the sea" is a perfectly appropriate expression in so far as used with reference to one angling with the rod, i.e. envisaged as exploring with his rod the metaphorical plot that the sea was visualized to be. Asphalion's colleague means that fishermen, not being able to grow any food in a real plot of land, must seek their food, i.e. fish, from what Oppian (*Hal.*, I, 797) calls *Ποσειδάωνος ἀλωά*, otherwise they will starve *ὕπνῳ λιμῷ*, line 67). Finally, in line 67, we shall refrain from altering *καί τοι* into *καὶ τοῖς*, because *καί τοι* in the sense "and indeed" is a Homeric grammatical *unicum*[34] attested in *Il.*, 13, 267: *καί τοι ἐμοί*, which Theocritus evidently wanted to reproduce: in Homer's phrase, the conjunction *καί* governs the dative *ἐμοί*, from which it is separated by *τοι*, and exactly the same is the case with Theocritus' *καί τοι χρυσείαν ὀνείρῳ*, where *καί* governs the dative *χρυσείαν ὀνείρῳ*, from which it is separated by *τοι*. In Theocritus' line the emphatic value of the particle *τοι* is singularly apposite, the sense being "lest you are killed by hunger, and *indeed* by your golden dream": if Asphalion allows himself to be worried by his dream concerning the golden fish, and consequently refrains from catching any fish in the future, his dream will be just as much the cause of his death as starvation.

I hope that the present paper has served a double purpose. On the one hand I have endeavoured to explain many passages of the *Idyll*, on the other, considering that the *Idyll* encompasses no more than 67 lines and that I have had to restore or explain no fewer than 22, i.e. one third of the whole poem (4, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 39, 42, 43, 45, 48, 52, 53, 64–65, 67) such a high percentage will, I trust, make scholars aware of the alarming state to which Theocritus has been reduced by recent editors and commentators.

Birkbeck College,
University of London,
England

Giuseppe GIANGRANDE.

[34] Cf. E. D. DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1959, p. 555.

HORACE, *ODES*, III, 13 AND III, 23 *

O fons Bandusiae, splendidior vitro,
Dulci digne mero non sine floribus,
Cras donaberis haedo,
Cui frons turgida cornibus
Primis et venerem et proelia destinat;
Frustra: nam gelidos inficiet tibi
Rubro sanguine rivos
Lascivi suboles gregis.
Te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae
Nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile
Fessis vomere tauris
Praebes et pecori vago.
Fies nobilium tu quoque fontium,
Me dicente cavis impositam ilicem
Saxis, unde loquaces
Lymphae desiliunt tuae. (*Odes*, III, 13)

It is well understood that Horace's ode to the *fons Bandusiae* has strong links with the ancient dedicatory epigram — a literary type most frequently exemplified in the sixth book of the *Palatine Anthology*[1]. But the precise relationship between *Odes*, III, 13 and the genre *anathematikon*, in which gifts are offered to gods and to men, remains to be defined.

The ode is, I believe, as much an *anathematikon* as any of the epigrams of *Anthologia Palatina*, Book VI. A small sophistication employed by Horace has helped to obscure this fact. The offering made to the *fons Bandusiae* is not, as is normal, made in the present; instead it is promised for

* This paper is the revised version of a lecture given to the Roman Society at the Institute of Classical Studies in November 1974. I am indebted to Mr. C. W. Macleod for his criticism and advice. Errors which remain are my own responsibility.

[1] Cf. e.g. G. WILLIAMS, *The Third Book of Horace's Odes*, Oxford, 1969, pp. 88 ff.

the future. Similar alterations in tense are found in many genres[2], and Horace liked this particular device of substituting future for present because it introduced an air of excitement and anticipation into examples of common genres[3]. It is worth noting however that *anathematika* employing the future tense may have suggested themselves to an ancient poet more easily than future examples of some other genres. This is because even in *anathematika* where the offering is made in the present tense, the gift can be accompanied by a prayer for a future blessing, and sometimes this prayer may lead to a promise of yet another offering to be made in the future, if the blessing is in fact imparted by the god[4]. Such subordinate uses of the future in the *anathematikon* may have made it easier for the principal offering to be placed on occasion in the future. It may be for this reason that two Theocritean *anathematika* employ the future[5] in *Ep.*, I = *Anthologia Palatina*, VI, 336, the sacrificial offering of a goat is promised, not made:

> Τὰ βόδα τὰ δροσόεντα καὶ ἁ κατάπυκνος ἐκείνα
> ἴουλλος κεῖται ταῖς Ἑλικωνιάσι,
> ταὶ δὲ μελάμφυλλοι δάφναι τὶν Πύθε Παιάν,
> Δηλίᾱς ἐπεὶ πέτρα τοῦτό τοι ἀγλάισε.
> βωμῶν δ' αἱμάξει χεραὸς τράγος οὗτος ὁ μακὸς,
> τερμίνθου τραγῶν ἔσχατον ἀκρεμόνα.

and in *Idyll*. 28, which involves a gift to a human being, not a god, but is none the less a member of the same genre[6]. Theocritus' gift to Theugenis will be made in the future. Horace does however make one concession to the anathematic norm, the present. The final verb in the future tense which occurs in the ode is a 'self-fulfilling' future[7]. This future is logically

[2] Cf. F. CAIRNS, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh, 1972, index s.v. 'formal sophistications'.

[3] Cp. e.g. *Odes*, I, 7 (*epibaterion*), III, 17 (*genethliakon*), III, 23 (*anathematikon* – see below pp. 535 ff.).

[4] For examples cf. KUHN, *op. cit. inf.*, pp. 64 f., 67 ff.

[5] I have treated *Idyll*. 28 and *anathematika* to men in general in *The Distaff of Theugenis – Theocritus* Idyll 28, in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 1976* (ARCA 2, 1977), pp. 293 ff. This paper may be consulted for further examples of the anathematic topoi listed below and, in combination with KUHN, *op. cit.*, for documentation of the statements made below about differences between the divine and human *anathematikon*.

[6] For such features, particularly in self-referent literary contexts, cf. W. J. SLATER in *CQ*, 19 (1969), pp. 86 ff.; NISBET-HUBBARD, *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book I*, Oxford, 1970, p. 284.

a present, because the final and principal offering which Horace makes to the *fons* is the gift of immortality. This he is conferring on it by his ode, so that the act of giving is simultaneous with the utterance of the ode. Having therefore established his variant, Horace closes the ode with a bow to the usual pattern.

The future tense of the ode is accordingly no barrier to its identification as an *anathematikon*. I shall now list briefly the elements of this genre, so that, through an understanding of what is commonplace in *Odes*, III, 13, Horace's originality and his individual statement in it can be better appreciated. The page references appended to each topos are to H. KUHN, *Topica Epigrammatum dedicatoriorum Graecorum*, Diss. Breslau, 1906, who has collected illustrative material. Kuhn has treated only *anathematika* addressed to gods, which are the kind most relevant to *Odes*, III, 13.

Primary Elements

- A1 The donor
- A2 The recipient
- A3 The object given
- A4 The giving of the object

Secondary Elements (topoi)

- B1 Fuller identification of the donor by family, home town, occupation, etc. (pp. 1 ff.)
- B2 Fuller identification of the recipient by family, home town, occupation, etc. (pp. 20 ff.)
- B3 Encomiastic description of the gift (pp. 52 ff.)
- B4 Modest derogation of the donor/his efforts/the value of the gift (pp. 54 f.)
- B5 The occasion of the gift (pp. 55 ff.)
- B6 The purpose/function of the gift (pp. 43 ff.)
- B7 The donor's sentiments towards the recipient (pp. 55 f.)
- B8 A request to the recipient to accept the gift/be gracious (pp. 67 ff.)
- B9 The suitability of the gift to the recipient (pp. 15 ff.)
- B10 Compliments to the recipient (pp. 11 ff.).

I begin with the primary elements, of which I have already treated A4 (the giving of the gift). As for the rest, it is clear that the donor (A1) is

Horace and the recipient (A2) the *fons Bandusiae*. The object given (A3) will be fourfold:

1. A kid (II. 3 ff.)
2. Flowers (l. 2). These can be identified with certainty as offerings in the light of Varro's account of the occasion of the offering — the *Fontinalia*: "*Fontinalia a Fonte, quod is dies festus eius; ab eo tum et in fontes coronas iactant et puteos coronant*" (*De Lingua Latina*, VI. 22).
3. Wine (l. 2), because it is associated with flowers. An offering of wine may have had some particular appropriateness at the *Fontinalia* (October 13th) since the feast of the *Meditrinalia* (October 11th) is one connected with wine[8].
4. The immortality conferred by the ode itself (see above).

Horace's method of introducing the flowers and wine is characteristic of his handling of generic commonplaces in *Odes*, III. 13. Aware of his readers' familiarity with the *anathematikon*, he deliberately brought in some of its elements in such a way as to leave their conceptual role unclear. Part of the reader's enjoyment of the ode was derived from supplying the missing links.

As for the secondary elements, Horace identifies himself (B1) only by his occupation — poet (II. 14 ff.), and this only in an oblique fashion. B2, the fuller identification of the recipient, is absent — the *fons Bandusiae* is identified in those two words only. The absence of particular topoi is not always significant, especially in lyric poetry, where the need for brevity causes rigorous selection. But in this ode the virtual absence of B1 and B2 may be significant, because the two topoi are handled differently in the divine and in the human *anathematikon*. In *anathematika* to gods it is usual for the donor and the recipient to be further identified. But in *anathematika* to men this is less frequently the case; and when further identifications do occur they are less ample. The reasons for this distinction are easy to see: a god with a multitude of worshippers might find difficulty in distinguishing individual donors; and the donor wants the correct god to hear his prayers. Antiquity was highly superstitious about correct identifications in divine/human relationships. On the other hand,

[7] See below pp. 527 ff.

[8] Cf. K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich, 1960, pp. 74 ff.

in human donor/recipient relationships such superstition was absent; and the difficulties of identification were less. Few men make gifts to the wrong recipients; and few have so many benefactors that they cannot distinguish between them. This distinction between divine and human *anathematika* is not, of course, absolute: examples can be found of fuller identifications, albeit brief, in cases of gifts between human beings[9]. But the virtual suppression of B1 and B2 in *Odes*, III. 13, which is a divine *anathematikon*, is something different. The identification of Horace by profession only and of the *fons Bandusiae* by its locality only may be intended to convey an atmosphere of familiarity, informality and individuality. Horace does not need to identify the *fons Bandusiae* more fully than by locality because there is no possibility of mistake. He knows intimately this small local stream. Similarly Horace does not need to identify himself more fully to the *fons* than as Horace the poet. There is little possibility that the *fons Bandusiae*, never before celebrated in song and unknown to most of the world, will mistake Horace's identity. As for the reader, he is being exposed to the personality which Horace adopts in odes to do with the countryside, that of a countryman who assumes that what is familiar to him is known to all the world. We may compare for example the unexplained place-names of *Odes*, I. 17. The conclusion that in *Odes*, III. 13, Horace is aiming at an air of rustic informality is confirmed by other aspects of the ode which will be considered below.

B3 — the encomiastic description of the gift — appears in *dulci* (l. 2) and in the description of the kid (II. 4-5). Because it has just reached maturity it is technically τέλειος and so fit for sacrifice. There is no modest derogation of the donor or his efforts or the value of the gift (B4). This is because it goes without saying that the goat, wine and flowers are humble offerings; but on the other hand the fame Horace promises the *fons* is no small thing. The status of the two classes of offering is deliberately contrasted to evoke the concept of the humble poet, who is nevertheless the possessor and giver of eternal glory[10].

B5 — the occasion of the gift — is the *Fontinalia* — October 13th. This is the traditional view of Horatian scholars and is, I believe, correct.

[9] E.g. *Donor*: *A.P.*, VI. 321, 328; IX. 353 (Leonidas); IX. 93 (Antipater); XVI. 62 (Anon.). *Recipient*: *A.P.*, VI. 222 (Crinagoras); 335 (Antipater); IX. 355 (Leonidas); X. 92 (Palladas).

[10] Cp. e.g. Hor., *Od.* II. 20; III. 30; Prop., III. 2.

The arguments in its favour are: first, the day of the offering will be a particular day denoted by *cras* (l. 3); second, the offering is made because the stream has continued to provide water during July and August. This is implied by ll. 9 ff., since the stream over which the dog-star has no power is one which has flowed all summer. The feast of springs (*Fontinalia*) falls on a specific date, October 13th, which suits such a thanks offering. Finally, the offering of flowers is an attested feature of the *Fontinalia*. Recently this view has been challenged by L. and P. Brind'Amour [11]. They have instead linked *Odes*, III, 13, with the *Neptunalia* of July 23rd. Because the occasion of the offering is an important aspect of any *anathematikon*, I must attempt to disprove the view advanced by the Brind'Amours.

They offer two arguments in support of a July date. The second, which can be rebutted briefly, relies on the assumption that ll. 9-12 of the ode describe events contemporaneous with the sacrifice. These lines do not describe October events, and for this reason the Brind'Amours argue that the sacrifice cannot have taken place in October but rather in July, to which the events of ll. 9-12 can be dated. The weakness of this argument is that the assumption of contemporaneity has no foundation. Since Horace makes no prayers to the *fons*, it is natural to conclude that the sacrifice is a thanksgiving for favours received, namely the events of ll. 9-12. It is the anathematic norm to make such offerings after the benefits have been conferred and not at the same time; and most commentators have regarded this as the case in *Odes*, III, 13. The second argument of the Brind'Amours is therefore without substance.

The first argument put forward by them concerns the life cycle of the goat. The Brind'Amours state that by October 12th a young goat born that year would have been too mature to be described by Horace in the terms which he applies to his sacrificial victim. They arrive at this conclusion via the following steps:

1. Goats in antiquity mated in November.
2. The gestation period of goats is "de quatre a cinq mois".
3. Birth took place "en fevrier et en mars".
4. Therefore since goats are almost but not quite sexually mature at six months and Horace's young goat is at this stage in his life, the sacrifice must have taken place in July.

[11] *La Fontaine de Bandusie, La Canicule et les Neptunalia*, in *Phoenix*, 27 (1973), pp. 226 ff.

These statements are backed by references to Varro, Pliny, Columella and Palladius. I have consulted these authorities: they support those of the Brind'Amours' contentions which are biologically accurate, but give no support to those which are inaccurate. The true facts of life for goats appear to be as follows [12]:

It is impossible to determine precisely the time of conception of any particular goat. Conception can in extreme cases occur over a range of five months or more and climactic factors can move the breeding season forwards or backwards by a month. Altitude, nutrition, light and geographical location also play a part. However Horace's kid is imaginary; so all we need to do is to determine the average expectations in this matter for the species. These seem to be:

1. The time at which any female goat comes on heat and mates depends on her geographical latitude, since the onset of oestrus is connected with the declining length of the day. The further south the goat is, the later she mates. The time in Northern Scotland is around August 10th, in Cornwall the latter part of September, at Marseilles mid-October. It is not known exactly where Bandusia was; but on the reasonable assumption that it was somewhere in Central Italy, a November date for the conception of Horace's kid seems likely.
2. The gestation period of goats is not "from four to five months", i.e. approximately 17-22 weeks, but is 21-22 weeks.
3. The probable time of birth of Horace's kid was therefore within the period from the last few days of March — if the kid was conceived at the beginning of November — to the first few days of May — if it was conceived at the end of November.
4. By October 12th, the kid was from 5½ - 6½ months old. He would

[12] On goat reproduction I have consulted: S. A. ASDELL, *Patterns of Mammalian Reproduction*, 2nd ed., Ithaca, 1965, esp. pp. 624 ff.; R. M. F. S. SADLEIR, *The Ecology of Reproduction in Wild and Domestic Animals*, London, 1969; D. MACKENZIE, *Goat Husbandry*, 3rd ed., Faber and Faber, 1970, p. 218; G. K. WHITEHEAD, *The Wild Goats of Great Britain and Ireland*, David and Charles, 1972, pp. 39 ff. My colleague Dr. T. D. Glover of the Unit of Reproductive Biology, University of Liverpool, has kindly advised me further on this matter. Naturally he is not responsible for any misunderstanding or misrepresentation of his advice on my part.

therefore have been of an age to be described by Horace as he is described.

I suggest therefore that the Brind'Amours have not succeeded in disproving the orthodox view of the date of the offering. Rather the life cycle of the goat confirms that the date is the *Fontinalia*, i.e. October 13th. Horace's reference in II. 4 f. to the aggressive behaviour which the kid is destined to display, were it not marked out for sacrifice, is a further indication of an October date. Such pre-coital behaviour is found in the male goat in the month before copulation.

B6 — the purpose of the gift — is thanksgiving. In II. 9-12, Horace tells us that the stream has flowed throughout the summer heat and has watered the animals of the countryside. As in I. 2 the reader was expected to realise that wine and flowers were part of the offering, so here in II. 9-12, although explicit causal links with the rest of the poem are absent, Horace clearly meant us to understand that these lines give the reason for his sacrifice. Therefore, as in most *anathematika* to gods, the sacrifice in *Odes*, III. 13, is a thanksoffering for favours received.

B7 is fairly explicitly represented. Horace shows his sentiments for the *fons Bandusiae* by his eulogistic description of it. It is clearer than glass, worthy of his offerings, a benefactor to its surrounding countryside, ever-flowing and has a picturesque source for its sounding waters. There is no explicit request to the recipient in *Odes*, III. 13, to accept the gift or to be gracious (B8). Nor can this be extracted from *cras donaberis*. While some Latin futures are polite requests, *donaberis* does not seem to be one. The absence of B8 need not in itself be very significant: many *anathematika* lack the topos. But in *Odes*, III. 13, it is possible that its absence is a further indication of the informal relationship between the small god and his worshipper, in which such overtures are superfluous.

B9 — the suitability to the recipient of the gift — may be implied. But it is not expressed directly. On one level Horace is clearly hinting at some similarity between the *fons* and the kid. The little spring and the little animal are deliberately juxtaposed in the first stanza; and later the phrases *lascivi suboles gregis* (l. 8) and *loquaces lymphae desiluunt* (ll. 15-16) may be intended further to underline the resemblance. It is possible that the analogy may go deeper. Large rivers are commonly spoken of and represented in ancient poetry and art as horned bulls. The horns symbolise the river's power, or sound, or windings, or tributaries. Other powerful animals also symbolise rivers — wolves, bears, dogs, boars [13]. I have not found goats in this role nor indeed any association between goats and streams except the proper name Aegospotamos (oi) and an *αἰγὸς χρήνη* in Anon., *A.P.*, XVI. 254. But it is at least possible that the emphasis which Horace places on the little kid's incipient horns shows that he wishes the kid to symbolise the *fons Bandusiae* in the same way as great horned bulls stand for great rivers. The relations between the gods and the sacrifices offered to them in antiquity are of course complex, but one standard category of offering is where the god and the offering are somehow envisaged as similar or related. The sacrifice of the goat to the *fons Bandusiae* would then fall into this category.

The fact that the imaginary date of the sacrifice is October 13th may point to another aspect of the appropriateness of the goat sacrifice. The kid is the flock's repayment to the stream for its maintenance throughout the year of the life of the flocks and it is made when the process of renewal of the life of the herd of goats is beginning and new kids are about to be conceived to replace the one who is being killed. The kid is therefore a "first-fruit".

Appreciation of the temporal setting of the sacrifice helps also to define the emotional basis of the ode. Some scholars have been troubled by the combination of aestheticism and apparent heartlessness on Horace's part. As H. P. Syndikus has well explained, the ode must be assessed from an ancient viewpoint and not in a sentimental way [14]. The death of the goat is seen by Horace as a miniature tragedy — and what seems pure aestheticism is in fact intended to deepen the pathos of the situation. This is why Horace contrasts the spring's clarity and the blood (and perhaps red wine too), emphasises the heat/cold antithesis and opposes great and small. A tragic view of the ode is very far from sentimentality. Horace knows the real needs of his estate, that the life of the stream and of the herds should continue. To achieve this one kid must die for its people. With due allowance for the scale of the events and for Horace's own characteristic self-distancing from the events of his poetry, the sacrifice of the kid is conceived in the same terms as Euripides conceives the death of Macaria in the *Heracleidae* and of Menoeceus in the *Phoenissae*.

[13] On these matters see *RE*, s.v. "Flussgottheit" (Wagner).
[14] *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, Darmstadt 1973, II, pp. 140 f.

The final topos, B10 — the compliments to the recipient — is, as is often the case in *anathematika*, substantially identical with B6 and B7.

The last stanza of the ode (III. 13-16) adds to and at once alters the scene portrayed in the first three. Horace proclaims that Bandusia will become one of the *nobiles fontes 'me dicente'*. The ablative absolute clearly refers to *Odes*, III. 13 itself and the future, as was noted above, is self-fulfilling. The gift of fame is conveyed by the ode itself. In this matter Horace is following the convention of Greek lyric. In regarding his own encomiastic poetry and the immortality and nobility which it will convey as a gift, Horace is again looking to early Greek lyric, where a poem is often described as a gift to the man it honours[15]. The *nobiles fontes* are the streams famous in Greek poetry like Dirce, Arethusa and Agamippe, and because of *Odes*, III. 13 Bandusia will join their company. These *nobiles fontes* were also sources of poetic inspiration. Horace refers indirectly to this concept when he describes the *fons Bandusiae*'s waters as *loquaces* (15 f.). There is a jocular touch here — the word *loquax* adds a colloquial flavour and makes the *fons*, as indeed it is, a country cousin, a touch consonant with the country character which Horace gives to his poetic *persona* in the ode. By making the *fons Bandusiae* the actual source of inspiration for *Odes*, III. 13, Horace contrives also to end the ode elegantly with the concept of the worshipper offering the god his own gifts. Statius employs the same notion when invoking Rutilius Gallicus, in a similar context where the encomiand is also to provide the inspiration for a poem which is described in terms of water:

> *ipse veni viresque novas animumque ministra,*
> *qui caneris.*
> *licet enthea vatis*
> *excludat Pimplea sitim nec conscia detur*
> *Pirene: largos potius mihi gurges in haustus*
> *qui rapitur de fonte tuo, seu plana solutis*
> *quom struis orsa modis seu quom tibi dulcis in artem*
> *frangitur et nostras curat facundia leges*
> *quare age, si Cereri sua dona merumque Lyaeo*
> *reddimus, et dives praedae tamen accipit omni*

[15] E.g. Pind., *Ol.* 7, 7 ff., *Pyth.* 2, 1 ff., 62 f., 67 f., 3, 68 ff., *Nem.* 1, 73 ff., Bacch., *Epin.* 4, 9 ff.

> *exuvias Diana tholo captivaque tela*
> *Bellipotens; nec tu (quamquam tibi, Gallice, mattus*
> *eloquium, fandique opibus sublimis abundas)*
> *sperne coli tenuere lyra* (Statius, *Silvae*, I. 4, 22 f., 25 ff.)

Through the enrolment of the *fons Bandusiae* among the great inspirational springs of Greek poetic mythology Horace balances the emphasis on smallness, familiarity and intimacy which he has so carefully established in the first three stanzas. It is of course true that the ultimate status of the *fons Bandusiae* has been anticipated to some extent in the first three stanzas. The hymnic style elements[16] in these stanzas show Horace's respect for the small deity of the *fons Bandusiae* and enhance its status. Horace again has Greek lyric antecedents for the device of so elevating a minor god[17]. Thus the promise Horace makes to the *fons Bandusiae* in lines 13-14 has already begun to be fulfilled in the first three stanzas. This is not to say that Horace's elevation of the stream to fame and honour is inconsistent with the themes of smallness and intimacy. In fact stanza 4 confirms the atmosphere previously established by Horace. Although the *fons* will become *nobilis*, its ennoblement will be achieved through the efforts of Horace. The little god's intimately known worshipper will alone make the *fons Bandusiae* great. The large-scale element therefore in the relationship between Horace and the *fons Bandusiae* consists of the elevation of the small-scale.

This situation is mirrored by Horace's literary achievement in *Odes*, III. 13. Horace has taken minor Hellenistic epigrammatic material and recast it in a higher and more complex lyric form. The result has the outward appearance of a Latin analogue of an archaic Greek poem; but it seems that it cannot have had a truly comparable predecessor in early Greek lyric. Epigraphic dedications, both public and private, date from a very early period. When the dedication was metrical, the elegiac metre was most frequently employed. Early epigraphic *anathematika* were brief because dressed stone and stone-cutting were expensive. Another type of early *anathematikon* was lyric, not epigraphic. It was sung by a chorus when cities made cult offerings at the great shrines. Traces of such works are

[16] Cf. Williams, *loc. cit.*

[17] Cf. Pind., *Ol.* 12, 1 ff. (*Tyche*), *Nem.* 7, 1 ff. (*Erythia*), *Isth.* 5, 1 ff. (*Thia*), Bacch., *Epin.* 11, 1 ff. (*Nixa*).

preserved in fragmentary references to *Tripodephorika*, *Daphnephorika* and *Oschophorika*.[18]

The epigraphic *anathematikon* could be either public, that is, set up by a city or ruler, or it could be put up by a private individual. The lyric *anathematika* on the other hand were public and choric. A third class of poem with occasional anathematic aspects was the *epinikion*. An *epinikion* sometimes honoured a private citizen, although a victor was always closely associated with his city. But it could be hymnic in form and it was always choric. An *epinikion* with pronounced anathematic content is Pindar's *Olympian*. 5.

The distinctions in the generic field between public and private and between choric and non-choric go back to the early period of Greek lyric.[19] What is interesting about the *anathematikon* is that there is no trace of a private, lyric but non-choric *anathematikon* in early Greek poetry. Nor is it likely that such poems existed but have been entirely lost, since the epigraphic type offered advantages in convenience and cheapness. It may be that the non-existence of private lyric *anathematika* in the early period explains the absence from Menander Rhetor's categorisation of hymns[20] of a category of "anathematic hymn".

By the Hellenistic period the private "epigraphic" literary *anathematikon* had generated a sophisticated type of elegiac epigram divorced from practical use and widely written by poets for imaginary situations. Horace drew his conception of the material of *Odes*. III. 23, from this corpus of *anathematika*, but he combined this material with a lyric metre and derived the ethos of his dedication from the public *anathematikon* of early Greek lyric. The result is something completely new — a private non-choric but anathematic lyric. The process of innovation is, of course, characteristic of the Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic period. The impulse to write larger and more impressive examples of genres which the poet knew only in minor forms was, like the reverse process, a trait of the time[21], and Horace was anticipated by Theocritus' *Idyll* 28 in enlarging

[18] E.g. Pfeiffer, *Ltr*. 66, 70, 94; cf. 1048b 15ff.

[19] For further discussion of such concepts see my *Generic Composition*, pp. 192 ff.

[20] *Rhetores Graeci*, ed. L. Spengel, Leipzig, 1856, III, pp. 333 ff.

[21] Cp. for this tendency: Theocr., *Id*., 10 (see F. Cairns in *Hermes*, 98 (1970), pp. 88 ff.); *Id*., 14 (see *Generic Composition*, pp. 171 ff.); *Id*., 28 (see n. 5 above); and the Ovidian examples treated by A. A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love Elegy*, Oxford, 1938, pp. 134 ff.

the sphere of the private *anathematikon*. But Horace's originality should not be understated. His combination of Hellenistic content and early lyric form is bold and striking, as well as being typically Horatian. The effect of Horace's originality is to add the final touch to the intimate links between god and worshipper portrayed by him throughout the ode.

* * *

Caelo supinas si tuleris manus
Nascente Luna, rustica Phidyle,
Si thure placaris et horna
Fruge Lares avidaque porca,
Nec pestilentem sentiet Africum
Fecunda vitis nec sterilem seges
Robiginem aut dulces alumni
Pomifero grave tempus anno
Nam quae nivali pascitur Algido
Devota quercus inter et ilices
Aut crescit Albanis in herbis
Victima pontificum secures
Cervice tinget: te nihil attinet
Tentare multa caede bidentium
Parvos coronantem marino
Rore deos fragilique myrto.
Immunis aram si tetigit manus,
Non sumptuosa blandior hostia
Mollivit aversos Penates
Farre pio et saliente mica.

(*Odes*, III, 23)

The genre *anathematikon* is even more useful in the interpretation of *Odes*, III, 23. Not only does it provide a context for the ode but it helps to clarify some longstanding problems in it. *Odes*, III, 23 is another member of the genre, although it is more difficult to identify as such than *Odes*, III, 13. The fact that, as in *Odes*, III, 13, the offering will be made in the future is not now a difficulty. The two remaining obstacles to its identification are: first, the fact that in it the speaker is not the sacrificer Phidyle, but Horace, who is not making an offering; and second, the related impression which the ode might give of being paraenetic and not dedicatory.

On the question of speakers, the position seems to be as follows. In most dedications the person making the offering speaks either straightforwardly in the first person or, more formally, names himself and speaks in the third person. In a few the poet describes a dedication made by someone else without his own personality coming into the picture[22]. In such *anathematika* only two "persons" are really involved, the donor/speaker and the recipient/addressee. In *Odes*, III, 23, we have a tripersonal *anathematikon* in which in addition to the donor and recipient a third party, the poet, genuinely enters into the generic situation. The "logical" speaker Phidyle, who is the donor, is replaced by Horace as "actual" speaker; she replaces the "logical" addressees, the Lares and Penates, and is addressed by Horace. This phenomenon is common in generic examples and I have discussed and exemplified it elsewhere[23]. It is from a technical point of view a useful device in lyric poetry because of the restricted character of the lyric "ego". Since the lyric speaker is always either the poet himself, in one sense or another, or a chorus, but never another individual, tripersonal poems are a necessity if two "persons" other than the poet are to be simultaneously involved. In *Odes*, III, 23, Horace could not have adopted the *persona* of Phidyle. So in addition to Phidyle the dedicator (A1) and the recipients of her dedications, the *Lares* and *Penates* (A2), he appears as a third party — a "vicarious" speaker. Horace exploits the tripersonality of the ode by using it to go beyond the normal subject matter of the *anathematikon*. He does not simply describe the offering and accompanying prayers which Phidyle will make (B8). He also states that Phidyle's prayers will be fulfilled. Even so in *A.P.*, VI, 243 (Diodorus) the poet first quotes Maximus' dedicatory prayer to Hera and then states that the goddess and the Fates assented to Maximus' prayer.

The second barrier to identification of *Odes*, III, 23, as an *anathematikon* is that it might appear to be paraenetic — advice to Phidyle on the kind of offerings she should make. But this is not in fact so. *si* in lines 1 and 17 does not indicate doubt that Phidyle will make her offerings. It is an example of the temporal use of *si* to mean "when"[24]. Similarly lines

[22] E.g. *A.P.*, VI, 30 (Macedonius), 203 (Lacon or Philippus of Thessalonica), 217 (Simonides), 220 (Dioscorides), 221 (Leonidas), 222 (Theodoridas), 223 (Antipater), 237 (Antiphilus), 284 (Myrinus).

[23] Cf. *Generic Composition*, pp. 192 ff.

[24] Cf. LEUMANN, HOFMANN, SZANTYR, *Lateinische Grammatik*, II, pp. 663 f.; J. WACKERNAGEL in *KZ*, 67 (1930), p. 5; *Kl. Schr.*, p. 261.

13 ff. are statements about what Phidyle will actually do. Horace is not advising Phidyle on this matter, because her poverty allows her no choice of offerings. He is describing with approval the only ones Phidyle can make. This approval may indirectly constitute *paraenesis* to Horace's readers but it is not advice to Phidyle.

An understanding of the anathematic nature of *Odes*, III, 23, clarifies the attitudes which Horace is expressing towards Phidyle's sacrifice. He might seem to be emphasising the spiritual side of Phidyle's offerings, and perhaps even suggesting that they are superior to those of the *pontifices*. Such an attitude might appear to be related to such philosophic and moral doctrines as the belief that God is ἀπροσδεής (needing nothing from us), so that what we offer him is indifferent[25], or that right action depends on the will of the agent[26].

I shall suggest below that *Odes*, III, 23 does indeed express a viewpoint derived from ancient moral philosophy. It is however one more consonant with a typically Roman view of the importance of state cults than those just outlined. As for the sentiments which seem to argue for a "spiritual" attitude on Horace's part, they are nothing more than an elaboration of topos B4 of the *anathematikon*. This is the concept of a small gift from a well-meaning donor. In gifts to men the stress is on the personal feelings of the giver, e.g. βαιὸν ἀπ' ὠϊκ ὀλίγης πέμπει φρενός (*A.P.*, VI, 229, 4 f. Crinagoras); or the statement can be couched in comparative terms — the donor's feelings exceed his ability to give, e.g. ὀλίγην δώσειν ἀλλ' ἀπὸ θυμοῦ / πλείονος (*A.P.*, VI, 227, 5 f. Crinagoras). In the divine *anathematikon* the antithesis is couched in the form, "the gift is small, but it is the gift of a pious giver". Close parallels to the notion which Horace amplifies in *Odes*, III, 23 are *A.P.*, VI, 25 (Julianus), VI, 191 (Cornelius Largus), VI, 199 (Antiphilus), VI, 320 (Quintus). The poverty-piety link found in *Odes*, III, 23 is therefore simply another example of the same commonplace.

If the ode is regarded in this light, it can be read as follows. Stanza 1 introduces a poor country woman, Phidyle — "thrifty". She will make small offerings of incense, barley meal and a sow. Stanza 2 predicts that these offerings will have their desired effect. Phidyle's crop will be spar-

[25] For examples of this motif cf. E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig-Berlin, 1913, pp. 13 ff.

[26] Cf. e.g. SEN., *Ep.*, 95, 52.

ed the ravages of the weather. So far the run of thought is clear. But the third stanza introduces an intentional complexity. It begins with *nam*, and seems to offer an explanation of stanza 2, i.e., *because* the *pontifices* make their sacrifices (stanza 3), therefore Phidyle's crops will be safe from the weather (stanza 2). However, stanza 1 has already proclaimed that the safety of Phidyle's crops will be thanks to *her* offerings.

I suggest that Horace means both the things he says – that the safety of Phidyle's crops will be due to her own offerings *and* to those of the *pontifices*. As W. Warde Fowler saw, Horace is expressing the standard Roman belief that the *pax deorum* and the fertility of the crops which results from it require the performance of the proper rites both on the private and on the public level.[27] Horace's firm assertion that Phidyle's crops will in fact be fruitful thus amounts to a proclamation that the *pontifices*' sacrifice will be effective and by implication that the state is in good and pious hands. It is therefore an endorsement of the Augustan regime. Phidyle and the *pontifices* stand for the Roman people united piously under a government which, because the proper rites are performed, enjoys good relations with the gods.

Horace makes a precise temporal distinction between the sacrifices of Phidyle and the *pontifices*. The future perfect is used of Phidyle's offerings and the future for those of the *pontifices*. Horace further states that Phidyle's offering will take place *nascente luna*, i.e. on the first day of a month. We may well ask why the two sacrifices are so distinguished and what month Horace means. The correct month for Roman sacrifices on behalf of the crops is May.[28] The date of Phidyle's offering then is May 1st. At this point our view is restricted by uncertainties. The main Roman sacrifice for the crops was the *Ambarvalia*, held later in May. But there seems to be no sound evidence that the *pontifices* participated in this rite which was the preserve of the Arval Brethren. However Horace does not say that the *pontifices*' offerings will be made specifically for the crops. He may simply mean that the *pontifices* will at some unspecified date later than May 1st make major offerings to preserve the *pax deorum*, thus

[27] *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, London 1922, pp. 430 f. and n. 7.

[28] On what follows concerning cults and festivals see G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2nd ed., Munich 1912, index s.vv. 'Arvalbrüder', '*Bona Dea, Lares* etc.'; K. Latte, *op. cit.*, index s.vv. *Arvales Sodales, Bona Dea, Lares*; W. Warde Fowler, *The Roman Festivals*, London 1899, index s.vv. *Bona Dea, Lares, Ambarvalia*. I have tried to avoid controversial aspects of these matters.

providing a context in which Phidyle's humble offerings, made specifically for her crops on May 1st, will be effectual.

Phidyle's 1st May offering to the Lares for the crops has interesting associations. Apart from the *Compitalia* which is a winter feast, the Lares were honoured on the Kalends, Ides and Nones of each month. This ode and Propertius, IV, 3, 53 f., which also mentions such an offering to the Lares, would suggest that of the three days the Kalends were the most important. May 1st may have had even more importance than other Kalends. The month of May was the one in which the Arval Brethren held the *Ambarvalia* and sang a hymn which included prayers to the Lares. The actual day May 1st was the anniversary of the establishment of an altar of the *Lares praestites* at Rome. Moreover May 1st was also the anniversary of a temple of the *Bona Dea* – worshipped only by women – which was restored at an unknown date by Augustus' wife Livia. I mention this last fact because the worship of this goddess seems to be alluded to in *Odes*, III, 23, partly by correspondence and partly by contrast. The *Bona Dea* was associated with herbs (cp. *rosa marina*, II, 15 f.) and the standard offering to her was a *porca* (cp. I, 4) but she had a special antipathy to myrtle (I, 16). Horace may therefore be thinking of two rites which took place on the same day: a May 1st offering by women to the Lares and Penates for the crops, which may have been a more important institution than we know; and May 1st worship by women of the *Bona Dea*. The complex of associations is enriched by the fact that the *Bona Dea* was the daughter of Faunus and had links with the countryside. She was also linked with the *Dea Dia*, the goddess of the Arval Brethren.[29] The hypothesis that Horace is alluding to two different festivals occurring on the same day is parallelled by W. Barr's account of the religious content of Horace, *Odes*, I, 4.[30] Barr has argued that the content and structure of that ode can best be explained on the assumption that Horace is alluding both to the sacrifice to Faunus made on the 13th of February in his temple on the island of the Tiber and to another religious institution, the *dies parentalis*, which began on the sixth hour of that very same day. I suggest that in *Odes*, III,

[29] Cf. Warde Fowler, *The Roman Festivals*, p. 105.

[30] *Class. Rev.*, NS 12 (1962), pp. 5 ff. Nisbet-Hubbard, *ad loc.*, are sceptical about Barr's conclusions. But Horace's interest in *Fauni* in the odes is clear and if *Odes*, III, 23, does also contain allusions to two religious events of the same day then the two odes work in the same way.

23. Horace is also meditating on the Roman calendar and on the possible connections of the two feasts falling on the same day.

The controversial fifth stanza is gnomic throughout: the perfects *tetigit* (17) and *mollivit* (19) convey a general proposition which sums up the ode. The main difficulty lies in the word *immunis* (17). The scholiasts interpret *immunis* as "guiltless"; but, as Bentley pointed out, it is never found alone in Latin with this meaning. Elsewhere in Horace the word means "not paying" or "not payed for", which would give poor sense here. Other interpretations have been collected by A. Ireloar[11]. Ireloar's own conclusion, which I believe to be correct, is that *immunis* means "without obligation". *Immunis* in this sense is well attested (*TLL*, s.v. IA1); and Ireloar's case is supported further by an epigraphic use of *immunis* as a technical term of religious and secular *collegia* and other associations[12]. In this context *immunis* refers to the exemption of some members of an association from duties of membership. In *Odes*, III, 23, Horace has just referred in lines 11-16 to the *pontifices*, who formed a *collegium*. He next says that the kind of sacrifices they make are irrelevant as far as Phidyle is concerned. Then in the final summing up stanza the phrase *immunis manus* is used to refer to humble sacrificers like Phidyle as opposed to *pontifices*. I suggest therefore that the *immunis manus* is the hand of persons exempt from the obligations which *pontifices* have *qua* members of their *collegium*. There is a slight extension of the technical sense of *immunis* in this application of it. Normally the person described as *immunis* is a member of the group from whose duties he is exempted; here the *manus* belongs to persons who are not in fact members of the *collegium* from whose obligations they are exempt. But its significance remains clear. It is because the *manus* has no obligation to perform pontifical sacrifices that, although its offering is small, nevertheless the *far* is *pius* and the *mica* leaps in the fire as a sign of the gods' favour[13]. The last

[11] *Class. Rev.* NS 6 (1956) pp. 4 ff.

[12] Cf. *TLL*, s.v. *immunis* IA3. The examples given are all of a date later than Horace. But in view of the paucity of Republican inscriptions, this fact is probably not significant.

[13] The commentators say, but scarcely prove, that the crackling of the salt in the fire was taken for a good omen" (WICKHAM, *ad loc.*). This scepticism is misplaced, since Horace's *saliente mica* falls within the sphere of well attested pyromancy. Cf. A. BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, *Histoire de la Divination dans l'Antiquité*, I (Paris, 1879) pp. 178 ff.; W. R. HALLIDAY, *Greek Divination*, London, 1913, pp. 184 ff.

stanza then sums up in a positive form the "poor but pious" commonplace around which the ode is constructed: if you are not the person responsible for and obliged to make expensive offerings, then the offerings suitable to your station will be acceptable to the gods.

I suggested above that certain philosophic views of the ode were a misunderstanding of its topical content. The ode does however advance a viewpoint rooted in popular Hellenistic philosophy. A Stoic pronouncement which comes from a later source but puts Horace's attitude in a nutshell is worth quoting:

> *σπένδειν δε καὶ θύειν καὶ ἀπαρχέσθαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἑκάστοτε προσήκει καθαρῶς καὶ μὴ ἐπισεσυρμένως μηδὲ ἀμελῶς μηδὲ γλίσχρως μηδὲ ὑπὲρ δύναμιν* (EPICTETUS, *Enchiridion*, 31, 5).

That this approach is not specifically Stoic is shown by a dramatic version of it:

> *... ὡς θύουσι δ' οἱ τοιχωρύχοι*
> *κοὐτὰς φέρονται, σταμνί', οὐχὶ τῶν θεῶν*
> *ἕνεκ' ἀλλ' ἑαυτῶν· ὁ λιβανωτὸς εὐσεβὴς*
> *καὶ τὸ πόπανον· τοῦτ' ἔλαβεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ* 450
> *ἅπαν ἐπιτεθέν.* (MENANDER, *Dyscolus*, 447 ff.)[14]

where the incense and cake are declared to be "pious" in the same way as the *far* is *pius* at *Odes*, III, 23, 20.

But although Horace is expressing a general Hellenistic view, he may be thinking specifically of the teaching of one important philosopher of the second century B.C. This is Panaetius[15], whose doctrine of *τὸ πρέπον* (*decorum*) gave him a place in the history of Stoicism. Panaetius' views were current in Horace's day through Cicero's popularisation of them in the *De Officiis* — published 43 B.C. — and Horace refers explicitly to Panaetius and also preaches his doctrines in *Odes*, I, 29[16]. Panaetius believed that a virtuous life should be based on the resources given to a man by nature:

[14] I am indebted for this reference to Prof. Eric Handley.

[15] Cf. M. VAN STRAATEN, *Panetius, sa vie, ses écrits et sa doctrine avec une édition des fragments*, Amsterdam, 1946. The last portion was republished separately as *Panaetii Rhodii fragmenta*, ed. M. VAN STRAATEN, Leiden, 1952.

[16] Cf. J. R. G. WRIGHT, 'Iccius: Change of Character', *Horace*, Odes I, 29, in *Mnemosyne*, 27 (1974), pp. 44 ff.

> *Ηρως τουτους ἐτι Παναιτιος το ζην κατα τας δεδομενας ἡμιν ἐκ φυσεως ἀφορμας τελος ἀπεφηνατο* (CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, *Stromateis*, II, 21 = Fr. 96 (VSD).

Decorum involved following one's own particular nature and achieving consistency in one's life and actions. Thus Panaetius taught that magistrates, private citizens and foreigners had different duties (*De Off.*, I, 124). In a typical exposition of Panaetius' position

> *nos studia nostra nostrae naturae regula metiamur, neque enim attinet naturae repugnare nec quicquam sequi, quod assequi non queas* (CICERO, *De Officiis*, I, 31, 110-111 = Fr. 97 (VSD).

Cicero expresses in the words *neque enim attinet* etc. in general terms the precept which Horace applies to Phidyle's specific circumstances in the words *te nihil attinet* etc. (l. 15).

One or two other attitudes of Panaetius may be relevant. He opposed vast expenditures on public buildings including temples (*De Off.*, II, 60). *De Officiis*, I, 151 commends *agricultura* as the best of occupations. Cicero of course means being a gentleman-farmer and not, like Phidyle, a peasant, and his conclusion may well be a Roman adaptation of Panaetius' doctrine. Yet there are indications that there was Stoic "theorising on appropriate occupations for the free poor".[1] It would seem also that work in the countryside was in general regarded as better by Stoics than work in town, and at any rate the later Stoics Musonius and Dio upheld as honourable the life of the poor farmer. Phidyle's peasant status fits this pattern well, and it may even be no accident that she is female. Musonius held that "women were as capable of virtue as men".

Even if none of these details are felt to be relevant to *Odes*, III, 23, the fact that in general terms at least it draws on philosophic inspiration makes it a strikingly original adaptation of the genre *anathematikon*. Horace begins with the kind of offering in which the humble dedicator might from a religious standpoint apologise to his god for the poverty of his offering and assure the god that despite appearances it is the offering of a pious heart. This religious topic is given a philosophic twist, so that the *anathematikon* is turned into a meditation on the appropriateness of

[1] On this theme cf. P. A. BRUNT, *Aspects of the Social Thought of Dio Chrysostom and of the Stoics*, in *PCPS*, NS 19 (1973), pp. 9-11.

various offerings to various sacrificers. *Odes*, III, 23 is therefore one of those in which Horace unites a genre with its roots in archaic Greece with a Hellenistic philosophic theme and so in his *Odes* anticipates the later development of his work in the *Epistles*.

University of Liverpool
Abercromby Square, P.O. Box 147
Liverpool L69 3BX
England

FRANCIS CAIRNS.

TOME XLVI, 1977, 2e fasc. DEEL XLVI, 1977, 2e afl.

L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

Revue semestrielle, publiée avec l'appui du Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale et de la Culture et de la Fondation Universitaire.

Zesmaandelijks tijdschrift, uitgegeven met de steun van het Ministerie van Nationale Opvoeding en Kultuur en van de Universitaire Stichting.

BRUXELLES — BRUSSEL
1977

TABLE DES MATIÈRES — INHOUDSTAFEL

Articles — Artikelen

Mélanges — Varia

Chronique — Kroniek