

v. 46 nimirum cum uestra *domus* ego funera
maestus

 increpitans.

The impossible *uestra domus funera* has been set right by Dr. Klotz, but his excellent conjecture *modis—maestis* is not even mentioned.¹

¹ I take the opportunity of acknowledging this scholar's fair and courteous review of the Corpus text in Wölfflin's *Archiv.* for 1905.

Its tone is in marked contrast to that of another notice which appeared in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* about which I might say something.

The foregoing observations might easily be extended, but they will suffice to show my view of the last edition of the *Siluae*. In brief it is this. The book could be much improved by a thorough revision, but take it all in all, it contains the best modern text of the *Siluae* which has been separately published.

J. P. POSTGATE.

But it is not worth while, as Lucretius iii. 388–390 'nec repentis itum cuiusuisicumque animantis | sentimus nec priua pedum uestigia quaeque | Corpore quae in nostro culices et cetera ponunt' has already expressed my sentiments.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PHILLIMORE'S TRANSLATION OF PROPERTIUS.

MAY I be allowed a few lines of explanation in order to forestall a possible charge of literary theft?

In my translation of Propertius which has recently been published at the Clarendon Press, a number of corrections appear in footnote form without acknowledgment of authorship. The reason for this omission was that it appeared pedantic to encumber the page with a kind of information which has no interest for the general reader. But I am horrified to find a reviewer in the *Oxford Magazine* for June 6th crediting me with the authorship of many of these variants which belong to other scholars, living or dead. For example *Meropem* (II. xxxiv. 33) is the property of Bergk and Schneidewin; and I had no idea of robbing Mr. Housman of

vacans (II. xxvi. 53): in such cases I presumed that emendations already published would be familiar enough to the expert, while the layman would have no concern with property in such points.

But I wish now to make public acknowledgment that the emendation '*uterer et quamvis nomine*' (II. xxiv. 8) belongs by priority to Mr. O. L. Richmond of King's. I was unconscious, when this correction struck me (in correcting the proofs of my translation) that it had been suggested by anybody, but Mr. Richmond reminds me that he communicated it to me in a conversation that we had two years ago. So it is his; and should be added to the list in the Preface of conjectures other than my own and hitherto unpublished.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

TRIREMES.

It surely is 'quite beyond dispute' that 'in the Acropolis relief the tholes of the thranite oars are vertically above the portholes of the thalamite oars.' If I rightly understand Mr. Newman's observations, *supra* p. 280, his point is that, if we had a section of the ship at right-angles to the plane of this relief, these tholes would not be ver-

tically above these portholes. But I have not asserted that they would.

Mr. Newman says that 'the shadow of the upper wale is much greater than those of the lower wales of the ship, and seems to indicate not merely a gunwale, but a gallery of some amplitude.' It does not seem to me to indicate more than a gunwale. And there is this difficulty about the gallery:—The remains of the Athenian docks show that