Pietatis Ergo

A LETTER FROM A. S. PEASE TO CYRIL BAILEY

The following communication and transcription of a letter from A. S. Pease to Cyril Bailey was sent to the Editor by Professor Arthur J. Pomeroy of the Department of Classics, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, and is here reprinted with Professor Pomeroy's permission.

Pease was Professor of the Classics at Urbana from 1909-1924, and from 1911 Curator of what was then known as the Museum of Classical Art and Archaeology. Subsequently he was President of Amherst College, Massachusetts, in which capacity he put through some needed reforms and was noted for his insistence that the aim of undergraduate education is to enable students to think for themselves. He abruptly resigned his position in 1932 to take up the Pope Professorship of Latin Language and Literature at Harvard, a chair he held until his retirement in 1950. He was President of the American Philological Association in 1939-40. He died in 1964.

A keen mountaineer, Pease was distinguished as botanist as well as classical scholar. Five plants bear his name. His A Flora of Northern New Hampshire, originally published in 1924, was reissued in 1964. In 1963 with a colleague he published Generic Names of Orchids. His youthful (1903) List of Plants on Three Mile Island has, in view of events of our day, a poignancy worthy of A Shropshire Lad.

His classical interests embraced the work of St. Jerome, on whom he published a number of papers, and collaboration with Urbana colleagues on a Concordance to the plays of Seneca. His edition of Aeneid IV appeared in 1935, and was followed in 1955 by Cicero's De Natura Deorum. The edition of the De Divinatione so mishandled
by Bailey was reprinted in Germany in 1963. His courtesy breathes from every line of his brief answer to his Oxford critic. *Ave, pia anima!*

Professor Pomeroy writes:

I recently discovered in the Victoria University of Wellington library some material relating to A. S. Pease which may be of interest to your Department.

The library possesses Pease's edition of the *De Divinatione* (Urbana, Illinois: Book One, 1920 [1921] and Book Two, 1923), purchased second-hand from Blackwell's in 1959. Inside Volume 1, between pages 64 and 65, are bound the corrected proofs from Cyril Bailey's review (*Classical Review* 37 [1923], pp. 30-31). This is clearly his review copy, dated Harlech 9/8/22 at the end of the volume. It has some marginal scorings and a comment to the note on I. xxxix. 84 *dirimat tempus*, "What does it mean?", indicative of what Bailey found interesting and also his frustration with the apparent lack of clear direction given by Pease's notes, as he complains in the review.

Volume Two has greater interest because between pages 574 and 575 are bound a handwritten letter from Pease, written after he had seen Bailey's review of Volume One, and Bailey's corrected proofs for the review of the second volume (*Classical Review* 41 [1927], p. 151). Attached is a transcription of Pease's letter.

I rather feel that Pease offered his comment on the Lucretius article as an excuse to defend his particular type of exacting scholarship against Bailey's criticisms. The comments had their effect. In his review of Volume Two, Bailey says that he may have been too rash in assuming that the book was intended for the use of ordinary, rather than more advanced students. But his "grumbling" at the lack of guidance offered in difficult passages and the large number of bracketed references is unabated.

Despite Bailey's recognition of the importance of Pease's work and the appreciation expressed from Pease's side, it is apparent that, irrespective of their common interests, the two hardly knew one another. Perhaps the distance was too great—more likely, I think, an indifference to American scholarship by the English which persists to this day explains the lack of contact and the tone of this exchange.

The text of Pease's letter is as follows:
A Letter from A. S. Pease to Cyril Bailey

1114 West Oregon Street, Urbana, Illinois, 15 March, 1923.

Professor Cyril Bailey

My dear Sir:-

May I express to you the interest which I have just felt reading your article on the Religion of Lucretius?* It has occurred to me that you would perhaps be interested in knowing of an article dealing with the question in a somewhat similar way by Professor G. D. Hadzits in the Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc. 39 (1908), 73-88, entitled: Significance of Worship and Prayer among the Epicureans.

In connection with Lucretius' allusion (5,8) to Epicurus as 'deus' (p. 20 of your article) one might compare Cic. N. D. 1,43, where Velleius says: Ea qui consideret quam inconsulte ac temere dicantur venerari Epicurum et in eorum ipsorum numero de quibus haec quaestio est (sc. deorum) habere debeat.

I am also naturally interested in your notice in the Classical Review of the first part of my edition of the De Divinatione. In one respect, perhaps, you did not fully understand the purpose of the edition, which was not to be a textbook for more elementary students (for, in America, at least, the book is rarely read in college courses) but rather a book of reference for the more advanced who might desire help in the investigation of particular points in religion, philosophy, folk-lore, history, etc. in which this book is so rich. Had it been for the former class the notes would have been less extensive and more dogmatic. Nor was it my intention to write an encyclopaedia of divination in general, like the excellent work of Bouché-Leclercq, but rather to furnish bibliographical and other suggestions which might be of help to those who desire to pursue individual points more in detail. With this in view I have often deliberately avoided appearing to prejudice a case by the expression of my own choice between conflicting views, thinking the decision a matter safely left to the reader.

It may well be that I have been mistaken in my idea of what would be useful in the case of this work, the appeal of which is rather from the side of learning than from that of pure literature; you and one or two other reviewers clearly feel so (though the majority have not so judged). It is too late, however, to change the plan of the

commentary on the second book (now in press), even were such a change not inconsistent and out of scale with the plan of the first book, but perhaps these explanations which I have given may serve to abate a little the "grumblings" which you express in your notes.

The lack of footnotes in the notes necessitated the use of parentheses for documentation which may at times be a little confusing; if there is also confusion in the arrangement of the subject matter of the notes I feel very regretful for it, since I strove to make the notes advance from beginning to end in a logical development, using, so far as possible, the words of the ancients themselves rather than my own paraphrases of them. This makes the notes slower reading, but more reliable for the scholar.

Very sincerely yours,

Arthur Stanley Pease.