

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](#)



Hartman's Essay on Horace *De Horatio Poeta*, scripsit I. I. Hartman, pp. 202. Published at Leyden, 1891, by S. Van Doesburgh. 5 Mk.

T. E. Page

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 26 - 29

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184562, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184562

How to cite this article:

T. E. Page (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 26-29 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184562

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

authors, the great lesson to be learnt from the history of the text, a lesson which each new year of Plautine research more strongly emphasizes, is that the closest following of the MSS. is essential for any satisfactory results. Of the ten emendations quoted by Loewe and Goetz from vol. viii. of *Hermathena*, some half dozen seem to have been abandoned or considerably modified in this edition, and one cannot help feeling that many of the new emendations are hardly convincing enough to be sure of keeping their place in the text. Not a few of them involve the acceptance of theories of Plautine Prosody and Language which have been for some time given up by many, if not most, of the leading authorities. Final *-d* in the Abl. Sing. of Nouns appears, for example, in i. 1. 10 *portud*, i. 1. 98 *suad*. It is of course risky, as Prof. Palmer remarks in his Preface, to dogmatise about an author like Plautus, but is there no risk in reintroducing forms like these into a school edition? Equally questionable is the scansion *divēs* in i. 1. 16, and the remark in the Critical Note on Prol. 146 (*nemo horum*): 'Hiatus is not so objectionable before *h*.' In iii. 1. 15 we find *hocedie*, a form generally regarded as un-Plautine, and in the Critical Note on i. 1. 179 reappear the old-fashioned *prosp're*, *v'rebamini*. Of course Prof. Palmer may have good reasons for restoring to favour these words, and the theories they represent; but, in the absence of a more detailed defence of them than that given on p. xxxvi. of the Introduction, they give his edition the appearance of not being quite up to date. Similarly in his proposed emendation of *Aul.* ii. 7. 25 (see p. xlii. note) *confice sagittis*, for *confige sagittis*, an emendation since proposed independently by Prof. Klotz, he takes no account, unlike Prof. Klotz, of the fact that *sagitta* is generally believed to have the second syllable short in Plautus.

I will conclude this article by mentioning one or two smaller points, which seem to me blemishes in this excellent edition. In the Introduction one misses a reference to the spurious Scenes by Hermolaus Barbarus,

found in the early editions of the play. There might too have been a mention of the recorded performance of the *Amphitruo* in the fourth or fifth century A.D. In the Notes *arbiter*, in the note on i. 1. 16, is still derived from *ad* and *bito*. The new and probably right derivation of the word from *ad* and the root of the English 'quothe' (see Wharton's *Etyma Latina*) should at least have been mentioned. If *adbīto* come from *ad* and *baeto* (Oscan *baiteis*, 'thou goest') as *acquiro* from *ad* and *quaero*, *arbiter* is an unlikely Latin derivative, and *adpūtrati* (= *arbitrati*), which occurs on the Eugubine Tables, a still more unlikely Umbrian one. On the other hand the Old Norse *at-kvaeda*, 'decision,' gives strong support to the new etymology. i. 1. 53. Is the Irish 'I'll be after doing so and so' really parallel to the use of the Fut. Pft. to denote certainty? Surely not. i. 1. 85. The discussion of the quantity of the first syllable of *statim* might have included Langen's account of the use of the word in Plautus (*Beitraege* p. 16). i. 1. 230 *luna* and the Praenestine *losna* stand for *louxna*, like the Prussian *lauxnos*, 'stars,' Zend *raokshma*, 'shining' (see Brugmann *Grundriss* ii. p. 132, and Wharton *Etyma Latina*). ii. 2. 46. A note on the form *rumificant* seems to be required. The form points to a Neuter *rumus*, beside the Masculine *rumor*, cf. *foedus* and *foedifragus*, *munus* and *munificus* etc. ii. 2. 57. To the instances of *rē-* (besides *redduco*), add: *red-ducem* Capt. 923: *reccordetur* Men. 972 (Schoell): *rēplebo* Poen. 701 (so the MSS.).

Schroeder's investigation of the fragments of the *Amphitruo* (in Studemund's *Early Latin Studies* vol. ii. 1891) does not seem to add much to Prof. Palmer's treatment of them. But another book which appeared subsequently to Prof. Palmer's edition, the great work of Klotz on Early Latin Metre (*Grundzüge altrömischer Metrik*, Leipzig (Teubner) 1890), would have thrown a great deal of light on the metrical difficulties of the play. Its influence will probably be seen in Prof. Palmer's second edition.

W. M. LINDSAY.

HARTMAN'S ESSAY ON HORACE.

De Horatio Poeta, scripsit I. I. HARTMAN, pp. 202. Published at Leyden, 1891, by S. Van Doesburgh. 5 Mk.

THIS is a vigorous and very readable essay on Horace, chiefly dealing with the *Odes*.

Those who disagree strongly with the views expressed in it will none the less find in the freshness and vivacity of its criticism a healthy tonic. The writer greatly admires Peerlkamp: he considers him a brilliant critic but he totally disagrees with him.

This paradox he promptly explains. The *Odes* as revised by Peerlkamp are infinitely superior to the *Odes* as usually edited, but this does not in any way prove that Peerlkamp's revision represents what Horace actually wrote, for the simple reason that Horace is often a mere versifier, who does not mind what rubbish he writes provided that it will scan.

Putting aside for a moment the judgment thus passed on Horace's poetry, it is certain that the writer's disagreement with Peerlkamp's method is just. Because an emendation or excision improves the text it does not in the least follow that it is necessarily or even probably right. Where manuscripts agree and the text presents a reasonable sense, emendations are for the most part a mere impertinence. If a person wishes to write poetry, let him write it. If he wishes to find fault with a poet, let him find fault. In the name of common sense however let him not argue that, because he would have liked a poet to write something, therefore the poet actually did write that something. For example, in spite of his general distrust, Dr. Hartman asserts that in *Od.* 2. 6. 7 *sit modus lasso maris et viarum* Peerlkamp's emendation *domus* for *modus* is practically certain. But why? Simply because an individual critic much prefers *domus*. The evidence that Horace wrote *domus* is absolutely non-existent. After all too it is merely a matter of taste whether *domus* is superior to *modus*, so that, when one editor has settled that Horace ought to have written *domus* and therefore must have written *domus*, another editor may tersely remark, as Orelli does,—‘*sit domus* languet post *sit sedes*.’ Indeed if emending according to taste is to be introduced we had better burn the classics at once. Here is a stanza of Horace as emended by Peerlkamp—

*regnum proprium atque tutum
deferens uni, diadema et auri
quisquis ingentes oculo irretorto
spectat acervos.*

It is quite justifiable for Dr. Hartman (p. 6) to say that this is better than what Horace actually wrote and describe it as *egregium*. Tastes differ. But whether it be better or worse than Horace, what right has any one to produce these parodies and call them emendations? They are a mere nuisance and encumbrance to classical study.

The unfavourable judgment which Dr. Hartman has formed of many of the *Odes*

he supports by quoting the opinion of Goethe as summarized by F. W. Riemer (*Mittheilungen über Goethe* II. 644) the poet's secretary. That opinion is so remarkable that it deserves to be given in full.

‘Horaz. Sein poetisches talent anerkannt nur in Absicht auf technische und Sprachvollkommenheit, d. h. Nachbildung der Griechischen Metra und der poetischen Sprache, nebst einer furchtbaren Realität, ohne alle eigentliche Poesie besonders in den Oden.’

It is impossible to deny the force of much of Goethe's criticism. Horace is clearly proud of his technical skill in the manipulation of metres: he is often confessedly not original but borrows freely from Greek poets: his imaginative power is probably slight. On the other hand it is hard to accept the saying that there is no ‘genuine poetry’ in the *Odes*. It would seem, for example, that in the *Regulus* ode there is real poetic power and that in such a line as *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* there is something more than mere technical mastery over words. Moreover in such lines as

*quo pinus ingens albaque populus
umbram hospitalem consociare amant
ramis? quid obliquo laborat
lympha fugax trepidare rivo?*

there is ‘*Realität*’ no doubt, but why, in the name of all that is beautiful and natural, *furchtbare Realität*? Even when you add ‘wine and unguents and roses that fade too soon,’ why is the realism ‘frightful’? Were all human joys, all natural delights so utterly despicable even to Goethe?

In his second and most important chapter (pp. 15-71) Hartman follows up Goethe's criticism by adducing specific instances of Horace's feebleness. He places his finger no doubt on many weak points. Few will probably care to defend the long *Europe* ode (3. 27) or the closing ode of Book II., which has however a stalwart champion in Plüss (*Horazstudien* pp. 179-184). In 4. 9 it is not unreasonable to say of the concluding stanzas—*sequitur Lollii virtutum enumeratio frigidissima ineptissimaque*. No one can defend the hideous parenthesis about the armour of the Vindelici, 4. 4. 18-22, though it may be observed that Hartman, when criticizing many notorious defects in this book, is clearly wrong in saying that it was written at a time when Horace ‘seemed to himself and others αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ δεινότερος,’ for it is historically certain that the Fourth

Book was not written willingly and that some of the odes deserve that tenderness of criticism which is always bestowed on the official productions of a Poet Laureate. It is reasonable and easy to satirize the stanza *sed ne relictis Musa procaz jocos...*, fondly loved and lovingly imitated though it has been by writers of Latin odes in all ages. Possibly in the same ode (2. 1. 28 *rettulit inferias Jugurthae*) we may allow '*ideo hic Jugurtham positum esse quia metrum Hannibalem et Carthaginem non admittebat.*' These and similar criticisms if temperately urged would perhaps almost establish the assertion that there is much in the Odes which is commonplace and poor. The tendency of criticism is however always to go too far, and when people begin finding fault they are apt to go on. This is what Hartman does. It is possible that Horace found his metres difficult, but it is rather rash to assert that, in compositions so highly finished as some of the Odes are, he would write bad Latin merely because he could not otherwise make the verse scan. When he writes

*quod ex hac
luce Maecenas meus affluentes
ordinat annos*

it is folly to ask the satirical question (p. 23) '*Eryone fastos corrigendi munus ab Augusto accepit Maecenas, eumque honorem Idibus Aprilibus iniit?* and to say that you can only extract a reference to Maecenas' birthday by 'doing violence to Latinity.' Surely Horace knew Latin and would write what was intelligible. When he writes (3. 8. 14) *vigiles lucernas perfer in lucem*, it is hard to believe a modern critic who says (p. 8) '*solum recte eo significari potest "tolera lucernas nimium splendentes vel male olentes."*' Again as regards the phrase

*neu sinas Medos equitare inultos,
te duce, Caesar,*

it is bold language to say that it is '*ineptissime dictum*,' because there is a 'ludicrous ambiguity in the words *te duce* thus placed.' Where is the 'ludicrous ambiguity'? Surely it needs a wilful and ingenious stupidity to make *te duce* go with *equitare*. But what is to be thought of a critic who says that *equitare* is merely used to make the verse scan and adds '*sed qui Medos equitare doleat, is etiam indignetur quod aves volitent piscesque natent*'? To appreciate the sarcasm it is only necessary to omit the emphatic word *inultos* and ignore the graphic power of *equitare* as well as

the secondary notion of pride which it conveys.

It is not however only Horace's Latin that Hartman attacks but also his taste. It is unnecessary with Peerlkamp to deny that he wrote 3. 8: the Ode is Horace's and merely illustrates his lack of 'urbanity' (p. 28). Why? Because he addresses to Maecenas ('*virum sapientem et sobrium*') the appeal *sume cyathos centum* and adds *procul omnis esto clamor et ira*. He shows the same lack of taste in his famous address to a wine-jar (3. 21) when inviting Corvinus to dinner. '*An nesciebat Horatius vinum e quo querelae, immo rixae nasci possent mimine convenire epulis cum Messalla Corvino, viro, cui iudice Cicerone (ad Brutum 1. 15. 1) constantia et probitate nil simile esset. Quid ejusmodi viro cum insanis amoribus, qui "in studio eloquentiae evigilare solet?"*' This is positively charming. The gravity of the critic is superhuman. He is a man who would positively take an epitaph or a testimonial as literally true. Because Cicero rolls out a panegyric on Corvinus, therefore Corvinus was always as sober as a judge. Pitt was a great man and austere, but Pitt liked port and no one then thought the worse of him for it. In spite of the language of Cicero it is possible that Corvinus did accept Horace's invitation and even conceivable that he paid too much attention to the *pia testa*. The Romans were Romans and they drank hard and made jokes about drinking. It is deplorable but true in spite of critics.

In his third chapter the writer discusses the question why Horace is hardly referred to or imitated by any of his contemporaries, and certainly not by Virgil. Possibly he is right in his opinion that his reputation was not great, though the opposite conclusion may more naturally be drawn from the official recognition bestowed on him by Augustus and from the fact that in Juvenal's day he had already become a classic. It is quite easy too to admit that the fourth *Eclogue* is not borrowed from the sixteenth *Epode*, for descriptions of the Golden Age are naturally alike, but it is interesting to see how prejudice runs away with a critic. Hartman despises the *Epode* and exalts the *Eclogue*, and after quoting from the latter some 'immortal verses' he finally writes enthusiastically — *nihil vero praestantius quam hoc* :—

*nec varios discet mentiri lana colores
ipse sed in pratis aries jam suave rubenti
murice, jam croceo mutabit vellera luto;
sponte sua sandyx pascentes vestiet agnos.*

It is astounding to see these lines quoted as a specimen of perfect poetry. They have merit no doubt; they are excellent in form and musical in sound, but directly you try to picture to yourself the scene represented their utter absurdity and want of taste is obvious. Imagine walking through a meadow and meeting first a yellow ram, then a scarlet ram, and then a ram whose fleece 'blushed sweetly' with purple! An infant with its first paint-box could hardly produce a worse picture.

In chapters 4 and 5 the writer goes on to show very carefully and successfully that Horace is never imitated and rarely mentioned by other contemporary poets. He especially repudiates all attempts to prove that Propertius ever borrowed a word from him. In chapters 6 and 7 he discusses Propertius, for the fire of whose amatory verses he has the strongest admiration. These chapters serve to introduce chapter 8 which deals with the *Odes* of Horace in which love forms the subject. He sufficiently demonstrates that, as Propertius was a true devoted and passionate lover, so the *Odes* exhibit no real passion. This is however merely slaying the slain. Surely no one imagines that a real history of Horace's amours can be extracted from the *Odes*. The subject once attracted the attention of a certain 'Teuffelius, doctor Tubigensis,' and sundry 'very grave' Germans (*gravissimi nostri Scholastici*, Orelli, Excursus to *Od.* 1. 5) have debated it, but perhaps it is best wisely left among the *περίεργα* of classical study.

In conclusion I must say that these criticisms give an unfair impression of the book.

It is distinctly a good and stimulating book. After attacking many things in it I must fully acknowledge its great ability, and so imitate the writer of it, who, after attacking particular passages of Horace without mercy, in a brief and judicious 'Epilogue' gives a very just and kindly verdict on his general merits as a poet. He denies him inspiration—*non ἐνθεος est Horatius; placida ei mens est et, ut ita dicam, tepida; flammæ ignesque nunquam sensit* (p. 195). He considers that he suffers from the faults to which all imitators are liable—*multa reperiuntur tanquam complementa numerorum, multa inania, multa quæ, quod ad sententiam attinet, cum ceteris carminum partibus aliquo modo certant*. On the other hand he fully recognises the literary skill which has won the admiration of so many generations of educated men; he acknowledges that no one has ever succeeded in embodying the precepts of a common-place philosophy in words so golden and everlasting—*sententias finxit morales revera ære perenniores, quæ, dum sermonis elegantiae et venustati sua laus stabit, discentur et recitabuntur. Nam sit sane Horatii philosophia humilis omnique careat magnificentia, at egregius ejus est sermo: mediocritatem quidem commendavit Horatius, sed iis eam exornavit laudibus ut vere aurea fieret*.

In a postscript the writer says '*æqualium nonnulli, si libro meo perfectio bonæ frugis aliquid inesse pronuntiaverint, impense lætabor*.' He may certainly 'rejoice heartily,' for, although those who only read this review may perhaps find more chaff than 'good grain,' those who are induced to read the book itself will find exactly the reverse.

T. E. PAGE.

HARTMANN ON PHAEDRUS.

De Phædri fabulis commentatio scripsit I. I. HARTMANN. Lugduni-Batavorum: S. C. Van Doesburgh. 1890. 125 pages.

THIS is a clever book; its writer has made a thorough study of Phædrus, and thrown much new light both on the text and on the literary questions connected with the fabulist. The work is divided into six chapters. The first discusses what is known of the poet's life; and the reader will feel grateful for the careful sifting by which facts have been discriminated from surmises. It would appear that Phædrus was not a

Greek or Macedonian by birth, but a barbarian, of what nation we can never know, and his mother a slave to some Macedonian master in Pieria. The prevalent theory is rejected that the troubles to which Phædrus so often alludes were brought upon him by something that he had written; this, it is shown, rests upon a misinterpretation of iii. præf. 40,

ego porro illius semita feci viam,
et cogitavi plura quam reliquerat,
in calamitatem deligens quaedam meam:

which does not mean 'selecting some so as