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](#)

Plüsz on the *Epodes of Horace Das Iambenbuch des Horaz*. Von Theodor Plüsz. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904. Pp.141. 8vo. M. 4.

J. Gow

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 1906, pp 123 - 124

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993879, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993879

How to cite this article:

J. Gow (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 123-124 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993879

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PLÜSZ ON THE *EPODES* OF HORACE.

Das Iambenbuch des Horaz. Von THEODOR PLÜSZ. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904. Pp. 141. 8vo. M. 4.

MR. PLÜSZ has asked himself a good question and has found an answer to it which is very likely on right lines, though certainly incorrect in many details. The question is 'What have Horace's *Epodes* in common that they should be collected into a separate book?' And this question may be resolved into two others: (1) 'Why are the *Epodes* written, in the main, in iambic metres?' and (2) 'Why did Horace say, as he did (e.g. *Epp.* I. 19. 25), that he had imitated Archilochus at least in spirit?' Mr. Plüsz's answers to these questions are in effect as follows. The *Epodes* are not lyrics prompted by emotion, but are dramatic and therefore iambic. And, again, they are all humorous—some cynically, some sympathetically humorous—criticisms of persons or situations or styles of composition, and this sarcastic attitude is Archilochian. This thesis, thus briefly put, is surely attractive at first sight, but it requires to be expounded closely and cogently in a complete edition of the *Epodes*, and not in a series of talks about them. Mr. Plüsz's method of exposition enables him to skip small difficulties and, when he encounters a big one, to smother it in words from which he triumphantly extracts a meaning that does not seem to be honestly come by. Moreover, it is essential to Mr. Plüsz's theory that those very ancient commentators who wrote *de personis Horatianis* and knew who Canidia was, and who Bavius and Maevius and who the parvenu of *Epode* 4, were all wrong; and there is a certain natural prejudice against a writer who professes to see jokes that nobody else has seen for about 1800 years. His Latin, one suspects, is apt to be more hasty than that of the dullards whom he wishes to supersede. And, in truth, Mr. Plüsz is capable of some odd translations: e.g. in *Ep.* 9. 19, 20 he thinks that *hostiliumque navium portu latent puppes sinistrorsum citae* means 'The Roman ships, that used to be so swift to rush into disaster, are now safe in the harbour that used to shelter the enemy's vessels.' Lastly, Mr. Plüsz is not always consistent with himself. He tells us that, for thirty years, he has been contending against the *Realismus* of the philological critic,

which leads to *Materialismus* in the German mind: and his point is that the *Ich* of a poem is not necessarily the *Ich* of the poet himself or of the poet in his actual surroundings, but may be an imaginary *Ich* or the poet's *Ich* in an imaginary situation. His treatment of most of the *Epodes* proceeds from this assumption, but his explanation of *Epodes* 1 and 9 is founded on his belief that Horace did not go to Actium. The fact, if it be a fact, is irrelevant. Horace could imagine himself at Actium and the word *nauseam* in 9. 35 suggests that the *Ich* of the poem was on shipboard.

Yet, when all the faults that justice or prejudice can find are pointed out, Mr. Plüsz's book remains an extremely interesting and stimulating piece of criticism, which ought to be widely known and carefully considered. I can shew this best by setting out briefly his explanation of each poem. I shall not add his speculations on the date, which seem to me highly fanciful and to serve no necessary purpose. He is anxious to assert that the *Epodes* are not all poems of Horace's youth, when he was embittered by poverty and failure; but the customary dating already indicates this fact. *Epode* 2 (for I will follow Mr. Plüsz's order) is a parody of the sentimental talk about country life current about the time of the publication of Virgil's *Georgics*. Its satirical intention is indicated by its being placed in the mouth of Alfius, the money-lender, the most constant of attendants on 'Change. *Ep.* 3 has the same intention, but is more dramatic. Somebody, who does not share the prevailing sentiment, is declaiming against garlic and comparing it to all the poisons of the mythology. Maecenas laughs at his fury and the speaker turns upon him. *Ep.* 4 does not express the opinions of Horace himself, who was the son of a freedman and had been a military tribune. It is dramatic, the diatribe of a crusty old Conservative. Mr. Plüsz's explanation of *Ep.* 5 is founded on an obstinate prepossession in regard to *hostilis domos* of l. 53. He imagines that Canidia is bewitching Varus so that he may, by adultery with some lady of the hostile faction, bring a noble house to shame. (This theory takes no notice of *ad me recurre* in l. 75 or of *amore meo flagres* in l. 81.) Varus suggests Antonius: Canidia suggests P. Canidius Crassus, a friend of Antonius and of Cleopatra. *Ep.* 6 appears

to be a dialogue. A statesman complains of a poet that he attacks harmless people, but is of no help against public enemies. The poet replies. (Here again I see no fair explanation of *me remorsurum petis* in l. 4.) Ep. 7 and Ep. 8 explain themselves, but it should be remembered that the speaker is not necessarily, or even probably, to be identified with Horace. Ep. 9 is a cry of disappointment for that, after the naval victory at Actium, a victory on land did not immediately follow or seem likely to follow. (Then why *terra marique victus hostis* in l. 27?) Ep. 10 is a parody of a propempticon: Ep. 11 a parody of the erotic elegy. Ep. 12 is a sort of distorted elegy, the complaint of the too-much-beloved. Ep. 13 is a comic protest, with parody, against gloomy vaticinations. Ep. 14 is a humorous defence of the elegiac lover, who is again comically presented in Ep. 15. Ep. 16 is 'a political elegy of an ironical, sarcastic, parodistic cast, composed about the time when

Virgil was finishing his lofty song of joy in country life.' In Ep. 17 Canidia is not a real person. 'Horace is trying to represent, with humorous irony, the failure of some enterprise, in which he had taken part, in the form of a parody of a tragic catastrophe.' Ep. 1 is a sportive declaration that Horace, though a very poor politician, was not going to retire to his Sabine farm, but was resolved to stay in Rome and assist Maecenas in his arduous work as *praefectus urbi*. The *navium propugnacula* are not real but only figurative, and the 'epodic' character of the piece lies in Horace's humorous criticism of himself. This summary does not include Mr. Plüsz's criticism of the customary interpretations. They are frequently more cogent than his own alternative explanations, but it does not occur to him that the fault may lie in Horace himself who has failed in carrying out his own ideas consistently.

J. Gow.

HENRY'S LIVY XXVI.

Livy XXVI. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by ROBERT MITCHELL HENRY, M. A., First Classical Master, Royal Academical Institution, Belfast. London: Edward Arnold, 1906. Pp. xxviii + 182 (one map). 2s. 6d.

THIS is a scholarly and workmanlike edition. The notes indeed might be terser (106 pages to 63 of text) and more attention paid to textual difficulties, e.g. at 27 § 16, 31 § 2, 38 § 7 Madvig's emendations should at least have been mentioned. But Mr. Henry's commentary is as a whole pertinent and helpful, and I have noticed few actual mistakes. In 6 § 1 *pro uallo* 'on the rampart' is substantially correct, but *pro* in such phrases means properly 'in front' and is a precious relic of the original adverbial sense of the so-called 'prepositions'. 11 § 12 *error* 'variation.' Livy 1. 24. 1 is a nearer parallel for the sense 'discrepancy' than the poetic quotations of T. W. D. (Prof. Dougan). 19 § 11 'et ipsi'] There is a very similar use in c. 42. 8. The form of this note is unsatisfactory. For as Mr. Henry has just said that here there may be a lacuna in the text, the similarity must be very hard to prove. In 42 § 8 'paeninsula excurrit ipse in quo etc.' the pronoun plays the same sort of rôle

as in e.g. 'Mens cuiusque is est quisque.' 21 § 10 *Nasum* comes from Νᾶσος the Syracusan form of Νῆσος. 35 § 10. 'paratuos.' A question asked in the first or third person usually (though not invariably) goes into the Infinitive in Oratio Obliqua. A good specimen of a useless note. In the future the infinitive is used without exception in all rhetorical questions, as Riemann long ago pointed out. This is by no means the only thing about Oratio Obliqua which the authors of current English American and German grammars have to learn. ib. *esse*] 'represents *sunt* "are to be." *esse* depends on *posse* like the other infinitives. *elici* in c. 7. 1 is different. 39 § 22 *foribus*. 'Door' and 'gate' are confused (so again at 46 § 6) 41 § 22. If *suboli* was to have a note, it should have been said that its proper meaning 'young shoot' was clearly present to the historian as 'uelut accisis recrescenti stirpibus' shows. 44 § 5 *qua cuique*. To say that 'cuique is attracted into the relative clause' is to suggest that it is scarcely intelligible in that clause, which is controvertible, and that it has been moved from the main clause, which is more questionable still. 45 § 3 *caliginem*. In Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 405 the word does not refer to 'dizziness' as here. 47 § 2 'captivus'] = *captis*: