

name in Regensburg, or in the neighbouring monastery of St. Emmeram. The style of illumination is plainly modelled upon that of the French school above described, perhaps upon the St. Emmeram Gospel-book itself; but it is somewhat degenerate, and will not bear comparison for beauty with the work of the contemporary Winchester school in England. The writing is a rather large and heavy Caroline minuscule, with a tendency to lean forward, which also appears in other German MSS. of the same period.

The other plates are of purely palaeographical interest. They are spread fairly evenly over the minuscule period, except that the latest stages are only scantily represented. Seven of the MSS. reproduced belong to the 9th century, three to the 10th, eleven to the 11th, six to the 12th, six to the 13th, four to the 14th, and two to the 15th. Six of the plates represent charter hands, while one is a purely private hand, containing a draft letter written in the chancery of Landshut in 1473; but the remainder consists of various kinds of book-hand, ranging from the year 818 to 1394. They do not, however, represent all the varieties of book-hand within that period.

The handsome style which we find in Bibles and chronicles of the 12th century, and the minute and compressed style of the Parisian Bibles of the 13th century, are not exemplified here. Rather we have the less formal writings of the monastic registers, with a few official documents from the courts of the Bavarian princes. Future parts will no doubt add more variety of style and place; but, considering how far the *general* field of palaeography is covered by existing publications, it is to be hoped that Dr. Chroust will, on the whole, adhere to the plan which he has so far followed, and will give us full materials for an adequate judgment on the development of writing in various parts of Germany. If, however, he wishes to go further afield, it may be worth while to suggest that the libraries of Russia have hardly been touched by the existing palaeographical repertories.

I may perhaps be allowed to comment from time to time on the future issues of this publication. For the present it must suffice to call attention to Dr. Chroust's enterprise, and to invite for it the consideration of librarians and students of mediaeval palaeography.

F. G. KENYON.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PLATO, *HIPPARCHUS* 230 A.

MR. H. RICHARDS points out (*Platonica* iii, *C.R.* xv 301) that in the *Hipparchus*, 230 A, οὐτι πᾶν γε τουτί μοι ἀνάθου, a colon should be inserted after οὐτι πᾶν γε. So W. H. Thompson, *Journal of Philology* v (1874) p. 220: 'Ita edd. soloece. Distinguendum οὐτι πᾶν γε τουτί μοι ἀνάθου. Ad quae infra

respondet Socrates ἀνατίθεμαι τοίνυν σοι τοῦτο.' Thompson's notes were, he says, 'sent to Prof. Baiter of Zürich, who is preparing a new edition of his Plato': but I am not aware that Baiter's new edition has ever appeared.

H. J.

ON EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*, LL. 1214-15.

'Ἄλλ' ἤνιχ' ἡμεῖς οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει
καπνῶ δ' ἐσήμην' ἄστου πολεμίων ὑπο
ξένον κατέκτας.

Mr. Marchant's suggestion¹ that πολεμίων ὑπο should be taken with οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει and not with καπνῶ δ' ἐσήμην' ἄστου is

¹ *Cl. Rev.* (1901), p. 295.

surely neither necessary nor natural. I understand καπνῶ δ' ἐσήμην' ἄστου to mean just what Aeschylus otherwise expresses when he writes, *Ag.* 815, καπνῶ δ' ἀλούσα νῦν ἔρ' εὔσημος πόλις. In other words, the point of the words may or may not be to indicate 'how Polymestor knew that the Trojans were lost,' but assuredly that in-