

But I am not flattered; I am shocked.

Few passages are so famous, even in the most famous of all Shakespeare's plays, as are those noble lines (upon our human faculty of 'large discourse' and 'godlike reason') in which this vigorous and most expressive verb is so effectively employed.

When Mr. Pickard-Cambridge combines so elementary a blunder with the disparagement of my poetic diction and the selection of two plays of Shakespeare as being by contrast appropriate models for the translator of Aeschylus, he is obviously somewhat unfortunate. But when he proceeds to his climax by requiring for this task 'a born poet' instead of such a shameless word-coiner, he is not only grossly inconsistent, he is urging the very fallacy against which it was precisely one of the main purposes of my translation to protest.

Neologism, in greater or less degree, is the mark of the born poet; the one thing above others that distinguishes him from the composer of class-room 'fair copies', to whom it is naturally abhorrent. *Tame and threadbare diction is the curse of our translations of Greek tragedy*; it remains the principal reason why even the least literal of them bear no real resemblance, after all, to those elaborate mosaics of hard, bright, variously shaped, and curiously compounded words. And of all Greek poets none was more notorious for neologism than Aeschylus.

Your reviewer treats this element as a defect; and as a defect of mine! I am—for that matter—a very minor poet, and my own style is accordingly devoid of neologism; *vid.* e.g. Binyon's extension of *The Golden Treasury*, Sir J. Squire's *Selections from Modern Poets*, L. Schücking's *Modern English Poetry*. Mr. Pickard-Cambridge could not of course have been expected to know that; but this does not excuse him; for the fact remains that the neologist element in my translation was intended

faithfully to reflect that element in the style of the original poet, and this is so obvious that how any scholarly reader could overlook it I simply cannot understand.

But Mr. P., when he has a mind to, can overlook anything. He says that in my translation he was often at a loss to 'find his place'. No wonder; let one example show why.

For representing the word *ἀλουργής* by 'marine product' my reasons were at least four: (1) precise English expression for choice Greek word, (2) variant on 'purple' corresponding to the poet's variant on *πορφύρα*—his other translators have only one word, and that the obvious—(3) passing glance at *ἔστιν θάλασσα*. To all such considerations as those three I am willing to believe that Mr. P. is honestly and by nature insensitive. But when he asserts that the words 'this marine product' are 'gratuitous additions' in the rendering of a line which contains *ἀλουργῆ*—when he will not even see that 'marine' represents *άλ-* and 'product' *-ουργ-*—from this and other evidence I must conclude, however reluctantly, that what conditioned his review was not so much an incapacity to understand as a refusal.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

Sirs—As regards 'fust' I apologize; I ought to have remembered a speech which I learned by heart fifty-five years ago. As for *ἀλουργῆ*, it is part of a line gratuitously inserted by Professor Campbell and not found in the text of Aeschylus; even if it were otherwise, I should still think 'marine product' prosaic. (It was for this that I criticized it.) For the rest, I am content that your readers should judge whether the translator's 'neologisms' have made his style Aeschylean, or secured the 'immediate and direct intelligibility to an audience' which he claims.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.