

CORRESPONDENCE

(i)

Dear Sir,

I submit the following corrections to J. Griffin's review of my book, *Narrative and Simile from the Georgics in the Aeneid* (Leiden, 1980), in *Classical Review* n.s. 31, 1 (1981), 27–28:

(1) P. 27 para. 3: 'thus on p. 44 Knauer would have referred him to *Il.* 22. 189 and *Il.* 21. 9'. I cite *Il.* 22. 189–92 on p. 42 n. 33.

(2) *Ibidem*: G. reproduces Knauer's misprint of *Il.* 21. 9 for *Il.* 21. 29, which I cite in the same footnote.

(3) *Ibidem*: 'Schadewaldt is cited for the view that in Homer, as opposed to Apollonius, "the psychological depiction had been only elementary" in the similes. Schadewaldt does not say that where B. says he does, and one would like to know where he does say it.' The Schadewaldt reference on Briggs, 12 ends in the sentence prior to that which G. quotes. What G. attributes to Schadewaldt should be attributed to me.

(4) P. 28 para. 1: "'G. 2. 107–8 number of vines like waves, source Catullus", but cf. for instance Theoc. 16. 30.' The paragraph preceding the chart on p. 13 of my book states that 'source' here 'refers to a similar object of comparison'. Theoc. 16. 30 does not compare a number of vines to waves. Perhaps G. means Theoc. 16. 60, which I mention (along with the Catullan source) on my p. 15 n. 13.

(5) *Ibidem*: "'G. 2. 279–83, agriculture like battle, sources Lucretius and Varro", but cf. *Il.* 19. 362.' But *Il.* 19. 362 is not a comparison of agriculture to battle.

(6) P. 28 para. 3: for 'Gretchen Kramer' read 'Gretchen Kromer'.

Very truly yours,
WARD W. BRIGGS, JR.

(ii)

Dear Sir,

You were kind in publishing a review of my Commentary on Tacitus, *Histories I and II* (1979). Your reviewer, for whose favourable words I am grateful, naturally called attention to the fact that the book contained no preface.

He was right to do so. The omission resulted from a misunderstanding between myself and my publishers, and it was probably I who was to blame. The book arrived on my table before the preface, which I had prepared, had been sent to them.

What I had wanted to say was first, that I was commenting on the text of the *OCT*, and to add a few words on what I meant in calling the book a 'Historical Commentary'. But, much more important was that I wanted to thank those who had helped me in my writing. In previous written work, of a recent date, Mr K. Wellesley and Professor Hans Heubner of Munich. But besides, many people, especially Professor Gavin Townend of Durham. But above all two scholars. Professor P. A. Brunt, of Oxford, read my MS, and offered amendments without which it would not have been publishable. And Sir Ronald Syme, not only through his writings, but through his friendship with me throughout my academic life, stimulated my interest in Tacitean problems and kept me, or so I hope, from absurdities.

Yours faithfully,
G. E. F. CHILVER