

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](#)



Propertiana and other Notes

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 01 / February 1899, pp 15 - 20

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042256, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042256

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1899). Propertiana and other Notes. The Classical Review, 13, pp 15-20
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042256

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

(x. 4); Portus' πράγμασι μορίων for πράγμασιν ὀρίων (xii. 2); Faber's ἀψίδα σὴν for ἀψίδας ἤν (xv. 4), or his ἐπ' εἶδους for ἐπ' ἰνδοῦς (xiii. 3: cp. Toup's ἐπ' εἶδους for ἐπιδοῦς in xliii. 6); Schurzfleisch's συμμαχεῖται for συμμαχεῖται (xvii. 1), or his Φρύνης for φρυγίης (xxxiv. 3); Pearce's αὐτοῦ Λυσίας for ἀπονσίας (xxv. 1), or his λαλεῖ μετὰ for λαλεύματα (xxxiv. 2); Boivin's ἄμυνος ἦ for ἄλλους ὅση (xxxix. 2); and Valckenaer's ἔχοντ' ἐπιστολῆς for ἔχον γὰρ στολῆς (xxxviii. 5). Erroneous readings such as those thus replaced may serve to indicate the general character of P. Its errors (when they occur) are due to pure ignorance, or they are merely mechanical blunders caused by confusion of letters similar in sound or form.

A modern editor will naturally admit into his text emendations which he considers so convincing as those just enumerated. Recent conjectures he will carefully consider

but will view them with considerable mistrust, remembering that the problems still unsolved are probably beyond the powers even of the best of critics, who will find a more hopeful opening for their gifts in newly discovered texts like those of Herodas or Bacchylides and may hope to enact therein the part of a Robortello or a Manutius. But of all deviations, however minute, from such a manuscript as P an editor will (as the result, if necessary, of a new collation) give the fullest record, believing that he thus supplies the best means of testing the soundness of the basis on which his text rests. A record of this kind cannot fail, in the present instance, to confirm our faith in P as a generally trustworthy and always conscientious authority, erring at times through want of intelligence, but hardly ever erring through a perverse and vexatious ingenuity.

W RHYS ROBERTS

PROPERTIANA AND OTHER NOTES.

1, 1, 31.

Vos remanete, quibus facili deus annuit aure,

Sitis et in tuto semper amore pares :

In me nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras,
Et nullo vacuus tempore deficit amor.

The prayer or wish in *sitis* seems out of place. The antithesis is imperfect unless their security and happiness is taken for granted. We may read either *estis*, understanding its subject *qui* out of *quibus*: or with less probability *sitis ut*, governed by *annuit*.

Two or three unsatisfactory conjectures have been made for *nostra*. Read probably *vestra*, between which and *in me* there is an antithesis—'kind to you, cruel to me.' The two words are apt to get confused. Thus in 2, 34 b, 30 the MSS. are divided between *nostror* and *vester*.

1, 4, 11.

Haec sed forma mei pars est extrema furoris :

Sunt maiora quibus, Basse, perire iuvat,
Ingenuus color et multis decus artibus et quae

Gaudia sub tacita ducere veste libet.

The last words seem hopeless. For *color* critics have suggested *calor*, *pudor*, *lepor*. I venture to suggest *ingenium celere*.

1, 17, 3.

Nec mihi Cassiope solito visura carinam.

Should we read *saltem* for the puzzling *solito*—'will not even look'?

1, 21, 3.

Quid nostro gemitu turgentia lumina torques ?

Pars ego sum vestrae proxima militiae.

Quid seems wrong, and *qui*, *quin* have been proposed. I think the poet wrote *quod* as in 3, 2, 9.

2, 5, 28.

Cynthia forma potens, Cynthia verba levis.

Surely it is impossible that Propertius wrote anything so awkward as *verba levis*. Symmetry imperatively demands a nominative parallel to *forma*, and what can it be but *lingua*? *Verba* I take to be an explanatory gloss. In 2, 28, 14 the *forma* and the *lingua* of Cynthia are again put together :

Hoc tibi lingua nocens, hoc tibi forma dedit.
For *lingua* used of a person compare the use of γλώττα in Cratinus' apostrophe to Pericles ὦ μεγίστη γλώττα τῶν Ἑλληνίδων, and in Aeschro (8 Bergk) Πολυκράτης δέ, τὴν γονὴν Ἀθηναῖος, | λόγων τι παιπάλημα καὶ κακὴ γλώσσα. The use of *lingua* in 3, 11, 56 and Livy 4, 49, 12 is only partly parallel. In Virgil,

Aen. xi. 339 Drances is a *frigida bello dextera*. Cf. Milton's *Blind mouths*, Scott's *Fleet foot on the correi*, the Greek poet's γαστέρες ἀργαί with Hes. *Theog.* 26, etc.

2, 12, 15.

Evolat a! nostro quoniam de pectore nusquam,

Assiduusque meo sanguine bella gerit.

Rather *nunquam*, which is repeated in *assiduus*. The reverse change should, I think, be made in a passage of the *Murena*. Cicero says (§ 28) 'Sapiens existimari nemo potest in ea prudentia quae neque extra Romam usquam neque Romae rebus prolatis quicquam valet.' There *usquam* should be *unquam*. *Extra Romam* and *Romae* refer to place, *unquam* and *rebus prolatis* to time. Without *unquam* the sense is inadequately expressed.

2, 15, 3.

Quam multa apposita narramus verba lucerna.

I conjecture *garrimus verba* as a much more suitable expression.

2, 18, 10.

Illum saepe suis decedens fovit in ulnis

Quam prius adiunctos sedula lavit equos.

Quam prius for *priusquam* seems impossible. Mart. 9. 35. 6 is not parallel. Should we not read *quom (cum) prius ...lavit* 'after first bathing'?

3, 1, 9.

A me

Nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis.

A me nata is a somewhat bold figure when used of a Muse. Should we read *mota*? *Movere Musam* would be a more poetical version of Virgil's *cantusque movere*, which is used of the Muses themselves (*Aen.* 10, 163).

3, 5, 25.

Tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores,
Quis deus hanc mundi temperet arte domum.

For *quis* read *qua*.

3, 10, 1.

Mirabar quidnam misissent mane Camenae,
Ante meum stantes sole rubente torum.
Natalis nostrae signum misere puellae
Et manibus faustos ter crepuere sonos.

Is it not clear that Propertius wrote *risissent* and *risere*? [The editor of the *Review* tells me that the first change was proposed long ago by Lievens and Passerat. Why has it not been adopted?]

3, 11, 5.

Venturam melius praesagit navita mortem,
Vulneribus didicit miles habere metum.

Instead of *mortem* Bährens reads *noctem* with some MS. authority. Neither word is at all suitable, and I conjecture 'venturum...ventum.' Cf. Virg. *G.* 1, 356, etc. Seneca (?) Agam. 490 agitata ventis unda venturis tumet.

ib. 25.

Duxit et Euphratem medium quam condidit arces.

Arcis Bährens and Postgate. Others *qua condidit arces* with some MS. authority. Is *medium quas condidit arces* possible? I do not know anything exactly parallel.

3, 14, 3.

Quod non infames exercet corpore laudes
Inter luctantes nuda puella viros.

Editors have adopted Dorat's *ludos* for *laudes*. I have sometimes thought of *luctas*, though the word wants better authority. Lewis and Short quote *exercebat luctam* from Capitolinus. *Luctas inter luctantes* would be no more objectionable than *shout among the shouting crew* (Scott) or ἰσος ἐν γ' (or ὦν) ἰσος ἀνρίφ Soph. *Phil.* 685.

3, 21, 6.

Omnia sunt temptata mihi, quacunque fugari possit.

Ought not this to be *posset*?

4, 1, 17.

Nulli cura fuit externos quaerere divos,
Cum tremere patrio pendula turba sacro.
Pendula seems doubtful. Perhaps *sedula*.

4, 3, 21.

Dignior obliquo funem qui torqueat Oeno.

Why should Oenus be *obliquus*? Rather *obliquum* or *oblique*.

4, 4, 87.

Prodiderat portaeque fidem patriamque iacentem,
Nubendique petit quem velit ipsa diem.

No good meaning can be got out of 88 as it stands with either *ipsa* or *ipse*. Read *putat* for *petit* and all is clear: she thinks she has only to name the day. The mistake is the same as that which I have pointed out in Juv. 10, 54, where *petuntur* should be *putentur*. Possibly it is to be found also at the beginning of poem 2 of this fourth book:

Qui mirare meas tot in uno corpore formas,
Accipe Vertumni signa petenda dei.

There is authority there for *paterna* and Dr. Postgate adopts Mr. Housman's *regna paterna*. I am not convinced of its being right, and would just suggest *signa putanda*, 'hear what are to be regarded as marks of Vertumnus.' The passer-by is supposed to wonder at the figure and not know for whom it is meant. But I feel very doubtful about this.

4, 6, 27.

Cum Phoebeus linquens stantem se vindice Delon

(Nam tulit iratos mobilis unda notos)

Adstitit Augusti puppim super.

Unda has been generally altered (*una*, *illa*, or *ante*), but editors have acquiesced in *nam*. The second hand in F however gives *non* (probably a conjecture), and surely that is right. The island of Delos *non tulit notos*, that is, gave way before them and was blown about, just as in 4, 9, 62 the gate gave way before the efforts of Hercules (*nec tulit iratam ianua clausa sitim*), and as in 1, 8 b, 28 Cynthia gave way before her lover's prayers (*assiduus non tulit illa preces*). Cf. probably 3, 7, 47.

In line 13 of this poem *ducuntur* may be right in *Caesaris in nomen ducuntur carmina*, but *dicuntur* suggests itself very strongly. If *picta* (26 *armorum et radiis picta tremebat aqua*) is to be altered, *tacta* is perhaps as likely as *icta*.

4, 7, 85.

Hic Tiburtina iacet aurea Cynthia terra :

Accessit ripae laus, Aniene, tuae.

So Bährens and most editors. The MSS. vary a little, but they all seem to begin with *sed*, not *hic*, which in some comes later. Postgate in the *Corpus*: *Hic Tiburne tua*, etc. I would suggest that for *sed* we should read *quod*. Cf. on 1, 21, 3 above.

4, 9, 37.

Audistisne aliquem tergo qui sustulit orbem?

Probably *auditis*. Cf. line 39 'quis facta Herculeae non audit fortia clavae?' where I take *audit* to be present. So constantly ἀκούω, κλύω, πυνθάνομαι in the present tense.

4, 10, 5.

Imbuis exemplum primae tu, Romule, palmae

Huius.

Primae should perhaps be *primus*. Cf. the corruption suggested in 4, 3, 21 above, and in 3, 11, 58 'femineas timuit territa Marte minas,' where Dr. Postgate has rightly written *femineo*. The tendency is to make

NO. CXI. VOL. XIII.

the adjective agree with the prominent noun at the end of the line. Against Dr. Postgate's argument in *Journal of Philology* 17, 244 I should contend that 'was the first to handsel' is a pleonastic but not a ludicrous phrase, any more than (say) 'prima initia incohastis libertatis vestrae' Liv. 3, 54, 9, where the pleonasm is doubled; and that here *primae palmae huius* is at least awkward.

ib. 45.

Haec (nunc, hinc) spolia in templo tria condita : causa Feretri,
Crimine quod certo dux ferit ense ducem.

In 46 Postgate reads *omine* with N and the second hand of V, Bährens *numine* by his own conjecture. As Propertius is explaining the origin of the name Feretrius, *omine* points clearly to *nomine*, on which *Feretri* will depend. In that case *causa* must be corrupt, and it is not difficult to see that Propertius may very well have written 'Haec spolia in templo tria condita cassa Feretri

Nomine, quod certo dux ferit ense ducem.

Compare Virgil's 'gravibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanes,' and Propertius himself in 2, 25, 8 'Et vetus in templo bellica parma vacat': also Coleridge's

The knight's bones are dust
And his good sword rust ;
His soul is with the saints, I trust.

4, 11, 86.

Seu tamen adversum mutarit ianua lectum,
Sederit et nostro cauta noverca toro,

Editors are rather put to it to explain *cauta*, as may be seen by looking at the notes of Paley, Postgate, or Ramsay. Heinsius *torva*. Did Propertius write *culta* 'well-dressed'? So in 1, 2, 26 'uni siqua placet, culta puella sat est': Juv. 11, 202 'quos cultae decet assedissee puellae.' We must not think of *lauta*.

I append a few *varia* on other Latin authors.

Lucretius 1, 256.

Frondeferisque novis avibus canere undique silvas.

For *canere* we should perhaps read *sonere* (3, 156). It is very bold to speak of the woods as singing.

1, 263.

Quando alid ex alio reficit natura nec ullam
Rem gigni patitur nisi morte adiuta aliena.

C

Adiuta should I think be *adiutam*, for which, if Wakefield may be trusted, there is some slight MS. authority. *Morte aliena* points to this, for it ought to mean the death of something else than that to which the participle refers, i.e. if we keep *adiuta*, something else than nature.

I have often thought that the same change should be made in the famous picture of Mars and Venus (1, 35):

Atque ita suspiciens tereti cervice reposta
Pascit amore avidos inhians in te, dea,
visus.

Eque tuo pendet resupini spiritus ore.

Tereti cervice points to Venus, not Mars, and *repostam* is clearly suggested by the parallels which Munro quotes: Cic. *Arat.* frag. 8 'tereti cervice reflexum': Virg. *Aen.* 8, 633 'tereti cervice reflexam': and even perhaps Ov. *Met.* 10, 558 'inque sinu iuvenis posita cervice reclinis' (though that might be quoted on the other side), for the words *posita cervice reclinis* go together and refer to Venus.

2, 1029.

Quod non paulatim minuant mirarier omnes.

Mittant Lachmann, and at one time Munro, who afterwards restored *minuant*. Perhaps *linguant*. Cf. 6, 654 'mirari multa relinquant.'

3, 852. *Et* should I think be *ut*, like the *velut* of 832.

3, 970.

Sic alid ex alio nunquam desistet oriri
Vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.
Surely *desistit* with the Cambridge MS.

Virg. *Aen.* 11, 843.

Nec tibi desertae in dumis coluisse Dianam
Profruit.

Deserta seems not so fit an epithet for Camilla as for the goddess she serves. So we have 'Ceres in the fields' in 2, 714: 'Est urbe egressis tumulus templumque vetustum Desertae Cereris.' Should we read *desertam*?

12, 40.

Quid consanguinei Rutuli, quid cetera dicet
Italia, ad mortem si te—Fors dicta refutet!—
Prodiderim natam et connubia nostra
petentem?

Perhaps we ought to write *prodidero*. *Si* with perfect subjunctive is an extremely rare construction. See Dräger's *Hist. Synt.* 2, p. 717; some of the possible instances given there are pretty certainly future per-

fects. Further, *prodiderim* requires by regular sequence *dicat*, and no example is quoted of a future in apodosis with perfect subjunctive in protasis, though with a present subjunctive in protasis it is not uncommon. Which is the more likely, that there is a trifling mistake in the MS. tradition, or that Virgil coupled one rare use with another probably unique?

Horace, *Sat.* 1, 10, 8.

Et est quaedam tamen hic quoque virtus.

Should *hic* be *haec*?

Sat. 2, 6, 59.

Perditur haec inter misero lux non sine votis.

Several suggestions have been made for getting rid of the doubtful present passive *perditur*. I would add to them *truditur*, comparing not only *Odes* 2, 18, 15 *truditur dies die* which is less parallel, but Petron. *Sat.* 45 *sic vita truditur*.

Epist. 1, 2, 31.

Ad strepitum citharae cessatum ducere curam.

In this much disputed passage I am disposed to suggest *cessantes* (or *cessantem*) *ducere cenam*. Is it not made probable by the αἰεὶ δ' ἡμῖν δαῖς τε φίλη κιθάρις τε κ.τ.λ. which Horace is following?

Epist. 1, 11, 16.

Nec, si te validus iactaverit Auster in alto,
Idcirco navem trans Aegaeum mare vendas.

This, like the passage of the *Aeneid* above, contains a very unusual sequence of tenses (Dräger 2, p. 714), and we may conjecture *vendes*. In *Epist.* 1, 2, 17,

Rursus quid virtus et quid sapientia possit
Utile proposuit nobis exemplar Ulixen

we should certainly expect *posset* (cf. the note on Prop. 3, 21, 6 above), but possibly the present may be excused by its coming before the perfect on which it depends.

Epist. 2, 2, 80.

Tu me inter strepitus nocturnos atque diurnos

Vis canere et contacta sequi vestigia vatū?

Contacta most MS., but some have *contracta*, which is usually read. Bentley *non tacta*. Perhaps *non trita*.

Ars. P. 48.

Si forte necesse est
Indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum,
Fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis
Continget dabiturque licentia sumpta
pudenter,

Et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba
fidem, si
Graeco fonte cadent parce detorta.

Why *Graeco*? It cannot really be supposed that Horace would allow the coinage of no new Latin word, unless it came direct from the Greek. *Abdita rerum* might for a moment mislead a reader into thinking of scientific or philosophical terms, such as we even now take from Greek sources. But Horace is speaking of poetry, not philosophy or science. He is concerned only with such words as the *promissi carminis auctor* (45) may find it convenient to coin. What rule then was he likely to lay down for the poet? Of course, that if a new word were wanted, he should form it with such deflexion as might be necessary from a good native stem. Such are the Greek words that in the *Poetics* (21, 9) Aristotle calls *πεποιμημένα*: ἀπηρρίψ for instance formed from ἀπαρῶθαι when a substantive was wanted, or ἔπρυξ varied from ἔπρος for a special use. Here, as in many other points (of which no sufficient study seems to have been made), Horace is repeating the *Poetics*, but with due adaptation. What he stipulates for is that new Latin words shall come from a good old (Latin) source: not *Graeco* but *prisco fonte*. *Priscus* is a favourite word of his, used by him some twelve times as against Virgil's seven and Juvenal's one.

Ars. P. 203.

Tibia

...tenuis simplexque foramine paucō.

Foramine paucō = *foraminibus paucis* is questionable Latin for Horace. The MSS. which Keller puts into his third class appear to have *parvo*. In respect of simplicity or complexity the number of holes is much more important than their size: cf. ἡμίονος. I suggest therefore *foramine parco*. But, as I can find no instance in which *parcus* with a singular substantive seems equivalent to *pauci* with a plural (*parcum sal*, *parca moles*, *parcum volnus* are not instances), I would take *foramina* as a sort of collective noun, in which case size or quantity translates itself into number. Thus *miles* may be collective and we could say *parco milite*. Horace uses *flos rosarum* in a sort of collective way (*Od.* 3, 29, 3: cf. 3, 15, 15: 1, 4, 10) and we could say *flos parcus*. For similar collective singulars cf. *Lucr.* 1, 405 'intectas fronde quietes': *Luc.* 7, 834 'nunquam tanto se vulture caelum Induit': *Juv.* 13, 57 'maiores glandis acervos.' This way of understanding *foramine* was suggested

to me by Dr. F. A. Dixey, whom I asked about the musical point.

Juvenal 2, 37.

Ubi nunc lex Iulia? dormis?

Rather *dormit*?

ib. 68.

est moecha Fabulla,
Damnetur, si vis; etiam Carfinia talem
Non sumet damnata togam.

Whether we adopt this punctuation of Bücheler's or the old one which joins *etiam Carfinia* with *damnetur*, I am inclined to think *est* in 68 should be *sit*. It is well-known that the confusion is very common.

ib. 149.

Esse aliquos Manes et subterranea regna
Et pontum et Stygio ranas in gurgite nigras
Atque una transire vadum tot milia cumba
Nec pueri credunt.

Neither *pontum* nor *contum*, the well-attested readings, can be considered satisfactory. What *pontum* would mean I cannot conjecture, though Bücheler keeps it. Surely *contum* is impossible too. Charon's pole, though Virgil mentions it, is not a thing marked enough to stand alone here—'powers of the dead and realms below, a pole and frogs.' Nor would Juvenal refer first to Charon's boat, then to the frogs, and then to Charon's boat again. An insignificant MS. is said to have *cantum*: may not this be right? Juvenal would be thinking of Aristophanes, possibly of other literature too. *Cantum et ranas* is not a more remarkable ἐν δὲ δύοῖν than many that we find in Latin. *Plin. N.H.* 8, 58 *ranae . . alio translatae canunt*.

ib. 170.

Sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores.

Read *referent* to suit the future tenses preceding.

8, 26.

Agnosco procerem; salve Gaetulice, seu tu
Silanus, quocunque alio de sanguine; rarus
Civis et egregius patriae contingis ovanti;
Exclamare libet etc.

This is Mayor's punctuation. Bücheler has practically the same, a comma after *sanguine*. Ribbeck and Weidner have a pause after *Silanus*, no stop whatever at *sanguine* and only a comma after *ovanti*. But no punctuation will make the passage quite right. I believe we ought to read *alto* for *alio*. Juvenal likes to mention two or more things and then generalise with a *quis-*

quis, quicunque or such like. So in 13, 78-83 he specifies a whole number of divine weapons and then sums them up 'quidquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli.' So in 15, 99 'post omnes herbas, post cuncta animalia, quidquid Cogebat vacui ventris furor. Cf. Liv. 1, 59, 1 'stirpe ferro igni, quacunque denique vi possim.' In the same way here, *quocunque de sanguine* is meant to generalise. What he wrote was 'Gaetulicus, Silanus, or any noble family you please.' For *altus* in this sense, cf. line 40 *alto Drusorum stemmate* and line 131 'altaque si te Nomina delectant': also 6. 607 *domibus . . altis* and perhaps 6. 385. Virgil *Aen.* 6. 500 has the exact expression, 'genus alto a sanguine Teucris.' For the confusion of *alius* and *altus* cf. the now well-known substitution of *multo* for *mulio* in line 148 of this satire. These very words have been confused in 10, 150 where the MSS. vary between *altosque elephantos* and *aliosque elephantos*. (I think it has not been pointed out that *alios* is confirmed by a passage in Aristotle *de Caelo* 2, 14, 19 λέγουσι δὲ τεκμαιρόμενοι καὶ τοὺς ἐλέφασιν, ὅτι περὶ ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς τόπους τοὺς ἐσχατεύοντας τὸ γένος αὐτῶν ἐστίν). In Lucr. 5, 1128 *aliis* has been read for *altis* since Lambinus. *Quocunque alto de sanguine* then is to be joined with *contingis*, whatever stop we prefer to put at *ovanti*.

10, 196.

Plurima sunt iuvenum discrimina: pulchrior ille

Hoc atque ille alio.

For *ille hoc* read *illo hic*. Cf. the generally received correction of Hor. *Epist.* 2, 2, 89 'Gracchus ut hic illi, foret hic ut Mucius illi' to *foret huic ut Mucius ille*.

13, 1-4. The point of these four lines is so entirely different from the point of what follows and also so far from leading up to it that the doubt may perhaps be legitimate whether they are in their proper place. If one were quite free to choose, it would seem proper to insert them after 195, where they fit in quite well. But unless we are to deal freely with Juvenal's text according to the method of Ribbeck, it must be admitted

that he is not very particular about sequence.

16, 25.

quis tam procul absit ab urbe
Praeterea, quis tam Pylades, molem aggeris
ultra
Ut veniat?

A little reflection will show that these words should be written

quis tam procul absit ab urbe
Praeterea? quis tam Pylades etc.

Quis . . praeterea is repeated in *quis . . veniat*.

I do not find in any edition that I have consulted what seems to me the right way of writing 4, 23-25

Hoc tu
Succinctus patria quondam, Crispine, papyro?
Hoc pretio squamam?

I understand *fecisti* out of *fecit* with the first question, *emisti* with the second (if *squamam* is right). Maclean apparently supplies *fecisti*, but he makes neither clause a question.

Cicero *pro Murena* 5. Non tam me officium debuit ad hominis amici fortunae quam res publica consulem ad communem salutem defendendam vocare.

The antithesis points to something like *debuit <hominem> ad hominis*.

Cic. *Phil.* 1, 7, 15. 'etiam si sequi minus audebitis orationem atque auctoritatem meam.'

Cobet in *Mnemosyne* N.S. 7. 115 takes exception to *sequi orationem* and says 'quid sit orationem alicuius sequi praesertim in curia non assequor.'

Rationem is an obvious correction.

Valerius Maximus ix. 2 ext. 7. 'socrum vivam capite defodit.'

Capite <tenuis>.

Seneca *de Brev. Vit.* 13, 2. Graecorum iste morbus fuit quaerere quem numerum Ulixes remigum habuisset, prior scripta esset Ilias an Odyssea, praeterea an eiusdem esset auctoris, alia deinceps, &c.

For the absurd *praeterea* read *alterius*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.