In vi. 17, 21 the text is improved by reading facit . . . . facit, with Baiter, for faciat . . . .faciat of Mueller and most of the manuscripts. In v. 14, 16 suasissem is changed to suasi. Sed, following Madvig's suggestion. On rather scant evidence, though not unsupported, Bennett reads te
i. 1, 1: consolatione, ii. 4, $9:$ fuerat in arce, iv. 11, 29 : ne sint, xi. 34, 8: vi evelluntur, xix. 71, 24. The text is altered by simple transposition in i. 2, $6:$ ii. 4, $31:$ v. 15, 23 : xx. 73, 15 : xxiii. 82, 6.

M. S. Slaughter.

## TWO EDITIONS OF CAESAR.

C. Iulii Caesaris Belli gallici libri vii. A. Hirtii liber viii. recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit Henricus Meusel. Berolini, Weber.
C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii ex recensione Bernardi Kübleri. Vol. i. de bello Gallico. Vol. iii. pars prior, commentarius de bello Alexandrino rec. B. Kübler, de bello Africo rec. Ed. Wölfflin. Lipsiae, Teubner. 1894, 1896. M. 2. 20.
The manuscripts of Caesar fall into two classes, rather like the manuscripts of the Acts of the Apostles: that is, one class contains a number of individual words, phrases, etc., which are absent in the other. Until recently, the shorter version was held both in the case of Caesar and in that of St . Luke to be the more genuine, and Nipperdey's characterization of the longer Caesar MSS. as interpolated was generally accepted. Lately there has been a revolt in the criticism of both authors. Blass has tried, with indifferent success, I fancy, to sustain the correctness of the longer version of the Acts: others with better fortune, have restored the reputation of the 'interpolated'

MSS. of Caesar. The grounds for the latter revolt are perhaps better justified than those on whioh Blass rested. Since Nipperdey, the MSS. of Caesar have been more carefully collated and the lexica of Merguet and still more of Meusel have illustrated the style and diction of the great Roman. Hence it has become generally accepted that the 'interpolated ' MSS. deserve full consideration, with the melancholy corollary that all the manuscripts even of the Gallic War have been seriously corrupted at an early date. I need not further criticize the editions named at the head of this paragraph than to say that they represent the revolt against Nipperdey. Mr. Kübler's text is not yet completed but it is a valuable addition to the Teubner series and contains a noteworthy 'Praefatio' of some length. Mr. Meusel's work is terser in form and more attractive in appearance and is thoroughly worthy of recommendation as a scholarly and judicious edition. Both books have convenient indices and maps.
F. H.

## AD LUCANI LIBROS MSS.

In fasciculo M. Maii h. a. Doctissimus Walter C. Summers aliqua dubia movet de lectionibus MSS. Lucani, quae ego quantum sciam et potero solvam. Potissimum improbat quod saepius meae collationi codicis Montepessulani addidi diversum Steinharti testimonium, eoque, ut ait, lectori optionem dedi, utra lectio, mea an Steinharti, vera esset. Allatis quibusdam locis subiungit (p. 229, col. i.) : 'was it not worth while to have these points definitely settled?' Et paulo ante me dubitasse de mea ipsius collatione dicit; ' nor is Dr. Francken always
confident of the accuracy of his own statements.' In hanc partem afferuntur vii. 303, ubi in annotatione commemorans, ubi lectio parata exstaret, dixi : ' in V et fort. in M.' Nempe sic retulit Steinhart, sed id mihi dubium videri ex verbis apparet ipsis.
ix. 605. dixi 'de M. dubito.' M. scribit versum bis, secundum me utroque loco habet quam, secundum Steinh. altero loco legitur qua. De hoc Steinh. testimonio me dubitare dixi : de M. dubito an non habeat qua, certe altero loco habet quam.
ix.749.'exquireret causis' lectionem ${ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \tau \rho o v$
testatur Steinhartus, quem exquireretausis, 'exquireret ausis' voluisse, utique errasse in Var. Lect. significavi.

His et aliis locis Steinharti testimonium a meo diversum retuli, sed ubique meam ipse collationem secutus sum, unde me meis non diffisum esse manifestum est. Discrimen duarum collationum notavi, quoniam testimonium Steinharti nova collatione explorare non potui: mea erat dudum confecta et liber MS. Montepessulam remissus, cum Hosii editio, Steinharti collationem continens, prodiit. Testimonium viri, qui inde a dissertatione pro gradu Doctoris defensa usque ad finem vitae in MSS. Lucani legendis versatus est, non licebat temere neglegere. Unde discrimen fortasse explicandum sit, dixi in Praefatione, sed certi nihil.

Praeterea ad singulos quosdam locos non inutile erit animadvertisse:
p. 228, col. 2, vi. 76 excidit :

$$
\left.\begin{array}{c}
\text { romae } \\
\text { terrae }
\end{array}\right\} V \text {, sic mea coll. }
$$

vii. 295. ruentis in $V$ scriptum est non tanquam V.L., sed velut explicatio.
viii. 48. vides $G$, ut est in textu; de erasa $s$ nihil in mea coll.
p. 229, col. 1. Quoties Hosii Vaticanum memoravi sic notavi : F. Hosic. Pertinet F ad codices Hosii ' hic illic adscitos,' quorum non magnum pondus est, eumque propterea omisi in 'Notis Codicum' initio vol. ii. Figitur si legitur in Var. Lect. corrigendum est $\mathbf{T}=$ Taurinensis Dorvillii. Obiter addo hunc, cuius collationem a Dorvillio factam
exhibui, re vera exstare etiamnunc Turini, de quo alibi referam.

Sin Var. Lect. significat Scholiastam, non excluso Commento Useneri.-' In vii. 633 it stands for Servius!' Adde: who two lines before was cited.
vii. 331. 'Two accounts of the reading of his own MS. A.' Non duae relationes unius lectionis, sed una relatio duarum lectionum. A enim habet (referam ut est in mea coll.) :

1 m. ceresque vires
inde factum : ceresque virisis (sic!)
2 m . marg: ceris viris.
vi. 316. ' $V$ mentioned along with 0 .' $V$ post $O$ non significare posse Vossianum animadvertit Vir Doctissimus ; positum erat pro vulgo. Sic (vulgo) correxeram deleta V, sed operae non paruerunt.

Denique Doctissimus vir: Moreover, inquit, there are cases where Dr. Francken does not mention that his account of a MS. reading differs from that of other scholars. See (for M), \&c. Ubi omisi M a Steinharto collatum, feci id quoniam de errore eius mihi satis constabat, aut quia mentio nulli bono fuisset.—Addit : see (for V) rell. Non eadem causa est librorum V et M ; in hoc litterarum ductus non satis conspicui quid primitus scriptum fuerit saepe dubium faciunt, non item in V.
C. M. Francken.

Traieoti ad Rhenum, 31 Maii 1898.

## ARCHAEOLOGY

## INSCRIPTIONS FROM PATRAS.

The castle at Patras is entirely of mediaeval construction, but its walls especially on the north-west side are largely composed of fragments from ancient buildings. It is in the shape of an irregular triangle, and the upper part of it near the apex on the height of the ridge is used as a prison. Villehardouin, if as is probable he erected it, seems to have converted the ancient acropolis into a mediaeval fortress in a rough and ready fashion, not even sparing the church of St. Sophia, which was the successor of the famous temple of Artemis Laphria. ${ }^{1}$
${ }^{1}$ So Blonet, Exp. Scient. de la Morée, i. Introd. p. 7. Leake, Morea, ii. 136 quotes Ducange to the effect that the church was destroyed, but I cannot find the passage.

What subsequent alterations of the building took place under Venetian and Turkish occupations, it would take a learned expert to decide. During a few days of enforced leisure, while waiting for a steamer, I examined the walls as far as possible and copied the following inscriptions.
$(1)=$ C.I.L. iii. 507 corrected in Suppl. i. 7261 : on the west side of the round tower in the north-west face of the outer wall. (Letters 05 high. Stone 68 by 30 ).

It is given in C.I.L. as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{L} \cdot \text { VEIRIO } \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{Q V I} \\
& \text { FRONTONI } \\
& \text { VECER } \cdot L E G \cdot X I . ~ F V L . ~
\end{aligned}
$$

The first two letters of the third line are now illegible, the fourth is certainly r and

