

'One ought to associate the words of a foreign language with the objects themselves, of which words are but vocal pictures. Take German, for instance: when the reader meets the word *Baum* there should recur at once to his mind the object itself, and not the English word *tree*... While he is merely reading German, the English *tree* should not intrude into the thought.'

The illustrative specimens are also in the main well selected and suitably annotated: the two first, an English version of a passage from Hugo's *Le roi s'amuse* and a German one of a stanza from Tennyson's 'Blow bugles, blow,' may be singled out as examples of the translator's art. But a book of this kind naturally challenges criticism at every turn. So when, to illustrate Cauey's dictum that 'the translator should always observe any broken syntax or obscurity there may be in the original,' Virgil's 'exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor' is rendered 'Arise, *some* avenger from my *bones*' (italics, of course, are mine), it must be noted that *some* is here un-English while *bones* is grotesque, and that 'Arise, Avenger, from my ashes!' would be a preferable rendering. On p. 56 Prof. Tolman blames the customary translation of 'L'état c'est moi,' 'I am the State,' as tame, and

prefers 'The State—it is I.' He forgets that the proud monarch, if uttering his vaunt in English, would 'spake' his *I* 'in italics,' and that while 'the State—it is I' is, to say the least, not ordinary English, the French phrase is the sole expression of the sense intended. The question of dialect is doubtless a delicate one; but I do not expect Prof. Tolman to adopt the defence of one of his countrymen whose idioms I had criticised, and to quote Theocritus for proof that 'Dorians may talk in Doric an they please.' I should imagine that he would reject this plea as provincial, admit that the literary English *κοινή* is the proper vehicle for published English translations, and perhaps concede that, when he translates Ennius' couplet

Ego deum genus esse dixi et dicam caelitum;
sed eos non curare opinor quid agat humanum genus

as 'I maintain and always shall maintain that there is a race of gods up in heaven, but *they don't bother, I guess, (my italics)* about what men do here,' he is, from this point of view, translating dignified Latin into undignified American.

J. P. P.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PHILLIMORE'S *PROPERTIUS*.

I HOPE in the course of a few months to get sufficient leisure from professional duties to make a detailed reply to the various censors who have criticised my edition of *Propertius*. I shall then have the pleasure of confronting Mr. J. Arbuthnot Nairn with Schulze who hails with approbation the fact that even in England there is a revolt against the re-writing school of critics.

For the moment I desire only to call attention to one matter in the *Classical Review's* recent article upon my *Propertius*. Mr. Nairn appears to be a slave to what I may call the 'progress-and-reaction' fallacy. To call an edition 'progressive' or 'reactionary' is respectively with some critics to bless it or to damn it: without regard to the question 'Is it progress away from, or reaction towards, what (according to the existing evidence) *Propertius* wrote?'

I leave (says Mr. Nairn) the text of *Propertius* in the state in which it was 20 years ago. I fear it may horrify him even

more if I confess that in my belief *Propertius* is more authentically given in Beroaldus' edition than in the new *Corpus* after 400 years of Progress. But as for the last 20 years, how does the case stand? There have been two main trends, represented, the one by Rothstein (illustrating the text of Vahlen very slightly altered), with the caution and humility of erudite and sympathetic scholarship—and the other by the dogmatic *Nolo interpretari* of the 'wildcat' school of English humanists, out-Baehrensing Baehrens when Baehrens had been disavowed by the mass of continental critics. Between these two I have made my choice. And I am content to be called a disappointing and belated editor, for the same stigma may be applied for the same reason to all editors of Milton since Bentley, who do not swallow Bentley's rewritings of *Paradise Lost*, and to all editors of Aeschylus who leave *Agamemnon* still pretty much as it was before Mr. Margoliouth's recension.

Within the limits of my present reference, I will only add this that Mr. Nairn's citation from my *Preface*, p. v. is, to put it in round terms, neither fair quotation nor sane reasoning. After summarizing the direct data for a text I went on to name, in a separate paragraph, two commentators. I added the obvious reservation in the case of Rothstein.¹

¹ 'Interpretum praeceptos habuimus Hertzberg et Rothstein, utrumque in tradita codicum auctoritate vindicanda felicissimum, quamvis ille apparatu critico niteretur mendoso, hic locupletissimam eruditionem

Mr. Nairn ignores it. Draw out the logical major premiss of his argument and it is this: 'No editor can be critical, who praises among commentaries a commentary which has no *ad hoc* recension accompanying it': which seems hard on Rothstein, on Vahlen (not least), and on me,—and on the reader who judges a book by the judgment of the *Classical Review*.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

totam in commentarios non in recensionem iustam largitus sit.

VERSIONS.

Cassius.

Hear me, good brother,—

Brutus.

Under your pardon:—you must note beside
That we have tried the utmost of our
friends;

Our legions are brim-full, our cause is ripe:
The enemy increaseth every day;

We, at the height, are ready to decline.

There is a tide in the affairs of men

Which taken at the flood leads on to
fortune;

Omitted, all the voyage of our life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

On such a full sea are we now afloat,

And we must take the current when it
serves,

Or lose our ventures.

SHAKESPEARE, *Julius Caesar* IV 3.

A. Καὶ μὴν ἄκουσον ἐν μέρει κάμου τόδε,—

B. μήπω γε, δέῃ καὶ τοῦτο δ' ἐνοεῖν, ὅτι

χρέος τὸ πιστόν ἐσμεν ἐκ τοῦ πυθμένος

πράξαντες ὄργῃ πάντα, πληθύνει στρατός·

καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἰσχὺς αὐξεται καθ' ἡμέραν,

ἡμῖν δ' ἐτοῖμος ἀκμάσας ἤδη φθίνειν.

ῤεῖ τοι βρότεια πράγματ'· εὐροούντα δὲ

ἦν μὲν λάβη τις, πλεῖ ξὺν οὐρία τύχη·

εἰ δ' οὖν ἀμάρτη, βράχεσι καὶ δυσπραξίαις

ξυνὸν τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου ναυτῖλλεται.

τοιᾶδε χῆμᾶς καιρὸς ἐν πλημμυρίδι

πλεῖν, ἢ παρέντας ἐμπολῆς ἀμαρτάνειν.

W. HEADLAM.

MARGARET AND DORA.

Margaret's beauteous: Grecian arts

Ne'er drew form completer,

Yet why, in my heart of hearts,

Hold I Dora sweeter!

Dora's eyes of heavenly blue

Pass all painting's reach,

Ringdove's notes are discord to

The music of her speech.

Artists! Margaret's smile receive,

And on canvas show it;

But for perfect worship leave

Dora to her poet.

T. CAMPBELL. 1802?

IDEM GRAECE REDDITUM.

Μορφῇ μὲν πρόχειε κούρη χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοία

Λευκονόη, θείας ὡσπερ ἄγαλμα τέχνης.

Μᾶλλον ἔμοιγ' ἔμπας Δωρὶς περὶ κῆρι φιλεῖται,

ἰμερόεν γλαυκοῖς ὄμμασι δερκομένη,

Τῆς, ὅπταν φθέγγεται, ἔρωτ' αὐδῶσα πελειᾶς

τραχύτερον προτεῖ λειριώεσσαν ὄπα.

Τὴν μὲν δὴ, δύνασαι γάρ, ἀγαλματοποιεῖ ἀφο-
μοίου·

Μοῦσα φίλη, σὺ δ' ἔμοι Δωριδ' ἔσωθε γράφε.

L. CAMPBELL. 1902.