

soon but also to a headland in N.E. Africa and to part of the Gulf of Aden, this being the region where the voyage to India by the monsoon began.

E. H. WARMINGTON.

*Birkbeck College, London.*

*Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome.*  
Vol. xii. Pp. 184; 17 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1935.

THIS volume contains five articles, four of which are mainly concerned with Italian archaeology. Philip Harsh discusses in detail the vexed problem of the origins of the *Insulae* at Ostia, making full use of literary evidence and of the material from Greek and African sites, as well as of the remains in Campania and at Ostia. Agnes Kirsopp Lake reviews the literary and material evidence for the 'Tuscan Temple,' largely with a view to settling the value of the formulae given by Vitruvius. Both these articles will be indispensable to students of the wider aspects of ancient architecture. Frank E. Brown's intensive examination of the ill-published Regia is also valuable. Less important is Thomas D. Price's restoration of the house of Marcus Loreius Tiburtinus at Pompeii, which is accompanied by a brief text by A. W. Van Buren. Dorothy M. Schullian's elaborate critical publication of Heirec's excerpts from Valerius Maximus chiefly concerns medievalists.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

*A Bibliography on the Survival of the Classics.*  
First volume. The publication of 1931. The text of the German edition with an English introduction. Edited by the Warburg Institute. Pp. xxii + 333. London: Cassell, 1934. Paper, 21s.

THE editors of this book, whose combination of English title and German contents is explained by the removal of the Warburg Institute from Hamburg to London, are more explicit in their own tongue (*Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike*). They have collected under appropriate headings, as *Folklore, Religion and Mythology, Philosophy, Law, Pictorial Traditions, Late Antiquity, Byzantium*, etc., all manner of books and articles published in the year which bear in any way upon the survival of classical ideas in the mediaeval and modern periods. How wide their net has been cast is apparent if we glance at a few random titles. These include A. D. Fraser on *A Scottish Version of the Odysseus-Polyphemus Myth* (reviewed on p. 18); Joan Evans' *Pattern* (p. 77); K. Lehmann-Hartleben on the form of Greek shrines (p. 151); F. Pelster on the MSS. of Duns Scotus; H. Robinson's *Bayle the Septic*, and other works to the total number of 1,238, all of which are given short but competent reviews. If this worthy enterprise can continue as it has begun, a most valuable addition to bibliography will result.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

## CORRESPONDENCE

*To the Editors of the 'Classical Review.'*

DEAR SIRS,

In the course of a kind review in your November issue (page 204), the hope is expressed that I may find means to publish my collation of O, the Vatican Plato. To avoid misunderstanding I venture to point out that in the appendices of my book and on the pages indexed under *collations* in the Editorial Index I have given some 400 readings of O, not to mention other manuscripts, in the form of corrections and supplements to Burnet's apparatus; I did not give more because there were no more of significance that had not been correctly cited before. I suppose that any new edition of the *Laus* will include a more minute collation, but, except where I may have made a mistake, it can add very little to our knowledge of the text. I have no intention of editing the *Laws* myself, but I should be glad to have my material used by anyone who undertakes the task.

Your reviewer, in remarking that I did not tackle the problem of the relation of A and the first part of O, overlooks my statements on pages 6 and 12. The common ancestor of AO was in uncials and had *ca.* 18 letters to the line. A more remote ancestor, which was probably the archetype of all our Plato manuscripts, had *ca.* 27 letters to the line. References to these pages are found in the Paleographical

Index under *ancestor of AO and archetype*. Perhaps I expected too much of my rather elaborate index.

Very truly yours,

L. A. POST.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE,  
HAVERFORD, PA.,  
December 4, 1935.

*To the Editors of the 'Classical Review.'*

SIRS,

I am most grateful to your reviewer for his praise of my translation of Ovid's *Art of Love* [*C.R.* XLIX. 192], but his criticism of my introduction seems to me to show a misconception of my purpose. My object was not to produce a textbook, but to introduce to English readers, who may or may not have any knowledge of Latin, one of the most famous works of antiquity in the form, the spirit and, as nearly as may be, the actual words of the original. Such readers are not interested in 'the structure of Roman society' or 'the social legislation of Augustus.' But they would rejoice in the parallels between Ovid's day and our own, and the modern analogies and phraseology to which your reviewer takes exception were deliberately introduced to arrest their attention and enlist their interest.

As regards his detailed criticisms, no one can