

enger Zusammenhang des Wortes mit Har-n, Urina, und einem Grundbegriffe etwa 'fließen,' 'ergießen,' 'anzunehmen.' Even now that a better etymology for 'Hure' has been found, the supposed relationship between Gr. *μοιχός* and *μίχεν* seems to prevent the connection of the two corresponding German words from being completely given up. Cf. Kluge (*Etymol. Wörterbuch* sub *Hure*): "Weniger wahrscheinlich ist Verwandtschaft mit Harn, obwohl gr. *μοιχός*, Ehebrecher aus *μίχεν*, 'mingere,' ist."

But although the derivation of *μοιχός* from *μίχ* is from a phonetic standpoint perfectly regular, no really plausible connection between the two meanings has ever been given. The one suggested by Grimm is only a makeshift with which no one can be satisfied. I therefore propose to connect *μοιχός* with the root meik', mik' which appears in Gr. *μίγ-νυ-μι*, Skt. *mic-ras*, Lat. *mi(h)-sceo*, Church Slavonic *més-iti*, Lithuanian *misz-ti*, O. H. G. *miskan*=mod. German *mischen*, Anglo-Saxon *miscian*=English *mix*. Here the connection in meaning is evident and the origin of the aspirate *χ* is due to the same analogy as the *χ* of the perfect *μεμίχεται* and of the so-called aspirated perfect in general. In forms like *μίξω*, *ἔμιξα*, *μεμίξομαι* the character of the final guttural of the root was completely lost to view, and from analogy with *τεύξω*, *ἔτευξα*, *τετεύξομαι* from *τεύχω* came to be regarded as *χ*.

Cf. Osthoff, *Zur Geschichte des Perfects in Indogermanischen*, pp. 284 ff., ; and for a similar phenomenon in modern Greek, Hatzidakis, K. Z. xxvii. pp. 69 ff.

* *
*

A CORRESPONDENT points out that the emendation of Aesch. fr. 291, proposed on p. 417, appears in Nauck (old ed. 1856), 'τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγείς τόπων coniecit *Heathius*.'

* *
*

At a meeting of the Cambridge Philological Society, held Oct. 24, Mr. Housman proposed the following emendations on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* :—

I. 345 for *loca* read *sola*, 441 for *et nunquam talibus* read *nunquam letalibus*, II. 278 for *sacra* read *fracta*, 855 for *parva* read *torva*, IV. 663 for *aeterno* read *Aetnaeo*, V. 118 for *fuit* read *ferit*, VII. 741 for *male fictor* read *simulator*, 637 for *facit* read *fuat*, XI. 153 for *carmina* read *flamina*, 181 for *velare* read *relevare*, 270 for *regebat* read *gerebat*, XIII. 602, 3 for *flumina natas exhalant* read *flumine Nais exhalat*, XIV. 200 for *inanem luminis orbem* read *lumen luminis orbem*.

Dr. Postgate supported Lehr's emendation of *Romana* for *matura* in Hor. *Od.* III. 6, 23.

OBITUARY.

CHARLES GABRIEL COBET.

At Leiden on the 25th October died Charles Gabriel Cobet, who will always be remembered as the greatest Greek scholar of this century.

He was born in Paris, November 28th, 1813, the son of a Dutchman holding an official position in the French Public Service who had married a Frenchwoman, Marie Bertranet. When the child was only six weeks old, his father returned to Holland, and it was in Holland that Cobet received his education. He was sent to the gymnasium at the Hague, and there began Greek and Latin under the able teaching of a Grecian of some note in Holland, Dr. Kappeyne van de Copello.

Whether we ascribe it wholly to natural bent or in part to the character of his early training, certainly when Cobet entered in 1832 the University of Leiden, he had already a strong leaning to classical studies. It was his father's wish that he should study theology with a view to entering the Church, and accordingly he attended lectures in this faculty, but the boy's whole mind ran upon ancient literature. The only part of the theological course which seems to have interested him was that which was most nearly

allied to his own favourite subjects. His professor in Hebrew, van der Palm, he learned to love and esteem. Indeed, the relations between Cobet and his teachers appear throughout to have been unusually happy. Some articles by his old schoolmaster appear in the early numbers of the *Mnemosyne*, and it is touching to observe the way in which van de Copello takes every opportunity of honouring his rising pupil's name with appreciative mention. In his inaugural lecture after he was made professor at Leiden, Cobet seems to rise even above his usually high level of eloquence when at the close he turns round, and addresses by name his old masters, Bake, Peerlkamp, and Geel. We cannot but feel the tenderness and the reverence, the ring of real affection in everything that he says of them.

In his fourth year of study at Leiden (1836) Cobet wrote for a prize the essay entitled *Prosopographia Xenophontea*. It was successful, and was published in the same year. This tract I have never seen, but it is said to have impressed both Bake and Geel. A more important book appeared four years later (1840), *Observationes Criticae*

in Platonis Comici Reliquias. This was evidently written in place of a university thesis of some description, as a list of theses is printed at the end. From the preface we learn that Cobet had been for some time interested in the Greek comedians, and that he had contemplated preparing a larger work on Plato Comicus. 'At mox publica auctoritate profecturus ex patria ad explorandos in celeberrimis Europae Bibliothecis Graecos Simplicii codices manu scriptos, malui illud editionis consilium nunc quidem omittere, et his in Platonem observationibus defungi in quibus locos quosdam in hoc argumento praecipuos de industria explicui. Si me Deus in patriam reduxerit, editionem, quam paraveram, δευτέρα φρονιδης et novae fortasse accessiones e Grammaticis ineditis, facient commendatiorem.'

It is plain from this that Cobet's talents were becoming known. He could not afford to travel, and had been given what in England would be called a travelling fellowship for five years. He had thus the opportunity of visiting every great library in Europe. There was, it is true, a somewhat burdensome condition attached, but we shall see that Cobet had the strength of mind to interpret his commission in a wiser and more profitable sense.

A further honour was conferred upon him when through the good offices of Bake and Geel he was made doctor *honoris causa* in 1841. The ordinary degree he did not hold, as a knowledge of Roman law was required from every candidate, and Cobet would not study Roman law.

In 1845 Cobet returned to Holland. Most of his five years had been spent in Italy—where by the way he made the congenial friendship of Badham—and well spent, not to any extent in the study of Simplicius, but in acquiring that intimate knowledge of the habits of copyists and the history of manuscripts upon which most of his best work is founded. He brought home with him a very large collection of notes, and these, like the accumulations made by Bentley during the time in which he had the run of Stillingfleet's Library, were to form the solid substructure of his critical labours.

In 1846 Cobet was made professor in Leiden, and married a lady to whom he had been betrothed before going to Italy. By her he had one child, a daughter who at sixteen lost her mother, and now survives her father. His life as a professor was uneventful, a student's life unbroken by incidents except so far as the publication of work may be accounted such. Even his holidays

were spent in his study. Once yearly he allowed himself a fortnight in Paris, but that was passed chiefly in the library over manuscripts. In 1883 he had a fit of apoplexy which confined him to his bed for some months, and left him much enfeebled. In the following year, at the age of 70, he became *emeritus professor*.

I am glad that I saw him once. It was in his own library in the Rappenburg at Leiden, and I shall not readily forget the genial yet keen expression, the quick eager face, the precise and racy Latin which put one's own halting sentences to shame. No one, I am sure, could have talked with him for five minutes even then, when in some measure his health was impaired, without feeling the force and charm of his personality and understanding why his students liked him. I had shortly before left the Senatus Room of the university, with its portraits of Scaliger, Grotius, Wyttenbach, and others, making of four narrow walls a record of learning in Europe, and I could not help thinking when I came out of Cobet's house that here was another whose portrait ought one day to hang there as having sustained the best traditions of a famous university.

It was seen above that before he went to Italy Cobet contemplated editing more fully the fragments of Plato Comicus, and again that he was sent abroad partly to collate manuscripts of Simplicius and prepare for the press an edition of that Aristotelian commentator. Moreover, by his friend and teacher Professor Geel's advice, the Paris publishing house of Firmin-Didot asked him in 1842 to edit Diogenes Laertius for their well-known series of Greek Classics; and Cobet undertook the work. Of these undertakings none was ever completely executed. We hear no more of the *Plato Comicus*. What happened to the *Simplicius* I cannot say, but no edition by Cobet was ever printed. I have seen it stated that he was understood at one time to be co-operating with Karsten, who succeeded to the commission to edit Simplicius; but even Karsten's edition was not published till 1865, and Cobet's name does not appear on the title-page. As for the *Laertius*, the Didots never got more than the text, certain prolegomena which had been promised never being sent. The reason of all this is that Cobet had found better work to do. A mind of the stamp of Cobet's, ever ready to receive and impart inspiration, cannot dwell long on any subject, however barren it may seem, without getting inspiration of one sort or another from it. Plato

Comicus, and Simplicius, and Laertius, all fulfilled their function of suggestiveness, and then were left on one side for the more promising fields to which they had led him. He had undertaken them all in perfect good faith, but he found he could do better for the cause of learning than by completing them. He found it easy doubtless to convince his friends Bake and Geel of this in regard to Simplicius, but it was more difficult to get the Didots' sympathy, as we gather from the amusing correspondence between publishers and editor printed as *avis des éditeurs* at the beginning of the *Laertius*.

That my explanation is right there can be little doubt. Compare the *Observationes criticae in Platonem Comicum* written immediately before his visit to Italy with the inaugural lecture delivered soon after his return (*Oratio de arte interpretandi grammatices et critices fundamentis innixa primario philologi officio*, 1847). There is a vast difference. The former, one can see at a glance, is written by no ordinary man. The thought is lucid and expressed in simple Latin; there are proofs also of a rare genius for emendation; but, though never dull, it yet reminds one now and then of a German dissertation. In the inaugural lecture, on the other hand, we have Cobet himself—strong, masculine writing, a style clear and bracing, with a nip in it like good air. He has plenty to say and knows how to say it. There is no fine talk any more than in Bentley, Porson, or Dobree. Every sentence has its work to do, and there is a moral force behind it all, an intense enthusiasm for truth, a quality that marks the whole of Cobet's critical work. Life is too short for what he has to do, or, as he himself expresses it at the close of the preface to the *Variæ Lectiones*, 'Mihi quidem non est quiescendi et otiandi animus. Plurima supersunt agenda. His ad finem perductis, statim ad reliqua me accingor; itaque

cras ingens iterabimus aequor.'

It is this force and strong personality which puts Cobet head and shoulders above all the Greek scholars of this century. We recognise this perhaps most clearly when his work is in immediate juxtaposition with that of others, as for instance when one comes upon an emendation of his among the tedious and unprofitable conjectanea which so often waste space on the lower margins of our modern editions. Or take the case of the *Mnemosyne* journal which will always be identified with Cobet's name. It was started in 1852 by a small knot of Dutch scholars.

For the first number there is nothing from Cobet's pen, but in the second he prints with notes a text of the then recently discovered oration of Hyperides *pro Euxenippo*, and also writes the first instalment of his *Variæ Lectiones*. The journal has become readable. In 1856 Cobet's name appears on the title-page as co-operating with the three original editors. And what a change he soon works! The old mediocrity, the talk-talk about things in general of which we get so tired, is put into a corner. Latin is substituted for the Dutch in which the first numbers were almost entirely written. Bit by bit Cobet comes to write almost the whole, and swells the seventh volume with telling prefaces and with indices to his *Variæ Lectiones*. Now I venture to say that with the exception of a few articles, at first principally from Bake's pen, there is little in the *Mnemosyne* which could have made it known if Cobet's work had been absent. As it is, no Greek scholar can be without a copy of it.

For some reason or another—perhaps from the jealousies bred by Cobet's success—there came a change in the editorship, and with volume x. (1861) begins a new series which was at first under the editorship of Bake and Cobet alone. In 1862 this series also comes to an end. Then there is a break of eleven years, until in 1873 another series begins. To every number until 1886 Cobet contributes largely, sometimes more than all the other writers put together.

But the work published in the *Mnemosyne* does not represent all Cobet's activity in the field of criticism, though it does to a very large degree. Some of his early books and pamphlets have been already mentioned. Of these I would rate very highly the *Oratio de arte interpretandi*, not only because in it first we get Cobet as we have learned to know him, but because in it his critical method is explained. Two other lectures delivered by him I possess, and both of them have the same virtue though in a less degree. They were delivered in the Royal Belgian Institute in successive years, 1850 and 1851. The one is entitled *De sinceritate Graeci sermonis in Graecorum scriptis post Aristotelem graviter depravata*, and the other *De auctoritate et usu grammaticorum veterum in explicandis scriptoribus Graecis*. He also edited besides the *Laertius* the two orations of Hyperides—the *pro Euxenippo* in *Mnemosyne* 1853, the *Oratio Funebris* in 1858—the newly discovered tract of Philostratus *περὶ Γυμναστικῆς* in 1859, the *Anabasis* (1859), and *Hellenica* (1862) of Xenophon, and the *Orations and*

Fragments of Lysias (1863). Of these the *Anabasis* reached a second edition in 1873, the *Hellenica* a second edition in 1880, and a third in 1888, the *Lysias* a second in 1882, while the two speeches of Hyperides were republished together in 1877. I possess all these various editions save the second of the *Hellenica*, but, except in the case of the Hyperides, the later differ hardly at all from the earlier. In any case they do not pretend to be anything more than editions for school use. The critical work on which they are based appears in the *Mnemosyne*. It is worth while noticing that the preface to the first edition of the *Lysias* tells us that Cobet had hoped to edit all the Attic orators.

It remains for me to say something of the work of Cobet in itself and in relation to the place which it takes in the history of learning.

Cobet was never tired of expressing his obligations to the English school of critics—to Bentley and Bentley's great detractor Dawes, to Porson, Dobree, and Elmsley. I remember well the enthusiasm with which he spoke of them all during my visit to him; and there is hardly a book or an article in which he does not refer to them in terms of unstinted admiration. The influence of the English school seems to be a persistent force in Holland. That it was at work among Cobet's teachers can be proved. The prospectus of the originators of the *Mnemosyne* compared with Cobet's preface to *Observationes criticae in Platonem Comicum*, suggests the inference that the writings of the English school were regarded in university circles as exercising a paramount influence in Holland. But neither is the prospectus of 1852 silent in regard to the influence of German scholarship, nor for that part had Cobet in 1840 shaken himself quite free from it. By the time of his return from Italy, however, there is a change in his attitude. He has adopted the method of the English school and takes up a position actually antagonistic to the German. And this he maintained through life. Very soon after he joined the editorial committee of the *Mnemosyne* the journal lost entirely its German colour and adopted the attitude of Cobet himself. To Cobet, therefore, English scholarship is deeply indebted. Just at the time when the traditional English method was in danger of being forgotten in England itself, it was through his exertions not only made dominant in Holland, but in many ways had its range enlarged. Nor is either fact surprising. On the one hand, the Dutch

intellect seems to be closely allied to the English in character. Except for the difference of language, an educated Dutchman always strikes me as really nearer to an educated Englishman than an educated American is. Then, on the other hand, the strain of French blood in Cobet must count for something in his manner of using the English method. Not that this French element was an unmixed advantage. For example, it seems fair to trace to it the excess to which Cobet carried his dislike to *apparatus critici*, and his misleading fondness for ideal systematization. Both of these defects are very marked. He is doubtless right in deriding the *apparatus criticus* in ordinary editions, and in maintaining the absurdity of collating a certain class of manuscripts. Bentley would have gone with him here, though Porson or Elmsley might not; but in his published texts he goes much further than this. The scholar must use another edition side by side with any of Cobet's. Again, although no one has insisted more than Cobet on the necessity of regarding Greek as a series of languages rather than as one language, yet he has not sufficiently recognised that even Athenians of the Attic period might, either by living long away from Athens or from literary motives of one kind or another, admit into their diction dialectical or conventional expressions. He thus frequently alters the manuscript text where Englishmen would have seen no reason for doing so, although they would all have maintained as strongly as Cobet the general truth of his contention in regard to Attic.

Yet if we take his general outlook and compare it with that of the English school, we must see how well Cobet understood his own position when he claimed to be the successor of that school. Do we not think of Bentley when Cobet maintains that Greek is not one language but many, that 'quidquid homines loquimur nisi forte quis joco aut dolo interdum de industria quaerit ambiguitatem, unum habet sensum'? Are the two men not alike in their high-handed, hard-hitting criticism, and their consciousness of power? If the humour of Cobet reminds us rather of Scaliger than of Bentley, still ought we not rather to say that it is Bentley's humour with a spice of French refinement in it? Certainly it would be difficult to compare Cobet with any other scholar than Bentley and Scaliger. He towers above his contemporaries, and in my judgment will take rank above all other critics except Bentley and Scaliger. There is a strength

about him denied even to men like Porson and Valckenaer. This is high praise deliberately bestowed, but it is praise which has been well earned. We talk of the opportunities of a Scaliger or a Bentley, and marvel that no one else arose to clear away the rubbish which had accumulated above the sources of literature. But even Cobet found plenty of rubbish to clear away, and after a life of labour still left much for other hands to do. But the most of us spend our lives rather in choking up the wells with false erudition than in seeking to purify them. This is why a life like Cobet's is a thing which cannot be valued too highly.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

We append a tribute to the memory of Cobet in the form of a letter to the University of Leyden, unofficially written by Dr. Sandys, Public Orator of Cambridge. The letter is signed by more than seventy members of the Senate interested in Classical studies.

*Academiae Lugduno-Batavae
Curatoribus Professoribus Doctoribus
Salutem.*

Quanto animi dolore commoti nuperrime audivimus, obisse mortem magnum illum virum, qui non modo Academiae vestrae illustrissimae inter decora praecipua sed etiam per totum orbem terrarum a doctissimo quoque litterarum Graecarum inter lumina insignia merito numerabatur! Nos autem collegae vestri interitum eo maiore desiderio prosequimur, quod vobiscum in communium studiorum societate nomine non uno sumus coniuncti. Recordamur enim epistularum consuetudinem quae Benteleio nostro non modo cum Graevio iam sene sed etiam cum Hem-

sterhusio illo vestro adhuc iuvene interessit; recordamur Ruhnkenii vestri et Porsoni nostri litteras fato iniquo nobis perditas; recordamur hospitio quam iucundo et olim Dobraeum, qui postea litterarum Graecarum Professor nobis erat, et nuper linguae Latinae Professorem nostrum, ad ferias vestras saeculares legatum a nobis missum, exceperitis; recordamur denique amicitiam ex communi studiorum amore natam, quae inter alumnum nostrum, Carolum Badham, et illum ipsum exorta est, quem nunc maxime desideratis. Multum sane in COBETO et vos, viri doctissimi, et nosmet ipsi nuper amisimus; atqui in libris suis et doctrina et acumine et lepore plenis Aristarchus ille vester nobis non minus quam vobis diu superstes vivet. Adulescentium studiosorum manibus teruntur et Xenophontis et Lysiae editiones illae nitidissimae, et ipsius et aliorum ingenio luculenter emendatae. Doctioribus loquuntur *Miscellanea* illa *Critica*, et Homero illustrando et Demostheni recognoscendo praesertim dedicata; diu eruditissimi cuiusque in deliciis habitae sunt et *Variae* eius et *Novae Lectiones*, in quibus non sine singulari quadam sermonis Latini elegantia egregie demonstravit quantum linguae Graecae antiquae sanitas et integritas et lucida simplicitas saeculorum recentiorum vitiiis inminuta et inquinata esset. Nemo certe inter aevi huiusce philologos scriptorum Atticorum pedestris praesertim sermonis consuetudinem incorruptam magis penitus perspexit, magis constanter conservavit, adeo ut in illo non minus quam in Hemsterhusio a Ruhnkenio laudato ipsae 'Athenae in Bataviam commigrasse viderentur.' Etiam de ipso imprimis vera est laus illa quam in oratione elegantissima, qua Professoris munus auspicatus est, Scaligero vestro aptissime tribuit:—illum sibi visum esse paene perfecti critici imaginem referre. Restat ut nos quoque, vobiscum eodem dolore hodie coniuncti, viri tanti memoriam veneratione debita etiam in posterum colamus. Interim philologi magni verba ab ipso quondam laudata mutuati, exemplar tam admirabile velut e longinquo alloquemur:—'Tu nobis effigiem ingenii et doctrinae expressam dabis quam intueantur bonarum artium studiosi.'

Valete et vestri omnium maeroris nos quoque participes esse patimini.

*Datum Cantabrigiae
pridie idus Novembres
A.S. MDCCCLXXXIX.*

EDWIN HATCH, D.D.

THE death of Dr. Hatch has left a gap in English theology and English scholarship which will not readily be filled. Edwin Hatch was originally a member of Pembroke College, Oxford: soon after taking his degree he obtained an appointment as Professor of Classics in Trinity College, Toronto, which he held from 1859 to 1866. In 1867 he returned to England, and became Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, a position which he retained till a few years ago, and in which he took an active part in the tuition and management of the Hall. In 1869, in place of the fly-sheets, appearing at

irregular intervals, on which official University notices had previously been issued, the weekly *University Gazette*—chiefly, we believe, at Dr. Hatch's own suggestion—was established; and of this he acted as editor from the beginning till the time of his death. In 1880 he was Bampton Lecturer, taking as his subject 'The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.' From 1882 to 1886 he held the post of Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint; and the lectures which he delivered in this capacity, revised and enlarged, have recently been published under the title *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Since