

introduced in addition to those warranted by the errata in the German edition, are a few corrections of indisputable mistakes; the change of *perduellis* (ii. p. 234 = 538) to *perduellio* would appear then to be an accident. The pagination of the original is given in the margin, and a full index is promised, the German one being insufficient. The tribute which the translator pays to the author may be quoted here: 'Il fallait, en effet, pour répondre aux exigences de tous

dans le domaine du droit pénal, réunir les connaissances du jurisconsulte, de l'historien et du philologue; or Mommsen les possédait toutes à un degré rare. Conçu et exécuté par un tel savant, le livre ne pouvait être qu'une œuvre magistrale appelée à une grande renommée et à un long avenir. Les espérances n'ont pas été déçues et tous les juges compétents s'accordent à reconnaître que l'édifice construit est "solide comme le granit."

NEWS AND COMMENTS

MR. B. G. TEUBNER (Leipzig) asks purchasers of Brandt's *Eclogae Poetarum Latinorum* to communicate with him, if they have any suggestions to make as to a new edition. He wishes to know whether they find the selection meets their wants, or whether they would recommend any change, omission, or addition. Letters may be addressed to Mr. Nutt.

THE two longest papers in the *Classical Quarterly* for April are Mr. T. W. Allen's dissertation on the meaning of Argos in Homer and Mr. A. T. Martin's examination of an inscription to Mars found at Caerwent. Mr. Cook Wilson writes on the use of ἀλλ' ἤ in Aristotle and points out in a shorter paper that Miss D. Mason's explanation of Philebus 31c has been anticipated. Mr. W. R. Paton contributes suggestions on the first six books of the Laws of Plato. The later Greeks are well represented in the number. Mr. Tucker emending Strabo and Plutarch's *Moralia* and Mr. Richards the *Philostrati*, while Mr. Kronenberg has a few notes on M. Antoninus. The editor, writing on 'Some Tibullian problems,' discusses Mr. Warde Fowler's theory of Tibullus II. i. as published in the *Classical Review* of March, 1908. The reviews comprise Traube's 'Nomina Sacra' and posthumous works by Mr. Lindsay, Henderson's 'Civil War and Rebellion,' by Mr. E. G. Hardy, Bianca Bruno's 'Third Samnite War,' by Miss Matthaei, and 'A

Sketch-book of Ancient Rome,' by Mr. Ashby.

BESIDES the representations of the *Frogs* at Oxford and the *Iphigenia* at Cardiff, there are other signs of the vivifying of classical work. Miss Ethel Wilkinson of Chicago describes in the *Classical Journal* the acting of Roman scenes in a way that gives scope for much originality. In one class a Latin debate was held on the punishment of the Catilinarian conspirators. 'The teacher's chair represented the sella curulis, the ordinary seats the subsellia, a side aisle the lobby where Cicero's son-in-law Piso stood. . . . Some had the part of tribunes stationed near the door, others were lictors. The auspices were declared favorable. . . . We had a number of short speeches in addition to those on record by Decimus Silanus, Cato and Caesar.' Since the pupils knew they were to act later, they took a keen interest in the preliminary reading of the fourth against Catiline.

Another class acted the meeting of the senate described by Cicero in his third speech before the people. Volturcius was brought in alone and cross-examined, afterwards the Allobroges, and then the conspirators, one by one, were confronted with their seal and handwriting, and obliged to own them. The thread was cut, and the contents of the waxed tablets read. During the cross-examination, Sulpicius rushed in

breathless, bearing an armful of poles (the weapons from Cethegus' house). Another class acted the trial of Archias in the same way.

Hints for similar scenes may be found in most of the ancient orations. For example, Zenothemis makes a very good series of scenes for beginners in Greek. Others, depending more on invention, may be found in the teacher's appendix to Walters & Conway's *Limen*.

THE 'FROGS' AT OXFORD.

LIKE all revivals of Greek plays, the recent representation of the *Frogs* was at once helped and embarrassed by the success of a former production. The immense popularity of the 1892 play has become a legend, and subsequent performances are bound to suffer by comparison: at the same time, the earlier experience of Oxford and Radley supplied many useful hints, sometimes warnings, more often examples, of which recent stage management was able to take full advantage: and it may be fairly said that in point of archaeological correctness, artistic effect, stage machinery and *mise en scène* generally, this year's representation improved on both its predecessors, and did infinite credit to the O.U.D.S. and their collaborators—notably to Mr. Cyril Bailey, the guiding spirit of the whole. All that criticism can suggest is that perhaps improvement and imitation can go a little too far in exploiting the (of course abundant) opportunities for comic business. For instance, the 'corpse' achieved an extraordinary popularity in 1892—in its place: ought it therefore to appear as a comic *κωφὸν πρόσωπον* in the latter part of the play? Again, the *βρεκεκεκέξ* scene was really spoilt by the introduction of small boys dressed as frogs,—however much this may have amused the children themselves and their families. But these are small matters.

If no two actors quite competed with the

Euripides-Dionysus combination of seventeen years ago, what was noticeable this year was the general average of competence throughout. The minor performers were uniformly good: Heracles had a gift of truly Heracleian laughter, Aeacus maintained the best traditions of his part, and Charon, with his far-away suggestion of a 'bus-conductor in the nether world, was quite excellent. Moreover, Greek seemed to be familiar to a larger proportion of the cast than is usual on these occasions. Among the more important rôles, Mr. Corbett's Euripides was the best piece of acting in the play—quiet, restrained, dignified, and showing also an unusual familiarity with the stage. The only question was whether Aristophanes did not intend Euripides to be a little more ridiculous. M. de Stein entered into the part of Xanthias with great humour. The rôle of Dionysus is extremely difficult: like Hamlet, he is on the stage nearly all the time: and no two critics agree as to how the part should be acted. Certainly it is wrong to make him an aesthete: probably to present him as a keen-witted and rather cynical and also rather effeminate man of the world is nearer the mark. Under the circumstances it is not to be wondered at that M. Howard as Dionysus seemed rather more conscious of what he had to avoid than what he had to aim at: and his representation was rather colourless in consequence: but the fault such as it was lay more in the conception, or want of conception, than in the acting, and he deserved credit for grappling manfully with difficulties which perhaps could hardly be overcome.

Taking the play as a whole, the impression of the acting is one of pervading merit rather than pre-eminent brilliance. But the chorus may be praised without any qualification. They moved as they should and they sang Sir Hubert Parry's music as it ought to be sung: it is even said that they satisfied their conductor. Few who saw the play will forget the delightful effect of the *χωρῶμεν ἐς πολυβρόδους λειμῶνας* movement.

Φ.