew how it felt to be suddenly startled out of a sound sleep by the night-alarm. But perhaps it would be too fanciful to suppose that his choice of the word was also suggested by his own sensations at such moments.

unless *educat* is forced into a meaning not supported by Schulze's appeal to Catullus LXII, 41—it would seem that his interpretation quite upset the natural chronology of the apple in all climates except, perhaps, that of the Golden Age, when, according to Ovid, 'ver erat aeternum.' I should prefer to translate *novus annus* here by something like "the season."

In line 14 *agricolae deo* is perhaps collective. At any rate the various attempts of the elder commentators to guess which god the poet was thinking of were labor lost. Tibullus is purposely indefinite.

The substitution of *igne* (*AV*) for the traditional and well attested *imbre* (*GPar.* and the best editors) in 47-48,

Aut gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit auster,
Securum somnos, imbre iuvante, sequi,

seems a little too suggestive of a porcelain stove and a feather-bed to be an improvement in this connection, and will hardly commend itself to those for whom a country attic, *imbre iuvante*, is one of the memories of childhood.

Those of us who have toiled over the Sulpicia question will heartily sympathize with the feelings, even if unconvinced by the logic, which, since his third edition, have prompted Schulze's addition of the following sentence to his introduction on II, 2:

"Vgl. Nr. x (iv. 6): dort bittet der Dichter die Götter, die Sulpicia mit ihrem Cerinthus-Cornutus zu vereinigen: *hier sind sie vermählt.*" The italics are mine.

If we possess any imagination—and it will be a sorry day when imagination and scholarship finally part company—we illuminate the dark corners of this question with the feeling that, amid the feminine characters of the Elegy, all of whom are so suspiciously typical, here, at least, is a genuine girl, of sufficient brains and position to make her emotions a matter of interest, and really in love with an actual, if not a genuine, man. We scorn the possible insinuation that the daughter of Servius Sulpicius could have been ill-favored or *passée*. We joyfully welcome anything helping us to believe that this attractive and wilful young person was happily united to her Gaius in the bonds of holy *confarreatio*. Certainly, she seems to have given up the composition of elegiac love-letters. Possibly she found it more advisable, in the course of time, to cultivate a branch of the Roman lyric more literally deserving of Quintilian's *tota nostra* than ever the Satire was. The one fragment of it, preserved by the Scholiast on Persius, 3.16, is also an undoubted example of "Feminine Latinity." Let us believe all, or any part, of this if we can. But we are not justified in citing Tibullus II, 2 as a document in the case. The identity of Cornutus and Cerinthus is scarcely to be proved.

It would be impossible here to make a detailed examination of Schulze's commentary on his selections from Propertius, moreover, the record of disagreement regarding the interpretation of such an

author is not especially valuable. Every one who has worked on the subject will easily detect the traces of long and profitable study in the majority of Schulze's notes on this most difficult and elusive of Roman poets. They are brief but usually to the point, and without that tendency to wordiness sometimes seen in the commentary of Rothstein. Moreover, unlike so many school editions of Latin and Greek authors, the difficulty is faced and explained, not overlooked, passed over in silence, or—worse yet—left to float about in the watery solution of a paraphrase.

The note, however, on *ibat videre*, I, 1, 13 (infin. in a final sense) seems to need revision. The statement "Von den augusteischen Dichtern erlaubt sich ausser Prop. nur noch Vergil diesen altertümlichen Gebrauch des Infinitivs" is at once disproved by such examples as Hor., *Od.* I, 2, 7; 23, 10; 26, 2: Ovid, *Her.* 1, 37; *Met.*, 5, 660-1, etc. See A. J. P. XVIII, p. 121.

In speaking of Hylaïos, l. 15 (in which Propertius alludes to the famous encounter with Atalanta) Schulze describes the centaur's attitude on that occasion as "bewarb sich um die Hand der Atalante." There is a flavor of wedding cards and future 'at-homes' about this expression which seems to me almost as incongruous in its mild conventionality as the mention of table manners in connection with a gorilla. Note here the poet's choice of *rami* to describe the weapon of Hylaïos. The word adds a touch of horror to this hairy Caliban of the forest which is quite lost in Ovid's imitation of this passage (A. A. 2, 191).

I observe with considerable surprise that in commenting on the exquisite poem which begins,

Quicumque ille fuit primum qui pinxit Amorem,

Schulze is, apparently, the first editor to mention the interesting parallel in Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* (I, 1):

Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind,
And therefore is wing'd Cupid painted blind:
Nor hath love's mind of any judgment taste;
Wings, and no eyes, figure unheedy haste: etc.

In the powerful and characteristic elegy to Paetus, line 6,

Obruis insano terque quaterque mari,

—one all but sees the downward push of that monstrous hand—it is, of course, true, as Bentley says, that *terque quaterque* 'semper habet significationem crebritatis.' The expression, as Schulze adds, is also "formelhaft zur Bezeichnung einer unbestimmten Zahl." But the flavor of epic is also interesting to observe. *Terque quaterque* has all the dignity and solemnity of the department from which it sprang. An excellent example is Tibullus, I, 10, 63-4;

Sit lacrimas movisse satis; quater ille beatus
Quo tenera irato flere puella potest!

where no one has seemed to note the characteristically sly touch of exaggeration—to be suspected as soon as we remember how Odysseus (5. 306) said:

τῆς μάκαρος Δαναῶν καὶ τετράκις,

and after him Aeneas (I, 94):

O terque quaterque beati,
quis ante ora patrum, etc.

One of the most difficult passages, among many others, in Propertius is line 47 f.:

Non tulit *haec* Paetus stridorem audire procellae
Et duro teneras laedere fune manus,
Sed thyio *thalamo* aut Oricia terebintho
Et fultum pluma versicolore caput.

Nothing seems to have been done to clear up the real difficulties in these lines by any commentator in the last fifteen years. Rothstein's special study of Propertius has contributed nothing here, and it is not necessary to mention those who, to judge from their silence, have joyously skated over this peculiarly thin strip of ice without observing their danger.

The principal difficulties are *haec* (*hic, hoc, hunc*) and *thalamo*. *Non tulit* is entitled also to a share. I should prefer *hic* for *haec*, not the *hic* of Ramsay, "while he was here at home," but *hic* the pronoun, after A. J. P. IV, 208, ff., "'*Hic* Paetus' brings before us the style of the man, 'this Paetus of ours', whatever another Paetus might do, and if Propertius had been gifted with prophetic foresight he would have known that there would be a Paetus of a very different stamp. Notice the iteration in what follows v. 51 *huic*, v. 53 *hunc* with the *πολύπρωτον* so characteristic of artificial poetry." But the real difficulty has been locked up in the *thalamo*. The key was discovered in the note to which I have just referred. As it seems, however, to have escaped the notice of Propertius-commentators, one and all, I take the liberty of repeating here that portion which bears on the point in question:

"*Non tulit* is *οὐκ ἔλη* = *non is fuit qui ferret*, from which we get for the contrast *sed is fuit qui mallet*. 'This Paetus was not the man to bear the sound of the piping storm, but he was the man (to have) his head propped on feather pillow of shot colors in a chamber of thyine wood or (of) Orician terebinth.' This chamber the commentators have sought on land and sought in a real chamber. But we know that Paetus was in narrow circumstances (*pauper*, v. 48), and had no such luxurious chamber or bed as [every commentator who commits himself on the subject since] Mr. Postgate would render it. Propertius simply tells us what Paetus would have preferred. But the *thalamus* is not a chamber on land nor yet a bed. It is a stateroom, the stateroom of such a ship as the Romans must have known as well as we know Cleopatra's barge in Shakespeare, the ship of Hieron, built under the direction of Archimedes and fully described by Athenaios, 5, p. 206. Of this ship we read *θαλάμους δὲ τρεῖς εἶχε τριμύριους* (p. 207 C), and further: *ἀφροδίσιον κατεσκευάαστο τρίκλινον . . . τοὺς*

ταίχους δ' εἶχε καὶ τὴν ὀροφὴν κυπαρίττου τὰς δὲ θύρας ἐλέφαντος καὶ θίου. This was the kind of seagoing environment that our Paetus was fit for, not the rough work of the deck that the mannish Roman lady of Juvenal delighted in (*duros gaudet tractare rudentis*)."

In the matter of selections the fourth edition differs only in the addition of V, VII and XLV to Catullus. But why was the *vivamus, mea Lesbia*, which echoes down the ages in scores of imitations,¹ why was the *quot mihi basiationes*, which is scarcely less famous, ever left out at all? These be parlous questions. And where is that interview with Varus's *grisette*, where is Marrucinus, the would-be "funny" man, where is Suffenus—*quem probe nosti*—and Egnatius, with his *fou rire*, and Fabullus's dinner-invitation? The principle of selection from Ovid is also far from clear to me. But people will always differ in the matter of selections from their favorite authors. Who has ever seen an anthology that was satisfactory in this respect? Of course, one must select from a poet as voluminous as Ovid. But Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius, are all compact. They are also three of the greatest among Roman poets. Why do we always read them in selections? However, whether we read them in selections or not, and to whatever extent we may differ on questions of text or interpretation it is certain that Schulze's excellent book is one of the best we have on the subject. It has already gone through three editions and has borne the practical test of constant use for nearly quarter of a century.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R. C. Seaton, M. A. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano.

In editing the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius Merkel's work must always be reckoned with. His great service consists

¹ For example, Balf's

Vivons, mignonne, vivons
Et suivons
Les ébats qu' Amour nous donne
Sans que des vieux rechargés
Renfrognés
Le sot babil nous étonne.

Les jours qui viennent et vont
Se refont :
Le soleil mort se relève,
Mais une trop longue nuit
Las, nous suit
Après une clarté brève, etc.

in having recognized the primacy of Codex Laurentianus XXXII, 9 as a source of the text. That Merkel had the right of it in throwing aside the *textus receptus* and basing his edition upon Laurentianus, will not be called in question. But his text is not final. There is another stream of tradition, although it is by no means so easy to define; and of this second tradition Merkel was not always duly regardful. It is therefore worth while to think over and work over the whole material from an independent point of view. Mr. Seaton, the editor of the Oxford text, while he accepts substantially Merkel's position, has approached his author in a spirit of independence. The result, as it lies before us in the new edition, is a conservative one. The editor has allowed himself a few slight changes, and while he shows familiarity with the efforts that have been made by others since Merkel's time to emend the text, he has been slow to set aside a tolerable reading, based upon evidence, for any conjecture whatsoever. In such passages as II 1127, III 892, 1384, where the manuscripts have difficult or impossible readings, Seaton has preferred to keep the tradition and mark the passage as corrupt rather than to accept Merkel's suggestions. The conjectures that are noted in the commentary suggest, for the most part, that a difficulty exists or that another reading is possible: not many of the recent conjectures are incorporated into the text. A few examples may be given of wise departure from Merkel. In III 644, Madvig's *σβέσαι* for *σβέσαι* of the manuscripts is adopted, and thus the only future optative with *κέ* is eliminated from the Argonautica. In III 980, Merkel kept the reading of L, *ἀλλήλοισι κάνομεν*, which involved the lengthening of iota in *κάνομεν*. Following codex Guelferbytanus and the metrical procedure of the poet, Seaton gives *ἀλλήλοισιν κάνομεν*. In II 298, III 1147, Seaton adopts Spitzner's emendation *διέτμαγεν*, in place of *διέτμαγον* of Merkel and the manuscripts. There is no reason for assuming a 2d aor. active form *διέτμαγον* with intransitive sense, and this same error has been banished from the text of the Iliad. In IV 203, the vocative *φίλοι* occurring in the middle of a verse and of a sentence and before *τε*, is disturbing. Seaton has followed Guelf. in writing *φίλην*. In III 745, *ναῦται* has long been under fire, and Seaton himself formerly held it to be objectionable (*Am. J. Phil.* X 467): but following Rzach (*Wiener Studien* 1881, p. 58) who offers Homeric parallels for *αι* as long in the first thesis before hiatus, Seaton has set *ναῦται* in the text. In IV 1523, Seaton adopts Brunck's emendation *ἀλγος* for *ἐλκος*. Merkel kept the latter in deference to manuscript authority. These instances, which might easily be multiplied, may serve to show that Seaton has gone his own way and has not set out to reproduce Merkel's text. In general, the new edition is marked not only by conservatism, but by a knowledge of the author's vocabulary, and by good judgment in the selection of individual readings when the evidence compels the editor to choose one of two alternatives.

Considered as a critical edition, the new text raises various points that are worthy of discussion. The proportion of dissent in the following remarks is not meant to reflect the total impression which the edition makes upon an attentive reader. It is rather in the interest of discussion upon the author whose works receive all too little attention. First, as to the commentary.

A critical commentary, to be of value, should contain evidence: not necessarily every fact which one might seek in larger works, but what is given ought, for quality, to be evidence. The nature of the evidence which one expects to find in the Oxford edition, is explained in the preface. In the tenth century there were two types of text: the first and best is known to us by means of Laur. XXXII, 9; the second we must determine by the help of Guelferbytanus, Laur. XXXII, 16, and the corrections entered in Laur. XXXII, 9: citations in the Etymologicum Magnum which agree with this second type of text, show that the separation into two types is as old as the fifth or fourth century.

Assuming the correctness of this classification of sources, the readings of L are of the first importance, likewise the agreement of G and L' as against L. Such variations between these two families, variations which carry us back at once beyond the time of printed editions, ought always to be given. As a matter of fact, the commentary does not systematically present the evidence in this way. A few examples will suffice to make this point clear. In IV 170, *δερκομένης* is read by Merkel and by Seaton on the authority of L' and G. L has the impossible *δερκομένη*. Seaton gives no note. In III 1001, we find *τὴν δὲ καὶ* in the text. In the commentary is noted the fact that L has *οἱ δὲ καὶ*, but no mention is made of the agreement of L' and G upon the reading adopted. In II 239, G and L 16 support the reading adopted, *ἦγον*. L's *ἦκεν* is the only fact noted in the commentary. One might, in these cases just cited, infer with approximate correctness upon what authority the text rests, but it would have been far better to give the various strands of evidence. In II 1174, is an interesting grammatical question. L has

οὐδέ σφιν θέμις ἦεν, ὅτ' ἀντιπέρθεν ἴκουτο—.

Seaton notes L's *ἴκουτο* but adopts *ἴκουτο* without explanation. An *ex silentio* conclusion would be fallacious here, for G has *ἴκουτο*. The plural *ἴκουτο* is presumably somebody's conjecture on the basis of G's reading; but if any further evidence was attainable it ought to have been given. In IV 145, the reading *έίστο*, in which L and G agree, and which is the basis of Merkel's emendation, is not mentioned.

Any increase in the size of the commentary which might become necessary by the method of citation here advocated, would be more than made good by the elimination of the vulgate readings. If the general theory of the text as it is set forth in the preface is the true one—and there is no doubt that it is the true

one—it is a matter of indifference what the vulgate readings may be. The habit of giving such readings is a part of the old theory of a *textus receptus*, handed down from one editor to another and changed here and there by the comparison of new manuscripts or the talent of an emendator. The logic of the doctrine set forth in the preface is that the *textus receptus* is to be discarded; that a printed edition has no authority as evidence save that of the manuscripts upon which it is based; that if a given printed edition preserves readings of a MS not now accessible it ought to be cited by itself, and its evidence as a representative ought to be brought into relation with the two types of text that can be shown to have existed in the tenth century. The point of my criticism, then, is that the preface embodies the modern theory of determining the history of a text as a historical problem, while the commentary is not free from the old leaven of a *textus receptus*. To mark a reading "vulg." is not the citation of evidence: it is rather a bushel under which all sorts of things may be hidden.

Apart from the theory involved, this notation has practical disadvantages. The readings of a manuscript like L are worth knowing even when they are palpably wrong, for they may contain a hint of the truth. They should stand out clearly and not be left to inference. A few examples are here given to show how easily one may draw a wrong inference from the commentary as it is arranged. In IV 1538, L and G give the aor. ἀπετεκμήρατο. Seaton cites this fact and adds, "ἀπετεκμήρατο vulg." A grammarian might be desirous of learning what authority there is, if any, for the imperfect. The fact that ought to have been stated is that the imperfect is a reading of Stephanus. On the same page, IV 1564 "Ἀτθίδα vulg." should be "Ἀτθίδα codd." This is, to be sure, the reading of the printed editions up to Wellauer's time, but the thing worth knowing is not what has been printed but that the true reading is preserved as a *varia lectio* in the scholia as against all the manuscripts. A fuller statement of the evidence would have been instructive in IV 324 where the genuine reading rests upon the testimony of L³, a *varia lectio* in the scholia and a note of Stephanus Byzantius, s. v. *καυλικοί*, as against L and G.

The important contributions of Rzach to our knowledge of Apollonius Rhodius (*Grammatische Studien zu Apollonius Rhodius*, Wien, 1878; *Wiener Studien*, 1881) have been valued and used by Seaton. Rzach proposes to read in IV 618, instead of μετ' ἀνδράσι κεκλήσται of the MSS μετ' ἀνδράσιν ἐκλήσται. This is in the interest of uniformity. A perfect without the κ of the reduplication is found in IV 267, 990, 1202, and is in each case the only possible metrical form. The fourth and remaining passage is the one in question, and the slight change proposed here would leave ἐκλήσται as the one form used by Apollonius. Seaton's adherence to the manuscript reading as against Rzach seems justifiable, since κεκλήσται is a familiar form and there is here no greater compelling power than the law of uniformity. Some-

times, however, Seaton has been too conservative. We read on p. 5 of the preface: "Rzachius inter alia *κούραι* pro τε *κόραι* (I 811) et *Ἄρειος* pro *Ἄρειως* (II 404) scribenda esse iudicavit, recte, ut opinor; neutrum tamen horum contra codices mutare ausus sum." And yet *Ἄρειος* has been taken into the text and *κούραι* ought to have been. The case of *νεός*, IV 208, for which Rzach proposes to write *νεός* is somewhat more difficult because the final syllable of the word stands in the arsis and must be long. In defence of such lengthening Rzach cites Odyssey X 172 and Argon. I 289, where a syllable with a vowel naturally short is lengthened under the accent in the arsis of the fourth foot. The strength of Rzach's contention against *νεός*, *Ἄρειως*, *κόραι*, is not that they are isolated forms but that they are contrary to the law of epic usage. They are Attic, not epic. The same holds true of the dative pl. *αἰσι*, which is nowhere allowed to appear in the Oxford edition, and of *βαρεία*, IV 1339, which long stood in the printed texts on very slender authority and which Wellauer rightly interpreted as *βαρείη*. The same objection obtains against *πρόραν*, I 372, which Seaton has adopted on the testimony of L 16. The epic genitive *πρόρης* (II 556) might conceivably have *πρόραν* or *πρόρην*, not *πρόραν*, as its accusative. If a dissyllabic word is to be retained *πρόρην* is the only tolerable form, and that is the form adopted by Lehrs. But there are signs which point to a trisyllabic word as the desideratum. L and G have *ἦδὲ κατὰ πρόραν ἔσω ἀλδς ὀσσύτιόν περ*. This is a faulty verse, metrically. The question then is, where is the fault? Brunck, without knowing the reading of L 16, pronounced *ἔσω* corrupt and proposed *είσω*. But this conjecture builds upon the unepic form *πρόραν*. Now assuming that *ἔσω* is sound and that *-ραν* is to be interpreted as short according to the law of epic speech, we reach the conclusion that the difficulty is with the first part of the *πρόραν* of the MSS. The emendation of Bergk, *πρώειραν*, accepted by Merkel, satisfies the conditions of the problem. The soundness of this reasoning rests upon the two facts, that *ἔσω* has the weight of authority and that *πρόραν* is for the epic speech an incredible form. Then the reading of L 16 is to be interpreted not as a good tradition but as a conjecture by some anonymous scholar who anticipated Brunck.

In matters of orthography, the following points may be noted. In obedience to evidence from various sources and in keeping with the best usage of the present day, *θήσκω* and *θρόσκω* appear with iota subscript, the former without any manuscript authority in Apollonius, and the latter with L's testimony in III 957, IV 42, 603. The derivative noun *θροσμός*, has *φ* in L, II 823, although not in III 199. Seaton has preferred *θροσμός*, although the other form is known to the grammarians and is found in Ven. A of the Iliad as well as in Laurentianus. The scrupulousness of L in these lesser points is one of the characteristic features of the manuscript. It has *διχῆ* IV 289, (Seaton *διχῆ*), just as it stands alone in giving *πάνη* (so Seaton) in 7 of the 13 cases of its occur-

rence in the poem. The general evidence for iota subscript in *μμήνσκω* is substantially the same as that for *η* and *φ* in the two verbs above given, (see Fleckeisen's *Jahrb.* 1865, 245 ff.) but Seaton has not introduced the form in II 1140, the only passage where the word occurs.

The adoption of *διπιτεύω* rather than *διπιεύω* is in the face of a strong array of testimony. In II 406, III 1137, L and G agree in *διπιτεύω*; in IV 469 L has *διπηεύω* with correction *διπιεύω*; IV 799, L has *διπιεύω*. L has, then, in two instances preserved the form *διπιεύω*, and stands alone in this save for two Vatican MSS. That this is the true orthography is clear from epic usage and the tradition of lexicographers. Since Bekker *διπιτεύω* has been banished from Homer, and that, too, upon evidence. The epic compound *παρθενοπίπης* is in point. Paley and Rzach, in Hesiod's Works, 29 and 806, edit *διπιεύω*, following codex Laur. XXXII 16 of Hesiod. Apollonius Sophistes, Photius, Suidas and Hesychius give *διπιεύω*. Accordingly Kinkel in Lycophron's *Alexandra* 45 gives *διπιεύω* as against the MSS. The article in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* s. v. *διπιτεύω* needs revising as to orthography, for not one of the examples there cited has a firm foundation.

In conclusion I will mention one more matter of editorial detail, which may serve incidentally to justify and render intelligible Merkel's robust faith in L. This manuscript has *προβαθής*, IV 283; G, and presumably the other manuscripts have *προβαθύς*. Merkel adopted *προβαθής*, Seaton *προβαθύς*. If the former is correct, we have an adjective in *-us* carried over to the class in *-ης* upon becoming a compound word. This is the only occurrence, to my knowledge, of this particular word, but the principle is a well-established one. *ἀγχιβαθής*, IV 1572, is as old as Homer. *μελαμβαθείος*, IV 516, is to be referred to a nom. *μελαμβαθής*, found in Aesch. Prom. 219. *προβαθής* is the opposite of Strabo's *προσβραχής*. Besides, Apollonius has *πολυθαρσής*, II 912, as Homeric form, and *περιθαρσής*, I 152, 195, a form peculiar to himself. *ποδώκης* is a familiar epic example of the same formation. In later times *τηλεβαθής*, *πολυβαθής*, *ἀμετροβαθής*, *ισοβαθής*, *ἀβαθής* occur; but no compound with the ending *-us*. The form *προβαθής* is therefore, in keeping with the habit of the language and is a significant token of a good manuscript, whereas *προβαθύς* is easily understood as a blunder. The question has been decided in principle in the text of Aeschylus. The form *μελαμβαθύς*, Prom. 219, found its way into the earlier printed texts from inferior manuscripts, but has long since been banished and forgotten. It is safe to say that *προβαθής* will eventually stand in the Oxford text of Apollonius and find its way thence into Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*.

HAMILTON COLLEGE,
CLINTON, N. Y.

EDWARD FITCH.

Lexique Etymologique des termes les plus usuels du Breton Moderne. Par VICTOR HENRY. Rennes, Plihon et Hervé, 1900.

Victor Henry's *Lexique Etymologique du Breton Moderne* (published as fascicle III of the *Bibliothèque Bretonne Armoricaire*, Rennes, 1900) is a book that well deserves the attention of Celtic as well as of English scholars. The author gives us in concise form a clear view of what so far has been done by various scholars towards elucidating the etymological connections of the most usual terms of modern Breton and we seem to be safe in following his guidance, as he exercises great caution and generally puts the reader on his guard, whenever the connection would seem either not to be well established or altogether doubtful. I have noticed only a few instances where the apodictic statement of fact does not seem to be in accord with the author's usual prudence: Under *darn* 'piece' Henry confidently pronounces upon English 'darn = to mend stockings' as a loan from Welsh *darn* 'piece,' while Rhÿs (in Murray's NED) considers the idea as absolutely inadmissible. Under *ler* 'leather' we are told that the corresponding Germanic words, English 'leather' and German 'leder' are loans from Celtic, while Kluge tells us that the Celtic words are generally considered as loans from the Norse. Under *houarn* 'iron' we learn that Germanic **eisarn* (whence English *iron* and German *eisen*) is a direct loan from ancient Celtic, while Kluge admits this only for ON. *jarn* (from OIr. *iarn*). Under *gwalc'ha* 'to sate' Henry brings together Latin *volgus* with English *folk*, German *Volk*, while Kluge pronounces upon the connection as doubtful, it being very questionable whether the Germanic words are conformable to a base **quelgos*, **quolgos*, nor does the latter mention any connection between the Germanic words and OIr. *folc* (according to Henry, from Celtic **wolg-o*), which connection would seem possible only under the supposition that the former are loans from the latter. Under *houc'h* 'pig' Henry is confident that English *hog* is a loan from Welsh (Cornish) *hoch*, but the idea is rejected on phonetic grounds by Rhÿs in Murray's NED. Nor do I think that Germanists will take kindly to the proposition, advanced under *oaled* 'hearth' that OE. *æled* 'fire' is a loan from Celtic **ägileita*, or that OE. *swin* like Breton *souin* is from Lat. *suinus*. *Ludu* 'ashes' Henry brings together (though doubtfully) with German 'lodern' to which he assigns the meaning of 'smouldering under the ashes.' I always thought the German word was rather expressive of a blazing up of the fire. As in the instances given the author seems to have deviated from his usual course of prudent caution, he also occasionally presents views now rather antiquated. So under *gwell* 'better' Greek βούλομαι is quoted as representative of the √*wel* with which it has nothing to do according to the opinion now prevalent. *Hirin*, W. *cirinen*, OIr. *airne* 'sloe' which

Henry brings from Celtic **arinio-* and compares with Skr. *arāni* 'wooden drill for producing fire' is now with Zimmer considered as cognate of Goth. *akran*, OE. *æcern* 'fruit.' Under *oad* 'age' Henry still brings OIr. *des* from Celtic **aiwestu* cognate with *aif-~~or~~* following a former suggestion of Stokes who now with Thurneysen posits a Celtic **ait-tu* cognate with *di-airāodau* and Latin *utor* (from **oitor*). Under *skant* 'scale of fish' we are rather surprised to see Henry consider English *skin* as sprung from a true OE. *scinn*, while it is a loan from OIcel. *skinn*. And, surely, the Celtic *skant-o* is not so isolated as Henry would have us believe. There can not be any doubt about OIcel. *skinn* being directly related to Breton *skant*. In fact, the correspondence between them is, as Zupitza points out, as close as it can be (see Zupitza, *die germ. Gutturale*, p. 156) and there may be a connection with *kenn* 'skin' OIr. *ceinn*, OIcel. *hinna*, which connection is admitted by Henry himself under *kenn*. I wonder why under *koan* 'supper,' from Latin *cena*, Henry does not mention the Irish loan from the same source, *cene*; see O'Mulconry's Glossary 427; cf. also *cen* *ibid.* 217 (*cen mo mair. i. cen a cena, mair uita*) and Todd Lect. V 55 *cōe leis ic a fur*. Under *klān* 'buttock' we miss reference to OIcel. *hlaun*, under *kavel* 'cradle' (from Low Lat. *cavellum*) to OE. *cavel* 'basket' from the same source. In regard to *ahū* 'trench' = W. *nant* 'valley,' I wish to draw attention to C. G. L. V 339, 1 *anes uallis* = Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels) A 570 which seems rather to stand for [n]an[ɬ]es *ualles* than *anrae uallis* as Goetz would have it (*Thes. Gloss. Emendat.*, p. 68a); also *antea uallis* (C. G. L. II 566, 30) seems rather to favor an *antes* than *anrae* cf. *nante ualle* in the Endlicher Glossary. Under *talm*, OJr. *tailm* 'sling' W. *telm* 'snare' mention might have been made of cogn. OIcel. *piälme* (*piälfe*) 'snare' (Noreen *Altisl. Gr.* §196, note 2) with which is evidently connected the OE. *pelma* glossing *tendiculum* in the Aldhelm-gloss printed in *Zts. f. d. A.* vol. IX. Worthy of attention seems to me Henry's suggestion that English *crumpet* is a fashioning of Celtic **cramm-poeth*, whence W. *cramm-uyth*, Breton *crampoez* 'pasta cocta.' The word must have been taken over already in Anglo-Saxon times, for Ahd. Gl. II 325, 1 we read *placente fiunt ex farina et simila et melle uel ferro (= farre?)*. *Saxonicè dicuntur cron pech (= cronpeth?)* with which Steinmeyer, l. l. compares *cronphetas (= cronpethas?) ex farina, simila, melle* in Cod. S. Galli 299, p. 280. Steinmeyer expresses, because of the latter passage, his disbelief in the genuineness of an Anglo-Saxon *cronpech* (*cronpeth?*), but granted that *cronphetas* is Latin, there is nothing to hinder us from supposing this Latin word to be a coinage from Celtic-English *cronpeth*.

Of the greatest interest to the English student are, of course, the Breton loans from Old English and Modern English. So *pusé* 'bitch' is conjecturally traced back to a loan from OE. *bicce*.

gôd 'pocket' with W. *cod* 'sack' comes from OE. *codd*.
kroumm 'crooked' with W. *crum*, Jr. *cromb* from OE. *crumb*.
krubul 'stomach' seems a derivative like W. *cromil* of a loan
 from OE. *cropp*.

barged 'buzzard' is conjectured to be a compound of *bar*
 'branche' and *cud* a loan from OE. *cyta*.

tell 'tente' from OE. (*ge*)*teld*.

falaouêta (for *faoul-aêta*) 'to take birds from their nests' is
 derived from *faoul*, a loan from OE. *fugol*.

ridel 'sieve' from OE. *hriddel*, etc.

About forty Breton terms are thus traced back to OE. sources.
 Curious is the alleged OE. *scyfen*, 'of the same family as OE.
sceoppa whence Engl. *shop*,' which on p. 241 is quoted as the
 original of Breton *skiber* 'wagon-shed.' What is meant is evi-
 dently OE. *scypen* 'stall.' Not among the loans from OE.
 appears Breton *kirin* 'pot à crème pour le beurre.' It is desig-
 nated as a 'Scandinavian loan word' (from Olcel. *kirna* 'churn'
 whence also English *churn* is said to have been borrowed). But
 there is every likelihood that Breton *kirin* owes its origin rather
 to a well authenticated OE. *cirin* (*cyrin*; cf. WW. 280, 32')
sinum cyrin with C. G. L. V 610, 32 *sinum uas in quo butirum*
conficitur. Also Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels) S 356 *sinnum*
cirm may stand for *sinum cirin*. At any rate, English 'churn' is
 now commonly considered as native and appears as such in
 Murray's NED. I will conclude with a personal remark. In my
 article, 'Some Celtic Traces in the Glosses,' I had occasion to
 compare Ir. *cló* 'wind' with Breton *glao* 'rain,' but I see from
 Henry's book that such a comparison is out of the question, *glab*
 standing for **gw-law* (Celtic *wo-law-o-*) from $\sqrt{\text{low}}$ as in Greek
 $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\text{-}\omega$, Lat. *lav-o*.

HARTFORD, CONN.

O. B. SCHLUTTER.

¹ E. Zupitza, Die germ. Gutturale, p. 193, errs in quoting this gloss from
 WW. 290, 31 and giving *ceren* as form of the OE. interpretation. Hence it
 cannot be placed with Goth. *kas* 'vessel.' The mistake is due to Lye, as
 pointed out by Murray s. v. churn in the NED.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOLOGIE, Vol. LVI (1901),
parts 1. 2.

Pp. 1-28. Italische Volksjustiz. H. Usener. On defamatory attacks such as were forbidden by the Twelve Tables: "si quis occentauisset siue carmen condidisset quod infamiam faceret flagitiumue alteri." Festus explains the early word *occentare* as meaning *conuicium facere* and the Liber Glossarum defines it as *infame carmen cum certo nomine dicere*. Compare the expression *occentare ostium*, Plautus, *Persa* 569, Merc. 408. In Plautus the word *flagitium* often means "shame" or "exposure to ridicule," and a still earlier meaning was the reproaching or defaming of a man publicly—for example, by uttering or chanting uncomplimentary words before his door. This earlier meaning may be seen in the early use of the verb *flagitare*, which was connected by popular etymology with *flagitium*. Both words were connected with *flagrum*, *flagellum*. After the analogy of *agere*, *agitare*, the verb *flagitare* meant "to beat soundly," "to drub," and *flagitium* meant "the beating." For the original meaning of *flagitare*, compare Festus Pauli, p. 110, 23: "*inter cutem flagilatos dicebant antiqui mares qui stuprum passi essent*." In the passage already quoted from the Twelve Tables, *infamiam* was probably inserted by Cicero, and afterwards wrongly regarded as synonymous with *flagitium*. Further, *carmen quod* cannot be the grammatical subject of *flagitium faceret*. The *quod* of the law was ablative, not nominative, and the passage presumably ran: "si quis occentassit quod (*for quo*) flagitium alteri faciat." Catullus evidently had in his mind the *flagitatio* of popular justice when he wrote his forty-second poem. The synonymous expressions *occentatio*, *pipulus*, *uagulatio*, are also discussed in this article.

Pp. 29-36. Ein Phrynioschitat. H. Diels. On a fragmentary quotation—*Φρύνιχος ἐν Φουρίσσαις*—in the scholia of Ammonius on Homer (Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. ii.)

Pp. 37-54. Jahrhundertfeier in Rom und messianische Weissagen. S. Sudhaus. Virgil's fourth Eclogue was written with reference to the secular festival which was proposed for the year 39 B. C., and in anticipation of the blessings which were to flow from the Peace of Brundisium. The resemblance between the imagery of this Eclogue and that of the Sibylline verses is only superficial.

Pp. 55-76. Gregors des Thaumaturgen Panegyricus auf Origenes. A. Brinkmann.

Pp. 77-105 ABC-Denkmaeler. A. Dieterich. On the order of the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabets in various inscriptions, papyri, etc.

Pp. 106-112. Eine Bestätigung aus Oxyrhynchos. O. Hense. On the history of the recognition of the antispast.

Pp. 113-19. Eine Dräsekesche Hypothese. P. Wendland.

Pp. 120-38. Zur Lex Manciana. A. Schulten.

Miscellen.—Pp. 139-41. L. Radermacher. Andocideum. Note on §§17, 18 of the speech On the Mysteries.—Pp. 141-5. J. F. Marcks. Zur Kritik der Briefe des Diogenes.—Pp. 145-8. H. Usener. Philonides (an Epicurean philosopher who lived at the court of the Seleucidae, 175-50 B. C.).—Pp. 148-9. M. Ihm. Zu Cicero ad Atticum XIV 10, 2. Read "redeo ad Tebassos, Scaevas, Fangones."—Pp. 149-50. C. Wachsmuth. Ehrendecret der Provinz Asia.—Pp. 150-4. C. Wachsmuth. Zur Metzger Alexander-Epitome.—Pp. 154-7. F. Buecheler. Zwei lateinische Epigramme.—Pp. 157-9. E. Ziebarth. Cyriaci Anconitani epistula inedita.—Pp. 159-60. C. Rothe and G. Andresen, on Lehmann's collation of the MSS of Cicero's letters to Atticus.—P. 160. Editor's note. An explanation, at the request of the author, that a certain article in the last volume was written two whole years before it was printed.

Pp. 161-6. Vermuthungen zur Iouxmenta-Inschrift. R. Thurneysen.

Pp. 167-74. Der Typhonmythus bei Pindar und Aeschylus. A. v. Mess. The pictures of Typhon and Aetna in Aeschylus, Prom. 367-88 (Weckl. 351-72) and Pindar, Pyth. I. 15-28, are probably derived from a common epic source.

Pp. 174-86. Eine Hesiodische Dichtung. H. Usener. This article, called forth by the preceding one, shows that the "common epic source" was probably Hesiod.

Pp. 187-201. Zur Lex Manciana (continued from p. 138). A. Schulten.

Pp. 202-14. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ ΦΑΝΙΑΙ. L. Radermacher.

Pp. 215-26. Bemerkungen zu griechischen Historikern. C. Wachsmuth. I. Herodot in Thurioi. II. Alexanders Ephemeriden und Ptolemaios. III. Das Alexanderbuch des Kallisthenes.

Pp. 227-32. Der Anfang von Tacitus Historien. O. Seeck. The History of Tacitus was probably intended to continue the history of Fabius Rusticus.

Pp. 233-46. Eine Bundesurkunde aus Argos. M. Fränkel.

Pp. 247-71. Die Antwerpener Handschrift des Sedulius. C. Caesar.

Pp. 272-83. Die Ueberlieferung über Aspasia von Phokaia. O. Neuhaus.

Pp. 284-303. Zu Herodianos Technikos περί μορίων λέξεως. P. Egenolff.

Miscellen.—Pp. 304-5. W. Kroll. Notula grammatica. On instances of epexegetis such as: quod ubi factum Dahae *Stiphamenen occisum* audierunt.—P. 305. H. Usener. Worterweiterung. On such tricks of MSS as *propicius* for *propius*, *sustinentasse* for *sustentasse*.—Pp. 305-7. O. Hense. Bakchylides VIII (IX) 36 Bl^o.—Pp. 307-10. S. Sudhaus. Von zwei kleinen Leuten (Papyrus-schnitzel).—Pp. 310-12. G. Landgraf. Zu Ciceros Rosciana § 11. Instead of the *dimissiui* of the cod. St. Vict. read *dimissuiri* (= *dimissum iri*). For the form of the infinitive see Arch. f. lat. Lex. II 349 ff., III 457; also Neue-Wagener III^o 177. Possibly *in* should be inserted before the word *manifestis*.—Pp. 312-13. H. Usener. Zu Cicero. I. For *Quo love?*, De re publ. I 36, 56, read *Quo Iovem?* II. For the *commutatione* of the MS, De re publ. I 45, 69, read *communitio*. III. In De re publ. II 2, 4 Cicero's *silvestris* (*belua*) and *ubera* are probably borrowed from Ennius. Compare Propertius, III (IV) 9, 51: "eductosque pares *silvestri ex ubere* reges."—Pp. 313-18. Fr. Susemihl. Chrysispos von Knidos und Erasistratos.—Pp. 318-20. C. Wachsmuth. 'Schriftquellen' und ihre Folgen.—P. 320. A. Zimmermann. Wandel von *l* zu *i* im Italischen (Zusatz zu Rhein. Mus. 55 p. 486 f.).

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, Vol. XXIV.

No. 1.

1. Pp. 1-18. Figures taken from a MS of Aristotle's *Meteorologica*. This article was prepared by Albert Martin from material left by Charles Graux. The figures in question are diagrams, found in MS No. 41 of the *Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs d'Espagne et de Portugal*, par Charles Graux et Albert Martin, in the *Nouvelles Arch. des missions sc. et lit.* t. II, 1892. They are intended to illustrate the meaning of several passages of the *Meteorologica*. Some (3) of them are reproduced from photographs, the rest (13) from drawings made by Graux.

2. Pp. 19-30. L. Malavialle gives a learned critical discussion of some passages in the *Chorographia* of Pomponius Mela, especially Ed. Frick, III, 67; p. 71, lines 3-7. Here we are to read *Oras tenent a Tamo . . . Ab Colide ad Indum . . .*

3. Pp. 31-43. Ancient Enharmonic Gamuts, by Louis Laloy. (Continuation from vol. XXIII, p. 233.)

4. Pp. 44-53. Critical Notes on Plautus, Miles 1022, 1088, and Trinummus 176, 289-291, 318, 332, by Alcide Macé.

5. Pp. 54-7. Orphica, Fr. 2 Abel, by Paul Tannery. The author shows that this fragment does not belong to Orphica and that it is almost certainly not ancient.

6. Pp. 58-60. Max Bonnet reads *impletae* sunt in Sal. Hist. 2, 87, and in 1, 88, defends *parum* celebrata for *incelebata*.

7. Pp. 60-61. In Aurelius Victor, Epit. XXV, J. Chauvin reads *nec* for *ne*.

8. Pp. 61-5. Fragment of a list of Olympic victors (an Oxyrhynchus papyrus), by T. W. Beasley. This article is of great importance for students of Pindar and Bacchylides, especially the latter.

9. Pp. 65-7. Note on Oxyrhynchus papyrus, No. 218, by B. Haussoullier. It is the *λεπείς* (though dead), not the *ζάκωπος*, that is put on trial.

10. Pp. 68-87. Book Notices. 1) Robert Brown, Researches into the origin of the primitive Constellations of the Greeks, Phoenicians, and Babylonians. Vol. I, London, 1899. Paul Tannery finds this work erudite and ingenious, but takes issue with the method and some of the conclusions. 2) Alfredo Monaci, Dello stile di Erodoto. Rome, 1898. Contains nothing altogether new according to Albert Martin. 3) Platon, Phédon. Texte grec publié avec une introduction, un commentaire et un appendice philosophique par Charles Bonny. Gand, 1898. A. M. finds this school edition in the main very good. 4) Helen M. Searles, A lexicographical Study of the Greek Inscriptions. Chicago, 1898. B. Haussoullier commends this work, but suggests several possible improvements. 5) Ph.-E. Legrand, Étude sur Théocrite. Paris, 1898. Du même, Quo animo Graeci presertim V^o et IV^o saeculis tum in vita privata tum in publicis rebus divinationem adhibuerint. Albert Martin pronounces both these works excellent, and says the former is undervalued by the author himself in the Preface. 6) Heronis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. I.—Heron's von Alexandria Druckwerke und Automatontheater, griechisch und deutsch herausgegeben von Wilhelm Schmidt. Im Anhang Heron's Fragment über Wasseruhren, Philon's Druckwerke, Vitruv's Kapital zur Pneumatik. Leipzig, 1899.—Supplementheft: Die Geschichte der Textüberlieferung, &c. Leipzig, 1899. Reviewed by Paul Tannery. The work is intended both for philologists and for engineers and physicists. The reviewer finds it wonderfully well executed, and gives some account of the contents. 7) Babrii Fabulae Aesopeae. Recognovit Otto Crusius. Accedunt fabularum dactylicarum et iambicarum reliquiae, Ignatii et aliorum Tetrasticha iambica recensita a C. F. Mueller. Ed. min. Leipzig, 1897. Noticed

by Albert Martin. This smaller edition differs from the larger only by the omission of the Prolegomena and Indexes, and consequently ignores other works that have appeared since 1894.

8) Galeni De victu attenuante liber. Primum graece edidit Carolus Kalbfleisch. Leipzig, 1898. Mentioned by A. M. This editio princeps is made from a MS brought from the Orient in 1840, with the aid of Latin versions, &c.

9) Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite des Lettres d'empereur Julien, par J. Bidez et Fr. Cumont. Bruxelles, 1898. Mentioned by Albert Martin. These researches constitute a preparatory study for an edition of the Letters of Julien. The present work is of the first order for philologists and palaeographers.

10) Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum. Codices Florentinos descripsit Alexander Olivieri. Bruxelles, 1898. Albert Martin gives a brief account of this work (the beginning of a series) with some remarks and suggestions.

11) Ettore Pais, Storia di Roma; vol. I, parte I: Critica della tradizione sino alla caduta del decemvirato. Torino, 1898. Highly praised by Philippe Fabia.

12) Albrecht Dieterich, Pulcinella, pompejanische Wandbilder und römische Satyrspiele. Leipzig, 1897. Ph. F. finds this an able work, but not free from unproved hypotheses.

13) Otto Ribbeck, Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta tertiis curis . . . ; vol. II. Comicorum fragmenta. Lipsiae, 1898. Philippe Fabia finds many improvements in the text, but regrets the omission of the index, and considers the work of conjecture carried too far.

14) T. Macci Plauti Trinumus with an introduction and notes by J. H. Gray, Cambridge, 1897. Mentioned briefly and favorably by Philippe Fabia.

15) P. Terenti Afri comoediae. Iterum recensuit Alfredus Fleckeisen. Lipsiae, 1898. Mentioned quite unfavorably by Philippe Fabia.

16) Paulus Tschernjaew, Terentiana. De Ciceronis studiis Terentianis; Casani, 1897. Highly commended by Ph. F.

17) Ch. Hiden, De casuum syntaxi Lucretiana. Pars II. Helsingfors, 1899. This work, devoted to the Ablative, is commended by R. Harmand, who suggests some slight improvements.

18) M. Terenti Varronis, Antiquitatum rerum divinarum libri I, XIV, XV, XVI. Praemissae sunt quaestiones Varronianae—Auctore Reinholdo Agahd. Lipsiae, 1898. Philippe Fabia briefly describes the work and finds in it valuable contributions to our knowledge.

19) Q. Horati Flacci carmina. Tertium recognovit Lucianus Mueller. Ed. ster. maior. Lipsiae, 1897. Ph. F. makes this work an opportunity to express great admiration for the important services of the author and his untiring activity.

20) Q. Horati Flacci opera recensuerunt O. Keller et A. Holder. Vol. I, Carminum libri IV, Epodon liber, carmen saeculare, iterum recensuit Otto Keller, Lipsiae, 1899. R. Harmand gives a general, and in the main, favorable account of this work, with discussion of several passages concerning which he does not agree with the author.

21) Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri. Ed. I curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn, Ed. altera quam curavit Mauritius Müller.

Pars 2, fasc. 1. lib. VII-X. Leipzig, 1899. Brief but favorable mention by R. Harmand. 22) *Lexicon Petronianum composuerunt Joannes Segebade et Ernestus Lommatzsch*. Lipsiae, 1898. Mentioned by Philippe Fabia, Segebade died when he had finished from *A* to *Hic*, and L. finished the work, which, according to Fabia, is a model of its kind. 23) Walter Dennison, The epigraphic Sources of the Writings of Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus (*Am. Journal of Archaeology*, II, 1898, pp. 26-70). B. Haussoullier finds this paper marred by bad arrangement and classification. 24) *Palladii Rutilii Tauri Aemiliani viri illustris opus agriculturae ex recensione J. C. Schmittii*. Lipsiae, 1898. Very favorably mentioned by Philippe Fabia. 25) Dr. Nicolaus Bubnov. *Gerberti postea Silvestri II papae Opera Mathematica. Accedunt aliorum opera ad Gerberti libellos aestimandos necessaria etc.* Berlin, 1899. Paul Tannery recognizes the great importance of this work, but finds it faulty in assuming as genuine what is not known to be so, and assuming as facts what are not proved to be facts.

11. Pp. 87-8. List of books received.

No. 2.

1. Pp. 89-96. Domitius Marsus on Bavius and his brother, by Louis Havet. On Verg. *Ecl.* III, 90, Philargyrius cites an epigram which is explained for the first time correctly in this article. "Un homme est accusé non pas d'avoir craint que son frère fût son rival auprès d'une femme, mais d'avoir craint qu'une femme fût sa rivale auprès de son frère." In the note of Philargyrius read "*stuprator* (for *curator*) fratris."

2. P. 96. In Cic. *Epist.* ix, 16, 3, for *Quod si id* Max Bonnet proposes *iam*.

3. Pp. 97-102. *Orphica*, Fr. 3 Abel, discussed by Paul Tannery.

4. Pp. 103-118. Notes on the Text of the "Institutiones" of Cassiodorus, by Victor Mortet. This interesting article first discusses the proper title of the work, and secondly calls attention to a new text of the "Conclusio" (not "Clausula" as it had been called).

5. Pp. 119-31. The *Cyranides*, by F. de Mély. Interesting discussion of the origin of the first book of the *Cyranides*, bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus as author, recently edited by Ruelle and F. de Mély.

6. Pp. 132-4. Remarks on Hor. *Ep.* III, 1, 102, by A. d'Alès. He renders 101-2 "Quelle sympathie ou quelle aversion est à l'abri de l'inconstance humaine? Tout fatigue à la longue: même les douceurs de la paix, même les vents favorables."

7. Pp. 135-42. The Decree of Callias, C. I. A., I, 32, examined by E. Cavaignac. A careful study of the income and outlay of Athens fixes the date at the beginning of the financial period B. C. 418-14. The article contains some details of interest to students of Attic finances.

8. P. 143. Louis Havet argues that the person to whom Phaedrus III was dedicated was named "Eutyches" rather than "Eutyclus," and thinks the name of Phaedrus himself may have been "Phaeder."

9. Pp. 144-5. Louis Havet discusses some verses of Paulinus Nolanus.

10. Pp. 145-6. Dr. Earle makes a tentative restoration of symmetry between vv. 28-37 and vv. 77-85 of the *Alcestis*.

11. Pp. 147-8. In Cic. de Domo 76 Paul Graindor proposes *emercanda* for *emendanda*, which all consider corrupt.

12. Pp. 149-54. Critical discussion of six passages of Cic. de Domo, by Daniel Serruys.

13. Pp. 155-8. Critical discussion of four passages of Plaut. Rudens by Daniel Serruys.

14. Pp. 159-66. Book Notices. 1) Zu Thukydides Erklärungen und Wiederherstellungen aus dem Nachlass von Ludwig Herbst mitgeteilt und besprochen von Franz Müller. Leipzig, 1898, 1899, 1900. Reviewed by E. Chambry, who highly commends the work both of Herbst and of Müller. The three fasciculi treat of books I-VII, the treatment of book VIII being promised in the *Philologus*. 2) Hans von Arnim: Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa. Mit einer Einleitung u. s. w. Berlin, 1898. Reviewed at some length by Paul Vallette, who finds fault with the work in many respects, but says it will henceforth be one of the indispensable sources for the study of Hellenism under the Roman Empire. 3) H. Bornecque. La prose métrique dans la correspondance de Cicéron. Paris, 1898. Georges Romain briefly sums up the conclusions arrived at in this important work. 4) Schüler-Commentar zu C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de bello civili von Dr. Franz Klaschka. Leipzig, 1900. Highly commended, but considered rather concise, by G. Chambry. 5) Weidners Schulwörterbuch zu Cornelius Nepos, bearbeitet von Johann Schmidt, zweite Auflage. Leipzig, 1898. Highly praised by E. Chambry. 6) H. Bornecque. Quid de structura rhetorica praeceperint Grammatici atque Rhetores latini. Paris, 1898. Brief description with commendation, by G. R. 7) S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim ex recognitione P. Knöll. Lipsiae, 1898. Briefly described by R. Harmand. This is an *editio minor*, but contains some improvements on the greater critical edition of 1896. 8) Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen ins

Lateinische für Abiturienten, von Prof. Dr. Hermann Knauth. Leipzig, 1900. Very briefly mentioned by E. C.

15. Pp. 166-8. List of books received.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 169-92. Specimen Commentarii critici et exegetici ex fontibus hausti ad Oracula Chaldaica elaboravit Alb. Iahnus. An extract from the Preface of the work will explain the situation. "Octavus hic est annus ex quo . . . Commentarius criticus et exegeticus ad Oracula Chaldaica . . . a me scribi coeptus est. Sed quominus eum ultra priorem, cuius *Specimen* nunc prodit, partem perducerem et ad finem usque pertexerem, obstiterunt edita a me Anecdota graeca theologica et deinde ingruens offuscatio meorum prope nonagenarii oculorum." [Cf. A. J. P. XX 460; + Aug. 23, 1900.]

2. P. 192. Louis Duval emendanda for emendanda in Cic. de Domo, 76.

3. Pp. 193-8. A. Cartault emends Propert. I, 8, 9-16, and discusses the emendations of others. To reconcile the inconsistent auferet and patiat̄ur he places 13 f. before 11 f.

4. Pp. 198-200. L. Parmentier reads ἡθεος for θεῖος and restores ἐπιθυμῆι of the MSS for ἐπιθυμῆ of the texts in Plat. Symp. 209 B.

5. Pp. 201-236. The metrical laws of Latin oratorical prose as exhibited in the Panegyric of Trajan, by Henri Bornecque. After deducing the laws for the end and the middle of clauses, the author applies them or shows how they may be applied in the establishment of the text, the interpretation, the punctuation, the quantity of doubtful syllables, etc. The article is a very important contribution to the subject of rhythm in ancient prose.

6. Pp. 236-41. Louis Lajoy defends the introduction of the Καταγωγή Καρόνος of Euclid (Jan. Musici Graeci pp. 115-119), showing that the objections against it are due to misinterpretation of part of it.

7. Pp. 241-2. Paul Graindor proposes, in Cic. de Domo 52, to read Roma cessisset for Romae decessisset, leaving the letters ede obelized to await an explanation.

8. Pp. 243-71. Seleucidæ and the temple of Didymeian Apollo, by B. Haussoullier. In his previous articles the author had omitted the early period of the history of this temple. It was destroyed by Darius in 494, and remained in ruins until Alexander took Miletus in 334. In this article its history is studied from 334 to 189, from the capture of Miletus by Alexander to the defeat of Antiochus by the Romans. The author makes use of inscriptions, especially one of considerable size which he discovered in 1896. The article is characterized by the same thoroughness and insight as were the previous articles.

9. Pp. 272-81. Notes on the text of the Institutiones of Cassiodorus, by Victor Mortel. This second article contains critical discussion of some passages of the De Geometria.

10. Pp. 282-9. Book Notices. 1) Rudolf Birzel, *Ἄγραφος νόμος*. Leipzig, 1900. Paul Graindor bestows the highest praise on this work. 2) T. G. Tucker, *Aristotelis Poetica*. London, 1899. P. G. considers this a carefully prepared edition but thinks the author should have been a little more conservative. 3) P. Masque-ray, *Traité de métrique grecque*. Paris, 1899. Médéric Dufour reviews the work at some length. He considers it the best elementary work (in French?) on the subject, but criticizes several points, offering a different treatment of some verses. 4) H. M. Léopold, *De orationibus quattuor, quae injuria Ciceroni vindicantur*. Specimen litterarum inaugurale. Leyden, 1900. Paul Graindor reviews this work quite unfavorably. The four condemned works are *Post reditum in Senatu*, *Post reditum ad Quirites*, *De Domo*, and *De Haruspicum responsis*. 5) Quintilien. *Il libro decimo della Instituzione Oratoria*, comm. da Domenico Bassi. Turin, 1899. Henri Bornecque mentions this work briefly but not unfavorably, making some suggestions for a third edition, this being the second. 6) Arthur Tappan Walker, *The sequence of tenses in Latin*. Lawrence, Kansas, 1899. H. B. briefly mentions this "interesting and conscientious work." 7) F. Antoine, *De la Parataxe et de l'Hypotaxe dans la langue latine*. Extrait de la Revue des Études anciennes, 1899-1900. Henri Bornecque mentions this work favorably, but does not like the Greek names for "coordination" and "subordination."

11. Pp. 290-2. List of books received.

No. 4.

1. Pp. 293-315. Critical discussion of twenty-two passages of Phaedrus, by Louis Havet.

2. Pp. 316-32. The Seleucidæ and the temple of Didymeon Apollo (second article), by B. Haussoullier. This article is a continuation of the previous one.

3. Pp. 333-50. Chronology of the works of Saint Cyprian and of the African Councils of his times, by Paul Moncaux. This article contains a table of the ecclesiastical councils at Carthage, from A. D. 251 to 256, and list of the works of Cyprian with the dates arrived at by the very learned investigation.

4. Pp. 351-2. Book Notices. 1) Gustave Michaut. *Le génie latin: la race, le milieu, le moment, les genres*. Paris, 1899. René Pichon highly commends this work, and regrets that it was not extended beyond its actual limits. 2) *The Amherst Papyri...* by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. Part. I. *The Ascension of Isaiah and other theological Fragments*. London, 1900. Described with high commendation by Max Bonnet.

The *Revue des Revues*, begun in No. 2 and continued in No. 3, is completed in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

BRIEF MENTION.

In Milton's copy of Pindar preserved in the Harvard Library, there are references to Lykophron, as appears from *Bibliographical Contributions* ed. by JUSTIN WINSOR, No. 6 (*On the Summer Collection*); and having this in mind, I missed in the Index of Authors of Dr. OSGOOD'S *Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems* (A. J. P. XXI 234) the name of Lykophron. True, Milton's allusions to mythology are not so recondite as Lykophron's, but they are both Alexandrian poets, though Milton's singing robes, heavily embroidered as they are, float in the empyrean while Lykophron is kept waddling on the ground by the patchwork quilt with which he has invested himself. And so I conceived the somewhat idle scheme for last summer's holiday of reading Milton and Lykophron side by side, a project that was further quickened by the appearance of Signor CIACERI'S *La Alessandra di Licofrone. Testo, traduzione e commento* (Catania, Giannotta, 1901). A trip to Europe, however, brushed this cobweb out of my brains with sundry others and I leave the subject to some despairing doctorand.

Few scholars now-a-days read Lykophron and almost all who do read him claim a reward of merit by writing something about him. 'Aujourd'hui,' says Croiset, cited by CIACERI, 'il n'est à peu près aucun savant qui ne recule épouvanté devant cette avalanche de phrases interminables et inintelligibles.' For my own part, I have found Lykophron taken in broken doses positively amusing. What could be more absurd, for instance, than his bombastic paraphrase of the old verse: *πολλὰ μεταξύ πέλει κύλικος καὶ χεῖλος ἄκρου*, which appears in the following travesty:

ὡς πολλὰ χεῖλος καὶ δεπαστραίων ποτῶν
μίση κυλινθε μοῖρα παμμήστωρ βροτῶν (vv. 489-90.)

And yet there are other lines in which the mimicry of Aeschylean manner is not so bad, and one would like to call up the shade of Mr. Arnold who believed in test verses (see my *Essays and Studies* p. 134) and ask his judgment as to Lykophron's description of one of the grand figures in Hades, Minos, to wit:

τοῦ νεκροτάγου τὰς ἀθωπέυτους δίκας
φθιτοῖσι ῥητρεύοντος ἀστόργη τρῶπη (vv. 1399-1400.)

The obscurity of Lykophron lies, of course, in the vocabulary and in the mythological allusions. Of the 3000 words, says CIACERI, which make up the 1474 verses, more than 1350 figure in Reichardt's index as *poetica, rariora et audaciora* and 326 are not found in other writers. In the *explicatio obscurorum verborum* appended to Scaliger's wonderful rendering, in which the great scholar tries to translate glossematic Greek by glossematic Latin, there are only about 140 words, and of these between a fourth and a third are conveniently taken from Festus. In spite of Cicero's unconscionable brag about the wealth of the Latin language, with which Scaliger's father, Julius Caesar, would doubtless have sympathized, Latin toils after Greek in vain. It is a queer performance, even to us who are imperfectly acquainted with Lykophron's sources, and it is amusing to recognize in one patch Hipponax, and in another Sophokles, here Aischylos and there Aristophanes, a bit of Euripides' half mocking archaisms here and an Homeric puzzle there. This industrious flea, this *πόδαργος ψύλλα*, (v. 166) who keeps us guessing as to his whereabouts, has skipped over the whole range of classic Greek poetry. He has read his Pindar, as Milton found out, and the Pindaric scholar may learn something from him; and the annotator of Latin poetry might consult with profit an author whom the *docti poetae* of Rome may well have used as a test of their knowledge of Greek mythology,—a harder test than the Ibis of Kallimachos. At all events, if I were editing Persius again I should not fail to cite on the Prologue 9 Lykophron's *λάληθρον κίσσαν* (v. 1319) which seems to have escaped Casaubon and Jahn. A chatty old Italian traveller, Pietro della Valle, tells us that when he was in Constantinople he made a great show at small cost by having his heels shod with silver horseshoes, and Lykophron's baser metal may serve the same end to an ambitious commentator.

The mythology is bewildering, and to some tempers nothing can be more exasperating than the endless succession of quizzes; and yet there are glimpses that have made me at least less forlorn. So when we read of *Δίσκον μεγίστου τάρροβος Κυναίθως* (v. 400) and learn that this *Δίσκος*, this stone which Rhea gave to Kronos in lieu of his offspring is Zeus himself, lo! out of the waves of mythology a pun emerges. *Δίσκος* is 'Jovelet' or 'godling' or if you choose 'godkin'; and Rhea kept the word of promise to the ear and broke it to the hope. But CIACERI fails to notice this as von Holzinger failed before him.

CIACERI'S text is that of Kinkel with few, and those not very noteworthy, exceptions. His translation, though too much of a paraphrase, will be welcome to those who have not time to

puzzle out Lykophron's way of putting things or to study the elaborate commentary, which shows that, like his countrymen, the editor has tried to master all the literature—all the commentators from Potter to v. Holzinger and a goodly number of monographs among which an American scholar figures, W. N. BATES in Harvard Studies, Vol. VI p. 78. To be sure, v. Holzinger's learned work which is only six years old would be a satisfying portion to most scholars, and CIACERI, who is evidently a young man, might have waited a few years before attempting so difficult an author. Still he has gleaned here and there after v. Holzinger and his edition has its uses, so that it would be ungracious to signalize little errors, such as a reference on v. 395 to Soph. Ai. 1142, which has nothing to do with Aias, the son of Telamon or Aias the *'Οἰλῆος τὰς ἐς υἱός*. In the Introduction he does not undertake to commend Lykophron to the affection of scholars but insists on the importance of a better knowledge of our author than has been shown by Christ, who, says CIACERI, has asserted unreservedly, *sens'altro* (p. 540), that vv. 1226-1280 and vv. 1446-1451 are interpolations because they speak of the arrival of Aeneas in Latium and of the power of the Romans, things of which there could scarcely have been, according to Christ, any knowledge in Greece at the time of Lykophron. But Lykophron was the pupil of an Italiote, was himself for many years a resident of Rhegium, had made his reputation before he went to Alexandria, and one of the passages obelized seems to have been written after the victory at Sentinum (295 A. D.). But it makes one shudder to think how many mistakes there must be in every history of any literature and the attentive reader of Christ must have noticed that his *pregevole manuale* is no exception.

A history of Greek literature which should have for its norm the influence of the Hellenes on English letters and English speech would reveal curious disproportions. The authors, who have perished or live on only in scant fragments, often bulk more largely than the most voluminous writers whose works have been preserved, and the semi-mythical triumphs over the historical. Demokritos and Herakleitos are household words and Arion is as familiar a name as Euripides. The one line of Epimenides of Crete, lodged in the Epistle to Titus, is as indelible as the one line of the comic poet, that has been burnt into the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and if the name of Epimenides is not so familiar as that of Pythagoras, it is because Rip Van Winkle has effaced the earlier sleeper, whereas the transmigrator has no modern rivals. At all events it is safe to say that the story of Epimenides will always attract more readers than the story of Parmenides and that M. DEMOULIN'S prize essay on *Epiménide de Crète* (Bruxelles, Lamertin) has the advantage of a popular subject, though the author has handled it in the orthodox fashion of the erudite.

The preliminary study deals with the life of Epimenides in Diogenes Laertius; and what a task he undertakes who has to do with the 'sources' of that cento, USENER has set forth in his *Epicurea*, as we all remember. (A. J. P. X 229). According to a later investigation of the same scholar the foundation of Diogenes goes back ultimately to the *Διαδοχή τῶν φιλοσόφων* of the Alexandrian scholar, Sotion, but everybody knows what 'ultimately' means. Before Sotion's work reached Diogenes it had been pawed over again and again, and into the fabric thus handled the compiler has introduced material from later authorities. A more mechanical, brainless proceeding it is hard to imagine, but there is a certain fascination in trying to follow the way in which the text has been stitched together. In the chapter consecrated to Epimenides Theopompos is the author most frequently cited, but he would be innocent who should suppose that Diogenes made any direct use of Theopompos. It was Theopompos who first treated in any detail the legend of Epimenides but Hermippos who flourished about 200 B. C., was the first to make a systematic collection of the traditions that were in circulation about the mysterious personage, and added to the story of Theopompos extracts from Timaios and Sosibios. But between Hermippos and Diogenes, there are several intermediaries. When we come next to examine with M. DEMOULIN the history of the tradition, we find that the remains of Epimenides are too doubtful or too scant to yield anything except the fact that he must have figured as an inspired prophet and a master exorcist. To Xenophanes, who flourished about 500 B. C. Epimenides was a legend and a legend which the free thinker of Kolophon could hardly have respected. Then the silence of a century or more falls on the wonder-worker. He is not mentioned either by Herodotos or Thukydidēs and the first trace of him is an Ionian logograph, Leandros or Maiandros, who gives nothing more than a surmise as to his date. It is not until we reach Plato that Epimenides comes out into the light, but the passage of the Laws in which he is mentioned (I, 642 D) brings him from the time of Solon, when he is supposed to have purged Athens of the Kylonian pollution, down, down to the year 500, the date of the prophecy in which he foretold the oncoming of the Persian war. Various solutions have been offered. Zeller makes Philip of Opus the scapegoat here as elsewhere. Diels supposes that Plato's Epimenides is not the Epimenides of history but the Epimenides of literature, Epimenides being a convenient sponsor for an *oraculum ex eventu*, and M. DEMOULIN thinks that Plato is amusing himself at the expense of the credulous and ignorant Cretan of the dialogue. The most obvious explanation, which M. DEMOULIN consigns to a footnote, is that of Rohde. The great age which Epimenides is said to have reached, 299 years, according to one estimate, would have enabled him to span a century with the greatest ease and really in all matters of chronology, Plato, being himself one of the immortals, exhibits a lightness of heart

that is most reprehensible from a prosaic point of view. But this *Brief Mention* has grown to unreasonable dimensions and I cannot undertake to follow M. DEMOULIN through the rest of the history of the tradition nor outline the biography of Epimenides which forms the second part. The main thesis that the author desires to uphold is the historical existence of Epimenides, the purifier of Athens from the Kylonian pollution, about whose figure have gathered the floating legends due in large measure to the inventions of Orphic and Pythagorean authors.

In Vol. X 470-480 of the Journal I gave a pretty full summary of CONSTANTIN RITTER'S *Untersuchungen über Plato*, the most elaborate study since Campbell's on Plato's language as a criterion of chronology. The contributions of Dittenberger, Frederking, Schanz and Gomperz have also been noticed in the Journal from time to time—cf. III 376, VI 387, VIII 506, IX 378,—and one of my former students, Dr. G. B. HUSSEY, published in X 437-444 a special treatise on the use of certain verbs of saying in Plato. But since that time the Journal has taken little notice of this line of research. Perhaps the discovery of some sad mistakes in RITTER'S statements may have disheartened me (XI 389). Perhaps I grew a little weary of the abuse of statistics in other directions (XIII 123). Perhaps the new work did not seem to be especially important. True, the appearance in 1897 of LUTOSLAWSKI'S big book, *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, challenged my attention, heralded as it had been by sundry articles of the same author, but it did not reach me in time for effective use in the work of my Plato year and now Lutoslawski is an old story.

The *caveats* that have been entered against the stylometric method are not without weight and have been fairly stated in GOMPERZ'S *Griechische Denker* (II 233). Time is not the only element in the shifting use and my own studies elsewhere have only confirmed me in the belief that the department is often more potent than the period. A later work may have been designedly composed in the tone of an earlier dialogue; a habit may be taken up and after a while dropped. There is the *retour de jeunesse* so characteristic of genius; there is the inevitable question of revision, the inevitable question of Plato's combings and curlings and plaitings. But the subject has its fascination for all that and I have not been able to shut my eyes to G. JANELL'S *Quaestiones Platonicae* in the twenty-sixth *Supplementband* of the *Neue Jahrbücher*. I pass over the first part which gives the unavoidable review of the work that has been done down to Lutoslawski, who, by the way, has not found universal acceptance even among those who work in stylometry. 'Lutoslawski's angewandte rechnerische Methode,' says von Arnim 'ist ein Irrweg.' Still JANELL believes in spite of Zeller, (A. J. P. X 471) that there

are peculiarities that may help us to decide the order of the dialogues, and chief of these is the hiatus which he attacks in minute detail and the examination of which constitutes the second and principal part of the paper.

The subject of hiatus in Plato had been touched on by Blass before (A. B. II^a 458) but Janell undertakes to go to the bottom of this *χασμωδία* business and proceeds statistically. The Didot page is taken as the standard, in conformity with Lutoslawski's example, and the resulting tables bristle with decimals. I can only give samples of the results. The higher averages are found in

Lysis	45.97		Parmenides	44.10
Euthydemus	45.10		Charmides	44.03

and so downward to Phaedrus 23.90. What a gap between Phaedrus and the next highest!

Laws V	6.71		Timaeus	1.17
Laws (average)	4.70		Critias	.80
Philebus	3.70		Sophista	.61
Laws VI (lowest)	2.36		Politicus	.44

The late date of Politicus, Sophista, Critias and Timaeus is an article of faith with many Platonists; and whatever part the redoubtable Philippos of Opus may have played, the position of the Laws is not an open question. The Parmenides exhibit will not satisfy everybody; but one is inclined to respect the hiatus test; for the treatment of the hiatus gives us the registry of a fashionable fad and the disappearance of it ranks with the disappearance of the *κρωβύλος* and the *ἔνερσις χρυσῶν τεττίγων* at Athens.

The third chapter deals with *καθάπερ* and *ὡσπερ* to which Dittenberger called attention long ago (A. J. P. III 376). *καθάπερ* belongs to the sphere of legal language (cf. Ar. Av. 1041), and the large use of it in the Laws might be ascribed to that. But here also the avoidance of hiatus is the potent influence. What is sauce for *ὡσπερ* ought to be sauce for *ὡ τρόπῳ* and it might be worth while to examine how far Plato's later usage was influenced by Isokrates in this regard also, (A. J. P. XV 521) Unfortunately there are no statistics at hand for Plato. But it is clear that in the period prior to the line drawn above Plato is indifferent to the hiatus produced by *τρόπῳ*. So we find Meno, 73 C; *τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ ἀγαθοὶ εἰσιν* and *τῷ αὐτῷ ἂν τρόπῳ ἀγαθοὶ ἦσαν* and Conv. 176 A: *τίνα τρόπον ὡς ῥᾶστα πίνεμεθα*; is followed by B: *τίμι τρόπῳ ἂν ὡς ῥᾶστα πίνοιμεν*; a curious specimen of Plato's *ποικιλία*.

In the fourth chapter after a discussion of the question as to the genuineness of the Ion, JANELL sides with Eduard Meyer, who says 'Ich muss bekennen dass ich nicht verstehe wie man es über sich bringen kann, die geistreiche Schrift Plato abzusprechen;' and Fraccaroli in his introduction to Pindar has made the Ion the starting point of his theory of lyric poetry (A. J. P. XV 505). The hiatus test puts the Ion in the neighborhood of the Meno, the Meno average being 38.28, the Ion average 38.06. There are 13 ὤσπερ's; and never a καθάπερ.

Mr. M. A. BAYFIELD has made himself responsible for a new edition of *Sophokles' Elektra* (Macmillan) in the preface to which after the inevitable compliment to Sir RICHARD JEBB'S 'incomparable editions' of the poet's works he adds 'Kaibel's interesting edition of the play came into my hands only after this book had gone to press.' For this laches there is no possible excuse. KAIBEL'S edition of the *Elektra*, which Mr. BAYFIELD deigns to find interesting appeared in 1896, and was reviewed in this Journal in 1897 (XVII 353-6). It is safe to say that all conscientious editors of the *Elektra* must deal seriously with KAIBEL; and while the steadfast contemplation of one's own centre may be conducive to peace of mind, the ἀμφαλόψυχοι of classical philology will find little sympathy in this restless age, so that Mr. BAYFIELD must not be surprised if his edition suffers in repute as it has suffered otherwise for his having ignored KAIBEL'S.

My attention has been called to the following curiosity of criticism, which goes far to reconcile me with any slips I myself may have made in the pages devoted to *Brief Mention*:

<Es> muss hervorgehoben werden, dass die Literatur der vergleichenden Syntax nur in ungenügendem Masse herangezogen und ausgenützt ist. Besonders macht sich dies in den auf das Verbum bezüglichen Theilen unserer Schrift bemerkbar, in denen die grundlegende Unterscheidung von "Zeitstufen" und "Actionsarten" ungern vermisst wird.

FR. STOLZ.
In the *Zeitschrift für die oesterreichischen Gymnasien*
LI 5 (Juni 1901) S. 400.

§184. The tenses express the relations of time, embracing:

1) The stage of the action, duration in time, kind of time <Actionsart, Zeitart>.

2) The period of the action, position in time, sphere of time <Zeitstufe>.

The first tells, for example, whether the action is going on or finished.

The second tells whether the action is past, present or future. GILDERSLEEVE, *Syntax of Classical Greek*.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Antoninus (Marcus Aurelius). To himself; in English by Gerald H. Rendall. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 42 + 167 pp. 16mo, cl., \$1.

Apollonius of Rhodes. Tr. by A. S. Way. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 208 pp. 16mo, cl., 50 cts.; limp. leath., 75 cts.

Cicero. De officiis liber primus; ed. with introd. and commentary by F. E. Rockwood. New York, *University Pub. Co.*, 1901. 183 pp. 16mo, cl., 90 cts.

— Fifty letters; ed. by J. H. Dillard. Boston, *Ginn*, 1901. 13 + 118 pp. 16mo, cl., 45 cts.

— Oratio Philippica secunda; ed. with introd. and commentary by E. G. Sihler. New York, *University Pub. Co.*, 1901. 157 pp. 16mo, cl., 80 cts.

— Pro Archia; ed. by G. H. Nall. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 22 + 91 pp. 18mo, cl., net 40 cts.

D'Ooge (B. L.) Latin composition based upon selections from Cæsar. Boston, *Ginn*, 1901. 9 + 86 pp. 16mo, cl., 55 cts.

Homer (Homerus). First Six Books of Homer's Iliad; with introd., commentary and vocabulary for the use of schools, by T. D. Seymour. Rev. ed. Boston, *Ginn*, 1901. 85 + 138 pp. 1 il., 8vo, hf. leath., \$1.75.

Horace. Odes of Horace; tr. from the Latin by various authors; selected and ed. by B. E. Smith. New York, *Century Co.*, 1901. 12 + 174 pp. 1 il., 24mo, leath., \$1.

— Satires of Horace. Book I; ed. by Ja. Gow. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 28 + 120 pp. 12mo, cl., net 50 cts.

Neville (K. P. R.) The case-construction after the comparative in Latin. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 86 pp. 8vo, bds., net 60 cts.

Schlicher (J. J.) Origin of rhythmical verse in late Latin. New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1900. 71 + 91 pp. 8vo, pap., net 50 cts.

Sophocles. The Elektra; introd. notes and appendices by M. A. Bayfield. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 29 + 163 pp. 12mo, cl., net 60 cts.

Virgil. The Æneid. Books 1-6; selections 7-12; with introd., &c., by G. Knapp. Chicago, *Scott, Foresman & Co.*, 1901. 4 + 175 pp. Maps, cl., net \$1.40.

Xenophon. The march of the ten thousand: a translation of the Anabasis, preceded by a life of Xenophon; by H. G. Dakyns. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 80 + 264 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.

ENGLISH.

Bardsley (C. W.) Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames, with Special American Instances. London, 1901. 4to, 854 pp. 21s.

Chambers' Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language. Ed. by Davidson. London, 1901. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Funk (J. K.) and March (F. A.). Standard Dictionary of the English Language. 2 vols. London, 1901. 4to, 2400 pp. £5.

India, Ancient, as described in classical Literature. Being a Collection of Greek and Latin Texts relating to India. Trans. and annotated by J. W. McCrindle. London, 1901. 8vo, 248 pp. 7s. 6d.

Jones (H. P.) New Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations. London, 1901. 8vo, 582 pp. 7s. 6d.

Murray (J. A. H.) New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles. Jew—Kairine. London, 1901. Fol. 2s. 6d.

Ottley (R. L.) Short History of the Hebrews to the Roman Period. London, 1901. 8vo, 332 pp. 5s.

Redhouse (J. W.) English and Turkish Lexicon. London, 1901. 8vo. 16s.

— A Turkish and English Lexicon. London, 1901. 8vo. £1 10s.

Smith (C. J.) Synonyms discriminated. Ed. by H. P. Smith. London, 1901. 8vo, 794 pp. 6s.

FRENCH.

Gantier (Vct.) La Langue, les noms et le droit des anciens Germains. 1901. 8vo, 282 pp. 9 fr.

Lebreton (I.) Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron. Paris, 1901. 8vo. 10 fr.

Pirson (J.) La Langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule. Bruxelles, 1901. 8vo, XVI, 328 pp. 7 fr. 50 c.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrg. v. Rich. Förster, VIII. Bd. 2 Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*.—2. Gloeckner, Step. Quaestiones rhetoricae. viii, 115 S. 1901. m. 4.80.

— VIII. Bd. 3 Hft. gr. 8. Heyden-Zielewicz, Ioa. de: Prolegomena in Pseudocelli de universi natura libellum. vii, 77 S. 1901. m. 3.20.

Benecke (G. F.) Wörterbuch zu Hartmanns Iwein. 3. Ausg., besorgt v. C. Borchling. gr. 8. ix, 313 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 10; bd. 12.

Bibliothek, Assyriologische, hrg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. XVII. gr. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—XVII. Johns, Rev. C. H. W., M. A.: An Assyrian Doomsday-book or liber censualis of the district round Harran. viii, 82 S. m. 17 autogr. Taf. 1901. m. 21.

Bibliothek, keilinschriftliche. Hrg. v. Eberh. Schrader. VI. Bd. Mythologische, religiöse u. verwandte Texte. 1. Tl. 2. Hälfte. 2. Lfg. gr. 8. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*.—VI 1. Jensen (P). Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen u. Epen. II. Hälfte. 2. Lfg. S. 465-588. 1901. m. 8.

Bissing (Fr. W. v.) Der Bericht des Diodor üb. die Pyramiden. Bibl. I 632-64. gr. 8. 40 S. Berlin, 1901, *A. Duncker*. m. 2.

Briefe Ciceros u. seiner Zeitgenossen. 1. Hft. Briefe aus den J. 67-60 v. Chr. Einleitung u. Text. Erklärungen. Von O. E. Schmidt. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. Bd. m. 1.40.

Chatelain (Aemil.) *Uncialis scriptura codicum latinorum novis exemplis illustrata.* gr. Fol. 60 Plates in Phototyp. viii S. Text. gr. 8. viii, 104 S. Paris and Leipzig, 1901, *H. Welter.* m. 48.

Church (James E.) *Beiträge zur Sprache der lateinischen Grabinschriften.* I. Thl. Diss. gr. 8. 99 S. München, 1901, *A. Buchhols.* m. 1.60.

Dietze (Carol. Aug.) *De Philemone comico.* Diss. gr. 8. 94 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.* m. 2.40.

Fleischer (Ida). *Die Wortbildung bei Notker.* Diss. gr. 8. 80 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.* m. 2.

Fragmentsammlung der griechischen Ärzte. Hrsg. v. M. Wellmann. I. Bd. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann.*—I. Fragmente, die, der sikelischen Ärzte Akron, Philistion u. des Diokles v. Karystos. Hrsg. v. M. Wellmann. viii, 254 S. 1901. m. 10.

Gemoll (W.) *Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis, Hellenika u. Memorabilien.* Mit 89 Textabbildgn., 2 Farbendr.-Taf. u. 2 Karten. gr. 8. vii, 340 S. Leipzig, 1901, *G. Freytag.* cl., m. 4.

Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, hrsg. v. W. Geiger u. E. Kuhn. I. Bd., I. Abtlg. IV. Lfg. u. 2. Abtlg. IV. Lfg. gr. 8. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner.* m. 10. I, 1, IV. Vorgeschichte der iranischen Sprachen. Awestasprache u. Altpersisch. Mittelpersisch. 3. Lfg. VIII u. S. 249–332. m. 4.50. I, 2, IV. Neupersische Schriftsprache. Die Sprachen der Afghänen, Balutschen u. Kurden. Kleinere Dialekte u. Dialektgruppen. Register zum I. Bd. 4. Lfg. X u. S. 429–535. m. 5.50.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. III. Bd. 3. Abtlg. 2. Hälfte. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck.*—III. 3, II. Richter, Gymn.-Dir. Prof. Dr. Otto: *Topographie der Stadt Rom.* 2. Aufl. Nebst 32 Abbildgn., 18 Taf. u. 2 Plänen v. Rom. x, 411 S. 1901. m. 15.

Kaluza (Max). *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache.* 2. Tl. Laut- u. Formenlehre des Mittel- u. Neuenglischen. gr. 8. xvi, 379 S. Berlin, 1901, *E. Felber.* m. 7.

Koegel (Rud.) u. Bruckner (Wilh.) *Geschichte der althoch- u. altniederdeutschen Litteratur.* 2. Aufl. [Aus: „Paul's Grundriss d. german. Philologie,“ 2. Aufl.] Lex. 8. iv, 132 S. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner.* m. 3.

Krause (K. C. F.) *Sprachwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen.* gr. 8. vi, 155 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich.* m. 3.

Littmann (Enno). *Zur Entzifferung der Šafā-Inschriften.* gr. 8. ix, 76 S. m. 7 autogr. Taf. Leipzig, 1901, *O. Harrassowitz.* m. 5.

Ludwich (Arth.) *Textkritische Untersuchungen üb. die mythologischen Scholien zu Homer's Iliad: II.* Progr. gr. 4. 24 S. Königsberg, 1901, *Akadem. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel.* —. 30.

Marx (Ant.) *Hilfsbüchlein f. die Aussprache der lateinischen Vokale in positionslangen Silben.* 3. Aufl. gr. 8. xvi, 93 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann.* m. 3.

Methner (Rud.) *Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Tempus- u. Moduslehre m. besond. Berücksicht. des Unterrichtes.* gr. 8. viii, 315 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann.* m. 6.

Meyer (Leo). *Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie.* 2. Bd. Wörter m. dem Anlaut *ι, αι, ει, οι, υ, αυ, ευ, ου, χ* (auch *ξ*), *π* (auch *ψ*), *τ.* gr. 8. 859 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel.* m. 20.

Münzer (Frdr.) Die Entstehung der Historien des Tacitus. [Aus: „Beiträge z. alten Gesch.“] Lex. 8. 31 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 1.60.

Neue (Frdr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. 1. Bd. Das Substantivum. 3. Aufl. v. C. Wagener. gr. 8. vi, 1019 S. Leipzig, 1901, *O. R. Reisland*. m. 32.

Palaestra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie. Hrg. v. Alois Brandl u. Erich Schmidt. XVI. gr. 8. Berlin, *Meyer & Müller*.—XVI. Kraeger, Dr. Heinr. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Quellen u. Wandlgn. seiner Gedichte. xxxi, 367 S. 1901. m. 10.

Ploetz (Karl). Lateinische Grammatik. (Fortsetzung der latein. Vorschule.) 4. Aufl. Neubearb. v. Otto Höfer. gr. 8. viii, 407 u. 63 S. Berlin, 1901, *A. G. Ploetz*. m. 3.50.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Hrg. v. H. Collitz, u. W. F. Bechtel. IV. Bd. 2. Hft. 2. Abth. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*.—IV, 2, II. Meyer, Heinr., u. Carl Wendel. Wortregister zum 2-6. Hefte des II. Bds. vi u. S. 167-331. 1901. m. 6.60.

Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der romanischen Sprachen u. Literaturen. I. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*.—I. Voretzsch (Carl). Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Sprache. Zum Selbstunterricht f. den Anfänger xiv, 258 S. 1901. m. 5.

Sammlung romanischer Elementarbücher. Hrg. v. W. Meyer-Lübke. I. Reihe: Grammatiken. I. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*.—I. Meyer-Lübke, (W.) Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft. x. 224 S. 1901. m. 5.

Schmidt (Max C. P.) Realistische Chrestomathie aus der Litteratur des klassischen Altertums. 3. Buch. 8. xi, 235 S. m. 26 Fig. Leipzig, 1901, *Dürr'sche Buchh.* m. 4.20.

Schulze (Guilelm.) Graeca latina. Progr. gr. 8. 25 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 50.

Sheehan (Mich.) De fide artis rhetoricae Isocrati tributae. Diss. gr. 8. 48 S. Bonnæ, 1901. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.50.

Spindler (Prosper). De Arnobii genere dicendi. Diss. gr. 8. 78 S. Strassburg, 1901, Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.50.

Studien, Kieler, zur englischen Philologie. Hrg. v. F. Holthausen. 1. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*.—1. Diehn, Otto. Die Pronomina in Frühmittelenglischen. Laut- u. Flexionslehre. 100 S. 1901. m. 2.80. 2. Schütt, Hugo: The life and death of Jack Straw. v, 160 S. 1901. m. 4.40.

Uppgren (Dr. Anders). Ueber sprachliche u. metrische Komposition u. Kunst des Terenz. 1. Hft. gr. 8. 201 S. Lund, 1901, *H. Möller*. m. 2.60.

Vambéry (Herm.) Alt-osmanische Sprachstudien. gr. 8. x, 232 S. Leiden, 1901, *Buchh. u. Druckerrei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 7.

Vick (Carol.) Quaestiones Carneadae. Diss. gr. 8. 48 S. Rostock, 1901, *M. Warkentien*. m. 1.20.

Wunderer (Carl). Polybios-Forschungen. 2. Tl. gr. 8. v, 100 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 2.40.

Xenophontis Hipparchicus sive de magistri equitum officio. Recensuit Pius Cerocchi. gr. 8. 66 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 2.

ITALIAN.

Actes du douzième congrés international des Orientalistes. Rome, 1899. Tome I (Résumé des bulletins; Inde et Iran). Firenze. 8vo, fig., p. 505. L. 15.

Cocchia (Enrico). Saggi filologici. Vol. II: Studi sulla letteratura latina arcaica. Napoli. 16mo, p. 440 e 1 tav. L. 3.

Menghini (Domenico). Gli amori e i carmi di Albio Tibullo. Torino. 8vo, p. 165. L. 2.

Platone. Dialoghi, tradotti da Ruggero Bonghi. Vol. VIII. Il Sofista o dell'Ente; Il Politico o del potere regio; Il Parmenide o delle idee. Torino. 16mo, p. 341. L. 5.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Abbott (Frank Frost). A History and Description of Roman Political Institutions. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901. \$1.60.

Aristophanis Comoediae. Recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt F. W. Hall, W. M. Geldart. Tomus II. *Lysistratam, Thesmophoriasusas, Ranas, Ecclesiazusas, Plutum, Fragmenta, Indicem Nominum continens* (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) New York, *Henry Frowde*. 90 cts.

'Αθηνά. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπιστημονικῆς ἐταιρείας. Τ. ιγ'. Τεύχος β' καὶ γ'. *Σακελλάριος*, 1901.

Barrett (F. C.) The use of *mē* in Questions. (Harvard Studies, Vol. XII).

Breymann (Hermann). Die neusprachliche Reform-Literatur von 1894-1899. E. bibliographische und kritische Uebersicht. Leipzig, *A. Deichert* (*Georg Böhmé*), 1900.

Byars (W. V.) The Practical Value of the Classics. Address delivered at McKendree College.

Cesareo (Placido). I due simposi in rapporto all' arte moderna. Palermo, *Alberto Reber*, 1901.

Ciceronis (M. T.) Epistulae, Vol. I. Epistulae ad Familiares. Recogn. L. C. Purser. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. New York, *H. Frowde*. Limp cl., \$1.50.

Conway (R. S.) On the Variation of Sequence in Oratio Obliqua. Offprint. From Appendix to Livy, Book II.

Review of Walker's Sequence of Tenses. *Classical Review*, Feb. 7, 1901.

Cordell (E. F.) The Medicine and Doctors of Horace. *Johns Hopkins Bulletin*, Vol. XII, No. 125.

Crenshaw (J. B.) The Present Participle in Old High German and Middle High German.

Curtius (Georg). Griechische Schulgrammatik. 23. Aufl., Bearbeitet von Richard Meister. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 3 m. 20 pf.

Dottin (G.) Les composés syntactiques et la loi de Porson. *Revue de philologie*. Juillet, 1901, Tirage à part.

Dunbar Anthology (The). 1401-1508 A. D. Ed. by Edward Arber. London and New York. *Henry Frowde*, 1901.

Eckels (William Alexander). "Dore as an index of style in the orators (Johns Hopkins University Diss.) Baltimore, *John Murphy*, 1901.

Evangelium secundum Matthaëum. Ed. Fr. Blass. Lipsiae, *Teubner*, MCM I.

Ferrell (C. C.) The Medea of Euripides and the Medea of Grillparzer. Reprint from *Sewanee Review*, July, 1901.

Gemoll (W.) Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis, Hellenika u. Memorabilien. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 4 m.

Gloeckner (Stephanus). *Quaestiones rhetoricae*: Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen, Bd. VIII., Hft. 2. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*, 1901.

Gower (John), *The Complete Works of*. Ed. by G. C. Macaulay. Vol. II, *The English Works: Confessio Amantis*, ProL.—Lib. V. 1970. Vol. III, *Confessio Amantis V. 1971.—VIII, and In Praise of Peace*. Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. \$4.00.

Greenough (J. B.) and Kittredge, (G. L.) *Words and their ways in English speech*, New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901.

Hanssen (Friedrich). *Zur lateinischen u. romanischen Metrik* (Separatabdruck aus den Verhandlungen des Deutschen Wissenschaftlichen Vereins in Santiago, Chile), Valparaiso, *Gmo. Helfmann*, 1901.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XII. Goodwin Volume, Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*, 1901.

Homer's Odyssey, Books XIII-XXIV. Edited with English Notes and Appendices, by D. B. Monro. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. \$4.

Hopkins (E. Washburn). *The Greek Epic of India, Its Character and Origin* (Yale Bicentennial Publications). New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901. \$4.

Horn (Wilhelm). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der englischen Gutturallaute*. Berlin, *Wilhelm Gronau*, 1901.

Hula (Eduard). *Römische Altertümer* Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. geb. 2 m.

Kieler Studien zur englischen Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Holthausen. Heft. 1. *Die Pronomina im Frühmittelenglischen Laut- u. Flexionlehre v. Otto Dien*. Heft. 2. *The Life and Death of Jack Straw. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des elisabethanischen Dramas v. Hugo Schütt*. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1901.

Köhler (Friedrich). *Die Allitteration bei Ronsard* (Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie XX. Heft.) Erlangen u. Leipzig, *Deichert*, 1901.

Lease (Emory B.) *Apotheosis among the ancients*. *Methodist Review*, Nov. 1901.

Lexicon Plautinum. Conscriptis Gonzalez Lodge, Vol. I. Fasc. I. A-ALIVS. Lipsiae, *B. Teubner*, MCM I.

Lindsay (W. M.) *Nonius Marcellus* (St. Andrews University Publications, Nov.) Oxford, *James Parker & Co.*, 1901.

Littmann (Enno). *Zur Entzifferung der Saka-Inschriften*. Mit 7 autographierten Tafeln. Leipzig, *Otto Harrassowitz*, 1901.

Lodge (Gonzalez). *Imagination in the Study of the Classics*. (*Educational Review*, September, 1901).

Long (O. M.) *On the usage of totiens and quotiens in different periods of Latin* (Johns Hopkins University Diss.) Baltimore, *John Murphy Co.*, 1901.

Maccari (L.) *Osservazioni ad Orazio* (Primo Saggio). *Sienna*, 1901.

Macleon (Arthur John). *A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syrian, as spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, Northwest Persia and the Plain of Mosul*. Oxford. *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. \$6.25.

Methner (Rudolf). Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Tempus- u. Moduslehre. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Unterrichts. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1901. 6 m.

Mirick (G. A.) *Lessons in Elementary Grammar*. New York. *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901.

Modern Language Association of America (Publications of the). Ed. by James W. Bright, Vol. XXI, No. 3. Contents: Weeks (R.) *The Primitive Prise d'Orange*.—Warren (F. M.) on the Latin sources of Thèbes and Énéas—Mead (W. E.) On the Prologue of the Wife of Bath's Tale—Schofield (W. H.) Chaucer's Franklin's Tale—Kittredge (G. L.) A Friend of Chaucer's—Ford (J. D. M.) English Influence upon Spanish Literature in the early part of the Nineteenth Century. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1901.

Moore (J. L.) and Reynolds (B.) *Exercises for Translation into Latin Prose* (Revised Ed.) New York, *University Publishing Co.*, 1901.

Morgan (Morris H.) *Miscellanea*. Reprinted from *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XII.

Morris (E. P.) *On Principles and Methods in Latin Syntax* (Yale Bicentennial Publications). New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901.

Moss (J. H.) *Indirect Discourse in Antiphon, Andocides and Lysias* (U. of Va. Diss.) Washington, D. C., 1901.

Mott (Lewis F.) *The Provençal Lyric* (a Lecture.) New York, *W. R. Jenkins*, 1901.

Münchener Beiträge zur romantischen u. englischen Philologie. Herausg. von H. Breymann u. J. Schick. XXI Heft. Dekker (Thomas), *The Pleasant Comedian of Old Fortunatus*. Herausg. v. Hans Scherer, 4 m. XXII Heft. Rotrous (Jean de) *Antigone u. ihre Quellen*, von Fr. Edmund Buchelmann, 6 m. 50 pf. Erlangen u. Leipzig, *Deichert (Georg Böhme)*, 1901.

Muret-Sanders. *Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache*. Teil II (Deutsch-Englisch), Lfg. 23: *Verdienst-Wochen* Lfg. 24. Schluss-Lieferung, 1901. @ 1 m. 50 pf. New York, *The International News Co.*

Nestle (Wilhelm). *Euripides, der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung*. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*, 1901.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterthum, Geschichte u. deutsche Litteratur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Richard Förster. *Vierter Jahrg. VII u. VIII Bandes*, 3. 4. 5. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1901.

Neville (K. P. R.) *The Case Constructions after the comparative in Latin*. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, XV.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 60 cts.

Newton (Homer Curtis). *The Epigraphical Evidence for the reigns of Vespasian and Titus*. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. XVI.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 80 cts.

Oertel (Hanns). *Lectures on the Study of Language* (Yale Bicentennial Publications.) New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901.

Otia Merseiana. *The Publications of the Arts Faculty of University College, Liverpool, Volume Two*. Contents: Bonnier (Charles), *Un village du nord de la France*.—Meyer (K.), *Stories and Songs from Irish MSS*—Elton (O.), *Notes on Colour and Imagery in Spenser*.—Sweet (H.), *Linguistic Affinity*—

Davies (G.A.), Statiana.—Wyld (H. C.), History of O. E. Frontal Initial 3., On the Etymologies of 'blight' and 'blain,' 'chornels' and 'kernels.'

Ovidius (P. O. Naso). Ausgewählte Gedichte. Für den Schulgebrauch herausg. Von H. S. Sedlmayer. Sechste umgearb. Aufl. Leipzig, *Freitag*, 1902. 1 m. 80 pf.

Patria Rura v. Carmen praemio aureo ornatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano. Accedunt quatuor poemata laudata. Amstelodami, *Apud Jo. Mullerum*, MCM I.

Perrin (Bernadotte). Plutarch's Themistocles and Aristides. Newly translated with introduction and notes. (Yale Bicentennial Publications). New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901.

Platonis opera recogn. I. Burnet. Tomus II. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Oxoni E. *typographo Clarendontane*. 6 s.

Reid (Whitelaw). University Tendencies in America. An address at Leland Stanford, Jr. University.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Buecheler u. H. Usener, LVI 3. 4. Frankfurt a. *M. Sauerländer*, 1901.

Richter (Otto). Topographie der Stadt Rom (Iwan v. Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Dritter Band. Dritter Abt., 2 Hälfte). Zweite verm. u. verb. Aufl. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1901. 15 m.

Rogers (J. D.) Fragment of an Archaic Argive inscription (Reprint from *A. J. Archaeology*).

Schenkl (Karl). Griechisches Übungsbuch. 10te Aufl. Wien, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *G. Freitag*, 1901. 2 K. 80 h.

Schmid (Wilhelm). Zur Geschichte des griechischen Dithyrambus. Tübinger Doktorenverzeichnis, 1900-1901.

Schneider (Gustav). Schüler-Kommentar zu Platons Apologie u. Kriton. Leipzig, *G. Freitag*, 1901. 80 pf.

Seymour (Thomas D.) The First Six Books of Homer's Iliad. For the use of schools. Revised Ed. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901.

Showerman (Grant). The Great Mother of the Gods. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 43 (Doctor's Thesis). Madison, Wis., 1901.

Skeat (W. W.) Notes on English Etymology. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901.

Smith (W. B.) Address and Destination of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Journal of Biblical Literature.)

Sophocles' Antigone, The Subject of. By N. P. Vlachos. University of Pennsylvania, Doctor's Thesis, 1901.

Σταυρίδου (I.) περί της νοθεύσεως του Θουκυδίδου κτέ. 'Ανατύπωσις ἐκ τῆς Νέας Ἡμέρας. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1901. 4 m.

Tropea (Giacomo). Il culto di Korā in Menai. Rivista di Storia Antica. N. S. V. 3. Messina, 1901.

— Studi sugli Scrittores Historiae Augustae. V. Commodus. Messina Rivista di Storia Antica, 1901.

— Numismatica di Lipara. Messina, 1901.

— Numismatica Siceliota del Museo Mandralisca in Cefalù. Messina, 1901.

Tropea (Giacomo). La stele arcaica del foro romano. Cronaca della discussione. Messina, Rivista di Storia Antica.

Vergils Aeneis nebst ausgewählten Stücken der Bucolica u. Georgica. Für d. Schulgebr., herausg. von W. Klouček. 4^{te} unveränderte Aufl. Wien, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1901. 2 m. 20 pf.

Weil (Henri). Observations sur le texte des Phéniciennes d' Euripide (Revue des études grecques), 1901.

Wellmann (M.) Die Fragmente der sikelischen Ärzte, Akron, Philistion, u. des Diokles von Karystos (Fragmentsammlung der griechischen Ärzte, Bd. I.) Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1901. 10 m.

Wilhelm (Ad.) Note sur un fragment d' inscription trouvé sur l' acropole d' Athènes. Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. Comptes rendus, 1900.

— Zwei gr. Grabgedichte: Ein Friedensbund der Hellenen; Inschrift aus Syrakus. Sonderabdrücke aus den Jahreshften des österr. archaeolog. Instit. Band III, 1900. Band IV, 1901.

Wunderer (Carl). Polybios-Forschungen. II Teil: Citate u. Geflügelte Worte bei Polybios. Leipzig, *Dietrich*, 1901. 2 m. 40.

Xenophontis Opera omnia. Recogn. brevis adnotatione critica instruxit E. C. Marchant. Tom. VI. Commentarii, Oeconomicus, Convivium, Apologia Socratis. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. 90 cts.

Zimmern (H.) The Babylonian and the Hebrew Genesis. Translated by J. Hutchison. The Ancient East, No. III. London, *David Nutt*, 1901.

Let. page

VOL. XXII, 4

WHOLE NO. 88

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.
PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING LEIPSIK: F. A. BROCKHAUS

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER

1901

CONTENTS.

I.—A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.	361
II.—The Torch-Race. By J. R. SITLINGTON STERRETT,	393
III.—The Pomerium and Roma Quadrata. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER,	420
IV.—Etymologies. By GEORGE HEMPL,	426
V.—Zarathushtra and the Lógos. By L. H. MILLS,	432
NOTES:	438
Cicero's Judgment of Lucretius. By G. L. HENDRICKSON.—Cicero ad Atticum. By LOUISE DODGE.—MAMA I'PAI. By J. S. SPREYER.	
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	442
Harper's Assyrian and Babylonian Letters.—Cumont's Textes et Monuments Figurés Retalifs aux Mystères de Mithra.—Osiander's Hannibalweg.	
REPORTS:	456
The Journal of Germanic Philology.—Beiträge zur Assyriologie.—Rheinisches Museum.	
BRIEF MENTION,	467
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	473
BOOKS RECEIVED,	477
INDEX,	481

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price \$3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, \$1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page.....	\$16 00	\$30 00	\$40 00	\$50 00
Half page.....	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page.....	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page.....	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of **THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY** has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, \$66 for the twenty-two volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, \$3; single numbers, \$1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXII, 4.

WHOLE No. 88.

I.—A FURTHER COLLECTION OF LATIN PROVERBS.

IV.

PELIAS, p. 271. See Crusius JJ. 135, 248, Wiesenthal, p. 18.

PENELOPE 1, p. 272. Lucian dial. meretr. 12, 1; anth. Pal. 1, 337, 2; id., append. 1, 278, 1; see Schmidt, p. 51.

PENELOPE 2, p. 272. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, p. 51.

PES 1, p. 274. Lactant. instit. 2, 3, 16 non prospexerunt quid ante pedes suos esset; compare Sen. ep. 94, 25 pleraque ante oculos posita transimus; Plin. ep. 8, 20, 1; Plin. n. h. 18, 253; Arnob. adv. nat. 1, 38, p. 26, 5 (Reiff.) nihil scire nec quae nostros sita sunt ante oculos non videre.

PES 8, p. 275. Pers. 3, 62 securus quo pes ferat; cf. Tib. 2, 6, 14.

PES 16. Szel. p. 19 cites Iuven. 10, 5 quid tam dextro pede concipis; so Prudent. c. Symmach. 2, 79 feliciter et pede dextro; Hier. adv. Pelag. 1, 22 si enim ipse Apostolus dicit de Petro quod non recto pede incesserit in Evangelii veritate; Sil. Ital. 7, 171-2 attulit hospitio. . . | pes dexter et hora Lyaeum; anthol. Pal., append. 1, 91, 3; so pede secundo in Vergil Aen. 8, 302 (see Servius ad loc.); 10, 255; similarly felici pede Ovid fast. 1, 514; pede fausto, Hor. ep. 2, 2, 37; compare Ovid ib. 101 nominibusque malis pedibusque occurrite laevis. The germ of the proverbial expression lies in the superstition which connected the right foot with good omens and the left foot with bad ones. This arose from the care to be observed in entering temples and other consecrated places on the right foot as we see from Vitruv. 3, 3, 4. So in Petron. c. 30, the slave enjoins upon the guests to enter

the banquet hall *dextro pede* for the sake of the omen. On the other hand *sinistro pede* is ill-omened, as in Apul. met. 1, 5 *sinistro pede profectum*; Sen. ben. 2, 12, 2 *non hoc est rem publicam calcare et . . . sinistro pede*; Ovid, ib. 101.

PES 17. Apul. met. 9, 1 *abrupto cursu me proripio totis pedibus*.

PES 18. Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 D) *nam paradigma tuum illud in armatura compositum quam mihi erat pervium et pede, ut aiunt, conterere*. This proverb has probably a much earlier origin.

PES 19. Lactant. instit. 5, 2, 9 *reducturum alios ab errore, cum ipse ignoraret ubi pedes suos poneret*; see Brandt-Laubmann's index under *proverbia*.

PHALARIS. Sen. d. 9, 14, 4 *Phalaris ille*; ben. 7, 19, 5 *sed ferus, sed immanis, qualis Apollodorus aut Phalaris*; Ovid ex Pont. 3, 6, 41 *forsitan haec domino Busiride iure timeres | aut solito clausos urere in aere viros*; Nic. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1628 C) *Falaris cruentior, Midas cupidior*; Gaufrid ep. 50 (M. 205, 883 D) citing Sid. Apoll. ep. 5, 7, 6 *Falaris cruentior*.

PHOENIX 2, of extreme age. Luxor, epig. 497. 2 (PLM. 4, p. 411) *cum sis phoenicis grandior a senio*. See ALL. 8, 35 and 9, 73.

PHRYNE as a type of meretrix. Hor. epod. 14, 16 *me libertina nec uno | contenta Phryne macerat*; comp. Tib. 2, 6, 45 (but see Hiller's app. crit.).

PHRYX 3, p. 278. Herond. 2, 38 *ἀλλ' ὁ Φρύξ οὐτος | ὁ νῦν θαλῆς ἰών*. See J. Koch, p. 39.

PICA, p. 278. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 13 (M. 199, 503 D) *pica siquidem pulvinaris efficacissima est, et, ut dici solet, cornix nocturna quovis oratore disertior*.

PICTURA, p. 279. Plaut. Merc. 313 *si umquam vidistis pictum amatorem, em illic est*; 315 *tantidemst, quasi sit signum pictum in pariete*; compare Petron. 126 *mulierem omnibus simulacris emendatiorem*; Pseud. 911 *et eccum vides verbeream statuam*; Capt. 951; Aristoph. Ran. 543 *γεγραμμένην εἰκόν' ἰστάνας*; see JJ. 135, 249; compare append. sent. 108 (Ribb.); *homo formonst ut pictura cuius pars nulla foeda est*; see Blaydes on Aristoph. Ran., 537.

PIGER, p. 279. Planud. 42 *ὅς πορεύεται βράδιον, πορεύεται τάχιον*; see Crusius, Rhein. Mus. 42, 403.

PISCIS 4. Ovid a. a. 1, 58 *aequore quot pisces*; trist. 4, 1, 56

quotque frenum pisces . . . habet; 5, 2, 25 quot piscibus unda natatur; ex Pont. 2, 7, 28 quotque natent pisces aequare; a. a. 3, 150; 2, 517; Coripp. Ioh. 6, 203 aut pelagus pisces . . . | habet; cf. C. H. Müller, p. 49.

PILUS 1, n. p. 279. For Greek parallels see Tribukait, p. 40.

PIX, p. 281. Hildebert. carm. misc. 1315 (M. 171, 1386 B) nigrior et pice.

PLANTA, p. 281. Sen. ep. 3, 2 cited by Petr. Cell. ep. 176 (M. 202, 634 D); Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 71 (M. 211, 370 C) plantae de loco ad locum translatae facillime arescunt.

PLUMA, p. 282. Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 198) sum levior pluma cedit cui tippula lymphae.

PLUMBEUS, p. 282. Compare Macar. 7, 82 *σικίνη μάχαρα*.

PLUMBEUS, n. 1, p. 282. Constant. ep. ad cath. Alex. eccl. (M. 8, 560 D) stulti enim illi in lingua sua sitam habent malitiam plumbeasque iras ita secum circumferunt ut seipsos mutuis vicibus feriant.

PLUMBUM. Licin. Crass. ap Suet. Ner. 2 cor plumbeum; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 14 (M. 199, 510 C); 7, 12 (662 C) plumbo hebetior es; metal. 1, 3 (829 B) obtunsiór plumbo vel lapide; compare Otto, PLUMBEUS.

PLUMBUM 2. Aldh. de sept. aenigm. 14 D (M. 89, 198) gravior plumbo.

PLURES, p. 282. See ALL. 4, 513.

POCULUM, p. 282. Compare S. Matth. 20, 22.

POETA 3. Reposian. 419, 2 (PLM. 4, p. 348) solus aut rex aut poeta non quotannis nascitur.

POLLEX, p. 283. See further T. Ehtmeyer, l. c. p. 7.

POMUM 2, Sonny, ALL. 8, 490. Compare Ovid a. a. 1, 717 quod refugit, multae cupiunt; odere, quod instat; 3, 576 quae fugiunt, celeri carpite poma manu; Sid. Apoll. c. 7, 260 vel qui mos saepe dolenti | plus amat extinctum; Cassiod. var. 8, 14, 2 bonum quippe amissum, dum quaeritur, plus amatur; Propert. 2, 33, 43 semper in absentes feliciór aestus amantes; Hier. ep. 66, 1 plus sensimus quos habuimus postquam habere desivimus.

PORCUS 3, p. 284. See Crusius, Herondas p. 73; Pherecrat. *Μεταλλῆς* 1; *Πέρσαι* p. 315, vol. 2¹ (Meineke); Teleclides, p. 361 (M.).

PORThAON. Plaut. Men. 745 ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone; compare CALCHAS.

PORTUS 1, p. 284. Sen. ep. 14, 15 perit aliqua navis in portu; Pentad. PLM. 4, 408, 32 p. 344 (Baehr.) in portu mersa est per mare iacta ratis; anthol. Pal. 9, 82, 3 *καὶ γὰρ Ἴων δρῦν ἐνικάππεσεν*.

PORTUS 2, p. 285. Terence's in portu navigo (Andr. 480) is a common phrase in mediaeval Latin; Ivo Carnot. ep. 19 (M. 162, 32 D) qui velut in portu navigatis; Ioh. Sar. ep. 247 (M. 199, 292 C) navigamus in portu; ep. 256 (299 C); ep. 290 (333 B); Petr. Bles. ep. 35 (M. 207, 114 A); Sen. ep. 19, 1 in freto viximus, moriamur in portu; Ennod. ep. 9, 30, p. 253, 14 (H.) fides nostra . . . in portu est; ep. 3, 14, p. 82, 10 (H.); Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 1, 4 in portu iudicii publici . . . ancora sedet; Alcuin ep. 72 (M. 100, 245 B) ut quandoque . . . in portum pervenias prosperitatis; Diogen. 4, 79 *εἰς τὸν λιμένα*; anthol. Pal. 9, 172, 2; see Leutsch-Schneidewin's note.

PRÆMEDITARI. Sen. ep. 76, 34 praecogitati mali mollis ictus venit; Varro frag. 6 (FPR. p. 296, Baehr.) ex Ephyra Periandre; 'cuncta emeditanda'; Sen. n. q. 6, 3, 2 levius accidunt familiaria; d. 2, 19, 3 omnia leviora accident expectantibus; d. 12, 5, 3; ep. 91, 3 in expectata plus adgravant; Columban. monost. 75 (M. 80, 289) praemeditata quidem levius sufferre valebunt; 76 quae subito adveniunt, multo graviora videntur; Braulio ep. 30 (M. 80, 677 D) nam omnia diu meditata et frequenter cogitata, quamvis sunt atrociam, efficiuntur lenia.

PRÆSENS 2, p. 286. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 7, 13 absentes praesentesque vota facimus; see Preuss, p. 42.

PRIAMUS, p. 287. Iuven. 6, 325 quibus incendi iam frigidus aevo | Laomedontiades; Priap. 12, 1 quaedam iunior Hectoris parente, | Cumaeae soror, ut puto Sibyllae, shows the same feeling for age in the person of Hecuba; cf. anthol. Pal. 11, 67, 2 *κορωνεκάβη*.

PRINCIPIUM 1, p. 287. Compare Cassiod. var. 6, 21, 1 sed quanto melius in ipsis cunabulis adhuc mollia reprimere quam indurata crimina vindicare; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 245 (M. 211, 513 C) melius est occurrere in tempore quam post exitum; Hier. ep. 100, 1 difficile sanantur mala quae non statim ut crescere coeperunt, opprimuntur; ep. 2, 108, (398 A); 2, 110, (399 C); Sen. d. 5, 10, 2.

PROBUS, as a type of literary critic. Mart. 3, 2, 12 illo vindice nec Probum timeto.

PROCINCTUS, p. 288. Ps.-Publil. Syr. 151 (Fr.) in recessu habeas severum, in procinctu clementiam; Cypr. ad Fort. 8, p. 329, 15 (H.) in procinctu firmiter stare; Hier. ep. 118, 1 in procinctu effusam putes (epistolam); Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 101 (M. 201, 124 A) in procinctu sum; gloss. Sangall. 912 I, 85 (Warren) in procinctu: ex apparatu; Placid. gloss. p. 58 (D.) s. v. 'in mundo.'

PROMETHEUS, as a type of antiquity. Iuven. 8, 133 tu licet a Pico numeres genus . . . inter maiores ipsumque Promethea ponas.

PROTEUS, p. 289. Thom. Cant. ep. 46 (M. 190, 506 D) rex . . . et versabilitate Protea vincit; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 9 (M. 199, 654 C) lubricum et volubilem Protea miraberis redisse.

PULLUS. Paul. ex Fest. p. 245 (M.) pullus Iovis dicebatur Q. Fabius; compare Aristoph. Av. 835 Ἄρως νεοττός and see Crusius on Herond. p. 136; Blaydes on Aristoph. l. c.; Macar. 2, 31; Apost. 4, 7.

PULVIS 2, p. 290. See Apost. 15, 19α ἀκοντὶ κρατεῖν.

[PULVIS 4. Ovid fast. 2, 360 inque suo noster pulvere currat equus, sounds proverbial; compare rem. am. 397 attrahe lora | fortius et gyro curre, poeta tuo.]

PULVIS 5, as a worthless substance. Fronto p. 211, 2 (Nab.) nihil serium potuisse fieri de fumo et pulvere; p. 228, 3 (Nab.) cum illa olim nugalia conscripsi, laudem fumi et pulveris; cf. Hor. od. 1, 28, 3.

PUMEX 3, p. 290. Eugipp. ep. ad Past. 3 quid tibi aquas expectare de silice.

PUNCTUM, p. 290. Petr. Dam. ep. 5, 3 (M. 144, 343 C) (tempus) id enim brevissimum, quod est velut in puncto, transcurrit; Leonidas of Tarentum, anthol. Pal. 7, 472, 3 τίς μοῖρα ζωῆς ὑπολείπεται ἢ ὄσον ὄσον | στιγμή καὶ στιγμῆς εἴ τι χαμηλότερον.

PUNICUS 1, p. 291. See Woelfflin, ALL. 7, 135; Claudian. 15, 284 (Jeep) tollite Massylas fraudes, removete bilingues | insidias.

PURUS 1, p. 291. See Preuss, p. 112.

PYRRHA, of great age. Mart. 10, 67, 1 Pyrrhae filia, Nestoris noverca.

QUAESTUS, p. 293. See Macar. 6, 98 πάντ' εἰς τὴν κερδαίνουσαν πήραν ἄθειν and Leutsch's note.

QUERCUS. Publil. Syr. 52 arbore deiecta, ligna quivis colligit; Macar. 3, 39 δρυὸς πεσοῦσης, πᾶς ἀνὴρ ἐυλεύεται. Ps.-Publil. Syr. 136 (Fr.). The proverb may have been known to the Romans as it appears again in Italian; Ariosto, Orlando Furioso 37, 106, 3-4 com' è in proverbio, ognune corre a far legna | all' arbore che'l vento in terra getta.

QUIRE, p. 293. See Crusius, Herond. p. 175.

RADIX. Avit. Vienn. c. 2, 106 non facit vivum radix occisa cacumen sounds proverbial.

RANA, p. 294. The fable of the ox and the frog is also referred to by Alan. de Insul. (M. 210, 590 A).

RARUS 1, p. 294. Zosim. pap. ep. 9, 1 (M. 20, 672 A) *rarum* est enim omne quod magnum est; Alcuin ep. 95 (M. 100).

RARUS 2. Alcuin ep. 58, (M. 100, 226 C) multi sunt in prosperitate amici, in adversitate rari; et eo cariores, quo rariores; ep. 89 (M. 100, 286 D) quanto rariores nunc temporis tales inveniri possunt, tanto cariores haberi debent; Petr. Ven. ep. 1, 5 (M. 189, 72 B) quanto carior, tanto rarior; compare Foliot. ep. 80 (M. 190, 801 B) *virtus et scientia quanto rarior, eo pretiosior est*; Mart. 4, 42, 6 *pulchrior est, quanto rarior, iste color*.

RASTRUM. Sidon. Apoll. c. 2, 529 a rastris ad rostra; compare Sen. ep. 51, 10 ad arma ab aratro; compare Apul. met. 10, 2 a socco ad cothurnum ascendere. Otto in his note, p. 326, denies any proverbial feeling in the citation from Apuleius. I am inclined to believe that these phrases, expressing a similar idea and both alliterative, may point to some expression of a proverbial character.

RATIO. Plaut. Trin. 419 *ratio quidem hercle apparet: argentum οἴχεται* (cited by Cic. in Pis. 25, 61); Ter. Phorm. 299 *non ratio, verum argentum deerat*.

REGNUM 5. Alcuin ep. 129 (M. 100, 364 C) sicut in illo Platonico legitur proverbio dicentis: *felicia esse regna, si philosophi, id est amatores sapientiae, regnarent vel reges philosophiae studerent*; Boeth. consol. phil. 1, 4, 15 *beatas fore res publicas, si eas vel studiosi sapientiae regerent vel earum rectores studere sapientiae contigisset*; Prudent. c. Sym. 1, 31 *publica res, inquit, tunc fortunata satis, si | vel reges saperent vel regnarent sapientes*; Plato rep. 5, 473.

REMUS, p. 297. Ovid rem. am. 790 *remis adice vela tuis*; a. a. 1, 368 *ancilla . . . | incitet, et velo remigis addat opem*; ex Pont. 2, 6, 37 *remo tamen utor in aura*; see further Flor. 1, 18 (2, 2) 18; Mamert. grat. act. Iul. 8; Preuss, l. c. p. 70.

REMUS, note p. 297. Hauschild p. 299¹ considers that the passages quoted by Otto from Cic. Phil. 1, 4, 9 and ad fam. 12, 25, 3 have reference to the proverbial phrase which appears in Cic. Tusc. 3, 11, 25 *velis . . . remisque*.

RES 1, p. 297. Fronto ad Ant. Pium 8 p. 169, 2 (Nab.) *res ipsa testis est* (= Plaut. Aulul. 421); Claud. Mar. Vict. Aleth. 3, 596 *res ipsa tacens loquitur*; Cypr. ep. 36, 2, p. 574, 14 (H.) *immo ut res ipsa loquitur et clamat*; ep. ad Cypr. 30, 2 (M. 4, 313) *ut res ipsa loquitur et clamat*; Hier. adv. Rufin. 1, 8 (M. 23,

¹ Act. Sem. Erlang. VI.

422 A): taces: ipsae res loquuntur; Phaedr. append, 22, 4 sed res clamabit ipsa; Gualbert. act. 115 (M. 148, 838 C) ut res ipsa . . . declarat; compare Plaut. Epid. 713 quid est negoti? EP: iam ipsa res dicet tibi; Abaelard. ep. 1 (M. 178, 122 A) quod si ego tacerem, res ipsa clamat; Helois. ad Abael. ep. 2 (183 C) et si omnes taceant, res ipsa clamat. See ALL. 11, 568; Eustath. Il. 3, 35 ἀντὶ θεῖται;¹ Koch, p. 58.

RES 4, p. 298. Ter. Eun. 166 relictis rebus omnibus; Plaut. Stich. 362 immo res omnis relictas habeo prae quod tu velis; Lent. ap Cic. ad fam. 12, 14, 1; Caesar bell. Gall. 7, 34, 1 omnibus omissis rebus; bell. civ. 3, 102, 1; Cic. Balb. 3, 6; de or. 3, 14, 51;² Hor. ep. 1, 5, 30 rebus omissis; Sen. d. 2, 3, 2 omnibus relictis negotiis; n. q. 6, 32, 12 omnibus omissis; ep. 5, 1; d. 10, 7, 4 relictis omnibus impedimentis; Fronto p. 4, 4 (Nab.) abruptis omnibus cursu concito pervolo; Lactant. inst. 1, 4, 6 derelictis omnibus; Claud. Mam. p. 48, 5 (Engel.) omissis omnibus.

[RES 5. Plaut. Rud. 1148 tua res agitur; Hor. ep. 1, 18, 84 nam tua res agitur; Ioh. Saris. vit. S. Anselm. 12 (M. 199, 1030 D); Sen. apoc. 9 mea res agitur; d. 6, 6, 1 tuum illic, Marcia, negotium actum; compare Pers. 3, 20 tibi luditur. The expression, like *relictis rebus*, is quasi-proverbial.]

RETE 1, p. 299. Licent. ad Augustin. ep. 26 (M. 33, 105) animis molitur retia nobis.

RETE 3. Ovid rem. am. 516 quae nimis apparent retia, vitat avis, sounds proverbial to Hartung, p. 16.

REX 1, p. 299. Plaut. Rud. 931 apud reges rex perhibeor; Capt. 825 non ego nunc parasitus sum, sed regum rex regalior.

REX 9. Kings are proverbially rich as well as happy. Tibull. 1, 8, 34 et regum magnae despiciantur opes; 2, 3, 24; Sen. ben. 1, 7, 1 qui regum aequavit opes animo; clem. 1, 26, 2 regii opibus.

RISUS 1, p. 301. Lucil. 30, 97 (M.) quae quondam populi risu pectora rumpit; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 11, 3 solvitur in risum; Augustin. ep. 95, 2 (M. 33, 352) sed etiam risu vinci ac solvi; see Kurtz, p. 310; Eustath. Il. 881, 2 γέλωτι ἐκβαλεῖν.

ROBUR. Ovid her. 7, 52 nisi duritia robora vincis; Hor. c. 3, 10, 17 nec rigida mollior aesculo; Ovid met. 13, 798 durior annosa quercu; PLM. 4, 319, 2 p. 302 (Baehr.) silvestri iuvenis

¹ Kurtz, p. 310.

² Köhler, *Ueber die Sprache der Briefe des P. Corn. Lentulus*, Nürnberg, 1890, p. 41.

durior arbuto; 4, 319, 9 duri resecans robora pectoris; Iuven. 6, 12 qui rupto robore nati; Pallad. anthol. Pal. 10, 55, 2 οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυὸς εἶ | οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης φησίν; 11, 253, 2; cf. 9, 312, 5 τηλόθι δ' ἴσχε δρυὸς πέλεκυν· κοκυίας γὰρ ἔλεξαν | ἀμίν ὡς πρότεραι ματέρες ἐντι δρύες. Hom. Il. 22, 126; Eustath. Il. 1262, 6 ἀπὸ δρυὸς καὶ ἀπὸ πέτρας¹ Macar. 3, 40 δρυὸς καὶ πέτρας λόγος; see Woelfflin ALL. 6, 458 and SILEX 1.

[ROMA. Auson. ord. nobil. urb. 8, 61 illa potens opibusque valens, Roma altera quondam.]

ROSA 1, p. 302. Alcuin ep. 117 (M. 100, 351 C; comp. ep. 147, ibid.) rosa inter spinas nata gratiam habere dignoscitur; Petr. Chrys. serm. 49 (M. 52, 338 C) sicut in spinis rosa; compare Ovid a. a. 2, 116 et riget amissa spina relictæ rosa; Damas. pap. (M. 13, 416 B) si vis tu spinas sumere, sume rosas. For similar proverbs in Greek see Schmidt, p. 121; anthol. Pal. 11, 53 τὰ ῥόδον ἀκμάζει βαιὸν χρόνον· ἦν δὲ παρέλθη | ζητῶν εὐρήσεις οὐ ῥόδον, ἀλλὰ βάτον.

ROSA 2, Szel. p. 17. Sen. d. 7, 11, 4 vide eosdem in suggestu rosae despectantis popinam suam; ep. 82, 3 aequè qui in odoribus iacet mortuus est quam qui rapitur unco; eleg. ad Maec. 1, 94 victor odorata dormiat neque rosa; compare sen. d. 4, 25, 2 questus est quod foliis rosae duplicatis incubisset; similarly with *pluma*; Vict. Vit. 1, 43 p. 19, 11 (Petsch.) dormire quasi super lectum plumis stratum omnibus videbatur; Sen. d. 1, 3, 10 tam vigilabat in pluma quam ille in cruce; Cypr. ep. 1, 218 (M. 4, 222) vigilat in pluma; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 4 (M. 210, 589 C) qui iacet in plumis; append. prov. 3, 54 κύων ἐν ῥόδοις: ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ αἰσθανομένων ἐν μεγάλοις δυνάτεω.

ROSA 3. Pers. 2, 38 quicquid calcaverit hic, rosa fiat, (see Jahn's note); Ovid ex Pont. 2, 1, 35 quaque ierit . . . | saxaque roratis erubuisse rosis; Claud. 29, 90 (Jeep) quacumque per herbam | reptares, fluxere rosae; the opposite of Saufinius, Petron. 44 is quacumque ibat, terram adurebat, or of Invidia, Ovid m. 2, 792 quacumque ingreditur, florentia proterit arva, exuritque herbas.

ROSA 4. Ovid am. 3, 7, 66 hesternæ languidiora rosa, is perhaps proverbial.

ROSA 5. Ovid rem. am. 46 et urticae proxima saepe rosast; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 582 A) fragrantès vicina rosas urtica perurit; compare ex Pont. 4, 4, 4 mixta fere duris utilis herba rubis; compare ROSA 1, and MEL 3.

¹ Kurtz, p. 309.

RUMPERE, p. 303. Cic. ad Attic. 4, 16, 14 dirumparis licet; 7, 12, 3 dirumpor dolore; in Vatin. 16; Plaut. Bacch. 603 dirump-tum velim; Truc. 701 laetitia differor; Propert. 1, 16, 48 alterna differor invidia; Sen. d. 6, 22, 5 non rumperetur super cineres Cn. Pompei constitui Seianum; Ovid rem. am. 389 rumpere, Livor edax.

SABINA, p. 304. Hor. ep. 2, 1, 25 vel Gabiis vel cum rigidis aequata Sabinis; Stat. silv. 5, 1, 22 velut Apula coniunx | agricolae parci vel sole infecta Sabino; Ovid met. 14, 797 nequiquam rigidis promissa Sabinis; fast. 1, 343 ara dabat fumos herbis contenta Sabinis; compare fast. 4, 741 and Prop. 4, 3, 58, with Rothstein's note; Claudian. 15, 106 malle[m] tolerare Sabinos | et Veios; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1334 (M. 171, 1408 C) redoletque Sabinam | non levis incessus nec datus arte decor; (1371 B) vera Sabina; (1529 B) par esto Sabinis, | regnet et in tenera facie matrona severa; with the general idea compare Maxim. eleg. 5, 40 Tusca simplicitate.

SAGITTA 1, p. 305. Hier. ep. 125, 19 sicut enim sagitta si mittatur contra duram materiam nonnumquam in mittentem revertitur et vulnerat vulnerantem; Sen. ep. 102, 7 in nos nostra tela mittuntur; compare **TELUM**.

SAGITTA 2, Szel. p. 6. Lucan 1, 229 it torto Balearis verbere fundae | ocior et missa Parthi post terga sagitta; Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 343 non pulsa Scythico sagitta nervo; Valerian. homil. 5 (M. 52, 707 B) multo enim velociores sagittis sunt; Claud. rapt. Proserp. 1, 285 Aethonque sagitta | ocior; Grat. cyneg. 204 ocior adfectu mentis pinnaque; Laurent. Veron. de bell. Balear. 2 (M. 163, 525 A) ecce Moabitae, pedibus vectantur equinis | ut solet a nervo dimissa venire sagitta | quando suum Parthus sinuat violentius arcum; Sil. Ital. 15, 570 velocior arcu; Aetn. 407 ferro citius; compare Ovid met. 7, 777 nec ocior illo | hasta nec exutae contorto verbere glandes; Lucan 1, 230; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 456.

SALUS, p. 307. Compare for a similar figure Plaut. Poen. 846 qui ip[su]s hercle ignaviorem potis est facere ignaviam; compare Asin. 268 ut ego illos lubentiores faciam quam Lubentias, and see **VERUS**.

SAMIUS, p. 307 n. Auson. Epigr. 2, 2 atque abacum Samio saepe ornasse luto.

SANNA, p. 307. Schol. Pers. 1, 59 quasi sannam facientes.

SAPIENS 1, p. 308. Compare Sen. apoc. 5 (Hercules) putavit sibi tertium decimum laborem venisse; in anthol. Pal. 9, 506, Sappho is spoken of as the tenth muse.

SARCINA 1, p. 308. With Varro r. r. 1, 1, 1 compare Seneca ep. 19, 1 incipiamus vasa in senectute colligere; compare Plaut. Pseud. 1033 cor conligatis vasis expectat; Plin. ep. 4, 1, 2 atque adeo sarcinulas alligamus.

SARCINA 2. Ennod. p. 342, 4 (H.) fit enim ad portandum facilis sarcina, quam multorum colla sustentant; compare our proverb 'Many hands make light work'.

SARDANAPALUS, Sonny, ALL. 8, 491. Sid. Apoll. c. 9, 29 nec quam divite, cum refugit hostem | arsit Sardanapalus in favilla; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 1746 (M. 199, 1002 C) Exspecta modicum: Sardanapalus erit; Petr. Damian. ep. 1, 13, 17 (M. 144, 219) ipse velut alter Sardanapalus; Graux *Rev. Phil.* 2, 221 ἡ Σαρδαναπέλλου γράσιζα; see Wiesenthal, p. 58.

SARDONIUS, p. 308. Cic. ad fam. 7, 25, 1 rideamus γέλωτα σαρδόνιον. Plat. rep. 337 A; Eustath. II. 1893, 4 and 21¹ Σαρδόνιος γέλωτες; see H. Koch II. p. 24.

SARTUS, p. 309. See Preuss, p. 107, who cites sarta, tecta frequently from the digest.

SATURNALIA, p. 310. Compare Theokr. 15, 26 ἀεργαῖς ἀλὲν ἑορτά; see Tribukait, p. 9.

SAXUM 1, p. 310. Plaut. Truc. 56 quod petra debeatque amans scorto suo; Hegesipp. 5, 16, 175 saxis duriores; Nov. Avian. 1, 3; Alcuin vit. S. Will. 9, 189 (M. 101, 699) homo . . . omni lapide durior; Columban. serm. 10, 1 (M. 80, 247 C) durum et lapideum cor; Sisebut. vit. S. Desid. 9 (M. 80, 383 D) cor saxeam; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 63 (M. 89, 766 B) tam saxei vel tam ferrei pectoris; Hincmar. ep. 2 (M. 126, 32 C) durior saxo; Anselm Cant. ep. 1, 76 (M. 158, 1145 C) si cor meum esset lapide durius; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1353 (M. 171, 1428 B) tua mens . . . saxea; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 262, 379 quis enim sit tam ferrei cordis, lapidei pectoris; Adam. Pers. ep. 11 (M. 211, 622) ex duritia cordis lapidei; Theokr. 10, 7 πέτρας ἀπόκομμ' ἀτεράμων; anthol. Pal. 5, 41, 2 τίς ψυχὴν λιθίνην εἶχε; see Tribukait, p. 36, Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 458.

SAXUM 2, p. 310. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 9 (M. 199, 654 A) marmoreum putes.

SAXUM 4. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, p. 46.

SCABIES, p. 310. Varro Catus 29 (Riese, p. 248) saepe enim unus puer petulans atque impurus inquinat gregem puerorum; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 57 (M. 89, 753 C) ne forte una ovis morbida

¹ Kurtz, p. 318.

totum gregem contaminet; Thom. Cant. ep. 122 (M. 190, 595 D) una ovis morbida gregem fidelium contaminare posset.

SCCLUS 2 (compare VIRTUS). Sen. ep. 97, 14 quoniam sceleris in scelere supplicium est; ep. 87, 24 atqui maximum scelerum supplicium in ipsis est.

SCINTILLA, p. 311. Optat. mil. 3, 9, p. 93, 1 (Ziwsa) in qua incendium de scintilla conflatum est; Valerian. homil. 6 (M. 52, 711) sic denique scintilla quamvis parva flammam evomit, et ex nihilo exorta magna frequenter movet incendia; Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 6 (M. 189, 199 C) quando ex modica scintilla vos multum flammae monstratis; Ioh. Sar. carm. de membr. (M. 199, 1008 A) nam de scintilla magnum fovet et movet ignem; compare Plaut. Trin. 678 ne scintillam quidem relinques, genus qui congliscat tuom.

SCINTILLA 2, (compare GUTTA 1, p. 156 Otto). Ennod. ep. 8, 39 p. 225, 19 (H.) si vivit amoris scintilla polliciti; incert. Sax. poet. de gest. Car. Magn. 5 (M. 99, 725 A) si qua meam scripturarum scintillula mentem | artis et illustrat.

SCIRE 2, p. 312. Apul. apol. 52 prudens et sciens delinquit; Paulin. Nol. ep. 42, 5, p. 363, 8 (H.) sciens prudensque; Salvian. de gub. dei. 6, 32; Ulp. dig. 42, 6, 7;¹ Thom. Cant. ep. 4 (M. 190, 440 C); compare Ps.-Cypr. de dupl. martyr. 28, p. 239, 28 (H.) sciens et volens; Sen. Herc. Fur. 1308 volens sciensque; d. 3, 16, 4 exercitatus et sciens (ut, Gertz); Ter. Heaut. 633 te inscientem atque imprudentem dicere et facere omnia; Phorm. 660 utrum stultitia facere ego an malitia | dicam, scientem an imprudentem, incertus sum; see Kaibel, Hermes 17, 412.

SCIRE 3. Othlo lib. prov. 12 (M. 146, 318 C) magna pars intelligentiae scire quid nescias; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1102); Fulgent. myth. 1, 22 primum, itaque, ego scientiae vestibulum puto, scire quod nescias; Hier. ep. 53, 7 imo, ut cum stomacho loquar, ne hoc quidem scire quod nescias; ep. 53, 8; adv. Rufin. 3, 31.

[SCIRE 4. Arnob. adv. nat. 7, 9, p. 243, 20 (Reiff.) numquam sciens aut nesciens tuum numen maiestatemque violarim; Gelas. I. ad episc. Dard. 36 sive scientes sive nescientes; cf. PRAESENS.]

SCIRPUS, p. 312. Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 8, 193 (M. 144, 388) et hoc non ut scirpi nodum, quo liber erat, absolveres; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 3 (M. 210, 587 B) nolumus in scirpo, quo non est, quaerere nodum.

¹ Preuss, p. 105.

SCYLLA. Hildebert. *carm. indiff.* 1365 (M. 171, 1441 C): Roma nocens | Scylla rapax; Ioh. Sar. *carm. de membr.* (M. 199, 1005 C) (venter) et sorbet omnia Scylla vorax.

SCYTHA, p. 315. For Greek parallels see J. Koch, p. 44.

SECUNDUS. Cic. *Brut.* 242 Q. Arrius qui fuit M. Crassi quasi secundarum; Hor. *sat.* 1, 9, 45; Sen. *d.* 5, 8, 6 optimum iudicat quicquid dixisset, sequi et secundas agere, *ben.* 2, 29, 3; Symmach. *ep.* 8, 15 secundae igitur mihi partes relictæ sunt; compare our expression 'to play second fiddle'; for the opposing idea note Ter. *Eun.* 151 sine illum priores partis hosce aliquod dies | apud me habere; Sen. *ben.* 4, 2, 2 primæ partes eius sunt, ducere debet.

SEGES 2, p. 315. Sen. *ep.* 81, 1 is cited by Gillebert. *ep.* 1, 90 (M. 184, 289 C).

SEMEL 2. Quintil. 5, 10, 90 nam ex pluribus ad unum et ex uno ad plura, unde est quod semel et saepius; 7, 8, 3 an, quod semel ius est, et saepius; see Preuss, p. 33; Nepos. *Epam.* 7, 3 and Nipperdey-Lupus ad. loc.

SENEX 1, p. 316. The Greek proverb *δὲ παῖδες οἱ γέροντες*, is cited by Auson. *ep.* 22, p. 261, 2 (Peiper); see H. Koch II. p. 7; Eustath. II. 1706, 4;¹ compare Plaut. *Merc.* 976 *vetus puer.*

SENEX 3, p. 317. Plin. *ep.* 4, 20, 1 cognovi te . . . cumque plurimum scias cotidie tamen aliquid addiscere. ita senescere oportet virum, etc.

SERIUS. Hor. *carm.* 2, 3, 26, *versatur urna serius ocius.* This is a proverbial expression according to Kraut.²

SERVIRE. Ps.-Cypr. p. 155, 2 (H.) de duod. abus. 3 unde et in proverbio apud veteres habetur quod serviri nequeat qui prius alicui servitutem præbere denegat.

SERVUS 1, p. 319. Ioh. Sar. *Polycrat.* 8, 12 (M. 199, 757 B) quotes Macrobian. *sat.* 1, 11, 13. Ps.-Publil. *Syr.* 314 (Fr.) quot servi, totidem multis sunt hostes domi.

SERVUS, n. 2, p. 320. See Greg. *Cypr. Leid.* 2, 11 *ελάφειος ἀνὴρ* and Leutsch's note.

SERVUS 2. Plaut. *Pers.* 648 *servi liberique amabant;* Nep. *Them.* 6, 5 *omnes, servi atque liberi;* compare our phrase 'bond and free', though we can hardly consider it proverbial; compare, however, Otto, *PUER*, p. 289.

¹ Kurtz, p. 311.

² Ueber das vulgäre Element in der Sprache des Sallustius, Blaubeuren, 1881, p. 7.

SIBYLLA 2, p. 321. Claudian. 19, 38 (Jeep) ad propriam cladem caeca Sibylla taces? See Wiesenthal, p. 50.

SIDUS 1, p. 321. Ovid trist. 4, 10, 108 quot inter | occultum stellae conspicuumque polum; Cassiod. var. 1, 10, 4 tanto amplius indubitanter augetur, quantitate numerabili . . . stellae lucidae concluduntur; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1330 (M. 171, 1403 C) non tot nox stellas . . . habet, crimina quot species.

SIDUS 2 n., p. 322. Ovid met. 1, 499 sideribus similes oculos; compare Stat. Achill. 2, 135 sidereis divarum vultibus; Mart. 4, 42, 7 lumina sideribus certent; Sulpic. Sev. ep. 2, 3.

SILENTIUM. Hor. c. 3, 2, 25 est et fideli tuta silentio | merces appears to be a translation of the Greek proverb Apost. 7, 97 *ἔστι καὶ σιγῆς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας*; CIG. 3, 6308; see Leutsch's note.

SILEX 1, p. 322. Ennius trag. 130 (Ribb.) lapideo sunt corde multi; 66 (Ribb.) sed quasi ferrum aut lapis durat; Mart. 11, 60, 8 at Chione non sentit opus nec vocibus ullis | adiuvat; absentem marmoreamque putes; Auson. epigr. 11, 2 (Peiper) semper saxeus ipse fuit; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 63 (M. 89, 766) non simus ergo tam saxei vel tam ferrei pectoris; incert. Sax. poet. de gest. Car. Magn. 5 (M. 99, 725) Saxonum saxea corda; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1314 (M. 171, 1385 C); Petr. Dam. ep. 2, 13, 84 (M. 144, 286) duri ac lapidei homines designantur; Petr. Ven. ep. 4, 18 (M. 189, 344 D) non adeo lapidei sumus ut non sentiamus; Gaufrid. ep. 47 (M. 205, 881 A) non sum tamen adeo lapideus . . . et siccus; Eustath. Il. 1940, 1 *σοὶ δ' αἰεὶ κραδίη στερεωτέρα ἔστι λίθοιο*;¹ Aristoph. Vesp. 280, *λίθον ἔψεις*; see Crusius, Herond. p. 145 and C. H. Müller, l. c. p. 37; compare Tibull. 2, 4, 9 o ego ne possim tales sentiri dolores | quam mallet in gelidis montibus esse lapis.

SILEX 2, p. 322. Venant. Fort. c. 5, 6, 5 quis enim flenti non crederet, quem lapis non genuit; PLM. 4 epigr. 188 p. 185 Baehr., thema Verg. (compare Aen. 4, 366) durae tigres lapidesque sinistri | te genuere virum.

SILEX 3, p. 322. Compare CIL. 6, 21521 (carm. epigr. 1109, 6 B): me desertum ac spoliatum | clamarem largis saxa movens lacrimis.

SILVA 1, p. 323. This proverb was extensively used in mediaeval Latin; Alcuin ep. 41, 49 (M. 100, 203 C; comp. ep. 11) quod facio insipiens contra philosophicum proverbium ligna in silvam ferens; ep. 76 (256 D) ego vero veteris immemor proverbii 'non

¹ Kurtz, p. 318.

feres ligna in silvam'; Servat. Lup. ep. 1 (M. 119, 432); Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 3 (M. 141, 193 B) poteram a planis arvis ligna in silvam vel aquas in mare comportare; Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 12 (M. 189, 202 A) secundum vulgare proverbium stolidissimum videatur humeris ligna ad silvam deferre; ep. 4, 17 (337 D) ut vulgo dicitur Minervam docere vel ligna ad silvam . . . deferre; ep. 4, 43 (382 B) videor, ut dicitur, Minervam docere, videor ligna ad silvam convehere; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 43, 59 (M. 211, 343) quasi in silvam ligna ferens; Phil. Harveng. ep. 20 (M. 203, 165 C) non attendens quod in silvam ligna ferre otiosum . . . iudicatur; see Diogen. 7, 68, Macar. 6, 100 and Leutsch's notes; compare also Ovid ex Pont. 4, 2, 9 quis mel Aristaeo | . . . det.

SIMIA, p. 323. Plaut. Most. 886 (B.); vide ut fastidit simia; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 1, 2 oratorum simiam nuncupaverunt; Cic. ad fam. 7, 2, 3 hic simiolus; see Schmalz, p. 41.¹

SINUS 2, p. 324. Compare Sen. ben. 7, 28, 3 si te diligenter excusseris, in sinu invenies.

SINUS 2, p. 324. See Heraeus.²

SIREN, p. 324. Fur. Bibac. frag. 1 (Baehr.) Cato grammaticus, latina Siren; Aldh. diplom. 3 (M. 89, 310) garrulo Sirenarum carmine spreto; Nicol. Clar. ep. 33 (M. 196, 1625 A) si has Sirenes usque in extremum dulces audieris; Phil. Harveng. ep. 13 (M. 203, 100 B) te in huius saeculi pelago naufragoso mortifera Sirenarum dulcedo retinebat; Petr. Bles. ep. 140 (M. 207, 418 B) nugae canorae et Sirenes usque in exitium dulces; Paul. Silent. anthol. Pal. 5, 241, 7 κείρο τὸ Σειρήνων γλυκερώτερον; anth. Pal. append. 2, 261, 1; 550, 5; incert. poet. CIG. 6268, 1 ἡ πολὺ Σειρήνων λιγυρωτέρη; see Schmidt, p. 50, J. Koch, p. 50, for further examples from Greek.

SISYPHUS, p. 325; for Greek parallels, see Wiesenthal, p. 52.

SOCRATES, as a type of philosopher; Plaut. Pseud. 465 conficiet iam te hic verbis ut tu censeas | non Pseudolum sed Socratem loqui; Hor. c. 3, 21, 9 quamquam Socraticis madet | sermonibus; Propert. 2, 34, 27; Plin. ep. 3, 12, 1 (cena) Socraticis tantum. sermonibus abundet; Pers. 5, 37 Socratico . . . sinu; compare Petron. 128 quod me Socratica fide diligis and 5, v. 13 Socratico plenus grege.

SOL 1, p. 326. Sen. ben. 4, 26, 1 nam et sceleratis sol oritur; for the thought compare ben. 2, 28, 3 optimorum virorum

¹ Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Asin. Pollio, München, 1890.

² Die Sprache des Petron. u. die Glossen, p. 31.

segetem grando percussit; Alcuin ep. 34 (M. 100, 191, A) et sicut—sol omnibus lucet.

SOL 2, p. 326. Ps.-Lactant. de mort. persec. 18, 12, p. 194, 5 (Brandt) illum saltatorem temulentum, ebriosum cui nox pro die est et dies pro nocte.

SOL 4, p. 326. Propert. 4, 1, 143 illius arbitrio noctem lucemque videbis: | gutta quoque ex oculis non nisi iussa cadet; compare Lactant. instit. 5, 19, 8 quid ergo non diem noctem vocant, solem tenebras, and the famous scene in the Taming of the Shrew.

SOL 5, p. 327. Sen. ep. 92, 17 igniculum nihil conferre lumini solis; Ennod. vit. S. Epiph. p. 366, 16 (H.) quis quaerat noctis lampadam ubi solis iubar effulgerat; pro Syn. 2, p. 295, 23 nescitis stolidi, solem facibus non iuari; Tertull. apol. 46 (233) quis enim philosophum sacrificare aut deierare aut lucernas meridie vanas proferre compellit. Petr. Cell. ep. 150 (M. 202, 594 A) superflua enim sunt impendia lucernae ubi sol meridianus lucet in virtute sua; ep. 1, 52 (479 B) nec enim praesumo docere Minervam vel in sole radios ponere; ep. 83 (531 B) quid faceret facula fumibunda inter astra lucentia; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 43, 59 (M. 211, 343) quasi solem certans facibus adiuvere; compare Petr. Dam. vit. S. Odil. 400 (M. 144, 925) superfluum quippe est lucernam manibus adhibere, dum micantium stellarum conaris signa distinguere.

SOLON, as a type of energy or severity; Plaut. Asin. 599 nunc enim esse | negotiosum interdus videlicet Solonem; Pers. 3, 78 aerumnosique Solones; of legal ability, Sidon. Apoll. ep. 5, 5, 3 novus . . . Solon.

SOLUS 1, p. 328. Plaut. Poen. 891 hic soli sumus.

SOMNIUM, p. 328. Plaut. Men. 1047 haec nilo esse mihi videntur setius quam somnia; Curt. 4, 1, 23 somnio similis res . . . videbatur.

SOROR. Plaut. Truc. 437 germanae quod sorori non credit soror; compare UXOR.

SPARTACUS. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 3, 13, 10 per hunc Spartacum quaecumque sunt clausa, franguntur.

SPECULUM 1. Hrosuitha Mon. com. Gall. act. 1, sc. 2 (M. 137, 979 D) si enim ut dicitur, speculum mentis est facies, 'the face is the mirror of the mind'; Cic. Pis. 1 vultus denique totus qui sermo quidam tacitus mentis est; see Otto, FRONS 1.

SPECULUM 2. Plaut. Most. 644 [aedis] speculoclaras, candorem merum.

SPERARE 2, p. 330. Compare Suet. Ner. 23 (citing Nero) omnia se facienda fecisse sed eventum in manu esse Fortunae; Ovid her. 19 (20), 44 exitus in dis est; met. 7, 23 vivat, an ille | occidat, in dis est.

SPES 2, p. 330. Compare anthol. Pal. 9, 620, 4 *ἀπὸς ἀληθείης ἰσὶ μελιχροτέρῃ*.

SPHINX. Cassiod. var. 7, 7, 4 facilius enim aestimare Sphingae aenigmata comprehendere potuisse quam raptoris fugacem praesentiam reperire.

STATUA, p. 331. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 9 (M. 199, 654 A) quavis statua taciturnior.

STENTOR, p. 331. For Greek parallels see Wiesenthal, p. 45.

STIMULUS 1, p. 331. Beat. Petr. ep. 3 (M. 201, 1393 C) ad insipientiam sibi contra stimulum calcitrantes; Steph. Torn. suppl. ep. 13 (M. 211, 551) tamquam contra stimulum calcitrare audemus; for Greek parallels see J. Koch, p. 10.

STIPES, p. 332. Arnob. 2, 22, p. 66, 11 (Reiff.) ligno . . . obtusior; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 5, 7, 4 ad iudicandum lignei; Hier. adv. Rufin. 1, 30 (M. 23, 440 C) ad unum stipitem cuncta iacula dirigo.

STUDIUM, p. 332. Stat. silv. 2, 2, 73 sua cuique voluptas; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 3 (M. 199, 639 C) et in hunc modum voluptate sua trahuntur plurima. Verg. ecl. 2, 65 is cited by Augustin. ep. 17, 3 (M. 33, 84) and by Abbo Flor. ep. 14 (M. 139, 442 D); see also Tribukait p. 24.

STYX. Ovid met. 11, 500 Stygia modo nigrior unda; compare Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 30 p. 72, 22 (Reiff.) tenebras Tartareas.

SUCCESSOR. Vulcac. Avid. Cass. 2, 2 scis enim proavi tui dictum: successorem suum nullus occidit.

SUDOR, p. 334. Sen. d. 7, 25, 8 sanguis et sudor; Plin. n. h. 10, 198; see Woelfflin, ALL. 3, 452.

SULLA 1, p. 334. Lucan 1, 326 et docilis Sullam sceleris vicisse magistrum.

SUMMUS 2. Publil.-Syr. 548 quicquid futurum est summum, ab imo nascitur; 390 necesse est minima maximorum esse initia (see Friedrich's note, p. 200); CIL. 4, 1870 necesse est minima maximorum esse initia.

[**SUPRA 2**. Ter. Andr. 120 nil supra; Eun. 427 ut nil supra; Macedonius ad August. ep. 154, 1 (M. 33, 666) ut nihil supra sit; compare Cic. ad Attic. 13, 19, 3 ut nihil posset ultra; ad fam. 14, 1, 4 ut nihil possit ultra. The expression may be held quasi-proverbial.]

SURSUM, p. 336. See Preuss, p. 29; for the use of *ἀνω κάτω* in Greek, H. Koch II. p. 25.

SUS I, p. 336. Compare Plaut. Asin. 430 erus in hara, haud aedibus, habitat.

SUUS, p. 337. Plin. n. h. 28, 67 sua cuique autem, quod fas sit dixisse, maxume prodest.

SYBARIS, p. 338. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 2 (M. 199, 713 D) frugalitas apud Sybaritas fortassis odio foret; τὸ *συβαριτῶν δαΐτας*, see Graux Rev. Phil. 2, 221.

TACERE I, p. 338. Hier. ep. 109, 2 ut qui loqui nescit, discat aliquando reticere; Othlo lib. prov. 19 (M. 146, 334 B) tacere qui nescit, nescit et loqui; dial. 50 (134 A); Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 80, 1111); Alvar. Cord. ep. 20 (M. 121, 513 A) dum loqui nescis, tacere non vales; Nicol. Clar. ep. 4 (M. 196, 1598 A) quid eloquentia, si loqui et tacere non novimus; Hildebert. de quat. virt. (M. 171, 1062 C) rarius ipse loqui disce, tacere magis.

TACERE 2, p. 339. Paulin. Petr. vit. Mart. 3, 336 cor clamat, si lingua tacet; Ennod. Euch. p. 395, 13 (H.) muti loquimur et clamantes tacemus; Claud. Mar. Vict. Aleth. 3, 596 res ipsa tacens loquitur; Orient. common. 1, 450 solent ore tacente loqui; Maxim. Taur. homil. 115 (M. 57, 521) tacebat quidem lingua sed spiritu loquebatur; Theobald. Stamp. ep. 1 (M. 163, 759) tacentes clamamus (citing Augustin.).

TACERE 3, p. 339. Ennod. ep. 9, 6, p. 232, 19 (H.) clamant silentia sua; amic. ad amic. ap. Thom. Cant. ep. 382 (M. 190, 718 D) respondit quod nostrae gentis proverbium; quod taciturnus spiritum praetendit confitentis; compare Caecil. 248 (Ribb.) innocentia eloquentiast.

TACERE 5 (compare TACERE I). Ps.-Sen. de mor. 104 auribus frequentius quam lingua utere; Columban. monost. 33 (M. 80, 288) saepius auditu instrueris quam voce fruaris; Alcuin ep. 82 (M. 100, 267 C) sciens dictum esse saepius auribus quam lingua utendum; compare Pompon. 12 (Ribb.) atque auscultare disce, si nescis dicere; Dem. Cleob. 4 *φιλήκοος ἴσθι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόλαλος*; see Brunco p. 31.¹

TAGUS, p. 340. Eumen. act. grat. Constant. 14 (M. 8, 652 B) quis Tagus quisve Pactolus tanto fluxerunt auro; Claudian. 22, 230 (Jeep) fulvaeque intexta micantem | veste Tagum; 12, 32 (Jeep) Tagus intumescat auro; compare HERMUS and PACTOLUS.

¹ Zwei lat. Spruchsammlungen, Bayreuth, 1885.

TANAQUIL, Sonny, ALL. 9, 77. Auson. ep. 31, 192 p. 301 (Peiper) nec Tanaquil mihi sed Lucretia coniunx.

TANTALUS n., p. 340. Apul. deo Socr. 22 Tantali vice in suis divitiis, inops, egens, cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 28 (M. 199, 632 D); for the proverbial use of the name Tantalus in Greek, see Koch, p. 47, Schmidt, p. 45, Wiesenthal, p. 15.

TARENTUM, p. 340. Compare Titin. 183 (Ribb.) Tarentinorum hortorum odores qui geris; compare PAESTUM.

TARTARA. Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 30 p. 72, 22 (Reiff.) tenebras Tartareas; anthol. Pal. 9, 289, 3 *χθονίης δυσφερότερα νυκτός*; compare our 'Egyptian darkness'; Orest. trag. 492 Tartareis . . . tenebris; Dracont. 3, 402.

TAURUS 4. Sen. ben. 3, 27, 1 tauri et vituli omnes idem optant, that is, all, young and old (compare Otto, PUER). For a similar use of *vitulus* for a young man see Plaut. Asin. 667 *agnellum, haedillum me tuom dic esse vel vitellum*; Hor. c. 2, 8, 21 *te suis matres metuunt iuvenis*.

TAURUS 5. Ovid a. a. 2, 341 *quem taurum metuis, vitulum mulcere solebas*, has proverbial coloring.

TELUM 1, p. 342. Ovid am. 2, 14, 3 *si sine Marte suis patiuntur vulnera telis*; a. a. 3, 590 *nec dubito, telis quin petar ipse meis*; Sen. ep. 102, 7 *in nos nostra tela mittuntur*; d. 6, 20, 5 *ut etiam de suo perirent*; Trebell. Poll. tyr. trig. 8, 7 *addidisse vero dicitur interemptor: hic est gladius quem ipse fecisti*; Dracont. 4, 35 (PLM. 5, 137); Ioh. Sar. ep. 99 (M. 199, 90 B) *quia nihil turpius est quam suis armis expugnari et quasi mucrone proprio iugulari*; Gualbert. act. 211 (M. 146, 893 B) *in nos nostrae reflectuntur sagittae*; anthol. Pal. 10, 111 *ὁ φθόνος αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν τοῖς βελέεσσι δαμάζει*; compare SAGITTA, Otto, p. 305.

TEMPUS 4, p. 343. Varro frag. hebd. 6, 3 (Baehr.) 'tempus nosce', inquit Mitylenis Pittacus ortus.

TEMPUS 5. Anth. Pal. supp. 4, 4, 1; Pythag. 47 *ἴσθι ὡς οὐδεμία προσποίησι πολλῶ χρόνῳ λαθάνει*; see Schenkl, Wiener Stud. 8, H. Koch II., p. 17.

TEMPUS 6, p. 343. Rather. Ver. ep. 5 (M. 136, 660 C) *o tempora, o mores*.

TEMPUS 7. Anthol. Pal. 9, 51, 1 *ἀλὼν πάντα φέρει*.

TENEBRAE, p. 343. Plaut. Pseud. 981 *credo, in tenebris conspicatus si sis me, abstineas manum*.

TENEDIUS p. 343. Compare Sen. ep. 88, 38 *ostendam multa securibus recidenda*.

TERRA 1, p. 344. Sen. d. 7, 11, 4 terrarum ac maris, ut isti vocant, bona conquirentis (Gertz, concoquentis); Apul. florid. 15 remedia mortalibus latis pecuniis terra caeloque et mari conquista; Paulin. Nol. ep. 16, 10 p. 124, 3 (H.) omnibus caelo terraque regionibus pervagata cogitatione; Gell. 6, 16, 1 quae elluones isti terra et mari conquirunt.

TERRA 2, p. 344. Lactant. instit. 1, 11, 55 ignotis parentibus natos terrae filios nominemus; compare Iuven. 6, 13 qui rupto robore nati | compositive luto nullos habuere parentes.

TESTA, p. 346. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 69 was a favorite quotation among mediaeval writers. It is found in Ivo Carnot. ep. 7 (M. 162, 17 C); Abaelard. ep. 9 (M. 178, 327 D); Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1635 A); Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 4 (M. 199, 595 C); 7, 9 (655 B); metal. 2, 7 (865 A); vit. S. Ans. 4 (1014 B); Petr. Bles. ep. 101 (M. 207, 312 B).

THRAX. The Thracians were proverbially quarrelsome, rough, and uncultivated; Hor. c. 1, 27, 1 pugnare Thracum est; epod. 5, 14 impube corpus, quale posset impia | mollire Thracum pectora (see Orelli's note to c. 1, 27, 1); Thracian hearts are called *impia* in epod. 5, 14 perhaps in reference to the Greek proverb Diogen. 5, 25 ἄρῆκες ὄρκια οὐκ ἐπιστάνται; see Callimach. frag. 109, p. 376 (Schneider); similarly the Scythians are spoken of as fierce; Claudian. 31, 135 (carm. min. 25, 135 Birt) tu quoque neu Scythicas infensis unguibus vias | exercere velis; 11, 25 quis vero acerbis horridior Scythis? Propert. 3, 16 13 quisquis amator erit, Scythicis licet ambulet oris: | nemo adeo, ut noceat, barbarus esse volet; Tibull. 2, 4, 91 barbara nec Scythiae tellus.

[**THYESTES 2**. Hor. epod. 5, 86 misit Thyestea preces; Cic. in Pis. 19, 43 Thyestea est ista execratio poetae, may perhaps refer to some proverbial expression.]

THYLE, p. 348. Eumen. panegy. Constant. 7 (M. 8, 627 B) nec Thulen ultimam . . . dignabatur acquirere; see Claudian. 24, 158; 5, 240, (Jeep); Plin. n. h. 1, 4, 104; ALL. 9, 78: 8, 37.

TIBIA. Lact. instit. 3, 14, 1 homo ille quem laudabit invenerit tamquam tibias ad fontem ut poetae aiunt; cf. Ovid fast. 6, 701-3 and see Brandt-Laubmann's index under *proverbia*.

TIGRIS 2, Sonny, ALL. 8, 493. Catull. 64, 154 quaenam te genuit sola sub rupe leaena; 60, 1 num te leaena montibus Liby-tinis | aut Scylla latrans . . . | tam dura mente procreavit? Ovid her. 7, 38 te saevae progenuere ferae; met. 8, 120 non genetrix Europa tibi est sed . . . | Armeniae tigres; Sidon. Apoll. c. 5, 530

cuius lac tigridis infans | Hyrcana sub rupe bibit? Venant. Fort. 5, 6, 5 quem non humanitas fleteret quem partus tigridis non effudit; PLM. 4, p. 185 (Baehr.) thema Verg. durae tigrides . . . | te genere virum.

TIGRIS 3. Claudian. rapt. Proserp. 2, 98 heu, fulvas animo transgressa leaenas; compare TIGRIS 2 and BESTIA 4.

TIMON. Sen. ep. 18, 7 Timoneas cenas et pauperum cellas.

TIMOR. Apul. met. 6, 26 nam timor ungulas mihi alas fecerat, sounds proverbial.

TIMOR 2. Verg. Aen. 4, 13 degeneres animos timor arguit, became a proverbial quotation; Prudent. psych. 248 mens humilis quam degenerem trepidatio prodit; Auson. ep. 31, p. 262, 26 (Peiper); incert. auct. panegy. Constant. (M. 8, 664 A); Schol. Stat. Theb. 1, 445; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 18 (M. 199, 684 D); compare Petron. epigr. 98 (PLM. 4, 98 Baehr.) una est nobilitas argumentumque coloris | ingenui, timidas non habuisse manus.

TIPPULA, p. 349. Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 199) sum levior pluma cedit cui tippula lymphae.

TITHONUS, p. 349. See Leutsch on Greg. Cypr. Leid. 3, 13 *Τιθωνού γῆρας*; Lucian dial. mort. 7, 1 *ὑπὲρ τὸν Τιθωνὸν ζῆν*; Schmidt p. 44, Wiesenthal, p. 50.

TITIUS, p. 349. See R. Heim, JJ. suppl.-bd. 19, 480, n. 1.

TONSOR, p. 350. Thom. Cant. ep. 159 (M. 190, 637, A) perspicua est et, ut dici solet, lippis et tonsoribus patens; Ioh. Sar. ep. 310 (M. 199, 367 B) quod, ut dici solet, lippis et tonsoribus notum sit; ep. 222 (250 B) cum illata sibi iniuria et violentia lippis et tonsoribus nota sit; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 228, 336 (M. 211, 499) apologus est lippis et tonsoribus patens.

TORQUATUS, as a type of ancient Roman; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 3, 8, 1 Brutos Torquatosque non pariunt saecula mea; Ennod. pro Syn. p. 327, 15 (H.) Curios, Torquatos, Camillos.

TUBER 1, p. 352. Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 5 (M. 210, 590 C) ulceribus plenum primo se liberet ipsum, | postea verrucas rideat ille meas.

UDUS, p. 353. Ps.-Cypr. de dupl. martyr. 36, p. 244, 26 (H. vol. III) nunc fides multis natat in labiis.

ULIXES, p. 354. Plaut. Men. 902 parasitus . . . | meus Ulixes, suo qui regi tantum concivit mali; see Wiesenthal, p. 52.

UMBRA 3, p. 355. Plin. ep. 1, 23, 1 inanem umbram et sine honore nomen; 8, 24, 4 reliquam umbram et residuum libertatis nomen eripere durum . . . est; Hier. ep. 128, 3 sub nomine religi-

onis et umbra continentiae; ep. 118, 2 ludus et umbra certaminis; Foliot. ep. 79 (M. 190, 798 D) solam libertatis umbram habemus.

UMBRA 4. Alcuin ep. 139 (M. 100, 379 B) quia omnes huius vitae iucunditates velut umbra transeunt; Nicol. Clar. ep. 33 (M. 196, 1623 D) transierunt haec omnia velut umbra et singularis ille splendor velut fumus evanuit; see FUMUS 3.

UNDA. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 22 adversis rerum inmersabilis undis; Catull. 64, 62 (cf. 97); 65, 4; 68, 13; Lucret. 6, 34; 74; 3, 298; Verg. A. 4, 532; 564; 8, 19; Eurip. Medea 362 κλύδωνα κακῶν, Achill. Tat. 3, p. 68 (Jac.) πλήθει βαπτισθῆναι κακῶν; Diogen. 1, 8 ἀγαθῶν θάλασσα; see Leutsch, and Forbiger on Verg. A. 4, 532.

UNGUICULUS, p. 355. Compare Ovid a. a. 3, 794 sentiat ex imis Venerem resoluta medullis | femina; Rufin. anthol. Pal. 5, 14, 3-4 ψαῖει δ' οὐκ ἄκροισ τοῖς χεῖλεσιν, ἀλλ' ἐρίσασα | τὸ στόμα τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξ ὀνύχων ἀνάγει.

UNGUICULUS 2. Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 49, p. 87, 1 (Reiff.) quod unius unguiculi nullum perpetiatur dolorem; Sen. n. q. 6, 2, 4 unguiculi nos et ne totius quidem dolor . . . conficit; Fronto ep. ad Ant. 1, 2, p. 96, 14 (Nab.) qui vitam suam pro unguiculo tuo libenter dediderit; compare UNGUIS 4.

UNGUIS 1, p. 355. Hier. in Ps. 1, 5 (M. 24, 29 C) a pedibus usque ad verticem, id est ab imo usque ad summum; Adam. itin. Hier. 2 p. 229, 12 (Geyer) a vertice usque ad plantas; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. prol. 6 (M. 199, 587 D) a capite . . . usque ad pedes; Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1634 A) a planta pedis usque ad verticem; Petr. Cell. ep. 171 (M. 202, 616 D) a capite usque in oram vestimenti; Fredegar. 3, 140, 1 per pede ad petram (per = ab); see Haag p. 75¹; add also to Otto's note, p. 355, Aristoph. Plut. 649 ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν with Blaydes' note.

UNGUIS 4, p. 356. Hincmar. ep. 3 (M. 126, 49 D) a quibus . . . vel transverso ut dicitur; ungue; compare Propert. 3, 14, 30 nec digitum angustast inseruisse via; Hier. ep. 132, 12 (Augustin.) stadiis multis . . . aut uno palmo aut digito.

UNGUIS 6, p. 357. Ennod. ep. 5, 8, p. 131, 16 (H.) ad unguem ductus sermo; p. 409, 3 (H.) mores ad unguem ducti; c. 1, 8, 25, p. 530 (H.) formavit ad unguem; Cypr. Gall. gen. 27 hominem nostris faciamus in unguem vultibus adsimilem. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5 prol. (M. 199, 539 A) non solent ad unguem grandia sine mora lustrari; Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 10 (M. 202, 413 D) quod sic

¹ Die Latinität Fredegars, Erlangen, 1898.

ad unguem episcopum abbas redarguere . . . praesumo; Philip. Harveng. ep. 13 (M. 203, 114 A) ad unguem expolitur; compare Sen. ep. 115, 2 iuvenes barba et coma intidos, de capsula totos, 'just out of the band-box'.

UNGUIS 7, Sonny, ALL. 8, 493. Propert. 3, 25, 4 ungue meam morso saepe querere fidem; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 9, 9, 14 digitis . . . Cleanthes propter unguem corrosis; c. 2, 170 arroso quicquid sapit ungue Cleanthes; Augustin. ep. 118, 1 (M. 33, 432) magna mora temporis fatigaret intentionem atque attererent unguis meos; Lucian dial. deor. 22, 1 *δακὼν τὸν δάκτυλον*; see Rowe p. 38.

UNGULA, p. 358. Compare Apost. 12, 63 *δλφ ποδί: ἐπὶ τῶν ταχέως ποιούντων*; Niceph. Greg. hist. 3, 3, 5 *ἔφυγον δλοῖς ποσί.*

UNUS 1, p. 358. Sen. ep. 81 8 unus e turba; Claud. Mam. ep. 1 p. 205, 1 (Eng.) etsi non omnium potior, unus ex multis; Euseb. Pamph. vit. Constant. 1, 44 (M. 8, 28 C) porro sedebat in medio tamquam unus e multis.

UNUS 2, p. 358. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 24 (M. 199, 703 C) unde Maro ut ab uno discas omnes.

UNUS 5, p. 358. Sen. ep. 120, 22 magnam rem puta, unum hominem agere . . . effice ut possis laudari, si minus, ut adgnosci; ep. 114, 26 quod nemo nostrum unum esse se cogitat; compare Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1103) non vivas aliter in solitudine, aliter in foro.

URCEUS, Sonny, ALL. 8, 493. Sid. Apoll. ep. 9, 16, 4 secundum regulam Flacci, ubi amphora coepit institui, urceus potius exisse videatur; Braulio ep. 44 (M. 80, 699) et, ut ait quidam, dum urceum facere nitor, amphoram finxit manus; ep. 11 (658 D); Taio ep. ad Eugen. Toletan. (M. 80, 727) et, ut ait quidam doctissimus, dum figuli rota currente urceum facere nititur, amphoram finxit manus; Phil. Harv. ep. 7 (M. 203, 60 B) amphora coepit institui, currente rota cur urceus exit? Hor. a. p. 22 is cited by Hier. ep. 27, 3.

USUS 1, p. 359. For Greek citations see H. Koch II. p. 17.

UTER, p. 359. Compare Verg. catal. 5 (7), 1 rhetorum ampullae.

UVA, p. 360. Iuven. 2, 81 is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 10 (M. 199, 563 A) with the remark, quia a convictu mores formantur: ep. 231 (260 D); Petr. Bles. ep. 94 (M. 207, 294 B); with the thought compare Sen. d. 9, 1, 3 tam malorum quam bonorum longa conversatio amorem induit; see R. Heim, JJ. suppl.-bd. 19, p. 486, n. 1.

UXOR. Pers. 3, 43 quod proxima nesciat uxor; compare SOROR.

VADUM, p. 360. Symmach. ep. 6, 11, 2 aut si res in vado sunt, viam mihi . . . aperite; Hegesipp. 5, 7, 1 eoque fieri ut illius effectu fraudis in vado sit; see Rönsch, *Coll. Phil.* p. 48.

VAS, p. 361. Petr. Bles. ep. 70 (M. 207, 217 D) proverbialiter enim dicitur stultum est vas incrustare sincerum; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 156, 237 (M. 211, 444) incrustare tendit sinceritatem famae praedicti viri; ep. 2, 164, 254 (453) non veritus incrustare veritatem.

VATES, p. 362. Eurip. Hel. 758 γνώμη δ' ἀρίστη μάντις ἢ τ' εὐβουλία; see Tribukait, p. 6.

VATINIUS. Sen. d. 2, 2, 1 infra Vatinios posuisset; ep. 120, 19 quidam alterius Vatinii, alterius Catones sunt; see CATILINA.

VELLE I, p. 362. Ovid am. 3, 11, 52 ut, quamvis nolim, cogar amare, velim; Sen. ep. 53, 3 vellet, nollet; ep. 117, 4 velint, nolint; d. 7, 4, 4 velit, nolit; 10, 8, 5 velis, nolis; Calp. Flacc. decl. 29 velis enim nolis; Ennod. vit. S. Epiph. p. 380, 22 (H.) velis nolis; p. 503, 23 (H.) volentes custodiunt et coactae; Sid. Apoll. ep. 9, 4, 3 velis, nolis; 9, 7, 1; 9, 11, 8. Sulpic. Sev. 2, 1, 9 velint, nolint; Auson. epigr. 56, 8 (Peiper) quod volo nolo vocant; Prudent. perist. 10, 70 nolis velisne; Gaius 2, 153, 157 sive velit, sive nolit;¹ incert. auct. panegy. ad Maxim. et Constant. 1 (M. 8, 610 A) velis, nolis; Zacch. Christ. consult. 1, 29 (M. 20, 1098 B) velint, nolint; Hier. adv. Iovin. 2, 21 velis, nolis; ep. 48, 11 velitis, nolitis; Augustin. ep. 145, 8 (M. 33, 595) velint, nolint; Columban. serm. 3, 3 (M. 80, 237) velis, nolis; Fredegar. 1, 80, 14 vellit, nollit; 3, 159, 17 vellint, nollint²; Gelas. I. adv. Pelag. haer. 81; Bonifat. Mogunt. serm. 7 (M. 89, 857 A) velit aut nolit; Rather. Ver. praeloq. 3, 6 (M. 136, 225 C) velis, nolis; Dudo Decan. de gest. Norm. duc. prooem. (M. 141, 614 A) nolens volensque; Hermann. carm. de conflict. ov. et lin. (M. 143, 445 B) velis, nolis; Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 15, 29 (M. 144, 231) velint, nolint; ep. 6, 7, 191 (386) et velle, nolle, te suscipere non coegi; serm. 11, 54 (562) velit, nolit; Gualbert. act. 79 (M. 146, 845 A) velim, nolim; act. 349 (945) velis, nolis; Goffrid. Vindoc. ep. 4, 18 (M. 157, 161 C) velit, nolit; Bernard. Clar. (M. 183, 490 C); Thom. Cant. ep. 38 (M. 190, 499 C) velit, nolit; Alcuin. ep. 18 (M. 100, 174 D) volenti et nolenti; ep. 22 (184 D) volentes

¹ Rhein. Mus. 37, 88 ff.

² Haag, p. 61.

nolentes; ep. 225 (732 D) dum volens dum nolens aeternus erit; ep. 277 (850 D) quem nolens volens latere non poteris; Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1633 C) aut volens aut nolens; ep. 40 (1639 B) velis, nolis; ep. 45 (1646 A) vellem, nollem; Ioh. Sar. ep. 218 (M. 199, 243 C) velit, nolit; ep. 305 (360 A); Polycrat. 6, 4 (596 C) velis, nolis; 6, 12; 8, 11 (751 C); Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 36 (M. 202, 447 C) velis, nolis; ep. 1, 52 (447 A) velitis, nolitis; Phil. Harv. ep. 5 (M. 203, 41 B) velit, nolit; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 145, 215 (M. 211, 431) velint, nolint; ep. 3, 234, 343 (503) nollemus vellemus; Eustath. Il. 443, 36 *ἐκὼν ἀέκων*;¹ anth. Pal. suppl. 4, 100, 7 *καὶ θέλης καὶ μὴ θέλης*; see further Goelzer, p. 73² and H. Koch II. p. 25.

VELLE 2, p. 362. Ovid ex Pont. 3, 4, 76 is cited by Hildebert. *carm. misc.* 1348 (M. 171, 1423 B) and by Thom. Cant. ep. 364 (M. 190, 692 D); with the thought compare Sen. ep. 71, 36 *magna pars profectionis velle proficere*;

VELUM 2, p. 363. See Friedlaender on Petron. p. 246.

VELUM 3, p. 363. Propert. 3, 9, 30 *velorum plenos subtrahis ipse sinus*; Ovid trist. 3, 4, 32 *propositique, precor, contrahe vela tui*; ex Pont. 1, 8, 72 *et voti, quaeso, contrahe vela tui*; Sen. d. 9, 4, 7 *cogiturque vela contrahere*; epigr. 17, 7 (PLM. 4, 61 Baehr.) *contrahe vela*; Claud. 8, 325 *disce . . . ubi cornua tendi | aequius aut iterum flecti*. Hier. adv. Iovin. 1, 3 (M. 23, 224) *paulisper sinus contraham*.

VELUM 4. Sen. ep. 30, 3 *magnus gubernator et scisso navigat velo*; compare Ovid ex Pont. 2, 3, 58 *et quoniam non sunt ea qualia velles, | vela regis quassae qualiacunque ratis*.

VENIRE, p. 363. Compare Sen. d. 2, 2, 2 *non intellegebant se, dum vendunt, et venire*.

VENTER 1, p. 363. Ennod. p. 404, 7 (H.): *pinguia nam tenuem suffocant corpora sensum*; Othlo lib. prov. 9 (M. 146, 316 A) *incrassata caro gustat coelestia raro*; Ps.-Baeda (M. 90, 1099).

VENTER 2, p. 364. Theobald. Stamp. ep. 4 (M. 163, 766 A) *venter satur facile disputat de ieiuniis*; B. Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1105).

VENTER 3, p. 364. Ennod. c. 2, 68, 3 *mandare pergis, sed venter commoda nescit*.

VENTUS 1, p. 364. Sen. ep. 99, 9 *omni tempestate mobilis*.

¹Kurtz, p. 311.

²Grammaticae in Sulpic. Sev. *Observationes*, Paris, 1883.

VENTUS 2, p. 364. Tibull. (Lygdam.) 3, 6, 49 periura ridet amantum | Iuppiter et ventos irrita ferre iubet; Ovid a. a. 1, 388 nec mea dicta rapax per mare ventus agit; Stat. Theb. 2, 286 irrita ventosae rapiebant verba procellae; Paulin. Nol. 10, 114 surda vocas et nulla rogas, levis hoc ferat aura | quod datur in nihilum, sine numine nomina Musas, | irrita ventosae rapiunt haec vota procellae; Commod. carm. apol. 75 clamamus in vacuum surdis referenda procellis; Notiz. d. scavi 1888, 519 (Carm. Epigr. 950, 3 B) i nunc, ventis tua gaudia, pupula, crede; compare Iuven. 12, 57 i nunc et ventis animam committere; Ioh. Sar. ep. 247 (M. 199, 291 D) me ventis verba dedisse, res iudicat.

VENTUS 5, p. 366. Sen. ben. 7, 23, 1 qui . . . anteirent, cursibus auras; Sedat. ep. ad Ruric. 8, p. 450, 14 (Eng.) celeritate ventos et flumina praecursurum; Aldh. de sept. aenigm. 14 D (M. 89, 198): Zephyri velocior alis; Nemes. e. 4, 14 rapidisque fugacior euris; Alcuin poet. Carol. 1, 257, 44 D. velocior euro; ep. 200 (688 Dümmler); Theodulph. 1, 527, 35, 13; Hildebert. (M. 171, 1354 A) et velut aura fugit;¹ Diomed. ars gram. 2 p. 461, 23 (K.) velocior euro; anthol. Pal. 16, 54, 4 τέχνη πνεύματος ὠκύτερα; see C. H. Müller, l. c. p. 17.

VENTUS 6, Szel. p. 16. Compare Hier. ep. 138, 1 tuis litteris . . . cognovi ventosque esse contrarios.

VENTUS 7, Szel. p. 31; compare Apost. 12, 100 ὄρνις ζητείς, ἀνέμους θηρεύσεις: ἐπὶ τῶν μάτην κοπιῶντων; Ioh. Sar. ep. 170 (M. 199, 163 C) ut opinione plebeia ventos sequereris in fastu mundano.

VENTUS 8. CIL. 4, 1049 (carm. epigr. 944 B.) alliget hic auras si quis obiurgat amantes. Compare Zenob. 3, 17 δικτύφ ἀνεμον θηράν; Diogen. 2, 40.

VENTUS 9. Columban. serm. 7, 2 (M. 80, 243) in vanum ergo laborat qui talia pascit et in ventum seminat; Alcuin moral. 25, 141 (M. 101, 632 A) in vanum laborat et in ventum seminat; compare HARENA 4, Otto.

[VENTUS 10. Ovid rem. am. 14 gaudeat et vento naviget ille suo; trist. 3, 5, 4 nave mea suo, forsan, eunte vento may be held quasi-proverbial.]

VERBUM 1, p. 366. Compare Philemon 37 (incert. fab. 11, 2) τὸν μὴ λέγοντα τῶν δεόντων μηδὲ ἐν | μακρὸν νόμιζε κἂν δὴ εἶπη συλλαβᾶς; so in Greek τέτταρα is used of a small number; see Blaydes to Aristoph. Acharn. 3 and F. Marion Crawford, *Marietta, a Maid of Venice*, Macmillan, 1901, p. 344, who notes a similar

¹ Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 456.

use of the number four in modern Italian. For the use of *tres* for a small number in Latin compare Catull. 79, 4 *si tria notorum savia reppererit*; Plaut. Most. 357 *trium nummum causa*; for further remarks on the hyperbole of diminution see Egli p. 10.¹

VERBUM 2, p. 367. Rufin. Aquil. apol. 1, 334 (M. 21, 563) *verbum ex verbo transferre*; Hier. ep. 28, 5 *verbum interpretatur ad verbum*; in M. 23, 1075 C *de verbo ad verbum transtulimus*; adv. Rufin. 1, 19 (M. 23, 432 A); 2, 29 (473 C); ep. 106, 3; 112, 22; 121, 10; adv. Ioh. Hier. 38. Greg. Magn. ep. 1, 29 (M. 77, 483) *verbum ex verbo*.

VERBUM 3, p. 367. Sulpic Sev. ep. de virgin. p. 247, 15 (H.) *lapis emissus est sermo prolatus*; correct citation of Augustin. 142, 3 (Sonny, ALL. 9, 79) to ep. 143, 4 (M. 33, 536); Valerian. homil. 5 (M. 52, 707 B) *verborum vero iactus non revocari potest*.

VERBUM 5 (compare VERBUM 1). Plaut. Rud. 652 *uno verbo absolvam: lenost*. Merc. 602 *uno verbo eloquere*. Ter. Eun. 178 *labascit victus uno verbo quam cito*; Andr. 45; Cato r. r. 157, 7; Catull. 67, 15 *non istuc satis est uno te dicere verbo*; Cic. Phil. 2, 54 *uno verbo*; Ovid am. 2, 16, 11 *verbo peccavimus uno*; Tac. ann. 1, 42 *Divus Iulius seditionem exercitus verbo uno compecscuit*; Plin. ep. 7, 6, 11 *permittas mihi unum verbum adicere*; Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 11, p. 55, 28 (Reiff.).

VERBUM 6. Cato. frag. (Jord. p. 80, 2) *rem tene, verba sequentur*; compare Hor. a. p. 311 *verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur*, and Porphyryon's remarks.

VERBUM 7. Arnob. adv. nat. 1, 22, p. 15, 16 (Reiff.) *verba sunt haec, verba sunt*; Sen. ben. 5, 20, 6 *verba sunt ista*.

VERBUM 8. Paulin. Nol. ep. 29, 9, p. 256, 5 (H.) *nemini parvulum suum verbo, ut dici solet, alendum erudiendum tuendum mandare dignata est*.

VERBUM 9. Ioh. Sar. metal. 1, 16 (M. 199, 846 B) *servi comici utetur proverbio: bona verba quaeso*; Ter. Andr. 204 *bona verba quaeso*; Tibull. 2, 2, 1 *dicamus bona verba*; see Heraeus Petron. p. 37.

VERITAS 3, p. 368. Ioh. Sar. ep. 193 (M. 199, 211 D) *sed frequens est et multis vulgatum exemplis quia veritas odium parit*; Petr. Cell. ep. 171 (M. 202, 622 B) *attamen quia veritas odium parit, digito compesco labellum*; Ter. Andr. 68 is cited by Rather.

¹ Die Hyperbel in den Komödien des Plautus und in Cic. Briefen an Atticus, Zug 1891.

Ver. praeoq. 3 prol. (M. 136, 219 B); Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1104).

VERITAS 4 (compare SALUS). Apul. met. 8, 7 multis caritatis nominibus veritatem ipsam fallere.

VERRES, as a type of a political rascal; Iuven. 3, 53 carus erit Verri, qui Verrem tempore quo vult | accusare potest; cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 500 D).

VERUS, p. 368. Sen. ep. 66, 8 verius vero; compare ep. 66, 28 plano nihil est planius; Diogen. 4, 22 Δίκης δικαιοτέρος; anthol. Pal. 12, 62, 2 κάλλιον ἢ τὸ καλόν.

VERVEX, p. 369. Apul. met. 8, 25 vervecem, inquit, non asinum vides; Ioh. Sar. ep. 273 (M. 199, 319 B) ut Franciam nostram vervecum patriam credas, et Francos esse verveces.

VESPA, p. 369. With Otto's remarks compare the words of Baeda ep. 2 (M. 94, 664 A) quibus apte convenit illud vulgi proverbium quia vespae favos quidem facere cum possint non tamen in his mella sed potius venena thesaurizent. This is slightly at variance with Otto's explanation *leere, untaugliche*. The *favi* of bees and wasps look alike but are radically different; 'Satan sometimes appears as an angel of light'.

VESPER, p. 369. See Crusius, Herond. p. 14.

VIA 9. Sentent. Varronis 88 (Riese) nescit quo tendat, qui multas sequitur semitas; 92 nusquam deveniet qui quot videt sequitur calles.

VICINUS 1, p. 370. Compare Florus 416, 2 (PLM. 4, 347) sed malos faciunt malorum falsa contubernia.

VINCERE 1, p. 371. Ovid fast. 1, 523 victa tamen vinces, eversa que Troia resurges; Paulin. Nol. ep. 24, 17, p. 217, 13 (H.) victus vero vinces; compare Plin. n. h. 24, 5 vincendo victi sumus; Ps.-Lactant. de mort. persec. 16, p. 190, 5 (Brandt) hic est verus triumphus cum dominatores dominantur; Optat. Mil. 6, 8, p. 157, 7 (Ziwsa) captivae liberas capiunt et mortuae viventes occidunt; Plaut. Epid. 359 iam ipse cautor captust; Rud. 1262 praeda praedam duceret; Ovid a. a. 1, 84; anthol. Pal. 9, 94, 5 ἀγρευθεὶς ἴγρευσεν; Byzant. Spr. 44, ἐγίνετ' ὁ ἐνάγων ἐναγόμενος;¹ see Koch p. 55.

VINCERE 2, p. 371. Pubil.-Syr. 654 cum sese vincit rapiens, minime vincitur; 398 non vincitur, sed vincit qui cedit suis; Calp. Flacc. decl. 21 cede fratri, cede vel patri; victor eris, mihi crede, si cesseris.

¹ Krumbacher, Sitz.-Ber. München, Akad., 1887, p. 70.

VINUM 2, p. 372. Eustath. Il. 710, 14 *οἶνος ἀνδρὸς ἴδειξε νόον*; Il. 740, 14 *οἶνος καὶ ἀλήθεια*;¹ Maxim. Planud. prov. 10 *ἐξ ἀνοήτου καὶ μεθύοντος μαθήση τὸ ἀληθές*; Alc. frag. 53, *οἶνος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους δίοπτρον*; Aesch. frag. 384 *κάτοπτρον εἶδους χαλκός ἐστ', οἶνος δὲ νοῦ*; see Tribukait p. 3.

VIPERA 1, p. 372; see Crusius, Herond. p. 127; cf. Gaufrid. ep. 32 (M. 89, 861 C) *haec est inimica Deo . . . haec est mus in pera, ignis in sinu, serpens in gremio*; Evagr. sent. (M. 20, 1183 B) *non remoretur scorpius in sinu tuo*.

VIPERA 4; as a term of reproach. Afran 282 (Ribb.¹); Iuven. 6, 641 *saevissima vipera*; Flor. 2, 30, 38 *tandem, inquit, vipera sibilare desisti*; see Donat. on Ter. Eun. 5, 1, 9; J. Koch, p. 23; compare ASINUS and CANIS.

VIR, p. 373. Curt. 6, 11, 25 (Philotas) *credite mihi et nos, si viri sumus, a diis adoptabimur*; Petron. 113 *si vir fueris, non ibis ad spintriam*; Ter. Adel. 934 *si tu sis homo*; Adel. 107 *et tu illum tuom, si esses homo, sineres nunc facere*; Sid. Apoll. ep. 5, 10, 4 *si quid hominis habet*; Tertull. adv. nat. 17, p. 70, 26 (Wiss.) *veni, si quis es, demerge ferrum in infantem*; Gualbert. act. 382 (M. 146, 958) *si vere viri estis*; compare Petron. 81 *nam aut vir ego liberque non sum, aut noxis sanguine parentabo*; Sen. ep. 51, 12 *quisquis vir est*; Plaut. epid. 493 *pugnasti, homo's*; schol. Pers. 1, 87 *an tu, Romane, vir non es*; see Crusius, Untersuch. zu Herond. p. 100 and compare MULIER 5.

VIRTUS 1, p. 373. Sen. d. 7, 9, 4 *quid petam ex virtute? ipsam . . . est ipsa pretium sui*; ben. 4, 1, 3 *rerum honestarum pretium in ipsis est*; clem. 1, 1, 1 *nec ullum virtutum pretium dignum illis extra ipsas sit*; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1346 (M. 171, 1421 A) *virtutem pretium qui putet esse sui*; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 60, 77 (M. 211, 353) *ibi virtus est pretium sui*; for the opposite idea note Ovid met. 2, 782 (*invidia*) *suppliciumque suum est*; Ps.-Sen. de mor. 64 (Haase) *nequitia ipsa sui poena est*; Sen. ep. 81, 22 (Attalus): *malitia ipsa maximam partem veneni sui bibit*; see SCELUS.

VIRTUS 4, p. 374. Ovid trist. 4, 3, 80 *apparet virtus arguiturque malis*. Compare Sen. d. 5, 8, 6 *iratus cito sine adversario desiit*; Ovid ex Pont. 2, 3, 53 *et bene uti pugnes, bene pugnans efficit hostis*.

VITA 1, p. 374. Lucan 5, 739 *vita mihi dulcior*; Iuven. 13, 180

¹ Kurtz, p. 316.

vita iucundius ipsa; Catull. 68, 106; Petron. 84, 1 (PLM. 4, 92); anth. Pal. suppl. 2, 432, 1; CIL. 10, 7570, 5; anthol. Lat. 474, 1; CIL. 14, 3940 (carm. epigr. 1214, 6 B) non delecta magis qu[o mihi vita fuit]; Gualbert. act. 224 (M. 146, 898 B) fratrem qui te, ut suam diligit vitam; Ovid trist. 5, 14, 2 o mihi me coniunx carior; Plaut. Truc. 887 quem ego, ecastor, mage amo quam me; Ter. Adel. 39 quod sit carius quam ipse et sibi; Curt. 6, 4, 11 carior spiritu; anthol. Lat. 1, 669, 3 R. carior vita ipsa; Claud. 26, 308 (Jeep) hic carior omni luce gener; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 455 and 459; compare ANIMUS 1.

VITIUM 2, p. 376. Compare Apost. 16, 49 τὴν Χάρυβδι ἐκφυγὼν τῇ Σκύλλῃ περιέπεσον.

VITIUM 3. Compare Liv. 22, 12 adfingens vicina virtutibus vitia; Sen. clem. 1, 3, 1 nam cum sint vitia quaedam virtutes imitantia; Ovid a. a. 2, 662 et lateat vitium proximitate boni; rem. am. 323 et mala sunt vicina bonis; see H. Koch II., p. 15.

VITRUM 1. Compare Ovid met. 13, 795 lucidior glacie; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 4 (M. 89, 696 B) candidior crystallo.

VIVERE 3. Othlo lib. prov. 12 (M. 146, 318 A) militia est vita hominis super terram; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1101); cf. Ovid a. a. 2, 233 militiae species amor est; cf. am. 1, 9.

VIVERE 5, p. 377. Pers. 4, 52 tecum habita, cited also by Petr. Bles. ep. 107 (M. 207, 331 C); Hor. sat. 2, 7, 112 adde quod idem | non horam tecum esse potes; Gualbert. act. 267 (M. 146, 915 A) secumque, ut dicitur, vivere; Aristot. Eth. Nicom. 9, 4 συνδιάγειν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐαυτῷ βούλεται.

VIVERE 6, (compare DIES 8.) Mart. 1, 15, 12 sera nimis vita est crastina; vive hodie; inscrip. Hisp. 391 vivete victuri moneo mors omnibus instat. Gruter inscrip. 1, p. 609 (Orelli 4807) dum vivimus, vivamus; (Orelli 4806) vivere in dies et horas; Petr. Dam. ep. 2, 13, 76 (M. 144, 279) a quibus scilicet haec saepe dicuntur; vive dum vivis.

VIVERE 7. Iuven. 8, 84 propter vitam vivendi perdere causas; Plin. ep. 5, 5, 4 nam qui voluptatibus dediti quasi in diem vivunt, vivendi causas cotidie finiunt, cited by Ioh. Sar. ep. 207 (M. 199 232 A) and by Petr. Bles. ep. 85 (M. 207, 361 A); Iuven. 8, 84 by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 9, 8 (M. 199, 739 A); ep. 186 (196 D) qui ut qualitercumque vivant, vivendi . . . abiiciunt causas; compare Iul. Val. p. 169, 18 (Kübler) quibus tamen informamur ad bene vivendum ut vivendi omnino causas et remedia non perdamus.

VIVERE 8. Vergil *Aen.* 3, 653 *vixi, et quem dederat cursum Fortuna, peregi*, became a semi-proverbial quotation; Sen. *ep.* 12, 9; *d.* 7, 19, 1; *CIL.* 11, 3752; 12, 287; 14, 316; compare Hor. *c.* 3, 29, 41 *ille potens sui | laetusque deget, cui licet in diem | dixisse 'vixi'*.

VIVUS 6. Ovid *trist.* 5, 7, 17 *verissima Martis imago*; Claudian 26, 468 *verus ductor adest et vivida Martis imago*.

VOLUPTAS. Plaut. *Amphitr.* 635 *voluptatem ut maeror comes sequatur*; Fronto *ep.* 4, 9, p. 71, 19 (Nab.) *est igitur vera Socrati opinio, doloribus ferme voluptatibus conexas esse*; Symmach. *ep.* 4, 34, 2 *legem natura dixit ut curae voluptatem sequantur*.

VOX 1, p. 378. Hier. *ad Augustin. ep.* 165, 1 (M. 33, 719) *viva, ut aiunt, voce*; Braulio *ep.* 12 (M. 80, 659 B) *nam habet nescio quid latentis energiae viva vox*; Greg. *pap.* III. *ep.* 5 (M. 89, 583 A) *viva voce*; Aldh. *ep.* 4 (M. 89, 95); *ep.* 10 (99); *ep.* 12 (101); Alcuin *ep.* 18 (M. 100, 171); *ep.* 145 (388 A); Udalr. *ep.* 1 (M. 141, 1322); *ep.* 2 (1323); Petr. Dam. *ep.* 6, 13 (M. 144, 397); 6, 23 (408); 8, 1 (462) *vivae conversationis*; *serm.* 17, 85 (594) *viva vox*; Gualbert. *act.* 62 (M. 146, 788 D); Anselm. *Cant. ep.* 2, 18 (M. 159, 45 B); Theob. *Stamp. ep.* 2 (M. 163, 764 C); Thom. *Cant. ep.* 7 (M. 190, 447 C); *ep.* 30 (492 C); *ep.* 39 (500 B); *ep.* 41 (502 D); *ep.* 130 (604 C); *amic. ad Thom. Cant. ep.* 463 (1028 A); Foliot. *ep.* 185 (887 C); Wibald. *Stab. ep.* 3 (M. 189, 1129 D); Ioh. Sar. *ep.* 324 (M. 199, 375 D); Polycrat. 3, 11 (499 C); Phil. Harv. *ep.* 12 (M. 203, 97 D); Petr. Bles. *ep.* 132 (M. 207, 391 C); Adam. *Pers. ep.* 6 (M. 211, 599 and 600); compare Sisebut. *ep.* 1, 5 (M. 80, 366) *vivida voce increpatus*; Bonifat. *Mogunt. ep.* 30 (M. 89, 728) *viva verba*; Ennod. p. 412, 24 (H.) *qui, ut aiunt, viva hominum testimonia non formidant*; Symmach. *ep.* 5, 32, 1 *iucunditatem vivi sermonis*; Alcuin *ep.* 32 (p. 244 Dümmler) *viva voce*; *ep.* 39 (259); 90 (379); 133 (523); 150 (569); 196 (681).

VOX 3. Petr. Bles. *ep.* 15 (M. 207, 54 C) *scriptum est; vox populi, vox Dei*.

VULPES 1, p. 397. Ioh. Sar. *ep.* 193 (M. 199, 212 C) *in pelle vulpeculae laborat improbitas*; Hor. *a. p.* 437 is cited *ep.* 290 (334 B) and Polycrat. 6, 29 (634 D); compare Hier. in *Rufin.* 3, 7 (M. 23, 484 B) *vulpecularum insidias Pacian. ep.* 2 (M. 13, 1058 D) *fraus enim quasi vulpeculae, vis autem leonis est*; Ioh. Sar. *ep.* 202 (M. 199, 225 C) citing Ofellus: *qui coarat vulpi sulcos variare necesse est*. For Greek parallels see J. Koch, p. 17.

VULPES 2, p. 379. Maxim. Taurin. homil. 87 (M. 57, 452) (haeretici) sunt enim sicut vulpes dolosi . . . omnis haereticus mutat verba, sed non mores; Ioh. Sar. ep. 202 (M. 199, 225 C) utique vetus proverbium est; vulpem posse mutare pilum, non animum; Polycrat. 3, 14 (510 C); cf. Hier. ep. 22, 16 nunc vero tantum veste mutata pristina non mutata ambitio.

VULCANUS, Sonny, ALL. 8, 493. Cassiod. var. 5, 1, 2 enses qui pulchritudine sui putentur esse Vulcani.

VULTURIUS 1, p. 379. Aemil. Scaur. in Q. Caep. (Meyer p. 240): nefarius vulturius, patriae parricida. Compare Ovid tr. 1, 6, 11 and C. H. Müller, p. 52.

M. C. SUTPHEN.¹

¹Owing to the death of Dr. Sutphen, on Aug. 31, 1901, the last three numbers of this article did not receive the benefit of his own revising hand. See p. 392 of this Journal.

NECROLOGY.

MORRIS CRATER SUTPHEN.

MAY 4, 1869—AUGUST 31, 1901.

MORRIS CRATER SUTPHEN, son of Eleanor B. and the late Morris S. Sutphen, was born in the city of New York on the fourth of May, 1869. He received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Princeton College in 1890 and in 1893, the degree of Master of Arts. After a course of special study in the classics, preceded by four years of service as teacher in the Morris Academy, at Morristown, New Jersey, and interrupted by two years of service as Instructor in Latin in Williams College, he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Johns Hopkins University in June, 1899, and was immediately appointed an Instructor in Latin in the same institution. On the evening of Saturday, August 31, 1901, he was returning from a short trip with some friends when the small cat-boat, containing the party, struck Highlands bridge, which spans the Shrewsbury river near Oceanic, New Jersey, and was instantly capsized. The accident occurred only a short distance from the shore and Sutphen was a good swimmer, but after a brief interval he was seen to sink without a struggle. He was buried at Morristown, the home of his mother.

Dr. Sutphen was a scholar of brilliant and rapid fulfilment as well as of rare promise. Upon his appointment he was at once associated in the advanced work and gave a course of lectures on a theme suggested by the subject of his dissertation, 'A Study of the Diction and Phraseology of L. Annaeus Seneca with special reference to the *Sermo Cotidianus*'—left in MS at the time of his death. Only the first number of his 'Further Contributions to a Collection of Latin Proverbs' could receive the benefit of his own final revision. An article on 'Magic in Theokritos and Vergil'—also left in MS—was his contribution to the 'Studies in Honor of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve' (pp. 315-327). It seems fitting to bear witness here to his labor of love upon that volume, to the ardent enthusiasm, the tireless energy which, as secretary of the editorial committee, he devoted to its inception and furtherance.

To the world at large, his early and tragic death must needs bring home the pathos of youth summoned to resign the fruition of its hopes and all its dreams of the future; to those friends who knew the strength and sweetness of his character, to the writer of these lines, with whom he was closely associated in work and in life, his loss comes as a lasting and personal bereavement.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

II.—THE TORCH-RACE.

A COMMENTARY ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AISCHYLOS

VV. 324-326.¹

Τὸ σὸν γὰρ ἄνθος, παντέχνοῦ πυρὸς σέλας,
θηητοῖσι κλέψας ὤπασεν·

* * *

τὰ δ' ἱερὰ νύκτωρ ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν τελεῖς;
νύκτωρ τὰ πολλά· σεμνότητ' ἔχει σκότος·

To-day athletic exercises are advocated for the most part for hygienic rather than for artistic, religious, or political reasons; that is, they are valued merely as a means for the promotion of health and the general development of the physique, in order that the growth of both mind and body may be symmetrical. The art of gymnastics as practiced among the ancient Greeks was in striking contrast with these our modern views and aims. For the object of Hellenic Gymnastics was partly purely artistic, and hence Gymnastic necessarily led to Agonistic; partly religious, and consequently the art was intimately connected with the Mythos and with popular beliefs and superstitions; partly political, and hence while it was for the present an index to the patriotic sentiments of the *νεολαία* and an evidence of noble and praiseworthy endeavor on their part, it also gave promise to the state of the future of a race of citizens distinguished for mental and physical power and moral force. Among the Hellenic contests or *ἀγῶνες*, in which the right to participate was conditioned by a highly developed and almost perfect physique, must be reckoned the Lampas or Torch-race. But whereas the gymnic agon was professedly secular or political in its tendency, the Lampas, being so intimately connected with religious tradition and mythos, was

¹ τοιοῦτε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι
ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλον διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι·
νικῆ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.

spiritual or religious. The Lampas or Torch-race is purely Hellenic in its origin, and can not be traced back to the Orient or to Egypt, as can so many features of Hellenic religion.¹

What was the torch-race? This question must suggest itself to every reader of the fire-signals of Aischylos, to every one, at least, who endeavors to understand his author thoroughly. The answers given by the exegetes to his natural curiosity on the subject only serve to create in him a feeling of perplexed dissatisfaction. This question, it is hoped, will be answered in all its bearings in the following pages.

The origin of the torch-race may be traced to the desire on the part of mankind to express their gratitude to Titan Prometheus by the institution of a festival in his honor which should illustrate in a characteristic and striking manner the way in which the human race became possessed of the civilizing element of fire.

For legends tell us that Prometheus, having stolen fire from heaven, concealed it in a reed and ran back to earth as swiftly as his heels could carry him, swinging the reed to and fro as he ran in order to keep alive the precious spark. It was in commemoration of this course of Prometheus from heaven to earth² that the popular festival of the torch-race was instituted, a simple but appropriate memorial-feast in honor of him, who, by his happy theft, had become the father of all civilization and the original institutor of the arts and sciences which beautify and ennoble human life, and which owe their existence to the moulding and purifying influence of fire.³ It must be admitted, however, that

¹ Gymnastic games were held, it is true, by the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs*, etc. II, p. 293), and Herodotos mentions a fire-festival celebrated in honor of Neith, especially at Sais, but also in the rest of Egypt as well: ἐς Σάιν δὲ πόλιν ἐπεὶ ἀν συλλεχθῆωσι, τῆς θυσίης ἐν τῇ νύκτι λίχνα καίουσι πάντες πολλὰ ὑπαιθρία περὶ τὰ δώματα κύκλω. . . . καὶ τῇ ὀρθῇ ὄνομα κέεται λυχνοκαίη. οἱ δ' ἂν μὴ ἔλθωσι τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐς τὴν πανήγυριν ταύτην, φυλάσσοντες τὴν νύκτα τῆς θυσίης καίουσι καὶ αὐτοὶ πάντες τὰ λίχνα, καὶ οὕτω οὐκ ἐν Σαί μόνῃ καίεται ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ πάσαν Αἰγυπτου, Hdt. II, 62; but it is clear that these festivals were in no way akin to the Lampas of Greece.

² Hygini *Astronomicon* 2.15: Itaque caeteris remotis venit ad Iovis ignem, quo diminuto et in ferulam coniecto, lactus, ut volare, non currere videretur, ferulam iactans, ne spiritus interclusus vaporibus extingueret in angustia lumen. Praeterea totum a certatione ludorum cursoribus instituerunt ex Promethei consuetudine, ut currerent lampadem iactantes. Cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1122 and *Soph. Oed. Col.* 56.

³ Aesch. *Prom.* 109 sqq.: ναμθηκοπλήρωτον δὲ θηρῶμαι πυρὸς πηγὴν κλοπαίαν, ἢ διδάσκαλος τέχνης πάσης βροτοῖς πέφηνε καὶ μέγας πρόρος.

the running and swinging of the reed is a fiction of comparatively late date. Hesiod knows nothing about it, and simply relates the theft of the fire and its concealment in a hollow reed.¹ But still, be this as it may, the very details of the contest, that is, a race and lighted torches, make it reasonably certain that the theft of fire and the course of Prometheus is the original idea of the Lampas.²

Still another very satisfactory reason why Prometheus should be honored by a *gymnastic festival* is given by Philostratos, who tells us that Prometheus was the originator of gymnastics in general, for, having made men of clay, he found it necessary to put them through a course of gymnastic exercise, in order that their clay bodies might become supple and be fused into a compactly united and congruent whole.³

From the cult of Titan Prometheus the Lampas soon passed over into and became a fixed factor in the festivals of the other fire-gods. Naturally it was first adopted into the cult of Hephaistos. For as the God of the forge he was the first to apply fire to metals,

¹ Hes. Opp. 48 sqq.: κρύψε δὲ πῦρ· τὸ μὲν αὐτίς ἐς παῖς Ἰαπετοῖο ἐκλεψ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς πάρα μητιέντος ἐν κοίλῳ νάρθηκι, λαθὼν Δία τερπικέρανον, and Hes. Theog. 566 sqq.: ἀλλὰ μιν ἐξαπάτησεν ἐς παῖς Ἰαπετοῖο, κλέψας ἀκαμάτοιο πυρὸς τηλέσκοπον ἀγῆν ἐν κοίλῳ νάρθηκι.

² It is in this character that the terms *δαδοῦχος* and *πυρφόρος* are applied to him, so Philostr. vit. Sophist. Teubn. ed. II, p. 104: ὑψηλὴν ἄρον, ἀνδρῶπε, τὴν δῆδα. τί βιάσῃ καὶ κατάγει κάτω καὶ βασανίζεις τὸ πῦρ; οὐράνιον ἐστίν, αἰθέριον ἐστίν, πρὸς τὸ ξυγγενὲς ἔρχεται τὸ πῦρ. οὐ κατάγει νεκροῦς, ἀλλ' ἀνάγει θεοῦς. ἰὼ Προμηθεῦ δαδοῦχε καὶ πυρφόρε, οἶά σου τὸ δῶρον ὑβρίζεται· νεκροῖς ἀναισθήτοις ἀναμίγνυται. ἐπάρησον βοήθησον κλέψον, εἰ δυνατόν, κάκειθεν τὸ πῦρ. This is spoken against burial by fire. It seems that Kallias, a member of the wealthy and distinguished Athenian family in which the dignity of *δαδοῦχος* in the Eleusinian mysteries was hereditary, had forbidden burial by fire, on the ground that the heavenly element became polluted by contact with dead bodies. Compare also Soph. Oed. Col. 56: ἐν δ' ὁ πυρφόρος θεὸς Τιτῶν Προμηθεύς.

³ Philostr. Teubn. ed. II, p. 270: . . . γένεσις δὲ αὐτῆς (viz. γυμναστικῆς) τὸ φῶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπον παλαιᾶσαι τε ἱκανὸν καὶ πικτεῦσαι καὶ δραμεῖν ὀρθόν . . . οὕτως ἡγώμεθα καὶ τὴν γυμναστικὴν ξυγγενεστάτην τε εἶναι καὶ συμφῶν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. καὶ λόγος δὲ ἄρεται τις, ὡς γυμναστικὴ μὲν ὅπως εἴη, Προμηθεύς δὲ εἴη καὶ γυμνάσαστο μὲν ὁ Προμηθεύς πρῶτος, . . . καὶ οἱ πλασθέντες δὲ ἐκ (πηλοῦ ὑπὸ) Προμηθεύς ἀνθρώποισι οἶδε ἄρα [αὐτοῖς] εἰεν οἱ (ἐν) τῷ πηλῷ γυμνασάμενοι [ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν], (οὐς) πλάττεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Προμηθεύς ᾤοντο ἐπειδὴ τὰ σώματα αὐτοῖς ἡ γυμναστικὴ ἐπιτήδειά τε καὶ ξυγκείμενα ἐποιεῖ. Here may also be added the words of Prometheus in Lucian, Prom. 13: καὶ τὸ ζημίωμα ὀρθῆς ἤλικον, εἰ ἐκ πηλοῦ ζῶσα ἐποίησα καὶ τὸ τέως ἀκίνητον ἐς κίνησιν ἤγαγον.

and to teach men how to melt and mould metal at will.¹ His whole handicraft was dependent on and conditioned by an accurate knowledge of the power of fire and its influence on metals. Consequently it is easily conceivable that the devotees of the divine blacksmith should honor him by a festival so appropriate and to which he had so valid a claim. In fact nothing more is known concerning the Hephaisteia than that a torch-race was held at their celebration.²

Athene took up fire where Hephaistos left it and, carrying its use still a step further, taught men what fire could do when applied to the other useful and ornamental arts. In an ideal sense she represents the fire of heaven, the divine godlike light that illuminates all things both in the physical world and in the world of thought. She was also originally a typification of the lightning which burst forth from the thunder-clouds of her father Zeus. It was through the connivance and actual assistance of Athene that Prometheus was enabled to scale the heights of heaven; and according to some it was she who lighted the torch for him at the chariot wheel of Helios (cf. Serv. ad Verg. Eclog. VI, 42). Being thus so intimately connected with Prometheus it is not surprising to find her honored with a torch-race.

These three, Prometheus, Hephaistos, and Athene, were the fire-gods properly speaking. From their service the Lampas soon passed over into the cults of the light-gods Artemis-Bendis and Pan.

The cultus of Artemis-Bendis originated in the worship of the

¹ Harpokration s. v. λαμπάς: Ἴστρος δ' ἐν πρώτῃ τῶν Ἀτθίδων, εἰπὼν ὡς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀπατουρίων ἑορτῇ Ἀθηναίων οἱ καλλίστας στολὰς ἐνδεδυκότες, λαβόντες ἡμένας λαμπάδας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας, ἕμνοῦσι τὸν Ἡφαίστον θέοντες (so Valesius for MS θύοντες), ἰπόμνημα τοῦ κατανοήσαντα (so Bekker for MS κατανοήσαντος, which is due to the scribe who did not notice that τοῦ belonged to the infinitive) τὴν χρείαν τοῦ πυρὸς διδάξαι τοὺς ἄλλους (he taught others after he had learned himself). And similarly Photios s. v. λαμπάδος: Ἴστρος δὲ φησὶν λαμπάδα νομίσει ποιεῖν πρῶτον Ἀθηναίους, Ἡφαίστῳ θύοντας (compare the θέοντες in the passage just cited from Harpokration. Both Photios and Suidas have θύοντας, but this is clearly a corruptela for the correct θέοντας seeing that the whole passage of Istros has been badly garbled by both Suidas and Photios), ἰπόμνημα τοῦ κατανοήσαντος τὴν χρείαν τοῦ πυρὸς διδάξαι τοὺς ἄλλους. And Suidas s. v. λαμπάδος in the same words.

² So Themist. de Theod. human.: φωνῆς νικώσης τῷ τάχει τὴν τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ τελομένην λαμπαδηφορίαν. C. I. A. III, III: Ἡφαίστια τοὺς ἐφήβους λαμπάδα νικῶσας, etc. Other passages will be cited in the sequel.

moon,¹ as did that of her brother Apollo in the worship of the sun. It is in her character of moon-goddess that a torch-race was held in her honor.²

But that the place of honor among these deities was accorded to Prometheus is clear from the Scholiast to Sophocles, who informs us that in the Academy at Athens there was an *old building* (παλαιὸν ἱδρυμα) with an altar, where Prometheus, Hephaistos, and Athene were all worshiped in common. Now near the entrance to this building there was an *old* pedestal on which

¹ Her epithet of *δίλογχος*, as some thought, was applied to her, because, being the Moon, she had two lights, her own moonlight and the reflected light of the sun; cf. Hesych. s. v. *δίλογχος*: οἱ δὲ διὰ δύο φῶτα ἔχει, τὸ ἴδιον καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου. τὴν γὰρ σελήνην Βενδὴν καὶ Ἀρτεμιν νομίζουσιν.

² There is no lack of examples of the introduction of strange gods into Greece, especially during the Hellenistic period, when Baal of Tarsos and Jehovah of the Jews enjoyed equal honors with Zeus of Hellas. In most cases the worship of such strange gods was confined to a limited number of votaries, and their cults were tolerated at the outset simply as cults in which private persons alone were interested. But with the lapse of time the religious sentiment of the Greeks grew less exclusive, and many foreign cults were formally recognized by the state and accorded a place of honor in the long list of national fasti. As instances may be cited the cults of Bendis, Anubis, Attys, Mithras, and Men, the Moon-God of Syria, all of whom, much to the disgust of Hermes and Zeus in Lucian, were the happy possessors of statues of solid gold, very heavy and very valuable, while the rats could hold high carnival in the hollow cavities of the wooden ξόανα or chryselephantine statues of the Olympic Gods (Luc. Iup. Trag. § 8: εὐκασιῶν, ὦ Ζεῦ, οἱ βαρβαρικοὶ προεδρεύουσιν μόνοι· ὡς τοὺς γε Ἑλληνας ὁρᾷς ὁποῖοί εἰσι, χαρίεντες μὲν καὶ εὐπρόσωποι καὶ κατὰ τέχνην ἐσχηματισμένοι, λίθινοι δὲ ἢ χαλκοὶ ὁμοίως ἅπαντες ἢ οἱ γε πολυτελέστατοι αὐτῶν ἐλεφάντινοι ὀλίγον ὄσον τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἀποστίλβοντες, ὡς ἐπιτεκνωθεῖν καὶ ἐπηλυγῆσθαι μόνον, τὰ δὲ ἔνδον ὑπέβυλοι καὶ οὗτοι, μῶν ἀγέλας βλας ἐμπολιτευομένης σκέποντες· ἢ Βενδὴς δὲ αὐτῆ καὶ ὁ Ἄνουβις ἐκεῖνοσὶ καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἄττις καὶ ὁ Μείθρης καὶ ὁ Μῆν ὄλοι ὀλόχρυσοι καὶ βαρεῖς καὶ πολυτίμητοι ὡς ἀληθῶς). Strabo, not to mention St. Paul, calls especial attention to the remarkable hospitality of the Athenians towards strange Gods (Strab. p. 471: Ἀθηναῖοι δ' ὥσπερ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλοξενούντες διατελοῦσιν, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τοὺς θεούς. πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν ξενικῶν ἱερῶν παρεδέξαντο ὥστε καὶ ἐκωμωδήθησαν· καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ Θράκια καὶ τὰ Φρύγια. τῶν μὲν γὰρ Βενδιείων Πλάτων μέρηται τῶν δὲ Φρυγίων Δημοσθένης διαβάλλων τὴν Διοσχίνου μῆτρα κ. τ. λ.). But of all these the introduction of the Thracian goddess Bendis (J. Grimm, in den Berliner Monatsberichten 1859, p. 515 ff., identifies her with Freya—Vanadis, the moon-goddess of the Northmen) is the most remarkable example of the *φιλοξενία* of the Athenians, because of the great popularity the cultus soon enjoyed. Even in very early times the Greeks and Thracians came into contact with each other in manifold ways, and according to Homer in an especial manner during the Trojan war. In later times the relations between the two peoples were of an intimate nature, nor was this intimacy confined to

Prometheus and Hephaistos were represented in bas-relief, and it is very significant for our purpose, that the precedence was given to Prometheus, by the fact that he occupied the foremost position and was represented as an old man with a sceptre in his right hand, while Hephaistos was represented as a youth and in the second position.¹

the natural intercourse between the Thracians and the Greek colonies on the Thracian sea-board, but Thracian slaves and Thracian merchants were numerous in Athens and the sea-port Peiraeus (cf. C. I. A. III 2493—2496. 3619). The *παιδαγωγός* of Alkibiades was a Thracian (Plato, Alcib. p. 122, b: σοὶ δ', ὦ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ, Περικλῆς ἐπέστησε παιδαγωγὸν . . . τὸν ἀχρεώτατον ὑπὸ γῆρας, Ζώπυρον τὸν Θράκα); Thracian nurses were much sought after at Athens and of course it lay to some extent in their hands to form the character and give shape and direction to the religious principles and prejudices of their charges (that these nurses were remembered with pious affection by their charges in after years is evidenced by the touching tribute paid to his nurse Melitta by Hippostrates C. I. G. 808). It was quite natural for these Thracian people to bring their national manners and customs, and their national Gods with them. It was through them primarily that the Thracian goddess Artemis-Bendis took up her abode in the city of the violet crown. Bendis, so far as can now be known, is first mentioned by Kratinos in a passage preserved by Hesychios s. v. *δίλογχος* (τὴν Βενδὴν οὕτω Κρατίνος ἐν Ὀρφίτταις ἐκάλεσεν κ. τ. λ.). The general opinion of the grammarians and the usage of such authors as mention the name of the goddess agree that it should be written *Βενδῆς* (so Herodian Teubn. ed. II, p. 760—761: τὰ εἰς ἰς περισπώμενα θηλυκὰ διὰ τοῦ δὸς κλίνεται, καὶ εἰς ῆ μόνως ἔχει τὴν αἰτιατικὴν οἶον Βενδῆς Βενδίδος Βενδῆν κ. τ. λ.). The later grammarians Laskaris (L. III, gramm. graec.) and Choiroboskos (MS. Coisl. 176 fol. 75 v.) sustain Herodian, but Theodosios p. 113, ed. Goettling, differs with them and writes *Βένδης Βένδιδος*: τῶν γὰρ εἰς ἰς ὀνομάτων ὅσα εἰσὶ κῆρια διὰ τοῦ ἰδὸς κλίνονται· τὸ μὲν Πάρις καὶ τὸ Ἄδωνις καὶ τὸ Βένδης. ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ Κοῖνοιφίς καὶ τὸ Σέφνουφίς κῆρια ὀνόματα διὰ τοῦ δὸς κλίνονται· Πάρδος, Ἄδωνιδος, Βένδιδος, Κονοιφίδος. But here the accent may be a blunder of the copyist; Goettling takes it as such. The Bendideion (concerning the accent of the word see Bekk. Anec. Graec. p. 1343 s. v. Ἀσκλημειῖον) was situated in Munychia, according to Xenophon Hell. 2, 4, 11: οἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως εἰς τὴν Ἰπποδάμειον ἀγορὰν ἐλθόντες πρῶτον μὲν συνετάξαντο, ὥστε ἐμπλῆσαι τὴν ὁδὸν ἢ φέροι πρὸς τε τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τὸ Βενδίδειον. According to this it was located somewhere near the present fort or church of St. Elias.

¹ Schol. Soph. Oed. Col. 56: Περὶ τοῦ τὸν Προμηθεῖα περὶ τὴν Ἀκαθήμειαν καὶ τὸν Κολωνὸν ἰδρῶσθαι, Ἀπολλόδωρος γράφει οὕτω τῇ πρώτῃ. Συντιμᾶται δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ τῇ Ἀθηνῶν, καθάπερ ὁ Ἡφαίστος· καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ παλαιὸν ἴδρυμα καὶ βωμὸς ἐν τῷ τεμένει τῆς θεοῦ. Δείκνυται δὲ καὶ βάσις ἀρχαία κατὰ τὴν εἰσοδὸν, ἐν ἣ τοῦ τε Προμηθεῖως ἐστὶ τύπος καὶ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου. Πεποίηται δὲ (ὡς καὶ Λυσιστραχίδης φησὶν) ὁ μὲν Προμηθεὺς πρῶτος καὶ πρεσβύτερος ἐν δεξιῇ σκῆπτρον ἔχων, ὁ δὲ Ἡφαίστος νεὸς καὶ δεύτερος· καὶ βωμὸς ἀμφοῖν κοινός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ βᾶσει ἀποτετυπω-

From this passage it is clear that the oldest Athenians considered Prometheus as the original fire-god and honored him as such not only in their fire-festivals but also in their art.¹

Pan was also honored by a torch-race because he too is a light-god; he is the shepherd of the starry flocks of heaven, and therefore the patron god of earthly shepherds; as an "ethereal fructifying principle" he is a symbol of the power of the sun-heat, the fire of heaven. It was because he is a god of eternal fire that fire was kept constantly burning in his sanctuaries.² As

μένος. Prometheus made men of clay and water; at the command of Zeus Hephaistos made Pandora, the first woman, of clay and tears. Can it be that the bas-relief on this pedestal is to be interpreted as referring to them in their common character of makers of men?

¹ In Lucian, Prometheus complains that while there are plenty of temples in honor of Zeus, Apollo, and even of Hermes, there are none in honor of him, the great benefactor of the race. In answer to the insinuation that by the creation of man he had wrought great mischief to the gods, Prometheus argues that the creation of man by him was not only not hurtful to the authority of the gods, but on the contrary, so far from making war on the gods, man had made the world prosperous and happy, had built cities, had made the earth to blossom by the peaceful pursuits of agriculture, had filled the sea with ships and the islands with inhabitants, and besides that they had everywhere instituted sacrifices and festivals and erected altars and temples in honor of the very gods who feared lest they might be dethroned by the creatures of Prometheus, while he, their maker, was left unhonored by temples (Luc. Prom. 14: . . . ἀπανταχοῦ δὲ βωμοὺς καὶ θυσίας καὶ ναοὺς καὶ πανηγύρεις·

μεστὰὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυαί,

πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί.

καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὲν ἔμαντ' ἴσως κτήμα τοῦτο ἐπλασάμην, ἐπλεονέκτουσ' ἴσως, νυνὶ δὲ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν φέρων κατέθηκα ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς· μᾶλλον δὲ Διὸς μὲν καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἑρμῆος καὶ σοῦ δέ, ὡς Ἑρμῆ, νεὼς ἰδεῖν ἀπανταχοῦ ἔστι, Προμηθέως δὲ οὐδαμοῦ). There was some cause, it is true, for his complaint, but still, as we have seen in connection with the altar and old building at Colonos, he was not wholly unhonored in this respect. It is doubtless to this building that Sallustius Pythagoreus refers in the argument to the Oed. Col. of Sophocles, where he mentions a *ιερόν* of Prometheus (*ἐπεὶ καὶ Ποσειδῶνός ἐστιν ἱερόν Ἰππιῶν καὶ Προμηθέως*). It must be noted also that one MS of the Scholiast to Sophocles ad loc. supra cit. reads *παλαιὸν ἴδρυμα καὶ ναὸς ἐν τῷ τεμένει*. Certainly the Panopeans had a temple and statue in honor of Prometheus (Paus. X 4, 3: *πλίνθου ὤμης οἰκῆμα οὐ μέγα, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ λίθου τοῦ Πεντέληςιν ἀγάλμα, ὃν Ἀσκληπιῶν, οἱ δὲ Προμηθέα εἶναι φασιν*). The Panopeans also preserved specimens of the earth from which Prometheus made men (Paus. X 4, 3).

² Paus. VIII, 37, 8: *Ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἀναβήσῃ διὰ κλίμακος ἐς ἱερόν Πανός (near Akakesion) . . . παρὰ τούτῳ τῷ Πανὶ πῦρ οὐ ποτε ἀποσβεννύμενον καίεται, and Paus. V, 15, 9: ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Πρυτανείῳ (at Olympia) παριόντων ἐς τὸ οἰκῆμα, ἐνθα σφίσιν ἡ ἔστια, Πανός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιῇ τῆς ἐσόδου βωμός. ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἔστια τέφρας καὶ αὐτῆ πεποιημένη, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς πῦρ ἀνὰ πᾶσάν τε ἡμέραν καὶ ἐν πάσῃ νυκτὶ ὡσαύτως καίεται.*

a light-god it was possible for him to commence a love-affair with Artemis, which he inaugurated by presenting that coy maiden with half of his flocks.¹ His epithets of Φάνης in Greek and Lucidus in Latin certainly owe their origin to the fact that Pan was a light-god.²

But however just may have been Pan's claim to a place among the fire-festivals of Athens, it is certain that he was not honored with a Lampas until after the battle of Marathon. This neglect was resented by him, for when Pheidippides had come to Mt. Parthenion above Tegea Pan accosted him and upbraided the Athenians for their ungrateful neglect of him who had already been helpful to them and would continue to be in the future.³ Pan kept his word, for by his timely appearance on the scene of action at Marathon he so thoroughly frightened the Persians as to cause their utter defeat, and from that day to this a demoralized retreat has been called a *panic* in remembrance of Pan.⁴ In token of gratitude for this timely succor, and in pursuance of Pan's wish as expressed to Pheidippides, the Athenians erected a sanctuary in a grotto⁵ on the northwestern slope of the Acropolis, and instituted a yearly torch-race in his honor.⁶

¹ Verg. Georg. 3, 391: Munere sic niveo lanae, si credere dignum est, Pan deus Arcadiae captam te, Luna, fefellit in nemora alta vocans; nec tu aspernata vocantem, etc. And Probus on this passage: Pan Mercurii filius, cum Lunam concupisset, et haberet optimum pecus, poscente ea partem pecoris pro concubitu, dicitur pollicitus, et duas partes fecisse gregum, quarum alteram candidiorem, sed lanae crassioris. Lunam deceptam candore deterius pecus abduxisse, ut poeta significat.

² Indeed the Greek epithet looks something like a pun on his name, for the word φανός, a lantern or torch, is also written πανός, cf. Aesch. Ag. 280; Eur. Ion, 195. This is also directly stated by Phrynichos in Bekk. Anec. Gr. s. v. λυχνούχος: φανός δὲ φακέλος τινων συνδεδεμένος και ἡμμένος. ὁ και διὰ τοῦ π.

³ Hdt. 6, 105: περὶ τὸ Παρθένιον ὄρος τὸ ὑπὲρ Τεγέης ὁ Πᾶν περιπέττει. βῶσαντα δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Φειδιππίδου τὸν Πᾶνα Ἀθηναῖοι κελύσαι ἀπαγγεῖλαι, δι' ὃ τι ἐνωτο οὐδεμίαν ἐπιμελεῖν ποιεῖνται ἐντος εἰνόνου Ἀθηναῖοι και πολλαχῆ γενομένων σφι ἤδη χρῆσιμον, τὰ δ' ἔτι και ἐσομένου.

⁴ Cf. the couplet of Simonides fr. 116:

τὸν τραγῶπου ἐμὲ Πᾶνα, τὸν Ἀρκάδα, τὸν κατὰ Μήδων,
τὸν μετ' Ἀθηναίων στήσατο Μιλτιάδης.

⁵ The grotto was doubtless chosen because it was a very ancient custom to worship Pan in caves and grottoes. Thus Porphyrios de antro Nympharum 20: Σπήλαια τοίνυν και ἀντρα τῶν παλαιωτάτων πρὶν και ναοὺς ἐπενοῆσαι θεοῖς ἀφοσιούντων· και ἐν Κρήτῃ μὲν Κουρήτων Δί, ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ δὲ Σελήνῃ και Πανὶ Λυκείῳ.

⁶ Hdt. 6, 105: και ταῦτα μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι, καταστάντων σφι εὐ ἤδη τῶν πρηγμάτων, πιστεύσαντες εἶναι ἀληθῆα ἰδρίσαντο ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκροπόλει Πανὸς ἱρόν, και αὐτὸν ἀπὸ

It seems remarkable that Helios, the sun, was not honored by a torch-race, inasmuch as he was certainly a light-god of the first magnitude. If asked for an explanation of this apparent neglect we shall have to assume with Brönsted¹ that the ruling notion in the conception of the fire and light divinities in the Attic religion was not so much external, attractive, and genial warmth, as it was the internal, germinating, vivifying, and creating principle or power of fire. Brönsted's theory is altogether plausible, but in attempting to account for this apparent neglect of Helios, still another important factor must be taken into consideration, and that is the fact that among the Greeks in general, but especially the Athenians, Helios was more a *simple personification of the sun*, than a deity who was worshiped by sacrifice and festival.²

It can be proved, according to what we have already seen, that in Athens a torch-race took place regularly at five different

ταύτης τῆς ἀγγελίης θυσίαι ἐπετείοισι καὶ λαμπάδι ἱλάσκονται. Paus. I. 28, 4: καταβᾶσι δὲ οὐκ ἐς τὴν κάτω πόλιν, ἀλλ' ὅσον ὑπὸ τὰ προπέλαια, πηγὴ τε ὑδατός ἐστι καὶ πλησίον Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν ἐν σπηλαίῳ καὶ Πανός. From these words of Pausanias the grotto of Pan may easily be recognized even at the present day. (It was excavated in 1896 by the Greek Arch. Society.) Marathon was one of Pan's favorite haunts and the battle was fought, so to speak, on his private property, not far from the cave in which are the curious rocks known as Pan's goat-pasture (αἰπόλιον), because they looked and still look like a herd of goats. Cf. Paus. I. 32, 6: ὀλίγον δὲ ἀπωτέρω τοῦ πεδίου Πανός ἐστὶν ὄρος καὶ σπήλαιον θεᾶς ἄξιον· ἑσόδος μὲν ἐς αὐτὸ στενὴ, παρελθούσαι δὲ εἰσὶν οἰκοὶ καὶ λουτρά καὶ τὸ καλούμενον Πανός αἰπόλιον, πέτραι τὰ πολλὰ αἴξιν εἰκασμένα.

¹ Reise und Untersuchungen II, 289 ff.

² Here it may be added that Brönsted in pursuance of the theory just mentioned attempts to prove that the torch-race in honor of Prometheus had an esoteric signification and symbolized the inner fire by which Prometheus put life into man. Thus Athene belonged to the fire-gods more on account of her relations to Erichthonios and Hephaistos (the Hephaistos-Erichthonios affair is supposed to symbolize the union of the heavenly ethereal light, represented by Athene, with the earthly visible fire, represented by Hephaistos), rather than on account of her recognized character of Grand Patron and Superintendent of the arts and sciences. In a similar manner the presence of the torch-race in the cult of Artemis-Bendis may be accounted for not so much from the fact that she was the Moon-Goddess as from the standpoint of her business of *Λοχεία, Εἰλείθια, Λυσίζωνος*, for as a midwife she brings to light. It was for this reason that she was called *σελασφόρος, φωσφόρος, lucifera, lucina*. Certainly the fact that Artemis is represented in art with a torch (she is *φιλολάμπδος*) in her hand has reference to this her maieutic profession. It may be noted that the moon was thought to exercise great influence on all terrestrial life; on animals and plants; on the organism of the human frame, and especially on that of the female man.

festivals of the fire- and light-gods. These festivals are the Prometheia, Hephaisteia, Panathenaia, Bendideia and festival of Pan.' The Lampas on horse-back at the celebration of the Bendideia at the Peiraeus is mentioned frequently enough, but the remarks of the scholiast to Plato have led to erroneous views in regard to the deity thus honored, so that some explanations are necessary. We gather from a passage of Plato that the torch-race on horse-back took place for the first time in Plato's own time; he makes Socrates say: I went down to the Peiraeus yesterday with Glaukon the son of Ariston, in order to pray to *the Goddess* and also at the same time to see in what manner they would conduct the festival, because they are celebrating it now for the first time.¹ Then follows a conversation in which Polemarchos tries to persuade Socrates to remain over night with him as his guest at the Peiraeus. The hard-headed Socrates, however, remains firm in his refusal of the proffered hospitality, whereupon Adeimantos adds as a further inducement: But do you not know that there is to be a torch-race on horse-back this evening in honor of *the Goddess*? On horse-back? That is new indeed! Will the horsemen carry torches and pass them to one another while they vie with each other on their horses? Yes, said Polemar-

¹ Photios s. v. λαμπάδος: τρεῖς ἀγῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι ἑορτὰς λαμπάδος· Παναθηναίους· Ἡφαιστείους· καὶ Προμηθεΐους. Photios s. v. λαμπάς: ἀγῶν Ἀθήνησι Πανὶ καὶ Προμηθεὶ ἀγόμενος. Suidas s. v. λαμπάδος: τρεῖς ἀγῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι ἑορτὰς λαμπάδος, Παναθηναίους, Ἡφαιστείους καὶ Προμηθεΐους. Bekker Anec. Graec. p. 277 s. v. λαμπάς καὶ λαμπὰ δηφῆροι: λαμπάδας ἀγῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι Παναθηναίους, Ἡφαιστείους, Προμηθεΐους· εἰσὶ δὲ αὐταὶ ἑορταί· λαμπαδηφῆροι δὲ καλοῦνται, ὅτι τὰς λαμπάδας ἔφερον. Schol. Ar. Ran. 131: λαμπαδηδρομαίαι δὲ γίνονται τρεῖς ἐν τῷ Κεραμεικῷ, Ἀθηνᾶς, Ἡφαίστου, Προμηθεΐως. Κεραμεικὸς τόπος Ἀθήνησιν ἵππου συνετέλουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ ἐνιαυτὸν λαμπαδοῦχον ἀγῶνα. Schol. Ar. Ran. 1087: (Ἐδεὶ γὰρ λαμπαδοῦχεῖν ἐν Ἡφαιστείους καὶ Παναθηναίους.) ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐστὶ γυμνάσιον, ἐν ᾧ ἐλαμπαδηφῆρον οἱ γυμναζόμενοι. ὅτι τῆς λαμπάδος ἀγῶν Ἀθήνησιν ἤγετο, Προμήθεια, Ἡφαίστεια, Παναθήναια. Harpocration s. v. λαμπάς: Δυσίας ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἐδῆμῳ, τρεῖς ἀγῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι ἑορτὰς λαμπάδος, Παναθηναίους καὶ Ἡφαιστείους καὶ Προμηθεΐους. Themistios de Theod. hysman.: καὶ τότε ἔγυ μόνον ἡσθόμην φωνῆς νικώσας τῷ τάχει τὴν τῷ Ἡφαιστῷ τελομένην λαμπαδηφορίαν, καὶ διὰ πομπίμων ἐξ ἄλλων εἰς ἄλλους, σταδίους τόσους καὶ τόσους, ὥσπερ φρυκτωρίας διαπεμπομένην. Libanios Declam. XV: Μηδ' ὀράσθω τοῖνον ὁ βωμός, μέχρις ἂν θεραπεύηται Παναθηναίους μὲν Ἀθηνᾶ, Μυσηθίους δὲ Δημήτηρ, τῇ Δαμπαδί δὲ ὁ Πάν. Pseilus in Phisic. V, 4.

² Plato, Rep. 327, A: κατέβην χθὲς εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστου, προσευξόμενός τε τῇ θεῷ καὶ ἅμα τὴν ἑορτὴν βουλόμενος θεάσασθαι τίνα τρόπον ποιήσουσιν, ἅτε νῦν πρῶτον ἄγοντες.

chos.¹ Now it will be noticed that in the remarks of Plato, just cited, the goddess, in whose honor the race was to be held has been named simply as *the Goddess*, and, inasmuch as the Athenians meant Athene whenever they spoke of *the Goddess*, the Scholiast to Plato, and after him most of those who have written upon the subject, understood the words of Plato as referring to Athene and the smaller Panathenaia, which he states were held at the Peiraeus,² adding that the Bendideia followed upon the smaller Panathenaia.³ But from the Republic of Plato itself it becomes clear that the torch-race in question was to take place at the festival of Artemis-Bendis and not at the smaller Panathenaia.⁴ However, even if Plato himself had left the least doubt as to which festival he had in mind, we have sufficient data to refute the Scholiast and those who follow him in referring the equestrian torch-race to the Panathenaia. Origenes, referring to the remarks of Plato just cited, states that Socrates and his companions went down to the Peiraeus to worship the goddess Artemis and to see the festival of the Bendideia.⁵ St. Athanasios gives vent to his righteous indignation at the thought that "Plato, whom the Greeks deemed so wise," should go down to the Peiraeus with Socrates to worship Artemis, a goddess made with hands.⁶ Simplikios also distinctly states that the festival of the torch-race at the Peiraeus was the Bendideia,⁷ and Proklos not only characterizes the festival as the Bendideia, but even mentions the date of its celebration.⁸

¹ Plat. Rep. 328, A: 'Αρά γε . . . οὐδ' ἴστε ὅτι λαμπὰς ἔσται πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἄφ' ἵππων τῇ θεῷ; 'Αφ' ἵππων; . . . καινὸν γε τοῦτο· λαμπάδια ἔχοντες διαδώσουσι ἀλλήλοις ἀμιλλώμενοι τοῖς ἵπποις; . . . Οὕτως, ἔφη ὁ Πολέμαρχος.

² Schol. Plat. ad loc. cit.: ἐορτὴν ἐνταῦθα τὴν τῶν μικρῶν Παναθηναίων φησὶν . . . and again: τὰ δὲ μικρὰ Παναθηναῖα κατὰ τὸν Πειραιᾶ ἐτέλουν.

³ ἂ δὴ τοῖς Βενδιδαίοις καλουμένοις εἶπετο.

⁴ Plat. Rep. 354, A: ταῦτα δὴ σοι, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες, εἰσιτάσθω ἐν τοῖς Βενδιδαίοις.

⁵ Orig. adv. Celsum VI, p. 277: καὶ οἱ τοιαῦτα περὶ τοῦ πρώτου ἀγαθοῦ γράψαντες (that is, Plato, or Socrates and his companions) καταβαίνουσι εἰς Πειραιᾶ, προσευξόμενοι ὡς θεῷ τῇ 'Αρτέμιδι· καὶ ὀφόμενοι τὴν ὑπὸ Βενδιδαίων ἐπιτελουμένην πανήγυριν.

⁶ St. Athanas. contra gentes 10, fin.: καὶ τό γε θαυμαστόν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ πάντων παρ' Ἑλλήσι σοφὸς καὶ πολλὰ καυχησάμενος, ὡς περὶ θεοῦ διανοηθεὶς ὁ Πλάτων, εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Σωκράτους κατέρχεται, τὴν ἀνθρώπου τέχνην πλασθεῖσαν Ἄρτεμιν προσκυνήσων.

⁷ Simplic. ad Physic. V, 4: τάχα τῆς ἐν Πειραιεὶ λαμπάδος τῆς ἐν Βενδιδαίοις μνημονεύει.

⁸ Proclus in Timaeum I, 9: ὅλοι δὲ ἐκ τούτων εἰσι καὶ οἱ χρόνοι τῶν διαλόγων, τῆς τε Πολιτείας καὶ τοῦ Τιμαίου, εἴπερ ἡ μὲν ἐν τοῖς Βενδιδαίοις ὑπόκειται τοῖς ἐν

The torch-races which took place on the occasion of the celebration of the Apatouria, Anthesteria, Epitaphia, and The-seia—festivals in honor of deities who had no connection with fire—were certainly of minor importance. The origin of the torch-races at these festivals is not clear, but possibly their institution was due to the great popularity which the Lampas enjoyed at the other festivals; certainly they are mentioned very infrequently. Istros in the passage preserved by Harpokration vouches for the Lampas at the Apatouria.¹ The second day of the Apatouria was devoted to the gods in general, and as we learn from this passage of Istros, the torch-race in the Apatouria was the part of the festival devoted to Hephaistos.

The Lampas at the Anthesteria rests on the authority of an inscription first published by Ludwig Ross.²

The Lampas at the Hermaia rests on the authority of an inscription published by Köhler.³

Πειραιεὶ δρωμένοις, ὁ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς τῶν Βενιδείων. διὲν γὰρ τὰ ἐν Πειραιεὶ Βενιδεία τῇ ἐνάτῃ ἐπὶ δεκάτῃ Θαρρηλιῶνος, ὁμολογοῦσιν οἱ περὶ τῶν ἑορτῶν γράψαντες. The accuracy of the date given by Proklos is a question which cannot be entered upon here. It may be noted that Proklos (in Tim. 27) also has the following: *Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ Ρόδιος μαρτυρεῖ τὰ μὲν ἐν Πειραιεὶ Βενιδεία τῇ εἰκάδι τοῦ Θαρρηλιῶνος ἐπιτελεῖσθαι κ. τ. λ.* In spite of all the evidence cited above it is really astonishing that Weiske (Prometheus und sein Mythenkreis p. 537, ff.) could write the following words: "Das von Plato erwähnte Fackelrennen zu Pferd gehört nicht den Bendideien, sondern ebenfals den kleinen jährlichen Panathenäen, also nicht der Artemis-Bendis, sondern der Athena an."

¹ Harp. s. v. *λαμπάς*: *Ἰστρος δ' ἐν πρώτῃ τῶν Ἀγθίδων, εἰπὼν ὡς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀπατουρίων ἑορτῇ Ἀθηναίων οἱ καλλίστας στολὰς ἐνδεδικότες, λαβόντες ἡμένας λαμπάδας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας, ἤμνοσι τὸν Ἡφαίστον θέοντες, ὀπίμνημα τοῦ κατανοήσαντα τὴν χρεῖαν τοῦ πυρὸς διδάξαι τοὺς ἄλλους.* This point—in regard to the Apatouria—has been omitted both by Suidas and Photios, who have their information from the same source as Harpokration, namely Istros. It has been denied that this was a torch-race, from the fact that the garments of the participants, of which special mention is made, were not suited to a race. It is true that both Suidas and Photios have *θύοντας* instead of *θέοντας*, but the passage has been garbled and disfigured by them almost beyond recognition, and Valesius' correction of Harpokration, *θέοντες* for *θύοντες* (see p. 396), seems to me convincing.

² Demen, p. 55. No. 29: *ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Σέξτου, κοσμητέοντος Ἐρεννίου Κορηλίου Ἀσηνείως Φλάβιου Πρόκλου γυμνασιαρχήσας τῶν Ἀνθεστηρίων τὴν λαμπάδα ἀνέθηκε κ. τ. λ.* The inscription was found not far from Phyle, in the convent Παναγία τῆς Χαστιῶς of the village Chastia.

³ In the Mittheilungen, 1883, p. 226 = C. I. A. ii. 1223: *Εὐμαρειδὸς Εὐφάνου Εὐωνυμῆος λαμπάδι νικήσας Ἐρμαῖα ἀγνωστοῦντος.*

The Lampas at the Epitaphia is also based on the authority of inscriptions; that it was a race is proved by the fact that there was a victory.¹ The same is true of the torch-race at the Theseia.²

These latter are festivals of non-fire deities in which we should not expect to find a torch-race, consequently especial attention is called to the fact that the inscriptions cited as authorities were dedicated in honor of *victories won in the Lampas*. It is inconceivable how there could have been a victory without a race; and hence, whether we wish it or not, we shall have to succumb to the burden of proof and acknowledge that a *torch-race*, nothing less, was actually held at the festivals just mentioned.

Let us now turn our attention to an examination of the details of the torch-race. It is difficult to settle all the questions that arise concerning the torch-race, or even to arrive at reasonable certainty in regard to all of its details, because of the insufficiency, not to mention the disagreement, of our authorities. Still the task is not altogether hopeless.

There were two kinds of torch-race, one on horse-back, the other on foot. The race on horse-back has already been sufficiently discussed. If we examine the torch-race on foot we shall find that it was subdivided into two kinds. The first kind is vouched for by Pausanias: "In the Academy," says Pausanias, "there is an altar of Prometheus; from it towards the city a race is run with burning torches. The point of the contest is to run (swiftly) and keep the torch burning at the same time. But if the torch goes out in the hands of the first racer, he loses the victory on that account, and then the second runner may be the victor;

¹ C. I. A. III, 106: Ἀντίοχος Φαιδρίου Φλυεὺς Ἐπιτάφια λαμπάδα νεκῆσας κ. τ. λ. and C. I. A. III, 108: Ἐράτων Ἐράτωνος Αἰξωνεὺς τὴν λαμπάδα τῶν ἀνδρῶν Ἐπιτάφια νικῆσας ἀνέθηκεν κ. τ. λ., C. I. A. III, 110: ὁ δεῖνα Προβαλίσσιος τὴν λαμπάδα τῶν ἀνδρῶν Ἐπιτάφια νικῆσας κ. τ. λ., *Ephemericis* No. 4097, 8: οἱ ἐφηβοὶ ἐδραμον δὲ καὶ τὴν λαμπάδα τοῖς ἐπιταφίοις πρὸς ξένους ἐφήβους οὐκ καὶ ἐνίκων κ. τ. λ. and in C. I. A. III, 118 λαμπάδα must doubtless be restored.

² C. I. A. III, 107: Ἐράτων Ἐράτωνος Αἰξωνεὺς τὴν λαμπάδα τῶν παρεντάκτων Θῆσεια νικῆσας ἀνέθηκεν κ. τ. λ. C. I. A. III, 109: Ὁ δεῖνα Προβαλίσσιος τὴν λαμπάδα τῶν παρεντάκτων Θῆσεια νικῆσας κ. τ. λ.; and Φιλίστωρ (σύγγραμμα φιλολογικόν) II, p. 132: Κόνων Κόνωνος Κειριάδης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Μιλτιάδης Ζωίλου Μαραθῶνιος χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου Θησειῶν ἀγωνοθέτης εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Φαιδρίου ἄρχοντος τὴν τε πομπὴν ἐπεμψεν εὐσχήμονα καὶ τὴν θυσίαν συνετέλεσεν τῷ Θησεὶ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τῆς λαμπάδος καὶ τοῦ γυμνικοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐποίησατο τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν κ. τ. λ.

but if he too allows his torch to go out, the third racer gains the victory, and if none reach the goal with burning torch, no one gains the victory."¹ From this passage may be gathered the following. The contestants were all supplied with burning torches at the starting-point; the start was made at the same time or one at a time and the race for each one of the participants was the whole distance between the starting-point and the goal, that is, there were no intermediate relays of racers at stated intervals along the line between the starting-point and the goal, so that the contest lay solely and entirely between the original racers, the victory being decided in the manner indicated by Pausanias. There is more uncertainty in regard to the second kind of torch-race on foot, but still it is not so great but that we may hope to come to some definite conclusion in the matter. In the first kind of torch-race we have seen that the contestants for the victory were placed in a row (or rank), *κατὰ ζεύγος*. But in this second race they were placed in rank and file, so to speak, that is, both *κατὰ ζεύγος* and *κατὰ στοίχον*. Herodotos in his description of the Persian postal messengers says in effect: Relays of horses and of men, corresponding in number to the number of days required to make the journey, are stationed at the proper intervals along the road; the first courier hands over his message to the second, the second to the third, and so forth, exactly as in the torch-race of the Greeks.² Aristotle says that the bearing of the torch in the Lampas was *successive*, and not continuous.³ Cicero, or, if you will, Cornificius, censures the frequent change of generals among the Romans

¹ Paus. I. 30. 2: 'Ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ δέ ἐστι Προμηθέως βωμός, καὶ θέουσιν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἔχοντες καιομένας λαμπάδας. τὸ δὲ ἀγώνισμα ὁμοῦ τῷ δρόμῳ φυλάξαι τὴν δῆδα ἐτι καιομένην ἐστίν. ἀποσβεσθείσης δὲ οὐδὲν ἐτι τῆς νίκης τῷ πρώτῳ, δευτέρῳ δὲ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ μέτεστιν· εἰ δὲ μὴδὲ τούτῳ καιοίτο, ὁ τρίτος ἐστίν ὁ κρατῶν· εἰ δὲ καὶ πᾶσιν ἀποσβεσθεῖη, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ἄφ' ἧς καταλείπεται ἡ νίκη.

² Hdt. 8. 98: τούτων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐστὶ οὐδὲν ἕ τι θᾶσσον παραγίνεται θνητῶν ἐν· οὕτω τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ἐξεύρηται τοῦτο. λέγουσι γὰρ ὡς ὅσων ἂν ἡμερέων ἦ ἡ πᾶσα ὁδός, τοσούτοι ἵπποι τε καὶ ἄνδρες διεστάσι, κατὰ ἡμερησίην ὁδὸν ἐκάστην ἵππος τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος τεταγμένους· τοὺς οὐτε νικητὸς, οὐκ ἄμβροτος, οὐ καῦμα, οὐ νύξ ἔργει μὴ οὐ κατανύσαι τὸν προκειμένον αὐτῷ δρόμον τὴν ταχίστην. ὁ μὲν δὲ πρῶτος δραμῶν παραδίδοι τὰ ἐντεταλμένα τῷ δευτέρῳ, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος τῷ τρίτῳ· τὸ δὲ ἐνθεύτερον ἦδη κατ' ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον διεξέρχεται παραδιδόμενα, κατὰ περ' Ἑλλήσι ἡ λαμπαδηφορία τὴν τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ ἐπιτελέουσι.

³ Aristot. Phys. Auscult. 5. 4: δραμῶν γὰρ ἂν τις πυρῆξειεν εὐθύς, καὶ οἷον ἡ λαμπὰς ἐκ διαδοχῆς φορὰ ἔχομένη, συνεχῆς δ' οὐ.

for the reason that a wholly inexperienced general is thus made to take the place of one who has gained experience: but on the contrary in the torch-race such succession is advisable, because a fresh runner is thus enabled to continue the race with unabated energy and speed, having taken the place of one who is already tired and incompetent.¹ The author of the *λέξεις ῥητορικαί* says there was a race with successive delivery of the torch.² Themistios states that each racer did not pass over the whole distance between the starting-point and the goal, but only over his own individual part,³ and again the same writer makes virtually the same statement elsewhere in his writings.⁴ Lastly the Scholiast to Persius confirms in the main the authorities just cited, but it must be conceded that his meaning is by no means clear. He evidently speaks from hearsay, and really has no well-defined notion of the torch-race, and yet we can gather from him that there was a successive delivery of the torch.⁵

From these passages it is clear that there were relays of racers at stated intervals along the race-course between the starting-point and the goal, each relay corresponding in point of numbers to the original number of racers at the start, and accordingly the

¹ Cic. ad Herenn.: 4. 46: Non enim, quemadmodum in palaestra, qui taedas candentes accipit, celerior est in cursu continuo, quam ille, qui tradit, item melior imperator novus, qui accipit exercitum, quam ille, qui decedit; propterea quod defatigatus cursor integro facem, hic peritus imperator imperito exercitum tradit.

² Bekk. Anec. Gr. p. 228, 11, s. v. γυμνασίαρχοι: οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν λαμπαδηδρομιῶν εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ Προμηθέως καὶ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου καὶ τοῦ Πανός, ἕφ' ὧν οἱ ἔφηβοι ἀλειψόμενοι κατὰ διαδοχὴν τρέχοντες ἤπτον τὸν βωμόν. The Scholiast of Patmos on γαμηλία in Demosthenes πρὸς Εὐβουλίδην § 43 (published in Bull. Corr. Hell. i. p. 11) gives this better: καὶ οὗτοι ἤγοντο Λαμπαδοδρομίαν τὴν ἑορτὴν τῷ τε Προμηθεῖ καὶ τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ καὶ τῷ Πανὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον. Οἱ ἔφηβοι, ἀλειψόμενοι παρὰ τοῦ γυμνασίάρχου, κατὰ διαδοχὴν τρέχοντες ἤπτοντο τὸν βωμόν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἄψας ἐνίκα, καὶ ἡ τοῦτον φυλὴ.

³ Themistius ad Physic. V, 4 (in edition of Aristotle of the Prussian Academy IV, p. 402, 15): οὐ γὰρ γίνεται ἐν τῷ ἔσχατον τῶν δρόμων, ἀλλ' ἐκάστου τῶν τρεχόντων οἰκείον τι τοῦ δρόμου πέρασ ἐστίν.

⁴ καὶ τότε' ἐγὼ μόνον ψυθόρην φωνῆς νικώσης τῷ τάχει τὴν τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ τελομένην λαμπαδηδρομίαν, καὶ διὰ πομπίμων ἐξ ἄλλων εἰς ἄλλους σταδίους τόσους καὶ τόσους ὥσπερ φρυκτωρίας διαπεμπομένην. Themistius de Theodosii humanitate.

⁵ Schol. Pers. ad VI, 61: Apud Athenas ludi celebrabantur, in quibus cursu juvenes certabant et qui victor primus erat, facem tollebat. Deinde sequenti se tradebat et secundus tertio; similiter omnes faciebant et sibi invicem tradebant donec currentium numerus completeretur.

final victory was not personal, that is, was not won by any single individual, but by a whole file or *στοίχος* of individuals. It is also clear that the racers, who made the start, never reached the final goal, their sole duty being to run as rapidly as possible, and, when the relay at the next station was reached, to hand over, each to his respective comrade, the torch still lighted. The duty of the comrade thus receiving the torch was to carry it to the next station, and so on, until the final goal was reached and the victory decided in favor of one or the other file (*στοίχος*) of racers. In this way alone could any contest be possible in this second kind of torch-race on foot. Thus the words of Aischylos, where he compares the fire-signals which brought the news of the capture of Troy to Mykenai with the torch-race, are made perfectly clear. Says Aischylos:

τοιῶδε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι,
 ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι'
 νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.

Exactly so, the first and the last carries off the victory, that is, in plainer words, the first to reach the goal with flaming torch is at the same time the last in the file or *στοίχος* to which he belonged. So too it was with the fire-signals, for the signal-fire which flamed down the tidings to the watchman on the roof was the first to reach the palace and was at the same time the last in the file of signal-fires. The likeness does not hold good throughout, for the fire-signals differed from the torch-race in that the torch-race was a real contest for a victory and consisted of several files, while in the fire-signals there was no contest and only one file, haste in speeding on the messenger-torch being the chief point.

This successive delivery of the torch is aptly illustrated by the metaphors of the ancients. Thus Plato likens the successive generations of men to the successive delivery of the torch in the Lampas.¹ The much-quoted words of Lucretius are to the same effect, for men hand over to each other the lamp of life as the racers do the torch in the Lampas.² Clemens Alexandrinus

¹ Plato, *Laws* p. 776: γεννώντας τε καὶ ἐκτρέφοντας παῖδας, καθάπερ λαμπάδα τὸν βίον παραδίδοντας ἄλλοις ἐξ ἄλλων.

² Lucret. II, 77: Augescunt aliae gentes, aliae minuuntur,
 Inque brevi spatio mutantur saecula animantum :
 Et quasi cursores, vitae lampada tradunt.

writes in the same spirit,¹ and Philo speaks of virtue being handed over successively from man to man like the torch in the Lampas.² Varro has a metaphor of this kind,³ as has also Statius,⁴ and lastly an anonymous writer in the Anthology has one of the lamp of life.⁵

¹ Clem. Al. 503: ἐπεσκεύασε τὴν ἀθανασίαν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν, καὶ οἰοεὶ διαμονὴν τινα πασὶ παίδων μεταλαμπαδεωμένην.

² Philo 2. 175: τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς λαμπαδεωμένης ἐπαλλήλοις διαδοχαῖς κ. τ. λ.

³ de re rustica III: Sed Merula, Axius noster ne, dum haec audit, physicam addiscat, quod de fructu nihil dixi, cursu lampada tibi trado.

⁴ Sylv. 4. 8. 50: Tuque, Actaea Ceres, cursu cui semper anhelō
Votivam taciti quassamus lampada mystae.

⁵ Anthol. Pal. Appendix, No. 148:

λαμπάδα γὰρ ζωῆς με δραμεῖν μόνον ἤθελε δαίμων,
τὸν δὲ μακρὸν γήρως οὐκ ἐτίθει ὀβλίχον.

We give the following as an example of wild exegesis—to use a mild term—on the part of scholars, whose works are generally used as handy books of reference by those who seek information in regard to such points of antiquarian research as the Lampas: Schoemann Griech. Alterthümer II, p. 467–468, 3rd edition, 1873, has this: “wozu aber später auch noch ein abendlicher Wettlauf mit Fackeln (*λαμπαδοδρομία*) kam, wo nach Einbruch der Dunkelheit in der mondscheinlosen Nacht,—denn das Fest war kurz vor dem Neumonde,—eine erlesene Anzahl von Epheben von dem Altare des Eros in der Akademie, von dem sie ihre Fackeln anzündeten, in verschiedenen Abtheilungen ausliefen, *Einige mit brennenden Fackeln voran, Andere ohne Fackeln in einiger Entfernung hinter ihnen. Ward ein Fackelträger von Einem der Hinterherlaufenden eingeholt, so musste er die Fackel an diesen abgeben, der dann mit ihr weiter lief.*” This is not up to the ordinary average of Gelehrsamkeit; in fact it seems that Schoemann has subjectively evolved it from the depths of his own consciousness, and it is to be all the more deplored, because, coming from an acknowledged antiquarian authority, it was calculated to lead many astray and inform none. But the whole passage of Schoemann has been changed by Lipsius in his new edition. In illustration of how blunders on the part of scholars are handed down from handbook to handbook be it allowed to give the following from Abicht’s edition of Herodotos (ad VIII, 98). Says Abicht: “Es gab verschiedene Arten dieses Wettkampfes (be it noted, however, that he contents himself with giving a description of the torch-race as Schoemann fancied it, without mentioning the other, that is, the only real kinds of torch-race): *eine derselben bestand darin, dass die Jünglinge in verschiedenen Abtheilungen ausliefen, einige mit brennenden Fackeln voran, während andere ohne Fackeln in einer bestimmten Entfernung folgten. Ward einer (oder mehrere) der Fackelträger von einem der nachfolgenden Abtheilung überholt so musste er diesem die Fackel übergeben, der nun seinerseits mit der brennenden Fackel das Ziel zu erreichen suchte.*” We might cite numerous examples of more or less grievous blunders on the part of those who have something to say about the Lampas, but we shall content ourselves with only one more. Caylus (Recueil d’Antiquités I, 17 ff.) informs us: “si le flambeau venait à s’éteindre entre les

The festival of the Lampas was celebrated on moonless nights, if possible. The racers were ἰφθβοί¹ and generally naked, although at the Apatouria, at least, they wore the richest garments.² In pictorial representations of the torch-race, we sometimes find wreaths on the heads of all the ἰφθβοί. It is very probable that these wreaths or crowns were symbolical of the chains which Prometheus had to endure in punishment for the theft of fire, and they were therefore worn only at the celebration of the Prometheia. They were made of the λύγος, a willow-like tree which was sacred to Prometheus.³ From other pictorial representations we see that shields were sometimes worn on the left arm.⁴ At the Prometheia the torch-race started from the altar of Prometheus in the Academy,⁵ from the fire of which the

mains de celui qui s'en avait été saisi le premier, celui-ci déchu de toute espérance, donnait le flambeau à un second, qui n'ayant pas été heureux le donnait à un troisième, et ainsi de suite, jusqu' à ce qu' on eût épuisé le nombre de ceux qui se présentaient pour disputer le prix." Caylus has jumped to a conclusion on insufficient data, and indeed his acquaintance with the literature of the Lampas seems to be limited to the remarks of the Scholiast to Persius.

¹ See Bekker, *Anec. Graeca*, p. 228. II, and the Scholiast of Patmos BCH. i. II; both already quoted in full.

² Harp. s. v. λαμπάς: εἰπὼν ὡς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀπατουρίων ἑορτῇ Ἀθηναίων οἱ καλλίστας στολὰς ἐνδεδυκότες, λαβόντες ἡμμένας λαμπάδας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας, ἕμνοῦσι τὸν Ἐφαιστον θεόντες κ. τ. λ.

³ In support of these statements we may cite the authority of Athenaios 15. 13; p. 672, f: ὁθεν ἀπ' ἐκείνου τὸν δεδηλωμένον στέφανον τῷ Προμηθεῖ περιγενέσθαι, καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ τοῖς εὐεργετηθεῖσιν ἀνθρώποις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς δωρεάν. διόπερ καὶ τοῖς Κασσὶ κατὰ τὸ παραπλήσιον ἔθος παρεκλείσατο, στεφανώματι χρωμένοις τῇ λύγῳ καταδεῖν τὴν ἐαυτῶν κεφαλὴν τοῖς κλάδοις, οἷς αὐτοὶ κατέλαβον τὴν θεόν. And Athen. 15. 16; p. 674, d: Διοχύλος δ' ἐν τῷ λυομένῳ Προμηθεῖ σαφῶς φησιν, ὅτι ἐπὶ τιμῇ τοῦ Προμηθέως τὸν στέφανον περιτίθειεν τῇ κεφαλῇ, ἀντίποινα τοῦ ἐκείνου δεσμοῦ, καίτοι ἐν τῇ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Σφειγγὶ εἰπὼν·
τῷ δὲ ξένῳ γε στέφανον, ἀρχαῖον στέφος,
δεσμῶν ἄριστος ἐκ Προμηθέως λόγου.

Compare also Eustathios (ed. Tafel, Frankfurt a/M. 1832), p. 319, line 66 sq.: ὁσοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐπιστεφῆς φρονήσεως ἢ κεφαλῇ, κατέκλυτον ἐπιδεικνύντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀνευδῶς ἔχοντας· καὶ ἦν τοῦτο προσκυνεῖν, καὶ τὸν εὐεργέτην Προμηθεῖα φιλεῖν.

⁴ For the pictorial representations of the torch-race cf. Tischbein II, 25; III, 48; Gerhard *Antike Bildwerke* I, 4; Krause *Hellenika* II,² fig. 16 and fig. 25 1; Brönsted *Reise und Untersuchungen* II, 289 ff.; Mionnet pl. 49, 6; Head *Coins of the Ancients* plate 21, nos. 7-8. Körte, *Vase mit Fackellaufdarstellung* in *Jahrb. d. Inst.* 1892, p. 149-152.

⁵ Paus. 1. 30. 2: Ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ δέ ἐστι Προμηθέως βωμός, καὶ θέουσαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἔχοντες καιομένας λυμπάδας.

torches were lighted. The race-course lay through the outer Kerameikos to the Dipylon, or as Pausanias says *πρὸς τὴν πόλιν*. Suidas, Hesychios, the Scholiast to Aristophanes, and the *Etymologicum Magnum* only make the general remark that the torch-race took place in the Kerameikos.¹ Indeed it would seem from the words of these men that they knew of the Kerameikos solely as the place where the torch-race was held, and Suidas takes especial pains to show his ignorance by stating that the Kerameikos is a high place in Attica: *τόπος τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὑψηλός* (*χαμηλός* would suit the facts better). At the other torch-races the start was made, not from the altar of Prometheus, but from that of Eros in the Academy, where the torches were lighted. The race-course extended in some to the altar of Anteros inside the city, in others probably to the altar of Athene, for the flame of the victorious torch was sacred, and was used to set on fire the great sacrifice which was the closing act of the Panathenaic festival.² It is significant that at the Prometheia the race extended only to the city, that is, the fact that the work of the runners was done as soon as the threshold of the city was reached was doubtless intended as a symbol of the arrival of Prometheus at fireless human dwellings with the heavenly flame, the civilizing element. The renewal of fire became necessary because it had been polluted by the uses to which it was put by man. All fires in the city

¹ Suidas s. v. *Κεραμεικός*: *τόπος τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὑψηλός*, ὅπου ἐπετέλουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κατ' ἔτος λαμπαδοῦχον ἀγῶνα. Hesychios s. v. *κεραμ.*: ἀγὼν γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν εὐτελής ἐν τῷ Κεραμεικῷ. Schol. Ar. Ran. 131: *Κεραμεικός τόπος Ἀθήνησιν ὅπου συνετέλουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν λαμπαδοῦχον ἀγῶνα*, and Ran. 1093: *τοῦτο δὲ φησὶν Εὐφρόνιος, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῷ Κεραμεικῷ ἀγῶνος τῆς λαμπάδος*. Schol. Ar. Vesp. 1203: *ὅτι γὰρ καὶ ἡγωνίζοντο δρόμῳ λαμπάδας ἔχοντες ἐν τῷ Κεραμεικῷ φανερὸν ἐκ τῶν εἰς Βατράχους*. *Etym. Mag.* s. v. *κεραμ.*: γίνονται δὲ τρεῖς λαμπαδοδρομαί ἐν Κεραμεικῷ.

² Plut. Solon. 1, 79: *λέγεται δὲ καὶ Πεισίστρατος ἐραστῆς Χάρμον γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἀγάλμα τοῦ Ἐρωτος ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ καθιερώσαι, ὅπου τὸ πῦρ ἀνάπτουσιν οἱ τὴν λερῶν λαμπάδα διαθέοντες*. Hermias Commentar. in Plat. Phaedr. p. 78: *καὶ γὰρ παρ' Ἀθηναίους ἐφέιτο τὸ ἐρᾶν, καὶ τοῦ Ἐρωτος βωμοὶ καὶ ἀγάλματα ἦσαν, καὶ Ἀντέρωτος . . . καὶ ὁ δρόμος ὁ μακρὸς τοῖς Παναθηναίοις ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Ἐρωτος ἐγίνετο* · ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ ἀψήμενοι οἱ ἐφηβοὶ τὰς λαμπάδας ἔδονε καὶ τοῦ νικησαντος τῆ λαμπάδι ἢ πυρὶ τῶν τῆς θεοῦ λερῶν ἐφήπτετο. Bekker, *Anec. Graec.* p. 228, s. v. *γυμνασιάρχου*: *ἰφ' ὧν (γυμνασιάρχων) οἱ ἐφηβοὶ ἀλειφόμενοι κατὰ διαδοχὴν τρέχοντες ἤπτον τὸν βωμόν*. Scholiast of Patmos, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* i. 11: *οἱ ἐφηβοὶ, ἀλειφόμενοι παρὰ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου, κατὰ διαδοχὴν τρέχοντες ἤπτοντο τὸν βωμόν*. The reason for the erection of the altars of Eros and Anteros is given by Pausanias I. 30. 1; compare also Suidas s. v. *Μέλιτος*.

were extinguished before the race began and were rekindled from the renewed and pure fire which had been lighted on the altar by the torch of the victorious runner. For the importance of the renewal of fire see Plutarch, Aristides 20. Similarly the fact that the goal at the torch-races held in honor of the other fire-gods was *inside* the city walls may be taken as a symbolical intimation that men were now in possession of fire; that credit was due to these gods, not for having introduced fire, but for having applied it to the uses of men after Prometheus had brought it down to human abodes.

The length of the race-course can only be ascertained approximately, as our authorities do not agree exactly. We know, for instance, that in the Prometheia the course extended from the altar in the Academy to the Dipylon, but while the site of the Dipylon is now known accurately, that of the altar in the Academy can never be established with absolute certainty. Cicero, in speaking of an afternoon promenade which he made with some friends to the Academy, mentions that it was six stadia distant from the Dipylon.¹ Livy reckons the distance from the Dipylon to the Academy as about a Roman mile.² It must be noted that neither Cicero nor Livy intended to be accurate, but only to give an approximate idea of the distance between the two places. The Roman mile of Livy is about 4824 feet, and the six stadia of Cicero about 3636 feet, making a difference of 1189 feet, or nearly one quarter of a mile, in the two statements. But at least we shall not go far wrong if we conclude that the length of the race-course at the Prometheia was about three quarters of a mile long, and at the other festivals—at which the race extended *into* the city—probably about one mile long, or even more, as we have no means of locating either the altar and statue of Anteros or the altar of Athene.³

¹ Cic. de fin. 5, 1, 1: Constituimus inter nos ut ambulationem postmeridianam conficeremus in Academia, maxime quod is locus ab omni turba id temporis vacuus esset. Itaque ad tempus ad Pisonem. Inde vario sermone *sex illa a Dipylo stadia confecimus.*

² Liv. 31, 24: Ab Dipylo accessit. Porta ea, velut in ore urbis posita, maior aliquanto patentiorque quam ceterae est, et intra eam extraque latae viae sunt, ut et oppidani derigere aciem a foro ad portam possent, et extra limes *mille ferme passus longus*, in Academiae gymnasium ferens, . . . liberum spatium praerberet.

³ Hermias speaks of the *long race-course*; Comment. in Plat. Phaedr. p. 78: καὶ ὁ δρόμος ὁ μακρὸς τοῖς Παναθηναίοις ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Ἐρωτος ἐγένετο. Certainly it is a long mile from the Dipylon to what is nowadays held to be the site of the Academy.

The torches used in the race were probably—but not certainly—of two kinds. From a verse of the *Προμηθεὺς Πυρκαεὺς* of Aischylos, which has been preserved by Pollux (10.64), it may be argued that pitch-torches were sometimes used. For what other explanation can be given to *πίσσα κώμολίνου μακροὶ τόνοι*, with which may be compared the *lucida funalia* of Horace (Carm. III, 26, 6)? The only answer that can be given to this question is that Aischylos has made use of the license usually accorded to poets, for if the substance used were *pitch*, there would be no need of *long cords*, as pitch requires no wick. It is then a question whether pitch-torches were used or not! But from vase-paintings and coins it is certain that taper-like torches of wax¹ were far more common, as indeed they were far better suited to the requirements of the race. No skill would be necessary in the case of pitch-torches, for there would be no difficulty in keeping them lighted; on the contrary rapid motion would be calculated to make them burn more readily than ever. Now it *was* difficult and it *did* require skill to keep the torches lighted, and hence we are inclined to think that the material used could never have been pitch.² These wax tapers were placed in a candlestick, whose handle was like that of a dirk or short sword; the candlestick was in most cases provided with a shield just below the socket, in order to prevent the hand from being burned by the hot drippings from the wax-torch.³

The signal for the start was given from the top of a tower in the neighborhood of the Academy and before the invention of the *σάλπιγξ* by the Etruscans, it consisted in dropping a lighted torch from the tower.⁴ By inference we conclude that the signal was given by the *salpinx* after its invention.

¹ Cf. Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung der Athener* I, p. 496 ff.

² We note, for what it is worth, that Weiske, *Prometheus und sein Mythenkreis* p. 537 ff., thinks the material used was liquid and that there was danger of its burning up too soon.

³ This dripping-pan was the shield used by the frogs in the *Batrachomyomachia* 129: *ἀσπίς δ' ἦν λύχνου τὸ μεσόμφαλον*. For the pictorial representations of the torch-race and the torches see the references in a previous note.

⁴ Aristoph. *Ran.* 129, sqq.: *καθέρπυσόν νυν ἐς Κεραμεῖκόν. Εἶτα τί; Ἄναβας ἐπὶ τὸν πύργον τὸν ἰψηλόν.—τί δρῶ; ἄφιμεμένην τὴν λαμπάδ' ἐντεῦθεν θεῶ. κάπειτ' ἐπειδὴν φῶσιν οἱ θεώμενοι εἶναι, τόθ' εἶναι καὶ σὺ σαυτὸν. Ποῖ; Κάτω. The Scholiast to this passage says: *ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῆς λαμπάδος σημεῖον ἦν τοῖς μέλλουσι δραμεῖν, ὡς δεῖ τοῦ δρόμου κατάρξασθαι· ἦν δὲ τοῦτο πρὸ τοῦ εἰρεθῆναι παρὰ Τυρσηνοῖς τὴν σάλπιγγα.**

Speed was an essential feature of the race. This may be gathered by inference from Themistios, who speaks of the sound of the voice, which was to travel faster than the racers in the Lampas,¹ and Aristophanes also gives us to understand that speed was essential, for he calls the race *νεανικώτατον* and treats us to a lively scene in which the racer who runs too slowly is beaten most unmercifully by the inhabitants of the Kerameikos.² From the words of Aristophanes we may infer that the disgrace of defeat and the honor of victory were great.

The victorious Gymnasiarch made a dedication of some sort in honor of the victory. The prize was of small money-value; sometimes it was a shield,³ sometimes a vase (hydria), as was usual in the Panathenaia.⁴

The number of racers can not be determined. Boeckh⁵ thinks that a racer or a line of racers, according to the kind of race to be held, was appointed from each Phyle. It is true that in Athens the Phylae were always rivals for agonistic and choregic honors but Boeckh does not prove his contention. It can not be denied, however, that the words of the speaker in Isaios do certainly tend to support the theory of Boeckh, a fact which

¹ Themist. de Theod. human.: *φωνῆς νικώσης τῷ τάχει τὴν τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ τελουμένην λαμπαδηφορίαν.*

² Aristoph. Vesp. 1203: *ἡ λαμπάδα | ἔδραμες, ἀνευρὼν δ τι νεανικώτατον.* And Aristoph. Ran. 1097 sqq.: *λαμπάδα δ' οὐδεὶς οἶός τε φέρεν ὑπ' ἀγυμνασίας ἐτι νινί. Μὰ Δῖ' οὐ δῆθ', ὥστ' ἐπαφανούνθην Παναθηναίοισι γελῶν, ὅτε δὴ βραδύς ἀνθρωπός τις ἔθει κίψας λευκός, πίων, ὑπολειπόμενος, καὶ δεινὰ ποιῶν· κῆθ' οἱ Κεραμεῖς ἐν ταῖσι πύλαις παίουσ' αὐτοῦ γαστέρα, πλευράς, λαγόνας, πυγὴν· ὃ δὲ τυπτόμενος ταῖσι πλατεῖαις ὑποπερδόμενος φουσὼν τὴν λαμπάδ' ἔφευγε.* And the Scholiast to this last passage says: *τοῦτο δὲ φησιν Εὐφρόνιος, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῷ Κεραμεικῷ ἀγῶνος τῆς λαμπάδος, καὶ τοὺς ὑστάτους τρέχοντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγοραίων τύπτεσθαι πλατεῖαις ὑπὸ τῶν νεανίσκων χερσὶ· καὶ λέγονται αἱ τοιαῦται Κεραμεικαὶ πλῆγαι. ἐμφαίνεται δὲ ἀπὸ τούτων ὅτι παρὰ τοῖς Κεραμεικοῖς τοῦτο μάλιστα γίνεται.* And Hesychios s. v. *κεραμεικαί: πλατεῖαι πλῆγαι. ἀγῶν . . . ἐν τῷ Κεραμεικῷ, ἐν ᾧ τύπτονται πλατεῖαις χερσὶ τοὺς μὴ τρέχοντας κ. τ. λ.* Aristophanes mentions that these blows were administered *at the gates*, by which must be understood, we think, the Dipylon. The Scholiast does not seem to be clear in his own mind on this subject, as he observes: *πύλαις δὲ ταῖς εἰσόδους τοῦ ἀγῶνος* and *ταῖς εἰσόδους τοῦ δρόμου.* But from our discussion above there can be little doubt that the Dipylon is meant.

³ C. I. G. 2360 line 31: *λαμπαδάρῳ τῷ νικῶντι ἄσπιδα.*

⁴ Rangabé, Ant. Hell. 960, B, line 27: *λαμπαδηφόρῳ νικῶντι ὕδρια.* Here the victory was individual or personal, and hence this Hydria was given to a victor in the first kind of Lampas on foot.

⁵ *Staatshaushaltung der Athener* I, p. 496 sq., first edition.

Boeckh himself has overlooked.¹ But the strongest proof is contained in the words of the Scholiast of Patmos *ad Demos. πρὸς Εὐβουλίδην* § 43 *B. C. H. i. 11*,² also unknown to Boeckh. But we have no proof that there were ten lines of runners. We have proof, however, that at least on one occasion there were as many as fourteen relays of runners in one line, all of whom belonged to the tribe Attalis, which through them gained the victory.³ The fact that Pausanias says that if the torch of the first runner go out, the second may be the victor, and if the second fail the third can be the victor, can not be taken as an indication of the number of runners; in fact the words of Pausanias can be allowed no weight whatever in deciding the question, as they were evidently intended as a mere illustration of the rules of the game.

The Gymnasiarch was the superintendent of the Lampas. The racers had to be fed, paid, and trained at his expense. We can not enter upon a discussion of the duties of the Gymnasiarch versus Lampadarch,⁴ but we may say that it is certain that the Lampadarchy was the principal duty of the Gymnasiarch. The author of the *λέξεις ῥητορικαί* knows of no other duty for the Gymnasiarch,⁵ and the words of Xenophon certainly strengthen this theory;⁶ again the words of the Scholiast of Patmos, *Bull. Corr. Hell. i. p. 11*, bear upon this point.⁷

Isaios (de Philoct. haered. 60) has *γεγυμνασιάρχηκε δὲ λαμπάδι* and

¹ Isaios de Apollodori haereditate 36: *γεγυμνασιάρχηκα γὰρ εἰς Προμηθεῖα τοῦδε τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ φιλοτιμίως, ὡς οἱ φυλέται πάντες Ἰσασιον.*

² *καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἄψας ἐνίκα, καὶ ἡ τοῦτου φυλή.*

³ C. I. A. iii, 122: *οἱ νεκῆσαντες τὴν λαμπάδα Ἀσκληπιάδης Εὐκάρπου Ἀθμονεύς, Λάδικος Σώζοντος Σουινεύς, Καλλίμαχος Διονυσίου, Ροῦφος, Ἀγάθων, Σωτᾶς, Διονύσιος, Ζώσιμος, Συναῖς, Φοῖβος, Ἀττικὸς, Ζωσιμᾶς, Σώτης.*

⁴ Discussions of this question will be found: by Haase, in *Allgem. Encykl. III, 9, p. 388*; by Krause, *Hellenika, I, p. 187 ff.*; and in the *Wiener Jahrbücher XCV p. 161*. Haase tries to prove that Gymnasiarch and Lampadarch are two terms for one and the same person, Krause combats Haase's theory, and the writer in the *Wiener Jahrbücher* defends Haase's theory, and, as we think, proves the point.

⁵ Bekker *Anec. Graec. p. 228 s. v. γυμνασιάρχου: οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν λαμπαδοδρομῶν εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ Προμηθέως καὶ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου καὶ τοῦ Πανός.*

⁶ *Xen. de Vect. 4, 52: οἱ τε γὰρ ταχθέντες γυμνάζεσθαι πολὺ ἂν ἐπιμελέστερον πράττειον τὰ ἐν ταῖς γυμνασίαις, τὴν τροφήν ἀπολαμβάνοντες πλεῖω ἢ ἐν ταῖς λαμπάσι γυμνασιαρχούμενοι.*

⁷ *οἱ ἔφηβοι, ἀλειψάμενοι παρὰ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου, κατὰ διαδοχὴν τρέχοντες ἤπτοντο τὸν βωμόν.*

de Apoll. haered. 36: *γεγυμνασιάρχηκα γὰρ εἰς Προμήθεια*, Andokides de Mysteriis 132 has *γυμνασίαρχον Ἡφαιστείους*, Lysias ἀπολ. δωροδοκ. 3 has *ἰγυμνασιάρχων εἰς Προμήθεια*, Ross' inscription (Demen, p. 55) has *γυμνασιάρχης τῶν Ἀθεστηρίων τὴν λαμπάδα*. Now the Prometheia and Hephaisteia consisted simply and solely of the torch-race, and when we read that such an one was Gymnasiarch at one of these festivals we must conclude that the Gymnasiarchy is simply another name for the Lampadarchy. It is necessary to add that Pollux gives the superintendence of the Lampas to the Archon Basileus and the Epimeletai, but most probably wrongly.¹ Boeckh thinks that the race-course was lighted up at the expense of the Gymnasiarch, but this is mere hypothesis, and can not be proved from ancient writers.

The cost of the Torch-race was very considerable.² Aristotle recommends the abolishment of the choregy and the lampadarchy, on the ground that they are both costly and useless.³ The Cyclic chorus and the Pyrrhic dance were cheaper than the Lampas. An inscription mentions the victorious Gymnasiarchs in the Prometheia and Hephaisteia along with those who gain the victory with a chorus of men in the Thargelia and Dionysia.⁴ Xenophon mentions the Dionysia, Thargelia, Panathenaia, Prometheia, and Hephaisteia in the same breath.⁵ Isaios classes the gymnasiarchy for the torch-race in the same category with the trierarchy and the choregy for tragedy,⁶ and the speaker in Isaios de Apollodori haereditate boasts of his gymnasiarchy at the Prometheia.⁷ Andokides mentions the Gymnasiarchy at the Hephaisteia in the

¹ Pollux 8. 90: *ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς μυστηρίων προέστηκε μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν καὶ Ἀθναίων καὶ ἀγώνων τῶν ἐπὶ λαμπάδι, καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς πατρίους θυσίας διοικεῖ*.

² To the data, which have in the main been collected by Boeckh (Staats-haushaltung etc., loc. cit.) I can make but unimportant additions.

³ Aristot. Polit. V, 8, fin: *βέλτιον δὲ καὶ βουλομένους κωλύειν λειτουργεῖν τὰς δαπανηρὰς μὲν μὴ χρησίμους δὲ λειτουργίας, οἷον χορηγίας καὶ λαμπαδαρχίας καὶ ὄσων ἄλλων τοιαῦται*.

⁴ Xen. de Rep. Athen. III, 4: *πρὸς δὲ τοῖσι χορηγοῖς διαδικάσαι εἰς Διονύσια καὶ Θαργήλια καὶ Παναθήνια καὶ Προμήθεια καὶ Ἡφαίστεια ὄσα ἔτη*.

⁵ Chandler II, 6, 125.

⁶ Isaios de Philoct. haeredit. 60: *οὔτοι δὲ Χαίρεστρατος τηλικούτος ὢν τετρατάρχηκε, κεχορηγήκε δὲ τραγωδοῖς, γεγυμνασιάρχηκε δὲ λαμπάδι*.

⁷ Is. de Apol. haer. 36: *γεγυμνασιάρχηκα γὰρ εἰς Προμήθεια τοῦδε τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ φιλοτιμῶς, ὡς οἱ φυλᾶται πάντες ἴσασιν*.

same breath with the Architheory to the Isthmos and to Olympia.¹ Nikias and Alkibiades, who were notorious for the lavish manner in which they expended money on their liturgies, were both gymnasiarchs.² Aeneas says that the Lampas was costly,³ and finally Lysias informs us that a victorious Gymnasiarchy in the Prometheia cost twelve hundred Drachmae, which, if the relative buying quality be taken into consideration, stands for at least one thousand dollars.⁴

The Lampas was popular not only in Athens, but in many other Greek cities and colonies. At Corinth a torch-race was held in honor of Athene-Hellotis, in remembrance of the taming of Pegasus.⁵ Further at Byzantion in honor of Artemis-Bendis;⁶ at Koressia on the island of Keos, in honor probably of Athene;⁷ at Paros in honor of a deity not mentioned;⁸ at Ephesos;⁹ at Teos;¹⁰ at Naples, in honor of Parthenope, one of the Seirens;¹¹

¹ Andoc. de mysteriis 132: ἀλλὰ τοῖναντίον λητουργεῖν οὗτοι προῦβάλλοντο, πρῶτον μὲν γυμνασίαρχον Ἡφαιστειοίς, ἔπειτα ἀρχιθεωρῶν εἰς Ἴσθμὸν καὶ Ὀλυμπίαζε, Andokides was himself a victorious gymnasiarch, cf. de Alcibiade 42: καίτοι τυγχάνω νευικηδὲς εὐανδρία καὶ λαμπάδι καὶ τραγῳδοῖς κ. τ. λ.

² Plut. Nic. et Crass. 1, 4: ἦν δὲ ταῖς δαπάναις πολιτικώτερος μὲν ὁ Νικίας ἀναθήμασι καὶ γυμνασιαρχίαις καὶ διδασκαλίαις χορῶν φιλοτιμούμενος κ. τ. λ., and Isokrates περὶ τοῦ ζεύγους 14, e: περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐνθάδε χορηγιῶν καὶ γυμνασιαρχιῶν καὶ τριηραρχιῶν αἰσχύνομαι λέγειν; spoken by Alkibiades.

³ Aeneae commentarius poliiorceticus XVII, 1: ἐν δὲ μὴ ὁμοιοσύνη πόλει καὶ ὑπόπτως πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐχόντων χρῆ πρνοοῦντα εὐλαβεῖσθαι τὰς μετ' ἄλλου ἐξέδοσιν ἐπὶ θεωρίαν λαμπάδος καὶ ἵπποδρομίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγώνων κ. τ. λ.

⁴ Lysias ἀπολ. δωροδοκ. 3: ἐπειδὴ δὲ κατέπλευσα ἐπὶ Ἀλεξίῳ ἀρχοντος, εὐθὺς ἐγυμνασίαρχον εἰς Προμήθεια, καὶ ἐνίκων ἀναλώσας δώδεκα μνᾶς.

⁵ Schol. Pind. O. 13, 56: Ἑλλάτια δ' ἐπτάκις] ἐρητὴ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ ἀγὼν τελεῖται ὁ καλούμενος λαμπαδοδρομικός, ἐν ᾧ ἔτρεχον νεανία.

⁶ C. I. G. 2034: Ὀλυμπιάδωρος Βενδιθάρου στεφανωθεὶς τῇ λαμπάδι τῶν ἀνήβων τὰ Βοσπόρια, τὸ ἄθλον Ἐρμῆ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ.

⁷ C. I. G. 2360: αἰρεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ γυμνασίαρχον ἅμα ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρχαῖς, μὴ νεώτερον τριάκοντα ἔτων· τοῦτον δὲ ποιεῖν λαμπάδα τῶν νεωτέρων τῇ ἐορτῇ καὶ τὰλλα ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὸ γυμνάσιον.

⁸ C. I. G. 2396: ἐπὶ ναποῦ Ἀῦρ. Χρησίμου τοῦ Μάρκου, λαμπαδαρχήσαντος Δωροθέου τοῦ Θεοτειμήτου, Ἀσκληπιῆ καὶ Ὑγείας.

⁹ The inscription on which this statement is based is very badly mutilated, but the word λαμπαδάρχου is certain, C. I. G. 3018.

¹⁰ Here too the inscription is mutilated, λαμπάδος, however, being certain, C. I. G. 3088.

¹¹ C. I. G. 287: νευήσας τὴν λαμπάδα (bis), and especially Lykophron. Alex. 732 sqq.: πρώτη δὲ καὶ ποτ' αὐθι συγγόνων θεῶ κραινῶν ἀπάσης Μόψοπος ναναρχίας πλωτήρια λαμπαδοῦχον ἐντυεὶ δρόμον, χρησμοῖς πύθηςας, and Tzetzes ad Lycophr.

at Syros, in honor of Demeter;¹ in Kerkyra;² the magnificent coins of Amphipolis, which bear a flaming torch of the kind already described, tell us distinctly of torch-races once held there.³ It will be noted that a Lampas is only claimed positively for places from which our information is direct and incontrovertible. But if Haase's limitation of the Gymnasiarchy be accepted, the list of places at which a torch-race was held may be increased almost *ad infinitum*. Lastly as an illustration of the immense popularity of the Lampas, it may be noted that Alexander the Great instituted torch-races at almost all of his festivals.⁴ From all this we may gather that the torch-race was extremely popular among the Greeks, wherever they lived, and that no other festival of the Athenians was celebrated so often. This frequency of its celebration is without doubt the reason why such an abundance of names for the festival have come down to us. The most usual name was simply *Λαμπάς* (e. g. Plat. Rep. 328, A and often elsewhere). The other names are :

ιερά λαμπάς Plut. Solon, 1. 4.

λαμπαδοδρομία Hdt. 6. 105; Plat. Rep. 328. A.

λαμπαδοδρομία Bekk. Anec. Graec. p. 228. 11.

λαμπαδοφορία Hdt. 8. 98.

λαμπάδος ἀγών Hesych. s. v. *λαμπάς*; Schol. Ar. Ran. 1087.

λαμπάδων ἀγών Eustath. Opusc. ed. Tafel, p. 237. 70.

ἀγών ἐπὶ λαμπάδι Pollux 8. 90.

θεωρία λαμπάδος Aeneae Comm. Poliorc. 17. 1.

ἐορτή λαμπάδος Harp. s. v. *λαμπάς*.

λαμπαδιστῆς ἀγών Schol. Ar. Ran. 131.

Alex. 732, sqq.: *Τίμαιος ὁ Σικελικός φησι Διότιμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων ναύαρχον θῦσαι τῇ Παρθενόῃ καὶ δρόμον ποιῆσαι λαμπαδικόν, ὅνπερ λαμπαδικὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ δρόμον οἱ Νεαπολίται ἐτησίως ἐτέλουν.* Compare also Statius Silv. IV, 8, 50:

Tuque, Actaea Ceres, cursu cui semper anhelo

Votivam taciti quassamus lampada mystae.

¹ C. I. G. 2347: *Διονυσίων τε τῷ ἀγῶνι τῶν τραγῳδῶν, καὶ Ἑρακλείων τῇ πομπῇ, καὶ Δημοτρίων τῇ λαμπάδι κ. τ. λ.*

² Brönsted, Reise und Untersuchungen II, 289 ff. Here they wore a shield on the left arm.

³ Cf. Head, Coins of the Ancients, plate 21, nos. 7 and 8.

⁴ For instance at Soloi, Arriani An. 2. 5. 8: *Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐν Σόλοις θύσας τε τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ πομπέσας αὐτῶς τε καὶ ἡ στρατιᾷ πᾶσα καὶ λαμπάδα ἐπιτελέσας κ. τ. λ.*; at Tyre, Arr. An. 2. 24. 6: *καὶ αἱ νῆες ξυνεπόμπευσαν τῷ Ἑρακλεῖ, καὶ ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ λαμπάδα ἐποίησε*; at Susa, Arr. An. 3. 16. 9; at Taxila, Arr. 5. 3. 6; at Nikaia, Arr. 5. 29. 2; at Karmania, Arr. 6. 28. 3; at Ekbatana, Arr. 7. 14. 1, and elsewhere.

- τὰ λαμπαδοδρόμα Bekk. Anec. Graec. p. 228 (v. l.).
 λαμπαδοῦχος ἄγων Schol. Ar. Ran. 131.
 λαμπαδοῦχος δρόμος Lycophr. Alex. 734.
 λαμπαδοδρομικὸς ἄγων Schol. Pind. Ol. 13. 56.
 λαμπαδικὸς ἄγων Timaios ap. Tzetz. ad Lyc. Alex. 734.
 λαμπαδικὸς δρόμος " " " " " "
 λαμπαδοῦχία Lycophr. Alex. 1197.
 λαμπάδιον Dinarch. and Plat. ap. Suid. et Phot. s. v. λαμπάδιον.

The act of running was called:

- λαμπάδα δραμεῖν Ar. Vesp. 1203.
 λαμπάδα τρέχειν Theophr. Charac. 27.
 λαμπάδα φέρειν Ar. Ran. 1087.
 λαμπάδα διαθέειν Plut. Solon, 1. 4.
 λαμπαδοδρομεῖν Schol. Ar. Vesp. 1203.
 λαμπαδίσειν Schol. Ar. Ran. 131.
 λαμπαδοῦχεῖν Schol. Ar. Ran. 1087.
 λαμπαθηφορεῖν Schol. Ar. Ran. 1087.

The runners themselves were called:

- λαμπαδισταί C. I. G. 242.
 λαμπαθηφόροι Aesch. Ag. 304.
 πυρσοφόροι Hesych. s. v. πυρσοφ.
 δρομείς Ar. Vesp. 1206.
 οἱ λαμπαδίζοντες Schol. Ar. Ran. 131.

To gain the victory was called:

- λαμπάδα νικᾶν C. I. G. 287.
 λαμπάδι νικᾶν Andoc. Alcib. 133.
 λαμπαθηφορίαν νικᾶν Themist. de Theod. human.

The victor was called:

- λαμπαθηφόρος Hesych. s. v. λαμπάς.

The superintendents of the festival being the gymnasiarchs the discharge of their duty was called:

- γυμνασιάρχειν λαμπάδι Isaios de Phil. haered. 60.
 γυμνασιάρχειν λαμπάδα Ross, Demen, p. 55.

J. R. SITLINGTON STERRETT.

III.—THE POMERIUM AND ROMA QUADRATA.

Nothing in connection with the topography of Rome has been discussed more frequently or at greater length, than the pomerium. The problem is complicated by the fact that not only the line of the pomerium is in question, but also the meaning and use of the word. As the pomerium was extended at various times during the history of the city, so the term itself underwent certain changes in meaning.

This whole subject has been treated with great fullness in the works referred to below,¹ but contradictory results have been reached. The only excuse for the present paper is to draw attention more closely to the relation between the pomerium² of the Palatine city and Roma quadrata.

So far as I know, the only definite allusion to this relation is made by Jordan (Topographie, I, 1, 168 note) who remarks:—"Um dies (i. e. Varro's description of the extent of Roma quadrata) mit dem unten erörterten Pomerium und der Auffassung des Dionys. I 88: περιγράφει τετράγωνον σχῆμα τῆς λόφου in Einklang zu bringen, ist es unumgänglich nothwendig dass der Ausdruck *Roma quadrata* technisch in doppeltem Sinne gebraucht wurde; einmal zur Bezeichnung der Linie des Pomeriums, zweitens der parallelen Linie der Befestigung der Arx."

But it is reasonably certain that *Roma quadrata* is also used in the sense of *mundus* or augural centre of the city-templum, and

¹ Mommsen, Das Begriff des Pomeriums. Hermes X 24-50, and Röm. Forschungen II 23-41; F. Wehr, Das Palatinische Pomerium. Brux, 1895; O. Richter, Die älteste Wohnstätte des Röm. Volkes. Prog., Berlin, 1891; Topographie der Stadt Rom, 2nd ed. 32-34; Becker, Topographie, 92-108; Jordan, Topographie, I, 1, 163-175; Gilbert, Topographie, I, 114-134; Hülsen, Mitth. 1892, 293.

² Tacitus, Ann. XII 24, describes the line of the Palatine pomerium thus:—sed . . . quod pomerium Romulus posuerit, noscere haud absurdum reor. igitur a foro boario, ubi aereum tauri simulacrum aspicimus quia id genus animalium aratro subditur, sulcus designandi oppidi coeptus, ut magnam Herculis aram amplecteretur. inde certis spatiis interiecti lapides per ima montis Palatini ad aram Consii, mox curias veteres, tum ad sacellum Larum, etc.

therefore we should be obliged to assume three different meanings of the word! This would require very strong evidence for its support.

Let us first consider the extant evidence with regard to the use of Roma quadrata. There is of course no doubt of the literal meaning of the term. It refers to a city laid out in square or rectangular form, for quadrata does not necessarily imply perfect squareness.

The passages in classical literature which are to be considered, are the following:—

(1) Dionysius II 65: *ὅτε γὰρ τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο, ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἱερόν φυλάττεται πῦρ, Ῥωμύλος ἦν ὁ καθιερώσας τῇ θεῷ. μέγα δὲ τούτου τεκμήριον, ὅτι τῆς τετραγώνου καλουμένης Ῥώμης, ἦν ἐκείνος ἐτείχισεν, ἐκτός ἐστιν.*

(2) Ibid. I 88: *περιγράφει τετράγωνον σχῆμα τῷ λόφῳ, βοῶς ἄρρενος ἄμα θηλεία ζευχθέντος ὑπ' ἄροτρον ἐλκύσας ἀβλακα διηρηκῆ τὴν μέλλουσαν ὑποδέξασθαι τὸ τεῖχος.*

(3) Plutarch, Romulus 9: *Ῥωμύλος μὲν οὖν τὴν καλουμένην Ῥώμην κουαδράτην, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τετράγωνον, ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκείνον ἐβούλετο πολιῆζειν τὸν τόπον.*

(4) Tzetzes in Lykophron. 1235: *πρὸ δὲ τῆς μεγάλης ταύτης Ῥώμης ἦν ἔκτισε Ῥωμύλος περὶ τὴν Φαιστύλου οἰκίαν ἐν ὄρει Παλατίῳ, ἑτέρα τετράγωνος ἐκτίσθη Ῥώμη παρὰ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου παλαιότερων τούτων.*

This last citation, which is sometimes supposed to be a fragment of Dio Cassius (IV 15), is due probably only to the Scholiast, and has no value whatever (cf. Hülsen, Mitth. 1896, 211 note.)

All that can be learned from the Dionysius and Plutarch passages is,—(1) the city which Romulus founded was called Roma quadrata; (2) the temple of Vesta was outside Roma quadrata; (3) a strict interpretation of No. 2 would seem to imply that the *τετράγωνον σχῆμα* around the hill was the *ἀβλαξ διηρηκῆς*, which was to be the line of the wall itself.

(5) Varro ap. Solin. I 17; *nam ut adfirmat Varro auctor diligentissimus Romam condidit Romulus, Marte genitus et Rea Silvia, vel ut nonnulli Marte et Ilia; dictaque primum est Roma quadrata, quod ad aequilibrium foret posita. ea incipit a silva quae est in area Apollinis et ad supercilium scalarum Caci habet terminum, ubi tugurium fuit Faustuli.*

This passage corroborates inference No. 1, drawn from the previous passages, and then states two limiting points on the boundary of Roma quadrata.

Supercilium scalarum Caci naturally refers to the top of the steps, the remains of which are still plainly to be seen, and begin at some little distance back from the edge of the cliff—so far as one can judge now of the original condition of the ground. The point is further defined by *ubi tugurium Faustuli fuit*. This hut, and its later stone representative, can hardly have been at the extreme edge of the cliff, and it is altogether probable that the ancient stone wall, at the top of the steps of Cacus, marks the approximate site of the tugurium. This terminus, then, of Roma quadrata, may be placed somewhere within a circle which has its centre at the top of the steps and a radius of not more than 20 metres.

The other point, the grove (*silva*) in area Apollinis, is not so easily located. The area Apollinis must mean the inclosure or temenos of the great temple of Apollo. The exact site of this temple has been assigned by most topographers to the spot between the Flavian Palace and the Hippodrome, and under the present Villa Mills, but since the demonstration by Hülsen (Rom. Mitth., 1896, 193-212) that this area can not possibly be large enough, it must be sought elsewhere. No room seems to be left for it except that assigned by Hülsen, viz., the extreme northeastern part of the hill, now largely occupied by the Vigna di San Sebastiano.

According to Hülsen's estimate, the very smallest possible dimensions which can be assigned to the porticus, within which the temple of Apollo stood, are about 80 x 90 metres, and probably it was much larger.

Now a line drawn from the top of the scalae Caci to the approximate centre of the area Apollinis (if it is placed at the northeastern corner of the hill), will be found to run very nearly east and west. This suggests at once that Varro may be describing the decumanus of a templum, especially as we observe that he is careful to follow the theory of the decumanus, by mentioning the eastern end first, the line being drawn ab oriente ad occasum.

The phrase 'quod ad aequilibrium foret posita' is unique in its use as descriptive of direction in space. *Aequilibris* is occasionally used in the sense of horizontal, a meaning which is readily derived from the position of the arm of the balance when the weights are equal. If *aequilibrium* be the correct reading in this passage, such an interpretation is natural as would refer the position of Roma quadrata to the points of the compass, corresponding to the EW decumanus.

In fact, however, a templum drawn on this decumanus, does not correspond in the least with the top of the hill, but stretches far beyond it on the NE and SW where the angles project out into the Forum and the Velabrum.

This hypothesis, therefore, is untenable.

There can be no doubt that the line a silva . . . ad supercilium is an EW line, and if it can not be the decumanus of a quadratum, it may be the diagonal. On this as a diagonal, it is possible to draw a slightly trapezoidal figure which will include practically all the top of the hill, provided we place the tugurium Faustuli as close to the edge of the cliff as possible, and suppose the limit of the silva to be at the extreme eastern edge. This templum would not be square, but would answer the augural requirements.

We assume then that Varro was describing the extreme limits of Roma quadrata, which were of course the two opposite ends of the longest diagonal. It is evident that the augural boundary ran along the edge of the hill, on its top, and certainly *not outside* of the existing wall. It must either have run inside this wall, or have coincided with it. By no possibility could it have coincided with the pomerium described by Tacitus.

Let us now examine certain other passages.

(6) Festus 258: quadrata Roma in Palatio ante templum Apollinis dicitur, ubi reposita sunt quae solent boni ominis gratia in urbe condenda adhiberi, quia saxo munitus est initio in speciem quadratam. eius loci Ennius meminit cum ait "Et quis est erat (qui se sperat, Müller) Romae regnare quadratae."

Taking the text as it stands, it is clear that Festus is thinking of something quite different from the templum of the city in its ordinary sense, and that he has in mind some sort of a receptacle built of stone and square in shape. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether Ennius, in the passage quoted, was thinking of any such receptacle, and not rather of the Roma quadrata referred to elsewhere.

The phrase ubi . . . adhiberi suggests certain other passages which refer to the so-called mundus:—

(7) Plutarch, Romulus 11:—βόθρος γὰρ ὠρύγη περὶ τὸ νῦν κομίτιον κυκλωτέρης, ἀπαρχαὶ δὲ πάντων, ὅσοις νόμφ μὲν ὡς καλοῖς ἐχρῶντο, φύσει δ' ὡς ἀναγκαίους, ἀπετίθησαν ἐνταῦθα. καὶ τέλος ἐξ ἧς ἀφίκτο γῆς ἕκαστος ὀλίγην κομίξων μοῖραν ἔβαλλον εἰς ταῦτα καὶ συνεμίγνυον. καλοῦσι δὲ τὸν βόθρον τοῦτον φ καὶ τὸν δλυμπον ὀνόματι, μούνδον. Εἶτα ὡσπερ κύκλον κέντρον περιέγραψαν τὴν πόλιν.

(8) Ovid, *Fasti* IV, 821-827:

fossa fit ad solidum. fruges iaciuntur in ima
 et de vicino terra petita solo.
 fossa repletur humo plenaque imponitur ara,
 et novus accenso fungitur igne focus.
 inde premens stivam designat moenia sulco:
 alba iugum niveo cum bove vacca tulit.

If this mundus was called Roma quadrata, then doubtless we have another reference to it in the following fragment of an inscription of the Ludi Saeculares:

(9) Acta ludor. saecul. Sever. Eph. Epig. VIII, 283, line 12:—
 tribunal [. quod es] t ad Romam quadratam.

This tribunal was one of the several *tribunalia* on the Palatine from which the XV viri distributed the *suffimenta*. One of these was quite certainly "in Palatio in area Apollinis" (cf. Hülsen, *Mitth.* 1896, 204 note).

(10) Ovid, *Tristia* III, 1, 27-64:

paruit et ducens "haec sunt fora Caesaris" inquit:
 "haec est a sacris quae via nomen habet.
 hic locus est Vestae, qui Pallada servat et ignem:
 hic fuit antiqui regia parva Numae."
 inde petens dextram "porta est" ait "ista Palati,
 hic Stator, hoc primum condita Roma loco est."
 singula dum miror, video fulgentibus armis
 conspicuos postes tectaque digna deo.
 "et Iovis haec" dixi "domus est?" quod ut esse putarem,
 augurium menti querna corona dabat.
 (Apostrophe to Augustus)
 inde tenore pari gradibus sublimia celsis
 ducor ad intonsi candida templa dei.
 signa peregrinis ubi sunt alterna columnis
 Belides, et stricto barbarus ense pater:
 quaeque viri docto veteres coepere novique
 pectore, lecturis inspicienda patent.

Hülsen (loc. cit.) endeavors to prove that in this passage, *hoc primum condita Roma loco est* refers to this same mundus which was known to Ovid as Roma quadrata, and compares the form of expression used by Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* XIX 3, 2: ἐν εὐχωρίᾳ δὲ τοῦ Παλατίου γενομένοις—πρῶτον δὲ οἰκηθῆναι τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως τοῦτο

παραδίδωσιν ὁ περὶ αὐτῆς λόγος—καὶ ἤδη τοῦ δημοσίου ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι πολὺ πλείων ἢ ἐπιφοίτησις ἦν τῶν στρατιωτῶν etc.

The pretorian guards are hurrying from the Palatine towards the Sacra Via, and passing the *area Palatina*.

Whether Ovid is referring to the mundus or not, there is little doubt that such a structure did exist, and the well-known figure on the Capitoline plan (Jordan, F. U. I. 1) probably represents it.

Furthermore, the direct statement of Festus (6) corroborated by the fragment of the inscription of the Ludi Saeculares (9) may be regarded as sufficient evidence that the term Roma quadrata was used to denote this *mundus*. We have already seen that it was also used to denote the city-templum, drawn on the line described by Varro, as a diagonal, and that the boundary of this templum can not have extended beyond the wall which surrounded the Palatine at its very edge. This boundary marked the augural limits of the city, as is implied in the very nature of a templum.

If now the line described by Tacitus (Ann. XII 24) as that of the pomerium of Romulus, and which extended from the Ara Herculis *per ima montis Palatini* to the ara Consi, the curiae veteres, and so around the hill, was the original pomerium, we are confronted with this dilemma:—

Either there were two city-templa, one called Roma quadrata on the hill, and another larger one inclosed by this pomerium line; or else one or the other of these inclosures was not an augural templum at all. Neither of these hypotheses is possible, and we are forced to the conclusion that Tacitus' line was not the original pomerium, and that his error was due to the current belief that the course followed by the Luperci in their procession, was that of this first pomerium.

The real pomerium of the Palatine city ran *within* the line of fortification, and marked the boundary of Roma quadrata. In this way the discrepancy between the natural meaning of the word "*post murum*," and the fact that Tacitus' line is outside the existing wall, can be explained.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

IV.—ETYMOLOGIES.

The following paper is intended to throw light on the origin of several groups of related words.

Skt. *manus*, Lat. *manus*, Eng. *man*.

English *man* is known to be the same word as Skt. *manus*, 'man', stem *manu-*, which in Germanic became *manw-*, *mann*. The idea that the word is derived from $\sqrt{\text{man}}$ 'think' and originally meant 'the thinker' is so sophisticated and so contrary to what we know to be primitive man's conception of his relation to other animals, that no one could successfully defend it to-day. Cf. Kluge under *Mann* and Lanman under *manu*. Sanskrit *manus* 'man' is phonologically identical with Latin *manus* 'hand', and it is not difficult to show that the words are really one and the same. The figurative use of *hand* for the whole *man* is very natural and appears in almost every language. It refers to the hand as the skillful member and generally designates a laborer or a skillful person. Thus *deckhand*, *farmhand*, 'The hands were dissatisfied with their pay', 'He's a good hand at finding things', Dutch: 'een fijne hand in het vioolspel', German: 'Alle Hände auf Deck!' In French it is *bras* 'arm' that is used in the same way to designate an employee. In Greek *πολυχειρία*, literally 'a multitude of hands', is used for a large number of workmen or assistants; cf. also *πολύχειρ* 'with many hands' = 'with many soldiers'. In Latin the plural of *manus* itself was at times used for 'laborers', as when Vergil says: *nos aera, manus, navalia demus*, *Aeneid*, II, 329, *quale manus addunt ebori decus*, I, 592. From the meaning 'workmen' to 'men' is but a short step and probably was first taken by workmen themselves. This use of *hand* is already common in English, especially in the form *all hands*: 'If all hands had been got together, they would not have more than half filled the room', Dickens; 'His moral character was exceedingly bad . . . he is still a loose hand', Russell, &c.; cf. the Oxford Dictionary. The change of meaning may also arise without intended metaphor, as when one person says, "All hands grasped the line at once", or "It passed from hand to hand",

and the listener conceives the whole person to whom the hand or hands belong. In this way *manus*, probably originally in the plural, crowded upon the older words for 'man'. Thus, for example, OE. *guma*, OHG. *gomo*, = Lat. *homo*, was limited to 'man' as contrasted with 'woman' and survives only in *bridegroom* and *Bräutigam*, just as *Mann* has since been crowded by *Mensch*. On the other hand a new word for 'hand' was needed, and we thus have explained the peculiar fact that the Indo-European languages have a variety of words for this very primitive idea. Some of these, being thus new words, can be associated with verbs etc., but it would probably be hopeless to try to get at the origin of the older *manus*, the conception being doubtless more primitive than even most verbal ideas.

manna.

By the side of the strong *mann*, we find a weak derivative, for example, Goth. and OE. *manna*. For this, two explanations are possible, of which I regard the second as the more likely. (1) The word may be a personal derivative formed from *manw-* when that still meant 'hand' and so be parallel with ON. *kampe* 'person having a beard', from *kampr* 'beard', *lande* 'countryman' from *land*, OE. *stēora* 'steersman' from *stēor* 'rudder', Goth. *staua* 'judge' from *staua* f. 'suit', 'trial', &c., (Kluge, *Stammbildungslehre*, § 16). Or (2) it may be simply a weak by-form of the strong *mann* 'man' (Kluge, *St.* § 17). Thus old English has *mæg* and *māga* 'son' '(kins)man', *ðēow* and *ðēowa* 'servant'; and for OE. *līod* 'prince', Old Norse has weak *ljōðe*; and for OE. *sweor* 'cousin', Gothic has weak *swaihra*. In all these cases the weak form probably originally denoted 'the child of a —', or one belonging to the general class; compare the rise of the derivative *Mensch* below. In Gothic the forms of the strong word and the weak word for 'man' became mixed; in most languages the strong form has prevailed, but German still has the plural *Mannen* in a special sense.

mensch, mīnsk, mīnx.

For *man* there was early formed an adjective in *-iska-*, which appears also as a substantive: Goth. *mannisks*, OHG., OS., OE., &c. *mēnnisc* 'human', OHG. *mēnnisco* 'human being' (compare the modern slang 'a human'), OE. *mēnnisc* 'people', 'crowd'. This word soon began to press upon the older *man* (as that had

upon still older words, page 427), largely restricting it to the masculine, while it itself retained the more general meaning 'human being' and later assumed, especially with the neuter gender, the meaning 'woman'. This latter idea developed as 'female servant', 'lady's maid', 'lissette' 'wanton girl', 'pert or coquettish girl', etc., and appears as the Ger. and Du. *Mensch*, LG. and Friz. *minsk*, Eng. *minks* or *minx*.

manwus etc.

The older meaning of *manw-* 'hand' is preserved in Gothic in *manwus* and *manwuba* 'ready at hand', 'handy', *manwipa* 'things or means at hand', *manwjan* 'to get ready', 'prepare'; whence Romance *manevis* &c. 'ready'; cf. Diez, Ety. Wört. under *manevir*.

gaman, mana-, manag, many.

In Germanic we generally have the *u*-stem *manw-* > *mann*, but not so in Gothic *ga-man* 'fellow-man', 'communion', and in Goth. and OHG. compounds in *mana-*. With this, one is tempted (cf. Kluge under *manch*) to associate Goth. *manag* &c. 'many', but for the still undetermined relation of OSlav. *mūnogū* and OIr. *menicc* 'many'. In that case, *manag* originally meant 'having people', as Skt. *rōma-ṣa* meant 'having hair', 'hairy' (Kluge, St. § 202 &c.). From 'having people' the development 'populous', 'numerous' was natural. Compare Latin *populōsus* (< *populus* 'people'), English *populous* &c.: 'the dust . . . raised by your populous troops', Antony, III, 6, 50.

gamang, among, eggnog, mangelkrām.

There is a compound derivative of the stem of *man*, with the suffix Gc. *g* < IE. *k* (Wilmanns,² II, § 342, § 416, p. 565 top). As an adjective it meant 'populous' (cf. the simplex *manag* above), as a substantive 'a crowd of people' (cf. Ger. *Menge*, OHG. *męnigī*, < OHG. *manag*). The Gc. *gá-mana-ga-* or *gá-manu-ga-* became WGc. *gamanga-*, with regular syncope of the third vowel (Wilmanns,² I, § 274). This appears as OS. *gimang*, OE. *jemong*, with the meaning 'crowd', 'company', 'union', 'commerce', 'business', etc. It also occurs in the phrase OS. *an gimange*, OE. *on jemong*, 'in (and into) the company of', 'among', whence MG., LG., and Friz. *mang* and *manken* and Eng. *among*.

With the meaning 'mixture' it is found in OE. *ægġimong* and *ægmonġ* (cf. Sweet's OET. p. 464) 'egg-mixture'. This *gg* rep-

resents a double palatal stop from the double palatal fricative ʃʃ , and must not be confounded with the earlier double palatal stop written *cg*, which arose out of ǰj and became dʒ in the seventh century (cf. *Anglia*, 22, 375 etc.). As though a simple word, ǣǰǰimōng to some extent suffered syncope of the medial vowel (Sievers, § 143) and simplification of the double consonant next to another consonant (Sievers, § 231, 2), whence the form ǣǰmōng . In both, the ǣ regularly became ē in Middle English and then shortened to *e*. It would not be strange if the form that OE. $\text{ǣ} \text{ǰ}$ 'egg' thus assumed in this compound had had influence in favoring the Old-Norse form *egg* against the usual native English form of the simplex, that is *ey* or *eye*. The presence of two nasals and several *g*'s in ǣǰ(ǰi)mōng , exposed it to confusion and dissimilation of the nasals, whereby one dropped out, compare OHG. *honang* > *honag* = OE. *huniǰ*, OE. *þeniǰ* > *þeniǰ*, OHG. *kuning* > MHG. *kūnic*, the frequent change of the Old English participial ending *-endne* to *-ende*, and cases like *windende* > *widende*, *tungena* > *tugena*, &c., Cosijn, p. 188. In this way, ǣǰǰimōng became *eggynog* (cf. OE. *hōndǰeweorc* > Eng. *handywork*), and ǣǰmōng became *eggnog*, the usual modern form of the drink 'made of eggs, hot beer, sugar, and rum'. But there are still other forms (cf. Wright's Eng. Dialect Dict.): *eggynog* became *eggnoggy* (to consort with *whisky*, *brandy*, &c.), and *eggnog* appears as *egghog* and still oftener as *egghot*, with evident working of popular etymology. Moreover, *-nog* assumed to some extent an independent existence, cf.:

*Dog Walpole laid a quart of nog on't
He'd either make a hog or dog on't.*

—Swift, Upon the Horrid Plot.

Here's Norfolk nog to be had next door.

—Vanbrugh, Journey to London, 1, 2.

This led Bradley (in the Oxford Dictionary) to assume that *eggnog* was from *egg* + *nog*, and *nog* short for *noggin* 'mug'; all of which is plausible, but for the OE. ǣǰ(ǰi)mōng and the modern *eggynog*.

Frizian and Low German have also *mangel- mengel- meng-* in compounds like *mangelkrām* 'things mixed together'.

OE. &c. $(\text{ʒe})\text{mēnčǰan}$, * mēnčlan , Eng. *minge*, *mingle*, &c.;

OE. &c. mōnčian , mōnčere , Eng. *monger*, Lat. *mango*.

The word *gemang* forms the basis of various derivatives.

When the idea of a simplex is differentiated in derivative verbs, these are generally divided between the different weak conjugations (cf. also Sievers, §416, 2). Thus in Old English we have, for example:—

I.	II.
<i>hyġan</i> 'remember':	<i>hozian</i> 'think about';
<i>lēnġan</i> 'extend', 'delay':	<i>longian</i> 'become long', 'long (for)';
<i>scyttan</i> 'remove or discharge (a debt)':	<i>scōfian</i> 'move rapidly', 'shoot';
<i>węġan</i> 'wake up':	<i>wacian</i> 'be awake';
<i>węġan</i> 'move', 'stir':	<i>wazian</i> 'move', 'wag';
<i>węndan</i> 'turn':	<i>wandian</i> 'turn aside', 'be ashamed', 'neglect'.

As I shall show more fully in a future paper, the verbs of the first class (-*ja*- verbs) generally have verbal derivatives in -*ing* and nouns of agency in -*jan*-, while those of the second class (-*ō*-verbs) have verbal derivatives in -*ung* (with weakening to -*eng* -*ing* only before a strong syllable having a back vowel or a secondary stress, for example, *leornian*, *leornung*, *leornunga* or *leorninga*, *leorningcniht*, &c.; Sievers errs in restricting this vowel gradation to the Psalter: §129, 255 A,) and nouns of agency in -*an*-; for example, Goth. *spilla* 'announcer': *spillōn* 'announce', OE. *hunta* 'hunter': *hunþan* 'hunt', *scadā* 'thief': *scadþian* 'steal', -*wara* 'guardian': *warþan* 'guard', &c. But the original method of forming nouns of agency by -*an*- early yielded to the use of the younger -*ari*- that became familiar to the Germanic people in the names of Roman officials, and functionaries, cf. Lat. *munētārius* > Gc. *munitāri*: OHG. *munizāri*, OS. *munitēri*, OE. *mynetēre* &c.: *mynetþan*. The change was doubtless due to the fact that the native -*an*- was ambiguous, not being restricted to nouns of agency, while -*ari*- was perfectly clear; also to the fact that the new nouns in -*ari*-, like the old ones in -*an*- were associated with weak verbs of the second class, cf. *mynetþan*. The struggle continued long and we find Chaucer still wavering between the older *hunte* and the younger *hunter*, both of which we have to-day in the names *Hunt* and *Hunter*. These principles are illustrated by the following words, which I have arranged on the basis of the old English:

(1) *ʒemong* 'mixture'.

(ʒe)*mənǣġan* 'combine', 'mingle', 'mix', 'confuse', whence dialectic Eng. *minge*; Friz. *mengia*, OS. *mengian*, OHG. *mengan*, whence Ger. *mengen*.

**męnġlan*, Eng. *mingle*, Friz., Du., L G. *mengeln*, &c.

(ʒe)*mənǣġung* 'mixing'.

(ʒe)*mənǣġ(ed)nes* 'mingling', 'connection'.

(ʒe)*mənǣġedliġ* 'mixed'.

(ʒe)*mənǣġedlice* 'confusedly'.

Friz. *mengsel* 'mixture', 'dough'.

męnǣġa 'merchant'.

(2) *ʒemong* 'commerce', 'business'; ON. *mang* 'traffic'.

(ʒe)*mongian* 'carry on business', 'traffic', 'trade'; OS. *mangōn* (Du. *mangelen*), ON. *manga*.

mongung 'trading', 'commerce.'

mongere 'trader', 'merchant', *flā̄sġ-mongere* 'butcher'; ON., OHG. *mangāri*, *mengeri*, MHG., MDu., LG., Friz. *manger*, *menger*.

That these two related groups should have influenced one another is not at all strange. So we find *ʒemęnǣġung* (for **ʒemęnǣġing*) like *mongung*, and *męnǣġa* 'merchant' for *męnǣġa* 'mixer' or **męnga*, 'merchant'. For, according to what was said above, we should expect that *mangāri mongere* was preceded by a **mango* **męnga*, and that such was the case is shown by the fact that, along with the German slave-dealer, his name went south and appears in post-Augustan Latin as *mango*. This is, then, one of the words that passed from Germanic into Latin, and not the reverse, as hitherto taken for granted, though this assumption left Latin *mango* quite unexplained. On another occasion I shall show that also in the case of *cheap*, *kauf*, *caupo*, it was the Latin that was the adopter, not the Germanic.

GEORGE HEMPL.

ANN ARBOR, Michigan,
August, 1901.

ZARATHUSHTRA AND THE LÓGOS.

My esteemed friends the Trustees of the Sir J. Jejeebhoy Translation fund in Bombay requested me now some years ago to refute the doctrine that the gāthīc Avesta dated from A. D., or 100 B. C. This curious view had been advanced, I need not say by whom, nor why I have delayed my publication. The theory was suggested chiefly upon the ground of a supposed similarity in the ideas involved in Philo's *lógos* and those which surround the *vohumanah* of the *Gāthas*, one of the chief *Ameshaspends* of the later, but still genuine Avesta. The general subject of philonian influence has had my attention since '76 more or less closely. The shortest discussion of the Greek *lógos*, which is at the same time authoritative and exhaustive, is Heinze's *Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen philosophie*, 1872; much valuable information is also afforded in his work, packed full of facts, by Dr. Carl Siegfried; see in his '*Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*, Jena, 1875.'¹

I began all my well-meant studies with an investigation of the history of the Gnosis, looking for traces of it in Philo. This was earlier than '72. And I had found out Matter's book upon the subject, which is by this time another quarter of a century old.

Matter held strongly to the view that much influence had been exercised by the Zend Avesta upon the gnostic developments; so after some years of enjoyable labour in Germany and Italy upon the Greeks and Germans, with reams upon Kant, etc., as the result, I turned in '75 to the Avesta.

In the first place it is *asha*, who is the Vedic *ṛtá* who, or which, should be compared, and not *vohumanah*. For *asha*, as the rhythm of law in nature, the sacrifice, and the creation is indeed a *Lógos*; and also holds decidedly a nearer place to *Ahura* in the *Gāthas*

¹ See also Gladisch *Herakleitos und Zoroaster*, 1859, now badly antiquated; also Daehne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der Jüdisch-alexandrischen Religionsphilosophie*, Halle, 1834; also Keferstein, *Philo's Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen*, Leipzig, 1846. See Zeller's incomparable sketch, as of course. Tauchnitz edition of Philo, 1880, may be used, as it gives all that is practically needed and holds in view the emendations of Mangey; it is moreover very cheap.

than vohumanah, who is 'sane benevolence' rather than 'law.'¹ Vohumanah elbowed himself, or itself, so to speak, into the first place in the later parsism and even in the later but still genuine Avesta, owing to a misapprehension on the part of the early pahlavi commentators at Y. 28, 2 or 3. Asha should therefore be chiefly in our thoughts here. As to the time-honoured allusion to the Honover, which has been so seriously recalled by writers on this subject, the mention of it again in this connection, while Asha or even Vohumanah are forthcoming, is enough to overpower any Zendist who has a sense of humour, or a human temper; for the 'Honover' is nothing in the world but the late degeneration of the name of the post-gáthic piece, the Ahunvairya; so 'hono-ver,' and has no original meaning as a lógos in any Greek sense whatsoever; though, for the matter of that, if we had no Gátha, then of course anything which might be called the 'word' 'which was before the creation' would do; cp. Y. XIX. As to the lógos of Heraclitus, that was not asha nor vohumanah for the simple reason that it was supreme, wholly materialistic, and yet later called 'divine'; and its analogon, if analogy were possible between the splendid pioneer panlogist and Zarathushtra, would be Ahura Mazda himself, and not Asha nor any of the Ameshas in any sense. Yet here we have the first occurrence of the word (not to speak too strictly),² and this was the proper beginning of the 'lógos' in the Greek Philosophy.

When people began to talk about the 'absolute intelligence' according to which 'nothing happens or is made in vain,' this looked a little more like it; but it was in 462 B. C. circa³ when Anaxagoras first invaded Athens with his *νοῦς* that we really settle down to the question. But if 'mind stirred matter like a whirlpool' after it had rested during 'endless time,'⁴ we begin to get a glimpse of the doctrine that it (matter) was inert, etc.; and then at last that it became so full of all things evil that a series of 'causes' had to be introduced between the Supreme Being and the created world lest his holiness should be defiled by his own evil creature. The last of these agents became the 'Demiurge.'

¹ I generally write vohumanah and asha where they mean attributes, Asha and Vohumanah where they are personified.

² See Sextus Empiricus, *adversus Math.* 27, 127 fig. quoted by Heinze, p. 44, where the adjective *θεῖος* or *θεῖον* is mentioned twice; but he hardly means to give the impression that H. used the word in this connection.

³ See Zeller, *Erster Theil*, p. 974.

⁴ An Avesta expression by the way; see Vend. 19.

At a first superficial glance we might be disposed to go off with the idea that we have found an analogy here, not with Asha indeed, but with the Gensh tashan. A Getish tashan, 'Herd's-maker' takes up the dialogue at Y. 29, 2, either as another name for Ahura, as an intimate associate; but my business at present is first with asha or vohumanah. Here we seemed also to have a fine analogon ready to our hand.

The cause of the created world according to the greatest (Greek) moralist was the 'goodness' of God, which makes a very pleasing 'vohu manah'; but our point here also is not so much an accidental coincidence in the shape of a common idea as the interior character of two separate schemes. Why were any intermediaries needed at all, even according to Anaxagoras and Socrates? The reason continued ever the same; matter was inert, evil, defiled, etc. And just as this doctrine of intermediaries developed through the series of subsequent men, so long as there were any successors, so the doctrine of the worthlessness of matter seems to have become intensified, till Philo at last had no good word left for it.

This dualism between matter and God was indeed repudiated by the Stoa and those who came under its influence, but only to be revived in Greek-Egypt by the predecessors of Philo and then by the alexandrian himself.

What I wished to say in a few words was this, which no expert anywhere will deny, viz., that the entire concept of the platonian dualism, really due to Anaxagoras, is totally foreign to the Avesta. Matter as such was no evil or detested thing with any Zoroastrian writer, original or late, as there was no 'chasm' between it and God. And the platonian *νοῦς*, seldom called by its author 'the *lógos*,' was, with its successors, thought out to bridge such a supposed chasm. Therefore such a *lógos* possessed no interior analogy with either asha or vohumanah for the reason stated.

The difference between the two is radical, a certain superficial resemblance in the expressions describing the two concepts to the contrary notwithstanding. For it was, and simply is, impossible that any two detailed systems of such a character and on the same general subject, theogony, etc., could be stated without a strong external likeness between the several items. How could any 'theogony' be thought out without an idea of 'benevolence' and of 'justice'? Such ideas are universal and not to be excluded. While Plato established more fully than any predecessor the idea

of the chasm between God and his (Plato's) idea of matter, i. e. 'necessity' (sic), he did so only less pointedly showing a series of mediating 'powers' or ideas; but Philo pushed vigorously on till he made his *lógos* the great intermediary. And this brings into the boldest relief the essential difference between his *lógos* and the Avesta as stated above. Nowhere is there, I repeat as I have said, anywhere so much as a surmise in the old Avesta that the material substratum of the Universe is evil in any sense; for the the good and the evil creations are good or evil because of the character of the 'first two Spirits.' Ahura did not need any intermediary whatsoever in creating his good creation. And just here indeed this especial feature of both Asha and Vohumanah becomes important to us; it is that both the one and the other were 'created' (by Ahura) that is to say, where they are considered otherwise than as His attributes; see the *gātha*-places, whereas the platonic-philonian *lógos* was neither created nor uncreated, (sic); it emanated (so) from the *εν*.

The *Geush tashan* or Herd-maker, to return to this, is a term which, as introduced at Y. 29, 2 and in Y. 31, 9 seems to have conveyed the idea that there existed in the mind of the composer a necessity for a secondary maker of 'the herd,' that is to say of the 'creation'; but this is only an apparent necessity founded upon a false inference. Ideas, like events, cast their shadows before;—and it is probably true that there already began to form itself within the minds of those who toyed with speculation a vague conception of an associate creator; motivated probably by a reason diametrically the opposite to that which influenced Plato and his later Alexandrian disciple; but this would show an anterior date for the *gātha*-places, whereas the object held in view by those who advanced the comparison of *vohumanah* and the *lógos* was to impair, if not to destroy, the long settled claims of the *Gāthas* to antiquity.

Be this as it might, in the *Gātha* itself the term '*Geush tashan*' is distinctly taken apart and applied to Ahura. See *Yasna*, 51, 7.

'Thou who didst create (*tashō*) the kine, the waters and the plants, long life and health—' . . . *Tashō* is the verbal, *tashan* (*tashā*) the nominal form.

Another item, has, however, as I confess, often given me pause and many an hour of long and curious reflection. It is the occurrence of the expression 'the better than the good'; i. e. the 'summum bonum.'

I have not been at all disturbed by the fact that almost its mate

occurs in a list of similar academic terms in Philo as a title of his God. He was among a mass of things τὸ κρείττον μὲν ἀγαθοῦ.¹ For in the Gatha it has nothing to do with such an application. In Y. 43, 2 'the better than the good' is the end, or goal, toward which the beatified approaches, whether here or hereafter, the summum bonum: 'thus that better than the good may he approach, who hath taught us the straight paths of the law.' But I have been always deeply impressed, not to say staggered, by the occurrence of such a thought at all. What a depth and refinement of ideas it discloses.

After a little, however, one recovers from the startled suspicion; as item after item of a similar cast comes back to the recollection. What could be more clear, pointed or profound in an intellectual sense than the astonishing words 'rewards for this bodily life and the mental', and 'whose own soul reproaches them,' 'astonishing' for a hymn in Iran at even the latest (early) date ever suggested, till at the next moment we have the speculative problem categorically put at Y. 28, 11.

'Teach thou me forth to proclaim from thy mouth of spirit the laws by which the primeval world arose'; literally, "forth to me teach from thy spirit to proclaim with thy mouth those *things* (i. e. laws, powers, or causes) in accordance with which the first world arose; i. e. became existent, 'bavat.'" Once again at home amidst such gāthic concepts, we must simply surrender to the *vanhēuš vahyō*—'the better than the good':—and no longer doubt that the entire gāthic literature at that time and place was only not philosophic because it was theosophic, so to speak, in a firm, and by no means in a certain modern, sense.

Very many expressions conveying ideas similar to *asha* and *vohumanah* were unavoidable in any system such as that of Philo and his sympathetic predecessors. No one at all like Philo could possibly write so much and say it so elaborately without redoubling scraps of speech which remind us of *asha* at every step. In fact he said so much that he used up the Greek vocabulary, pretty nearly, in his fervour. The two themes were practically identical; both the authors were keen and pious, each had predecessors doubtless whose 'call' they were perpetuating. How is it possible that throngs of expressions closely allied should not occur in what the two teachers said? But their principles on the *lógos* and its business were simply radically

¹ De Legatione ad Gaium II, 546.

opposed. In fact if I had to make a choice, (I for one) would call *asha* nearer the *lógos* of the panlogistic stoics, or to that sublime fire-*lógos* of the great Ephesian, the wonderful concept to which I first alluded, though both he and the stoics practically pushed the gods aside, for neither of them accepted the so-called 'chasm' between a God and matter, and each of them lacked that one incompatibility with the Zoroastrian concepts.

Not wishing to encroach upon space here, I have elaborated this subject (so far as articles in reviews or journals can well do so) in the July numbers of the *Journal of the R. Asiatic Society*, and of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*,¹ to which the reader is referred. They embody the conclusions of well-nigh a quarter of a century, and of some four years of special labour on the Greeks and the Germans from the spring of '72.

In the essay which I have been preparing for my friends in Bombay I have also elaborately cited all the texts, overdoing the matter as usual, unfortunately, with unnecessary care.

With regard to the influence of Mazdaism upon Heraclitus,—there is no doubt at all that such a man as he was knew a very great deal about Mazdaism, so far as the form of it which surged about him during certain years of his prime was knowable;—though it is somewhat curious that no gibe upon it has survived from him. The armies of Darius were in possession of the territory up to the gates of Ephesus for periods longer or shorter; and Ephesus was not captured for the very reason that it always stood true to Persia; and it is conceded that he (Heraclitus himself) was invited to the court of Darius, the false letters being the echo of the fact. That the dualism of the Mazda-worship existed in the lores of the Persian priests who accompanied the monarch, I hold to be most probable, if not practically certain,—and also that Heraclitus was much interested as well as amused by what he could learn of it; but that it really influenced his entire departure I hardly feel. He was a singularly original person, and I do not think that the 'barbaric' lore of his hated enemy could have been the originating cause of his own astounding system. A system which, as I think, a great many of us are beginning to feel more and more, came very near indeed to suggesting the 'key' to the great Enigma.

OXFORD, FEB., 1902.

LAWRENCE MILLS.

¹ See also the last number, Jan. 1902.

NOTES.

CICERO'S JUDGMENT OF LUCRETIVS.

Lucreti poemata ut scribis ita sunt multis luminibus ingenii multae tamen artis. Sed cum veneris (ad Quint. frat. II 9, 3).

It had seemed as if pretty general agreement had at length been reached concerning this passage in an interpretation somewhat as follows: "The criticism of Quintus with which Cicero expresses his accord was that Lucretius had not only much of the *genius* which characterized the older Latin poets (as Ennius or Accius), but also much of the *art* of the new school (so essentially Tyrrell ad loc. following a suggestion of Munro)." The word which has caused difficulty is *tamen*. For while it is true that in ancient as well as modern usage there is a frequent antithesis between *ingenium* and *ars*, yet it did not seem clear why this antithesis should be emphasized if both are accorded to Lucretius. For this reason it was felt that one or the other quality was denied to him, and therefore *non* was inserted either before *multis* or *multae*, or the antithesis was eliminated by changing *tamen* to *etiam*. But agreement was never reached in any of these suggestions and opinion had apparently begun to crystallize in the interpretation of the text as given above.

Professor F. Marx, however, in a valuable article on Lucretius in the *Neue Jahrbücher* for 1899 (Vol. III, p. 536) goes back to *< non > multis* and Mr. Saintsbury, in his recent volume on the *History of Literary Criticism* (p. 215), does likewise, selecting with rather palpable partizanship the form which will yield the most effective condemnation of Cicero for failing to recognize the genius whose fate had been entrusted to his keeping. This wavering in a conclusion which had begun to seem fixed has made me bold to advance a view of this passage which has always seemed to me the natural one, but which has not, to my knowledge, been advocated publicly.

The text I accept as sound, but I would look upon *tamen*, not as marking the antithesis between *ingenium* and *ars*, but as indicating the point at which Cicero dissents from the judgment of

Quintus—that is, in contrast to *ita*. The form of expression is a familiar one, but an example may not be superfluous: *fac ita esse; tamen hoc ferendum nullo modo est* (Cic. Verr. II 141). And so in our passage the relation is *ita sunt . . . tamen*, and not *ingeni . . . tamen artis*, as is assumed by Tyrrell (*supra*) and others, and recently by Norden (*Antike Kunstprosa*, Vol. I, p. 182), who cites a parallel usage from Seneca Rhet.¹ Apparently Quintus had written that the verses of Lucretius were characterized by *multis luminibus ingeni*, and had either expressed the opinion or implied that they lacked in *ars*. Cicero writes in reply: *Lucreti poemata ut scribis ita sunt multis luminibus ingeni*, so far agreeing with his brother and quoting his words; but he adds in dissent *multae tamen artis*. That there was disagreement between the two in some respect is suggested by the words which follow: *Sed cum veneris*—‘but we’ll discuss the matter more fully when you come.’² Apart from the objection to *tamen* which others have felt, it would seem to me unnatural that Cicero should repeat verbatim or essentially the judgment of Quintus unless it were to express a partial dissent from it, to which, as has been said, the succeeding words point. Finally, the formula of partial agreement and exception, *ita . . . sed* or *tamen*, is so common that it seems to me a Roman reader must have grouped the words together in this manner most naturally.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

CICERO AD ATTICUM.

The postal facilities of ancient Rome were precarious at best, and it seems quite clear that Roman ideas concerning the inviolability of private letters were very much less strict than ours. We should therefore expect to find Roman letter-writers resorting to all manner of devices to render their private correspondence unintelligible to prying eyes, and there is plenty of testimony to the fact that they did so. In Cicero’s case, we have his own explicit statements. So (Ep. ad Att. II 20. 3) *de re publica breviter ad te*

¹Controv. Praef. I 17; *memoria ei natura quidem felix, plurimum tamen arte adiuta.*

²For this interpretation and punctuation of the text, which is obviously correct, cf. F. Marx, *Berl. Ph. Woch.*, 1891, col. 835. A passage of similar import and brevity of expression I owe to my colleague, Professor W. G. Hale, *Ad fam. XII 1, 2*: *Verum haec propediem et multa alia coram.*

scribam, iam enim charta ipsa ne nos prodatur pertimesco: itaque posthac, si erunt mihi plura ad te scribenda, ἀλληγορίαις obscurabo.

Another suggestion is made by Cicero Att. II 19. 5. (posthac ad te aut, si perfidelem habebō cui dem, scribam plane omnia, aut, si obscure scribam, tu tamen intelleges; in eis epistolis me Laelium, te Furium faciam; cetera erunt ἐν αἰνιγμαῖς,) and modified in the next letter. (II 20. 5 quod scripseram me¹ Furio scripturum, nihil necesse est tuum nomen mutare. Me faciam Laelium et te Atticum, neque utar meo chirographo neque signo, si modo erunt eiusmodi litterae, quas in alienum incidere nolim.)

The two periods of Cicero's life when such precautions would have been most needful, for Atticus' sake if not for his own, were the months of his exile (696-7) and those which elapsed between the June day 706 when he finally followed Pompey over seas and his pardon by Cæsar more than a year after the battle of Pharsalia. These letters comprise the third and eleventh books *ad Atticum*.

Turning now to the internal evidence of the text, we are struck by the entire absence in these two books of those Greek epithets and quotations which occur so frequently in most of the other letters to Atticus. We know from Att. X 8. 1. that Cicero's ever prudent friend felt so keenly the danger which attended their correspondence in 705 as to have doubted the desirability of writing at all, and we know that Cicero disregarded the delicate intimation even while admitting its wisdom. Still harder would it have been for him in 696 or 707 to deny himself such an outlet for his conflicting emotions as was afforded by these most free and intimate epistolary outpourings; and that he compromised the matter by employing a cipher seems at least a plausible theory.

We need not suppose that he is referring to the comparative laboriousness of following a code, when he makes use—as he does so often at these times—of such phrases as *plura scribere non possum* and *non queo plura scribere*, and still less that he was too much disturbed in mind during those trying times to have the patience requisite for employing a difficult cipher, for he undoubtedly had at hand an expert amanuensis, who possessed the key to all his "enigmas," and who was able to use the most complex. But might we not satisfactorily explain the absence of Greek words by supposing that he adopted some such simple expedient as that of moving the letters of the Latin alphabet a certain number of

¹ Reading of M., variously altered by editors who have thought emendation necessary.

places forward or back? Greek words could not have been left intact on such a page, for their significance would have been suggestive to the inquisitive reader, while, if they too had been transposed, according to the code, but in their own alphabet, the small, isolated groups of foreign characters must have given the clue to the cipher. Nor could the letters of the Greek words have been transposed and then written in Latin characters, because of the different order in which the letters occur in the two alphabets as well as the presence in the Greek of the double-consonant symbols. The only feasible way would have been to keep to the vernacular, as Cicero has done in the third and eleventh books.

LOUISE DODGE.

MAMATPAI.

In the current volume of this Journal XXII, p. 195 foll., two American scholars have tried with greater or less probability to carry back to their Indian original form a number of Indian glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychios. With respect to one of them *μαμάτραι οἱ στρατηγοὶ παρ' Ἰνδοῖς*, I would propose another explanation which gives both a simpler account of the word itself and one more in accordance with phonetics. In my opinion, *μαμάτραι* represents Skrt. *mahāmātrāḥ*, a well-known term to denote a minister of high rank. *Mahāmātrāḥ samṛddhe cāmātye hastipakā dhiḥ*. 'Mahāmātra signifies as well a high minister as an elephant-driver.' So the Medinikośa. In literature the word is very common in both acceptations. In the Amorakośa commentary found in the edition of Vamanacharya Jhalakikar, Bombay, 1890, the right etymology is given (p. 181) *mahati mātrā yeṣāṃ te mahāmātrāḥ*. Its translation by *στρατηγοὶ* may have been made by Megasthenes or some other source of information about Indian matters in the time of the Diadochoi; and as *στρατηγός* is employed in a wider sense than to denote mere military power, it may have been considered an adequate term for rendering tolerably well the name by which the Indian high officials were designated. Cp. *στρατηγός* as equivalent of the Roman *praetor*. That *mahāmātra* in Greek transcription must become *μαμάτρα* (as to the accent, cp. *mātrā*), is almost evident.

GRONINGEN.

J. S. SPEYER.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum, by ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, Ph. D., Professor of the Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago. Part V. The University of Chicago Press, Luzac and Co., London, 1900.

The value of the letters and dispatches to students of Assyriology is not easily overestimated. They frequently supplement the historical inscriptions with valuable details, and, in some instances, are the only source of information in regard to important events; they cast much light upon the administrative methods of the Assyrian government, and upon the practical workings of the state religion; and, although with few exceptions of an official character, they furnish valuable information concerning Assyro-Babylonian life and customs. From the standpoint of philology they constitute a rich mine, yielding a wealth of material to be found in no other class of cuneiform texts. At first, owing to the superior attractions of the historical, religious, grammatical, and lexicographical texts, the letter tablets were little studied, and it is only within the last fifteen years that they have their due share of attention.

Father Strassmaier in his *Alphabetisches Verzeichniss* (1886), S. A. Smith in his *Assyrian Letters* (1888) and in his *Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipals*, and Dr. Hugo Winckler in his *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten* (Part II, 1894), have published a considerable number of these texts, and Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, in a series of articles in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* (Vols. I & II, 1889-91) laid the foundation for their scientific study. But to Prof. Harper belongs the credit of conceiving and carrying into execution the plan of publishing a complete corpus of Assyrian and Babylonian letters, thus making the whole mass of these interesting texts available for study. The first volume of Prof. Harper's *Letters* appeared in 1892, and five volumes have now been published containing, in all, 538 texts edited with great care and skill, and printed in a manner that leaves nothing to be desired. The fact that at least three additional volumes will be required to complete the series is evidence both of the magnitude of the undertaking and of the wealth of material available. The fifth volume, which has recently appeared, measures fully up to the standard of excellence set by its predecessors.

Among the writers of the 103 letters contained in it may be

mentioned Tem-Ašur, who is probably to be identified with the eponym of the year 717 B. C.; Tâb-çil-Eshara, governor of the city of Asshur, who filled the office of eponym in 714; Ashur-rêçu'a who, under Sargon, held a military command on the northern frontier of Assyria, and is mentioned in the correspondence of Sennacherib; Arad-Nabû, a priestly official contemporary with Esarhaddon; and Bel-ibni, governor of the Gulf District in 650, who played an important part in the Elamite wars of Ashurbanipal. It should be noted, by the way, that Nos. 460 (K. 1250) and 462 (K. 1374), although the writer's name is broken away in both instances, were certainly written by Bel-ibni. The subject matter, the general style, and several marked peculiarities of expression leave no room for doubt as to their authorship. No. 469 (48-11-4, 282), although badly mutilated, is especially interesting. It contains an appeal to the King from the people of Erech who state that a dispute about some houses, gardens, and other property had been decided in their favor by "thy father Ashurbanipal" (obv. 12-13; rev. 1). The King addressed must, therefore, have been either Ashur-etil-ilâni or Sin-shar-ishkun (the Saracus of Abydenus), and the letter affords new evidence of the fact that the rule of Assyria was maintained in Babylonia for some time after the death of Ashurbanipal.

Very few textual errors have escaped the editor's watchful care. In No. 521, rev. l. 21, *ar* (*ar-ra-ti*) should be read instead of *bi*, and, in No. 469, rev. l. 2, the context shows that the first character must be *di* (*di-i-nu*) not *ki*. Both errors are trivial and the present writer has discovered no others. In the preface, Prof. Harper states that Part VI will probably be ready within the present year, and it is to be hoped that this expectation may be realized. The appearance of a new volume of the *Letters* is ever a welcome event.

CHRISTOPHER JOHNSTON.

Textes et Monuments Figurés Relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra,
publiés avec une Introduction Critique par Franz Cumont,
Professeur à l'Université de Gand. Bruxelles, H. Lamertin.
Two Volumes, 4°: Volume II, Textes et Monuments, 1896,
pp. viii, 554; Volume I, Introduction, 1899, pp. xxviii, 377.

When a certain scholar of international reputation, during a recent Winckelmannsfest at the German Archaeological Institute at Rome, pictured as the ideal of scholarship that in which there should be a union of the untiring industry and patience of the Teuton and the brilliant intuition of the Latin, he gave utterance to a sentiment which is common among scholars of the Latin nations, who, while they admire and imitate German scholarship,

find in it a certain heaviness and a tendency to rest content with the bare collection and presentation of material. After an examination of M. Cumont's two beautiful volumes on Texts and Monuments Relative to the Mysteries of Mithras, we cannot but think that their author, if indeed he has not fully realized this ideal, has at least more nearly approached it than any scholar who has yet written on a like subject. His geographical position typifies his scholarship: living on ground common to Teuton and Latin, and *doctus sermones utriusque linguae*, he exhibits in the highest degree the characteristics of both German and French scholarship.

An examination of M. Cumont's work properly begins with the second volume, which was first issued, and contains the texts and monuments which constitute the sources of our knowledge of the cult of Mithras. The contents are presented under three heads—*Textes Littéraires*, *Textes Épigraphiques*, and *Monuments Figurés*. Under *Textes Littéraires*, the author gives oriental, Greek, and Latin literary sources, arranged according to the alphabetical order of their authors' names. Greek and Latin sources are grouped together under one head. Under oriental sources, only Armenian texts are given, and those in translation. To have transcribed all the texts which form his oriental sources would have necessitated the presentation, not only of a great part of the Avesta, but of the Pahlavi writings, and would have drawn the author into a task which he prefers to leave to those whose knowledge of the oriental languages will permit them to do justice to it. He therefore limits himself to the transcription of a translation of the Armenian texts, and refers the reader by foot-notes to the Avesta and other oriental sources. Concluding the literary texts is a collection of *Textes Douteux*, passages which seem to contain allusions to Mithras, but are not beyond doubt. Following is an appendix containing *Noms Théophores* to the number of one hundred and six, classified according to territory.

Under *Textes Épigraphiques* are arranged in two divisions oriental, and Greek and Latin inscriptions. Three inscriptions in Persian constitute the oriental epigraphic sources, while there are five hundred and forty-seven in Greek and Latin. These are classified according to provincial distribution in Asia, Europe, and Africa. The number of Greek inscriptions is exceedingly small. Thirty-six *Inscriptions Douteuses*, five *Inscriptions Faus-ses*, with a concordance for use as a guide to *C. I. L.*, *C. I. G.*, etc., follow.

The third part of Volume II—*Monuments Figurés*—is a catalogue of all the known Mithraic monuments. Temples, grottoes, coins, amulets, paintings, statues, reliefs, altars, and all other objects having to do with the worship, are classified in the same manner as the inscriptions, are minutely described, and abundantly illustrated by four hundred and ninety-three cuts, and nine plates in heliotype. This is the most valuable and important part

of the volume. Following are *Monuments Douteux, Falsifications Modernes*, an appendix treating *Pierres Gravées et Amulettes*, and an extensive supplement repeating the classification of the whole of the preceding part of the volume. An exhaustive index concludes the whole.

We turn now from the sources to M. Cumont's critique on them in Volume I. Besides the preface, table of contents, and bibliography, there are two main parts to this volume—*Critique des Documents*, and *Conclusions*. After chapters on *Les Livres Iraniens, Textes Syriaques et Arméniens, Textes Grecs et Latins*, and *Les Inscriptions*, M. Cumont proceeds to discuss at length the principal source of information regarding Mithracism—*Les Monuments*. This part of the work occupies the whole of Chapter V, and is divided into sixteen sections, whose content may be judged by the following brief outline. Naturally, by far the greater part of the chapter is given to the consideration of the typical Mithraic relief which invariably represents the bull and its slayer, the scorpion, the serpent and the dog, and which very frequently represents, in addition to this group, many other symbolic objects—the raven, the Sun-god, the fig-tree, the lion, the ewer, the dadophoroi—and in rarer instances is enclosed in a frame of figures and scenes in relief—the signs of the zodiac, the Moon-goddess, Mithras and the Sun-god, Mithras in pursuit of the bull, etc., etc. I. The Mithraeum, its parts and their appointments. II. Mithracism essentially Persian, though modified by Chaldean influence. III. The lion-headed figure identified as the Mithraic Kronos, the Persian god of Infinite Time. IV. The god of Infinite Time and his relation to the god of the Heavens, Zeus, Jupiter, and Atlas. V. Representations of the Seasons and the Winds. The group of the lion, ewer, and serpent symbolical of Fire, Water, and Earth. VI. The Signs of the Zodiac and the Planets. Modification of the religion of ancient Iran by Chaldean astrology. VII. The Sun and the Moon. VIII. The Persian pantheon. Catalogue of Persian divinities whose names appear in Greek, Armenian, and Syriac sources. IX. The Persian pantheon on the monuments. Its identification with the Hellenic pantheon. X, XI. The series of small scenes surrounding the group of the tauroktonos on certain of the larger monuments. These scenes are the illustrations of some lost religious poem, and are generally arranged approximately as they are found on the monument of Osterburken (no. 246). With this monument as a basis, after changing the order slightly and supplying from other monuments, the scenes fall into two groups: illustrations of the legend of the generation of the gods and the origin of the world, and illustrations of the legend of Mithras. In the first group are: Infinite Time; Tellus and Atlas bearing the globe, representing the union of Earth and Heavens. Juno and Jupiter; Oceanus; the Moirai; Infinite Time presenting his successor, Ahura-Mazda, with the thunderbolt, the symbol of authority; Ahura-Mazda

contending with a giant of evil—the Persian gigantomachy. The second group includes: the birth of Mithras; Mithras, nude, cutting fruit and leaves from a fig-tree, in which is the bust of a god, and before which one of the winds blows on Mithras; Mithras discharging an arrow against a rock and creating a fountain before which a figure kneels to catch the water in his palms; the bull in a small boat, and near by the sacred animal a second time, under a roof to which (no. 273 *ter* Suppl.) two figures are about to set fire—allusions, perhaps to a flood and a conflagration; other episodes in the legend of the bull—his flight, the pursuit by Mithras, who finally bears him away on his shoulder. The conclusion of this series is of course the large central figure of the slaying of the bull. The remaining small scenes depict Helios kneeling before Mithras; Mithras and Helios clasping hands over an altar; Mithras with drawn bow on a galloping horse; Mithras and Helios banqueting; Mithras and Helios mounting the chariot of the latter, which rises in full course above the ocean. XII. The central relief, the concluding scene in the legend of the bull. Mithras slays the sacred animal as a sacrifice to bring about terrestrial life. XIII. The scorpion, attacking the genitals of the bull, is sent by Ahriman from the lower world to defeat the purpose of the sacrifice; the dog, springing toward the wound in the bull's side, was venerated by the Persians, and was the companion of Mithras; the serpent is the symbol of the earth being made fecund by drinking the blood of the sacrificed bull; the raven, toward which Mithras turns his face as if for direction, is the herald of the Sun-god, whose bust is near by, and who has ordered the sacrifice; various plants near the bull, and heads of wheat springing from his tail, symbolize the result of the sacrifice; the cypress is perhaps the tree of immortality. XIV. The Mithraic reliefs in their astrological aspect. Astrological interpretations had only a secondary importance, and were superficial. XV. The dadophoroi with Mithras represent one being in three aspects—the morning, noon, and evening sun, or the vernal, summer, and autumnal sun. XVI. The importance of Mithraic representations in the history of Roman art.

M. Cumont's comprehensive grasp of all subjects having to do with his field of investigation and the boldness and at the same time reasonableness of his combinations make his studies of the monuments fascinating. The second half of Volume I, however, will surpass the first in interest for the ordinary reader. In it the author gives the results of all his investigation, and it is to this part—the *Conclusions*—that the reader is to go for his orientation. They are divided into six chapters, of whose contents we give the following brief abstract.

I. *Les Origines*. Mithras was worshiped even before the separation of the Persian and Hindu stocks, both the Vedas and the Avesta representing him as the divinity of light, protector of truth, and antagonist of falsehood and error. In the Avesta, as

god of the light, he is ever watchful and all-seeing, and thus signifies the god of truth and loyalty. Light is accompanied by heat, and he becomes the god of vegetation and all increase. He is the enemy of darkness, and of all evil spirits, and the champion of heroes. But the Mithras of the Vedas, though less clear, is greater than the Mithras of the Avesta. At the rise of Zoroastrianism, he becomes one of the *yazatas*, created by Ahura-Mazda, and subject to him in the work of destroying demons and administering the world. Ahura-Mazda reigns in eternal brightness, Ahriman in eternal darkness, and Mithras occupies an intermediate position. He is the greatest of the *yazatas*, protects souls, accompanies them to paradise, and is thus a redeemer. But Semitic star-worship identified Ahura-Mazda with Bel, god of the Heavens, and Mithras with Shamash, god of the Sun. The influence of the indigenous religion of Armenia was strong. The modified Iranian religion became the religion of the Diadochoi, who wished to keep up the traditions of their Persian ancestors. Greek civilization in turn exerted a strong influence. Mithras was associated with Helios, and other members of the Persian pantheon were identified or associated with the Olympic deities. Greek art at Pergamum, about the second century B. C., reduced the Mithraic legend to concrete form in the typical relief, and thus aided to equip the cult for success in the western world, to which it was transmitted during the piratical disturbances of the first century B. C. The essential features of the old Iranian religion continued to be the same throughout its existence in the Occident, although the ritual changed from Persian to Greek, and from Greek to Latin.

II. *La Propagation dans l'Empire Romain.* With the exception of the port Peiræus, Mithracism had not gained a footing in the Hellenic world even as late as during the Alexandrine period, and its existence even under the Empire was only sporadic, and confined to seaport towns, Memphis being the only exception known thus far. At Rome the Great Mother, Astarte, Bellona, and Dea Syria were all well known before the advent of Mithras, whose worship was first brought there by Pompey's captive Cilician pirates. It was not until toward the close of the first century A. D., however, that the cult began to claim attention. Statius had seen the typical Mithraic relief, and the first known dedicatory inscription was set up by a freedman of the Flavians. The cult existed in Germany in 148, and after the reign of Commodus proofs of its presence in all the provinces multiply. At the end of the second century there were at least four sanctuaries at Ostia. The army, consisting in large part of Asiatics, and quartered for long periods of time in the same frontier cities or regions, was the principal agent of distribution of the cult, the character of Mithras as the god of victory explaining in great part his popularity with the soldier. Mithraic monuments abound on the line of the ancient frontier—the Danube, the Rhine,

Britain, the line of the Sahara. In the more peaceful districts, the most active propagandists were the merchant class, a great part of whom were from the far East. In connection with these are to be considered the slaves, whose numbers may be estimated by the statement of Josephus that in his Judaean campaign alone Titus made 97,000 slaves. The incessant wars with the Parthians and neighboring nations kept Rome full of slaves of the Mithraic faith. Sold to western masters, they were distributed throughout the European and African provinces. Especially that part of them who were employed by the State in positions of trust, or who became freedmen and composed a large part of the machine of administration in the provinces, were of great importance in the spread of the cult. Finally, there was no doubt the usual missionary activity. Rome, where all these forces were present in abundance, naturally became a stronghold of the cult. Though its worshipers were for many years from the humblest classes, its rise was rapid, and at the close of the second century it had become a favorite with the aristocracy and the court; literature and philosophy began to take note of the dogmas and rites of the cult, and its doctrines and practices were held up in opposition to Christianity, the only dangerous rival it possessed.

III. *Mithra et le Pouvoir Impérial.* Owing to the relative lateness of its appearance at Rome, the cult of Mithras found the Emperors at least tolerant, if not favorable. Its growth in favor was such that by the close of the second century it received the active support of the reigning house. Commodus himself was initiated. The ground of this favor with the Emperors, which continued up to the fall of Paganism, is to be sought in the convenient support which the religion of Mithras afforded the principle of the divine right of monarchs which had been growing up at Rome under the influence of Eastern conditions. The Persian monarch was not considered as a god, like the Egyptian monarch. The Persian conception of the source of authority of the monarch was unique. He reigned by the grace of Ahura-Mazda, creator of Heaven and Earth, and this grace was manifested by a sort of supernatural fire, a celestial aureole, which illumined the legitimate sovereign, and was called the Hvarenô. This conception, influenced first by the idea that the crown was bestowed by Fate, and second by the Chaldean idea that destiny and the heavenly bodies were in intimate connection, resulted in the doctrine that the sun, the royal planet par excellence, *Sol Invictus*, was the dispenser of the Hvarenô. Mithras, identified with *Sol Invictus*, thus became the giver of authority and victory, and was worshiped as such by the imperial house. The doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Emperor and Mithras, growing out of this was a second factor in raising the former to a plane above the human.

IV. *La Doctrine des Mystères.* Mithracism, in contradistinction to the old Graeco-Roman Paganism, possessed a real theology,

and a dogmatic system based on science. To give more than a rough outline of its doctrines, however, is impossible because of the insufficiency of documents. Mithras was not the only Persian god worshipped at Rome, nor was he the supreme member of the Persian pantheon there, although he was the most prominent. Infinite Time—Kronos, Saturn—was the head of the divine hierarchy; the Heavens and the Earth were his progeny, and they begat the Ocean, who formed with them a supreme triad equivalent to Jupiter, Juno, and Neptune. The Heavens and the Earth created the remaining members of a circle corresponding to the Olympic deities. Ahriman, begotten also by Infinite Time, was the Persian Pluto. The influence of the scientific theology of the Semitic race early resulted in the identification of the greater number of the Iranian divinities with the stars, and consequently in the Occident every Persian god possessed a double significance—astrological and natural, Semitic and Iranian. The cult at Rome preserved both these aspects, but the clergy reserved for the elect the deeper signification of the earlier Iranian theology, imparting to the multitude only the brilliant and easily understood symbolism of the Semitic theology. The planets, the constellations, and the signs of the zodiac found their place in the latter, and the conception of Fate as connected with them exercised a great influence over the public. Mithras, however, was by far the most important member of the pantheon, and his name was the center of a cycle of legends. From his character as god of Light, midway between the Heavens and the Earth, the centre of the choir of planets, he became known as the mediator between suffering humanity and the unknowable and inaccessible god of all being who reigned in the Ether. The Mithras legend has been lost, and can be reconstructed only from the scenes on the Mithraic reliefs (see pp. 445, 6 above). Mithras was born of a rock, the marvel being seen only by certain shepherds, who brought gifts and adored him. Chilled by the wind, the new-born god went to a fig-tree, partook of its fruit, and clothed himself in its leaves. He then undertook to vanquish the beings already in the world, and rendered subject to him first the Sun, with whom he concluded a treaty of friendship. The most astonishing of his adventures, however, was that with the sacred bull which had been created by Ahura-Mazda. The hero seized it by the horns and was borne headlong in the flight of the animal, which he finally subdued and dragged into a cavern. The bull escaped, but was overtaken, and by order of the Sun, who sent his messenger the raven, was sacrificed by Mithras, who performed the deed against his inclination. From the dying animal sprang the life of the earth, although Ahriman sent his emissaries to prevent it. The soul of the bull rose to the celestial spheres and became the guardian of herds and flocks under the name of Silvanus. Mithras, by his deed, was the creator of life. Meanwhile Ahriman sent a terrible

drought upon the land. Mithras defeated his purpose by discharging an arrow against a rock and thus miraculously drawing water from it. Next Ahriman sent a deluge, from which one man escaped in a boat with his cattle. Finally a fire desolated the earth, and only the creatures of Ahura-Mazda escaped. Mithras, his work accomplished, banqueted with the Sun for the last time, and was taken by him in his quadriga to the habitation of the immortals, whence he continued to protect the faithful. . . . Faithfulness involved striving for perfect purity, even by asceticism. Courage and watchfulness—in fact, the military virtues—were essential in the incessant combat between the forces of good and evil. Resistance to sensuality was one aspect of this struggle. Mithras was ever on the side of the faithful, who were certain to triumph in this world and the next. The worthy soul ascended to its former home in the skies by seven gates, or degrees, while the unworthy soul descended to the realms of Ahriman. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul was accompanied by that of the resurrection of the flesh; the struggle between good and evil was one day to cease, and the divine bull was to appear on the earth, Mithras was to descend to call forth from their tombs all men and to separate the good from the bad. The bull was to be sacrificed by Mithras, who was to mingle its fat with consecrated wine and give to drink of it to the just, rendering them immortal, while the unjust, together with Ahriman and his spirits, were to be destroyed by a fire sent from heaven by Ahura-Mazda. The universe, renewed, was to enjoy eternal happiness. . . . The success of Mithracism was due to its morals, its promise of reward for good deeds in immortal life, its deification of all nature, its impressive rites, and its adaptability to both high and low classes of society.

V. *La Liturgie, le Clergé, et les Fiddles.* The liturgy of Mithracism has disappeared almost without leaving a trace. Jerome tells us that the mystic went through the seven degrees of *Corax, Cryphius, Miles, Leo, Perses, Heliodromus*, and *Pater*. The *Patres* became directors of the community, and their chief was called *Pater Patrum*. Members of the community were *Fratres*, and children could be admitted to the lower grades. Initiation was called *sacramentum*, an oath being exacted of the neophyte not to divulge what was revealed to him. Numerous ablutions were prescribed for the cleansing of his soul from the stains of sin, and he seems to have been branded on the forehead with a hot iron. After a considerable period of service he was privileged to participate in a ceremony comparable to the Communion of the Christians. Bread and water were administered, and the ceremony conferred not only mental and bodily vigor, but immortality. At the same time the mystic was subjected to strange trials in order to test his moral and physical courage. . . . Of the clergy little can be said. According to Tertullian, the high priest could marry only once, and there were *virgines et*

continentes as in the Christian Church. The ordinary priest was the intermediary between the faithful and their god, kept the sacred fire bright, administered the sacrament, celebrated the services, addressed prayers to the Sun thrice daily, and officiated in such special services as were added to the daily routine. Each day of the week, the appropriate planet was invoked at a certain place in the crypt, Sunday being especially sacred. The *Mithrakana*, famous in the East, were probably transferred to Dec. 25 in the Occident. . . . The Mithraic community was a corporate body as well as a religious association, having *decuriones*, *decemprimi*, *magistri*, *curatores*, *defensores*, and *patroni*. The cult was supported by voluntary contribution. From the size of the Mithraea, it seems certain that not more than one hundred members were enrolled in the territory of each sanctuary. The growth of a community to a number sufficiently exceeding that membership resulted in the formation of a new community. The sense of close fraternal relation, the attraction of titles and degrees, the constant hope of higher spiritual vision, the stimulation and consolation of the ceremonies, the sense of purification from sin by the ablutions and of the approach of a better life where the sufferings of this world were to be compensated, the veneration which was excited by the thought of the antiquity and the wisdom of this religion from the remote Orient—were some of the elements which caused the rapid multiplication of Mithraism in the West. One element of weakness, however, was the exclusion of women from the mysteries.

VI. *Mithra et les Religions de l'Empire*. Mithraism, on its arrival at Rome, was at its full maturity, if not beginning to decay. The only modifications it ever suffered were experienced in its youth in Asia. It was never essentially modified in the Occident. With the Egyptian religions it was at rivalry, if not at enmity. With Jupiter Dolichenus and the Great Mother it had close relations, its relations with the latter partaking of the nature of an alliance. As to the mutual influence of Mithraism and the other religions of Rome, the natural outcome of the long-continued attempt to recognize in all the gods of the Graeco-Roman system the forces of nature was the recognition of the Sun as the most important of all of them. Thus philosophy as well as politics placed Mithraism in the front rank. In the fourth century the followers of Mithras conceived the idea of uniting all divinities and all myths in a single new system. The struggle with Christianity was the more obstinate because of the resemblances between the two religions, which were so numerous and so complete as to be the subject of remark as early as the second century and were from that time on the cause of mutual recrimination. These resemblances, however, were in the main the result of common eastern origin. Only in art can it be definitely asserted that one borrowed from the other: Mithraic representations served as models which were often adopted or adapted by the Christians. The

beginning of the downfall of Mithracism dates from 275 A. D., when Dacia was lost to the Empire, and the invasions of the northern peoples resulted in the destruction of temples along a great stretch of frontier, the natural stronghold of the cult. The aggression of Christianity was also now more and more effective. However, the Emperors favored the cult which was the army's favorite until Constantine destroyed its hopes. The cult became tolerated instead of recognized. The reign of Julian and the usurpation of Eugenius renewed the hopes of its devotees, but the victory of Theodosius (394) may be considered the end of the cult's existence. It still survived in certain cantons of the Alps in the fifth century, and clung to life with more tenacity in its eastern home. Its legitimate successor was Manicheism, which offered a refuge to those mystics who had been shaken in faith but not converted by the polemics of the Church against their religion.

The strongest impression carried away from an examination of this work is that of the immense industry and thoroughness of the author. The reader feels that M. Cumont was dominated by a determination to put into his two volumes (*doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis*) absolutely nothing less than the whole thing. He tells us in his preface that he has spent more than ten years on the work, and only those who have engaged in work along similar lines realize how short a period even that is for a work of this magnitude, for the preparation of which a thorough familiarity with so many fields of knowledge is necessary. The only evidence which M. Cumont does not present is that which has not yet been brought to light by the spade of the excavator. Evidence of this kind will accumulate (indeed has already accumulated), but it is not likely to alter greatly the conclusions already drawn.

M. Cumont's thoroughness is equaled only by the brilliancy of his conclusions. In his interpretation of the monuments he has succeeded in many instances in reaching a plausible conclusion only by reason of his keen intuition. In his statement, in the preface, that his work is not a conclusion, but a prologue, and that its merit will consist in having formulated clearly many problems, he no doubt refers to those theories tentatively advanced by him which have not the weight of material evidence sufficient to satisfy the most conservative scholarship. One feels this to be true, not only in cases where the author avows that he does not consider his point proved, but in some cases where he feels more certain. But while the reconstruction of the Mithraic legend, for example (*Conclusions*, pp. 304-306), rests in some of its details upon very scant material evidence, M. Cumont's solutions of its problems in most instances bear conviction with them and are always plausible and brilliant, and the reader leaves the work with a feeling that its conclusions as a whole will remain unaltered as long as there is no radical difference in the sources from which they are drawn.

The most striking feature of M. Cumont's work is the parallelism which he shows to have existed between Mithracism and Christianity (*Conclusions*, pp. 339-343, and *Critique*, *passim*). The common oriental origin; the democracy, fraternity, and humility of the first communities; the identification of the object of adoration with Light and the Sun; the legends of the shepherds with their gifts and adoration, the flood, and the ark; the representation in art of the fiery chariot, the drawing of water from the rock, etc.; the presence in the ceremonial of bell and candle, holy water, and the communion; the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the flesh, the mediation of the Logos emanating from the Divine, the atoning sacrifice, the constant warfare between good and evil and the final triumph of the former—are some of the resemblances which he presents. They may be more apparent than real, but there is no escaping the conviction that they are as a whole grounded in a common eastern origin. M. Cumont, with just conservatism, does not presume to say that either religion borrowed from the other, except in the realm of art. The work is thus of great value to the student of Christian, as well as of classical antiquity.

But M. Cumont deserves above all the thanks of the student of history—especially of religious history. His work is one of those which are invaluable for establishing the point of view so much to be desired but so rarely possessed—of the history of religious development as a continuous whole, of the supplanting of worn-out Graeco-Roman religion by the more fervent, more moral, and higher eastern religions, and the yielding of these in turn to the still more perfect Oriental religion, Christianity. With all the multitudinous details of M. Cumont's work, with all the problems it raises, and with all the force with which it makes the reader see how much and yet how little we know, it leaves him with distinct impressions and the feeling that the sum total of knowledge has really been advanced not only in the details of fact but in the larger ideas which make for intelligent living.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

Der Hannibalweg neu untersucht und durch Zeichnungen und Tafeln erläutert von WILHELM OSIANDER, mit dreizehn Abbildungen und drei Karten. S. VIII-204. Berlin, 1900.

In reading Osiander's book one is impressed with the thoroughness with which he handles his subject. He has not only made an independent study of the original sources, but has made a careful study of the topography of the Alps, having himself travelled over all the various routes in question. The study of the books of the ancient historians has its value, but there is another book of equally great value, and that is the Book of

Nature. To the study of this book Osiander rightly attaches the greatest importance, adding that it is here that "he who seeks, finds." It is the same as saying that he who produces a work while centuries of monographs are looking down upon him from the shelves of his own library is at fault and his labor in vain, unless his conclusions harmonize with the statements of this book. The statements of the Book of Nature cannot be set aside. It holds the key to the situation. Osiander tells us in his preface that "Der Hannibalweg" is the final result of years of study and is the fruit of his tours in the Alps during the summer of 1899, when he travelled over the Great and Little St. Bernhard, the Great and Little Cenis, the Genève, and Lautaret, and made a careful study of the topographical difficulties which beset the problem. The result has been a book of unusual interest and of lasting value, and one which cannot be disregarded by any one writing upon this subject. The conclusions reached by Osiander will come as a shock to the one who has settled down into a comfortable position after reading Mommsen's and Ihne's masterly arguments for the Little St. Bernhard, though prepared in a way by Fuchs' (Hannibals Alpenübergang, Wien, 1897), Marindin's (Class. Rev. XIII (1899) p. 238 f.) and Cocchia's (Il Libro XXI delle storie di Tito Livio, p. 141-156) strong reasons for the Genève, and, if he is not thoroughly convinced after reading Osiander's work, will at least find it not so easy to be comfortable in his original position.¹

At the present time it will be possible to give only a brief summary of some of the main results, referring the reader to the book itself for the *data* by which these are supported. As preliminary to the main part of the book the author devotes 23 pp. to the discussion of several important questions, as to the *sources*, where he decides for Polybius as the *auctor primarius*. He then takes under consideration the various statements of this writer regarding distances, marches, geographical details, dates, etc. On p. 19 Osiander gives *Hannibal's Itinerary*, according to the modern mode of reckoning: Sets out from New Carthage Apr. 21; from the Ebro May 30; from Emporion July 10; from the Pyrenees July 18; from the Rhone Aug. 15; and begins the 15 days' passage of the Alps Sept. 6, arriving in Italy Sept. 20. In the first Chapter (24-40) O. lays down twelve fundamental propositions as a basis for the discussion, the last being that the first people with whom Hannibal came into contact after crossing the Alps were the *Taurini*, a conclusion, which, he says, "stands fast" from Livy, 21, 38, 6 and follows indirectly from Polyb. III, 60, 2; 8 ff. The second chapter is naturally an important one,

¹ The drift of opinion in recent years seems to be away from the theory that Hannibal crossed *via* the Little St. Bernhard. For strong objections to this route, together with arguments favoring the Mont Genève, see especially: Woelfflin, Liv. XXI, 5. Aufl. (1900), p. 128 f. and Fügner, Liv. Röm. Gesch., Hilfsheft (1901), p. 82 f.

as it is devoted to a criticism of the three opposing theories: A. Poeninus, requiring but two pages (42-44); B. Little St. Bernhard,¹ more (45-64); C. Genève, most (65-86), probably from its coming into such prominence in recent years. To these three routes he adds, as deserving honorable mention, Monte Viso (87-88). The third chapter is the main part of the work (107 pp.) and has four subdivisions; A. Introductory Marches (91-102) from the Ebro to the Rhone, via Nemausus to St. Esprit, where he crosses, then along the left bank of the river to Valentia, followed by a march along the valley of the Isara. B. Passage of the Alps (102-169) divided into 4 parts; I First 4 days; from beginning of the ascent to the rest near Garocelum; II From 5th to 8th day; from G. to Leucopetron; III 9th and 10th day; heights of Mt. Cenis reached and halt on the plain of Medulina. Here arises the cardinal question: from what Mt. can a view of the plains about the Po be obtained? Mt. Cenis alone stands the test. From the statements of both Livy and Polybius this is a requisite. Osiander quotes Marindin: "In fact, of all the competing passes, the Cenis is the only one from the top (O. reads 'op') of which any Italian view can be seen". O. corroborates this statement and emphasizes its importance. IV 11th to 15th day: Descent to Ocelum. Osiander claims that the slopes of the Cenis both for the ascent and for the descent best meet the requirements of the accounts of Livy and Polybius, substantiating his statement by quotations from other travellers who had made a study of the topography of the Alps. Then follows C. Refutation of the arguments usually brought against the Cenis theory (170-188), and D. Testimony of Antiquity for the Cenis Route. Osiander introduces his own investigation of this Route by recounting the advocates of this view from two Italian scholars of the 16th century who first brought it into prominence, Maccaneo and Gioivo, and the Swedish, German and French scholars, to Robinson Ellis and Colonel Perrin.² The book concludes with "Nachträge" (203-204) made at Grenoble, August, 1900.

The writer feels that this brief summary has done but scant justice to the thoroughgoing investigation of Osiander, and the many important points that have been incidentally illuminated in the course of his work. The book as a whole deserves the highest praise.

THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

EMORY B. LEASE.

¹ With Osiander's view that the *Cremonis iugum* of Coelius = the Little St. Bernhard, compare Sanders (Die Quellen contamination im 21. u. 22. Buche des Livius, Berlin (1898, p. 101). S. maintains, however, that Han. crossed by this route.

² Osiander might well have cited also the eminent Russian scholar and military authority, N. S. Galitzin (cf. Allgem. Kriegsgesch. d. Alt. (1875), vol. III, p. 34).

REPORTS.

THE JOURNAL OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. III, 1900-1901.

Pp. 1-14. F. A. Blackburn (University of Chicago). The Husband's Message and Accompanying Riddles of the Exeter Book. Thorpe, in his edition of the Exeter Codex (pp. 470-75), printed four short pieces, the first three under the heading 'Riddles,' the fourth with the title 'Fragment.' Grein's arrangement of these in his *Bibliothek*, where he prints the first and second as riddles but joins the third and fourth, calling the whole *Botschaft des Gemahls an seine Frau*, has been hitherto generally accepted. Blackburn essays to prove that the second piece, like the third, is a part of a poem which is continued in what follows in the MS. He maintains his claim by a study of the subject-matter of the pieces in question, showing the appropriate and close connection in sense of the second part with the remainder. The whole reconstructed poem ought to be entitled 'A Love-letter' of a banished knight to his lady-love. Blackburn satisfactorily accounts for the presence of the first piece, which he also considers to be a riddle, and gives a reprint and connected translation of all four pieces, supplying by conjecture the illegible parts of the MS.

Pp. 14-24. Arthur C. L. Brown (Harvard University). The Source of a Guy of Warwick Chap-Book. The author shows by parallel columns and a general comparison that the best known of the Guy of Warwick chap-books, first printed in London, 1706, and reprinted frequently since, even to the present day, is a prose version of Samuel Rowland's *Famous History of Guy Earle of Warwick*, a popular epic of the 17th century, with three added episodes. Of these episodes two are popular tales, and the third, the 'Tale of the Dun Cow', is a local tradition handed down orally and found also in earlier Guy of Warwick chap-books.

Pp. 24-35. John McLaren McBryde (Hollins Institute, Va.) contributes the second part, *Metre of the Davideis*, of his *Study of Cowley's Davideis begun in Vol. II, of the Journ. of Ger. Phil.* He discusses Cowley's use of the hemistich, which was founded upon a doubtful conception of Virgil's metre and the use of which has persisted down to our day. In his discussion of the triplet, which Cowley used only in his *Anacreontics*, McBryde gives some interesting new information concerning the use of this poetical device in Middle English. He further treats of the poet's use of the alexandrine, of feminine rhymes, and of run-on lines and run-on couplets with tables of percentages, showing that Cowley's verse, as he grows older and more skilled, tends to become more 'correct'.

Pp. 35-92 and 431-92. Philip S. Allen (University of Chicago). Wilhelm Müller and the German Volkslied II and III. In a previous article Allen had defined Volkslied, had shown how every poet at the beginning of the 19th century was permeated with its spirit, and especially how Müller had never departed from this spirit in any of his songs. This is so true, that many of the poet's songs have since become Volkslieder. In the first part of his second contribution the author takes up Nature-Sense in the Volkslied and Müller. Uhland was the first to lay stress upon the fact that the lively sense for surrounding and sympathizing nature, which is evident in the Volkslied, lies at its very roots. In this feature Müller follows the Volkslied very closely. Allen gives a detailed comparison of analogies between the poet and the Volkslied in their sense for nature. Under various subheadings (flowers, trees, birds, animals, water, sun, moon and stars, natural phenomena) the author shows by many examples Müller's agreement with and divergence from popular poetry. He establishes clearly that, on the whole, the poet is on the same level with the Volkslied as regards appreciation of nature, though he shows a tendency towards sentimentality and romanticism, and frequently goes far beyond the Volkslied in detailed parallelism as well as in his fondness for the sea and the forest. Müller essentially differs from the Volkslied only in his didactic poems.

In the chapter, Reminiscences of the Volkslied in Müller, Allen traces the development of Müller's poetic technique from its first shallow imitation of the Volkslied to its later mastery of the principles of art. Numerous parallelisms make clear the dependence of the poet upon his models. The foreign songs show the influences only indirectly and to a limited extent. The anacreontics have lost the sturdiness and directness of the Volkslied, and are weak and trivial. The drinking songs, though popular in metre, treatment and language, are without direct correspondence in the Volkslied.

In the third main division of this study, Allen presents an exhaustive treatment of the Diction of the Volkslied and of Müller. In sub-paragraphs the general characteristics of the Volkslied style (terseness, vagueness, mention of authorship), the figures of rhetoric (metaphor and simile, personification and apostrophe), the figures of syntax (repetition in its varying forms of epizeuxis, epibole, epistrophe, refrain, epanadiplosis, inverted and climactic repetition, parallelism, polysyndeton), popular speech-words (use of diminutive, noun, adjective, adverb, verb), syntax (position of words in the sentence, tautology, omission of the article and of the personal pronoun, use of the impersonal *es*) are analyzed, defined and traced in the Volkslied and paralleled in complete lists from Müller's poems. The results prove, as conclusively as is possible by 'mechanical' and 'tangible' examples, Allen's claim of Müller's complete dependence upon the Volkslied. In conclusion some scattering observations are appended and the author pleads warmly for a fairer estimate of Müller as a poet and for a

reintroduction of his poetry to Germany, which can be done only by an adequate edition of his verse.

Pp. 92-100. E. W. Fay (Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.). The Primitive Aryan Name of the Tongue. The author (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, May, 1894) had deduced 'all the Protean forms of the word for the tongue from a primitive root **ǵliǵh-* with alternative forms **liǵh-* and **ǵiǵh-* due to sentence euphony.' Collitz the same year claimed as the common base for 'tongue' **denǵh-* with alternatives **lenǵh-* and **deǵh-*. Fay in this article makes a restatement, with some modifications, of his theory, together with a table of words used for comparison and the reasons for his views.

Pp. 127-38. Oliver Farrar Emerson (Western Reserve University). Transverse Alliteration in Teutonic Poetry. After a résumé of the previous discussions of the subject, the article inquires into the mathematical method of chances which Frucht (*Metrisches und Sprachliches zu Cynewulfs Elene, Juliana und Crist*, 1887) had employed to substantiate his theory, that transverse alliteration is due to chance and not design. Emerson takes exception to the different proportions of chance derived by Frucht and, after showing the errors in the latter's calculations, reaches the conclusion, that 'the mathematical doctrine of probabilities is absolutely inapplicable to the problem in hand' and the proof of any theory regarding transverse alliteration 'must not rely on the exactness of mathematical science, but on the less conclusive, psychological argument from the numerous examples.'

Pp. 138-43. Frederic Ives Carpenter (University of Chicago). Notes on the Anonymous 'Richard II'. Notes to the text of the play published in the current volume of the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*.

Pp. 143-238. Herbert Z. Kip (Stanford University, Cal.). *Zur Geschichte der Steigerungs adverbien in der Deutschen Geistlichen Dichtung des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts.*

This study gives an exhaustive treatment, with exemplifications and general discussion of form and origin, of the various intensifying adverbs during the transition period from Old to Middle High German. The article is supplemented by a bibliography and index.

Pp. 238-48. W. Kurrelmeyer (Johns Hopkins University). The Genealogy of the Pre-Lutheran Bibles. Of the fourteen editions of the German bible antedating that of Luther, exclusive of the three Low German editions, the genealogy of the first five has been determined with some degree of certainty. The object of this article is to set forth the exact position of the later editions by a comparison of the errors and changes peculiar to the different editions. The comparisons and the relation between the editions are shown in clear tabulations.

Pp. 277-335. Ora P. Seward (University of Utah). The Strengthened Negative in Middle High German. The purpose of Seward's dissertation is to test the conclusions of I. V. Zingerle's article (published in the *S. B. Wien*, XXXIX, 417-477, 1862) on the strengthened negative by a study of the Middle High German texts since published. Upon the basis of these investigations the author objects to certain of Zingerle's statements in regard to (1) the decrease in the frequency of these negatives after the first half of the 13th century, and (2) the frequency of use in the different dialects and also in regard to some minor points. The one general conclusion to be drawn is that 'between 1200 and 1500 A. D. the frequency of occurrence of the strengthened negative is not affected by date or locality, but is affected somewhat by the character of the composition and more yet by the preference of the individual author.' Insufficient data in Old French and Middle English do not permit of comparison of their usage with that in Middle High German. Nor can satisfactory conclusions be drawn as to whether the strengthened negative is of popular origin and character, or whether it is due to French influence. The summaries, with citations of examples, are arranged according to periods, authors, literary character of the different works and geographical distribution. There are also lists of the usage in Middle Low German authors and in Old High German, and an appendix including a number of implied negatives and of those strengthened by specifying things not of small size or value. The dissertation contains the usual bibliography and a general index.

Pp. 335-42. G. L. Kittredge (Harvard University). The 'Misogonus' and Laurence Johnson. In a letter to *The Nation*, March 16, 1899, Kittredge had suggested, and given reasons in support of his view, that the author of the 'Misogonus,' the recently published English university comedy, was Laurence Johnson who had concealed his identity under the name *Laurentius Bariona* in the MS of the play. Johnson, after graduating from Oxford, had entered the Romish church and was hanged for treason in 1582. This same name appears as the name of the author of a 'Cometographia, London, 1578,' an account of the comet of 1577. Since the letter was written Kittredge has seen a copy of the 'Cometographia' and in this article expresses the positive opinion that Laurence Johnson, the Martyr, was *not* the *Laurentius Bariona* of the *Misogonus* MS. *Laurentius Bariona* of the MS is, however, the same as the author of the 'Cometographia' and a graduate of Cambridge. This identity does not settle the question of the authorship of the *Misogonus*, though Kittredge thinks there is no reason, not even of chronology, which opposes the ascription of the comedy to Laurence Johnson the author of the 'Cometographia.'

Pp. 342-51. William Dinsmore Briggs in an article, *King Arthur and King Cornwall*, connects this ballad (No. 30 in

Child's collection) with the French romance, *Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*. He reconstructs the outline of the fragmentary ballad, recalls the views of Gaston Paris, opposing the relation of the ballad and the romance, and thereupon develops his own views, maintaining a close connection between the two.

Pp. 352-54. George Hempl (University of Michigan) contributes in the article on Influence of Vowel Quantity some cases in Latin (*fōtus*) *fōveo*, *mōtus* (*mōveo*, etc.) where 'a short vowel, by analogy, so affects the pronunciation of an associated form, that there results a vowel of similar quantity but long'.

Pp. 354-62. Gustaf E. Karsten (University of Indiana) reprints *The Ballad of the Cruel Moor*, one of the Sources of 'Titus Andronicus,' which is taken from *A Collection of Old Ballads*, London, 1726, and adds some information concerning this collection of ballads, as it is not easily accessible.

Pp. 393-415. A. S. Jack (Lake Forest, Ill.), in *The Autobiographical Elements in Piers the Plowman*, maintains the thesis that the poem, as far as it concerns the outer life of the author, is not autobiographical, though it has autobiographical elements containing the opinions, hopes, fears and spiritual history of the poet. Jack collects the previous views concerning the author of the allegory and states the course of his investigation, which takes up 'first the statements of time, second the dreams, third the wanderings, fourth the account of the dreamer's social life and occupation, and fifth minor personal details'. The discussion of the first point leads to the result that 'these figures (of time) professedly relating to the author should be understood as the other passages not referring to William, as *definite alliterative expressions for indefinitely long periods of time*. Hence we have no basis for certainty, nor even for probability as to the date of the poet's birth, nor age at time of writing any of the texts, nor length of wandering'. The dreams are only a literary device and universally so considered by students of the poem. As to the wanderings the author sums up his discussion as follows: "Since (1) to have the hero wander about was in our poet's age, a common literary device, since (2) the incidents mentioned in connection with the wandering are not real incidents; since (3) to think of the poet's leading a 'vagabond' life is to think of him as doing that which he from beginning to end condemns, and finally since (4) the imaginative and allegorical interpretation is in harmony with the spirit of the whole poem and obviates many difficulties, the imaginative interpretation of the wandering is the true one." The account of the dreamer's social life and occupation is also best explained in the same way as the account of his wanderings, allegorically. The remaining allusions are only of minor importance and may be true or not, though the author mentions a number of objections to their literal interpretation. However there are valuable hints between the lines for drawing a rough sketch of the

poet's life. He was a student, probably in the church as a priest, who led a quiet, meditative life, possibly in the country, away from the influences that helped to make Chaucer. He probably had an acquaintance with London; of more than that we cannot be sure. He sympathized with the common people. The fear of persecution or a dislike of publicity probably influenced him to remain silent and unknown. "Farther than this in sketching Langland's life, if such were his name, we cannot safely go."

Pp. 415-31. Neil C. Brooks (University of Illinois). The Lamentations of Mary in the Frankfurt Group of Passion Plays. This article is a study of the scenes at the crucifixion and entombment, where Mary laments the fate of Christ, occurring in five passion plays, with an attempt to show the relations between these plays and other similar plays.

Pp. 492. F. G. G. Schmidt (University of Oregon) contributes a Bursenknechtlied of eight lines, found in a 15th century MS in the library at Mailingen, Bavaria.

Pp. 493-97. Kuno Francke (Harvard University). A Romantic Element in the Prelude to Goethe's Faust. In Novalis' Die Lehrlinge zu Sais, written in 1797-98, though not published until 1802, there are some passages, which Francke here cites, bearing a striking similarity to the glorification of poetry in the Prelude to Goethe's Faust I. 138 ff. and anticipating the chief elements of Goethe's effusion. Francke thinks that Goethe knew Novalis' work in MS form and reproduced its sentiments in the Prelude.

Pp. 497-501. Frederick Klaeber (University of Minnesota) suggests as An Emendation in the Old English Version of Bede IV. 24, the separation of *meaht* into *mē āht*, making the passage read *pū mē āht singan*, the correct and required translation of the *Latin mihī cantare habes*.

A. S. Cook (Yale University) also contributes an appreciative In Memoriam to Professor Cosijn of Leyden, who died Aug. 26, 1899.

The third volume of the Journal contains the usual book-reviews covering some twenty-six different works in the various domains of Germanic philology.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

Beiträge zur Assyriologie, herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH und PAUL HAUPT. Vierter Band, Heft 3 (pp. 279-422). Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1901.¹

The third Heft of the fourth volume of the Beiträge contains five articles, of which two are by J. A. Knudtzon on the El Amarna tablets (pp. 279-337 and 410-17).

¹ For Band IV, Heft 2, see Prince, A. J. P. XXI, pp. 103-6.

The author divides his first treatise into nine sections, designated by the letters of the alphabet. He states at the outset that he has been obliged to deviate sharply from his former paper in BA. IV, Heft 1, pp. 101-54,¹ and he corrects the present article again, with respect to a number of important points, in his second paper on the same subject in this third Heft (pp. 410-17). The most striking sections of Knudtzon's work are: A. On Sayce's supposed "Ionian" name (pp. 280-88); B. The arrangement of Rib-Addi's letters and of those of several other periods (pp. 288-327); G. On tablets in Egyptian from Egypt (pp. 327-30); H. Tablets from the land of the *Hatti* (pp. 330-34).

In the year 1891 Sayce reported in the Academy, Vol. XL, p. 341, that he had found in one of the El Amarna tablets "the mention of an 'Ionian' who was connected in some way with the country of Tyre." In order to correct Sayce's version *amil Yivāna* 'Ionian,' which he reads as one word from *Yi-i-ma a-na*, Knudtzon cites and discusses four passages in which this combination occurs. He shows quite conclusively that in the phrase *na-ad-nu . . . u amelūt Yi-i-ma a-na a-na Suri ina lu-qi, Yi-i-ma* is a distinct word from the preposition *ana*, which, as is frequently the case in the El Amarna letters, is written *twice*. He translates then:—"they gave . . . and the *Yi-i-ma* people to the land of Suri as a surety." He considers that *Yi-i-ma* cannot be a proper name, but is probably to be read as *Yi-i-wa* (*m = w*), i. e. as an Egyptian plural form, denoting some sort of official. Sayce's idea that this is an allusion to an 'Ionian' cannot stand. The word *Yi-i-wa* is found also in the form *Yi-u* as subject and as *Yi-a, Yi-i-ma, Yi-e-ma* as object. Knudtzon is inclined to connect this word tentatively with Eg. *w 'w* 'officer,' reading the sign *pi*, not as *yi*, but as *wi*; *wi-i-ma*. This would make the word identical with the form *u-i-u = Eg. w 'w* 'officer,' which has long ago been known from the Jerusalem letters.

Knudtzon's arrangement of the letters of Rib-Addi (B.) is a valuable chronological study. In establishing the order of the letters, the author took into consideration not only the text and the historical situation, but also the appearance of the clay of the individual tablets. I will call attention merely to the following forms: *irtixal* (p. 295; fem. 3 p. perm. 1. of *√ rixl*) 'it remained.' This form of *rixl* occurs also IVR. 54, 14 a:—*murṣu ṣṣu (dilib) tum ḏliṣu irtixl* 'sickness, plague, affliction rest upon him.' The word *xamādu* 'something desirable' (p. 328) is clearly cognate with Heb. *חמדה*. On p. 319, the intransitive form *id-du-ul* from *נדל* 'close, shut' is unusual in this stem. This is a present tense made like *eppuš, errub*. The pret. of *ḏdlu* is *ḏdil*.

Ernest Lindl follows Knudtzon's first article with a treatise on the list of dates of the first Babylonian dynasty with four plates and additional notes (pp. 338-402). The period of the so-called

¹See Prince, A. J. P. XX, p. 107.

first dynasty of Babylon has long been known to us through accounts dating from the reigns of the ancient kings. We may now, moreover, get an excellent idea of the civilization of this interesting epoch from newly found records which are highly instructive for the study of both the public and private life of these ancient times. The most important sources for the history of the first dynasty are undoubtedly the royal inscriptions of Hammurabi and Samsuiluna.¹ Next to them should be classed the contract literature belonging to this epoch which, from the days of Loftus (1864) until the present time, has been constantly growing. In this article, which is part of Lindl's Dissertation for the Doctorate at Munich, the author has begun his investigations in this mass of literature which bears so directly on the ancient civilization. He pays especial attention in his study to the following four points:—1) The contents of the contracts. 2) The names of the witnesses, or that of the judge, in whose presence the contract was executed. 3) The date, day, month and year of the individual record. 4) The so-called form of oath.

The author's object is to confirm and fill out when necessary the data of the valuable "London List" (in Sumerian) which, in so far as it has come down to us un mutilated, gives in exact chronological order the dates of the kings of the first Babylonian dynasty from Sumuabu to Samsuiluna (published by Pinches, *Cuneiform Texts*, VI, pp. 9-10). This list makes it possible for us to register the contracts themselves within a period of not less than 183 years. These private documents are moreover of great chronological value, in that they do not merely give the year number of the king's reign in which they were executed, but, following an unusual system, they mention the chief occurrence of the year immediately preceding their own year. The most striking feature of Lindl's work is his publication of plates and texts of a hitherto unnoticed Hammurabi inscription (Sumerian) which is part of Scheil's excavations in Sippar-Abu-Habba in 1893. Lindl found these in the Museum at Constantinople, where he copied them with the permission of the Librarian (p. 342). He follows the publication of this text with a complete transliteration and translation with commentary of the "London List," which he has filled out by means of the Constantinople fragment and of the Contracts (pp. 343-88), of which he gives (pp. 389-90) a complete list.

Friedrich Delitzsch follows this treatise with a number of "marginal remarks" on Lindl's work (pp. 403-9). It is interesting to notice that Delitzsch calls attention (p. 409) to Hommel's unfortunate identification of Marduk with Uru-ki the moon-god (*Gesch.* p. 416) which has attracted the notice of others who have used Hommel's extensive history.

The Heft ends with a few entertaining pages by Bruno

¹Jensen and Winckler, *KB.* III, i, pp. 106-27; 130-33.

Meissner on falconry among the Babylonians and Assyrians (pp. 418-22), wherein he shows that the *ars venandi cum avibus* can be followed back to a much more ancient period than has hitherto been thought. According to certain texts published by Pinches and Delitzsch, the Assyrians had a bird called *surdû*, clearly a species of falcon, which hunted game for its (royal) master. A synonym is given IIR 37, 15a; 64a *kasûsu*, besides which there are other names. Meissner believes that *ifçur xurri* = *buçu* was also a term for falcon, possibly cognate with Ar. *têr el hurr*, which may itself be a literal translation of *ifçur xurri*. The texts quoted by Meissner are all from the Assurbânipal library and date from the middle of the seventh century B. C. It is highly probable, however, that falconry in Mesopotamia is much older than this date. Meissner does not insist that this form of venery had its origin in Mesopotamia. Persians and Koords still practice it, and it is quite possible that the early Babylonians and Assyrians first learned it from the mountaineers who were their eastern neighbours. It is still followed in Iraq, especially in the neighbourhood of Bagdad, where the writer of this report has frequently heard it described, although he has never had the good fortune to see a hunt with falcons.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOLOGIE, Vol. LVI, parts 3, 4.

Pp. 321-32. F. Buecheler. Coniectanea. Notes on Plutarch, *Quaest. Conviv.* VIII 6; on certain passages in the Latin grammarians Martyrius and Caper; on some of the papyri recently published by Messrs. Hunt, Grenfell and Hogarth, etc.

Pp. 333-9. R. Kunze. Zu griechischen Geographen. Notes on Strabo, XV p. 730 Cas. (read *καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλείας*); XVI p. 770; III p. 167; VII p. 315; XVI p. 779; XVII p. 835; Eustathius, p. 395, 21 M.; p. 315, 44; p. 273, 34; p. 322, 34.

Pp. 340-68. R. Helm. *Vindiciae Ovidianae*. Textual notes on various passages in the *Metamorphoses*: IV 446, 766; VII 186-7, 762; VIII 87; XII 230 sqq., 434-9; XIII 399-400, 846-7; III 249 sqq., 400-1; VI 294; XI 293; XIII 332-3, 404-11, 457-63; XIV 385, 739; XV 49 sqq., 426-30.

Pp. 369-91. F. Reuss. Zu Arrian's *περίπλουσ τοῦ Πόντου Εὐξείνου*. The *Periplus* is probably the genuine work of Arrian, not "a forgery composed in the late Byzantine period" (see C. G. Brandis, *Rh. Mus.* LI, pp. 109-26). •

Pp. 392-403. R. Wünsch. Zu Ovids *Fasten* Buch I und II. Textual notes on F. I 6, 26, 161, 652, 705-8, 701-2; II 23, 575. The passage in F. I 479-96, may be regarded as a type of the rhetorical "consolatio."

Pp. 404-15. K. Tittel. Heron und seine Fachgenossen. 1) Herons Mechanik und Poseidonios. 2) Heron und Geminus. 3) Heron und Philon.

Pp. 416-22. H. Dessauer. De codice rescripto Parisino 7900 A.

Pp. 423-8. M. Fränkel. Bronzeinschrift aus Ligurio. Notes on an inscribed bronze pedestal in the Berlin Museum.

Pp. 429-42. A. Klotz. Das Geschichtswerk des älteren Seneca. The only evidence for the existence of this work is a short notice in cod. rescr. Vatic. Palat. 24.

Pp. 443-61. J. Steup. Thukydides, Antiochos und die angebliche Biographie des Hermokrates.

Pp. 462-72. M. Manitius. Zu den Scholien zu Germanici Aratea.

Miscellen.—Pp. 473-4. E. Norden. Das Alter des Codex Romanus Vergils. This MS contains the spurious line, Aen. VI 242, which seems to be derived from Priscian, Perieg. 1056. It was probably written about the first half of the sixth century.—Pp. 474-5. O. Hoffmann. Προμηθεΐνος. This Homeric word is perhaps connected with the verb προμνάσμαι. It may be due to an ancient custom according to which several women were brought before a wooer, "one after another".—Pp. 475-7. F. Solmsen. *Ονομα κη ἐπιπατρόφιον.—Pp. 477-80. O. Seeck. Zur Lex Manciana.

Pp. 481-96. H. Usener. Zu den Sintfluthsagen. Supplementary notes to the author's recent book on this subject.

Pp. 497-507. F. Solmsen. Zwei Nominalbildungen auf -μα (the Argolic γράσμα, for γράμμα, and the Cretan ψάφιμμα, for ψήφισμα).

Pp. 508-16. F. Rühl. Zu Tacitus. The passage at the end of the second book of the Annals where Tacitus says of Arminius, "caniturque adhuc barbaras apud gentes," may be a reminiscence of the passage of the Cyropaedia, I 2, 1, where Xenophon says of Cyrus, ἀδεται ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων. The expression in the twenty-third chapter of the Germania, "in quamdam similitudinem vini corruptus," may be compared with Pliny, N. H. XIX 42, 145, "non inficeto Ti. Caesaris dicto herbam ibi quamdam nasci simillimam asparago." [Compare also Tacitus, Ann. III 33, 2, "inesse mulierum comitatu quae . . . Romanum agmen ad similitudinem barbari incessus convertant."]

Pp. 517-42. Ad. Ausfeld. Das angebliche Testament Alexanders des Grossen.

Pp. 543-62. C. Schubert. Die Porusschlacht.

Pp. 563-70. A. Breysig. Zu Avienus (continued from Vol. LV, p. 562).

Pp. 571-86. A. Wilhelm. Nochmals die Bundesurkunde aus Argos.

Pp. 587-95. P. Deiters. Zu Corp. inscr. Graec. II 2555.

Pp. 596-606. L. Gurlitt. Textkritisches zu Ciceros Epistulae ad Quint. frat. Notes on II 7 (9) 1 (for *de non curantia* read *de nostra curatione*); II 10 (12) 1 and 5; III 1, 23; II 3, 2 (for *peregerat sed* read *perseverasset*); II 3, 5; II 6 (8) 1.

Pp. 607-26. W. Crönert. Neues über Epikur und einige herkulanensische Rollen.

Miscellen.—Pp. 627-31. H. Stein. 'Ἡροδότου Θουρίου? The writer rejects the suggestion that Herodotus began his history with the words 'Ἡροδότου Θουρίου (not 'Ἀλικαρνησσίους) ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξι ἦδε.—Pp. 631-4. O. Seeck. Das Geburtsjahr des Marcus Brutus. According to Cicero (Brut. 94, 324 and 64, 229) Brutus was born about the year 85; according to Velleius (II 72, 1), in the year 78 or, at the earliest, in the last days of 79. This later date is supported by the statements of Appian (Bell. Civ. II 112) and Plutarch (Brut. 5), that Brutus was believed to be the son of Cicero.—Pp. 634-5. F. Rühl. Mummius Achaicus und die Lex Varia.—Pp. 635-6. M. Ihm. Bentley's Noten zu Suetons Schrift de grammaticis et rhetoribus.—Pp. 636-8. F. Sommer. Zum Nom. sg. *sēmifer* und *vir*.—Pp. 638-9. F. Skutsch. Etruskische Monatsnamen und Zahlwörter.—Pp. 639-40. A. Klotz. Zu den ABC-Denkmalern.—P. 640. H. Usener. Zur Vasengeschichte

BRIEF MENTION.

One is curious to know what M. VICTOR TERRET of the Petit Séminaire d' Autun, will have to say about ROBERT'S *Studien zur Ilias* (Weidmann). The spectre which he had exorcised in his big book on Homer (A. J. P. XX 87) walks the earth again, and, like the Empusa in the Frogs, it has for the nonce assumed a most attractive shape, so that the literary critic of to-day may well exclaim with the dramatic critic of Aristophanes' time, *φέρ' ἐπ' αὐτήν ἴω*. To me at least, the charm is undeniable, and I hate to think that before this preliminary notice can be printed, Homerists of high and low degree will have poured forth their columns in review of these studies, that the general result will be ferociously assailed and the detail work torn into shreds. But at the time of the present writing the hour has not yet come, and even when it does, I shall not cease to be grateful to the distinguished author of *Bild und Lied* for the rare enjoyment afforded by the first reading of his new work, and for the fresh life he has brought into the inevitable Homeric Question by his fascinating combination of antiquarian and linguistic evidence. Of course, in the present specialization of knowledge, no one scholar could command every detail in both these spheres; and the title-page bears besides the name of CARL ROBERT that of his *τηλεκλειτός ἐπικούρος*, FRIEDRICH BECHTEL, the upholder of Fick's famous thesis, which in this volume comes to honor again.

The modern study of Homer is prefigured in the Shield of Achilles. The city in peace has for its counterpart the city in war, and he who wishes to live in the one, must nerve himself to fight for the other. No one, nowadays, is supposed to enjoy Homer unless he is willing to take up arms for some theory, and the first note of these studies is at once a challenge and a tribute to the shade of Reichel, whose sudden death has removed him from the lists as a champion of the Mycenaean theory. *Si Reichelius non lyrasset, Robertus non sallasset*; and our author frankly acknowledges that it is the keen vision with which Reichel saw and the cogent argument with which he demonstrated the traces of Mycenaean culture in the Homeric poems that have made these *Studien zur Ilias* possible. 'No one had seen so much, none had proved so much.' 'But,' continues ROBERT, 'no one had taken such liberties with the meaning of Greek words'—those handmaids of all argument—'no one had so proudly ignored the gradual growth of the Epos.' 'To him, Iliad and Odyssey represented a thoroughly homogeneous culture,

the Mycenaean, with the bare reservation that about the year 700 an interpolator had introduced the metallic corselet in some passages of the Iliad, which by that time had been substantially finished.' This, ROBERT contends, is too simple to be true, and in these matters he undertakes to follow the stratification of the Iliad, with the difference in armour to guide him in his research.

To one who has lived, as I have, from the age of the flint musket to that of the magazine rifle, who has witnessed the motley array of a Southern Home Guard, who has written a poem on the 'Southern Pike' with which the Confederates for a few brief weeks actually essayed to imitate John Brown; to one who has had his thigh-bone broken by a Spencer bullet, and has read of assegais and machetes and bolos in recent warfare, as well as of Martini-Henrys and Krag-Jörgensens, to such an one, the contemporaneous use of arms that belong to successive or widely separated epochs of culture would not be a serious shock. But fortunately, not being an editor of Homer, I am not compelled to take up a position on any phase of the Homeric Question, unlike Mr. MONRO, who, evidently much against his will, has recently been compelled by his eminence as an Homeric scholar to commit himself to a variety of conclusions. And so, for the remnant of my days, I may be allowed to watch from the shore the waves of Homeric controversy, and delight in the smoothness of the beach when the angry waters recede. The wrecks concern me little.

In long stretches of the Iliad, says ROBERT, the bronze armour, which he calls for brevity's sake, Ionian, is not interpolated but original. Then there is a droll mingling of Mycenaean and Ionian armour, and then again we encounter in yet other passages strange weapons that are neither Mycenaean nor Ionian. Now this variety is not surprising. On the contrary, it corresponds to the evolution of the Epos and shows that there were not only poets who tried to smuggle into the older parts of the Iliad the armour of their own time, but also those who played the antiquarian and made the heroes who appeared in their additaments fight with Brummagem Mycenaean weapons. Now if we find further that these divergencies coincide with the linguistic and aesthetic criteria already at our command, we may hope to trace the stratification of the great poem with more confidence than heretofore.

The antiquarian part is attacked first with the whole armour of the Homeric heroes, shield and corselet, belt and tunic and helmet, the metallic greaves which the Mycenaean warrior did not wear and the leathern gamashes which he did. We follow

the warrior as he dons his armour, for the sequence has been deemed important since the time of Aristarchos, and we examine the wounds with the scrupulous care of the modern coroner when he seeks to determine the calibre of the weapon that wrought the mischief. This antiquarian chapter which occupies only some seventy pages, is followed by an analysis of the Iliad of nearly 200 pages, and this by a reconstruction of the 'Urilias' in Aeolic dialect and the 'Urilias' by a second, third and fourth Iliad in Ionic, if we dare call anything Ionic.

The 'Urilias,' as reconstructed, is a poem of moderate compass, 2146 verses, less than a seventh of the Iliad, as we have it, and the headings will indicate its make-up. A yields a large proportion of the material, and no less than 372 verses out of 611 are saved alive,—the Curse of Chryses, the Prophecy of Kalchas, the Quarrel of the Kings, the Epiphany of Athena, Nestor's Attempt at Reconciliation, the Taking away of Breseis (Briseis), the Prayer of Thetis. Of B we have the Dream of Agamemnon and the Marshalling of the Two Hosts. The Beginning of the Battle starts from Δ 457 and, as from a springboard, leaps into H 219, and after a run of some seventy verses, the First Duel of Aias with Hektor, jumps back to Δ 517. Of E we have the description of the Prowess of Aineias. Of Z, which is one of the shorter books of the Iliad as ζ is the shortest of the Odyssey, a large part is left, another Oncoming of Aias, the son of Telamon, the First Success of the Achaians, the Counsel of Helenos, and the Interview of Hektor with Helen and Paris. The Appearance of Paris on the Field is taken from H and then we pass to N and O and back to Λ, which gets a large slice. The Trojans flee, Agamemnon is wounded. Hektor presses forward, Odysseus is wounded, Aias retreats. Θ comes next with the intercalation of three lines from I and out of the troubled waters of the much abused Eighth Book is drawn the Council of the Trojans followed by the Bivouac. I, κ, and N, furnish forth the Council of the Achaians, N the Battle of the Ships, κ the wounding of Hektor by Aias, and N yields further the Death of Peisandros at the hands of Menelaos. From o comes the Mission of Iris and the Withdrawal of Poseidon from the Battlefield. Then N makes another contribution to the fighting in which Deiphobos has his innings, and o tells the Story of the Assault upon the Ships and prepares for the Coming of Patroklos. With the Coming of Patroklos in Π we take breath, the Aeolic bard has his true hero, and the rest of the poem is virtually a Patrokleia, of which I will not recount the stages. The Vengeance occupies but a brief space. Some forty verses from γ and four from x prepare for the fight between Achilles and Hektor and prepare for the Fall of Hektor.

In this 'Urilias,' this Aeolic lay, Achilles and Patroklos, the *áíras* and the *εἰσπνήλας*, dominate the scene, hold hands, as it were, across the stage. The Ilias has become an Achilleis and not a pure Achilleis; it is largely a Patrokleia. And what more Aeolic than this? One remembers the echoes in one of Theokritos' Aeolic odes—the famous *ἀλλάλοισι πελώμεθ' Ἀχιλλεῖοι φίλοι*; one remembers how prominent Patroklos is made in two of Pindar's Lokrian odes, O 9, 76 and 10, 21, and only there. But according to the 'Urilias,' Patroklos was no Opuntian but a Myrmidon. And ROBERT maintains that it was the poet of the *Ἔκτορος ἀναίρεσις* that first made him an Opuntian, 2 326, and that the author of the *ἄθλα ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ*, noticing the discrepancy, tried to salve it over by the story that Patroklos had fled to Phthia on account of blood-guiltiness incurred in his boyhood. The scholiasts make themselves very busy with this point and tell a long story about the fortunes of Menoitios and the Aktoridai but they get nothing but contemptuous silence for their pains. To be sure, nothing seems to have been more common than the contracting of heroic marriages outside of the native canton, as Menoitios is said to have done, and there is no more familiar *motif* in heroic legend than exile on account of manslaughter. It is the 'Gone to Texas' of my boyhood. It is the 'Gone to Canada' of later years. But ROBERT considers this a lame device and insists on the horsy side of Patroklos in the 'Urilias' where he is as addressed as *Πατρόκλειε ἴππευ* with the same affectionate tone, by the way, as Eumaios is addressed in the Odyssey, *Εὐμαῖε σὺβάτα*. No king is Patroklos; he has no chariot of his own, and, while his rank is higher than that of Eumaios, he is a vassal and Achilles his overlord; and according to ROBERT he was originally nothing but the charioteer of Achilles. But this is only one little point among hundreds and, being one, it may serve to show how much room there is for comment in this notable contribution to the study of Homer, a comment which I must leave to those who are better qualified to deal with Homeric questions.

In the *Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes Études* for 1902, M. GAIDOZ, the well-known Keltic scholar, has published an interesting little essay suggested by the mention of the apple as a declaration of love in Old Irish literature. Next come Greeks and Romans and after them the Christian use of the apple in the *Vierge à la pomme*, in whose person Eve, the mother of us all, and *cette archidiabliesse de Vénus*, as Heinrich Heine calls her, are blended after a fashion not unfamiliar to the student of such matters. This apple, it need not be said, is not strictly the apple of commerce. It may be the quince, it may be the pomegranate; and in Tahiti it appears as the 'nono', a round fruit, which the Kanaka girls throw at the lovers whom they design to favour. As for the symbolism of the apple, M. GAIDOZ scouts it. The

throwing of the apple is only a *grata protervitas*, as an old commentator calls it. A flower would answer every purpose but the apple or any other spherical fruit carries better. Snow-balls, I would add, sometimes serve the same teasing purpose: and M. GAIDOZ actually mentions the use of rotten eggs at English elections as a familiar and popular practice which indicates the reverse of love; and the instance of Mrs. Nickleby's demonstrative neighbour will recur at once to the minds of those who are not ashamed to remember Dickens. The first apple thrown, says M. GAIDOZ, was merely to attract attention. The symbolism was an afterthought. One is curious to know what M. GAIDOZ will do with the various representatives of the vegetable kingdom, the symbolism of which in Greek is hardly to be denied. One asks in the words of the flower song: *ποῦ μοι τὰ ῥόδα; ποῦ μοι τὰ ἴα; ποῦ μοι τὰ καλὰ σέλινα;* one abandons reluctantly the long-cherished explanation of the 'parsley bed', which is the English rival of the German stork; and I am afraid that some *amoureux de tetons*, to use La Fontaine's phrase, will not resign the symbolism, which Aristophanes did not invent and which is quite as evident as any of the popular wall-pictures, the exaggerations of which Montaigne so feelingly deplores.

The *Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames*, by the late CHARLES WAREING BARDSLEY, author of the well-known work on English Surnames, and younger brother of the Bishop of Carlisle, who has furnished an interesting and pathetic biographical preface (N. Y., Henry Frowde), is a storehouse of material on a subject which comes near to everyone, and the *special American instances* which have been incorporated in the work will be welcome to a period of genealogical fads. As in the thesaurus of English words there are hosts of survivals in America that are little known in the mother-country, so in the list of English surnames there are many whose representatives have increased and multiplied on this side, while the stock has become barren beyond the water. In any event the distribution of surnames is always an interesting problem for the historian, as their etymology is tempting and elusive.

M. W. H.: *Welche dem Menschen gefährlichen Spinnen kannten die Alten?* Such is the title of an interesting address delivered by Dr. R. KOBERT before the section on the History of Medicine, Sept. 1901, reprinted from *Janus*, VI, II. As to whether spiders in temperate latitudes are ever poisonous, the author is very emphatic, asserting that he *knows* some of them are. A book of his on venomous spiders (in press when the address was delivered, but now published) is not at hand. The address summarizes the book and attempts to determine which of

the present venomous spiders were known to the ancient Greeks and Romans. It will be sufficient here to note only these. Pliny mentions a spider that drove out the entire population of a country, and his description shows plainly that the spider belonged to the solifugae or "giant ants." KOBERT, however, says that these are not venomous, though they may bite. Pliny's story would therefore seem to be fabulous. Aristotle mentions a spider which appears to have been a tarantula (not, of course, the venomous mygalid called "tarantula" in Texas); but even the bite of this spider, according to K., is comparatively harmless. "Tarantism" grew out of a passage of Strabo by people confounding the lathroedectes, which Strabo evidently meant, with the much more conspicuous tarantula. The very remarkable effects of the bite of some spiders of the lathroedectes genus, renders it easy to recognize ancient allusions to it. It probably includes the φαλάγγιον of Xenophon (and Plato, not mentioned by K.), two species of it are spoken of by Aristotle as being venomous, and one by Nicander (who calls it ῥώξ and accurately describes the effects that are produced to-day by the bite of the Italian and Russian lathroedectes), and by Pedanius Dioscorides. Celsus speaks of a Gallic poison, which K. thinks may have been made from spiders. The facts reproduced by Aelian from earlier writers confirm the existence of venomous spiders. This address is not intended for philologists, and, with rare exceptions, we are not told exactly where the passages referred to occur; still the author seems to have been the first to explain correctly the description of the ῥώξ in Nicand. *θηριακά* 715 as referring to the black color with red spots characteristic of the Italian species, the "malmignatto" (lathroedectes tredecimguttatus), which name he says is derived from "marmoratus", "marmoriert d. h. gefleckt."

W. P. M.: By some odd obliquity of vision the editor of the 'Parnassus' Virgil (p. xi) transposes the subjects of the Second and Third Georgics. The same editor has the same mistake in the Introduction to his Virgil in Macmillan's 'Classical Series': "the first deals with husbandry proper, the second with the rearing of stock, the third with the cultivation of trees," etc. This sentence stands in all three parts; Aen. i-vi (1894); Bucolics and Georgics (1897), and Aen. vii-xii (1900). Moreover, the commentary on Geor. iv. 559-60 makes 'pecorum' the subject of Bk. ii, and 'arboribus' the subject of Bk. iii. If these things can happen even to an editor who is very jealous for Virgil, one may perhaps be the less surprised to read in Carter's *Elegiac Poets* (p. 198) that the subject of the Third Georgic is "arboriculture."

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Aristophanes. *The Knights*; ed. by Rob. Alex. Neil. New York, *Macmillan*, 1902. 14 + 229 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$2.50.

Caesar. *Commentaries on the Gallic War*; with introd., notes, and vocabulary by Albert Harkness and C. H. Forbes. New York, *Amer. Book Co.*, 1902. 3-593 pp. 1 il. 12mo, hf. leath., \$1.25.

Keller (A. G.) *Homeric Society*. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1902. 12mo, 8 + 332 pp. cl., \$3.

Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. *A Sanskrit grammar for beginners*. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1901. 20 + 240 pp. cl., \$3.

Morris, (E. P.) *On principles and methods in Latin syntax*. New York, *Scribner*, 1901. c. 11 + 232 pp. 8vo, net \$2.

Ogilvie, (Rob.) *Horæ Latinæ; studies in synonyms and syntax*; ed. by Alex. Souter; with a memoir by Joa. Ogilvie. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1901. 23 + 339 pp. 8vo, cl., \$5.

ENGLISH.

Anecdota Oxoniensia: Classical Series, No. 9. Collations from the Codex Clunacensis s. Holkhamicus by W. Peterson. London, 1902. 4to. 7s. 6d.

Aeschylus. *Choephoroi. Critical Notes, Commentary, Translation, Recension of the Scholia*, by T. G. Tucker. London, 1901. 8vo, 422 pp. 12s. 6d.

Brodrick (M.), and A. A. Morton. *Concise Dictionary of Egyptian Archaeology*. London, 1902. 8vo, 206 pp. 3s. 6d.

Crow (F. E.) *Arabic Manual*. London, 1901. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

King (L. W.) *Assyrian Language. Easy Lessons in the Cuneiform Inscriptions*. London, 1901. 8vo, 232 pp. 3s. 6d.

Thesaurus Palæohibernicus: Collection of Old Irish Glosses, Scholia, Prose and Verse. Edited by Whitley Stokes and J. Strachan. Vol. I. London, 1901. 8vo, 756 pp. £1 10s.

Wright (W.) *Catalogue of Syriac MSS preserved in Library of University of Cambridge*. 2 vols. London, 1901. 8vo, 1320 pp. £3.

FRENCH.

Gsell (S.) *Les Monuments antiques de l'Algérie. Tome I*. Paris, 1901. 8vo. Illustr. 20 fr.

Ptolemaei, Claudii, *geographia. E codicibus recognovit, prolegomenis, annotatione, indicibus, tabulis instruxit Carol. Müllerus*. Vol. I, pars II. *Lex*. 8vo, ii u. S. 571-1023. Paris, 1901, *Firmin-Didot & Co*. 15 fr.

GERMAN.

Adami (Frider.) De poetis scaenicis graecis hymnorum sacrorum imitatoribus. [Aus: "Jahrb. f. class. Philologie."] gr. 8. S. 213-262. Leipzig, 1900, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.

Aeschylus. Perser. Hrag. u. erklärt v. Hugo Jurenka. Textheft u. Einleitg. u. Kommentar. x, 39 u. 63 S. m. Bildnis. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.40.

Arx Athenarum a Pausania descripta, in usum scholarum edd. Otto Jahn et Adolf. Michaelis. Ed. III. gr. 4. viii, 140 u. xli S. Bonn, 1901, *A. Marcus*. u. *E. Weber*. m. 10.

Bartal (Ant.) Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis regni Hungariae. xxviii, 723 S. gr. 4. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 50.

Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken. I. Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel*. I. Sievers, Ed. Grundzüge der Phonetik. 5. Aufl., xvi, 328 S. 1901. m. 5.

Blass (Frdr.) Die Rhythmen der attischen Kunstprosa. Isokrates—Demosthenes—Platon. gr. 8. xi, 199 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Blaydes (Frider. H. M.) Adversaria in Herodotum. gr. 8. vii, 160 S. Halle, 1901, *Buchh. des Waisenhauses in Komm.* m. 3.80.

Christoffersson (Herm.) Studia de fabulis Babriani. gr. 8. iv, 178 S. Lund, 1901, *H. Möller*. m. 3.50.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. XI, partis 2, fasc. I. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. XI. Inscriptiones Aemiliae, Etruriae, Umbriae, latinae. Ed. Eugen. Bormann. Partis 2, fasc. I. Inscriptiones Umbriae. S. 53-92 u. 595-1224 m. Abbildgn., 1901. m. 75.

—Vol. XIII, partis 3, fasc. I. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. XIII, 3. Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum latinae. Collegerunt Otto Hirschfeld et Carol. Zangemeister. Ed. Ose. Bohn. Partis 3, fasc. I. 429 S., 1901. m. 40.

Cuntz (Otto). Polybius u. sein Werk. Mit 1 Kärtchen. v, 88 S. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.80.

Demetrii Phalerei qui dicitur de elocutione libellus. Praefatus, recensuit adnotavitque Ludov. Radermacher. gr. 8. xvi, 132 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 5.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XIV. Pars IV. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. IV. Ritter (Rud.) De Varrone Vergilii in narrandis urbium populorumque Italiae originibus auctore. iii, 131 S. 1901. m. 2.

—dasselbe. Vol. XV. Pars I. gr. 8. Ebd. I. Lippelt, (Ernest) Quae fuerint Justini Martyris ἀπομνημονεύματα quaque ratione cum forma evangeliorum syro-latina cohaeserint. iv, 102 S. 1901. m. 3.

Euripidis fabulae. Edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. I, pars III. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. I, 3. Hecuba, ed. Rud. Prinz. Ed. altera, quam curavit N. Wecklein. vii, 67 S. 1902. m. 2.40. Vol. III, pars 5. Troades, ed. N. Wecklein. gr. 8. v, 72 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.80.

Festschrift, Strassburger, zur XLVI. Versammlg. deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner. Lex. 8. iii, 332 S. m. 8. Abbildgn. u. 1 Taf. Strassburg, 1901, *K. G. Trübner*. m. 10.

Finck (Frz. Nik.) Die Klassifikation der Sprachen. gr. 8. 26 S. m. 1 Tab. Marburg, 1901, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 60.

Grammatici graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi. Pars III. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* III. Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam, recensuit et apparatus criticum indicesque adiecit Alfr. Hilgard. li, 652 S. 1901. m. 36.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. 25. u. 26. Halbbd. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck.* 25 V. Bd. 2. Abtlg. 2. Hälfte. 1. Lfg. Gruppe, (Otto). Griechische Mythologie u. Religionsgeschichte. 2. Hälfte. 1. Lfg. S. 385-768. 1902. m. 7. 26. V. Bd. 4. Abtlg. Wissowa (Geo.) Religion u. Kultus der Römer. xii, 534 S. 1902. m. 10.

Hermeri, Claudii, Mulomedicina Chironis ed. Eug. Oder. 8. xxxvii, 467 S. m. 1 Taf. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 12.

Holder (Alfr.) Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz. 14. Lfg. gr. 8. Sp. 1281-1536. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Hommel (Fritz.) Vier neue arabische Landschaftsnamen im Alten Testament. [Aus: "Aufsätze u. Abhandlgn."] gr. 8. iii, u. S. 273-343. München, 1901, *H. Lukaschik.* m. 3.50.

Janell (Gualth.) Quaestiones Platonicae. [Aus: "Jahrb. f. class. Philologie."] gr. 8. S. 263-336. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.80.

Kempf (I. G.) Romanorum sermonis castrensis reliquiae collectae et illustratae. [Aus: "Jahrb. f. class. Philologie."] gr. 8. S. 341-400. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.40.

Lodge (Gonzalez). Lexicon Plautinum. Vol. I, fasc. I. Lex. 8. S. 1-96. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 7.20.

Lysiae orationes. Recensuit Theod. Thalheim. Ed. minor. 8. xx, 268 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.20.

Meinhof (Carl.) Das Tši-Venda. Linguistische Studie. [Aus: "Ztschr. d. deut. morgenländ. Gesellsch."] 76 S. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1901, *F. A. Brockhaus, Sort.* m. 2.40.

Meyer (Leo). Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie. 3 Bd. Wörter m. dem Anlaut γ , β , δ , ξ , χ , ϕ , ϑ . gr. 8. 488 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel.* m. 12.

Meyer (Wilh.) Fragmenta Burana. [Aus: "Festschr. z. Feier d. 150 jähr. Bestehens d. kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen."] gr. 4. 190 S. m. 15 z. Tl. farb. Taf. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann.* m. 14.

Mythographi graeci. Vol. II. Fasc. I. Supplem. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* II, 1. Suppl. Parthenii Nicaeni quae supersunt. Ed. Edg. Martini. xiii, 107 S. m. 1 Taf. 1902. m. 2.40.

Nestle (Wilh.) Untersuchungen üb. die philosophischen Quellen des Euripides. [Aus: "Philologus, Ergänzungsbd."] 100 S. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *Dieterich.* m. 3.

Osthoff (Herm.) Etymologische Parerga. 1. Tl. gr. 8. viii, 378 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel.* m. 9.

Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio. Edd. Herm. Hitzig et Hugo Blumner. Vol. II, pars 1. Liber IV: Messeniaca. Liber V: Eliaca I. gr. 8. xiv, 449 S. m. 5 Taf. Leipzig, 1901, *O. R. Reisland.* m. 20.

Pischel (Rich.) u. Karl F. Geldner. Vedische Studien. 3. Bd. gr. 8. v, 215 S. Stuttgart, 1901, *W. Kohlhammer.* m. 7.

Poetarum graecorum fragmenta. Auctore Ulr. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff

collecta et edita. Vol. III, fasc. I. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmanns*. III, 1. Poetarum philosophorum fragmenta ed. Herm. Diels. viii, 270 S. 1901. m. 10.

Pradel (Frider.) De praepositionum in prisca latinitate vi atque usu. [Aus: "Jahrb. f. class. Philologie."] gr. 8. S. 465-576. Leipzig, 1901. *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4-40.

Prosopographia attica. Ed. Ioa. Kirchner. Vol. I. gr. 8. viii, 603 S. m. 2 Tab. Berlin, 1901, *G. Reimer*. m. 24.

Roemer (Adph.) Studien zu Aristophanes u. den alten Erklärern desselben. 1. Tl. xiv, 196 S. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Sammlung indogermanischer Lehrbücher, hrsg. v. Herm. Hirt I. Reihe: Grammatiken. 3. Bd. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. 3. Sommer (Ferd.) Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- u. Formenlehre. xxiii, 693 S. 1902. m. 9.

Samter (Ernst). Familienfeste der Griechen u. Römer. gr. 8. vi, 128 S. Berlin, 1901, *G. Reimer*. m. 3.

Schoemann (G. F.) Griechische Alterthümer. 4. Aufl., neu bearb. v. J. H. Lipsius. 2. Bd. Die internationalen Verhältnisse u. das Religionswesen. vii, 644 S. gr. 8. Berlin, 1902, *Weidmanns*. m. 14.

Schrader (Eberh.) Die Keilinschriften u. das Alte Testament. 3. Aufl., neu bearb. v. H. Zimmern u. H. Winckler. 1. Hälfte. gr. 8. vi, 342 S. Berlin, 1902, *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 13.

Seidel (A.) Systematisches Wörterbuch der nordchinesischen Umgangssprache (Peking-Dialekt). xvi, 208 S. 8. Oldenburg, 1901, *Schulze*. m. 2-50.
Skutsch (Frz.) Aus Vergils Frühzeit. gr. 8. vii, 170 S. Leipzig, 1901. *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.

Statius. Vol. II. Fasc. I. Achilleis. Ed. Alfr. Klotz. xliii, 61 S. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1-20.

Streck (Max). Die alte Landschaft Babylonien nach den arabischen Geographen. 2. Tl. gr. 8. xv u. S. 173-333. Leiden, 1901, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 5.

Szanto (Emil). Die griechischen Phylen. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] 74 S. gr. 8. Wien, 1901, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 1-70.

Thucydidis historiae, ad optimos codices denuo ab ipso collatos recensuit Carol. Hude. Tom. II: Libri V-VIII. Indices. gr. 8. viii, 348 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 12.

Weymann (K. E.) Die aethiopische u. arabische Uebersetzung des Pseudo-callisthenes. (Diss.) gr. 8. vii, 83 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 2-50.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulr. v.) Hieron u. Pindaros. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss."] 46 S. gr. 8. Berlin, 1901, *G. Reimer in Komm.* m. 2.

Wundt (Wilh.) Sprachgeschichte u. Sprachpsychologie. Mit Rücksicht auf B. Deibrücks "Grundfragen der Sprachforschg." gr. 8. 110 S. Leipzig, 1901, *W. Engelmann*. m. 2.

ITALIAN.

Limentani (Umberto). L' "Hercules furens" di Seneca nelle sue relazioni colle "Trachinie" di Sofocle e nelle sue fonti. Padova-Verona. 16mo, p. 136. L. 2.

Mestica (Giovanni). Studi leopardiani. Firenze. 16mo, p. 652, 2 ritratti e 1 tav. L. 4.

Studi italiani di filologia classica. Vol. IX. Firenze. 8vo, p. 520. L. 20.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aetna. A critical recension of the text based on a new examination of MSS. With prolegomena, translation, textual and exegetical commentary, excursus, and complete index of the words. By Robinson Ellis. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1901.

Alciphronis rhetoris Epistularum Libri IV. Annotatione critica instruxit M. A. Schepers. Groningae, Ap. *J. B. Wolters*, MCM I.

'Αθηνᾶ, σύγγραμμα περιοδικῶν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπιστημονικῆς ἑταιρείας τόμος γυ' τεύχος δ'. Ἀθήνησιν, 1901.

Bardsley (C. W.) A Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames, with special American instances. London and New York, 1901. 21 s. net.

Bonfiglio (Salvatore.) Questioni Akragantine. Messina, Rivista di Storia Antica, 1901.

Bréal (M.) Etymologies. Extrait du Mémoires de la Société de linguistique, tome XII.

— Sur la critique de texte en ses rapports avec la linguistique. Bulletin des Humanistes français. Nouvelle Série, N. 1.

— Les verbes signifiant 'parler.'

— Notice sur Max Müller. Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. Comptes rendus, 1900.

Caesars Denkwürdigkeiten über d. gallischen Krieg. Schtüler-Kommentar von Johann Schmidt. 3te durgesehene Auflage. Leipzig, *Freitag*, 1901. 1 m. 50 pf.

Ciceronis (M. T.) Rhetorica. Tomus I: Libros de oratore tres continens (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis). Londini et Novi Eboraci, Ap. *Henricum Frowde*, 1902. 2s. 6d. Paper.

Ciceros Rede für Cn. Plancius. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. von Hermann Nohl. Leipzig, *Freitag*, 1902. 60 pf.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Literarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXXXII. Sancti Aureli Augustini. Sect. VIII, Pars II. Ex rec. Caroli F. Urba et Josephi Zycha. Vindobonae, F. Tempsky. Lipsiae, *G. Freitag*, MDCCCCII.

Curti (Q. C. Rufi.) Historiarum Alexandri Magni Libri qui supersunt. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. v. Theodr. Stangl. Leipzig, *G. Freitag*, 1902. geb. 2 m. 50 pf.

Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue allemande sur le plan de celui de M. Kluge, mais d'après les principes nouveaux de la Méthode Évolutionniste, par Paul Regnaud. 1^o Livr. AAL-BERG, 2^o Livr. BERGEN-DURCH. Paris, *Albert Fointemoing*, 1901.

Edmonds (Richard H.) The Youth's Industrial Task. A Plea for Technical Training of Poor White Boys. An address. Baltimore, 1902.

English Dictionary. The Oxford. Edited by James A. H. Murray. KAISER-

VYX. Vol. V. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901. \$1.20.

— LAP-LEISURELY (Vol. VI). By Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1902. \$1.25.

Etórquia [Genesis translated into French Basque by Pierre d'Urté about 1715.] London. The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1898.

Euripidis Fabulae. Recogn. brevis adnotatione critica instruxit Gilbertus Murray. Tomus I: Insunt Cyclops, Alcestis, Medea, Heraclidae, Hippolytus, Andromacha, Hercules. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Londini et Novi Eboraci. Ap. *H. Frowde*, 1902. 3 s. Paper.

Fowler (H. N.) A History of Ancient Greek Literature. New York, *D. Appleton & Co.*, 1902.

Gaidoz (H.) La réquisition d'amour et le Symbolisme de la pomme. École pratique des Hautes Études, Annuaire, 1902.

Glover (T. R.) Life and Letters in the Fourth Century. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. \$3.25.

Goebel (Julius). Goethe u. Schiller. Festsrede. Separatabdruck aus den Pädagogischen Monatsheften II, 10. Milwaukee, 1901.

— Goethe's Poems selected and edited, with introduction and notes. New York, *Henry Roth & Co.*, 1901.

Griechisches Lesebuch v. Ulrich v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Text I. Halbband, 2 m. 60. II. Halbband 2 m. 80 pf. Erläuterungen. I. Halbband, 2 m. 80. II. Halbband, 2 m. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1902.

Guthrie (W. N.) The Old Hemlock and other Symbols. (Poetry.) Cincinnati. *The Robert Clarke Co.*, 1902.

Hollander (J. H.) The Finances of Porto Rico. Political Science Quarterly, Vol. XVI, No. 4.

Hopkins (E. Washburn). India, Old and New, with a memorial address [on E. E. Salisbury]. Yale Bicentennial Publications. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1901.

Horton-Smith (Lionel). Hymn by Lord Macaulay. An effort of his early childhood. Cambridge, England. *Metcalf & Co.*, 1902.

Huddilston (John Homer). Lessons from Greek Pottery. To which is added A Bibliography of Greek Ceramics. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1902. \$1.25.

Huvelin (P.) Les tablettes magiques et le droit Romain. (Extrait des Annales internationales d'histoire. Macon, *Protat Frères*, 1901.

Journal of Philology (The). Edited by W. A. Wright, I. Bywater, and H. Jackson. Vol. XXVIII, No. 55. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1901.

King Horn. A Middle-English Romance. Edited from the MSS by Joseph Hall. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, MDCCCI. \$3.20.

Kobert (R.) Welche dem Menschen gefährlichen Spinnen kannten die Alten? Janus VI, 6. 15 Nov. 1901.

Livi (T.) Ab Urbe Condita Libri. Ed. Antonius Zingerle. Pars III. Lib. XXI-XXV. Ed. minor multis locis emendata. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCCI. 2 m.

Modern Language Association of America (Publications of the). Ed. by

J. W. Bright. Vol. XVI, No. 4. N.S., Vol. IX, No. 4. Contents: Fletcher (R. H.) Two Notes on Geoffrey of Monmouth.—XV. Scott (Mary A.) The Book of the Courtyer—a possible source of Benedict and Beatrice.—XVII. Northrup (C. S.) Dialogus inter Corpus et Animam, a Fragment and a Translation. Appendix. Proceedings of the 18th Annual Meeting of the M. L. A. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1901.

Monatschrift für höhere Schulen. Herausg. v. R. Köpke u. A. Matthias. 1 Jahrg. 1 Heft. Januar. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1902.

Müller (Eugene.) Der echte Hiob. Hannover, *Fr. Rehtmeyer*, 1902. 1 m. 50 pf.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Litteratur u. für Paedagogik. V. Jahrg. IX. u. X. Bandes. 1 Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1902.

Orazio, Le odi et gli epodi di. Commento ad uso delle scuole del Pietro Rasi. Milano, *Remo Sandron*, 1902.

Osthoff (Hermann.) Etymologische Parerga. Erster Teil. Leipzig, *Hirzel*, 1901. 9 m.

Peterson (William.) Collections from the Codex Cluniacensis s. Holkhamicus. IX C. MS of Cicero. (Anecdota Oxoniensia. Classical Series. Part IX.) Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1901.

Plauti (T. Maeci) Rudens. Editio Minor. By E. L. Sonnenschein. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1901.

Poetarum philosophorum fragmenta. Ed. Hermannus Diels. (Poetarum Graecorum Fragmenta. Auctore Udalr. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, collecta et edita.) Berolini, *Ap. Weidmannos*. MCM I. 10 m.

Pope's The Iliad of Homer. Books I, VI, XXII and XXIV. Edited, with introduction and notes, by Francis Elliott Shoup and Isaac Belt. Richmond, *B. F. Johnson Publishing Co.*, 1901.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας τοῦ ἐτους 1900. Ἀθήνησιν, 1901.

Properti (Sexti) Carmina. Recognovit J. S. Phillimore. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Oxonii, *Ex Typographeo Clarendoniano*. Novi Eboraci, *H. Frowde*, 1901. Paper, 2s. 6d.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Buecheler u. H. Usener. N. F. LVII 1. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer*, 1902.

Royce (Charles C.) Indian Land Cessions in the United States, compiled by. With an Introduction by Cyrus Thomas. Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, 1896-97. By J. W. Powell, Director. Part 2. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1899.

Sallust's Catiline, with parallel passages from Cicero's orations against Catiline. Introduction, notes and vocabulary by Jared W. Scudder. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1901.

Schneider (Gustav.) Schüler-Kommentar zu Platons Euthyphron. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1902. 50 pf.

Schoemann (G. F.) Griechische Alterthümer. Vierte Auflage. Neu bearbeitet von J. H. Lipsius. Zweiter Band. Die internationalen Verhältnisse u. das Religionswesen. Leipzig, *Weidmann*, 1902. 14 m.

Sipkema (P. A.) *Quaestiones Terentianae*. Amstelod. *Apud de Bussy*, 1901. Skrifter utgifna af Kongl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet. I Upsala, Band IV. Upsala, *Akademiska Bokhandeln*. Leipzig, *C. Harrassowitz*.

Smith (W. B.) *Unto Romans*, XV and XVI. Deprint from the *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

Sophokles (The Antigone of). With Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. By M. A. Bayfield. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1901.

Steele (R. B.) *Anaphora and Chiasmus in Livy*. Reprint from *Tr. A. P. Asso.* Vol. XXXII, 1901.

Ten Brink (Bernard). *The Language and Metre of Chaucer*. Second Ed., revised by Friedrich Kluge. Trans. by M. Bentinck Smith. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1901.

University of Nebraska. *Quarterly Bulletin*. Contents: Kind (J. L.) On the influence of Greek on the coining of Gothic Compounds. Jeffords (C. R.) The uses of Dum, Donec and Quoad in Livy. Persinger (C. R.) The Political Philosophy of Thomas Paine. Lincoln (Nebr.), *The University Press*, 1901.

Vahlen (J.) *Über die Verschlüsse in den Komödien des Terentius*. *Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Ak. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, im Jahre 1900.

— *Über Fragen der Verstechnik des Terentius*. *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 14. März, 1901.

— [De versibus quibusdam Menaechmorum]. *Index Lect. Berol. MDCCCI-II*.

Warren (Minton). *On Some Ancient and Modern Etymologies*. *Transactions of A. P. Association*, Vol. XXXII, 1901.

Wijkop (J. D.) *Handleiding tot de kennis der hebreuwsche taal*. Tweede Stuk. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*, 1901.

INDEX TO VOL. XXII.

Achaemenian Inscription, Bh. I, §18,	317-319	Bayfield's Elektra,	350
Aesopic Fable in O. F. Prose,	78-9	Cauer's Grammatica Militans,	108
Aischylos, Agamemnon 324-326,	393	Ciaceri's Lykophron,	344-346
Alfred's Boethius,	215, 216	Demoulin's Epiménide de Crète,	346-348
Alliteration, Transverse,	458	Earle's Oedipus Tyrannus,	227
Antispast, Recognition of the,	330	Fabia's Onomasticum Taciteum,	112
Apollonius Rhodius, Seaton's (rev.),	326-331	Festschrift Joh. Vahlen gewidmet,	229
Apple, Symbolism of the,	470	Gaidoz, On the Apple,	470
Apuleius XI 24,	221	Hemphill's Persius,	106-7
Archaeological Gleanings,	225	Hiller v. Gärtringen's Ausgrabungen,	228
Argive Heraeum, The <i>ἱερεῖαι</i> of Hellanicus and the Burning of the,	39-43	Janell's Quaestiones Platonicae,	348-350
Aristotle's <i>Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία</i> , Notes on,	225	Kobert's Gefährliche Spinnen,	471
De Anima,	149-164	Macé's De emendando Differentiarum Libro,	111
Meteorologica,	337	Meister's Gr. Dialekte,	108
Aristophanes, Nubes, 1371-91, 1407-28,	225	Meyer's Schlagworte,	232
Army, Greek and Roman,	222	Robert's Studien zur Ilias,	467 fol.
von Arnaim's Dio von Prusa,	341	Roscher's Ephialtes,	233
Arrian's Periplus,	464	Schanz's Römische Litteratur,	112
Arthur, King, and King Cornwall, a ballad,	459	Sosii Fratres Bibliopolae,	110-111
Arthurian Cycle, Provenience of the,	217	Thompson's Meno,	109-110
Aryan name of Tongue,	458	Tolman's Art of Translating,	105-7
Asclepiads, Horace's Lesser,	283-296	Virgil's Georgics transposed,	472
Asianismus und Atticismus,	220	Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's Reden und Vorträge,	231-2
Asiatic leap-year,	223	Brown's Primitive Constellations,	338
Association of Numerals,	261-267	Byroniana,	97
Assyrian and Babylonian Letters,	442, 443	Byron's Parisina,	101
Athenaeus, Source of Medical Citations in Books I-III,	223	Callias, Decree of, C. I. A., I, 32,	341
Aurelius Victor, Epit. XXV,	338	Caradoc, The Story of,	218
Babylonian Dynasty, First,	462-3	Cauer's Grammatica Militans (ment'ed),	108
Bardsley's Dictionary of English and Welsh surnames,	471	Chapman, George. The Sources of,	99
Bavius,	340	CLEMENT, WILLARD K. Elmer's Treatment of the Prohibitive—A Rejoinder,	87-96
Bayfield's Elektra,	350	Clement's Prohibitives in Silver Latin (rev.),	80-87
Beiträge zur Assyriologie,	461-464	Chaucer, Dissyllabic Thesis and Epic Caesura in,	100
Bibles, Pre-Lutheran,	458	Chaucer, Pope and,	97
Boccaccio's Filostrato,	103	Ciaceri's Lykophron,	344-346
Bodleian Fragments of Juvenal,	268-282	Cicero ad Atticum,	439, 440
BOLLING, GEORGE MELVILLE. An Epic Fragment from Oxyrhynchus,	63-69	ad Q. F. II, 3, 2; 7 (9) 1 (emended),	
Books Received, 118-120, 237-240, 356-360,	477-480	de Domo, 52-76,	342
Breton Moderne,	332-334	ad Fam. IX, 16, 3,	340
Brief Mention.		De re publ. I 36, 56; II 2, 4,	337
Bardsley's Dictionary of English and Welsh surnames,	471	Judgment of Lucretius,	438, 439
		Rosciana, 11,	337

- Cipher in Cicero's Letters to Atticus, 439-40
 Commodus' favorite, Perennis, 226
 Cowley's Davideis, Metre of the, 456-7
 Cumont's *Mystères de Mithra*, 443-453
- Demoulin's *Epiménide de Crète*, 346-8
 Diogenes Laertius' *Parmenides*, 221
 Dodge, Louis. *Cicero ad Atticum*, 439, 440
- Earle's *Oedipus Tyrannus* (mentioned), 227
 El Amarna Tablets, 461-2
 Elegiac Distich, Some Irregular Forms of the, 165-194
 ELMER, H. C. Review of Clement's Prohibitives in Silver Latin, 80-87
 Elmer's Treatment of the Prohibitive (rev.), 87-96
 English Proper Nouns as Common Nouns, 99
 Englische Studien, Report of, 97-101
 Epic Fragment from Oxyrhynchus, 63-69
 Etrurian Names in -swes, 223
 Etymologies, 426-431
 Eurypontids, History of the, 222
 Exeter Book, Riddles of the, 456
- Fabia's Onomasticon Taciteum, 112
 Falconry among the Babylonians, 464
 FITCH, EDWARD. Review of Seaton's *Apollonius Rhodius*, 326-331
 Floire et Blanchefleur, Arabic origin of, 219
- Gaidoz, On the apple, 470
 GARNETT, JAMES M. Review of Sedgfield's *King Alfred's Boethius*, 215-216
 Toller's *Outlines of the History of the English Language*, 214-215
 German Bibles, Manuscript Copies of Printed, 70-76
 German Criticism, Fairness of, 350
 GILDERSLEEVE, BASIL L., see *Brief Mention*.
 Goethe's *Faust*, Prelude to, 461
 Gormond et Isembard, 201
 Gradenwitz, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (rev.), 210-214
- GRAY, LOUIS H. and SCHUYLER, MONTGOMERY. *Indian Glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychios*, 195-202
 Gray's *Trinummus*, 339
 Greek: $\xi\theta\alpha$ and $\sigma\chi\eta\sigma\omega$, $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\delta\omega\sigma$, 228
 GRUENER, GUSTAV. Report of Journal of Germanic Philology, 450-451
 Guy of Warwick Chap-Book, 456
- Hannibal's route across the Alps, 453-455
 Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters* (rev.), 442-443
 Hellanicus, The *ἱεραὶ* of, and the Burning of the Argive Heraeum, 39-43
- Hemphill's Translation of *Persius*, 106-7
 HEMPT, GEORGE. *Etymologies*, 426-431
 HENDRICKSON, G. L. *Cicero's Judgment of Lucretius*, 438, 439
 Hermes, 220-226
 Herodotus, I 1, 466
 Hesychios, *Indian Glosses in the Lexicon of*, 195-202; 441
 Homer, II. XIX 369-424, a late addition, 224, 225
 Horace, Ep. III, 1, 102, 340
 and Bacchylides, 230
 Lesser *Asclepiads*, On the Form of, 283-296
 HUMPHREYS, MILTON W. Report of *Revue de Philologie*, 337-343
- Indian Glosses in the *Lexicon of Hesychios*, 195-202
- Janell's *Quaestiones Platonicae*, 348-350
 Johnson, Laurence, *The Misogonus* and, 459
 Journal of Germanic Philology, 456-461
 Juvenal, the *Bodleian Fragments of*, 268-282
 The *Parentage of*, 51-62
- Kallisthene's *Hellenika*, 221
 KENDAL, GEORGE C. *An Aesopic Fable in Old French Prose*, 78-9
 Report of *Romania*, 101-104
 Kober's *Gefährliche Spinnen*, 471
 KURRLEMEYER, W. Manuscript Copies of Printed German Bibles, 70-76
- Latin: *flagitium*, 335
Epitaphs, 226
Prohibitives in Silver, 80-96
Proverbs, a Further Collection of, 1-28; 121-148; 241-260; 361-392
Words from German, 43
- LEASE, EMORY B. Review of *Osiander's Hannibalsweg*, 453-455
 Legrand's *Étude sur Théocrite*, 338
 LINDSAY, W. M. *The Leyden MS of Nonius Marcellus*, 29-38
 Lógos, *Zarathushtra and the*, 432-437
 Lommatzsch's *Lexicon Petronianum*, 340
 Lucilius, *Non. 351, M.*, a Comment on, 44-50
 Lucretius, *Cicero's Judgment of*, 438, 439
 Lysias XXXII, 7-20 (emended), 224
- Maccabees, The two books of the, 222-3
 Manuscript Copies of Printed German Bibles, 70-76
 Μακάβραι, 441
 Medea, *No Women's Rights in*, 214
 Meister's *Griechische Dialekte* (mentioned), 108-9
 Menander, *Hidden Verses of*, 223

- MERCHANT, FRANK IVAN.** The Parentage of Juvenal, 51-62
- Mette, Ancient,** 223
- Meyer's Schlagworte (mentioned),** 232-3
- MICHELSON, TRUMAN.** Note on the Achaemenian Inscription, Bh. I, 118, 317
- MILLS, L. H.** Zarathushtra and the Logos, 432-437
- Milton, Pope as a Student of,** 100
- Misogonus and Laurence Johnson,** 459
- Mithras, The Mysteries of,** 443-453
- Müller's Horace,** 339
- Müller, Wilhelm and the Volkslied,** 457-8
- MUSTARD, WILFRED P.** Report of Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 335-337; 464-466
- Virgil's Georgics transposed,** 472
- Mutare pulices,* 44-50
- Necrology.** Hübner, Emil, 113-114
- Keelhoff, Joseph, 114
- Passy, Jean, 102
- Sutphen, Morris C., 392
- Negative in M. H. German, Strengthened, 459
- Nonius Marcellus, The Leyden MS of, 29-38
- NUTTING, H. C.** The Unreal Conditional Sentence in Plautus, 297-316
- OERTEL, HANNS.** On the Association of Numerals, 261-267
- Olympic Games and the victors therein, 221
- OSGOOD, CHARLES GROSVENOR.** Report of Englische Studien, 97-101
- Osiander's Hannibalsweg (rev.), 453-455
- Oxyrhynchus.** An Epic Fragment from, 63-69
- Papyri, 223, 338
- Pais, Storia di Roma,** 339
- Papyri, Greek, 210-214
- Parlement of the Three Ages, Author of, 99
- Passion Plays, Frankfurt, 461
- Passy, Jean, Death of, 102
- Peleus and Thetis, Wedding of, 221
- Peloponnesian War, Chronology of, 225
- Pentameter, Justification of the name, 223
- PERRIN, B.** The *idépeia* of Hellenicus and the Burning of the Argive Heraeum, 39-43
- Persis, Hemphill's Translation of, 106-7
- Phonetics, Value of, 98
- Piers, the Plowman, Autobiographical Elements in, 460
- PLATNER, SAMUEL BALL.** The Pomerium and Roma Quadrata, 420-425
- Plato's Phaedrus, 392-390 B. C., 224
- Sophistes, 221 A (em.), 224
- Symp. 209 B, 342
- Platonic Statistics, 348-50
- Plautus, The Unreal Conditional Sentence in, 297-316
- Pliny, Prices in, 225
- Pliny's Panegyric of Trajan, Rhythm of, 342
- Pomerium, The, 420-425
- Pomponius Mela, 337
- Pope as a Student of Milton, 100
- Pope and Chaucer, 97
- Praetorium=Governor's Dwelling, 223
- PRINCE, J. DYNLEY.** Report of Beiträge zur Assyriologie, 461-464
- Proper Nouns, English, as Common Nouns, 99
- Proverbs, Latin, a Further Collection of, 1-28; 121-148; 241-260; 361-392
- Pulices, Mutare,* 44-50
- Recent Publications,** 115-117; 234-237; 351-355
- Reports:**
- Beiträge zur Assyriologie, 461-464
- Englische Studien, 97-101
- Journal of Germanic Philology, 456-461
- Revue de Philologie, 337-343
- Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 335-337, 464-466.
- Romania, 101-104; 217-220
- Reviews:**
- Clement's Prohibitives in Silver Latin, 80-87
- Cumont's *Mystères de Mithra,* 443-453
- Elmer's Treatment of the Prohibitive—A Rejoinder, 87-96
- Gradenwitz, Papyruskunde, 210-214
- Harper's Assyrian and Babylonian Letters, 442, 443
- Henry's *Lexique Étymologique des termes les plus usuels du Breton Moderne,* 332-334
- Osiander's Hannibalsweg, 453-455
- Schulze's *Römische Elegiker,* 321-326
- Seaton's Apollonius Rhodius, 326-331
- Sedgefield's King Alfred's Boethius, 215, 216
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, 203-208
- Toller's Outlines of the English Language, 214-225
- RICE, JOHN WESLEY.** Notes on the Septuagint Text of II Sam. 7: 22 and Isa. 42: 21, 318-320
- RICHARDSON, LEON J.** On the Form of Horace's Lesser Asclepiads, 283-296
- Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 335-337, 464-466
- Robert's Studien zur Ilias, 467 fol.

- ROBINSON, JAMES J. *Review of Grad-*
enwitz, Einführung in die Papyrus-
kunde, 210-214
- RODLER'S *Aristotle de Anima* (rev.), 149-164
- ROMA *Quadrans,* 420-425
- ROMAN *Soldiers Paid in Kind,* 203
- ROMANIA, *Report of,* 101-104
- ROSCHEER'S *Ephialtes* (mentioned), 233
- SALLUST, *Hist., s. 87; 1, 66,* 338
- SANDERS, HENRY N. *Notes on Soph.*
Ajax 143, 77, 78
- SCHAAR'S *Geschichte der römischen*
Litteratur (mentioned), 112
- SCHLUTTER, O. B. *Review of Henry's*
Lexique Étymologique des termes les
plus usuels du Breton Moderne, 330-334
- SCHMIDT'S *Heron von Alexandria,* 338
- SCHULZE'S *Römische Elegiker* (rev.), 321-326
- SCHUYLER, MONTGOMERY and GRAY,
LOUIS H., *Indian Glosses in the Lexi-*
con of Hesychios, 195-202
- SEATON'S *Apollonius Rhodius* (rev.), 326-331
- SECULAR *Festival in Rome,* 335
- SEDFIELD'S *King Alfred's Boethius*
(rev.), 215, 216
- SELEUCIDAE and the temple of Didymean
Apollo, 342, 343
- SEPTUAGINT *Text of II Sam. 7: 22 and Isa.*
42: 21, 318-20
- SHAKESPEARE'S *Sonnets,* 100
- SHOREY, PAUL. *Aristotle's de*
Anima, 149-164
- SHOWERMAN, GRANT. *Review of Cu-*
mont's Mystères de Mithra, 443-453
- SMITH, KIRBY FLOWER. *Mutars Pulices.*
A Comment on Lucilius, Non. 351,
M, 44-50
- Fabia's Onomasticon Taciteum,* 112
- Notice of Roscher's Ephialtes,* 233
- Review of Schulze's Römische*
Elegiker, 321-326
- Review of Thesaurus Linguae*
Latinae, 203-208
- Irregular Forms of Elegiac Distich,* 165-194
- Soph. Ajax 143,* 77, 78
- SPRYUE, J. S. *Μαμάρτα,* 441
- SPIDERS, *Dangerous,* 471
- STANBETT, J. R. *SITTLINGTON. The*
Torch-race, 393-429
- STEVENSON, ROBERT LOUIS, 98
- SULLY, MAURICE DE, *Sermons français,* 218
- SUTPHER, MORRIS C. *A Further Collec-*
tion of Latin Proverbs,
1-28; 121-148; 242-260; 361-392
Necrology of, 392
- Tacitus' Histories in the XIV century,* 226
- Tacitus, Ann. I, s. f.,* 465
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (rev.), 203-210
- THUKYD. II 6. 2-3, an afterthought, 224
- TOLLER'S *Outlines of the History of the*
English Language (rev.), 214, 215
- TOLMAN'S *Art of Translating* (mentioned), 106
- TONGUE, *Aryan name of,* 458
- Torch-race, The,* 393-419
- TRISTAN, *The Legend of,* 104
- TUCKER'S *Aristotelis Poetica,* 343
- Twelve Tables, Laws of,* 335
- Typhoeus, The myth of,* 336
- URSO, *The Code of,* 222
- VAHLEN'S *Seventieth Anniversary,* 229-230
- Vergil Ecl. III. 50, Philargyrius on,* 340
- Vergil's Fourth Eclogue,* 335
- Vergil, Age of the Codex Romanus of,* 465
- Vergil's Georgics, Trick played on,* 472
- Vowel-Quantity, Influence of,* 460
- WARREN, M. *Schanz's Geschichte der*
Römischen Litteratur, 112
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF'S *Reden und*
Vorträge (mentioned), 231
- WILSON, HARRY LANGFORD. *The Bod-*
leian Fragments of Juvenal, 268-282
- WOLFFIN'S *Seventieth Anniversary,* 230
- ZARATHUSHTRA and the *Lógos,* 432-437

CORRIGENDA.

p. 107, l. 4 from top *dele* the first 'who will come after the king?' and for the second read 'What can the man do that cometh after the king?' A scriptural quotation is bad enough. A scriptural allusion is lost on an unscriptural generation.

p. 110, l. 19 fr. bottom, for 'when' read 'where'.

p. 289, line 6 from bottom, for — ω read ~ ~

p. 344, l. 8 fr. bottom read *μίσω*.

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

WIDENER
RECORDS
~~CANCELLED~~ 1997
2378198
JUN

Widener Library



3 2044 098 628 472