The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

***English Literature and the Classics.* Collected by G. S. Gordon. 8vo., pp. 252. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6s. net.**

R. B. Appleton

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 06 / September 1914, pp 213 - 213

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00007745, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00007745

How to cite this article:

R. B. Appleton (1914). The Classical Review, 28, pp 213-213 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00007745

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

46. There is nothing to be gained by this kind of thing.

In vi. 29 an inaccuracy of Halm's is repeated. Walther never read 'Sex-tilia,' he only preferred it, and the same is true of Halm's 'poscebantque' in xiii. 52. But Walther, in xiii. 20, did suggest 'si qui,' and should be credited with it, and in the same chapter Puteolanus should be credited with 'et ex.' Lipsius put the beginning of Book VI.

at chapter xi., not at chapter vii. This is another error inherited from the fourth edition.

However, these are small matters. The truth remains that not since Rhenanus, Froben's reader at Basle, has any single scholar done more for the text of Tacitus, than the reviser of this fifth edition of the *Annals*.

C. D. FISHER.

Christ Church, Oxford.

SHORT NOTICES

English Literature and the Classics. Collected by G. S. GORDON. 8vo., pp. 252. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6s. net.

THIS is a collection of nine lectures by Oxford scholars on the influence of classics in the history of literature. The titles are *Tragedy*, by Gilbert Murray, *Platonism* by J. A. Stewart, *Theophrastus* by G. S. Gordon, *Greek Romances* by J. S. Phillimore, *Ciceronianism* by A. C. Clark, *Vergil* by H. W. Garrod, *Ovid* by S. G. Owen, *Satura* by R. J. E. Tiddy and *Senecan Tragedy* by A. D. Godley. The essays vary much in merit from that of a mere uninspired catalogue of parallels between Ovid and English writers from Chaucer downwards, to that of a real appreciation of the subject in question. Mr. Garrod on Virgil as 'half a Celt' is excellent; we have rarely read anything so good within so short a space. Prof. Stewart makes a good distinction between what he calls *personal* and *traditional* Platonism and compares the *Platonic mood* with Wordsworth's 'amplitude of mind' which pictures in tranquillity 'nature's living images.' His essay embodies much of that very spirit of Plato which made *The Myths of Plato* so remarkable a work. The essay on Theophrastus contains very interesting remarks on the connection between character-writing and comedy, 'to every Theophrastus his Menander,' and the whole collection should be very valuable to students of English literature. It should also help to jog the classical

scholar out of any rut into which he may have sunk by presenting to him a wider outlook upon his subject.

R. B. APPLETON.

Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin. By F. W. WESTAWAY. Cambridge: University Press. 1913.

MR. WESTAWAY's heart is in the right place; that is, in what the present reviewer regards as the right place. He is a thoroughgoing adherent of the reformed pronunciation of Latin, and, as that reform still needs advocates in some quarters, his little book will do good service. He has clearly given a considerable amount of attention to the subject, and he writes with conviction. Some points I find very happily put, e.g. his statements about doubled consonants (p. 30), his rules of syllable division (pp. 32, 33), his protest against reading Latin verse with an 'ictus' after the school-boy fashion (p. 88). But some matters of detail call for reconsideration, e.g., the comparison of the Latin diphthong æ with the German ā, which is not a diphthong (p. 11), and the accentuation of words like *cunctāne*, *respicēdum* (p. 69); here the writer puts the accent on the syllable preceding the enclitic, as in *virūmque*. This point has been set at rest by Wagener. And why should the accentuation *intēr nos* be ruled out (p. 71)? Cf. *apūd me*. The writer seems never to have heard of the accentuation on the first syllable of words of the