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](#)

The New Edition of Orelli's Horace *Q Horatius Flaccus ex recensione* I. G. Orelli: editio iv. maior: post I. G. Baiteum cur. W. Mewes: vol. ii. Fasc. i. (Sat. lib. i. et ii. 1). 1889. 3 Mk.

W. T. Lendbum

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 06 / June 1890, pp 252 - 254

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190742, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190742

How to cite this article:

W. T. Lendbum (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 252-254 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190742

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ἡδικοῖτο—indic. because generic, and imperfect, being the 'unfulfilled' past tense of present time, as ἐχοῖν is. (So, in a conditional sentence: e.g. *Rep.* ix. 592 D. εἰ μὲν πλούτῳ τε

καὶ κέρδει ἄριστα ἐκρίνετο τὰ κρινόμενα ἃ ἐπῆναι ὁ φιλοκερδὴς καὶ ἐψέγει, ἀνάγκη αὖ ἦν ταῦτα ἀληθέστατα εἶναι.)

R. WHITELAW.

THE NEW EDITION OF ORELLI'S HORACE.

Q Horatius Flaccus ex recensione I. G. ORELLI: editio iv. maior: post I. G. BAITERUM cur. W. MEWES: vol. ii. Fasc. i. (Sat. lib. i. et ii. 1). 1889. 3 Mk.

THE fashion of reproducing under the light of recent criticism famous classical editions, which the progress of research is threatening to supersede, has many examples in our day, and the arguments for or against it will be felt to apply with peculiar force in the case of a work so long and justly popular as Orelli's Horace. Few, however, will doubt that, on the critical side at least, Orelli, if he were still alive, would find much to alter in his views:

Si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in aevum, detereret sibi multa, and those who are jealous for the fame of the great Swiss scholar may congratulate themselves that the redaction of his edition has been entrusted to the hands of a critic so well equipped as Prof. Mewes and so generally in harmony with the spirit of Orelli's work.

The salient feature of the new issue is, we take it, the editor's conservative attitude towards MSS. authority and in particular the primary importance he ascribes to the readings of the Blandinian MSS. as reported by Cruquius. 'No one, I believe,' wrote Munro in 1869, 'now doubts the essential good faith of Cruquius': but just when these words were written Keller and Holder, whose edition of the *Satires* had not then appeared, were formulating a direct indictment against the integrity of the old Bruges editor. Prof. Mewes depends of course for the recension of his text upon the great critical apparatus of Keller and Holder; but, while utilizing the materials of these critics, he is far from adopting their views. He takes as his basis a selection of some ten of what he considers the best of Keller and Holder's MSS., and, as his brief prefatory note informs us, 'lectionibus ex his codicibus allatis maxima cura eas adiunximus, quas Cruquius ex quattuor Blandiniis, imprimis ex vetustissimo eorum (V) enotavit.' And Cruquius is especially valuable for the *Satires*,

because the best existing MSS. (all A and the greater part of B, C, R, D, 8) are defective in this part of Horace. Prof. Mewes has elsewhere given the ground for the faith that is in him. He has examined the whole question of the Blandinian MSS. in two monographs: one, 'de codicis Horatiani, qui Blandinius vetustissimus (V) vocatur, natura atque indole' (Berol. 1881), which identifies the 'unus' or 'quartus' of Cruquius with V, and a second, 'Über den Wert des Codex Blandinius vetustissimus für die Kritik des Horaz (Berlin 1882),' which contains an elaborate and very interesting defence of Cruquius against his modern detractors. The prejudice and perversity—as we must consider it—of Keller's attitude on this question is well illustrated by his note on *Ep.* i. 16, 43, where the true reading 'res sponsore' (MSS. *responsore*) is preserved by Cruquius alone: 'sic habet Blandinius vetustissimus et verissima lectio est, hactenus ignorata doctis.' This reading Keller, in common with all modern editors, accepts, but with how bad a grace! 'denn es konnte sehr leicht sein dass Cruquius...als der Codex selbst verbrannt und keine Controle mehr möglich war, sich oder uns übrige getäuscht hat...und ich muss erklären, dass ich hier an eine Conjectur des Cruquius nicht an eine wirkliche Lesart des verbrannten codex glaube.' But the good Cruicke—to give him the name he bore in the flesh—has elsewhere given us specimens enough of his conjectural skill, e. gr. *Ep.* i. 19, 12, where he proposes '*Exiguaque toga simulet textoque Catonem*': metaphoricos a lanariis mercatoribus, qui inspecto texti margine de universo facile coniecturam faciunt: and with such instances before us, we may well agree with Prof. Mewes 'dans eine Conjectur (i.e. 'res sponsore') von so seltener Vortrefflichkeit...vom Kritischen Talente des Cr. eben-sowenig zu erwarten ist, wie Feigen von den Dornen oder Trauben von den Disteln.'

Acting on these principles the editor has introduced, on the authority of 'V,' the following changes in Orelli's text (Baiter 1868): i. 1, 8 adffixit 101 Naevius 108 qui nemo, ut i. 2, 110 tolli i. 3, 60 versemur i. 4,

25 elige 110 Baius i. 5, 1 accepit 35 vatillum i. 6, 31 et cupiat 39 deicere de 68 nec i. 7, 9 tumidus adeo i. 9, 50 inquam 64 prensare i. 10, 27 patris Latini, ii. 1, 15 describit. Yet that Prof. M. can upon occasion stop his ear even to the voice of Cruquius appears from i. 4, 85, where he keeps the MSS. *avet* in spite of the *amet* of 'unus codex Bland.' This is the more surprising because Prof. M., as we have remarked, identifies the 'codex unus' with 'V,' and *amet* = *soleat* is not only a favourite Horatian word, but seems here demanded alike by the grammar and the sense. We notice too that in i. 1, 64 the codices Bland. have 'quatinus,' and the best MSS. of Priscian, who quotes the line, exhibit the same form (*Archiv.* v. p. 405): if then the note of Festus on this word (quatenus significat 'qua fine' ut hactenus hac fine. At quatinus 'quoniam') represents the classical usage (cf. Stolz-Schmalz Lat. Gr. 294), we would here have a small but not insignificant proof of the integrity of the Blandinian codices.

Prof. Mewes' other alterations are for the most part a return to MSS. authority: i. 1, 88 An si cognatos, nullo i. 2, 38 moechis 68 videnti i. 3, 7 Bacchae 130 Alfenus i. 4, 39 poetas 70 sim i. 5, 70 producimus i. 6, 75 octonos . . aeris i. 10, 68 sint ii. 1, 1 videar 31 usquam (but *unquam* 'codex unus').

Most of these readings have already appeared in one or other of the numerous recent editions of the *Satires*, so that anything more than a mere enumeration of them is likely to prove tedious and superfluous here. We may, however, be permitted to call attention to i. 1, 108, a much disputed passage, where Prof. M. has accepted the reading of 'V' with the punctuation and interpretation of 'Kiessling: 'qui nemo, ut avarus, se probet': 'to return to my enquiry, why no one, through avarice, is satisfied with his own lot.' This view we, for our part, accept with both hands. The Satire now gains a unity which it did not possess under any of the previous explanations; its subject is no longer double—'Discontent and Avarice'—but single—'Discontent due to Avarice.' Horace *more suo* (cf. i. 6, 18; C. i. 12, 1) had given no definite reply to the question put in the first line, to which he is here referring, but had allowed the general course of the argument (the adversative *quae* in 36 gives the key-note) to answer it, and that answer he is here in conclusion incidentally repeating. *Ut* = *utpote*, *ὥς ἔν*, is common in Horace, as Prof. M.'s note shows; and the construction of *avarus*, agreeing with *quisque* implied in *nemo*, though harsher

than the similar license in 1—3, will not offend those who feel that the style of the earlier *Sermones* often lacks the 'curiosa felicitas' of the *Odes* and *Epistles*.

On the other hand it is a disappointment to find that on i. 1, 88

At si cognatos nullo natura labore
quos tibi dat retinere velis servareque
amicos,
infelix operam perdas etc.

Prof. M. abandons Orelli's view and reads 'An si,' joining *labore* with *dat*, not *retinere*. This arrangement has somewhat the better MSS. authority in its favour, but it has little else. For to make *infelix* not vocative but predicate, and to ascribe the simile of the ass, not to Horace, but to the 'avarus'—'do you think you would be wasting your labour to no purpose, just as if you were to put a donkey into training'—is to adopt a singularly infelicitous mode of expression, while the clause 'quos tibi dat'—'whom Nature gives you without any trouble (on your own part)'—is not only harsh in grammar, but pointless in sense. But the older view—if you expect to retain the affections even of your natural relations *without taking any trouble about it*, you expect an impossibility—conveys a very serious truth, which Horace may well have learned from Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1, 28, εἴτε ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων ἐθέλεις (cf. *velis*) ἀγαπᾶσθαι, τοὺς φίλους εὐεργετητέον: for that he was familiar with this passage appears from *S.* i. 9, 60, 'nil sinemagno Vita labore dedit mortalibus,' where he literally translates the opening words of the sentence just quoted from Xenophon: οὐδὲν ἄνευ πόνου καὶ ἐπιμελείας θεοὶ διδόνασιν ἀνθρώποις.

With the exception of Bentley's 'resonarint' (MSS. 'resonarent') i. 8, 41, we do not find that Prof. Mewes has anywhere introduced a conjecture into his text; but on i. 6, 19 he adopts a new punctuation, which invites a few words on this, one of the most difficult passages in Horace:

—qui stupet in titulis et imaginibus.
Quid oportet
nos facere a vulgo longe longaeque
remotos?
Namque esto, populus Laevino mallet
honorem
20 quam Decio mandare novo, censorque
moveret
Appius, ingenuo si non essem patre
natus,
vel merito, quoniam in propria non pelle
quiessem.

Sed fulgente trahit constrictos Gloria
curru
non minus ignotos generosis.

Prof. M. punctuates in 19 'namque esto: populus,' explaining 'namque esto pro prodosi, apodosis ab *populus* orditur' and adopting the paraphrase of Herbst: 'quid oportet nos facere, qui a vulgo longissime dissentientes non stupemus in titulis et imaginibus? Num, etsi ignobili sumus loco nati, tamen honores petemus? Minime.' Surely this explanation of *esto* and *remotos* is impossible. Horace's words in 17 (qui stupet in titulis) refer to the 'populus' i.e. to the *electors*; but in 18 he is speaking of himself as a possible *candidate*, and a candidate, as such, cannot be said either 'stupere' or 'non stupere in imaginibus.' Kiessling then is surely right in comparing ii. 1, 71: 'se a vulgo et scaena in secreta *remorat*' and explaining the words of a man 'der sich von dem Trieben der Öffentlichkeit des politischen Lebens auf sich selbst zurückgezogen hat und im Dunkeln dahinlebt.' Horace says 'a vulgo (not "populo") *remotos*,' and he is plainly speaking of himself as an *ignotus*, who has no claims for office, but, far from the madding crowd, lives the 'vita solutorum misera ambitione gravique' (129: cf. 52 'ambitione procul'). Prof. M. urges that '*esto* semper est concedentis et ad praecedentia pertinet': this is true, but it is to 'qui stupet in titulis,' not to '*remotos*' that the word here refers. Just as *Ep.* i. 1, 81 (*esto* aliis alios rebus studiisque teneri) refers to and repeats in a new form ll. 77—80 (*pars*—*sunt qui*—*multis*), so here *esto* resumes ll. 15—17: 'what is a quiet-going nobody like me to do? (I may well ask the question) for, though what I said just now (*populus* stupet in titulis) is quite true, though it is quite true that the *populus* (not "vulgus"), in spite of the historical instance I have quoted to the contrary, would as a general rule prefer *a* Laevinus to *a* Decius, and that most censors, unlike the exceptional Appius, would eject me from the senate as *ignobilis* (quite right too, since I did not know my place), still I see most "ignoti" carried away captive in Gloria's gleaming car.' The true apodosis to *esto*, *mallet* comes

on at l. 23 ('*sed fulgente*': cf. *S.* ii. 1, 83 '*esto*—*sed*') and the full stop should be removed from l. 22, which is parenthetical. 'A juvenile taste for parenthesis is the crying sin of the Satires' wrote the late Prof. Maguire (*Hermath.* v. p. 130) and Vahlen (de vers. nonnullis Horat. Berol. 1886) has touched on the same point on *S.* i. 1, 114, which, to the great gain of the context, he has enclosed within brackets as a parenthetical comment on the preceding verse, entirely in the early manner of Horace (cf. i. 6, 57).

In the purely exegetical part of the commentary the hand of the new editor has been less busy in introducing new matter than in removing much that seems superfluous for modern readers, and the result is that the 206 pages of the original Orelli are now reduced to 160. The edition, when complete, will embrace a much-needed 'Lexicon Horatianum,' and to the editor's labours in this direction we may perhaps ascribe the addition of a few valuable notes, mainly of a statistical nature, on points of Horatian usage: *e. gr.* i. 1, 46 (plus *ac*) 97 (*adusque*) 101 (*mi*) i. 2, 77 (*quare*) 79 (*est*) i. 3, 81 *cum quibus* ii. 1, 1 *sunt qui*. For the rest, the alterations are either occasional notices of important views put forward in recent German editions of Horace, among which it is no surprise to find that Kiessling's learned independent and stimulating work occupies a leading place, or references to handbooks on language or archaeology of better authority than those in use in Orelli's day. In the latter direction an opportunity seems lost on i. 6, 27 (*nigris pellibus*), where Orelli did not distinguish between the '*senatorius*' and '*patricius calceus*.' Marquardt (*Privatl.* ii. 573) shows that the latter only, and not the former had the '*lunula*,' which, like the '*bullae*,' could be worn only by '*ingenui*': and the distinction becomes important in this passage of Horace, because if the character here referred to had worn the '*patricius calceus*,' the question '*quo patre natus*' (29) could not have arisen.

A word of praise must in conclusion be said of the type and paper of this important edition which are of a singular beauty.

W. T. LENDRUM.