

The Romano-British Establishment at Stroud near Petersfield, Hants. By A. MORAY WILLIAMS, B.A. [From the *Archaeological Journal*, lxvi (2nd Ser. xvi.), pp. 33-52.] Seven plates. London and Aylesbury: Hunt Barnard and Co., 1909.

A REPORT on the completion of an interesting excavation, carefully carried out. The building presents several curious features, and is thought to have been a bathing establishment.

CORRESPONDENCE

'DUPLICATION' IN CLASSICAL REVIEWS

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—In the Proceedings of the Classical Association for 1910, p. 32, I am correctly reported to have used these words: 'The fact of having two journals means duplicating a certain amount of work. Some persons take in both journals, so that they will get the review of a certain book in one journal, and some months later a review of the same book in the other journal.' In reply to Dr. Postgate's letter in the number for August (p. 165), I have simply to say that I was referring to a matter within my own experience. In 1909, as Editor of the *Classical Review*, you did me the honour of inviting me to write for that journal a review of the first part of Traube's *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*. In the same year the Editor of the *Classical Quarterly* published, in the April number, Professor W. M. Lindsay's excellent review of Traube's works, one of the only two books mentioned at the head of the article being the first part of Traube's *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, which was briefly but sufficiently noticed. Any arrangement that admits of the possibility of two reviews of the same book appearing in the two journals clearly implies 'duplicating a certain amount of work.' The Chairman, Mr. Butcher, who also presides over the new Board of Management, subsequently said: 'Clearly the same book should not be reviewed in both publications.' Another member of the Board added: 'There is now no possibility of duplication.' I had carefully read the book which I had been asked to review, but, after these definite declarations of policy, it was clearly undesirable that my notice should appear in the *Classical Review*.

Dr. Postgate invites me to 'complete' my statement by giving instances of duplication during the years 1907-9. I reply that I did not refer to any actually published proof of such duplication. I referred to the prospect of such duplication being exemplified in the immediate future; and, in consequence of the remarks made in the course of the discussion, I resolved that, so far as I was myself concerned, such duplication should not take place.

I remain,

Yours faithfully,

J. E. SANDYS.

Cambridge, August 13, 1910.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I thank Dr. Sandys for his explanation, and I am glad to find that he does not suggest that there has been any breach of the pledge given on behalf of the editors of the two journals on the first page of the new *Classical Review* (February 1907) that 'no books will be reviewed in both.' But I think that his meaning would have been better expressed by saying 'may possibly get' the review instead of the 'will get' which he used.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool, August 21, 1910.

CALVERLEY'S 'ODE TO TOBACCO.'

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I have read with much pleasure the Latin lyrical version of Calverley's 'Ode to Tobacco' which my friend Mr. Tyrrell has published in the last number of the *Classical Review*. It is therefore in no carping spirit that I note in it a small but inveterate error, the employment of *forte* with the sense of *fortasse*. This usage, which belongs to late Latin, is to be found, I know, in the Latin writings of many great scholars from the time of the revival of learning until now. My old private tutor, Richard Shilleto, used to impress on the memories of his pupils the difference between the two words by telling them a story. William Paley (the author of the *Evidences*) was reciting in the Senate House a Latin essay which had won for him the Members' Prize. He chanced to pronounce the word *prösfüfus* as though it were *prösfüfus*. A friend wrote down a couplet in Latin and sent it to Paley. It ran thus:

'Italiæ fato profugus Laviniaque venit—'
Errat Virgilius: forte profugus erat.

Paley rejoined that the mistake of his friend in writing *forte* for *fortasse* was the worse of the two.

It would be well also to write *insanientes* for *vesanientes* in the sixth stanza.

J. S. R.