result of the new programme, general culture was declining and with it the power to think, compose, and write.

'The idea was to teach French alone, to do away, they were told, with dead languages and the history of a profitless past. According to critics, the result had been that Latin had lost its educative force, that there was no Greek to second Latin, while French had become a special subject like the rest and was perishing.

'The modern student, it was said, could not write French and did not think. Taste, composition, and style were going. Minute specialisation took the place of study of the great authors, and savants took the place of humanists.'

'Doing away with dead languages and the history of a profitless past,' does not, apparently, bring the millennium after all! Well—England is still at the parting of the ways.

CORRESPONDENCE

ARISTOTLE'S POETICS.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

Mr. Hamilton-Fyfe, in the Classical Review for this month, in his comments upon Aristotle's Poetics, ch. xxi. § 5, seems to take it for granted that $la\mu\beta\sigma\sigma\omega\epsilon\ell\nu$ means 'to write hexameters.' May it not equally well be translated 'to write iambics.' The two confessedly corrupt, and unsuccessfully emended lines, if read accentually, quantity being disregarded, make comic senarii of a sort, thus:

1. Ἐπιχά	ρην εί	δον Μαρα	θῶνά	δε βαδίξ
οντα				
2. οὖκ αν βορον	γερά	μενος τόν	έκεί-	νου έλλέ

all accented syllables being counted as long, and unaccented as short. The only foot that is faulty is No. 4 in line 1—but I think that one MS. reads Μαραθωνάδε. May not ἐκτείνειν ἐφ' ὁπόσον βούλεται mean 'to make an accented syllable being shortened? It is a strange fact that a modern Greek would consider these lines iambics, and no amount of torturing them by emendations and addition of letters could twist them into accentual hexameters for him.

I should say laμβοποιήσας ἐν αὐτῆ τῆ λέξει might mean 'taking the speech (in which the passages occur) just as it stands, and turning it into iambics.'

ALFRED D. COPE.

The Rectory, Little Bromley, Manningtree.

December 31, 1910.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

Re ARISTOTLE, POET. 1458b 7.

MR. FYFE replies:

I did not translate $la\mu\beta o\pi o\iota e \bar{\iota} \nu$ as 'to write hexameters.' I took it to mean simply to 'parody,' like $la\mu\beta l \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ with the sense of 'lambic metre' inert in the word. In the whole of this passage Aristotle is speaking of the proper use of poetic licence and drawing his examples now from Epic, now from Tragedy. At this particular point his attention is fixed on Epic, as is shown by the words $\dot{\epsilon}\pi \dot{\iota} \tau \hat{o}\nu \ \dot{\epsilon}\pi \hat{o}\nu$ in l. 16. It therefore seems probable that Eucleides was making fun of the incontinent use of poetic licence in Epic and that his lines are therefore mock hexameters.

They can be forced into almost any metre. It seems more natural to suppose them to be meant for hexameters, both for the reason given already and because this particular licence of lengthening short syllables by 'ictus' is characteristic of Epic. The pet licence of Tragedy is noted below in the allusion to Ariphrades. I doubt very much if $la\mu\beta\sigma\pi\sigma\iota\dot{\eta}\sigma as$ $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $a\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\eta}$ $\tau\dot{\eta}$ $\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\xi}\epsilon\iota$ could bear the meaning he suggests, and, anyway, why should Eucleides want to turn it into comic senarii? To suit the context he must have turned it into either tragic iambics or hexameters: the latter, I still think.

Merton College, Oxford. January 8, 1911.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

THE emendation in Plutarch's Life of Lycurgus (Classical Review, 24, 240) has not been neglected, but approved by the best editor of the Vitae, Sintenis, I Lips., 1884, p. ix and (text) 83, 27 (Bibl. Teubner).

H. DIELS, LL.D

Berlin, December 18, 1910.