

how much originated in mediaeval times is not always easy to determine. Such clues as are to be found are mentioned by Keller in his Introduction and in a recently published article 'Zu Pseudacron,' in which he defends some of his emendations of the text.

To attempt to criticize a work of this

description would be impertinence. We can only express our thanks to the Prague professor for the great service which he has rendered to students of Horace. The *Pseudacron Scholia* will have to find a place beside the *Porphyrion Scholia* on our bookshelves.

W. M. LINDSAY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE OPENING SENTENCE OF THE VERRINES.

In the *Classical Review* for December, 1904 (p. 440 f.), Principal Peterson proposes to change the *mirantur* of the MSS into *mirabitur*. The very excellence of the MS tradition and the fact that the error, if error it be, could—shall we say? must—have been corrected long before the date of our existing MSS, ought to make us suspicious of any emendation, and to look for corruption (or misunderstanding) in another part of the sentence. I take liberty to doubt the explanation that *mirantur* is a copyist's error for *mirabitur*, through the stages *miravitur*, *mirantur*. It is true that *b* is often written *v*, but in verbs this would surely hardly occur except where the other form is a real word, for example, where *habitavit* appears instead of *habitabit*. Also, the confusion between *n* and *w* is not common before the 13th century.

The proper solution is, I think, to regard *quis* as the nominative plural, and not as the nominative singular. This form is the same as that *ques*, which is attested by Charisius, Festus, and Priscian, and found in Cato, the S. C. De Bacanalibus, and Pacuvius, etc. (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 444). The form *quis* is quoted by Mr. C. H. Turner, in his *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* (Oxonii 1899–1904), Fasc. I. (Pars ii.), p. 150, seventeen times from Latin MSS of the Canons of Early Church Councils, which are amongst the most careful productions

of the scribe's art. The originals of these MSS are in no case older than the fourth century A.D.; so that we are face to face with the fact that a nom. pl. *quis(ques)* existed continuously throughout the long period of Latin literature. Confusion with the singular, or alteration to *qui*, was most natural.

I cannot see that there was anything to hinder Cicero from using this form. If it be a colloquial form, then he may have avoided it in his later speeches, as it is well known that there are stylistic features in the Quinctius and the Roscius, and even in the Verrines, which he seems to have given up afterwards. But this is a point, for the full discussion of which it would be necessary to have collations of all the oldest MSS of Cicero's works, and it must be left to experts like Dr. Peterson.

As to the last part of the sentence, I think it may stand as it is. The sentence is long, and the plural *si quis* may quite easily have been varied to the singular subject of *probabit* and *putabit*. But there is a ready way out of the difficulty; namely to regard *probabit* and *putabit* as corrections of *probab̄t* (= *probabunt*) and *putab̄t* (= *putabunt*). The contraction assumed is found in ninth century MSS, perhaps also earlier.

A. SOUTER.

Mansfield College, Oxford.

A TRANSLATION OF MÜLLER AND DEECKE'S *ETRUSKER*.

MAY I be allowed space to state that I am engaged on A Translation into English of Müller and Deecke's *Etrusker*? Some of

LIVERPOOL, January, 1905.

the latest discovered Etruscan inscriptions will be reproduced in the volume.

HERBERT A. STRONG.