

p. 5 Where Cato got his knowledge of them we cannot say.

The ingenious theory of Neibuhr, that the current legends of the Roman kings represents the contents of these and similar ballads, which was used by Macaulay for his Lays of Ancient Rome, was refuted by Schwegler in his Römische Geschichte (vol. 1, Tübingen, 1853) and is now held by no scholar.¹¹

Footnote 11. Brief account of the matter in Rose, Myth, p. 305

p. 6 To what extent the imperfect specimens we have go back to really ancient sources is, in the case of all the historical documents, a hotly contested point; certainly we have now none left which actually reproduce anything later than the records of classical republican days in Rome, for their language is but slightly more archaic, if at all, than that of the surviving literary works.

p. 41-42 How many plays Plautus wrote was a disputed point in antiquity, for there were attributed to him some 130. Several ancient scholars made lists of those which they considered genuine; that which was finally accepted as canonical was Varro's, consisting of the twenty-one plays which still survive, entire or in fragments. But this consists solely of those which he thought quite indubitably genuine; there was a considerable class, perhaps numbering nineteen, of doubtful pieces, several of which Varro personally thought to be his, on stylistic grounds. The matter was complicated both by the confusion between Plautus and Plautius (see note 34) and by Plautus having worked over sundry older plays.³⁸

p. 166 ((Re Cicero.)) There are many resemblances, strongly suggesting that Cicero had used it, to an anonymous work generally called ad Herennium. It is in four books, addressed to a certain Gaius Herennius, and its author says that he is more interested in philosophy than rhetoric, intends to write on grammar, and has some thoughts of composing treatises on tactics and government.²⁷ Who he was, is quite uncertain. In later antiquity, and also for a while after the Revival of Letters,²⁸ it was imagined that Cicero had written it; but it is the work of a mature scholar, master of his subject, which he handles excellently, and not of a young beginner.

²⁸ . . . The first modern to show that Cicero could not have been the author was Raphael Regius, in 1491.