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the worst of guides; but the mixture of negligence and confidence with which he controverts Lachmann is, to use the mildest term, inappropriate. Mr Bailey seems to have detected this sometimes (e.g. iii 118, iv 858–876), but at other times it escapes him (e.g. i 454, iv 110–234). At iv 632, where the MSS have *urnidum*, he prefers *umectum* to *umidulum*, which he does not mention. Does he believe Mr Brieger’s assertion that ‘Lucretius adiectiuis deminutiuis non uti solet nisi quantitatem significatibus’? It is not true.

Mr Bailey says in his preface that he has been sparing of original conjectures because he does not wish to inflict new wounds upon the text. This estimate of his own talent in that department is certainly modest and seemingly correct. He prints only one emendation, and it is *intust*. Better one than two.

A. E. Housman.

**BRIEFER NOTICES.**

*Euripides Iphigenia auf Tauris,* herausgegeben von Dr. Siegfried Reiter. Leipzig. G. Freytag. 1900. (Pp. xx., 126, 6 engravings; price 1 M. 20 Pf., bound 1 M. 60 Pf.)

An excellent school book, thoroughly equipped. The constitution of the text shows scholarship and judgment. It is in fact as good a text of the play as is to be found anywhere. The explanatory notes, which are not copious, consist largely of idiomatic translations which throw clear light on the character and force of the Greek words and phrases. The critical appendix is the least satisfactory part of the book. It professes to give the more important deviations from the MSS, but many which are left out are more important than some which are given. Of the four emendations proposed by the editor himself 414 *bepotw* omitted, 452 *symbaioi*, ‘ν for *symβaih*, 454 *apoleias* for *apoulain*, 1260 *apeniasaoi* δ for *apeniasaro* (Barnes *apeniasaro*)—the two first have been made long ago, though probably no other editor would be content with the metre of 414 thus shortened as the equivalent of that of v. 399 in the strophe. As an instance of the independence and at the same time the soundness of the editor’s judgment, may be mentioned the adoption of Makler’s beautiful 5π *dipoklyteiv* (which Reiter translates *mundat*) for *dipoklyteiv*, at v. 951, an emendation which, however, Wecklein regards as third-class. Noticeable also is his punctuation of vv. 6 f. where he puts a comma after *Eipwor* and another after Δα.


Dr. Adolf Bauer has undertaken to render account of the contributions to Greek History which have been made between the years 1888 and 1898. The extension of research in the spheres of Archaeology and Epigraphy, the multiplication of histories and monographs, the dissipation of results in learned periodicals will explain the magnitude of the task; and the record of ten years’ work, which has hitherto been a section in a *Jahresbericht*, now appears as a volume of nearly 600 pages. That anyone should carry through a study so minute and so laborious constitutes in itself a claim on our gratitude; and Dr. Bauer’s book must serve a useful purpose for those who desire to know what work has been done in different branches of Greek History. At the same time one cannot but regret defects which seriously diminish the value and usefulness of the book. With a thousand or more separate works and articles cited in the footnotes, nothing is done to facilitate reference; there is only one brief index of authors’ names and there is not even a detailed list of contents prefixed to the chapters. On the other hand Dr. Bauer undertakes the impossible in attempting to give a digest and appreciation of so many diverse books and studies. Controversial criticism seems out of place in what should have the neutral character of a bibliography. Full lists of works and articles classified according to subject, brief abstracts of contents in the case of the more important