

sort of way? At p. 23, 5, I should say 'b ex p,' not 'b ex u.' P. 26, 8, *capitibus* (om. T) is absent from the text, though it is in the index. P. 32, 6, I have recorded *precursorem* as the reading of T also. P. 34, 6, the cross stroke crosses the stem of the 'h' in 'ioh.' P. 43, 13, it might have been explained that 'amartiis' is the ἀμαρτίας of the Greek; that *amartia* had some vogue in Latin is suggested by the *Amartigenia* (so the MSS.) of Prudentius. There are misprints on pp. 9 and 42.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Neue Wege zur Antike VIII. Pp. 117. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Paper, RM. 5. THE eighth issue of *Neue Wege zur Antike*—a notice of which should have appeared in this journal more than a year and a half ago—consists of three excellent lectures given at Breslau with reports of the discussions that followed. Dr. Walther Kranz gives suggestions for the best courses of Platonic reading in the gymnasium with a survey of some recently discussed problems that can be treated with advantage to the pupils. With remarkable lucidity Professor Alfred Körte surveys the field of research in the study of Greek choric metres. In the discussion that followed the pious hope was expressed that from the earliest stages of teaching more attention in future will be given to the sound of verse. Professor Wolfgang Schade-waldt of Königsberg (in the longest of the three lectures as here reported) makes some sane criticism of Tycho von Wilamowitz, and suggests

how the ἦθος of the main characters in Sophocles is unfolded. Schade-waldt takes for his purpose the 'deception' speech of Ajax and the end of Antigone's last long speech (ll. 913 ff.). Ajax reveals a true change of mood, and though there is an element of 'deception'—necessary for technical reasons so that the chorus and Tecmessa may not know his true purpose—the Greek audience would not be concerned much with the psychology of the deception since during the acting of the scene it would be under the spell of the new self-restraint of Ajax, and would be realizing that he had indeed learnt to 'yield to the Gods.' Antigone, when faced with necessity for action, had not allowed herself to doubt, but when death is certain she can in her shaken faith even envisage the possibility of the 'other side' being right. Both the ὀμοκρατής Ajax and Antigone with her ὀμὸν γέννημα remain true to their strong natures, yet both undergo in some sense a change of attitude which has the effect of revealing them more to the audience. Though not professing great originality this study is interesting and to a large extent sound. In the opinion of the present reviewer too much is made of the parallel between the two characters and their ἀντινομία, while not sufficient stress is laid on the difference between the change of mood experienced by each. The best thing in the lecture is the suggestion of the senses in which characterization in Sophocles is and is not 'psychological.'

S. K. JOHNSON.

University College of Swansea.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

Δωρίσδεν δ'έξεσσι, δοκῶ, τοῖς Δωρίεσσι.

The last time that I was accused in your columns of lapsing into transatlantic idiom was when I neglected to protect by marks of quotation a phrase of Keats' *Ode to a Nightingale*, which I could trust my American readers to recognize.¹ This time my offense seems to be that I tried to capture the benevolence of an undergraduate audience by beginning my talk with a mild undergraduate jest which I said that I had overheard on the campus. Seriously, a reviewer has a right to his preferences, his prejudices even, but is it quite cricket according to the best British practice in a review of a book that contains six lectures to give half your space to 'slating' one of them and to omit all mention of the main content and interest of that one? Instead of a balanced estimate leaning, if you please, to severity, your reviewer has nothing to offer but the inevitable gibe at Americanisms, an angry retort to a polemical digression which did well enough in the lecture but might perhaps have been judiciously omitted in the printing, and a sneer at three obvious and unimportant inaccuracies. One of these is entirely insignificant and if admitted would

commit the reviewer to the admission that I quote and translate Sophocles from memory; a second depends on the reviewer's captious interpretation of my meaning; and the third is at the worst a careless inference from a single line about a minor link in the action off the stage. None of them concerns Greek scholarship or the thought or style of Sophocles. Any reviewer might be thanked for correcting such slips of the pen. No fair-minded reviewer would harp on them to make an invidious point. Your reviewer seems to wish to convey the impression that he is dealing with a crude ignorant enthusiast who may love Sophocles, but knows very little about him. Does he believe that? Does he really think that the style of the lecture is that of the προλαλιά to the students? Does he sincerely believe that, because I somewhat ambiguously abbreviated a transition in order to bring in quotations from Schiller and Matthew Arnold, I thought that Philoctetes is a character in the *Trachiniae* and that Sophocles actually changed the scene to the summit of Mount Oeta?

Yours truly,

PAUL SHOREY.

¹ [C.R. XIV (1900), pp. 230, 289.]