

'To fold thee thus, to press thy balmy Lips,
And gaze upon thy Eyes, is so much Joy'
—and I doubt whether Mr. Barrett has really
got there with

ἀλλ' ὡς περιπτύσσω σε καὶ φιλημάτων
πίπλημι τέρψεις σαῖσι τ' ἐμβλέπω κόραις . . .

Mr. Holmes deploras well enough (8) in a style between that of long Horace and Juvenal the traffic problem in Oxford. Mr. Brinton's (9) version of the *Snark* (perhaps Latin hexa-

meters were not the right medium) is not sufficiently pointed at the critical passages—such as 'Fry me, or Fritter my wig,' 'Transportation for life . . . And *then* to be fined forty pound,' and the climax of all 'For the *Snark* was a Boojum, you see.' But I must admit some admiration for the rendering of the famous line 'Then the bowsprit got mixed with the rudder sometimes'—it seems easy, but others might have been forced to a couplet for it—*Commixtam proramque gubernaculumque videres.*

S. GASELEE.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIRS,

In the review of *The Prae-Italic Dialects* which you published in *C. R.* xlviii, 1934, pp. 183 f. there are some errors of fact which should be corrected.

1. 'Italic' by universal consent and usage does not mean merely Osco-Umbrian; it includes also Faliscan and the Latinian dialects, together with Latin itself. Therefore 'prae-Italic' is justified in the sense defined in vol. i, p. v, and in vol. ii, p. 208 n. 1; and 'East Italic' in the sense defined in vol. ii, p. 226.

2. Kretschmer does *not* consider Raetic a dialect of Etruscan. In his paper in *Symbolae Philologicae* (to which reference was made in vol. ii, p. 632) he considers it a mixed dialect, partly of the Rasenna (whom he distinguishes very carefully from the Etruscans), partly Indo-European (more precisely Umbrian): *op. cit.*, p. 141 'diese Mischsprache mit ihrem Nebeneinander von rasennischen und umbrischen Flexionsformen.' This is very like my view, except that I consider the Indo-European elements of Raetic to be Illyrian rather than Umbrian; its Etruscan elements I freely admit, vol. ii, pp. x, 5, 57, 548 f. Your reviewer's assertion misrepresents both Kretschmer and me.

3. The interpretation of the 'prae-Italic' dialects is an undertaking which your reviewer regards as hopeless. He is entitled to his opinion. But it should be stated as an opinion, not as a fact. A 'competent observer' has expressed the contrary opinion, and he bases his opinion on the fact that in *The Prae-Italic Dialects* is gathered the necessary evidence, archaeological as well as philological, which your reviewer affects to despise: 'Espérons . . . que le grand et bel ouvrage de MM. Conway et Whatmough aura le succès qu'il mérite, qu'il

attirera les travailleurs sur ce champ immense et presque inconnu . . . et que l'interprétation des documents fera désormais des progrès en rapport avec la parfaite et exacte présentation qu'ils en ont donnée' (A. Cuny, in *Revue des Études anciennes*, xxxvi, 1934, p. 425).

4. Anyone who holds that it will always be impossible to interpret the inscriptions, as some used to hold that Oscan and Umbrian would always be unintelligible, must, if only in order to be consistent, reject aid from any source. But the proper names of the dialect-areas have in fact proved valuable in the attempt to interpret the texts: for example, Ven. *who.u.xo.n.tah* and *Fougonia* at Este. And a collection of names which is incomplete is of little use. The names are *not* repeated in vol. iii, which gives an index to them, unless an index is always 'repetition.'

5. Conway is no longer alive to defend his (and Pauli's) interpretation (and transliteration) of the form *rehtia*. But many 'competent observers,' Kretschmer among them, accept it, because a 'frequently repeated formula makes it possible' and even probable. Everything that goes with it in the texts tends to strengthen that interpretation. It is in fact necessary to assume the validity of the comparison of Ven. *rehtia* with Latin *rect-us*, for the same kind of reason that it is necessary to assume, for the time being, the validity of the comparison of Gaulish *luxtos* with Irish *lucht*—an assumption made in the course of 'long and confused notes' by one J. Fraser in *Revue Celtique* xlii, 1925, pp. 95 f. As for the transliteration *rētia*, 'a theory need not be taken seriously simply because it has appeared in print.'

Yours faithfully,

J. WHATMOUGH.

Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXVIII, NOS. 6-10. NOVEMBER-
DECEMBER, 1934.

D. O. S. Lowell (with notes by C. Knapp),
Vergilianism. Views of Vergil's life and early

writings have changed radically in a generation: L. analyses poems of the Appendix Vergiliana and discusses recent opinions. J. Stinchcomb, *Catiline on the Stage*. Compares the presentations by Jonson, Crébillon, Voltaire, Dumas, and Ibsen. M. E. Hutchinson,