LOST.

During the Aberdeen meeting I unfortunately lost my official copy of the "Year Book" containing a number of written corrections and additions, the disappearance of which will cause not only myself but other members considerable inconvenience. My initials were written in the top left-hand corner of the cover. If any member has found it and will return it to me, I shall be deeply indebted to him.—J. Y. W. MACALISTER, Hon. Sec.

LIBRARY CHRONICLE.

Record of Bibliography and Library Literature.

A CORRECTION.

THE LIBRARY, NOS. 46-8, published last December, has come but tardily under my notice.

I have to thank your reviewer for the kindly way in which he speaks of my work on The Golden Legend, and shall be greatly obliged to you if you will permit me to explain the apparent misprint which he points out, as his suggestion is a good example of the dangerous pitfalls that await the conjectural emendator. Your reviewer says, "As we turned over the leaves of this beautiful book, our eyes fell on the phrase, 'for myes ben gon out of their caves,' on the penultimate line of p. 242. It is the history of Judith that is being written, and a little experience of fifteenth century English prompts us to offer the suggestion that 'myes' is a misprint for 'thenameyes,' i.e., the enemies. But whether the error originated with Caxton or Mr. Ellis we have not been able to ascertain."

Now, if I had not been able to refer my critic, not only to Caxton, but also to Caxton's original, I should perhaps have endeavoured in vain to justify the word "myes" on the ground that the word "caves" points to a feeling of contempt on the part of the speaker and explains the use of the word "myes." That would have been set down as a possible and plausible explanation, but untenable in the face of the ingenious conjecture of [thene]myes, which makes the sense clear "to the meanest understanding." But it fortunately happens that a reference to the Vulgate version of the Scriptures is available, which exonerates Caxton from the charge of misprint, and myself from the suspicion of having overlooked one. If your reviewer will turn to the Vulgate, Judith, Cap. xiv. 12, he will see "Intrate, et excitate illum, quoniam egressi mures de cavernis suis, ausi sunt provocare nos ad præmium."

My own experience in the reading and editing of old English books prompts me to look with the greatest doubt on all obvious and plausible emendations, for I think in at least nine cases out of ten they are but pitfalls.

F. S. ELLIS.

[Our reviewer takes off his hat to Mr. Ellis, and is delighted to own that Mr. Ellis and Caxton are entirely right, and that his own suggestion is, as Mr. Ellis remarks, only one more example of the danger of rash emendation.]