The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Two Books on Horace *Scholia Antigua m Q. Horatium Flaccum*, Vol. I. Porphyriionis Commentum recensuit A. Holder. Ad Aeni Pontem, sumptibus et typis Wagneri. MDCCCLXXXIII. 20 Mk.

T. E. Page

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 02 / March 1895, pp 129 - 133

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201455, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201455

How to cite this article:

T. E. Page (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 129-133 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201455

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

HARDY'S CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT.

Christianity and the Roman Government, by
E. G. HARDY, M.A. London. 1489. 5s.

MR. HARDY'S interesting little volume is, like many other recent bits of writing, an outcome of Prof. Ramsay's stimulating book upon *The Church in the Roman Empire*. But it is to Mommsen's article 'Der Religionsfrevel nach römischem Recht' that Mr. Hardy is chiefly indebted for his point of view, which may be thus summed up in his own words (p. 101): 'Christianity by virtue of its inherent disobedience (*obstinatio*, *παράταξις*) was a criminal offence, but in the eyes of the police administration, not of the law.' And on p. 90 he argues that 'when repressive measures were taken, they would be taken usually, not from any "*Flavian policy*" (i.e. general instructions given to provincial governors to put down Christianity), not because membership in the sect was looked upon as treasonable by the government, certainly not because the Church was looked upon as "*an organized unity dangerous to the state*," but in consequence of some manifestation of hostile feeling on the part of the populace.'

This criticism of Prof. Ramsay (whose are the words italicized) is probably true of the period ending about 250 A.D., but surely not after that. However this is a minor point, and his readers have reason to thank Mr. Hardy for the clear and cogent way in which he brings out many points, e.g. that the Church was not persecuted in Bithynia or elsewhere because it was an illicit collegium; that torture was, primarily at least and in theory, applied to Christians in order to induce them to recant and save themselves from the death-penalty; that the obligation to sacrifice to the Emperor's image was a mere test to determine whether men were truly Christians; that the Roman authorities, during the first two centuries

at any rate, rather reined in than not the very intelligible fury and rage which the new religion excited in the breasts of men and women in general. Had the populace been allowed to have their way with the religion from the first, it would hardly have survived.

Mr. Hardy thinks that the whole of the charge against the Christians was from the first persecution under Nero onwards simply and solely that of hatred of the human race, 'odium generis humani.' 'They were potentially outlaws and brigands and could be treated by the police administration as such, whether in Rome or the provinces.' He cannot therefore agree with Prof. Ramsay that the Flavian emperors introduced any new principle of punishing the mere profession of the name of Christian. That name simply denoted the bearer's mischievous tendencies.

In an appendix Mr. Hardy reprints the Acts of the martyrs of Scili and the Acts of Apollonius. He accounts for the action taken by the Senate in the latter trial by supposing that the martyr was a senator. This Mommsen in a recent paper read before the Prussian Academy denies. The circumstance, which I noticed in republishing these Acts, that the Armenian MSS. name Tarruntenus and not Perennis as the prefect in charge of the case, has not been considered either by Mommsen or Harnack in their arguments against and for the senatorial rank of the accused. Yet it must surely bear upon it, besides putting the date of the martyrdom two or three years earlier.

Mr. Hardy's book may be warmly recommended to all who desire a guide to the intricate question of the origin and nature of the earlier persecutions. It is a pity that no index of contents is supplied.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

TWO BOOKS ON HORACE.

Scholia Antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum, Vol. I. Porphyrii Commentum recensuit A. HOLDER. Ad Aeni Pontem, sumptibus et typis Wagneri. MDCCCLXXXIII. 20 Mk.

Q. Horatius Flaccus, Philologische Untersuchungen von G. FRIEDRICH, Gymnasialoberlehrer zu Schweidnitz. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1894. 6 Mk.

NO. LXXVI. VOL. IX.

THE first of these two books is a most careful and admirably printed edition of Porphyrius's commentaries according to the text of the *Codex Vrsinianus* (Vaticanus 3314), which the editor carefully collated during October and November 1887, and which he assigns to the ninth century. All variations from the actual text of the MS. are accurately marked, any letters which are

added, removed, or corrected being clearly indicated, and various readings and emendations being given at the foot of the page, while an elaborate index of more than 100 pp. makes the book most useful for reference. As it stands the work is indispensable to all advanced scholars, but even for them it would be improved—and it is the only improvement needed—if the editor had prefaced his work with some observations on the value which those who consult them may reasonably attach to Porphyry's comments and on the authority which his evidence as to a reading possesses.

A well-known instance will show that some guidance is needed. In *Od.* 1, 20, 10 his reading is *tu uiuis uiam*, but *Sat.* 2, 2, 48, commenting on the words *Infamis. Quid? Tum*, he writes '*Figura nota apud H. transeundi ad aliam rem . . . ut:*

*Caecubum et prelo domita(m) Caleno
Tu(m) bibes uua(m),'*

where although, as in *domita* and *uua*, the final *m* is not written, yet the context shows that *tum* must be read, while in the note on *Od.* 1, 20, 10 there is no indication whether *tum* or *tu* is intended. Again in the difficult passage *Sat.* 1, 4, 14 (*Crispinus minimo me provocat*) one would be glad to know what is the weight of his testimony to Latin usage when he says that *minimo me digito provocat* is proverbial '*cum volumus quem intelligi tantum valere minimo digito, quantum alium totis viribus*,' because, if his opinion is worth anything, this is a case where we must accept it, or else with Bentley write *nummo*; for the alternative explanation 'lays me long odds,' though generally received, is impossible, the person who 'lays long odds' surely 'challenging with a great sum' and not 'with a very little one.' But, though in the first of these passages Porphyry has preserved the only possible reading, and also by the spelling of his MS. illustrated the origin of the hopeless *tu bibes*, and in the second passage provides an explanation which is at least probable, still those who accept him as an authority will find themselves often very wrong. What can be said for a man who, in *Ep.* 1, 11, 26 *non maris effusi late locus arbiter*, explains *arbiter* as = *remotus*—'*maris arbiter est locus, qui trans mare longe positus atque discretus est*'—and then adds *potest arbiter et medius in'ellegi?* Or who remarks on *iratis natus paries . . .* that poets were 'accustomed to cover the walls with wax so

that they might write down on them any idea that occurred to them in the night'? Finally, what real knowledge can a man have who, *Epod.* 17, 52 *utcunque fortis exilis puerpera*, takes *exilis* not as *exilis* but as *exilis*? Perhaps, however, this last instance might do some good if it could help to show the need of some sane method of Latin spelling. Doubtless in a book of this sort the MS. spelling should be preserved. It is odd enough—first *uiuis* then *bibes*, *furnos* and *fornos* in the same line, *yperbolen*, *lagynae*, *lymfa*, *cumuae*, *celeps*, *Saffo*, *Cantauer*, &c.—but it has a historic and technical interest, while its eccentricities can do no harm. Yet, if a scholar like Porphyry—or Porphyry—can be seduced by a merely ambiguous spelling into such a blunder, it is natural to ask whether the absolute chaos which now prevails as regards Latin orthography is not a grave danger to classical study. By all means let experts, who choose, study the subject. Their labours may ultimately produce some good, and a careful examination of the new *Corpus* proves that they have at any rate established one law, to wit 'that in the Augustan age no two poets spelled alike and no individual poet had any fixed standard of spelling of his own.' This happy result may amuse cynics or delight the learned, but those who are concerned with classical study as a means of education know that the absence of any common system of spelling in ordinary books is a constant hindrance to their work and productive of no good whatever. The difficulty did not exist thirty years ago when Latin spelling was possibly bad, but at any rate fairly consistent. Now, under an affectation of knowledge, every editor spells as he chooses or as accident dictates, and one more stumbling-block is wilfully placed in the way of classical teaching in all our schools.¹

The second book is eminently interesting. It is a remarkable combination of sound scholarship, acute criticism, and foolish speculation. The writer is one of those scholars who find more in the Odes than is reasonably to be got out of them, but who in the course of their investigation bring out very forcibly many interesting details. Like most critics of this class he takes a special interest in the unknown ladies to whom Horace addresses Odes, and on his

¹ Take these instances from the *Corpus Poetarum*: *Aen.* 3, 173 *agnoscere*, 180 *adgnovit*, 6, 580 *anticum*, 648 *antiquum*; *Hor. Od.* 4, 8, 24 *opstaret*, 9, 43 *obstantis*. Any decent 'reader' would correct such blunders during printing, if only he were allowed.

first page he gives us a very vigorous sketch of Lyde, whose identity in the three Odes addressed to her is so clear that, he says, 'few things can be affirmed with greater certainty,' though how his statement that, after being 'wooed' as a 'coy young maid' by Horace in 3, 11, she becomes in 3, 28 'seine Geliebte' can agree with Nauck's famous description of her there as 'eine fleissige ernstgesinnte haushälterische Schaffnerin,' is a question which no one less versed in such matters than German professors can be expected to decide. On 2, 12, 28, however, he shows sound judgment in preferring the MSS. *occupat* to Bentley's *occupat*, which Schütz defends on the ground that to describe Licymnia as 'letting the same kisses, which she *facili saevitia negat*, be snatched from her and sometimes snatching them herself' is 'nonsense.' 'Yes,' is the reply, 'nonsense undoubtedly, but the charming nonsense of passion. With *rapere occupat* the passage becomes—as happens with most conjectures in Horace—more intelligible and more home-baked (*hausbackener*).' So, too, he will have nothing to do with the absurd theories that *magis poscente* (*poscente* abl. abs. Kiessling; = a *poscente* Schütz) do not go together, because to say 'more than you who beg for them' would represent Maecenas as a very cold wooer. He shows by some most interesting quotations how passionately devoted Maecenas was to Terentia, and, after reviewing her relations to Augustus, rightly says: 'As matters stood it must have sounded like music to Maecenas' to hear her passion for him described as greater than his own. Similarly in 1, 6, 28 he rightly rejects both the usual explanations of *sectis unguibus* as either specially 'pared' so as to do no harm or specially 'sharpened' so as to do a deal. The adjective only describes the ordinary carefully trimmed condition of a fashionable beauty's nails (the opposite of Canidia's *irresectum pollicem*), though of course it suggests that the wounds they will inflict in their 'fierce' attack will be only trivial. Surely this is sounder sense than Bentley's appalling *strictis* which he calls *certissima emendatio*.

In 2, 11, 4 *nec trepides in usum* is explained 'and be not slow to enjoy.' Of course *trepidare* is often almost *timere*, and so in Luc. 5, 728 *dubium trepidumque in praelia*, where the context makes the sense certain, the word describes not 'quivering eagerness' but 'trembling hesitation.' Here, however, the context absolutely forbids our taking the word in such a non-Horatian

sense, for *trepides in usum* is carefully opposed to *remittas quaerere* ('slack thy search and be not eager'). Moreover, why should any one show 'trembling hesitation' about enjoying life? 'Trembling hesitation' about going into battle is natural, but with regard to doing something pleasant the phrase is absurd. In the same stanza, however, the difficult *Scythes . . . Hadria divisus objecto* is well explained by the remark that the Adriatic is considered as a shield which is held close to the body (*objecto nobis*, not *Scythis*), though the enemy, as here the Scythians, may be at a considerable distance.

Epist. 1, 20, 19 *cum tibi sol tepidus plures admoverit aures*. The school in which the book is being read is out of doors, 'a hedge-row school,' cf. Dio Chrysost. 20, 9, οἱ τῶν γραμμάτων διδάσκαλοι μετὰ τῶν παιδῶν ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς κάθηνται, and as the day grows warmer idle loungers come and listen to the school-master, and it is to these gentlemen he is to recite the passage which tells them how the writer is, like themselves, a humbly born, little, irritable, placable, sun-loving fellow.

Od. 2, 18, 29 *Orci fine*, about which editors make so much ado, is clearly shown to be merely the Greek θανάτου τέλος reproduced on the principle stated *A. P.* 52 *et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem si Graeco fonte cadent parce detorta*. In l. 20 he shows that Peerlkamp's correction of *sub-movere litora* to *promovere litora* would produce a meaning the exact opposite of what Peerlkamp intended, cf. *Sen. nat. quaest.* 3, 27, 10 of an inundation *jam enim promovel (mare) litus*, 28, 3, *litus prolatum*; but the process of killing conjectures and emendations is like the labour of Hercules against the Hydra.

On *Od.* 1, 15 there is a long discussion to show that this ode is closely connected with the obviously political ode which precedes. Thus the shepherd Paris naturally becomes M. Antony, and Helen is Cleopatra (as Cruquius suggested), Menelaus disappears because the name was commonly used for an injured husband (cf. *Cic. ad Att.* 1, 18, 3), and so could not be applied to Octavian, who therefore is represented by Diomedes, Ulysses is Agrippa, the 'wrathful fleet of Achilles' is the fleet of S. Pompeius, and so on, and so on. It is as clear as daylight. The last line *ignis Iliacas domos* with its well-known metrical difficulty hides a mystic meaning. After nineteen centuries the seer has seen the interpretation thereof. *Ignis* with a final short! Yes, O blind leaders of the blind, but at last there has come a

Gymnasialoberlehrer, who is a teacher indeed. Put an *n* before *Iliacas*, and what then? *Niliacas domos*—‘Rome shall burn the palaces of the Nile.’ No prophecy was ever plainer.

In *Epod.* 9 Bücheler’s view that Horace was present at Actium is rightly accepted, the words *fluentem nauseam* thus obtaining some real force which in old editions they never had, and the hopeless *sinistrorsum* becoming explicable as a pictorial word used by one who had actually just seen the vessel moving off ‘to the left.’ On l. 17 he remarks that ‘all MSS.’ have *frementes* (and not the acc. form *fremētis*) which must therefore go with *Galli*. One would like to know the value of this assertion about *frementes* being necessarily nominative. Common sense almost demands its connection with *equos*.

Od. 3, 19. The scene opens with Horace strolling with some friends who are discussing antiquities, when Horace, who is cold and hungry, suggests that they should dine: as the writer well puts it, ‘nowadays he would have suggested an adjournment to some well-known restaurant,’ but in those days a *δείπνον ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν* was the only method. In l. 9 he makes Horace *start* with three bumpers of unmixed wine, for he says the ‘mixing’ first begins in l. 11. Thus he makes Horace begin with pure wine, and then recommend wine mixed with either 75 or 25 per cent. of water. Did ever mortal man drink liquor on such principles? It would be folly for an English editor to refer a German critic to an English edition, for German students of Horace respect nothing but conjectural emendations, and scorn every one but Bentley, but I may perhaps refer to Marquardt ed. 2, p. 335, where the view, which I arrived at independently some time before, is taken—viz. that the ‘rule of 3 or 9’ does not refer to the *proportions* of wine and water, but to the number of *cyathi* taken in each bumper to drink to the various toasts.

Od. 3, 11, 49. He rightly calls attention to the pathos of *dum favet nox et Venus*, used just when the lovers are *parting*, and to the wonderful music of the words *i secundo* . . . with the almost rhyming assonance of *secundo* and *sepulchro*. Has not the remarkable hiatus in *secundo omine*, which no editor notices, also something to do with the charm of these lines?

Od. 4, 11, 2. *Fulges* is probably *future*—‘there is parsley for weaving garlands, and ivy with which you will be able to deck your hair,’ cf. *fervit* in the oldest MSS., *Od.* 4, 2, 7. In *Od.* 3, 8, 5, *utriusque linguae*

refers to Latin and Etruscan, for ‘in what Greek folk-lore would Maecenas find anything about a bachelor keeping the purely Roman *Matronalia*?’ On the other hand, Etruscan ‘tradition’ (*sermone*s) was the basis of many Roman ceremonies. *Od.* 2, 13, 7 he proves to demonstration that *robur* is the *Tullianum* to which the conquered chief was led away as the *triumphator* began to ascend the Capitol, on the summit of which he halted *μέχρις ἂν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῶν πολεμίων θάνατον ἀπαγγείλῃ τις* (Jos. de Bell. J. 5, 6). *Od.* 3, 10 10 *ne currente retro funis eat rota* is of a man pulling up a weight with a pulley, and, on finding it too hard a task, letting the rope go, but the application is not, as most take it, to Lyce, but to Horace, who, as the last lines show, threatens to give up the weary task of wooing her.

The twelfth Ode is described as an elaborate ode to be sung on the marriage of Marcellus and Julia. Starting on this assumption, the writer finds all sorts of hidden meanings in the various names mentioned, e.g. Fabricius and Curius suggest Pyrrhus, Pyrrhus suggests Epirus and the East, and so the reference to Octavian crushing the forces of the East on the coast of Epirus is at once obvious. The curious list of names in the ninth stanza—Romulus, the ‘quiet reign’ of Numa, ‘the haughty fasces’ of Tarquin and Cato’s ‘famous death’—suggests the ideas of ‘fratricide, ignominious repose, tyranny, and civil war,’ and so affords a contrast to the glorious era which is just commencing. Of course it is impossible to reply to such theories. There is undoubtedly in some of the odes a meaning not apparent to the ordinary eye, and scholars from time to time flatter themselves that they have discovered its exact character. But after the lapse of 2,000 years, the elements of uncertainty in such investigations are so great that exactitude is impossible, and those who attempt to fill in the historical background to an ode with too careful detail are in danger rather of marring the effect of the ode itself than of bringing it out in clearer relief. When we conceive the ninth Epode as written at sea immediately after Actium, we at once double our power of understanding it, and similarly in *Od.* 1, 12 the knowledge that it was written for the marriage of Julia and Marcellus would place us in a better position for understanding it, but, even then, it would be folly to inquire exactly what suggestion—if any—Horace intended to convey to Augustus and his court by the mention of ‘Regulus and the Scauri.’

Od. 1, 37, 14, *lymphatam* is not *vano pavore territam*, as in Orelli, but is exactly parallel to *dulci fortuna ebria* and *quidlibet impotens sperare* expressing her 'delirious hopes,' and so in exact opposition to *veros timores*. *Od.* 4, 8, 24, the name *Romuli* is put designedly at the end of the sentence, because Horace wishes to suggest that but for the help of *potentes vates* the very name would have been forgotten. The famous difficulty in 4, 8, 17 is really a joke! The confusion between the two Scipios is designedly introduced to show the importance of not leaving your fame and name to be the sport of vague tradition. In l. 25 of the same ode, *virtus* is connected with *vatum*, a discovery which is not new among us 'remote Britons,' though German editors 'almost unanimously' connect the word with *Aeacum*. *Od.* 3, 18, the festival of Faunus referred to is not that in December, but in February, because the kid born in February could not be 'of a full year' before then! One would like to know why, in face of the fact that this ode is obviously written for the December festival, cf. l. 10 *cum tibi nonae redeunt Decembres*, we are to be compelled to accept the dictum of any editor (e.g. Kiessling) that *pleno haedus anno* go together, or indeed are Latin. But it is foolish to ask questions. Horace knew less about his own works than his critics do.

'Both the last stanzas,' we are told, 'form an almost independent picture, *that has very little to do with the poem itself*.' After that there is little to be said, and there is only room for regret that a critic so acute as Herr Friedrich shows himself to be, and whose book is one of the ablest contributions to Horatian study made during recent years, should not see that whether an ode was written for the Faunalia of December or February is a matter ludicrously unimportant, but that to say that in an ode of four stanzas two 'have very little to do with the poem' is to convict either the poet or the critic of folly. However, we must do him justice. He will have nothing to do with that famous conjecture of Bentley's 1, 23, 5 . . . *vepris ad ventum*, which a singularly able reviewer (*Oxford Mag.* October 31, 1894) has recently termed 'monstrous,' and for this he deserves credit. But his defence of it is curious. 'It might be objected,' he says, 'that the thought *mobilibus veris inhorruit adventus foliis* is too poetical for Horace. And yet we must not absolutely deny him genuine poetic feeling (*eigentliche Poesie*), though it certainly is shown least of all in the Odes.' Poor Horace! Wisely was he in dread of pedagogues and professors.

T. E. PAGE.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF PROPERTIUS.

(A DISCLAIMER.)

OTHER engagements prevent me from replying to Mr. Housman's article till the April number of the *Classical Review*. In the meantime I wish it to be understood that, neither as it stands nor with the unauthorized alterations of Mr. Housman,

does the passage quoted on p. 27, col. 1, from p. 24 of my pamphlet, represent my views either now, or at the time of the pamphlet's publication.

J. P. POSTGATE.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

PROF. CHRIST ON THE GREEK STAGE.

SCENIC archaeology has been much indebted to Prof. Christ of late, not only for the three Munich dissertations which sprang from his interest in the stage question, but also for his own contributions to the subject.

Beginning with a strong leaning toward the new theory because of its remarkable agreement with the requirements of the extant dramas, he has attempted in a series of investigations to bring order into the chaos of apparently conflicting notices, and to trace the various stages in the development of the Greek theatre from Aeschylus