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96 Qui scit se factis has meruisse preces.

Hilberg denies that se scit, which is found in several of the best MSS. including the Turonensis (T), can be right. Why? Because there is no emphasis on se and because scit se is the natural order. I cannot feel this to be at all convincing: and I notice that Mr. Housman, the most recent editor of the poem, prints se scit.

Two cases, where I have been the first to make a conjecture subsequently made by others, must not be passed over in silence. One is in A. A. ii. 307, 8:

Ipseos concubitus, ipsum uenerere licebit
Quod iuuat et quaedam gaudia noctis habe.

On p. 393 of the American Journal of Philology for 1892 I emended this: et quae clam gaudia noctis habet (or habes), constructing Quod iuuat with ipsum. licebit uenerere ipseos concubitus ipsamque voluptatem coitus et gaudia ueneris quae tacet (taces). Hilberg has made this identical emendation, p. 653 of his Gesetze (published in 1894), punctuating however with a comma after licebit and writing the pentameter

Quod iuvat et quae clam g. n. habes.

which I do not quite understand.

The other is in Pont. ii. 7, 23, 4 which the Bavarian codex gives thus:—

Crede mihi, si sum ueri tibi cognitus oris, Nee planus nostris casibus esse potes.

In a review of Korn's edition of the Pontic Epistles which I published in the Academy of Jan. 8, 1870 I emended this:—

Nec planus (an impostor) e nostris casibus esse puter.

This conj. I subsequently sent to Merkel, who admitted it into his text of 1884. In Gühling's edition of the Pontic Epistles a nearly identical conj. Nec planus in nostris casibus esse puter is admitted, of which planus in is ascribed to A. Rothmaler, puter to Korn. On purchasing Rothmaler's pamphlet I found that he read the line Nec planus in nostris casibus esse potes: but that his work was not published till after the battle of Sedan, Sept. 1, 1870.

These facts are completely misstated by Hilberg and he even seems to believe that I meant puter to be an adjective. Of course I meant it to be the pres. subj. of puter: but it is perhaps improbable that Ovid should have combined sum with puter: then, with S. G. Owen in the new volume of Postgate's Corpus Poetarum Latinorum., I should read puter.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

EDITIONS OF CLAUDIAN BY BIRT AND KOCH.


Claudii Claudiani carmina recensuit JULIUS KOC. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubner. Pp. lxi. 346. 3 Mk. 60.

An adequate critical edition of the last of the Latin poets has long been desired; and it is a tribute which he well deserves. For although his graces are often of the engine-turned order and his lustre metallic, yet in power and range and deftness of poetical expression he recalls the best ages of Rome while the purity of his Latinity and his mastery of metre, wonderful in any case in a foreigner, are almost miraculous in a successor of Ausonius. It is however to his historical importance, not to his poetical merits, that we owe the editions now to be passed under review.

The first of these editions is in scope and method a truly 'monumental' work, indispensable to every student of Claudian. Of its mere contents even it is not easy to give an adequate account within the limits of a review. The two hundred and thirty pages of prolegomena each containing forty-seven square inches of print as against forty-two in this article, to say nothing of the difference in type, deal with every topic in which any reader of the poet may be supposed to take an interest. Its divisions are as follows. I. On the life and writings of Claudian and contemporary history ('tem-
and the birthplace of the poet, is sati-
factorily settled. All the evidence points
to Egypt except the phrase of Iohannes
Lydius, in a passage which is incidentally
emended, de magistr. i. 47 otros δ Παυλαγών
which is shown by parallels from Procopius
and the Anthology to be a derisive, not a
gentile appellation. A more interesting
question is how and when Claudian obtained
his proficiency over Latin verse. It
would appear that he was from a boy
'sine dubio bilinguis'; and it is rather less
than the truth that 'non saepe oratio eius
ab ingenio Latino abhorret ut male graecis-
stantem audire uidearis.' In fact the list of
these infelicitous graecisms (p. 8, n. 4)
requires revision. There is no Greek
attraction in Pan. 167 sq. 'meminisse Probi
quo uindicis totam uidiimus Hesperiam
fessaque resurgere gentes.' We need not
go to Musaeus and Homer for parallels to
'induere patrem': Persius and Tacitus will
serve. It is not credible that Claudian used
'rapere' for sorbere (Ruf. i. 307, ii. 121)
through thinking of the Greek σφάκα; in
his time the words resembled each other no
more than rap resembles rof in English.
The approximate date of Claudian's birth
is deduced from the 'deprecatio ad Hadri-
num,' carm. min. 22, a poem full of
obscurities: Hadrianus, himself an Egyp-
tian, was 'comes' of the public exchequer
in 395, 'magister officiorum' 397—399 and
praefect of the praetorium in Italy 400—
405 (and again 413—416). By some
juvenile indiscretion ('me lubrica duxerit
aetas')—perhaps the epigram 'de Theodoro
et Hadriano,' carm. min. 21 'Manlius in-
duflg somno nocet'—the poet, who
was now at Rome, had seriously offended
the magnate, and his face had ceased to
shine upon his protégé. Claudian, estab-
lished, as in 397 he was, in the favour
of Stilicho, could hardly have feared the resent-
ment of Hadrianus, while there is nothing
to prove either epigram or apology earlier
than 396. In this case Claudian could
hardly have been born before 375. The
first public appearance of Claudian as a
Roman poet is rightly said to be the Pane-
gyrical of Probinus and Olybrius. carm. min.
41, 13 sqq. 'Romanos bibimus primum te
consule fontes et Latiae accessit Graua
Thalia togae incipiensque tuis a fascibus
omnia cepi fataque debebo posterior tibi
is adduced and thus explained: 'Claudia-
lius Probino consule primum fontes
Romanos bibt uel moratus est per Italios,
et Musa eius quae adhuc Graea fuerat ad
togam Romanam accessit, uel Graecus poeta
in domicilium transit occidentale, Italianum,
Romanum.' I doubt both reading and
interpretation. The metaphor of 13
means that then the poet devoted
himself to Roman subjects: so Pro-
pertius represents himself in iii. 3, 5 sqq.
as about to drink at the spring from which Ennius drew inspiration for his *Annals*. In 14 for ‘accessit,’ which cannot be understood in the way proposed, the oldest and other manuscripts read *cessit* with the excellent sense that the poet’s sportive Greek Muse made way or was abandoned for Roman national themes. If the *Pannegyricus* was the earliest, the *De ratione* was, it is ingeniously argued, amongst the earliest poems. It is dedicated to Florentinus who, as Prefect of the City (395–397), carried out the plans of Stilicho for securing Rome against famine, when Gildo rose in rebellion and cut off the African corn supplies; and the theme of the unwritten portion was Ceres’ bounty (*unde datae populis fruges,* as the poet himself declares i. 30, where the goddess furnished the subject but the minister supplied the motive (*praef.* ii. 50 ‘tu mea plectra moues’). Whether this conjecture be correct or not, it seems undoubtedly that Florentinus, who was cashiered at the end of 397, would not have been thus complimented by one who then had become the domestic poet of Stilicho. The materials for a life of Claudian are scanty; nor is it necessary to follow the editor through his work of piecing and supplying. He leaves it at p. xxiv. to give a sketch mainly drawn from the paper by J. Koch, the Teubner editor, in the *Rhein. Mus.* 44, 575 sqq. of the important events of 395–400. The tyranny and fall of Rufinus in the East, the defeat of Gildo, the war with Alaric and his Goths, not to speak of less important events like the marriage of the feeble emperor Honorius, and the rise and fall of Eutropius in the government of the not less feeble Arcadius, furnished abundant material to the laureate of the Western court. On page xxii. we return to our subject and trace his poetical activity in unbroken connexion with the events of the time. His advancement culminated in an honour far more appropriate than a peerage as a reward of literary merit, a statue erected to him by Imperial order in the splendid forum of Trajan, with an inscription in which the speech of the Greek Thalia and of the Roman *toga* are both called into requisition to honour the *praegloriosissimus poetarum* who combines in one the last of the public poems of Claudian is on the sixth consulship of Honorius, and was published in January 404. To the same year the editor assigns the *Laus Serenae* (c. m. 30), a poem in honour of the wife of Stilicho. It lacks a prologue and breaks off abruptly at v. 236. As, like the Latin *Gigantomachia* where the break is in the middle of a line, it ends with a completed sentence, he regards the alternative that the conclusion has perished as not so likely. The argument appears to be sound. Since it is not more probable *per se* that a page should have ended with a finished rather than an unfinished sentence, and as the lines in the rest of the *Laus* which would, or might, give the impression of doing so, were the subsequent portions lost, are, according to my reckoning, about 52 out of 230, the odds in favour of the poem being unfinished are 3 or 4 to 1. For this and the sudden cessation of Claudian’s poetical activity, the editor offers the not unnatural explanation that both were interrupted by their author’s sudden death. Certainly one would be glad to think that the final task of the last of Roman poets was the celebration of the glorious victory at Pollentia, and that he did not survive to see the degradation and death of Stilicho, and Alaric master of Rome. But the hypothesis of sudden interruption can hardly be applied to all of the other unfinished works, the *Raptus*, the *Bellum Gildonicum* and the Latin *Gigantomachia*; and thus the only argument that remains is the doubtful, if plausible, one of silence. The weighty authority of Gibbon is given to another hypothesis—that Claudian was involved in the ruin of his patron Stilicho; but this would not explain the silence of the muse of Claudian for the intervening years, which, as is well pointed out on p. ix., offered several occasions when we might expect it would have been heard. On the question of Claudian’s religion, the editor writes ‘animo ille indifferens fuit circa religionem nisi quod, ubi coactus est, consuetudini temporum hoc condonabat ut christianum ritum obseruaret’; but it must be added that his sympathies were pagan, not Christian, as is shown by *c. min.* 50 whose significance Birt hardly apprehends. The bantering tone used towards Peter, Paul and other Old and New Testament worthies shows one whose spirit is outside the pale. The question has been wrongly mixed up with that of the authorship of *c. min.* 32, *de Salvatore*, the genuineness of which Birt rightly defends, though line 7 must then certainly be an interpolation as the Teubner editor has seen. This cold and artificial composition may well have been written to order, as hymns have been in later times. It seems to have been unknown to Augustine, who describes Claudian as ‘a
Christi nomine alienus’ (Ciu. Dei v. 26). What is most significant of all is that it would be impossible to discover from any of Claudian’s poems that they were addressed to the personages of a Christian court. The chapter on the Greek poems need not detain us. For the authenticity of the Greek Gigantomachia and the non-Christian epigrams a fair case, all that we can demand, is made out, while that of the two Christian fragments is most reasonably doubted, stress, as we might expect from the author of the history of the Latin Hexameter, being laid upon the metrical treatment. The next chapter brings before us the most important aspect of the book—its character as a contribution to the history and tradition of Claudian’s Latin works. One of the most remarkable features in this tradition is the threefold separation of the poems, the Panegyricus and the Raptus having come to us by different routes from the ‘Greater Claudian.’ Birt believes that the guiding principle of the editor of the last named was to do honour to Stilicho and that this was the reason of the exclusion of the two works which belong to the pre-Stilichonian period; from which it would follow that this posthumous publication must be placed between 404 and 408. To this Stilichonian collection of the longer poems the collection of the minor poems was added in the course of the fifth or sixth century. Though thus separated, the poet’s works were none of them entirely submerged, as was the fate of some other Roman poets; and we still have a MS. of a portion of them written not more than 500 years after his death, while from the eleventh century onward are abundant proofs that he was well-known and esteemed.

For ‘the greater Claudian’ in this edition the whole or portions of twelve manuscripts including the two excerpta have been collated by the editor himself or by others, chiefly the former: besides this, reports and in many cases specimens are given of nearly a hundred others (or ‘deteriores’). For the Raptus and the Panegyricus the corresponding numbers are nine and seventy-five, nine and twenty-eight respectively. Besides these, reports are given of nine florilegia which contain extracts from Claudian and mention made of eleven more. The difficulty of controlling such an enormous mass of manuscript materials is much enhanced by the complexity of their relations. The descendants of the archetype have been crossed and re-crossed until their pedigree is almost undecipherable. Omitting minor variations, the longer poems are arranged in no less than six different ways, and the shorter ones in five. And interpolation has gone hand in hand with conflation and re-arrangement. According to our editor it had begun in the copies of the ‘greater Claudian,’ made not later than the ninth and perhaps as early as the sixth century. The pedigree of the authorities selected for the greater Claudian is thus described. In the fifth or sixth the ‘codex archetypus perantiquus’ arose by the union of the larger and smaller poems. It was probably written continuously in capitales. Of this two copies were made, x and y; of y again two, z and w, of which z was the better; lastly from w was made a copy a. The representatives of x are V = Vaticanus 2809 (the first thirty-nine leaves only), twelfth century, a source of great value, and P = Parisinus 18552, twelfth or beginning of thirteenth, which has a number of readings derived from y principally through w; other members of this family are G = Sangallensis S.n. 429, ninth century, the Gigantomachia only, and G = Reginensis 123, A.D. 1056, the de Nilo only. From w’s descendant a came B = Neapolitanus Borbonicus iv. E 47, thirteenth century, and A = Ambrosianus S 66 sup. fifteenth century. From z the other copy of y came, R = Veronensis 165, ninth century, containing only the carmina minora, C = Bruxellensis 5380—5384, eleventh or tenth century, E = the Florentine ‘excerpts’ entered in the editio princeps in the National Library at Florence, A 436, and t the cognate ‘excerpta Gyraldina’ in the Aldine edition, at Leyden 757, Q 2, II = Par. 8082, thirteenth century, once in the library of Petrarch; all of which show contamination, but of different character and extent. For the minor poems, absent in II, one of our Trinity MSS. in the Gale collection—O 3 22, thirteenth century, collated by J. Jenkinson (the University Librarian is meant)—is employed, except for the Epithalamium Palladii and the Lais Serenae, where for some unexplained reason the collation is deficient.1 Of these, V, the two G’s, C, E and t were used in Jeep’s edition (1876—9); but new collations have been made for this edition. Time alone can show whether in all cases the best representatives of the different currents of tradition have been selected. With regard to the ‘deteriores,’ Birt candidly admits that intersunt qui codicem II laude sequent, 1 I have supplied the deficiency, Journal of Philology, xxiii. pp. 282 sqq.
rection, one instance is enough to show. Their merits supply the defects of other manuscripts. The most surprising feature in the apparatus is the appearance of a later fifteenth century codex (A)—a phenomenon which those who condemn the manuscripts of the renaissance wholesale will do well to study—in company so much older than itself. That its excellence is derived from tradition and not from correction, one instance is enough to show. With the help of this 'optimus codex' as he calls it, Heinsius restored the true reading 'Thebaeo' in *carm. min.* 27, 91 where our other authorities give 'Thebano.' To know that Thebes in Egypt formed a different adjective to Thebes in Boeotia would have been strange learning in a renaissance scribe. But what are we to say when we observe that A does not give 'Thebaeo' itself, but only a meaningless sequence of letters 'Thabes,' from which however the genuine reading may be at once restored? The editor takes a somewhat lower view of the 'excerpta' than has hitherto prevailed. Like many other of the sources of the text of Claudian, they are a compound of gold and dross. Though with V they rank first in authority, they abound with interpolations, including even a species, the removal of gross expressions, the very existence of which Madvig has denied, *Adversaria* i. 11 note.

Passing over the florilegia and the scholia, of which latter only a very few seem to be as old as the tenth century, as presenting nothing of value for the text, we have still other problems awaiting us. The critical student of the tradition in most Latin classics has done with antiquity as soon as he has passed the renaissance, and indeed very often before; he need assign no more weight to the peculiarities of later manuscripts than to the conjectural divinations of his contemporaries. But this is not the case with Claudian. It is not the first or the second of the printed editions of the poet, but the eighth, the famous 'Isengrinian,' published at Bale in 1534, that has put us in the possession of lines which appear in no manuscript source extant or elsewhere recorded. These lines, eight in number, *IV. Cons. Hon.* 315, 432, 509, 636—7 'fluctus—consule,' and *Pan. IVth consuls* 201—204, appear to have been derived from a lost codex, belonging to Wolfgang Fabricius Capito, the well-known Strasburg Reformer. These lines, though clearly in the poet's proper style and supplying obvious deficiencies, would naturally be regarded with suspicion but for the singularly fortunate circumstance that one of them itself reveals the reason of its own omission. For in both *IV Cons. Hon.* 636 and 637 the same words *te consule* occur in the same place in the verse. And if the pertinacious sceptic should contend that the wily forger has fabricated even this appearance of genuineness, let him explain how it is that it has been allowed to appear in only one instance (or possibly two, cf. *IV. Cons. Hon.* 509, 510) out of the five.

How far back goes the line of tradition of which this particular MS. of Capito was the sole surviving heir, it is impossible to say. Birt thinks that the encomium on the IVth consulate of Honorius which is absent in V was also absent in x and so derived by P from the family of y. As we do not know what V (an imperfect MS. with its deficiencies supplied by a later hand) contained originally, this is obviously an artificial hypothesis. At any rate, if it does not go as high as Ω, it certainly mounted above y to y¹ as Birt calls it.

The readings of this unique manuscript are to be ascertained by means of subtraction. Michael Bentinus, who began this edition for Isengrin but died before it was completed, founded his text upon the *camerum* of 1510 plus the readings of the codex of Capito. 'Ergo,' says Birt, 'qui ab Isengrinio Camerum detraxerit aut egregie fallor aut habebit fere librum Capitonis; nisi quod nonnumquam quamuis raro etiam alias editiones consuluisse uidetur Bentinus.'

Nor are we yet at the end. An edition of the seventeenth century (Claverius, Paris 1602) must be ransacked for the genuine fragments of a MS. which now has disappeared. Its editor, 'umbra magni Cuiaci, elegantiarum captator magis quam cognitor, ingenii festivi uentosi ac paene subdoli,' has buried the witness of two ancient copies' belonging to his patron Cuiaci under a mountain of rubbish and corruptions. Through the Augean task the Teubner editor has already waded. His conclusions in the pamphlet 'De codicebus Cuiaciannis quibus in edendo Claudiano Claverius usus est' (Marburg 1889) are accepted by Birt. He has shown that one portion of his collections consists of the variants which are entered as it would seem by the very hand of Cuiaci in the margin of the Göttingen copy of Isengrin's edition and are often called the 'excerpta Gudiana,' and these are almost all found in Ambrosiani M 9 sup. (M), so that M is one of
the codices of Cuiaci. The remainder come from a lost codex X, not dissimilar in character to the 'liber Capitonis,' often preserving the truth with V or E or C; and in two passages, as it would seem, alone, but at the same time deeply corrupted by an 'interpolator at once most learned and most daring.'

For the *Panegyricus* the authorities are partly the same as the foregoing, E, ε and the two last named editions, but mainly different, viz. the codices W = Antverpiensis iii. 59 (12th cent.), R = lat. bibl. Arras n. 438 (12th to 13th), L = Laurentianus 33. 4 (13th), F = Florentinus bibl. nat. vii. 144 (13th), P = Parmensis bibl. reg. 2504 (13th), B = Neapolitanus iv. E 47 (13th), T = Turicensis Carolinus 10 (end of 13th or beginning of 13th). In the *Raptus* besides ε (E is absent from i. 25) and the editions, our authorities are W, F = Florentinus bibl. St. Crucis xxiv. sinistr. n. 12 (12th cent.), D = Brit. Mus. 6042 (13th), A = Ox. Bodl. Auct. F 2, 16 (13th), C = Coll. Corp. Christi Cantab. 228 (13th), B = the third portion of the same codex cited occasionally, S = Paris. Lat. 15005 (14th), V = Antverpiensis N 71 (14th).

Whether the editor has made the best selection from the enormous number of codices of Claudian, and again whether his collations faithfully represent the evidence of his selections, no one can judge who has not himself traversed the same ground. For my own part I should feel little hesitation in predicting that the answer to both these questions will be 'Yes' and the future will discover little to the critical student of Claudian. For wherever I can test his judgments, as in the comparison of selected manuscripts and readings recorded, I find them marked by great sobriety and no little discrimination, and I receive the impression that in his company I cannot go far wrong.

It is a matter for some regret that the editor has not bestowed upon the language of the preface the same consistent care which he has devoted to the matter. The readers of so valuable and laborious an introduction to Claudian would have welcomed in it a reflection of the elegant style and correct Latinity of the poet and they well may ask why, if the editor's own book *das antike Buchwesen* is to be disguised out of all recognition in the classical attire of de re libraria, they should be led a dance through every style and period of Latin literature in 'emortualis,' 'consectarium est,' 'prosluitt,' 'indubium,' 'ingratitudo,' 'compiler giganticus.' In one or two instances this absence of 'sprachgefühl' has obscured the meaning.

The text which is built up out of these materials is not unnaturally conservative. Conjectural emendations are, as a rule, not admitted into the text; and, in the editor's own modest words, we have in this edition 'Claudianus nondum emendatissimus...nee omni modo sibi redditus at potiorum emendationem appatur.' The 'potiores,' whoever they may be, will not do anything better than his 'ruand' for 'ruant' *Pan. Manl. Theod.* 300, 'ille citas' *Eutrop. praef.* ii. 9 for 'illicitas,' which have been rightly placed in the text. We owe him gratitude for taking this view of his task. It is well that there should be an edition to let us know the best that tradition or ancient correction can do for the poet's text. The world of scholarship will take some time to digest the ample spread before it; and till then none but the most adroit conjectures are likely to be admitted. Of the textual problems a single example may be given. In the *laus Serenae* 86 sqq. the vulgate is ' nec tua mortalis meruit cunabula nutrix | ubera prima dabant gremitis redolente Horae | ternaque te se ternaque te lentibus Horae gremiis redo- vulgate is 'nee tua mortalis meruit cunabula

*Horae* : the reading we reject must be 'vetus Cuiaci.' But the other authorities disagree as follows: gremitis redolentibus Horae *termaque te (se should be read) nudis insectens Gratia membris | affidavit docuitque loqui* and thus read the 'vetus Cuaci.' But the other authorities disagree as follows: gremitis redolentibus Horae whereas Birt accepts. It is partly on [J], 'nymphae' supported by 'nymphae' *Stil.* ii. 345; and 'Napae' occurs in Venantius Fortun. vi. 1, 105 'quod carmen scatet Claudianeis,' while again Nymphs and Graces are often associated. On the other hand 'aurae' and the like are most naturally explained from 'horae,' the two words being elsewhere confused in MSS, the sense of which would have an excellent parallel in Pind. *Pyth.* 9, 60, while for the union of the Hours and Graces we may compare *Hymn. Apoll.* 194. It may be that the corruptions of the last word point to a confusion in capitals of AVRAE and NAPAE. But one thing is clear whether we read 'Napae' or 'Horae': the reading we reject must be assumed to have arisen from deliberate unnecessary and learned interpolation or to have existed already in the unrevised autograph of Claudian. Accordingly, though Birt has retained a good many corruptions in the text which he would have been justified in removing, this can hardly be said to detract from the merits of...
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his work. The punctuation has been thoroughly revised and in many instances improved.

To pass to the testimonia. The reader should be very grateful for such an ample collection of parallel passages, and especially for those which he owes to the editor's familiarity with the verse which was written by our author's contemporaries. But I am afraid that all the same he will want to know about many of Birt's 'testimonia.' What are they evidence of? A critical 'testimonium' does or should mean something perfectly definite, a quotation from another writer containing a thought or expression the direct offspring or parent of the one in the text. How then, will he ask, are two of three quotations on p. 186 'testimonia'?—Pan. Theod. 270 'nuntia uotorum celeri iam fama ulatut | mouerat Aonio,—lucos,' Virg. Aen. iii. 121 and 274, Mart. viii. 65 'redimita comas.' At this rate we might have half the Latin literature and dictionaries copied out as 'testimonia.' If again in v. 270 Claudian was following Virgil and not simply using a poetical commonplace, the 'testimonium' to cite is Aen. iv. 173 sqq., not Aen. iii. 121. In these examples the resemblance is real though unimportant, but what resemblance there is between Pan. Theod. 332 where Rhaetia boasts it is the parent of the Rhine and the Danube, and Prop. iv. 10, 41 where a Gaul boasts of his descent from the Rhine, it is impossible to see. The editor himself in a second revision would, I am sure, have seen the inadequacy of such comparisons.

With the view of giving a better idea of the text I subjoin a comparison of the chief differences between it and the last critical edition (Jeep, 1876–9) in the Raptus book i. I give Birt's reports of the MS. readings where, as often, they differ from Jeep's:

i. 6 totum MSS. B(irt) K(och); solum J(scp); 8 limina BK, culmina J; 16 levisque BK, laetusque J (so AVF); 21 opibus BK, foribus J (ex coni.); 35 mariti BK, maritae J with the 'vetus Cuiacii'; 59—63 repunctuated BK; 61 certisque BK, certis J; 67 uix ille pepercit BK, uix illa: pepercit J; 71 getica BK, gelida J (so F); 98 uusus BK, uacuas J with F; 99 grati quod BK with S (superi quod W); quod grati J (so FDABV); 103 thalamis BK, thalamos J, so FW(S); 113 dicto BK with ACB; dictis J (so FSWDV); 140, 141 bracketed BK, J adopts Baehrens' emendations; 143 magna B (text) with W, tuneta B (conij.) K, una J with the others (ABC omit 139—213); 150 Vellitur B (comparing ii. 143) K, Vertitur J (Cuiaci mg.); 164 motibus BK, molibus J; 165 nutrit BK, mutit J; 171—8 bracketed by Jeep; 172 amnis BK with D, ignis J (as the rest); 174 Offenso rimosa BK, Offensas rimata J with F; 195 cui B with S, tibi JK (as the rest); 213 intendit BK, ext. J with F; 244 vestit B (comparing Lucan x. 119) with S, cingit JK; 268 spectantes BK, operantes J.

In the majority of these passages the reading of Birt's text is better or at any rate not worse than its rivals; and it may be defended either as extrinsically or else as intrinsically probable; but it is clearly wrong in two cases, in which the tradition is retained: 67 where Jeep well compares Val. Fl. v. 453, and 164 where motibus is intolerable; and in others it must be felt to be doubtful. Thus in 99 it rests on a theory of the limitations to the use of spondaic words in the fourth foot of the hexameter, prolegomena p. 214, which has not been properly worked out.

The index of proper names is not a mere register, but comprises a good deal of valuable historical and geographical information. The index of words is fuller than Gesner's upon which it is based, but not however complete. The usefulness of both would have been much increased if the editor had abandoned the enumeration of Gesner, numbered the poems in the order of his own edition and made the references to correspond. There are of course a certain number of misprints scattered throughout the book, but those I have noticed are too unimportant to record.

The Teubner Editor has been careful to avoid trenching upon the ground of his predecessor. The consequence is that we have lost one of those very convenient texts with short critical apparatus which we now expect from Messrs. Teubner. This regression must have been regretted even if it had been necessary. But where was the necessity? The appearance of Schenkl's Ausonianus in the series of the 'monumenta' did not banish the critical footnote from the pocket edition of Peiper; and if Koch felt, as was very natural, scruples about making full use of the materials collected by his friend, there was no reason why the Teubner Claudian should not have waited a little. Critical 'annotationes' there are, but except a few signposts they are placed after the preface; and consist of comments of various length upon debated passages, the most elaborate being the discussion of the confusion of 'Hennaeus' and 'Aetnaeus' Rapt. i. 122. The editor has already done
good service to Claudian, as indeed we have seen in the course of this article. For the present edition he has ‘employed’ (adhíbui) two manuscripts ‘ad deteriorem gregem plane adgregandos,’ cod. Rodomensis 1040 saec. xii. and Cod. Mus. Brit. Egerton n. 2827 saec. xii. (i), neither of which adds anything to our knowledge, of whose readings he gives specimens in the preface. A real contribution is the conspectus of all ‘Isengrinian’ readings not derived from Camers except ‘orthographica’ (praef. pp. viii. sqq.); but why were these omitted? Koch’s text, as will have been noticed above, agrees in the main with that of Birt from which it differs chiefly in the higher value set upon the Vaticanus. When he leaves his predecessor, he is generally in the right. Thus in Bell. Gild. 54 alerenti (alerem B), 69 praeda C (praedo B), 130 Cybele siccio (siccio C. B), [347 Seruati | Deuicii coni. B], 402 Hic (Hinc B), 414 dum (cum B), 441 arma oneri (arma outium B). But not (to omit doubtful cases) in 247 petisset (petissent B) and 395 occidit (obtruncat B), where the reasons alleged for the changes reveal a somewhat superficial acquaintance with grammatical and lexical niceties, apparently the editor’s weak point. Compare Ruf. i. 230 ‘non coniunx, non ipse simul, non pignora caesa | sufciunt; illud enim semper, hoccrarius indicatum postulat.’ dum is right, but this is not the reason.

The following certain or attractive emendations of the editor’s own are among those which now appear in the text: Pan. 22 ‘per aethram’ (for Arcton), Rufin. ii. 270 Clam (lam), Bell. Gild. 299 patre remoto (carchere moto), c. min. 32.5 numen (mundum). Rapt. ii. 23 sq. ‘summa peremptus | ima parte uiget parte emoriens et parte superstes’ (‘Ima parte uiget moriens et p. s.’ vulg.) In the index of proper names the reader is inconvenienced by a repetition of the error of Birt; but taking the edition as a whole it may be recommended as a serviceable and judicious one.

I conclude with a few words on the carmina Graeca. Birt has made excellent use of the valuable work of Koechly and others on the corrupt Gigantomachia nor has he failed to do something himself. 1. 7 òς καί νῦν δή Φοίβε seems better than anything else proposed; 22 ἀκριν for ἀκτίνα is a fine correction; 64 χθόνων for φθόνων may be right, but there are other corruptions as ἀναγχομένη, which should perhaps be ἀναγχιέμενη. The Teubner editor only contributes the remarks that in 60 κατέναντι is defensible because it is used in the LXX., and that σιν νοῦς τε κερανοὺς may be tolerated in a poem ‘serae graecitatis.’ Though he accepts Birt’s τετυφῶς in 68 for τε πυρὸς, it is probably wrong, as is his ἐπινευσίας (for ἐν) in 17 where we should take ἔπαινοι from Koechly and Schenkl; something appears to have been lost before v. 16 in which ὃς should be ὃς.

J. P. Postgate.

HAUVETTE ON HERODOTUS.


It is not easy within the compass of a column or two to write an adequate notice of a large volume, which to a considerable extent is occupied with the discussion of uncertain and disputed points. M. Hauvette has made a real contribution to the study of Herodotus; he has brought together all that is known about his life and travels; he deals with the nature of his book, and the question whether or not it was finished; he passes in review the criticisms of writers ancient and modern on Herodotus, and after thus dealing with the book as a whole, enters on the criticism of the account given of the Persian Wars.

A few points may be noticed. In refusing to accept (as Stein does accept) the year 468 (Euseb.) as the floruit of Herodotus in the sense that Herodotus was forty years old at that time, Hauvette is probably right. For if Herodotus were forty years old in 468, his birth falls in 508, and he would be a contemporary of the Persian Wars, eighteen years of age at the battle of Marathon, and twenty-eight at the battle of Salamis. This is highly improbable; had he taken a personal part in those great events, or witnessed them with his own eyes, he would have let us know, and he would have been able to ascertain with