THE ALCAIC KID (HORACE, *CARM.* 3.13)

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.

(Hor. *Carm.* 3.13)[1]

O spring of Bandusia, more glimmering than glass, deserving sweet wine and flowers, too—tomorrow you will receive a kid, whose brow now swollen with the first horns foretells the battles of love. All in vain, since this son of the lusty flock will taint your cool waters red with blood. You the awful hour of the Dogstar has no resource to touch; you offer pleasant coolness to the plow-weary cattle and the wandering flock. You, too, will become one of the famous springs, through the song I sing of the oak planted over the grotto, from where your talking waters leap.

Odes 3.13, *O fons Bandusiae*, has evoked a range of readings from the literal to the figurative. The best-known literal reader is perhaps A. Y. Campbell, whose unabashed disgust at the blood of the kid (*haedus*) mingling with the waters of the *fons Bandusiae* offered a hostage to scholarly fortune.[2] Campbell's extreme reaction implies belief that the second stanza actually occurred at the Sabine

[1] All Horatian text, apart from changes in punctuation, follows the *OCT* of C. Wickham and H. W. Garrod (Oxford 1912) unless otherwise noted. The texts of other authors follow the editions noted at each citation. All translations are my own.

[2] A. Y. Campbell, *Horace: A New Interpretation* (London 1924). Campbell envisions a parched reader turning to *Odes* 3.13 for refreshment and being revolted at the prospect of blood in the water: "Who wants a drink out of the fountain of Bandusia after that?" (2). Compare the famous critique of D. West (*Reading Horace* [Edinburgh 1967]), who censures Campbell for removing the kid-sacrifice from its cultural context: "So modern taste does not like blood in running water. This is neither here nor there. . . . The critic must shed . . . local prejudices" (129).

villa.[3] Other literal critics check their cultural baggage and treat 3.13 as poetry, albeit as poetry connected to reality. Francis Cairns, for example, reads the ode as an *anathematikon* (dedicatory offering); the poem follows the conventions of dedicatory epigrams in the *Anthologia Palatina*. On the other hand, Cairns argues for the *Fontinalia* as the occasion of composition, and tracks the conception, gestation, and maturation of the kid from data on the mating habits of goats in central Italian climates.[4] There is little distinction between Horace the poet and Horace the farmer.[5]

Literal readers, however, are in the minority. The vast majority of the scholarship reads 3.13 from a figurative standpoint—as detached from reality to some degree—and especially as a manifesto about poetry itself. For instance, Steele Commager notes the promise made to the *fons* (*fies nobilium tu quoque fontium*, 13) and declares the ode "an invocation to [Horace's] own art."[6] John R. Wilson calls attention to the "proud ringing tone" of *me dicente* (14), and the identification of the poet with the spring: "[I]n praising the spring he is almost praising himself."[7] David R. Smith takes this notion further, commenting on the shifting poetic focus of the ode: "The climax comes when the focus suddenly zooms away from the thematic and the physical to show the poet himself in operation."[8] Virginia B. Jameson reads 3.13 as an allegory, with the *fons*

---

[3] The existence of the so-called Horatian villa near Licenza, complete with *fons*, complicates matters. E. W. Leach ("Horace's Sabine Topography in Lyric and Hexameter Verse," *AJP* 114 [1993] 271–302) notes, "We are fortunate in having a real Sabine property against which to evaluate the poet's technique, since the agreement of topography and description indicates that Horace wanted his reader to visualize the actual appearance of his place" (278). Perhaps, but critics must beware of succumbing to the myth of presence. For the first systematic excavation of the site, see G. Lugli, *La villa Sabina di Orazio* (Rome 1926).

[4] F. Cairns, "Horace, *Odes*, III, 13, and III, 23," *AC* 46 (1977) 523–43, esp. 527–30. Cairns sees a reciprocal relationship between the farmer and the spring, a concept to which I will return.

[5] Compare E. Fraenkel (*Horace* [Oxford 1957]), who reads the poem as a biographical record: "No doubt the commentators are right who localize the *fons Bandusiae* in or near Horace's Sabine farm and refer . . . 10–12 to his own cattle and flock" (203).

[6] S. Commager, *The* Odes *of Horace* (New Haven 1962) 323. Likewise M. O. Lee, *Word, Sound, and Image in the* Odes *of Horace* (Ann Arbor 1969): "The closing stanza . . . implies that Horace's art will rank with the greatest of antiquity" (57); G. Davis, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley 1991): "[T]he poet objectifies the creative performance and the *carmen* itself as a means of clarifying his lyric program and validating his achievement" (132).

[7] J. R. Wilson, "*O Fons Bandusiae*," *CJ* 63 (1968) 296. Likewise R. Hexter, "*O Fons Bandusiae*: Blood and Water in Horace, *Odes* 3.13," in Michael Whitby, P. Hardie, and Mary Whitby, eds., Homo Viator: *Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol 1988) 131–39: "In the last stanza, fountain and poet have become more closely allied . . . the fountain and the poet have become one" (139). See also E. Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge 1998): "By canonizing the spring, Horace effectively canonizes himself" (99).

[8] D. R. Smith, "The Poetic Focus in Horace, *Odes*, 3.13," *Latomus* 35 (1975) 826.

Bandusiae as manuscript, the kid as vellum wrapping, and its *cornua* as the rolling-rods of the scroll. Jameson's interpretation, which denies the poem any connection with reality, is the polar opposite of Campbell's: "One thing is sure: '*O fons Bandusiae*' cannot stand as an apostrophe to a real spring. The emphatic point is not that the spring does not exist. It does exist, and is everlastingly regenerated—but only because of the poet's words on a page."[9]

My purpose in this article is twofold. First, I will read 3.13 both literally and figuratively; the sacrifice of Horace the farmer will elucidate the sacrifice of Horace the poet, although I will consider both rituals on their own terms.[10] Second, I will demonstrate the significance of the poem within the collection of *Odes* 1–3. David Coffta has recently analyzed 3.13 as a composite of Greek literary themes, motifs, and images: "[Horace] not only draws on Hellenistic models but creates from them a synthesis which furthers their individual effect, transcends generic boundaries, and epitomizes the type of literary innovation sanctioned by those very predecessors."[11] Gottfried Mader also reads 3.13 from a generic standpoint: "The ode that begins with the pure Callimachean waters and the emblems of lyric conviviality rises to an 'epic' note with the promise of future fame for the spring."[12] In my view the ode, which is an example of "programmatic synthesis" (to borrow Coffta's title), synthesizes two Horatian precursors: Callimachus and Alcaeus, represented respectively by the *fons Bandusiae* and the sacrificial *haedus*. It should be noted that Horace's take on these poets is subjective; who they were or what they wrote is less important than how they are (re)constructed.[13]

---

[9] V. B. Jameson, "What Words Can Do: Horace, *C.* 3.13, '*O Fons Bandusiae*,'" *Helios* 24 (1997) 57. D. W. T. Vessey ("The *Fons Bandusiae* and the Problem of the Text," in C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 4 [Brussels 1986] 383–92) also notes the booklike qualities of the kid.

[10] I will employ the respective terms "farmer" or "poet" in a literal or a figurative reading. Note that my literal reading, like my interpretation of the Sabine landscape, treats Horace the farmer as a construct, albeit a realistic one. Compare J. Henderson (*Writing down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry* ([Oxford 1999]), who explores Horace's rustic self-representation in *Odes* 3.22, *Montium custos*, which promises a young boar to a pine tree. For Henderson the representation cannot be taken literally: "We are supposed to see right through Horace, pigging it by the fish pond, press-on warts and all" (120).

[11] D. J. Coffta, "Programmatic Synthesis in Horace, *Odes* III, 13," in C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 9 (Brussels 1998) 281. Coffta's survey of Hellenistic antecedents encompasses (in particular) Callimachus and Theocritus, but not Alcaeus. D. C. Feeney, "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," in N. Rudd, ed., *Horace 2000: Essays for the Bimillennium* (Ann Arbor 1993) 41–63, demonstrates Horace's indebtedness to Greek (and Alcaic) lyric in the collection at large.

[12] G. Mader, "That St[r]ain Again: Blood, Water, and Generic Allusion in Horace's Bandusia Ode," *AJP* 123 (2002) 57. Mader reads the mixing of blood and water as a fusion of epic and lyric, in keeping with the elevated tone at the poem's end. I agree that Horace's program in 3.13 is to elevate lyric, but not necessarily by appropriating a foreign genre.

[13] D. O. Ross (*Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* [Cambridge 1975]) observes that acknowledging a model means redefining it: "Each generation

There are many poets in the landscape of *Odes* 1–3, and their names provide fitting labels. For example, "Theocritean" accurately describes the Sabine estate, whose idyllic qualities verge on the pastoral. Equally suitable is "Callimachean," due to Horace's tendency to privilege the small, the delicate, and the private over the grandiose, the grave, and the public. This is not to say that Callimachus never attempted anything grand, nor that his poetry was detached from the public sphere; rather, Horace projects delicacy and privacy onto his Greek precursor.[14]

An exemplary Callimachean passage is the final stanza of poem 2.1, *Motum ex Metello*. Horace interrupts a reverie induced by the lofty themes of Pollio's history:

> sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis
> Ceae retractes munera neniae,
> mecum Dionaeo sub antro
> quaere modos leviore plectro.
> (*Carm.* 2.1.37–40)

> But, my shameless Muse, do not leave laughter behind and drag back the Simonidean dirge; rather, seek with me in a grotto of Venus strains from a lighter *plectrum*.

This is, naturally, a *recusatio* reminiscent of the prologue to the second edition of the *Aetia*, in which Callimachus objects to producing a long poem about kings and heroes.[15] The last verse, moreover, translates a Callimachean watchword: *leviore*, like the more common *tenuis*, approximates the adjective λεπταλέην in Apollo's injunction to Callimachus (fr. 1.24 Pfeiffer).[16] The stanza also reveals a connection between topography and poetry. Horace's "strains from a lighter *plectrum*" are linked to the landscape, to be performed in a grotto

---

of Latin poets . . . was to create a different image of Callimachus according to the needs of their own verse, an image that often has little resemblance to the original" (142–43). See further S. J. Heyworth, "Some Allusions to Callimachus in Latin Poetry," *MD* 33 (1994) 51–79.

[14] The topic of how Horace negotiates Callimachus is well documented. The pioneering studies are G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico* (Florence 1966; first pub. 1920); F. Wehrli, "Horaz und Kallimachos," *RhM* 1 (1944) 69–76; W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960); and J. V. Cody, *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics* (Brussels 1976). W. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5 (1964) 181–96, provides useful background for Callimachus and the Augustan poets in general (and Vergil in particular), but not Horace. Ross (above, n.13) applies the Callimachean question to a discussion of the *Odes* (ch. 7, "The Roman Poetry of Horace and Tibullus").

[15] So Ross (above, n.13), with reservations: "In 2.1.37–40 there is no suggestion that the Muse is Callimachean" (141–42). Not the Muse, perhaps, but (as I next state) the *plectrum* is Callimachean.

[16] On *tenuis*, see Wehrli (above, n.14) 72; Ross (above, n.13) 140 and index *s.v. tenuis*; and M. S. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes (Chapel Hill 1986) 34. D. Porter (*Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of* Odes *1–3* [Princeton 1987] 246–50) recommends *parvus* as a Callimachean watchword in the collection.

of Venus (*Dionaeo sub antro*, 39). An essential aspect of the Callimachean aesthetic in the *Odes* is the combination of subject and space. Private themes, such as love and leisure, are explored in private environments.[17]

Like the surrounding landscape, the *fons Bandusiae* evokes Callimachus.[18] A modest spring, the *fons* recalls the λιβάς recommended in the *Hymn to Apollo* (112 Pfeiffer)—a pure and uncomplicated source of inspiration.[19] The virtual anonymity of the *fons* bestows further modesty. It has a name, Bandusia, but the name is elusive; no one has ever explained with certainty its etymology or meaning.[20] Perhaps that is the point. Horace's apostrophe is Callimachean, by which I mean that the name is either too obscure to identify or (if a coinage) too idiosyncratic to decode. Bandusia is no Hippocrene—although it is well on its way at the end of the poem.[21] Even the initial description of the *fons*, *splendidior vitro* (1), translates a phrase from the *Hecale*, ὑάλοιο φαάντερος (fr. 18.4 Hollis).[22]

The figurative reader of 3.13 finds the poet contemplating how best to repay the spring for its Callimachean inspiration. The literal reader finds a similar relationship between the spring and the farmer, who must also choose a suitable offering. The kid might seem an unusual choice in the context of the *Fontinalia*, about which Varro says the following:

> Fontinalia a Fonte, quod is dies feriae eius: ab eo tum et in fontes coronas iaciunt et puteos coronant.
> (Varro, *Ling.* 6.22 Semi)

---

[17] See, for example, 1.17 (*Velox amoenum*) and 1.22 (*Integer vitae*), in which the landscape becomes a lyric sounding board. See further Commager (above, n.6) chs. 5 and 6; E. A. Schmidt, "Das horazishe Sabinum als Dichterlandschaft," *A&A* 23 (1977) 97–112; and A. Bradshaw, "Horace *in Sabinis*," in C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 5 (1989) 160–86. Leach (above, n.3) finds the Sabine topography shifting to fit Horace's programs in the *Odes* and the *Epistles*.

[18] Hexter (above, n.7) regards the *fons* as a Callimachean body of water. See also Coffta (above, n.11) 269–70 and Mader (above, n.12) 53–54.

[19] This, at least, is the larger picture. For the nuances, see F. Williams, ed., *Callimachus*, Hymn to Apollo (Oxford 1978), the end of whose discussion I repeat here: "The fine spray from the pure spring stands for Callimachus' own poetry: on a small scale, but highly refined, written for the few who are able to appreciate the poet's learning and subtlety."

[20] P. Shorey and G. J. Laing, ed., *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes (Pittsburgh 1919): "A corruption of παυδοσία"; Jameson (above, n.9): "A Greek neologism, παντουσία . . with south Italian mimetic resonances of two places near the poet's birthplace: Bantia, near Venusia—telescoped into Bant(iaVen)usia?" (57). For an exhaustive discussion see A. Mayer, "*O Fons Bandusiae. . .*," *Glotta* 25 (1936) 173–82.

[21] A critical commonplace: Fraenkel (above, n.5) 203; Commager (above, n.6) 324; Wilson (above, n.7) 295; G. B. Nussbaum, "*Cras Donaberis Haedo* (Horace, *Carm.* 3.13)," *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 156; Cairns (above, n.4) 532; Davis (above, n.6) 127; Oliensis (above, n.7) 99.

[22] So G. Williams, ed., *The Third Book of Horace's* Odes (Oxford 1969). D. Curley, "*Splendidior Vitro*: Horace and Callimachus," forthcoming in *CP*, explores the allusion at length.

> The Fontinalia are named from Fons, since that is the day of his holiday. Then on his account people toss coronals into springs and crown the wells.

Again the first three lines of *Odes* 3.13:

> O fons Bandusiae, splendidior vitro,
> dulci digne mero non sine floribus—
> cras donaberis haedo. (*Carm.* 3.13.1–3)

> O spring of Bandusia, more glimmering than glass, deserving sweet wine and flowers, too—tomorrow you will receive a kid.

According to Varro floral wreaths are the typical offering to springs (*coronas iaciunt . . . puteos coronant*). Such is also the case in poem 3.13: *non sine floribus* (2) reads as an afterthought, as if flowers are to be expected. The first offering listed, however, is wine (*mero*, 2). Although Varro does not mention libations, it is no stretch of the imagination to regard the pouring out of wine—a common practice in so many Greco-Roman rituals—as appropriate to the occasion.[23] The point of wine and flowers, the reason why the farmer lists them first, is that they are so appropriate as to be inappropriate. Because they are ordinary offerings, they are mentioned in order to be rejected in favor of something extraordinary.

That something is the kid, whose status as an extraordinary gift is emphasized as the last word in a new metrical line: *cras donaberis haedo* (3). Where the pherecratean departs from the preceding asclepiadeans, there Horace departs from the traditional sacrifices. But why offer a kid? The third stanza presents an answer:

> te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae
> nescit tangere; tu frigus amabile
> fessis vomere tauris
> praebes et pecori vago.
> (*Carm.* 3.13.9–12)

> You the awful hour of the Dogstar has no resource to touch; you offer pleasant coolness to the plow-weary cattle and the wandering flock.

Without the *fons* and its *frigus amabile* (10) the farmer's livestock, which represent the vitality of the farm, would perish. As Cairns notes, "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 . . . is beginning. . . . The kid

---

[23] G. Williams (above, n.22) compares an epigram by Leonidas (*Anth. Pal.* 9.326), in which wine is dedicated to a spring. Cairns (above, n.4) 526 notes that the wine-tasting festival of the *Meditrinalia* (October 11), two days before the *Fontinalia*, might have some bearing on wine as a sacrificial option in poem 3.13.

is therefore a 'first fruit'."[24] The sacrifice of the *haedus* will establish reciprocity not only between the spring and the flocks, but also between the spring and the farmer, who will return life to the spring in exchange for the continued giving of life to his estate. The quintessential principle of ancient sacrifice, *do ut des*, is at work here.

The literal reading informs the figurative one. Gregson Davis remarks that all of the offerings in 3.13 are emblematic of Horace's convivial poetry:

> Unmixed wine, flowers, and young animal constitute the *sine quibus non* of the banqueting apparatus: the wine is destined to be mixed with water according to the dictates of the *magister bibendi*; the flowers will compose the obligatory wreaths worn by the participants; the sacrificed lamb [sic] will ultimately furnish the meat course.[25]

Convivial poetry, moreover, is Callimachean poetry—the private celebration as an escape from public turmoil.[26]

A Callimachean celebration is described in *Odes* 2.7, *O saepe mecum*, which commemorates the return of Pompeius, a comrade at Philippi. The poet anticipates a symposium that features the requisite wine and flowers:

> ergo obligatam redde Iovi dapem
> longaque fessum militia latus
> depone sub lauru mea, nec
> parce cadis tibi destinatis.
>
> oblivioso levia Massico
> ciboria exple; funde capacibus
> unguenta de conchis. quis udo
> deproperare apio coronas
>
> curatve myrto? (*Carm.* 2.7.17–25)

> So repay the banquet owed to Jupiter, and lay down your limbs, worn out from long warfare, beneath my laurel tree. Don't hold back from the wine jars arranged for you. Fill up the smooth cups with the Massic that brings oblivion. Pour the perfumes from the vast conches. Who will hurry to make garlands of pliant celery or myrtle?

Commager has noted that *oblivioso*, "oblivion-inducing" (21), is more than a stock epithet for the Massic wine. Pompeius is

---

[24] Cairns (above, n.4) 531.

[25] Davis (above, n.6) 128. Although I agree with Davis' interpretation of the wine and flowers, I advocate an alternative reading of the kid.

[26] See Commager, "The Function of Wine in Horace's *Odes*," *TAPA* 88 (1957) 75, for a catalog of escapist banquets in the *Odes*.

invited to match the amnesty shown by Octavian with a display of amnesty on his part.[27] The location is once again paramount: *sub lauru mea* (19), a private symposium.[28] Against the convivial setting of poem 2.7, flowers and especially wine[29] are worthy offerings to the *fons Bandusiae*, poetic first fruits in a Callimachean repertoire.

The kid also may be read as a Callimachean offering. Poem 17, *Velox amoenum*, shows the *haedus* and its flock as fixtures of the Sabine landscape:

> impune tutum per nemus arbutos
> quaerunt latentis et thyma deviae
> olentis uxores mariti,
> nec viridis metuunt colubras
>
> nec Martialis haediliae lupos.
>
> (*Carm.* 1.17.5–9)

> Without fear, throughout the safe grove, the wandering she-goats, mates of the reeking he-goat husband, seek out the hidden strawberries and thyme; the young kids fear neither the grass-green snakes nor the wolves of Mars.

In poem 3.13 the kid is the "son of a lusty flock" (*lascivi suboles gregis*, 8). That is, he is a product of *eros*, which looms large in the *Odes*. The kid's erotic qualities are inscribed on its brow via the nascent horns that preordain *et Venerem et proelia* (5). This phrase is usually taken as hendiadys for the "battles of love," which the literal critic might explain as a reference to the clashes among

---

[27] Commager (above, n.26): "[T]he time has come for Pompeius to forget, or at least to forego, his doctrinaire Republicanism of the past, as Horace himself had already done" (70).

[28] The phrase *sub lauru mea* may have associations with public song: Horace triumphantly claims a laurel from Melpomene at the end of book 3 (*lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam*, 3.30.16). Pompeius might therefore take shelter under an emblem of civic poetry. R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, eds. (*A Commentary on Horace:* Odes, *Book II* [Oxford 1978]), note, however, that Horace typically uses the second declension for the wreath and the fourth for the tree itself. The distinction seems important in 2.7, whose ambivalence reveals a poet not yet ready to confront the affairs of state. Porter (above, n.16) notes a progression from poem 2.1, in which Horace shudders at "the very thought of [the civil] wars," although he cannot yet speak of Philippi in the "more balanced tones" of poem 3.4 (120). The battle is clearly embarrassing for the poet, who cast away his shield in Archilochean fashion (*relicta . . . parmula*, 2.7.10). The symposium is another escape from Philippi, a retreat into the private world—although not necessarily the world of the Sabine estate, as in 1.17. On the very public *laurum* of poem 3.14, see below, n.48.

[29] A tradition that poses wine as an anti-Callimachean source of inspiration is reflected in the *Anthologia Palatina*: see Commager (above, n.6) 28–31. This tradition, however, belongs to the detractors of Callimachus, not to the Alexandrian poet himself: see P. Knox, "Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics," *HSPh* 89 (1985) 107–19 and Heyworth (above, n.13) 63–67.

he-goats during the mating season.[30] But *et Venerem et proelia* also yields a figurative interpretation in light of *Odes* 1.6, *Scriberis Vario*. In that poem Horace recuses himself from singing the exploits of Agrippa on the grounds that he is too slight a poet (*tenues grandia*, 9).[31] His métier is private:

> nos convivia, nos proelia virginum
> sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium
> cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur,
> non praeter solitum leves.
>
> (*Carm.* 1.6.17–20)

> I sing banquets, I sing the battles of fierce girls scratching at boys, I, free from care—or, if somewhat inspired, a trifler as usual.

Note the Callimachean watchwords *tenues* (9) and *leves* (20). The kid, which fights its own battles of love, is a Callimachean first fruit.[32] As the farmer offers a kid to the spring in order to renew the flock, so the poet offers a Callimachean emblem in order to renew Callimachean inspiration.

Or so it seems. The situation at the end of 3.13, which goes beyond sacrificial reciprocity, demands further consideration. In reality, the striking change of color in the second stanza (*rubro sanguine rivos*, 7) is temporary, since the water will soon run clear. From a figurative standpoint, however, more lasting changes are predicted in the fourth stanza: *fies nobilium tu quoque fontium / me dicente* ("You, too, will become one of the famous springs, through the

---

[30] So Wilson (above, n.7), whose generally figurative reading of the poem treats the kid literally: "The horns are beginning to protrude from his brow, and he is thinking of love and its battles" (292).

[31] Horace demonstrates his ostensible inadequacy through botched reminiscences of Homer (e.g., the μῆνιν of Achilles mistranslated as *stomachum* at 1.6.6). See further Davis (above, n.6) 36–39. On the *recusatio* motif of 1.6, see Nisbet and Hubbard, eds., *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes, *Book I* (Oxford 1970); Santirocco (above, n.16) 35–36; and C. F. Ahern, "Horace's Rewriting of Homer in *Carmen* 1.6," *CP* 86 (1991) 301–14.

[32] Compare Davis (above, n.6), who also brings the *proelia virginum* of 1.6.17 to bear on *et Venerem et proelia*, although outside a Callimachean framework: "[T]he *proelia Veneris* of the libidinous goat . . . embody aggressive *amor*, or, more aptly put, they testify to the inclusiveness of the amatory theme" (129). The amatory theme appropriates bellicosity, the "disavowed other," via the hendiadys. See also Coffta (above, n.11):

> The *haedus* is equivalent, in programmatic terms, to the *tener vitulus* of *Odes* IV, 2 as a representative of brevity and refinement as poetic ideals. . . . Horace elsewhere speaks of young sacrificial animals and their juvenile traits (cf. the boar of *Odes* III, 22 which is still practicing its sidelong thrusts), but here the specific connection with Venus may have a further programmatic significance in its suggestion of the frequent Hellenistic theme of frustrated adolescent love (275).

song I sing," *Carm.* 3.13.13–14). The spring will be transformed from *ignobilis* to *nobilis* (13). It will become something grander, something more than Callimachean. An analog for *levis* or *tenuis* poetics cannot achieve this transformation.

The *haedus* represents a different kind of poetics, the key being the phrase *et Venerem et proelia* (5), which seems Callimachean. Goats do engage in the "battles of love"; yet they also engage in "both battles and love," not necessarily at the same time. Horns indicate sexual potency apart from territorial fighting and can ward off creatures more dangerous than other goats. "Love and battles" are experiences of which the kid will never partake, experiences suggested by its swollen brow. This reading of *et Venerem et proelia*, which classifies the function of the kid's horns under the separate rubrics of "love" and "battles," is a literal one. A figurative reading must also distinguish love from battles, not as facts of life, but as themes of poetry.[33] For Horace this thematic distinction is exemplified not by the works of Callimachus, but by those of Alcaeus.

For those who have read the collection sequentially, Alcaeus may already be in mind from *Odes* 3.12, *Miserarum est.* The poem's theme (a soliloquy by a love-struck girl, Neobule) and its meter (pure Ionic) derive from fragment 10B of Alcaeus.[34] Moreover, the opening appears to emulate the first line of the fragment:

> Miserarum est neque amori dare ludum. . . .
> (*Carm.* 3.12.1)

> Miserable women should grant no sport to love. . . .

> ἔμε δείλαν, ἔ]με παίσ[αν κακοτάτων πεδέχοισαν. . .
> (Alc. fr. 10B.1 Lobel-Page)

> Me, a miserable woman, partaking entirely of the worst woes. . . .

The rewriting of an initial Alcaic verse, or "borrowing of a motto,"[35] is standard Horatian practice. *Odes* 3.12 is an appropriate preface to 3.13, and is but one example of the many adaptations of Alcaic lyric in the *Odes*.[36] My reading of the Alcaic kid, however, depends

---

[33] Compare Mader (above, n.12): "[T]he conjunction *et venerem et proelia* suggests . . . a generic reference. In terms of signature themes, love is to lyric as war is to epic" (55).

[34] On the fragment see D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 291–94.

[35] Fraenkel (above, n.5) 159.

[36] See Pasquali (above, n.14) 1–140 and Fraenkel (above, n.5) 154–78 for other examples. Fr. 71 (Lobel-Page) mentions a kid: φίλος μὲν ἦσθα κἀπ' ἔριφον κάλην / καὶ χοῖρον ("You used to be a friend—someone to invite to kid and pork," tr. D. A. Campbell, Cambridge, Mass., 1977). The scholiast interprets ἔριφον κάλην καὶ χοῖρον as a proverbial expression for an elaborate feast. Without further context, it is impossible to say whether there is a direct connection between Horace's *haedus* and the χοῖρος of Alcaeus. Nevertheless, as I discuss below, this fragment illustrates the kind of song that en-

on a smaller body of evidence: not those poems inspired by Alcaeus, but those in which Horace constructs Alcaeus himself.[37]

Alcaeus appears twice in the collection. His first appearance is in poem 1.32, *Poscimus si quid*,[38] in which Horace asks his lyre for a song. The word for lyre is *barbitos* (4), which, in the inaugural poem of the *Odes*, is associated with the island of Lesbos (*Lesboum barbiton*, 34).[39] Now Horace requests a "Latin song" (*Latinum . . . carmen*, 3–4), but his request prompts an excursus on the poet who first took the instrument in hand:

> Lesbio primum modulate civi,
> qui ferox bello, tamen inter arma
> sive iactatam religarat udo
> litore navim,
>
> Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
> semper haerentem puerum canebat,
> et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque
> crine decorum. (*Carm.* 1.32.5–12)

> [O lyre] first played by the citizen of Lesbos, fierce in war, who nevertheless while fighting or securing his storm-tossed ship to the wave-washed shore used to sing of Bacchus; or the Muses; or Venus and her son, clinging to her always; or lovely Lycus, dark eyes and dark hair.

The "citizen of Lesbos" (5) is of course Alcaeus, who is portrayed as being on the threshold between love and battles—or nearly so. Denis Feeney observes that Horace emphasizes the private Alcaeus over the public.[40] His *arma* (6) and *navim* (8), metaphors for poetry about strife and factionalism, are depicted realistically, much like the kid-sacrifice of 3.13. They are presented as actual moments in a contentious life, which is antithetical to the poet's art. Alcaeus may have lived *inter arma*, but as far as Horace is concerned he

---

abled Horace to fashion Alcaeus as a Callimachean poet. Convivial poetry also can be Alcaic poetry.

[37] Santirocco (above, n.16) 71–73 also discusses Alcaeus as a constructed precursor in the *Odes*.

[38] The *OCT* reads *poscimur* for *poscimus*. On the distinction, see Nisbet and Hubbard (above, n.31).

[39] Feeney (above, n.11) notes that the epithet *Lesboum* (1.1.34) incorporates both Alcaeus and Sappho, while the emphatic *civi* of 1.32.5 includes only the former and occludes the latter: "Horace is here glancing at an emerging preference in the possibilities of his own lyric, allowing an alignment which will empower his voice as a citizen" (47).

[40] Feeney (above, n.11), a rich discussion upon which mine is predicated—although Feeney ultimately finds in Horace's separation of public and private an "elegant reluctance to assign clear priority to one sphere or the other" (47), whereas I find the two spheres rather polarized. Likewise Santirocco (above, n.16) 72; and Porter (above, n.16) 92–93.

sang only erotic and symposiastic songs. *Odes* 1.32 configures Alcaeus as a Callimachean poet, whose private songs brought solace from hardship.[41] Horace asks no less of his *barbitos*, which he calls the *laborum dulce lenimen*, "sweet reliever of toils" (14–15).

Odes 2.13, *Ille et nefasto*, reconfigures Alcaeus as a public poet. In an imaginary journey to the underworld, suggested by an almost fatal encounter with a falling tree, Horace envisions both Alcaeus and Sappho competing in song:

> quam paene furvae regna Proserpinae
> et iudicantem vidimus Aeacum
> sedesque descriptas[42] piorum et
> Aeoliis fidibus querentem
>
> Sappho puellis de popularibus,
> et te sonantem plenius aureo,
> Alcaee, plectro dura navis,
> dura fugae mala, dura belli.
>
> utrumque sacro digna silentio
> mirantur umbrae dicere; sed magis
> pugnas et exactos tyrannos
> densum umeris bibit aure vulgus.
> (*Carm.* 2.13.21–32)

> How I nearly saw the kingdom of shadowy Proserpina, Aeacus in judgment, the assigned houses of the just—and Sappho, lamenting on her Aeolian lyre over the girls of her circle, and you, Alcaeus, sounding out more clearly with a *plectrum* of gold the awful hardships of the sea, of exile and war. The shades of the dead marvel at each poet singing what is worthy of respectful silence; but the dense crowd prefers to drink in by ear the battles and the forcing-out of tyrants.

This passage is ground well traveled in the critical literature.[43] Most important for the present discussion is that between poems 1.32 and 2.13 the Alcaic pendulum has swung from *levia* to *grandia*. Alcaeus' poetry has room for both love and battles; to sing both is to adhere to an artistic golden mean, a mean that defines Horatian lyric.

Alcaeus inaugurates a threefold sequence of liminal poets in the collection. The second is Bacchus, whom Horace claims to have seen teaching songs in *Odes* 2.19, *Bacchum in remotis*:

---

[41] So Fraenkel (above, n.5) 175–76. See Page (above, n.34) 284–85 on the disparity between the Horatian catalog of Alcaeus' private poetry and the remains of the Lesbian poet's work.

[42] On *descriptas* versus *discriptas* (*OCT*) and *discretas*, see Nisbet and Hubbard (above, n.28).

[43] See Feeney (above, n.11) 48–49, who takes stock of many previous discussions.

Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus
vidi docentem—credite posteri—
Nymphasque discentis et auris
capripedum Satyrorum acutas.
(*Carm.* 2.19.1–4)

I saw Bacchus teaching songs on the distant cliffs—you future generations, believe me—and I saw the nymphs learning and the goat-footed satyrs, their ears alert.

In the same poem, after recounting Bacchus' triumphs in the Gigantomachy, Horace ponders the god's dual nature:

quamquam choreis aptior et iocis
ludoque dictus non sat idoneus
pugnae ferebaris, sed idem
pacis eras mediusque belli.
(*Carm.* 2.19.25–28)

Although it was commonly said that you were not wholly fit for battle, being better suited to choral dances and jokes and games, you were nevertheless the selfsame mediator of peace and war.

This is a remarkable transformation for a deity whose wine induces oblivion earlier in book 2 (*oblivioso . . . Massico*, 2.7.21). Bacchus, like Alcaeus, is reconstructed as a poet occupying two polar extremes.[44]

The third liminal poet of the *Odes* is none other than Horace, who on the heels of Bacchus' metamorphosis in 2.19 imagines himself as a swan in poem 2.20, *Non usitata*:

Non usitata nec tenui ferar
penna biformis per liquidum aethera
vates, neque in terris morabor
longius, invidiaque maior
urbis relinquam. (*Carm.* 2.20.1–5)

I will be carried by neither customary nor slender wing through the clear air; nor will I, the biform poet, linger too long on earth, but, greater than envy, I will leave the cities behind.

The poet will become a *biformis vates* (2–3), a singer with double form, both man and bird. His new plumage hints at the kind of poetry he will produce: *nec tenui penna* (1–2), which Feeney rightly calls a wing of "un-Callimachean grandeur."[45] Horace, following Alcaeus and Bacchus, will sing both private and public lyric. With

[44] So Commager (above, n.6) 339 and Feeney (above, n.11) 51.

[45] Feeney (above, n.11) 50, whose subsequent treatment of *Odes* 2.20 (52–53) encompasses 1.32 and 2.13, the Alcaeus poems, as well as 2.19, the Bacchus poem.

the advent of a new book and the Roman odes, he offers a dose of the latter.[46]

To return to *Odes* 3.13 and the projected sacrifice: the kid, whose horns suggest *et Venerem et proelia* (5), appears *levis* but is actually *biformis*—an analog for the Alcaic aesthetic, which encompasses opposing lyric themes. By offering an Alcaic kid to a Callimachean *fons*, the poet not only remunerates his source of inspiration but also transforms it forever. The transformation validates the poet's shift from private songs to something more magnificent and more apt for the Augustan age.

A brief excursus before some conclusions. The last stanza of *Odes* 3.13 is one measure of the success of the sacrifice. The *loquaces lymphae* (15–16) confirm the metamorphic capacity of the poet's art; the waters are now audible to the reader. Another indicator of success is *Odes* 3.14, *Herculis ritu*, in which Horace celebrates the return of Augustus from Spain in 24 B.C.E. Without entering into a full exegesis, I note that the poem merges public and private in the wake of the Alcaic program of 3.13.[47] The emperor's arrival, for example, is larger than life:

> Herculis ritu modo dictus, o plebs,
> morte venalem petiisse laurum
> Caesar Hispana repetit penatis
> victor ab ora. (*Carm.* 3.14.1–4)

> Recently, O people, Caesar was reported to have sought in Herculean fashion the laurel, a deadly purchase, and he seeks again his household gods as a victor from the Spanish shore.

Augustus has accomplished an almost superhuman task, the subjugation of Spain, and has become a latter-day Hercules. Horace also offers a panegyric of the emperor:

> hic dies vere mihi festus atras
> eximet curas; ego nec tumultum
> nec mori per vim metuam tenente
> Caesare terras. (*Carm.* 3.14.13–16)

> Truly this festive day will banish my black anxieties. I will fear neither civil uprising nor a violent death while Caesar rules the earth.

Given the prevaricating stance of the poet elsewhere in the collection, such declarations are striking in their candor.

---

[46] So Ross (above, n.13): "The danger [i.e., of the Roman Odes] was clearly that the acceptance of important themes—the themes of Rome, the emergence and realization of her destiny with its concomitant negative aspects—might appear to be a betrayal or disavowal of Callimachean poetics" (141).

[47] See D. Mankin, "*C.* 3.14: How 'Private' is Horace's Party?" *RhM* 135 (1992) 378–81, for a discussion on this point.

Augustus' return calls for a party, the preparations for which are outlined in the rest of the poem. One stanza will suffice:

> i pete unguentum, puer, et coronas
> et cadum Marsi memorem duelli,
> Spartacum si qua potuit vagantem
> fallere testa. (*Carm.* 3.14.17–20)

> Go get perfume and garlands and a jar that remembers the Marsian War, if any vessel was able to elude roving Spartacus.

The usual *convivialia* are named—perfume, flowers, and wine—but they will be used in a celebration that connects with, rather than detaches from, *imperium*. This is not an insular symposium like the one for Pompeius (2.7). The difference is in the wine, formerly inducing oblivion, now fully mindful of past tumult (*Marsi memorem duelli*, 18).[48] Horace's banquet, like the *fons Bandusiae*, has transcended its Callimachean limitations.

Three final thoughts. First, if the formula "Callimachus plus Alcaeus equals Horace" sounds too simplistic, it is. Horace implies as much in *Epistles* 2.2, in which he describes an *agon* between himself and another poet:[49]

> caedimur et totidem plagis consumimus hostem
> lento Samnites ad lumina prima duello.
> discedo Alcaeus puncto illius; ille meo quis?
> quis nisi Callimachus.
> (*Epist.* 2.2.97–100)

> We come to blows and like Samnites we consume the enemy with equal blows in a long battle until the first lights are lit. By his vote I walk away an Alcaeus. And he? None other than Callimachus.

The formula ignores Horace's other precursors, such as Theocritus, Pindar, Archilochus, or Anacreon. That said, the Callimachus-Alcaeus dichotomy provides a starting point for reading Horatian lyric, the beginning of the story but by no means the end. Second, my attempt to decode poem 3.13 violates, and thus trivializes, the mysteries of the sacrificial ritual. Yet, this is unavoidable: performing and understanding a rite are two very different things. Last, it might

---

[48] Fraenkel (above, n.5): "*Marsum duellum* and *Spartacus vagans* strike us as a terrible echo of *vis* and *tumultus* in Italy, and once more we remember the man who has brought about the change" (290). Note also the difference in the laurel, which in 2.7 suggested a private landscape (*sub lauru mea*, 19), but which in 3.14 (*morte venalem . . . laurum*, 2) symbolizes the subjugation of the entire world. I am inclined to take the poem more or less at face value; Oliensis (above, n.7), on the other hand, finds it an "allegory of political submission" (148).

[49] The other poet is often thought to be Propertius: Commager (above, n.6) 34. See further Feeney (above, n.11) 44.

be objected that all of the above is too much to lay on the immature horns of a young goat. The answer to this is what Callimachus knew well: sometimes great things come in small packages.[50]

Skidmore College DAN CURLEY
Classical World 97.2 (2004) dcurley@skidmore.edu

[50] My thanks to Matthew Santirocco, the reviewers of *CW*, and Naomi Gutierrez. A special thank you to Denis Feeney, in whose seminar on Horace poem 3.13 first captured my interest (University of Wisconsin, autumn 1988). Any errors, omissions, or misinterpretations are, of course, my responsibility.