

but one cannot say much more than that. There is very little new observation in it, and its object is not to teach archaeology; it is meant to give pleasure, and it does give pleasure. But not pleasure unalloyed; for there is a great deal of repetition, both stories and phrases coming in over again, which matters little in ephemeral papers but does matter in a book. Even papers on the same subject are not put together; we hop from Andros to Paros and elsewhere, and then back to Andros again. The style also is full of commonplace tags, and has a few American phrases which are not pleasing, nor is the sentimental touch; 'poor Helen' hardly sums up her story, and 'poor Ajax' is the last thing one would say of Ajax.

The account of Naxos is perhaps the best paper in the book, for the remarkable tower of Andros has been described before; but there are several good descriptions, such as the community of monks in Andros, the wise woman, the trampling of roofs (why, O why, did not Mr. Manatt give us the song they sing as they make the roofs?); and there is a vampire story and one piece of observation which I shall quote (p. 176). As they descended from the

heights of Andros, 'the sun was just enough clouded to produce the peculiar effect, familiar to the Homeric poet . . . of the "wine-faced deep." Except immediately inshore, where the colour was a vivid green, the whole sea was a flood of rich red wine—no eye could mistake it, no one could give it any other description. This continued for half an hour, when dense rain-clouds gathered on Kouvári, and the sea darkened into purple.' But Homer becomes a Lesbian (p. 280), and Mr. Manatt is quite bewitched by Dörpfeld; although he 'reserves his judgment,' he clearly inclined to accept all the airy hypothesis which un-Ithacas Ithaca, and 'establishes the poet's highest claims as a geographer' (p. 387). Homer doubtless did not willingly deceive us in geography, but his object was, I imagine, rather to be a poet.

These remarks may convey a wrong impression. The book raised expectations from its size and magnificence, which it does not quite fulfil; but it is written with genuine pleasure, and it gives pleasure to read, which would have been even greater if it had been pruned of what is trivial or repeated.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—In 'Etymologies and Derivations' (*Classical Quarterly*, January, 1914) Mr. E. W. Fay speaks of *gurgēs* as meaning 'eddy' (p. 57).

I think it is difficult to establish this meaning. *Gurgēs* is used by Livy merely as the opposite to *vadum*, and I think it only means something in which you can be swallowed up, not something that goes round and round. In other words, it is a synonym for *vorago* (and thus it is used by Cicero), and not for *vertex*.

This view is in no way adverse to Mr. Fay's explanation of the meaning and derivation of the word; indeed, it rather helps it than otherwise.

I am, sir,
Yours faithfully,
M. T. TATHAM.

Northcourt House, Abingdon.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—I beg a few lines of your space in order to advertise among scholars a project for a *Lexicon Terentianum*, on which Mr. Patrick M'Glynn, George Clark Fellow in the University of Glasgow, is now engaging. The utility of some more exact and complete analysis of Terence's language than the Delphin and Lemaire indices needs no emphasizing. Mr. M'Glynn is planning his work on the model of Merguet's *Vergil-Lexicon*, giving contexts.

As the undertaking is laborious and lengthy, it would be deplorable if, for want of announcement made betimes, anybody else should set about the same. This notice is intended to avert the risk of duplication.

Yours faithfully,
J. S. PHILLIMORE.

5, The College, Glasgow, December 6, 1913.