

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XXXV. 3: JULY 1940

M. L. W. Laistner, *Some Reflections on Latin Historical Writing in the Fifth Century*. R. J. Getty, *The Introduction to the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus*: (1) v. 1, retains *nautis*, taking *deum freta* together and explaining *prima magnis freta pervia nautis* as hypallage for *primis magna f.p.n.*, and adds speculations about the opening of Varro's *Argonautica*; (2) v. 10, reads *alenti* (Campbell and Bonner); (3) vv. 11–21, reads 13 *namque potes*, transposing this and *sancte pater* (11), 11 *venerande*, 13 *nigrantem et pulvere*, 17 *erit Tyriae . . . carinae* (Heins.), 19 *sub te duce*, and stops after *instituet* (16) and *magistris* (18). P. W. Townsend, *The Oil Tribute of Africa at the Time of Julius Caesar*: the levy recorded in *B. Afr.* 97. 3 must have been exacted not from Leptis but from the Emporia region, of which it was the centre. J. A. Notopoulos, *Porphyrus's Life of Plato*: the fragments of P.'s Life and the Syriac version of Bar-Hebraeus agree with Apuleius, *De Platone*, which must be used as the basis for reconstruction; the probable source of P.'s Life is Arius Didymus. M. E. Keenan, *The Terminology of Witchcraft in the Works of St. Augustine*: a catalogue supplementing Burriss in *C.P.* xxxi. 2. A. K. Lake on Prop. i. 22 reads *si* in v. 6 and takes 3–5 as protasis, 6 as apodosis, of a condition, *dolor* as complement to both *sunt* and *sit*, and *tu* as addressed to *pulvis*. I. M. Linforth, *Greek and Egyptian Gods*: against Lattimore (*C.P.* xxxiv. 4) holds that Hdt. ii. 50 means not that the Greeks had taken names of gods from Egypt but that they had learned from Egypt of gods already named there. T. B. Jones, *The Death of Numerian and the Accession of Diocletian*: the statement in some ancient authorities that N. died in Thrace is due to misunderstanding. Mary Johnston, *S.V.B.E.*: corrects Laidlaw (*C.P.* xxxiv. 3) the rarity of the formula *S.T.E.Q.V.B.E.* is not due to the rarity of letters to governors in their provinces.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE

LXVI. 2: APRIL 1940

A. Aymard, *La Mort d'Antiochos, fils d'Antiochos III Mégas*. The death of Antiochos is placed by Livy in the summer of 193 and firmly embedded in his narrative of affairs in Asia for 194–193, which

are themselves connected at several points with his Roman chronology. But he is mentioned as if still alive in two cuneiform contracts of Sept. 193 and Jan. 192. A. argues against É. Cavaignac (*Rev. d'Assyriologie*, xxxv. 123) that it is easier to suppose ignorance or carelessness on the part of the scribes than a blunder by the historian. A. Levi, *Questioni platoniche*. I: Why did Plato maintain the dialogue form in his later works without the dialogue spirit? and why are his later dialogues thus more open than the earlier to the criticism made in the *Phaedrus* and *Seventh Letter* of all written composition? True discussion would take too long to arrive at positive conclusions, but the dialogue form is retained as a reminder of its necessity. II: The Platonic Socrates represents in the main Plato's development of Socratic ideas and methods, but the aesthetic and visionary intuition of Forms is not such a development but an entirely original factor. Yet Plato learnt from Socrates' methods how the Forms of which he had an intuition could be made the object of scientific thought, and therefore he did not hesitate to ascribe the whole complex to the Socrates of his dialogues. É. des Places, *Un livre nouveau sur les Lettres de Platon*, gives an account of G. Pasquali, *Le lettere di Platone*, who admits the authenticity of VI, VII, VIII (dated 350), and XI, and hesitates over X. P. Tryssier, *Notes de dialectologie béotienne*: I. *λεως* (Att. *λέγεις*), now learned to be the true reading of a Boeotian vase-inscription, shows intervocalic γ changed, doubtless by way of a spirant g , to a y -sound, and allows us to explain *ιώνγα* as $\langle *εἰώνγα \langle *εγώνγα$. In another inscription (*S.E.G.* ii. 185) *μεξυλλεω εντος* is to be interpreted as *μη ξυλλέγου εντός*. As *ξυν* is unknown in Boeotian, T. suggests that this is a compound of *ξύλον* and *λέγω*. [? Read *μη ξύλ(α) λέγου*.] II. *ταππαματα* (*I.G.* vii. 3172) is not to be read *τὰ ππάματα* with Buck, Bechtel, Schwyzer, &c., but as = *τὰ ἀππάματα* (= Attic *ἀνακτήματα*), cf. Corinna's *ἀππασάμενος*, glossed *ἀνακτησάμενος*. III. *Ἐλικίων* originally began with *σφ*. Notes et Discussions: A. Ernout on A. Cordier, *I. Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Énéide*. II. *L'allitération latine*, gives references for later use of words first appearing in Virgil, and concludes that he found the majority in existence and that, where he did innovate, his innovations were so much in accord with the genius of the language that they readily passed into the literary vocabulary.

CORRESPONDENCE

'CAMPBELL'S AGAMEMNON IN ENGLISH'

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW
Sirs—Ostensibly, I suppose, I ought to feel flattered upon finding in an

academic journal, *C.R.* liv. 83, the verb *to fust* included in a list of neologisms of mine, and described as 'not bad company' for some of the others, and those by no means the best even in the incomplete list there given.

But I am not flattered; I am shocked.

Few passages are so famous, even in the most famous of all Shakespeare's plays, as are those noble lines (upon our human faculty of 'large discourse' and 'godlike reason') in which this vigorous and most expressive verb is so effectively employed.

When Mr. Pickard-Cambridge combines so elementary a blunder with the disparagement of my poetic diction and the selection of two plays of Shakespeare as being by contrast appropriate models for the translator of Aeschylus, he is obviously somewhat unfortunate. But when he proceeds to his climax by requiring for this task 'a born poet' instead of such a shameless word-coiner, he is not only grossly inconsistent, he is urging the very fallacy against which it was precisely one of the main purposes of my translation to protest.

Neologism, in greater or less degree, is the mark of the born poet; the one thing above others that distinguishes him from the composer of class-room 'fair copies', to whom it is naturally abhorrent. *Tame and threadbare diction is the curse of our translations of Greek tragedy*; it remains the principal reason why even the least literal of them bear no real resemblance, after all, to those elaborate mosaics of hard, bright, variously shaped, and curiously compounded words. And of all Greek poets none was more notorious for neologism than Aeschylus.

Your reviewer treats this element as a defect; and as a defect of mine! I am—for that matter—a very minor poet, and my own style is accordingly devoid of neologism; *vid.* e.g. Binyon's extension of *The Golden Treasury*, Sir J. Squire's *Selections from Modern Poets*, L. Schücking's *Modern English Poetry*. Mr. Pickard-Cambridge could not of course have been expected to know that; but this does not excuse him; for the fact remains that the neologist element in my translation was intended

faithfully to reflect that element in the style of the original poet, and this is so obvious that how any scholarly reader could overlook it I simply cannot understand.

But Mr. P., when he has a mind to, can overlook anything. He says that in my translation he was often at a loss to 'find his place'. No wonder; let one example show why.

For representing the word *ἀλουργής* by 'marine product' my reasons were at least four: (1) precise English expression for choice Greek word, (2) variant on 'purple' corresponding to the poet's variant on *πορφύρα*—his other translators have only one word, and that the obvious—(3) passing glance at *ἔστιν θάλασσα*. To all such considerations as those three I am willing to believe that Mr. P. is honestly and by nature insensitive. But when he asserts that the words 'this marine product' are 'gratuitous additions' in the rendering of a line which contains *ἀλουργῆ*—when he will not even see that 'marine' represents *άλ-* and 'product' *-ουργ-*—from this and other evidence I must conclude, however reluctantly, that what conditioned his review was not so much an incapacity to understand as a refusal.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

Sirs—As regards 'fust' I apologize; I ought to have remembered a speech which I learned by heart fifty-five years ago. As for *ἀλουργῆ*, it is part of a line gratuitously inserted by Professor Campbell and not found in the text of Aeschylus; even if it were otherwise, I should still think 'marine product' prosaic. (It was for this that I criticized it.) For the rest, I am content that your readers should judge whether the translator's 'neologisms' have made his style Aeschylean, or secured the 'immediate and direct intelligibility to an audience' which he claims.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.