

abbreviation *cum* for *circum* written over *uentos* in i. § 98 is significant.' Surely the reader wants no more. What further *stimulus* would Mr. Clark apply to him?

Lower down in the same column your reviewer states that my notes do not sufficiently recognize the significance of the fact that V² very frequently supplies MS. evidence for the corrections of scholars. By way of proof he gives a list of six passages, in every one of which I cite the reading of V² and name the scholar who first put forward the same reading by conjecture.

My critic next takes up a passage where I have failed to state the name of the originator of an emendation which I accept, viz. the insertion of *ille* in i. § 51 'ut ait *ille* in synephebis,' and he goes on to observe 'It is necessary to refer to Orelli where we find that it was supplied by Wolf.' Mr. Clark does not say by which Wolf, and he is very unfortunate in his attempt to supply my omission, for the emendation in question was made by Gebhard, two hundred years before the time of F. A. Wolf, who is the Wolf to whom Orelli refers. See Moser *ad locum*. It is to me almost incomprehensible that a Ciceronian scholar of Mr. Clark's deserved repute should not have long ago discovered how little Orelli is to be depended upon for information of this kind. I have found a considerable number of emendations

in the Tusculan Disputations credited by editors to the wrong man: Davies especially has been a loser in this way. I have restored a good many to their rightful owners.

Mr. Clark winds up his remarks on this point with a misstatement to which I regret to have to enter a very strong objection. He says 'In such cases he (Mr. Dougan) generally contents himself with saying *non inueni* where a very little research would have discovered the author of the reading.' There is absolutely no foundation for this assertion. From one end of the book to the other not an instance will be found where I use the words *non inueni* with reference to the author of a conjectural reading, or in a case where 'a very little research' would have enabled me to make a definite statement. The only cases in which I use these words are those in which I have made the most diligent search for a *manuscript* reading and have failed to find it.

If Mr. Clark has only noticed two original contributions of mine to the text, this is not due to the fact that the book contained no more. Amongst others there is one on i. 44, 105 which I published in *Philologus* of March 1905. Others will be found by those who read the notes through.

T. W. DOUGAN.

BELFAST, March 24, 1906.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE DOLONEIA.

I HAVE read with interest Mr. Henry's new remarks on the *Doloneia*, but a reply to them could only touch the fringes of the curious topic. Since writing my remarks in *The Classical Review* I have returned to the study of the Homeric poems, and hope to publish the results, including an essay

on the *Doloneia*, and a new view of the archaeology of the poems, in which the theory of Reichel is opposed on the grounds of a comparative study of the evolution of arms and defensive armour.

A. LANG.