

LUCIAN MUELLER'S *ODES AND EPODES OF HORACE*.

Q. Horatius Flaccus, Oden und Epoden; erklært von LUCIAN MUELLER. 2 vols. Pp. 319 and 497. Published by R. L. Ricker, St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 1900. M. 16.

THE eminent scholar, who by this work wins a fresh title to the respect of all students of Latin, died at St. Petersburg in April 1898 leaving his task incomplete. The present volumes consist (1) of the text, (2) of Introductions to each Ode, and (3) of Notes. They have been edited with great care by G. Goetz, who states that proofs of a considerable portion had already been revised by the author, while the MS of the remainder was ready for the press; but that the fourth part, which consisted of a general Introduction, was not in a sufficiently advanced state to admit of publication.

It may be said generally that the book is a notable addition to Horatian literature, and deserves a place in every classical library. Disputed points are lucidly dealt with; grammatical questions are well handled and without those terrible references to sections and sub-sections in the authorities which make some notes look like a Law Report; rare words are illustrated by short and effective quotations; the Greek sources of many phrases are indicated with great accuracy and learning, while almost everywhere the commentary exhibits taste, judgement, and originality of thought.

In 3, 4, 38, for instance, the editor reads *addidit oppidis*, pointing out that there is no reference to any final settlement of dismissed veterans in military colonies (which is the assumption on which *addidit* is justified) but to the ordinary *retirement* of the troops into winter-quarters, while Augustus in consequence was able to devote himself to those literary studies for which—according to Horace—he so eagerly longed. “Think, for example, of Frederick the Great,” says the editor, and in half-a-dozen words throws more light on the point than all previous notes on the subject put together. On *unicis Sabinis* (2, 18, 14) he rightly rejects Haupt’s dictum that a *farm* in any district can be described by the name of the people of that district. Haupt, with apparent aptitude, quotes Mart. 10, 44, 9 *sed reddare tuis tandem mansure Sabinis*, but neglects to quote the first line *Quinte Caledonios Ovidi visure Britannos*, which shews that Martial

reproaches Ovidius with leaving his ‘Sabine friends and neighbours’ to visit northern barbarians. Similarly he quotes Ovid Am. 2, 16, 37, *non ego Paelignos videor celebrare salubres*, as though *Pael. sal.* were = ‘my health-giving farm among the Paeligni,’ but does not quote line 39 *sed Scythiam Cilicasque feros viridesque Britannos*, where the last two words should on his theory = ‘a verdant estate in Britain.’ The fact is that a person may be said ‘to visit Britain’ or ‘the Britons,’ and an affected writer like Pliny says that he is going *in Tuscos meos* (Mayor on Pl. 3, 4, 2) when he merely means ‘to my Tuscan estate,’ but when a poet speaks of *unicis Sabinis* he can only mean ‘the Sabines who are all in all to him,’ so that he wants nothing more. Doubtless when Horace uses the phrase he refers to his Sabine farm, but he does so, as a poet should, by saying that he holds *the people* who live there very dear. Mueller unfortunately spoils his just criticism of Haupt by wishing to read *unico Sabino*, which is excellent prose but bad poetry.

On *fine destinata* (2, 18, 29) the agreement of *fine* and *destinata* is rightly regarded as certain, and a valuable reference given to Serv. on Aen. 6, 152 who explains *f. d.* of the tomb, though, as one good MS gives the quotation with *sede* for *fine*, while *tres codices Cruquiani* were also said to have *sede*, and *sede destinata* Tac. Ann. 1, 8 seems an echo of Horace, it is not improbable that *sede* should be read here. Anyhow either *sede* or *fine* is good, and ‘the destined dwelling’ or ‘goal of the grave’ is the clear meaning of a passage, about which commentators have created much needless trouble.

In 1, 1, 3 the odd phrase *curriculo pulverem collegisse* is rightly said to be used ‘ironically’ for *curru certare*, since irony is a distinct characteristic of Horace, and the recognition of it in 1, 6, 6 would have prevented the editor from accepting the censure which the grammarian Charisius passes on the rendering of *μῆνιν*... *Ἀχαιῶς οἰλομένην* by *gravem Pelidae stomachum*. The repetition of *Telephi* 1, 13, 1, is provided with a close parallel from Archilochus 69 (*νῦν δὲ Λεωφίλος μὲν ἄρχει, Λεωφίλος δ’ ἐπικρατεῖ, Λεωφίλῳ δ’ ἐπ’ πάντα κείται, Λεωφίλον δ’ ἀκούεται*), but the exact point of the ‘special emphasis’ given to the name is not made clear as it should be. In 2, 1, 10 *desit theatris*: ein feines

Lob für Pollio' is excellent criticism, and so is that on *servare* 2, 3, 2, 'Man achte auf dies Wort, durch dessen Wahl Horaz den Verdacht des Moralpredigers vermeidet. Dellius besitzt schon die *mens aequa*, braucht sie nicht zu erwerben.' Or again on 3, 25, 2 *quae nemora aut quos agor in specus* the omission of the first *in* is excellently dealt with, while in the noted difficulty *immunis aram*... 3, 23, 17-20 nothing could be better than the treatment. The word *immunis* is the key to the problem, and my own rendering 'without a gift' is certainly wrong, for Phidyle had at least offered a pig. The word is used 'in a legal sense' (cf. *ager immunis, cives immunes*); Phidyle was not under any debt or obligation to the gods, but of her own free will makes her humble offering, which is for that reason more acceptable than the 'costly victims' of those who seek by such means to ' wheedle ' (cf. *blandior*) forgiveness from the gods.

The point of the description *quae Liris qujeta | mordet aqua taciturnus amnis* (1, 31, 7), is justly indicated; it is the repose of the district which makes the weary business man long for it. Exception is taken to explaining *ne* in 1, 33, 1 *Albi, ne doleas* and 2, 4, 1 *ne sit ancillae* . . . as = 'lest,' for the result of doing so, in obedience to grammatical pedantry, produces 'eine ungeheuerliche Periode.' *Placare* . . . *deos* (1, 36, 2), which seems to us an odd phrase to use when celebrating a banquet for a soldier's safe return, is well referred to the ancient belief that it is in the hour of prosperity that the jealous gods specially need 'appeasing.'

The instances thus selected, somewhat at random, will suffice to shew the merits of the commentary; but, unhappily, an edition of this character raises other questions of such importance to the welfare of classical study that it is impossible not to consider them. 'With the dead,' doubtless, 'there is no controversy,' but I shall criticize the method rather than the man, and the present editor represents a body of scholars who are now so supreme that a simple schoolmaster who tilts against them need hardly fear the reproach of attacking the defenceless.

The mere notes, then, in this edition fill 497 pages, which, though slightly smaller than the pages of the *Classical Review*, yet probably, owing to the size of the type, contain considerably more matter. They are moreover not discursive but concise. It is impossible to skim them, and to read them through is a very lengthy process even for

one who is comparatively an expert in Horace. That any poet, who is worth reading, can need to be elucidated or obscured by such a mass of comment is *prima facie* absurd. Least of all can this be so in the case of a poet who is as transparently clear as Horace is in three-fourths of the Odes, while anyone who knows the editions of Nauck and Kiessling will be aware that practically all which is best worth knowing on the subject may be adequately represented in a very limited space. There are a certain number of difficulties which, except some new MS should be discovered, are likely to prove difficulties until the end of time. No one, for example, has as yet found any real solution of *iam virum expertae* . . . or of *venena magnum fas nefasque* . . . Commentators and emendators have merely made such puzzles more puzzling, and the best editor is the man who states the difficulty in its simplest form, quotes half-a-dozen conjectures in order to shew their absurdity, and then leaves the problem unsolved. Except as an amusement for specialists, such passages have little real interest, and do not concern ordinary readers more than the trisection of an angle does a boy learning Euclid.

Unfortunately, however, because in some places MSS are corrupt and unintelligible, and because a certain number of brilliant emendations have been made, it has become the fashion to examine the text of some ancient writers, if not with the view, at least with the hope of finding some novelty of reading or interpretation. In the case of Horace Bentley set a notable example. He did, indeed, much admirable work at a time when texts were generally bad, but he also did much which only deserves a kind oblivion. His emendations of Milton are a permanent proof of the difference which may exist between a critic and a poet, and his emendations of Horace are often no whit better. When he writes *capacis Orci* for *rapacis Orci* he merely makes a bad pun; when he alters *emirabitur insolens* into *ut mirabitur insolens* he stirs the open-mouthed wonder he objects to; when he proposes *postque equitem sedet atra Cura* adding '*mollius, opinor, fluet versus*,' you ask what his ideas of euphony were. Anybody might make such alterations, but it needs a certain self-confidence to publish them. Bentley, however, was Master of Trinity, a royal Chaplain, and Archdeacon of Ely, so that, along with his vast erudition, he overawed and still overawes the human mind. On the continent he reigns supreme; he is practically the one Englishman who a German editor will con-

descend to refer to. But his reputation has raised him up rivals, and Peerlkamp has notoriously outrun him in the attempt to re-write Horace. The consequence is that to arrive at the real Horace in an edition where the names of Bentley and Peerlkamp perpetually appear is an almost hopeless task. The simplest Odes become unintelligible, the plainest words dubious, and the happiest phrases corrupt.

To make such statements may seem the language of exaggeration, but at least some of the evidence shall be submitted. The ordinary reader, who merely enjoys Horace, will find that he has much to learn.

1, 12, 37-43 are marked as not genuine. Peerlkamp struck out 33-48, but M. Haupt and the editor are more modest. The words *animaeque magnae | prodigum Parulum superante Poeno* are apparently not good Latin. It is allowed to be 'scarcely disputable' that Juvenal 11, 90 refers to these stanzas, and that Claudian 'after the stanza by an unknown author had slipped into the text' imitates the use of *prodigum* by writing *intumuit virtus et lucis prodigum arsit | impetus*. The interpolator who could deceive Juvenal and Claudian must have been a remarkable man; but he could not deceive Peerlkamp.

1, 13, 2 for *cerea Telephi brachia* the reading *lactea* is given against all MSS evidence on the authority of *vetustissimus grammaticus Flavius Caper*, and thus one *grammaticus* repeats the errors of another *grammaticus* from age to age. Why Telephus should not have arms 'like wax' those who choose can see in Bentley, who playfully asks whether he had 'the jaundice.' That his beauty was of the 'wax doll' order is a suggestion from the nursery which may now be more intelligible at Cambridge.

1, 20, 5 for *care Maecenas eques* Bentley with some unknown MS of course reads *clare*, and *care eques* is declared by Mueller to be 'abgeschmackt.' This is one of those emendations which is sure to be made, and would not deserve mentioning did it not shew how the taste for this sort of thing grows. In Epod. 3, 20 Horace ventured to write *iocose Maecenas*, but now we have *iocosa, Maecenas, precor | manum puella savio opponat tuo*. 'After the pathetic though apparently satirical tone of what precedes' to call Maecenas *iocosus* would be out of place, and then follows proof of how well the epithet fits *puella*. Markland and Peerlkamp claim the credit of this discovery.

1, 24, 5 *cui Pudor et Justitiae soror | incorrupta Fides*; so Horace, but this edition

has *et Justitia et soror* 'with Peerlkamp after Waddel,' for Justice is the chief of virtues and 'cannot possibly' be mentioned as it were 'casually' (beiläufig). Etiquette should come first and poetry afterwards.

1, 31, 5 the *grata Calabriae armenta* become *lata*. To speak of flocks or herds as *grata* = 'lieblich' is, it seems, 'bad taste.' Of course, too, in line 9 *Calenam* is read because the MSS evidence is wholly for *Calena*, while line 12 appears as *vina sua reparata merce*. It would be difficult to produce a worse adjective than *sua*, but then Peerlkamp and Meineke agree that stanzas 3 and 4 of this Ode are *omnis generis ineptiis repletas* and to save them they must be improved. The merchant who goes to the *aequor Atlanticum* 'three or four times a year' in line 14 cannot possibly drink wine 'bought in exchange for Syrian merchandise,' but to preserve his credit as an honest man it is fitting that we should know that the merchandise was 'his own.'

1, 37, 14 *mentemque lymphatam Mareotico* and 4, 17, 17 *spectandus in certamine Martio* are obelized as violating the laws of metre. They certainly do so, and are certainly right. The first reflects in its striking rhythm the haste and enthusiasm with which the splendid Ode where it occurs was thrown off. The second is as fine an instance of deliberate violation of rule in order to produce marked effect as can be found in any Latin poet—

'Great wits sometimes may gloriously offend
And rise to faults true critics dare not mend.'

As, however, space is an object, I must be content with merely mentioning many other instances. In 2, 3, 7 *per dies festos* is obelized and so too *quo pinus . . . ?* 2, 5, 12 *purpureo varius* becomes *varios*; while *quos tibi dempserit apponet annos* becomes *quod . . . annus*. 2, 6, 18 *amicus Aulon* is of course turned into *amictus*. 2, 8, 2 poor *Barine* is obelized; her name is 'leider ebenso verderbt wie ihre Sitten'; *Barcine, Barsine, Larine*, and *Carine* are suggested for her, and the wonderful stanza beginning *adde quod pubes tibi crescit omnis* is mutilated into *adde quod pubes, ubi crescit, omnis*. 2, 11, 15 *canos odorati capillos* becomes *cinctos*, and 2, 13, 1 *ille et nefasto* appears as *vilem nefasto*. 2, 14, 6 *amice* is printed but in the notes Peerlkamp's view that it is 'superfluous' is approved and the editor suggests *iam rite*, adding the delicious comment 'hier wäre *iam* kein Flickwort (stopgap).' 2, 15, 8 *domino priori* is altered to *priorem*, which few will be able to construe; 2, 16, 29 in

abstulit clarum cita mors Achillem the last word is obelized, for what reason few will be able to guess. 3, 1, 33-40 are not genuine; so too 3, 21-24, 4, 69-72, while 3, 3, 18 *Ilion, Ilion* ought to be 'something like *Ilion inpium*.' In lines 37-40 of the same Ode there are two marks of obelization which any reader will find it a pretty puzzle to place correctly, and in line 46 *medius liquor* appears as *modicus liquor*. 3, 4, 46 *et urbes regnaque tristitia* is *et umbras*; 3, 5, 8 *in armis* is *in arvis*; 3, 5, 17 *periret* is *perires*, while in 3, 6, 22 *matura virgo* turns up as *acerba virgo*! Even that flawless gem the amoebaeic ninth Ode is not sacred; the line *reiectaeque patet ianua Lydiae* is obelized. It appears that *Lydiae* is a genitive; decorum demands that Horace should call on Lydia, and not *vice versa*, and therefore, 'as the elder Burmann suggested,' we ought to read *si flava excutitur Chloe, reiectaene patet ianua Lydiae*? 'If I give up Chloe, is (hier steht ne in emphatischer Frage) Lydia willing to be "at home" when I call?'

But enough! I had collected 30 or 40 more similar instances; those, however, which I have referred to will satisfy all ordinary students. There are good emendations, of which Bentley's *dedicet Euro* (1, 25, 20) for *dedicet Hebro* is an excellent specimen. There are too plausible emendations like *vepris inhorrui ad ventum foliis* (1, 23, 5), or like *Marsi peditis* for *Mhuri* (1, 2, 39), although personally I think that Horace is depicting a fierce-eyed blackamoor (some figure like 'the Turk's Head' which used to glare from sign-boards), and that all considerations of the Moors being horsemen and the Marsi famous warriors are beside the question. Again, to suggest *fama Marcellis* for the MS *fama Marcelli* or *maior an illa* for *maior an illi* is reasonable, but what can be said for printing (3, 14, 14)

*ego nunc tumultum
nunc mori per vim metuum tenente
Caesare terras*

or for stating that in *te duce Caesar*, the fine ending of 1, 2, the word *Caesar* is not genuine? In the last case the editor quietly says 'Doch ist die Besserung kaum möglich,' and indeed, if anyone will blot out *Caesar* and then try and 'find the missing word,' he will discover that he has entered upon a very difficult competition.

It is certainly time that this arbitrary criticism of Horace, which erases or emends whatever displeases the critic's taste, should be relegated to a secondary place in Horatian study. It is stifling real and

living acquaintance with him as a great poet. His text is buried under a mass of comment as effectively as the simple teaching of the Synoptic Gospels is entombed under a portentous pile of theological literature. The scholarship which is needed is that scholarship which is strong enough to relegate technicalities to their proper place and to devote itself to the real elucidation of a great writer.

At present, however, the only way to obtain any credit for classical learning is to study manuscripts, scholiasts and lexicographers; the sure road to immortality is to sit down and see whether some word, which is *prima facie* genuine, cannot be altered into some word which closely resembles it in appearance (e.g. *rapidus rabidus, totum tutum, atra arta, alto arto, puro duro, puellis duellis*). The editor, on the other hand, who merely tries to make clear what Horace meant is certain of oblivion. I might prove the point by referring to the total silence with which the work of a scholar so skilful and sympathetic as Dr. Wickham is passed over in the present edition, but I prefer to be egotistic, for, after all, to avoid the word 'I' in writing is a mere trick of style, and a man can only state what he knows himself, while 'The Confessions of a classical Editor' may at least provoke some interest on the ground of rarity.

It was my fortune, chiefly by accident, some twenty years ago to edit the Odes. At that time I was totally ignorant of Bentley; I knew absolutely nothing about MSS; about scholiasts, editors, and emendators I cared not one jot. My sole qualification for my task was that I knew the Odes thoroughly, admired them exceedingly, and could write a decent imitation of them with facility. Since then I have read and made notes on an enormous mass of Horatian literature, so that at the present time I am, in a muddled sort of way, what may be termed an expert on the subject. But in my own heart I am well aware that my real knowledge of Horace, my real power of understanding him is less now than it was in 1880. If I had to edit the Odes afresh to-day I am satisfied that the edition would be technically superior to what I produced long ago, and also intrinsically worse. It would have fewer blunders and fewer merits, because my mind is now so encumbered with a mass of miscellaneous information, mostly worthless, that it can no longer act with native and necessary freshness. My intimacy with Horace has ceased; my

intimacy with critics, who never could have written one of his Odes, has become a sad reality. I am becoming a 'scholar' in name exactly because I am ceasing to be so in fact.

Moreover, amid all the bulk of comment which I have now read, what excites surprise is the exceedingly minute proportion of anything which is really valuable. Book after book comes to me and I read it with a natural desire to find something which I may use to improve my own notes. Anything worth having I am selfishly eager to appropriate, but unfortunately I find very little that I care to steal. My edition remains a small book not because I could not long since have made it a large one, but because I cannot find anything more to put in it. 'This little School-book' is consequently the remark generally made about it by critics who weigh literature by pounds avoirdupois, while scholars agree that one who prefers Horace to what the *grammaticorum turba* has said about him is unworthy of serious discussion. Yet surely even German erudition might recognize a poor Englishman's work rather than assert that *tenebit* in 1, 7, 21, is 'corrupt' and suggest that *latebris* 'might do' in its place. Or again when it is said that *redemptor frequens cum famulis* 3, 1, cannot mean 'with a throng of workmen,' a reference which I give to Ter. Andria 1, 1, 81, *cum illis qui amabant Chrysidem una aderat frequens* might serve to prove the opposite. The use of *notus animi paterni* (2, 2, 5) as = 'noted for affection' is allowed to be unparalleled in Horace (for 4, 13, 21 is

rightly explained otherwise) but surely the explanation of *animi paterni* as a simple gen. of quality deserves notice. Macaulay's illustration of *incedis per ignes | suppositos cineri doloso* as an image drawn from walking 'on the thin crust of ashes beneath which the lava is still glowing' deserves a place in any notes. A knowledge of Wickham's school edition (p. 330) would make even a boy recognize the folly of altering 3, 4, 46 *urbes regnaque tristitia* into *umbras*. The explanation of *tuis ignibus* 3, 7, 11 as = Gyges, though this use of *ignis* 'is not found elsewhere in Horace,' and the use of the plural seems altogether exceptional, would surely be modified by fuller acquaintance with the problem. A glance at Milton's phrase

'A multitude, like which the frozen North
Poured never from her frozen loins,'
might give a critic pause before he condemned *Germania quos horrida parturit fetus* as 'abgeschmackt,' so that *motus* is preferable, or indeed the whole stanza should be rejected.

There are numerous other instances where the editor might at least have learnt something from several English commentators on Horace. I do not for one moment maintain that their views or my own have any special merit, but I respectfully submit that they deserve consideration, and that the emendations, erasures and obelizations of Bentley, Peerlkamp and similar critics are not the only part of classical study which deserves to rank as real scholarship.

T. E. PAGE.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Adversaria Critica in Sophoclem. By F. H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Saxonum. 1900. 6 Mk.

THIS volume is a supplement to the author's edition of Sophocles and is similar in scope and character to his *Adversaria* on Aristophanes which were noticed recently in this *Review*. It contains a large number of fresh conjectures by Mr. Blaydes himself, together with a selection of conjectures made by others and readings from the Paris codices 2787, 2886, 2711. The notes are interesting and useful but the survey of the field of Sophoclean criticism is tantalisingly incomplete. Hardly any account is taken of Jebb's recently published editions.

F. W. HALL.

Onomasticum Taciteum composuit PHILIPPUS FABIA. Annales de l'Université de Lyon II. Droit, Lettres; fascicule 4. Paris: Fontemoing, 1900. Pp. 772. 8vo. 15 francs.

THIS handsomely printed volume is what it professes to be, neither more nor less. It contains all the proper names occurring in the works of Tacitus, with all the passages where they occur appended in full or nearly in full, and some brief footnotes exhibiting manuscript variants or conjectures of importance. It is therefore more than an index: on the other hand, it makes no attempt to give biographies of persons named or indications of books where bio-