

The Editor, THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—We trust that we shall not seem ungrateful if we venture to offer a few comments on the review of *Limen* (C.R. June).

I. Prof. Postgate describes the book as containing 'grammar, reading lessons, questions upon them, and exercises with conversations.' Although the last two points of his description are in a sense correct, they are, we think, likely to give a wrong idea of the book; for, while we hold with Dr. Postgate that conversation in Latin upon suitable topics may be made a valuable part of teaching, we have laid down definitely in our Appendix that the plan of the conversations ought to be the spontaneous work of the teacher. This Appendix, which contains hints upon and examples of oral exercises, is for the use of teachers only; from the book itself we have deliberately excluded any conversations which the pupils who use it are expected to repeat, since we have observed the deadening effect of putting into the hands of a class questions and answers ready made. But we have added to the Appendix three Latin Dialogues such as a class can perform (and these can be obtained separately); while in the Reading Lessons in the book itself we have done our best to provide topics of sufficient interest to be the theme of questions and answers. The first three of them, while the pupil has learnt as yet no Cases but the Nominative, Accusative, and Vocative, are in the form of conversations, and here Dr. Postgate criticises as 'unnatural' the boy's exclamation, *O Iuppiter* (when his oar falls into the water). Our choice was between (1) using this phrase; (2) using *Iuppiter* alone, which would have been more lively but much more difficult for a beginner; and (3), as Dr. Postgate would prefer, using no exclamation at all. We submit in view of the colloquial colour of passages like Plaut. *Merc.* v. 2. 24, and the English school-boy's favourite appeal to this particular god, that we have chosen the least evil of the three.

II. The only important point on which Dr. Postgate would seem to differ from us is the difficult matter of the rule for questions in Oratio Obliqua. Dr. Postgate's words are: 'The statement that rhetorical questions, the answer to which is not known or clearly foreshadowed, are put into the Subjunctive, is insufficient. Such questions, if a first or second person is concerned, are normally put into the Infinitive.' (We venture to assume that in the last sentence the word 'second' is a clerical error for 'third.') Now this criticism scarcely represents our statement of the rule. On page 289 we define '*Rhetorical*' questions as being those 'To which the answer is known or clearly foreshadowed'; and these, we say, are regularly put into the Infinitive. In the next sentence we define *real questions* as 'those to which the answer is not immediately clear'; and these latter, we say, are treated like Dependent Questions, and put into the Subjunctive. To this last statement Dr. Postgate seems to demur, and he suggests that we

ought to have introduced the criterion of the Person who is the Subject in the question. We are glad that our account should be 'insufficient,' provided only that it is true so far as it goes, for we do not think that a First Latin Book is the place for a discussion of the complex and often inconsistent usage of Latin authors in this matter. The difficulty of the topic will be at once apparent to your readers if we remind them that Dr. Postgate's present statement is hardly consistent with his own description of the use [on page 192 of the *New Latin Primer* (Edition 1898)] where he gives four rules, of which the first is that 'Questions in the Subjunctive in Oratio Recta remain in the Subjunctive in Oratio Obliqua'; such questions, namely, as *quid faciam?* 'What am I to do?' which becomes, of course, *quid faceret*. This appears to us to be a Question to which the answer is not clearly known. It is a Question in the First Person, and yet, as we all know, and as Dr. Postgate himself quite correctly stated in his *Primer*, it is put into the Subjunctive. In these circumstances, we decided that the right course to adopt was to put the learner at once into possession of the real principle which underlies the complexity, and leave him to study the inconsistencies in its application by different authors at a later period. That principle is that if, and only if, the question in O. R. is equivalent to a statement it is regularly represented in O. O. by the construction proper to an oblique statement, *i.e.* by the Accusative and Infinitive. The general principle appeared to us to be worth grasping at the outset; the variations of usage ought not, we think, to be studied by learners till a later stage. But the serious misconception into which our critic has been led by supposing that we used the term 'rhetorical' as he has used it, namely, to include all questions of every kind that are asked in the course of a speech, has now determined us to discard the term 'rhetorical' altogether. It will disappear from our second edition, where we contrast *real questions* with *artificial questions* without insisting on the use of either term.

III. As to the English derivatives from Present and Supine-stems, are we not perhaps rather hardly treated? By the time that the Supine was introduced, every inch of our pages was urgently wanted for more important matters than the derivation of single English words. But we made room in three Exercises (pp. 95, 110, 112) for this distinction, feeling confident that when it had been clearly indicated every competent teacher would from that point onwards insist upon the difference in any derivation that he might ask or give. If the Supine could speak, we fancy it would be more inclined to thank us than to grumble. For similar reasons at a more advanced stage (p. 141) we have once given a list of English words whose meaning has been largely changed from that of their Latin originals, asking the learner to point out the nature of the changes. But we have not thought it necessary to make room for such examples at any later point.

IV. Finally, we are sorry that our policy on the insoluble question on the use of the Hyphen in printing paradigms, is not entirely such as Dr. Postgate approves. For the most part we have cut the knot by not using it at all; but in some places it appeared to us (as on p. 299) far more helpful to the learner to print, for instance, the Imperfect Subjunctive thus:—

}	rem, etc.
amā-	
monē-	
rege-	
audī-	
cape-	

than to print *am-ārem, mon-ērem* and so forth, which is the principle that Dr. Postgate recommends. His

particular example is chosen from the 5th Declension, and there we still venture to think that our division *diē-s* contrasted with *gradu-s* in the immediately preceding pages is of some help to the learner. But we have reserved the symbol for such cases.

May we conclude by cordially thanking Dr. Postgate for the praise he has given us, which we count a welcome reward for the hard work which the book involved?

Yours faithfully,

C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS.
R. S. CONWAY.

London,
Manchester, } July 8th, 1909.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

*** Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Amico Monita rebus novis adversanti.* Carmen Francisci Tranquillini Moltedo Neapolitani in certamine poetico Hoefftiano magna laude ornatum. 10" × 6½". Pp. 16. Amsterdam, J. Muller. 1909.
- Ashburner* (Walter) *Νόμος Ροδίων Ναυτικός.* The Rhodian Sea-Law. Edited from the Manuscripts by W. A., M.A. 9" × 5½". Pp. ccxcvi + 132. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Cloth, 18s. net. (\$5.75.)
- Braun* (Franz) Die Entwicklung der spanischen Provinzialgrenzen in römischer Zeit. (*Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie, herausgegeben von W. Sieglin. Heft 17.*) 9¾" × 6½". Pp. 140. Berlin, Weidmann. 1909. M. 5.
- Cavenagh* (Francis A.) The Ethical End of Plato's Theory of Ideas. 9" × 5¾". Pp. 90. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto, and Melbourne. 1909. 2s.
- Dellefsen* (D.) Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius und ihre Quellen. (*Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie, herausgegeben von W. Sieglin. Heft 18.*) 9¾" × 6½". Pp. viii + 172. Berlin, Weidmann. 1909. M. 6.
- Diels* (Hermann) Herakleitos von Ephesos. Griechisch und Deutsch. Zweite Auflage. 9¾" × 6". Pp. xvi + 84. Berlin, Weidmann. 1909. M. 3.20.
- Hoorn* (G. van) De Vita atque cultu puerorum monumentis antiquis explanatio. Dissertatio Inauguralis. 11¼" × 8¾". Pp. viii (?) + 98 + vi. Amsterdam, J. H. De Bussy. 1909.
- Horace.* The Satires. With introduction and notes by Edward P. Morris. 7½" × 5". Pp. 254. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, The American Book Company. 1909. Cloth.
- Liverpool Committee for Excavation and Research in Wales and the Marches First Annual Report, 1908.* 10¼" × 7¼". Pp. 86, with 16 Plates. Liverpool, University Press. 1909.
- Livy.* Book IX. Edited with introduction, notes, etc., by W. B. Anderson, M.A. (*Pitt Press Series.*) 7" × 4½". Pp. xxiv + 276. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth.
- Paulys Real Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Neue Bearbeitung. Unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen, herausgegeben von Georg Wissowa. Zwölfter Halbband. Euxantios-Fornaces. 9¾" × 6½". Pp. 769-1438 (columns 1537-2876.) Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler. 1909. M. 15.
- Pohlenz* (M.) De Ciceronis Tusculanis disputationibus. Ad Praemiorum a quattuor ordinibus propositorum publicam Renuntiationem quae fiet die IX Mensis Junii A. MDCCCXCIX hora XII, huius Academiae cives et qui eius studiis favent invitant Universitatis Georgiae Augustae Prorector et Senatus. 10" × 7". Pp. 38. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht. 1909.
- Postgate* (J. P.) Flaws in Classical Research. (*From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. III.*) 9¾" × 6¼". Pp. 52. London, Henry Frowde. 1909. 3s. 6d. net.
- Salt* (Henry S.) Some Thoughts from Lucretius. (*Reprinted from the Humane Review, July, 1909.*) 8½" × 5½". Pp. 12.
- Sex Carmina in certamine poetico Hoefftiano magna laude ornata.* 10" × 6½". Amsterdam, J. Muller. 1909.
- Watson* (Foster) The English Grammar Schools in 1660: their Curriculum and Practice. 7¾" × 4¾". Pp. x + 548. Cambridge, University Press. 1908. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Webb* (Clemens C. J.) Joannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri VIII, recognovit et prolegomenis, apparatus critico, commentario, indicibus instruxit C. C. J. Webb, A.M. 9¼" × 5¾". Tom. I. Pp. i (50) 368. Tom. II. Pp. viii + 512. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Cloth, 36s. net.