

NOTES AND NEWS

NORTHUMBERLAND AND DURHAM CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION.

THE two Spring meetings of the Northumberland and Durham Classical Association were held alternately in Durham and Newcastle. At the former, Canon Cruickshank's paper on 'The Problem of Euripides' *Bacchae*' led to an interesting discussion, taken part in by Dr. Dawson Walker, who was in the chair, Miss E. F. Stevenson (Newcastle), Miss A. M. Ashley (Darlington), Mr. E. P. Pestle, Professor How, and Dr. J. Wight Duff. After the statutory business of the sixth general meeting of the branch, held on March 23 at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Mr. R. Bousfield

(Bishop Auckland) gave an account of excavations which had been conducted from time to time at the Roman station of Binchester (Vinovia), and exhibited an admirable set of large coloured plans in illustration of the site as a whole, as well as of the buildings, bathing-tanks, and hypocausts. Copies of the chief inscriptions recovered in the nineteenth century at Vinovia were also shown. Dr. J. Wight Duff, who presided, recalled details of the archaeological visit paid by the society to Binchester in 1914.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I HAVE read with much interest the article by Mr. Shewan on Πολύχρσος Μυκῆνη in your last number, and will try to profit by his arguments. But unfortunately I must begin by knocking away the foundation on which they all rest, and thereby depriving him of his fancied triumph over me. Mr. Shewan seems to think that the new Mycenaean site found by the Americans is at Corinth. He is misinformed. It is not at Corinth.

I said in *Homer and History* (p. 217) that Ephyre—the name which we must give to the new site—was the nearest town in the Sikyonian territory, and a few miles away from Corinth. The new site is in fact a few miles from Corinth, in the direction of Sikyon. It lies on the coast of the Gulf, somewhere near Lechaion. No Mycenaean remains have been found at Corinth to confute me. Any 'value of my essay on Agamemnon's realm' is not greatly reduced, but greatly strengthened by this confirmation of my assertion that the Mycenaean Ephyre was not at Corinth, but a few miles away. My prophecy may have been a foolish gamble; but it has the merit of fulfilment.

The information about the site of the Mycenaean Ephyre I owe to Mr. Wace. I wish it were more detailed; but letters to Athens were very uncertain when I wrote on the subject three years ago, and either my enquiry for further particulars or his reply to it must have gone astray; and we are all too busy on more urgent matters to spend much time on such things. But it is possible that one part of what I have said may have to be modified. With all reserve, and even open scepticism, I thought that there might be something in what Strabo said about an 'Ephyre on the Selleis' in Sikyonian territory. Now I cannot ascertain that the new site is on any stream: if it is not,

then what Strabo says as to this particular Ephyre may have to go with the other fables he talks about the name of Ephyre (*Homer and History*, 178). This of course affects him, and not me. My argument is only based on the fact that there never was a Mycenaean settlement at Corinth; the negative evidence is now confirmed by our knowledge of the place where the settlement was. It was on the northern coast, and therefore unsuited to fulfil the conditions which placed an important town where Corinth stood. To all appearance it was dependent on Sikyon.

Yours faithfully,
WALTER LEAF.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I CANNOT but be happy over the generous praise bestowed upon *Plotinus: The Ethical Treatises*, in *Class. Rev.* February-March, 1918.

I ask permission, however—for the few who may be interested in the interpretation of Plotinus—to touch very briefly on the friendly reviewer's animadversions. I take them seriatim:

1. 'Complement' is a misprint for 'couplement.'
2. The *πᾶν* in the context is not necessary, nor any English equivalent; but, with Mueller and Kieffer, I take it as strengthening *ἢ*.
3. The steps, I find, by which the form of my version developed were: (a) 'Anyone that allows the *soul* to be the user (of the body) separates it.' (b, etc.) 'If the *soul* is (allowed) to use the body, it is separate.' In the context I take that twist and condensation to be quite laudable.
4. It was only after long search that I discovered the reviewer's implication, if I grasp it yet. My first rough draft (to which the final adheres in entire content) was: 'We must