the received reading is vindicated. Finally we are to follow Wachsmuth in altering the punctuation, starting a fresh sentence at *θεν τοῦ κατὰ*, and expunging the full stop after *διεληλύθαμεν*.

(viii) 27 B. *σὺν οὖν ἔργον λέγειν ἂν, ὃ Τίμαιε, εἴη τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐπικαλέσαντα κατὰ νόμον θεούς*. So Hermann. *ἐπικαλέσαντα* is the reading of A, which omits *εἴη*: the other MSS. give *καλέσαντα*, and some of them place *εἴη* just before, some just after *ὃ Τίμαιε*. Rawack makes out a good case for *λέγειν ἂν, ὃ Τίμαιε, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔοικεν, εἴη καλέσαντα*.

(ix) 40 C. Rawack's suggestions in this difficult sentence are as follows. (1) *Ἰν καὶ περὶ τὰς τῶν κύκλων πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐπανακυκλήσεις*, he applauds 'Dielesii egregiam coniecturam' *πρὸς* (adverbial) for *περὶ*. But surely the ambiguity and cacophony of this can hardly be endured. (2) *προσχωρήσεις* should be *προχωρήσεις*. (3) for *ὅποιοι τῶν θεῶν* read *ὅποσοι τῶν θεῶν*—a clear improvement. (4) The words *μεθ' οὐστίνας...πέμπουσι* are 'explicanda magis quam emendanda.' Rawack takes *ἀλλήλοις ἡμῖν τε* together.

(x) 33 A. *προσπίπτοντα ἀκαίρως λυεῖ*. For *λυεῖ* read *λυπεῖ*: but the argument is not convincing.

(xi) 33 D. Read *ξυντιθεῖς*, not *ξυνθεῖς*.

(xii) 41 E. *ὄργανα χρόνου* is rightly defended against *χρόνων*.

(xiii) 66 A. For *πάντα τοιαῦτα* read *πάντα ταῦτα* or *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα*.

(xiv) 70 D. *ὅσων ἔνδειαν* is maintained against Hermann's *ὅσων*.

(xv) 86 C. *κακῶς* is to be rejected before *δοτάζεται*. Next follows the appendix of 'testimonia,' pp. 40-81.

Herr Rawack makes effective use of his Proclus, and his criticism is sober and scholarly: some of his corrections will, if I mistake not, be adopted by future editors.

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

The Republic of Plato: Book X. By B. D. TURNER, M.A. 4s. 6d.

THE tenth book of the *Republic* is a little unmeaning when taken by itself, and when Mr. Turner pleads as the justification for a separate edition of it the theory that it formed no part of the original scheme but was 'a pendent or supplement,' the answer is obvious that supplements are usually very incomplete without that which they supplement, though it may be tolerably complete without them. For a school-book the earlier parts of the *Republic* are certainly better, and if any one above the years of a schoolboy is beginning the study of Plato's philosophy it would hardly be worth his while to begin with the last book. Mr. Turner's notes, which deal mainly with the Greek, though other things are not neglected, seem to be fairly full and accurate. A good deal of attention is given to grammatical matters and they are usually treated with good knowledge and judgment. In the words *τὸ δὲ νῦν μοι περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰπέ* (604 A), where Mr. Turner justifies the use of *τό* as a demonstrative, he seems hardly to see the difficulties in the way of taking it so here, the chief of which is perhaps the fact that, when so used in Attic, it always (I think) points to something preceding, not following. Is there any example of such a use as this would be? When he remarks on *οὐδ' ἂν ἤξει* (615 D) that 'the future indicative with *ἂν* is a rare but undoubted usage in Attic Greek,' Mr. Turner can hardly mean by 'undoubted' more than that he thinks we ought not to doubt it, for he must be well aware that there have been and are great doubts on the subject. In his note on *καὶ τοῦτο προστήσασθαι τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ βίου ὡς βέλτιστον ἔχοντα*

(599 A) he translates the verb by 'put this forward as the aim' and then explains it as '=sibi proponere,' which seems another thing. Surely the translation is the more correct of the two and the word means 'make it the profession of his life' in the strict sense of the word 'profession.' The statement on 599 C that 'εἰ when interrogative is followed by *οὐ*' seems too brief and unqualified a canon. He regards the obscure words in 615 C *τῶν δὲ εὐδὸς γενομένων καὶ ὀλίγον χρόνον βιούντων* as probably right and does not mention the conjecture of Cobet, *ἀπο-γενομένων*, which had occurred to me independently. If it or anything like it were right, the two participles would of course refer to two distinct sets of children.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

Xenophon, Oeconomicus. H. A. HOLDEN. Fourth Edition. 1889. 6s.

DR. HOLDEN is to be heartily congratulated on the fact that his excellent and scholarly commentary on Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, which first appeared in 1884, has so soon reached its fourth edition—the best possible proof of its usefulness and merit as a school book. On the whole the editor has made but little change in the present edition: he has 'adopted one or two emendations in the text, and introduced a considerable number of corrections and additions in the notes and lexicon.' Most of these alterations however are relegated to an Addenda and Corrigenda of some thirteen pages, and for their suggestion Dr. Holden acknowledges himself chiefly indebted to two recent works on Xenophon, the one Dr. J. J. Hartmann's *Analecta Xenophontea*, the other a small edition of the *Oeconomicus* by M. A. Jacob, on both of which he bestows high praise. Dr. Holden's own work has now reached the somewhat unwieldy size of 440 pages of introduction, notes explanatory and critical, and lexicon compared with 84 pages of text. Surely therefore in a future edition we may look for very considerable compression in the notes, as the *Oeconomicus* is a dialogue which, however elegant and interesting as illustrative of Greek agricultural and social life, is after all somewhat limited in its scope.

G. E. UNDERHILL.

Caesar's Army, by HENRY P. JUDSON, University of Minnesota. Ginn & Co. Boston, 1888. 3s. 6d.

MR. JUDSON's little book consists of 125 pages, of which 17 are occupied by maps. It is on the whole a useful piece of work, though not containing much original matter: but the straightforward way in which borrowings are acknowledged almost atones for their frequency.

Mr. Judson divides his book into three main heads, the organization, tactics, and equipment of the army of Caesar. His other sections, on Caesar's fleet and Caesar's enemies, are too short and sketchy to require notice.

The chapter on the organization of the Roman army in the last years of the Republic contains plenty of solid information, but passes over a great many disputed points without any allusion to their uncertainty. For example Mr. Judson simply says in regard to the numbering of the legions that "Roman legions were designated by numbers, probably according to priority in formation." This completely omits the two tiresome facts that on the one hand Caesar had legions (e.g. the *legio Martia*) which seem to have had no numbers, while on the other duplicate numbers appear, owing to each imperator taking account of his own troops only, e.g.