

systematically from the standpoint of comparative antiquities than either of the preceding writers. He first deals with the view, which he thinks still to be held by the majority of Orientalists, that the minute ceremonies were invented by an idle priesthood in order to strengthen their hold upon the people. He holds on the contrary that the religious customs as well as the laws of the Hindus are based upon immemorial antiquity, of which the priesthood were diligent and conscientious students. He therefore first deals with those customs which appear to be part of Indo-European institutions, and in particular with the marriage customs. Thus, when the Indian ritual prescribes to the bride the duty of weeping as she leaves her father's home, and a special verse has to be recited as an accompaniment to her tears, Hillebrandt compares similar customs amongst Russians and Czechs, and explains them by the violent character of the primitive marriage. In the German Palatinate it appears that the bride must begin to weep from the day of her betrothal, and indeed 'so awfully violently, that she can hardly eat a morsel.' A similar observance connects India with the district of Aargau. In the latter, when the bridegroom drives off, the young people of the neighbourhood block the road with cords and pieces of iron, tied together by coloured cloth, and the bridegroom must cut his way through these impediments with the wedding sword. In India the bridegroom, during the recitation of a particular verse,

lays a red thread in the track of one wheel, and a blue thread in the track of another. Whilst reciting the next verse he drives over them. The custom of throwing rice after newly-married couples is also mentioned as common to many countries, amongst which our own (curiously enough) is not included. The ceremonies connected with the twelve days which separate the old year from the new are treated in the same comparative spirit.

It is perhaps needless to say that on subjects of this kind the author's views will not meet with assent in all quarters. In dealing with matters more specifically Indian he is necessarily on surer ground. In describing the ritual of the Rigveda he has the courage to draw his materials solely from the text of the hymns, and to deduce the conclusion that the ceremonies of that time, though they had reached a considerable degree of elaboration, were still far simpler than in later periods. As a whole, this book may be described as not only an indispensable guide to the student of this department of Sanskrit literature, but also as an invaluable collection of facts interesting to the student of any side of primitive antiquity or folk-lore.

The fact that four volumes of such importance as those here reviewed have been issued in rapid succession is an indication that the study of ancient Sanskrit is by no means losing its attractiveness.

EDWARD V. ARNOLD.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### LATRANS IN PHAEDRUS.

In the review of Postgate's *Corpus*, Fasc. iii, which appeared in the *Classical Review* for December 1900, Prof. Housman has been led, by his cross-nibbed pen perhaps, to do me a little injustice. Commenting on my edition of Phaedrus, at V. 10. 7 (*canem obiurgabat, cui senex contra latrans*), he says 'One generally accepted emendation, Bentley's *Lacon* (loc. cit.) Dr. Gow refuses, and prints the false quantity *lātrāns* with nothing to mark it as corrupt: I know that Auienus says *lātrantis*, but Auienus says *quasi*.' This remark appears to impute to

me ignorance of the usual quantity of *latrans*. As a matter of fact, my note on the passage runs '*latrans* PR, *Lacon* Bentl. in *ā* breuiato offendens, *latrans* cui c.s. Cunningham, *latrans* substantiue accipiens.'

It is not easy to see what Prof. Housman wants. Did he desire me to mark by obelus, or note, that a possibly genuine word was corrupt? On the merits surely *latrans* has rather the best of it. Prof. Housman will not deny that *latrans* is sound Latin for 'a dog' (Ovid. *Met.* viii. 412 *inmeriti fatum latrantis*) and that Phaedrus elsewhere uses

a descriptive epithet as a noun (I. 1. 6 *laniger* 'the lamb', I. 11. 6 *auritululus* 'the ass', IV. 4. 3 *sonipes* 'the horse', IV. 9. 10 *barbatus* 'the goat'). Again, it is unlikely that Phaedrus, after using *canis* twice, should substitute the specific name *Lacon*: indeed neither *Lacon* nor *Molossus* occurs in Phaedrus at all. In I. 1 the sequence is *agnus—agnus—laniger*: in I. 11 *asellus—auritululus—asinus*: in IV. 4 *equus—sonipes*: in IV. 9 *hircus—barbatus—hircus*. The evidence of style is thus strongly in favour of *latrans*. Cunningham's emendation is improbable because *latrans*, placed at the beginning of the sentence, would naturally mean 'barking' and not 'barker.' The existing MS. P does not give the least hint of suspicion: *latrans* is fully and clearly written, and Prof. Housman's conjecture that *Lacon* was corrupted by the following *non* is quite arbitrary, for, though Phaedrus is written as prose in P, there is no evidence

that he was so written in P's archetype. Against style and tradition, therefore, stands only a rule of prosody which is not so clear. Avienus, who must have known Vergil's (*Aen.* VIII. 698) *omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis*, nevertheless wrote *cura latrantis Anubis*. The *a* may have been really short, usage in the poets notwithstanding, or it may have tended to become short in the *sermo quotidianus* or when *latrans* was used as a noun. I believe that the *i* of *migro* is short only in Ter. *Hec.* 589 and Manil. III. 79: similarly the *a* of *flagrum* is short only in one or two passages of Plautus. Lastly, Phaedrus was a foreigner and may have made a mistake, as foreigners will. There happen to be so many chances of evading the rule of prosody that I think I was not bound to treat it as paramount and to obelize *latrans* as corrupt.

J. Gow.

#### PROF HOUSMAN, BENTLEY, LUCAN.

'FINDING faults,' says Prof Housman, if they are real and not imaginary, is the most useful sort of criticism.' So I have thought as long as I can remember, and I am truly glad to learn that I have been right.

In settling the text of an ancient author there are two main lines of fault-finding: there are the faults of the MSS tradition, and the faults of the author himself. When MSS evidence is conflicting, and when it tells, as it sometimes does, on the side of that reading which is in itself clearly inferior, it is of the first importance to take full and fair account of the character and circumstances of the author so far as they are known to us. It may well be that what commends itself to the judgment of a modern scholar as the better reading is not (even though that scholar be infallible) what the author wrote. The cases of the several authors vary, and a slip that would be improbable in Statius' *Thebaid* *bis senos multum vigilata per annos* may more safely be allowed to stand in an unfinished poem by a young and fluent writer.

To take the case of Lucan. Prof Housman finds fault with me for 'refusing corrections by Bentley and others.' Now I admire the cleverness and learning shewn

in Bentley's 'corrections' as much as any one. But when I ask myself in each case 'is this a correction, or an improvement, or both, or neither?' I find myself generally constrained to answer 'an improvement, at least from Bentley's point of view.' And it seems to me that the mature and ratiocinative Bentley was out of touch with the crude and uneven rhetoric of Lucan, and that his actual results are in this case of little value. As for 'correcting,' he could not help it: but his attempts to correct Milton betrayed the false direction of much of his work.

But it may be said that some corrections are so obvious, the improvement in the sense so manifest, that we must perforce accept them. Thus in I 481 *inter Rhenum populos Albimque iacentes* does indeed seem preferable to *Alpem*, let alone *Alpes*. But two objections soon occur (a) with *Albim* the reference is clearly to Germans, and it is not certain (see 308-9) that Lucan is thinking of Germans rather than Gauls, (b) the words 'inter Rhenum Alpemque' seem strained when judged by a modern map, but Lucan had not a modern map. And when I read the queer geographical notions of Polybius (III 47), when I recall the endless controversies to which the Roman landings in