in red, and only incised at a later date. The editor says of *Loucanam* in the last line: 'Lucana omisso terrae uocabulo pro Lucania singulare.' Is it any stranger than *continens*, *Celtica* and many other things of the kind?

63, l. 6:

nomen si quaeras, exoraturi Saluiae.

For *exoraturi* is substituted *exoriatur*, an unlikely word, it seems to me. Read *exoratur*, and for *exorare aliquid* 'to obtain something in answer to an appeal,' compare Propert. 5, 5, 19.

106, l. 1:

uixi beatus dis, amicis, literis.

Rather read uixi beatus, dis amicis, literis. The deceased was *θεοφιλής*, and ascribes to that fact his success in literature.

207: Sabinus praetor magna res formis perit. The words *magna res* recall ἰσοκράτους, μέγα πρᾶγμα, μαθητής, and like usages; cf. 1109 'corpore in exiguo res numerosa fui.' Buecheler, I think (the note is a little obscure) construes *formis* with *magna res*, and supposes the praetor to be described as 'powerful in formulae.' This is hardly possible, and we are driven back on the very natural supposition of Gatti that *formis* = *Formis*.

363: Somnio praemonitus miles hanc ponere iussit aram. The editor says 'poetae licuit somno scribere.' But if MSS. are to be trusted there are many passages in prose writers where *somnus* has the sense of *somnium*.

479: Fata me rapuere mea et me iacio eidus ignotis. Mommsen and others have thought *eidus* corrupt; but Buecheler brilliantly suggests that it is *εἰδώς*, quoting Homer's ἴνα εἰδότες ἦ κε θάνωμεν ἦ... A fair number of instances may be collected from

inscriptions of Greek words thus embedded in Latin; so in 1109 *epoi* = ἐποίει.

1252 n.: The reference to Cic. *Cluent.* should be 40 not 48.

1273:

ille ego qui uarios cursus uariumque laborem sustinui ut iustas conciliaret opes.

The curious syntax (*conciliaret* for *conciliarem*) may be illustrated from inscriptions, as *C. I. L.* xiv. 2485.

1362, l. 6: hoc quoque non vellet mors licuisse sibi. So Martial 4, 44, 8 nec superi uellent hoc licuisse sibi. There are some other echoes of Martial and a good many of other authors, to which reference is not made in the notes.

1409, l. 4: cui pietas fidei gratia comis erat. I do not comprehend the note 'propter fidem comis.' Seemingly *pietas fidei* (the Christian faith) go together, *pietas* and *gratia* both being subjects to *erat*.

1552, l. 30:

Aegyptos Phariis leuitatibus, artibus actis Gallia semper ouans.

Buecheler speaks of the great difficulty of *artibus actis*, and after rejecting other explanations, decides that *actis* agrees with *artibus*, *agere artes* being quite possible in the African Latin. It would be better to assume asyndeton and to suppose the words to stand for *artibus et actis*. But I suspect error here. It may be that either the stone-cutter or the transcriber of the inscription should have made the words run *actibus artis* 'the achievements of her art' i.e. the art rhetorical, which was the special glory of Gaul. The date of the inscription (second century) accords well with this supposition.

J. S. REID.

VAN LEEUWEN'S *RANAE*.

Aristophanis Ranae, cum prolegomenis et commentariis, edidit J. F. VAN LEEUWEN, in Academ. Lugduno-Batava Prof. Ord., *Lugduni Batavorum*, apud A. W. Sijthoff, 1896. M. 6.

THIS is the third play of Aristophanes which van Leeuwen has edited. The notes to his *Acharnians* (1885) are written in Dutch, but

in his edition of the *Vespae* (1893) and in the present volume on the *Ranae* he has appealed to a wider audience by writing Prolegomena and notes in Latin—in Latin which, though at times somewhat fearlessly un-Ciceronian in vocabulary, is always unpedantic and pleasant to read.

The Introduction (pp. i-xx) deals in the main with the argument and composition of

the play. Van Leeuwen believes that the news of the death of Euripides early in 406 suggested to Aristophanes as an argument for a comedy the meeting in Hades between Aeschylus the *μαραθωνομάχης* and the sophisticated Euripides and their subsequent contest before Pluto for the primacy of the dramatic art. While the poet was writing a comedy on these lines the death of Sophocles occurred towards the end of 406. 'Sensit tunc comicus eam quam ducebat telam non revellendam quidem sibi esse sed tamen ex parte retexendam (p. vi).' Consequently he remodelled his original scheme by introducing the journey of Dionysus to Hades in search of a good poet. 'Magna autem dexteritate duo haec themata, quorum alterum est: "quis poeta tragicus apud inferos primas feret," alterum: "quis in lucem reducetur," ita coniunxit et permiscuit, ut lector non nimis accurate attendens nullos in fabulae compositione deprehendat rimas (p. viii).' This is an interesting though necessarily unverifiable hypothesis.

The theory first proposed by Stanger in 1870 that there were two editions of the play has not found many adherents. The prose *ἰνóθεσις* states that the play was acted a second time because the parabasis was admired. Van Leeuwen sensibly remarks that this statement is fatal to any theory of two editions. 'Corriguntur—διασκενδύονται—fabulae quibus poeta repulsam tulit: quae vero reposcitur comoedia sine mutationibus scenae denuo est committenda (p. viii).' A verse here and there or perhaps a short passage¹ may have been altered, but the play must have remained substantially the same.

The *Adnotatio critica* is the least valuable part of van Leeuwen's otherwise valuable edition. It is to be regretted that he gives no discussion of the relation which the MSS. bear to one another, but this evidently does not enter into the plan of his work. It is still more to be regretted that he follows (to all appearances) the antiquated collations of Bekker. Why this should be I do not know, as he gives no reasons for impugning the accuracy of the more recent collations given by von Velsen in his edition of 1881. I append a list of the discrepancies which I have noted,—von Velsen's report of the Ravennas being in each case confirmed by a collation of that MS. in my possession:

Cf. Tucker's plausible explanation of the difficulties in 1435 sq. in the July number of this Review. VL's suggestion that part of this passage is interpolated from the *Demi* of Eupolis seems to me very farfetched.

57 'ἀππαταί (ἀππατάτ pauci) codd.' R reads ἀππαπαί, V αππαπαί.

245 'πολυκολύμβοις codices.' R, V and *Suidas* read πολυκολύμβουσι.

286 '(ε)ῖσιν] 'στ' alii, om. V, R alii.' R reads 'σιν.

488 'γ'αῦτ' R.' V also reads γ'αῦτ'.

748 'ἀπίης Kuster] ἀπῆς codd.' R reads ἀπίης.

844 'θερμήνη(ι) M.' If M = *Ambrosianus* L. 39 (VL gives no list of the sigla he employs) von Velsen gives its reading as θερμήνης.

889 'θεοί VA]. V reads θεοῖς.

911 'τιν' ἄν Dobree] τινα codd.' V reads τιν' αν.

1182 'εὐδαίμων] εὐτυχής VR.' R reads εὐδαίμων.

1448 'σωθείμεν V]. V reads σωθείμεν.

Some of these inaccuracies are not due to Bekker.

The text is divided into acts and scenes, and stage directions, often very happily conceived, are supplied. Conjectures are freely admitted, and the evidence of ISS has been followed in such forms as *ἀνύτω*, *ἀνύσας*, *Τειθράσαι* (477). Crasis is nearly everywhere avoided. In this I do not quite grasp the principle that van Leeuwen has followed. In 80 he prints καὶ ἄλλως, but in 1060 κάλλως (as in *Vespae* 1357), in 34 ἡτᾶν. I do not see that there is much to be gained by the omission, since according to Meisterhans,² p. 56, the evidence of ISS is pretty evenly balanced. The *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is very conveniently marked where it occurs, e.g. εἰς Μακ...άρων εὐωχίαν. I subjoin a few criticisms upon the notes:—

103 σὲ δὲ τᾶντ' ἀρέσκει codd. VL suggests σοὶ τᾶντ' on the ground that this is the only clear instance of ἀρέσκω with acc. in Aristophanes. All other apparent instances contain an elided μ', which is not an accusative but a dative. It may be historically correct that ταῦτά μ' ἀρέσκει originally meant ταῦτά μ(οι) ἀρέσκει, but it must soon have been taken for an acc., and the phrase may have formed the starting point for the construction with the acc. which is so frequent in Plato and Thuc.

108–115. VL punctuates μίμησιν and Κέρβερον. in place of the usual commas. Surely this speech of Dionysus is of the nature of what we should call 'patter,' i.e. it was delivered in one breath, winding up with the long catalogue which flabbergasts Hercules and makes him reply ὦ σκέτλιε.

168 τῶν ἐκφερομένων ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται. I do not feel sure that this verse is interpolated. I certainly mistrust the reason

given by VL, 'arguit enim interpolatorem verbum ἔρχεται quod Attice non *it* sed *venit* significat.' It surely means *ire* in *Kan.* 301, ἴθ' ἥπερ ἔρχει and in *Thesm.* 485 εἰς τὸν κοπρῶν' οὖν ἔρχομαι. βάδιζέ νυν.

169 *D.* εἰν δὲ μὴ εὖρω. *X.* τότ' ἐμ' ἄγειν.

VL adopts Ritschl's ἔχειν for ἄγειν. I see no reason why the MS. reading should not be kept and translated, 'Then take me' ?—cf. 190 δοῦλον οὐκ ἄγω.

170 ἔκβαυ'...ἀπόδος τὸν ναῦλον.

VL adopts Halbertsma's ἀποδοῦς. I find more humour in the passage if the MS. reading is kept. Dionysus lands and attempts to move away without paying his fare. Charon shouts after him ἀπόδος τὸν ναῦλον !

301a VL gives to Dionysus instead of to Xanthias. In this suggestion he has been anticipated by Piccolomini, *Studi FG* 1882. The change seems to improve the passage.

308 ὁδὶ δὲ δέϊσας ὑπερπυρρῖασε σοῦ. Bakhuizen's explanation that ὁδὶ = ὁ πρωκτός, and that Dionysus κατατιλᾷ εἰνὸν, seems right. The slave lifts up the κροκωτός. VL extends this by making ὁδὶ = ὁ κροκωτός. My only objection to this is that it must have been somewhat difficult to represent the event on the stage in so graphic a manner.

369 τοῖτοισ αὐδῶ < the reading of *Aulus Gellius*. ἀπανδῶ codd. > καὶ τὸ τρίτον μάλ' ἀπανδῶ
ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς.

VL adopts Blaydes' πρωυδῶ in place of the thrice repeated ἀπανδῶ. But surely the more regular construction ἀπανδῶ μὴ is not grossly violated here, owing to the implied negative in ἐξίστασθαι, ἀπανδῶ ἐξίστασθαι = ἀπανδῶ μὴ ἐφίστασθαι.

593 VL reads ἀνανέζειν <σοβαρὸν ὄντα>. The ὄντα sounds very weak, and is not much better than Meineke's <πρὸς τὸ σοβαρὸν>.

609 *Aeac.* εἰεν, καὶ μάχει;
ὁ Διτύλας χῶ Σκεβλύας χῶ Παρδόκας
χωρεῖτε δευρὶ καὶ μάχεσθε τουτῶι.

VL adopts Naber's λάβεσθε τουτουί for μάχεσθε τουτῶι to the detriment of the passage. μάχεσθε forcibly echoes the preceding μάχει, 'You mean to show fight, do you? Here, Ditylas, etc., come and show the fellow how to fight.'

655 *Aeac.* ἐπεὶ προσιμᾶς γ' οὐδέν; *Dion.*
οὐδέν μοι μέλει.

Aeac. βαδιστέον τᾶρ' ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τονδὶ
πάλιν.

VL says 'particula ἐπεὶ huic loco vix apta ...An εἴτ' οὐ προσιμᾶς οὐδέν; The passage does not require the knife, but only an alteration in the punctuation. *Aeacus'* speech is really continuous: ἐπεὶ προσιμᾶς γ' οὐδέν—<Dionysus (interrupting), οὐδέν μοι μέλει>—βαδιστέον τᾶρ' ἐστὶν κτέ.

839 VL's suggestion, ἀπορολάλητον for ἀπερι. has been anticipated by Ribbeck, *Rh. M.* 1894.

1119 βιβλίον τ' ἔχων ἕκαστος
μανθάνει τὰ δεξιὰ.

VL thinks these lines refer to the second representation of the play, 'cum primo acta est fabula fuere inter spectatores...qui nimis doctam esse quererentur, intellectu enim difficile esse locos crebros ubi ad varias *Aeschyli* et *Euripidis* tragoedias alluderetur.' So at this second performance they solemnly provided themselves with hand-books to the play, in which they could look up the references to the passages parodied. I give the Athenians credit for more humour. It must have been as bad as looking up the references in Eber's novels. Why should the passage be more than (as it is usually interpreted) a compliment to the increased education of the Athenians owing to the increase in books about this time? We are always hearing of Euripides' library. 'Every body has his book' was a phrase something like our 'the schoolmaster is abroad.'

The book is well printed—the type used in the introduction is especially pleasing—and contains few misprints. A list of the few I have noticed may be useful for a second edition:—

P. 5, last line of metrical ὑπόθεσις, read *Εὐριπίδην*; line 51 (note) ἐστιώμεθα; l. 308 (note) inficete; l. 607 (note) οὐκ ἐς κόρακας ἀποφθερεῖτον seems doubtful Greek; l. 944 (note) in the fragment quoted, τραγῳδίαν should surely be marked as a conjecture if it is intended to replace the MS. reading μελῳδίαν; l. 1004 (note) read οἰκοδομήσας; l. 1349 (note) *glomus* as a masc. noun has hardly survived Bentley's note on *Hor. Epp.* i. 13, 14. There are minor misprints in the notes to 295, 216 and on p. 110 [*Aristot.*] *Rep. Ath.* is printed, while p. 111 gives *Aristot. Rep. Ath.*

F. W. HALL.

Westminster.