

292.—LET IT TO VIRTUE PROVE A GUIDE AND FRIEND.]

Ille bonis saveatque, &c.

"*The Chorus*," says the poet, "*is to take the side of the good and virtuous, i. e. is always to sustain a moral character. But this will need some explanation and restriction. To conceive aright of its office, we must suppose the _Chorus_ to be a number of persons, by some probable cause assembled together, as witnesses and spectators of the great action of the drama. Such persons, as they cannot be wholly uninterested in what passes before them, will very naturally bear some share in the representation. This will principally consist in declaring their sentiments, and indulging their reflexions freely on the several events and mistresses as they shall arise. Thus we see the *moral*, attributed to the Chorus, will be no other than the dictates of plain sense; such as must be obvious to every thinking observer of the action, who is under the influence of no peculiar partialities from *affection* or *interest*. Though even these may be supposed in cases, where the character, towards which they *draw*, is represented as virtuous.*"

"A Chorus, thus constituted, must always, it is evident, take the part of virtue; because this is the natural and almost necessary determination of mankind, in all ages and nations, when acting freely and unconstrained." *Notes on the Art of Poetry.*

297.—FAITHFUL AND SECRET.]—*Ille tegat commissa.*

On this *nice part* of the duty of the CHORUS the author of the English Commentary thus remarks.

"This important advice is not always easy to be followed. Much indeed will depend on the choice of the subject, and the artful constitution of the fable. *Yet, with all his care, the ablest writer will sometimes find himself embarrassed by the Chorus.* i would here be understood to speak chiefly of the moderns. For the antients, though it has not been attended to, had some peculiar advantages over us in this respect, resulting from the principles and practices of those times. For, as it hath been observed of the ancient epic Muse, that she borrowed much of her state and dignity from the false *theology* of

the pagan world, so, I think, it may be justly said of the ancient tragic, that she has derived great advantages of probability from its mistaken *moral*. If there be truth in this reflection, it will help to justify some of the ancient choirs, that have been most objected to by the moderns."

After two examples from Euripides; in one of which the trusty CHORUS conceals the premeditated *suicide* of Phaedra; and in the other abets Medea's intended *murder of her children*, both which are most ably vindicated by the Critick; the note concludes in these words.

"In sum, though these acts of severe avenging justice might not be according to the express letter of the laws, or the more refined conclusions of the PORCH or ACADEMY; yet there is no doubt, that they were, in the general account, esteemed fit and reasonable. And, it is to be observed, in order to pass a right judgment on the ancient Chorus, that, though in virtue of their office, they were obliged universally to sustain a moral character; yet this moral was rather political and popular, than strictly legal or philosophic. Which is also founded on good reason. The scope and end of the ancient theatre being to serve the interests of virtue and society, on the principles and sentiments, already spread and admitted amongst the people, and not to correct old errors, and instruct them in philosophic truth."

One of the censurers of Euripides, whose opinion is controverted in the above note, is Monsieur Dacier; who condemns *the CHORUS* in this instance, as not only violating their *moral* office, but *transgressing the laws of Nature and of God, by a fidelity*; so vicious and criminal, *that these women, [the Chorus!] ought to fly away in the Car of Medea, to escape the punishment due to them*. The Annotator above, agrees with the Greek Scholiast, that *the Corinthian women (the Chorus) being free*, properly desert the interests of Creon, and keep Medea's secrets, *for the sake of justice*, according to their custom. Dacier, however, urges an instance of their *infidelity* in the ION of Euripides, where they betray the secret of Xuthus to Creusa, which the French Critick defends on account of their attachment to their mistress; and adds, that the rule of Horace, like other rules, is proved by the exception. "Besides (continues the Critick in the true spirit of French gallantry) should we so heavily accuse the Poet for not having made *an assembly of women* keep a secret?" *D'ailleurs, peut on faire un si grand crime à un poete, de n'avoir pas fait en sorte qu'une troupe de femmes garde un secret?* He then concludes his note with blaming Euripides for the perfidy of Iphigenia at Tauris, who abandons these faithful guardians of her secret, by flying alone with Orestes, and leaving them to the fury of Thoas, to which they must have been exposed, but for the intervention of Minerva.

On the whole, it appears that the *moral importance of the CHORUS* must be considered *with some limitations*: or, at least, that *the CHORUS* is as liable to be misused and misapplied, as any part of modern Tragedy.

300.—*The pipe of old.*]—*Tibi, non ut nunc, &c.*

"This, says the author of the English Commentary, is one of those many passages in the epistle, about which the critics have said a great deal, without explaining any thing. In support of what I mean to offer, as the true interpretation, I observe,

"That the poet's intention certainly was not to censure the *false* refinements of their stage-music; but, in a short digressive history (such as the didactic form will sometimes require) to describe the rise and progress of the *true*. This I collect, I. From *the expression itself*; which cannot, without violence, be understood in any other way. For, as to the words *licentia* and *praeceps*, which have occasioned much of the difficulty, the *first* means a *freer use*, not a *licentiousness*, properly so called; and the *other* only expresses a vehemence and rapidity of language, naturally productive of a quicker elocution, such as must of course attend the more numerous harmony of the lyre:—not, as M. Dacier translates it, *une éloquence temeraire et outrée*, an extravagant straining and affectation of style. 2. From *the reason of the thing*; which makes it incredible, that the music of the theatre should then be most complete, when the times were barbarous, and entertainments of this kind little encouraged or understood. 3. From *the character of that music itself*; for the rudeness of which, Horace, in effect, apologizes in defending it only on the score of the imperfect state of the stage, and the simplicity of its judges."

The above interpretation of this part of the Epistle is, in my opinion, extremely just, and exactly corresponds with the explication of De Nores, who censures Madius for an error similar to that of Dacier. *Non rectè sentire videtur Madius, dum putat potius in Romanorum luxuriam_ invectum horatium, quam_ de melodiae incremento tractasse.*

The musick, having always been a necessary appendage to *the Chorus*, I cannot (as has already been hinted in the note on I. 100 of this version) confider the Poet's notice of the Pipe and Lyre, as a *digression*, notwithstanding it includes a short history of the rude simplicity of the Musick in the earlier ages of Rome, and of its subsequent improvements. *The Chorus* too, being originally *the whole*, as well as afterwards a legitimate *part* of Tragedy, the Poet naturally traces the Drama from its origin to its

most perfect state in Greece; and afterwards compares its progress and improvements with the Theatre of his own country. Such is, I think, the natural and easy *method* pursued by Horace; though it differs in some measure from the *order* and *connection* pointed out by the author of the English Commentary.

314.—For what, alas! could the unpractis'd ear Of rusticks revelling o'er country cheer, A motley groupe; high, low; and froth, and scum, Distinguish but shrill squeak, and dronish hum? —*Indoctus quid enim saperet, liberque laborum, Rusticus urbano confusus, turpis honesto?*

These lines, rather breaking in upon the continuity of the history of theatrical musick, *create* some obscurity, which has given birth, to various interpretations. The author of the English Commentary, who always endeavours to dive to the very bottom of his subject, understands this couplet of Horace as a *sneer* on those grave philosophers, who considered these *refinements* of the musick as *corruptions*. He interprets the passage at large, and explains the above two lines in these words. "Nor let it be objected than this *freer harmony* was itself an abuse, a corruption of the severe and *moral* musick of antient times. Alas! we were not as yet so *wise*, to see the inconveniences of this improvement. And how should we, considering the nature and end of these theatrical entertainments, and the sort of men of which our theatres were made up?"

This interpretation is ingenious; but Jason De Nores gives, I think, a more easy and unforced explanation of this difficult passage, by supposing it to refer (by way of *parenthesis*) to what had just been said of the original rude simplicity of the Roman theatrical musick, which, says the Poet, was at least as polished and refined as the taste of the audience. This De Nores urges in two several notes, both which I shall submit to the reader, leaving it to him to determine how far I am to be justified in having adapted my version to his interpretation.

The first of these notes contains at large his reproof of Madius for having, like Dacier, supposed the Poet to censure the improvements that he manifestly meant to commend.

Quare non recté videtur sentire Madius, dum putat potius in Romanorum luxuriam invectum Horatium, quàm de melodiae incremento tractasse, cùm seipsum interpretans, quid fibi voluerit per haec, luce clarius, ostendat,

Tibia non ut nunc orichalco vincta, tubaeque AEmula. Et,
Sic priscae motumque, & luxuriam addidit arti
Tibicen, traxitque vagus per pulpita vestem:
Sic etiam fidibus voces crevere feveris,
Et tulit eloquium infolitum fecundia praeceps.

Ad quid enim tam longâ digressionem extra, rem propositam in Romanos inveberetur, cum de iis nihil aliud dicat, quàm eos genio ac voluptatibus indulgere: cum potius veteres Romanos insimulare videatur inonorantiae, quod ignoraverint soni et musices venustatem et jucunditatem, illa priori scilicet incondita et rudi admodum contenti, dum ait; Indoctus quid enim saperet, liberque laborum, Rusticus urbano confusus, turpis honesto?

The other note is expressly applied by way of comment on this passage itself.

[Indoctus quidem saperet?] Reddit rationem quasiper digressionem, occurrens tacitae objectioni quare antea apud Romanos musica melodia parva aut nulla pene fuerat: quia, inquit, indocti ignarique rerum omnium veteres illi nondum poterant judicare de melodia, utpote apud eos re novâ, atque inufitatâ, neque illius jucunditatem degustare, quibus verbis imperitiam eorum, rusticatatemque demonstrat.

Upon the whole De Nores appears to me to have given the true sense of the passage. I am no friend to licentious transpositions, or arbitrary variations, of an author's text; yet I confess, I was strongly tempted, in order to elucidate his perplexed passage, to have carried these two lines of Horace four lines back, and to have inserted them immediately after the 207th verse.

Et frugi, castus, verecundusque coibat.

The English reader, who wishes to try the experiment, is desired to read the four lines, that compose my version, immediately after the 307th line,

With modest mirth indulg'd their sober taste.

318.—The Piper, grown luxuriant in his art.]

320.—*Now too, its powers increas'd, The Lyre severe.*]

Sic priscae—arti tibicen, &c. sic fidibus, &c.

"This is the application of what hath been said, in general, concerning the refinement of theatrical music to the case of *tragedy*. Some commentators say, and to *comedy*. But in this they mistake, as will appear presently. M. *Dacier* hath I know not what conceit about a comparison betwixt the *Roman* and *Greek* stage. His reason is, *that the lyre was used in the Greek chorus, as appears, he says, from Sophocles himself playing upon this instrument himself in one of his tragedies*. And was it not used too in the Roman chorus, as appears from Nero's playing upon it in several tragedies? But the learned critic did not apprehend this matter. Indeed from the caution, with which his guides, the dealers in antiquities, always touch this point, it should seem, that they too had no very clear conceptions of it. The case I take to have been this: The *tibia*, as being most proper to accompany the declamation of the acts, *cantanti fuccinere*, was constantly employed, as well in the Roman tragedy as comedy. This appears from many authorities. I mention only two from Cicero. *Quam multa* [Acad. 1. ii. 7.] *quae nos fugiunt in cantu, exaudiunt in eo genere exercitati: Qui, primo inflatu Tibicinis, Antiopam esse aiunt aut Andromacham, cum nos ne suspicemur quidem*. The other is still more express. In his piece entitled *Orator*, speaking of the negligence of the Roman writers, in respect of *numbers*, he observes, *that there were even many passages in their tragedies, which, unless the TIBIA played to them, could not be distinguished from mere prose: quae, nisi cum Tibicen accesserit, orationi sint solutae simillima*. One of these passages is expressly quoted from *Thyestes*, a tragedy of *Ennius*; and, as appears from the measure, taken out of one of the acts. It is clear then, that the *tibia* was certainly used in the *declamation* of tragedy. But now the song of the tragic chorus, being of the nature of the ode, of course required *fides*, the lyre, the peculiar and appropriated instrument of the lyric muse. And this is clearly collected, if not from express testimonies; yet from some occasional hints dropt by the antients. For, 1. the lyre, we are told, [Cic. De Leg. ii. 9. & 15.] and is agreed on all hands, was an instrument of the Roman theatre; but it was not employed in comedy, This we certainly know from the short accounts of the music prefixed to Terence's plays. 2. Further, the *tibicen*, as we saw, accompanied the declamation of the acts in tragedy. It remains then, that the proper place of the lyre was, where one should naturally look for it, in the songs of the chorus; but we need not go further than this very passage for a proof. It is unquestionable, that the poet is here speaking of the chorus only; the following lines not admitting any other possible interpretation. By *fidibus* then is necessarily understood the instrument peculiarly used in it. Not that it need be said that the *tibia* was never used in the chorus. The contrary seems expressed in a passage of Seneca, [Ep. ixxxiv.] and in Julius Pollux [1. iv. 15. §

107.] It is sufficient, if the *lyre* was used solely, or principally, in it at this time. In this view, the whole digression is more pertinent, and connects better. The poet had before been speaking of tragedy. All his directions, from 1. 100, respect this species of the drama only. The application of what he had said concerning music, is then most naturally made, 1. to the *tibia*, the music of the acts; and, 2. to *fides*, that of the choir: thus confining himself, as the tenor of this part required, to tragedy only. Hence is seen the mistake, not only of M. Dacier, whose comment is in every view insupportable; but, as was hinted, of Heinsius, Lambin, and others, who, with more probability, explained this of the Roman comedy and tragedy. For, though *tibia* might be allowed to stand for comedy, as opposed to *tragoedia*, [as in fact, we find it in 1. ii. Ep. I. 98,] that being the only instrument employed in it; yet, in speaking expressly of the music of the stage, *fides* could not determinately enough, and in contradistinction to *tibia*, denote that of tragedy, it being an instrument used solely, or principally, in the chorus; of which, the context shews, he alone speaks. It is further to be observed, that, in the application here made, besides the music, the poet takes in the other improvements of the tragic chorus, these happening, as from the nature of the thing they would do, at the same time. *Notes on the Art of Poetry.*

319.—with dance and flowing vest embellishes his part.]

Traxitque vagus per pulpita vestem.

"This expresses not only the improvement arising from the ornament of proper dresses, but from the grace of motion: not only the *actor*, whose peculiar office it was, but the *minstrel* himself, as appears from hence, conforming his gesture in some sort to the music.

"Of the use and propriety of these gestures, or dances, it will not be easy for us, who see no such things attempted on the modern stage, to form any very clear or exact notions. What we cannot doubt of is, 1. That the several theatrical dances of the ancients were strictly conformable to the genius of the different species of composition, to which they were applied. 2. That, therefore, the tragic dance, which more especially accompanied the Chorus, must have been expressive of the highest gravity and decorum, tending to inspire ideas of what is *becoming, graceful, and majestic*; in which view we cannot but perceive the important assistance it must needs lend to virtue, and how greatly it must contribute to set all her graces and attractions in the fairest light. 3. This idea of the ancient tragic dance, is not solely formed upon our knowledge of the

conformity before-mentioned; but is further collected from the name usually given to it, which was [Greek transliteration: Emmeleia] This word cannot well be translated into our language; but expresses all that grace and concinnity of motion, which the dignity of the choral song required. 4. Lastly, it must give us a very high notion of the moral effect of this dance, when we find the severe Plato admitting it into his commonwealth. *Notes on the Art of Poetry.*"

326—he who the prize, a filthy goat, to gain, at first contended in the tragick strain. *Carminē qui tragico, vilem certavit ob bircum.*

If I am not greatly deceived, all the Editors, and Commentators on this Epistle, have failed to observe, that the *historical* part of it, relative to the Graecian Drama, commences at this verse; all of them supposing it to begin, 55 lines further in the Epistle, on the mention of Thespis; whom Horace as early, as correctly, describes to be the first *improver*, not *inventor* of Tragedy, *whose* original he marks *here*. Much confusion has, I think, arisen from this oversight, as I shall endeavour to explain in the following notes; only observing this place, that the Poet, having spoken particularly of all the parts of Tragedy, now enters with the strictest *order*, and greatest propriety, into its general history, which, by his strictures on the chorus, he most elegantly, as well as forcibly, connects with his subject, taking occasion to speak *incidentally* of other branches of the Drama, particularly the satyre, and the Old Comedy

323—*Soon too—tho' rude, the graver mood unbroke, Stript the rought satyrs, and essay'd a joke. Mox etiam agrestes saytros, &c.*

"It is not the intention of these notes to retail the accounts of others. I must therefore refer the reader, for whatever concerns the history of the satiric, as I have hitherto done of the tragic and comic drama, to the numerous dissertators on the ancient stage; and, above all, so the case before us, to the learned Casaubon; from whom all that hath been said to any purpose, by modern writers, hath been taken. Only it will be proper to observe one or two particulars, which have been greatly misunderstood, and without which it will be impossible, in any tolerable manner, to explain what follows.

"I. The design of the poet, in these lines, is not to fix the origin of the satyric piece, in ascribing the invention of it to Thespis. This hath been concluded, without the least warrant from his own words, which barely tell us, 'that the representation of tragedy was in elder Greece followed by the *satires*;' and indeed the nature of the thing, as well

as the testimony of all antiquity, shews it to be impossible. For the *satire* here spoken of is, in all respects, a regular drama, and therefore could not be of earlier date than the times of Aeschylus, when the constitution of the drama was first formed. It is true indeed, there was a kind of entertainment of much greater antiquity, which by the antients is sometimes called *satyric*, out of which (as Aristotle assures us) tragedy itself arose, [Greek: *illegible] But then this was nothing but a chorus of satyrs [Athenaeus, l. xiv.] celebrating the festivals of *Bacchus*, with rude songs and uncouth dances; and had little resemblance to that which was afterwards called *satiric*; which, except that it retained the chorus of satyrs, and turned upon some subject relative to Bacchus, was of a quite different structure, and, in every respect, as regular a composition as tragedy itself."

"II. There is no doubt but the poem, here distinguished by the name of satyri, was in actual use on the Roman stage. This appears from the turn of the poet's whole criticism upon it. Particularly, his address to the Pisos, l. 235 and his observation of the offence which a loose dialogue in this drama would give to a *Roman* auditory, l. 248, make it evident that he had, in fact, the practice of his own stage in view."

"III. For the absolute merit of these satires, the reader will judge of it himself by comparing the Cyclops, the only piece of this kind remaining to us from antiquity, with the rules here delivered by Horace. Only it may be observed, in addition to what the reader will find elsewhere [n. l. 223.] apologized in its favour, that the double, character of the satires admirably fitted it, as well for a sensible entertainment to the wise, as for the sport and diversion of the vulgar. For, while the grotesque appearance and jesting vein of these fantastic personages amused the one, the other saw much further; and considered them, at the same time, as replete with science, and informed by a spirit of the most abstruse wisdom. Hence important lessons of civil prudence, interesting allusions to public affairs, or a high, refined moral, might, with the highest probability, be insinuated, under the slight cover of a rustic simplicity. And from this instructive cast, which from its nature must be very obscure, if not impenetrable, to us at this day, was, I doubt not, derived the principal pleasure which the antients found in this species of the drama. If the modern reader would conceive any thing of the nature and degree of this pleasure, he may in part guess at it, from reflecting on the entertainment he himself receives from the characters of the clowns in Shakespeare; *who, as the poet himself hath characterized them, use their folly, like a stalking horse, and, under the presentation of that, shoot their wit.*" [As you like it.]—*Notes on the Art of Poetry*. [Footnote: This, and all the extracts, which are quoted, *Notes on the Art of Poetry*, are taken from the author of the English Commentary.]

This learned note, I think, sets out with a misapprehension of the meaning of Horace, by involving his *instructions* on the Satyrick drama, with his account of its *Origin*. Nor does he, in the most distant manner, insinuate, tho' Dacier has asserted the same thing, that *the satyrs* owed their first introduction to *Thespis*; but relates, that the very Poets, who contended in *the Goat-Song*, to which tragedy owes its name, finding it too solemn and severe an entertainment for their rude holiday audience, interspersed the grave strains of tragedy with comick and *satyrical* Interludes, producing thereby a kind of medley, something congenial to what has appeared on our own stage, under the name of Tragi-comedy. Nor, if I am able to read and comprehend the context, so the words of Horace tell us, "that the representation of Tragedy was, in 'elder Greece,' *followed by the satyrs*." The Satyrs composed a part of the Tragedy in its infancy, as well as in the days of Horace, if his own words may be quoted as authority. On any other construction, his directions, concerning* the conduct of the *God* or *Hero* of the piece, are scarcely reconcilable to common sense; and it is almost impossible to mark their being incorporated with the Tragedy, in more expressive terms or images, than by his solicitude to prevent their broad mirth from contaminating its dignity or purity. *Essutire leves indigna tragaedia versus ut sestis matrona moveri jussa diebus, intererit satyris paulum pudibunda protervis.*

The cyclops of Euripides, the only Satyrick drama extant, written at a much later period, than that of which Horace speaks in this place, cannot, I think, convey to us a very exact idea of *the Tragick Pastorals*, whose *origin* he here describes. *The cyclops*, scarce exceeding 700 lines, might be played, according to the idea of some criticks, after another performance: but that cannot, without the greatest violence to the text, be supposed of the Satyrick piece here mentioned by Horace. The idea of *farces*, or *after-pieces*, tho' an inferior branch of the Drama, is, in fact, among the refinements of an improved age. The writers of an early period throw their dramattick materials, serious and ludicrous, into one mass; which the critical chymistry of succeeding times separates and refines. The modern stage, like the antient, owed its birth to the ceremonies of Religion. From *Mysteries* and *Moralities*, it proceeded to more regular Dramas, diversifying their serious scenes, like *the Satyrick* poets, with ludicrous representations. This desire of *variety* was one cause of the *agrestes satyros*. *Hos autem loco chori introductor intelligit, non, us quidam volunt, in ipsa tragoedia, cum praesertim dicat factum, ut grata novitate detinerentur spectatores: quod inter unum & alterum actum sit, chori loco. in tragoedia enim ipsa, cum flebilis, severa, ac gravis sit, non requiritur bujusmodi locorum, ludorumque levitas, quae tamen inter medios actus tolerari potest, & hoc est quod ait, incolumi gravitate. Ea enim quae sunt, quaeve dicuntur inter medios*

*actus, extra tragordiam esse intelligentur, neque imminuunt tragoedioe gravi*tem.*—
DE NORES.

The distinction made by *De Nores* of *the satyrs* not making a part of the tragedy, but barely appearing between the acts, can only signify, that the Tragick and Comick Scenes were kept apart from each other. This is plain from his laying that they held the place of the Chorus; not sustaining their continued part in the tragick dialogue, but filling their chief office of singing between the acts. The antient Tragedy was one continued representation, divided into acts by the Chant of *the CHORUS*; and, otherwise, according to modern ideas, forming *but one act*, without any interruption of the performance.

These antient Satyrick songs, with which the antient Tragedians endeavoured to enliven the Dithyrambicks, gave rise to two different species of poetry. Their rude jests and petulant raillery engendered *the Satire*; and their sylvan character produced *the Pastoral*.

328.—THO' RUDE, THE GRAVER MOOD UNBROKE—
Stript the rough Satyrs, and ESSAYED A JOKE

—Agrestes Satyros nudavis, & asper,
INCOLUMI GRAVITATE, jocum tentavit.

"It hath been shewn, that the poet could not intend, in these lines, to *fix the origin of the satiric drama*. But, though this be certain, and the dispute concerning that point be thereby determined, yet it is to be noted, that he purposely describes the satire in its ruder and less polished form; glancing even at some barbarities, which deform the Bacchic chorus; which was properly the satiric piece, before Aeschylus had, by his regular constitution of the drama, introduced it under a very different form on the stage. The reason of this conduit is given in *n.* on l. 203. Hence the propriety of the word *nudavit*, which Lambin rightly interprets, *nudos introduxit satyres*, the poet hereby expressing the monstrous indecorum of this entertainment in its first unimproved state. Alluding also to this ancient character of the *satire*, he calls him *asper*, i.e. rude and petulant; and even adds, that his jests were intemperate, and *without the least mixture of gravity*. For thus, upon the authority of a very ingenious and learned critic, I explain *incolumi gravitate*, i. e. rejecting every thing serious, bidding *farewell*, as we may say, *to all gravity*. Thus [L. in. O. 5.].

Incolumi Jove et urbe Româ:

i.e. bidding farewell to Jupiter [Capitolinus] and Rome; agreeably to what is said just before,

*Anciliorum et neminis et togae
OBLITUS, aeternaeque Vestae.*

or, as *salvus* is used more remarkably in Martial [I. v. 10.]

*Ennius est lectus salvo tibi, Roma, Marone: Et sua riserunt secula
Maeonidem.*

"_Farewell, all gravity, is as remote from the original sense of the words *fare well*, as *incolumi gravitate* from that of *incolumis*, or *salvo Morona* from that of *salvas*."

Notes on the Art of Poetry.

The beginning of this note does not, I think, perfectly accord with what has been urged by the same Critick in the note immediately preceding; He there observed, that the "satyr here spoken of, is, *in all respects*, a regular Drama, and therefore *could not be of earlier date*, than the times of Aeschylus.

Here, however, he allows, though in subdued phrase, that, "though this be certain, and the dispute concerning that point thereby determined, yet it is to be noted, *that he purposely describes the satyr* in its ruder and less polished form; *glancing even at some barbarities, which deform the bacchic chorus*; which was properly the Satyrick piece, *before Aeschylus* had, by his regular constitution of the Drama, introduced it, *under a very different form*, on the stage." In a subsequent note, the same learned Critick also says, that "the connecting particle, *verum*, [*verum ita risores, &c.*] expresses the opposition intended between the *original satyr* and that which the Poet approves." In both these passages the ingenious Commentator seems, from the mere influence of the context, to approach to the interpretation that I have hazarded of this passage, avowedly one of the most obscure parts of the Epistle. The explanation of the words *incolumi gravitate*, in the latter part of the above note, though favourable to the system of the English Commentary, is not only contrary to the construction of all other interpreters, and, I believe, unwarranted by any acceptation of the word *incolumis*, but, in my opinion, less elegant and forcible than the common interpretation.

The line of the Ode referred to,

INCOLUMI *Jove, et urbe Româ?*

was never received in the sense, which the learned Critick assigns to it.

The	Dauphin	Editor	interprets	it,		
STANTE <i>urbe,</i>	&	<i>Capitolino</i>	<i>Jove</i>	<i>Romanos</i>	<i>protegente.</i>	
Schrevelius,	to	the	same	effect,	explains	it,
SALVO <i>Capitolio, quae Jovis erat sedes.</i>						

These interpretations, as they are certainly the most obvious, seem also to be most consonant to the plain sense of the Poet.

330.—*For holiday spectators, flush'd and wild, With new conceits and mummeries were beguil'd. Quippe erat ILLECEBRIS, &c.*

Monsieur Dacier, though he allows that "all that is here said by Horace proves *incontestibly*, that the Satyrick Piece had possession of the Roman stage;" *tout ce qu' Horace dit icy prouve incontestablement qu'il y avoit des Satyres*; yet thinks that Horace lavished all these instructions on them, chiefly for the sake of the atellane fables. The author of the English Commentary is of the same opinion, and labours the point very assiduously. I cannot, however, discover, in any part of Horace's discourse on *the satyrs*, one expression glancing towards *the atellanes*, though their oscan peculiarities might easily have been marked, so as not to be mistaken.

335.—*That GOD or HERO of the lofty scene, May not, &c. Ne quicumque DEUS, &c.*

The Commentators have given various explanations of this precept. *De Nores* interprets it to signify *that the same actor, who represented a God or Hero in the Tragick part of the Drama, must not be employed to represent a Faun or Sylvan in the Satyrick.* _Dacier has a strange conceit concerning the joint performance of a *Tragedy* and *Atellane* at one time, the same God or Hero being represented as the principal subject and character of both; on which occasion, (says he) the Poet recommends to the author not to debase the God, or Hero of *the Tragedy*, by sinking

his language and manners too low in *the atellane*; whose stile, as well as measure, should be peculiar to itself, equally distant from Tragedy and Farce.

The author of the English Commentary tells us, that "Gods and Heroes were introduced as well into the *Satyrick as Tragick* Drama, and often the very same Gods and Heroes, which had born a part in THE PRECEDING TRAGEDY; a practice, which Horace, I suppose, intended, by this hint, to recommend as most regular."

The two short notes of Schrevelius, in my opinion, more clearly explain the sense of Horace, and are in these words.

Poema serium, jocos Satyricis ita commiscere—ne seilicet is, qui paulo ante DEI instar aut herois in scenam fuit introductus, postea lacernosus prodeat.

On the whole, supposing *the Satyrick Piece* to be *Tragi-Comick*, as Dacier himself seems half inclined to believe, the precept of Horace only recommends to the author so to support his principal personage, that his behaviour in the *Satyrick* scenes shall not debase the character he has sustained in the *TRAGICK*. No specimen remaining of the Roman *Satyrick Piece*, I may be permitted to illustrate the rule of Horace by a brilliant example from the *seroi-comick* Histories of the Sovereign of our Drama. The example to which I point, is the character of *the Prince of Wales*, in the two Parts of *Henry the Fourth*, Such a natural and beautiful decorum is maintained in the display of that character, that the *Prince* is as discoverable in the loose scenes with Falstaff and his associates, as in the Presence Chamber, or the closet. after *the natural*, though mixt dramas, of Shakespear, and Beaumont and Fletcher, had prevailed on our stage, it is surprising that our progress to *pure* Tragedy and Comedy, should have been interrupted, or disturbed, by *the regular monster* of *Tragi-comedy*, nursed by Southerne and Dryden.

346.—LET ME NOT, PISOS, IN THE SYLVIAN SCENE, USE ABJECT TERMS ALONE, AND PHRASES MEAN]

Non ego INORNATA & DOMINANTIA, &c.

The author of the English Commentary proposes a conjectural emendation of Horace's text—*honodrata* instead of *inornata*—and accompanied with a new and elevated sense assigned to the word *dominantia*. This last word is interpreted in the

same manner by *de Nores*. Most other Commentators explain it to signify *common words*, observing its analogy to the Greek term [Greek: kuria]. The same expression prevails in our own tongue—a reigning *word*, _a reigning *fashion*, &c. the general cast of *the satyr*, seems to render a caution against a lofty stile not very necessary; yet it must be acknowledged that such a caution is given by the Poet, exclusive of the above proposed variation.

*Ne quicumque DEUS—— Migret in obscuras HUMILI
SERMONE tabernas, Aut dum vitat humum, NUBES & INANIA CAPTET.*

350.—*Davus may jest, &c.]—Davusne loquatur, &c.*

It should seem from hence, that the common characters of Comedy, as well as the Gods and Heroes of Tragedy, had place in *the Satyrick Drama*, cultivated in the days of Horace. Of the manner in which the antient writers sustained the part of Silenus, we may judge from *the CYCLOPS* of Euripides, and *the Pastorals* of Virgil.

Vossius attempts to shew from some lines of this part of the Epistle, [*Ne quicumque Deus, &c.*] that *the satyrs* were *subjoined* to the Tragick scenes, not *incorporated* with them: and yet at the same moment he tells us, and with apparent approbation, that Diomedes quotes our Poet to prove that they were blended with each other: *simul ut spectator*, inter res tragicas, seriasque, satyrorum quoque jocis, & lusibus, *delectaretur*.

I cannot more satisfactorily conclude all that I have to urge, on the subject of the Satyrick Drama, as here described by Horace, than by one more short extract from the notes of the ingenious author of the English Commentary, to the substance of which extract I give the most full assent. "The Greek Drama, we know, had its origin from the loose, licentious raillery of the rout of Bacchus, indulging to themselves the freest follies of taunt and invective, as would best suit to lawless natures, inspirited by festal mirth, and made extravagant by wine. Hence arose, and with a character answering to this original, the *Satiric Drama*; the spirit of which was afterwards, in good measure, revived and continued in the Old Comedy, and itself preferred, though with considerable alteration in the form, through all the several periods of the Greek stage; even when Tragedy, which arose out of it, was brought to its last perfection."

368.—_To a short syllable, a long subjoin'd, Forms an _IAMBICK FOOT.] *Syllaba longa, brevi subietta, vocatur Iambus.*

Horace having, after the example of his master Aristotle, slightly mentioned the first rise of Tragedy in the form of a Choral Song, subjoining an account of *the* Satyrick Chorus, that was *soon* (*mox etiam*) combined with it, proceeds to speak particularly of the Iambick verse, which he has before mentioned generally, as the measure best accommodated to the Drama. In this instance, however, the Poet has trespassed against *the order and method* observed by his philosophical guide; and by that trespass broken the thread of his history of the Drama, which has added to the difficulty and obscurity of this part of his Epistle. Aristotle does not speak of *the* Measure, till he has brought Tragedy, through all its progressive stages, from the Dithyrambicks, down to its establishment by Aeschylus and Sophocles. If the reader would judge of the *poetical beauty*, as well as *logical precision*, of such an arrangement, let him transfer this section of the Epistle [beginning, in the original at v. 251. and ending at 274.] to the end of the 284th line; by which transposition, or I am much mistaken, he will not only disembarass this historical part of it, relative to the Grascian stage, but will pass by a much easier, and more elegant, transition, to the Poet's application of the narrative to the Roman Drama,

The English reader, inclined to make the experiment, must take the lines of the translation from v. 268. to v. 403, both inclusive, and insert them after v. 418.

In shameful silence loft the pow'r to wound.

It is further to be observed that this detail on *the* IAMBICK is not, with strict propriety, annexed to a critical history of *the* SATYR, in which, as Aristotle insinuates insinuates, was used *the* Capering *Tetrameter*, and, as the Grammarians observe, *Trisyllabicks*.

394.—PISOS! BE GRAECIAN MODELS, &c.]

Pope has imitated and illustrated this passage.

Be	Homer's	works	your	study	and	delight,	
Read	them	by	day,	and	meditate	by	night;
Thence	form	your	judgment,	thence	your	maxims	bring,
And	trace	the	Muses	upwards	to	their	spring.

Still with itself compar'd, his text peruse!
And let your comment be the Mantuan Muse!

Essay on Criticism.

404.—A KIND OF TRAGICK ODE, UNKNOWN BEFORE, THESPI, 'TIS SAID, INVENTED FIRST. IGNOTUM *Tragicae* GENUS INVENISSE *Camaenae Dicitur*, &c.

It is surprising that Dacier, who, in a controversial note, in refutation of Heinsius, has so properly remarked Horace's adherence to Aristotle, should not have observed that his history of the Drama opens and proceeds nearly in the same order. Aristotle indeed does not name Thespis, but we cannot but include his improvements among the changes, to which the Critick refers, before Tragedy acquired a permanent form under *AEschylus*. Thespis seems not only to have embodied *the* CHORUS, but to have provided a theatrical apparatus for an itinerant exhibition; to have furnished disguises for his performers, and to have broken the continuity of *the* CHORUS by an *Interlocutor*; to whom *AEschylus* adding another personage, thereby first created Dramatick Dialogue; while at the same time by a *further diminution of the* CHORUS, by improving the dresses of the actors, and drawing them from their travelling waggon to a fixt stage, he created *a regular theatre*.

It appears then that neither Horace, nor Aristotle, ascribe *the origin* of Tragedy to Thespis. the Poet first mentions the rude beginning of Tragedy, (*carmen tragicum*) *the* Goat-song; he then speaks of *the Satyrick Chorus*, soon after interwoven with it; and then proceeds to the *improvements* of these Bacchic Festivities, by Thespis, and *AEschylus*; though their perfection and final establishment is ascribed by Aristotle to Sophocles. Dacier very properly renders this passage, *On dit que Thespis fut le premier jui inventa une especie de tragedie auparavant inconnue aux Grecs*. Thespis is said to be the first inventor of a species of Tragedy, before unknown to the Greeks.

Boileau seems to have considered this part of the Epistle in the same light, that I have endeavoured to place it.

La Tragedie informe & grossiere au naissant n'etoit qu'un simple Choeur, ou chacun en danfant, et du Dieu des Raisins entonnant les louanges, s'essorçoit d'attirer de fertiles vendanges. la le vin et la joie eveillant les esprits, *du plus habile chantré un Bouc étoit le prix*. Thespis sut le premier, qui barbouillé de

lie, promena par les bourgs cette heureuse folie; et d'acteurs mal ornés chargeant un tombereau, amusa les passans d'un spectacle nouveau. aeschyle dans le Choeur jetta les personnages; d'un masque plus honnête habilla les visages: sur les ais d'un Theatre en public exhaussé, fit paroître l'acteur d'un brodequin chaussé.

L'art poetique, *chant troisieme.*

417.—*the sland'rous Chorus drown'd In shameful silence, lost the pow'r to wound.*

Chorusque turpiter obticuit, *sublato jure nocendi.*

"Evidently because, though the *jus nocendi* was taken away, yet that was no good reason why the Chorus should entirely cease. M. Dacier mistakes the matter. *Le choeur se tût ignominuesement, parce-que la hi reprimasa licence, et que ce sut, à proprement parler, la hi qui le bannit; ce qu' Horace regarde comme une espece de siétrissure. Properly speaking, the law only abolished the abuse of the chorus. The ignominy lay in dropping the entire use of it, on account of this restraint. Horace was of opinion, that the chorus ought to have been retained, though the state had abridged it of the licence, it so much delighted in, of an illimited, and intemperate satire, Sublatus chorus fuit, says Scaliger, _cujus illae videntur esse praecipuae partet, ut potissimum ques liberet, laedertnt."*

Notes on the Art of Poetry._ If Dacier be mistaken in this instance, his mistake is common to all the commentators; not one of whom, the learned and ingenious author of the above he excepted, has been able to extract from these words any marks of Horace's predilection in favour of a Chorus, or censure of "its culpable omission" in Comedy. De Nores expresses the general sense of the Criticks on this passage.

[Turpiter.] *Quia lex, declaratâ Veteris Conaetdiae scriptorum improbitate, a maledicendi licentiâ deterruit.—Sicuti enim antea summâ cum laude Vetus Comediae, accepta est, ita postea summa est cum turpitudine vetantibus etiam legibus repudiata, quia probis hominibus, quia sapientibus, quia inte*s maledixerit. Quare Comaediae postea conscriptae ad hujusce Veteris differentiam sublato choro, novae appellatae sunt.*

What Horace himself says on a similar occasion, of the suppression of the Fescennine verses, in the Epistle to Augustus, is perhaps the best comment on this passage.

"II. Next, which should ever be one great point in view, it renders the drama more generally useful in its moral destination. For, it being conversant about domestic acts, the great instruction of the fable more sensibly affects us; and the characters exhibited, from the part we take in their good or ill qualities, will more probably influence our conduct.

"III. Lastly, this judgment will deserve the greater regard, as the conduct recommended was, in fact, the practice of our great models, the Greek writers; in whose plays, it is observable, there is scarcely a single scene, which lies out of the confines of Greece.

"But, notwithstanding these reasons, the practice hath, in all times, been but little followed. The Romans, after some few attempts in this way (from whence the poet took the occasion of delivering it as a dramatic precept), soon relapsed into their old use; as appears from Seneca's, and the titles of other plays, written in, or after the Augustan age. Succeeding times continued the same attachment to Grecian, with the addition of an equal fondness for Roman, subjects. The reason in both instances hath been ever the same: that strong and early prejudice, approaching somewhat to adoration, in favour of the illustrious names of those two great states. The account of this matter is very easy; for their writings, as they furnish the business of our younger, and the amusement of our riper, years; and more especially make the study of all those, who devote themselves to poetry and the stage, insensibly infix in us an excessive veneration for all affairs in which they were concerned; insomuch, that no other subjects or events seem considerable enough, or rise, in any proportion, to our ideas of the dignity of the tragic scene, but such as time and long admiration have consecrated in the annals of their story. Our Shakespeare was, I think, the first that broke through this bondage of classical superstition. And he owed this felicity, as he did some others, to his want of what is called the advantage of a learned education. Thus uninfluenced by the weight of early prepossession, he struck at once into the road of nature and common sense: and without designing, without knowing it, hath left us in his historical plays, with all their anomalies, an exacter resemblance of the Athenian stage, than is any where to be found in its most processed admirers and copyists.

"I will only add, that, for the more successful execution of this rule of celebrating domestic acts, much will depend on the aera, from whence the subject is taken. Times too remote have almost the same inconveniences, and none of the advantages, which attend the ages of Greece and Rome. And for those of later date, they are too much familiarized to us, and have not as yet acquired that venerable cast and air, which tragedy demands, and age only can give. There is no fixing this point with precision. In

the general, that aera is the fittest for the poet's purpose, which, though fresh enough in pure minds to warm and interest us in the event of the action, is yet at so great a distance from the present times, as to have lost all those mean and disparaging circumstances, which unavoidably adhere to recent deeds, and, in some measure, sink the noblest modern transactions to the level of ordinary life."

Notes on the Art of Poetry.

The author of the essay on the writings and genius of Pope elegantly forces a like opinion, and observes that Milton left a list of thirty-three subjects for Tragedy, all taken from the English Annals.

423.—_Whether the gown prescrib'd a stile more mean, or the inwoven purple rais'd the scene.

Vel qui praetextas, vel qui docuere togatas._

The gown (*Toga*) being the common Roman habit, signifies *Comedy*; and the inwoven purple (*praetexta*) being appropriated to the higher orders, refers to Tragedy. *Togatae* was also used as a general term to denote all plays, which the habits, manners, and arguments were Roman; those, of which the customs and subjects were Graecian, like the Comedies of Terence, were called *Palliatae*.

429.—But you, bright heirs of the Pompilian Blood, Never the verse approve, &c.

Vos, O Pompilius Sanguis, &c.

The English commentary exhibits a very just and correct analysis of this portion of the Epistle, but neither here, nor in any other part of it, observes the earnestness with which the poet, on every new topick, addresses his discourse *the Pisos*; a practice, that has not passed unnoticed by other commentators.

[On this passage De Nores writes thus. *Vos O Pompilius Sanguis!*] *Per apostrophem sermonem convertit ad pisones, eos admonens, ut sibi caveant ab bujusmodi romanorum poetarum errore videtur autem eos ad attentionem excitare dum ait, Vos O! et quae sequuntur.*

434.—*Because DEMOCRITUS, &c.] Excludit sanos Helicone poetas Democritus.*

De Nores has a comment on this passage; but the ambiguity of the Latin relative renders it uncertain, how far the Critick applies particularly to *the Pisos*, except by the *Apostrophe* taken notice of in the last note. His words are these. *Nisi horum democriticorum opinionem horatius hoc in loco refutasset, frustra de poetica facultate in hac AD PISONES EPISTOLA praecepta literis tradidisset, cùm arte ipsâ repudiâtâ, ab his tantummodo insaniae & furori daretur locus.*

443.—*Which no vile CUTBERD'S razor'd hands profane. Tonfori LYCINO.]*

Lycinus was not only, as appears from Horace, an eminent Barber; but said, by some, to have been created a Senator by Augustus, on account of his enmity to Pompey.

466.—ON NATURE'S PATTERN TOO I'LL BID HIM LOOK, AND COPY MANNERS FROM HER LIVING BOOK.]

Respicere exemplar vitae, morumque jubebo doctum imitatore, & veras hinc ducere voces.

This precept seeming, at first sight, liable to be interpreted as recommending *personal imitations*, *De Nores*, *Dacier*, and the Author of the English Commentary, all concur to inculcate the principles of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero, shewing that the truth of representation (*verae voces*) must be derived from an imitation of *general nature*, not from copying *individuals*. Mankind, however, being a mere collection of *individuals*, it is impossible for the Poet, not to found his observations on particular objects; and his chief skill seems to consist in the happy address, with which he is able to *generalize* his ideas, and to sink the likeness of the individual in the resemblance of universal nature. A great Poet, and a great Painter, have each illustrated this doctrine most happily; and with their observations I shall conclude this note.

Chacun peint avec art dans ce nouveau miroir,
S'y vit avec plaisir, ou crut ne s'y point voir.

L'Avare des premiers rit du tableau fidele
D'un Avare, souvent tracé sur son modèle;
Et mille fois un Fat, finement exprimé,
Méconnut le portrait, sur lui-même formé.

BOILEAU, *L'Art Poet.* ch. iii.

"Nothing in the art requires more attention and judgment, or more of that power of discrimination, which may not improperly be called Genius, than the steering between general ideas and individuality; for tho' the body of the whole must certainly be composed by the first, in order to communicate a character of grandeur to the whole, yet a dash of the latter is sometimes necessary to give an interest. An individual model, copied with scrupulous exactness, makes a mean stile like the Dutch; and the neglect of an actual model, and the method of proceeding solely from idea, has a tendency to make the Painter degenerate into a mannerist.

"It is necessary to keep the mind in repair, to replace and refreshen those impressions of nature, which are continually wearing away.

"A circumstance mentioned in the life of Guido, is well worth the attention of Artists: He was asked from whence he borrowed his idea of beauty, which is acknowledged superior to that of every other Painter; he said he would shew all the models he used, and ordered a common Porter to sit before him, from whom he drew a beautiful countenance; this was intended by Guido as an exaggeration of his conduct; but his intention was to shew that he thought it necessary to have *some model* of nature before you, however you deviate from it, and correct it from the idea which you have formed in your mind of *perfect beauty*.

"In Painting it is far better to have a *model* even to *depart* from, than to have nothing fixed and certain to determine the idea: There is something then to proceed on, something to be corrected; so that even supposing that no part is taken, the model has still been not without use.

"Such habits of intercourse with nature, will at least create that *variety* which will prevent any one's prognosticating what manner of work is to be produced, on knowing the subject, which is the most disagreeable character an Artist can have."

Sir Joshua Reynolds's Notes on Fresnoy.

480.—ALBIN'S HOPEFUL.] *Filius ALBINI*

Albinus was said to be a rich Usurer. All that is necessary to explain this passage to the English reader, is to observe, that *the Roman Pound consisted of Twelve Ounces.*

487.—_Worthy the _Cedar *and the Cypress.*]

The antients, for the better preservation of their manuscripts, rubbed them with the juice of *Cedar*, and kept them in cases of *Cypress.*

496.—Shall Lamia in our sight her sons devour, and give them back alive the self-same hour?]

Neu pranse Lamiae vivum puerum extrabat alvo.

Alluding most probably to some Drama of the time, exhibiting so monstrous and horrible an incident.

503.—The Sosii] Roman booksellers.

523.—Chaerilus.] A wretched poet, who celebrated the actions, and was distinguished by the patronage, of Alexander.

527.—If Homer seem to nod, or chance to dream.]

It may not be disagreeable to the reader to see what two poets of our own country have said on this subject.

—foul descriptions are offensive still, either for being *like*, or being *ill*. For who, without a qualm, hath ever look'd on holy garbage, tho' by Homer cook'd?

never more happily blended. The Poet assumes the air of a father advising his son, rather than of a teacher instructing his pupils. Many Criticks have thrown out a cursory observation or two, as it were extorted from them by the pointed expressions of the Poet: but none of them, that I have consulted, have attempted to assign any reason, why Horace, having closed his particular precepts, addresses all the remainder of his Epistle, on the nature and expediency of Poetical pursuits, to _the Elder Piso only. I have endeavoured to give the most natural reason for this conduct; a reason which, if I am not deceived, renders the whole of the Epistle interesting, as well as clear and consistent; a reason which I am the more inclined to think substantial, as it confirms in great measure the system of the Author of the English Commentary, only shewing _the reflections on the drama in _this Epistle, as well as in the Epistle to Augustus, to be *incidental*, rather than the *principal subject, and main design*, of the Poet,

Jason De Nores, in this instance, as in most others, has paid more attention to his Author, than the rest of the Commentators. His note is as follows.

[O major juvenum!] _Per apostrophem _ad majorem natu __ex pisonibus convertis orationem, reddit rationem quare summum, ac perfectissimum poema esse debeat utitur autem proaemio quasi quodam ad _benevolentiam & attentionem _comparandum sumit autem _benevolentiam à *patris & filii laudibus*: attentionem_, dum ait, "hoc tibi dictum tolle memor!" quasi dicat, per asseverationem, _firmum _omninò et _verum.

543.—_Boasts not *MESSALA'S PLEADINGS*, nor is deem'd *AULUS IN JURISPRUDENCE*.]

The Poet, with great delicacy, throws in a compliment to these distinguished characters of his time, for their several eminence in their profession. Messala is more than once mentioned as the friend and patron of Horace.

562.—*Forty thousand sesterces a year.*]

The pecuniary qualification for the Equestrian Order. *Census equestrem summam nummorum*.

565.—*Nothing*, IN SPITE OF GENIUS, YOU'LL *commence*]

Tu nihil, invitâ dices faciesve Minervâ.

Horace, says Dacier, here addresses the Elder Piso, as a man of mature years and understanding; *and he begins with panegyrick, rather than advice, in order to soften the precepts he is about to lay down to him.*

The explication of De Nores is much to the same effect, as well as that of many other Commentators.

567.—But grant you should hereafter write. *Si quid tamen olim scripseris.*]

"This," says Dacier, "was some time afterwards actually the case, if we may believe the old Scholiast, who writes that *_this_ _PISO composed Tragedies.*"

568.—Metius.] A great Critick; and said to be appointed by Augustus as a Judge, to appreciate the merit of literary performances. His name and office are, on other occasions, mentioned and recognized by Horace.

570.—Weigh the work well, AND KEEP IT BACK NINE YEARS! *nonumque prematur in annum!*]

This precept, which, like many others in the Epistle, is rather retailed, than invented, by Horace, has been thought by some Criticks rather extravagant; but it acquires in this place, as addressed to the elder Piso, a concealed archness, very agreeable to the Poet's stile and manner. Pope has applied the precept with much humour, but with more open raillery than need the writer's purpose in this Epistle.

I drop at last, but in unwilling ears,
This wholesome counsel——KEEP YOUR PIECE NINE YEARS!

Vida, in his Poeticks, after the strongest censure of carelessness and precipitation, concludes with a caution against too excessive an attention to correctness, too frequent revisals, and too long delay of publication. The passage is as elegant as judicious.

Verùm esto hic etiam modus: huic imponere curae
 Nescivere aliqui finem, medicasque secandis
 Morbis abstinuisse manus, & parcere tandem
 Immites, donec macie confectus et aeger
 Aruit exhausto velut omni sanguine foetus,
 Nativumque decus posuit, dum plurima ubique
 Deformat sectos artus inhonesta cicatrix.
 Tuque ideo vitae usque memor brevioris, ubi annos
 Post aliquot (neque enim numerum, neque temporar pono
 certa tibi) addideris decoris satis, atque nitoris,
 Rumpe moras, opus ingentem dimitte per orbem,
 Perque manus, perque ora virum permitte vagari.

POETIC. lib 3.

592.—AND ON THE SACRED TABLET GRAVE THE LAW. LEGES INCIDERE LIGNO.]

Laws were originally written in verse, and graved on wood. The Roman laws were engraved on copper. DACIER.

595.—TYRTAEUS.] An ancient Poet, who is said to have been given to the Spartans as a General by the Oracle, and to have animated the Troops by his Verses to such a degree, as to be the means of their triumph over the Messenians, after two defeats: to which Roscommon alludes in his *Essay on translated Verse*.

When by impulse from Heav'n, Tyrtaeus sung,
 In drooping soldiers a new courage sprung;
 Reviving Sparta now the fight maintain'd,
 And what two Gen'ral's lost, a Poet gain'd.

Some fragments of his works are still extant. They are written in the Elegiac measure; yet the sense is not, as in other Poets, always bound in by the Couplet; but often breaks out into the succeeding verse: a practice, that certainly gives variety and animation to the measure; and which has been successfully imitated in the *rhime* of our own language by Dryden, and other good writers.

604.—_Deem then with rev'rence, &c]

Ne forte pudori Sit tibi MUSA, Lyrae solers, & Cantor Apollo.

The author of the English Commentary agrees, that this noble encomium on Poetry is addressed to *the Pisos*. All other Commentators apply it, as surely the text warrants, to *the ELDER PISO*. In a long controversial note on this passage, the learned Critick abovementioned also explains the text thus. "In fact, this whole passage [from *et vitae, &c.* to *cantor Apollo*] obliquely glances at the two sorts of poetry, peculiarly cultivated by himself, and is an indirect apology for his own choice of them. For 1. *vitae monstrata via est*, is the character of his *Sermones*. And 2. all the rest of his *Odes*"—"I must add, the very terms of the Apology so expressly define and characterize Lyrick Poetry, that it is something strange, it should have escaped vulgar notice." There is much ingenuity in this interpretation, and it is supported, with much learning and ability; yet I cannot think that Horace meant to conclude this fine encomium, on the dignity and excellence of the Art or Poetry, by a partial reference to the two particular species of it, that had been the objects of his own attention. The Muse, and Apollo, were the avowed patrons and inspirers of Poetry in general, whether Epick, Dramatick, Civil, Moral, or Religious; all of which are enumerated by Horace in the course of his panegyrick, and referred to in the conclusion of it, that Piso might not for a moment think himself degraded by his attention to Poetry.

In hoc epilago reddit breviter rationem, quare utilitates à poetis mortalium vitae allatas resenfuerit: ne scilicet Pisones, ex nobilissimâ Calpurniorum familiâ ortos, Musarum & Artis Poeticae quam profitebantur, aliquando paniteret.

DE NORES.

Haec, inquit, eo recensui, ut quam olim res arduas poetica tractaverit, cognoscas, & ne Musas coutemnas, atque in Poetarum referri numerum, erubescas.

NANNIUS.

Ne forte, pudori. Haec dixi, O Piso, ne te pudeat Poetam esse.
SCHREVELIUS.

608.—WHETHER GOOD VERSE or NATURE is THE FRUIT, OR RAIS'D BY ART, HAS LONG BEEN IN DISPUTE.]

In writing precepts for poetry to *young persons*, this question could not be forgotten. Horace therefore, to prevent the Pisos from falling into a fatal error, by too much confidence in their Genius, asserts most decidedly, that Nature and Art must both conspire to form a Poet. DACIER.

The Duke of Buckingham has taken up this subject very happily.

Number *and* *Rhyme*, and that harmonious found,
Which never *does* the ear with harshness wound,
Are necessary, yet but vulgar arts;
For all in vain these superficial parts
Contribute to the structure of the whole,
Without a GENIUS too; for that's the Soul!
A spirit, which inspires the work throughout,
As that of Nature moves the world about.

As all is dullness, where the Fancy's bad,
So without Judgement, Fancy is but mad:
And Judgement has a boundless influence,
Not only in the choice of words, or sense,
But on the world, on manners, and on men;
Fancy is but the feather of the pen:
Reason is that substantial useful part,
Which gains the head, while t'other wins the heart.

Essay on Poetry.

626.—As the fly hawker, &t. Various Commentator concur in marking the personal application of this passage.

Faithful friends are necessary, to apprise a Poet of his errors: but such friends are rare, and difficult to be distinguished by rich and powerful Poets, like the Pisos. DACIER.

Pisonem admonet, ut minime hoc genus divitum poetarum imitetur, neminemque vel jam pranfum, aut donatum, ad fuorum carminum emendationem admittat neque enim poterit ille non vehementer laudare, etiamsi vituperanda videantur. DE NORES.

In what sense Roscommon, the Translator of this Epistle, understood this passage, the following lines from another of his works will testify.

I pity from my foul unhappy men,
Compell'd by want to prostitute their pen:
Who must, like lawyers, either starve or plead,
And follow, right or wrong, where guineas lead:
But you, POMPILIAN, wealthy, pamper'd Heirs,
Who to your country owe your swords and cares,
Let no vain hope your easy mind seduce!
For rich ill poets are without excuse.
"Tis very dang'rous, tamp'ring with a Muse;
The profit's small, and you have much to lose:
For tho' true wit adorns your birth, or place,
Degenerate lines degrade th' attainted race."

Essay on Translated Verse.

630.—*But if he keeps a table, &c.—Si vero est unctum, &c.*

"Here (says *Dacier*) the Poet pays, *en passant*, a very natural and delicate compliment to *the Pisos*." The drift of the Poet is evident, but I cannot discover the compliment.

636.—*Is there a man, to whom you've given ought, Or mean to give?*

TU, *seu donaris, &c.*

Here the Poet advises the Elder Piso never to read his verses to a man, to whom he has made a promise, or a present: a venal friend cannot be a good Critick; he will not speak his mind freely to his patron; but, like a corrupt judge, betray truth and justice for the sake of interest. DACIER.

643.—*Kings have been said to ply repeated bowls, &c.*

Reges dicuntur, &c.

Regum exemplo Pisones admonet; ut neminem admittant ad suorum carminum emendationem, nisi prius optimè cognitum, atque perspectum. DE NORES.

654.—[QUINTILIUS.] The Poet *Quintilius Varus*, the relation and intimate friend of Virgil and Horace; of whom the latter lamented his death in a pathetick and beautiful Ode, still extant in his works. Quintilius appears to have been some time dead, at the time of our Poet's writing this Epistle. DACIER.

[QUINTILIUS.] *Descriptis adulatorum moribus & consuetudine, assert optimi & sapientissimi judicis exemplum: Quintilii soilicet, qui tantae erat authoritatis apud Romanos, ut ei Virgilii opera Augustus tradiderit emendanda.*

664.—THE MAN, IN WHOM GOOD SENSE AND HONOUR JOIN.]

It particularly suited Horace's purpose to paint the severe and rigid judge of composition. Pope's plan admitted softer colours in his draught of a true Critick.

But where's the man, who counsel can bestow,
Still pleas'd to teach, and yet not proud to know?
Unbiass'd, or by favour, or by spite;
Not dully prepossess'd, nor blindly right;
Tho' learn'd, well-bred; and tho' well-bred, sincere;
Modestly bold, and humanly severe:

Who to a friend his faults can freely show,
And gladly praise the merit of a foe?
Blest with a taste exact, yet unconfin'd;
A knowledge both of books and human kind;
Gen'rous converse; a soul exempt from pride;
And love to praise, with reason on his side?

Essay on Criticism.

684.—WHILE WITH HIS HEAD ERECT HE THREATS THE SKIES.]

"Horace, (says *Dacier*) diverts himself with describing the folly of a Poet, whom his flatterers have driven mad." *To whom* the caution against flatterers was addressed, has before been observed by *Dacier*. This description therefore, growing immediately out of that caution, must be considered as addressed *to* the Elder Piso.

699.—*Leap'd COLDLY into AEtna's burning mount.*

Ardentem FRIGIDUS aetnam insiluit.

This is but a cold conceit, not much in the usual manner of Horace.

710.—

*Whether, the victim of incestuous love, THE SACRED MONUMENT he
striv'd to move.*

An TRISTE BIDENTAL moverit incestus.

The BIDENTAL was a place that had been struck with lightning, and afterwards expiated by the erection of an altar and the sacrifice of sheep; *hostiis BIDENTIBUS*; from which it took its name. The removal or disturbance of this sacred monument was

deemed sacrilege; and the attempt, a supposed judgement from heaven, as a punishment for some heavy crime.

718.—

HANGS ON HIM, NE'ER TO QUIT, WITH CEASELESS SPEECH. TILL GORG'D, AND FULL OF BLOOD, A VERY LEECH.

The English Commentary introduces the explication of the last hundred and eleven lines of this Epistle, the lines which, I think, determine the scope and intention of the whole, in the following manner.

"Having made all the reasonable allowances which a writer could expect, he (Horace) goes on to enforce *the general instruction of this part, viz.* A diligence in writing, by shewing [from l. 366 to 379] that a *mediocrity*, however tolerable, or even commendable, it might be in other arts, would never be allowed in this."—"This reflection leads him with great advantage [from l. 379 to 391] to *the general conclusion in view, viz.* that as none but excellent poetry will be allowed, it should be a warning to writers, how they engage in it without abilities; or publish without severe and frequent correction."

If the learned Critick here means that "*the general instruction of this part, viz.* a diligence in writing, is chiefly inculcated, for the sake of *the general conclusion in view*, a warning to writers, how they engage in poetry without abilities, or publish without severe and frequent correction;" if, I say, a dissuasive from unadvised attempts, and precipitate publication, is conceived to be the main purpose and design of the Poet, we perfectly agree concerning this last, and important portion of the Epistle: with this addition, however, on my part, that such a dissuasive is not merely *general*, but *immediately* and *personally* directed and applied to *the Elder Piso*, and that too in the strongest terms that words can afford, and with a kind of affectionate earnestness, particularly expressive of the Poet's desire to awaken and arrest his young friend's attention.

I have endeavoured, after the example of the learned and ingenious author of the English Commentary, though on somewhat different principles, to prove "an unity of design in this Epistle," as well as to illustrate "the pertinent connection of its several parts." Many perhaps, like myself, will hesitate to embrace the system of that acute Critick; and as many, or more, may reject my hypothesis. But I am thoroughly persuaded that no person, who has considered this work of Horace with due attention,

and carefully examined the drift and intention of the writer, but will at least be convinced of the folly or blindness, or haste and carelessness of those Criticks, however distinguished, who have pronounced it to be a crude, unconnected, immethodical, and inartificial composition. No modern, I believe, ever more intently studied, or more clearly understood the works of Horace, than BOILEAU. His Art of Poetry is deservedly admired. But I am surprised that it has never been observed that the Plan of that work is formed on the model of this Epistle, though some of the parts are more in detail, and others varied, according to the age and country of the writer. The first Canto, like the first Section of *the Epistle to the Pisos*, is taken up in general precepts. The second enlarges on the Lyrick, and Elegiack, and smaller species of Poetry, but cursorily mentioned, or referred to, by Horace; but introduced by him into that part of the Epistle, that runs exactly parallel with the second Canto of Boileau's Art of Poetry. The third Canto treats, entirely on the ground of Horace, of Epick and Dramatick Poetry; though the French writer has, with great address, accommodated to his purpose what Horace has said but collaterally, and as it were incidentally, of the Epick. The last Canto is formed on the final section, the last hundred and eleven lines, of *the Epistle to the Pisos*: the author however, judiciously omitting in a professed Art of Poetry, the description of the Frantick Bard, and concluding his work, like the Epistle to Augustus, with a compliment to the Sovereign.

This imitation I have not pointed out, in order to depreciate the excellent work of Boileau; but to shew that, in the judgement of so great a writer, the method of Horace was not so ill conceived, as Scaliger pretends, even for the outline of an Art of Poetry: Boileau himself, at the very conclusion of his last Canto, seems to avow and glory in the charge of having founded his work on that of HORACE.

Pour moi, qui jusq'ici nourri dans la Satire,
 N'ofe encor manier la Trompette & la Lyre,
 Vous me verrez pourtant, dans ce champ glorieux,
 Vous animez du moins de la voix & des yeux;
 Vous offrir ces leçons, que ma Muse au Parnasse,
 Rapporta, jeune encor, DU COMMERCE D'HORACE.
 BOILEAU.

After endeavouring to vouch so strong a testimony, in favour of Horace's *unity* and *order*, from France, it is but candid to acknowledge that two of the most popular Poets, of our own country, were of a contrary opinion. Dryden, in his dedication of his translation of the aeneid to Lord Mulgrave, author of the Essay on Poetry, writes thus. "In this address to your Lordship, I design not a treatise of Heroick

Poetry, but write *in a loose Epistolary way*, somewhat tending to that subject, *after the example of Horace*, in his first Epistle of the 2d Book to Augustus Caesar, *and of that to the Pisos*; which we call his Art of Poetry. in both of which *he observes no method that I can trace*, whatever Scaliger the Father, or Heinsius may have seen, *or rather think they had seen*_. I have taken up, laid down, and resumed as often as I pleased the same subject: and this loose proceeding I shall use through all this Prefatory Dedication. *Yet all this while I have been sailing with some side-wind or other toward the point I proposed in the beginning.*" The latter part of the comparison, if the comparison is meant to hold throughout, as well as the words, "*somewhat tending to that subject*," seem to qualify the rest; as if Dryden only meant to distinguish the *loose EPISTOLARY way* from the formality of a *Treatise*. However this may be, had he seen the *Chart*, framed by the author of the English Commentary, or that now delineated, perhaps he might have allowed, that Horace not only made towards his point with some side-wind or other, but proceeded by an easy navigation and tolerably plain sailing.

Many passages of this Dedication, as well as other pieces of Dryden's prose, have been versified by Pope. His opinion also, on the Epistle to the Pisos, is said to have agreed with that of Dryden; though the Introduction to his Imitation of the Epistle to Augustus forbids us to suppose he entertained the like sentiments of that work with his great predecessor. His general idea of Horace stands recorded in a most admirable didactick poem; in the course of which he seems to have kept a steady eye on this work of our author.

Horace	still	charms	with	graceful	negligence,
And	WITHOUT	METHOD	talks	us	into sense;
Will,	like	a	friend,	familiarly	convey
The	truest	notions	in	the	easiest way:
He,	who	supreme	in	judgment,	as in wit,
Might	boldly	censure,	as	he	boldly writ,
Yet	judg'd	with coolness,	tho'	he	sung with fire;
His	precepts	teach	but	what	his works inspire.
Our	Criticks	take	a	contrary	extreme,
They	judge	with fury,	but	they	write with flegm:
NOR	SUFFERS	HORACE	MORE	IN	WRONG TRANSLATIONS
By Wits,	THAN	CRITICKS	IN	AS	WRONG QUOTATIONS.

Essay on Criticism.

* * * * *

I have now compleated my observations on this popular Work of Horace, of which I at first attempted the version and illustration, as a matter of amusement but which, I confess, I have felt, in the progress, to be an arduous undertaking, and a laborious task. Such parts of the Epistle, as corresponded with the general ideas of Modern Poetry, and the Modern Drama, I flattered myself with the hopes of rendering tolerable to the English Reader; but when I arrived at those passages, wholly relative to the Antient Stage, I began to feel my friends dropping off, and leaving me a very thin audience. My part too grew less agreeable, as it grew more difficult. I was almost confounded in the Serio-Comick scenes of the Satyrick Piece: In the musical department I was ready, with Le Fevre, to execrate the Flute, and all the Commentators on it; and when I found myself reduced to scan the merits and of Spondees and Trimeters, I almost fancied myself under the dominion of some *plagosus Orbilius*, and translating the *prosodia* of the Latin Grammar. Borrowers and Imitators cull the sweets, and suck the classick flowers, rejecting at pleasure all that appears sour, bitter, or unpalatable. Each of them travels at his ease in the high turnpike-road of poetry, quoting the authority of Horace himself to keep clear of difficulties;

—et que Desperat tractata nitescere posse, relinquit.

A translator must stick close to his Author, follow him up hill and down dale, over hedge and ditch, tearing his way after his leader thro' the thorns and brambles of literature, sometimes lost, and often benighted.

A master I have, and I am his man,
Galloping dreary dun!

The reader, I fear, will fancy I rejoice too much at having broke loose from my bondage, and that I grow wanton with the idea of having regained my liberty. I shall therefore engage an advocate to recommend me to his candour and indulgence; and as I introduced these notes with some lines from a noble Poet of our own country, I shall conclude them with an extract from a French Critick: Or, if I may speak the language of my trade, as I opened these annotations with a Prologue from Roscommon, I shall drop the curtain with an Epilogue from Dacier. Another curtain now demands my attention. I am called from the Contemplation of Antient Genius, to sacrifice, with due respect, to Modern Taste: I am summoned from a review of the magnificent spectacles of Greece and Rome, to the rehearsal of a Farce at the Little Theatre in the Haymarket.

* * * * *

Voilà tout ce que j'ai cru nécessaire pour l'intelligence de la Poétique d'Horace! si Jule Scaliger l'avoit bien entendue, il lui auroit rendu plus de justice, & en auroit parlé plus modestment. Mais il ne s'efforça point de le bien comprendre. Ce Livre estoit trop petit pour estre goûté d'un homme comme lui, qui faisoit grand cas des gros volumes, & qui d'ailleurs aimoit bien mieux donner des regles que d'en recevoir. Sa Poétique est assurément un ouvrage d'une erudition infinie; on y trouve par tout des choses fort recherchées, & elle est toute pleine de faillies qui marquent beaucoup d'esprit: mais j'oferai dire qu'il n'y a point de justesse dans la pluspart de ses jugemens, & que sa critique n'est pas heureuse. Il devoit un peu plus étudier ces grands maîtres, pour se corriger de ce défaut, qui rendra toujours le plus grand savoir inutile, ou au moins rude &c sec. Comme un homme délicat étanchera mille fois mieux sa soif, & boira avec plus de goût & de plaisir dans un ruisseau dont les eaux seront claires & pures, que dans un fleuve plein de bourbe & de limon: tout de même, un esprit fin qui ne cherche que la justesse & une certaine fleur de critique, trouvera bien mieux son compte dans ce petit traité d'Horace, qu'il ne le trouverait dans vingt volumes aussi énormes que la Poétique de Scaliger. On peut dire véritablement que celui qui boit dans cette source pure, plate se *proluit auro*; & tant pis pour celui qui ne fait pas le connoître. Pour moi j'en ai un très grand cas. Je ne fay si j'auray esté assez heureux pour la bien éclaircir, & pour en dissiper si bien toutes les difficultés, qu'il n'y en reste aucune. Les plus grandes de ces difficultés, viennent des passages qu'Horace a imité des Grecs, ou des allusions qu'il y a faites. Je puis dire au moins que je n'en ay laissé passer aucune sans l'attaquer; & je pourrais me vanter,

—*nec tela nec ullas V'itamsse vices Danaum.*

En general je puis dire que malgré la soule des Commentateurs & des Traducteurs, Horace estoit très-malentendu, & que ses plus beaux endroits estoient défigurés par les mauvais sens qu'on leur avoit donnés jusques icy, & il ne faut pas s'en étonner. La pluspart des gens ne reconnoissent pas tant l'autorité de la raison que celle du grand nombre, pour laquelle ils ont un profond respect. Pour moy qui fay qu'en matiere de critique on ne doit pas compter les voix, mais les peser; j'avoie que j'ay secoué ce joug, & que sans m'assijetir au sentiment de personne, j'ay tâché de suivre Horace, & de démêler ce qu'il a dit d'avec ce qu'on luy a fait dire. J'ay mesme toujours remarqué (& j'en pourrais donner des exemples bien sensibles) que quand des esprits accoutumés aux cordes, comme dit Montagne, & qui n'osent tenter de franches allures, entreprennent de traduire & de commenter ces excellens Ouvrages, où il y a plus de finesse & plus de mystere qu'il n'en paroist, tout leur travail ne fait que les gêter, & que

la seule vertu qu'ayent leurs copies, c'est de nous dégoûter presque des originaux. Comme j'ay pris la liberté de juger du travail de ceux qui m'ont précédé, & que je n'ay pas fait difficulté de les condamner tres-souvent, je declare que je ne trouveray nullement mauvais qu'on juge du mien, & qu'on releve mes fautes: il est difficile qu'il n'y en ait, & mesme beaucoup; si quelqu'un veut donc se donner la peine de me reprendre, & de me faire voir que j'ay mal pris le sens, je me corrigeray avec plaisir: car je ne cherche que la verite, qui n'a jamais blesse personne: au lieu qu'on se trouve toujours mal de persister dans son ignorance et dans son erreur.

Dacier

THE END.

*** END OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK THE ART OF POETRY: AN EPISTLE TO THE PISOS ***

Updated editions will replace the previous one—the old editions will be renamed.

Creating the works from print editions not protected by U.S. copyright law means that no one owns a United States copyright in these works, so the Foundation (and you!) can copy and distribute it in the United States without permission and without paying copyright royalties. Special rules, set forth in the General Terms of Use part of this license, apply to copying and distributing Project Gutenberg™ electronic works to protect the PROJECT GUTENBERG™ concept and trademark. Project Gutenberg is a registered trademark, and may not be used if you charge for an eBook, except by following the terms of the trademark license, including paying royalties for use of the Project Gutenberg trademark. If you do not charge anything for copies of this eBook, complying with the trademark license is very easy. You may use this eBook for nearly any purpose such as creation of derivative works, reports, performances and research. Project Gutenberg eBooks may be modified and printed and given away—you may do practically ANYTHING in the United States with eBooks not protected by U.S. copyright law. Redistribution is subject to the trademark license, especially commercial redistribution.

START: FULL LICENSE

THE FULL PROJECT GUTENBERG LICENSE

PLEASE READ THIS BEFORE YOU DISTRIBUTE OR USE THIS WORK

To protect the Project Gutenberg™ mission of promoting the free distribution of electronic works, by using or distributing this work (or any other work associated in any way with the phrase “Project Gutenberg”), you agree to comply with all the terms of the Full Project Gutenberg™ License available with this file or online at www.gutenberg.org/license.

Section 1. General Terms of Use and Redistributing Project Gutenberg™ electronic works

1.A. By reading or using any part of this Project Gutenberg™ electronic work, you indicate that you have read, understand, agree to and accept all the terms of this license and intellectual property (trademark/copyright) agreement. If you do not agree to abide by all the terms of this agreement, you

must cease using and return or destroy all copies of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works in your possession. If you paid a fee for obtaining a copy of or access to a Project Gutenberg™ electronic work and you do not agree to be bound by the terms of this agreement, you may obtain a refund from the person or entity to whom you paid the fee as set forth in paragraph 1.E.8.

1.B. “Project Gutenberg” is a registered trademark. It may only be used on or associated in any way with an electronic work by people who agree to be bound by the terms of this agreement. There are a few things that you can do with most Project Gutenberg™ electronic works even without complying with the full terms of this agreement. See paragraph 1.C below. There are a lot of things you can do with Project Gutenberg™ electronic works if you follow the terms of this agreement and help preserve free future access to Project Gutenberg™ electronic works. See paragraph 1.E below.

1.C. The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation (“the Foundation” or PGLAF), owns a compilation copyright in the collection of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works. Nearly all the individual works in the collection are in the public domain in the United States. If an individual work is unprotected by copyright law in the United States and you are located in the United States, we do not claim a right to prevent you from copying, distributing, performing, displaying or creating derivative works based on the work as long as all references to Project Gutenberg are removed. Of course, we hope that you will support the Project Gutenberg™ mission of promoting free access to electronic works by freely sharing Project Gutenberg™ works in compliance with the terms of this agreement for keeping the Project Gutenberg™ name associated with the work. You can easily comply with the terms of this agreement by keeping this work in the same format with its attached full Project Gutenberg™ License when you share it without charge with others.

1.D. The copyright laws of the place where you are located also govern what you can do with this work. Copyright laws in most countries are in a constant state of change. If you are outside the United States, check the laws of your country in addition to the terms of this agreement before downloading, copying, displaying, performing, distributing or creating derivative works based on this work or any other Project Gutenberg™ work. The Foundation makes no representations concerning the copyright status of any work in any country other than the United States.

1.E. Unless you have removed all references to Project Gutenberg:

1.E.1. The following sentence, with active links to, or other immediate access to, the full Project Gutenberg™ License must appear prominently whenever any copy of a Project Gutenberg™ work (any work on which the phrase “Project Gutenberg” appears, or with which the phrase “Project Gutenberg” is associated) is accessed, displayed, performed, viewed, copied or distributed:

This eBook is for the use of anyone anywhere in the United States and most other parts of the world at no cost and with almost no restrictions whatsoever. You may copy it, give it away or re-use it under the terms of the Project Gutenberg License included with this eBook or online at www.gutenberg.org. If you are not located in the United States, you will have to check the laws of the country where you are located before using this eBook.

1.E.2. If an individual Project Gutenberg™ electronic work is derived from texts not protected by U.S. copyright law (does not contain a notice indicating that it is posted with permission of the copyright holder), the work can be copied and distributed to anyone in the United States without paying any fees

or charges. If you are redistributing or providing access to a work with the phrase “Project Gutenberg” associated with or appearing on the work, you must comply either with the requirements of paragraphs 1.E.1 through 1.E.7 or obtain permission for the use of the work and the Project Gutenberg™ trademark as set forth in paragraphs 1.E.8 or 1.E.9.

1.E.3. If an individual Project Gutenberg™ electronic work is posted with the permission of the copyright holder, your use and distribution must comply with both paragraphs 1.E.1 through 1.E.7 and any additional terms imposed by the copyright holder. Additional terms will be linked to the Project Gutenberg™ License for all works posted with the permission of the copyright holder found at the beginning of this work.

1.E.4. Do not unlink or detach or remove the full Project Gutenberg™ License terms from this work, or any files containing a part of this work or any other work associated with Project Gutenberg™.

1.E.5. Do not copy, display, perform, distribute or redistribute this electronic work, or any part of this electronic work, without prominently displaying the sentence set forth in paragraph 1.E.1 with active links or immediate access to the full terms of the Project Gutenberg™ License.

1.E.6. You may convert to and distribute this work in any binary, compressed, marked up, nonproprietary or proprietary form, including any word processing or hypertext form. However, if you provide access to or distribute copies of a Project Gutenberg™ work in a format other than “Plain Vanilla ASCII” or other format used in the official version posted on the official Project Gutenberg™ website (www.gutenberg.org), you must, at no additional cost, fee or expense to the user, provide a copy, a means of exporting a copy, or a means of obtaining a copy upon request, of the work in its original “Plain Vanilla ASCII” or other form. Any alternate format must include the full Project Gutenberg™ License as specified in paragraph 1.E.1.

1.E.7. Do not charge a fee for access to, viewing, displaying, performing, copying or distributing any Project Gutenberg™ works unless you comply with paragraph 1.E.8 or 1.E.9.

1.E.8. You may charge a reasonable fee for copies of or providing access to or distributing Project Gutenberg™ electronic works provided that:

- • You pay a royalty fee of 20% of the gross profits you derive from the use of Project Gutenberg™ works calculated using the method you already use to calculate your applicable taxes. The fee is owed to the owner of the Project Gutenberg™ trademark, but he has agreed to donate royalties under this paragraph to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation. Royalty payments must be paid within 60 days following each date on which you prepare (or are legally required to prepare) your periodic tax returns. Royalty payments should be clearly marked as such and sent to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation at the address specified in Section 4, “Information about donations to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation.”
- • You provide a full refund of any money paid by a user who notifies you in writing (or by e-mail) within 30 days of receipt that s/he does not agree to the terms of the full Project Gutenberg™ License. You must require such a user to return or destroy all copies of the works possessed in a physical medium and discontinue all use of and all access to other copies of Project Gutenberg™ works.

- • You provide, in accordance with paragraph 1.F.3, a full refund of any money paid for a work or a replacement copy, if a defect in the electronic work is discovered and reported to you within 90 days of receipt of the work.
- • You comply with all other terms of this agreement for free distribution of Project Gutenberg™ works.

1.E.9. If you wish to charge a fee or distribute a Project Gutenberg™ electronic work or group of works on different terms than are set forth in this agreement, you must obtain permission in writing from the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, the manager of the Project Gutenberg™ trademark. Contact the Foundation as set forth in Section 3 below.

1.F.

1.F.1. Project Gutenberg volunteers and employees expend considerable effort to identify, do copyright research on, transcribe and proofread works not protected by U.S. copyright law in creating the Project Gutenberg™ collection. Despite these efforts, Project Gutenberg™ electronic works, and the medium on which they may be stored, may contain “Defects,” such as, but not limited to, incomplete, inaccurate or corrupt data, transcription errors, a copyright or other intellectual property infringement, a defective or damaged disk or other medium, a computer virus, or computer codes that damage or cannot be read by your equipment.

1.F.2. LIMITED WARRANTY, DISCLAIMER OF DAMAGES - Except for the “Right of Replacement or Refund” described in paragraph 1.F.3, the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, the owner of the Project Gutenberg™ trademark, and any other party distributing a Project Gutenberg™ electronic work under this agreement, disclaim all liability to you for damages, costs and expenses, including legal fees. YOU AGREE THAT YOU HAVE NO REMEDIES FOR NEGLIGENCE, STRICT LIABILITY, BREACH OF WARRANTY OR BREACH OF CONTRACT EXCEPT THOSE PROVIDED IN PARAGRAPH 1.F.3. YOU AGREE THAT THE FOUNDATION, THE TRADEMARK OWNER, AND ANY DISTRIBUTOR UNDER THIS AGREEMENT WILL NOT BE LIABLE TO YOU FOR ACTUAL, DIRECT, INDIRECT, CONSEQUENTIAL, PUNITIVE OR INCIDENTAL DAMAGES EVEN IF YOU GIVE NOTICE OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE.

1.F.3. LIMITED RIGHT OF REPLACEMENT OR REFUND - If you discover a defect in this electronic work within 90 days of receiving it, you can receive a refund of the money (if any) you paid for it by sending a written explanation to the person you received the work from. If you received the work on a physical medium, you must return the medium with your written explanation. The person or entity that provided you with the defective work may elect to provide a replacement copy in lieu of a refund. If you received the work electronically, the person or entity providing it to you may choose to give you a second opportunity to receive the work electronically in lieu of a refund. If the second copy is also defective, you may demand a refund in writing without further opportunities to fix the problem.

1.F.4. Except for the limited right of replacement or refund set forth in paragraph 1.F.3, this work is provided to you ‘AS-IS’, WITH NO OTHER WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PURPOSE.

1.F.5. Some states do not allow disclaimers of certain implied warranties or the exclusion or limitation of certain types of damages. If any disclaimer or limitation set forth in this agreement violates the law of the state applicable to this agreement, the agreement shall be interpreted to make the maximum

disclaimer or limitation permitted by the applicable state law. The invalidity or unenforceability of any provision of this agreement shall not void the remaining provisions.

1.F.6. INDEMNITY - You agree to indemnify and hold the Foundation, the trademark owner, any agent or employee of the Foundation, anyone providing copies of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works in accordance with this agreement, and any volunteers associated with the production, promotion and distribution of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works, harmless from all liability, costs and expenses, including legal fees, that arise directly or indirectly from any of the following which you do or cause to occur: (a) distribution of this or any Project Gutenberg™ work, (b) alteration, modification, or additions or deletions to any Project Gutenberg™ work, and (c) any Defect you cause.

Section 2. Information about the Mission of Project Gutenberg™

Project Gutenberg™ is synonymous with the free distribution of electronic works in formats readable by the widest variety of computers including obsolete, old, middle-aged and new computers. It exists because of the efforts of hundreds of volunteers and donations from people in all walks of life.

Volunteers and financial support to provide volunteers with the assistance they need are critical to reaching Project Gutenberg™'s goals and ensuring that the Project Gutenberg™ collection will remain freely available for generations to come. In 2001, the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation was created to provide a secure and permanent future for Project Gutenberg™ and future generations. To learn more about the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation and how your efforts and donations can help, see Sections 3 and 4 and the Foundation information page at www.gutenberg.org.

Section 3. Information about the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation

The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation is a non-profit 501(c)(3) educational corporation organized under the laws of the state of Mississippi and granted tax exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service. The Foundation's EIN or federal tax identification number is 64-6221541. Contributions to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation are tax deductible to the full extent permitted by U.S. federal laws and your state's laws.

The Foundation's business office is located at 809 North 1500 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84116, (801) 596-1887. Email contact links and up to date contact information can be found at the Foundation's website and official page at www.gutenberg.org/contact

Section 4. Information about Donations to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation

Project Gutenberg™ depends upon and cannot survive without widespread public support and donations to carry out its mission of increasing the number of public domain and licensed works that can be freely distributed in machine-readable form accessible by the widest array of equipment including outdated equipment. Many small donations (\$1 to \$5,000) are particularly important to maintaining tax exempt status with the IRS.

The Foundation is committed to complying with the laws regulating charities and charitable donations in all 50 states of the United States. Compliance requirements are not uniform and it takes a considerable

effort, much paperwork and many fees to meet and keep up with these requirements. We do not solicit donations in locations where we have not received written confirmation of compliance. To SEND DONATIONS or determine the status of compliance for any particular state visit www.gutenberg.org/donate.

While we cannot and do not solicit contributions from states where we have not met the solicitation requirements, we know of no prohibition against accepting unsolicited donations from donors in such states who approach us with offers to donate.

International donations are gratefully accepted, but we cannot make any statements concerning tax treatment of donations received from outside the United States. U.S. laws alone swamp our small staff.

Please check the Project Gutenberg web pages for current donation methods and addresses. Donations are accepted in a number of other ways including checks, online payments and credit card donations. To donate, please visit: www.gutenberg.org/donate

Section 5. General Information About Project Gutenberg™ electronic works

Professor Michael S. Hart was the originator of the Project Gutenberg™ concept of a library of electronic works that could be freely shared with anyone. For forty years, he produced and distributed Project Gutenberg™ eBooks with only a loose network of volunteer support.

Project Gutenberg™ eBooks are often created from several printed editions, all of which are confirmed as not protected by copyright in the U.S. unless a copyright notice is included. Thus, we do not necessarily keep eBooks in compliance with any particular paper edition.

Most people start at our website which has the main PG search facility: www.gutenberg.org.

This website includes information about Project Gutenberg™, including how to make donations to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, how to help produce our new eBooks, and how to subscribe to our email newsletter to hear about new eBooks.