

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](#)



An American Edition and Translation of Horace *Horace*, edited with Explanatory Notes by Thomas Chase, LL.D. Philadelphia, Eldredge and Brother. Revised Edition, 1892; 1 doll. 10c. Text pp. 1—252, Notes 253—458. *The Odes and Epodes of Horace*, translated into English Verse with an Introduction and Notes and Latin Text by John B. Hague, Ph. D. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons, 1892.

T. E. Page

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 08 / October 1892, pp 354 - 357
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186500, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186500

How to cite this article:

T. E. Page (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 354-357 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186500

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

while this last cannot well be earlier than 380, and may be considerably later, the value of Revillout's discovery begins to sink far below zero.

(2) But if the compiler of the Didascalia in its parent form derived his dogmatic materials from the creed in the *Ancoratus*, through the channel of its pseudo-Basilian adaptation, whence did he take his code of precepts? How do they stand related to the *Syntagma*, and is Epiphanius the borrower or the lender? With regard to the latter question, Batiffol tenders proof of the dependence of Epiphanius upon the *Syntagma*: Revillout was therefore as right on this point as he was wrong on the question of the Epiphanian creed. But the *Syntagma* itself, as we saw above, is but the recension of a code from which the compiler of the 'Didascalia' derived his moral precepts. What then was this code? It proves, on examination, to have consisted of two elements,—precepts applicable to the Christian life generally, and precepts for the special guidance of ascetics. Now the latter simply apply to the *ascetics* the canons imposed at Nicaea and other fourth-century Councils upon the *clergy*. Moreover they contemplate the existence of coenobite as well as solitary monasticism. They therefore belong to the period before Epiphanius, and after the rise of communities of monks. Batiffol, following Weingarten, puts the latter about 360; but Pachomius the founder of coenobitic communities was already dead in May 346 (see note 3 on Athanasius *ad Orsisiuum* in Nicene Library, vol. iv. p. 569). The ascetic code *may* therefore date from the *first* half of the fourth century.

But eliminating the ascetic precepts, the remainder of the code gains in coherence: we find a little manual for the Christian life

(printed by Batiffol pp. 150—154) of which the unmistakable germ is the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. The manual itself is approximately dated (p. 155) by the heresies mentioned (Marcionites, but not Arians nor Meletians) to about 300 A.D. Its relation to the *Didaché* was closer than the present text of the *Syntagma* implies; e.g. the Didascalia preserves from the prototype a remarkable clause from *Didaché* vi. 1 which has vanished from the *Syntagma* itself. We have therefore an adaptation of the *Didaché* parallel to the 'Apostolische Kirchenordnung' and to the seventh book of the Apostolical Constitutions, the former of which would belong to about the same date, the latter falling some fifty years later. Moreover the *Syntagma* descends from the *Didaché* by a line independent of either of the two last-named texts. This point, made good by Dr. Warfield, is rightly accepted as certain by M. Batiffol.

Lastly, the *Syntagma* preserves a text of the *Didaché* of singular interest in several respects. Dr. Warfield (*Schaff, Oldest Church Manual*, p. 305) distinguishes an Egyptian and a Syrian text of the *Didaché*, the latter represented by the Apostolical Constitutions and the Bryennian text, the former by the Latin fragment and Barnabas on the one hand, the 'Kirchenordnung' on the other. Now M. Batiffol (pp. 159, 160) gives good reasons for regarding the *Syntagma* as a peculiar witness for the Egyptian text, or possibly even as an intermediate form between the Egyptian and the Syrian.

M. Batiffol's Study marks a real advance in the problem of the *Syntagma* and will, it may be hoped, gain serious attention both in this country and in Germany.

A. ROBERTSON.

AN AMERICAN EDITION AND TRANSLATION OF HORACE.

Horace, edited with Explanatory Notes by THOMAS CHASE, LL.D. Philadelphia, Eldredge and Brother. Revised Edition, 1892; 1 doll. 10c. Text pp. 1—252, Notes 253—458.

The Odes and Epodes of Horace, translated into English Verse with an Introduction and Notes and Latin Text by JOHN B. HAGUE, Ph. D. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons, 1892.

THESE volumes from beyond the Atlantic should disarm criticism from those who love

Horace and value the study of classical literature as a means of liberal education. In England that study is nowadays denounced with passionate vehemence and defended with timorous apologies. These two editions are however a visible proof that in the New World old studies may look forward to a fresh life, and, if ever the day comes when Englishmen shall have discarded classical education in favour of 'commercial German' and the *argot* of Parisian cafés, then perhaps a quotation from Virgil, unintelligible at Westminster, will be heard with applause in

debates at Washington, and Horace, forgotten by the Cam and the Isis, will still flourish

‘in the fresh praises of posterity’

by the banks of the Hudson and the Mississippi. At any rate neither of these two American editors betrays the slightest consciousness that he is dealing with a dead language or is the advocate of a dying cause. They both write of the poet as of one in whom all men of education take necessarily a considerable interest. Dr. Chase cannot decide whether he is to be compared to ‘a Burns, who had lived with gentlemen and scholars and been trained in a great university,—a Béranger capable of more earnest themes and loftier flights—a Heine without his drop of gall—a Pope without mannerism—a larger Cowley, Dobson, or Lang,’ but he does not hesitate to describe him as ‘the charmer of youth, the counsellor of manhood, the delight and refreshment of old age’. Dr. Hague is even bolder: he offers his book not merely to scholars but to ‘general readers’ and asserts that he has ‘in its preparation had particular regard to the wants of the latter.’ When such language issues not from Paternoster Row or 270 The Strand, but from ‘The Knickerbocker Press 27 West Twenty-Third Street New York,’ then even classical students may feel that they are not mere antiquarian relics.

Dr. Chase’s work is a handy school edition, convenient in shape and excellently printed, but with the grave defect in a schoolbook of being stiff-backed, so that it will not lie open flat without the use of violence. The notes are on the whole good and on the *Odes* fairly abundant, but probably from considerations of space those on the *Satires* and *Epistles* have been compressed into about 65 pages. It is of course impossible that they can be adequate, but there is a growing demand for short decisive notes; and they have at any rate one advantage—they leave a student time to read the text itself, whereas many modern editions contain such a mass of erudition that they entomb the author whom it is their object to enshrine. Terse notes, however, except where great judgment is employed, are apt to degenerate into mere feeble jottings such as a schoolboy enters on the margin of his book. For instance on *Sat.* 1, 8, 1

*olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum,
quum faber, incertus scamnum faceretne
Priapum,
mahit esse deum. deus inde ego....*

Dr. Chase gives as his only note—‘The uselessness of the wood of the fig-tree was proverbial.’ Surely this is at once insufficient and superfluous. The text itself declares that the wood of the fig-tree is useless, while on the other hand no notice is taken of the one noteworthy thing in these noble lines, their splendid simplicity of sarcasm. Professor Palmer also omits to comment on this, but Mr. Wickham rightly refers to it and quotes the famous passage of Isaiah (44, 17) ‘and the residue thereof he maketh a god.’

Where space is so sorely needed an editor should surely omit such notes as (*Od.* 1, 7, 1—4) ‘Between what two seas (or gulfs) does Corinth stand?’ and ‘gender number and case (accusative) of *Tempe*?’ He might thus find room to give references which are essential. For instance on *Od.* 1, 3, 8 *animae dimidium meae* it is exasperating to find

‘Part of my soul I seek thee, and thee claim
My other half’

simply quoted as from ‘Milton,’ and on *Od.* 1, 16, 1 *o matre pulchra filia pulchrior* we should be glad of something more definite than ‘An English nobleman gracefully applied this verse in a speech in the House of Lords to America in her relation to England.’ These illustrations are however very happy, as are many others, e.g. *Od.* 1, 20, 5 *care Maecenas eques*, ‘Maecenas, like some illustrious commoners in England, was contented with the equestrian rank’: nothing could be better than the words in italics. We could spare however the remark on 1, 22, 16 *arida nutrix*—‘Arida parched (Do not translate “the dry nurse”).’ Some warnings are dangerous, and the second half of the note reminds one of the hint conveyed in the solemn warning of a book on etiquette: ‘It is not customary after dining at a house to give the butler a shilling and ask him to put your card in the hall two days afterwards.’ The editor elsewhere exhibits a happier humour and when describing how the *annosa cornix* lived during nine generations of men judiciously adds, ‘Students may remember the *σχολαστικός* who bought a young crow to see whether it would live so long as it was reported it would.’ His observation on another bird also deserves attention; referring to the fact that in *Od.* 4, 2 Pindar is called ‘the Dircaean swan’ he writes, ‘The glorious cry of the “trumpeter-swans” when they pass in full flight overhead can never be forgotten by those who have

once heard it.' Lastly, the same ode shows the danger of dogmatic utterances. Dr. Chase reads *Tuque dum procedis* and writes 'and as thou (Antonius) leadest the way (as praetor)' This is beautifully simple, but where is the proof that Antonius was praetor at the time or that he would head the procession in honour of the return of Augustus? What too about the strong MSS. authority for *teque*? Perhaps however dogmatism is excusable in schoolbooks and schoolmasters. It is certainly common.

Of Dr. Hague's work it is as difficult to speak as it is of most translations of Horace. Translating the *Odes* is like rearing memorials to the departed; it is a visible sign of affection, but only once in a thousand times is the memorial itself a work destined to survive. The *Odes* in fact defy alike the attacks of time and of translators. This is not the highest praise. The noblest poetry does not depend upon form, and translations of Job and the Psalms, of Homer and Lucretius, may often be not unworthy of the originals. But in the *Odes* the thoughts are on the whole commonplace; the form in which they are expressed is unique and inimitable. In them simple truths are expressed in Latin of monumental brevity and clearness which will outlast the ages, but which no modern language can reproduce. Yet generation after generation the attempt is made, and occasionally here and there a happy translation of some particular Ode obtains ephemeral fame, but there is certainly no rendering of any of them which really clings to the memory of itself, as a good lyric should and as the original does. Dr. Hague has attempted 'the greatest possible condensation' and on the whole a close translation. As a necessary result he wants life and ring in his verse. The following (*Od.* 3, 16) is a fair specimen of his style:

'Nor Calabria lend her bees,
Nor my wine on Formian lees
Rests and mellows, nor shall feed
Flocks of mine in Gallic mead.

Yet no pinching want I feel,
Thou wouldst answer such appeal,
And my modest income grows
By the fewer wants it knows.

They who always pine for more,
Would be poor with Croesus' store,
Blessed is he to whom is given
Just enough by frugal Heaven.

It would be difficult to call the first stanza poetry at all; the last six lines are on the other hand distinctly good as a translation, but as poetry they sound more like a hymn than like Horace. Dr. Hague however errs throughout in this respect. He takes Horace with a seriousness which is positively astounding. In his general introduction and the notes prefixed to each Ode he speaks of the poet as of one whose principal aim was to inculcate moral and religious precepts. The *Odes* to Mercury (1, 10), to Bacchus (2, 19) to Faunus (3, 18 *Faune, Nympharum fugientum amator*) are 'properly hymns actually used for religious service on public and private occasions.' So serious a view naturally leads him to make some observations on a topic which seems to have singular attractions for many who are rather eminent for scholarship than for common sense, viz. the relations of Horace with the various members of the other sex to whom he addresses *Odes*. According to Dr. Hague Horace was a man of perfect purity: 'he could challenge the severest scrutiny into his youthful life,' and Maecenas made this scrutiny 'before inviting him to a position of much trust and responsibility in his household,' while Augustus, who 'lived an exemplary life in the palace and had what we would have called his golden wedding,' would not have tolerated any irregularities in the poet he had selected to preach virtue. So too, 'he who wrote the fifth stanza of the Saecular Hymn praying for the blessing of Diana upon the marriage laws established by the state's decree, would be likely to respect those laws in his own home.' Considering that Horace was a confirmed bachelor the stanza

*Diva, producas subolem Patrumque
prosperes decreta super jugandis
feminiis prolisque novae feraci
lege marita*

could hardly have come from his heart of of hearts, and indeed its metrical prose sufficiently indicates the poet's enthusiasm for his subject. But Dr. Hague is not to be deterred by trifles. Having made Horace a Doctor of Morals he resolutely faces the problem of the 'sixteen or seventeen' female recipients of *Odes*. He seeks no evasion. The ladies are all real and all real ladies 'moving in good society' (p. 14), to whom Horace is father-confessor, counsellor and friend. Here is the introduction to 1, 23 *vitas hinc nuleo* as a specimen of his method:—

'Nothing is known of Chloe outside of

these lyrics. She is very young, and is the same, we think, as the Chloe mentioned in the last stanza of Ode 3, 26, where the same wish is expressed—that she might be brought under the power of love, though not for the poet's sake. The Chloe of the amoeban ode is *Thressa Chloe*. The Chloe mentioned in Ode 3, 7 is a landlady (*sic*) of Oricum. In this lyric, as in that to Lyde of the third book, Horace makes the matter so far personal, that he represents some of the friends of Chloe, and expresses his and their opinion that she ought to enter into the life of society. It was a graceful way of reaching a delicate and difficult case.'

Comment on such criticism is wasted, but the fact of the recurrence (see *Class. Rev.*

1892, p. 29) of this discussion in Horatian literature surely deserves serious consideration from all careful students of human nature. For my own part I can only say that, when the identity of Chloe who behaved 'like a fawn' with the vivacious 'landlady of Oricum' shall have been definitely proved or disproved, and when scholars have decided whether Horace's addresses to Lydia justified an action for breach of promise, then I hope to write an article for the *Classical Review* on the biography of Nancy Lee and the underlying conception (*Grundidee*) of morality which animated the author of 'Sally in our Alley.'

T. E. PAGE.

VIENNA DISSERTATIONS

Dissertationes Philologicae Vindobonenses.
Vol. III. Leipzig. G. Freytag. 10 Mk.

1. De Octavia praetexta, scripsit FRIDERICUS LADEK. Pp. 1-109.
2. Quaestiones de vetustiorum poetarum elegiacorum graecorum sermone, ad syntaxim, copiam, vim verborum pertinentes, scripsit FLORIANUS WEIGEL. Pp. 109-239.
3. Quaestiones de Orphei quae feruntur Argonauticis, scripsit GUILIELMUS WEINBERGER. Pp. 239-319.
4. De mediae et novae quae vocatur comoediae atticae trimetro iambico, scripsit FRANCISCUS PERSCHINKA. Pp. 319-373.

1. The author of the first-named dissertation, having stated the well-known convincing proofs that the *Octavia* could not have been written by Seneca the philosopher, takes up the question by whom, or rather when, the play was written. He sums up what has been done by others towards the solution of this problem, and agrees with those that believe the work was already among the plays of Seneca at the beginning of the fifth century. Next he criticises and rejects the opinion of Richter that the play was composed in the fourth century by the person who prepared the MS. of Seneca from which are derived those that contain the *Octavia*. Now one argument employed by Richter is that the play bears marks of having been composed after the publication

of Tacitus' *Annals*. This view is shared by Vater, Braun, and Birt. A considerable, and perhaps the most important, part of the work before us is devoted to a confutation of this view. For this purpose Ladek takes up *seriatim* the evidences adduced by Braun to show that the author of the *Octavia* followed the narrative of Tacitus. His conclusion is that in no instance is there any evidence that the poet had the work of the historian before him, and in some instances the play is inconsistent with the history, and in a few instances reference is made to facts not narrated at all by Tacitus. Ladek infers that the poet did not follow Tacitus or any of the extant authors, but both he and Tacitus drew in part from the same sources, one important source for the poet being the common report among the people. From these facts, and from the style, metre, and other internal evidences, the conclusion is drawn that the *Octavia* was composed a short time after the death of Nero by some one personally familiar with the times.

Ladek's method in this part of his work could have been easily made more satisfactory. Braun appears to have laid stress on verbal resemblance between the play and Tacitus; and Ladek, directing his efforts to the confutation of Braun, demonstrates conclusively enough that the poet did not imitate the historian. Again and again he finds 'no traces of imitation.' Now the fact is, the incidents of the play found also in Tacitus are so numerous that, unless some