

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

Professor Conway and his work command my affectionate admiration, but when he takes Professor Butler to task for speaking of the 'Fourth *Georgic*,' it becomes a duty to protest. He supports his criticism by a factitious analogy, a baseless statement, and what after deliberation I must interpret as a jest.

When he speaks of 'Aristotle's Third *Ethic*,' as a parallel expression to the 'Fourth *Georgic*,' the only reply is that educated people, not slovenly of speech, habitually use the one expression, while no one uses the other. There is no more to be said. Next the Professor asserts that to use the name *Georgic* in the singular robs it of part of its meaning. In one sense only is this true: a *Georgic* means one quarter

of the *Georgics*. Lastly, when he fancies that 'schoolboys' are left to connect the name subconsciously with the Hanoverian dynasty, I can only suppose that he is being pleasant with us. Well and good, but by implication this 'Hanoverian theory' arises from the singular use of the word. Come, come, Professor!

The fact is, we all speak of the 'Fourth *Georgic*,' the 'Sixth *Aeneid*,' the 'First *Iliad*,' and never dream of asking for authority. But if literary authority is required, we can have it. The writers quoted in Murray's Dictionary as using the singular form, *Georgic*, are those two purists Joseph Addison and Thomas Gray. Can Professor Conway find half so good a pedigree for his *Vergil*?

Yours faithfully,
A. L. IRVINE.

Charterhouse, Godalming.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(OCTOBER—DECEMBER, 1921.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—W. A. Kosten, *Inquiritur quid Xenophontis Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία valeat ad Lacedaemoniorum instituta cognoscenda* [Diss. inaug. Rheno-Traiect., 1921] (Gemoll). Much material collected, but the work as a whole is not a success.

LATIN LITERATURE.—A. Kurfess, *Sallusti Crispi epistulae ad Caesarem senem de re publica* [Leipzig, 1921, Teubner. M. 2 + 120%] (Levy). Welcome and reliable edition based on Hauler's collation of Vaticanus (Wien. Stud. 17); useful indices.—G. Thörnell, *Studia Tertulliana, II.* [Uppsala, 1921, Akad. Bocktryckerie] (Tolkiehn). Marks an advance in the criticism and exegesis of Tertullian as well as in the knowledge of his peculiar language.—C. Giarratano, *Q. Asconii Pediani commentarii* [Rome, 1920] (Klotz). Thoroughly useful edition.—W. Rinkefeil, *De adnotationibus super Lucanum* [Diss. Greifswald. Dresden, 1917, Ramming] (Hosius). Methodical and on the whole convincing investigation of the second body of Lucan scholia.—W. A. Merrill, *Notes on the Silvae of Statius, Books I.-IV.* [University of California Publications, Vol. V., 1918-1920] (Hosius). Superficial. Reviewer criticises several passages.—G. Janell, *P. Vergili Maronis opera. Post Ribbeckium tertium recogn. Editio maior* [Leipzig, 1920, Teubner] (Güthling). Eradicates Ribbeck's wild conjectures and on the whole successfully restores the true text; cannot be overlooked by those specially interested in Vergil.—Alice H. Byrne, *Titus Pomponius Atticus. Chapters of Biography* [Diss. Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, 1920] (Klotz). Failure to draw a living portrait of Atticus is largely due to the insufficient material.—V. Ussani, *Rutilii Claudii*

Namatiani de reditu suo libri II. [Florence, 1921, Perrella. L. 6] (Levy). Contains introduction, text, critical notes, and index, but leaves room for another edition. V. Wiesner, *Donatiana. Die Interpretationes Vergilianae des Ti. Claudius Donatus sprachlich untersucht* [Diss. Würzburg. Bamberg, 1920, Kirsch] (Hofmann). W., a pupil of Stangl, is a thoroughly competent late Latin scholar; his excellent chapter on the text is carefully discussed by reviewer.—Gladys Martin, *Laus Pisonis* [Cornell University, 1917] (Hosius). Deals with the anonymous Panegyricus in Pisonem; tradition and personalities discussed clearly and soberly; sensible and sufficient notes form the most valuable portion of the work.

HISTORY AND INSTITUTIONS.—J. de Decker, *De Grieksche en Romeinsche Oudheiden en de Philosophie der Geschiedenis* [Gent, 1918, de Veirman] (Kraemer). Reviewer gives very full account of D.'s academic address, and agrees with most of his argument.—A. Heisenberg, *Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiogenzeit* [Sitz.-Ber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. München, 1920, Franz] (Wellnhofer). Admirable treatment of a number of difficult Byzantine questions; in particular, much new light is thrown on court-ceremonial.—W. J. Snellman, *De interpretibus Romanorum deque linguae latinae cum aliis nationibus commercio. Pars I.: Enarratio; Pars II.: Testimonia veterum* [Leipzig, 1914-1919, Dieterich. M. 10 each part] (Hofmann). Part II. is a valuable collection of all ancient evidence on the cultural relations between Rome and her subject peoples; Part I. seeks to explain the material collected, but is little more than a mere paraphrase, faulty both in language and in interpretation.—W. E. Caldwell, *Hellenic Conceptions of Peace* [Studies edited by the Faculty of Political Science of