

B for *ναυαρχίαν* 33¹; *ναυμαχία* Bdf for *ναυαρχία* 20¹; *ναυμαχίας* Bg for *ναυαρχίας* 39²; *ναυμαχίας* Bi for *ναυαρχίας* 85¹. It is notable that, whereas in Thucydides *ναυαρχία* is corrupted into *ναυμαχία*, the corruption

in Aristotle is in the opposite direction: Thucydides' scribes were more used to *μάχαι*, Aristotle's to *ἀρχαί*.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

DIPRAX 'MRS MALAPROP.'

Is *diprax* the Latin for 'Mrs Malaprop'? That is suggested by a curious gloss, first unearthed by Goetz (*Rhein. Mus.* 40, 324):

Diprax: qui perdit sermones et aliud hinc, inde aliud defert,

'who murders his English, dropping a letter here, a syllable there.' It is one of a small group of glosses which come apparently straight from a MS. of Festus in Italy of about the year 900. In my large annotated edition of Festus (in vol. IV of my *Glossaria Latina*, Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930) I call them *Glossae Festinae*. Another of them preserves for us that delightful line of Lucilius about the death of his old steward (*thesaurophylax*), who used dialect-words like *abzet*, Lat. *abiit* 'passed away' (p. 119 of my large Festus):

primum Pacilius tesorofilax pater abzet.

Diprax may belong to the mongrel Greek-Latin of Campania and further South, with *φράζω* lurking in the second syllable (cf. *tricae* for *τρίχες*, *apinae*, etc.).

The Mrs Malaprop of extant Latin comedy is the *truculentus servus* in that play of

Plautus which has the most corrupt text of all; and his mannerism breaks out at v. 682:

heus tu! iam postquam in urbem crebro
 commeo,
 †hicax† sum factus, iam sum cau[i]llator
 probus.

Editors naturally print *dicax*. And *dicax* was probably the reading in the 'Palatine' archetype. But the 'Palatine' text is often the 'Revival' text, the text as altered by stage-managers at a revival of a play, while the Ambrosian palimpsest conserves the genuine text of Plautus. For this part of the play the palimpsest fails us. I wonder whether it had *diprax*, just as it has *vestispica* (pronounced¹ *vestipica*) at *Trin.* 252, where the Palatine reading is *vestiplica*.

W. M. LINDSAY.

University of St. Andrews.

¹ Not spelled; *C.R.* 47, 187.

CORRIGENDUM.

IN *C.R.*, February 1934, p. 15, note 1, read
 υ υ υ = υ υ ζ.

REVIEWS

THE HOMERIC HYMN TO APOLLO.

F. JACOBY: *Der homerische Apollonhymnos*. Pp. 72. (Sonderausgabe aus den *Szb. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, Ph.-Hist. Kl. 1933. XV.) Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Paper, RM. 4.50.

F. DORNSEIFF: *Die archaische Mythen-erzählung. Folgerungen aus dem homerischen Apollonhymnos*. Pp. 103. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Paper, RM. 4.50.

READERS of the articles written by Wilamowitz and Bethe on the *Hymn to Apollo* must have had an uneasy feeling that its problems were not yet settled, and Jacoby has found a puzzle well suited to his keen, analytical mind. Taking his stand where Wilamowitz stopped, he assumes that the Hymn as we have it is distinguishable into a Delian Hymn and a Delphic Hymn, and the task he has set himself is to define the relation

of the two parts to each other. His conclusion is that the first part is the work of a Chian poet, who wrote about 600 B.C. or earlier for the festival of Apollo at Delos, while the second part is the deliberate continuation of the first, composed by a Delphic poet at the time of the Sacred War in 591-590 B.C. But the real kernel of his paper is the effort to detect in the first part those lines which were put in by the second poet to secure a superficial harmony. In this hunt Jacoby is thoroughly at home, and his results are extremely attractive. He takes a series of passages in the first part, 72-8, 96-8, 128-9 and 136-9, and endeavours to show that their present unintelligible shape is due to an ineffectual combination of two versions; the two versions