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Dr. Gemoll is well known as an editor of Xenophon. His clearly arranged and admirably illustrated lexicon is noteworthy as an indication that the German schoolboys of the twentieth century are to be pampered like our own. The pictures, over ninety in number, are very well selected, and there are two good maps. It is worth noticing that neither Dr. Gemoll nor Dr. Pantazides have availed themselves of Prof. W. M. Ramsay's researches in Asia Minor (Journal of Hellenic Studies, vols. iv. and viii.) for their maps of the Route of the Ten Thousand; the situation of Keramon Agora should certainly be altered.

G. M. Edwards.

PRAECHTER'S HIEROCLES THE STOIC.

Hierocles der Stoiker. Von KARL PRAECHTER. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1901.

This book is intended to prove that the quotations given by Stobaeus from Hierocles do not belong to the Neo-Platonic writer of that name but to a philosopher of the Stoic school. Whether this was the same as the author of the phrase ἄενθετον τὸν πόρυς ἐςμά, cited as 'verba Hieroclis Stoici viri sancti et gravis,' by Gellius (9. 5. 8) is regarded by Herr Praechter as doubtful; but he considers that there is much more to be said for the identification of the philosopher quoted by Stobaeus with another philosopher named Hierocles of Hyllarima in Caria who began life as an athlete, and who must as being entitled 'of Hyllarima' have lived before the days of Hadrian, who refounded that city under the name of Hadrianopolis. The passage from Stephanus Byzantinus in which this Carian Hierocles is mentioned has been thought to be derived from the treatise of Philo περὶ πόλεων καὶ φυέντας ἐνδόξους ἡγεμόνες. The argument of Herr Praechter takes the form of a careful investigation of the views on various leading subjects attributed to the Hierocles of Stobaeus, and the conclusion arrived at is that they differ on the whole from those of the Neo-Platonic Hierocles: though it is admitted that on certain points, specially in what is said of duty to parents (p. 53) and of luxury in the furnishing of houses (p. 90), there is a close parallel. On p. 89, l. 3 there appears to be a misprint of HS. (Hierokles der Stoiker) for HN. (Hierokles der Neo-platoniker). The supposition of Bock quoted on p. 123 who 'beide' (viz. Jerome and Hugh of St. Victor) 'auf eine gemeinsame Quelle, Tertullian de nupt. angust. zurückführt,' is improbable. Is there any reason to believe that Hugh did not depend wholly, as is scarcely doubtful in the case of John of Salisbury in the next generation, upon Jerome for the Theophrastean discussion of matrimony?

C. C. J. Webb.

GOW'S HORACE, SATIRES I.


Dr. Gow here gives us not only an excellent schoolbook but a very considerable contribution to our knowledge of the Satires. The merits of the late Arthur Palmer's edition are not quite such as fit it for teaching purposes, but Dr. Gow's notes are models of perspicuity and provide neither too much nor too little. Where they run to
some length, as on the difficult passage 6. 7–22, they throw light on the darkness. In this passage Dr. Gow has not only found a consistent and reasonable explanation of the text but also achieved the even more difficult task of understanding and stating in an intelligible form the view taken by Orelli.

The lines in which the text differs from recent editions are not very many, but although some of the readings may not ultimately stand, it is distinctly in advance of its predecessors. In 3. 10 we have Dr. Postgate’s si for qui, and this correction will surely be accepted as certain. The same corrector’s et quantis for atque alius in 6. 111, is less convincing, though the MSS. text is undoubtedly corrupt. In 3. 103, Dr. Gow accepts Professor Housman’s transposition of voce and sensus, getting the sense which long ago Fröhlich vainly endeavoured to extract from the MSS. readings. In 5. 15, the omission of ut, supported by some MSS., is in all ways an improvement. In 6. 14 Dr. Gow will not have notanle, and his own suggestion of quid autem seems to deserve more attention than he ventures to claim for it. In 3. 120–121 he successfully defends the text against Palmer’s unhappy nunc vereor and others. Now that it is well established that non vereor ut for non vereor ne non is not sound Latin, there should be no difficulty in taking ut caedas as a substantival clause. Indeed, as the clause precedes the main verb, it is hard to see how a living sense of the Latin could ever find any difficulty in the passage. In 6. 126, Munro’s pulsum for lusum is perhaps unnecessary. In face of such a construction as ludere aleam, ludere par impar, the construction here seems to be the same as in post ignem aetheria domo | subductum and memor mutatae togae. This view must, however, assume that trigon may mean the game as well as the ball.

On 5. 38, Dr. Gow suggests that the journey to Brindisi is commemorated by the ode on Murena’s augurship. The journey can hardly have taken place earlier in the year than February, while the ode (3. 19) seems to refer to January. Possibly, however, even at Formiae a north wind in February might make a man shiver with Paedigian cold

‘fremetur saeva cum grandine versus Juppiter.’

On 5. 16 Dr. Gow’s suggestion that viator is not a passenger on the boat but a traveller on the towpath is strongly supported by the contrast between viator and navita in Car. III. 4. 30–32.

I will note a few trivial points on which I venture to disagree. It is not quite accurate to say that ‘Caesar’s park ... was ... a good way down the river from the Pons Sublicius,’ and the apparent implication that Horace would cross by that bridge to see his sick friend, real or imaginary, can hardly be accepted. He would probably cross by the Pons Aemilius and so by the Lungaretta and up the Janiculum. Dr. Gow states somewhat too roundly that ‘the construction dignus qui does not occur in Augustan poets,’ but it is true that in the one notable exception, Aeneid vii. 653, there is a special reason for its adoption. In 4. 23 we cannot actually understand mei, for scripta mei will hardly stand. How often it happens that the word of the ellipse is not definitely conceived. On 4. 63 would it not be more accurate to say that Cicero’s usual formula is not hactenus haec but haec hactenus? In 2. 8 the metaphor of stringat is as likely to be from gathering fruit or reaping ears of corn as from stripping leaves off trees. I will only add that Dr. Gow’s edition is one which no Horatian will choose to be without.

J. SARGEAUNT.

ELLIS’ AETNA.


This very complete and exhaustive edition includes a critical recension of the text based on a new examination of MSS., a prose translation facing the text, and an exegetical commentary as well as elaborate prolegomena dealing with the history of the poem and the MSS. in which it is preserved. It is a model of criticism at once brilliant and cautious, giving full weight, and yet no more than is due, to diplomatic tradition on the one hand and to the imperative claims of language and metre on the other. It