in fact no section of the glossary, where all the plays are represented. In one section (pp. 42-3) five plays are drawn on, but in the majority of cases we have to be content with three or four. Nor are all the plays represented to the same extent. Three bulk more largely in the glossary than the others, viz. Andria, Eunuchus and Hauton. In almost every batch of any length at least two of these plays are found. The combination Andr.-Haut. is very frequent. (It is not easy to explain this partiality for these plays, unless we suppose that they were read more frequently than the others and were, therefore, more fully annotated.) At the first glance this is apt to give the impression that the order of the plays began Andr., Haut., Eun., or something like that; but this order is not borne out in batches where more plays are represented. Another factor which has to be kept in mind is reshuffling: traces of its work may be found on nearly every page of 'Abolita,' so that we must always consider its influence in determining the position of glosses drawn from any of the plays.

Leaving on one side the very short batches, which naturally give us little help, and taking those where the track is not too heavily obscured, we find that the plays group themselves in the following combinations:

Andr., Ad., pp. 57 : 63: $150: 159$.
Andr., Ad., Eun., pp. 79: 97.
Andr., Ad., Eun., Phorm., pp. 98-9: 159.
In the long batch, pp. 42-3, the order is Haut., Andr., Haut., Andr. (a mixture due to reshuffling ?), Eun., Phorm., Hec. The Eunuchus group at the end of the batch, composed, as it is, of words beginning col-, con-, cog., cannot be cited as evidence. It is obviously an addition.

Eun., Phorm., pp. 42-3: 62: $69: 88:$ 98-9: г29.
Haut., Hec., pp. 9: 50: 69: 98: $119: 150$.
As connecting links we have:
Phorm., Haut., Hec., p. 50.
Eun., Haut., p. 122.
These combinations point to the order of the plays as having been $A n d r ., A d$. , Eun., Phorm., Haut., Hec.-an order which corresponds to that of the MSS. D and G.

I have again to thank Professor Lindsay for help and advice.
Robert Weir.
King's College, Aberdeen.

## CORRIGENDA

In vol. xv., p. IOO, note I, for 'Phaedrus' read 'Seneca.'
In this number:
p. 35, line 14, for 'Suppl. I., pp. 23I sq.' read 'Suppl. II., coll. 23 I sq.'
p. 38, last line, for 'Isocrates' read 'Leocrates.'

