

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN his notice of the Poet Laureate's 'Ibant obscuro,' *Class. Rev.* 31, 5 and 6, Dr. Rouse makes two or three statements upon which one would be grateful for more light. First, he says of the Virgilian hexameter: 'There is always (with perhaps one exception in the *Aeneid*) at least one ictus which has no accent.' Can this dictum be reconciled with *Aen.* 5, 591, 'falleret indeprentus et irremabilis error,' and with *Ecl.* 1, 70; 3, 8; 5, 52; 7, 33; 8, 80; 9, 60; 10, 33; and *Aen.* 1, 500; 9, 348; 11, 601; 12, 212? Or with the following, which show stress on every ictus when enclitics are taken into account? *Georg.* 3, 104, 'Corripuere ruuntque effusi carcere currus.' *Georg.* 4, 330; 4, 482; *Aen.* 1, 420, 566; 2, 497; 4, 486; 8, 245; 10, 91, 699; 11, 236, 634; 12, 281, 652, 732, 833. There are other lines where it may be plausibly maintained that there is a stress on every ictus, but the point is open to debate, e.g. *Ecl.* 3, 28, 'vis ergo inter nos quid possit uterque vicissim,' the second ictus can scarcely be said to have no stress. In *Ecl.* 8, 73, etc., 'ducite ab urbe domum mea carmina ducite Daphnin,' ictus-stress fails at 'domum mea'; but was 'domum' never pronounced oxytone in Latin? Plaut. *As.* 5, 21, 'Surge amator, i domum.' In other lines elision complicates the question: *Aen.* 6, 422, 'corripit obiectam atque immania terga resolvit,' shows stress on every ictus if 'soporat' and 'obiect' are accented as here marked: on the other hand, *Aen.* 9, 729, 'viderit irrumpentem ultroque incluserit urbi,' does not show stress on every ictus unless the second word was accented 'irrumpént'.

In *Ecl.* 10, 33, 'Arcades O mihi tum quam molliter ossa quiescant,' every ictus is stressed, and coincidence of ictus metricus with word-accent is complete except for the stress on 'quam.' 'O mihi' was probably pronounced as one word, 'mihi' enclitic. These actual or probable word-groups are another element of uncertainty in determining how far Virgil neglected or observed prose accent when he recited his verses. 'Tu quoque magnam' is a normal ending, 'quoque' enclitic. How many discrepancies of accent *v.* ictus are there then in *Aen.* 2, 648, 'demoror ex quo me divom pater atque hominum rex'? Was 'divóm-pater' a word-group like 'Juppiter'? If so, was 'hominúm-rex' also a word-group? If so, then *Aen.* 7, 761=9, 523, 'at Messapus ecúmdomitor, Neptunia proles,' may be another instance of complete correspondence, for there are several lines in which every ictus would be stressed if a choriambic word or group of syllables could be accented $\underline{\quad} \underline{\quad} \underline{\quad} \underline{\quad}$, e.g. *Aen.* 1, 30, 'Troas reliquias Danaum atque inmitis Achilli: *Aen.* 6, 573, 'tum demum horrisono stridentes cardine sacrae; cf. *Ecl.* 2, 4; *Aen.* 1, 45; 3, 280; 5, 791; 6, 61, 234, 264, 265, 279, 285; 8, 162, 214; and, with enclitics, *Aen.* 2, 465, 'impulímúsque'; 6, 279, 'mórtiferámque'; 11, 840, 'ingemútfque.' That choriambic groups

of syllables could be so stressed is proved by their frequent occurrence in pentameters at the beginning of the second half of the line, a place where ictus and stress normally coincide: *Ov. Trist.* 2, 425, 'casurumque triplex vaticinatur opus'; *Ov. Fast.* 1, 156, 'ludit et in pratis luxuriatque pecus.' The same principle might be held to cover lines like *Aen.* 5, 856, 'tempora cunctantique natantia lumina solvit,' where 'cunctánti,' with enclitic 'que,' becomes 'cúnc-tantique': *Aen.* 6, 289; 7, 424; 8, 375; 9, 751; 10, 894; 11, 207. Hexameter verses, in which every ictus would have a stress accent, if the line were read as prose, are much more frequent in Virgil than Dr. Rouse's dictum asserts.

2. Another statement that needs elucidation is that the ictus 'is unfortunately named, for it had no stress upon it, being merely a translation of *théous*, the foot-beat in the dance.' Is there no stress on the foot-beat in the dance? And is ictus a natural translation of *théous*? Why not 'positio'? Why was ictus 'a blow,' 'a beat,' adopted as a technical term? When Horace, *A.P.* 253, speaks of the *senos* ictus of the iambic senarius, he must mean six stresses; and, if so, then the hexameter also must have six ictus, six stresses. If not, how did it come about that authorities on ancient metre used to tell us that the first syllable of the foot in dactylic metres was stressed? E.g. Müller's *Handbuch*, 1890 edit., vol. ii., p. 713: 'Die gewöhnlichen Formen des daktylischen Fusses sind (1) der Daktylos selbst $\underline{\quad} \underline{\quad} \underline{\quad}$, (2) der daktylische Spondeus $\underline{\quad} \underline{\quad}$.' The same authority, p. 714, gives four forms of the Greek dactylic hexameter, of which the first is $\underline{\quad} \underline{\quad} \underline{\quad} \underline{\quad} \underline{\quad} \underline{\quad}$. The first syllable in every foot is indicated as stressed in all four forms. *Ibid.*, p. 688: 'Wahrnehmbar wird die Gliederung der Zeit erst dadurch, dass in einer Reihe von Zeiteinheiten in regelmässiger Folge eine vor den anderen stärker hervorgehoben wird. Diese Hervorhebung geschieht durch *σημαρία*, percussio, ictus.' This authority therefore, in 1890, was of opinion that the first syllable of a foot in dactylic metre was stressed. Until Dr. Rouse can demonstrate that this traditional view of the nature of ictus metricus was erroneous, we may be excused if we continue our pronunciation of Virgil with an ictus, *i.e.* a stress, on the first syllable of every foot. This ictus was caused by the rhythm of the metre itself. But there are also in most of Virgil's hexameters places where the ordinary prose pronunciation would not fit the rhythm of the metre. Thus, putting V above the line for verse ictus, a Virgilian hexameter recited as verse would be, e.g.

v v v v v v

'triste ministerium et subiectam more parentum.'

Read as prose, the same line would be, putting P below the line for prose accent:

P P P P P P

'triste ministerium et subiectam more parentum.'

To what extent this prose pronunciation was heard amid the 'jog-trot,' as Dr. Rouse calls it, of the verse rhythm, is a question on which we should be grateful if Dr. Rouse would give us more light. At present he seems to require us to read Virgil as prose, neglecting the verse ictus altogether, merely taking care to pronounce all long syllables long and short syllables short. But *poë* was not to be read as prose according to Quintilian 1, 8, 2: 'sit autem in primis lectio virilis et cum suavitate quadam gravis, et non quidem *prosaë similis*, quia et carmen est et se poetæ canere testantur.' Quintilian may mean that in reciting hexameters as poetry the ictus metricus was allowed to override ordinary prose accent, producing an effect of unusualness, elevation, heroic epic style. The Latin stress accent was not so strong, nor so irrevocably fixed, in Virgil's day, that words became unintelligible when it was shifted. It may be that in ordinary conversation men said 'cáno,' and when they heard 'canó' they inferred from the unusual accent that 'Arma virumque cano' was not being spoken as prose, but recited 'canora voce' (Petronius, *Sat.* 68, 35) as poetry, much as we infer that English poetry is being recited as poetry when we hear 'wind' pronounced 'wined.' 'Canere' cannot refer to strict observance of prose colloquial accent, it rather indicates an exaggeration of the musical pitch differences between one word and another, and to a sustaining of the length of long syllables 'canora voce.' The six long ictus syllables, recurring regularly, must have produced of themselves, when so sustained, a rhythmic six times repeated stress in every line—whether this is hurdygurdy, jog-trot, and monotonous to modern ears or not. The monotony was varied by the unusual verse pronunciation occurring sometimes only once in a line: 'tantæ molis eræt Romanam condere gentem'; in other lines several times: 'pavillatim adnabam terræ'; in some lines not at all; and by confining the non-prosaically pronounced words as a rule to the centre or beginning of the line, leaving the ending complete harmony between prose pronunciation and verse ictus. Variety was secured even in the ending by occasional admission in the ending of words pronounced as poetry and not as prose.

If Latin hexameters were pronounced as Dr. Rouse maintains, how did Ovid recite his own pentameters? The Ovidian pentameter ends normally || ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘, with prose-stress and verse-ictus coinciding in both of the complete feet. Are we to believe that 'cármina mórtē cárent,' with stress on first syllable of 'cárent' contradicting the rhythm of the rest of the ending, was so grateful to Ovid's ears that he made it his almost invariable norm? Is it not much more probable that a word pronounced distinctly as poetry 'cárent,' and not as prose 'cárent,' formed a pleasing ending and climax to the pentameter, contrasting with the ending of the hexameter in which prose and verse pronunciation coincide?

3. Dr. Rouse says: 'English and Latin are alike, in that they have both stress-accent and quantity.' But the Latin stress-accent was so inconspicuous in literary Latin of the Golden

Age that Cicero can discuss the rhythms of his clausulæ at length without mentioning stress-accent at all. In English, on the contrary, quantity is so inconspicuous that an ordinary Englishman, on Dr. Rouse's showing, requires long practice in light-infantry marching, or with a metronome, before he can understand what quantity is. Therefore the hexameter cannot be Englished by treating it 'in the same way as the Latin.' The attempt to do so results in a cacophonous *reductio ad absurdum*, Tennyson's 'barbarous experiment' in *extenso*. No doubt the Poet Laureate and Dr. Rouse can readily hear the difference between a stressed syllable and a long syllable in English; but for us ordinary folk it is practically impossible to stress a syllable without at the same time lengthening it, and *vice versa*. When Mr. Bridges asks us to stress a short syllable, and realise at the same time that the syllable remains short, we do our best to oblige; but when he demands that we make similar painful efforts over and over again, the best goodwill in the world gets exhausted, and we cease our unavailing struggle to discover any rhythm at all in quantitative English hexameters.

'Those lame hexameters *the* strong-wing'd music of Homer.'

Dr. Rouse may assure us that *the str* is a long syllable: he may even demonstrate it with his metronome; but to our ear *str* belongs not to that syllable, but to the next, *strong*; and even if *the str* were one syllable, it would remain to our ear unstressed, and therefore short, and the line would limp as lame as ever, with second foot gouty and third foot a pyrrhic. When Dr. Rouse demonstrates that 'intelligent man' is a rhythm like 'ridiculus mus,' we admire his subtlety, and say 'intelligent mán!' In English, stress and length generally coincide; when they don't, we obey the stress and neglect the length. 'Presents (noun substantive) is a true iambus.' Very true it may be, but to our ears it sounds a trochee; whereas 'Present arms!' sounds a good bacchius. When we are told that the first syllable of 'rubbish' is short, we reply, 'Rübbish! We regard it as long.'

E. J. BROOKS.

20, Cornwall Road, W. 11.

I AM much obliged to Mr. Brooks for criticising my remarks about the hexameter, and I admit with regret that I expressed the doctrine inaccurately. The one line of the *Aeneid* which I seem to remember as exactly like Ennius's, *i.e.* with an accent on each ictus and no others, I have omitted to note; those quoted by Mr. Brooks all differ in some detail. Thus 5. 591 has only a secondary accent on the first of *indeprénsus* (similar is 9. 348 *absurgénti*, *Ecl.* 9. 60 *appurére*); there is an extra accent, out of ictus—a very effective variant—in 11. 601 *túm*, possibly 1. 500 *átque* (although I do not press this), and so *Ecl.* 1. 70 *tám*, 7. 33 *té*, 10. 33 *míthi* and *quám* (*Ecl.* 5. 32 is normal, there must be some mistake). In *Aen.* 12. 212 the accent is *intér se*, as is well known. After

all, four lines, if exceptions, are not many out of nearly 10,000.

But what has interested me most is to find that, if we examine not single lines, but the verse-period, including the lines before and after which are to be read together, we see Virgil using this device as a kind of relief. I will use for shortness A to represent syllables where the accent falls on the ictus, B those where it falls off, and we thus get (not including the lines quoted) : 1. 498-502, four lines, 10 B : 5 A ; 9. 347-350, three lines, 11 B : 3 A ; 11. 596-602, six lines, 14 B : 4 or 5 A.

Sometimes the exception is in the middle, sometimes at the beginning ; in the passage leading up to Mr. Brooks's crucial exception, it is at the end of one group, but in the middle of the period (*Aen.* 5. 588-95) :

' ut quóndam Créta fértur labyrinthus in alta
pariétibus téxtum cáecis íter áncipitemque
mille vísis habuisse dólum, quá signa sequendi
frangeret índeprensus et ínremeabilis error :'

The variants only are here marked. I am very much mistaken if this beautiful period gives any support to the *strawberry-jam* style of reading. The weak accents on *án-* and *ín-* are an added delicacy. Read and reread !

I cannot forbear adding another example of Virgil's consummate skill in the use of the accent from *G.* 4. 170 (the variants only are marked) :

' ac véluti léntis Cyclopes fulmina massis
cum próperant, álii taurinis follibus auras
accipiunt redduntque, álii stridentia tingunt
aera lácu : gémit ímpósis incudibus Aetna :
illi ínter sése mágna ví bracchia tollunt
in númerum, versantque tenaci forcipe ferrum.'

Can you not hear the hammers in 174. with its short heavy words and regular beats, seven in six feet, no less than four together off the ictus, and all thrown into relief by the soft line that follows ?

The same effect is produced admirably by Plautus in *Men.* 259, contrasted with the resolved *hythms* that precede it :

faciam quod iubes : securim capiam ancipitem,
atque hunc senem
ósse fini dedolábo assulátim víscera,
he actor thumping at each accent.

It would take too long now to discuss the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, but I find the same principle there : we must not read by the line, but by the period. The *Eclogues*, of course, are much less careful, more colloquial, less imposing in every way : and it would not be surprising to find that Virgil was not yet fully master of his rhythm, if indeed any reason were needed beyond the character of the poems. Even here it is Virgil who writes, full of neat touches for the reader who can recognise them. Thus *Eccl.* 8. 80 is a riming jingle, intentionally rude, its style borrowed from those charms of which *arro* and others have left a few :

limus ut hic durescit, et haec ut cera liquescit,
uno eodemque igni, sic nostro Daphnis amore.'

We find the same principle, conflict of ictus and accent, in the *Odes* of Horace also, but differently worked out ; and, oddly enough, he is content with less conflict than Virgil. Plautus and Terence are quite different. In their *diverbia* the accent dominates the whole, but it is certainly remarkable that there is often a conflict in the last foot of the iambic line. I have not examined this question with any care, but Mr. Brooks may rest assured that *dómum* was never pronounced *domúm*. He is at liberty of course to read Virgil with a stress on the ictus, as he seems to wish, but may I not be there to hear it. Verse is of course not similar to prose, but the words must be pronounced as they are in prose, and this applies to all languages. That so many can maintain the contrary is one of the many proofs that very few people can now speak verse, either in Latin or in English.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

GREEK IN SCOTLAND.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN the last number of the *Classical Review* my friend Professor Harrower quotes me as saying that the position of Greek in Scotland is 'very satisfactory.' This conveys a wrong impression of my meaning. What I actually said in my little book on *Higher Education and the War* (p. 206) was : 'So far, then, the position of Greek in Scotland' must be regarded as very satisfactory.' The emphatic words are 'so far,' and the context shows that the sentence refers to the case of those who have studied Greek for two or three years at a good secondary school before coming to college. In the next section of the same chapter I go on to discuss certain very important respects in which the position of Greek in Scotland is anything but satisfactory, though it might easily be made so. The fact is that there are a great many boys, and girls too, in the country districts who would study Greek eagerly if they got the chance, but who never get it ; and that, even in the secondary schools, there are many who are not allowed to take Greek, and who find it indispensable later on. I have mentioned one case in the footnote to p. 176 of my book, and I am constantly coming across them. At the present moment I am dealing with two. One is that of a lad from the country who has taken his degree in Arts and who has been two years in the army. When he leaves it he wishes to study for the Church, but he has never had the chance of learning Greek at any time. The English lecturer in our training college very kindly helped him over the declensions and the verbs in *-ω*, and when he comes back from service we shall have to teach him *τίθημι, δίδωμι*, and the rest of it. He is determined to learn Greek, and I believe he will ; but is it fair to him ? The other case is that of a woman student who turned out to be the best Latin scholar of her year, but who did not know a word of Greek. Of course her Latin is no use to her without Greek, and she has had to give up her vacation to acquiring the elements of that language with

such help as she can get from friends who know it. Yet she was at a school where Greek is taught. The trouble in this case is the necessity of gaining a leaving certificate. The schools naturally wish to get as many of these as possible, and so they do not encourage their pupils to take up a new language at an advanced stage of their course. Greek is begun late, and is, therefore, most easily shelved. It is still worse in the case of the country lad who does not discover his vocation till he is fifteen or so. He cannot as a rule hope to get a leaving certificate at all, and the machinery of our secondary schools leaves him quite out of account. This is a very serious matter from a social point of view, as most of the success Scotland has had in the past was due to students of this type. In former days they struggled into college somehow, and often distinguished themselves greatly when they got there. It is still just possible for such a lad to emerge, but he is discouraged by the regulation of the Carnegie Trust, which confines the benefits of that institution to those who are fortunate enough to have a regular secondary course and to gain a leaving certificate. That condition can easily be satisfied by those who live in or near a town, but it is very hard on those born in the country, and in this way the Carnegie Trust has introduced a novel and most undesirable social stratification in Scotland. Under the present system James Adam would probably have been 'turned down,' and W. R. Hardie, who never was at a secondary school, would not have been eligible as a candidate for a leaving certificate. I agree entirely with Professor Harrower as to all this, and I also agree with his condemnation of the 'dehumanised and desiccated methods' fostered by our pretentious system of entrance examinations. As a distinguished French scholar once said to me, these are based on the principle of *la poudre aux yeux*. Professor Harrower is perfectly right in saying that we have to do more elementary teaching in the Universities now than we had under the old system. Personally, I do not object, as I like elementary teaching. What is really hard is that the 'lad of parts' should be compelled to take up a new language after he has come to college, when it would be quite possible, with a little forethought, to give him at least a year of Greek first. We cannot, however, expect our small School Boards to understand this kind of thing. It may be that the authorities of the larger areas which we are promised will be capable of seeing it. The fundamental fact is that the demand for Greek in Scotland is considerably greater than the supply, and this will have to be adjusted somehow.

JOHN BURNET.

St. Andrews.

I REGRET if I have involuntarily misrepresented Professor Burnet's meaning. But the sentences immediately following the words he quotes above, 'So far, then,' etc., appeared to me an elucidation of his contention. They read thus: 'It is quite true that compulsory Greek has disappeared, and that there are fewer people

now who know the Greek alphabet and have a bowing acquaintance with Greek declensions and conjugations and the *Anabasis* of Xenophon. That, however, is more than made up for by the increased number of students who really know Greek'—viz. 'those who take it up as a subject for an Honours degree.' That is a view to which I cannot subscribe, for it ignores the calamitous loss of the good passman in Greek.

I need not say that I rejoice to have Professor Burnet's powerful support for so much in my articles.

J. HARROWER.

September 18, 1917.

DEIGMA, A FIRST GREEK BOOK.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN a notice of this book in the June number of the *Classical Review* Mr. R. B. Appleton has shown commendable zeal in correcting a wrong accent, which indeed ought not to have strayed, since it is typical of a characteristic peculiarity of the development of the accent in Greek.

But in doing so he has attributed, or allowed his printer to attribute, to us a monstrosity of which we are innocent. Grave as our ignorance appears, it did not extend to printing the name of Aeschylus as a quadrisyllable. For our 'Αἴσχυλος' instead of Αἰσχύλος we are deeply contrite; but we must leave it to the reviewer to discuss with his editors and printers the genesis of "Αἴσχυλος."

One even stranger misrepresentation should perhaps be set right. We do not know from what source the same reviewer drew his theory that we intended the book to be used to the end without the reading of any Greek authors; he certainly could not have found it in our Preface: see pp. v and ix, and especially the footnote on p. vii.

In the same place we have expressed fully our view of the standpoint from which he now condemns the book. To the Preface and to the book itself we refer any of your readers who may desire to estimate the accuracy and importance of his other comments.

R. S. CONWAY.

Manchester,
August, 1917.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

ORDINARILY I do not believe in answering reviewers; but my first impression of the unfairness of Mr. S. G. Owen's notice (*Class. Rev.*, 1915, pp. 184-5) of the Loeb Library *Heroides and Amores* has been so deepened by a second examination in connection with a revision of the volume for another printing that I feel a word of protest is due as a matter of justice. Whether objection to 'I began' for *coepi* (*H. VI. 31*) where *coepi* is in the same sentence and line with the perfect definite *rediit*, or to 'the wind bellies out the sail' for *ventus concava vela tenet* (*ibid. 66*) because it ignores *tenet* (does it?) and translates *vela* by the singular (for reasons not hard to discover), is good criticism or mere

captiousness may be left to any reader to judge. Imperfections like the omission of *adductis* (*H. X.* 15) may be similarly carped at on almost any page of any translation. They represent a difficulty whose perfect solution is impossible. If criticism of this kind is to be heeded, translators in future who, for the sake of emphasis, vividness, euphony, rhythm, the poetic touch, or other desirable effect, deviate from the narrow path of strict literalness, will have to justify themselves in footnotes in order to be safe from reviewers, who may otherwise think them deficient in the knowledge of mood, tense, case, or number.

Farther, in spite of his admonition to study more carefully the editions of Palmer and Shuckburgh, Mr. Owen arbitrarily declares wrong in nine instances interpretations which are in agreement with either Palmer or Shuckburgh, or both. Surely, in company with authority approved by himself, one may be permitted to differ from him without incurring quite such dogmatic disapproval.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

Classical Review, p. 140, for G. Norwood read C. Norwood.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- British Association.* Report on Science Teaching in Secondary Schools. 8½" × 5½". Burlington House, 1917. 1s. net.
- British School at Athens* (Annual of). No. XXI. 10" × 7½". Pp. viii + 238, with 15 plates. London: Macmillan and Co., 1917. Half cloth, 21s. net.
- Byrne* (M. J.) Prolegomena to an Edition of the Works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius. 9" × 6". Pp. viii + 102. Oxford University Press, for Columbia University Press, 1917. Cloth, 5s. 6d. net.
- Eitrem* (S.) Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte. II. Kathartisches und Rituelles. 10½" × 7". Pp. 50. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1917.
- Fowler* (W. W.) Aeneas at the Site of Rome. Observations on Aeneid Book VIII. 7½" × 5½". Pp. x + 128. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1917. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Hancock* (J. L.) Studies in Stichomythia (Doctor's dissertation). 9½" × 6¾". Pp. vi + 98. Chicago: University Press, 1917.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Vol. XXVIII. 9" × 6". Pp. vi + 236. Oxford University Press, 1917. Paper boards, 6s. 6d.
- Horace* (and his age). A Study in Historical Background, by J. F. D'Alton. 7½" × 5". Pp. xii + 296. London: Longmans and Co., 1917. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Kyriakides* (A.) English Greek Dictionary of Idioms, Proverbs, and Phrases. 5¾" × 4½". Pp. x + 908. London: Williams and Norgate, 1916. Cloth.
- Lacey* (R. H.) The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian: Their Careers with some Notes on Hadrian's Reforms (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9" × 6". Pp. viii + 88. Princeton University Press, 1917.
- Laurand* (L.) Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines. Fasc. IV.: Géographie, Histoire, Institutions romaines. 9" × 5½". Pp. 379-488 + xxv-xxxii. Paris: A. Picard, 1917. Fr. 2.
- Pallis* (A.) The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans (a paraphrase). 8¾" × 6". Liverpool: Booksellers Company, 1917.
- Plotinus* (the Ethical Treatises). Translated by Stephen Mackenna. Vol. I. 11" × 8". Pp. 160. London: P. Lee Warner, 1917. Half cloth, 16s. net.
- Sepulcrum Joannis Pascoli* (Carmen praemio aureo ornatum). Accedunt decem carmina laudata. 10" × 6½". Amsterdam: J. Müller, 1917.
- Taylor* (A. E.) Plato's Biography of Socrates (British Academy Proceedings, No. VIII.). 9½" × 6". Pp. 40. Oxford University Press, 1917. 2s. 6d. net.
- Walters* (C. F.) and *Conway* (R. S.) Ad Limen: being Reading Lessons and Exercises for a Second and Third Year Course in Latin. 7½" × 5". Pp. xi + 129. London: John Murray, 1917. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Westaway* (K. M.) The Original Element in Plautus. 6½" × 5". Pp. xii + 82. Cambridge University Press, 1917. Cloth.

ALTERATION IN PRICE.—Owing to the increase in the cost of materials, the price of cases for binding volumes of the CLASSICAL REVIEW is advanced to 2s. 6d. These may be obtained from any bookseller; postage 4d. extra.