

are only five references to articles or treatises which appeared more recently than 1915. The reason for this is puzzling. Doubtless the war should be held responsible for some of the omissions, but it is to be hoped that when the book is revised the bibliography will be made somewhat fuller—why, for example, are only two of Robert's many able articles cited?—and brought down to date. The two indexes are full and executed with gratifying care. Personally, however, I should prefer to have the two combined; it would save the reader a considerable amount of time. One misses the words "entrances," "painting," "theophanies," and "theoric fund." Under the word "curtain" the last citation should be page 311. Other misprints are rare. There are two on page 302, and the date of Felsch's dissertation (p. 246) is given incorrectly. It should be 1906.

Many other matters invite comment, but their consideration would greatly lengthen this review, which is already too long. For the production of so monumental and so trustworthy a volume Professor Flickinger deserves both gratitude and congratulation.

JAMES TURNER ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

---

*Notice sur le manuscrit Latin 4788 du vatican.* By ANTOINE THOMAS. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1917.

This is a very interesting document and Professor Thomas has done a service to mediaeval and indirectly to classical scholarship by publishing in sufficient extracts its substance, with Index and glossary. A Pierre de Paris had been known since 1692 as author of a manuscript translation of the Psalms, and the present manuscript by a Pierre de Paris was described in 1889 by M. Ernest Langlois. Professor Thomas establishes the identity of the two Pierres by the style and also by the fact that Simon Le Rat, to whom the translation of the Psalms is dedicated, lived at Cyprus from 1299 to 1310, where the author of the commentary tells us he also lived and where he says he wrote a translation of Aristotle's *Politics* and a work on philosophy dedicated to the Seigneur de Tyr, i.e., Amauri de Lusignan. The naïveté and the spelling of Pierre's fourteenth-century French are intelligible and very amusing to the amateur. Professor Thomas says that it shows the influence of the dialect of Venice, and his glossary records about fifty words not found in the *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* of Frédéric Godefroy. Leaving this topic to reviewers of special competence I will merely give a few illustrations of the main interest of the document and the light it throws on the culture and classical scholarship of the early fourteenth century.

Pierre is not able to construe Boethius' Latin correctly, still less his Greek quotations, and the few names of classical literature and mythology and the anecdotes of ancient history of which he has heard are jumbled in inextricable confusion in his mind. We could almost match from this single treatise

the list in Professor Kittredge's "Chaucer's Lollius" (*Harvard Studies*, XXVIII, 81) of the howlers which a poet might commit in the fourteenth century. Alcibiades is a seductive damsel wooed by Alexander and Aristotle, Epygurius is derived from the Greek epy, "under," and gyros, "pig," and means "home menant vie de porc." Socrates was poisoned by the roy Got in presence of Plato because he refused to destroy two virtuous men, Filatus and Omer. Vesseus (Vesuvius) is a *furiosité* who reigns in hell. Parmenides masquerades as Carparmentes. It would be easy to infer too much from this. Tredwell's *Apollonius of Tyana*, published in New York in 1886, would furnish almost as good an anthology of Quiproquos. Anything may happen when a careless and confident sciolist mixes his notes and his memories. What Professor Thomas calls *sa suffisance imperturbable* leads Pierre on the trail of Boethius into many fields where a modern scholar would venture only with the guidance of a reference library. Pierre bluffs his way through and imperturbably refers to his alleged translation of the *Politics* or the *De Caelo* for things not dreamed of in Aristotle's philosophy. Professor Thomas does not attempt to write an exhaustive monograph on the sources and psychology of Pierre's blunders. A plausible explanation of the strange jargon which he makes of Boethius' Greek quotations would be the hypothesis that he consulted some Cyprian Barlaam who, himself unable to translate the classical Greek, substituted for it edifying short sentences of his own which Pierre took down by ear, together with his guide's translation of them.

A specialist in mediaeval philosophy could perhaps discover the sources of the singular disquisition on time in Pierre's prologue. He himself refers to the *liber de causis* attributed to Aristotle. But that affirms (sec. 4) *prima rerum creaturarum est esse*, while Pierre's thesis is (p. 11) "la premiere creature que nostre Sire Dieus forma si fu le Tens." Pierre goes on to argue Platonically or neo-Platonically "que les formes de toutes les choses estoyent en la pensée de Dieu avant que le Tens." But no "forme esperituelle" outside of the Trinity could have been produced outside of or before time in the Non-Tens. For in that case such forms would be sempiternal and without beginning, like God himself. This is derived directly or indirectly from Plato's *Timaeus*. But I cannot give the source, if any, of Pierre's ingenious argument that time is a cause of life in creatures and a living thing itself because it grows, six hours annually, necessitating an interpolated day every four years.

The reference (p. 42) to a book of Aristotle "apele le livre des Derreniers" at first seems very blind, but on reflection it is obviously the *Analytica Posteriora*, and there we in fact find *au comensement* Pierre's statement "que toutes les doctrines et toutes les sciences sont fait de une conoissance de devant." These are only specimens of the dissertation which Professor Thomas declines to write and which this reviewer at present has no ambition to undertake.

PAUL SHOREY