The literary form of Horace's Odes

IV

STEPHEN HARRISON

THE LITERARY FORM OF HORACE'S ODES[1]

There is no doubt that the *Odes* of Horace belong firmly to the ancient genre of lyric poetry. Use of archaic lyric metres, allusions to archaic lyric poets as models and uses of archaic lyric patterns and conventions make it clear that the *Odes* are lyric poems in terms of the Alexandrian classification of the ancient genres, a label underlined by their frequent (if misleading) allusions to lyric performance[2]. However, the category 'lyric' in antiquity is not commensurate with the category of the same name in modern European literatures, as Richard Heinze notably pointed out[3], and the assumption that this was so vitiated much nineteenth-century work on Horace. In the

---

[1] My thanks to Prof. R.G.M. Nisbet, who read an earlier draft and provided much useful advice and comment.

[2] Cf. *C.* I 1, 34; I 6, 10; I 12, 1; I 26, 10; I 32, 4; III 3, 69; IV 3, 23; IV 15, 2. On the fictionality of these references cf. HEINZE, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 184-8. For a recent attempt to revive some degree of performance for Horace's *Odes* cf. O. MURRAY, *JRS* 75 (1985), 39-44.

[3] R. HEINZE, *Vom Geist des Römertums* [4th ed.] (Darmstadt, 1972), 172-89 (= 'Die Horazische Ode', *NJb* 51 (1923), 153-68). Useful points are also made by R. REITZENSTEIN'S reply to Heinze (*NJb* 53 (1924), 232-41), and by H.-P. SYNDIKUS, *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Band I* (Darmstadt, 1972), 1-20.

twentieth century, scholars are aware that the issue is more complex, and that the lyric genre in antiquity provided a literary category which was both broader and more flexible than its modern counterpart. This was true for precepts on the writing of lyric as well as the practice of lyric poets: in his treatment of *The Idea of Lyric*, W.R. Johnson has rightly pointed to an "absence of ancient lyric theory", other than the use of standard lyric metres and of basic literary conventions[4]. This theoretical vacuum left the poet very considerable room for manoeuvre, and we will see that Horace exploited this to the full.

This flexibility of lyric form is a historical development in antiquity, and here there is a great gap between archaic Greek lyric and Horace[5]. Lyric poems which in the archaic Greek period were linked to and performed in particular religious and social contexts, such as hymns at festivals and public gatherings and sympotic poetry at private gatherings, became detached from their original function and context over time as the institutions of Greek society changed. By the Hellenistic period, when the different poems of the lyric poets were gathered by scholars into collections, the different categories of lyric were purely literary rather than reflecting any social function of poetry, although they were maintained in the classification of different lyric books, such as the extant books of Pindaric epinicians. In the Roman period, the collection of Catullus,

---

[4] W.R. JOHNSON, *The Idea of Lyric* (Berkeley, 1982), 76-95. For a list of the many ancient categories in ancient lyric cf. H. FÄRBER, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (Munich, 1936), and for a useful analysis A.E. HARVEY, *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955), 157-75. See too the important survey of ancient notions of genre by L.E. ROSSI, *BICS* 18 (1971), 69-94. Horace himself is also aware of the variety of themes to be handled in lyric verse, from epinician to erotic/sympotic: cf. *Ars Poetica* 83-5.

[5] Cf. R.G.M. NISBET and M. HUBBARD, *A Commentary on Horace's Odes: Book I* (Oxford, 1970), xiv.

whether or not the extant collection is in a form assembled by the poet himself, shows that different kinds of lyric such as love-poetry, epithalamia and hymns, could be juxtaposed in the output of the same poet, and Horace is following this tradition.

But flexibility of form means more than the capacity to combine different kinds of lyric in the same collection. The relative absence of prescription in ancient lyric is crucial in another way for an appreciation of the literary form of Horace's *Odes*, since it allows for the use in lyric of elements of other genres. These encounters with non-lyric literary traditions provide a vital infusion of new material into lyric, inherited from archaic Greek poets in a somewhat limited form, and bring it back to importance after a period of relative lack of prestige, apart from the excursions of Catullus. The general view of Greek lyric poetry in the intellectual culture of the Roman Republic is best shown by Cicero's comment, cited by Seneca *Ep.* 49, 5: *negat Cicero, si duplicetur sibi aetas, habiturum se tempus quo legat lyricos*. All our evidence for Horace's use of genres from outside the lyric tradition comes of course from the language and themes of the *Odes*, and detailed analysis of Horatian diction is necessary. But first we must consider some of the general issues of literary form in Horace's *Odes*, and some of the ideas and terms to be applied as developed by modern Horatian scholarship.

1. General Issues: Generic Mixing, Crossing and Inclusion

The use of non-lyric genres in Horace's *Odes* was most prominently noted by Wilhelm Kroll in a famous treatment of *die Kreuzung der Gattungen* (The crossing of the genres)[6]. Here

[6] W. KROLL, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1924), 202-224. For further remarks on generic crossing, cf. ROSSI, *art. cit.* (*supra* n.

Kroll pointed to the many elements in the *Odes* which clearly derived from literary traditions other than those of lyric, singling out epigram, elegy, popular philosophy and formal rhetoric. Here he was partly following on the work of Pasquali and Reitzenstein, both of whom had stressed the importance of Hellenistic poetry in general and epigram in particular in Horace's transformation of archaic Greek lyric[7], a stress to be continued by most distinguished modern commentators on the *Odes*[8]. But Kroll not only identified a considerable number of genres as present in the *Odes* ; he also saw this flexibility and generic crossing as a vital and fruitful characteristic of Augustan poetry in general, deriving both from a reading of Hellenistic poets in which similar generic mixtures occurred, such as Callimachus and Theocritus, and from a desire to be original and innovative in the Roman Augustan context.

"Crossing of the genres" has recently been well studied by Zanker and Hutchinston (amongst others) in the context of Hellenistic poetry[9], and some work has been done on Vergil[10], but Kroll's application of the notion to Horace can still be supplemented. The first step is to provide a terminology to classify the uses of 'alien' genres in a particular genre of poetry such as lyric. Useful terms are available in modern scholarship,

---

4), 84-6.

[7] G. PASQUALI, *Orazio Lirico* (Firenze, 1920); R. REITZENSTEIN, *NJb* 21 (1908), 81-102.

[8] The major contributions here are by NISBET and HUBBARD (*op. cit., supra* n. 5) and H.-P. SYNDIKUS (*op. cit., supra* n. 3; *infra* n. 59).

[9] G. ZANKER, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* (London, 1987), 133-54, is positive about the idea; G.O. HUTCHINSON, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988), 15-16, 55-6, 199-201, is more sceptical.

[10] Cf. *infra*, n. 72.

and genre theory is a topic of much useful discussion[11]. Amongst classical scholars, Francis Cairns has defined 'inclusion', which occurs when an element from an alien genre (e.g. epic) is included in a poem of another genre (e.g. lyric), but "fully retains its own generic identity and function", that is to say remains evidently alien in spirit[12]. One particular form this phenomenon of 'inclusion' takes in Horace's *Odes*, which will be the main topic in what follows, is what Gregson Davis has recently called "generic disavowal", a way of assimilating non-lyric material "by which the speaker disingenuously seeks to *include* material and styles that he ostensibly precludes"[13]. Cairns and Davis are particularly interested in the effect of generic crossing on the rhetorical impact of a poem; my interest here is in linguistic and literary-historical aspects. I wish to trace the enrichment of the lyric genre in Horace's *Odes* through the use of language and thought-patterns primarily associated with other kinds of writing.

Primarily, I intend to look at allusions in Horatian lyric to a genre not mentioned by Kroll in his discussion of generic crossing in the *Odes*. This is epic, the kind of poetry which was most seriously valued at Rome for its dignified, improving and politically useful qualities, and which had the longest and most

---

[11] For useful introductions to genre theory cf. A. FOWLER, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford, 1982), esp. 170-90 on 'Transformations of Genre', and G. GENETTE and T. TODOROV (ed.), *Théorie des genres* (Paris, 1986). On ancient ideas of genre, cf. also S. STABRYLA, *Problemy Genologii Antycznej* (Warsaw/Krakow, 1982), with English summary pp. 109-110, and J. DONOHUE, *The Theory of Literary Kinds: Vol. I* (Dubuque, 1943), *Vol. II* (Dubuque, 1949).

[12] F. CAIRNS, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972), 159.

[13] G. DAVIS, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley, 1991), 11.

august history in Latin literature. Some valuable work has been done here. The Horatian use in the *Odes* of the *recusatio*-formula to express Callimachean views against the writing of traditional Homericizing epic has been exhaustively studied by Wimmel and again by Davis[14], but it is also worth considering how this rejection of epic functions in its lyric context. Is the epic material simply being written off as something inappropriate for Horatian lyric discourse, as the poet sometimes claims and many scholars have assumed ? Or is it, as Davis suggests, rather being used in more complicated ways, perhaps satirised and rejected but also included in and adapted to the lyric form simply by appearing there recognisably as itself, thereby extending and enriching the lyric genre with evidently epic elements ? The latter view is that adopted here.

The definition of epic in antiquity is an interesting issue, which has been much discussed[15]. For the present context, epic will be taken to include all lengthy and serious hexameter verse, and will not be restricted to mythological or historical heroic poems in the Homeric tradition. There was a wide range of hexameter verse available to Horace in the first century B.C., and we shall see that he made use of it. With this definition in mind, we shall proceed to investigate the appearance of various forms of epic in the *Odes*. As already stressed, the inclusion or incorporation of material from such a prestigious and established genre is an obvious way for Horace to elevate and vary lyric, a less influential genre in Rome which Horace famously claims to

---

[14] W. WIMMEL, *Kallimachos in Rom* [Hermes Einzelschriften 16] (Wiesbaden, 1960), esp. 187-92 and 271-5; DAVIS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 13), 11-77.

[15] Cf. S. KOSTER, *Antike Epostheorien* (Wiesbaden, 1970), J.B. HAINSWORTH, *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley, 1991), 1-10.

be putting into Latin for the first time[16]. The presence of epic is detectable above all through the use of its vocabulary and conventions, and these will be closely investigated in the analyses which follow, though I will also investigate allusions to further non-epic genres as they occur in the same contexts.

2. Odes I 6 — Agrippa, Varius and Epic

Here my analysis need not be particularly extensive, since the commentary of Nisbet and Hubbard and the recent treatment by Davis make many of the necessary points[17]. The opening of the poem is of course cast in the classic complimentary form of the *recusatio* found so convenient by poets in the Augustan period: 'I am not lofty enough to write about wars and battles, though I am not unwilling' (1-12) :

Scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
Victor Maeonii carmini alite,
quam rem cumque ferox navibus aut equis
miles te duce gesserit:
nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem
Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei
nec saevam Pelopis domum
conamur, tenues grandia, dum pudor
imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
culpa detere ingeni.

---

[16] Cf. *C.* III 30, 13-4; *E.* I 19, 32-3; Catullus had of course anticipated Horace in the matter of Aeolic metre (Catullus 11, 51).

[17] NISBET and HUBBARD, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 5), 80-90, DAVIS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 13), 33-39.

Here a notional epic on Agrippa is declined by Horace and passed on to Varius, claimed to be much better at this type of writing; but this poem and its possible form play more than a fleeting role in the ode. As commentators have noted, the ode is saturated with Homeric allusion, but Homeric allusion of a somewhat parodic and satirical kind: *gravem / Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii* and *duplicis... Ulixei*, clearly deriving from critically moralising treatments of Homer[18], suggest that the heroes of epic are far from moral paragons. This is continued in the penultimate stanza (13-16), which ironically doubts that any poet can match Homeric epic:

> *quis Martem tunica tectum adamantina*
> *digne scripserit aut pulvere Troico*
> *nigrum Merionen aut ope Palladis*
> *Tydiden superis parem?*

These pictures from *Iliad* V of the extravagantly armed Mars who is none the less wounded, the filthy Meriones and Diomedes whose deeds are accomplished through the aid of a female goddess hardly present an ideal of martial courage. Something is happening here.

One strong possibility here, suggested by several scholars, is that these allusions to Homer tease the poet Varius, who is in essence the joint adressee of the poem. Varius' lost *Panegyricus Augusti*, which is likely to have been an epic poem celebrating

---

[18] Such as those picked up at *E.* I 2, 6-31 (cf. R.B. RUTHERFORD, *JHS* 106 (1986), 145-52), a tradition which begins with Xenopanes — cf. R. PFEIFFER, *A History of Classical Scholarship: I* (Oxford, 1968), 8-9. For a recent consideration of Horace's treatment of Homer here cf. C.F. AHERN Jr., *CPh* 86 (1991), 301-14.

the victories of Augustus in Homeric style[19], may well be the target of Horace's Homeric allusions; this would be the kind of teasing of a literary friend using his own way of writing which we see in *Odes* I 33, which makes fun of Tibullus using the conventions and language of love-elegy. If this is so, it makes sense of more than one detail in the poem. Line 11, *laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas* seems rather strange in a poem which sets out to flatter Agrippa rather than Augustus; but it becomes more comprehensible if the *Panegyricus Augusti*, in which Agrippa no doubt played an important supporting role to his chief, is alluded to in the phrase *laudes... Caesaris. Laudes* is used again by Horace of a poetical panegyric of Augustus at *E.* I 16, 29 'Augusti laudes'[20]; if Agrippa is being honoured through a reference to Varius' poem in which he played a subordinate part, the suggestion may be being made that Varius, having honoured Agrippa by inclusion in the *Panegyricus Augusti*, should go further and devote a whole poem to him. It is even possible that the kind of detailed Homeric allusion to *Iliad* V found in lines 13-16 may have played a part in Varius' poem. It is not inconceivable that Agrippa may have been compared in it to a specific Homeric hero such as Diomedes[21]; Diomedes would be an appropriate analogue for the historical role of Agrippa as a tough fighter who can be a reliable subordinate, but all must be speculation here.

---

[19] For what can be pieced together about this poem cf. W. WIMMEL, *ANRW* II 30, 3 (1983), 1605-14; P.V. COVA, *Il poeta Vario* (Milan, 1989), 82-9 is too sceptical.

[20] See the discussion of *E.* I 16, 25-9 in my treatment of *C.* IV 2 (*infra*).

[21] See for this intriguing possibility R.G.M. NISBET in N.M. HORSFALL (ed.), "*Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus*" [*BICS* Suppl. 51] (London, 1988), p. 105 n. 29.

The last stanza is part of the generally humorous approach, which we have already seen in the satirical references to Homer and the allusions to the poetry of Varius (16-20).

> *nos convivia, nos proelia virginum*
> *sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium*
> *cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur*
> *non praeter solitum leves.*

Deploying the common elegiac topos of the *militia amoris*[22], the poet claims to have his own epic wars in the battles of love: with his *proelia virginum* (17) we may compare Propertius III 5, 1-2 *Pacis Amor deus est, pacem veneramur amantes: / stant mihi cum domina proelia dura mea.* The last stanza also picks up several of the previous Iliadic themes in detail, but inverts them, implying that the world of love has more positive elements to offer than the world of heroic battle. The love-poetry claimed by Horace sings of *convivia*, harmonious gatherings rather than the disruptive anger (*gravem... stomachum*) of Achilles in the troubled assemblies of the *Iliad*. It sings of battles in which fingernails are sharpened (*sectis... unguibus*), weapons different from those sharpened for epic war; in these battles virgins fight against young men rather than in their support, the opposite of *Iliad* V, where the virgin goddess Athene acted as support for the hero Diomedes. Finally, the poet's passions are frivolous and light-hearted (*leves*), the opposite of the heavy and destructive anger of Achilles (*gravem... stomachum*); this is an implicit claim that the lighter poetry of erotic lyric is more wholesome and satisfying than the stormy passions of epic.

---

[22] Cf. most conveniently the treatment by P. MURGATROYD, *Latomus* 34 (1975), 59-79.

It is clear that in this poem epic material is given a larger space than it need have occupied; the poet could have dismissed it quickly, and concentrated on his own more 'frivolous' material. Instead of this, epic elements are given an extended satirical treatment in the central three stanzas and then transformed into the world of the erotic and symposiastic lyric in the last stanza. As Davis argues[23], the poet is making a point about generic impropriety, namely that traditional epic material is not appropriate for his form of lyric; but one can surely add that by dwelling upon it as such length, he is also showing that such material is appropriate for lyric if defused and treated in a suitably frivolous and ironic way. One might compare the way in which the moralising reading of the Homeric epics in *E.* I 2 can be incorporated into the otherwise un-epic and philosophical *Epistles*[24]. In both cases the genre involved, lyric or *sermo*, is broadened and enriched by extensive treatment of epic material, even if that treatment is very much on the receiving genre's own terms.

3. Odes III 3: Ethics, Panegyric, Ennius and Prophecy

This poem is of course set in the grand context of the Roman Odes, so that its excursion into lofty themes and diction comes as no surprise; it is in fact one of the prime cases of multiple generic crossing in the *Odes*, moving from Stoic philosophy through Hellenistic ruler-panegyric to Ennian epic and Sibylline prophecy, all within a lyric poem.

Its famous opening image of the imperturbable sage who resists riots, tyranny and cosmic destruction clearly represents

---

[23] DAVIS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 13), 37.

[24] Cf. *supra* n. 18.

the Stoic *sapiens*, with more than a glance at the younger Cato (*C.* III 3, 1-8)[25]:

> *Iustum et tenacem propositi virum*
> *non civium ardor prava iubentium,*
> *non vultus instantis tyranni*
> *mente quatit solida neque Auster,*
> *dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,*
> *nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis:*
> *si fractus illabatur orbis,*
> *impavidum ferient ruinae.*

This is a portentous beginning, which has a great deal in common with the similar opening of *C.* I 22, later revealed as not wholly serious, and which would also seem to glance towards Cato[26], a prominent figure in Augustan poetry. Here at least we are in the realms of popularly-conceived moral philosophy, identified by Kroll as one of the literary traditions commonly combining with lyric in the *Odes*[27]: the images of *quatit* and *solida*, and the general idea of utter indifference to external physical circumstances, are all found in prose writing

---

[25] *Civium ardor prava iubentium* specifically suggests the occasion when Cato as praetor in 54 B.C. single-handedly quietened a rioting mob in the Forum (Plutarch, *Cato Minor* 44); this incident seems to be referred to by Vergil at *Aen.* I 148 ff. — cf. R.G. AUSTIN'S commentary *ad loc.*

[26] The opening of *C.* I 22 suggests the intransigence and endurance of Cato in his famous desert march of 47 B.C. — cf. NISBET and HUBBARD on *C.* I 22, 5. For the general prominence of Cato in Augustan literature cf. R.J. GOAR, *The Legend of Cato Uticensis from the First Century B.C. to the Fifth Century A.D.* [Collection Latomus 190] (Brussels, 1987), 23-31.

[27] KROLL, *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 6), 210-11.

on the imperturbability (ἀπάθεια) of the Stoic *sapiens*[28], while *impavidus* is actually used by Seneca of the Stoic courage of Cato during the Civil War (*Ep.* 95, 69). The choice of evidently philosophical motifs and metaphors is a common way of achieving thematic elevation in the Roman Odes[29].

After this philosophical opening, the poem switches in the third stanza to ruler-panegyric (9-12):

hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules
enisus arces attigit igneas
quos inter Augustus recumbens
purpureo bibet ore nectar.

This belongs in some sense to lyric, since Pindar's odes to Hieron of Syracuse are the ultimate model for much of Horace's praise of Augustus, especially in *Odes* 3, 4[30]. But, as has often been pointed out, the closest parallel is with Theocritus' panegyric on Ptolemy II, where Ptolemy like Augustus drinks with the gods in heaven and is associated with Hercules and Alexander, both depicted as figures who became gods through their achievements on earth (Theocritus, *Id.* 17, 16-22):

ἦνον καὶ μακάρεσσι πατὴρ ὁμότιμον ἔθηκεν
ἀθανάτοις, καί οἱ χρύσεος θρόνος ἐν Διὸς οἴκῳ
δέδμηται· παρὰ δ'αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρος φίλα εἰδὼς
ἑδριάει Πέρσαισι βαρὺς θεὸς αἰολομίτρας.

---

[28] For *quatit* cf. Sen. *Ep.* 74, 33 (the opposite of the *sapiens*) *infirmus animus "quatitur"*, for *solida Dial.* II (*De Const. sap.*) 3, 5 *ita sapientis animus "solidus" est.* For the absolute indifference of the Stoic sage to physical disaster cf. Cicero *Tusc.* IV 37-8 and the Senecan passages collected by A.L. MOTTO, *Guide to the Thought of Lucius Annaeus Seneca* (Amsterdam, 1970), p. 131.

[29] Cf. S.J. HARRISON, *CQ* n.s. 36 (1986), 502-7 on philosophical elements in *C.* III 5.

[30] Cf. E. FRAENKEL, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 276-85.

ἀντία δ'' Ηρακλῆος ἕδρα κενταυροφόνοιο
ἵδρυται στερεοῖο τετυγμένα ἐξ ἀδάμαντος·
ἔνθα σὺν ἄλλοισιν θαλίας ἔχει Οὐρανίδῃσι, ...

A link with Theocritus' poem in hexameters, a form of epic in the general sense defined earlier, here constitutes some kind of generic crossing.

The link of the admission of Romulus to this company (15-18) then allows Horace to present us with the great speech of Juno, which occupies almost all the remainder of the poem (18-68). Epic features play a considerable role here. Denis Feeney has recently convincingly reasserted[31] that this speech echoes the great scene of Romulus' apotheosis in Ennius' *Annales*, which is almost entirely lost, and in which Juno, as in Horace, must have accepted Romulus' acceptance into the divine company of Olympus, perhaps with a major speech. It is at least clear that *C.* III 3, 46-7 *qua medius liquor / secernit Europen ab Afro* echoes Ennius *Ann.* 302 Skutsch *Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda*, which is likely to come from a wholly different context within the *Annales* but supports the general notion of Ennian imitation here[32].

More generally, the context and language of the speech are highly epic. The *concilium deorum* at which it takes place is a central element of Homer and subsequent epic, and the fiery character which Juno displays is consistent with her presentation in the divine discussions of the *Iliad* [33]. In detailed terms, much of the vocabulary has an epic ring. *Refringit* (28) is an Ennian verb (*Ann.* 226 Skutsch) occurring only here for sure in the text of Horace, while *pugnaces Achivos* (27) may echo

---

[31] D.C. FEENEY, *CQ* n.s. 34 (1984), 185-93, *id.*, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991), 125-7.

[32] O. SKUTSCH, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), 14; 478-9.

[33] Cf. *Iliad* IV 24 ff.; VIII 461 ff.; XXIV 55 ff.

Homeric formulas for the Achaeans such as μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί (*Iliad* I 123) and μένεα πνείοντες Ἀχαιοί (*Iliad* III 8). *Hectoreis opibus* (28) recalls a Homeric use of adjective for genitive (cf. *Iliad* II 416 Ἑκτόρεον... χιτῶνα, XXIV 579 Ἑκτορέης... κεφαλῆς), while *lucidas... sedes* (33-4), given Lucretius I 1014: *caeli lucida templa* and Ennius *Ann.* 48 Skutsch *caeli caerula templa*, may well be a reminiscence of a lost phrase of Ennius as well as of the Homeric αἰγλήεντος Ὀλύμπου (*Iliad* I 532).

This high-flown diction continues in the second half of Juno's speech (37-68), where her promises of a great future for Rome include elements of a true prophetic vocabulary. Here we have clear generic crossing with a species of ancient hexameter poetry not always recognised as possessing a separate identity, the prophetic hexameter. The brief Delphic prophecies in the classical period were usually in hexameter verse[34], as were the longer Greek Sibylline prophecies which were so highly esteemed at Rome and alluded to by several Augustan poets, and of which we possess a collection of late Imperial date[35]. Amongst the motifs in this collection is that of animals playing among the ruins of a great city, a motif which Horace had already used in the *Epodes* in an equally apocalyptic passage (*Ep.* 16, 10: *ferisque rursus occupabitur solum* — cf. *Orac.*

---

[34] Cf. H.W. PARKE and D.E. WORMELL, *The Delphic Oracle: II* (Oxford, 1956), xxi-xxxvi.

[35] The most recent edition of the Sibylline collection (a selection) is A. KURFESS, *Sibyllinsche Weissagungen* (Nordlingen, 1951); for the content and character of the Sibylline Oracles cf. H.W. PARKE, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity* (London, 1988), 1-22, and for their use by Augustan poets cf. R.G.M. NISBET, *BICS* 25 (1978), 59-78, C.W. MACLEOD, *CQ* n.s. 29 (1979), 220-1.

Sibyll. VIII 41 καὶ τὰ θέμειλα λῦκοι καὶ ἀλῶπεκες οἰκήσουσι)[36]. Something like this clearly underlies lines 40-42 in Horace's *Ode*:

> *dum Priami Paridisque busto*
> *insultet armentum et catulos ferae*
> *celent inultae...*

Oracular, too, seems the language of lines 49-56:

> *aurum irrepertum et sic melius situm,*
> *cum terra celat, spernere fortior*
> *quam cogere humanos in usus*
> *omne sacrum rapiente dextra.*
> *quicumque mundo terminus obstitit,*
> *hunc tanget armis, visere gestiens,*
> *qua parte debacchentur ignes,*
> *qua nebulae pluviique rores.*

This passage looks very much like deliberate prophetic obscurity: this impression is created by its difficult syntax, its unclear generalizations and its moralising content, all qualities of ancient prophecy. The idea of prophetic obscurity is in fact helpful in interpreting a number of other passages in the Roman Odes, and coheres with the self-presentation of the poet in *C.* III 1, 1-4 as a priestly presenter of new and original *carmina*, a word which can refer to poetic prophecies as well as to poetry in general[37].

---

[36] The parallel is noted by Kiessling/Heinze on *Ep.* 16, 10, who also draw the analogy with *C.* III 4, 40-2.

[37] Cf. esp. A.J. WOODMAN in *Poetry and Politics in the age of Augustus*, ed. A.J. WOODMAN and D.A. WEST (Cambridge, 1984), 84-6, and PARKE and WORMELL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 35), xxvi, on the Delphic hexameter responses:

The enigmatic expressions in 53-6, a marked contrast with the specific geographical names of 42-4, have a decidedly prophetic air, as do the personification of Rome (44) and the reference to the standing of the Capitol (42), both elements which appear elsewhere in prophecies in Augustan poetry[38].

The final stanza, by a technique already familiar from our considerations of *C.* I 6 and II 1, rebukes the Muse for leading the poet off into such generically inappropriate material (*C.* III 3, 69-72):

> *non hoc iocosae conveniet lyrae:*
> *quo, Musa, tendis? desine pervicax*
> *referre sermones deorum et*
> *magna modis tenuare parvis.*

Here we feel that the point is made too late and with some irony. There is a clear parallel with *C.* II 1, 37-8 *sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis / Ceae retractes munera neniae*, as commentators have noted[39]. Both are concluding passages which state that Horace's own lyric is fundamentally frivolous, both address the Muse, and both attempt to separate the lighter Horatian lyric from a different and more serious kind of poetry which has dominated the preceding *Ode* (here epic, designated by its characteristic feature of divine councils, *sermones deorum*).

'Obscurity was an essential element in this literary genre'. This is also true of some of the Sibylline Oracles — cf. PARKE, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 35), 15-18.

[38] Personification of Rome: MACLEOD, *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 35); *Orac. Sibyll.* III 46, 350; VII 108; XIII 46. Standing of Capitol: *C.* III 30, 8; Verg. *Aen.* IX 446-9.

[39] The formulas in Horace are versions of those used by Pindar to break off when prasising the victor in order to avoid excess (e.g. *N.* III 26 ff.; *I.* VI 56 ff.); Horace uses the technique for different and subtler purposes — cf. NISBET and HUBBARD on *C.* II 1, 37.

Furthermore, the term *pervicax* like *procax* refers to the headstrong or unruly character of the Muse, claimed by Horace as the one who has led him astray: indiscipline (*procacitas*) and stubbornness (*pervicacia*) both lead to the kind of generic wilfulness witnessed in the two poems. This is an unconvincing disclaimer, an insincere attempt to claim that Horatian lyric has narrow limits, a 'generic disavowal' in Davis' terms[40]: the poet's prescriptive statement has already been disproved by the contents of his poem, which has been full of epic elements.

4. Odes III 27: Lyric, Epyllion and Tragedy

Odes III 27 has been seen as one of the most difficult of Horace's *Odes*[41]. This difficulty cannot be unconnected with the generic complexity of its form. For its first six stanzas the poem appears to be a propempticon of the beloved, of a type familiar from love-elegy, as commentators have noted (cf. Propertius I 8, Ovid, *Am.* II 11)[42]. Joined to this is some play on the role of the poet; much of the language in these opening stanzas uses the official terminology of the taking of omens, as Kiessling/Heinze stress[43], and the allusion to the poet/speaker as *providus auspex* suggests that here, as in the *Roman Odes*, the poet relies on the dual sense of *vates* — both 'poet' and

---

[40] *Loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 13).

[41] So K. BÜCHNER in *Gnomon* 14 (1938), 638. For more negative judgements cf. FRAENKEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 30), 192-6.

[42] On its character as a propempticon cf. especially CAIRNS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 12), 189-92.

[43] For *auspex* cf. *ThLL* II 1540, 84 ff., for *oscen ThLL* IX 2, 1100, 79 ff.; for the *parra* as a bird of omen cf. Plautus *Asinaria* 260, Festus p. 214. 11 Lindsay.

'prophet/priest'[44]. In the first half of the poem, there is already a clear generic mixture: the poet appropriates in lyric the discourse of erotic elegy and of augural pronouncement. This somewhat portentous opening is to be characteristically deflated by the poet. Already at line 14 the beloved's pseudonym, a way of naming which is of course characteristic in love-elegy (Cynthia, Delia, Nemesis), provokes some humour, as Cairns stresses[45]: that Galatea, the beloved for whom protection is asked, happens to have the same name as one of the sea-goddesses regularly called upon to protect the beloved in her travels (Prop. I 8, 18; Ov. *Am.* II 11,34), is a good literary joke.

This atmosphere of levity is important when dealing with the lengthy myth of Europa which follows and which dominates the poem until its close (25-76), neatly attached as an *exemplum* of a similar overseas journey by a vulnerable young woman. This lengthy section is itself dominated by the monologue of Europa, which irresistibly recalls not archaic lyric but the tradition of the epyllion, in particular the monologue of the abandoned Ariadne in Catullus 64 (132-201). Given that the mythical character chosen here is Europa, there are obvious parallels to be drawn with the *Europa* of Moschus, which Bühler has fully investigated in his edition of the latter[46]. Thus the chief generic crossing here is with an epic text; leaving aside the problems of

---

[44] On the term *vates* in Augustan poetry cf. J.K. NEWMAN, *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry* [Collection Latomus 89] (Brussels, 1967), G. WILLIAMS, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 47-8.

[45] CAIRNS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 12), 90.

[46] W. BÜHLER, *Die Europa des Moschos* [Hermes Einzelschriften 13] (Wiesbaden, 1960), 20-24. For other treatments of Horace's poem and its use of Moschus, cf. FRAENKEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 30), 92-6, W.-H. FRIEDRICH, *NGG* 1959, 5, 88-100, T. BERRES, *Hermes* 102 (1974), 58-86.

definition which attach to the term 'epyllion'[47], the *Europa* of Moschus is clearly an ἔπος in ancient terms. This link may have something to do with the length of this ode, at 76 lines one of the longest in the entire collection, perhaps a gesture towards the 166 lines of the *Europa* or the 125 lines of the pseudo-Moschan epyllion *Megara*. It is even possible that a further epyllion other than the *Europa* is alluded to in the poem's close, different indeed from that of the *Europa*. We know of a similarly-ending version of the Ariadne-story to be found in a V-scholion on *Od.* XI 322, which, though it appears in context to be ascribed to Pherecydes looks very much like the summary of a Hellenistic poem[48]. Particularly close to Horace is the scene where Venus appears to Ariadne, abandoned by Theseus: κατολοφυρομένης δὲ τῆς Ἀριάδνης ἡ Ἀφροδίτη ἐπιφανεῖσα θαρρεῖν αὐτῇ παραινεῖ· Διονύσου γὰρ ἔσεσθαι γυναῖκα καὶ εὐκλεῆ γενήσεσθαι.

Compared to that of Moschus, Horace's narrative is notably more sharp and humorous, and here is a clear case of tempering the tone of the original to suit the lighter generic requirements of Horatian lyric. Though the Hellenistic epyllion form as seen in *Europa* has considerable wit and sophistication[49], Moschus there presents a fairy-tale, romantic version of love: a princess is kidnapped by a bull who turns out to be a god in disguise, they have an exchange of speeches while passing over the sea, they land, and he marries her, returning to human form, with no previous rape. The poem ends in the voice of the narrator,

---

[47] Cf. K. GUTZWILLER, *Studies in the Hellenistic Epyllion* (Königstein, 1981), 2-9. A. PERUTELLI, *La narrazione commentata: studi sull'epillio latino* (Pisa, 1979), 13-30.

[48] The similarity is pointed out by KIESSLING/HEINZE *ad. loc.*, who also argue for a poetic source for the Ariadne story.

[49] Cf. G. ZANKER, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 9), 92-4.

celebrating the wedding and Europa's great descendants. Horace, on the other hand, provides a version which is more realistic and cynical as well as bizarre. First, Europa's speech takes place not in mid-ocean but immediately after landing, a more natural location, and it is a monologue of self-rebuke rather than a conversation with a metamorphosed Zeus. Second, her speech is full of sexual guilt, a realistic touch, since she seems to have been raped before reaching Crete[50], a contrast with Moschus; but her words are presented with considerable humour and artificiality. Much is made of her strange passion for the bull, and the whole elaborate presentation of her speech, with rhetorical questions, exclamations, and quotation from absent characters suggests the world of clever *declamatio* rather than serious and realistic psychology.

Horace's most substantial alteration to Moschus is the ending, which may itself have a literary ancestry (see above). The appearance of Venus at the end of the ode, *perfidum ridens Venus*, confirms that she has been the manipulator of the whole affair (*C.* III 27, 66-76):

> *aderat querenti*
> *perfidum ridens Venus et remisso*
> *filius arcu.*
> *mox, ubi lusit satis, 'abstineto'*
> *dixit 'irarum calidaeque rixae,*
> *cum tibi invisus laceranda reddet*
> *cornua taurus.*
> *uxor invicti Iovis esse nescis:*
> *mitte singultus, bene ferre magnam*
> *disce fortunam; tua sectus orbis*
> *nomina ducet'.*

---

[50] The rape seems to be implied by *multum amati* (47), *impudens* (49, 50), and *zona* (59).

This machinating role is the usual part of Venus in Horatian love-lyric[51], and has no part in the simple love-story of Moschus. Her appearance injects a particular note of amusement and irony absent from Moschus but appropriate to Horace. The reader is forcefully reminded of the beginning of Horace's poem, and of the fact that he has set his version of the Europa-myth in an ironic and erotic context; it is not a romantic and charming mythological story for Horace in this poem. This leads the reader to think that the dramatic and exaggerated protests of the heroine Europa have some relevance to the Galatea of the opening stanza. In fact, the figure of Europa is used to convey a message to Galatea; Horace's use of her points out to Galatea in an ironic and amusing way the dangers she supposedly courts in leaving the poet for overseas, presumably for a rival[52]. This is a clever and subversive version of the attitude of the elegiac poet in such situations. The elegist normally expresses extreme and sentimental fears for the beloved's safety in such a context (Propertius I 8, 5-16); Horace transfers these fears to the woman herself, and makes them amusing by presenting them in an artificial and rhetorical manner.

One final element of generic crossing in this complex poem is that with Greek tragedy. Here I can be brief, since some details of my argument can be found elsewhere[53]. The protesting heroine is of course a feature of Greek tragedy as well as of Hellenistic epic, and it is clear that Horace has blended together both these literary traditions in the speech of Europa and the appearance of Venus at the end of the poem. The prominent role of Europa's father and his views brings this out most clearly (57-66):

---

[51] Cf. e.g. *C.* I 19, 9; I 30, 1; I 33, 10; IV 1, 1.

[52] Cf. CAIRNS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 12), 191-2.

[53] S.J. HARRISON, *Hermes* 116 (1988), 427-34.

'vilis Europe', pater urget absens,
'quid mori cessas? potes hac ab orno
pendulum zona bene te secuta
laedere collum;
sive te rupes et acuta leto
saxa delectant, age te procellae

crede veloci, nisi erile mavis
carpere pensum
regius sanguis, dominaeque tradi
barbarae paelex'.

The fear of her father's opinion echoes Euripides' *Medea* (166, 483), and the quotation of the reproach of another which is then turned into self-reproach by the speaker is a common feature of tragic rhetoric (Sophocles, *Ajax* 500-04, 1008-16; Euripides, *Alcestis* 954-5, *Phoenissae* 500-03). Further, the debate between the *Selbstmordwege* of hanging and self-precipitation (58-63) recalls a notable feature of Euripidean tragedy famously analysed by Eduard Fraenkel[54] (*Heracles* 1148-52, *Orestes* 1035-6, *Helen* 299-302, *Andromache* 841-50 and especially *Troades* 1012-15). Finally, the concluding appearance of Venus as *dea ex machina* with her consolatory or complimentary αἴτιον (75-6) is a classic pattern of closure in Euripidean tragedies (e.g. *Hippolytus* 1423-30, *Ion* 1553-1605, *Orestes* 1625-65).

All this lofty material from epic and tragedy is managed with characteristic lightness, not to say black humour; Europa's panic is a storm in a tea-cup, and the lady protests too much. Epic and tragedy becomes melodrama, indeed comedy. This again is a

[54] E. FRAENKEL, *Philologus* 87 (1932), 470-3, reprinted in *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome, 1964), II 465-7.

necessary strategy for the inclusion of such elevated elements in Horatian lyric; epic and tragedy cannot be assimilated in a pure and unadulterated form. Nevertheless, enough of their generic characteristics remain to ensure that the lyric tradition is perceptibly enriched by addition from other sources. The humour and wit of the whole poem must be seen against the background of its complex generic crossings, evidenced through its display of language and motifs from love-elegy, augury, Hellenistic epyllion and Greek tragedy; only when questions of literary form are answered can its effects be understood, which may explain the vague and unfavourable judgements this poem has sometimes evoked.

5. Odes IV. 2 : Horace, Pindar and Panegyric

Odes IV 2 faces us with an evident paradox. Having employed imitation of Pindar in at least two of the more prominent poems in the first three books of the *Odes*[55], and on the point of using Pindar even more in the panegyrical *Odes* of the fourth book[56], Horace claims that those who imitate Pindar are doomed to ignominious failure (1-4):

> *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,*
> *Iulle, ceratis ope Daedalea*
> *nititur pennis vitreo daturus*
> *nomina ponto.*

---

[55] *C.* I 12 and III 4: cf. the excellent analyses by FRAENKEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 30), 291-7 and 273-85.

[56] *C.* IV 4 and IV 14: cf. FRAENKEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 30), 426-32. For further Pindaric material in *C.* IV, cf. A. THILL, *Alter ab illo : Recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personnelle à l'époque augustéenne* (Paris, 1979), 165-223, S.J. HARRISON, *JRS* 80 (1990), 35-6.

There are two possible solutions to this difficulty: either the poet is talking of a particular aspect of Pindaric imitation which he himself does not practice, for example attempts to reproduce his rich and abrupt style, or the claim is ironic. This must be so, whatever we make of the theories which try to explain why Horace should be concerned with Pindaric imitation in this poem. Some think that Iullus, the addressee of the poem, actually asked Horace to write a Pindaric ode[57] for the return of Augustus about 16 B.C., the evident historical context of the poem; but this need not be inferred from the poem, just as *C.* I 6 need not mean that Agrippa asked for an epic poem from Horace (see **2** above). The poet talks about Pindar in IV 2 as he talks about Varius in I 6; he uses a fellow-poet to make points about poetry and its different kinds. He is *not* concerned with the practical difficulties which prevent him from writing encomiastic odes for Augustus, for this is precisely what he goes on to do in *Odes* IV 5 and IV 15.

Horace's irony here seems genuine and characteristic. As in *Odes* III 3, 69 ff., the poet disingenuously attempts to disassociate his «light» lyric poetry from other poetical types with which he is already involved in that very poem. Lines 5-24 of *Odes* IV 2 contain a memorable characterization of Pindar's style, followed by a catalogue of his works, full of Pindaric echoes which have been well collected by commentators: dithyrambs (10-12), hymns (13-16), epinicians (17-20) and laments (21-24) are discernible in the list (note the neat distribution of one stanza for each type)[58]. Thus Horace is disclaiming Pindaric

---

[57] So FRAENKEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 30), 433.

[58] Cf. FRAENKEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 30), 432-40, following his earlier treatment, «Das Pindargedicht des Horaz», *SB Heid. Ak. Wiss.* 1932-3. For a recent treatment of the Pindaric catalogue here cf. R. FREIS, *Cl. Ant.* 2 (1983), 27-36.

imitation in a long passage in which he imitates him.[59] This passage also contains evident hints at Augustus and his forthcoming victorious return (*deorum sanguinem, domum reducit, palma caelestis*); in a sense he has already praised Augustus before handing on that same task to Iullus Antonius at 33 ff.

Particularly notable in what follows are lines 27-32:

> *ego apis Matinae*
> *more modoque*
> *grata carpentis thyma per laborem*
> *plurimum circa nemus uvidique*
> *Tiburis ripas operosa parvus*
> *carmina fingo.*

Here the poet characterizes his poetic activity as that of a low-hovering bee rather than that of the soaring Pindaric swan. The image of the bee for the poet has long been regarded simply as a reminiscence of Simonides *PMG* 593 <ὁμιλεῖ δ'ἄνθεσσι μελίσσα> / ξανθὸν μέλι μηδομένα, with *fingo* picking up μηδομένα;[60] but it is also a specific allusion to a famous passage of Pindar, where he uses the same image for poetic activity (*P.* 10, 53-4) ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων / ἐπ' ἄλλοτ'ἄλλον ὥτε μελίσσα θύνει λόγον, from which *plurimum* (clearly going with *nemus* in Horace, as Bentley saw) seems to pick up ἐπ'ἄλλοτ'ἄλλον, similarly emphasising the variety and flexibility of the poet's presentation. Thus Pindaric

---

[59] Cf. H.-P. SYNDIKUS, *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Band II* (Darmstadt, 1973), 301-2.

[60] FRAENKEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 30), 435 n. 1; cf. W.J. OATES, *The Influence of Simonides of Ceos upon Horace* (Princeton, 1932), 98-100. SYNDIKUS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 59), 302 n. 38 regards the thought as more of a commonplace than a specific allusion.

language is used to disclaim Pindaric ambitions, a splendid Horatian irony.

At line 33 the poem turns to Iullus Antonius, its addressee, until this point only briefly alluded to in line 2. The contrast with Horace, no match for Pindar, is clearly made; Iullus will be able to sing of Caesar and his return as *maiore poeta plectro* (33). Fraenkel argued that this phrase referred to the Pindaric grand lyric which Horace himself has just disclaimed[61], but this is not entirely clear. The reference to *maiore... plectro* does not in itself exclude epic hexameters, the natural medium for panegyric in the Augustan period for poets other than Horace[62]; epic panegyric would be much more suitable for Iullus himself, who was the author of an epic *Diomedeia* in twelve books according to Ps.-Acro's commentary on this poem[63]. All that is needed is that the poem be of a grandeur equivalent to Pindar. Indeed, a reference to Pindaric lyric seems very unlikely; if Horace, having said that no-one can successfully imitate Pindar *as lyric poet*, then goes on to encourage Iullus to do just that, that would be very strange. It would also provide no compliment to Iullus, who is surely honoured as the addressee of this poem and as a favoured relative of the *princeps*, whose young relatives are prominent in *Odes* IV [64].

---

[61] *Loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 58).

[62] At Ovid *Met.* X 150 *graviore plectro,* perhaps an imitation of Horace, evidently refers to Gigantomachic epic (149-52): *Iovis est mihi saepe potestas / dicta prius: cecini «graviore plectro» Gigantas / sparsaque Phlegraeis victricia fulmina campis. / nunc opus est «leviore lyra».*

[63] Ps. Acro on *C.* IV 2, 33 *Iullus Antonius heroico metro Diomedias libros scripsit egregios... concines ergo, inquit, hoc est: cantabis nobiscum, tu Antoni, «maiore plectro» meliori opere victorem Caesarem.* I see no reason to doubt this testimony.

[64] On Iullus and Augustus and the prominence of the *princeps*' younger relatives in *C.* IV, cf. R. SYME, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 396-402.

Lines 33-44 give added support to the notion that Iullus' imagined poem is a panegyrical epic in the manner of Varius' *Panegyricus Augusti* and of the more encomiastic parts of Vergil's *Aeneid*. The military triumphs of 34-6 are significant here:

> *quandoque trahet feroces*
> *per sacrum clivum merita decorus*
> *fronde Sygambros.*

This clearly parallels the panegyrical material about Augustus and defeated tribes included by Vergil on the Shield of Aeneas (*Aen.* VIII 720-8). Similarly panegyrical is the fulsome personal praise for Augustus at 37-40:

> *quo nihil maius meliusve terris*
> *fata donavere bonique divi*
> *nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum*
> *tempora priscum.*

There are clear echoes here of the lines apparently quoted by Horace in *E.* I 16 which are commonly assumed with some probability to be from the *Panegyricus Augusti* of Varius itself [65] (*E.* I 16, 25-9):

> *si quis bella tibi terra pugnata marique*
> *dicat et his verbis vacuas permulceat auris,*
> *'tene magis salvum populus velit an populum tu,*
> *servet in ambiguo qui consulit et tibi et urbi*
> *Iuppiter', Augusti laudes agnoscere possis.*

---

[65] On this and the evidence for the *Panegyricus Augusti* cf. *supra*, n. 19.

Both passages present the idea of the *princeps'* mere existence as a benefit for the Roman people. The comparison or identification of the reign of Augustus with a new Golden Age at 41-2 is also of course a staple element of Vergilian panegyric of the *princeps* (*Aen.* VI 791-805, cf. *Aen.* I 291-6)[66].

All this provides clear reference to a non-lyric genre, panegyrical epic. Horace's ironic pose that he is *not* writing such panegyric is maintained in lines 45-52: after hearing Iullus' epic praises, he himself will utter a few laudatory commonplaces as a simple citizen, blinded by the dazzling presence of the *princeps* (this is surely the point of *o Sol pulcher*)[67]. This contrast between Iullus and Horace is repeated in the description of their respective sacrifices, the normal thanksgiving for the return of a friend, which occupies the last two stanzas of the poem (53-60):

> *te decem tauri totidemque vaccae,*
> *me tener solvet vitulus, relicta*
> *matre qui largis iuvenescit herbis*
> *in mea vota,*
> *fronte curvatos imitatus ignis*
> *tertium lunae referentis ortum,*
> *qua notam duxit, niveus videri,*
> *cetera fulvus.*

Iullus is assigned ten bulls and ten cows, dismissed in a single line, while Horace promises a single exquisite calf, lovingly described in seven lines. This of course reflects and matches the

---

[66] Cf. G. BINDER, *Aeneas und Augustus* (Meisenheim, 1971), 281-2.

[67] On the background to the sun-imagery here and its trite and popular character cf. SYNDIKUS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 59), 308 n. 73, E. DOBLHOFER, Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht (Heidelberg, 1966), 86-91.

contrast between the two types of poetry attached to the two men in this poem.[68] Iullus' sacrifice is epic in both scale and type, and indeed in expression[69]; Horace's single victim echoes his light, erotic and well-crafted lyric, a calf with complex and beautiful markings, beautifully decorated, young and ready for love.[70] Just as the fine calf will be sacrificed to celebrate Augustus' homecoming, so Horace's exquisite poem will be offered in his praise, although the praise of Augustus in the high style is a task he has just emphatically declined.

In this poem Horace has managed to include a considerable amount of material which is generically inappropriate to the light and erotic type of lyric which he professes to write here and elsewhere, especially in the immediately preceding *Odes* IV 1. He appropriates not only the grandeur of Pindar but also the high praise of epic panegyric, while returning at the poem's end to an indirect statement of his own more modest poetic preferences. This movement into other genres and from high to low is matched in all the poems so far examined. In effect, this is a double instance of Davis' 'generic disavowal'[71]: both Pindaric grandeur and panegyrical epic are notionally excluded by Horace from his humble lyric, but actually practiced within his poem.

---

[68] This theme is partly explored by DAVIS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 13), 142-3, and SYNDIKUS, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 59), 309-10.

[69] The sacrifice is on an epic rather than Roman scale: compare the twelve bulls sacrificed to Poseidon at *Odyssey* XIII 180 ff. For the epic expression cf. Verg. *Aen.* V 97: *totque sues, «totidem» nigrantis terga iuvencos.*

[70] *Relicta matre* suggests this (cf. *C.* I 23, 11-2), as does the term *tener*, strongly associated with love-elegy and used of the lover, the beloved and the poetry of love — cf. R. PICHON, *De Sermone Amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores* (Paris, 1902), 277-8. This all implies that the calf represents Horace's lighter and more erotic poetry.

[71] *Loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 13).

6. Conclusion

Examination of some key poems has considered the literary form of Horace's *Odes*. Particular attention has been paid to encounters with the various forms of epic, including epyllion, panegyric, and prophecy, though crossings with other literary genres (such as tragedy and elegy) have also been tangentially discussed. The use of language from other genres and of their literary conventions has provided the main evidence for the investigation; ideas about generic crossing developed by twentieth-century scholarship on Horace and on genre theory have been deployed as techniques in dealing with the linguistic data of the poems. The poet generally sets up some kind of distancing between his lyric stance and language and the non-lyric material. Nevertheless, that non-lyric material is absorbed into the literary form of the *Odes*; this is usually done by an ironic or parodic presentation which stresses its difference from lyric and generic inappropriateness, but this presentation which claims to exclude non-lyric material is often illusory or disingenuous. The crucial thing is the extended deployment of non-lyric material within lyric poetry, the means by which it is in effect absorbed into the lyric tradition. Through generic crossing and consequent widening of vocabulary and literary convention, the *Odes* of Horace enrich the ancient lyric tradition very considerably, and are also typical of the Augustan period. This was a time when poets sought generic experiment within the bounds of recognisable literary forms, something very clearly visible in another masterpiece of the time, Vergil's *Aeneid* [72]. In literary

---

[72] On generic crossing in the *Aeneid* cf. KROLL, *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 6). Much has been done on the use of Greek tragedy in the figure of Dido in *Aen.* IV, less on other parts of the poem. See most notably K. QUINN, *Vergil's Aeneid: A Critical Description* (London, 1968), 324-49 (tragedy), W.S. ANDERSON, *TAPA* 99

form as in verbal style, Horace can be seen applying in the *Odes* the prescriptions of the *Ars Poetica* (86-98): each genre has its established identity and verbal colouring, of which the true poet is acutely aware, but that colouring can be transferred to a different genre for a particular literary effect.

(1968), 1-17 (pastoral), Gordon WILLIAMS, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (New Haven, 1983), 194-5 (epigram), S.J. HARRISON, *A Commentary on Vergil Aeneid 10* (Oxford, 1991), 285-6 (various).

DISCUSSION

Mme Thill: Il convient de reconnaître la "generic complexity" du lyrisme horatien. Depuis les débuts de la "Quellenforschung", la recherche a progressivement élargi le champ d'investigation des sources, et on est très loin aujourd'hui du "modèle unique" dénoncé jadis par J. Hubaux à propos des *Bucoliques* de Virgile. On a admis peu à peu que tous les genres peuvent être 'inclus', par la citation, par l'allusion, par la miniaturisation. Vous avez souligné l'apport épique au lyrisme d'Horace. Mais il faut toujours remonter à l'épopée (au sens large d'*epos*), dont dépendent tous les genres. Des éléments épiques se trouvent aussi bien dans l'élégie que dans le lyrisme, adaptés à chaque genre.

L'ouvrage de F. Cairns, que vous avez cité, a beaucoup apporté à la compréhension de la technique poétique. Il faudrait ajouter celui de W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom*, car les questions de génétique littéraire sont inséparables du problème de l'imitation, central dans la poésie augustéenne. Ainsi, dans *C.* IV 2, Horace fait un résumé allusif de l'œuvre de Pindare, mais se présente lui-même comme *parvus*, c'est-à-dire un adepte de la Μοῦσα λεπταλέη. L'image de la fin est toute alexandrine. C'est aussi chez les Alexandrins qu'il faut chercher le modèle de la technique allusive et du rapprochement des genres.

M. Harrison: Thank you for your agreement with my main thesis. As for Wimmel and Callimacheanism, his book is of course an important (if stolid) work, and I have cited it along with Cairns in my footnotes; I have deliberately played down the evident Callimachean aspects of *C.* IV 2 in order to focus on Pindar. You are of course right that the crossing of genres is already complex in Hellenistic literature,

the direct source for its appearance in Augustan poetry, as Kroll stressed.

M. Schrijvers: Comme vous avez prétendu que, dans l'Antiquité, les conceptions théoriques relatives au poème lyrique sont assez vagues, voire presque inexistantes, je m'étais attendu que vous donneriez, au moins de manière inductive, un aperçu de la présence d'autres genres dans la poésie lyrique des Grecs à l'époque archaïque. A mon avis, vous avez exagéré sur ce point l'originalité d'Horace, alors que chez Alcée, Anacréon et d'autres apparaissent des traces homériques. Quelle est, à votre avis, la situation dans les genres pratiqués par Pindare et, de manière générale, dans la poésie hellénistique ? En outre, dans l'histoire de la littérature latine, on décèle déjà l'inclusion d'autres genres chez Plaute (éléments tragiques dans la comédie). Le thème du *concilium deorum*, que vous avez signalé, se rencontre dans une *Satire* de Lucilius; et, en général, les *Satires* d'Horace montrent elles-mêmes ce phénomène d'inclusion (monologue, dialogue, éléments de la comédie et de l'épopée). Quelle est donc, à votre avis, l'originalité d'Horace sur ce point dans les *Odes* ?[1]

---

[1] Voici encore quelques remarques que j'ajoute à ce que j'ai dit dans la discussion:

1) "He is doing what he denies" n'est pas exclusivement lié à l'inclusion d'autres genres. C'est un jeu littéraire, assez sophistiqué (cf. Ovide), disponible quand l'acte d'écrire le poème est lui-même le thème du poème (une sorte de réflexivité). Cf. l'*Epode* 14, où le message "je ne peux pas écrire un poème, car je suis amoureux" constitue le poème qu'il n'est pas capable de faire. On trouve d'autres exemples de ce jeu chez Ovide, ou chez Stace: "Je suis si désolé et je pleure tellement que je ne peux pas écrire", message énoncé dans de splendides hexamètres!

2) Pour compliquer les choses, les *Odes* III 3, 69-72 et II 1, 37-40 ont été considérées comme "Abbruchsformeln" *à la manière de Pindare* ! Comment terminer les odes? C'est la question qui vient à l'esprit à ce propos.

3) Ce qui m'a toujours frappé dans *C.* IV 2, 55-60, c'est l'asymétrie quantitative. Le sacrifice 'epic in scale' obtient cinq mots d'*Erzählzeit*; le *vitulus* et la toute petite tache sur son front obtiennent le reste (sept vers). C'est aussi une manière indirecte d'agrandir les petites choses et les petits poèmes.

M. Harrison: I fully agree that there are epic elements in archaic Greek lyric poetry, but I would ascribe these to the paucity of other literary material to allude to rather than to conscious generic crossing, which is a later and more sophisticated phenomenon.

M. Ludwig: Sie haben die Schlussstrophen von *C.* III 3 und II 1 als "ironical" und "insincere" bezeichnet, da sich Horaz zuvor viele Strophen bei der anderen — ernsten — Thematik aufgehalten hatte. Wird hier die *iocosa lyra* und das *levius plectrum* nicht zumindest auch als die vom Leser erwartete (bzw. von Horaz in Aussicht gestellte) normale Ebene der lyrischen Poesie bezeichnet? Er deutet an, dass *sermones deorum referre* eigentlich Sache des Hexameters ist, dass ihm gegenüber die lyrischen Masse *parvi modi* sind, denen dann eigentlich auch eine leichtere — sympotisch-erotische — Thematik zukommt. Diese wird damit anscheinend als normale Erwartung für die lyrische Dichtung bezeichnet (obwohl Horaz in *A.P.* 83-85 auch Götterhymnen und Epinikien als traditionell gegeben Gegenstand der Lyrik bezeichnet hatte). Entspricht dies der Gesamterscheinung von Horazens lyrischer Dichtung oder etwa nur einer Lesererwartung?

Hinsichtlich der Einfügung epischer Elemente in seine Lyrik (hier scheint mir der Begriff 'inclusion' besser als der der 'mixture' oder 'Kreuzung') ist gewiss festzuhalten, dass dies auch in der früheren griechischen Lyrik geschah, Horaz also auch hierin Griechisches ins Lateinische brachte. Unterscheidet sich seine Art der 'inclusion' anderer Gattungen ihres Erachtens von der Art, in der dies in der — nur teilweise bekannten — griechischen Lyrik geschah?

M. Harrison: You must be right in suggesting that Horace is playing with his readers' generic expectations in the last stanzas of *C.* III 3 and II 1, but I would still maintain that the inclusion of epic and other 'elevated' material here and elsewhere in the *Odes* is a deliberate attempt to widen the purview of lyric while professing not to do so (Davis' 'generic disavowal'); this is the sense in which Horace is

---

L'asymétrie quantitative devient qualitative.

'ironic' in these statements. I agree with you that Cairns' term 'inclusion' is better than Kroll's 'crossing', since it makes clear the hierarchy — epic elements occur in Horace's lyric and influence its content, but remain subordinate to its lyric character.

M. Syndikus: Sie haben ein entscheidendes Problem der Interpretation der Horaz*oden* angesprochen, aber ich frage mich, ob hier nicht eine andere Begrifflichkeit förderlicher wäre. Die Wichtigkeit der Frage liegt auf der Hand: Horaz wurde seit der Romantik oft deswegen nicht mehr als Lyriker anerkannt, weil man von einem lyrischen Gedicht eine einheitliche Stimmung verlangte und so den Wechsel der Stillsage in einem horazischen Gedicht nicht verstand. Aus diesem Grund hat etwa Wilamowitz, den Sie zitierten, *C.* III 27 für ein schlechtes Gedicht gehalten; Wilamowitz war ein ganz einseitiger Bewunderer der Lyrik seit Goethe.

Meine Frage ist nun, ob man die Verschiebungen und Veränderungen in Inhalt, Gefühlslage und Stilhöhe in einem Horazgedicht begrifflich nicht besser erfassen kann, wenn man mit den ursprünglich rhetorischen Begriffen des mittleren und hohen Stils arbeitet. So würde ich die von Ihnen behandelten Schlussstrophen der *Oden* I 6, II 1 und III 3 lieber nicht ironisch nennen. Ist es ironisch, wenn Horaz am Ende eines Gedichts nach Ausflügen in die hohe Stilebene den Leser wieder zu seinem üblichen mittleren Stil zurückruft? Der Gedichtschluss dieser drei Gedichte ist mit einer Erscheinung verwandt, die zuerst Ed. Fraenkel beobachtet hat. Er sah, dass stilistisch hohe und inhaltlich bedeutende Gedichte oft mit einer sehr persönlichen und scheinbar gewichtlosen Wendung schliessen. Man kann das natürlich Selbstironie nennen, aber ist es nicht eher so, dass Horaz, dieser Meister des 'understatements', ganz schlicht sich und den Leser von einer Stilhöhe zurückrufen möchte, die nicht so ganz seinem Wesen entspricht?

Meiner Meinung nach kann man diese partielle Erscheinung erweitern. Nicht selten führt in einer horazischen Ode eine Bewegung bzw. eine Gewichtverschiebung von der Ausgangslage zu etwas anderem, oft Gegensätzlichem, im allgemeinen aus einer bedrängten oder erregten Stimmung zu etwas Leichterem, Heiterem. Auf diese Weise haben Klingner und Wilkinson Horazgedichte interpretiert, und

auch Brink hielt in seinem, dem Kommentar der *ars poetica* angeschlossenen Kapitel 'Poetic Patterns' solche Umschwünge oder Umbrüche für ein wesentliches Charakteristikum der *Oden*. Ich möchte auf einige besonders typische Beispiele für eine solche Kompositionsart nur kurz hinweisen: *C.* I 2, I 9, I 13, III 14, IV 11. In den *Sermonen* und *Episteln* sind die Gedichtbewegungen natürlich komplizierter.

M. Harrison: Again, I would maintain that Horace's excursions into higher styles are actually a way of *including* such 'inappropriate' material in epic, and that his professions of *exclusion* cannot therefore be taken seriously. I would indeed agree that Horace has the capacity to switch between stylistic levels within the same poem, just as he can in his work as a whole, but this in my view is a larger and more frequent technique than that of 'generic disavowal'.

Mme Thill: Horace a-t-il voulu faire œuvre nouvelle en incluant dans son lyrisme des éléments épiques ? Il nous manque des maillons de la chaîne qui permettraient de répondre avec certitude:

— en Grèce, des œuvres lyriques de l'époque alexandrine;
— à Rome, la plupart des textes des *neoteroi*.

On peut remarquer cependant que Théocrite a imité Homère (*Herakles Leontophonos*), que Callimaque a imité Pindare (*Epinikion à Sosibios*), deux exemples de 'grands genres' inclus dans de plus petits. Sans revenir à Catulle, notons que les *Bucoliques* de Virgile, qui ne sont pas une œuvre lyrique, mais apparentée au lyrisme, incluent l'*epos*, en particulier l'*epyllion* dans la *Sixième*. (On pourrait rapprocher cet exemple de l'*Ode* III 27 d'Horace [Europe], que vous avez commentée.)

En partant des observations que l'on peut faire sur l'imitation, je penserais volontiers qu'Horace continue une pratique en usage depuis l'époque alexandrine dans les différents genres poétiques, et qui a continué à se développer à Rome.

M. Harrison: You are right to raise the possibility that generic crossing occurred in lost Hellenistic lyric, given its frequency in other

Hellenistic poetry. This seems not imposible, but, as you say, the evidence is simply not available; there are a few lyric fragments in *Collectanea Alexandrina* and *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, but not enough to be useful or significant. The general Hellenistic trend seems to be away from elaborate lyric (cf. G.O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* [Oxford 1988], 16).

M. Schrijvers: Pour circonscrire le genre ancien de la poésie lyrique, il faut, je crois, à côté des thèmes lyriques que vous avez signalés dans l'*Art poétique*, et des formes métriques, ajouter le fait que le poème lyrique est par excellence le poème d'une occasion et d'une situation spécifiques. Il est évident qu'Horace lui-même a lié ce dernier élément à la notion du genre lyrique, parce qu'il l'a thématisé à mainte reprises dans ses *Odes*.

M. Harrison: You must be right that Horace's 'occasional' odes for festivals and the like recall in a muted way the original socio-religious functions of Greek archaic lyric. As for your account of *Ode* I 6, you are surely right that Horace is here, amongst other things, showing in practice his unsuitability for writing epic by satirising epic terminology.

M. Tränkle: Im Zusammenhang mit den von Ihnen angenommenen 'epic inclusions' haben Sie auf die Erwähnung epischer Szenen und die Verwendung epischer Motive, aber auch auf epischen Sprachgebrauch verwiesen. Nun fällt mir auf, dass im Falle von *C.* I 6 die Wortwahl teilweise seltsam unepisch ist. Besonders merkwürdig ist, dass die Μῆνις Achills als *stomachus* bezeichnet wird, aber auch das prosaische *rem gerere* der Verse 3 f. und *duplex* (7) wäre hier zu nennen. Wie müssen wir diese Tatsache erklären ? Liegt hier ein Unvermögen des Dichters im Sinne der Ausführungen von B. Axelson (*Unpoetische Wörter* [Lund 1945], 98 ff.) vor, oder hängt es mit den besonderen dichterischen Absichten des Horaz zusammen?

Plurimum in *C.* IV 2, 30 würde ich mit dem vorausgehenden *laborem* verbinden. Es verstärkt so den im Zusammenhang der Stelle entscheidend wichtigen Gedanken des emsigen Bienenfleisses des

Dichters: *per laborem plurimum* entspricht auf der Ebene des Vergleichs den *operosa... carmina* der Verse 31 f. Neben *nemus* wäre *plurimum* ein müssiges Füllsel.

M. Harrison: You are right to observe the 'unepic' and satirical slant given to epic vocabulary in *C.* I 6. I would interpret this as Horace's attempt simultaneously to allude to Varius' Homerizing poetry and to make fun of it. As for *plurimum* in *C.* IV 2, 30, I follow Bentley in taking it with *nemus*, with which it seems to have much more literary significance, introducing the new (callimachean) idea of variety and versatility rather than once again stressing the theme of effort, already present twice in *laborem* (29) and *operosa* (31).

M. Ludwig: Eine Bemerkung, die helfen soll, den Bezug von *plurimum* auf *laborem* in *C.* IV 2, 29 f. zu sichern: Dem Sinne und der Wortstellung innerhalb der Strophe nach ist der Bezug von *plurimum* auf *laborem* ausgezeichnet. Anstössig war dann aber bisher das angeblich isolierte *nemus*. Aber *nemus* ist meines Erachtens nicht isoliert: *uvidi Tiburis* kann ἀπὸ κοινοῦ auf *nemus* und *ripas* bezogen werden. Dagegen spricht nicht die Stellung des *-que*. Dieses Wort wird in der Dichtung mehrfach nicht an das eigentlich zu kopulierende Wort (also hier an *ripas*) angehängt. Vgl. z.B. Fr. Klingner in seiner Horazausgabe, S. 337: "*que* aut *ve* aut *ne*: suspenduntur ad vocabula ἀπὸ κοινοῦ inter bina sententiae cola posita...". In diesem Bereich sind meines Erachtens die Parallelen zu suchen. *Circa nemus uvidique / Tiburis ripas* erscheint mir so als geschlossener Ausdruck, in dem *uvidi Tiburis* gedanklich sowohl auf *nemus* als auf *ripas* zu beziehen ist. Im übrigen spricht gegen die Verbindung von *nemus* und *plurimum* (oder einem anderen konjizierbaren Adjektiv), dass dann der nicht ortsspezifische Wald mit dem Ufer von Tibur koordiniert werden würde.

Bentley, der zuerst *plurimum* zu *nemus* zog, scheint auch *uvidi Tiburis* ἀπὸ κοινοῦ sowohl auf *nemus* als auch auf *ripas* (wofür er lieber *rivos* schrieb) bezogen zu haben ("plurimum vero esse nemus circa Tibur... satis constat"). Dann aber entsteht das Ungleichgewicht,

dass *nemus* ein zusätzliches Attribut hat, *ripas* aber nicht, womit der anfängliche Anstoss nicht behoben, sondern verschoben wäre.

M. Harrison: That an epithetless *nemus* could be in an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction with *ripas*, depending on *uvidique Tiburis*, is certainly a possible reading of *C.* IV 2, 29 ff. Personally, I still agree with Bentley that *per laborem* goes well on its own; *nemus* needs *plurimum* as an emphatic epithet to precede it and balance *uvidique Tiburis*, and an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction still seems possible even if *plurimum* goes together with *nemus*, as Bentley seems to have assumed ("about many a grove of damp Tibur and about its banks"). That *ripas* has no epithet of its own seems no argument for *nemus* to stand similarly alone, since *ripas* goes closely with the genitive *uvidique Tiburis*, a complement which functions similarly to an adjective.