



1938

## On Translating Horace

James Francis Gibbons  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses)



Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gibbons, James Francis, "On Translating Horace" (1938). *Master's Theses*. 3461.  
[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/3461](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3461)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1938 James Francis Gibbons

ON TRANSLATING HORACE

JAMES F. GIBBONS, S.J.

November 1938

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Loyola University.

### Vita Auctoris

James Francis Gibbons was born at Pittston, Pennsylvania, December 9, 1914. He attended St. John's High School, Pittston, and St. Thomas High School, Scranton, from which he graduated in June, 1932. In the following month he entered the Jesuit Novitiate of St. Isaac Jogues, Kermersville, Pennsylvania, and was enrolled in the College of Arts of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. In August, 1936, he entered West Baden College and was enrolled in the Bachelor of Arts course of Loyola University, from which he received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in June, 1937. He then entered the Graduate School of Loyola University to pursue his studies for the degree of Master of Arts.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. On Translation In General	1
II. The Chief Characteristics Of The Odes	25
III. some Remarks On Meter	60
IV. AN Examination Of Translations Of The Odes	98
V. Conclusion	117
Bibliography	123

## CHAPTER I

## ON TRANSLATION IN GENERAL

"For this last half-year I have been troubled with the disease (as I may call it ) of Translation".

Dryden, Preface to Sylvae, p. 175.

Just as people have always found it difficult to write verse like that of Horace, so too, they find difficult the task of writing about Horace, and more difficult still the work of discussing the translation of his Odes. As a matter of fact, so great and varied is the work of discovering the ideal in the translation of the odes, and so difficult is it to comprehend the particular elements of the odes with all their ramifications, that it can be said, that for one thesis that is written on the odes there are ten that can be written, or as the lover of Horace would say, there are ten that should be written. In this matter, however, since definite limitations must be set to the field of inquiry, it will be well here to indicate what the comprehension of this thesis is to be. It is three-fold in aim: To discover what essential elements a good translation of the odes should contain; secondly, to see how these elements are verified in the translations of various authors, and thirdly, through a critical study of these translations to arrive at a greater appreciation of the odes in the original.

The aim will be attained in this manner. After having set down in the first chapter the necessary qualifications of the translator, the general and particular characteristics of the odes will be examined in the second chapter to see how the translators reproduce these characteristics in their own versions. Four typical odes will suffice, namely, the fourth and fourteenth odes of the First Book, the fourteenth of the Second Book and the thirteenth of the Third Book. Of course, these will be supplemented by parts of many others. The third part of the thesis, that is, "Through a critical study of the translations of various authors to arrive

at a greater appreciation of the odes in the original", will be discussed in the fifth chapter.

At the outset it might be well to explain the title of the present chapter somewhat more fully. It is "On Translation in General". However, the chapter will not be an abstract ( and, therefore, in this matter, abstruse) consideration of translation, but rather will be concerned in penetrating into the mind of the translator himself to see what qualifications he must possess before he can set out upon his task. Therefore, in the beginning an attempt will be made to show what translation is, and to decide whether or not the odes can be translated. Then the general background that the translator must have before he attempts to translate will be examined.

What, then, is a working definition of translation?

Translation "is the arousing in the English reader or hearer the identical emotions or sentiments that were aroused in him who read or heard the sentence in his native tongue". However, when this definition is analysed it seems quite an assumption to hold that an American of the twentieth century can find the same sentiments in the translation of an ode that a man wearing a toga found in the days of the Roman Empire. Because of this seemingly violent change of conditions, in living, language and idiom, many are firmly convinced ( with an a priori conviction, it is true) that it is impossible to have a true translation. Though this conviction seems to have a deep foundation, it is nevertheless arguable that there can be a true translation, even if it is not as perfect as the original, just as there can be true certitude without its being perfect. Barrett Wendell is correct

when he says that "one might as well hope to keep a plucked flower in dewy freshness",<sup>2</sup> and it is also true that nothing harmonized by the laws of music can be translated from its own tongue into another without losing some of its sweetness and harmony. But does it lose everything? Surely not, and those who do not favor translation might be asked if they can prove that a translation is in no wise like the original. They cannot prove their contention. On the other hand, it can be shown that translation is possible.

Here is an example from Latin outside the works of Horace. Virgil's line:

3

Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt

is considered by many to possess the height of perfection. Yet if it is translated :

Here are tears for sorrow, and hearts grieve for mortal lot,  
does the translation seem to be something wholly different? Certainly not. The



The translation reproduces the spirit exactly. As a matter of fact, the word "here" brings out the full meaning of the original in the context. Furthermore, in form the translation follows the original closely. There are fourteen syllables in the Latin line; the English version has thirteen. The Latin is balanced by la.....la; the English by for.....for. As regards letters that produce a pattern of assonance, in the Latin line the labials m and n carry the music. M is used five, and n four times, making a total of nine. In the English the sound is determined by the labial r which is used ten times. There are other resemblances, but these will suffice to show that a good translation is possible. However, another example may not be amiss. Prudentius has the following:

Sed cum resolvable corpus  
 revocas, Deus, atque reformas  
 quam regione jubebis  
 animam requiescere puram? <sup>4</sup>

Here is a true translation:

But until the resolvable body  
 Thou recallest, O God, and reformest,  
 what regions unknown to the mortal  
 Dost Thou wish the pure soul to reside in. <sup>5</sup>

The translation speaks for itself. It is in the meter of the original. The first two lines of the original and the first two lines of the translation are practically identical. Then too, the key words "resolvable" in the first line, "revocas" and "reformas" in the second "regione" in the third, and "requiescere" in the fourth, are perfectly

translated by "resolvable" in the first, "recallest" and "reformeest" in the second, "regions" in the third, and "reside" in the fourth. Without a doubt this translation does justice to the original.

But if there are those who say that translation in general is impossible, there are those who with much more vigor insist that it is impossible to translate Horace. One, for example, writes: "Where is the grace of the fifth ode of the first book when you attempt to mould it to the alien idiom of our language? Read Milton's translation and weep".<sup>6</sup> Why, we ask, weep? Where are the idioms in the original that cannot be translated? They do not exist. Let us show it from a few lines of the original.

simplex munditiis? heu quotiens fidem  
 mutatosque deos flebit et aspera  
 nigris aequora ventis  
 admirabitur insolens,  
 qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,  
 qui semper vacuum, semper amabilem  
 sperat, nescius aurae  
 fallacis....<sup>7</sup>

Here are the corresponding lines of Milton's rendering:

Plain in thy neatness? O how oft shall he  
 On faith and changed gods complain, and seas  
 Rough with black winds and storms  
 Unwonted shall admire!  
 Who now enjoys thee credulous, all gold

Who always vacant, always amiable

Hopes thee, of flattering gales

8

Unmindful.....

In form the translation approaches the original closely. The meter is not the same, but then, the translation need not be in the original Latin meter. However, it is similar enough to convey the spirit of the original. The translation is quite exact. "Simplex munditiis" is turned by "Plain in thy neatness", and "qui nunc... qui semper.... semper", by "Who now.....Who always". Incidentally, Conington's version might be preferred since it is more modern.

So trim, so simple! Ah! how oft shall he

Lament that faith can fail, that gods can change

Viewing the rough black sea

With eyes to tempest strange,

Who now is basking in your golden smile,

And dreams of you still fancy-free, still kind,

Poor fool, nor knows the guile

9

Of the deceitful wind!

The good points of this translation are evident. It is "so trim, so simple" as it was meant to be, and the key words are exactly translated in their original positions. For example, "Qui nunc.....semper.....semper", is changed to "who now.....still.....still". The fact is that these are good translations; for he who reads them gains a deeper appreciation of Horace. As a matter of fact, if Horace's poem were lost and Milton's and

Conington's remained, they could be justly praised.

From the foregoing it may be concluded that translation is possible. True, not many examples have been cited, yet from the many that will be quoted in the course of this thesis it will be abundantly clear that successful translations have been made. And now let us consider the qualifications that a translator must possess in order to do his work well.

In passing, it may be remarked that the translator must be acquainted with prose translation, for if he cannot translate prose, a fortiori he cannot translate verse. A knowledge then of the rules for prose translation must be had. They seem to resolve themselves into the following: "Let the work be blocked out. Let idiom be translated by idiom. Let intention be translated by intention. Let the meaning of words be thoroughly known. Let the translator be bold, and although he should never embellish he should preserve as much ornament as possible." Of course, these rules do not help in translating verse except perhaps indirectly, since in translating poetry there is but one aim--to consider and try to reproduce the spiritual effect, for this is the only thing that makes poetry the thing of beauty that it is. But by what rules can this be done? We may anticipate the findings in the following pages by citing the principal ones. In general they are: To understand clearly the background of the odes; to have a knowledge of and to translate the language and the characteristic qualities, and to use a metrical pattern that conveys the spirit of the original. However, these will be seen in detail in succeeding chapters. Let us now consider the general means by which the translator may do his

work successfully.

Before he undertakes the business of translating he must possess two qualifications: first, a thorough knowledge of Latin; secondly, an acquaintance with the general background of the odes.

In the first place, then, the translator must know Latin, and especially the technique of the use of Latin in the odes. He ought not merely to be able to turn and appreciate each word considered in itself, but he must also possess that closer familiarity and deep penetration that throws into perspective the interrelationships of words. For it is not so much the single words in Latin that give a composition elan and richness but rather the combined related effect produced by the pattern as a whole. This combined effect of words is in great measure produced by the inflection of the language, and it is a quality difficult to render in a loose uninflected language like our own. "The rock on which translators come to grief lies in the inexorable law of classic art; out of the commonest words must be fashioned the most uncommon line; soiled and jaded words must be lifted up into the glory of the pure brilliant word". This is a property of a classic--and Horace is a classic.

That Horace possessed the power of writing just mentioned does not need to be emphasized. In this art the name of Horace can stand for the art itself. Let us examine a few examples of the skill that has made him a classic and has merited for his art the name of "curiosa felicitas". In I-iv-6, his entwining of words suggests the intermingling bands of dancing Nymphs and Graces.

"junctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes"

And also in IV-vii-5:

"gratia cum Nymphis geminisque sororibus audet  
ducere nuda choros",

and in the same ode in line 27-28:

"nec Lethaea valet Theseus abruptere care  
vincula Pirithoo".

Then, too, remark his deft use of chiasmic order in IV-vii-1-2:

"Diffugere nives, redeunt jam gramina campis  
arboribusque comae".

It will be noted how Horace has given the impression of activity to the lines by placing the verbs at the head of the clauses. How difficult this position of words is to translate will be seen from Conington's version:

The snow is fled: the trees their leaves put on,  
12  
The fields their green:

In this version the first verb is practically passive and is inverted in position. The phrases of the second clause are changed in position and the construction varied. The translation possesses quite a matter of fact tone and not the excited activity of the original. Lord Lytton translates:

Fled the snows--now the grass has returned to the meadows,  
13  
And their locks to the trees.

Here the position of the second verb has been changed, and another figure has been added, namely "locks".

Another indication of Horace's art may be seen in his use of balanced form. III-i-16 has:

"omne capax movet urna nomen"

where the scheme is a b e b a. And in III-xv-16 the balanced form again appears:

"pulso Thyias uti concita tympano".

It is also had in III-xix-26:

- "puro te similes, Telephe, Vespero",

and in I-iv-12:

"seu poscat agna sive malit haedo",

and in the same ode in the fourteenth line:

"pauperum tabernas regumque turris".

That a translator must appreciate these points can be seen from a few translations of them. For example, of:

"omne capax movet urna nomen",

Conington has this translation:

14

The fatal urn has room for all.

The metaphor is practically lost in the translation, which is far from assessing the original, <sup>meaning</sup> not to mention the obvious fact that the word order has not been preserved. T. Rutherford Clark has the following:

And every name hath ample room

15

To jostle in her ballot urn.

But the precise point is missed, namely that the urn--fatal necessity--determines the lot which no one escapes. Then, too, the line is expanded to two lines and loses the preciseness of the original. Mr. Gladstone writes:

16

The urn hath ample room for every name.

But this line has become static with the omission of the active verb "mouet":  
 In his version Lord Lytton changes the meaning somewhat:

Each in her ample urn she shakes

17

And casts the die for all.

But the impression given here of everyone being shaken in an urn is quite ridiculous. Of course the exact form of the original is difficult to render in English, but the translators could at least have translated more directly:

The great urn turns out every name.

The remaining lines quoted above could also be used to show that the translator must appreciate the form and pattern of Latin considered as a language, if he would obtain a smooth flowing line as well as the exact meaning. The verse used, however, will have demonstrated that the translator must know the language in order to be able to preserve in his work the qualities and spirit of the original.

The next requisite of the successful translator is an acquaintance with the background of the odes. This mastery of the background of Horace is so large a task that it will never be achieved perfectly. There is one remarkable instance of this having been accomplished in commenting upon the work of a poet. In the Road to Xanadu, J. L. Lowes meticulously penetrates into the life of S.T. Coleridge, into all his readings, diaries, literary works, letters, etc., in order to show how every element in the poems "Xanadu" and the "Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner" was drawn from the poet's past experience, and how they coalesced into the form that they assumed in these poems. Every minute detail is tracked down and the entire



psychological and imaginative process of the poet's mind is laid open like a specimen to the inspection of the reader. This, however, cannot be done in the case of Horace. Yet if our translator cannot know Horace in this detail, he should at least have a scholarly understanding of him. While it is true that this information will not help directly in translating, nevertheless it will still be an essential aid. Let us show this by means of a few facts.

In the first place, the translator must be acquainted with the status of Roman literature. He should know why the period is called "Golden", and what influences brought it about that Horace's works were the flower of the great Roman literary awakening. For if the translator does not appreciate the fact that the works of Horace are the expression of the new Roman spirit, he has missed half the secret of the odes. To take a much discussed point. One of the influences that arose at Horace's time towards a movement of poetry was a longing for a return to nature. Incidentally, this influence explains the enthusiastic reception of Virgil's eclogues. Now if the translator really knows that Horace loved nature--that he was immersed in a current of thought that was predominantly naturalistic in outlook-- and that he wrote from genuine feeling, then the translator's attitude will be essentially changed in turning Horace's references to nature that are by no means few. In this matter since there are not at hand any examples of translation by those who consider Horace to be either insincere in his concept of nature, or lacking in any great thought about it, we cannot compare versions to perceive the differences. One, however, can easily understand that there would be an essential difference in the

translation of one who thought the ode on the Fount of Bandusia to be an insincere imitation, and in the work of another who appreciated the ode as a sincere expression of nature by the Golden Age of a great people's literature.

Let us also see that it is necessary for the translator to know the purely historical field. For example, ode III-iii seems to have been written to counteract the desire to change the capitol to the Eastern Mediterranean. From this aspect the ode takes on a new significance. As a matter of fact, concern about the matter was so great in those days that Virgil probably wrote the eighth book of the Aeneid to change this desire and to offset it; also Livy has Camillus give a speech at the end of his fifth book, urging the people not to move from that site to captured Veii.<sup>19</sup> Whether or not a translator understood the significance of this point, would make little difference in the literal translation of the ode, but it surely would in the spirit. There is also another example:

Tendens Venafranos in agros

20

Aut Laecedemonium Tarentum,

the end of ode III-v takes on a new light as the "falling close" to an ode written on the bravery of Regulus, when one understands that Venafranum was the home of the Samnite warriors who were accounted among the best. Again, the realization of this might not change the literal translation of the ode but it would undoubtedly stamp the translation as Horatian. These are but a few of the many instances that might be given. For in Horace they are almost endless since "for encyclopaedic range he is rivalled only by Dante".<sup>21</sup> A knowledge of such points is not to be branded as

pedantry of the type that Dryden frowned upon when he criticized translators before him, saying: "They neither knew good verse nor loved it; they were scholars 'tis true, but they were pedants; and for all their pedantic pains, all their translations went to be translated into English".<sup>22</sup> Moreover, such information of the purely historical field is necessary not only to understand Horace but also to prevent our reading into him our own interpretation, for, "modern sentiment will try to make the ancient not less than the modern world its own".<sup>23</sup> One may find examples of this in "Echoes From the Sabine Farm", by Eugene and Roswell Martin Field. The fifth ode of the first book that we have quoted above is rendered in this rather subjective manner:

What perfumed, posse-dizened sirrah,  
 With smiles for diet,  
 Clasps you, O fair but faithless Pyrrha,  
 On the quiet?  
 For whom do you bind up your tresses  
 As spun-gold yellow,---  
 Meshes that go with your carresses,  
 To snare a fellow?  
 How will he rail at fate capricious  
 And curse you duly,  
 Yet now he deems your wiles delicious,---  
 You perfect, truly!  
 Pyrrha, your loves a treacherous ocean;  
 He'll soon fall in there!

Then shall I gloat on his commotion

24

For I have been there.

Because of the defect of reading too much into Horace, this rendering becomes almost a parody; it certainly is not a translation. However, in the matter of translation there is a middle course, and, if one must translate exactly, at the same time it is necessary to avoid the other extreme, for  
 25  
 "Ein Übersetzung kann und soll kein Kommentar Sein". Let the translator then hold fast to the mean, but let him know the matter thoroughly, for  
 26  
 "Horace is the index of his age", and his age can explain much that is in him. But, indeed, at the same time, Horace is the judge of his age, and from this point of view we may proceed with our investigation and examine his philosophy of life.

Why must the translator know Horace's philosophy of Life? Because to produce the spiritual effect that is the ultimate aim of a translation one must know Horace's attitude to things, and the sense in which he wishes his thought to be received. The reason why Milton's translation of the fifth ode of the first book, which has been quoted above, is passed by and not liked, would seem to rest not on any intrinsic demerit in the form of the translation itself, but on this only, that people cannot harmonize their concept of Milton's puritanical attitude to life with that of Horace. Milton is Milton and not Horace, and in so far as he is not Horace, to such an extent does his translation lack the spirit of the original. In other words the translator must penetrate into the author, and not only that, but he must, as it were, put off his own personality that he may put on that of the author. This developing of the personality, that is, the attitude to

life, the philosophy, of the author in oneself is of prime importance and often too lightly passed over. Dryden aptly remarked on this: "Nor must we understand the language only of the poet, but his practical turn of thought and expression, which are the characters that distinguish, and as it were, individuate him from all other authors. When we have come thus far, 'tis time to look into ourselves, to conform our genius to his, to give his thought either the same turn if our tongue will bear it, or not, to vary but the dress, not to alter or destroy the substance".<sup>27</sup> Concerning translators who have not put on their author he says: "In such translators I can easily distinguish the hand which performed the work, but I cannot distinguish their poet from another".<sup>28</sup> To translate Horace correctly, then, the translator must be acquainted with his philosophy of life. But in what this philosophy of life specifically consists we shall now investigate.

A knowledge of Horace's philosophy of life will consist in many things, but in these three at least: an appreciation of the moralistic tone of his mind; an acquaintance with his philosophy of poetry, and, thirdly, an appreciation of his humanism. Of course, a detailed and lengthy discussion of Horace's philosophy would be out of place in this thesis. It will suffice to show that the translator must have some clear ideas on Horace's philosophy of life, at least, as regards the three points that have been mentioned.

In the first place, then, the translator must appreciate the moralistic tone of Horace's mind. This does not demand that the translator know Horace's moral ideals, or be in sympathy with them, but he must know that this factor exists and that it has a direct influence on the

shade of meaning that Horace wishes to put into the ode. For example, now and then Horace will use what we call platitudes. But the question might be asked: Why did he put them down in such a direct manner? Because he really felt them, and he did not believe that a metaphor would convey the thought as well as the direct saying. An instance occurs in II-xvi:

.....nihil est ab omni  
29  
parte beatum.

This is not always turned with the directness and force with which it should be. Translators usually try to improve it by making it more colorful. They fail because because the plain statement in its context has much more force than any adaptation of it has. Conington does not do justice to the original in his:

.....: No suns on earth  
29  
Unclouded glitter.

The "sun" does not exist in the original, whose comprehension and meaning is far more effective. Sir Richard Fanshawe has:

.....: No soul that ere was blest  
30  
Was blest in all.

But the original has no mention of "soul" and Horace does not simply concede that anything is blest. Gladstone, in his turn, writes:

31  
The sweetest is not wholly sweet.

An interesting saying, but not a translation. Lord Lytton approaches the original more closely:

.....nought was ever  
32  
Happy on all sides.

It is evident that the statement--some would call it a platitude--should be translated directly. Why? Because Horace has given his colorful examples of ever-present evil in the seven preceding stanzas, and brings the point home with force by the direct saying. In other words, if one misses this point, one misses the ode. Conington's translation:

.....No suns on earth

Unclouded glitter,

is in reality a continuation of the examples that Horace has given. But Horace had stopped at this point and said: Now this is what I mean to bring out by those examples--Nihil est ab omni parte beatum. Some of the translators, however, seem to miss the point and give just one more example. They do not understand Horace's moralistic tone or attitude. Many instances could be quoted showing how frequently translators do not catch the spirit of the ode by not appreciating the moralistic tone. However, let those given above suffice, and let us turn to our next point namely that the translator must be acquainted with Horace's philosophy of poetry.

A knowledge of Horace's philosophy of poetry will naturally give the translator a high estimation of it, and a deeper understanding of the poet himself. One does not need to search far for Horace's philosophy of poetry. He gives it to us in his own words. "To mould the faltering speech of childhood, to fashion the heart of youth by noble precepts, to be a corrector of harshness, malice and anger, to portray virtuous actions and by familiar examples train the rising generation and finally to sustain the weak and console the discouraged". One can easily recognize this as a

true Roman sentiment. As a matter of fact, Horace brings out his philosophy of literature so well in his works that he measures up to Cardinal Newman's criterion of a great writer: "A great author, Gentlemen, is not one who merely has a copia verborum whether in prose or verse..but he is one who has something to say and knows how to say it. I do not claim for him as such, any great depth of thought, or breadth of view, or philosophy, or sagacity, or knowledge of human nature, or expression of human life, though these additional gifts he may have, and the more he has of them the greater he is; but I ascribe to him, as his characteristic gift, in a large sense the faculty of Expression.....He says what all feel, but all cannot say; and his sayings pass into proverbs among his people." <sup>35</sup>

This quotation shows that a writer such as Horace is a great author. Horace does not write to say something great; he will not attempt to produce epic poetry or to imitate the grand writers before him, but he does say what all feel, and does so from his own viewpoint, and with his own end in view—one that is deeply human and moralistic. If the translator realizes this characteristic of Horace he will be content to be led by the original and will not try to improve an ode because of some subjective attitude not in accord with the mind of Horace. Roscommon has put this rule very well:

Your author always will the best advise

36

Fall when he falls and when he rises, rise.

Those, of course, who do not understand Horace's attitude toward literature will not agree with this last statement. They will create an epic out of an ode, or, under the pretext of translating the idioms perfectly, they will append what for all practical purposes is a commentary on the original.



Those who persist in translating according to their own subjective viewpoint and not that of the author, may produce some very good work. As a matter of fact, they may throw much light on the original; nay, they may open up an entirely new approach, yet when all things have been considered, just as it was said of Pope's "Homer": "It is a pretty poem but you must not call it Homer",<sup>37</sup> so too, it will be said of their work: "It is a pretty poem but you must not call it Horace."

The third characteristic of Horace's philosophy of life is that the translator must understand<sup>is</sup> Horace's humanism and its component elements. For Horace's humanism is in a very peculiar manner the combination of romantic extensiveness and classical centrality. There is extensiveness in the odes, for there is perhaps no aspect of human life that they do not comprehend, nor any emotion that they do not embody; centrality is present, for there is always one moralistic attitude and classical restraint. The translator must see the harmonious combination of these in the odes to translate them with the exact spirit. For instance:

nos, ubi decidimus

quo pius Aeneas, quo Tullus dives et Ancus,  
38

pulvis et umbra sumus.

is not too exactly rendered by Conington:

We, soon as thrust

Where good Aeneas, Tullus, Ancus went

39

What are we? dust.

The differences are obvious. Conington omits the one word that gives the note of futility to the verse-"dives", and in the third line substitutes a rhetorical question that is quite out of place as a translation of what appeared to be a hard declarative fact to Horace-- and which he put down as such. The lines seem to be properly translated by H. Rider:

When wee, where good Aeneas is, descend,

Where wealthy Tullus, and where Ancus bee,

40

Then ashes and a very shade are wee!

Another example offers itself from III-ii. Horace says:

41

dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.

Conington returns:

42

What joy, for fatherland to die!

in which he has the romantic sweep of the original, but not the restraint and centrality. The line might better be given as:

A sweet honor to die for one's country,

since Horace, though enthusiastic about the glory, yet realized (more poignantly, too, since he was a pagan) how great a sacrifice it was to give up one's life. Examples could be multiplied but these will suffice to show that each aspect of Horace's humanism must be apprehended if one would produce a genuine translation.

Now that the qualifications of the translator have been discussed and determined, let the odes themselves be examined to see what characteristics they possess, and how they must be translated.

## Notes for Chapter One.

1. Tolman, H.C., The Art of Translating, p. 1.
2. Wensell, Barrett, The Tradition of European Literature, p. 36.
3. Virgil, Aeneid, I, 462.
4. Prudentius, Ad Exsequias Defuncti, Cathemerinon X, lines 149-152 as quoted from Kuhnmuensch, Otto J., S.J., Early Christian Latin Poets, p. 183.
5. Neale, J.M., as quoted from Kuhnmuensch, op. cit., p. 182.
6. Hamz, Victor M., "Originals vs. Translations in Culture" in Marquette University Classical Bulletin, Vol. 1. No. 6, (June 1924) p. 4.
7. Ode I-v-5-12. (All notes to the odes refer to Bennett, C?E., Horace The Odes and Epodes with an English Translation, The Loeb Classical Library.
8. Milton, John, Ode I-v-5-12, as quoted from Translations of the Odes of Horace Collected and Arranged by M. Jourdain.
9. Conington, The odes of Horace; I-v-5-12, p. 5.
10. Cf. Belloc, H., "On Translation" in Selected Essays.
11. Haecker, T., Virgil, Father of the West, translated by Whalen, A.W., p. 24
12. Conington, op. cit., IV-vii-1-2, p. 173
13. Lord Lytton, The Odes and Epodes of Horace, IV-vii-1-2, p. 412
14. Conington, op. cit., III-1-16, p. 96.
15. Clark, T.R., as quoted from Jourdain, M., op. cit., III-1-16, p. 103
16. Gladstone, The Odes of Horace, III-1-16, p. 73
17. Lord Lytton, op. cit., III-1-15-16, p. 238.
18. Lowes, J.L., The Road to Kanadu.
19. Verrall, Studies in Horace, passim.
20. Ode III-v-55-56, p. 198.

21. Wendell, Barrett, op. cit., p. 244.
22. Dryden, John, Dedication of examen poeticum, Essays, Vol. 2, p. 10.
23. Arnold, M., On Translating Homer, p. 8.
24. Field, E. and R.M., Echoes From The Sabine Farm, pp. 82-3.
25. Humbolt, W.V., as quoted from Cauer, P., Die Kunst des Ubersetzens, p. 69.
26. Duff, J.W., A Literary History of Rome to the Close of the Golden Age, p. 536.
27. Dryden, J., Preface to the Translation of Ovid's Epistles, Essays, Vol. 1. p. 241.
28. Dryden, J., Preface to Sylvae, Essays Vol. 1., p. 254.
29. Conington, op. cit., II-xvi-27-8, p. 87
30. Fanshawe, Sir R., as quoted from Translations of the Odes of Horace Collected and Arranged by M. Jourdain, p. 90
31. Gladstone, op. cit., II-xvi-28, p. 65.
32. Lord Lytton, op. cit., II-xvi-27-8, p. 218
33. Cf. no. 32.
34. Horace, Epistles, II-i-126 ff.
35. Newman, J.H., The Idea of a University, ed. by O'Connell, D.M., P. 306
36. Roscommon, The Essay on Translated Verse, as quoted from Tytler, Essay On the Principles of Translation. pp. 45-6.
37. Cf. Amos, F. R., Early Theories of Translation, p. 172.
38. Ode IV-vii-14-16, p. 210
39. Conington, op. cit., IV-vii-14-16, p. 173.
40. Rider, H., as quoted from Translation of the Odes of Horace Collected And Arranged by M. Jourdain, p. 190
41. Ode III-ii-13, p. 174.
42. Conington, op. cit., III-ii-13, p. 100.

## CHAPTER II

## THE CHIEF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ODES

"My one object is to give practical advice to a translator; and I shall not concern myself with theories of translation".

Arnold, On Translating Homer, p.3.

This second chapter attempts to consider the characteristic qualities of the odes, and it may be remarked that although this consideration will of its very nature tend to be subjective, yet for the most part the odes will be allowed to speak for themselves.

The problem that arises at the beginning is concerned with the method to be used in determining the characteristic qualities of the odes. Ordinarily in a consideration of this kind, a comparison with the works of other poets would be of use in addition to the ordinary analytical method, an example of which is Arnold's On Translating Homer. The first method, however, does not seem to be feasible as far as comparing Horace with English poets is concerned, since judgments that arise from comparisons of this sort are usually criticized as being too subjective. This would follow for many reasons but especially for this, that while this or that English poet may resemble Horace in one quality, yet when considered from all aspects he is quite different. As a consequence then, a comparison with English poets is hardly suitable, as the great diversity of opinion on the matter proves. One writer, for instance, will claim that "Horace is <sup>1</sup> Whitmanesque"; another holds that "there is perhaps in literature no better <sup>2</sup> brother to the genius of Horace than is the genius of O. Wendel Holmes"; another proposes that Cowper had he lived would have been our English Horace." <sup>3</sup> However, Whitman's work has not the finish and restraint of the odes; Holmes has not Horace's poetical touch, and Cowper has not the Roman's broadness and sympathy. It seems then that there is no one in English literature whose works will form the basis of a comparative study with those of Horace. But the question arises whether or not any other language possesses works

that would be suitable for comparison with those of Horace. The answer must be in the negative, for no modern language possesses the quality or type of literature that we desire and although at first sight it would seem worth while comparing Horace with the Greeks, yet even this is impossible.

Although it must be conceded that Greek literature is a perfect standard for judging literary works, yet Horace cannot be compared with the Greeks because there is not a sufficiency of Horace's type of writing extant in Greek with which to make a comparison. We know but this, that Horace's writings resemble those of Alcaeus, and that Horace studied and used the technique of Sappho. Furthermore an interesting study has been made of the influence of Simonides upon Horace by Whitney Oates. He cites as points of resemblance the following: In ode III-ii-14:

Mors et fugacem persequitur virum

seems to be an imitation of fragment 65 Simonides:

ὄσ' ἄν θάνατος κίχῃ καὶ τὸν φερόμαχον

And fragment 85 shows Simonides' influence in ode IV-vii-17. But be this as it may, one cannot judge the odes by a few strands of information. As a result then we must come to a decision on the chief qualities of the odes by analysis. In other words, we must take a stanza here and there to see what common characteristics they possess. We may anticipate ourselves by saying that two compound qualities will present themselves quite prominently --rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity. Let no one conclude however that there are not other qualities to be found in the odes. There are, but it is important at present to know the general characteristics, for these the translator must reproduce in his work. Let us therefore examine a few

stanzas to see what general characteristics they possess.

A first example comes from ode III-vi:

<sup>N</sup>  
damosa quid non imminuit dies  
<sup>^</sup>  
aetas parentum, peior avis, tulit  
nos nequiores, mox daturos  
5  
progeniem vitiosiore[m].

Naturally the first element one perceives is the compact manner in which the four generations, aetas parentum, peior avis, nos progeniem, are described in three lines, or rather eleven words. I do not know of any translation that reproduces these eleven Latin words in eleven English words. But this compact manner of writing, this terseness, is not the only recommendation of these lines. It may be noticed that the use of the ts at the end of the lines gives them a terse sharp effect, a rhythm peculiar and suitable to the thought. Furthermore, the lines are not flighty and light as might perhaps be expected from such compression, but rather through the preponderance of the solemn ms and ns and the quasi rhyme of nos.... daturos, and progeniem vitiosiore[m], give an impression of dignity and stability. Another example presents itself in IV-vii-10:

frigora mitescunt Zephyris, ver proterit aetas  
interitura simul  
pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit, et mox  
6  
bruma recurrit iners.

If one glances closely at these lines, he will observe a certain tendency to speed emphasized by the interspersing of sixteen rs and eleven ts. To be more definite, the lines have a sharp military sweep to them that is



brought out very well in Jennings's translation:

Frosts yield to zephyrs; Summer drives out Spring,  
 To vanish, when  
 Rich autumn sheds his fruits; round wheels the rim, -  
 7  
 Winter again.

There can be little doubt but that rhythmical terseness is an outstanding characteristic of the odes, since the translation given above seems to possess it, and for no other reason except that the translation is an exact rendering of the original. Each clause is direct and maintains the proportion of the Latin. Practically the only fault to be found with the English is in the translation of iners. In this case the original is distorted for the sake of the rhyme. How justifiable this is will be considered later. Although there is nothing to be gained in driving a comparison to death, yet it may be added that these lines catch the spirit of the original in this, that while they have only eight rs and seven ts, of which the Latin has sixteen and eleven respectively, nevertheless the ms and ns give the English the tone desired and keep the verse on a steady plane. The English differs in intensity in as much as the more numerous similar consonants of the Latin produces smoother lines. However the English uses labials throughout which produce the desired uniformity. Another example may be drawn from the *Carmen Saeculare*:

Phoebe silvarumque potens Diana  
 lucidum coeli decus, O colendi  
 semper et culti, date quae precamur  
 8  
 tempore sacro.

We may contrast this, not with a translation, but with a poem somewhat like it in English:

Queen and huntress chaste and fair  
 Now the sun is laid to sleep  
 Seated in thy silver chair  
 Grace in wonted manner keep  
 Hesperus entreats thy light  
 Goddess excellently bright.

It may be seen that the stanzas have much in common. The author of the English poem gives his work practically all the qualities of the classics: quietness, smoothness, restraint. But he also adds a type of cold chiselledness that is not present in the lines of Horace. The English is direct but unemotional, because each line is a clause complete in itself, loosely constructed and therefore monotonous. Horace's, on the other hand, show a certain warmth and tone color produced not only by periodicity of thought but also by the rhythm, one point of which may be observed in the use of similar sounds in the last three lines. This quality of rythmical terseness recurs in another verse:

nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium  
 nunc desiderium curaque non levis  
 interfusa nitentis  
 vites aequora Cycladas.

The rhythm is obvious, for sollicitum, taedium and desiderium are balanced against curaque, interfusa and aequora. The conciseness is evident not only from the fact that Horace uses but one verb instead of four that were pos-

sible, but also from the balanced contrast between the first and second lines in which close continuity of thought is preserved. A translation that is exact will possess this rhythmical terseness.

The following translation of Austin Dobson does not reproduce the original closely, and therefore fails to have rhythmical terseness:

Ship of the State, before  
 A care, and now to me  
 A hope in my heart's core, -  
 Tempt not the tyrant sea."<sup>11</sup>

The meter is too uniform to possess rhythm, and the fact that only part of the original's thought has been translated prevents the lines from attaining terseness. A more faithful rendering of the original is found in Conington's version, which attains some degree of rhythmical terseness:

Your trouble late made sick this heart of mine  
 And still I love you still am ill at ease  
 O, shun the sea where shine  
 The thick-sown Cyclades.<sup>12</sup>

In these lines the liberty taken in translating nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium by "your trouble late made sick this heart of mine" breaks the firmness that is found in the original continuity of thought, and as a result loses the terseness that the Latin has so outstandingly. A more faithful attention to the original is found in Lord Lytton's

Thou, lately the cause of my wearisome trouble,  
 Object now of deep care and regretful affection,

Mark well where the Cyclades shine

And avoid the waves flowing between them.

In as much as these lines render the original quite closely and preserve the proportion between the clauses that is found in the original, they seem to possess a sort of balanced conciseness. This quality can be seen at least in the first two lines, where the original has been transferred quite exactly.

The outstanding characteristic then of the Latin stanzas that have been cited seems to be rhythmical terseness, and it has been noted that the translations have possessed this quality in the degree that they have faithfully rendered the original. In other words, the odes are marked by a conciseness that is compact and free from all superfluity. As a matter of fact, a stanza must be free from all superfluity if it will possess rhythmical terseness as can be observed in one of the examples quoted above:

frigora mitescunt Zephris, ver proterit aestas

interitura, simul

ponifer autumnus fruges effuderit et mox

14

bruma recurrit iners.

The refined smoothness or rhythmical terseness is seen in the rapid straight march of the thought and in the use of the labials as has been noted above. Furthermore, the fs and ts interlock, and by their order produce a recurring rhythmical effect. Obviously, this rhythm could not have been produced by any other words, for only these words can cause this effect. This will be clear from observing how the accent of the words coincides with the ictus of

of the meter:

/ frigora / mites / cunt Zephy / ris, ver / proterit / aetas  
 / interi / tura si / mul  
 / pomifer / autum / nus fru / ges ef / fuderit / et mox  
 / bruma ra / currit in / ers.

It will be noted in these Archilochian Strophes that smoothness and terseness is secured by having the word accents in each hexameter coincide three times with the long syllables of the metrical feet. Monotony is avoided by placing an extra spondee rather than a dactyl in the second hexameter, and by uniformly spreading out the coincidences of the word accents with the first syllable of the metrical foot. This subject could be developed at great length, since it is one of the means Virgil used to make the Aeneid the most masterful piece of metrical art. <sup>15</sup> Here, however, it is sufficient to indicate its importance in the odes, and what more we have to remark about it may be reserved for the following chapter on meter. It is an obvious deduction then that if Horace wished to produce this rhythmical terseness, which is here obtained by the coincidence of the word accents and the first syllable of the metrical feet, he had to choose just those words. However, in addition to this aspect of the odes, there is another that brings out the rhythmical terseness more fully.

Rhythmical terseness can be produced in large measure by building the sense lines of the odes upon the meter in regular patterns, that is to say, that the sense lines into which a stanza resolves itself when one reads it naturally are built in regular patterns upon the underlying meter.

Let us take a few stanzas of an ode, and divide it off into sense lines, to see into what sort of pattern the sense lines will fall. To bring out the point more clearly, Horace's ode may be contrasted with one not written by Horace:

Poecimur) (siquid vacui sub umbra	(Vestiunt silvae tenera merorem
lusimus tecum) (quod et humo in animum	virgulta) (suis onerata pomis)
vivat et pluris) (age, dic Latinum	(canunt de celsis sedibus palumbes
barbite, carmen)	carmina cunotis)
(Lesbic primum modulate civi)	(Hic turtur gemit) (resonat hic turdus
(Qui ferox bello) (tamen inter arma)	(Pangit hic priscae merula sonores)
(sive jactatam religaret udo	(passer hic tacet) (arritens garritu
litore navem)	alta sub ulmo)
(Liberum et Musas Veneremque) (et illi	(Hic leta canit philomela frondis),
semper haerentem puerum canebat)	(longas effundit sibilum per auras
(et Lycum nigris oculis) nigroque	solempne); (milvus tremulaque voces
16 crine decorum)	17 aethera pulsat).

The differences are immediately evident. In passing, it may be remarked that the ode not Horace's does not even correspond to the regular sapphic meter. Instances of this fault are canunt in the first stanza, merula in the second, leta and longas in the third. This defect proves that even the elementary requirements for writing good verse are often difficult to observe. Let us however look at the sense lines.

In each of Horace's stanzas there are four sense

lines. These, constructed upon a regular meter, produce a certain smoothness in the entire ode. The other ode is evidently lacking in this uniformity in the length of the sense lines when considered upon the meter. There are three sense lines in the first and also in the third stanza, and five sense lines in the second. There is, of course, no reason why such a number of sense lines considered in themselves should detract from the general tone of the verse, but they do detract in this case, since they are not placed in a regular pattern. There is hardly any regard for the balance of the sense lines against the meter in the first stanza of the ode. In Horace's ode the case is different. This stanza is balanced by the second and third sense lines ending in the same place in the second and third lines of the stanza, and by the third and fourth sense lines being equal in length, that is to say, each has eleven syllables. In Horace's second stanza there is one sense line followed by two sense lines that together make up the length of the first sense line, and the fourth sense line runs to the end of the verse to avoid monotony. In the second stanza of the other ode, the first three sense lines are just the reverse of those of Horace. So far so good. However, the rest of the verse is uneven because the fourth and fifth sense lines are divided at the dactyl, and the fifth sense line by its too great length overbalances the fourth. Compare the technique of this stanza with the third stanza of Horace. The stanza that Horace never lived to see, breaks the dactyl in the third line, just where Horace would do so ordinarily. Horace, however, in his third stanza does not break the sense at that point, but does so before the third last syllable, giving the third and fourth sense lines an equal length, that is, eight syllables apiece. From this consider-

ation then it follows that there is a definite arrangement in Horace's odes that the translator must imitate if he would give a faithful translation.

However, to say that the translator must imitate the sense lines, does not mean that he must render or follow them exactly. As a matter of fact, just as the meter of the odes cannot be translated exactly, or the words turned literally, so too, it is not necessary to follow the sense lines of the original exactly, although the closer one can reproduce them, the better will be his work. In other words, it may happen that the meter one chooses will not allow a pattern of sense lines upon the metrical structure, exactly as in the original. In this case, the effect of the original will be obtained if a pattern proportional to the original pattern is used, for this will usually create the same psychological effect that the original Latin does. We shall see an instance of the use of a pattern of sense lines proportional to the original when we examine Lord Lytton's translation of the ode just quoted.

The translation of Conington renders the sense lines of the original quite exactly and happily:

Pescimus, si quid vacui sub umbra	They call;-if aught in shady dell
lusimus tecum quod et hunc in annum	We twain have warbled, to remain
vivat et pluris age, dic Latinum	Long months or years, now breathe, my shel
barbite, carmen	A Roman strain
Lesbie primum modulate civi	Thou strung by Lesbos' minstrel hand,
qui ferox bello, tamen inter arma	The bard, who 'mid the clash of steel,
sive jactatam religaret udo	Or haply mooring to the strand
litore navem	His batter'd keel,



Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi	Of Bacchus and the Muses sung,
semper haerentem puerum canebat	And Cupid, still at Venus' side
et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque	And Lycus, beautiful and young
18	19
orine decorum.	Dark-hair'd, dark-eyed.

The translation seems to possess rhythmical terseness, which is due in large measure to the fact that a rather close translation of the original has produced a pattern of sense lines quite similar to that of the Latin. The first stanza of the English, for instance, is a perfect rendition of the Latin. The sense lines fall in practically the identical spots that they do in the original, and the form is quite close to the Latin in all respects, for although there are twenty-four words in the English and but twenty in the Latin, yet there are only twenty-eight syllables in the English compared to thirty-eight for the Latin. The second and third stanzas of the English have not the degree of perfection that the first has, but approach it quite well. Whatever defects they have can be traced to the restrictions the poet was under because of his desire to rime the lines. We shall see more of this later. However that this translation does possess rhythmical terseness can be seen by a consideration of the translation of the last two lines of the ode:

..O laborum

dulce lenimen, mihi cumque salve

20

rite vocanti.

Blest balm in trouble, hail and hear

21

Whene'er I call.

The sense lines of the translation follow the order and arrangement of those of the original, and worthy of notice is the fact that the translator uses the same number of words as the original possesses. In general it may be said that since the translation is quite exact and follows the pattern of sense lines which the original has, it is a success, especially as regards rhythmical terseness. Incidentally, it may be remarked that the number of words used in translating the ode is something quite extrinsic to the poetic value, and should not be emphasized in determining the conciseness of a work. Lord Lytton, for instance, uses a greater number of words in his translation of the ode we have just quoted. However, his translation reproduces the rhythmical terseness of the original rather faithfully.

We are summoned. If e'er under shadow sequestered,  
 Has sweet dalliance with thee in light moments of leisure  
 Given birth to a something which lives, and may, haply,

Live in years later.

Rouse thee now, and discourse in the strains of the Roman,  
 Vocal shell, first attuned by the patriot of Lesbos,  
 Who, in war though so fierce, yet in battle, or mooring

On the wet sea-sand

His bark, tempest-tossed, charmed Liber, the Muses,  
 Smiling Venus, the Boy ever clinging beside her,  
 And adorned by dark locks and by eyes of dark luste,

22

Beautiful Lycus.

An examination of this translation must be prefaced by a remark concerning its meter. Lord Lytton believed that the poetical effect of the Sapphic stanza could be better obtained in English by using a meter of a somewhat broader sweep than the original. He says: "For the sapphic meter...I have avoided save in one or two of the shorter poems, any imitation of the chime rendered sufficiently familiar by Canning's "Knife-grinder"...chiefly because an English imitation of the Latin rhythm with a due observance of the trochee in the first three lines of the stanza, has in itself an unpleasant and monotonous sing-song. In my version of the sapphic I have chiefly employed two varieties of rhythm: for the statlier odes, our own recognized blank verse in the first three lines, usually not always with a dissyllabic termination; and in the fourth line, a meter analogous in length and cadence to the fourth line of the original." <sup>23</sup>

From this it can be seen that Lord Lytton in his method of translation was thinking primarily of the form of meter to be used. However, upon this meter which he has chosen, he has placed his sense lines, if not in the exact order of the original, at least in such a close proportionate order that he very beautifully produces the full poetical effect. As a matter of fact, Lord Lytton's translation might be preferred to Conington's inasmuch as it is more faithful to the original.

The differences between the two translations are quite obvious. Conington's is weak in that he does not translate all the words of the original. For example, the line qui ferox bello tamen inter arma, he translates: "The bard, who mid the clash of steel." He thus omits translating ferox bello. Lord Lytton, however, puts the complete poetical effect

and rhythm of the original in his: "Who, in war though so fierce, yet in battle, or mooring." Besides, Conington perhaps compresses the first stanza too much in his endeavor to rime the lines.

His:

We twain have warbled to remain

24

Long months or years.

does not produce a clean-cut impression, but loses force by its vagueness.

On the other hand, Lord Lytton's:

If e'er under shadow sequestered

Has sweet dalliance with thee in light moments of leisure

Given birth to a something which lives, and may, haply

25

Live in years later,

is absolutely clear and satisfying. Conington is more direct and therefore

more Horatian in his rendering of "nigris oculis nigroque crine," by

26

Dark-hair'd, dark-eyed.

Lord Lytton has not failed however in his translation, and perhaps has

secured a better rhythm:

27

And, adorned by dark locks and by eyes of dark luster.

Furthermore, Lord Lytton seems to have a better rhythmical touch in that he

ends his lines with dissyllabic words after the manner of the Latin, while

Conington uses monosyllabic words. However, this is merely a subjective

reaction and must not be overemphasized. But be that as it may, it seems

that the third lines of Lord Lytton's stanzas have more rhythmical - we

might call them overtones - than do those of Conington. For instance,

28

Given birth to something which lives, and may haply

and

29

Who, in war though so fierce, yet in battle, or mooring

and

30

And, adorned by dark locks and by eyes of dark lustre  
seem to be richer and more poetical than:

31

Long months, or years, now breathe, my shell

and

32

Or haply mooring to the strand

and

33

And Lycus, beautiful and young.

However, each translation has its good points and seems to show that close fidelity to the original results in a translation possessing rhythmical terseness.

From what we have said, then, it seems to follow that rhythmical terseness is an essential characteristic of the odes, since all translations that reproduce the original faithfully, taking into consideration the types of words, meter, construction and placing of sense lines upon the metrical pattern that Horace used, possess it as an outstanding quality. This may be summed up in a rule: If the verse has rhythmical terseness, it is Horatian.

Rhythmical terseness looks more or less to the form of the odes. The second characteristic of the odes rather regards the thought. This quality is in the odes so perfectly that it is often entirely unnoticed. Let us examine a few stanzas to see in what manner this quality is present.

First, let us take ode I-iv:

Solvitur acri hiems grata vice veris et Favoni

trahuntque siccas machinae carinas

Ac neque jam stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni

34

nec prata canis albicant pruinis...

The one quality that these lines give evidence of, without a doubt, but which is liable to escape notice, is simplicity. Each thought is put down in a line, and the first two lines have the same simplified--though, expressing excitement--form in that the verbs come first. Furthermore, every adjective is appropriate and in its proper place, and there is not one word too much. Another example can be had in ode II-xvi,21:

scandit aeratas vitiosa naves

cura nec turmas equitum relinquit

ocior cervis et agente nimbo

35

ocior Euro.

In this stanza also there is an arrangement of words which expresses the thought in such a manner as to be immediately grasped and understood. Here too not a word is superfluous. Aeratas is necessary, for care does not travel on every kind of ship, and in the third and fourth lines, which an amateur would probably think the ideal place for adjectives, Horace does not use any. This is indeed a point of no small importance in verse of this sort. For while it may be somewhat easy to write perfect first and second lines of a stanza, it is a different matter entirely to finish off the verse firmly and smoothly. The author has had his difficulties in trying to do this in an alcaic:

Jacent aratra et vimina segniter,  
 Arvum quiescit, flumina congelant,  
 Nidos tegit nix alba celsos  
 Venit et adspirat alma Bruma.

It can be noticed quite easily that celsos is used primarily to fill out the third line, and alma is hardly a perfectly appropriate epithet for winter. Therefore it can be said that Horace's technique is of the first water in fashioning verses smooth and firm. In translating this verse of Horace, Conington falls somewhat, since he tries to expand the thought in the first line. In so doing he falls into abstruseness, for his figure of care trimming a sail would bring a question mark into the minds of not a few readers.

Care climbs the bark, and trims the sail

36

Curst fiend! nor troops of horse can 'scape her.

There seems to be no justification in the original for "Curst fiend." Horace does not become oratorical when speaking of vitiosa cura. He seems to realize that such is the condition of life and he puts it down as a solid fact. Furthermore we remarked that aeratas was necessary, since care does not travel on every type of ship. Conington, however, by leaving out this most important word, would have us think that it does. On the other hand, Lord Lytton translates the line in this manner:

Diseased care ascends the brazen galley

and thinks that even the adjective vitiosa deserves a note. He says:

" 'Vitiosa cura'. In the translation, Orelli's interpretation of "Vitiosa," 'morbosa'-i.e. morbid or diseased, from the vice of the mind whence it

springs--is adopted. But this hardly gives the full force of the word.

Horace means that Care, which spoils or infects everything, ascends the galley, etc." <sup>37</sup>

In other words the adjective has real importance though Conington does not translate it at all. However, let us take another example of

Horace's direct manner of saying things. In ode IV-vii we find:

Diffugere nives, redeunt jam gramina campis

arboribusque comae;

mutat terrae vices et decrescientia ripas

flumina praterunt.

Gratia cum Nymphis geminisque sororibus audet

ducere nuda choros,

immortalia ne speres, monet annus et almum

38

quae rapit hora diem...

In these lines it may be noted that each strophe presents a different thought; that there are no superfluous words, but that they are concerned with expressing as many thoughts as possible, and these diverse. In other words, Horace does not grow verbose in developing one idea on one plane, but rather brings in as many sentiments as he can. These, though as varied as Spring and death, yet unify in a central theme and mark the ode with color and simplicity.

Perhaps some examples may demonstrate the simplicity in ode III-xiii:

te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae

nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile

fessis vomere tauris



praebes et pecori vago...

Mr. Sargent's translation is as follows:

No rage of the Dog-Star thy freshness invades

Steers tired of the plough seek repose in thy shades

Straying flocks at thy brink

40

Of the cold water drink.

There is no mention, however, of "Steers tired of the plough seek repose in the shades" in the original. Horace is very direct. He speaks of te and tu, keeping the emphasis on the spring, and does not change the construction of "Steers tired" or "Straying flocks." Then too there is no reference to the shadows of the fountain in the original. As one commentator has quaintly remarked: "It is difficult to understand just what the Shades of spring should be."<sup>41</sup> The translation easily manifests the simplicity of the original, but adds ideas that Horace never thought of, because they are difficult of comprehension in the form which they possess. They are not immediately evident to the reader in their own concrete power. The Latin is direct, and therefore colorful and simple. The translation is abstruse and in this fact, at least, hardly colorful in that "thy" occurs three times in the first three lines and always at the emphatic points.

Another interesting translation of the same verses is that of Sir Theodore Martin:

'Gainst flaming Sirius' fury thou

Art proof, and grateful cool dothyield

To oxen wearied with the plough

And flocks that ran e afield...<sup>42</sup>

The translation from "and grateful" to the end is decidedly Horatian in tone. It renders the Latin in its simplicity. But this quality is lacking to the first part. The verb of the Latin is in the active voice, but in the translation the verb is passive and the meaning difficult to grasp instantly.

But it may be well to note also that if one can fail to translate the odes correctly through indulging in over-expansiveness, or in such abstruseness that the simplicity and meaning become clouded, so too, though this is not a common failing, one can do injustice to the original by over simplification. For example, M. Jourdain translates the four compact lines of Horace in three lines, but to accomplish this feat, he does mild violence to the exact meaning:

When the hot Dog-star's hours to rage incline,

They pierce thee not, that proffert pleasant cold

To flocks that range, and labor-weary bulls.

43

"Labor-weary" is not too exact a turn for fessis vomere, which could have been translated quite exactly if another line had been added. Incidentally, one of the reasons for the lack of fidelity to the original is the attempt to rime the verses. This will occupy our attention in the next chapter. However, the fact stands that lack of fidelity in translating the original discloses a dearth of colorful simplicity in the translation. In other words, the more exactly Horatian the translation is, the more direct and simple it will be.

It cannot be objected that Horace's colorful simplicity is, in point of fact, only barrenness of composition and that

translators departing from the original have really improved him. As a matter of fact, the very form and substance of the odes prove the opposite to be the case. Horace's simplicity is not that of Norman architecture, but rather it is Gothic, if we may thus characterize it. The following ode will bring to light Horace's power of building up an ode from many elements, and as it were disposing all things sweetly:

Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus  
 tam cari capitis, Praecepit lugubres  
 cantus, Melpomene, cui liquidam Pater  
 vocem cum cithara dedit.

ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor  
 urget! cui Pudor, et Justitiae soror,  
 incorrupta Fides, nudaque Veritas  
 quando ullum inveniet parem,  
 multis ille bonis flebilis occidit;  
 nulli flebilior quam tibi, Virgili.  
 tu frustra pius, heu! non ita creditum  
 poscis Quintilium deos.

quod si Threicio blandius Orpheo  
 auditam moderere arboribus fidem,  
 non vanae redeat sanguis imagini,  
 quam virga semel horrida,  
 non lenis precibus fata recludere,  
 nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi.  
 durum! Sed levius fit patientia,  
 quidquid corrigere est nefas.

What points help to bring out colorful simplicity in this ode? In the first place, instead of declarative sentences, rhetorical questions are used.

Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus

tam cari capitis?

Ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor

urget?

Quando ullum inveniet parem?

These help to produce an atmosphere of sympathy and quietness. Then, too, there is a reference to the death of Quintilius in every stanza and every reference is different. In the first stanza there is tam cari capitis; in the second, ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor; in the fourth; non vanas redeat sanguis imagini; in the last stanza we have: quam nigro empularit Mercurius gregi. Thus one can appreciate the art with which Horace makes each reference different and of such a nature that it not only helps to carry on the central thought, but also to give it color. Each reference seems to possess a different color of the spectrum, and these when combined in the one ode produce brilliant light. Furthermore, each stanza also has a reference to the gods, thus giving a balanced variety of emotions. In the first stanza is found Melpomene. Pater; in the second: Pudor et Justitiae soror; incorrupta Fides, nudaque veritas; in the third; poscis Quintilium deus; in the fourth and fifth; Orpheus. Mercurius. Another point worthy of note is the manner of ending, the little moral touch at the end that Horace wishes to be remembered. As was remarked in the first chapter, this should be translated exactly and not paraphrased if one would get the full force of

Horace's idea and sentiment.

To translate this ode correctly, one must render every thought correctly and exactly. A slight change from the original will either produce a jarring note, or appear to be so general that it will produce no clear-cut effect, and the tone and color will consequently be lost. A few translations will elucidate this point. For instance:

....praecepe lugubris  
 cantus, Melpomene, cui liquidam pater  
 45  
 vocem cum cithara dedit.

is thus translated by M. Jourdain:

Begin, to thee  
 Divinely the clear liquid note was wed,  
 46  
 And lyre, Melpomene!

"Was wed" however, seems to be a rather abstruse way of saying pater dedit.

The directness and sharpness is lost entirely. Gladstone writes:

Lead thou the dirge, for Jove, <sup>Melpomene</sup>  
 47  
 Gave lyre and song to thee.

The very word, however, that gives color to the lines, liquidam, is not translated. Furthermore, though this is a fine point, "Jove" is a rather matter-of-fact rendering for the more easily heard "pater". Conington does not fare to well either in his version:

Begin the mournful stave  
 Melpomene, to whom the Sire of all  
 48  
 Sweet voice with music gave.

"Music" is too general a rendition of cithara. "Sire of all" is rather

brusque for pater. Such a translation seems to have been used to rime the line with "fall" in the first line. "Stave" is one of those words that repel people from the classics. It is not immediately evident and clear. Added to this is the fact that the meaning here used is the third or fourth meaning according to the dictionary. It is easily seen how the meaning desired would have an unconscious connotation, at least, of other meanings and thus obscure the one we wish. From all the translations, Lord Lytton's seems to be the best:

Music attuned to sorrow

Lead thou, Melpomene, to whom the Father

Gave liquid voice and lyre.<sup>49</sup>

"Sorrow" certainly has the meaning of lugubris. "Father" is a worthy translation of pater. "Liquid voice and lyre" are concrete and sharp as the Latin. "Lead" is the exact translation of praecipe, as Lord Lytton wishes to make clear in one of his footnotes. There is no doubt that the last quoted translation is the best and a worthy rendering of the Latin.

The first line of the second stanza is a good testing ground for the powers of the translator:

ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor

urget?

Gladstone, it would seem, uses "bind" to turn urget only because he wishes a rime for "mind" in his next line. His translation is:

Shall then unending sleep Quintilius bind?

51

O bashful Shame, O Truth's transparent mind.

Not only is "bind", as has been remarked, too far from giving the heart of

the Latin, but also the time of the verb has been advanced from the present to the future. The Latin line finds this rendering at the hands of M. Jourdain:

52

Heavy on him doth Sleep perpetual lie?

While the line has the required quietness and ease, yet it is not entirely perfect. "heavy" and "lie" hardly do justice to urget. "heavy" occurs also in Conington's translation:

And sleeps he then the heavy sleep of death,

53

Quintilius?

"Heavy sleep" seems to water down the idea contained in perpetuus. "Death" is too abstract for sopor. Just a degree different is the work of Lord Lytton:

54

So, the eternal slumber clasps Quintilius?

The construction of the sentence is the same as that of the original. However, one wonders, if "clasps" really is fitting for urget. For example, St. Paul uses urget in his famous sentence: "Caritas Christi urget nos", and while it would be perhaps quite colorful to translate urget by "clasps"; yet the word means "charges us" as with electricity; "drives us on", or "presses us on". And in the case of the line to be translated the idea of "presses" would convey the full force of the original. That is to say, eternal sleeps presses upon Quintilius, presses just as the lava from Vesuvius pressed upon Pompeii. In other words, Horace's word urget has colorful simplicity if one will only give it a true translation.

In this same ode we meet with one of Horace's short moralistic sayings. As was remarked previously, this should be turned exactly, for it gives the finishing touch and specific tone to the ode. The original:

durum! sed levius fit patientia  
 56  
 quicquid corrigere est nefas.

Conington fails in translating by using the word "sorrow", but Horace wishes to say quite directly that nothing can heal the wound. The translation:

Ah, heavy grief! but patience makes more light  
 57  
 What sorrow may not heal.

Another translation that blurs the picture of the entire ode by coloring the original is that of Gladstone:

Alack! But what the iron laws impose  
 58  
 By patience lighter grows.

"iron laws" again leave a question mark in the mind. "Alack" seems to be quite romantic; durum quite classical. A perfect translation is that of

Lord Lytton:

Hard! yet still Patience lightens  
 59  
 That which admits no cure.

From the foregoing examination, then it is clear that Horace has written the odes in such a way that they are characterized by a simplicity that is varied and colorful. We have seen that those translations that have reproduced the original faithfully, possess colorful simplicity; they satisfy by their clarity, and delight by their variety. Lord Lytton's translation of the ode quoted above shows to a high degree these qualities --or rather the one compound quality, since each is intrinsically bound up in the other. The complete translation speaks for itself:

What shame or what restraint unto the yearning  
 For one so loved? Music attuned to sorrow



Lead thou, Melpomene, to whom the Father  
 Gave liquid voice and lyre.

So, eternal sleep clasps Quintilius?  
 Whose equal when shall shame-faced sense of honor  
 Incorrupt Faith, of Justice the twin sister,  
 Or Truth unveiled find?

By many a good man wept, he died;--no mourner  
 Wept with tears sadder than thine own, O Virgil!  
 Pious, alas, in vain! thou redemandest  
 Quintilius from the gods;

Not on such terms they lent him! --Were thy harp-strings  
 Blander than those by which the Thracian Orpheus  
 Charmed listening forests, never flows the life-blood  
 Back to the phantom form

Which Hermes, not re-opening Fate's closed portal  
 At human prayer, amid the dark flock shepherds  
 With ghastly rod. Hard! yet still Patience lightens  
 60  
 That which admits no cure.

How truly Horatian this translation is as regards colorful simplicity there is no need to say. It is something more than a word-for-word translation, or a stilted paraphrase. Rather the author has caught the spirit of the original and has put into his work the characteristic qualities that one finds in the Latin. The thought is not expanded, nor, on the other hand, is it compressed to the point of abstruse-

ness. One feels that the Latin is present as under a mask, especially when faced with such happy renderings as:

Gave liquid voice and lyre

of

liquidam...voces cum cithara dedit;

and

Not on such terms they lent him

of

non ita creditum;

and

never flows the life-blood

back to the phantom form,

of

non vanae redeat sanguis imagini;

and

with ghastly rod

of

61

virga...horrida.

The qualities of the above translation should be present in every translation, for they are characteristic of the original, and stamp a work as truly Horatian and a thing of beauty.

There is something more to be said under the question of colorful simplicity. As the writer looks upon the many translations of *H<sub>o</sub>race* upon his desk, and considers also the many translations that have been published through the ages, each one diverse in some way from all others;

as he thinks of the thousands of "first-prize" translations that have been collected and delighted in; as he considers the vast multitude of translations that have received being at the hands of students( and every teacher knows that no two translations are exactly alike)-- as he considers these things, he feels that there truly is colorful simplicity in the odes of Horace. Simplicity, because the odes are easy to understand, and have no savor of studied artificiality; color, because, notwithstanding the simplicity each translation that has been made of the odes has been different from every other. Each one penetrates somewhat differently into the spirit of the original. From this it would seem to follow that the odes, the words, the phrases, the stanzas, are charged and bursting with richness of meaning, and that they possess a certain luxuriousness that shows itself as immediately attractive to everyone. Cardinal Newman's words on appreciating the classics would seem to confirm this viewpoint: "Passages, which to a boy are but rhetorical commonplaces, neither better nor worse than a hundred others which any clever writer might supply, which he gets by heart and thinks very fine....at length come home to him, when long years have passed, and he has had experience of life, and pierce him, as if he had never before known them with their sad earnestness and vivid exactness. Then he comes to understand how it is that lines, the birth of some chance morning or evening...among the Sabine hills, have lasted generations after generation, for thousands of years, with a power over the mind, and a charm which the current literature of his own day, with all its obvious advantages, is utterly unable to rival."

62

It follows then, that there must be a certain depth and richness of meaning in Horace. While, indeed, we cannot find in

him great epic sweep, or magnificent dramatic power, nevertheless, we can see in his odes a colorful reflection of God's world, that alone, perhaps, we are too color blind to see.

## Notes for Chapter Two

1. Slaughter, Moses S., "Horace, An Appreciation" in Classical Journal  
Vol. III (Dec. 1907 pp. 53 ff)
2. Wilkinson, Wm. C., Preparatory and College Courses in English, p. 371
3. Cf. Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, Studies in Literature, First Series, p. 68
4. Oates, Whitney, Influence of Simonides of Ceos upon Horace, passim
5. Ode III-vii-45-48, p. 202.
6. Ode IV-vii-9-12, p. 310.
7. Conington, The Odes of Horace, IV-vii-9-12, -. 173.
8. Horace, Carmen Saeculare-4, p. 350.
9. Johnson, Ben, Hymn to Diana, as quoted from The Golden Treasury, p. 82
10. Ode I-xiv-17-20, p. 42.
11. Dobson, Austin, as quoted from Notes on Horace (unpublished as yet) by  
Rev. A. P. Farrell, S.J.
12. Conington, op. cit., I-xiv-17-20, p. 27.
13. Lord Lytton, The Odes and Epodes of Horace, I-xiv-17-20, p. 90
14. Cf. no. 6.
15. Knight, W.F.J., "Homodyne in the Fourth Foot of the Virgilian Hexameter"  
in The Classical Quarterly, XXV, (1931), p. 184ff.
16. Ode I-xxxii-4-12, p. 86.
17. As quoted from the "Cambridge Songs" in Mediaeval Latin ed. by Harrington,  
K.P., p. 277.
18. Cf. no 16.
19. Conington, op.cit., I-xxxii-1-12, p. 51.
20. Ode I-xxxii-14-16, p. 86
21. Conington, op. cit., I-xxxii-15-16, p. 51.
22. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxxii-1-12, p. 142.

23. Lord Lytton, op. cit., p. xxxii.
24. Conington, op. cit., I-xxxii-2-3, p. 51.
25. Cf. no. 22.
26. Cf. no. 19.
27. Cf. no. 22.
28. Cf. no. 22.
29. Cf. no. 22.
30. Cf. no. 22.
31. Cf. no. 19.
32. Cf. no. 19.
33. Cf. no. 19.
34. Cf. ode I-iv-1-4, p. 16.
35. Ode II-xvi-21-24, p. 150.
36. Conington, op. cit., II-xvi-21-22, p. 85.
37. Lord Lytton, op. cit., p. 218.
38. Ode IV-vii-1-8, p. 310.
39. Ode III-xiii-9-12, p. 224.
40. As quoted from Thayer, Mary R., "On Translating Horace" in The Classical Weekly, Vol. XI, (Jan. 14, 1918), p. 93.
41. Thayer, Mary R., op. cit., p. 92.
42. As quoted from Thayer, M. R., op. cit., p. 92.
43. Jourdain, M. Translations of the Odes of Horace, III-xiii-8-1-, p. 132.
44. Ode I-xxiv, p. 68.
45. Cf. no. 44.
46. Jourdain, M., op. cit., I-xxiv-2-4, p. 43.

47. Gladstone, W.E., The Odes of Horace Translated into English, I-xxiv-3-4, p. 29.
48. Conington, op. cit., I-xxiv-2-4, p. 41.
49. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxiv-3-4, p. 120.
50. Cf. no. 44.
51. Gladstone, W.E., op. cit., I-xxiv-5-6-, p. 29.
52. Jourdain, M., op. cit., I-xxiv-5, p. 43.
53. Conington, op. cit., I-xxiv-5, p. 41.
54. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxiv-5, p. 120.
55. St. Paul, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. V. v. 14.
56. Cf. no. 44.
57. Conington, op. cit., I-xxiv-19-20, p. 41.
58. Gladstone, W.E., op. cit., I-xxiv-19-20, p. 29.
59. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxiv-19-20, p. 120
60. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxiv, p. 120.
61. Cf. no. 44.
62. Newman, John H., The Grammar of Assent, p. 75.

## CHAPTER III

## SOME REMARKS ON METER

"But the ear must preside and direct the judgment to the choice of numbers."

Dryden, Preface to Sylvae, p. 181.



Perhaps the most intricate section of our discussion will be this chapter that is concerned with the question of what type of metrical pattern should be used in translating the odes. Attention might be called to the fact, however, that all the elements of an ode are so interlocked that when we are studying one element, we should not forget that it has many connections with other details of the whole composition. For example, the metrical ictus in Latin has a close relation to the word accents, and the sense lines of the composition are built upon the meter in a certain way, as has been pointed out in a previous chapter. However, in a consideration of meter, the sole matter of the metrical tone is of such importance that it is well worth while to abstract it from all secondary elements with which it is connected and treat it in itself. Let us then point out a few facts about the meters in general, and then take up the problems which they offer. Naturally, these will be the questions that will have to be answered: Can Latin meters be transferred into English? Should rhyme be used or not? And, finally, what metrical patterns are best suited for translations?

Before we begin to answer the questions concerning meters, it may be well to see just why Horace chose the meters that he did, as this knowledge may throw light on the subsequent discussion. For instance, if we appreciate the fact that no one has used in Latin the meters as he has used them, then we may understand that it is not easy to adapt them to English. And, even if a discussion on the subject of Horace's choice of meters does not solve any technical points connected with the understanding of them, yet it will, at least, place them in proper perspective.

Why then did Horace select the meters that he

did? The answer is not difficult. He found from experience that the most difficult Greek meters were best suited to express the thoughts he wished to convey. It has been truly observed that the secret of Horace's odes lies in the fact that "he chose the most tantalisingly difficult foreign meters and with consummate skill tamed them to the Latin tongue." <sup>1</sup> And in so doing he has produced a Roman sapphic and alcaic, and other forms as good as those in Greek, if not better. True, there were slight differences inasmuch as the Greek was written for the lyre, while the Latin was written to be read. It is evident that Horace found the task of using Greek meters in Latin exceedingly difficult not only because of the nature of the language, but also because of the restrictions which the meters themselves imposed upon him. However, these restraints have proved to be the cause of a more perfect verse, and an analogy from English may show that the overcoming of restrictions and difficulties in writing verse creates a high standard of poetry.

Great poetry has not been written, nay, cannot be written without a restricted pattern. For example, it has been said that in English: "The sonnet is the prime test of a poet. The writing of verse like all activity is strengthened by limitation, and the poetry of a mind classical is braced up (and thus strengthened) by fixed form and rule. Thus, those who shall come to question the greatness of Shakespeare--and a reaction sooner or later shall do that--can be answered abruptly by the example of the sonnets. In that mould he excelled himself and all others".<sup>2</sup> Without a doubt, it will be conceded by all that the sonnet is the most difficult verse form in English and what has been said of it above can be applied mutatis mutandis to the meters of Horace. In other words, Horace

has in them reached in them a high degree of literary perfection. Moreover, as regards translation, it might be thought advisable to use the Latin meters in English, since they seem to be such a success in the original.

When the matter has been thoroughly considered, it does not seem advisable to transfer the meters in which the Latin odes are written, to the English when translating, and the fundamental reason for this lies in the nature of the two languages. In Latin, the quantity of a syllable is of prime importance, and the accent depends upon it; in English, the quantity is subordinated to the accent. Latin can use quantity, word accent, and the ietus of the metrical foot in building up a verse; English, only word accent, and, if it wishes, rime. In other words, there is an essential difference in the meters of the two languages. So great is this diversity that the Latin meters when used in English will convey the impression that they are verses, but not verses of the Latin type. We have a good example in the following heroic verses of Tennyson:

O mighty mouth'd inventor of harmonies

O skill'd to sing of Time or Eternity

God-gifted organ-voice of England

Milton, a name to resound for ages.

Whose Titan angels, Gabriel, Abdiel

Stand from Jehovah's gorgeous armories

Tower as the deep-domed empyrean

Rings to the roar of an angel onset.

Me rather all that bowery loveliness  
 The brooks of Eden mazily murmuring  
 And bloom profuse and cedar arches  
 Charm, as a wanderer out in ocean  
 Where some refulgent sunset of India  
 Streams o'er a rich ambrosial ocean isle  
 And crimson-hued the stately palm-woods  
 Whisper in odorous heights of even.

The above verses are not a translation of a Latin ode, but are used only to exemplify the alcaic meter in which they are written. We have used the word "alcaic", but this word may be used only in an analogous sense. Tennyson himself admonishes us: "My alcaics are not intended for Horatian alcaics", and rightly, for in examining one line from the above quoted verses, we find that the verse is determined primarily by the accent of the words giving us:

Streams o'er a rich ambrosial ocean isle

with little difference in the length of the syllables as far as the metrical form is concerned. A Latin line, however, we find to be determined by the quantity in this manner:

— — u — — u u — u — 5  
 Soracte, nec jam sustineant onus.

The line is not determined by the accent, but primarily by the fact that the syllables possess a definite length--the long receiving twice the time it takes to pronounce the short. In the last English verse quoted, for instance, this line:

where some refulgent sunset of India

shows that each syllable takes the same amount of time to pronounce, ~~as~~ the verse is determined by the accent. Even the fact that the verse is governed by the accent does not change the length of the accented syllables. The

etia, on the other hand, is quite definitely quantitative, and

u                    u u                    u  
 Vides ut alta stet nive candidum,

is so to be spoken that each long syllable (marked ) has twice the time that is given to a short one (marked u). From this it will appear that there are marked differences between the two verses. But to bring the point out more clearly, let us take a translation of one of the ones:

Behold Soracte, shrouded with snowy depths  
 Its bending tree tops groaning beneath their load  
 Its babbling streams no longer vocal  
 Tight in the grip of the keen ice-crystal. <sup>7</sup>

The original is as follows:

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum  
 Soracte, nec jam sustinent onus  
 silvae laborantes geluque  
 flumina constiterint acuto. <sup>8</sup>

The differences noted above can be seen in these verses. <sup>†</sup>

It may be observed that the first line of the translation is determined by the accent, and that only secondary attention is given to quantity. In the Latin, however, the word accent is of secondary importance and the line is determined by the length of the syllables. In the first line of the English the "with"

receives an accent and is of the same length as the two syllables of "unhrouded" though it is supposed to be the last and short syllable of a dactyl. Furthermore, the differences in the use of the word accent and the lengths of the syllables may be observed in the following examples. This Latin line from the odes is scanned thus:

$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & \text{u} & \text{u} & & \text{u} & \text{u} & \\ \text{frī} & \text{gōra} & / & \text{mī} & \text{tes} & / & \text{cū} & \text{nt} & \text{Lē} & \text{phy} & / & \text{rīs} & \text{vēr} & / & \text{prō} & \text{terit} & / & \text{vō} & \text{stas} \end{array}$

This hexameter is constructed primarily of long and short syllables, since the word accent coincides with the first syllable of the dactyl only three times. An English hexameter, on the other hand, depends entirely on six word accents as:

10

See how so / racte is / covered with / snow lying / deep on the / hillside.

No doubt the caesura occurs after "covered". Yet this would seem to give the following word "with" a certain ictus entirely destroying its "shortness". Furthermore, there is an opportunity in Latin of giving a smooth or interrupted rhythm to the hexameter, by the coincidence or the non-coincidence of the word accent with the thesis of the fourth metrical foot, as is shown in an interesting study by H.F.J. Knight. In English, however, there is no such possibility for a change of rhythm, and as a consequence, the lines tend to become monotonous. In other words, the differences between Latin and English would seem to destroy the possibility of obtaining from a meter in English the same results that may be obtained from it when it is used in Latin. But let us proceed somewhat more deeply into the subject.

An examination of a typical English poem will disclose that English is not quantitative, that is to say, the lengths of the syllables comprising the feet or bars have no fixed proportional relation to each

other. For example, in "Shelley's 'Ode to Night':

Swiftly walk o'er the western wave

Spirit of Night!

Out of the misty eastern cave

Where, all the long and lone daylight,

Thou rovest dreams of joy and fear,

That make thee terrible and dear,--

Swift be thy flight!

the structure of the stanza is determined merely by the number of equidistant stressors in each line, and by the relative lengths of the lines, as indicated by the rimae. The actual proportions of the syllables and the changes from one time to another, though of the greatest aesthetic importance, has no structural value at all. But how different is the classical meter!

Here every syllable is felt to have a definite proportional relation to each other. as a general rule, a short is half the length of a long; in any case the quantity of each is fixed and known and felt. The metrical pattern is precise and unmistakable, and we are at once conscious of any modulation into another rhythm." <sup>12</sup> It is evident, then, that there is a gap between the

metrical pattern of English and Latin that can hardly be bridged. For if a definite metrical pattern is used in Latin according to the length of the syllables, it will produce essentially different results from those obtained when it is used in English according to the word accent. To be concrete, a translation in the same alcaic meter may be made in English of:

Vides, ut alta stet nive candidum

Socrate, nec jam sustineant crux

silvae laborantes geluque  
 flumina constiterint acuto

13

The translation as we have seen before is:

Behold Soracte, shrouded with snowy depths  
 Its bending tree tops groaning beneath their load  
 Its babbling streams no longer vocal

14

Tight in the grip of the keen ice-crystal.

If we consider the verse abstractly in itself, and not as a translation, we shall indeed praise it highly. However, it is not exactly attuned to the original. It is not Horatian. The meter is very much faster than it is in the Latin. Horace takes great care to soften up the rhythm of the original. He breaks up the second line by running Soracte into it, thus placing a natural hiatus between the sense lines. The second sense line is run over into the third, thus slowing up the rhythm by the natural hiatus between laborantes and geluque. The only line that Horace does not impede is the last in which the rhythm marches along very swiftly and provides a pleasing contrast to the others. But the English has no rhythmical balance. Each line is a complete clause and the swiftness of one line only accentuates the swiftness of the line following. What in Latin would suitably terminate the above elocic we shall see later.

What we have just said about the use of classical meters in English is not something that is proved by a few stray comparisons, for the history of English literature seems to indicate that the effective poetic use of classical meters in English is too much to be hoped for.



Not a little amount of experiment has been performed upon the classical meters in an endeavor to adapt them to English. As early as the sixteenth century an unsuccessful attempt was made by men such as Ascham, Sidney, Spencer, and Campion to break the usual form of rime and syllabic verse and improve a quantitative prosody, just as Ennius had once brought Greek meters and scansion into the Latin language. The attempt failed because there was a "fatal lack of any consistent and rational method of determining the quantity of English syllables for the science of phonetics did not yet exist. It is probable that the quantitative verse closest to the Roman was written by Robert Bridges in the beginning of the twentieth century. To quote his verse, however, and examine its merits and defects, its metrical and quantitative technique especially in the meters in which he attempted to imitate the Latin poets, would indeed be hardly suitable for this paper. However, Bridges has laid down two necessary conditions for quantitative verse that will throw some light on the aspect of the subject that we are considering. The conditions are as follows: "1) We must have a definite theory of quantity, based so far as possible, on phonetic fact; 2) we must not allow ourselves to be disconcerted when we find that accents do not always fall upon long syllables, and we must even welcome the fact that the speech accents will often not correspond with the metrical ietus or accent of the verse".<sup>15</sup> What Bridges desires to obtain, however, is practically impossible for English has not developed up to now a definite theory of quantity, and, in all probability, will not do so.

If quantitative verse as the Latins knew it is impossible in English, it might be asked whether or not a mean might be

is not between the strict use of accent and rime and the strict quantitative style. In this matter the best opinion seems to be that of R.S. Trevelyan. He says: "The structure would have to be mainly indicated and expressed by accent, and the quantity would play a subordinate though still an important part. Careful attention to the weight and lightness of syllables would be even more necessary than it is in the writing of blank verse; but a strict and consistent observance of quantity would be superfluous, and perhaps an embarrassing luxury. Rime might sometimes be used with discretion, but should no longer be the chief instrument for emphasizing and indicating structure".<sup>16</sup>

These laws- if thus they may be named\* are quite correct, if they are used in building up original meters in English that are somewhat similar to the Latin meters in as much as they endeavor to produce the same rhythmical practical effect. This theory is practically the same as that of Lord Lytton which we shall examine at length later. However, the theory just quoted cannot be taken to mean that the classical meters can be used in English, for, as we have seen, these do not produce the same effect in English as in Latin. In other words, Horace cannot be translated into English by means of classical meters.

While classical meters are not employed frequently to correspond to the odes, yet many translators seem to go to the other extreme in producing translations according to fixed English metrical patterns with which they have used rime. But the question immediately arises in one's mind as to the appropriateness of using rime in translating Horace. For what we desire is not so much a pretty English poem as a true translation of Horace, and it does seem that if one were not restricted to riming

words he could produce a translation more in keeping with the spirit of the original. Moreover, there is another difficulty with rime as observed by a well-known modern critic: "That is the nuisance with rime; it can hardly suggest the epigram, the clinch, the verse brought off with a little note of triumph".<sup>17</sup> And if it can be said that this is true quite frequently in original English poetry, a fortiori it is true in a translation. If rime detracts from an original poem because of the restrictions that it imposes, it certainly detracts from a translation which is hampered by many more restrictions than an original poem. For example, to show how rime narrows a translator's scope let us consider a few translations of:

Te flagrantis atrox horn Caniculae  
nascit tangere; tu frigus amabile  
fessis vomere tauris  
præbeas et pecori vago.<sup>18</sup>

Mr. Conington gives as his version:

Thee the fierce Sirian star to sadness fired  
Forbears to touch: sweet cool thy waters yield  
To ox with ploughing tired  
And lazy sheep field.<sup>19</sup>

In this translation, Conington has changed the meaning in the first line and has lost the force of tu in the second. To make a rime for "field" he has widely translated vago, a word expressing activity, by "afield", a word that is static. Moreover, he has used "lazy" without warrant. The translation, then, rimes, but it does not translate. It is interesting to see the restrictions that rime imposes if used in translating this verse.

Sir Thomas Martin, for instance uses rime and has exactly the same rime in his second and fourth line as does Conington:

'Gainst flaming Sirius' fury thou  
 Art proof, and grateful cool doth yield  
 To oxen wearied with the plough  
 And flocks that range afield.<sup>20</sup>

In this rendering, it may be observed that to use "thou" at the end of the first line, the active flagrantis atrox hora Canicula, nescit, is changed to the passive, "'Gainst flaming Sirius' fury thou".

Why then exactly does rime detract from a translation?

Because, as we have noted in our second chapter, the translation must follow as closely as possible the exact thought and sense lines of the original, if it is to possess the rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity of the original. If the sense lines and thought are not translated as faithfully as possible, we shall have a translation of:

te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae  
 nescit tangere; tu frigus amabile  
 fessis vomere tauris  
 praebis et pecori vago.<sup>21</sup>

on an oratorical scale as the following seems to be:

The Dog-star's cruel season with its fierce and blazing heat  
 Has never sent its scorching rays into thy glad retreat;  
 The oxen wearied with the plough, the herd which wanders near  
 Have found a grateful respite and delicious coolness here.<sup>22</sup>

It is evident that the thought has been expanded too much to convey the

brevity and color of the original, and the sense lines are distorted too violently to allow the translation to pass as perfect. This translation by no means even hints at the metrical art and perfection of the Latin.

Let us turn our attention for a moment to the first verse of this ode:

O fons Bandusiae splendidior vitro  
 dulci digne mero non sine floribus  
 cras donaberis haedo  
 cui frons turgida cornibus....<sup>23</sup>

Mr. Conington translates in rime as follows:

Bandusia's fount, in clearness crystalline  
 O worthy of the wine, the flowers we vow!  
 Tomorrow shall be thine  
 A kid, whose crescent brow...<sup>24</sup>

Lord Lytton translates without rime thus:

Fount of Bandusia, more lucid than crystal  
 Worthy of honeyed wine, not without flowers  
 I will give thee tomorrow a kid  
 Whose front, with the budded horn swelling...<sup>25</sup>

Mr. Conington's rime shows its cost on examination. To obtain the rime he turns splendidior vitro, a comparison, by "in clearness crystalline". Lord Lytton, on the other hand, translates it perfectly, "more lucid than crystal".

Conington changes the idea of the second line by adding "we vow", and omitting to translate dulci. Lord Lytton translates the Latin perfectly again into a natural sense line. Conington to obtain rime in his fourth line expands the two lines of the Latin into three English lines. Lord Lytton, however, follows the original closely, and has practically the identical pattern of thought as the Latin. In other words, translations with rime seem of their very essence inferior to those that dispense with rime.

There is another dangerous attribute that rimed translations possess, and that is the tendency to artificiality and monotony. It may happen that not only are the sense lines and order of the original ignored, but also that each rime of the rimed translation will be made complete in itself, thus producing monotony. For instance, Horace writes:

Saepius ventis agitatur ingens  
 pinus et celsae graviore casu  
 decidunt turres feriuntque summos  
 fulgura montis.

sperat infestis, metuit secundis  
 alteram sortem bene preparatum  
 pectus. informis hiemes reducit

26

Juppiter, idem...

Gladstone translates by:

Tallest pines must oftenest bend,  
 And the tallest towers descend;

Heaviest fall from loftiest heights:  
 'Tis the tops that lightning smites.

Fear in good time, hope in ill,  
 Wise and well-trained bosoms fill:  
 Angry winters come from Jove,  
 Jove those winters will remove. <sup>27</sup>

Each line in the translation (unlike each line in the original) is a clause complete in itself and the recurring rhythm hardly does justice to the sense line and psychological "swing" of the Latin. The monotonous sing-song easily ruins any aesthetic beauty that the verse might have otherwise possessed. Horace never commits this fault of having a verse monotonous in thought or structure, because of which, for example, the verse of Claudian has been criticized: "Claudian.... perpetually closing his sense at the end of a verse, and that verse commonly called golden, or two substantives and two adjectives, with a verb betwixt them to keep the peace". <sup>28</sup> Horace has carefully avoided the least tinge of monotony in his verse, and a translation is not a genuine translation if it is monotonous.

If Horace makes each line complete in itself, it is only when the alternate lines are of a different meter. For instance:

Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni,  
 trahuntque siccas machinae carinas,  
 ac neque jam gaudet pecus aut arator igni  
 nec prata canis albicant pruinis,  
 jam Cytherea chorus dicit Venus imminente luna.... <sup>29</sup>





It will suffice to glance at the metrical schemes to realize that the means which Horace uses to achieve variety are numerous. In three of the four hexameters, the word accent coincides with the ictus of the metrical foot three times; in one of the hexameters it coincides four times. The first line has three dactyls; the second, two; the third, four--an appropriate rhythm to suggest the dance of the Graces; and the fourth hexameter has three. The archilochian strophes are similar except in this that the second does not have a coincidence of the word accent with the ictus of the second metrical foot.

It stands to reason then that if Horace has a varied pattern in an ode, it will not do for the translator to be content with a stereotyped jingle of English if he is really serious in his desire to translate Horace, and does not wish to merely use the ode as a point of departure for his own original verse, as so many translators seem to do. Nor must he attempt to render the ode with what may be termed a translator's bias. That is, he should not have a preconceived determination to rime in a certain manner, and thus essay to build up his stanza or lines from the end and work back in such a manner that the thought must be distorted to fit his rime. Rather, he should let the ode determine his translation, and as we have said so frequently before, let the translation follow the original, not the original follow the translation. Mr. Gladstone sins against such an ideal in his translation, and his work will serve to bring out in the concrete what we have just remarked.

Snows melt away; the fields are flecked with grass  
 And foliage clothes the tree,  
 Earth shifts her dress, the rivers shrunken pass  
 And travel to the sea.

The Graces three and Nymphs no longer cower,  
 31  
 But twine, unclad, the dance;...

The distortions which the original underwent to fit Gladstone's personal rhyming scheme are evident. Horace uses one verb, redeunt, simple, concrete and suggesting the cycle that runs throughout the entire ode. Gladstone uses two bright verbs, but loses the central idea of the ode, namely, that everything has a cycle and always has a rebirth, but nam, never. Furthermore, to rhyme the second and fourth lines, arboribusque is turned into the singular "tree". This in itself is not any great change, but when it is made to rhyme with an idea that is not even in the original, as "travel to the sea" is not, then it is quite noticeable. "Cower" is a striking word, but not in the original, and it is in the translation only to make a rhyme, one suspects, for "hour" two lines later.

Lord Lytton's translation dispenses with rhyme and attains the spirit of the Latin:

Fled the snows--now the grass has returned to the meadows  
 And their locks to the trees;  
 Now the land's face is changed, dwindled rivers receding  
 Glide in calm by their shores.  
 Now, unrobed, may the Grace intertwined with her sisters  
 32  
 Join the dance of the Nymphs.....

An examination will reveal that the Latin is translated perfectly, and that the rhythm is terse and smooth. Key words are in their proper places, as "Fled" translating diffugere is the opening word. Praetereunt seems to have a very happy rendering in "glide in calm". There is no rime, it is true, but there is rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity that marks the translation as a faithful mirrored image of the original.

Our discussion, then, resolves itself into this.

Horace very rarely makes each line complete in thought and structure, and when he does so it is only because he finds means of giving variety to the composition. Therefore, a translation cannot with success attempt to use rime and a regular recurring rhythm, since, as we have noted, this destroys any other aesthetic beauty the ode may have possessed. If, however, we are convinced that rime is a detriment rather than an aid in translating, we may turn to another point that should not pass unheeded, that of prose translation.

Perhaps it may seem that we have omitted an important consideration by not asking whether or not the odes should be turned into prose. However, at this point, it is probably clear that translation into prose would probably be the baldest manner of rendering the odes and the most un-Horatian of all. As a matter of fact, even a somewhat faulty riming translation would seem to be preferable to a prose translation, for the riming verse would at least have some positive virtues in as much as it attempted to capture the music of the original, the soul of the odes, while, on the other hand, though the prose translation would have less defects strictly speaking, yet it would also possess fewer virtues and would hardly convey by its looseness of form the rhythmical terseness of the original. A few

translations will bring these differences to light. Horace has:

Poscimur. siquid vacui sub umbra  
 lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum  
 vivat et plures, age, dic "atinum  
 barbite carmen,

Lesbio primum modulate civi,  
 qui ferox bello tamen ~~inter~~ arma  
 sive jactatam religaret udo  
 33  
 litore navem...

The prose translation of C.E. Bennett is as follows:

I am asked for a song. If ever in idle hour beneath  
 the shade I have sung with thee any trivial lay that  
 shall live not merely for this year, but for many, come  
 give forth now a Roman song, thou, lyre, first tuned  
 by the Lesbian patriot who, though bold in war, yet  
 whether amid arms or having moored his storm-tossed bark  
 34  
 on the watery strand....

It hardly seems possible that "I am asked for a song", or "any trivial lay that shall live not merely for this year, but for many", are to be preferred to Lord Lytton's "We are summoned", and "Given birth to a something which lives, and may haply, Live in years later". After all, we have seen that a translation should possess rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity, and it is evident which of the two translations possess these two qualities in the higher degree, that is, the prose version, or Lord Lytton's which is here appended:



endurance that grows lighter which Heaven forbids to change for good.

Lord Lytton translates:

Which Hermes, not re-opening Fate's closed portal  
 At human prayer, amid the dark flock shepherds  
 With ghastly rod. Hard! yet still patience lightens  
 38  
 That which admits no cure.

And Conington has:

Whom once with wand severe  
 Mercury has folded with the sons of night  
 Untaught to prayer Fate's prison to unseal.  
 Ah, heavy grief! but patience makes more light  
 39  
 What sorrow may not heal.

Lord Lytton's "at human prayer", and Conington's, "untaught to prayer", seem to be better renderings of non lenis precibus than the prose translation, "to our entreaty". Lord Lytton's "Hard", is more exact than Bennett's "'Tis hard", and "yet still patience lightens That which admits no cure" renders the more stoical attitude of the original better than the prose "but by endurance that grows lighter which Heaven forbids to change for good". Naturally, there will be differences of taste in the versions, and in a few grammatical points the prose translations will seem to have a clear advantage. However, when the translations are considered in their entirety, we must say that the verse translations are in no wise inferior to the prose in general exactness of meaning, and quite superior, in rendering the musical spirit of the Latin.

If, however, we do not desire prose translations

and consider non-riming verse superior to riming verse, we must determine what our rule will be concerning the choice of the metrical form for the translation. I believe the answer has been given most exactly by Lord Lytton. His opinion is as follows: "I have rather sought to construct measures in accordance with the character of English prosody, akin to the prevalent spirit of the original, and of compass sufficient to allow a general adherence to the rule of translation line by line, or, at least, strophe, without needless amplification, on the one hand, or harsh contradiction, on the other.

"With regard to the rhythmical form in which a sufficient analogy with the Latin meter can be best obtained by the English, there will always be a difference of taste and opinion. My own plan, when I originally commenced these translations, was in the first instance to attempt a close imitation of the ancient measure, the scansion being of course....by accent, not quantity--and then to make such modifications of flow and cadence as seemed to me best to harmonize the rhythm to the English ear, while preserving as much as possible that which has been called the "type" of the original".

40

To be more specific, Lord Lytton has the following to remark about the choice of a meter for the translation of the Latin sapphic: "In my version of the sapphic I have chiefly employed two varieties of rhythm: for the statlier odes, our own recognized blank verse in the first three lines, usually, though not always with a dissyllabic termination; and, in the fourth line, a meter analogous in length and cadence to the fourth line of the original, though, of course, without any attempt at preserving the Latin quantity of dactyl. In fact, as Dr. Kennedy has truly observed,

the spondee is not attainable in our language, except by a very forced effort of pronunciation. That which passes current as an English spondee is really a trochee. For the lighter odes of the Sapphic meter, a more sportive or tripping measure is adopted.

2 41

An example will show how successfully Lord Lytton's rules can be applied. The last verse of ode xxxii of the first book:

O decus Phoebi, et dapibus supremi  
grata testudo Jovis, O laborum  
dulce lenimen, mihi cumque salve  
rite vocanti.

42

he translates as follows:

O thou grace of Apollo, O charm in Jove's banquets,  
Holy shell, dulcet solace in labor and sorrow,  
O respond to my greeting, when I, with rite solemn,  
Duly invoke thee.

43

The rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity that this translation possesses are far superior to these qualities as they are found in Gladstone's version:

By Jove in banquet loved quite well,  
Apollo's crown, beguiling Shell,  
I pray thee, let my fond 'all hail'  
And prayer prevail.

44

There is no need to enter into a detailed criticism of these translations. They speak for themselves. Or rather Gladstone's translation speaks for itself, but Lord Lytton's version sings for itself--and quite appropriately,



since the ode is to the lyre.

It may be agreed then that serious critics will approve the opinion of Lord Lytton as regards the choice of a metrical form.

We may repeat his ideal: "My own plan when I originally commenced these translations, was in the first instance to attempt a close imitation of the ancient measure, the scansion being, of course,.....by accent, not quantity-- and then to make such modifications of flow and cadence as seemed to me best to harmonize the rhythm to the English ear, while preserving as much as possible that which has been called the "type" of the original". We may observe these principles applied and working by taking an alcaic stanza and seeing just how a meter that is closely akin to it in English will best translate it. Ode I-ix presents:

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum

Soracte, nec jam sustineant onus

silvae laborantes geluque

flumina constiterint acuto.

46

It would be hardly feasible to render these lines in iambic dimeters:

Soracte stands so white and still

Snow-covered deep upon its hill,

The forests toil to bear their load

The stream's stock-still, a frozen road.

47

Among other defects in rendering the original is this, that the meter makes each line complete in itself, and the repetition tends to become monotonous, especially if the entire ode of six stanzas is to be translated into this

meter. Let us glance at another meter that is used more or less as an experiment:

See how Soracte is covered with snow lying deep on the hillside,  
 Scarce can the trees bear their burden; the waters stand still in their courses  
 The original is too informal to be enclosed in such a long sweep of words as  
 the dactylic hexameter demands. The meter carries little of the rhythm of  
 the original. Added to this is the fact that the translation is not exact.  
 For instance, "in their courses" is a wide rendering of geluque acuto.

Another meter, the trochaic dimeter, runs as follows:

Look! how beautiful Soracte  
 Glistens nesth its load of snow!  
 Trees are struggling with their burdens  
 Frozen streams no longer flow!

Here again the substance has been distorted to fit the meter. "Beautiful" has no foundation in the original. "No longer flow" is a not too exact turning of the last line of the Latin. In general, the same defect of monotony and complete lines is shown by this meter, as by other meters that we have seen.

Another meter used more or less experimentally, as the dactylic hexameter was used, is the Greater Asclepiad:

See! Soracte the fair snow-covered mount stands up against the sky  
 While its forest-clad slopes groan with their load, nor can the streams rush by.  
 Not only is the original rhythm lost in the transfer, but the English version also seems to take too much liberty in translating the meaning.

None of the aboveseters, then, seem to be suited to convey the rhythm of the Latin. However, Lord Lytton, in accordance with his general principles, has constructed a type of anapestic rhythm that seems to have some of the overtones of the original Latin. His translation:

See how white in the deep-fallen snow stands Soracte!  
 Laboring forests no longer can bear up their burden;  
 And the rush of the rivers is locked,  
 Halting mute in the grip of the frost.

Thaw the cold; more and more on the hearth heap the fagots  
 More and more bringing bounteously out, Thaliarchus,  
 The good wine that has mellowed four years  
 51  
 In the great Sabine two-handled jar..

It may be noticed that this translation has the informality and changes of tone that the original manifests so clearly. The anapests have a certain speed and freedom comparable to the Latin dactyl, and when this meter is patterned out as it is here, a varieted stanza is obtained. The first two lines are catalectic in accord with the original; the next two lines follow the plan of the original in as much as they have a change of rhythm through being shortened a foot and through being acatalectic. Individual taste might dictate a slightly different pattern. However, any different version would have to be more or less similiar to that of Lord Lytton's, in order to preserve the original rhythm. A translation of the Latin in, for instance, anapestic trimeters is impossible:

Do you see how Soracte all white

Stands enwrapped in a mantle of snow,  
 While the trees find their burden not light  
 52  
 And the cold, ice-checked streams cannot flow?

When we say "impossible" we mean that anapestic trimeters are hardly suitable for conveying any notion of the rhythmical terseness of the Latin, as a reading of the version will indicate.

It is probably a settled fact, then, that every translator should take as his rule of rendering the odes the rule of Lord Lytton, that is: "a close imitation of the ancient measure, the scansion being of course by accent, not quantity--and then to make such modifications of flow and cadence as seem best to harmonize the rhythm to the English ear, while preserving as much as possible that which has been called the "type" of the  
 53  
 original". We have just observed in a few examples that this method of rendering the Latin meter in English has been very successful, and these few examples will suffice, since they are the most characteristic metrical forms of Horace. True, this method of translating, that is, of trying to follow the rhythm of the original by using a stereotyped English form is rather difficult, and therefore has not been attempted by many translators. Trying to make the English rhythm similar to the Latin is not easy, since it demands an ear closely attuned to the music of the odes and a certain amount of judgment and taste in matters metrical. Though, indeed, by far the greater number of translators use rime and set English metrical forms, yet they do not give us Horace. Their works present but one or two aspects of him. The man who will translate Horace as he is, must penetrate to a keen appreciation of the odes and then develop a metrical pattern that

will convey the original as he sees it. Such a translator will really translate the odes, for the secret of the odes lies, as we said in the beginning of the chapter, in the meter.

This ability to create metrical forms in

English for the odes shows the freshness and originality of the translator, and proves that translation is a creative process, a work of art. We may evaluate a translation by asking whether or not it shows a certain metrical scheme on which has been constructed a pattern of sense lines proportional to the original, and the entire composition characterized by rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity. We shall apply this criterion to the works of some of the more prominent translators of the odes in the following chapter.

## Notes for Chapter Three

1. Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, Studies in Literature, p. 70.
2. Belloc, Hilare, Milton, p.211
3. Tennyson, A. Lord, Poetical Works, p. 268.
4. Tennyson, A. Lord, as quoted from Classical Weekly, (Jan. 14, 1918) p.91
5. Ode I-ix-2, p.28
6. Ode I-ix-1, p.28.
7. Harrington, Karl P., "Rhythm vs. Rhyme", in the Classical Journal, Vol. 14, (1918) pp. 513 ff.
8. Ode I-ix-1-4, p. 28.
9. Ode IV-vii-9, p. 310.
10. Cf. no. 7.
11. Cf. Chap. II, no. 15.
12. Trevelyan, R.C., "Classical and English Verse Structure" in Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, XVI (1926) pp. 11 ff.
13. Cf. no.8.
14. Cf. no. 7.
15. Trevelyan, R.C., op. cit., p. 16.
16. Trevelyan, R.C., op. cit., p. 21.
17. Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, op. cit., p. 66.
18. Ode III-xiii-9-12, p. 224.
19. Conington, The Odes of Horace, III-xii-9-12, p. 127.
20. Martin, Sir Theodore, as quoted from the Classical Weekly, Vol XI, (Jan. 14, 1918), p. 92.
21. Cf. no. 18.
22. Jourdain, M., Translations of the Odes of Horace Collected and Arranged by M. Jourdain, III-xii-9-12, p. 132

23. Ode III-xii-1-4, p. 224.
24. Conington, op. cit., p. 127.
25. Lord Lytton, The Odes and Epodes of Horace, III-xiii-1-4, p. 304.
26. Ode II-x-9-15, p. 130.
27. Gladstone, W.E., The Odes of Horace translated into English, II-x-9-15, p. 57.
28. Dryden, J., "Preface to *Sylvae*" in Poetical Works, p. 177.
29. Ode I-iv-1-5, p. 16.
30. Ode IV-vii-1-8, p. 310.
31. Gladstone, W.E., op. cit., IV-vii-1-6, p. 136.
32. Lord Lytton, op. cit., IV-vii-1-6, p. 412.
33. Ode I-xxxii-1-8, p. 86.
34. Bennett, C.E., Horace, The Odes and Epodes, I-xxxii-1-8, p. 67.
35. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxxii-1-8, p. 142.
36. Ode I-xxiv-17-20, p. 68.
37. Bennett, C.E., op. cit., I-xxiv-17-20, p. 69.
38. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxiv-17-20, p. 120.
39. Conington, op. cit., I-xxiv-16-20, p. 41.
40. Lord Lytton, op. cit., p. xxxi.
41. Lord Lytton, op. cit., p. xxxii.
42. Ode I-xxxii-13-16, p. 86.
43. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-xxxii-13-16, p. 142.
44. Gladstone, op. cit., I-xxxii-13-16, p. 37.
45. Cf. no. 40.
46. Cf. no. 8.
47. Cf. no. 7.

48. Ibid.

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid.

51. Lord Lytton, op. cit., I-ix-1-8, p. 70.

52. Cf. no. 7.

53. Cf. no. 40.



## CHAPTER IV

## AN EVALUATION OF TRANSLATIONS OF THE ODES

"The peculiar effect of a poet resides in his manner and movement, not in his words taken separately."

Arnold, On Translating Homer, p. 14

If one were to read the thousands of pages of criticism that have been written on the subject of translations of Horace, he would probably despair of ever finding any criterion for evaluating the translations that would be acceptable to all critics. No field of literature seems to have been blighted by so much subjectivism as that dealing with the judging of translations. For not only do critics frequently have different ideas regarding the aim of translations, but they also have diverse methods of attaining their aim. Some, for instance, will wish to use the original solely as a point of departure for their own work. An example of this is the translation by Eugene Field of Ode I-xxvii:

Pocimur. siquid vacui sub umbra  
 lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum  
 vivat et pluris, age dic Latinum  
 barbite, carmen,

Lesbie primum modulate civi,  
 qui, ferox bello, tamen inter arma,  
 sive jactatam religaret ude  
 litore navem,

Liberum et Lhasas Veneramque et illi  
 semper haerentem puerum canebat  
 et Lyceum nigris oculis nigroque  
 crine decorum.....<sup>1</sup>

If ever in the sylvan shade  
 A song immortal we have made

Come now, O lute, I prithee come,  
Inspire a song of Latium!

A Lesbian first thy glories proved;  
In arms and in repose he loved  
To sweep thy dulcet strings, and raise  
His voice in Loves and Liber's praise.  
The Muses, too, and him who clings  
To Mother Venus' apron-strings,  
And Lycus beautiful, he sung  
In those old days when you were young.....<sup>2</sup>

We may deduce from this translation that the writer evidently began his work with a preconceived idea that he wished to write something quite different from the original, and he has done so. The translation may be in the same genus of beings as the original, but it is surely not in the same species.

Again, there are some translators who desire to follow the original, but should they think that the author can be improved upon they straightway set about the task. We have seen obvious instances of this in preceding chapters. A few, for the sake of clarity, may be recalled, as the translation of:

...nos, ubi decidimus  
quo plus Aeneas, quo Tullus divis et Ancus  
pulvis et umbra sumus....<sup>3</sup>

by Donington:

We soon as thrust  
Where good Aeneas, Tullus, Ancus went

What are we? dust.<sup>4</sup>

It is obvious that the rhetorical question originated by Conington is truly striking, but it is not Horatian. The spirit has been decidedly changed. Again, Gladstone tries to improve the thought of:

lactus in praesens animus quod ultra est  
 oderit curare et amara lento  
 temperet risus; nihil est ab omni  
 parte beatum.<sup>5</sup>

Eschew, with present joys content,  
 The mind with forecast idly bent;  
 Calm smiles the sourest chance can cheat;  
 The sweetest is not wholly sweet..<sup>6</sup>

It is distressing that Gladstone--as so many translators do in innumerable instances--lengthens the metaphor hinted at by "amara" beyond its natural place and renders without the spirit of the original:

nihil est ab omni  
 parte beatum

The sweetest is not wholly sweet.

In this translation the thought structure has been wholly lost.

Examples such as the foregoing could be multiplied to show that it is penny wise and pound foolish to try to improve Horace. It may be true that even Horace nods, as great Homer, but just when he is nodding it is difficult to say. As a result, translators of this type develop such subjective notions of translations, that they can neither produce good translations, nor are they competent judges of translations

There are also many others who on entirely subjective grounds have denied the possibility of good translations, because they have formed a bias as a result of having encountered a vast quantity of bad or inferior translations. But, just as in philosophy one need not become a sceptic because one meets with so much falsehood (since, after all, falsehood is falsehood because there is truth), so too there is no need for us to despair of ever finding a translation that will give us Horace as he is. As a matter of fact, it will probably be conceded that among the numerous examples of translation cited in our preceding pages there are many that do attain this ideal. It follows that the class of literary sceptics, and all other subjectivists in this matter, have arisen because they have not had a firm and solid criterion for judging translations. One cannot, for instance, say that Lord Lytton has failed to give us verses that charm and let the matter rest at that. What does "charm" mean? What relations does it have with the odes etc. are questions that immediately arise. Furthermore, another author will dogmatically state that the characteristic quality of the odes is "curiosa felicitas", but in what this consists, we are not explicitly informed. In other words, most of the contradictions and mistakes in the matter of evaluating translations have been due to the fact that the critics have not had an adequate and clear criterion for judging. We, on our part, intend an evaluation--brief, to be sure,--of a few translators of Horace according to the fixed and objective norm that has come to light as a result of our examination of the odes just completed.

The ideal translation, of course, is one that reproduces Horace exactly, and our criterion for judging a translation is

this, that the work should possess the two characteristic qualities of the original, that is to say, rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity. It makes no difference what type of words are used in a translation; they may be abstract Latinized words, or sharp clear Anglo-Saxon monosyllables; it makes no difference whether one uses quantity or accent or both in his metrical scheme; it makes no difference whether rime be used or not, but it does make a difference whether or not the translation possesses rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity, for these are the distinctive Horatian qualities, as we have seen at great length, which make the odes the masterpieces that they are.

A translation, then, must contain, in the first place, rhythmical terseness, and it will have this quality if the sense lines of the original are turned into proportional sense lines in the translation. Furthermore, the meter should make the closest possible approach to that of the Latin, and the choice of meter we have reserved to the translator's genius. In the second place, the translation must have colorful simplicity, a quality that will be evident in a verse that adheres rigidly to the thought of the original, and exactly expresses it. Of course, in the preceding examination of these qualities it has been shown that it is easier to obtain them in non-riming verse than in riming verse; that it conduces to a better translation to seek up one's own metrical pattern, rather than attempt to bring the Latin meters into English, or to use stereotyped English forms. But these are secondary considerations. It may be said, for example, that a verse may possess our characteristic qualities and yet have rime, though it may be added, that the verse will have rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity not because of the rime, but, as it may be

remarked, in spite of the rime. This, then, is our criterion of a good translation--Does it possess rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity?

The translations of Conington provide excellent material on which to use our criterion. Not only does his work have a high degree of polish, and in its own manner, a certain "curiosa felicitas", but it has also merited the praise and approval of most critics. However, it would seem that most critics make the mistake of judging the translations from the viewpoint of English verse, and not from the standpoint of Horace's odes. It would seem that the pleasing qualities of the verse unconsciously deceive the critics' judgment. For instance, the extremely satisfying rime of Conington is evident in his translation of ode IV-vii:

Diffugere nives, redeunt jam gramina campis

arboribus comae,

Mutat terrae vires et decrescentia ripas

flumina praetercunt,

Gratia cum Nymphis geminisque sororibus audent

ducere nuda choros.

Immortalia ne speres, monet annus et alma

9

quae rapit hora diem.....

The snow is fled: the trees their leaves put on,

The fields their green:

Earth owns the change, and rivers lessening run

Their banks between.

Naked the Nymphs and Graces in the meads

The dance essay:

'No 'soaping death' proclaims the year, that speeds

10

This sweet spring day...

The rime is most pleasing, and though to secure it the meaning of the original has not been distorted too much, yet there has been sufficient violence done to it to detract from the verse as a translation. For instance, "gramina" becomes "green"; "between" is placed in a unnatural position at the end of the third line so as to rime with "green"; and, "essay" does duty for "audet ducere". Furthermore, there are many other examples in Conington's translations to show distortions in the work owing to the restrictions of rime. In ode I-xxiv-19-20;

durum: sed levius fit patientia

11

quidquid corrigere est nefas.

the translation rime:

Ah, heavy grief! but patience makes more light

12

What sorrow may not heal.

It is evident that "heal" is used only as a rime for "unseal" of the third last line. Because of this fact, the colorful simplicity of the ode suffers, since the abstract moralizing of these last lines gives the ode its tragic tone. Another instance of the loss of colorful simplicity is found in III-

11:

13

dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.

The translation is:

14

What joy, for fatherland to die.

Here, however, it is patent that the necessity of riming has produced an emotional commonplace that is such, only because it omits translating the one word "decorum" that makes the original an universally known line.



Of course, it may be disputed, whether or not the entire reason for Conington's changing the original meaning and thus losing some of the colorful simplicity, lies in the desire to rhyme, or whether this is only one motive joined with another motive of improving the original. We have already seen examples of his changing the moral tone of lines in order to make them more picturesque. It may not be amiss to cite a few more examples. Of:

non, si male nunc, et olim  
15  
sic erit:

he has:

Why should rain today  
16  
Bring rain tomorrow?

The translation changes a declarative statement into an interrogative sentence, and seems to be much more colorful than the original, but in being so, it loses the clear thought-structure of the Latin. Again, to render:

composcit unda, scilicet omnibus,  
quicumque terras munere vescimur  
enaviganda, sive reges  
17  
sive inopes erimus coloni..

he writes:

That circling flood, which all must stem,  
Who eat the fruits that Nature yields,  
Wearers of haughtiest diadem,  
18  
Or humblest tillers of the fields..

It may be argued whether "haughtiest diadem" is used primarily for a rime, or principally to improve "reges". At all events, it does not translate the original, but it is a good indication of just how Conington fails to sense the exact spirit and colorful simplicity of the original.

It also seems that with reason, one might be dissatisfied with Conington's rhythmical terseness. For, although, he translates the sense lines more or less in accordance with those of the original, nevertheless, the meters used do not seem to transfer the rhythmical terseness of the Latin. Probably the greatest defect in the meters lies in the fact that they are stereotyped forms, as it were. Though Conington does say that he tries to achieve some metrical conformity to the original,<sup>19</sup> yet his lines are in great measure iambic, and are similar to the original in this only, that they look like it when side by side on the printed page. But, it stands to reason, that the ear is the judge of poetry, not the eye. How stereotyped the lines can become may be judged from a few examples:

See, how it stands, one pile of snow,  
 Soracte; 'neath the pressure yield  
 Its groaning woods; the torrents' flow  
 With clear sharp ice is all congeal'd.<sup>20</sup>

This translation of:

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum  
 Soracte, nec jam sustineant onus  
 silvae laborantes geluque  
 flumina constiterint acuto,<sup>21</sup>

with its regular iambic meter is endeavoring to convey one of the most

elaborate rhythms ever used--the alexaic. That the English meter fails to carry the rhythm of the original, there is no need to say. Furthermore, Conington uses the identical iambic meter to render the most powerful stanzas that Horace wrote:

Eheu, fugaces, Postume, Postume,  
 labuntur anni, nec pietas moram  
 rugis et instanti senectae  
 afferet indomitaeque morti. <sup>22</sup>

The translation:

Ah, Postumus! they fleet away,  
 Our years, nor piety one hour  
 Can win from wrinkles and decay,  
 And Death's indomitable power. <sup>23</sup>

by its regular metrical scheme has made of the mosaicked rhythm of the original a plane bare surface with little of the beauty of the Latin preserved.

These defects, then, present themselves when we apply our criterion to the translations of Conington. In the first place, whether because of rime or not, he often does violence to the thought, and thus destroys the sharpness and color of the original, and, in the second place, he rests content with rime and devotes little attention to rendering the rhythm of the original. True, he is terse, but his terseness is not rhythmical. However, there is no doubt that Conington's translations are not only pleasing to read, and excellent English verse, but they also instill in the reader a high appreciation of the original. Do they, though, approach

the original sufficiently? Hardly, and the criticism of Conington's work might be summed up in this, that while the translations are pleasant, yet because of frequent defects in conveying the characteristic qualities of rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity, we cannot call them Horatian without essential qualifications.

Let us now make a quasi book-review of the work of W.E. Gladstone, using as our norm of judging, the characteristic qualities of rhythmical terseness and colorful simplicity. Gladstone seems to have been impressed by Horace's terseness, for he writes in his preface, that a translator to be Horatian must have a compressed style. <sup>24</sup> But it seems that the compression of Gladstone has been achieved not by art, but by violence. For instance, his translation of:

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum  
 Soracte, nec jam sustineant onus  
 silvae laborantes geluque  
 flumina constiterint acuto. <sup>25</sup>

is:

Behold Soracte, white with snow,  
 Its laden woods are bending low,  
 Keen frost arrests the river's flow;  
 Melt, Thaliarchus, melt the cold. <sup>26</sup>

It is evident that "white with snow" has none of the sparkle of the original, and, "its laden woods are bending low" conveys scarcely a glimpse of the power of "nec jam sustineant onus, silvae laborantes". On account, therefore, of this unnatural compression the

colorful simplicity and ease of the Latin are lost. Furthermore, the fact that each line is a clause complete in itself makes for monotony and destroys the rhythmical tone of the original.

Gladstone does not seem to have appreciated Horace's rhythms with any more than an amateur's understanding. For instance, in his preface he remarks: "Every one of the odes, as a rule, has a spirit, genius, and movement of its own; and I hold that the translator of Horace should both claim and exercise the largest possible freedom in varying his meters, so as to adapt them in each case to the original with which he has to deal".<sup>27</sup> Though this seems to be Gladstone's ideal in theory, it surely does not seem to be his aim in practice. For example the ninth ode of the first book is unlike in spirit and tone to the fourteenth ode of the second book, yet Gladstone uses the same meter for both. The translations show the similarities. Ode I-ix-1-8 is rendered:

Behold Soracte, white with snow,  
Its laden woods are bending low,  
Keen frost arrests the river's flow;  
Melt, Thaliarchus, melt the cold.

Heap freely logs upon the fire.  
May, more and better I desire,  
And from the Sabine jar require  
Its wine, that reckons four years old.<sup>28</sup>

The translation of ode II-xiv-1-8 reads:

Ah! Fortunus! Devotion fails  
The lapse of gliding years to stay,

With wrinkled age it nought avails  
 Nor conjures conquering Death away.

Think not with daily hecatomb  
 To alter iron Pluto's mind,  
 Him, that with rivers wrapt in gloom,  
 Can Geryon hugh, and Tityus, bind.

The only difference between the two odes as regards form lies in a slight diversity in the riming. One making Horace's acquaintance through these translations would indeed come to know but an imitation Horace with none of the vigor and power which the true Horace possesses.

Gladstone, of course, recognizes the fact that there is a great difference in some of the odes. He insists: "Horace has in numerous cases employed the same meter for odes the most widely divergent in subject and character. Nothing, for example, can be farther apart in their spirit than ode I-ix suggested by the view of Scroache, and the great ode of Regulus (III-v) the loftiest in the whole collection. But these are both written in  
 50  
 alcaics" Very fine, but if Gladstone recognizes the difference between "ode III-ix suggested by the view of Scroache, and the great ode of Regulus" why does he not recognize the difference in the two odes we have examined above? It seems that they are just as "widely divergent in subject and character" as the two he admits are. Gladstone, it appears, judges Horace from a subjective viewpoint and not from the standpoint of the objective qualities of the Latin, for there seems to be nonsufficient reason for his judgment.

However, let us concede that Gladstone has (by accident)

arrived at a true decision on the difference between "ode I-ix suggested by the view of Soracte, and the great ode of Regulus", and let us observe how he has rendered these differences in his translations. The odes read as follows:

Behold Soracte, white with snow,  
 Its laden woods are bending low,  
 Keen frost arrests the river's flow;  
 Melt, Thaliarchus, melt the cold.

Heap freely logs upon the fire,  
 Nay, more and better I desire,  
 And from that Sabine jar require  
 Its wine, that reckons four years old. 31

The "great ode of Regulus" is:

Jove's thunder proves for heaven his reign:  
 On earth Augustus shall be crowned,  
 A god, who unto Rome's domain  
 Hath Britian and the plaguy Persian bound.

One served with Crassus: yet he ties  
 His lot to a barbarian wife,  
 Wretch! and, Oh, sight for Senate's eyes!  
 With foes for kin will close in arms his life. 32

The only difference between the two translations that Gladstone considers "widely divergent" lies in this fact that an extra metrical foot has been added to the last line of each stanza of the more elevated ode of Regulus. This, however, by no means, conveys the high tone of the original. The

intricate and delightful rhythm of the alcaic of the grand style cannot be imitated in English simply by adding an extra foot to the last line of each stanza that is totally iambic. This manner of writing is too loose and accidental; it does not touch the substance of the ode. Adequately to convey the rhythm of the original one must change the meter of the third line of his translation, for in the alcaic itself, the change from a dactylic tone in the first two lines to the swing of trochees in the third line, and then back again to dactyls in the fourth line gives the stanza intricate balance and contrast. In other words, Horace's alcaic rhythm has not been substantially transferred to English by Gladstone. Furthermore, neither has Horace's colorful simplicity been reproduced, for it has suffered from the use of rime, and from an inordinate compressing of the verse, as we have seen.

Our final judgment of Gladstone's work may be summed up as follows: The translations, in general, are concrete and quite compact and in these points they resemble the original. However, they lose some of the colorful simplicity of Horace owing to their often unnatural terseness. The use of rime appears to detract rather than to help, and frequently produces a melodramatic effect rarely found in the odes. Besides, the translations are woefully weak as regards rhythm, and the delicate sensibility for the various forms of music of the Latin.

Our third and last examination of the work of a translator will concern itself with the translations of Lord Lytton. It will have become evident from the discussions in previous chapters that the translations of Lord Lytton are, by no means, unfaithful mirrors of Horace. Among other reasons for this is the fact that Lord Lytton dispenses with



rime and thus, unhampered by any artificial restrictions, is able to devote his entire attention to following faithfully the sense lines and rhythm of the original. That a superior verse has been obtained from this, a few examples will prove.

Pescimur, siquid vacui sub umbra  
 lusimus tecum quod et hunc in animum  
 vivat et pluri; age, dic latinum  
 barbite carmen,

Lesbio primam modulate civi,  
 qui, ferox bello, tamen inter arma,  
 sive jaetatum religaret udo  
 33  
 litore naven..

Lord Lytton translates:

We are summoned. If e'er, under shadow sequestered,  
 Has sweet dalliance with thee in light moments of leisure  
 Given birth to a something which lives, and may, haply,  
 Live in years later,

Rouse thee now, and discourse in the strains of the Roman,  
 Vesal shell, first attuned by the patriot of Lesbos,  
 Who, in war though so fierce, yet in battle, or mooring  
 34  
 On the wet sea-sand...

The points of faithful resemblance are many. The rendering of the meaning exactly has produced colorful simplicity in the thought. Even though not hindered by the necessity of rime, still the translator does not rush to

the other extreme and append a commentary to the original, or use it as a general pattern for his own original work. On the contrary, he takes just that amount of freedom which allows him to develop a meter in keeping with the original sapphic lines. While there may be found among critics some accidental differences of taste as regards Lord Lytton's meter, yet the majority will concede that in general it reproduces the rhythm of the sapphic as well as that rhythm can be reproduced in English. A comparison of a line of the original with one of the translation will show the similarities. The first line of the sapphic reads:

$$\overset{u}{\text{P}oeci} / \overset{u}{\text{m}i}r. \overset{u}{\text{s}}i / \overset{u}{\text{q}}u\overset{u}{\text{i}}d \overset{u}{\text{v}}acu / \overset{u}{\text{I}} \overset{u}{\text{s}}ub / \overset{u}{\text{u}}mbra$$

The first line of the translation:

$$\overset{u}{\text{W}}e \overset{u}{\text{a}}re \overset{u}{\text{s}}um / \overset{u}{\text{m}}oned. \overset{u}{\text{I}}f \overset{u}{\text{e}}'er / \overset{u}{\text{u}}nder \overset{u}{\text{s}}ha / \overset{u}{\text{d}}ow \overset{u}{\text{s}}eque\overset{u}{\text{s}} / \overset{u}{\text{t}}ered.$$

Each line has five metrical feet that take practically

the same time in pronouncing. The short syllables of the English do not produce a more noticeable effect than those of the Latin, since the short syllables of the Latin are more deeply felt because of their contrast with the many long syllables of the Latin line. The use of anapests, too, in English allows a greater liberty in the choice of words than does the use of any other meter. Because of this wider choice of words the Latin tone may be better reproduced. For instance, the sc....si....and su of the Latin are paralleled by su....sh....and se in the English. Besides, the consonantal quid....sub...umb of the Latin is equalled by the ed....und....had of the English. This proves that the translator has an ear for the music of the original, and manages to convey the rhythm in English while at the same time preserving all the colorful simplicity in the form and meaning of the original.

Lord Lytton, furthermore, does not set down general rules a priori about the use of meter or the forms of his translations, but decides on the rhythm and form of his work only after he has studied the original. For example, he does not employ the same metrical pattern to translate all the sapphics, but realizing that Horace has used the sapphic meter to convey very diversified emotions, he has suited his translation to the emotional spirit of the original. An example of this is provided by his translation of:

Persicos odi, puer, apparatus,  
 displicent nexae philyra coronae;  
 mitte sectari, rosa quo locorum  
 sera moretur.

simplici myrto nihil adlabores  
 sedulus curo; neque te ministrum  
 dedecet myrtus neque me sub arta  
 vite bibentem.

Boy, I detest the pomp of Persic fashions-  
 Coronals wreathed with linden rind dispense me;  
 Cease to explore each nook for some belated  
 Rose of the autumn.

Weave with plain myrtle nothing else, I bid thee;  
 Thee not, in serving, misbecomes the myrtle,  
 Me not, in drinking, underneath the trellished  
 Dowerly vine-leaves.

In the above translation Lord Lytton does not follow a metrical pattern of anapests of sustained dignity as he does in the ode to the lyre, but produces a light tripping tone by the combination of one dactyl and four trochees. This skill in adapting the English metrical feet so as to produce the same effect as the Latin makes possible a good translation and a high degree of rhythmical terseness. It proves that Lord Lytton is not satisfied with having his translations look like the odes of Horace on the printed page, but shows, on the contrary, that he is intent on satisfying the ear--the only judge of rhythmical terseness. It is, therefore, a fact that Lord Lytton achieves the rhythmical terseness which we consider a sine qua non of a good translation.

It is not difficult to perceive the colorful simplicity of the Latin in the odes of Lord Lytton. Since he has neglected rhyme and set English metrical patterns, he has given himself sufficient leeway to turn the Latin--and all of the Latin--into a precise translation. For instance:

Maccenas atavis edite regibus  
 O et praesidium et dulce decus meum,  
 sunt quos curricula pulverem Olympicum  
 collegisse juvat, metaque fervidis  
 evitata rotis, palmaque nobilis  
 terrarum dominos evehit ad deos... 37

he renders:

Sprung from a race which mounts to kings, Maccenas,  
 Shield and sweet ornament of life to me;  
 There are those whose sovereign joy is dust Olympic

Gathered in whirlwind by the car; the goal  
 Shunned by hot wheels; and the palm's noble trophy--  
 38  
 Up to the gods it bears the lords of earth..

The sense lines are exactly similar in the Latin and in the English.

*Maeceenas a tavis edite regibus*

is translated in one line by:

Sprung from a race which mounts to kings, Maeceenas.  
 O et praesidium et dulce decus meum

is turned by:

Shield and sweet ornament of life to me.  
 Sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum  
 collegisse juvat

is exactly given in:

There are those whose sovereign joy is dust Olympic  
 Gathered in whirlwind.

*estaque fervidis*

*evitata rotis*

could not be better translated than by:

the goal

Shunned by hot wheels.

*palmaque nobilis*

is given in a perfect sense line:

and the palm's noble trophy.

*Terrarum dominos evehit ad deos*

quarrels in no wise with:

Up to the gods it bears the lords of earth.

In the above translation which is a characteristic piece of Lord Lytton's work, there is no violent compression of thought so evident in the work of Gladstone; and there is no change of meaning which one meets with so frequently in the translations of Conington. What defects there are, seem to be too insignificant for criticism in an examination such as we are undertaking.

When all things have been considered, it appears that the work of Lord Lytton makes the closest approach to our ideal of translation. Lord Lytton has employed every available means to translate the spirit of the Latin into the English, and for the most part he has succeeded. It is only too obvious, of course, that he sometimes nods, and is open to the accusation that his verses show the hand of Lord Lytton and not that of Horace. However, he has in the main succeeded in his work, and those who would translate Horace exactly would do well to make use of the technique of Lord Lytton.

## Notes for Chapter Four.

1. Ode I-xxxii-1-12, p. 66.
2. Field, Eugene, Echoes From the Sabine Farm, p. 67.
3. Ode IV-vii-14-16, p. 310.
4. Conington, The Odes of Horace, ode IV-vii-14-16, p. 173.
5. Ode II-xvi-25-28, p. 110.
6. Gladstone, The Odes of Horace, ode II-xvi-25-28, p. 66.
7. Trent, Wm. P., The Authority of Criticism and Other Essays. Cf. essay "On Translating Horace", p. 189.
8. Thayer, Mary R., "On Translating Horace" in The Classical Weekly, (Jan. 14, 1918), p. 93.
9. Ode IV-vii-1-8, p. 310.
10. Conington, op. cit., ode IV-vii-1-8, p. 173.
11. Ode I-xxiv-19-20, p. 68.
12. Conington, op. cit., ode I-xxiv-19-20, p. 41.
13. Ode III-ii-9, p. 174.
14. Conington, op. cit., ode III-ii-9, p. 101.
15. Ode II-x-17-18, p. 130.
16. Conington, op. cit., ode II-x-17-18, p. 75.
17. Ode II-xiv-9-12, p. 142.
18. Conington, op. cit., ode II-xiv-9-12, p. 83.
19. Quoted from the Classical Weekly (Jan. 14, 1918), p. 90.
20. Conington, op. cit., ode I-ix-1-4, p. 17.
21. Ode I-ix-1-4.
22. Ode II-xiv-1-4, p. 142.
23. Conington, op. cit., ode I-xiv-1-4, p. 81.
24. Cf. Gladstone, W.L., The Odes of Horace, p. v.

25. Cf. no. 21.
26. Gladstone, op. cit., ode I-ix-1-4, p. 17.
27. Gladstone, op. cit., p. vii.
28. Cf. no. 26.
29. Gladstone, op. cit., ode II-xiv-1-8, p. 62.
30. Gladstone, op. cit., p. vi.
31. Cf. no. 28.
32. Gladstone, op. cit., ode III-v-1-8, p. 83.
33. Cf. no. 1.
34. Lord Lytton, The Odes and Epodes of Horace, ode I-xxxii-1-8, p. 142.
35. Ode I-xxviii-1-8, p. 102.
36. Lord Lytton, op. cit., ode I-xxviii-1-8, p. 160.
37. Ode I-i-1-8, p. 2.
38. Lord Lytton, op. cit., ode I-i-1-8, p. 40.



## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION

"I shall have to try your patience yet once more upon this subject, and then my task will be completed".

Arnold, On Translating Homer, p. 65.

At the beginning of this discussion it was stated that the fifth chapter would be a short essay showing how the study of translations of the odes of Horace would lead to a more profound insight and appreciation of the odes. Such a consideration, naturally, would deepen our penetration into the art of translating Horace, not only by throwing into focus different aspects of the odes, through a consideration of the varied points that many translations would provide, but also by opening up the different lines of thought with which such a consideration is connected. However, our discussion has already studied the subject of translating in so many of its aspects, that no more than a summary need here be attempted.

First, the effect of Horace's philosophy upon his poetry has been seen, and how translators, as different as Milton and Eugene Field, have thrown light upon it in its relations to the odes. Again, what place Horace's moralizing has in the odes and how important it is, has also been shown in our consideration of the true method of translating it. And so many elements have been evaluated and established in their relations to the odes, that it were but needless repetition to go over the field again, and reiterate many of the points of our four preceding chapters. Therefore, let us conclude our thesis by a few general remarks on how the study of translations lead to a deeper appreciation of the Latin odes.

That the study of translations will provide one with a deeper understanding and, therefore, appreciation of the odes is evident from the very aim of imitation. Imitation means the reproduction of some beautiful form in a material different from the original. And just as we may come to a deeper appreciation of God by studying the Saints who have fashioned themselves according to His Image, so too (if things small can

be compared with things magnificent) we may come to a more penetrating relish of the odes by studying the translations of them, since each translation shows better than another at least one aspect of the original.

Translations do not only cast attention on this or that aspect of the original, but they also, and often by their deficiencies, enhance the absolute oneness or perfect unity of the original. It is an esthetic delight to observe how every element of an ode is subordinated to producing one impression, and how every word or thought only serves to bring out the richness of every other word or thought. and just as some of the early Greek philosophers would have it that the soul of man was an internal harmony, so, too, we can say that the soul of each ode is an internal harmony of the elements--a compact balanced work of art. and, indeed, not only is this harmony or magnetic cohesion between the elements of each ode shown in comparison with a translation, but also something more important is obtained--the very message is elucidated by the most enlightening commentary in the world--a translation.

Studying the odes from the different viewpoints that translations provide will manifest the solidness of Horace's message. That Horace has a message is evident, for every true poet has one. Horace's message is a balanced interpretation of life. Different interpretations in the translation of men of every creed and philosophy only serve to show the centrality of Horace's outlook--a centrality all the more to be admired, since for encyclopaedic range of subjects Horace is rivalled only by Dante. The fact that men of all nations and ages have translated Horace seems to argue to the fact that Horace has embodied in his odes a true humanistic outlook on life. It does not seem that Horace's Stoicism, Epicureanism, or

any other issue of which he is supposed to have been a votary, ever produced a very deep impression on him, since all these issues are ultimately unnatural. It seems best to say that Horace orientated himself to life in a humanistic manner and found life good. Whether we can say that his soul was an unio naturaliter christiana can be left to the judgment of each one. At all events, Horace enjoyed and always speaks of the ordinary things of life. Every translation thrusts that fact into relief. Scholastic philosophy, however, does no more than build upon common sense, and if it is true that Horace sang in the language of the world's greatest empire, it is also a truth that he sang the facts of the world's greatest philosophy.

Translations, if they are faithful, bring out vividly the pleasing qualities of Horace since they are unique in the world's literature. And translations, if they are unfaithful, and lack the fire of the original, manifest by contrast the intrinsic coordination and relationships of each small element in the original that makes for intensity. The fact that translations cannot ring true with every tone of the original's rhythmical terseness, or shine with every ray of the original's colorful simplicity, proves that the Latin is possessed of a certain principle of beauty. It is the aim of a translation to penetrate as closely as possible to this principle, and the more closely it attains to it the more truly does it reflect and elucidate the original.

We could discuss the odes and their translations from an infinite variety of aspects, since as we have remarked in the beginning of our thesis: "for every thesis that is written on the odes, there are ten that should be written", but let this suffice. Our purpose seems to have been accomplished. We may conclude by saying that the more we

know of the odes of Horace, so much the more will they live for us, and provide a never failing source of beauty. One of the best means to know Horace is through a study of his translations, and as long as translations are written it may truly be said:

Ne forte credas interitura que  
 longe sonantem natus ad Ausonium  
 non ante vulgatas per artes  
 verba loquor socianda chordia. <sup>2</sup>

## Notes For Chapter Five.

1. Wendell, Barrett, *The Traditions of European Literature*, p. 244.
2. Cde IV-ix-1-4.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amos, Flora Ross, Early Theories of Translation, New York, Columbia University Press, 1920.
- Arnold, Matthew, On Translating Homer, London, George Routledge & Sons, n.d.
- Becker, Thomas A., S.J., "On Translating Horace", in America, (Jan. 28, 1922), p. 173 sq.
- Bellos, H., Selected Essays, New York, Lippincott, 1935.
- Bennett, C.S., Horace, The Odes and Epodes with an English Translation, (The Loeb Classical Library), New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1929.
- Butler, H.E., Odes of Horace in English Verse, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1932.
- Cauer, Paul, Die Kunst Des Uebersetzens, Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1903.
- Chesterton, G.K., Chaucer, New York, Farrar & Hinehard, 1932.
- Clafin, Edith F., "On Translating Latin" in Classical Journal, Vol. 20, p. 104 sq.
- Clary, Arthur E., "The Snobbery of Quintus Horatius Flaccus", in Studies, Sept. 1918, Vol. VII, p. 436 sq.
- Conington, John The Odes of Horace, The Latin Text with Conington's Translations, London, George Bell & Sons, 1906.
- Cowper, W., Translations From the Latin Classics: Horace, in Complete Poetical Works, New York, Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Dryden, John, Poetical Works, New York, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1909.
- Fairclough, Henry R., "Influence of Virgil Upon the Forms of English Verse", in Classical Journal, Vol. 26, p. 74 sq.
- Fairclough, Henry R., Love of Nature Among the Greeks and Romans, New York, Longmans, 1930.

- Farrell, Allan P., S.J., "An Outline For The Study of Horace", in The Classical Bulletin, Dec. 1925, p. 19 sq.
- Field, E. and R.M., Echoes From the Sabine Farm, New York, Scribner's Sons, 1892.
- Fiske, G.C., Lucilius and Horace; A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation, Madison, N.Y., 1920
- Fowler, W.W., Roman Essays and Interpretations, London, Oxford University Press, 1920.
- Gladstone, W.E., The Odes of Horace, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901.
- Goad, C. M., Horace in the English Literature of the Eighteenth Century, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1918.
- Goodrich, E.H., "On Translating Horace", in Vassar Journal of Undergraduate Studies, Vol. 10, p. 26 sq.
- Haecher, Theodor, Virgil, Father of the West, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1934.
- Harrington, Karl P., Medieval Latin, New York, Allyn & Bacon, 1935.
- Harrington, Karl P., "Rhythm versus Rhyme", in Classical Journal, Vol. 14, p. 513 sq.
- Hamm, Victor M., "Originals vs. Translations in Culture", in Marquette University Classical Bulletin, Vol. I. No. 6.
- Hardie, W.R., Res Metrica, London, Oxford University Press, 1920.
- Jourdain, M., Translations of the Odes of Horace, London, J.M. Dent & Co., 1894.
- Kuhnmuensch, Otto J., S.J., Early Christian Latin Poets, Chicago, Loyd a University Press, 1929.
- Lowe, John L., The Road To Kanadu, New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927.
- Lytton, Lord, The Odes and Epodes of Horace, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1870.



- Martin, T., Horace, Philadelphia, Lippincott & Co., 1881.
- Mierow, Herbert E., "Horace and Omar Khayyam", in The Classical Weekly, Oct. 15, 1917, p. 19 sq.
- Mierow, Charles C., "Odes of Horace as Freshman Latin", in the Classical Journal, Vol. 18, p. 173 sq.
- Mierow, Charles C., "Some Random Notes on Horace", in The Classical Weekly, Oct. 9, 1922, p. 9 sq.
- Miller, F., "Translation Plus" in Classical Journal, Vol. 29, p. 404 sq.
- Newman, J.H., Grammar of Assent, New York, Catholic Publ. Soc., 1870.
- Newman, J.H., The Idea of a University, Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1927.
- Oates, W. J., Influence of Simonides of Ceos Upon Horace, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1937.
- Palgrave, F.T., The Golden Treasury, New York, Macmillan, 1931.
- Prout, Father, The Reliques of Father Prout, London, George Bell & Sons, 1909.
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, Studies in Literature (First Series), New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1918.
- Robert, H.F., Virgil and Those Others, Amherst, The Virgil Bimillennium committee of Amherst College, 1930.
- Richardson, L.J., "Horace's Alcibi Strophe", in California U. Publications; Classical Philology, Berkeley, Vol. 1, no. 6, 1907
- Sainte-Beuve, C.A., Etude Sur Virgile, Paris, Calmann Levy, 1900.
- Schiller, H., Mètres Lyriques D'Horace d'après Les Resultates de la Métrique Moderne, Paris, C. Klincksieck, 1893.
- Sellar, W.Y., The Roman Poets of the Augustine Age, London, Oxford U. Press, 1899.

- Shorey, Paul, Odes and Epodes, Boston, Sanborn, 1900.
- Showman, Grant, Horace and His Influence, Boston, Marshall Jones Co., 1932.
- Slaughter, Moses S., "Horace, An Appreciation", in The Classical Journal, Dec. 1907, p. 45 sq.
- Tennyson, A. L., Poetic and Dramatic Works, New York, Riverside Press, 1927.
- Theyer, Mary H., The Influence of Horace on the Chief English Poets of the Nineteenth Century, New Haven, Yale U. Press, 1916.
- Theyer, Mary H., "On Translating Horace", in The Classical Weekly", Jan. 14, 1918, p. 90 sq.
- Tolman, H.C., The Art of Translation, Boston, Sanborn, 1901.
- Trent, W.F., The Authority of Criticism and Other Essays, New York, Scribner, 1897.
- Trevelyan, R.C., "Classical and English Verse-Structure", in Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, Vol. XVI, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1931.
- Wendell, Barrett, The Traditions of European Literature, New York, Scribner, 1909.
- Wilkinson, W.C., Preparatory and College Latin Courses in English, New York, Chautauqua Press, 1889.
- Wilson, H.J., "Translations in Relation to Originals", in Classical Journal, Vol. 18, p. 261 sq.
- Woods, G.B., Versification in English Poetry, New York, Scott, Foresman, 1936.
- Woodworth, D.C., "The Unit of Sense With Especial Reference to Translation", in Classical Journal, Mar. 1937, p. 232 sq.