No. 6 June, 1966

P E G A S U S

University of Exeter Classical Society Magazine

Editors: Terence J. Hunt
Roy Lett
Charles Wigmore

CONTENTS

* * * * *

ERRATUM

We regret the omission of Mr. Roy Lett's name from the list of editors of p. 1 of the last issue of Pegasus.

The Editors

* * * * *

RONSARD'S "A SA MUSE" AND HORACE'S "EXEGI MONUMENTUM"

It is a commonplace of literary criticism to state that a poem consciously imitated from another poem can itself be original and personal. Originality, we know, lies not in the particular idea or theme, but in the treatment of the source material, in what the imitator wilfully rejects from his model, and in what he adds to the original text in the way of poetic detail, personal emotion, emphasis and technique. Thus where a paraphrase, adaptation or imitation of a source is involved, it is fundamental to the question of originality and aesthetics to compare the model and the poem understudy very closely in order to discover those subtle differences of approach and tone which often constitute a poem's particular quality and its lasting appeal.

Such a process is not frequently demonstrated in detail by teachers or critics for it falls outside the framework of most fields of academic interest. However a comparative study of this sort is valuable as a literary exercise for it not only tells us more about the nature of poetry and aesthetics, but, if more than one language is involved, it reveals interesting side-lights about the construction, vocabulary and syntax of those languages and of the limitations and possibilities of expression permitted by the respective tongues.

This method of comparative study is essential when considering the poetry of Pierre de Ronsard (1524-1585), for he, like the other poets of the Pléiade, openly admitted and boasted of his debt to classical literature. It was, indeed, a fundamental principle of the Pléiade's theory of poetry that their verse should be imitated from the best Greek and Latin writings. It was their belief that through a deep familiarity and assimilation of classical texts and techniques the impoverished French language would at last be able to express the widest possible range of subjects - scientific, philosophical, cosmic, epic, religious and moral - and would automatically produce its Homer, its Lucretius and its Virgil.

A particularly rewarding comparative study can be made of Ronsard's poem A Sa Muse with which he originally closed his first four books of Odes published in 1550:

"Plus dur que fer, j'ai fini mon ouvrage,
Que l'an dispost à demener les pas,
Ne l'eau rongearde ou des freres la rage
L'injuriant ne ruront point à bas:
Quand ce viendra que mon dernier trespas
M'asouspira d'un somme dur, à l'heure
Sous le tumbeau tout Ronsard n'ira pas
Restant de lui la part qui est meilleure.
Tousjours tousjours, sans que jamais je meure
Je volerai tout vif par l'univers,
Eternizant les champs où je demeure
De mon renom engressés et couvers:
Pour avoir joint les deus harpeurs divers
Au dous babil de ma lire d'ivoire,
Se connoissans Vandomois par mes vers.

Sus donque Muse emporte au ciel la gloire
Que j'ai gaignée annonçant la victoire
Dont à bon droit je me voi jouissant,
Et de ton fils consacre la memoire
Cerrant son front d'un laurier verdissant."

The source of this poem is almost certainly evident to any student even remotely familiar with Horace's Odes. It appears from a hasty comparison to be a virtual translation of the Latin Exegi monumentum (III, xxx):

"Exegi monumentum aere perennius
regalique situ pyramidum altius,
quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
possit diruere aut innumerabilis
annorum series et fuga temporum.
non omnis moriar multaque pars mei
vitabit Libitinam: usque ego postera
crescam laude recens. dum Capitolium
scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex,
dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus
et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium
regnavit populorum, ex humili potens
princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos
deduxisse modos. sume superbiam
quaesitam meritis et mihi Delphica
lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam."

Although Horace is the main source for the French ode, Ronsard may well be recalling, in addition, certain details from the concluding lines of Ovid's Metamorphoses:

"Iamque opus exegi, quid nec Iovis ira nec ignis
nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas.
cum volet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius
ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi:
parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis
astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum,
quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,
ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama,
siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam." 1.

---

1. Certain details lead one to suppose that Ronsard has this passage consciously in mind, for Ovid's "edax ... vetustas" is reflected, perhaps, in the French adjective "rongearde", whilst the Latin "Iovis ira" may well be echoed in Ronsard's "des freres la rage". It is also possible that Ovid's "parte ... meliore mei" rather than Horace's "multaque pars mei" is translated in Ronsard's "la part qui est meilleure". However these are the only brief reminiscences of Ovid which occur in Ronsard's ode, and for the purpose of this comparative study we have decided to discount Ovid's relatively minor role in order to concentrate our attention on Horace's poem.

In spite of Ronsard's close imitation of Horace's essential ideas and developments, it is my contention that the French ode is itself a remarkably original, personal and poetic treatment of similar themes. Such a statement would doubtless antagonise those critics who in the past have insisted on Ronsard's slavish imitation — "il [Ronsard] suivit vers par vers l'épilogue latin", wrote Paul Laumonier (1), whilst André Barbier echoes the same thought, "Ronsard y suit d'ailleurs de fort près l'ode d'Horace" (2) — but in the remainder of this article I hope to be able to justify this dogmatic assertion concerning Ronsard's originality.

Like Horace, Ronsard's development of ideas is fundamentally the same, for both poems express the belief in the immortality of poetry over worldly transience within progressive stages. Lines 1-4 of Ronsard's ode refer to poetry's victory over time, the elements and destiny, three corrupting powers of flux. Lines 5-8 more particularly deal with the relationship between Ronsard, his art and man's final reckoning, death; and, although death appears to triumph, it is rendered painless like sleep, and poetry, "the better part" of Ronsard, survives. Lines 9-15 develop the theme of the poet's fame in detail and mention to what Ronsard owes his glory, namely that he has adapted Pindar and Horace ("les deus harpeurs divers") to his native language. The classical apostrophe of lines 16-20 calls on the Muse to consecrate the poet's victory over the elements of transience by crowning him with the laurel wreath.

Although the construction of the French poem is basically the same as Horace's ode, Ronsard's development of the idea of the immortality of poetry — that is the actual transition from death to after-life — is much more emphatic and more poetically expressed. In lines 5-6 Ronsard purposely insists on the apparent finality of death — "dernier trespas", "somme dur" — whilst nevertheless underlining its painlessness by reference to a classical euphemism: Death is sleep, and this idea is poetically evoked in the French poem by the alliteration of the soft sibilant "s" (remembering that in 16th century French the "s" in the words "trespas" and "asouspira" — now disappeared — would be pronounced) and the long vowel sounds of "M'asouspira d'un somme dur".

This adjective "dur", applied to death, consciously echoes the "plus dur que fer", related to poetry (l. 1), as if to suggest that at this stage in the struggle between fame and transience the opposing forces are at equal strength. By this clever repetition of an epithet Ronsard has pointed to the pivot of his transition from death to life and has subtly added an aesthetic level to the conflict. The tussle between poetry and death is on an artistic as well as thematic level. The importance of this word "dur" as the fulcrum is underlined furthermore by Ronsard's use of versification. The enjambment at line 5 means that the reader

---

1. Ronsard Poète Lyrique, Paris, Hachette, 1909, p.368.
2. Pierre de Ronsard: Poèmes, choisis et commentés par A. Barbier, Blackwell's French Texts, Oxford, 1946, p.133.

moves quickly from line 4 up to the adjective "dur", where he waits in suspension, for the caesura break in line 6, which divides the decasyllabic line into two unequal measures of 8 and 2, causes him to pause at this point and leaves him in expectation.

This apparent victory of oblivion is followed by a rapid reversal of idea. The speed of this reversal, where death gives way to after-life, is again emphasised by Ronsard's versification, for the enjambment of lines 6 and 7 necessitates the reader moving from line 6 to line 8 in a single breath. Moreover this final triumph of life over death is accentuated by the inversion and negative statement of line 7, and by the positioning, in line 8, of the important key words "restant" and "meilleure" at the head and foot of the line respectively; for these disyllabic words bracket six monosyllables and receive all the stress.

The triumph of life is developed one stage further in the following lines by the combined forces of sound and sense. The long vowel sounds, the repetition of "tousjours", the emphatic position of the disyllabic "jamais" in a hemistich of monosyllables, the alliteration of "j" and the heavy rhythm and balanced construction (measures of 4 and 6 of the line,

"Tousjours tousjours, sans que jamais je meure",

all evoke the durability of poetry and succeed in rendering death invalid, irrelevant. The ponderous nature of this line is immediately broken by means of an enjambment and by the rapid movement and liveliness of,

"Je volerai tout vif par l'univers",

in which the short vowel sounds, the alliteration of "v" and the brisk rhythm (4 monosyllables and 2 trisyllabic words arranged in a musical pattern of 4, 2, 4) all express the victory of life over death.

Ronsard has, however, not finished his transition. Images of life now become images of richness and generation with help of the picturesque and visual detail of the words "engressés" and "couvers", which suggest the poet's fame fertilising the fields where he has lived. Poetic immortality has become a concrete force for preservation and not an abstract concept as in Horace. Again the word positioning of line 11 is similar to that of line 8, for the important key words "eternizant" and "demeure" are placed at the beginning and end of the line and so receive especial stress, the more so since they are the only words in the line which are not monosyllables.

Thus over a period of eight lines Ronsard has defeated death by an alliance of sound and sense. By a sensitive use of rhythm, versification, word order, enjambment, choice of vocabulary and realistic and visual detail, Ronsard has moved from images of death and oblivion to images of life and, finally, to images of growth and fertility. These eight lines are all the more fundamental to the original and poetic contribution of Ronsard since they transpose three rather undistinguished lines of the Latin source (ll. 6-8).

Another factor that transforms Ronsard's poem and contributes to its originality is the personal emotion behind the lines, the arrogant, youthful confidence (Ronsard was twenty-six when he published this collection of Odes) which emanates from every word and which is so different from the restrained classical emotion and moderate attitude of Horace. Whilst students tend to find Ronsard's arrogance offensive, one should remember that this is a moral rather than an aesthetic criticism and is a consideration that has to be overcome if one is to enjoy the full flavour of the French poet's personal contribution.

The assertive confidence of Ronsard's statement is prepared in the emphatic opening of his ode. In the very first line,

"Plus dur que fer, j'ai fini mon ouvrage",

the certainty of the poet's immortality is emphasised by the perfectly balanced line (measures of 4 and 6), by the determination of the labial-dental sounds (P, D, K, F) and by the unequivocal finality of the tone, which is helped in this case by the classical inversion.

In the remainder of the poem up to line 16 Ronsard continues in the same declamatory and assertive manner. We have already noted that the position of certain key words in lines 8, 9 and 11 is basic to Ronsard's confident transition from death to life. Indeed this whole central portion expresses an unwavering self-assurance. Similarly the emphatic certainty of the poet's statements is reinforced on several occasions by the use of negative assertion. This is a technique of persuasion whereby a positive statement is expressed through a negative emphasis in such a way that all doubt is removed. Ronsard adopts this technique in lines 3-4, 7 (rendered even more effective here by an inversion) and line 9, which we have already had cause to analyse in detail. Again the assurance with which Ronsard's verbs move, like those of his model, from past tenses to future tenses cleverly fuse together in the present, negate the passage of time and anticipate the glory he is to enjoy.

This assertive tone reaches its most declamatory pitch in Ronsard's final invocation to his Muse, which is nothing less than a jubilant battle hymn to victory, an arrogant appraisal of his own merit. Horace, it should be noted, humbly attributes his fame to Melpomene, specifically stating that any honour he enjoys as a poet has been won by the Muse's efforts, and graciously asks to be crowned (1). In Ronsard's apostrophe, however, the militant and declamatory tone borders on a sort of religious fervour, a rhetorical incantation, expressed by a concrete, visual vocabulary and physical imagery, and by a series of arrogant open vowel sounds (note especially the "wa" sound of "gloire", "victoire",

---

1. On the interpretation of Horace's final lines compare this remark of E. C. Wickham (editor), Horace, Oxford, 1912, vol.I, p.221: "The Muse who inspires is so identified with the poet that his pride and his merits are hers, though it is she that crowns him."

"droit", "voi", "memoire"), and a predominance of proud-sounding nasals ("emporte", "annoncant", "dont", "bon", "jouissant", "ton", "consacre", "serrant", "son front", "verdissant"). A series of enjambments, which symbolise the inevitability of the poet's glory, and this declamation, this emotional climax, culminates in the final scene of triumph,

"Serrant son front d'un laurier verdissant",

in which all the sounds (the alliteration of "r", "s" and the repetition of nasals) evoke the poet's proud conquest, and the young and ever-green image of the "laurier verdissant" becomes a symbol of his undying fame, reaching forward across the years.

Moreover Ronsard does not beg or request his Muse in the humble manner of his model, nor does he treat her with Horace's respect and deference. Ronsard commands his Muse to consecrate him by using imperative verb forms (ll. 16 and 19) and presumptuously states that it is his just reward ("à bon droit") that he should gain immortality.

Whilst this study has already shown Ronsard's originality and mastery as an artist, there are other clear instances in this ode of his poetic skill and of his independence of his source. In line 2 for example,

"Que l'an dispost à demener les pas",

although the notion of fleeting time is borrowed from Horace, Ronsard has expressed the idea poetically with the aid of the doubled alliteration of three consonantal sounds ("l", "d", "p") and the careful rhythmic arrangement of monosyllabic, disyllabic and trisyllabic words. One can almost hear the echoing footsteps of retreating time in this line.

Again in lines 3-4,

"Ne l'eau rongearde ou des freres la rage
L'injuriant ne ruront point à bas",

the ideas are recalled from Horace and Ovid, but Ronsard makes excellent use of sound here and employs periphrasis to good effect. "Des freres la rage" refers to Castor and Pollux and thus denotes the injurious forces of the stars or destiny. By introducing this periphrasis Ronsard deliberately includes three more "r" sounds in his lines, and it is the alliteration of this consonant which evokes the wrath and destruction of the forces of flux. Here we have a good example of a stylistic device used poetically and meaningfully, and not arbitrarily or gratuitously as is often the case in the work of an inferior poet.

In lines 13-14,

"Pour avoir joint les deus harpeurs divers
Au dous babil de ma lire d'ivoire",

Ronsard again combines sound and sense to perfection, for the alliteration of "d" and "v" and the "i" vowel sound musically evoke the plucking sound of the accompanying lyre. It is interesting to note that besides modernising and "Frenchifying" his adaptation at this point (1), Ronsard introduces the periphrastic reference to "les deus harpeurs divers" (Pindar and Horace) to poetic effect, for the alliteration of "d" is, as we have just remarked, fundamental to the alliance of sound and sense.

Such a study is, of course, highly subjective and open to the criticism of "having gone too far" or "not far enough". I have purposely tried to limit myself to those essential features of both poems which would be generally acceptable to students of French and the Classics, and I think that even the most sceptical and cynical reader will agree, on a close comparison of these two texts, that Ronsard, whilst imitating his ideas from Horace's poem, has created an original, personal and poetic ode, and that his arrogant boast of immortality has been seen to be justified.

MALCOLM QUAINTON
Department of French, Exeter

---

(1) I have purposely refrained from stressing this important aspect of Ronsard's originality, because Paul Laumonier has already drawn attention to this feature (op. cit., p.368), where he writes of Ronsard "substituant avec habileté aux détails purement romains et horatiens ceux qui concernaient sa personne et son pays."

A FRAGMENT OF JUVENAL?

The discovery in 1899 of the O fragment of Juvenal's sixth satire, if it did little to enhance the poet's reputation, had at least the salutary effect of ruffling the complacency of his editors, who had never suspected that the work as they had it was incomplete. That Winstedt's discovery may not have been unique is suggested by a note found among the papers of Dr. Holofern (ob. 1870) of Hilltop School in Warwickshire. Holofern, whose early Prolusiones Academicae ('De Aristotele animi in rem publicam nimis paterni' and 'Horatius quo se modo cuilibet quidlibet praestiterit nec tamen non incolumis evaserit') caused something of a stir, was disappointed by the cool reception accorded to his more ambitious ventures in historical criticism, 'Thucydides Reprobatus: de Justissima Atheniensium in Melios Vindicta' 1839 (which led to a heated controversy with Dr. Arnold) and 'De Lycanthropis: Graecorum Historia Funditus Retractata' 1847. This, and his failure to obtain the preferment that had been confidently predicted, led him to eschew further publication, resign his fellowship, and betake himself to school-keeping. His interest in scholarship remained, however, unabated, and he left behind him a number of meticulously composed papers remarkable for their fresh and unconventional approach to Classical literature, and expressed in vigorous and lucid language.

Holofern's claim to have discovered some lines of Juvenal in a country rectory (the full circumstances remain unknown) was never communicated to a world 'desidia (as he expresses it) et socordia obtorpescentem', and he did not (alas) live to complete his edition of the fragment, which he had intended for posthumous publication. He was certainly assured of the authenticity of his find which (disregarding, it would seem, the possibility of a Doppelrezenzion of Satire X) he supposed to have been part of an early, and probably uncompleted, satire. That the fragment was actually committed to writing by Juvenal while serving with Agricola in the Scottish campaign of 84 A.D., and independantly preserved and transmitted in this country (possibly, as he hints elsewhere, in the little-known Bibliotheca Godivensis) is a bold and provocative hypothesis, typical of the man, though unlikely, it may be, to win immediate acceptance in a less confident and robust epoch.

The present whereabouts of the MS is unknown and the text has been transcribed as it stands, with Holofern's introductory note, from the impeccable calligraphy of his autograph notebook.

RM

Quod viri doctissimi prioris et eruditioris saeculi asseverare non dubitabant, Juvenalem poetam aliquando in Britannia functum esse militia, illud contra recentiores adversantium asseclas, blennos profecto homines et timiditate occaecatos, numquis nunc affirmare cunctabitur, hoc fragmento chartaceo fretus vetustissimo certe et mirum in modum adhuc servato, quod in villa repertum viri equestris ordinis,

haut sane indocti mihique admodum familiaris, Nathaniel Vasconis, prope a Stratfordio juxta Avonem flumen sita, jam in lucem mendis nonnullis leviter sanatis censui prodendum? quodsi militiae taedium et splena quod vocatur Britannicum nescioquo modo redolens cum aliquibus Anglici cuiusdam poetae barbaris ariolationibus tibi, lector, congruere vel consentire vel potius conspirare vel etiam (quod bona sit venia dictum) correspondere videbitur, ne nimium, quaeso, mireris; quippe cum non minus fuerit usitatum versificatoribus olim nostris vernaculis Romanorum auctorum sententias lingua sua vertere ac pro suis venditare quam nunc sit hominibus aliquanto doctioribus ambitionis causa Latinam sibi arrogare linguam. Sed haec minuscularia isti potius e nostratibus sibi habento quorum cura est res planas explanare et Anglicarum litterarum sterili versare litus aratro: tu vero divini poetae versus politissimos pellege, perpende, admirare, atque adeo mentis vacuis inscribe tabellis.

dabam de Monte Kal. Apr. MDCCCLXVI.

Crastina quid spectas? aliud manet, inde aliud cras.
Proxima quaeque dies tardum atque ignobile repit
Segnis iter, donec serissima linea claudat
Ingentem historiam, et series praelonga dierum
Hesternarum ideo tantum eluxisse videtur
Vt fatuos ad pulvereum deduceret Orcum.
Candelam ergo brevem quidni restinguimus, umbrae
Quippe vagae, aerumnas velut histrio Pacuvianas
Turpis ubi evomuit, fregitque impulsa cothurno
Pulpita, conticuit? Deliras nempe fabellas
Hic agimus, quales pulmone phrenecticus aegro
Effutiat, sine mente sonos et inania verba.

* * * * * *

> The best known separative error in the tradition of the Greek classics is probably the omission of the verse Soph. O.T.800 in Cod. Laur. 32.9 of the tenth or eleventh century (L) as against the thirteenth century manuscripts (ΔΓ). It is generally agreed today, quite rightly, that no Byzantine in those three centuries, in fact no scholar of any period, could have composed this line. Moreover it has meanwhile been proved by means of other separative errors in L (mostly, it is true, in the text of the scholia) that a number of Byzantine manuscripts of Sophocles are independent of L (cf. Byz. Zeitschr. XXXVI. 455 on V. de Marco). The text of the poet in the common exemplar was obviously transcribed by L with unusual care. [Emphasis mine — JMF]

The difficulty arises over the last sentence of the paragraph quoted. 'Unusual care' would hardly accord with the omission of verse 800 - and yet to what else can the phrase refer? That it is not a mistake in the translation is shown by the original German: Den Dichtertext der gemeinsamen Vorlage hat L offenbar ungewöhnlich sorgfältig abgeschrieben. (This passage appeared first in the second German edition, 1949, on which the English translation is based. There are a few changes incorporated from the third German edition, 1957, but they do not affect this sentence). There remains one possible explanation: that the phrase is used ironically. But (a) I think this unlikely in a serious book where it could lead to confusion; (b) I am told that this use of irony is highly improbable in German; (c) from the rest of the book, this does not seem typical of the author's style.

Since it is clear that, as it stands, the English is at best confusing and at worst plainly wrong, is it possible that this minor error — for after all it is the sense, not the grammar, that is wrong — has escaped the notice of all the proof readers in three editions as well as the author himself?

J. M. FOREMAN

* * * * * *

A PRESENTATION COPY OF CASAUBON'S ATHENAEUS IN EXETER CATHEDRAL LIBRARY

The Cathedral Library has, for some time (1), been in possession of the two volumes of Casaubon's Athenaeus, the text of 1597 and the Animadversiones of 1600. Both are similarly bound in vellum, and have probably passed through the same hands before they reached the Cathedral Library — as I hope to show later. But I shall first discuss the history of our copy of the Animadversiones, which was Casaubon's presentation copy to Richard Thomson — a fact which has not been noticed before.

At the bottom of the title-page of our copy of the Animadversiones — a place normally used by authors of that age for dedications — there is a subscription in what is undoubtedly Casaubon's hand (2). It reads:

Richardo Thomsoni suo
viro doctissimo
d.d.
Is. Casaubonus. (3)

The book contains many marginal notes, some in the hand of Richard Thomson, some by later hands. These are of no great interest: they are mainly in the nature of readers' comments on a word or two in the text — in some cases a word or a phrase translated into English (4), in many cases a word or a phrase underlined — especially proper names and books or authors mentioned. But there is a note on the fly-leaf, which is clearly in Thomson's hand (5), the history of which we can trace in some detail. It reads (6):

Casaubonus scripturum & editurum se promittit.
Criticum Praefatio ad lectorem. & alibi saepe.
Senatusconsultum Arginiensium in Eubuli honorem. p.271
De notibus sanctorum in seclis hymnis ecclesiasticis. 277.
De usu stapedum. p. 283.
Commentar. in Persium. 285.
Prolegomena in Athenaeum. Praefatio.
De Proverbijs. p.6.
Commentar. de coloribus 37.
Commentar. de lectis veterum. 60.
Comment. ad Polybium. 381.

These are notes Thomson took, as he was reading parts of the book, of other works in various stages of preparation which Casaubon refers to as forthcoming, usually in the future tense. For example, the words 'Criticum Praefatio ad lectorem' refer to Casaubon's words on the first page of the Praefatio: 'Nos autem in eo libro quem acuratissima diligentia de Critica fecimus, plurimos in vitam errores ab hoc fonte manasse, vero vicimus' (7). Fortunately, we can find more about the background of this note, and of this presentation copy in general, in some of Casaubon's published letters — and it is to these that we must turn now.

Richard Thomson (d.1613), better known as 'Dutch Thomson', was a famous Classical and Biblical scholar at that age (8). Born in Holland of English parents, he later became a fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he received his education. He distinguished himself mainly in the fields of Biblical and Rabbinical studies (9), and was one of the translators of the Old Testament for the Authorized Version. His connections with the Continent made him a kind of 'go-between' for English and Continental scholars. He was a friend of Joseph Scaliger, and corresponded with him about Classical and other subjects, providing him at times with some information of what was going on in the Classical world in England — sometimes even on the reception of his works by English scholars (10). Thomson was one of Casaubon's closest friends. Their friendship lasted until Thomson's death. He helped Casaubon with rare books and manuscripts, encouraged him with his works, and was one of his few English friends who did not turn their back on him when he arrived in England (11). In Almeloveen's edition of Casaubon's letters, eleven letters from Casaubon to Thomson are published (12). Casaubon calls him (13) τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς τὸ ἥμισυ, amicissime Thomson (14) and doctissime Thomson (15), and the tone of his letters to him is always that of a most intimate friend.

Among these letters, we have the actual letter of Casaubon to Thomson which accompanied this presentation copy of the Animadversiones. It is Almeloveen Ep. CCXIII. Since most of my readers will find it rather difficult to refer to Almeloveen's edition — of which, as far as I know, no copy exists in any public library in Exeter — I print the relevant part of it as Appendix A.

But this is not the end of the story. Thomson was far from satisfied with noting down Casaubon's promises of forthcoming publications. He sent a letter to Casaubon, in which, as was his wont, he encouraged him to press on with his work on all these promised books. Casaubon found it necessary to explain his plans to Thomson and to give reasons for the delay in publishing these works. Thomson's letter, if it is still preserved, has not, to the best of my knowledge, been published. But Casaubon's answer is printed as Epistle CCLXVIII in Almeloveen's edition. For reasons similar to those just given, I print the relevant part of this letter as Appendix B. The reader will notice that Casaubon is referring to 'libellorum editio, de quibus breviter ad Athenaeum' - 'the publication of books briefly mentioned in the notes to Athenaeus' - and that he is talking of the 'Commentarium de coloribus' as part of a greater work, 'De re Vestiaria' - and of his forthcoming book on Persius. It is clear that this is an answer to some letter of Thomson, based on the note Thomson has written on the fly-leaf of our Cathedral Library copy of the Animadversiones.

So much for Casaubon's presentation copy to Thomson and its background, as far as this can be found in documents available in print. It is now time to ask, how did this presentation copy find its way into the possession of Exeter Cathedral Library.

So far we have only dealt with one of the two volumes, the Animadversiones of 1600, which was clearly Richard Thomson's copy. The other volume, the edition of Athenaeus of 1597, has no sign in it that it also belonged to Thomson. That both volumes are bound in the same type of vellum, is, perhaps, no proof in itself. But the names of two other owners appear in the 1597 volume: that of George Cuthbert and that of William Hutchenson. We shall return to these two gentlemen in a moment. Suffice it to say that Hutchenson's signature informs us quite clearly that he bought the 1597 volume 'cum altero volumine'. This can only mean that both the 1597 text and the 1600 Animadversiones were acquired together by Hutchenson (16). As for Cuthbert, I have no proof that the 1600 volume definitely belonged to him. It is more than likely that the words 'give these' in his signature on the inside of the back cover of the 1597 volume mean 'gave these two volumes'. The meaning of the whole phrase, however, is not clear (as we shall see later), and I would not like to risk a guess. But some marginal notes in the 1600 volume look very much as if they were written by his hand (17). If this is so, then the set of two volumes most probably belonged to the only two owners we know about apart from Thomson himself, and we shall see presently that their date could not be much later than that of Thomson. That Thomson would have had the text of 1597 as well as the Animadversiones of 1600 is more than likely. I think one can assume that it is Thomson's set of the two volumes which belonged to Cuthbert and Hutchenson later on. But who are they?

On the fly-leaf at the back of the 1597 volume we find an inscription: 'Mr. George Cuthbert / of the Queens' Colledge in Cambridge'. Inside the back cover of the same volume we have another inscription in the same hand: 'Mr. George Cuthbert / of the Queens' Colledge in Cambridge / give these'. On the fly-leaf at the front of the same volume there is another inscription by a different hand: 'Gulielmus Hutchensong. / A.P'. C. cum altero volumine. / 0-16-0.'

George Cuthbert is easier to detect. In the various editions and volumes of the Alumni Cantabrigienses there are a few people of that name, but there is only one who was 'of the Queens' Colledge in Cambridge'. He appears in Venn and Venn's Alumni, Part I, vol. I, 1922, p. 436. The very brief entry reads: 'Cuthbert George, Adm. Pens. of Queens', Sept. 18, 1599. of Northamptonshire'. There is no mention of whether he took a degree or how long he stayed in the University. But at least, he is the only George Cuthbert to be mentioned as a member of Queens', Cambridge - and a contemporary of Thomson's, too.

William Hutchenson is more difficult to fix with any amount of certainty. Three men of this name, connected with Devon and Exeter, are mentioned in Vol.II of Venn's Alumni, pp.441 ff. All three of them were rectors of Kenn, Devon, in succession: the first, 1604-16, the second, 1616-44, and the third ('Possibly', says the entry in the Alumni, 's. of William (1604)' — that is, of the second— 'whom he succeeded at Kenn'), 1644 to his death in 1675. The first two, though not the third, were prebendaries of Exeter, 1608-16 and 1624-44 respectively. The first was buried in Exeter Cathedral on July 22, 1616. The second left a will, dated 1644, which is mentioned in the Alumni as a document existing in Exeter (18). All three Hutchensons (whose names, incidentally, are spelt Hutchinson in the Alumni), were Cambridge men. The first was at Queens', the second at Pembroke and Clare, the third, again, at Queens'.

We are now left in the realm of probability and conjecture. It is tempting to guess that George Cuthbert was the man who bought this set at Cambridge, either from Thomson himself or at a sale of his books, and that one of the Hutchensons bought it with him and presented it to the Cathedral Library - probably as a bequest. But which of the three? The first two were prebendaries of Exeter Cathedral, but not the third. The first and the third - but not the second - went to Queens', where Cuthbert was in 1599, and therefore could have bought it straight from him, if he stayed in Queens' long enough. It looks as though the first Hutchenson, who was more likely than the other two to have been Cuthbert's contemporary at Queens' and was a prebendary in Exeter, is our man.

But this is not very likely. Richard Thomson died in 1613, a year before Casaubon. Being such a close friend of Casaubon's, one can hardly imagine him selling two of Casaubon's books - one of them a presentation copy - during his friend's lifetime - that is, in this case, during his own lifetime. The first Hutchenson left Cambridge for Devon in 1604. Even if he did visit Cambridge from time to time (and an Exeter man going to a place like Cambridge is bound to come across <u>some</u> books which are not constantly available here), he had only three years between Thomson's death and his own to buy the books and bring them here. That would imply that in three years the books passed through the hands of Cuthbert and Hutchenson to the Cathedral Library at Exeter. This, of course, is not unlikely. It is not even unlikely that Thomson <u>may</u> have sold the books in his own, and Casaubon's lifetime. If he was, as Prynne is quoted in the D.N.B. to have described him, 'a debosh'd drunken English Dutchman, who seldom went one night to bed sober', he may have needed to sell some of his books.

The third Hutchenson, again, is a possibility, because of his connections with Queens' - but he has no connection I can trace to the Cathedral. The second Hutchenson has some connections with the Cathedral - though not a Queens' man. The only one of the three whose signature survives is the second. Some specimens of his signature exist in the Salary Books of our Cathedral. I have examined them and compared them with the signature on the 1597 volume. Apart from the spelling (in the Cathedral books it is Hutchenson, not Hutchensong), the hand looks as if it may have been the same as that on the 1597 volume - but it is not the same in every detail. I have consulted Mrs. A. M. Erskine on this point, and she considers it not unlikely that the signatures <u>may</u> have belonged to the same man in various periods of his life. Beyond this one can hardly go.

The only George Cuthbert of Queens' entered Cambridge during Thomson's life - but once he has matriculated we lose track of him. The meaning of the words 'give these' in his signature is obscure. One may be tempted to interpret it as if the books were his donation to Exeter Cathedral. One may even assume that the second Hutchenson, being a Clare Hall man, bought it from Thomson or at the sale of his books, and that Cuthbert was the next owner and presented it to Exeter Cathedral. This is not unlikely, though one tends to prefer one of the Hutchensons, who were definitely connected with this part of the country, to Cuthbert, of whom we know nothing in connection with Exeter - in fact, nothing but his date of matriculation at Queens'.

Such is men's short memory. To illustrate this moral, one may, perhaps, touch on a point which, as regards the main body of this article, is a side issue - but, to me, a rather fascinating one. The second William Hutchenson, rector of Kenn like the other two, died in 1643 - to be precise, on February 21, 1643 - not in 1644, as in the Alumni. The proof of this can be found in his obituary notice in the Kenn Parish Registers, written in a neat Latin hand in the — otherwise rather undistinguished — 1538-1669 volume, p.222. It is too good not to be quoted in full:

> Anno 1643. Diu. Regni. C. R. Decimo. non. Obijt Gulielmus Hutchenson. Sacrae Theologiae Doctor; Archidiaconus Lewensis, Ecclesiae Cathedralis Exoniensis Canonus Residens Et Patronus: Necnon huius parochiae Rector: De eo si sileat Ingrata Posteritas Sat erit Compendio Dixisse: Theologiae Oraculum ffebr. XXJ 1643: Amissimus. (19).

J. GLUCKER.

Note: I am grateful to the following persons for help: to the Assistant Secretary of the Historical Manuscripts Commission for information about autographs of Richard Thomson; to Mrs. A. M. Erskine and Miss J. Packer of Exeter Cathedral Library for help in looking up signatures of William Hutchenson and identifying some hands; to the Reverend R. A. H. Bate, Rector of Kenn, for his kind permission to go through the Kenn Parish Registers in search for documents about the Hutchensons; and to Mrs. M. Connolly of the University Library, Exeter, for helping to obtain the accompanying facsimile of Casaubon's autograph.

* * * * *

NOTES

1. Probably since the middle of the seventeenth century. This will be discussed later.
2. Casaubon's handwriting is easily accessible in the collection of his MS notes in the Bodleian Library - the 'Casaubon MSS' - presented by his son Meric, prebendary of Canterbury: see Pattison's Casaubon, second edition, 1892, pp.424 ff. I have checked it against some of these MSS.
3. See accompanying plate.
4. For example, on p.34, Casaubon's text reads: 'Quod capiti nocet vinum Graeci eleganter dicunt πλήττειν τὴν κεφαλήν,& πλῆξιν ἔχειν καὶ τόνον'. The words πλήττειν τὴν are underlined, and in the margin, there is a note in Thomson's hand: 'to stryke in to the head'.

5. Thomson's handwriting is available in a few documents. I have checked this and other notes against the MS Tanner 283, f.207, in the Bodleian Library, which contains Thomson's autograph. But the most important is, perhaps, the last page of the Bodleian MS Casaubon 19. The MS is a Greek text of Polybius which belonged to Casaubon and has some of his notes. But at the end, a letter from Thomson to Casaubon was bound up with it. I have checked our note against this letter, and the hand is clearly that of the same person. This letter is so far undated and unpublished. I hope to print it elsewhere with a few notes.

6. In copying out this and other notes I have expanded the abbreviations current in 16th and 17th century Latin hands.

7. It is, however, not quite clear that Thomson understood Casaubon's references always, and that all of them refer to actual books in progress. The commentaries on Persius and Polybius are the famous ones, published later. So is the 'Commentarium de coloribus', to which Casaubon refers in the letter printed here as Appendix B. But the only reference to anything 'de usu Stapedum' on p.83 is 'ut alibi docemus' - hardly a promise to write a book on the subject. The same is true of the mention of saints in hymns. All Casaubon actually says on p.277 is: 'qua de re dicemus multa alibi, si vitam Deus produxerit, scitu digna, nec protrita'. Again, hardly a reference to a separate book to be published.

8. For Thomson, see D.N.B. vol. LVI, pp.266-7; Pattison pp.295 ff.

9. There is a note in his hand in the margin of p.283 of our volume, containing one Hebrew word and one Aramaic word in Hebrew characters. In Rabbinical texts Aramaic is always written in Hebrew characters.

10. I have dealt with an example of this in a note on a letter of Scaliger to Sir Henry Saville, to be published shortly.

11. See Pattison, Section V passim, esp. pp.297 ff.

12. Letters 12, 79, 113, 115b, 122, 213, 264, 268, 652, 990, 1024. I quote in Arabic numerals.

13. Almeloveen Ep. LXXIX, p.45.

14. Alm. Ep. CCXIII, p.109.

15. Alm. Ep. CCLXVIII, p.139.

16. Some of the marginal notes in the Animadversiones volume are in a 17th century hand not quite the same as Thomson's. This may be Hutchenson's hand. But since the notes are not of much importance - and since Hutchenson's hand is not easy to identify: see later - I do not see why one should go into it, once it has been established that both volumes belonged to him.

17. For example, notes on p.85, p.102, p.151 and at the bottom of p.298. The letters are big and somewhat crude and childish, like the letters in Cuthbert's signature in the 1597 volume.

18. I am told by Mrs. A. M. Erskine that most of the documents of this kind were destroyed during the last war. Since this is only a minor point, I have not tried to search for it.

19. I have kept the original spelling and punctuation, but extended the abbreviations.

* * * * *

APPENDIX A

Casaubon to Thomson. Almeloveen Ep.CCXIII, p.109 ff. Lutetiae Parisiorum, a.d. XII Kalend. Octob. MDC.

Ecce tibi, quem tantopere visus es optare, amicissime Thomson, Animadversionum nostrarum librum. Qui si spei tuae nulla respondeat ex parte, testor fidem tuam, non hanc esse meam, sed tuam culpam. Nam ego quid dixi, cur expectationem tantam infortunatissimi scripti in animo tuo excitarem? Equidem τὸ καδδύαμιν(sic) fide bona praestiti: sed magna optimo Deo gratia, quod quantum inter velle & posse meum interesset, serio tandem isto maxime experimento didici. Adde, quod otium & quietem altam studia haec postulant. Nos ab instituto opere variis casibus continuo iactati, vix mensem unam, vix diem tranquillum inter libros egimus. Quae summa studiorum meorum infelicitas, facile spero, veniam a te, & ab omnibus aequis judicibus meis culpis impetrabit. Ego vero, mi Thomson, etiam illud a te pro mutuo amore nostro exspecto, ut quaecumque aut ipse animadverteris, aut ab aliis animadversa esse cognoveris perperam nobis scripta, ea omnia in schedam conijcias, & mecum ἡ θέμις ἐστὶ τοιοῦτον φίλον(sic) communices. Hoc mihi praesta officium: & immortalitate me donatum abs te consebo. Quod scribis, te, si semel Lutetiam uxorem ac liberos produxero, ad nos advolaturum, serione, ambo, an joco a te scriptum .....

* * * *

APPENDIX B

Casaubon to Thomson. Almeloveen Ep. CCLXVIII, p.139 ff. Lutetiae Parisiorum, pridie Non. Februar. MDCII.

..... Quod me ad libellorum editionem hortaris, de quibus obiter ad Athenaeum; scito, doctissime Thomson, καὶ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ κάτθεο σῆσι, non per inanem iactantiam illa nobis promissa, sed quia aut affecta, aut prope jam confecta penes nos, hoc est, in librariis nostris ea habemus. Sed ad publicationem illorum non hoc est satis. Nolumus enim, si ulla σπουδῇ καὶ μηχανῇ possumus, ἀφειδεῖν τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων. De Re Vestiaria opus ingens in manibus habemus: pars enim libri est de Coloribus; quem tamen separatim animus est edere. Qui tuus est in nos amor, si acumen non laudabis, diligentiam tamen amabis in tam subtili argumento. Habemus item alia multa, si Deus Opt. Max. voluerit, edenda; sin minus, nobiscum sepelienda. Illud διαῤῥήδην praedico tibi, temere nihil editurum me; nisi vis quaedam major coegerit. De novo Persii interprete tibi assentior. Impurus Ludimagister, κενεὸς οἰήσιος ἔμπλεος ἄσκος, doctissimum se mortalium & putat & praedicat. Caeteri prae ipso fungi, bardi, bestiae denique, & vix λογικὰ ζῶα. Soleo dicere, nequissimum plagiarium uno beatum, quod stomacho meo sit indignus. Nam si mereretur, & omnia illius esset tanti, non ferret inultum, quod in magnum Scaligerum, & iter magnum Cujacium, ut alios taceam, est ausus. Scis, opinor, ante decem annos exactissimae diligentiae commentarium scriptum nobis in eum poetam. Eo quid facturi sumus, videbimus. Iste quidem nebulo observatiunculas nostras non praecipuit nobis: quas tamen aspernari & facere non tanti, magis magisque in dies assuescimus. Nunc in Spartiano, &c. sumus: de quo opere quid tu, quid docti gentis tuae judicaturi sitis, avec jam scire .....

* * * *

QUAESTIONES EXONIENSES

ANSWERS

(From Pegasus, No. 4.)

1. (a) Joseph of Exeter (ob. c.1210), de bello Trojano I 1-5; he was born and educated in Exeter.

   (b) Sir Thomas Bodley, Letter to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, Feb. 23rd 1597; he was born in what is now Lyons' Café, High Street, Exeter.

   (c) John Lempriere, A Classical Dictionary (1788 and later editions); he was master of Exeter Free Grammar School, with a salary of £40 a year, from 1809 to 1823, when he retired as a result of a dispute with the trustees of the school.

   (d) I. R. D. Mathewson, Senior Lecturer in Classics at the University of Exeter; from a poem published in Pegasus I (1964).

2. (a) On the monument to Bishop Walter Stapledon (ob. 1326) in Exeter Cathedral.

   (b) Under blue Sphinx in pediment of Messrs. Reid and Lee Ltd., Garage, New North Road (city end).

   (c) On clock in Exeter Cathedral.

   (d) Near the Caledonian Market at the Iron Bridge.

   (e) On the monument to T. Okes, M.D. (ob. 1797) in Exeter Cathedral.

   (f) On the Queen's Building, University of Exeter.

   (g) Under the statue of Stafford Henry Northcote (1818-87) in Northernhay Gardens.

   (h) On Agamemnon's tomb on the Attic red-figured pelike by the Jena Painter (c.380 B.C.) in the Roborough Library, University of Exeter.

* * * * *

ODYSSEAN ESSAYS, by L. G. Pocock,
formerly Professor of Classics, University of Canterbury, N.Z.
Basil Blackwell 133pp. 27/6.

A collection of essays on a single theme is bound to be disjointed and repetitive. That does not matter, but it is irritating when the argument is relegated to footnotes and the footnotes refer to other, inaccessible, works by the same author. With that one exception, this book is a pleasure to read. Apart from two consecutive essays describing the internal arrangements of Odysseus' palace, it deals almost entirely with geography, and the geography centres on Sicily and the Straits of Gibraltar; and the author's interests, like the ideas of the young lady of Portugal, are exceedingly nautical.

Odyssean geography, like Hannibal's Alpine pass, is an ever-interesting, and an evidently inexhuastible, topic, though one might sometimes wish that some of the energies directed to the precise localization of Ogygia might be diverted, for example, to the trail of the Argonauts, or of Heracles, or of Perseus; so much has already been written, most recently by Ernle Bradford, and earlier by scholars reaching from Strabo to Rhys Carpenter. But the reader's sympathy is with the author when he indignantly rejects those who, like H. J. Rose, relegate the whole geography to "fairyland"; much as one may appreciate the bilingual and faintly surrealist French pun about "Ulysse au pays des merveilles".

Pocock follows Butler (whom he acknowledges) and Graves (whom he does not mention) in siting both Scheria and Ithaca at Trapani in Sicily, but he does not accept the more engaging theory that the author was a local princess, the original of Nausicaa. Sicily and its neighbourhood do duty for both the Deep-Sea Tales and the rest of the story. Circe lives on Ustica, the Laestrygonians near Castellamare, the Sirens on Salaria near Lipari, Scylla on Vulcano Island, Aeolus on Stromboli; the Planctae are Montel Vulcanello (there is no explanation, here at least, of that cryptic remark about the doves). Only Calypso and the Underworld are further; Calypso lives on Perejil Island on the Straits of Gibraltar, the Underworld is on the coast of Morocco, and the Styx flows in St. Michael's Cave under Gibraltar. One would have appreciated a map, but at least we may be grateful for page 106, which gives us a side-view of several of the offshore islands mentioned. Nausicaa was originally a "ship-burner" because the travel-weary Trojan women burnt their ships at Egesta, as Vergil tells us; Pocock claims this as an original view, but the reviewer first heard it, as an accepted fact, from the late Jackson Knight in 1942. The harbour of Phorcys in Ithaca "seems familiar" to the Phaeacian mariners who drop Odysseus there, because it is in fact the same place; "this type of humour", we are told, "would be best appreciated by the inner circle of the poet's audience" (dare we say that, in that case, they would seem to be easily, if elaborately, amused?). A really informative article points out a surprising topographical similarity between the Bay of Missolonghi on the Gulf of Corinth and the coast near Marsala in Sicily, with a Long Island, Isola Lunga, opposite Motya, corresponding to the

long spit of land, now called Nisos Tholi, which may have been the Dulichium ruled by Meges in the Iliad. The diagram which illustrates this is impressive, and the argument would be even more impressive if we could be sure that this coincidental resemblance was unique, and if one of the maps were not three times the scale of the other. (Pocock engagingly admits that the maps are far more convincing than "dozens of air photos".)

Passing from Sicily to Spain, we learn that the "back-flowing stream of Ocean" refers to the tidal races and cross-currents which flow out through the Straits of Gibraltar, against the main current which flows in, along the Moroccan coast and as far as Egypt and Palestine; the Odyssean Hades is on the African coast, though Styx, Hades and Tartarus were originally sited in St. Michael's Cave under Gibraltar, and this had been familiar both to Hesiod and to the author of Gilgamesh. (One begins, perhaps, to appreciate why archaeologists tend to regard "Phoenicians" as a dirty word).

The author is finally identified as a sailor of Phocian-Elymian origin, flourishing in late C7 but remembering, and recording, the eclipse of January 688 (for which reason the Phaeacian landfall, and the Return, are, inconveniently, dated at midwinter); after 25 years as a seaman he spent fifteen years in an "eastern school of poets or rhapsodists", where he learnt the Iliad by heart (a change from Professor Page, whose Odyssey-author had never read the Iliad) and, with "outstanding genius", succeeded in mastering the poetic dialect. (How long, one wonders, did Professor Pocock's students need to "master" ordinary Attic?) In his declining years, he constructed an epic based partly on Phoenician Far-West tradition, partly on autobiography, partly on reminiscences from Hesiod who knew a slightly different Odyssean tradition, and spiced freely with Sicilian in-jokes. He was unable to finish the last book, and it was put together, rather ineptly, by a successor working on his notes. (A parallel, which he does not adduce, is the similarly scamped and unsatisfactory eighth book of Thucydides.)

Now, what is the likelihood in all this farrago? Any Odyssean researcher deserves respect rather than ridicule, and Professor Pocock seems to have satisfied such scathing critics as Davison, Cary, and Badian. This makes it all the more surprising that his logic, and his language, sometimes seem positively Baconian. He talks about "the defences of faith in long-accepted error", "consign fashionable doctrines about the Odyssey to the wastepaper basket along with the doctrines that the world began in 4004 B.C.", "I challenge even the most obstinate of fairylanders to refute that statement", "a red-herring to be drawn across the trail of unwelcome truth": he uses arguments about the Elymi and their foundation-legends which could equally well be adduced to prove the Trojan origin of Rome, or Saguntum, or indeed of Totnes; and he quotes with indignation Stanford's reasonable remark that "searching for Odyssean landfalls is an agreeable hobby for travellers in the Mediterranean but a delusive subject for factual research".

The arguments against single authorship for Iliad and Odyssey are probably slightly stronger than those for it, but they are not conclusive, and Pocock's Sherlockian ingenuity about the author's biography is only one of many possible solutions; the lines in which Hesiod talks about Odysseus' children by Circe and Calypso are inorganic, and have been taken as a fourth-century insertion — Circe's son "Latinus", "ruling among all the famous Etruscans", is more of a fourth-century than a seventh-century figure, and his brother "Agrius", though the name is regularly applied to the bug-eyed monsters of the Odyssean West, looks suspiciously like a Hellenization of the word Campanus; and in any case Calypso, the Cover-Goddess, was surely invented to keep Odysseus "under cover" until Telemachus had had time to grow up and provide a theme for the writer of the Odyssey, who created her as a doublet of Circe. St. Michael's Cave may resemble the Hesiodic underworld, but the quotations from the Theogony are ruthlessly tailored to fit it (there is nothing about the "brass anvil" which would take nine days to reach the bottom, by which time it would probably be approaching the speed of light, and the one essential similarity, a cold waterfall, has to be provided by Pocock's imagination), and Hesiod is thought to be ignorant of the Odyssey because he says nothing about the return of Odysseus to Ithaca — why on earth should he, in the Theogony?

There is a more important fallacy, however. Pocock, like other Odyssean geographers, treats a poetic description as if it were a Mariners' Mirror (and without Berard's justification, that the Odyssey may well be based on one). Harbours must be precisely as described; darkenings of the sun must occur at precisely the same time and place as recorded eclipses. In fact, topographical details in fiction are often blurred, telescoped, and kaleidoscopically intermingled, even where there is no sheer mistake. The author of the Iliad puts Pylos within a day's march of Elis; Sophocles puts Dirce East of Thebes (as Verrall, later, did with Helicon); Statius puts Lerna North of Argos. Even the historian makes mistakes; some of the details in Thucydides' Pylos never were on sea or land, and Xenophon's remarks about Sestos and Aegospotami are hard to reconcile with any map that ever existed. When one tries to correlate the Odyssey's darkness at noon with any recorded eclipse, one is doing what Velikovksy did when he synchronized the halting of the sun at Ajalon with the moving back of the sun when Atreus killed Thyestes' children. To make Odysseus land at midwinter to support this is to pile absurdity on absurdity; Mireaux has clearly shown that the baths, and the cleansings, and the ritual marriages, imply a spring festival. St. Michael's Cave might be a convincing underworld if it were the only such cave in the Mediterranean, or if there were any evidence of Mycenaean or Phoenician penetration of it; and in any case eschatological details are not usually based on explorers' discoveries, but on facts nearer home — the smouldering bonfires of the Vale of Hinnom, the caves and volcanoes round Cumae, the green fields of Elis, the sunny valleys of Avalon behind the dismal swamps of Sedgemoor; even in the Frogs, the imagery clearly comes from a boat crossing the Saronic Gulf while Xanthias, like Elpenor, goes round on foot and gets there first. It is true that later discoveries may be identified with the mythical underworld; Hy Brasil and the Fountain of Youth existed in Celtic legend before they were sought, or found, beyond the Atlantic, and Beloch may be right in lumping Phaeacians, Phoenicians and Ethoopians all together into a fairy race until they were identified with real communities in the far south and east; and the myth helps the discovery, just as alchemy led to chemistry and astrology to astonomy.

Should this book, then, be treated merely as an amusing production from the lunatic fringe of scholarship? Certainly not. Pocock is a distinguished scholar, and, unlike other scholars, he clearly knows something about navigation. His reconstruction of Odysseus' megaron is no more, and no less, convincing than anyone else's, but at least he knows what a bilge-block is, and he gives one of the few convincing explanations of how the author came to think of his grotesque shooting-test (because axe-heads were used to align keel-blocks). He also knows something about Mediterranean currents; and if such knowledge were more widely available, we would know more about ancient seaways (It helps, for example, to explain why Roman governors sailing to Sardinia used to go round by Pisa). Without accepting his conclusions, we may at least accept his explanations of the puzzles which led Professor Page to his almost atom-splitting separatism; and, Gibraltar or no Gibraltar, he does at least establish that neither in fact nor in fiction, in this world or the next, was the Styx ever a river or anything like one.

H. W. STUBBS

* * * * *

SOLUTION

TO CROSSWORD IN PEGASUS 5.

ACROSS:

1. Hypermnestra .8.Fie 9. Paris 10. Parcae 13. Ode 14. Proh
16. Orthrus 19. Re 20. As 21. Isis 23. Ad 26 Tarquin 27. Ei
28. Pre 29. Thasos 31. Samnite 32. Io 34. Eo 36. Leto 37 Danae
39. Tua 41. Os 42. Remus 43. Oenone.

DOWN:

1. Hippolytus 2. Par 3. Rostra Julia 4. Nepos 5. Sirens 6. Afer
7. Lethe 11. Ad 12. Apis 15. Ora 17. Tetrameter 18. Us 21. Id
22. Iris 23. Anteia 24. Ops 25. Nero 27. Ea 30. Ohe 33. Naso
35. Otho 36. Law 37. Diu 38. No 40. Ate.

SCOTT TO LIDDELL

A few years ago the following letter was found by a student between the leaves of a classical text in the Roborough Library. The Librarian now houses it with one or two other curiosities in the new Library. It is written in small handwriting on a piece of paper which looks as if it was from a larger sheet torn in half, and is folded to make four pages about 4½" x 3½". Unfortunately the year is not given, but may be roughly arrived at from the fact that the second edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon came out in 1845, in which the editors acknowledge their indebtedness to the German Lexicon of Wilhelm Pape, and the third edition in 1849. This glimpse of the ponderous sport of Victorian leviathans is not without interest, puns and mock archaism and all. The Americanism "chaw up" in the context of the vexed question of American 'pirate' publishing may recall that Dickens used it in Martin Chuzzlewit, which belongs to the same period and was also concerned with the copyright row of British authors with American publishers. One suspects that a modern psychologist might determinedly see some significance in the fact that the writer at one point starts referring to himself in the third person and then corrects this. No doubt it would be possible with a little further research to pin down the date and some of the other references.

* * * * *

My dear Liddell,

To me much and long revolving the letter of Cardinal Woolsey, it seemeth that the man is well-disposed— Nay-the-less, however, I should like to know more of him before connecting ourselves with him in the way which (if he proved altogether satisfactory) I should think expedient— The way to which I allude is this- that the Delegates should propose to him to make an arrangement with some honorable publisher for the reprinting of our Second Edition, so as to chaw up the Harpers to immortal smash— The sheets might be communicated from the Press in such a way as to secure us from being cheated by its being published in America (in parts) before it came out in England; and yet so that our agent might fully ensure his having the start with the genuine edition, before the Harpers could return to their dirty work— In such a case, Mr. Woolsey would naturally act as Editor— This is, of course, for the Press and not for us: but if Woolsey was a creditable colleague, I should very much recommend it— and the Press would probably receive something for American copyright in this way, which they would never get in any other—

As for ourselves, I do not think that we need draw up anything as from ourselves: but by all means authorise W. without loss of time to disown Harper's project, & to protest against our being bound up Mezentius-like with Donnegan & Dunbar, in our name—

Pape's Errata might be of use— I therefore enclose the first sheet of my unverified quotations, in which the Errata are placed between + + — And I may as well explain, that I have never put down a false reference among them where it might have been an error of the pen or the press, but only when I detected the source from which it had been taken without verification. I have a dozen or so more, up to πάρυγρος which is the last word that I have corrected— Les voici.

παραχορηγέω wron signf. in Ath.

—— ψήχω d°. in Plut.

—— δαλιοκτόνος in Anth. l. c. it is κέντορα παρδαλέων

—— εισδέχομαι wrong signf. in Arist. P.A.

—— εξίστημι d°. in Plut.

—— εκτείνω reference to wrong signf-

—— εργον ἐν π. ποιεῖσθαι not in Thuc. 7.27, but ἐκ π. μελετᾶσθαι

—— ηγόρημα wron. signf. in Ap. Rh.

—— ιημι Plat. Rep. 560 D, wrong ref. copied from Ast. in Hdt. 7161 not with ὥστε

—— ιππεύω in Polyb. not c. acc.

As for ~~him~~ myself, I have had a sharp bout of bilious head-ache, which after laying me quite up for a few days, has left me rather better than I was before— And I have nearly made up the awful arrears which that stoppage involved— So I will try how long I can go on; and if I cannot, - why then I must stop— But amabo te, try all you can to rid me of the pupil after Xtmas——

There seems to have been a lull to a considerable extent in the sale — I hope it is not in consequence of Teasdale's article — Have you seen or heard of any other notice of the Book?-

In Ar. Lys. 1263 you will find κυναγὲ παρσένε: do you think that this means a hunting parson?

Ever Yours

Robert Scott

Dunloe, Sep.13.-

καρχαίρω Insist

F. W. CLAYTON

THE CLASSICAL PUBLICATIONS OF W. F. JACKSON KNIGHT

Supplement A

This is a first supplement to the original Bibliography published in Pegasus 4, October 1965, pp.16-27. It contains some items which have come to light since, some additional information on items included in the original Bibliography.* Mr. John D. Christie of Glasgow University has kindly supplied me with a list of such corrections which his expert eye has detected, and I print this list here with acknowledgements and thanks. Professor G. Wilson Knight has been, as usual, most obliging in helping me to find out new items, and my thanks go to him.

Since some more items are to be published later on — including an article or two to be printed posthumously and some new editions of published books — I call this Supplement A. Supplement B will be published in some future number of Pegasus, when there is enough new material. The numbering of items in this supplement is continuous with that of the original bibliography, to facilitate reference.

A. ADDENDA

1. Articles.

194.	The Homeric Myth.	Exe No.1, Winter 1947, pp.4-9.
195.	The Use of the Classics.	The Tatler Times, Port of Spain, Trinidad, August 1960, pp.4-5.
196.	Articles VIRGIL and LIVY.	The Oxford Junior Encyclopedia, 1953, vol.V. Reprinted with no changes in the second edition, 1964.
197.	Spiritualism among the Ancients.	Light, vol. LXXXV, Autumn 1965, No.3462, pp.113-118.

2. Book Reviews.

198.	G. M. A. Grube: The Drama of Euripides	The Poetry Review, XXXII,6, Nov.-Dec.1941, p.388.(Title: Euripides the Human).
199.	M. Bodkin: The Quest for Salvation in an Ancient and Modern Play.	The Wind and the Rain, Vol.II, No.1, Autumn 1942, pp.18-21. (Title: Miss Maud Bodkin's Psychology of Drama).

* And some corrections to the original Bibliography.

200. Review of some Penguin translations of Classical texts. — Nine, Magazine of Literature and the Arts, No. 6, Winter 1950/1, pp.71-3. (Signed: Classicus).

201. David Jones: The Anathemata. — The Listener XLIX, No.1244, January , 1953, pp.33-35. (Review of a modern book, but written from a Classicist's point of view, with some Classical refs.)

202. Maria Helena Monteiro da Rocha Pereira: Concepcoes Helenicas de Felicidade. Além de Homero e Plateo. Coimbra 1955. — Revista Filesófica, Coimbra, Ano 8, No. 22, Maio de 1959, pp. 131-134. I am grateful to Professor Pereira for sending me a copy of this review.

3. Summaries of Lectures and other short notices

203. Lecture on Ritual Origins of Myth: (Summary of talk) — The Citizen, St. Andrews, Nov. 16, 1935, p.2.

204. Litterae ad Editorem Missae — Acta Diurna XLII, pagina secunda, 21 May 1960. (signed P.Vergilius Maro).

4. Additional Information on Items printed in the original Bibliography:

4. (Roman Vergil) — A paperback edition has now appeared in Penguin Books, April 1966. This is a revised edition, containing as Appendix 1 the article on Vergil's Latin (No.61), as Appendix 2 the article Vergil's Secret Art (Nos 69 and 157), and three revised indices compiled by Mr. T.J.Hunt. Two paragraphs of this book (pp.390-1, inc. 'Vergil's gods are grand!, expl. 'a necessity in it for both') appear on p.19 of A Partridge in a Pear Tree, A Celebration for Christmas, arranged by Neville Braybrooke, The Newman Press, Westminster, MD, 1960.

5. (The Great Tradition), and 6. (The Wisdom of the Ages) — A number of printed abstracts of lectures given to the Exmouth Branch of the Vergil Society at this period by W.F.J.K. are in the possession of Professor G.Wilson Knight.

158. (Vergilius Redux). — I have now verified the date of this article, and it is 21 May, 1961.

B. CORRIGENDA.

(Supplied by Mr. J. D. Christie)

19.	For: Epilegomena to the Wooden Horse	read: Epilegomens to The Wooden Horse
51.	For: pp.15-21	read: pp.16-21
52.	For: VI	read: IV
65.	For: 199-293	read: 199-203
67	For: Vergilio	read: Virgilio
72.	For: inschriften	read: Inschriften
74.	For: 246-248	read: 246-247
76.	For: dramatischen	read: dramatischer
78.	For: the Seven	read: The Seven
86.	For: and the French	read: and French
87.	For: de Phenix	read: du Phénix
97.	For: quelle	read: Quelle
101.	For: 1948	read: 1948/9
104.	For: Lanschap	read: Landschap
106.	For: Beujon	read: Beaujon
111.	For: de filologia	read: di filologia
116.	For: GR 1950	read: GR XIX, 1950
118.	For: Homere	read: Homère
123.	For: onomastica	read: onomástica
157.	For: Virgil's	read: Vergil's

J. GLUCKER

* * * * *