

Marlowe's Works: Poems. Edited by L. C. MARTIN. Pp. ix + 304. London: Methuen, 1931. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THIS volume contains Marlowe's little-known versions of Ovid's *Amores* and the first book of Lucan; neither is more than a curiosity to-day. The author of *Hero and Leander* clearly found Ovid congenial, and his translation contains passages of great charm; but much of it is tortuous and obscure, obviously hurried work. It is a wildly erratic version of an erratic text; for instance: 'Plena venit canis de grege praeda lupis' is rendered,

From dog-kept flocks come preys to wolves
most grateful.

The translation of Lucan, an early specimen of undramatic blank verse, is more straightforward and less attractive; also the discrepancy between the modern text and Marlowe's is far less. The editor's footnotes contain a full and careful collection of the mistakes in

translation, and the text Marlowe used is as far as possible reconstructed. D. W. LUCAS.

King's College, Cambridge.

The Archaeology of Surrey (The County Archaeologies). By D. C. WHIMSTER. Pp. xiv + 254; 12 plates, 40 figures and maps, and 1 folding map. London: Methuen, 1931. 10s. 6d.

THE pre-Roman, Roman and Saxon remains of Surrey are fairly numerous but not of outstanding importance. Mr. Whimster provides a sensible account of them, satisfactorily fulfilling the modest aims he proposes for himself. The gazetteer should be of value to local students. The distribution maps are unfortunately small and very often not clear, though a larger scale might suggest far greater accuracy of record than is in many cases justified.

J. A. PETCH.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

I was interested to notice that in his review of my translation of the *Ars Amatoria* your reviewer (*C.R.*, February, p. 38) spoke of Ovid's 'elevated language and mock solemnity,' and the more so that a similar phrase was used by another reviewer elsewhere. Evidently this is a more or less received view, and it appears to me to be a false one.

The theory of mock solemnity begins to show slight cracks on the first and obvious point of metre. It is difficult to believe that with so definite a tradition in the matter Ovid would have chosen the elegiac as his medium had he been intending to secure an effect by the contrast of mock-impressive treatment and trifling subject. He chose the elegiac presumably as the appropriate metre for erotic matter, and though we need not press the words too much, he is at pains in his introduction to disclaim the higher inspiration and the Hesiodic tradition.

After this warning one is not surprised to find the cracks spreading terribly upon further examination. It is necessary perhaps to premise that poetic diction will of its essence be at least slightly more elevated than that of prose, and in consequence something more than that ordinary elevation will be needed to support a supposition of mock-heroic burlesque. Were I asked to write down a few couplets representing the general tone of diction and treatment in the *Ars Amatoria*, they would be, out of an *embarras de richesse* conned at random, such as these:

Parua leuis capiunt animos: fuit utile multis
Puluinum facili composuisse manu.

Et lacrimae prosunt: lacrimis adamanta
mouebis.

Fac madidas uideat, si potes, illa genas.

Sensit et Hylaei contentum saucius arcum:

Sed tamen hoc arcu notior alter erat.

Compositum discrimen erit: discrimina lauda;
Torserit igne comam: torte capille, place.

It is difficult for me to read into these lines any peculiar elevation of language. In them and their greatly preponderant brethren, the mainly commonplace words appear to fall into their pattern with a minimum of poetic contrivance and a quiet economy of effort: they say what is to be said lightly and rapidly, and the art is not that of the burlesquer conveying humdrum situation or information with high seriousness, but that of the poet making plain materials sing.

The preponderant diction doubtless does not end the matter. It may be that the use of mythology is made a test point. But the presence of mythology in a Roman poet's work says nothing: for the mock-heroic purpose the mythological element must be a semi-portentous machinery. Ovid's is not that: from the didactic point of view much of it is parallel to the use of cases in a modern psychological treatise, and mythology may be fairly considered the Roman poet's natural case-book: from the artistic, it is *décor*. Further it allows Ovid a field for two of his strong points, the creation of pictures and the light and easy telling of a story, which he would not easily renounce, and I see no ground for assuming any further purpose. In the cases where the story is developed, the treatment appears to bear this out: it is the swift sketching of a picture or sometimes a series of panels, if we may so put it, in a comedic vein. Nowhere is the ordinary mortal

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