

peace.' IX. 284 'Iunonis gratia'—'Juno's hatred.' 677 'et vires fortuna negat'—'and fortune has denied them (girls) strength.' X. 191 'lilia . . . fulvis horrentia linguis'—'lilies still hanging from the yellow stems.' XI. 258 'pulchra relecto Nereis ingreditur consueta cubilia saxo'—'the fair Nereid, seeking again the grot, lay down upon her accustomed couch.' XII. 372 'id quoque vix sequitur'—'this also he, with much trouble, sought to reach.' XIII. 709 'ferre diu nequiere Iovem'—'unable to endure for long the ills that Jove inflicted.' 799 'fallacior undis'—'falsar than water.' XIV. 237 'tertius e nobis Laestrygonis in pia tinxit ora cruore suo'—'the third of us stained with his blood the Laestrygonians' impious mouths.' 496 'numeri maioris amici'—'we, the greater number of his friends.' XV. 330 'parum moderato gutture'—'e'en moderately.' 652 'umbraque telluris tenebras induxerat orbi'—'the darkness spread its shadows over the world.'

The text is adopted from Ehwald, but in not a few cases the translation implies a different reading—e.g. I. 70, 199, 258; II. 62, 823; V. 81; XIII. 464, 619, 748; XIV. 739. I have noticed more than fifty typographical

errors. There is a useful index appended to the second volume, but this also calls for some revision; for example, 'Hōra (Hersilia)' should be distinguished from the 'Hōrae.'

E. H. ALTON.

Idylls of Theocritus. Translated into English Verse by J. H. HALLARD, M.A., Oxon. Third Edition. London: Rivingtons, 1913. 5s.

NOT many months ago Dr. Way's verse translations of Theocritus appeared, and now we have a third edition of Mr. Hallard's versions, which first appeared in 1894. Dr. Way's were nearly all in catalectic hexameters: Mr. Hallard has adopted a great variety of metre; the more conversational idylls are in blank verse, which runs smoothly and keeps close to the Greek; the amoebean contests, and those idylls which are mostly lyrical in sentiment adopt other metres. The verse, where it can be compared with Dr. Way's, runs more smoothly and is less artificial. The translator has succeeded in being literal without being strained, and simple without being prosaic.

A. S. OWEN.

CORRESPONDENCE

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR DUFF.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—In the C.R. XXX. (August, September, 1916), pp. 166 ff., Professor Duff publishes a remarkably painstaking review of my translation of Suetonius. For such a review one cannot but feel grateful, however much one might wish that the reviewer had busied himself with larger questions of interpretation rather than with mere typographical errors; for nearly all of the actual mistakes in Professor Duff's formidable list belong under the latter head. I must perforce plead guilty to defective proof-reading, and I shall not ask to be allowed to share the blame either with the general editor or with the office proof-reader. Present-day methods of composition and printing have put such errors into a somewhat different class from that which they once occupied; so that reviewers often leave them out of consideration, and in

some cases are kind enough to send a list of them privately to the author of the book.

This reply is forced upon me by these words: 'but it is disappointing that the editor of a classic should suffer from defective proof-reading, inaccuracies of translation, and neglect of sound English.' This very sentence shows on what thin ice critics of English walk; for it either displays a charity which the reviewer does not seem to feel, or it is itself unclear, if not inaccurate. Defective proof-reading and the rest are surely not diseases from which an editor suffers, but crimes which he commits.

To the first charge I have already pleaded guilty; yet some of the instances which Professor Duff lists as typographical errors must be stricken from his list. If he had consulted Ihm's text, which might have been expected of so careful a reviewer, he would have found that Ihm reads *oportunitate* (I. 28. 19), and that this is obviously not a

misprint of the German editor's. The same thing is true of *iantacula* (II. 226. 6), but in the explanatory footnote I naturally used the familiar form *ientaculum*. The other so-called 'inconsistencies in spelling' are for the most part intentional. As a rule I followed the orthography of the various texts included in the volumes, although I made a few changes at the request of the general editor.

The second charge is not justified by the exhibit. To translate *dexter* 'left' or *venetus* 'green' is lamentable and to my mind unpardonable, but to call it a 'slip in Latin' is either downright insulting or to lack the 'keen sense of words' (questionable English, to my mind) which the reviewer misses in his victim.

It is perhaps too much nowadays to ask a Latinist to read all the periodicals devoted to his subject, or even to glance at their tables of contents; but if Professor Duff will consult *Class. Phil.* X., pp. 82 ff., he will find some fairly good arguments for translating *biduo post* 'on the following day' in the very passage of Caesar which he cites against that rendering. He will also learn that Dr. Rice Holmes accepted the translation in his recent edition of the *Gallic War*. When I say 'he also wrote the *Aetna*, though its authorship is disputed' (II. 471. 7), I use 'though' with an ellipsis, as *tamen* is often used in Latin. I mean to say, 'Vergil *did* write the *Aetna* (in my opinion, and I make this assertion), though its authorship is disputed (by some).' This I take to be exactly what Suetonius had in mind; at all events, it is a literal translation of his words. Not to discuss all the passages in detail, I can confess to but one 'slip in Latin' in the entire list, and I fear that even that is really a slip in English.

It is the third charge which I most resent; in particular the inappropriateness and unfairness of the word 'neglect.' To charge neglect is outside of a reviewer's province. He may charge ignorance and various other things, but he has no means of knowing whether a writer has been neglectful or not. Everyone knows how difficult it is in writing English to avoid repetition, cacophony, and unclear arrangement. So far from 'suffering from neglect of sound English' (if that be sound English, *dispeream!*), I recast a hundred sentences at least for every one in the reviewer's list. But waiving the use of the term 'neglect,' the cases of bad English are no more numerous than the slips in Latin; for again I consider it positively insulting to regard 'propitiary' as anything but a misprint or to charge me with deliberately composing the sentence quoted from II., p. 283. It ought to be obvious to a wayfaring man that the latter arose from a correction in which 'that' should have been stricken out; just as 'in particularly' was caused by changing 'in particular' to 'particularly.' If, as is my recollection, I did not see a revise of that particular correction, I may fairly ask to share the blame in this case with the office reader.

I question the archaism of 'stricken out' and the commercialism of 'listed.' At any rate, since Mr. Loeb saw fit to select English editors and an English publisher, I thought it proper to be docile in the matter of 'Americanisms' and the like. I cannot recall rejecting a single one of the suggestions made by the general editor under that head. 'Different than' is supported in the *Oxford Dict.* by so impressive a list of great names that I am minded to let it stand, although 'different from' is my normal usage, and only the (printer's) devil knows how I came to write anything else. If Professor Duff, as do so many of his countrymen, prefers 'different to,' I would refer him to the *Oxford Dict. s.v.* I only wish I could lay claim to the rendering of *Graeculis* (I. 308. 10) which the reviewer criticises. Honesty compels me to confess that I filched it from the *Latin Grammar* of my old master, Professor Lane (quoting from memory; he has 'the good people in Greece'). I consider it an ideal translation: it certainly conveys no idea of 'kindliness.'

In connection with the 'several sentences' which 'lack clearness,' Professor Duff does not invariably show a 'keen sense of words,' nor is he strictly accurate. It is a small matter that he puts 'and at once recalled' (II. 269. 18) in italics without acknowledging them as his own, but it surely is not fair to insert a comma before the phrase. Without this the sentence is cacophonous, but it is clear enough, if I know what 'recalled' means. What would the reviewer suggest in place of 'took him one side' (II. 225. 27)? If I had said 'took him apart,' he would gleefully have added the passage to his list of *facetiae* and accused me of dismembering the wretched man.

Since I myself am sometimes rash enough to try to lighten up an article with alleged humor (I wrote 'humour' in the Loeb Library), I am truly sorry to spoil the best of what Suetonius would call *frigida et arcesita ioca*. But regard for accuracy compels me to state that the reviewer misquotes the sentence at II., p. 103, and that the presence of the words 'tickets for' before the bulkier articles makes the passage decidedly less 'comically alarming.' To reject every word that to a lively imagination can possibly suggest a double meaning or a comical reminiscence is too much to demand of any man, and 'he had a bad fall' (II. 239. 2) shall stand, spite of Humpty Dumpty. I leave Professor Duff 'hens' (*quicquid ibi gallinarum erat interit*), merely protesting that he did not quote me correctly; 'all' is a small word, but its omission is quite as criminal as to write 'poety' for poetry, and it spoils the rhythm of my sentence.

I have no desire to make light of a serious subject. I cannot forgive myself for so many *errata*, even in 1,088 pages; but, as Professor Duff has shown within somewhat smaller compass, *humanum est errare*.

JOHN C. ROLFE.