

quirer,' whose discussion of critical and exegetical difficulties throughout goes hand-in-hand with an enlarged scientific perception, such as neither Jacob nor Munro could claim.' His principal defect was not individual but the mark of a school—he was 'trained to the belief that the Ueberlieferung, or MS. tradition, of the text is to be defended at all costs.' Sudhaus' *Aetna* was published

in 1898. Six years previously he had published, in the Teubner series, *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica*. In 1909 appeared his *Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica*. He wrote a good deal in the learned periodicals: and it was reserved for him to make quite recently one of the few certain corrections which have ever been made in the text of Horace (S. I, 4, 35).

CORRESPONDENCE

PROP. III. x. 27.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—I owe it to Dr. Postgate to acknowledge that his text in the *Corpus Poetarum* has *gravius*; the language of my note made a too sweeping implication that all editions gave *gravibus*.—Yours.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.

April 11, 1915.

AESCHYLUS, *PERSAE*, 332-3.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—May I put on record a suggestion as to one of the passages discussed in Mr. Shepard's interesting paper upon a play which is *Ἄρεως μεστόν* and good reading at any time? It was proposed in a school edition in 1879, and so is eight years older than the *Classical Review*, and I have had no opportunity of bringing it before scholars. But I still think, though I may be sanguine, that it is right. In 332-3 M has

τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων ὑπεμνήσθη περὶ
πολλῶν παρόντων' ὀλίγ' ἀπαγγέλλω κακά.

And so Wecklein. In M *νυν* (*sic*) is added over the line by a later hand. There is a scholium to the second line *λείπει τὸ κακῶν*.

Omit 332. Then 333 closes and clenches the messenger's narrative in a manner which is abrupt and also Aeschylean. For such a single line without a connecting particle, cp. *Agam.* 680 or 1046 (Dind.), also such half lines as *πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον* (582). When the best has been done for it, 332 is a poor line. The process by which it was constructed is perhaps best left to the imagination of readers. Briefly, *ἀρχόντων* (perhaps *τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων*) is a gloss, as Blomfield, Hermann; not, however, on some word which it has replaced, as *ἀρχῶν, ταγῶν*, but on *πολλῶν* in 333, which the writer, in spite of the scholium, or not having it before him, understood to be masculine, and to refer to such Persian captains as those named above. So understood, the genitive requires *περὶ* or the full *ὑπεμνήσθη περὶ*, probably a tag from some play familiar to him.

δὲ in 333 is merely intrusive. Still, it would

be right to know *which* secondary MSS. show it. It is found in two late MSS. in the Bib. Nat. and, I think, in several now in England, but none of these need count.

A. O. PRICKARD.

March 19, 1915.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I add two queries on the text of Plutarch's *Moralia*.

1. *De Defectu Oraculorum*, c. 20, p. 420C, runs:

Ῥηθέντων δὲ τούτων, ὁ Ἀμμώνιος, ὀρθῶς, ἔφη, 'μοι δοκεῖ Θεόφραστος ἀποφῆναισθαι· τί γὰρ κωλύει φωνὴν δέξασθαι σεμνὴν καὶ φιλοσοφωτάτην· καὶ γὰρ ἀθετουμένη πολλὰ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων, ἀποδειχθῆναι δὲ μὴ δυναμένων, ἀναίρει, καὶ τιθεμένη πολλὰ συνεφέλλεται τῶν ἀδυνάτων καὶ ἀνυπάρκτων;'

Query, read *καὶ τιθεμένη οὐ πολλὰ κ.τ.λ.*?

2. The fragment from Stobaeus ascribed to Themistius, but redeemed for Plutarch's dialogue *περὶ ψυχῆς* by Wyttenbach in 1772, has in chap. ii. (Wyt., vol. v., p. 724; ed. Teub., vol. vii., p. 22):

καὶ τὴν τελευταίην ἀπόλυσιω καλοῦσι· ἂν δὲ ἔρημαι σώματος.

Query, *ἂν δὲ ἔρη, καὶ σώματος—i.e.*, 'if you ask the question (from what?), why from the body?' A. O. P.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN the notice of my *Elementary Latin Grammar* (*Classical Review*, February, 1915) my critic denies the truth of my statement that no imperative of *ēdo* occurs in Classical Latin, affirming that *es* occurs in Plautus (*e.g. Mil.* 677) and Ovid, *Ars am.* III. 758. Permit me to point out (1) that Plautus does not fall within my definition of 'Classical Authors' (see p. v Introd. of my *Grammar of Classical Latin*); (2) that the reading *es* in Ovid *l.c.* is merely conjectural and does not occur in any MS.

A. SLOMAN.

[Mr. R. T. Clark writes to say that the third of the emendations suggested by him in our March number (p. 48, Notes on *Vespa*) is 'unreservedly withdrawn.'—ED. C. R.]