
Par cette longue série de remarques, nous avons voulu montrer que la lecture de cet ouvrage excite le linguiste à des réflexions ultérieures.
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The edition of the Homeric scholia has been mainly the domain of German scholars. I am thinking of the editions of G. Dindorf and E. Maass, while I. Bekker may also be mentioned 1). The edition by Prof. Erbse is a worthy successor to these works and surpasses them in a decisive way. German scholars are known to us Dutch because of their thoroughness (‘Gründlichkeit’), a characteristic which among other merits likewise distinguishes this edition. The critical apparatus shows that a complete investigation of the mss. has been made. Moreover, in the space between the text of the scholia itself and the app. cr. a welcome contribution is offered by a kind of commentary, which presents and often discusses testimonies, parallel passages, etc. I wish to call special attention to this part, because it enriches our knowledge of ancient and especially of Alexandrian scholarship and will aid us in the future to put these studies on a sound basis. One is surprised at the wealth of testimonies which is given by the well-read author.

For the general points on which this edition may be criticized I refer the reader to my reviews of vol. I and II in this periodical (1972, 84-6 and 1975, 304-7). As to the general aspect I call special attention to the vocabulary and grammar of the Scholia, which

*Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXI, Fasc. 3*
enrich our knowledge of the Greek language and have unfortunately not often been explored or put to use 3). I shall now discuss a number of passages where the text or the idiom is of interest, and where I differ from the views of Prof. Erbse.

In Sch. T K 265b (Erbse, vol. III, 54, 18 f.) I should like to retain the text of T κουνόν τε πᾶς τὸ ἔχειν, scil. πῦλον ἐντὸς, as Eust. 804, 16 has rightly seen. The words need not be supplied, for one must not forget that the scholia often do not present a style and composition which is elaborated as is the case with treatises destined to be published. Moreover, for this very reason the annotations were often concise. One might compare the practice of the notices written down in short-hand.—Schol. K 332 (Erbse, p. 70 Testim.). The discussion of ἀπόθυμον ἐπόθυμον in Valk, Textual Criticism of the Odyssey (Leiden 1949), 133 f. seems to have escaped Erbse.—Schol. A K 350 c (Erbse, 75, 61). I think that the difficulties may be solved by emending the corrupt ἄπειροκτία into παρῆκται.—Schol. T K 352-3 (Erbse, 76, 84) says of plough-land προσωριμάτισται τῷ ἐκφ.; Erbse, App. cr., proposes προσφηστὶ. Unfortunately he thus deletes an interesting Greek word which, as it seems, is known only from this passage (cf. Valk, Researches, I, 144). Though I am readily inclined to give the highest marks to Prof. Erbse as a scholar, I am of the opinion that in the interpretation of words he has not always revealed his highest qualities, a fact which may be easily forgiven in an author who had to fulfil such an immense task.—Schol. T Λ 248 διὰ τὸ ἄπειρον καθ' ἑνὸ τῶν πολεμίων. I should like to read ἔνεον; cf. L.Sc.J., s.v. ἔνεος 2, who quote from Plato ἄπειρος καθ' ἔνεος "senseless, stupid".—In Sch. T Λ 315b (Erbse 184, 63) Ludwich has rightly noticed a gap. I should like to supplement ἔρχες < ἀρήγοι >.—In Sch. T Λ 318a (Erbse, 185, 74) a slight emendation is sufficient: ἐκυτοῦς (cod. ἐκυτοῖς) ἐπιδιδοῦσι τοῖς δεινοῖς. The testimony of Sch. b is of no avail, for as he often does, b has completely altered the text of bT. I observe that in T the subject of the sentence has been altered, scil. ἐπὶ βούλετα (scil. ὁ ποιητής) .... ἐκυτοῦς ἐπιδιδοῦσι κτε. However, one must take account of the fact that, as I have already observed, the style and grammar of the scholia is often sloppy and does not meet the higher standards of written treatises 8).—Schol. bΤ Λ 459b ἐνα... λαυθάνει. Erbse with Bekker reads λαυθάνω, which is grammatically correct. I should like to read λαυθάνη, which is closer to λαυθάνει and is found in a few mss. Cf. my Researches, I, 507, n. 514, where I have assembled a number of testimonies illustrating the false use of moods after ἐνα.—In Sch. T Λ 515 (Erbse, 222, 23 f.) Erbse reads τοῦ διατητικοῦ Ἡρόδικος μὲν ᾧδέατο, συνετέλεσε δὲ Ἰπποκράτης, which presents the exact and correct facts. T, however, offers