et 9, 1 ἵππου legere præstet (ἡν M, κυρίου Wk ad sensum quidem recte). 5, 22 pro ὑπὸ πολλοῦ proponere velim ὑπούλου.

Praeterea vasta litterarum peritia multos locos eruit Westerink quos e scriptoribús diversissimis laudat Arethas, vel quos huius menti obversatos esse manifestum est. Quod nonnulli illum fugerunt, nemo mirabitur. In opusculo primo hos locos notavi e Sacra Scriptura mutuatos: 2, 16 θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν δώρων: Eph. 2, 8; 5, 18 τὴν λογικὴν πᾶν: cf. 1 Petr. 2, 2; 5, 29: τὸν τῆς σωφροσύνης περιέχεται κόσμον: 1 Tim. 2, 9; 6, 6 πνεύματι πραξίτητος: 1 Cor. 4, 21 et Gal. 6, 1; 6, 22-25 μὴ ἐν τοῖς ... καὶ ἠτοίκησε: cf. 1 Cor. 12, 14 sqq.

Grati sumus erga editorem, quod tanta cura hos textus publici iuris fecit.

ZUIDHORN, De Gast 63

D. HOLWERDA


Professor Riposati's well-written and remarkably full introduction to the study of the Corpus Tibullianum, which has been out of print for many years, appears in a second edition, in which the author chiefly limits himself to a modernization of the bibliographical notes. As all Latin scholars know, the subject-matter of the book is particularly controversial, and it is for this reason that, besides numerous highly favourable reviews, it has also received a certain number of polemical, and even acrimonious, reactions. Since, however, most of the relevant questions are still as much sub iudice as they were in 1945, the year of the appearance of the first edition, we can only agree with the author's decision to preserve "l'impostazione sostanziale del lavoro". The literature on Tibullus which has appeared since 1945 has been worked up with great care and exactness.

LEIDEN, Cobetstraat 40

J. H. WASZINK


This Oxford text of Gellius is based on a fresh collation of all the major codices used by Hertz in his Teubner edition (1883-85); in addition a recently discovered major codex F has been used for Bks. IX-XX. The editor states that he has also read about eighty codices recentiores. His industry has extended even further; the app.
crit. makes it clear that M. has carefully evaluated much of the important secondary literature on Gellius and on the authors cited by Gellius.

In a commendably simple introduction, M., besides describing the MSS. tradition, lays down the basic principles on which he constituted his text—the careful weighing of all readings, the acceptance of the reading of the greater number of witnesses (thus Fγ against δ; Fθ against γ and so on); he departs from this latter procedure only when, in his opinion, it seems to conflict with his major objective, the production of a truly Latin text.

M. introduces some eighteen conjectures of his own into the text. Four of these, dealing with the use of Greek words by Gellius (I 4, 2, II 20, 9, XII 2, 14, XIII 21, 25) he has discussed in CQ 10 (1960), 179-180. He defends his conjecture vectaculum in XX 1, 28 in Mnemosyne 15 (1962), 272-4; this has been challenged in RIFC (1967), 302, but the powerfulness of the transmission of vectaculum in XX 1, 30 seems a decisive factor. Others of M.’s conjectures recommend themselves on paleographical grounds and on the score of Latinity. Thus IV 6, 6 <i>littera</i> (haplography), X 27, 5 caducei (dittography), XV 9, 8 <i>pons</i>, <i>fons</i> (frons by perseveration); most attractive are an quid, V 18 lemma, ecquid XIV 1, 27. Other passages, however, require further consideration. M.’s depingremus at XII 9, 6 has not solved all the difficulties here; where did esse of the MSS. come from? Vogel’s designaremus seems paleographically better, but he, like M., has simply deleted esse. Similarly at XVI 10, 5 M. has mended the complex corruption <i>civi cui quis</i>, but he ignores the strong MS. support for <i>iam</i> which does not appear to be either a conjectural supplement or a mechanical error and therefore ought to be retained or accounted for. At IV 17, 6 M. substitutes <i>eae</i> for <i>eam</i> of VPR. This is attractive, but since it has no MS. support it ought, perhaps, to be relegated to the <i>app. crit.</i> Conversely, however, one should applaud the decisiveness which underlies the deletion of <i>id est</i> . . . . . in novem after Musarum in XIII 11, 2. This supplement, which has a disastrous effect on what comes after, was probably a gloss in the archetype and deletion seems imperative. Likewise, M.’s aucupari at XVII 19, 3, though farther from the MSS. suscipari than Eussner’s auspicari, is a better synonym of sciscitari; it is not possible to measure precisely the corrupting influence of sciscitarique on what preceded. At three places M. makes what seem to me unnecessary conjectures: at II 16, 3 <i>patris</i> and at XX 3, 1 <i>n</i> appear to be glosses which could well be omitted; similarly M.’s. <i>fluctibus</i> at XIX 7, 14 seems redundant.

M. restricts other conjectures to his <i>app. crit.</i> Of these, <i>summae</i>