reason for supposing that the migration of a branch of the Mysians from Europe into Asia was later than the thirteenth century B.C. Champollion identified Yevan with the Iavones (Hebrew יָוָן). All these identifications, none of which can be called forced, mutually support one another. The likelihood of one depends upon the cumulative likelihood of all. But hitherto there has been a serious difficulty in the case of the Ionians. According to the traditional view, which represents the Ionian migration as subsequent to the Dorian invasion, there were no Iavones in Asia Minor in the thirteenth century, unless, indeed, that view were supplemented by the untenable theory of pre-Ionian Ionian Greeks in Asia, as held by Curtius. Nor does the difficulty disappear for those who hold—as I hold myself—that the Ionian migration began before the Dorian invasion. The Achæan or Aeolian settlements were older than the Ionian, and there is no likelihood that the Aeolian migration began at an earlier period than the thirteenth or the Ionians at an earlier than the twelfth century. The hypothesis which has been put forward in this paper easily solves the difficulty. The Yevan chief and his followers who went to Syria as mercenary soldiers of the Hittites were not Ionian Greeks, but non-Greek Iavones, of the same race as the Lycians and Coracesians.

J. B. BURY.

ON SOME POEMS ASCRIBED TO ALDHELM.

DÜMMLER's edition of the letters of Boniface and Lull in the 'Monumenta Germaniæ Historica' (epist. tom. iii.) includes a number of pieces which clearly belong to an earlier period and to England. The reason for their being given in this inappropriate place is that they are taken from the Vienna MS. of the Moguntine letters, and have been printed along with these by former editors. Among these pieces is a series of five poems (if they may be called by that name), written in rhyming and alliterative, but unrhymical, octosyllabic lines.¹

All the poems, except the fourth, which is written continuously with the third, have in the manuscript the heading *incipit carmen al*; and at the end of the first of them is the sentence *finit carmen Aldhelmi*. This first poem, thus doubly attributed to Aldhelm, begins with the following enigmatic couplet:

Lector casses catholicae atque obses anthletice.

In Jaffe's edition² the text has undergone very heroic treatment, *lector* being 'corrected' into *rector*, *casses* into *casae*, *obses* into

¹ Or hemistichs, according to the view of modern scholars; but Æthilwald, the author of at least one of the poems (and, in my opinion, of all of them), says that it is in *versus* of eight syllables each.

² *Monum. Mogunt.* p. 88.

ospes, *anthletice* into *athletice*. The last is, of course, a real emendation (though the misspelling may very well have proceeded from the author himself); but in all the other cases the alteration is for the worse. Happily Dümmler has rejected these deformations, and printed the text of the manuscript with the one obvious correction. With regard to the interpretation, he follows Traube, who pointed out that in the fourth poem of the series the name of Aldhelm (etymologically 'old helmet') is twice rendered as *cassis priscus*. (The writer, by the way, mistakes not only the gender but also the declension of *cassis*, putting *cassem* in the accusative and *cassis* in the genitive.) Traube's conclusion is that the first poem was addressed to Aldhelm, and this view has been adopted by Dümmler in the heading which he has prefixed to it. With all respect for the admirable sagacity of Traube I venture to think that he has not hit the mark in this instance. It is clear that the name of the person addressed was Helmgisl (*cassis*=helm, *obses*=gisl). We have, of course, to read *cassis catholice*, the solecism of gender being the same as that in the fourth poem. This conclusion leaves it possible to accept the testimony of the manuscript attributing the poem to Aldhelm's authorship. But, as the manuscript attribution is admittedly wrong in the case of the second poem, it cannot be relied on in the case of the first; and, as the mistake of gender seems unlikely to have been made by Aldhelm,³ and the style of the first two poems is absolutely similar, I think it probable that they are both by one hand. Now there is no doubt whatever that the second poem, as well as the fourth, is rightly assigned by Dümmler to Aldhelm's disciple Æthilwald. The other two Dümmler considers to be by Aldhelm. In the case of the fifth poem—a consummately ridiculous effusion—this attribution depends on a conjectural substitution of the vocative *Æthilwalde* for the genitive which appears in the manuscript. But the genitive, which involves Æthilwald's authorship, makes perfectly good sense. The name of the person addressed is contained in the line *hanc hona altissime*, for which Dümmler prints the conjectural reading *hanc, hanc*. Several persons named Oua (written also Oba, Ofa) are mentioned in charters dated in Aldhelm's time. As to the third poem, it contains Æthilwald's characteristic blunder in the declension of *cassis* (ablative plural *cassibus*), and it has no features that render necessary the attribution to Aldhelm. The probable conclusion, therefore, seems to be that all the five pieces were written by Æthilwald.

HENRY BRADLEY.

³ Aldhelm does play on his own name, but he uses *galea*, not *cassis*.