The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Spooner's Histories of Tacitus *The Histories of Tacitus, with Introduction, Notes and an Index*, by the Rev. W. A. Spooner, M.A. Macmillan and Co. 1891. 16s.

E. G. Hardy

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 35 - 40
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184598, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184598

How to cite this article:

E. G. Hardy (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 35-40 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184598

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SPOONER'S HISTORIES OF TACITUS.

The Histories of Tacitus, with Introduction, Notes and an Index, by the Rev. W. A. SPOONER, M.A. Macmillan and Co. 1891. 16s.

MR. SPOONER deserves the hearty thanks of English scholars for having done something to meet what was really an urgent want. While Mr. Furneaux is giving us a first-rate and admirable edition of the *Annals*, the *Histories*, as far as English editions are concerned, have remained practically unworked ground. The edition of Mr. W. H. Simcox in the *Catena Classicorum*, which somewhat strangely Mr. Spooner, while not omitting Valpy, forgets to mention, is not a book to be strongly recommended, while Mr. Godley's careful little edition is professedly only intended for school use. Mr. Spooner's work is undoubtedly a great advance on either of these, and is, as he claims in the Preface, the most complete English edition which has as yet appeared. That it does for the *Histories* however what Mr. Furneaux is doing for the *Annals*, it is impossible to assert; and Mr. Spooner himself with equal generosity and modesty is the first to disclaim any such comparison. The book does not claim to contain, and it certainly does not contain, much that is new either in the way of illustrative references or interpretation or textual criticism. The commentaries of Ruperti, Ritter, Orelli and especially of Dr. Heraeus are the sources from which Mr. Spooner has professedly drawn, and 'my task,' he says, 'has often been more that of selection and arrangement than of original work.' This method, it need hardly be said, is not only perfectly legitimate in itself, but it is the bounden duty of every fresh editor, unless his edition has some special end in view, to utilize and incorporate the best work of his predecessors. Now this part of the work I desire to say emphatically has been excellently done by Mr. Spooner; he has not only carefully consulted the best previous editions, but he has exercised, and generally with great ability, an independent judgment in choosing between conflicting views. But from an editor of Tacitus we might perhaps expect something more than this. Roman history is a study which in the last two or three decades has received a great increase in exactitude, and many gaps, which writers like Tacitus leave unfilled,

may be supplied from other and even more certain sources. Mommsen, Marquardt, Hirschfeld, Schiller and many other foreign scholars have shown to what important results epigraphical evidence may lead, and no editor of Tacitus can come fully up to the requirements of the time who is not familiar with the recent literature, mostly German, which has thrown so much light on details of administration, constitutional points and miscellaneous matters of all kinds which so constantly illustrate or may be illustrated by an author like Tacitus. In Oxford certainly, where Prof. Pelham's influence and teaching are doing so much to spread German methods and German exactitude in these studies, we should expect to find an editor of Tacitus thoroughly abreast, as Mr. Furneaux is, with all that has been done of late years in these respects. It is here that Mr. Spooner, at any rate comparatively, fails. Good in interpretation, often very happy in translation, with a thorough appreciation of Tacitus and evidently, as has been said, a most conscientious student of former editions, he has nevertheless produced a book almost unaffected, except in that part of the Introduction which is taken from Mommsen's fifth volume, by the results of recent research, and accordingly full of the inaccuracies which were pardonable thirty years ago, but are pardonable no longer. Mr. Spooner's commentary is preceded by an Introduction of 100 pages which falls into the following sections: (1) The MSS. and previous editions.—This part is perhaps a little too briefly treated, and would at any rate have been rendered more useful for scholars, if the Catalogue numbers of the various MSS. referred to had been given. (The Bodleian MS., I may note in passing, is Arch. D, n. 35.) (2) The *Histories* and other writings of Tacitus,—in which connexion we miss any discussion as to the title '*Historiae*,' while it seems to be assumed that the whole book was published together about 100 or 101 A.D. (p. 7), whereas probably even the earliest books were not published before 105 or 106 A.D. while we know from Plin. *Ep.* vi. 16 and 20 that the part dealing with Titus was still in preparation in 106 or 107 A.D. (3) The materials used by Tacitus in the *Histories*.—Here I would only remark that too much weight seems to be given to the possibility that Tacitus may

have been a personal observer, or may have received descriptions from personal observers, of many of the events of 69 A.D.; e.g. if the story of the mutiny of the cohort at Ostia 'is told with so much spirit that it would seem to have been communicated by one of the guests present at the banquet,' what are we to say of Plutarch's account, which is equally if not more minute, and given to some extent in identical words? (4) The condition of the Roman provinces in 69 A.D.—This is an abstract, necessarily a very brief one, of the account given by Mommsen in his fifth volume. It is undoubtedly a useful addition to the book and, though not absolutely free from mistakes, is put together with a good deal of skill and literary tact. It is however unsafe for Mr. Spooner to quote Mommsen from memory, as the following sentence will show (p. 28): 'The two western provinces of North Africa were closely related with the province of Baetica, being related to it, as Mommsen says, something in the same way as Noricum to Pannonia or Raetia to Upper Germany.' To any one who knows anything about these provinces, this will appear a startling statement. What Mommsen does say is that 'Mauritania was for Baetica what Germany was for Gaul' (p. 636 Germ. ed.), Baetica of course being the protected not the protecting province. The Introduction concludes with an account of the characters of Galba, Otho and Vitellius,—in which an ingenious but not convincing attempt is made to whitewash Otho,—an account of the two battles of Bedriacum, and of the rising of Civilis.

Mr. Spooner fears that his commentary may be considered fuller and lengthier than is needed. I do not think that is a fault which competent critics will find with his work. In many places indeed it might with advantage have been fuller than it is. Thus, to take a few instances only, the note on *praefectus urbis* (p. 121) is very insufficient: *diplomata* (p. 238) is imperfectly explained: a note is wanted on '*Gallorum auxilia*' (p. 250): a *praefectura cohortis* (p. 271) needs further explanation (add here after 'wrongly quoted' the words 'by Ruperti'): Nipperdey's note on genitives like '*compendae proditiōis*' (p. 278) or '*usurpandi iuris*' (p. 389) might with advantage have been given in full: so also might that of Heraeus on *ultra* (i. 7): a note is wanted on '*lege repetundarum*' (p. 410), while the position of the legate of the African army, *legatus Caesaris*, as Mr. Spooner calls him (p. 413), might have been more fully explained. On

the other hand, to make room for these and other notes, the excision of a somewhat large number of repetitions would have been a gain. Thus the notes on *potentia* (p. 119): on the boundary between Upper and Lower Germany (p. 156, conf. p. 36 and 383): on *legio XXI.* (p. 169): on the connexion of Marius Celsus with *legio XV.* (p. 172): on *Illyricum*, *iurasse* in eum and *provincia Narbonensis* (p. 175): on *Iudaicus exercitus* (p. 176, conf. p. 59 and 198): on the Moesian army (p. 222, conf. p. 48 and 233): on *Illyrici exercitus* (p. 265): on *vexillarii* (p. 287) and *immane quantum* (p. 398)—all make their appearance two or three times, besides a number of others. But however full the commentary, there is no doubt whatever that in one point Mr. Spooner should have made it still fuller, I mean by the insertion of his references. I have no space to give examples, but the most cursory comparison of a few pages of Mr. Spooner's with Mr. Furneaux's notes will at once show what I mean and justify the criticism. Coming now to what I have already hinted is the weak point of Mr. Spooner's notes, inaccuracy as to constitutional, military and archaeological details, I shall justify what I have said by the following instances, I will not say taken at random, for I have naturally chosen the most striking, but still differing in degree and not in kind from a number of others which space only compels me to omit.

Mr. Spooner has apparently vague ideas as to the difference between the senatorial and the equestrian *cursus honorum*. Tacitus of course passed through the former, being *quaestor*, *aedile* or *tribune*, *praetor* and *consul*, but on p. 104 the hypothesis is mentioned that he was at one time *procurator* of *Gallica Belgica*, and though Mr. Spooner does not favour this, he evidently does not see that it is constitutionally impossible. Again on p. 41 *Valerius Festus* is described as at once '*imperial procurator and legate of a legion*,' an absolutely impossible conjunction of offices, while on p. 413 it is stated that the legates of the imperial provinces 'were in official position far inferior to the senatorial *proconsuls*, being ordinarily mere knights.' It is hardly necessary to point out that the legates whether of legions or provinces were, except in very rare cases, at least *praetorii*. Of course instances are known of men who, beginning with the equestrian career, have been by special favour promoted to the senatorial, but I am afraid we cannot credit these mistakes to a knowledge of that fact. Again, within the equestrian career itself, Mr. Spooner on

p. 287 supposes that Arrius Varus was promoted from being a praefectus cohortis sociorum to the post of centurio primi pili of a legion, whereas the dignity of the two offices was precisely the reverse. No doubt Heraeus makes the same mistake here, but Mr. Spooner might have corrected him, if not from his own knowledge, at least by referring to Nipperdey's note on *Ann.* xiii. 9, who shows that the praefectus cohortis must have been the father of the centurion. On page 118 it is stated that Gallica Belgica was governed by a procurator, whereas Tacitus himself (i. 59) speaks of 'Valerius Asiaticus Belgicae provinciae legatus.' Corsica and Sardinia could not possibly, as Mr. Spooner states on p. 208, have still been governed by a procurator after Nero restored them to the senate, and in point of fact we know from an inscription (see *Hermes* ii. p. 102 foll.) that in 68 A.D. L. Helvius Agrippa was proconsul, and that his predecessor in 67 A.D. was the Caecilius Simplex mentioned in *Hist.* ii. 60. No doubt Nero, while taking away the governorship of the islands from his procurator, nevertheless left him still to perform his properly procuratorial offices. On p. 262 praefecturae, which of course, as Heraeus rightly points out, means the commands of auxiliary cohorts and alae, is wrongly explained 'the governorships of such countries as Egypt'—I wonder what other countries were under praefects—while in absolute disregard not only of correct terminology but of Tacitus' next words 'plerosque senatorii ordinis honore percoluit,' clearly a different class from the former, he adds that it may perhaps refer to the office of legatus Caesaris pro praetore. Again on p. 371 in his note on praetores aerarii Mr. Spooner, in order to show how there came to be praetors in 69 A.D., says that 'Nero had entrusted the office to the praetors, or rather certain praefecti who had held the office of praetor... and this was the arrangement now in force.' But two distinct arrangements are mixed up here, the praetores are by no means the same as the praefecti praetura functi (see Suet. *Claud.* 24). Nero entrusted the aerarium to the latter (*Ann.* xiii. 29); Galba, with his senatorial leanings must have again restored it to the former, though the change was probably a short one, and there were certainly praefecti again by 80 A.D. (*C.I.L.* vi. 1495). In the notes on quando legatum... venire, p. 376, Mr. Spooner says: 'Since Vitellius had gone to Italy, no legatus consularis had been appointed.' The real meaning is of course that outlying

districts like that of the Frisii and Batavi were entrusted by the legatus of the province to the semi-independent administration of an officer usually called praefectus, and taken from the superior centurions. So in *Ann.* iv. 72 we have 'Olennius e primipilaribus regendis Frisiis inpositus' and in *Hist.* iv. 55 'Tutor ripae Rheni a Vitellio praefectus.' Conf. the 'praefectus orae maritimae conventus Tarraconensis' Wilm. p. 611. So much of the Histories is taken up with military affairs that constant reference has to be made in the notes to army details. Heraeus pays a good deal of attention to these matters, and usually Mr. Spooner being content to follow him (where he is mistaken, no less than where he is correct: e.g. on p. 320 in calling the 6th legio 'Sexta Gallica victrix') is on safe ground. Where however he does make statements of his own he is frequently wrong. Thus on p. 76 (conf. p. 30) Gaul is said to have had a 'permanent garrison' of one legion, the 1st Italica stationed at Lugdunum. Undoubtedly the legion together with an ala of auxiliaries was there in 69 A.D., but in describing this as a permanent garrison Mr. Spooner overlooks several things: (1) the statement of Josephus (*bell. Iud.* 2, 16, 4) that Gaul was kept under control by 1200 men, (2) that the legion had only been enrolled by Nero a few years previously (Dio Cass. 55, 24), (3) that after the war it was sent not to Gaul but to Moesia, (4) that Lugdunensis is specially called 'inermis provincia' (*Hist.* i. 16). In point of fact the legio I. Italica, when enrolled by Nero, was probably sent at once to Upper Germany, and having taken part under Verginius in the campaign against Vindex, was left temporarily to preserve order in Lugdunum. Again Mr. Spooner (p. 114), to account for there being three legions only in Upper Germany, says that the fourth was absent in Britain; but two legions were sent from Upper Germany to Britain, II. Augusta and XIV. Gemina, and it was 26 years previously. Their places were probably almost at once supplied by the IV. Macedonica and XXII. Primigenia: at any rate we cannot suppose that an important frontier was left for 26 years with one fourth of its garrison absent. Neither the 18th cohort at Lugdunum (i. 80) nor the 17th at Ostia was, as Mr. Spooner says (p. 180 and 245), a cohors civium Romanorum. Mommsen has shown conclusively (*Hermes* vol. xvi.) that they were both cohortes urbanae, the number of which was considerably increased by Claudius, a

fact which makes the statement (on p. 128) that there were four urban cohorts at this time incorrect. On p. 200 it is stated that there were three legions in Egypt till the time of Tiberius, who removed one of them. In all probability (see Momms. *res gest. d. Aug.* p. 72 and *röm. Gesch.* v. p. 592) the number was reduced to two by Augustus at the time of the Pannonian rebellion. The statement again on p. 25 that in Vespasian's time three full legions were retained in Spain is incorrect: there were two only, I. Adiutrix and VII. Galbiana or Gemina. The 8 Batavian cohorts attached to legio XIV. could hardly have amounted to 8000 men (p. 88); there is no reason to suppose that they were all cohortes milliariae, nor could the auxiliaries have so far exceeded the number of men in the legion to which they were attached. Mr. Spooner's language, perhaps he does not mean it so, rather implies that Civilis commanded all these Batavian troops: of course he was only 'praefectus unius cohortis' (iv. 32). The legions V. Alauda and V. Macedonica are hopelessly mixed up. In the Index and in other places Mr. Spooner, following Orelli, makes the V. Alauda the Judaeae legion, and V. Macedonica the German, whereas on pp. 115 and 198 he correctly reverses their positions. On p. 188 Mr. Spooner says 'it appears from an inscription that Suedius Clemens had had the command of the forces in Egypt.' An inscription on the statue of Memnon certainly calls him 'praefectus castrorum,' but it needs an explanation, which Heraeus supplies, to show how a mere primipilaris could be in command of two legions. Lastly Mr. Spooner seems to have no very clear idea of the difference between the auxiliary forces (cohortes and alae) and the 'native militia.' He says twice over, p. 44 and 169, that 'Raetia had no standing army but was garrisoned by its native militia,' and similar statements are made about Noricum (p. 45 and 83), while he says of Mauretania (p. 29) 'in neither district did the Romans keep any permanent force of their own, but the native militia consisted according to Tacitus (ii. 58) of nineteen cohorts and fifteen alae,' and on p. 206 'all the small provinces were defended by a native militia.' I should have thought it was hardly necessary to point out that the cohortes and alae were as really and as permanently a part of the Roman army as the legions, though they were, as Mommsen calls them, soldiers of the second class, and in several passages, notably iii. 5 'octo cohortibus ac Noricorum iuventute' and i. 68,

Tacitus expressly distinguishes them from the native militia. Curiously enough on the latter passage Mr. Spooner speaks of the 'auxiliary troops quartered in Raetia as distinct from the Raeti themselves' without seeing that it absolutely contradicts his note on Raetica auxilia (on the same page) and the other places I have quoted. Some of these points, though surely not the last, may seem comparatively insignificant matters, but Mr. Spooner did not think them too insignificant to deal with in his notes, and I think we may fairly expect either correct information or none.

Mr. Spooner, as I have hinted, does not often make use of Inscriptions, and where he does refer to them, it is difficult to believe that he does so at first hand. As a rule references are not given at all, as e.g. 'its name is found on inscriptions' (p. 163), 'it appears from an inscription' (p. 188), 'we learn from an inscription at Capua' (p. 368, see also p. 278, 309, 418, 465). Where the *Corpus* is referred to, it is often cited as if all in one volume (e.g. p. 287 and 288), or we get a puzzling reference like the following (p. 171) 'C.I.L. vol. 1112, Priv. Vet. xxx.' which to be intelligible should be 'C.I.L. vol vii. 1112 and iii. Privil. Veteran. No. xxx.'; or this which would probably be quite useless to a young student 'C.I.L. iii. 30, Priv. Vet.' (p. 429). On p. 418 we have as from an inscription (it is in Wilmanns 1145) 'Ti Plautius M.F.A.N. Silvanus' etc. where of course A.N. should be An. the abbreviation for Aniensi (tribu). In another case Mr. Spooner does, with the help of Heraeus, recognize the statement of tribe, but not with certainty, 'Titus Clodius M.F. Pal. (atina tribu, *probably*)' (p. 368). In one case however Mr. Spooner has undoubtedly dealt at first hand with an inscription—the lex de imperio Vespasiani—but his curious mis-translation of lines 22-25 'he (Vespasian) is not to be bound by the laws by which Augustus and Tiberius and Claudius were bound but to have all their legal powers' (p. 365) shows that in some cases it is perhaps after all safer not to derive one's knowledge immediately from the original sources. Still with very little extra trouble Mr. Spooner might have thrown some very interesting light on various details by the aid of Inscriptions. Thus he tells us, following Heraeus, that the ala Auriana mentioned in iii. 5 was the ala I. Hispanorum Auriana and is known from Inscriptions to have been quartered in Raetia; why not have told us also, though Heraeus does not, that the ala Tauriana (i. 59) is the same as

the ala I. Flavia Gallorum Tauriana afterwards stationed in Numidia (*C.I.L.* viii. 2394), or that the ala Sebosiana (iii. 6) was the ala Gallorum Sebosiana, which, as we know from Brambach *Inscrip. Rhenan.* 894, in confirmation of Tacitus, was posted in Germany? Again Mr. Spooner gives from Orelli's note an inscription found near Mogontiacum, relating to the ala Picentina (in Brambach it is 915, see also 1344); why does he not add that in 74 A.D. it was in Pannonia Superior (*C.I.L.* iii. Privil. Veteran. No. ix.) and add the date 124 A.D. when it is known to have been in Britain? Similarly a more skilful use of the *Corpus* would have produced a much better note on the ala singularium (p. 436). In the first place Mr. Spooner tells us that 'the singulares were recruited individually, hence their name.' How this mysterious process differed from ordinary recruiting is not clear. An ala singularium was of course a squadron of cavalry, not taken, as most of the alae were, from some one nation like e.g. the ala Treverorum or Batavorum, but from men of different nationalities. In the next place Mr. Spooner in consulting the Index of Vol. iii. of the *Corpus* has unfortunately looked under the head of 'equites singulares,' and as this term has a special and technical meaning of its own (see Marquardt *Staatsverw.* ii. p. 489 and *Ephem. Epigr.* iv. p. 404) the references he gives are irrelevant. If he had looked under the head of 'ala singularium' he would have found that the ala I. Singularium Civium Romanorum was in the year 108 A.D. stationed in Raetia (*C.I.L.* iii. 5910, 5912 and Privil. Veter. p. 886) while a very little more research would have shown that in 90 A.D. the ala I. Singularium was in Upper Germany (*Ephem. Epigr.* v. p. 652). I will only mention one other instance in which Mr. Spooner has missed the chance of an interesting epigraphical reference. He rightly points out (p. 180) that Aurelius Fulvus was legate of the legio III. Gallica: he might have added that from an Inscription found in Cappadocia he is known to have held that position as far back as 54 A.D. during the campaign of Corbulo (*Ephem. Epigr.* v. p. 35). Among a number of other points which I had set down for notice, I have only space for the following. Galba's full name could not possibly have been L. Sulpicius Servius Galba, as stated on p. 103; nor is he so described on the gladiatorial tessera (*C.I.L.* i. 771), the name there given is simply L. Sulpicius. His name after his adoption and before his accession was L. Livius Sulpicius Galba (Suet. *Galb.* 4, and

C.I. Gr. 4957); after his accession it was Servius Sulpicius Galba. Note also that the name of Caelius Sabinus is given wrongly on p. 197, Caelius not being a praenomen as Mr. Spooner makes it. Vindex was certainly not *legatus* of Aquitania, as stated on p. 124, for Suetonius (*Galb.* 9) expressly tells us that the legate of Aquitania implored Galba's help against Vindex: he was no doubt governor of Lugdunensis. Nor did he claim descent from Julius Caesar (p. 33): Mr. Spooner is thinking of Julius Sabinus (iv. 55). Tacitus can hardly have supplemented Manetho's account from Justin (p. 23), for Justin probably lived and wrote under the Antonines. Verginius can hardly be described as having 'risen in Gaul' (p. 365) or anywhere else, unless Dio Cassius and Juvenal are preferred as authorities to Tacitus and Plutarch. What is Mr. Spooner's authority for saying (p. 131) that 'the sportula... given by the rich to their clients had been extended by the emperors to their guards?' Is this a misunderstanding of Walther's note 'qui mos excubiarum inter epulas originem traxit Claudio imperante'? On p. 409 the note on 'senator' is insufficient and misleading: 'he had been admitted to the senate, but had not yet held office.' Mr. Spooner probably meant 'curule office,' because he must have been at least 'quaestorius' to be in the senate at all. But the bare title senator is certainly given to men who were praetorii, e.g. Catus Firmius (*Ann.* iv. 31) and Juncus Vergilianus (xi. 35), when they are to be distinguished *qua* senators from other classes. Here 'senator' is clearly added to mark the contrast between the dignity of the man's station and the ignominy of his treatment. Mr. Spooner is surely wrong in saying on p. 392 that Civilis was more a Gaul than a German, and on p. 396 that the Batavians though German by descent were Gaulish in feeling. The position is clearly enough expressed by Tacitus iv. 61, 'neque se neque quemquam Batavum in verba Galliarum adegit, fisis Germanorum opibus' etc. The statement too on p. 244 that 'the Aedui from the first had been conspicuous for their loyalty to Rome' needs some qualification, as they had joined in the revolts (1) of Sacrovir, (2) of Vindex. Minor mistakes, slips and misprints I shall not notice here, having already sent Mr. Spooner a complete list of all I have discovered.

In his treatment of the text Mr. Spooner has mainly followed Orelli, preferring, as he himself says, in most cases the

more conservative reading, though he has occasionally adopted emendations of Meiser, Ritter and Heraeus. In most cases he has, I think, been judicious; but in a few passages a little greater boldness would not have been out of place, *e.g.* the MS. readings—aviditate imperandi (i. 52): immutatus (i. 87): quod avidius (ii. 84 *ad fin.*): et ut proditionis ira (iii. 10): militiae legionariis (iii. 18): Asiam (iii. 54): erant et domi (iv. 12): pecunia fer...qua (iv. 46): eum qui attulerat, ipsas epistulas (iv. 75)—and some others might surely have made room for emendations. An apparatus criticus, not of course a complete one, but giving the chief MS. readings and conjectures, would have been easier to refer to than the same information given in the form of notes. On questions of interpretation I should differ from Mr. Spooner with some diffidence, but I doubt his rendering of 'nobilitatus mutuis cladibus Dacus' (i. 2): fugae ultimus erat (iii. 16): magnis consultis (ii. 4): principalis matrimonii instrumentum (i. 22): per classarios transferri—in the passage of Suetonius

cited on p. 180. In matters of orthography I have noticed such small inconsistencies as nunquam and numquam, tanquam and tanquam, Caius and Gaius, Suria and Syriaci, vicesima and vicensima, while there is a little uncertainty about assimilation or non-assimilation in compound verbs.

In a detailed criticism on any book the reviewer is obliged from the necessity of the case to deal more with defects than merits, for while a general statement of the latter will suffice, the former must be pointed out with particularity. I should be very sorry however to seem, while pointing out some imperfections on one side of the book, the side which is most interesting to me, in any way to have overlooked the undoubted merits of Mr. Spooner's work on its other sides. No other English edition can bear any comparison with his, and for the students at the Universities, and doubtless they are still many, who cannot read German notes, Mr. Spooner's help will be simply invaluable.

E. G. HARDY.

SWETE'S EDITION OF THE SEPTUAGINT. VOL. II.

Of this second volume an important instalment has been in the hands of the public for the last two years in the Psalter. The poetical books which form the larger part of the present volume are all stichometrically arranged, and where the MSS. differ in the arrangement of the lines, this has been recorded in the notes. The Sinaitic Codex, as suggested by Dr. Sanday, has been taken as the basis where B is deficient in the Psalms (cv. 27—cxxxvi. 7), and each page explains for itself in the outer margin what MS. gives the text printed, what MSS. supply the readings at the foot, and by the signs § and ¶ respectively the exact point where the testimony of each MS. begins and fails.

The order of the books is of course after the Vatican which arranges Job, Wisdom and Sirach after the Song, and retains Esther, Judith and Tobit as histories to come immediately before the Prophets. In Sirach ch. xxx.-xxxvi. are transposed according to the Old Latin, which preserves the original sequence, as was proved by Fritzsche, *κατακληρονομήσεις* in xxxvi. 16b being substituted for *κατεκληρονόμησα* contrary to all uncials, but with one cursive and

with the Old Latin hereditabis. The Canticles which follow the Psalter in A are of course not printed, but are mentioned in the preface, and it is interesting to observe that, excepting the Song of Habakkuk, these occur in the order of their appearance in the Horology of the Greek Church.

In Ps. xlvii. 3 *ἐνρίζω* and xci. 11 *ἐλαίω* of the corrector have been accepted for the original B readings *ἐνρίζων* and *ἐλέω*. On the other hand xvi. 14 *ὑείων* stands with B^S for *υἱῶν* of A although, since the accents do not come from the first scribe, this may be an itacism; but xliii. 13 there was no escape from the corrupt *ἀλαλάγμασιν* given by all uncials instead of *ἀλλάγμασιν*. The omission of *βασιλεὺς* Ps. ii. 6 modifies in a marked degree the Messianic significance of the Psalm. Printing *Σωταί με Κύριον* with a capital in lxix. tit. appears to suggest that these words were intended to mark the tune. No light is thrown on the hopeless passage lxvii. 19b.

In numberless instances, as Dr. Hatch pointed out in this *Review*, the ordinary editions said to be *juxta exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum* fail to exhibit B, following more or less accurately the Sixtine