results by a careful reading of Lucian's Deorum Dialogi, selected as containing but little narrative. In those Dialogues he finds in all 154 Aorists Indicative. Of this total 83 are in narrative passages ; four refer to a definite time just past ; twelve may be translated indifferently by the Simple Past or the Perfect ; one may be best rendered by the Present (ἐγέλασα, 'you make me laugh') ; but ' the remaining fifty-four seem to me *all* to require, or at least to prefer, the Perfect in English.'

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE FIRE-SIGNALS IN THE *AGAMEMNON.*

To the EDITOR *of the* CLASSICAL REVIEW.

MAY I say a word respecting the references to this matter on pp. 220 and 238 of the last number of the *Review*? There seems to be some danger that the question may be misapprehended. What is the farthest distance at which a bonfire can be seen, is a question which has, I conceive, no bearing at all upon the story of Aeschylus. For myself at least, so far from asserting that a bonfire upon Athos could not be seen from Makistos, I have expressly assumed that it could. The impossibility which I (and, so far as I know, all others before me) attribute to the story, is an impossibility relative to the whole circumstances given. That impossibility would not be affected in the least, if it were known that the poet had himself seen a bonfire across the interval marked ; and it would remain, even if such a bonfire had been seen and interpreted as a signal.

Quite apart however from the *Agamemnon*, it is a historic question, at what intervals fire-signals have been or are likely to have been established. And upon this we may observe, that the limit is not the longest distance at which the fire may possibly be seen, but the distance at which it is fairly certain that the fire will be seen, and seen unmistakably. To establish a signal beyond this limit would be worse than useless. Does this condition allow an interval of 100 miles, or of 50 miles, or of anything near that distance? Surely we can all say from our own experience, that to arrange a chain of beacon-signals, and to leave in it deliberately a gap of 100 miles, would be sheer insanity. Everything must yield to evidence ; and when or if evidence shall be produced that a chain of beacons with such a gap in it was established by the Greeks or others, we shall allow that, however unwise, the thing was done. Meanwhile we shall presume that it never was.

A. W. VERRALL.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

THE following is a list of the passages in which a fresh revision of the MS. has established readings different from those given in the printed text, or has made it possible to fill up lacunas which were there left blank or only tentatively supplied. Corrections which have already been mentioned as certain in the notes which the editor of the *Classical Review* has permitted me to add to the suggestions sent to him are not repeated here. There still remain some passages in which further study may discover the true MS. readings :—

P. 3, l. 14. [ἵ]στασαν. There is room for [καθί]στασαν in the lacuna.

P. 5, l. 2. ἐν [ἀρχῇ ἐγένετο δευ]τέρα. I think ἦν should be substituted for ἐγένετο. The other letters printed between the brackets are faintly legible, and are written in a very straggling manner.

P. 6, l. 17. ἐς. MS. χρόνον (written in abbreviated form).

P. 17, l. 6. κατεκύρωσε, MS. κατεκύρω-σεν.

P. 22, ll. 1, 2. τού[τους ἐκλή]ρουν. Perhaps τού[τοις] ἐ[πε]κλήρουν. Between τού and ε there is only space for one letter, but something has been written above the line, and perhaps the scribe wrote τους first, and corrected it to τουτοις. In ch. 59 (p. 147, l. 15)