

surrounded in his trivial acts by celestial prodigy: defending sylphs are not caught in the glittering forfex of a peer; clouds do not, at the duke's half-conscious gesture, mass themselves to suit his state of mind: it is all rather the reverse. Where the story is only suggested, no mock-solemn atmosphere is created by the presentment of five or six instances in as many couplets of an almost mnemonic brevity and plainness, though the sort of music of sense and sound which Ovid liked is attained by a succession of legendary allusions and melodious names. The occasional invocation of a Muse, the appearances of Venus and Apollo to the poet, may be considered mildly mock-solemn; yet for Ovid, bred in the idiom, as we are not, had they the disproportionate solemnity which would lift them out of the category of conventional artistry?

In short, I believe there is no point at which the theory of mock solemnity and elevation does not break down, and the closer the study of detail the more evident this is. As far as I can judge, it rests on a modern induced contempt for the subject, and a consequent hasty conclusion that any poetic graces or picturesqueness of presentment whatever must be intentional and burlesque exaggeration. But Ovid had not that contempt, though he obviously found plenty of matter for a gently ironic commentary on the manners and foibles of the *vie galante*. The poem is a new departure—the didactic treatment of a light and popular subject in the elegiac fashion, with such decoration as that fashion and Ovid's peculiar gifts and wit would suggest: its humour is self-contained, and does not rest on a reference to the heroico-didactic tradition of style and conception. Such at least is my view.

Yours truly,
E. PHILLIPS BARKER.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

Professor R. L. Dunbabin's 'Notes on Livy,' only brought to my notice a year after publication (*C.R.*, May, 1931), do not mention Mr. D. W. Freshfield's *Hannibal Once More* (London: Edward Arnold, 1914). Mr. Freshfield's identification of Hannibal's pass cannot, I think, be maintained, but he does produce cogent evidence that that pass was certainly not the Col du Clapier, but was situated somewhere between the Mont Genève and the coast. Professor Dunbabin himself further damages the Col du Clapier theory, for he is constrained to dissent from Professor Spenser Wilkinson's location of the Island, and to place it elsewhere, for which purpose he is compelled to assume that in Polybius' day the Aygues was called the Isara. Even this assumption does not remove all his difficulties as to mileage, and he presently makes the further assumption that 'Polybius' distances were merely inferences from the number of days of Hannibal's march or his own journey.' This second assumption is based on a third (not originated by Professor Dunbabin), that Polybius followed Hannibal's route through the Alps, which Polybius himself does not claim

to have done. A fourth assumption, which forms the basis of the Col du Clapier theory and leads to most of the difficulties over mileage, is that the 'river itself' (unnamed) of Polybius III. 39 was the Rhone, and not the Durance. And one may point out a fifth assumption, that in P. III. 42 s. 1. the 'four days' march from the sea' is to be reckoned from the nearest point of the coast, and not from the point where Hannibal himself turned inland.

More might be said, but it seems unnecessary to follow further an argument based on a series of assumptions having no sure foundation in scripture, and leading to disagreement between its own advocates. In order that any theory should be accepted on any subject, it is necessary that it should be based on, and take into account, the evidence, the whole evidence, and nothing but the evidence; and, to my thinking, no theory of Hannibal's march is complete which does not offer some sort of answer to, and explanation of, the following points:

- (1) How was it that, as early as Livy's day, differences of opinion as to Hannibal's route already existed?
- (2) How was it that Hannibal came to be attacked by the tribesmen after he had requisitioned hostages?
- (3) Where did Hannibal's guides mislead him (Livy XXI. 35), and how did they manage to do it?
- (4) How did the Carthaginians come to have any ideas of their own as to the way? (Livy, *ibidem*.)
- (5) How does the episode of the Boii, with all its implications, fit in with the theory?

There are other points, but these will suffice. The route I have traced in *Where Hannibal Passed* provides answers to all these questions, though I have not specifically given the answers to (2) and (5).

I am not here concerned to defend my own thesis, though I am ready to do this in response to informed and unprejudiced criticism. But I have noticed that the only three unfavourable reviews which I have seen of my book are the work of three writers committed in advance to the advocacy of three different routes, all of course mutually exclusive, and all to my thinking demonstrably erroneous. I notice, too, that though Professor Dunbabin writes of 'many points in which Mr. Bonus is contradicted by the plain statements of Livy and Polybius,' he does not specify any one of them.

Yours faithfully,
A. R. BONUS.

MESSIEURS LES DIRECTEURS,

Le compte-rendu que M. A. E. Housman a consacré dans votre n° de juillet à mon récent ouvrage intitulé *Les Satires de Juvénal. Étude et analyse*, appelle quelques observations que je m'excuse de vous communiquer.

1°. Si j'ai préféré la forme *Ombos* à la forme *Ombi*, ce n'est point que j'aie confondu un accusatif avec un nominatif, comme M. Housman le suppose charitablement. C'est simplement que la forme *Ombos* est couramment