

University of Massachusetts Boston

ScholarWorks at UMass Boston

Classics Faculty Publication Series

Classics

January 1981

Greek and Roman Elements in Horace's Lyric Program

Emily A. McDermott

University of Massachusetts Boston, emily.mcdermott@umb.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umb.edu/classics_faculty_pubs



Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McDermott, Emily A., "Greek and Roman Elements in Horace's Lyric Program" (1981). *Classics Faculty Publication Series*. 13.

https://scholarworks.umb.edu/classics_faculty_pubs/13

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics at ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classics Faculty Publication Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact scholarworks@umb.edu.

SONDERDRUCK AUS:

AUFSTIEG UND NIEDERGANG DER RÖMISCHEN WELT

GESCHICHTE UND KULTUR ROMS
IM SPIEGEL DER NEUEREN FORSCHUNG

HERAUSGEGEBEN
VON

HILDEGARD TEMPORINI
UND
WOLFGANG HAASE

II

PRINCIPAT

EINUNDDREISSIGSTER BAND
(3. TEILBAND)

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON W. HAASE



WALTER DE GRUYTER · BERLIN · NEW YORK

1981

Greek and Roman Elements in Horace's Lyric Program

by EMILY A. McDERMOTT, Boston, Mass.

Contents

I. Horace's Lyric Undertaking	1640
II. The Adduction of Classical and Alexandrian Models	1644
III. Horace and his Models	1649
1. Horace and the Alexandrians	1650
2. Horace and the Neoterics	1654
3. Horace and the Elegists	1657
4. Summary	1660
IV. Roman Elements in the 'Odes': Introduction	1661
V. Greek and Latin Verbal Elements	1662
VI. The Landscape of the 'Odes'	1664
VII. Conclusion	1671

*vos exemplaria Graeca
nocturna versate manu, versate diurna.
(Ars Poetica, 268-269)*

I. Horace's Lyric Undertaking

The vision of Horatian scholars into the nature of Horace's 'Odes' has for many years been obscured by a number of disputes concerning both his use of Greek literary models, classical and Alexandrian, and his poetic judgment of his Latin predecessors and contemporaries, the neoterics and elegists. It is ironic (though the eclectic Horace might well have found it amusing) that one of the first self-proclaimed literary critics of the Western tradition has left posterity in such doubt about where precisely he himself, as poet, fits into the trends and currents of literary history.

As a means of approaching these vexed critical questions, one may begin by considering why Horace chose the lyric genre as the medium for his most elevated

poetic expression. Of the available genres, both Greek and Roman, only classical lyric offered him the diversity of theme which was to characterize his 'Odes': hymnic, amatory, political, philosophical and convivial poems all fell traditionally within its province. Concomitantly, the lyric genre could encompass a variety of poetic tones, for along with diversity of theme came the freedom to alternate between slight and elegant poems and those of a more serious inspiration, whether political, social or philosophical. Certainly neither the Alexandrian forms nor Gallus' *exigui elegi* (nor, for that matter, Horace's own prosy 'Sermones') could offer him the desired flexibility;¹ nor, from the opposite end of the poetic scale, could the 'higher' genres of epic and didactic. Furthermore, the metrical πολυειδία of lyric allowed Horace ample opportunity to display the technical virtuosity of which he was to become such a master. And finally, the choice of lyric afforded him the extra enticement of being able to proclaim himself εὐρετής of his genre.²

For reasons such as these, Horace adopted the lyric genre for his own and paid due homage to its early proponents, Alcaeus and Sappho. But more than four hundred years of literary history separated him from his classical Greek counterparts — four hundred years in which poets had more and more turned to self-conscious inquiry into the nature of poetry, as it was and as it should be. The question of the relative merits of *ars* and *ingenium* had raged unceasingly since it was first posed by the Alexandrians; and by Horace's time it must have been virtually impossible for an educated man to set himself to poetic endeavor without first coming to terms with his own personal place within the controversy. In other words, at the same time as Horace undertook to choose his genre, he had as well (and separately) to choose the aesthetic tradition within which to align himself.³

¹ Virgil, an innovative genius, did in fact contrive in his 'Eclogues' (esp. Ecl. 1, 4, 9) to expand the Alexandrian pastoral mode to accommodate graver, 'Roman' issues; but the form could bear only a limited amount of extra weight.

² As the first to devote himself to the task of systematically importing to Rome the lyric meters, Horace certainly was the εὐρετής of Latin lyric, and his claims to this effect at Odes 3.30.13 and Epp. 1.19.26ff. are, accordingly, justified. Critics have often escalated his silence on Catullus' two Sapphic experiments (Poems 11, 51) into a deliberate snub of the earlier poet (see below, p. 1654ff.). But, in doing so, they not only overlook the conventionality of poetic claims to originality (cp. the similar claim of Propertius at 3.1.3-4, though he certainly would not have denied following Gallus in both genre and aesthetic tradition), but also underestimate the importance to the Roman poets of recognized genre. This latter point has been made convincingly by C. W. MENDELL, *Catullan Echoes in the 'Odes' of Horace*, Class. Phil. 30 (1935), p. 295: "Horace did not deny to the earlier writer anything that Catullus would have claimed for himself. The Augustan poet did announce himself in his first ode as an aspirant for lyric honors in the field of Alcaeus and Sappho, and his claim to have attained the first and greatest Roman success in this field is no disparagement of Catullus. Ovid did not include Catullus in the list of his predecessors (Tristia 4.10.53), although he was an admirer of Catullus and in spite of the fact that Catullus was one of the earliest writers of elegy. For, while he wrote elegy, and that too in imitation of the Alexandrians, the recognized type of erotic elegy was a later crystallization. The same, in a general way, is true of his lyrics."

³ These two tasks were undoubtedly not sharply separated in Horace's own mind; but, from our critical standpoint, the disjunction should rather be exaggerated than underplayed, for

During the course of the twentieth century, literary critics have come increasingly to recognize Horace's affinity for the poetic credo which was first espoused by Callimachus and the other Alexandrians and then imported to Rome by the neoteric poets.⁴ The sophistication of craftsmanship which the neoterics had introduced to Roman poetry was an advance which, one may reasonably assume, no poet of Horace's stature would have wanted (or even known how) to spurn. At any rate, it is indisputable that Horace regularly and openly adopts critical terminology and motifs which set him in the Alexandrian-neoteric aesthetic tradition.⁵

failure to perceive any such distinction between genre and poetics has frequently led to the faulty assumption that Horace could not have looked to both classical and Alexandrian models at the same time.

⁴ For detailed discussion of critical opinion on this and related issues, see below, p. 1649ff.

⁵ Full discussions and lists of such motifs in Horace may be found in the several sources cited below, p. 1653ff. For convenience, I cite exemplary Horatian *loci* here. For Horace's uses of the Callimachean motif of *recusatio* (drawn from Ait. 1.1.21–24 [Pf.]), see, e.g., Odes 1.6.5ff., 2.12.13ff., 4.2.33ff., 4.15.1–4 (esp. close to Callimachus' version); Sat. 2.1.12ff.; Epp. 2.1.250ff. The Callimachean antithesis of the long, overblown poem and the slight, finely spun one (again found in the prologue to the 'Aitia'; cp. Fr. 398 [Pf.]) pervades Horace's poems. See, e.g., *parvus* at Odes 4.2.31 (cp. 2.16.37); *tenuis* (= λεπτός, λεπταλέος) at Odes 1.6.9, 2.16.38 (cp. Epp. 2.1.225, A.P. 46), 3.3.72 (= *tenuare*). See E. REITZENSTEIN, *Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos*, Festschrift f. Richard Reitzenstein (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 34ff., on the various forms in which λεπτός appears in Latin. A number of related size terms are combined in Horace's self-description at Sat. 1.4.17–21:

*di bene fecerunt inopis me quodque pusilli
finxerunt animi, raro et perpauca* loquentis:
at tu conclusas hircinis foliibus auras,
usque laborantis dum ferrum molliat ignis,
ut mavis imitare.*

[*Cp. Callimachus' ὀλίγος: Ait. 1.1.9 (Pf.); Hymns 2.112 (Pf.); cp. also Horace's pun at Odes 2.16.39 (*Parca non mendax*: i. e. a Fate who is truly *parcus*, -a, -um).]

By contrast, a lack of the Callimachean value of ἀργυρινή (Epigr. 27.4 [Pf.]) is imputed to Lucilius: *garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem, / scribendi recte* (Sat. 1.4.12–13; cp. Sat. 1.10.67ff.). Callimachean muddy river imagery (from Hymns 2.108–112 [Pf.]) is applied to sloppy, overblown composition at Sat. 1.4.11, 1.10.36–37, 50–51, 62–63; Epp. 2.2.120. Cp. also a non-pejorative example at 'Odes' 4.2.5–8, where Horace contrasts Pindar's grand and roiling *ingenium* with his own small-scale, laborious *ars* (for the poet as *apis*, cp. Callimachus' Διοτὶ μέλιττοι [Hymns 2.110 (Pf.)]):

*... ego apis Matinae
more modoque
grata carpentis thyma per laborem
plurimum circa nemus uvidique
Tiburis ripas operosa parvus
carmina fingo. (Odes 4.2.27–32)*

For Callimachean esotericism (drawn, e.g., from Ait. 1.1.25 [Pf.]ff., Epigr. 28.4 [Pf.]), see Odes 1.1.32, 2.16.39–40, 2.20.4 (where *invidia* = Callimachus' φθόνος [Hymns 2.105 (Pf.)ff.] or βασκανία [Ait. 1.1.17 (Pf.)]), 3.1.1; Sat. 1.4.21ff., 1.10.73ff.; Epp. 1.19.21–22, 1.20 (entire). Poetry as *ludus* is found first in Catullus 50 and later in Virgil's 'Eclogues' (1.10, 6.1, 7.17; cp. Geo. 4.565). Horace uses *ludo* of his own poetic endeavors at

There is a paradox, then, in Horace's lyric undertaking; it arises from the fact that he (like Virgil in his 'Aeneid') was determined to apply Alexandrian aesthetic standards to a classical form, and thereby to certain themes (most notably political ones) which were largely incompatible with the Alexandrian program. For the Alexandrians' advocacy of 'art for art' had effectively severed poetic endeavor from the individual poet's contemporary world – a process succinctly described by STEELE COMMAGER:

"To the poet of fifth-century Greece the city-state or πόλις offered an imaginative as well as a physical center. His poetry, like the sculpture on the Parthenon, made explicit its glory. The Alexandrians, living by and large in an adopted city, felt no such allegiance. The Muses had emigrated from Helicon to a new home in the great library, the Museum, which now became the quickening source upon which poets drew . . . Writers cultivated a learned coterie, for under a dictatorship their work was necessarily divorced from public affairs. Poetry became increasingly esoteric . . . The isolation from a great national tradition, the unavailability of any real political issues, and the learned, cosmopolitan audience for which Alexandrians wrote forced their work into new molds . . . No longer the expression of a national consciousness, poetry had become simply a reflection of the poet's ingenuity. He wrote not as the educator of his people but as the pupil of his art, and his verse, from being a means to express an allegiance, now became its object."⁶

Like the fifth-century Greeks (and unlike, for the most part, their Roman predecessors, the neoterics), Horace and Virgil were deeply involved, as poets, with their times (*res Romanae*) and concerned to speak forth as "educators of their people," or *vates*.⁷ However, this concern, while it was for both of these Augustan poets a major inducement to the choice of classical Greek forms, could not impel them to jettison the aesthetic program of the Alexandrians; rather, they had to reinterpret this latter credo in light of their own needs. And thus was born the so-called Augustan program, comprising at once (and somewhat paradoxically) classical Greek form, contemporary Roman theme, and Alexandrian search for perfection of poetic craftsmanship.

Sat. 1.10.37 and Odes 1.32.2 (cp. the reference to Anacreon, in strikingly similar terms, at Odes 4.9.9). For occasional uses as well of critical terms associated with Catullan *urbanitas*, see, e.g., *facetus* at Sat. 1.10.44 (of Virgil); *ineptus* at Sat. 1.10.2, 79; A.P. 140; Epp. 2.1.269–270 (*deferar in vicum vendentem tus et odores / et piper et quidquid chartis amicitur ineptis* – probably an intentional recall of Cat. 95.7–8: *at Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam / et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas*); *crassus, illepidus*: Epp. 2.1.76–77.

⁶ STEELE COMMAGER, *The Odes of Horace: a Critical Study* (New Haven, 1962), pp. 24–25.

⁷ The reintroduction by the Augustans of the archaism *vates* to describe the role of the poet as oracle of his times has been examined thoroughly by J. K. NEWMAN, *Augustus and the New Poetry*, Coll. Latomus 88 (Brussels, 1967), pp. 99–206. For the opposed view, that in NEWMAN's work "a great deal too much significance has been read into the Augustan adoption of the word *vates* for poet, which soon became a cliché," see L. P. WILKINSON's review of NEWMAN, *Gnom.* 41 (1969), pp. 156–159.

II. The Adduction of Classical and Alexandrian Models

The respective techniques by which Horace in his 'Odes' adduces classical and Alexandrian models differ significantly. Since Horace was undertaking to Romanize for the first time a Greek form, it is natural that he should explicitly acknowledge his formal debt to his Greek predecessors in the same genre. In fact, in addition to his two most frequently noted Greek models, Alcaeus and Sappho, he mentions as well Pindar, Simonides, Stesichorus and Anacreon.⁸ Critics who posit a distaste on Horace's part for the Alexandrian poets (see below, p. 1650ff.) attribute negative significance to the fact that he nowhere pays similar homage to Callimachus, Theocritus, Aratus or Euphronion.⁹ But such critics fail to give

⁸ Alcaeus appears at Odes 1.32.5ff., 2.13.26ff., 4.9.7; Epp. 1.19.29ff., 2.2.99; Sappho at Odes 2.13.24ff., 4.9.10ff.; Epp. 1.19.28. More indirect allusions to both Alcaic and Sapphic (and, therefore, Horatian) artistry occur, e.g., at Odes 1.1.34 (*Lesboum barbiton*), 1.26.11 (*Lesbio plectro*), 3.30.13 (*Aeolium carmen*), 4.3.12 (*Aeolio carmine*), 4.6.35 (*Lesbium pedem*). For Simonides, see Odes 2.1.38, 4.9.7; for Stesichorus, see Odes 4.9.8; for Anacreon, see Odes 4.9.9 (for an indirect allusion to Anacreon's art, cp. Odes 1.17.18 [*fide Teia*]); for Pindar, see Odes 4.2.1ff., 4.9.6; Epp. 1.3.10ff.; citations of critical studies of Horace's relationship to Pindar may be found in E. BURCK's bibliography, appended to A. KIESSLING-R. HEINZE, *Oden und Epoden*¹² (Berlin, 1966), p. 603, par. 4 (also in eds. 10-11). Cp., more recently, M. BROZEK, *De Scriptoribus Latinis antiquis Pindari laudatoribus et aemulis*, *Eos* 59 (1971), pp. 101-107; N. T. KENNEDY, Pindar and Horace, *Act. Class.* 18 (1975), pp. 9-24. For Horace's preference of Alcaeus over Sappho, see esp. Odes 2.13.21-28:

<i>quam paene furvae regna Proserpinae</i>	
<i>et indicantem vidimus Aeacum</i>	
<i>sedesque discriptas piorum et</i>	
<i>Aeoliis fidibus querentem</i>	
<i>Sappho puellis de popularibus,</i>] amatory themes
<i>et te sonantem plenius aureo,</i>	
<i>Alcae, plectro dura navis,</i>	
<i>dura fugae mala, dura belli!</i>] political themes

This 'preference' is based on recognition that the adduction of Alcaeus as a model more tellingly reflects the variety of the Horatian lyric program, for Alcaeus too (unlike Sappho) was deeply involved in contemporary political themes - certainly weightier (*sonantem plenius*) topics than the amatory themes Horace portrays as characteristic of Sappho.

⁹ His single mention of Callimachus is contained in his description of the mutual congratulations exchanged by himself and a certain elegist (generally presumed to be Propertius):

discedo Alcaeus puncto illius; ille meo quis?
quis nisi Callimachus? si plus adposcere visus,
fit Mimnermus et optivo cognomine crescit.
 (Epp. 2.2.99-101)

This vignette certainly contains irony, but it is aimed at Horace himself as much as at the elegist. To claim in turn that it can be used to prove a distaste on Horace's part for Callimachus seems the height of critical overinterpretation. One cannot even assume from

proper weight to the fact that adoption of an aesthetic tradition demands less explicit comment than does importation of a genre. Furthermore, within the "learned coterie" of neo-Alexandrian poets, the accepted way to espouse Alexandrian poetics was not so much to name names as, first, to create a finished product which would pass rigid scrutiny for fineness of craftsmanship; second, to draw on recognizably Alexandrian forms and/or themes; and, third, to adopt in one's own programmatic statements the terminology and motifs which had become, through usage, necessarily associated with and redolent of Callimachean aesthetics. The first of these Horace obviously achieved: the very keynote of his 'Odes' is meticulous craftsmanship. As to the second, while his lyric forms are technically classical rather than Alexandrian, his decision to limit himself to the short and finished poem is definitely in keeping with the Alexandrian formal program;¹⁰ thematically, Hellenistic motifs abound in the 'Odes', as PASQUALI, for one, has clearly demonstrated.¹¹ Horace's recurrent use of the third technique has already been mentioned (see note 5 above).

The fact that espousal of Alexandrian poetics was preferably expressed only indirectly may be seen from even a brief look at the practice of Catullus and Virgil (to whom few would deny emulation of Alexandrian models) in this regard. Catullus mentions Callimachus only twice (Poems 65.16 and 116.2), and neither time in a programmatic statement (i.e. as the leader of the aesthetic tradition within which he himself writes), but only as a predecessor whom Catullus has on occasion undertaken to translate into Latin; no other Alexandrian poet appears in his work. Virgil, who perhaps more than any other Roman poet uses literary echo and even 'translation' to recall, thematically, his chosen models, names no Alexandrian names at all. And in such extended programmatic statements as the sixth Eclogue, his adduction of models becomes so allusive and indirect that it will undoubtedly always be debated just what kind of poetry is at issue here. As J. P. ELDER has noted, perceptively:

"[Virgil's] is usually a connotative world, in which things are not 'spelled out'; that is the business of prose."

He goes on to describe the ways in which Virgil's sixth Eclogue makes use of 'associations', in order to "build up throughout the poem his House of Inspiration, and delicately to include himself within the edifice."¹²

these lines that Horace prefers Mimnermus to Callimachus: it is not the substitution of the second compliment for the first that pleases the elegist so, but the addition of a second favorable comparison — perhaps aimed more specifically at the erotic element of his verse. (If I may be allowed a flippant analogy: would anyone attempt to read a preference for French Romanticism over Roman Monumentalism into COLE PORTER's 1934 lyric: "You're the top! / You're the Colosseum. / You're the top! / You're the Louvre Museum"?). And it is further significant that Mimnermus was taken as a preferred model by Callimachus himself at Ait. 1.1.11 (Pf.).

¹⁰ It is further notable that such loosely-jointed 'longer' efforts as Odes 3.11 and 3.27 have a distinct affinity with a favored Alexandrian form, the epyllion.

¹¹ GIORGIO PASQUALI, *Orazio lirico* (Florence, 1920), pp. 141–641. See below, n. 23.

¹² J. P. ELDER, *Non iniussa cano: Virgil's Sixth Eclogue*, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. 65 (1961), p. 114.

Two examples from the 'Odes' may suffice to illustrate not only the complexity of Horace's lyric program (which attempts to knit classical form, Alexandrian poetics and Roman themes into a single fabric), but also his sensitivity to the different techniques (explicit or allusive) traditionally suitable to the adduction of his separate sets of models. In the programmatic closing poem of his first collection of 'Odes', Horace boasts that he shall be known as:

*princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos
deduxisse modos.*

(Odes 3.30.13–14)

The phrase encapsulates the complexities of his poetic role as sketched above.¹³ His form is classical Greek lyric (*Aeolium carmen*); this form is to be adapted to his Roman world (*ad Italos modos*).¹⁴ The third element, Alexandrian poetics, is more subtly intimated. The verb *deduco* looks neutral enough upon first glance, but further examination will reveal that its appearance here constitutes a gracefully allusive espousal of Alexandrian poetics. For this metaphor, drawn from the technical terminology of weaving, had been introduced to Latin by Virgil in the beginning of his sixth Eclogue as specifically expressive of both the fineness and intricacy of Alexandrian verse:

*cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
vellit et admonuit: "pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen."*

(Ecl. 6.3–5)

In this paraphrase of Callimachus (the first of many such *recusationes* in extant Latin poetry), *deductum* stands for the Callimachean tag, λεπταλέην.¹⁵ From the time of this Eclogue on in Latin poetry, the image of a poet 'spinning' the web of his verse was meant to connote a specifically Alexandrian *ars*, or *labor*.¹⁶ Horace's boast at Odes 3.30, then, reflects his pride not only in the

¹³ For a parallel analysis of these lines, see DAVID O. ROSS, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge, Eng., 1975), pp. 133–136.

¹⁴ The phrase *Italos modos* must not be taken as a specifically metrical reference (as PASQUALI, e.g., recognized early, rendering „suoni latini“ [p. 112]), but as a more general reference to an Italian 'context'.

¹⁵ Callimachus, Ait. 1. Fr. 1.21–24 (Pf.):

Καὶ γὰρ ὅτ' ἐπὶ πρῶτιστον ἔμοις ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκε
γούνασι, Ἄ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος:
'.] . . αἰδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
θρέψαι, τῇν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθέ λεπταλέην.

¹⁶ For *deduco* in general, see E. REITZENSTEIN, pp. 34–35. Horace uses the same image again (its metaphor made more explicit the second time) at Epp. 2.1.225, when he characterizes the fruits of a poet's labor as *tenui deducta poemata filo*. Propertius has *deduco* in this precise sense of the 'spinning' of poetry at 1.16.41; Ovid at Epp. Pont. 1.5.13, 4.1.1; Trist. 1.1.39, 2.560, and 5.1.71; and most notably at Met. 1.4 (*ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen*), where he plays on the word's Alexandrian connotations by connecting it oxymoronically with the incompatible idea of a 'continuous' epic (ἐν αἰσμα διηγεκές: Call.

Romanization of a classical Greek form, but also in the Alexandrian poetic sophistication which he has applied to that form.

The same weaving together of diverse traditions may be seen in Horace's hymn to his lyre, Odes 1.32.¹⁷ While this poem is often viewed as little more than a trifle, it is nonetheless important as a statement (perhaps early) of Horace's lyric program:

*Poscimus. si quid vacui sub umbra
lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum
vivat et pluris, age dic Latinum,
barbite, carmen,*

*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.*

*o decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi
grata testudo Iovis, o laborum
dulce lenimen, mihi cumque salve
rite vocanti.*

The lyre is invoked and enjoined by the poet to assist him in a *Latinum carmen*; the paradox of the undertaking is underlined by the bald juxtaposition of *Latinum* with the strong Grecism, *barbitos*.¹⁸ Having stated his prayer, the poet goes on to adduce Alcaeus as his prime lyric model, casting these lines (in an understated stroke of wit) as that section of a hymn in which the exploits of the god's youth are narrated.¹⁹ Thus, the lyre which in its youth had sung classical Greek lyrics is asked, in its maturity, to join Horace in singing Italian ones.

However, it is not classical models alone which the poet invokes here. Working on a principle of literary echo, the first three lines of Odes 1.32 have (before mention of Alcaeus, or even of the *barbitos*) firmly set the poem in the Alexandrian aesthetic tradition. *Vacui sub umbra lusimus*: one hears in these

Ait. 1.1.3 [Pf.]), in order to emphasize humorously the anomaly of his program in the 'Metamorphoses'.

¹⁷ The overall cast of this poem as a hymn, as well as its various textual problems, have been discussed admirably by EDUARD FRAENKEL, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 168–176. His arguments (pp. 171 ff.) in favor of the reading *poscimus* in the first line (rather than *poscimur*, which has equal manuscript authority), for example, are thoroughly convincing.

¹⁸ In Latin, this Grecism appears first in Horace's 'Odes' and is never integrated into the Latin poetic vocabulary: see EMILY A. McDERMOTT, *Horatius Callidus*, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* 98 (1977), p. 367.

¹⁹ FRAENKEL, p. 169.

words both Virgil's *lentos in umbra* (Ecl. 1.4) and Catullus' *otiosi lusimus* (Poem 50.1–2). Horace's *tecum*, addressed to his instrument, likewise recalls the 'Eclogues': *incipit Maenalis mecum, mea tibia, versus* (Ecl. 8.21). The adoption of the trope by which the poet expresses the hope that the resulting poems may achieve a measure of immortality points back to Catullus, Cinna and Callimachus.²⁰ Horace's combination and reworking of these elements, then, indicates that his models include (in addition to Alcaeus) Callimachus, the neoterics Catullus and Cinna, and Virgil's 'Eclogues'.²¹

Within the same ode, Horace also makes programmatic allusion to the diversity of theme and poetic tone which will characterize his lyrics. Critics have generally not penetrated beneath the surface picture presented by the poet here of the doughty warrior and sailor Alcaeus, in his spare moments using song as an escape to soothe away the travails of his daily life. Thus, for example, both FRAENKEL and NISBET-HUBBARD point out that mention of Alcaeus' characteristic political themes is absent here.²² I would suggest, however, that the particular cast of Horace's description of Alcaeus here is tantamount to mention of the

²⁰ Catullus: *quod . . . plus uno maneat perenne saeclo* (Poem 1.10); Cinna, frg. 14 (MOREL): *saecula permaneat nostri Dictynna Catonis*; Callimachus, frg. 7.14 (PF.): *ἵνα μοι πολὺ μένωσι(ν) ἔτος*.

²¹ But, some commentators have said, these *ludi* are now in the past: it is a more elevated (*Latinum*) song on which Horace now embarks. Some, following BENTLEY (on *poscimus*) construe the *quod*-clause with *Latinum carmen* rather than – as is surely more natural (see FRAENKEL, p. 172) – with the preceding *siquid*. Others (e.g. WICKHAM, HEINZE, LENCHANTIN) merely presume a disjunction between earlier *ludi* and the *Latinum carmen* to come; again, FRAENKEL's remarks (following R. REITZENSTEIN, *Horaz Ode I, 32*, Rh. Mus. 68 [1913], p. 254) seem definitive: "It is indeed almost inconceivable that in a poem which is so consistently reminiscent of the formulas of prayer, a protasis of the type αἶ ποτα κἀτέρωτα . . . ἐκλυε, or εἰ ποτε καὶ προτέρως ἄτας ὕπερ . . . ἠνύσατε, and the like – that such a protasis should be followed by an apodosis which, instead of stressing the parallelism between the present emergency and the case which is adduced as a precedent, would express the very opposite thought and emphasize the difference between the benefit received in the past and that asked for now. Such a differentiation, from the point of view of any praying worshipper, would be madness, for it must be his main concern to make the analogy between the hoped-for action of the god and his action in the past as close as possible." (p. 173)

²² See R. G. M. NISBET and MARGARET HUBBARD, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (Oxford, 1970), p. 359, and at lines 5 and 6. FRAENKEL (p. 175) points out that: "... certain serious themes which are prominent in the work of Alcaeus and accordingly emphasized in Horace's Hades ode (ii.13) are here pushed into the background . . . Nothing is here said of the σπασιωτικά." While I would disagree with him on that point, I would nonetheless agree that appreciation of the shape Horace has given these lines (Alcaeus the political man [5–8] as opposed to Alcaeus the poet of light-hearted themes [9–12]) does contribute to our fuller understanding of Horace's own poetic program. FRAENKEL continues (p. 175): "This omission serves to intensify the contrast between the Lesbian poet's harassed life and the triumphant freedom of his art." One may, perhaps, take this interesting remark by FRAENKEL even further. There is a strong parallel between Horace's own situation in the 30's B.C. and the description of Alcaeus as presented in Odes 1.32. As a follower of Brutus, Horace too (a *Romanus civis*, as Alcaeus was *Lesbius civis* [Odes 1.32.5]) had been involved in a war. In this context, the image of Alcaeus tying his storm-tossed

στασιωτικά. By a simple synecdoche, Alcaeus' actions here stand for his most characteristic poetic themes. Both *ferox bello* and *inter arma*, then, refer to his writing of στασιωτικά. The picture of him bringing his storm-tossed ship to shore likewise suggests such fragments as Alcaeus A 6 (L.-P.) and Z 2 (L.-P.). If (as seems likely) Alcaeus was in those poems using a 'ship of state' metaphor (or even if Horace wrongly assumes that he was), this last phrase too is descriptive of his political poetry. According to this interpretation, then, the second two stanzas of Odes 1.32 programmatically list the types of themes to be treated by the poet and his *barbitos* in their *Latinum carmen*: political (6-8), convivial (*Liberum* [9]), programmatic (*Musas* [9]), and amatory (*Veneremque et seq.* [9-12]). The overall frame of the ode adds as well a fifth type: hymn.

In sum, Odes 1.32 informs the reader directly that Horace in his 'Odes' draws upon classical Greek models, and indirectly that an aesthetic debt is owed to Alexandria. While explicit parallel is drawn between Alcaeus and Horace's lighter lyrics, the cast of the description of Alcaeus the warrior implicitly informs us that Horace's lyric collection too will encompass weighty themes. And so the complexities and paradoxes of the Horatian lyric program may all be read into these 'trifling' sixteen lines.

III. Horace and his Models

At this point let us retrace some of the ground covered in the previous sections from a more detailed bibliographical stance. The source material will be arranged in three sub-sections covering, respectively, 'Horace and the Alexandrians', 'Horace and the Neoterics', and 'Horace and the Elegists'. While such division is to an extent artificial (and there will necessarily be overlap among sources cited in each section), nonetheless it may serve to clarify certain issues. Strictly, of course, only the first of these three issues is critical to understanding of Horace's relation to his Greek models, and major emphasis will accordingly be laid on this issue. But briefer surveys of the second two questions will also be included, since various faulty inferences have arisen from the merger of these three separate issues into one. For instance, one critic may be convinced first that Horace's 'silence' on

(*iactatam*) ship up on shore suggests his own and Horace's winning their way through to safety after the perils of war. One may with some point compare Odes 2.7, in which Horace uses a 'ship of state' motif to describe his friend Pompeius' re-involvement in the Civil War, in contrast with his own safe extrication from it:

*te rursus in bellum resorbens
unda fretis tulit aestuosis.*

(Odes 2.7.15-16)

In Odes 2.7, the cure which the poet proposes for the pain and weariness imposed by the real world (*fessum militia latus* [18]) is the forgetfulness brought on by drunkenness: *oblivioso levia Massico / ciboria exple* (Odes 2.7.21-22). In Odes 1.32, he finds his *laborum dulce lenimen* (14-15) rather in poetry.

his Alexandrian predecessors necessarily argues his disdain for them, and so deduce that this disdain must extend as well to all Roman poets who embrace them. Another may begin by inferring dislike of the netoerics and/or elegists from their sparing and 'unflattering' mentions in Horace's works and go on to presume that Horace could not then have liked these poets' stated models, the Alexandrians. Approaching these three issues separately, then, may be a convenient way of unraveling certain critical knots, in order to discern the poet's true intentions.

1. Horace and the Alexandrians

The orthodox view of Horace's relationship to the Alexandrian poets has changed rather dramatically during the course of the twentieth century, until it seems to be more or less conceded that — far from despising them and decrying their influence on Roman poetry — Horace felt a definite affinity for the art of these latter-day Greeks.

Early in this century, first REITZENSTEIN (1908), then PASQUALI (1920) stressed the extent of Horace's relationship to Hellenistic poetry. Both their studies take pains to qualify the common assumption that Horace turned directly to the classical lyrists, emphasizing instead a more pervasive thematic debt to the modern Hellenistic world.²³ But in spite of such early appreciations of non-classical influences on Horace's art, scholars in the English-speaking world were slow to give up the view of Horace as a poet of unadulterated classicism, one who, in SELLAR's words, "[set] before himself purer models than even Virgil had in his earlier works."²⁴ For example, D'ALTON (1917) points emphatically to Horace's choice of classical models:

²³ R. REITZENSTEIN, *Horaz und die hellenistische Lyrik*, *Neue Jahrb. klass. Alt.* 21 (1908), pp. 81–102 (see also pp. 365–367; cp. *Id.*, *Horaz als Dichter*, *Neue Jahrb. klass. Alt.* 49 [1922], pp. 24–41). See esp. p. 85: „Wir müssen, um dem Dichter gerecht zu werden, bei jedem Gedicht, gerade umgekehrt wie Kiessling es wollte, damit beginnen, das für seine Zeit Moderne, also überwiegend das Hellenistische in Empfindung und Technik zu suchen. Erst dann werden wir verstehen, wie die Einzelreminiszenz aus der klassischen Lyrik sich einfügen konnte.“ PASQUALI, pp. 104–105, similarly argues the rather cursory nature of 'imitation' of Alcaeus: „L'esame accurato di quelle odi di Orazio per le quali si hanno riscontri nei frammenti di Alceo, mostra che quegli non ha mai né tradotto né parafrasato questo, ma che o ha preso da esso solamente lo spunto, il motto, per passar subito a cantare romanamente sentimenti ignoti all'età del Lesbio; o anche, ma raramente, ha composto su argomenti cantati già da Alceo carmi di tal fatta che ricordassero al lettore dotto la poesia corrispondente, non però simile, del poeta antico.“ Cp. the earlier comments by U. v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin, 1913), pp. 305 ff. PASQUALI goes on to stress Horace's use „nella maggior parte delle poesie [dei] motivi che non possono essere anteriori all'ellenismo“ (p. 105) — and, indeed, PASQUALI's detailed description of such Hellenistic tropes in Horace takes up five hundred pages.

²⁴ W. Y. SELLAR, *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age* (New York, 1965; first published Oxford, 1892), p. 147.

"It is to the finest period of Greek poetry he has gone for his inspiration, and he reiterates this fact with such insistence, that one is forced to conclude that he wished above all to free himself from the suspicion of any taint of Alexandrianism."²⁵

CAMPBELL (1924) grudgingly concedes in his analysis of Epodes 5 that the themes and style of the poem are Alexandrian rather than classical, but cites it as an aberration in Horace, "who was the least open to Alexandrian influences of all the Latin classic poets."²⁶ FRANK (1928) speaks of Horace's "scorn for the Alexandrian style and his advocacy of a firmer, compacter, and more restrained manner of composition";²⁷ GLOVER (1932) states flatly that "Horace despised the Alexandrians . . .; they posed, they displayed their art, and paraded their obscurity — no poets for a man with a sense of humour";²⁸ SYME (1939) attributes to Horace "a healthy distaste both for archaism and for Alexandrianism."²⁹

Two assumptions obviously underlie all these inferences. The first is that — as WILKINSON sums it up — "the term 'Alexandrianism' as conventionally applied . . . is a term of abuse."³⁰ In fact, to a large extent, one might justifiably assert that the orthodox view of Horace's relationship to Alexandria has changed less as a result of reappraisal of the nature of Horace's own work than from the gradual rehabilitation of the reputations of the Alexandrian poets. As the latter have begun to win greater critical appreciation (a process stimulated by WILAMOWITZ' 'Hellenistische Dichtung'), critics have become less reluctant to admit Horace's ties to them.³¹ The second (probably the single most deceptive

²⁵ J. F. D'ALTON, *Horace and his Age. A Study in Historical Background* (New York, 1962; first published London, 1917), p. 282.

²⁶ ARCHIBALD Y. CAMPBELL, *Horace* (London, 1924), p. 139.

²⁷ TENNEY FRANK, *Catullus and Horace* (New York, 1928), p. 159.

²⁸ T. GLOVER, *Horace* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), pp. 69–70.

²⁹ RONALD SYME, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), p. 255. For similar views of Alexandrianism and Horace's reactions to it, see, e.g., J. WIGHT DUFF, *A Literary History of Rome* (London, 1914), pp. 272, 303 ff.; W. R. HARDIE, *Lectures on Classical Subjects* (London, 1903), pp. 277 ff.; J. I. M. TAIT, *Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets* (Bryn Mawr, 1941), p. 66; and PAUL WENDLAND, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum* (Tübingen, 1907), pp. 55–57.

³⁰ L. P. WILKINSON, *Horace and his Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1951; first published 1945), p. 117.

³¹ See U. v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (Berlin, 1924), *passim*. In the English-speaking world, a new critical direction was pointed by E. A. HAVELOCK, *The Lyric Genius of Catullus* (New York, 1929), pp. 162 ff. In discussion of the fallacies involved in critical assessment of Alexandrian influences on Roman poetry, HAVELOCK astutely notes the circularity of traditional arguments: "A sentence from Wight Duff (p. 272) can serve to illustrate this distorted perspective, which has affected all the handbooks — 'No literary movement had been more phenomenal than the Alexandrianism which fascinated the circle of Catullus and shrank before the more unfettered art of Virgil and Horace.' When confronted with the difficulty that, in contrast to the Augustans, Catullus is anything but 'fettered,' reply is made that in so far as he was unfettered, he was not an Alexandrian, i.e., not really one of the *poetae novi*; so criticism falls back on the theory of the 'two Catulluses,' and supports one false hypothesis by

assumption commonly made by critics) is that, for the Roman poet, the use of classical models and Alexandrian models must necessarily be viewed as opposed, or mutually exclusive. Yet, as early as 1908, REITZENSTEIN argued eloquently against the existence of any such gulf in the minds of the Alexandrians themselves.³² And COMMAGER is certainly correct in asserting that "the eagerness to regard distinct influences as necessarily hostile receives no encouragement from Horace himself."³³ Indeed, certain of the critics who assume hostility against the Alexandrians in Horace seem to sense intuitively (even despite themselves) something of Horace's affinity for the Alexandrian program. Thus SELLAR (1892) allows that, in certain ways, Horace "yield[s] to tastes formed and fostered by Alexandrian learning."³⁴ D'ALTON, even while insisting on a totally classical Horace, reveals, perhaps, an uneasy intuition that all is not well with the picture he has just painted:

"It is clear then where Horace's predilection lay [i.e. with classical models], though we might expect from him a greater sympathy with the Alexandrians, considering that Virgil had fallen to some extent under their sway . . . Moreover, Horace and the Alexandrians had this in common that they set the highest value on perfection of technique, and on the elegance and polish of their verse."³⁵

another" (p. 191, n. 97). While HAVELOCK does not attempt to reassess the artistic worth of the Alexandrians themselves, he does defend the neoterics' adoption of the idea of Alexandrianism (his essential argument here is in line with that of R. REITZENSTEIN [1908], esp. pp. 85 [partially quoted, n. 23], 101–102): "The instinct which led these poets to Alexandria was essentially sound, because Alexandrian literature was not an archaeological curiosity, it was not 'classical,' it was alive and exciting and contemporary; it belonged to the same world . . . The past can provide 'higher,' more classical standards. But for present creative purposes they are dead . . . The occasional verse, epigrams and idylls of Alexandria may all have been second-rate; they were Greek and foreign anyway. But they were still alive, still being written, when Catullus grew up" (pp. 167–168). It is, of course, a sign of the genius of Virgil and Horace that they were able to revivify their respective classical forms.

³² See R. REITZENSTEIN (1908), p. 85: „Es ist ja keine unüberbrückte Kluft zwischen beiden. Die klassische Lyrik lebt und wirkt in der hellenistischen Dichtung weiter. Ich brauche für die *ἀοιδὴν*, das größere Einzellied, nur an Theokrit zu erinnern und muß es mir versagen, die Freude alexandrinischer Dichter, einen älteren Vorwurf in ein anderes Metrum und *εἶδος* zu übertragen, an Beispielen darzulegen oder hervorzuheben, wie viel Gedanken und Bilder der großen Lyrik, die bei Horaz wiederkehren, schon von Theokrit vorweggenommen sind. Aber auch ohne derartige Umbildung leben z.B. Sapphos Hochzeitslieder weiter, nur daß die Typen sich farbenprächtiger ausgestalten."

³³ COMMAGER, p. 35. As specific indicators of Horace's genial eclecticism, recall the frenzies he has sent critics into concerning (a) whether he is really a Stoic or an *Epicuri de grege porcus* (Epp. 1.4.16); or (b) his place in the wine vs. water controversy — on which, COMMAGER's assessment that Horace gently mocks both sides of that silly quarrel (Epp. 1.19) is certainly correct (COMMAGER, pp. 28 ff.).

³⁴ SELLAR, p. 147.

³⁵ D'ALTON, pp. 282–283.

But that intuition fades quickly in the face of an absolute conviction that classical and Alexandrian values may not mingle:

"One might possibly argue that Horace's hostility to the Alexandrian school has been exaggerated, but the indications I have mentioned, together with the poet's unceasing appeal to the lyric writers of early Greek as his models, leave no doubt as to *the side on which* his sympathies were ranged."³⁶
(Emphasis mine.)

Similarly, FRANK, after positing Horace's 'scorn' for the Alexandrians, notes nonetheless his similarity in taste to the neo-Alexandrian Catullus:

"His program [in Sat. 1.10] calls for pure diction, a fastidious taste, exactness, lightness and charm. He might have summed up his principles by referring to the ideals of the early Catullus, but that would have been misunderstood. He prefers to reject the work of Catullus completely."³⁷

These similarities between Horatian and Alexandrian stylistic theory were soon noted more formally. WEHRLI (1944), after citing certain broad similarities in the two programs, goes on to note specifically Callimachean elements in Horace (e.g. the *recusatio* and the imagistic contrast between the muddy river and the pure fount) and so to conclude that his adoption of these motifs was conscious and deliberately Alexandrian.³⁸ While WEHRLI himself at one point defers to earlier scholarly consensus by attributing to Horace „[prinzipielle] Orientierung an klassischen Vorbildern,"³⁹ he also breaks relatively new ground by portraying Horace arriving at his own characteristic style after drawing eclectically upon separate schools of influence.⁴⁰

WEHRLI's article was followed in the German-speaking world by studies by HOWALD (1948) and PUELMA PIWONKA (1949), both of which set Horace squarely in the camp of the Alexandrians, and specifically in that of Callimachus.⁴¹ Meanwhile, WILKINSON's chapter entitled 'Art and Alexandria' adopts a position

³⁶ D'ALTON, p. 284.

³⁷ FRANK, p. 164.

³⁸ FRITZ WEHRLI, Horaz und Kallimachos, Mus. Helv. 1 (1944), pp. 69–76. See on p. 71: „Daß diese allgemeine Ähnlichkeit im Sinne literaturgeschichtlicher Kontinuität zu verstehen ist, beweist, wenn es überhaupt eines Beweises bedarf, die Verwendung einzelner Prägungen des Kallimachos durch Horaz.“ – For Callimachean influences, cp. E. ENGELMAIER, Was ist in des Horaz Satiren und Episteln auf griechischen Einfluß zurückzuführen? (Diss. Erlangen, 1913), p. 37.

³⁹ WEHRLI, p. 69.

⁴⁰ See WEHRLI, p. 70: „So ist es auch nicht zu verwundern, daß Horaz sich in der Theorie ebenfalls nicht schulmäßig festlegen läßt; klassizistische Elemente sind in derselben zwar festgestellt, sie verbinden sich aber mit Hellenistischem zu einem eigenwilligen Ganzen, das getreuer Spiegel des dichterischem Schaffens ist.“

⁴¹ ERNST HOWALD, Über das Wesen der lateinischen Dichtung (Erlenchbach, 1948), pp. 58ff.; MARIO PUELMA PIWONKA, Lucilius und Kallimachos (Frankfurt, 1949), pp. 115–169. Cp. also F. KLINGNER, Kunst und Kunstgesinnung des Horaz, Altspr. Unterr. 12 (1951), pp. 18–42 (= Id., Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur [Zürich-Stuttgart, 1964], pp. 432–455).

somewhere between earlier critics in his own language and the more extreme views being espoused contemporaneously by HOWARD and PUELMA: he acknowledges Horace's thematic debt to Hellenism and the formal parallelism between the Horatian lyric and the Callimachean epigram, but argues for a certain distaste on Horace's part for the 'musical trifles' of the neoteric and (by extension) Alexandrian programs.⁴²

The 1960's saw a renewed interest in this subject, as studies appeared by WIMMEL (1960), METTE (1961), and NEWMAN (1967).⁴³ SCHWINGE (1963) tries to check what he sees as the excesses of critics who view Horace as a true Callimachean („*der er gar nicht ist*“); he points out, interestingly, that Horace's art is built upon a deliberately paradoxical „*Grundprinzip der Einheit von ingenium und ars*“, citing such examples as *spiritum tenuem* (Odes 2.16.38), where the Callimachean catchword *tenuis* (= *ars*) is connected oxymoronically with the divine *afflatus*, or *spiritus*, which traditionally symbolizes *ingenium*.⁴⁴ A recent study by CODY (1976) also emphasizes the transformation of Callimachean principles in Horace's hands.⁴⁵

2. Horace and the Neoterics

The view that Horace felt nothing but disdain for Catullus and the neoteric movement in Rome arises primarily from two presumptions: that Horace's silence on Catullus first in his 'Epodes', then in his 'Odes', constitutes a snub, and that his sole reference to Catullus (along with Licinius Calvus) must be taken as an active insult:

. . . quos neque pulcher
Hermogenes umquam legit, neque simius iste
nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.
(Sat. 1.10.17-19)

⁴² WILKINSON, pp. 116-122. For thematic and formal debts, see esp. pp. 117-118; for Horace on the neoterics, see esp. 116-117, 121.

⁴³ WALTER WIMMEL, *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*, Hermes Einzelschriften 16 (Wiesbaden, 1960), an important but difficult and unwieldy study which traces in detail the single Callimachean motif, the *Apologetik* (or *recusatio*) in Latin literature (for criticisms of WIMMEL [e.g. for extremism or for style], see GEORG LUCK, *Gnom.* 33 [1961], pp. 366-373; and E. J. KENNEY, *Class. Rev.* N.S. 12 [1962], pp. 57-58); HANS JOACHIM METTE, 'Genus tenue' und 'mensa tenuis' bei Horaz, *Mus. Helv.* 18 (1961), pp. 136-139; NEWMAN, esp. pp. 270ff. NEWMAN's interesting study (like WIMMEL's) has been faulted by critics: see, e.g., suggestions that it is too extreme in seeking out Callimachean elements in Horace and that its claims to originality are not always well-founded, in WILKINSON's review in *Gnom.* 41 (1969), pp. 156-159. The lack of an index in NEWMAN's study distinctly detracts from its utility as a research tool.

⁴⁴ ERNST-RICHARD SCHWINGE, *Zur Kunsttheorie des Horaz*, *Philol.* 107 (1963), pp. 77, 95-96.

⁴⁵ J. V. CODY, *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics*, Coll. Latomus 147 (Brussels, 1976). For a handy and well-balanced survey of Horace's attitudes toward his sources, see COMMAGER, pp. 20-31 ('Ars and Ingenium'), pp. 31-49 ('Horace and Alexandrianism'). For a specific comparison of Horace, Epp. 2.2.70 and Callimachus, Ait. 1.1.25 (Pf.)ff., see EDUARD FRAENKEL, *Kallimachos bei Horaz*, *Mus. Helv.* 26 (1969), pp. 113-114.

Critical attempts to combat these presumptions have taken basically two forms, whether separately or in concert. The first attacks directly, by effectively explaining away the snub (see, e.g., MENDELL, n. 2 above) and by construing Horace's one reference to Catullus in such a way that the sting is removed. The nub of the latter argument (and the point is certainly a valid one) is that the insult here is aimed not at the neoterics Catullus and Calvus themselves, but at their ape-like follower — in other words, at one of those tiresome and second-rate neoteric epigones that lived on in Horace's own day, a member of the *servum pecus* of *imitatores* later attacked by Horace so vituperatively.⁴⁶ The second, proceeding on the principle that "imitation is the sincerest form of flattery," argues (also convincingly) that Horace could not have felt the presumed disdain for Catullus, since it is clear from his poetry that he has borrowed and adapted his predecessor's works liberally, thus proving his appreciation of Catullus, as one poet to another.⁴⁷ Critics in this latter vein will also point with satisfaction to A.P. 386–390, where Horace's allusion to the nine-year gestation period of

⁴⁶ See Epp. 1.19.19–23:

*o imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe
bilem, saepe iocum vestri movere tumultus!
libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps,
non aliena meo pressi pede. qui sibi fidet
dux reget examen.*

The fact that Horace goes on to contrast his own free adaptation of Archilochus and the Greek lyric poets with the slavish imitation mentioned here makes this a locus much cited by critics, e.g. PASQUALI (pp. 106 ff.), who argue against Horace's total indebtedness to classical models.

⁴⁷ I shall attempt only a survey of bibliography on this subject. Arguments against the construction of Sat. 1.10.19 as evidence of Horace's hostility to Catullus stem from E. K. RAND, *Catullus and the Augustans*, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. 17 (1906), pp. 15–30. Cp. B. L. ULLMAN, *Horace, Catullus, and Tigellius*, Class. Phil. 10 (1915), pp. 270–296, who goes so far as to suggest that *cantare* can mean "to satirize"; see also OTTO WEINREICH, *Catull, Liebesgedichte und sonstige Dichtungen* (Hamburg, 1960), p. 179. PUELMA (1949) was instrumental in pointing the need for reevaluation of the relationship between the two poets, Catullus and Horace. Horace's particular uses of Catullus have been pointed out, e.g., by R. REITZENSTEIN, *Zu Horaz und Catull*, Hermes 57 (1922), pp. 357–365; MENDELL, pp. 289–301; JOHN FERGUSON, *Catullus and Horace*, Amer. Jour. Phil. 77 (1956), pp. 1–18 (who, however, accepts the notion of Horace's overall hostility to Catullus); FRAENKEL (1957), pp. 202 n.2, 209 ff.; COMMAGER, *passim* (see p. 33, n.67, for specific references); C. P. JONES, *Parody in Catullus* 44, Hermes 96 (1968), pp. 378–383; R. T. VAN DER PAARDT, *Catullus en Horatius*, Hermeneus 40 (1969), pp. 287–296; J. A. RICHMOND, *Horace's Mottoes and Catullus* 51, Rh. Mus. 113 (1970), pp. 197–204; A. TRAINA, *Orazio e Catullo: Poeti latini (e neolatini)* (Bologna, 1975), pp. 253–275; M. O. LEE, *Catullus in the Odes of Horace*, Ramus 4 (1975), pp. 33–48 (the latter two of which, like FERGUSON, emphasize the negative impulse behind such borrowings). Attention to particularly neoteric tendencies in Horace's style has been paid by L. ALFONSI, *Poetae novi* (Como, 1945), pp. 112 ff.; E. CASTORINA, *La poesia d'Orazio* (Rome, 1965), pp. 159–170; D. GAGLIARDI, *Orazio e la tradizione neoterica* (Naples, 1971); for affinities between Catullan and Horatian critical terminology, see N. B. CROWTHER, *Horace, Catullus, and Alexandrianism*, Mnem. IV 31 (1978), pp. 33–44.

Cinna's 'Zmyrna' may justifiably be taken as a deliberate identification of Horace's own aesthetic credo with the neoteric Cinna's.⁴⁸

It has, then, gradually become possible for a critic to assert as flatly as RECKFORD (1969) that:

"... there is no quarrel between Augustans and Neoterics: the standards of the Thirties continue those of the Fifties, Horace's insistence on brevity and polish is thoroughly Catullan, and the poetasters he satirizes correspond to the 'toilet-paper writers' lampooned by Catullus."⁴⁹

Nonetheless, the opposite view – that Horace did indeed feel hostility to the neoterics – persists in certain critical circles.⁵⁰ While this question will certainly inspire further debate, perhaps the most reasonable position to assume now is something of a compromise. Whereas the evidence of Horace's own poetry overwhelmingly supports the thesis that Horace felt affinity not only for the Alexandrian aesthetic credo espoused by the neoterics, but also for neoteric (and specifically Catullan) composition itself, still, in turning to Sat. 1.10.19, one may well be affected by some of the same uneasiness expressed by WILKINSON when he says: "... and no amount of faith that one good poet must really have appreciated another can entirely sweeten the line *Nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum*..."⁵¹ It is perhaps, then, best to assume that the rancor of this line (if rancor it is) is essentially extra-literary in nature – born, perhaps, from Horace's weariness of having the earlier poet thrown up to him as perfect by

⁴⁸ Horace, A.P. 386–390:

*si quid tamen olim
scripseris, in Maeci descendat iudicis auris
et patris et nostras, nonumque prematur in annum,
membranis intus positis: delere licebit
quod non edideris; nescit vox missa reverti.*

As early as Ps.-Acro and Porphyrio, Horace's lines were seen to refer to Catullus 95.1–4, in which Cinna's time-consuming precision and painstakingness are contrasted with the careless overproduction of a certain Hortensius:

*Zmyrna mei Cinnae nonam post denique messem
quam coepta est nonamque edita post hiemem,
milia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno*

For overproduction, cp. Horace's similar remarks on Lucilius at Sat. 1.4.9–10 (*in hora saepe ducentos, / ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno*), and see n. 5 above. For the 'minute' art of Cat. 95, see WENDELL CLAUSEN, Callimachus and Latin Poetry, Gr. Rom. Byz. Stud. 5 (1964), pp. 188–189.

⁴⁹ KENNETH J. RECKFORD (New York, 1969), p. 32.

⁵⁰ See, e.g., F. PLESSIS, La poésie latine (Paris, 1909), p. 320; G. L. HENDRICKSON, Horace and Valerius Cato, Class. Phil. 12 (1917), pp. 329–350; FRANK, pp. 162–164; BROOKS OTIS, Horace and the Elegists, Tr. Amer. Phil. Assoc. 76 (1945), pp. 177–190; FERGUSON, p. 1; A. LA PENNA, Orazio e l'ideologia del principato (Turin, 1963), pp. 166 ff.; C. W. MENDELL, Latin Poetry: the New Poets and the Augustans (New Haven, 1965), p. 66; WEINREICH, pp. 148, 153; M. O. LEE, pp. 33 ff.; J. P. SULLIVAN, Propertius (Cambridge, Eng., 1976), p. 11 *et passim*.

⁵¹ WILKINSON, p. 121.

obviously less-than-perfect aesthetic *simii*. But such an essentially personal animus would not affect either Horace's conception of his own art or his appreciation of Catullus' *lepidus libellus*. Thus we may concede the futility and invalidity of further pursuing this basically biographical, rather than aesthetic, issue.

3. Horace and the Elegists

The purported hostility of Horace to the elegists seems to have sprung full-grown from the imaginations of critics, working from only sparing (and certainly not unambiguous) passages within Horace's works.⁵² Tibullus (so it is generally presumed) is addressed in terms of respect at Epp. 1.4.1 (*nostrorum sermonum candide iudex*) and of affection in Odes 1.33. 'Deprecating' affection, critics will hasten to assure us – but on what evidence? The fact that he enjoins Tibullus not to continue grieving certainly does not sufficiently justify this inference (see n. 54 for further discussion). The elegist Valgius first appears in Horace among the select few whose approval Horace hopes to win for his own poetry (Sat. 1.10.81 ff.). Horace later addresses him in a *consolatio* (Odes 2.9) and, in a standard suggestion of constructive alternatives to mourning, urges him to desist from erotic themes (*molles querelae*) and join Horace instead in singing political ones.⁵³ That exhortation is construed by critics as an indication of Horace's

⁵² For discussions of Horace's relation (personal and/or literary) to the elegists, see E. BOLAFFI, *Orazio critico* (Pesaro, 1932); F. DORNSEIFF, *Horaz und Properz*, *Philol.* 87 (1932), pp. 474–476 (cp. *Id.*, *Verschmähtes zu Vergil, Horaz und Properz*, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächs. Akademie d. Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, phil.-hist. Klasse 97, 6 [Leipzig, 1951], part 6, pp. 72 ff.); T. F. HIGHAM, *Ovid: Some Aspects of his Character and Aims*, *Class. Rev.* 48 (1934), p. 110; L. HERRMANN, *Horace adversaire de Propertius*, *Rev. Étud. Anc.* 35 (1933), pp. 281–292 (on which COMMAGER [p. 33] aptly comments: "The recent attempt to locate a common mistress over whom they might have fought betrays how slender the actual evidence [for his quarrel with Propertius] is"); J. DE DECKER, *Horace et Tibulle*, *Rev. Phil.* 11 (1937), pp. 30–44; W. WIL, *Die literarischen Beziehungen des Properz zu Horaz*, *Festschrift f. E. Tièche* (Bern, 1947), pp. 179–196; FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN, *Propertius and Horace*, *Class. Phil.* 43 (1948), pp. 105–109; A. LA PENNA, *Propertio e i poeti latini dell'età aurea*, *Maia* 3 (1950), pp. 209–236; *Maia* 4 (1951), pp. 43–69; S. D'ELIA, *Propertio e Orazio*, *Ann. Fac. Lett.* (Naples, 1952), part 2, pp. 45–77; W. L. GRANT, *Elegiac Themes in Horace's Odes*, *Studies Norwood* (Toronto, 1952), pp. 194–202; KENNETH QUINN, *Latin Explorations* (London, 1963), pp. 154–162; A. W. J. HOLLEMAN, *Horace's Lalage* (Ode 1, 22) and Tibullus' Delia, *Latomus* 28 (1969), pp. 575–582; M. C. J. PUTNAM, *Horace and Tibullus*, *Class. Phil.* 67 (1972), pp. 81–88; SULLIVAN, pp. 12–13 et passim.

⁵³ Odes 2.9.17–24, to the elegist Valgius:

<i>desine mollium</i>] amatory themes rejected
<i>tandem querelarum, et potius nova</i>	
<i>cantemus Augusti tropaea</i>] political themes preferred
<i>Caesaris et rigidum Niphaten,</i>	
<i>Medumque flumen gentibus additum</i>	
<i>victis minores volvere vertices,</i>	
<i>intraque praescriptum Gelonos</i>	
<i>exiguus equitare campis.</i>	

opposition to the elegiac *Weltanschauung*, even though throughout his first collection of 'Odes' Horace is himself busy renouncing just such political themes in favor of his own lyre's *molles modi*. Surely the disingenuousness of Odes 2.9's final exhortation to 'serious' poetry, then, should make us wary of concluding that the preceding injunction to abandon elegiac themes springs from 'sincere' philosophical disaffection on Horace's part.⁵⁴ The single presumptive allusion to Propertius in Horace has similarly been subjected to overinterpretation as a slur.⁵⁵ And Horace's passing characterization of elegy as *exiguus* (at A.P. 77) is generally assumed to be flatly prejudicial and denigrating, without due consideration that similarly pejorative terms relating to size were regularly applied by Horace to his own poetry (as they had been by Catullus to his) in a form of inverted praise.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ With the passage quoted in n. 53, cp. esp. Odes 2.12.1–16 (just three poems later), where Horace exactly reverses the priorities set in Odes 2.9:

<i>Nolis longa ferae bella Numantiae</i>	
<i>nec durum Hannibalem nec Siculum mare</i>	
<i>Poeni purpureum sanguine mollibus</i>	
<i>aptari citharae modis,</i>	
<i>nec saevos Lapithas et nimium mero</i>	
<i>Hylaeum domitosque Hercule manu</i>	
<i>Telluris iuvenes, unde periculum</i>	
<i>fulgens contremuit domus</i>	
<i>Saturni veteris; tuque pedestribus</i>	
<i>dices historis proelia Caesaris,</i>	
<i>Maecenas, melius ductaque per vias</i>	political themes rejected
<i>regum colla minacium.</i>	
<i>me dulces dominae Musa Lycimniae</i>	
<i>cantus, me voluit dicere lucidum</i>	
<i>fulgentis oculos et bene mutuis</i>	amatory themes preferred
<i>fidum pectus amoribus . . .</i>	

Horace's similar injunction to Tibullus to temper his amatory concerns (*Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor / inmitis Glycerae neu miserabilis / decantes elegos . . .* [Odes 1.33.1–3]) should be viewed with the same critical caution: any attempt to read a serious philosophical point into Horace's initial command is contraindicated by the poet's concluding lines, in which he concedes that he is himself subject to the same irrational erotic enslavement as Tibullus:

ipsum me melior cum peteret Venus,
grata detinuit compede Myrtale
libertina, fretis acrior Hadriae
curvantis Calabros sinus. (Odes 1.33.13–16)

⁵⁵ See n. 9 above; for bibliography, see n. 52 above.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Horace's self-deprecating comments on his own poetry and genius as *inops* and *pusillus* at Sat. 1.4.17 (quoted, n. 5 above) and the slave's 'insulting' charge at Sat. 2.3.1–4 (where the grounds for attack are, ironically, exactly the grounds on which Horace praises himself elsewhere):

Sic raro scribis, ut toto non quater anno
membranam poscas, scriptorum quaeque retexens,
iratus tibi quod vini somnique benignus
nil dignum sermone canas.

Finally, altogether too much credence has been given to the flawed argument that Horace, as a 'true Augustan', must have felt hostility to the elegiac poets, whose exclusively amatory interests were frivolous and in conflict with the Augustan program. Even COMMAGER falls into this trap to a certain extent. After properly asserting that "the political hostility between Horace and the elegists has surely been exaggerated," he goes on (improperly) to conclude that Horace does disapprove of the elegiac 'style of life', and so satirizes the elegiac amatory conventions.⁵⁷ Two points should be made in refutation of COMMAGER's view. First, while Horace, as a poet of love, certainly presents his reader with detached and amused perceptions of the human comedy, rather than an empathetic treatment of controlling passion, he scarcely rivals Ovid in his irreverent treatment of the amatory conventions. Yet no one has attempted (and I hope no one will) to suggest that Ovid's flippant treatment of the elegiac mode is reflective of disdain for such a narrow poetic perspective. Second, the very cornerstone for such a critical construct as COMMAGER's has been removed by ROSS' argument that Roman elegy was not – either in its inception or in its continuation through Horace's poetic career – a strictly amatory genre, but has been forced into that mold retrospectively by the rigid preconceptions of later critics.⁵⁸ And Propertius' third and fourth books are capable of as fervid a patriotism as Horace ever exhibits in his first lyric collection.

This quick review of some of the issues involved in assessment of Horace's relation to the elegists is not intended to provide any final answers. Its purpose is merely to point out the tenuousness of the grounds upon which presumption of Horace's hostility to the elegists has traditionally been based, and to warn against

Cp. also Catullus' characterization of his poetry as *nugae* (Poem 1.4) and his purportedly diffident triple qualification of the noun *liber* at Poem 1.8–9 (*quidquid hoc libelli / qualecumque*), as well as his occasional ironic references to himself as *pessimus poeta* (Poems 36.6, 49.5).

⁵⁷ COMMAGER, p. 33. Cp. his treatments of individual poems from this same standpoint on pp. 132, 239–240.

⁵⁸ ROSS, *passim* (see esp. his chapters on Gallus and Propertius), builds up a plausible picture of Roman elegy as generalized in theme at its inception. See, e.g., p. 109: "Elegy began, then, not primarily as an attempt to describe erotic experience, not from any compelling personal concerns of the poet-lover, but rather because, as a new form in Latin poetry, it afforded a means to integrate various poetic traditions and purposes. The song of Silenus, the aboriginal prophet-seer, embraces without distinction universal science, mythology, and pastoral imagination: so, originally at least, did Gallan elegy, and so do the 'Eclogues'." He goes on to hypothesize that Gallus, toward the end of his career, turned more to subjective love elegy; see, e.g., p. 111: "We may, I think, assume that Gallus' change from objective to subjective elegy was partly due to a greater interest in the effects of personal obsession and that he came more and more to express the power of love (the most obvious, convenient, and acceptable manifestation of an obsession) by presenting himself in subjection to it – much as Virgil in fact presents him [in the tenth Eclogue]." Conversely, Propertius begins his elegiac career, in the 'Monobiblos', with an almost exclusive concentration on the particularly erotic element of elegy as introduced by the later Gallus; but in his own later books, he broadens his horizons considerably, thus effectively returning elegy to where it had begun.

the building of critical constructs on too unquestioning acceptance of tenets which remain essentially unproven.

4. Summary

The perception which should strike a critic most forcefully after he completes any sort of study of Horace's use of his models is that Horace cannot be labelled any one thing, except Horatian. He is not a classical lyricist, he is not a Callimachean, he is not purely Roman. He is all of these things and none of these things. His odes can seem alternately extremely classicizing and thoroughly contemporary. He can be Pindaric or Callimachean — or even both at once. Whenever a critic sets out to study Horace's use of models, then, the essential question must not be what theme or motif Horace has adopted, or even what poetic fount he has drawn upon, but what he has done with it to make it peculiarly his own. That Horace was himself fully aware of the transforming nature of his use of models may quickly be seen from his proud response to the *imitatores* of Epistles 1.19: *qui sibi fidet dux reget examen*.

This summary by no means represents a radically new critical perception: scholars throughout the centuries (no matter what side they have taken on the question of Horace's relationship to his Greek poetic forebears) have recognized in Horace what BURCK has summed up as:

„ . . . den Grad der inneren Aneignung, die Stärke der individuellen Umgestaltung und die persönliche Zielsetzung der Oden auch bei der Übernahme fremder Anregungen . . . ”⁵⁹.

However, this point will bear emphatic repetition, since discernment of this prevailing individuality of Horace's seems sometimes to have dimmed as critics have (understandably) overstated their cases for 'Horace as This', or 'Horace as That', in order to convince or overwhelm their opposition.

On the other hand, at the same time as one refuses to allow Horace strict categorization as either classical or Alexandrian, it may be asserted with some right that there are two senses in which he owes an overriding debt to Alexandria. The first is that it is in large part thanks to widespread acceptance of certain of Callimachus' aesthetic pronouncements that later poets had not only the right, but also the obligation, to cut new and original creative paths. As ROSS has said of the inheritance of Callimachus in Roman poetry:

“What is surprising and novel is that a model no longer meant imitation but rather was a justification of individual and personal expression: the importance of Callimachus for the neoterics lies in the fact that he supplied a set of precepts that not only allowed but demanded such expression.”⁶⁰

⁵⁹ E. BURCK, in: KIESSLING-HEINZE, p. 601.

⁶⁰ ROSS, p. 7.

The second sense in which Horatian poetry betrays a pervasive Alexandrian influence is in its high level of self-conscious self-examination. A dictum on modern poetry – that its most characteristic subject is poetry itself – is aptly applied to Horace by COMMAGER.⁶¹ The degree to which this dictum may truthfully be applied not only to Horace but to Augustan poetry in general could not have been achieved without Alexandria in the background.

IV. Roman Elements in the 'Odes': Introduction

To ask what is Roman in Horace's 'Odes' is, in many senses, tantamount to asking what is Horatian in Horace's 'Odes'. The reader of PASQUALI's index, then, might find himself raising his eyebrows at the fact that that great critic's chapter on the Roman elements of Horace's lyric poetry is confined to less than seventy pages (whereas the chapter on Alcaeus takes up over a hundred, and the one on Hellenistic models a full five hundred). Such a reader would be reassured, however, upon delving further into the study, for he would then find PASQUALI's explanation that the short compass of his third chapter is due to the fact that one of the primary purposes of the preceding two chapters on Greek elements in the 'Odes' has been to demonstrate, theme by theme, poem by poem, the ways in which Horace (*„Romano dell' età di Augusto“*) has taken what is Greek and transformed it into something totally different, and Roman.⁶²

Indeed, the question of 'Roman elements' in Horace's 'Odes' is so broad as to defy not only comprehensive answer, but even satisfactory division into smaller classifications. One might, with PASQUALI, isolate particularly Roman types of poems, such as the Roman Odes and the so-called *„invito a godere“*, *Eheu fugaces* . . . (Odes 2.14). One might turn to study of such Roman elements as innovations made by the Roman poet in the Greek meters, or to identification of allusions to particularly Roman myths or religious practices. One might easily expend all his allotted time on the question of Horace's lyric treatments of Roman political themes, of contemporary history, and, in particular, of Augustus. In short, such an undertaking would involve an immense catalogue of names, events, customs, allusions, motifs, themes – each of which would have to be glossed by references to elaborate scholarly discussions. This whole mass of material would, in turn, have to be put back into context and reexamined in light of the organic development of each ode involved.⁶³ In an attempt to narrow the focus of this

⁶¹ COMMAGER, p. 307, paraphrasing LAURA RIDING (1916).

⁶² PASQUALI, pp. 642–643.

⁶³ The paramount importance of such 'organic' analysis of poetry is eloquently stated by R. JOSEPH SCHORK, *Aemulos Reges: Allusion and Theme in Horace 3.16*, Tr. Amer. Phil. Assoc. 102 (1971), p. 519: "A Horatian ode will demand the most detailed and sensitive scrutiny: structure, metaphor, tone, image, diction, allusion, transition, word-placement, rhythm, symbol, sonic effect must be analyzed and evaluated in terms of the total impact. An ode is more than the skillful conjunction of its components: these components

broad topic (and in keeping with the scope of this study), I shall proceed from the following formulation: that what is most Roman in Horace's 'Odes' is their blend of what is Greek with what is Roman. Accordingly, I shall attempt to deal only with aspects of the 'Odes' which reveal the poet's constant awareness of the particular blend of Greek and Roman which he wants to achieve in his poetry. That is, I shall examine only those statements by the poet which can be seen as programmatic and which are signalled as such by the poet's explicit use of contrasting Greek and Roman elements.

V. Greek and Latin Verbal Elements

One of the specific techniques which Horace adopts to express the hybrid, Greek and Roman nature of his lyric undertaking is the oxymoronic connection of Greek and Latin verbal elements in his programmatic statements. The Latin critical vocabulary available to Horace (like so much of the Latin poetic vocabulary as a whole) was composed, in large part, of sets of Greek and Latin counterparts for the same thing: the lyre, the Muse, the poet himself could all be denoted, in turn, by native or foreign terms.⁶⁴ Horace consciously and

paradoxically are generated by the poem and in this genesis create the poem." — SCHORK's own study of Odes 3.16 may be seen as paradigmatic of the complexities of critical analysis and re-synthesis of an ode.

⁶⁴ The arguments in this section are generally digested from EMILY A. McDERMOTT (cited above, n. 18), to which refer for more detailed explication of specific points. Horace uses four Greek terms and two Latin ones for 'lyre' (*lyra*, *cithara*, *plectrum* and *barbitos*; as opposed to *fides* and *testudo*); the Muse appears as the Greek *Musa*, or in her various individual Greek *personae*, but also as the native Italian *Camena*; the normal term for 'poet' in the 'Odes' is the old Latin *vates*, but the Greek *poeta* appears twice (at Odes 4.2.33 and 4.6.30). In the 'A.P.', Horace enunciates his views on the permissibility of a moderate number of both neologisms and archaisms, and advocates the use of *callida iunctura* in order to render a common word new:

*in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis
diceris egregie notum si callida verbum
reddiderit iunctura novum. si forte necesse est
indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum,
fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis
continget, dabiturque licentia sumpta pudenter;
et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem si
Graeco fonte cadent, parce detorta . . .
multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque
quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus,
quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi.*

(A.P. 46–53, 70–72)

significantly presents the reader of his 'Odes' with such recurrent Greek-Latin oxymora as *Graia Camena*, *Romana lyra*, *Latinus barbitos* and *lyricus vates*,⁶⁵ all of which contribute subtly to his cumulative statement of the paradox of his poetic program, which demanded that he be both Greek and Roman at the same time. In two poems (Odes 1.12 and 3.4), an initial invocation of the Muse in one of her Greek guises (Clio and Calliope, respectively) is superseded, lines later, by her appearance as Camena, the native Latin term reintroduced to Latin poetry by Virgil and Horace. In each case the replacement of the Greek Muse by her Latin counterpart is intended to gloss, first, that poem's thematic development from a Greek beginning to a Roman ending and, ultimately, the parallel development in the poet's own career.⁶⁶ The poet himself undergoes the same transformation in Odes 4.6.29–44;⁶⁷ Horace attributes to himself the Greek term *poeta* (which appears in the 'Odes' only extraordinarily) when speaking of his initial inspiration by the Greek god of lyric poetry, Phoebus Apollo; but his subsequent lyric career – most significantly as composer and producer of the great paean to the Roman state, the 'Carmen Saeculare' (Odes 4.6.31 ff.) – has transformed him instead into a very Roman *vates Horatius*.

These are the precise principles put into practice in Horace's choice of critical vocabulary. All the Greek-Latin oxymora cited in the text here constitute *callidae iuncturae*. *Barbitos*, *lyricus*, *lyra* and *fidicen* in its transferred sense as 'lyric poet' all seem to have been Horatian neologisms (see McDERMOTT, pp. 367, 368, 369, and 369–370, respectively) – the first three issuing, as prescribed, *Graeco fonte*. Camena and *vates* are both Latin archaisms significantly reintroduced to Latin poetry by the Augustans, Virgil and Horace (on Camena, see McDERMOTT, pp. 365–366; OTTO SKUTSCH, *Studia Enniana* [London, 1968], pp. 3–5, 18–21; for *vates*, see n. 7 above).

⁶⁵ See McDERMOTT, pp. 364–371, for fuller discussion of these individual phrases and their effects.

⁶⁶ See McDERMOTT, p. 375 and p. 375 n. 16; cp. Ross, pp. 145–148; and see further discussion of these two poems below, pp. 1666 ff.

⁶⁷ Odes 4.6.29–44:

*spiritum Phoebus mihi, Phoebus artem
carminis nomenque dedit poetae.
virginum primae puerique claris
patribus orti,
Deliae tutela deae fugaces
lynxas et cervos cohibentis arcu,
Lesbium servate pedem meique
pollicis ictum,
rite Latonae puerum canentes,
rite crescentem face Noctilucam,
prosperam frugum celeremque pronos
volvare mensis.
nupta iam dices "ego dis amicum,
saeculo festas referente luces,
reddidi carmen, docilis modorum
vatis Horati."*

See also McDERMOTT, pp. 379–380.

VI. *The Landscape of the 'Odes'*

In the chapter entitled "The Blending of Greek and Roman" in his monumental work, "Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry", GORDON WILLIAMS explores perceptively the question of the "imaginary world" of Augustan poetry. He traces this world, "which has no real existence, is neither Greek nor Roman, but both," back to Plautus, then through its limited appearances in Catullus (Poems 61 and 62), and into the Augustan age, where it flourished (most notably in its "most powerful exploitation" in Virgil's 'Eclogues').⁶⁸ WILLIAMS cites as exemplary individual occurrences of such Greek-Roman blends Odes 3.7, in which an erotic triangle among three Greek characters (Asterie, Gyges and Enipeus) is imagined as living in Rome, where Enipeus impresses Asterie with his athletic prowess on the Campus Martius; and Odes 3.21, where the "poem is addressed to a distinguished Roman nobleman, the wine is Roman, and the example of Cato is quoted . . . [but] the political situation implied [in the following lines on the strengthening power of wine] is entirely alien to Rome; it is of a tyranny or kingship, with the person of the ruler surrounded by a bodyguard of soldiers."⁶⁹ WILLIAMS ends this section by analyzing more complex combinations of Greek and Roman worlds throughout whole poems.

Two further features of Horace's technique in the creation of the poetic landscape of his 'Odes' should also be noted. First, it is clear that Horace deliberately varies the blend of Greek and Roman elements from poem to poem. At times the blend is evened out to achieve WILLIAMS' intermediate, imaginary world; but at other times the poet wants to achieve either a definitely 'Greek' tone or a more thoroughly 'Roman' atmosphere. For example, the world of the hymns to Mercury and Venus (Odes 1.10 and 1.30) must be seen as primarily archaizing and Grecizing, as FRAENKEL has recognized in his admirable discussions of the two: Horace attempts in these poems to recreate and enliven the "beliefs of a remote past, ennobled and perpetuated in works of poetry and in monuments of decorative art."⁷⁰ By contrast, an evocation of a more contemporary and

⁶⁸ GORDON WILLIAMS, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 295-296; 303. These references frame the section of the chapter devoted to Horace.

⁶⁹ WILLIAMS, p. 296.

⁷⁰ FRAENKEL (1957), p. 165 (on Odes 1.10). See also his conclusion on this hymn to Mercury: "Whatever he thought himself of the power which he may have called τὸ θεῖον, those wonderful tales [of the god's first theft and of his role in Iliad 24 as protector of Priam] captivated his imagination, not only as perfect poetry but also as manifestations of a belief which once had arisen from human hearts and which now, in a changed world, was echoed by the heart of a true poet" (pp. 165-166). And cp. his remarks on Odes 1.30: "With a calm detachment, which may be mistaken for coldness, Horace pictures the gods and goddesses as, in the retinue of Aphrodite, they rush into the mortal woman's house, Eros, the Charites, the Nymphs, Hebe, and Hermes. Here we have to use the Greek names, for the particular κῶμος of immortals that unfolds before our eyes takes us away from the Rome

thoroughly Roman world may be seen in the 'Carmen Saeculare', written to celebrate the great *ludi* of 17 B.C. and so to capture the spirit of much of the Augustan experiment. While this poem is, of course, based on a Greek form, and the religious practices behind it were performed *Graeco ritu*, the hymn itself — as Horace has chosen to present it — deliberately emphasizes its Roman setting: Greek names and words are generally edited out of the poetic text;⁷¹ the gods (*quibus septem placere colles* [7]) are asked to foster and protect the great city of Rome and its posterity (the latter specifically by working in concert with recent Augustan legislation on marriage [16–20]); the mythic element of the hymn centers around the story of Aeneas' founding of Rome (36–44, 50).

The second feature of Horace's 'blending technique' to be discussed here is his occasional and deliberate variation in the mix within a single poem. Certain Horatian odes are marked by a distinct development from a Greek beginning to a more Roman end; this progression in a poem is intended to represent, iconically, the poet's transformation of Greek models into a poetry of and for Rome. Within such progressions, there are times as well when Horace chooses purposely to highlight the slight anomaly that is always present in the blending of Greek and Roman elements in the poetry's landscape, specifically in order to alert his audience that this blend may be seen as emblematic of his lyric program as a whole.

of Caesar Augustus and back to many representations in Greek paintings and reliefs and to early Greek songs" (p. 198).

- ⁷¹ The 'C.S.' contains only two Greek words (*aura* and *chorus*) and two Greek names (*Phoebus* and *Ilithyia*). Of these, *aura* can be effectively discounted as a Grecism, since it had been frequent in poetry since Ennius and was not uncommon even in prose. *Phoebus* and *chorus*, both common in Augustan poetry, are only mild Grecisms. *Ilithyia* (which in classical Latin appears only here and twice in Ovid) is the only strong Grecism in the poem; but, paradoxically, this Grecism serves to emphasize the resolutely Roman quality of the poem's diction:

*rite maturos aperire partus
lenis, Ilithyia, tuere matres,
sive tu Lucina probas vocari
seu Genitalis.* (C.S. 13–16)

The fact that it was by this Greek name that the goddess of childbirth was addressed during the actual ceremonies (see Acta, 90ff.) does not sufficiently explain the appearance in the poem of this exotic Grecism. The Fates too were addressed during the rites by their Greek name, *Moerae*; yet Horace did not hesitate to call them *Parcae* in his hymn (25). Unlike the *Parcae*, however, the Εἰλειθυῖαι were unknown to Roman cult, so that no standard, or immediately recognizable, Latin translation for them existed. The effect, then, of the "whether . . . or" construction here (*sive . . . seu*) is to offer the Greek goddess a choice between two Latin cult names, *Lucina* and *Genitalis*: "Ilithyia — shall we (in Latin) call you *Lucina* or *Genitalis*?" This deliberate Latinization of a Greek name is further accentuated by the fact that the Latin *Genitalis* seems to have been Horace's own neologism — a pointed translation of the Greek Γενέθλιος. (KIESSLING-HEINZE, who understand the form thus, suggest a relation to the old Roman *Geneta Mana*. BENTLEY, faced with the unprecedented *Genitalis*, wants to emend to *Genetyllis*; but in doing so he misses the point, which is one of purposeful Latinization of a Greek cult name.)

Let us turn now to examination of several individual odes which illustrate the techniques identified in the previous paragraph. Odes 3.4 (*Descende caelo . . .*) is an apt poem with which to begin, for here, perhaps more than in any other single ode, the anomaly of the transposition of Greek poetic topoi into an Italian landscape has left critics feeling uncomfortable. They suffer from uneasy suspicions that this otherwise consummate artisan somehow fails to recognize the vast differences in tone between the two worlds he is trying to wed here. See, for example, FRAENKEL's remarks at the beginning of his discussion of this ode:

"It was a bold venture when Horace transferred to his own childhood the kind of miracle with which the biographical tradition has adorned the early life of several great Greek poets. The boldness is increased by the insertion of some realistic detail such as the name of Horace's nurse and the list of obscure towns in the neighbourhood of Venusia. The manner in which the fabulous happenings are worked out compels us to view them against a real background and under a glaring sunshine while we, brought up in conventions of romantic poetry, might prefer such miracles to take place in the twilight between the land of fairy-story and the world of every-day life."⁷²

FRAENKEL's ensuing explication of this problematic ode, in which he demonstrates its pervasive debt to Pindar's first Pythian, shows that the seemingly loose connection between the 'personal' and 'political' halves of Horace's ode is due to the poet's reworking here of Pindar's theme of the power of music over even the world of politics and war. This elucidation both demonstrates a pervasive unity to the poem and helps to explain the basis upon which in the second half of the poem Horace presumes to offer Augustus cautionary advice on the subject of *vis consili expers* (65). FRAENKEL then goes on to draw a vital distinction between Pindar's poetic role as Music's intermediary and Horace's more individualistic and personal conception of the poet. He explains thereby the 'autobiographical' quality of Horace's first section on poetic inspiration (so often condemned as trivial), as opposed to the sweeping universality of Pindar's corresponding section on the power of music.⁷³

Ross' equally valuable discussion of Odes 3.4 picks up where FRAENKEL's has left off; through a combination of these two critics' insights, one may achieve an understanding of the complexities of Horace's poetic program as here laid out. Whereas FRAENKEL shows the ode's debt to Pindar, Ross demonstrates that it is

⁷² FRAENKEL (1957), p. 275. His full discussion of this ode extends from pp. 273–285. See p. 274 for his brief survey of negative critical reactions to the anomalies of Odes 3.4.

⁷³ See FRAENKEL (1957), esp. p. 284: "[Horace's] poetry, his 'music' was not the joint product of an effort of his individuality and of something that was there before he was born, that existed independently of him and had its roots in a supra-personal sphere. His poetry, though inspired by the Muses, was entirely the work of himself alone. Pindar undertakes a task which is to be done, whether or not he, Pindar, discharges it: had he declined to write the poem for Hiero's festival, someone else would have written it. Horace's *carmina non prius audita* could never have come into existence except by his own effort . . . He is alone, left to his experience as an individual and to his personal inspiration."

Alexandrian at the same time. Through analysis of the motifs adopted by Horace in the initial section on his poetic inspiration (e.g. its significant coupling of Calliope with Apollo in lines 1–4 and its adoption of an initiation motif in lines 5–8), Ross reveals that one of Horace's prime purposes in these lines is to "[claim] a position in the line, established by Apollo and Calliope, of Orpheus and Linus, Hesiod, the select Alexandrians, and their Roman successors."⁷⁴ Thus Ross deems specifically Alexandrian Horace's personal, and non-Pindaric, conception of the poet (as previously noted by FRAENKEL), and concludes:

"We should not . . . let the detail in which we now understand the Pindaric elements of 3.4 obscure for us the similar position of the poet [as intermediary between things divine and human] as elaborated by Gallus and Virgil: the poet who had been received and ritually instructed by Apollo and the Muses possessed knowledge and understanding, like Orpheus, of the universe and had the ability, or the magic, to control the universe – to the extent, at least, that he could control the limitations of his own humanity. Horace, by associating himself with this initiation and instruction, claims a second right to address Caesar. Moreover, his Camenae, the Italian Muses, are a particularly appropriate source of ultimate authority for the poet who addresses words of caution and advice to the one man who had finally emerged as the ruler of the Roman world."⁷⁵

The changes in landscape in the course of Odes 1.12 and Odes 4.3 are discussed in some detail in McDERMOTT (1977);⁷⁶ a brief summary of the movement of each will, then, be sufficient here. Odes 1.12 opens with an invocation of the Greek Muse Clio, within a 'motto' from Pindar's second Olympian;⁷⁷ it then proceeds first to an evocation of the power of poetry (set firmly in a Greek poetic landscape by references to Mts. Helicon, Pindus, and Haemus, as well as to Orpheus [5–12]),⁷⁸ then to generalized hymnic praise of representative Olympian deities and the Greek demigods Heracles (called by his Greek patronymic, Alcides) and the Dioscuri. The essentially Greek poetic landscape of these first eight stanzas, however, is radically transformed by the poem's sudden relocation into the world of Roman history, both past and present

⁷⁴ Ross, p. 143.

⁷⁵ Ross, p. 152.

⁷⁶ McDERMOTT, pp. 371–377.

⁷⁷ Odes 1.12.1–3:

*Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
tibia sumis celebrare, Clio?
quem deum?*

Cp. Pindar, Ol. 2.1–2:

*Ἀναξίφορμῳ γαγες ὕμνοι,
τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίν' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;*

⁷⁸ Ross, p. 138, points out the specific associations of these references (as well as others in the first three stanzas) with the neo-Alexandrian poetics espoused by Gallus and Virgil. Odes 1.12's conjunction of Pindaric and Alexandrian 'tags' is thus parallel to the similar phenomenon discussed above in respect to Odes 3.4.

(lines 33–57): it is a particularly Roman brand of hero whose glorification is clearly uppermost in the poet's mind here.

Odes 4.3 also seems, at its beginning, to be set in a purely Greek poetic landscape. The ode is addressed to Melpomene; the man upon whom she has looked with favor is contrasted with the athlete on whom *labor Isthmius* will confer glory, with a victorious competitor in a *curru Achaico*, and with the martial leader decorated with *Delii foliis* because he has bravely faced the *tumidas minas* of hostile kings (1–8). But when, in a bit of a surprise ending, this last worthy's reward turns out to be prominence on the Roman *Capitolium* (9), we are presented with our first switch in landscape – from Greek to 'imaginary', or hybrid. This hybrid landscape continues in the next few lines, even more paradoxically, as Horace turns to his own case:

*sed quae Tibur aquae fertile praefluunt
et spissae nemorum comae
fingent Aeolio carmine nobilem.
Romae principis urbium
dignatur suboles inter amabilis
vatum ponere me choros . . .*
(Odes 4.3.10–15)

First, Horace's renown for Aeolian (Greek) song is to be brought about by his initiation not into the waters of the Permessus (or any other standard 'poetic' river) but into those of the local Anio, a tributary of the Tiber. Then, the achievement of his poetic success is phrased in such a way that we are compelled, incongruously, to envision him, along with other Roman *vates*, dancing in a ring (*choros*) about the city of Rome.⁷⁹ The poet finishes by granting full credit to the Greek Muse Pieris for his celebrity status on the streets of Rome (*quod monstror digito praetereuntium / Romanae fidicen lyrae* [22–23]). It is clear that these oxymoronic combinations of Greek and Roman elements are intended to convey the message that it is only through assimilation and transformation of his Greek models that Horace has managed to achieve his lyric success in Augustan Rome.

A related change in landscape may be seen between Odes 1.1 and Odes 3.30. It is clear that the opening and closing poems of Horace's first collection of 'Odes' were meant to be read as a pair: not only are they both explicitly programmatic odes framing the collection as a whole, but they are the only two poems in the collection written in Lesser Asclepiadeans. Thus, one may justifiably speak of a progression from the former to the latter as roughly parallel to the movement within a single poem.

After an initial two-line invocation of Maecenas, Odes 1.1 moves into a standard Greek topos, the priamel, dealing with the diversity of men's pursuits. The Olympic victor, Roman politician, land *entrepreneur*, self-sufficient farmer, merchant, pastoral *fait-néant*, soldier, and hunter are all mentioned serially

⁷⁹ See KIESSLING-HEINZE, ad loc., on the impossibility of construing *choros* in line 15 in its more neutral sense of "troop" or "throng"; and see McDERMOTT, pp. 368–369, on the effect of the oxymoron *vatum choros*.

throughout lines 3–28. The landscape of these lines might best be deemed 'imaginary', since (except for the description of the politician, whom *mobilium turba Quiritium / certat tergemini tollere honoribus* [7–8] and specific references to Massican wine [19] and a Marsian boar [28]) the individual typologies seem largely generalized, rather than fixed to any one geographical or cultural locale. On the other hand, a case might be made that all these descriptions are meant to conjure up distinctly Roman images of Horace's fellow-citizenry. After all, Horace's contemporaries were still entering their chariots in the Olympic games,⁸⁰ and there are no other references in this section of the ode which are incompatible with a realistic setting in Horace's cosmopolitan Roman world. At any rate, no matter which of these formulations one accepts, it is clear that there is a shift in landscape when the poet turns to description of himself:

*me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium
dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori
secernunt populo, si neque tibiās
Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
Lesbous refugit tendere barbiton.
quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera vertice.*

(Odes 1.1.29–36)

When the poet himself takes the stage, all semblance of every-day realism is abruptly dropped, and the reader is asked to join the poet in a fantasy world where the latter sports about, ivy leaves in his hair, in the company of nymphs and satyrs and Muses. Whichever the 'reality' we leave behind (be it a strictly realistic Roman world, or a slightly unreal hybrid between the Greek and Roman worlds), we are now out of the mundane, and into a purely poetic, or symbolic, landscape. Here it is the Greek Muses, by their exotic Greek names Euterpe and Polyhymnia, who inspire the poet; he, in turn, plays on a Greek instrument, the *Lesbous barbitos*. The reader is thus presented with a picture of the poet retreating from a real, if somewhat stylized, world, to enter instead the Greek poetic world of his classical lyric and Alexandrian models.⁸¹

⁸⁰ JEAN-PAUL BOUCHER, *Études sur Properce. Problèmes d'inspiration et d'art*, Bibl. des Écoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome 204 (Paris, 1965), p. 35 – citing the facts that the lines on the Olympic victor follow directly upon the invocation to Maecenas, that Maecenas was known to indulge a «goût . . . pour les chevaux,» and that similar references occur in Propertius (3.9.17) and Virgil (Geo. 3.49 ff.) – has argued that reference is here made to an actual entering of Maecenas' team into the chariot race. But his case is hardly overwhelming.

⁸¹ As usually happens in Horace (and other good poets), the expression of these lines does not lend itself to unambiguous definition of specifically what models are being adduced. While mention of the *Lesbous barbitos* (34) and the lyric canon (35) obviously refer directly to classical Greek lyric models, the rest of the passage works not on a principle of one-to-one reference, but by symbolic association. The epithet *doctus* (29) is traditionally associated with Alexandrian and neoteric poetry (though it should be noted that it was also more generally applied: see, e.g., the somewhat anti-neoteric Cicero at Tusc. 1.4, 4.71). Similarly,

The second poem of the programmatic couplet which frames Horace's lyric collection is very different in tone. It is a thoroughly personal poem. No conventional Greek topos here, listing alternate occupations; no dancing about in a symbolic Greek landscape. This is the Roman Horace speaking, emphasizing throughout the ode his own achievements in his own everyday world. While the first five lines are metaphorically cast, they are nonetheless grounded in a real world by their relation to the first-person singular Horace (*exegi monumentum*), and the reader of this second poem never crosses into a world of fantasy. After the first five lines, the images and expression of the poem center it firmly in a realistic landscape in and around the city of Rome. The poet's use of the metonymy *Libitina* for death (7) is not only particularly apt in that she is the goddess of burial, which is just the thing that Horace has previously claimed that he, as poet, will escape (Odes 2.20.21 ff.), but also because it specifically refers the reader to the actual temple in the city of Rome in which all the arrangements concerning funerals were made. Next, the 'eternity' for which Horace's poetry will endure is made dependent upon the continued duration of a significant Roman civic site and a symbolic socio-religious procession thereon: *usque ego postera / crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium / scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex* (7-9). And finally - in contrast with more extravagant geographical pretensions, such as those expressed by Catullus in Poem 95.5-6 (of Cinna) or by Horace himself in Odes 2.20 - the spatial area over which the poet's renown will spread is delimited by reference to his own native Apulia (*qua violens obstrepit Aufidus / et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium / regnavit populorum* [10-12]). Greek touches enter the poem only in the last four lines. The poet first explains the basis for his achievement, or *monumentum*: that he has been *princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*. Then, he calls upon the Greek Muse Melpomene, asking her to crown him with the laurel of the god of Greek lyric poetry, Phoebus Apollo (*mihi Delphica / lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam* [15-16]).

The movement within the couplet of Odes 1.1 and 3.30, then, is somewhat as follows. Upon receiving his initial inspiration from Greek poetic founts, Roman Horace withdraws (in Odes 1.1) from the reality of his own world into the symbolic landscape open only to initiates of the Greek Muses. Perhaps the only hint in this introductory ode that there is to be anything Roman about Horace's poetry is that he asks of his Muse that he be counted not only a *lyricus*,

the *gelidum nemus*, which aligns itself regularly with such related symbols as *umbra*, *fontes*, and *aquae*, is especially suggestive of the 'sacred wood' of Alexandrian and neo-Alexandrian verse (cp. esp. Propertius 3.1.1 ff.; and see BOUCHER, pp. 216 ff.; NISBET-HUBBARD, ad loc.; for other occurrences of the grove in Horace, see Odes 3.4.7, 3.25.2, 4.3.11; for *gelidus*, cp. Virgil, Geo. 2.488, immediately preceding his own priamel, which obviously influenced Horace's expression here). On the other hand, the conjunction of nymphs and satyrs was traditionally associated with Bacchus (cp. Odes 2.19.3-4, Epp. 1.19.3-4). Thus it seems that here too Horace is playfully and oxymoronically joining the two halves of the water-wine, *ars-ingenium* polemic: the ivy (*hederae* [29]) sacred to Bacchus is seen as the reward of the learned (Alexandrian) poet; the *ars* of the water-cooled groves of Alexandrian poetry is joined by the *ingenium* of a Bacchic revel to set Horace onto the esoteric path of poetry.

but a *vates* as well (Odes 1.1.35). Such nearly exclusive emphasis on the Greek nature of his original inspiration is natural in an inaugural ode. However, by the time the reader comes to Horace's closing poem, it will be clear to him that the intervening collection of odes is marked not only by deference to Greek models, but also by an Augustan spirit which has successfully cast those models into a distinctly Roman mold. In recognition of this transformation process, Horace closes his collection with a poem which portrays his success in a context set firmly within his own civic and personal milieu, Rome and Italy. This very Roman poem is tinged lightly with a Greek brush in its final lines, however, in order to remind us that, without his initial inspiration from the Greeks, Horace's Roman poetry could never have come into being. But the true emphasis by the end of this programmatic couplet of odes is clearly on the poetic achievement of an Augustan *vates*.

VII. Conclusion

In the epigraph affixed to the beginning of this study, Horace advises the young Pisones that aspiring poets should be prepared to thumb through their Greek models both night and day. That piece of advice obviously issues from the poet's heart. His own poetry reveals, at all turns, his thorough familiarity with the Greek *exemplaria* of various genres and through the various eras of literary history. Like the *apis Matina* of Odes 4.2, he flies from flower to flower, plucking from each whatever he finds most pleasing. Thus, there is room in his 'Odes' for Pindar's rushing genius, for Callimachus' learned refinement, for Alcaeus' masculinity, Anacreon's elegance, and Sappho's charm. No theme or motif, whether classical or Hellenistic, is interdict, so long as it may be reworked and adapted to his own poetic modes and purposes. In addition, from Callimachus and the other poets centered around the great library at Alexandria he draws not only theme and tone, but a whole set of critical precepts by which he may express his aesthetic credo.

At all times, however, Horace is concerned not with uncritical adoption or imitation of his models, but with their integration into a new, living, and Roman poetry. The pervasiveness of this concern is apparent from the regularity with which he takes the difficulties of this adaptation process as a theme within the poems themselves.

In the 'Ars Poetica', shortly after the injunction to the Pisones noted above, Horace praises the Roman dramatists for their innovative use of their Greek models:

*nil intemptatum nostri liquere poetae,
nec minimum meruere decus vestigia Graeca
ausi deserere et celebrare domestica facta,
vel qui praetextas vel qui docuere togatas.*

(A.P. 285-288)

Yet, he adds, they have failed to equal their Greek predecessors, as a result of their lack of commitment to the professional demands of poetic endeavor:

*nec virtute foret clarisve potentius armis
quam lingua Latium, si non offenderet unum
quemque poetarum limae labor et mora.*

(A.P. 289–291)

While Horace is speaking specifically of the dramatic genres here, these lines might, with minimal editing, be recast to summarize Horace's own lyric program. Like the Roman dramatists, Horace too abandoned the *vestigia* of his Greek models: *libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps, / non aliena meo pressi pede* (Epp. 1.19.21–22). Like them, his prime innovation and source of pride was that he dared to *celebrare domestica facta*. But, unlike the dramatists, he did not shrink from the hard work necessary to putting his program into practice. And so he joins his friend Virgil as one of the great Roman poets, one of the select few who helped to immortalize that nation not only for its *virtute clarisve armis*, but also for its magnificent literature.

INHALT

Band II. 31.3:

- KISSEL, W. (Heidelberg)
 Horaz 1936–1975: Eine Gesamtbibliographie 1403–1558
-
- BABCOCK, CH. L. (Columbus, Ohio)
Carmina operosa: Critical Approaches to the 'Odes' of Horace,
 1945–1975 1560–1611
- CONNOR, P. (Melbourne)
 The Actual Quality of Experience: An Appraisal of the Nature
 of Horace's 'Odes' 1612–1639
- McDERMOTT, E. A. (Boston, Mass.)
 Greek and Roman Elements in Horace's Lyric Program . . . 1640–1672
-
- SETAIOLI, A. (Perugia)
 Gli 'Epodi' di Orazio nella critica dal 1937 al 1972 (con un'ap-
 pendice fino al 1978) 1674–1788
-
- LAFLÉUR, R. A. (Athens, Georgia)
 Horace and *Onomasti Komodein*: The Law of Satire 1790–1826
- TER VRUGT-LENTZ, J. (Geldrop, Niederlande)
 Horaz' 'Sermones': Satire auf der Grenze zweier Welten . . . 1827–1835
-
- DILKE, O. A. W. (Leeds)
 The Interpretation of Horace's 'Epistles' 1837–1865
- SBORDONE, F. (Napoli)
 La Poetica oraziana alla luce degli studi più recenti 1866–1920
-
- DOBLHOFFER, E. (Kiel)
 Horaz und Augustus 1922–1986
- LEFÈVRE, E. (Freiburg i. Br.)
 Horaz und Maecenas 1987–2029
-
- LEBEK, W. D. (Augsburg)
 Horaz und die Philosophie: Die 'Oden' 2031–2092
- NUSSBAUM, G. (Keele)
 Sympathy and Empathy in Horace 2093–2158