27. Cf. N-H (1975) *ad loc.*
28. Cf. N-H (1975) on 11.21f.
29. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.851ff. In *C.* 1.35.3 ***superbos*** suggests rather the truism of pride going before a fall.
30. Cf. Seager (1980) 110f.
31. Cf. Seager (1980) 111.
32. Cf. Williams (1976) 37.
33. Cf. Seager (1980) 109f.
34. Cf. Seager (1980) 107f.
35. Cf. Williams (1976) 54.
36. Cf. Seager (1980) 111ff.
37. Cf. Williams (1976) 73.
38. Cf. Seager (1980) 116.
39. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.28.3.
40. Cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 22, 131.
41. That the standard applied is also one of the cornerstones of the ideology of the Athenian democracy (cf. e.g., Lys. 14.43, Dem. 23.191, 38.25f.) is probably an unintentional irony.
42. The notion of compulsion in *cogas* (228) is somewhat ambivalent.
43. Cf. Enn. *Ann.* 500 V.
44. Cf. K-H (1930) *ad loc.*
45. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.851ff.
46. Cf. Seager (1980) 113ff.
47. L1.29-32 are about heredity, while 33-6 insist on the importance of a favourable environment, without which innate *uirtus* cannot flourish.
48. Cf. K-H (1930) 435f.
49. Cf. Syme (1986) 399ff.
50. Cf. Seager (1980) 116ff.

Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets[1]

Denis Feeney

THERE WERE NINE poets in the canon: Alcman, Alcaeus, Sappho, Stesichorus, Pindar, Bacchylides, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides. The list had been established in the Library of Alexandria some hundred and fifty years before Horace began writing his *Odes* in the late 30s BC, for these were the nine selected out of the herd by the great scholar Aristophanes of Byzantium for editing and systematic organisation in book form.[2] The list was closed, fixed for ever, as proclaimed in an epigram which was probably written around 100 BC, where the nine are named in nine lines and hailed as the ones who constitute 'the beginning and final boundary (πέρας) of the whole of lyric' (*Anth. Graec.* 9.184.9-10).

How extraordinary, then, that this list should ever be thought capable of extension, with the addition of a tenth name. And yet this is what happened, years after Horace's death, when the poetess Corinna was inserted to become number ten.[3] How much more extraordinary that Horace, without even this precedent, and a Roman, writing in Latin, could have voiced the hope, at the end of his first ode, that the reader of his collection would insert him into the canon of the Greek lyric bards. Using the lyric form of priamel ('some might like this, some might like that, but as for *me*...'), he surveys other life-styles for almost thirty lines before finally reaching his own poetic ambitions with the postponed *me...me* (29-30); line 34 appears to round off the poem with the closural device of an adjective and noun bracketing the line (*Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton*). But with *quodsi*, 'but if', we move to another, and unexpected, climax (with a repetition, this time final, of the closural pattern):

> quodsi me lyricis uatibus inseres
> sublimi feriam sidera uertice.
>
> But if you insert me among the lyric bards, I shall strike the stars with the exalted crown of my head.

The audacity is marvellous. Greek works and Latin works may be catalogued separately in every library in the Roman world, but Horace will vault across that divide to become number ten in a Greek list of poets organised by the criteria of Greek

scholarship: that Greek word *lyrici* (sitting beside the Latin *uates*) is very specifically the term used 'in references to editions of texts', almost certainly made canonical for that use by the arch-editor, Aristophanes, in preference to the older word *melici*.[4] Horace will achieve this in the teeth of the invincible chauvinism of the Greeks, virtually every one of whom had a practically pathological inability to appreciate the other literary culture. He will do it despite the sheer technical intractability of the manifold lyric metres of a foreign tongue, which were difficult even for post-classical speakers of Greek, so that the learned Alexandrian poets themselves 'were no longer perfectly at ease with [their] complexities':[5] when he speaks from hindsight of his achievement in the *Odes*, his pride focuses on his triumph in this formidible artistic challenge (*C.* 3.30.13-14).[6] If he succeeds in his ambition to become one of the ἐγκριθέντες, one of those included in the canon, he will be commented upon and studied; should he fail to make the cut, then the fate of the ἐκκριθέντες, the unselected, awaits him, neglected in the ignominious company of Eumelus, Terpander, Xanthus, Apollodorus, Lasus, Tynnichus, Pratinas, Cydias....[7]

What was involved in such an ambition? We must note, first of all, the monumental scale of the body of work he had to contend with. We have lost Greek lyric almost in its entirety, with only four Pindaric books preserved in the manuscript tradition, and everything else surviving only in papyrus finds or in quotations from other ancient writers. But Horace had it all, roll upon roll of it, catalogued – commentaries and all – in Pollio's library in the temple of Libertas, or, after 28 BC, in the porticoes of Augustus' Apollo Palatinus. The four rolls of Pindaric epinicians (*Olympians, Pythians, Nemeans, Isthmians*), which are the only Greek lyric books to have survived in the manuscript tradition, make up 180 pages in the Oxford Classical Text, a fair-sized volume. Horace would also have had encomia, hymns, paeans, dirges (one roll each, say another OCT); dithyrambs, hyporchemata, prosodia (two rolls each, at least one more OCT); and three rolls of partheneia (yet another).[8] At the very roughest calculation, then, Horace had four times as much Pindar as we have got, and Pindar is the author for whom, by a very long way, we are best placed. Of Ibycus, we have something like 100 lines plus scraps and testimonia; Horace would have had seven books (two OCTs minimum overall); we have perhaps 2 or 3 per cent of this original total in the form of 350 (often mutilated) lines, of which many are single lines or doublets, plus scraps and testimonia.

Not only bulk, but variety: maiden songs, victory songs for the athletic festivals, hymns, love songs, drinking songs, funeral dirges, narratives of myth – a mass of poems which ranged in size from just a snatch of song to the 1,500 lines (at least) of Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*. There were songs sung by individuals and songs sung by choruses – and Horace acknowledges both types (1.1.32-4) when he refers to the Lesbian lyre (that is, the lyre of Alcaeus and Sappho), the *barbitos*, which accompanied solo song, *and* to the *tibia*, the pipe, which accompanied the chorus[9] (note the characteristic Horatian chiasmus of thought by which the solo performer's instrument is to be tuned by the Muse *Polyhymnia*). A basic kind of order had been imposed upon this protean mass by Aristophanes' book arrangements, building upon the cataloguing of Callimachus; but the criteria of arrangement were bewilderingly multiple, of necessity, since the manifestations of song in archaic and classical

Horace would have had at least ten books of Alcaeus, of which one was over 1, 000 lines long, and another at least 800 lines long (three OCTs

culture were too various for any pattern of grouping to be inherent: 'the whole classification of lyric poems was determined by the needs of the editor, not by any older traditions of poetical theory or artistic practice'.[10] We find, then, books of lyric arranged by metre, addressee (human or divine), performer (maidens), by occasion (wedding, funeral), by location of athletic victory, as with Pindar (Olympia or Delphi), or by type of athletic victory, as with Bacchylides and Simonides (foot-race or chariot-race) – and this is far from being an exhaustive list.

What was Horace to make of this large and variegated corpus, and who was he to make it mean something for his own poetry? How was he to find his way into it, and how may we best follow him? To organise the enquiry, some might choose to use the category of which poets are used as models, looking at the places where Horace exploits Alcaeus, or Sappho, or Pindar, or Simonides. Some might use the category of which forms or genres are on display, exploiting the very useful book of Färber (1936), with examples of hymn, encomium, or symposiastic poem. Some might deploy the category of the various features of lyric which Horace takes over, or the range of metres he uses, or the lyric themes which he makes his own – love, death, transience. But my approach will be to organise discussion around the relationship which Horace establishes between himself and Greek lyric as he develops his own vision of what being a lyric poet means in the place and time in which he found himself – in a self-consciously modern age, in the metropolis of a Roman world empire. I speak of a 'relationship' out of dissatisfaction with the language of 'influence' and 'imitation' which we classicists are prone to employ. 'Influence' makes Horace into a passive object who is moulded, while 'imitation' preserves this passivity but foists it upon the Greek poets instead. The question is not just how we read Horace but how we read the Greeks, and how Horace makes us read the Greeks as he involves us in reading him. Any judgment of Horace's lyric is, as we shall see, inevitably bound up with a judgment of Greek lyric.

If we think of Horace, then, in his self-consciously modern age, in the metropolis of a Roman world empire, we must at the outset be struck, as he no doubt was, by a sense of the tremendous gulf which divided him from his Greek lyric exemplars. When he began writing lyric poetry in the 30s BC, after all, there was a gap of over 600 years between himself and the earliest of the Greek lyricists, Alcman – the same gap as there is between us and Chaucer. The Greek lyricist who was closest to him in time, Pindar, had still died over 400 years earlier (438 BC) – as far from Horace as Sidney or Marlowe from us. To capture the disparity in culture which was superimposed upon the disparity in time, we should perhaps recast these comparisons and say that Horace was as far removed from Alcman as we are from Petrarch, and as far removed from Pindar as we are from Tasso.

The disparity in culture is particularly striking, for, as Fraenkel says, the source of Pindar's music 'is something established in the customs and the cults of a society to which both the poet and those for whom he wrote belonged', while 'for Horace, there exist no singers, no festival ceremonies, no tradition which he can follow'.[11] We will need to express some reservations later on about the more general ways of reading Greek lyric which are implied here, but the basic point is well taken: the forms of Greek lyric had, at least initially, a purchase in the institutions of

their society (cult, athletic festival, the symposium), and Horace cannot have been ignorant of the contrast with his own modern and Roman world, which offered no niche for the performance of the lyric singer.

Our initial apprehension of this tremendous gulf needs to be followed by the recognition that between Horace and this remote world was interposed yet another culture, that of Hellenistic Greece, of Alexandria – at first sight another barrier, but also a corridor, for Hellenistic Greece was, as we have seen, the only medium through which he had access to the earlier archaic and classical culture. The Alexandrians' sense of distance from their own cultural past was also very profound, and Horace was therefore heir to an intellectual culture which had itself struggled with the problems of living as epigoni, without the social status of earlier poets.[12] From Alexandria he had inherited artistic patterns of response to this social displacement, in particular the 'interbreeding of genres' (the blending of one kind of poetry with another – a most distinctive feature of Horace's verse).[13] The very act of composing in books is a feature of Hellenistic culture, for pre-Hellenistic poets composed poems, not books; Horace, like Callimachus, both composes poems and organises his own editorial format for them. In particular, the avant-garde poets of Horace's own generation and of the generation before had responded enthusiastically to the dry and challenging aesthetics of this master-poet, Callimachus, who had laid it down that the modern poet must not show bad faith by fudging the issue of belatedness. Anyone who wished to pretend that the old certainties still obtained would not be able to claim a hearing in the circles which mattered to Horace.[14]

Horace's twin inheritance has often been polarised, so that he finds himself painted into an archaic or a Callimachean corner.[15] This was going on even in Horace's day, when the issues were already clichés, and it irritated the poet intensely, as he reveals in *E.* 2.2 91-101, where the labels 'Alcaeus' and 'Callimachus' are bandied about between himself and an unidentified elegist.[16] The polarisation between the 'Alcaeus' and 'Callimachus' of this little exchange, and between the traditions those straw men represent, is one which we should treat with great caution, for a number of reasons. It can, for a start, blur important continuities, of which one particularly striking example is the powerful presence of Pindar in Callimachean literary criticism and aesthetics;[17] for Horace, at a stylistic level at least, homage to Callimachus may look oddly like homage to Pindar. Again, if we set up these two traditions as polar antitheses, we run the risk of overlooking the (by now familiar) fact that Horace could not know the culture of archaic Greece through any medium other than that provided by the culture of Hellenistic Greece. At this level, at any rate, there can be no question of 'either/or'. It is not just that Horace's tastes and reading practices were inevitably those of a post-Alexandrian man. More fundamentally, it was the Alexandrian scholarship of Aristophanes of Byzantium and his fellows which made the Greek lyricists readable to Horace. Horace's use of 'mottoes' at the head of some of his poems is only one example of his double allegiance. When he begins a poem by giving a near-translation of an opening line of Greek lyric, before veering away, this is a mark of homage both to his poetic models and to the scholars who had catalogued them under the *incipit*.[18] And it is a self-referential anticipation of how he himself will one day be cited, once his own

carmina have been catalogued in the world's libraries (and so he still is often cited by the *incipit*, despite the introduction of a new numbering system of citation).

The real threat in this polarised way of respecting Horace's traditions nowadays, however, comes from those who would push the Alexandrian allegiance to dominate centre-stage, since the urge to construct an essentially Alexandrian Horace 'misses', as Don Fowler well puts it, 'the classicism of Augustan poetry, and its "postmodern" attempt to move beyond Hellenistic modernism'.[19] Speaking of Horace's classicism is not a matter of glossing over discontinuities in Horace's past or present, or of committing ourselves to the absurdity of claiming that any of his odes could be translated into Greek and passed off as a pre-Hellenistic document.[20] Horace's modernism was very precious to him, and he could be scathing in his contempt for those who underrated it in their hankering after older models (*E.* 2.1). What is at issue is the significance of Horace's attempt to join long-dead master-poets in a list which had been definitively *closed*. The very urge to reach back five and six hundred years for inspiration and a standard of judgment is itself a classicising urge. Like all successful classicising initiatives, it looks wholly natural after the event, but it cannot have seemed so at the time. For someone of Horace's background and training, the search for the classical was not something tame and predictable, but something fraught with hazard.

Horace needed to undertake this search because the legacy of Callimachus was now only a necessary, not a sufficient, condition for poetic excellence. Alexandrianism had been liberating and enabling for the generation of Catullus, but for the next generation it threatened to become disabling and cramping. Horace wanted, as the dichotomy of the day had it, both *ingenium* and *ars* (naturally inspired genius *and* perfection of technique). For Horace (as for Virgil), this was most emphatically not a problem of aesthetics *tout court*, as it is often represented. Horace had huge ambitions in his *Odes*, of which many could be accommodated to the aesthetics of Alexandria, but among his ambitions were – to be blunt – sublimity and the right to speak to his contemporaries about their public lives. This he could not get from Callimachus.[21] The poetry (especially the sympotic poetry) of archaic and classical Greece, however, had ranged over a medley of experience, subsuming the 'serious-political' and the 'convivial-erotic', in Giangrande's terms.[22] During the Hellenistic period the 'serious-political' had been displaced from personal poetry,[23] but archaic lyric offered Horace a way of recapturing it. To achieve this he would not follow the Alexandrian path of inflating a minor form, but he would tackle the major form directly. Somewhere in the various world of Greek lyric Horace might find the voice, or voices, he needed, a voice that might be ironic but would not be perpetually hamstrung by irony, that might astonish, not just startle, a voice that would live as theirs had.

Given Horace's elusiveness, and his stated aim of responding to the protean nature of the lyric corpus, any way in to these large issues is going to be selective, at best. Our main focus is Horace's rewriting of lyric tradition with himself as number ten, so let us begin by seeing how he tracks down the Lesbian tradition, the only one he explicitly names as his model in his first ode (1.1.34); in the process, we will see an increasingly clear concentration on his own posthumous fate, for his claim to immortality depends upon joining that tradition; and we will note Horace's concern

not to enlist in the camp of the *stulti* by sullying his Callimachean source. Our progress in this initial stage will be sequential, following what strikes me as being a process of revelation.

After the introductory ode, the first time that Horace refers openly again to his literary tradition is in 1.26, where he tells his Muse that it is appropriate for her and her sisters to 'hallow (Lamia) with the Lesbian plectrum' (*hunc Lesbio sacrare plectro*, 11); the unique metrical movement of this line throws the epithet *Lesbio* into very high relief.[24] What will Horace's Muses actually do to Lamia? *sacrare*, 'hallow', is 'vague and grandiose', say Nisbet-Hubbard *ad loc.*, 'and may include the notion of conferring immortality by song'. This vagueness is very studied, and recalls the studied vagueness in the language Horace had used at the end of the introductory ode ('strike the stars with the exalted crown of my head'). Increasing precision on the topic of immortality in song will only come as Horace explicates his place in the lyric tradition.

The next odes to engage with these topics come as a pair, 1.31 and 32, poems which are linked by prayer, by Apollo and his lyre, and by references to the future of Horace and his poetry. And in the second of these odes we meet for the first time Alcaeus, as yet anonymous. 1.31 introduces a degree of slippage between Horace's public and private masks. Although the bard (*uates*, 2) is praying to the newly dedicated Apollo Palatinus, home of the new Greek and Latin libraries, he is not present on the public day of celebration which attended the dedication itself (9th October 28 BC), but is alone, two days later, on the day of Meditrinalia, with a libation as modest as the lifestyle he advocates.[25] The preoccupation with public and private is picked up in the next poem, 1.32, where the first explicit reflection upon his lyric prototypes enables him to open up some new areas of possibility:

> Poscimus, si quid uacui sub umbra
> lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum
> uiuat et pluris, age dic Latinum,
> barbite, carmen,
>
> Lesbio primum modulate ciui,
> qui ferox bello, tamen inter arma
> siue iactatam religarat udo
> litore nauim,
>
> Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
> semper haerentem puerum canebat
> et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque
> crine decorum.
>
> o decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi
> grata testudo Iouis, o laborum
> dulce lenimen medicumque, salue
> rite uocanti.

> I pray – if I have, at leisure under the shade, produced with you any idle composition which may live for this year, and for more – come, pronounce a Latin ode, lyre, first tuned by the citizen of Lesbos, who, though brave in war, still, in intervals between fighting, or if he had tied up his ship on the wet shore, would sing of Dionysus and the Muses and Venus and the boy always clinging to her, and Lycus, handsome with his black eyes and black hair. O glory of Phoebus, tortoise-shell lyre welcome at the feasts of Jupiter on high, o sweet and healing solace of toils, accept the greeting of one who invokes you with due rite.[26]

At the end of his introductory ode, Horace had expressed the hope that Polyhymnia would tune for him the *barbitos*, the lyre, of the Lesbian poets, Sappho and Alcaeus (1.1.32-4). Now the *barbitos* is his, and he may address it, commanding it to produce a Latin poem, a poem which centres on the first person to play the instrument in regulated and harmonious fashion: the splendid oxymoronic effect of *Latinum, barbite, carmen* has been often noted. The line in which Alcaeus is introduced (but not named) begins with the same epithet *Lesbio* which we saw carrying such weight in 1.26.11, but the epithet is not here a collective one in which the other poet of Lesbos, Sappho, may have a share, for emphatically at the end of the line is *ciui*, 'citizen'. This is a function which Sappho could not discharge, and it is also, very importantly, a function which Callimachus and his fellows could not discharge;[27] 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.

It is only a glance. The disposition of Alcaeus' range in stanzas two and three should not be overlooked. His public and his private poetry receive a stanza each, but not with equal weight, for most of the stanza occupied by his public poetry (citizen, warrior, sailor stand for poetry of those respective roles) is formally in parenthesis, while his private poetry (wine, Muses, erotica) takes up a self-sufficient and climactic stanza. This ranking will not stay stable, however, for the formally self-sufficient third stanza of love and wine is itself parenthetical 'biographically', retailing the subjects which engaged Alcaeus in the intervals between his public activities (and compositions). This elegant reluctance to assign clear priority to one sphere or the other catches at the equivocations which must always accompany attempts to bracket Horace in one sphere or the other, as he follows the model of a life in poetry which his master offered him.

At the end of the first of these paired odes, Horace for the first time in the collection looks ahead, not to the end of his life as such, but to the old age which will precede that end (1.31.19); in the first stanza of the second of the pair, he alludes for the first time to the future fate of his poetry ('which may live for this year, and for more', 1.32.2-3). Both these passages will have come to the contemporary reader with a particularly Callimachean aura, as befits the relative modesty of both poems.[28] The studied vagueness about the fate of his poetry which we remarked in 1.26 and 1.1 is now coming into sharper focus, but the diffidence of the claim in the first stanza of 1.32 needs to be registered. 'This year, and more' is far more

tentative even than Callimachus' 'many a year' or Catullus' 'more than one generation'.

The sixth ode of the next book shows us Horace for the first time looking to his own death. May Tibur, he says, be the fixed abode for my old age, the limit for me, fagged out from sea and land voyages and military service (*Tibur../sit meae sedes utinam senectae/sit modus lasso maris et uiarum/militiaeque*, 2.6.5-8). The language here looks back to Alcaeus the warrior and seaman of 1.32, and may even be based on some Alcaean prototype; we will see such language being used of Alcaeus himself again, in the next poem we look at. At the end of the poem (with Tarentum now the proposed joint retirement home for himself and his addressee), he tells Septimius *ibi tu calentem/debita sparges lacrima fauillam/uatis amici* ('there you will sprinkle with the due tear the warm ash of your bard friend', 2.6.22-4).

The first intimation that he will not simply die and have a funeral like Septimius comes seven poems further on, in 2.13, when he alludes to the posthumous fate of his Lesbian models, Sappho and Alcaeus, naming them for the first time. The progression we have been tracing so far makes sense of the fact that, as soon as he touches for the first time upon his own fate after death, his Lesbian tradition immediately becomes the topic. The ode begins with hilarious invective against the unknown man who almost provided Horace with his passport to the underworld by planting the tree which narrowly missed falling on his head (2.13.1-12). As Horace reflects upon how close he came to seeing the realm of the Queen of the dead, we are introduced to the underworld topic of judgment (*iudicantem..Aeacum*, 22), a topic which veers in an unexpected direction, as we see the two Lesbian poets singing to their ghostly audience, and submitting to another form of judgment, a literary σύγκρισις.[29] Here is the second half of the poem:

> quam paene furuae regna Proserpinae
> et iudicantem uidimus Aeacum
> sedesque descriptas piorum et
> Aeoliis fidibus querentem
>
> Sappho puellis de popularibus,
> et te sonantem plenius aureo,
> Alcaee, plectro dura nauis,
> dura fugae mala, dura belli!
>
> utrumque sacro digna silentio
> mirantur umbrae dicere; sed magis
> pugnas et exactos tyrannos
> densum umeris bibit aure uulgus.
>
> quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens
> demittit atras belua centiceps
> auris et intorti capillis
> Eumenidum recreantur angues?

> quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens
> dulci laborem decipitur sono,
> nec curat Orion leones
> aut timidos agitare lyncas.

> How close I came to seeing the realms of dusky Proserpina, and Aeacus sitting in judgment, and the assigned abodes of the blessed, and Sappho, complaining on her Aeolian lyre about the girls of her city, and you, Alcaeus, making a more resonant sound with your golden plectrum, your subject the harsh evils of ship-board, the harsh evils of exile, and of war. The shades are enthralled that each of them says things worthy of holy silence; but battles and ejected tyrants are what the mob drinks in more with its ear, packed in thick, shoulder to shoulder. What wonder, when under the influence of those songs the hundred-headed beast is dumbstruck and lets his black ears droop, and the snakes entwined in the hair of the Eumenides are relaxed? Indeed, even Prometheus and the father of Pelops are beguiled of their toil by the sweet sound, nor does Orion care to harry the lions or the timid lynxes. (2.13.21-40)

Sappho had been displaced from the collective epithet *Lesbio* in 1.32 (*Lesbio primum modulate ciui*, 5); she here appears for the first time, but as the victim of another displacement, for she is now saddled with the persona of a wholly private poet, while Alcaeus is left as the grander exponent of martial and political themes, his own erotic and private verses (which had taken up a stanza in 1.32) now eclipsed.[30] Sappho is laden with the shortcomings of the slighter form of neoteric attainment[31] (very unfairly, it need hardly be said, but poets have no obligation to be fair in matters so important to them). This stark polarisation of the Lesbian tradition is partly Horace's way of continuing from 1.32 his process of homing in on Alcaeus as the model for the more engaged and resonant voice he wants to be able to claim – such is the point of redeploying the language of hardships at sea and in war which he had earlier used of Alcaeus and of himself. But the polarisation is also a recognition of the reductive way in which reception of a tradition works amongst posterity. For we must remember that this scene shows the judgment of the audience of the underworld. Their humorously described preference for the mightier work of this (deliberately unrepresentative) Alcaeus is Horace's way of organising his anxieties about grander poetry, and of anticipating the anxieties about that poetry which will be felt by the ironic and cultivated reader. A man who had grown up with Callimachean attachments, and who had proclaimed in his first ode that his poetic allegiances isolate him from the people (*secernunt populo*, 1.1.32) – such a man cannot, without causing some fluster in his audience, speak approvingly about how the packed mob prefers more resonant poems about battles and tyrants. 'The danger', as Ross puts it (speaking not of this poem, but of the Roman Odes), 'was clearly that the acceptance of important themes...might appear to be a betrayal or disavowal of Callimachean poetics...'.[32] One of Horace's aims here is to ensure that any readers of the Roman Odes who wish to raise such objections may be reminded that Horace had warned them (and himself) of the risks well in advance.

The last two stanzas of 2.13 represent a very decided escalation even from battles and tyrants, for Alcaeus' mighty poetry, so we are told, may charm the barbarous and soothe the afflicted. The power of poetry to soothe looks back to the minor statement of this theme in the last stanza of 1.32, where Alcaeus' and Horace's lyre is hailed as *o laborum/dulce lenimen medicumque* ('o sweet and healing solace of toils', 14-15). Now Alcaeus' poetry is being associated openly with the more Orphic tradition which Horace had referred to in his Pindarising 1.12, where the voice of Orpheus moves and enthrals the world of nature (7-12).

After what we have seen in the Lesbian poems so far, it is important to acknowledge the ellipses in Horace's approach to the topic of immortality in 2.13. Nisbet and Hubbard are certainly right in sensing 'an unspoken thought' here: 'if he escapes the meaningless accidents of fortune (cf. Milton, *Lycidas* 73 ff.), perhaps he himself may have the same capacity to enthral, to console, and to survive'.[33] The thought is, strictly, unspoken: as Commager puts it, 'Horace was not yet prepared to celebrate the poet's immortality explicitly, or not, at least, in his own name'.[34] Horace's alignment of himself and Alcaeus as veterans of voyaging and warfare comes into play here. In 2.6 he had said that Tibur would provide a limit for his sea and land voyages and military service (7-8); in the underworld we see that there is no limit for Alcaeus' songs on these subjects (2.13.27- 8), for they still go on. The wry humour of that earlier identification is replayed here as well, for the event that so nearly placed Horace amongst the audience of shades was no shipwreck or arrow wound, but the absurd collapse of a rotten tree. This ludicrous event, and its ludicrous elaboration in Horace's poetry, will (so goes the unspoken thought) endure alongside the dramatic vicissitudes of Alcaeus. The immortality of poetry is linked to the quirky, freakish individuality of one man's quotidian life.[35]

Horace's own immortality will only be announced at the end of this book, when he will soar aloft on a wing of un-Callimachean grandeur: *non usitata nec tenui ferar/penna* ('I shall be borne aloft on no familiar or slender wing', 2.20.1-2).[36] That poem will be a culmination of the process by which his penetration to the heart of the redefined Lesbian tradition entitles him to be inscribed within that tradition, and it will provide a (decidedly bizarre) point of departure for his onslaught on his new grand style in the opening poems of the next book. Before that, many of the disparate themes of 2.13 need to be addressed again, and Horace moves into them via Bacchus, in the penultimate ode of the book, for it is the two-formed, mediating power of Bacchus which will transform Horace into the *biformis uates*, the two-formed bard, of the last poem.

There is no space here for an analysis of 2.19 that will do any kind of justice to this remarkable poem.[37] Let us concentrate ruthlessly on the themes which presented themselves in 2.13, and look at the second half of the poem, when Horace begins his hymn to the god:

> tu flectis amnis, tu mare barbarum,
> tu separatis uuidus in iugis
> nodo coerces uiperino
> Bistonidum sine fraude crinis:

> tu, cum parentis regna per arduum
> cohors Gigantum scanderet impia,
> Rhoetum retorsisti leonis
> unguibus horribilique mala,
>
> quamquam choreis aptior et iocis
> ludoque dictus non sat idoneus
> pugnae ferebaris: sed idem
> pacis eras mediusque belli.
>
> te uidit insons Cerberus aureo
> cornu decorum leniter atterens
> caudam et recedentis trilingui
> ore pedes tetigitque crura.

> You deflect rivers, you deflect the barbarous sea, you, drenched on the ridges held apart, confine the hair of the Bistonides in a knot of vipers without their suffering hurt. You, when the impious cohort of Giants was scaling your father's realm through the steep sky, flung back Rhoetus, dreadful with the claws and jaw of a lion, although (being said to be more suited to dances and fun and games) you were reported to be not properly fit for war: but you, one and the same personality, were a mediator of peace and in the middle of the fight. You, handsome with your golden horn, Cerberus saw without causing harm, gently rubbing his tail against you, and, as you departed, touched your feet with his triple tongue, and your legs. (2.19.17-32)[38]

The last stanza shows the beast of hell being tamed by Bacchus, as it has been tamed by Alcaeus' song in 2.13.33-5. The beginning of the hymn section catches his same taming power over barbarous nature (*tu flectis amnis, tu mare barbarum*, 17); Horace then concentrates on the radical ambivalence in Bacchus' nature which is the source of that power, focusing on 'the god's double aspect' in the weird plays on the binding power of the loosening god in 18 and 19.[39] The god's double aspect comes most dramatically into its own in the next two stanzas, where we learn that the normally unbellicose deity was able to transform himself in order to take part in the Gigantomachy, becoming a beast in order to fight monsters: the same personality mediated between the polar realms of war and peace. Commager well observes that 'the balance struck' here 'approximates that in Horace's praise of Alcaeus' (*C.* 1.32.6 ff.). Both passages suggest the double capacity in which Horace himself served, poet both of convivial themes and of such gigantic historical dramas as the fourth Roman Ode.'[40] Although we have had some preparation for this elevation in the images of Alcaeus in the underworld in 2.13, the surprise with which we apprehend Bacchus at his Gigantomachic heights is a genuine one, reinforced by the penultimate stanza's reminder that such loftiness is not normally associated with this personality.[41] The surprise we feel at Bacchus' leap out of the sphere normally

assigned to him is parallel to our surprise at Horace's own leap from the realm of dances and fun and games.[42]

It is the discovery of twin-formed Bacchus as *idem pacis...medlusque belli*, prepared for by the hunt for Alcaeus, that sets up the metamorphosis into an immortal swan of song, a *biformis uates*, which crowns the second book; the mediating god, so much involved with transgression of boundaries, helps to set up both the end of the second book and the beginning of the third, for his ode is the first of a series of eight Alcaics which bridge the book divisions.[43] At the beginning of 2.20 Horace declines confinement to the Callimachean realm of 'slightness' in the first line with *nec tenui*, but the ever self-conscious bard remains *biformis*, and disarms criticism of hysterical afflatus with the breathtaking third stanza, in which the details of his allegorical transformation are remorselessly and hilariously actualised:

> iam iam residunt cruribus asperae
> pelles, et album mutor in alitem
> superne, nascunturque leues
> per digitos umerosque plumae.
>
> Now my skin is going rough and shrinking on my legs, I am changing into a white swan in my top part, and light feathers are sprouting over my fingers and shoulders. (2.20.9-12)

These lines have evoked revulsion and derision, but it may be that they owe their imagistic zeal to an unexpected source. The Bacchus ode is an account of inspiration, and 2.20 narrates its effects. The first philosopher to talk about inspiration at length was Plato, and there may be more Plato lurking here than one at first expects. Plato's kindest account of poetic inspiration comes in his discussion of the blessings of madness in the *Phaedrus*, a discourse which is introduced as if it were that of Stesichorus, the lyric poet (*Phdr.* 244a). Here poetic madness, which comes from the Muses, is linked with prophetic madness (from Apollo), mystic madness (from Dionysus), and erotic madness, the best sort (from Aphrodite and Eros; 244a-245a; 265b). Plato is concerned to show that devotees of erotic madness are best placed to escape the cycle of reincarnation. Every soul is immortal, and winged, but souls fall back into the corporeal realm, to be incarnated in a better or worse category of human according to the degree of truth which they have glimpsed in their ascent; it is tempting to see Horace identifying with the first category, that of the lover of wisdom and beauty, the musical and erotic man, rather than with the sixth, the poetic or otherwise mimetic man (248d-e). This category of person, 'since he separates himself from human interests and turns his attention toward the divine,...is rebuked by the vulgar, who consider him mad and do not know that he is inspired' (249d, Loeb translation); and when he comes under the impulse of the beautiful, the wings of his soul may grow again (251a-c).

There may be enough here to set us thinking, but what strikes me as particularly relevant to Horace's metamorphosis is Plato's bizarre concentration on the physical detail of the business:

> The effluence [of beauty] moistens the germ of the feathers, and as he grows warm, the parts from which the feathers grow, which were before hard and choked, and prevented the feathers from sprouting, become soft, and as the nourishment streams upon him, the quills of the feathers swell and begin to grow from the roots over all the form of the soul; for it was once all feathered. Now in this process the whole soul throbs and palpitates.... *Phdr.* 251b (Loeb trans.)

This is precisely the kind of passage which the author of *On the Sublime* had in mind when he discussed Plato's use of metaphors, reporting criticisms which are uncannily akin to the modern criticisms of Horace's imagery in 2.20. He first quotes with approval a lengthy Platonic section on the body (one with more than a passing stylistic resemblance to our feathers passage; *Laws* 773c-d), and then remarks:

> The passage contains similar examples; but these are enough to make my point, namely that tropes are naturally grand, that metaphors conduce to sublimity, and that passages involving emotion and description are the most suitable field for them. At the same time, it is plain without my saying that the use of tropes, like all good things in literature, always tempts one to go too far. This is what people ridicule most in Plato, who is often carried away by a sort of literary madness into crude, harsh metaphors or allegorical fustian. 32.6-7 (trans. Russell)

It remains only to observe that Horace appears to have taken over the larger stylistic trope which C.J. Rowe has described in the *Phaedrus* as a whole, whereby 'something which is otherwise treated as deadly serious is now simultaneously located on a different and less serious plane'.[44]

This ode at the end of the second book marks the culmination of the strange redefinition of Alcaeus, but Alcaeus himself becomes a stepping-stone, as we find when we reach the Roman odes of Book 3. Here Horace's Pindar, after two early forays (1.2 and 12), comes into his own as the prototype for inspired social song; we remember that the first ode in the collection closed with Horace hoping to play the Lesbian lyre *and* the choral pipe (i.e., Pindar's).[45] The complexity of this process has been variously analysed by Fraenkel and Ross, and I may direct the reader to them.[46]

Fraenkel in particular, as we have seen, concentrates on the profound cultural gap between Horace and Pindar.[47] The abiding distinction is that between, on the one hand, the publicly sanctioned speech offered to kings and aristocrats by Pindar, and, on the other, the speech of the freedman's son, without any recognised social tradition of public poetry. Horace is acutely aware of this distinction. One sign of his self-awareness may be seen in the fact that he can assert his own immortality by the end of the second book, in a manner characteristic of Roman poets but very rare in extant Greek lyric, while only coming late, in Book 4, ten years later, to a status from which he may claim to immortalise others in the way so commonly claimed by his Greek predecessors.[48] The same dilemmas are at least partly responsible for the

remarkable fact that, although Horace claims the right to speak *about* Augustus, he never speaks *to* him in the first three books, but only in the fourth. Given the literary and social norms of the day, the problem of how to address Augustus is a problem of how to praise him, and in the first three books Horace walks around this problem but never lays both hands on it.[49]

He comes deceptively close early on. In the very last line of the second ode of Book 1, Horace's address to Mercury swerves obliquely into a near-address to Octavian/Mercury: *te duce, Caesar* ('with you as commander, Caesar'). The mighty phrase *te duce* recurs in ode 1.6, four lines in, introducing a further obliquity, for the 'commander' addressed here turns out in the next line to be not Octavian, but his right-hand man Agrippa. This is a double shock, for in the first line, when we still do not know who the addressee is, we are told that he will be written up by Varius, and Varius was the author of a *Panegyricus Augusti*.[50] The refusal (*recusatio*) to write in lofty praise of Agrippa masks a more urgent refusal to write in praise of Octavian. One of the reasons for the refusal emerges as the ode goes on and Horace botches one epic topic after another, speaking of Achilles' 'belly-aching' (*stomachum*) instead of his 'wrath', and of 'tricky' (*duplicis*), instead of 'resourceful', Ulysses (5-6); Agrippa (and Octavian) should not wish to be praised by a poet so ill-fitted for the higher genres.[51] In this connection, it certainly looks as if Horace had read a very puzzling poem by Ibycus 282a in a helpful way. Ibycus retails mighty epic themes which he will not treat, trailing on for stanza after stanza, and many modern readers have been repelled by what strikes them as his garrulousness and incompetence.[52] Horace's tricks in 1.6 make it difficult not to read Ibycus as his imagined forerunner in this droll technique.

Augustus is not in fact addressed in Horace's lyric until the fifth ode of Book 4. Even there, he is absent from Rome, and the way this is put by Horace becomes a self-referential comment upon Augustus' absence from the list of addressees of his poetry until this point: *abes iam nimium diu*, he says, 'you have been absent now for far too long' (4.5.2). The book is almost at an end before Augustus is spoken to once more, actually addressed as present, with his proper title: *Auguste* (4.14.3; note *praesens*, 43). And even this poem veers into a celebration of the young Tiberius, a Pindarising epinicion to match the Pindarising epinicion offered to his brother Drusus in 4.4. The difficulties in praising the *princeps* are persistent, even when Horace might be thought to have done more than enough to claim the right to don Pindar's mantle. An extraordinary resolution for the *biformis uates* is sought in the *recusatio* of the last poem, when Callimachus' famous opening of the *Aetia* is used as an exit from Horace's dilemmas and book. Apollo stops Horace singing of warlike themes (4.15.1-2), as he had stopped Callimachus (*Aetia* fr. 1.21-4),[53] with the twist that it is now not just poetically, but politically, inappropriate to sing of war, for peace reigns. As in the lofty 3.25, Horace ends up promising song (*canemus* is the last word here; compare *dicam, loquar*, 3.25.7, 18). The gap between himself and Pindar persists, testimony to the sweet peril of attempting the sublime in a weary and ironic culture.[54] Margaret Hubbard describes Pindar as setting Horace a standard: 'that was how a poet of conscious power had been able to talk to the world and particularly to the great'.[55] Horace had magnificently succeeded in talking to the

world and to the great; talking to the greatest remained at the very limits of the tractable until the end.

The peril at the extreme bounds of his attempts should not blind us to the boldness with which Horace so often does close the gaps between himself and the Greek lyric tradition in the pursuit of his classicising ambition. Here his difference from the Alexandrians is most noteworthy. In a fascinating study of the Hellenistic reception of earlier poetry, Bing describes the 'sense of rift' under which they laboured, a symptom of 'a perceived epigonality and artistic disjunction'.[56] Callimachus, for example, brought Hipponax back to life in his first *Iambos*, but Hipponax's revival is a 'conditional revival, one qualified by a strong awareness of difference in tastes and aims, of fracture in time and space'.[57] The Hellenistic poets repeatedly remind their audience that their works are written, not performed; their Muse has become bookish. It might seem entirely natural for Horace to exploit such stances, using the Hellenistic poets as a paradigm for his own belatedness, but his classicism is actually in dramatic contrast to this sensibility; the very fact that Greek culture is not his culture may remove him from the oedipal mesh of anxiety which necessarily entangled Callimachus and his peers. Sappho and Alcaeus in Horace's underworld are not an evocation of a past from which Horace is irredeemably cut off, but an image of a past-in-present which he may join. In contrast to his persistent habit elsewhere in his poetry, in the first three books of his *Odes* he never refers to his lyric poetry as written, but maintains the archaic and classical aura. He refers to books of philosophy (1.29.13-14); his iambs are written objects to be burnt (1.16.1-3); he mentions written inscriptions on tombs (3.11.51-2) and statues (3.24.27-8); epics may be composed in writing (*scriberis, scripserit*, 1.6.1, 14). But his own work is song (*cantamus* in that same ode, line 19), even into the future: the *fons Bandusiae* will live in Horace's speech, not book (*me dicente*, 3.13.14). Only in the fourth book does Horace speak of his own written texts (8.21, 9.30-1), pointedly inserting his written *chartae* into the oral terminology of his Pindaric model, *Nem.* 7.11-16); this is not an adoption of the Hellenistic trope, but a recognition of the fact that he has turned himself into a public monument and will be catalogued in the library of Apollo Palatinus.

If Horace invites his readers to read him as one of the lyric bards, most of them clearly find it quite easy to decline the invitation, for the reading practices brought to bear on the Greek lyric poets tend to be very different from those brought to bear on Horace. Horace suffers here by being compared on grounds which are even more disadvantageous to him than the grounds on which he is compared to Propertius or Catullus. Horace has been crippled by being set off against the 'sincerity' and 'spontaneity' of these two; when it comes to the Greek lyricists, the dice are even more loaded against our poet, for the Greeks have not only spontaneity and sincerity on their side, but a phalanx of yet more formidable allies – an organic social setting for their poetry, and the perennial allure of the original, the natural, and (perhaps most formidable of all) the oral.

It is striking that the most robustly anti-Romantic readers of Horace are remarkably Romantic in their reading of Greek lyric: the two reading techniques construct and reinforce each other. Nisbet and Hubbard observe (with a telling

qualification) that 'Alcaeus's verses, even if less spontaneous than they pretend, at least reflect the loves and hates of a forthright aristocrat; they were capable of being sung on social occasions, whether a symposium or a religious festival...'; they go on to contrast Horace's 'imaginary, or at any rate stylized' situations, setting his 'literary sophistication' against the 'simplicities of archaic Greek lyric'.[58] Such Romantic readings of Greek lyric are very powerful and widespread, not just among readers of Horace.[59] By the Romantic account, Greek lyric, or at any rate monody, presents us with direct access to the 'I' of the man or woman singing, while the immediacy of that access, and the authenticity of the experience, are further guaranteed by the organic social setting for the spontaneous song. I may refer the reader to Burnett's *Three Archaic Poets* for a history of such interpretations, and for a trenchant exposure of their inadequacies (how, for example, were such poems preserved if they were never repeated, and what does repetition imply for the integrity of the speaking 'I' and its authenticating original setting?).[60]

Most modern readers of Greek lyric are more cautious about using the language of 'sincerity'.[61] The search continues, however, for a validating social occasion for speech. Thus Gentili seeks to explain the 'unusual features of the prayer' in Sappho's ode to Aphrodite (1) by saying that 'they are not simply derived from real episodes in the life of the *thiasos* [religious guild of Sappho's companions]', but 'must also mirror a precise ceremonial'.[62] Yet even Romantic readers have long been sceptical about whether Sappho and Alcaeus composed their hymns for a cult occasion. Page's remark on the Lesbian hymns might be taken to be a comment on Horace's hymns: 'they appear rather to be literary exercises...than devotional cult-song'.[63] And even those who might dissent from Burnett's questioning of the social authentication of Lesbian song may still push back into the sixth century the moment when 'the devices of poetry' were freed 'from their organic contexts in society and its institutions'.[64]

As we have seen throughout this essay, any polarised account is going to be reductive. The last thing I am aiming to do is to turn the Greek lyricists into proto-Alexandrians, or (by implication) strip Horace of his cherished literarity and turn him into some dashing improviser of the sort which he so loathed. The point is that a polarised account of some kind is inevitable, since we need to say (or even imply) *something* about Greek lyric in order to address Horace.[65] My remarks here are only a plea that we should try saying things about Greek lyric which will be enabling for Horace, rather than emasculating. We might begin by joining Burnett in seeing Greek lyric as 'more artful and less passionate, more conventional and less individual' than many readers do;[66] the Hellenistic filter has been particularly distorting here, since a lot of the talk about the Hellenistic poets' craftmanship and attention to minute detail can end up making a Stesichorus or a Bacchylides look like some kind of *idiot savant*. We might begin by reading the Greek lyricists through Horace's eyes. Although we cannot read the whole of them and of their commentaries, as he could, we must remember that Alcaeus, for example, represented to Horace the ancient equivalent of at least three volumes of Oxford Classical Text, and that he was, for non-epic poetry, the father of that most 'unnatural' and 'unspontaneous' form of speech, allegory. Such a perspective might help us see how

Horace regarded these voluminous poets as being, like himself, accomplished exponents of the most demanding metrical forms, as imitators and adapters of each other in a tradition which he is continuing (*E.* 1.19.23-31), as self-conscious and versatile literary artists.

If we may use Horace to bring the two parties closer together, the pendulum must always be allowed to swing, and I will finish by focusing once more on the differences between Horace and the other nine of the canon. This time, instead of finding the differences to be hurdles which Horace has to surmount more or less successfully, we shall see him turning the centuries-long and miles-wide rift into the source of his most potent and characteristic lyric strengths. Let us consider, briefly, place and time.

Horace loves to celebrate places which have no resonance in his tradition because they have no presence there. The names of Horace's girls may slip in and out of the memory, but no one who has read the *Odes* ever forgets Tibur, Lucretilis, Soracte, Bandusia; these names are often set off against famous Greek places, nowhere more memorably than in 1.7 (*Laudabunt alii*). He may well have found an aid in Sappho for the kind of evocation of place he achieves in 1.17 (*Velox amoenum*),[67] but the urge to do it does not come from her or from anyone else; it must have been the very absence of all these locales from Greek tradition which especially impelled him to fix them in his poetry and in our memories, and to introduce 'a new way of thinking to European literature'.[68] His confidence in his utterly unsupported efforts is so secure that he claims to immortalise a place (*Fons Bandusiae*, 3.13.13-14) before he ever claims to immortalise a person. His boldest endeavour of all is his elevation of Tibur into a self-sufficient metaphor for a frame of mind and a mode of poetry;[69] from the start, he speaks of the place as if it were numinous, as if we ought to know what it stands for, as if it had been part of a poetic tradition for centuries before him.

The centuries between himself and his models were intimidating in many ways, but it must have been partly the very sense of that great distance which made Horace such a great poet of time. Time, of course, is a perennial lyric preoccupation, and the Greek poets were well stocked for virtually anything Horace wanted to say on transience, ageing, or memory. And he wanted to say a lot: his poems on the passing of time are among his most cherished (1.4, 4.7); especially in the fourth book, when many of the people who meant most to him are dead, and when he is addressing a generation of epigoni, he creates an unforgettable atmosphere of nostalgia and loss. But Horace had ways of apprehending time which simply had not been available to his Greek models, and he is able to turn them to remarkable effect. Here is the beginning of 3.30:

> Exegi monumentum aere perennius
> regalique situ pyramidum altius,
> quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
> possit diruere aut innumerabilis
> annorum series et fuga temporum.

> I have completed a monument more enduring than bronze and higher than the royal pile of the pyramids, which neither gnawing rain nor the wild north wind could destroy, nor the uncountable sequence of years and the flight of ages. (3.30.1-5)

Fraenkel remarks: 'The magnificent opening period...revives thoughts familiar from Greek poetry, especially choral lyrics; in it there is nothing that might not have been said by a Greek poet'.[70] We need to qualify this observation by concentrating on the phrase *innumerabilis annorum series* (4-5). Horace is able to conceive of future time as a continuous linked sequence of years (the hyperbole consists in the claim that his immortality will be so protracted that it will escape any attempt to number that series). No Greek lyric poet could have thought in terms remotely like this. To our way of thinking (which is fundamentally a Roman, specifically Julian, way of thinking), their apprehension of the year was extraordinarily plastic, without agreed fixed points, each state having 'its own mode of time reckoning as it had its own month names and numerals'.[71] No Greek could have thought in terms even close to Horace's until the time of Hippias, the first Greek to publish a list of Olympic victors (late fifth century, after the death of Pindar), providing 'a method of dating which would be understandable everywhere'.[72] Roman literature found the patterning of time a rich theme from early on (one thinks immediately of Ennius' *Annales*, and of annalistic history itself, the distinctive Roman contribution to historiography). But a decisive shift occurs in Horace's own lifetime, with Caesar's transformation of the Roman calendar. Julian and natural time are now one,[73] and this is the mode of thought which we still inhabit - with the spectacular addition of a fixed point around which the numbered years go back into BC and forward into AD.

In Horace's case we are talking about more than just a sense of history (though no Greek lyric poet could have had anything remotely like the sense of history which we recognise in Horace and his contemporaries). We are dealing with a mode of apprehending time as an organised grid through which natural time flows, or flies; he articulates this mode of apprehension for us in Book 4, in words of tremendous resonance:

> nec Coae referunt iam tibi purpurae
> nec cari lapides tempora quae semel
> notis condita fastis
> inclusit uolucris dies.

> Neither your Coan purples nor your precious stones now bring back to you time, which winged day has locked up once and for all, preserved in the public record of the calendar. (4.13.13-16)

No Greek lyric poet could have thought or written in such a manner. Everything hangs on that *semel*:[74] it focuses the clash between the impersonal grid of the state's time and the uncatchable winged unit of Lyce's natural time (a winged unit which performs, not suffers, the locking up); it organises the collision between the marble of the abiding *Fasti* and the perishable pebbles of Lyce's jewellery (not to mention her garments).

This Roman mentality provides him with quite novel possibilities for his lyric. The elapse of time is marked by a dating system which carries with it great historical or sentimental charge: *ex Metello consule*, the formation of the 'first triumvirate' and origin of the civil war (2.1.1); *consule Planco*, the year Horace fought at Philippi (3.14.28); *consule Manlio*, the year of Horace's birth (3.21.1); *consule Tullo*, the year of Maecenas' birth?[75] (3.8.12); *Bibuli consulis*, the year of Julius Caesar's first consulship – and Bibulus' (3.28.8); *Martiis Kalendis*, the day Horace almost went to join his lyric ancestors in the underworld (3.8.1); *pleno...anno/...cum tibi Nonae redeunt Decembres*, the Faunalia (3.18.5, 10); *dedicatum Apollinem*, Apollo Palatinus' birthday (1.31.1); the Ides of April, Maecenas' birthday (4.11.14-16).

The birthday in particular shows up his new power and his distance from his models. In the time of the Greek lyric poets people did not observe birthdays, and we do not know any of the poets' birthdays.[76] Horace is able to use birthdays to create new ways of organising the ancient lyric pathos about the fugitive nature of our life. Here is his description of the date of Maecenas' birthday:

> Idus tibi sunt agendae,
> qui dies mensem Veneris marinae
> findit Aprilem,
>
> iure sollemnis mihi sanctiorque
> paene natali proprio, quod ex hac
> luce Maecenas meus adfluentis
> ordinat annos.

> You must observe the Ides, the day which splits April, the month of Venus of the sea, a day rightly celebrated by me, almost more sacred to me than my own birthday, because from this light of day my Maecenas arranges in order the flow of his years. (4.11.14-20)

The title of the Roman demarcation, *Idus*, is a redescription of *lux*, 'light of day', the original unit of time as given in nature. The precision of the Roman calendar, which sets up the years in an order, and which splits the month *just here*, is in tension with the watery immeasurability of the natural flow of years, *adfluentis*.[77] T.S. Eliot catches something rather akin to this sensibility in *The Dry Salvages*:

> The tolling bell [on the buoy]
> Measures time not our time, rung by the unhurried
> Ground swell, a time
> Older than the time of chronometers...
> And the ground swell, that is and was from the beginning,
> Clangs
> The bell.

Again, in 3.17, the wide sweeping panorama of remote mythical periods is

interrupted by the intense *cras*, 'tomorrow' (9), fixed as the day of the birthday (*cras Genium*, 14); there is a very similar movement two poems further on, in 3.19, where the question of the difference in time between remote kings is set against the increasing precision of mid-winter, new moon, and, finally, midnight, the (implied) eve of Murena's new tenure of the office of augur.

Horace knew all about the power of anniversaries. If we went to the underworld, and interrupted the joint singing of Sappho, Alcaeus, and Horace to inform them that we were observing the bimillennium of Horace's arrival in that place, Sappho and Alcaeus would have no conception of what we were talking about. Horace would understand at once.

Notes

1. My main debts are to Niall Rudd and Charles Martindale, to Terry McKiernan, for his thoughts on Horace and on Bacchylides, to Zetzel (1983), and, above all, to the students in my class on Horace in Madison, Fall 1988 (S. Anderson, V. Burns, D. Curley, A. Johnson, J. Manthey, T. McKiernan, P. O'Loughlin, M. Peterson, P. Roney).

2. Pfeiffer (1968) 203-6.

3. Färber (1936) I.26.

4. Pfeiffer (1968) 182-3.

5. Bing (1988) 23.

6. Wilkinson (1945) 11; Woodman (1974) 126. Non-poets may find it difficult to intuit how intoxicating technique is to them. Catullus wrote a poem about it, describing the quasi-sexual charge he derived from metrical experimentation with his friend Calvus (50); but this was no shared experience for Horace, he was on his own.

7. Only the first eight of Page's thirty-five *poetae melici minores*: Page (1962) 360. Of course, a Latin poet could never join the Greek canon in the strict sense. This is a desperately serious joke.

8. All these figures on the lyric poets' books come from the appendices to Volume I of *CHCL*.

9. West (1967) 80; the metre of this poem is one used by Alcaeus (e.g., 34b, 112).

10. Pfeiffer (1968) 183; cf. Johnson (1982) 87.

11. Fraenkel (1957) 283-4, discussing Pindar's first *Pythian* and *C.* 3.4; cf. Syndikus (1972) 3-4.

12. Bing (1988).

13. Kroll (1924) 202-44, on the 'Kreuzung der Gattungen'; Zetzel (1983) 100-1.

14. Reitzenstein (1963); Newman (1967); Syndikus (1972) 8-10.

15. A history of the debate in McDermott (1981).

16. Brink (1982) 325: 'H. is ridiculing a convention'.

17. Newman (1967) 45-8; Richardson (1985) 391-8.

18. Callimachus introduced this cataloguing principle in his *Pinakes*: Pfeiffer (1968) 129.

19. Fowler (1989) 236, reviewing Thomas (1988); cf. Zetzel (1983) 83. Already in 1920 Pasquali had stressed how important it is to see Horace as part of a classicising epoch: Pasquali (1920) 137-40.

20. Here I may refer to the picture given by Zanker (1988) of the larger Augustan classicising movement of which the *Odes* are a part, and to the difficulties of periodisation within this large picture, picked out by Wallace-Hadrill (1989), in his review of Zanker; generally, on periodisation, Martindale (1992) 9-10.

21. On Callimachus' generically arch responses to the need to encompass his monarchs in his poetry, see Zetzel (1983) 100.

22. Giangrande (1968) 119.

23. Giangrande, loc. cit.; Murray, below, 96.

24. This line 'is unique in the 317 lines of this type in Horace in having a break after the fourth syllable when this is not a monosyllable', Wilkinson (1945) 11 n.1.

25. N-H (1970) on 3: 'The prayer with libation is a simple one, not involving a complicated or expensive *uotum*'.

26. Following N-H (1970) *ad loc.*, for text and interpretation of *medicumque salue rite uocanti*.

27. Hubbard (1973) 12.

28. N-H (1970) *ad loc.*, referring to *Aetia* fr. 1.7-8 (old age); fr. 7.14 ('that [my elegies] may live for many a year'), and Cat. 1.10 ('may last for more than one generation').

29. La Penna (1972).

30. For an interpretation which harmonises the opposition, see Davis (1991) 85-6.

31. La Penna (1972) 209-10.

32. Ross (1975) 141.

33. N-H (1978) 205.

34. Commager (1962) 316 (for him, a question of date of composition).

35. Cf. *C.* 3.4.26-8.

36. On the programmatic force of *tenuis*, see Ross (1975), index *s.v.* When Callimachus had prayed to be a winged creature, it had been a 'dainty' one, a cicada (*Aetia* fr. 1.32).

37. For discussion of the metaphorical power of Bacchus, see Commager (1962) 337-41; Griffin (1985) 72-8. To provide a context for 2.19 one would need to begin by looking, with the help of Lissarrague (1987), at how Horace follows, e.g., Alcaeus (346) and Anacreon (356, 409, fr. eleg. 2), in using the mixture and limiting the wine (and in his case, types of wine) as metaphors for behaviour in poetry and society (*I.* 9, 13; *C.* 1.7, 17, 18, 20, 27, 36; 3.8, 19, 21, 28).

38. Following N-H (1978) on the main difficulties of interpretation.

39. N-H (1978) 316; see their commentary on 18 for the oxymoron of *separatis...iugis*.

40. Commager (1962) 339.

41. 'A surprising feat for this particular god', Fraenkel (1957) 200. *proeliis audax* in *C.* 1.12.21 refers to Pallas, not Bacchus.

42. On Horace's use of Bacchus for his self-consciousness about the perils of grand composition, with reference also to *C.* 3.25, see Williams (1968) 70-1; Rudd

(1982) 401; Griffin (1985) 72-3.

43. Silk (1956) 258-62.

44. Rowe (1987) 95.

45. West (1967) 80.

46. Fraenkel (1957) 273-85; Ross (1975) 139-52.

47. Even the most fundamental categories are not the same for the two. When Pindar begins *Olympian* 2, he asks 'What god, what hero, what man shall I celebrate?', and answers 'Zeus, Heracles and Theron' in three lines, but when Horace asks the 'same' question at the beginning of *C.* 1.12, the compartments prove to be far less watertight: in particular, by the end of the poem it is by no means certain in which category Augustus belongs.

48. Fraenkel (1957) 423; N-H (1978) 336. On Greek claims to bestow immortality, see Campbell (1983) 262. On their claims for their own immortality, see *CHCL* 1.185. This seems to be a special theme of Sappho's (65, 147, 193). Horace and Sappho are the only lyric bards in the canon who are not Greek males; is it their self-consciousness about this marginalisation which makes them concentrate on their power to immortalise themselves, rather than others?

49. On the difficulties for both parties in these negotiations, see Griffin (1985) 200-6, especially 203-4, with reference to *E.* 2.1.

50. N-H (1970) 81. The effect is reinforced by the stuttering addition of *et tuas* after *laudes egregii Caesaris* in line 11.

51. Commager (1962) 71 n. 25; now, in detail, Ahern (1991).

52. Full account of the debate over this poem in Woodbury (1985).

53. And Virgil (*Ecl.* 6.3-5). Horace's ode moves from the *Eclogues* here at the beginning, via the *Georgics* (5) to the *Aeneid* at the end (31-2).

54. Williams (1968) 70-1, on the *dulce periculum* of 3.25.18. I end up quite close to Newman (1967a) 50, though not wishing to say that 'in the last analysis Horace is on [Callimachus'] side'.

55. Hubbard (1973) 23.

56. Bing (1988) 74-5.

57. Op. cit., 66-7.

58. N-H (1970) xii.

59. See Genette (1992) 38-44, for the Romantic evolution of 'subjective' lyric.

60. Burnett (1983), esp. 1-7; cf. Bowie (1986), on occasionalist readings of early Greek elegy.

61. Even if they might not all join me in agreeing with Burnett's formulation: 'the archaic poets, like poets everywhere, invented both ego and occasion when they composed their songs', Burnett (1983) 6; cf. Emily Dickinson, quoted in Johnson (1982) 83: 'When I state myself as the Representative of the Verse – it does not mean *me*, but a supposed person'.

62. Gentili (1988) 79-80; contrast Burnett (1983) 229.

63. Page (1955) 244; cf. N-H (1970) 343-4, on Sappho 2: 'Sappho has already broken away from the old-world piety of the cult-hymn'.

64. Woodbury (1985) 206, on Ibycus 282a.

65. For the issues, see Martindale (1992) esp. 73-4.

66. Burnett (1983) 2.

67. Jenkyns (1982) 38, on Sappho's description of a temple in fr. 2, and its capturing of the 'sentiment of place'.

68. N-H (1970) xxi, on the Sabine farm.

69. Davis (1991) 193-4, on 1.7, 3.4.23, 4.2.29-32, 4.3.10-13 (this last poem answering to 1.7).

70. Fraenkel (1957) 302.

71. Bickerman (1980) 33.

72. Bickerman (1980) 75.

73. Wallace-Hadrill (1987) 224; cf. Bickerman (1980) 47.

74. From Catullus 5.5, *cum semel occidit breuis lux*; cf. *C.* 4.7.21 (looking to *simul* in line 10).

75. N-H (1978) 202. Or else Maecenas was born, like Horace, *consule Manlio*: Nisbet (1987) 186.

76. Fraenkel (1957) 23. Pindar comes closest (fr. 193), when he says that he was born on the first day of the Pythian festival; but this is not a birthday proper, because Pindar cannot tell us the year.

77. There is a nod towards the Etruscan ancestry of Maecenas in the use of *findit*, 'splits', for by one account the Ides derived their name from *iduare*, the Etruscan word for *diuidere* (Macr. *Sat.* 1.15.17). *adfluentis* seems to look back to the incomparable image of the flow of time in the last ode addressed to Maecenas, *fluminis ritu...* (3.29.33 ff.).

Translation of Laudes Horatianae

IN PRAISE OF HORACE

On Horace Phoebus has conferred the happiness of heaven; for two thousand years the poems of the renowned bard have lived; they will go on living as long as the Latin tongue gives forth sound.

Whether, Horace, you sing with golden quill of the battles fought by girls in the night or of most copious cups of fiery Falernian wine and young men drinking freely, or whether you relate the fable of the two mice, or whether the theme of your song is the pair of witches, Canidia and Sagana, striking terror into the living and the shades, true indeed is the delight of those who hear your witty poems.

Yet in graver measures your lyre sings of the plan and direction of the happy life. When chance is unkindly and gloomy Fate issues her threats, you can by your pleasing counsel shift the storm-cloud from the mind.

How excellently you teach us, you who so merit our praise,what poetry really is! It is far from simple to follow the model of a prince of poets. More swiftly gallops a charger than an unskilful nag.

Notes (references are to the lines of the Latin poem):

1. *C.* 4.8.29
4. *S.* 1.4.43
5-6. *C.* 1.6.17 and 2.13.26-7
9. *S.* 2.6.79-117
10-12. *I.* 3.7-8; *I.* 5; *I.* 17; *S.* 1.8.23-50; *S.* 2.8.94-5
16. Lucretius *DRN.* 3.95
20. *C.* 4.4.7
22. *C.* 4.2.47

Bibliography

Ahern, C.F., 'Horace's rewriting of Homer in *Carmen* 1.6' *CP* 86 (1991) 301-14
Altheim, F., *A History of Roman Religion* (London, 1938; Eng. trans.)
Ampolo, C., 'Le condizioni materiali della produzione. Agricoltura e paesaggio agrario' *Dialoghi di Archeologia*, n.s. 2 (1980) 15-46
Anderson, W.S., *Pompey, his Friends, and the Literature of the First Century BC* (Berkeley, 1963)
Arkins, B., 'Horace *Odes* 1.11', in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* I, C. Deroux (ed.) (Brussels, 1979) 257-65
——— *Sexuality in Catullus* (Hildesheim, 1982) esp. 46-103
——— 'A reading of Horace, *Carm.* 1.25' *C & M* 34 (1983) 161-75
——— 'Epicurus and Lucretius on sex, love and marriage' *Apeiron* 18 (1984) 141-3
Badian, E., 'A phantom marriage law' *Philologus* 129 (1985) 82-98
Becatti, G., *Arte e gusto negli scrittori Latini* (Sansoni, 1951)
Belmont, D.E., 'The Vergilius of Horace, *Odes* 4.12', *TAPA* 110 (1980) 1-20
Benario, J.M., 'Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*: Augustan propaganda' *TAPA* 91 (1960) 339-52
Benediktson, D.T., 'Pictorial art and Ovid's *Amores*' *QUCC* 49 (1985) 111-20
Bickerman, E.J., *Chronology of the Ancient World* (London, 1980)
Bing, P., *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen, 1988)
Boucher, J-P., *Calus Cornélius Gallus* (Lyons, 1966)
Bowersock, G., *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965)
Bowie, E.L., 'Early Greek elegy, symposium and public festival' *JHS* 106 (1986) 13-35
Boyle, A.J., 'The edict of Venus: an interpretive essay on Horace's Amatory Odes' *Ramus* 2 (1973) 163-88
Bradshaw, A., T. von S., 'Horace, *Odes* 4.1' *CQ* 20 (1970) 142-53
Brink, C.O., *Horace on Poetry II: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, 1971)
——— *Horace on Poetry III: Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus* (Cambridge, 1982)
Brunt, P.A., '*Amicitia* in the Late Roman Republic', repr. in *The Crisis of the Roman Republic*, R. Seager (ed.) (Cambridge, 1969) 199-218
Büchner, K., 'Die Epoden des Horaz', in *Studien zur römischen Literatur* 8 (1970)
———*Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig, 1982)
Bühler, W., *Die Europa des Moschos* (Hermes Einzelschrift 13, 1960)
Burnett, A.P., *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London, 1983)

Cairns, F., *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972)
——— 'Horace on other people's love affairs, *Odes* 1.17; 2.4; 1.8; 3.12' *QUCC* 24 (1977) 121-47
Campbell, A.Y., *Horace. A New Interpretation* (London, 1924)
Campbell, D.A., *The Golden Lyre: The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets* (London, 1983)
Carlson, G.I., 'From Numantia to necking: Horace *Odes* 2.12' *CW* 71 (1978) 441-8
Coarelli, F., 'Il sepolcro degli Scipioni' *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6 (1972) 36-106
Cody, J.V., *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics* (Brussels, 1976)
Colonna, G., '*Graeco more bibere*: l'iscrizione della Tomba 115 dell' Osteria dell' Osa' *Quaderni del Centro di Studio per l'archeologia etrusco-italica, Archeologia Laziale* 3 (1980) 51-5
Commager, S., 'The function of wine in Horace's *Odes*' *TAPA* 88 (1957) 68-80
——— *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study* (New Haven and London, 1962)
Connor, P., *Horace's Lyric Poetry: The Force of Humour* (Berwick, Victoria, 1987)
Conte, G.B., *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario* (Torino, 1974)
——— *Virgilio, il genere e i suoi confini* (Torino, 1984)
Courbaud, E., *Horace, sa vie et sa pensée à l'époque des Épîtres* (Paris, 1914)
Curtius, E.R., *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, (New York/ Evanston, 1953; Eng. trans.)
Davis, G., *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (California, 1991)
De Witt, N., 'Epicurean doctrine in Horace' *CP* 34 (1939) 127-34
Diels, H., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (Berlin, 1903)
Dietz, H., 'Non semper imbres, Horaz *C.* II.9' *RCCM* 15 (1973) 247-55
——— 'Bemerkungen zu Horaz, *Carm.* 1.8' *Latomus* 34 (1975) 745-53
Donini, P., 'The History of the concept of eclecticism', in *The Question of Eclecticism*, J. Dillon and A.A. Long (edd.) (California/London, 1988) 15-33
Duckworth, G.E., '*Animae dimidium meae*: two poets of Rome' *TAPA* 87 (1956) 281-316
Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M., 'Horace and Maecenas: the propaganda value of *Sermones* I', in *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, A.J. Woodman and D.A. West (edd.) (Cambridge, 1984) 19-58
Elsner, J., 'Cult and sculpture: sacrifice in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*' *JRS* 81 (1991) 50-61
Esler, C.C., 'Horace, Barine and the immortality of words, *Odes* 2.8' *CJ* 84 (1988-9) 105-12
Färber, H., *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (Munich, 1936)
Fowler, D.P., review of Thomas (1988), *G & R* 36 (1989) 235-6
——— 'Narrate and describe: the pattern of Ekphrasis' *JRS* 81 (1991) 25-35
Fraenkel, E., *Horace* (Oxford, 1957)
——— *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960)
Fuqua, C., 'Horace *Carm.* 1.23-5', *CP* 63 (1968) 44-6
Galinsky, G.K., *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton, 1969)
Genette, G., *The Architext: An Introduction*, trans. J.E. Lewin (California, 1992)
Gentili, B., *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*, trans. A.T. Cole (Baltimore, 1988)

Gerhard, G.A., *Phoinix von Kolophon* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1909)
Giangrande, G., 'Sympotic literature and epigram', in *L'Epigramme grecque, Entretiens Hardt* 14 (1969) 93-177
Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L., *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge, 1968) 2 vols
Gras, M., 'Vin et société à Rome et dans le Latium à l'époque archaique' *Collection de l'école française de Rome* 67 (1983) 1067-75
Griffin, J., 'Caesar qui cogere posset', in *Caesar Augustus*, F. Millar and E. Segal (edd.) (Oxford, 1984)
——— *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London, 1985)
Griffin, M., 'Philosophy, politics and politicians at Rome', in *Philosophia Togata*, M. Griffin and J. Barnes (edd.) (Oxford, 1989) 1-37
Guarducci, M., '*Domus Musae*: epigrafi greche e latine in un' antica casa di Assisi' *Atti d. Acc. naz. dei Lincei Mem.* 23 (1979) 269-97
Hagstrum, J.H., *The Sister Arts: The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray* (Chicago, 1958)
Hardie, P.R., *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986)
Harrison, S.J., 'Horace, *Odes* 3.7: an erotic odyssey' *CQ* 38 (1988) 186-92
——— 'The praise singer: Horace, Censorinus, and *Odes* 4.8' *JRS* 80 (1990) 31-43
Haskell, F., and Penny, N., *Taste and the Antique* (New Haven/London, 1982)
Häuber, C., Rizzo, S., de Vos, M., and Scandurra, C., *L'archeologia in Roma Capitale tra sterro e scavo, Roma Capitale*, 1870-1911, 7 (1983) 204-52
Heinze, R., see Kiessling
Helbig, W., *Untersuchungen über die campanische Wandmalerei* (Leipzig, 1873)
Henderson, W.J., 'The Paraklausithyron motif in Horace's *Odes*' *A. Class.* 16 (1973) 63-4
Henrichs, A., 'Riper than a pear: Parian invective in Theokritos' *ZPE* 39 (1980) 7-27
Hense, O., *Teletis Reliquiae* (Tübingen, 1909)
Hubbard, M., 'The *Odes*', in *Horace*, C.D.N. Costa (ed.) (London, 1973) 1-28
——— *Propertius* (London, 1974)
——— see also Nisbet
Jenkyns, R., *Three Classical Poets: Sappho, Catullus, and Juvenal* (London, 1982)
Johnson, W.R., *The Idea of Lyric: Lyric Modes in Ancient and Modern Poetry* (California, 1982)
Jones, C.P., 'Tange Chloen Semel Arrogantem' *HSCP* 75 (1971) 81-3
Keyssner, K., 'Die bildende Kunst bei Properz', in *Properz*, W. Eisenhut (ed.) (Darmstadt, 1975) 264-86
Kiessling, A., and Heinze, R., *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Oden und Epoden*, 8th edn, repr. (Berlin, 1955)
——— *Briefe*, 5th edn, repr. (Berlin, 1957)
Kindstrand, J.F., *Bion of Borysthenes* (Uppsala, 1976)
——— 'Demetrius the Cynic' *Philologus* 124 (1980) 83-98
Kroll, W., 'Horaz' Oden und die Philosophie' *WS* 37 (1915) 223-38
——— *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1924)

La Penna, A., 'Schizzo di una interpretazione di Orazio, partendo dal primo libro delle *Epistole*' *ASNP* 18 (1949) 14-48
——— *Orazio e l'ideologia del principato* (Florence, 1963)
——— 'Sunt qui Sappho malint. Note sulla σύγκρισις di Saffo e Alceo nell' antichità' *Maia* 24 (1972) 208-15
Leach, E.W., *The Rhetoric of Space* (Princeton, 1988)
Lee, R.W., '*Ut Pictura Poesis*: the humanistic theory of painting' *The Art Bulletin* 22 (1940) 197-269
Lissarrague, F., *Un flot d'images: une esthétique du banquet grec* (Paris, 1987)
Litchfield, H.W., 'National *Exempla Virtutis* in Roman literature' *HSCP* 25 (1914) 1-72
Loewy, E., 'Orazio ed *Ara Pacis*', in *Atti del 1° Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* I (1929) 104-9
Luck, G., 'An interpretation of Horace's Eleventh Epode' *ICS* 1 (1976) 122-6
Lyne, R.O.A.M., *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford, 1980)
Macleod, C.W., 'Ethics and poetry in Horace's *Odes*', in *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983) 229-35
——— 'The poetry of ethics: Horace, *Epistles* 1', ibid. 280-91
Maguinness, W.S., 'The eclecticism of Horace' *Hermathena* 52 (1938) 27-46
Mannebach, E., *Aristippi et Cyrenaicorum Fragmenta* (Leiden, 1961)
Martindale, C.A., *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge, 1992)
Mayer, R., 'Horace on good manners' *PCPS* 31 (1985) 33-46
——— 'Horace's *Epistles* 1 and philosophy' *AJP* 107 (1986) 55-73
McDermott, E.A., 'Greek and Roman elements in Horace's lyric program' *ANRW* 2.31.3 (1981) 1640-72
McGann, M.J., *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles* (Brussels, 1969)
Merlan, P., 'Epicureanism and Horace' *JHI* 10 (1949) 445-51
Moles, J., 'Honestius quam ambitiosius' *JHS* 103 (1983) 103-23
——— 'Cynicism in Horace, *Epistles* 1' *PLLS* 5 (1985) 33-60
Momigliano, A., 'Epicureans in revolt' *JRS* 31 (1941) 151-7
——— *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome, 1960)
Moritz, L.A., 'Horace's Virgil' *G & R* 16 (1969) 174-93
Murray, O., '*Symposion* and *Männerbund*', *Concilium Eirene* 16.1 (1982) 47-52
——— 'Rileggendo il *Buon Re Secondo Omero*', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 14 (1984) 157-60
Newman, J.K., *Augustus and the New Poetry* (Brussels, 1967)
——— *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry* (Brussels, 1967a)
Nielsen, R.M., 'Horace *Odes* 1.23: innocence' *Arion* 9 (1970) 373-78
——— 'Horace, *Odes* III.12: of longings and wool baskets', in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* II, C. Déroux (ed.) (Brussels, 1980) 237-44
Nisbet, R.G.M., 'Horace for the connoisseur', review of Shackleton Bailey's Teubner text *CR* 33 (1983) 23-7
——— 'Small problems of text and interpretation in Horace *Odes* 3.14 (*Herculis ritu*)', *PLLS* 4 (1983) 105-19

——— 'Horace's *Epodes* and history', in *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, A.J. Woodman and D.A. West (edd.) (Cambridge, 1984) 1-18
——— 'Pyrrha among roses: real life and poetic imagination in Augustan Rome', review of Griffin (1985), *JRS* 77 (1987) 184-90
Nisbet, R.G.M., and Hubbard, M., *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1* (Oxford, 1970)
——— *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (Oxford, 1978)
Norberg, D., 'Le quatrième livre des Odes d'Horace' *Emerita* 20 (1952) 95-107
Oates, W.J., 'Horace and the doctrine of the mean', in *Studies Presented to E. Capps* (Princeton, 1936) 260-7
Olivieri, G., *Le Favole Mitologiche delle Odi confrontate con le Pitture di Pompei ed Ercolano* (Palermo, 1903)
Otis, B., 'Horace and the Elegists' *TAPA* 76 (1945) 177-90
Page, D.L., *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford, 1955)
——— *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962)
Parsons, P., 'Papyri and Greek literature' *CUCD Bulletin* 10 (1981) 7-8
Pasquali, G., *Orazio lirico*, repr. (Florence, 1964)
Pfeiffer, R., *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968)
Philippson, R., 'Horaz' Stellung zur Philosophie', in *Festschrift des Königs Wilhelm – Gymnasium in Magdeburg* (1911)
Porter Packer, M.N., 'Consistent epicureanism in Horace' *TAPA* 72 (1941) xxxix-xl
Préaux, J., 'Caton et l'ars poetica' *Latomus* 25 (1966) 710-25
Putnam, M.C.J., 'Horace and Tibullus' *CP* 67 (1972) 81-8
——— 'Horace, *Odes* 3.15: the design of *decus*' *CP* 71 (1976) 90-6
——— 'Horace, *Odes* 3.9: the dialectics of desire', in *Ancient and Modern Essays in Honour of Gerald F. Else* (Michigan, 1977) 139-57
——— *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (Ithaca, 1986)
Quinn, K., *Latin Explorations* (London, 1963)
——— 'Horace as a love poet', in *Essays on Classical Literature*, N. Rudd (ed.) (Cambridge/New York, 1972) 103-21
——— *Horace: the Odes* (London, 1980)
Rabe, A., 'Das Verhältnis des Horaz zur Philosophie', in *Archiv. für Geschichte der Philosophie und Soziologie* (1929) 77-91
Rawson, E., *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London, 1985)
——— 'Roman rulers and the philosophic adviser', in *Philosophia Togata*, M. Griffin and J. Barnes (edd.) (Oxford, 1989) 233-57
Reckford, K.J., 'Some studies in Horace's Odes on love' *CJ* 55 (1959) 25-33
Reitzenstein, R., *Aufsätze zu Horaz* (Darmstadt, 1963)
Richardson, N.J., 'Pindar and later literary criticism in antiquity' *PLLS* 5 (1985) 383-401
Rieks, R., 'Vergils Dichtung als Zeugnis und Deutung der römischen Geschichte' *ANRW* 31.2 (1981) 728-868
Riposati, B., 'L'ultima ode di Orazio (4.15) e i carmi convivali' *Riv. di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 25 (1983) 3-9

Ross, D.O., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge, 1975)
Rostagni, A., *Suetonio de Poetis* (Torino, 1944)
Rowe, C.J., 'Platonic irony' *Noua Tellus* 5 (1987) 83-101
Rudd, N., 'Patterns in Horatian lyric' *AJP* 81 (1960) 386-92
——— *The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge, 1966)
——— *Lines of Enquiry* (Cambridge, 1976)
——— 'Horace' *CHCL* 2 (1982) 370-404
Russell, D.A., and Winterbottom, M., *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations* (Oxford, 1972)
Santirocco, M.S., *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes* (Chapel Hill/London, 1986)
Seager, R., 'Horace, *Odes* 1.29 as a propempticon' *LCM* 1 (1976) 65-70
——— '*Neu sinas Medos equitare inultos*: Horace, the Parthians and Augustan foreign policy' *Athenaeum* n.s. 58 (1980) 103-118
Setaioli, A., 'Gli Epodi di Orazio nella critica dal 1937 al 1972', con un' appendice fino al 1978, *ANRW* 31.3 (1981) 1674-1788
Shackleton Bailey, D.R., *Profile of Horace* (London, 1982)
Silk, E.T., 'A fresh approach to Horace, II.20' *AJP* 77 (1956) 255-63
Skutsch, O., *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford, 1985)
Snell, B., 'Die 16. Epode von Horaz und Vergils 4. Ekloge' *Hermes* 73 (1938) 237-42
Stenuit, B., 'Le séjour d'Horace à Athènes' *LEC* 47 (1979) 249-55
Stinton, T.C.W., 'Horatian echoes' *Phoenix* 31 (1977) 159-73
Stockton, D., 'Primus and Murena' *Historia* 14 (1965) 18-40
Suerbaum, W., *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischen Dichter* (Hildesheim, 1968)
Syme, R., *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939)
——— *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986)
Syndikus, H.P., *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden* (Darmstadt, 1972-3) vol. 1
Thomas, R.F., 'Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenikes* and Roman poetry' *CQ* 33 (1983) 92-113
——— (ed.) *Virgil: Georgics* (Cambridge, 1988)
Torelli, M., *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs* (Michigan, 1982)
Trimpi, W., 'The meaning of Horace's *ut pictura poesis*' *JWCI* 36 (1973) 1-34
Troxler-Keller, I., *Die Dichterlandschaft des Horaz* (Heidelberg, 1964)
Usener, H., *Epicurea* (Leipzig, 1887)
van Berchem, D., 'Cynthia ou la carrière contrariée' *MH* 5 (1948) 137-54
van Straaten, M., *Panaetii Rhodii Fragmenta* (Leiden, 1952)
Vespignani, V., and Visconti, C.L., 'Antica sala da recitazioni ovvero auditorio scoperto fra le ruine degli Orti Mecenaziani sull' Esquilino' *Bolletino della Commissione Archeologia* 2 (1874) 137-71
von Arnim, H., *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1903-24)
Wagenvoort, H., *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion* (Leiden, 1956)
Wallace-Hadrill, A., rev. of J.M. Croisille *Poésie et art figuré de Néron aux*

Flaviens, in *JRS* 73 (1983) 180-3
——— 'Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus, and the *Fasti*', in *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, M. Whitby and P. Hardie (edd.) (Bristol, 1987) 221-30
——— review of Zanker (1988), *JRS* 79 (1989) 157-64
West, D., *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh, 1967)
White, P., 'The presentation and dedication of the *Silvae* and the *Epigrams*' *JRS* 64 (1974) 40-61
Wili, W., *Horaz und die Augusteische Kultur* (Basel, 1948)
Wilkinson, L.P., *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1945)
——— *The Georgics of Virgil* (Cambridge, 1969)
Williams, G.W., *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968)
——— '*Horace*', *Greece and Roman Survey* 6 (Oxford, 1972)
——— *The Third Book of Horace's Odes* (Oxford, 1976)
——— *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (New Haven/London, 1980)
Wimmel, W., 'Der Augusteer Lucius Varius Rufus' *ANRW* 30.3 (1983) 1562-1621
Witke, C., *Horace's Roman Odes: a Critical Examination* (Leiden, 1983)
Woodbury, L., 'Ibycus and Polycrates' *Phoenix* 39 (1985) 193-220
Woodman, T., '*Exegi monumentum*: Horace, *Odes* 3.30', in *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, T. Woodman and D. West (edd.) (Cambridge, 1974) 115-28
Yardley, J.C., 'Lovers' quarrels: Horace, *Odes* 1.13.11 and Propertius 4.5.40' *Hermes* 104 (1976) 124-28
Zanker, P., *Forum Augustum* (Tübingen, 1968)
——— *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Michigan, 1988)
Zetzel, J.E.G., 'Re-creating the canon: Augustan poetry and the Alexandrian past' *Critical Inquiry* 10 (1983) 83-105
Ziegler, K. (ed.), *Das hellenistische Epos*, 2nd edn (Leipzig, 1966)

for Stephen and Cathy (do you get incensed at being sent things jointly? Let me know if so!)
All Best, Denis

(Please forgive the many typos here; Niall Rudd didn't read the proofs, and lots of howlers got in).

HORACE 2000: A CELEBRATION

Essays for the Bimillennium

Edited by

Niall Rudd

Duckworth

1993