

**GENERIC ENRICHMENT, READER EXPECTATION, AND METAPOETIC TREES**

**IN HORACE'S *ODES***

by

**John Joseph Scanlon**

B.A. in Greek and Latin, Catholic University of America, 2005

M.A. in Classics, University of Pittsburgh, 2009

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2014

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

DIETRICH SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

John Joseph Scanlon

It was defended on

March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2014

and approved by

Edwin D. Floyd, Professor, Department of Classics

Dennis Looney, Professor, Department of French and Italian

D. Mark Possanza, Associate Professor, Department of Classics

Dissertation Director: Mae J. Smethurst, Professor, Department of Classics

Copyright © by John Joseph Scanlon

2014

**GENERIC ENRICHMENT, READER EXPECTATION, AND METAPOETIC TREES IN  
HORACE'S *ODES***

John Joseph Scanlon, Ph.D.

University of Pittsburgh, 2014

Generic enrichment, sometimes known as *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, is a well-known feature of Roman poetry that plays an integral role in Horatian lyric. This study explores Horace's use of metapoetic trees as a tool for enacting and representing his attempts at generic enrichment in the *Odes*. After reviewing the traditional origins of genre theory in classical literature and attributing generic enrichment to an Alexandrian and Roman desire to enhance the value of their poetry, this study reconciles the apparent conflict between generic enrichment and prescriptive, invariable literary kinds by recasting genre as a set of expectations shared between author and audience in a continual and ever-evolving literary dialogue. Having done so, this study then reviews the ancient poets' use of programmatic trees before specifically discussing their potential use by Horace as a means of engaging with the generic expectations of his audience. As proof, this study continues by recasting *Odes* 2.13, Horace's poem celebrating his near-death escape from a falling tree, as a generic manifesto which reflects Horace's successful integration of epic, elegy, and tragedy into the entirety of the *Odes*. After revealing the multi-generic nature of *Odes* 2.13, this study concludes by showing how Horace employs metapoetic trees throughout the remainder of the *Odes*, and particularly within the three poems which revisit the falling tree

episode, to transform the divinities to whom Horace attributes his salvation (Faunus, the Muses, and Liber) into symbols of the very genres he has adapted to his lyric verse. In doing so, Horace establishes an interconnected web of arboricentric poems spanning the *Odes* which comments on the generically enriched nature of Horatian lyric.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	ix
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 GENRE, GENERIC ENRICHMENT, AND AUDIENCE EXPECTATION	11
2.1 GENRE: ORIGINS TO ALEXANDRIA	12
2.2 HORACE AND GENRE: <i>ARS POETICA</i> 73-88	21
2.3 PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ON GENRE IN HORACE	24
2.4 REFLECTION ON PRIOR SCHOLARSHIP	42
2.5 GENRE AS AUDIENCE EXPECTATION	44
2.6 LYRIC EXPECTATIONS	47
3.0 TREES AND GENERIC ENRICHMENT	58
3.1 PRELIMINARY NOTES ON UNUSUAL TREES	58
3.1.1 Unexpected <i>Arbores</i> : Vine and Ivy	59
3.1.2 Unforgotten <i>Arbores</i> : Ships	61
3.2 METAPOETIC TREES	65
3.2.1 General Metapoetic Trees in Horace	67
3.2.2 Horatian Trees and Generic Enrichment	72
3.3 METAPOETIC SHIPS	77
3.3.1 General Usage of the Ship of Poetry	77

3.3.2	Ships as Generic <i>Recusationes</i>	81
3.3.3	Horace's Use of the Ship of Poetry	84
3.4	GENERIC TREE/SHIP INTERACTION IN THE <i>ODES</i>	89
4.0	GENERIC ENRICHMENT IN <i>ODES</i> 2.13	99
4.1	PRIOR GENERIC ANALYSIS OF <i>ODES</i> 2.13	100
4.2	A GENERIC PRELUDE: <i>ODES</i> 2.1-12	102
4.3	THE GENERICALLY SUGGESTIVE METER OF <i>ODES</i> 2.13	110
4.4	<i>ODES</i> 2.13.1-12: IAMBIC	112
4.5	<i>ODES</i> 2.13.13-20: LYRIC	115
4.6	<i>ODES</i> 2.13.21-32: EPIC AND ELEGY	117
4.6.1	"Lyric" Models: Sappho and Alcaeus	118
4.6.2	Epic Proserpina	125
4.6.3	Elegiac Aeacus	128
4.6.4	The Epic <i>Vulgus</i>	132
4.6.5	Final Thoughts on <i>Odes</i> 2.13.21-32	135
4.7	<i>ODES</i> 2.13.33-40: TRAGEDY	136
4.7.1	Unhelpful Underworld Allusions	139
4.7.2	Prometheus, Eumenides, and Tantalus	145
4.7.3	Orion and Cerberus	152
4.8	MOVING BEYOND <i>ODES</i> 2.13	159
4.8.1	The Puzzle of Horace's Salvation	160
4.8.2	A Clarifying Comparison with <i>Odes</i> 1.32	164
5.0	THE GENERIC GODS OF HORACE'S <i>ODES</i>	170

5.1	FAUNUS AND ELEGY	170
5.1.1	Faunus, God of Trees, Ships, and Love	171
5.1.2	Lyric, Elegy, and the Sea of Love	179
5.1.3	Faunus, “the God who Controls the Sea” in <i>Odes</i> 1.5	182
5.1.4	Conclusion: Faunus	189
5.2	THE MUSES AND EPIC	191
5.2.1	The Epic Connotations of “ <i>Musa</i> ”	193
5.2.2	Named Muses, Harmonization, and Instruments	195
5.2.3	The Meaning of “ <i>Camena</i> ”	200
5.2.4	Epic and Lyric in <i>Odes</i> 3.4 and 1.12	202
5.2.5	Conclusion: Muses	210
5.3	LIBER AND TRAGEDY	211
5.3.1	Liber’s Generic Potential	211
5.3.2	Political Anxiety in <i>Odes</i> 3.8	213
5.3.3	Examples of Tragic Civil War in the <i>Odes</i>	217
5.3.4	Linking Liber to Civil War in the <i>Odes</i>	221
5.3.5	Conclusion: Liber	225
5.4	LOOKING BACK TO <i>ODES</i> 2.13	225
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	227

## PREFACE

It is only fitting that a study of generic enrichment should recognize the many contributors whose combined efforts have helped to bring this dissertation to completion. My most heartfelt thanks go to my dissertation director and committee for their invaluable guidance and abounding patience. I also owe much gratitude to the entire faculty and staff of the Department of Classics at the University of Pittsburgh for providing me with an outstanding education, and to the faculty and staff of the Department of Greek and Latin at the Catholic University of America for laying the foundations for my career in classics, especially Stratis Papaioannou and William McCarthy with whom I first studied Horace.

I would also like to thank my first Latin teacher, John Buettler, for helping me discover my passion for antiquity, my graduate student colleagues in the Classics Department at the University of Pittsburgh for their friendship and insight, and the undergraduate members of Eta Sigma Phi at the University of Pittsburgh whose enthusiasm for the ancient world has been a constant source of inspiration.

I owe an immeasurable debt of gratitude to all of my friends and family members for supporting me throughout my academic career, but I must single out my parents, Joseph and Despina, and my brother, Christopher, for their never-ending love and constant encouragement throughout my life. Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Emily, without whom I could achieve nothing: *sume superbiam quaesitam meritis, Melpomene*.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Ever since their traditional origins in the writings of Plato the concept of separate literary kinds and the notion of generic propriety, the idea that certain genres should treat certain subjects in certain ways, has been an important element of both ancient and modern literary criticism.<sup>1</sup> Equally as familiar is the reality that genres often defy such attempts at compartmentalization since many works of literature purposefully deviate from their expected generic boundaries by coopting generically “unsuitable” subject matter or methods. Harrison’s study of this phenomenon, which he calls “generic enrichment,” explains:<sup>2</sup>

I define ‘generic enrichment’ as the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres....The general concept of generic enrichment, of the creative confrontation of different literary genres, is not a radical innovation either in classical scholarship or in wider genre theory; the name is a convenient new label for a familiar general idea.

Under what guise has this “familiar general idea” previously been known? Fantuzzi and Hunter tell us that earlier scholarship used negative terminology (“generic contamination,” “generic corruption,” “generic confusion,” etc.) when speaking about this process because the Alexandrians who practiced it seemed to have no worthwhile reason for such rule breaking:<sup>3</sup>

The concept of the ‘contamination of literary genres’ has often, and rightly, been identified as one of the distinctive characteristics of the refined poetry which flourished in the Alexandria of Callimachus in the first half of the third century BC. Much less correctly, however, such ‘contamination’ has at times been associated with an intellectualizing pursuit of novelty at all costs, with a ludic and subversive sophistication which was wholly preoccupied with books and only too ready to sacrifice the traditional literary system. Arid intellectualism, experimentalism and arbitrariness are indeed the qualities most often

---

<sup>1</sup> On the Platonic origins of genre theory in western literary criticism see section 2.1.

<sup>2</sup> Harrison (2007) 1.

<sup>3</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 17-8.

thought to characterize Alexandrian ‘contamination’, though the modern scholarly sense of deliberate generic arbitrariness of Hellenistic poetry in fact rather hardened over time. A. Couat in 1882, Ph. E. Legrand in 1898, R. Heinze in 1919, and L. Deubner in 1921, still spoke, respectively, of ‘mélange’, of ‘confusion des genres’, of ‘Gemisch’ and of ‘Mischung’ of genres, without pointing to a deliberate authorial policy.

Harrison tells us that Brunetière was one of the first to abandon such negative views by “[seeking] to trace the development of literary genres as (essentially) a process of Darwinian natural selection, with genres coming into being, modifying through interbreeding, and passing away according to the needs and requirements of differing cultural circumstances.”<sup>4</sup> This idea of “generic evolution” was subsequently taken up by Kroll and formed the basis of what he called “the crossing of genres” (*Die Kreuzung der Gattungen*),<sup>5</sup> a positive reinterpretation of the concept which claims that authors purposefully use generic enrichment in order to impart originality and variety to their texts.<sup>6</sup> Kroll’s theories left a lasting impression on subsequent discussions of genre in classical scholarship<sup>7</sup> and prepared the way for those who would later discuss the concept of generic enrichment in the works of Roman poets influenced by Alexandrian genre theory.

Horatian scholarship in particular has benefited from this revised understanding of generic enrichment. In addition to Harrison’s study of the *Odes* which seeks to show “how ‘guest’ modes are skillfully incorporated into the ‘host’ genre to produce an enriched and extended lyric tradition,”<sup>8</sup> works by Lowrie and Davis consider the programmatic benefits of generic enrichment as a tool for the expansion of Horatian lyric and its promotion over other genres of poetry.<sup>9</sup> This study will build upon the works of these authors by considering Horace’s use of trees as a vehicle for enacting and representing his attempts at generic enrichment in the

---

<sup>4</sup> Harrison (2007) 13 citing Brunetière (1890).

<sup>5</sup> Kroll (1924) 202–24.

<sup>6</sup> Kroll’s views will be discussed in section 2.1

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Schwinge (1986) 44–7. For a retrospective view on Kroll’s “Kreuzung” see Barchiesi in Harrison (2001).

<sup>8</sup> Harrison (2007) 170.

<sup>9</sup> Harrison (2007) 168–206; Lowrie (1997); Davis (1991). The specific content of all three studies will be discussed in section 2.1

*Odes*. The importance of nature, and specifically trees, in ancient literature is another familiar subject, and Roman poets made abundant use of programmatic natural imagery in their work.<sup>10</sup> Horace is no exception to this trend; his poems frequently include elements of the natural world which can also function as metapoetic statements.<sup>11</sup> But a potentially discouraging question comes to mind. If generic enrichment is such a well-treated phenomenon, particularly with regard to the *Odes*, and if nature imagery, too, is a common subject, is there anything new and worthwhile to be gained from an investigation which combines the two? Or are we, to borrow a phrase from Horace himself, foolishly carrying logs into a forest?<sup>12</sup>

Although it is true that trees occasionally appear in existing treatments of generic enrichment, tree-centric treatments of genre in the works of the Augustan poets are a relatively recent trend in classical scholarship. Henkel's 2009 dissertation, for instance, argues that Vergil uses the metapoetic potential of trees in order to combine Gallan love elegy and Theocritean pastoral in the *Eclogues* and, citing an unpublished paper delivered at the 2008 meeting of the American Philological Association delivered by Marquis, Henkel argues that a similar process can be found at work in the *Aeneid*.<sup>13</sup> Henkel also claims that Vergil's use of tree symbolism was adopted by Propertius, Ovid, and Horace as part of "an important means through which Augustan poets respond to one another's poetry by offering rival literalizations for important literary-critical metaphors."<sup>14</sup> Fenton's 2008 study of the "Parade of Trees" in *Odes* 1 supports

---

<sup>10</sup> On nature in Greek literature see e.g. Peradotto (1964); Forster (1952); Forster (1942); Forster (1936); Haight (1910). For Roman poets see e.g. Gowers (2011); Leach (1966); Highet (1957); Sargeant (1920); Howe (1911). A review of nature symbolism as a programmatic tool will be included in Chapter 3 of this study.

<sup>11</sup> On Horace's programmatic use of nature/trees see Chapter 3 of this study and e.g. Henderson (1999) chap. 5; Gold (1993); Commager (1966) 235–306.

<sup>12</sup> See Horace *Satires* 1.10.34: *in silvam non ligna feras insanius*.

<sup>13</sup> Henkel (2009). On Marquis's treatment of metagenic trees in *Aeneid* 12 see Henkel (2009) 251-3.

<sup>14</sup> On Henkel's treatment of these poets see section 5.3 of his study. Henkel says little about tree imagery in the *Odes*, spending most of his consideration of Horace on the *Satires*, the *Ars Poetica*, and a brief mention of *Odes* 3.30.10-4. Admittedly, Henkel does tell us that his discussion of Horace is in no way meant to be exhaustive (260), but his relative silence regarding the *Odes* does lend support to the direction of this study.

this assertion by revealing an elaborate program of symbolism in which different species of trees work together to define Horatian lyric as multi-generic hybrid over which Horace has achieved an Orpheus-like mastery.<sup>15</sup>

In the hopes of making further contributions to this emerging topic of Augustan literary criticism this study will examine the use of trees for the purpose of generic enrichment in Horace's *Odes*. We will begin in Chapter 2 by charting the development of genre theory from its traditional origins in the writings of Plato to the literary culture of the Hellenistic and Augustan periods. Along the way we will notice that poets from both of these eras, including Horace himself, simultaneously defend the sanctity of literary kinds while nevertheless permitting, and in some cases requiring, acts of generic enrichment which defy generic boundaries. To make sense of this paradox we will review prior scholarship on the subject of generic enrichment in Horace, ultimately coming to the conclusion that we must abandon prescriptive conceptions of genre in favor of a newer understanding of literary kinds which views genre as an author's tool for establishing a literary dialogue with his readers. In this scenario, generic enrichment thus becomes a process wherein authors like Horace are not "breaking rules" but instead defying and fulfilling their audiences generic expectations based on their prior literary experience. Having demonstrated the popularity of this view in recent scholarship, we will then catalogue the major expectations Horace's readers would have possessed with regard to lyric poetry in order that we might more easily recognize Horace's interaction with these expectations in subsequent chapters of this study.

---

<sup>15</sup> See Fenton (2008) which will be discussed in detail in subsection 3.2.2 of this study. Fenton's study and our own analysis of *Odes* 2.13 and Horace's savior divinities (Chapters 4 and 5) complement each other well: Fenton asserts that an elaborate tree program established in *Odes* 1 has wider applications that reach into individual tree poems in *Odes* 2 and 3. Our study asserts that tree symbolism in *Odes* 2 has the same effect on tree poems found in *Odes* 1 and 3.

Chapter 3 will address a specific symbol which Horace uses to enact and represent generic enrichment in the *Odes*, the tree. After reaffirming the arboreal nature of several items (ivy, the vine, and ships), we will reflect on the ancient poets' use of the tree proper as a metapoetic symbol before focusing specifically on its use in Horace for the purpose of general programmatic symbolism and generic enrichment more specifically. From here we will move on to metapoetic ships, first showing how the general "Ship of Poetry" metaphor which likens the poet to a helmsman directing his song was adapted to Callimachean genre aesthetics in order to depict the singer as guiding his poetry away from the deeper waters of the *genus grande*. After providing examples of the generic Ship of Poetry in the works of other Roman poets, we will then discuss Horace's use of the symbol in the *Odes*. The final portion of this chapter will explore the generic implications of Horace's combined use of trees and ships together within individual odes. We will learn that Horace consistently depicts sailing as a dangerous act of trespass contrasted against safer, tree-centered, lyric activities in order to dramatize the commonly-held notion that generic enrichment, the trespassing of generic boundaries, is a more dangerous poetic activity than simple adherence to lyric expectations. Yet we will find through deep consideration of *Odes* 1.3 that Horace also proves he is fully capable of successfully enriching his lyric in spite of this danger.

The large-scale generic tree/ship interaction discussed at the end of Chapter 3, which takes on generic significance through a reinterpretation of *Odes* 1.3, suggests that similar analysis of other metapoetic odes may likewise reveal previously unrecognized generic programs throughout the *Odes*. As proof of this, Chapters 4 and 5 will discuss one such program which comes to light through an expanded analysis of *Odes* 2.13, which presents what Nisbet and

Hubbard call a “familiar but puzzling episode” from Horace’s personal narrative.<sup>16</sup> This ode recalls Horace’s narrow escape from death at the hands of a falling tree before transitioning into a reflection on human mortality and a vision of the underworld in which the spirits of Sappho and Alcaeus enthrall the denizens of the nether realm. As one of the most unique – and perhaps most unusual – poems in Horace’s lyric collection, *Odes* 2.13 has always been a subject of scrutiny, although scholars have traditionally struggled to determine the meaning behind this ode. West’s commentary on *Odes* 2.13 summarizes the complicated nature of this poem’s scholastic history before, in characteristic fashion, dismissing it all:<sup>17</sup>

How serious is this? What is Horace trying to say? In the words of Nisbet and Hubbard, ‘what is the intention of the whole?’ Did his narrow escape from the falling tree lead him to see his place in the hierarchy of poets and contemplate the possibility of his own survival after death (Reitzenstein, 358)? Is it likely that ‘the frequency with which Horace returned to the incident of the falling tree suggests an abiding concern that resisted all attempts to banish it by ridicule’ (Commager, 141)? Was the poem born out of Horace’s enthusiasm for Sappho and Alcaeus? Was poetry ‘with all its glory...the mainspring of the ode’ (Fraenkel, 167)? Does the poem express Horace’s new understanding of the essence of his art, as offering in its harmonies a release from grief and pain? Is it related to the spiritual nature of man, giving sense and order to life against a background of random senseless chance (Syndikus, 427)? Is Horace suggesting an unspoken thought that ‘if he escapes the meaningless accidents of fortune...perhaps he himself may have the same capacity to enthrall, console, and to survive’ (Nisbet and Hubbard, 1978: 205)?

These explanations are all attempts to find deep meanings in the poem, and they fail.

...

Poets do not need to preach and there is no need to believe that there must be a message. Sometimes they write as the poem takes them. The Muse has her own values, and tells her devotees when their poem works. Sometimes, even, they write for fun. Horace was Mercury’s man (2.17.19) and Mercury was a mischief-maker (1.10.7-12). And sometimes, in the middle of cheerful poems they chill the blood, as Horace does here in lines 13-20.

West’s ultimate conclusion by no means constitutes the sole legitimate interpretation of this ode. Many scholars, both before and after West, analyze this poem using methods that reveal great programmatic significance in this ode, and in many ways *Odes* 2.13 itself seems to demand such scrutiny. Poems in which Horace tells stories about himself are much loved by scholars

---

<sup>16</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 201.

<sup>17</sup> West (1998) 91–2, 94–5.

attempting a metapoetic interpretation of Horace's works,<sup>18</sup> and the questions regarding poetic immortality implicit in this particular poem's rare depiction of Alcaeus and Sappho *in propria persona* cry out for deeper analysis.

Yet for all this prior scholarship on *Odes* 2.13 there remain many nagging uncertainties. Consider, for example, the aforementioned inclusion of Sappho and Alcaeus just described. Although early scholarship staunchly supports the notion that *Odes* 2.13 is Horace's attempt to align his poetic voice with that of Alcaeus rather than Sappho, later commentaries convincingly present a wide range of arguments supporting either this opinion, the exact opposite opinion, or some compromise between the two.<sup>19</sup> Certainly there is something to be learned from these figures regarding Horace's self-conception and his feelings regarding his relation to his poetic models, but in the face of such contradictory contemporary interpretations, which is most sound? Similarly, consider the ambiguity inherent in Horace's purposeful alterations to the very story described in *Odes* 2.13, Horace's longest treatment of the tree episode. In his three subsequent retellings of the event in later odes (2.17, 3.4, and 3.8) Horace assigns responsibility for his salvation to three different divine entities: Faunus, the Muses, and Liber, respectively. *Odes* 2.13 thus sets up Horace's readers for one of the strangest puzzles to be found in the lyric collection. Is Horace being negligent, foolish, deceptive, playful, or something else entirely when he tells us something in one poem only to contradict himself in another? All manner of interpretations can be found for this ambiguity but each differs in its conclusions,<sup>20</sup> once again leaving us with a void in our understanding of what is undoubtedly an important poem in the *Odes*.

---

<sup>18</sup> Lowrie (1997) 185: "Mostly, the stories Horace tells about himself engage poetics, no matter the genre." As examples Lowrie cites Krasser (1995); Henderson (1993); Freudenburg (1993); Davis (1991) 78–114; Johnson (1983) 119–34; Leach (1971).

<sup>19</sup> For the complicated history of this debate, see subsection 4.6.1 of this study.

<sup>20</sup> On the varied interpretations of the contradictions revolving around the savior gods see Chapter 5 of this study.

Perhaps most frustrating is the simple fact that even if one were to pick and choose their preferred answers to these questions and others like them, many (if not all) of the commentaries fail to truly address these issues with an eye towards the fact that this poem is addressed to a tree. There is no shortage of dangerous moments in Horace's personal narrative, and this poem could, after all, have been just another Philippi ode.<sup>21</sup> Yet Horace decided to place these difficult questions and enticing ambiguities in the context of a tree ode, and few have considered the ramifications of this fact. Ultimately, then, Horace has left us with a poem which scholarship knows is important but does not fully understand, particularly with regard to the significance of the tree. This study, therefore, is an attempt to solve this dilemma by presenting a new interpretation of *Odes* 2.13, one which not only accounts for the numerous complications inherent in this surprisingly complex poem, but also refuses to lose sight of the most underappreciated element of the poem, its addressee, a miserable hunk of wood (*triste lignum*, 11).<sup>22</sup>

Some of the most successful and extensive interpretations of *Odes* 2.13 to date focus on treating the poem as a vehicle for Horace to address questions of genre, and as such a generic analysis of *Odes* 2.13 seems the proper starting point for any attempt at clarifying the significance of this poem. To this end, Chapter 4 will consist of a reinterpretation of *Odes* 2.13 which attempts to recast this poem as a reflection, in microcosm, of the generic enrichment taking place throughout the entirety of Horace's *Odes*. Specifically, it will show how Horace has consciously designed *Odes* 2.13 as a poem which incorporates numerous non-lyric genres while

---

<sup>21</sup> See e.g. *Odes* 2.7.9.

<sup>22</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all Latin texts are taken from the Oxford Classical Texts series (OCT), all Greek texts are taken from the online edition of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG), and all translations are my own. Abbreviations for the names of classical authors and their works are taken from the Oxford Classical Dictionary (OCD), and abbreviated versions of modern journal titles are taken from *L'Année Philologique*. Liddell Scott Jones *Greek-English Lexicon* and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* are abbreviated as LSJ and OLD, respectively.

nevertheless retaining its lyric unity. We will begin by explaining how, the series of poems which lead up to the falling tree poem (*Odes* 2.1-12) form a programmatic series that engages Horace's readers' generic expectations and foreshadows the generic complexity of both the meter and content of *Odes* 2.13 itself. Then we will consider one of the most recent and well-known of prior genre-focused analyses on *Odes* 2.13, that of Davis, who believes this poem presents the iambic genre's inferior response to the vicissitudes of life before next asserting the superiority of the lyric response and, hence, the lyric genre as a whole. Davis' treatment demonstrates that a generic analysis of *Odes* 2.13 is not only possible but also fruitful for anyone attempting to discuss Horace's elevation of lyric over other genres, an undeniable feature of the poetic program of the *Odes*. Where it fails, however, is in its unfair limitation of the generic scope of *Odes* 2.13 to merely iambic and lyric poetry. To this end, we will build upon Davis's analysis by examining how Horace engages with his readers' generic expectations in order to ensure that they will identify multiple non-lyric genres at work as they progress through the poem, dividing it into four sections which each embody a particular genre or set of genres: iambic, lyric, epic, elegy, and tragedy. Throughout this analysis we will take care to show how Horace is able to seamlessly incorporate this non-lyric material while nevertheless maintaining a strong lyric character in each section of *Odes* 2.13.

Having treated the expanded generic nature of *Odes* 2.13 we will attempt to resolve the remaining, unexplored element in the poem, namely, the meaning behind Horace's refusal to name his savior divinities. To do so we will show that Horace's silence encourages us to compare *Odes* 2.13, the falling tree poem, with *Odes* 1.32, in which Horace speaks of peaceful times spent under a tree playing while playing the lyre of Alcaeus, which sings of Liber, the Muses, and Venus (*Liberum et Musas Veneremque*, 9). The similarity between these gods and

those who rescued Horace from the tree (Liber, the Muses, and Faunus) will allow us recast the divinities' act of salvation as a metaphor for Horace's successful integration of non-lyric genres associated with these gods into Horace's lyric *Odes*. This point will be demonstrated in Chapter 5, which will show how Horace uses the three poems that revisit the falling tree episode in order to associate their respective divinities with genres: Faunus with elegy, the Muses with epic, and Liber with tragedy. Although we will treat each god (or set of gods, in the case of the Muses) separately, our methodology will repeat itself. Within each ode that names a savior divinity we will find clues placed by Horace that guide us towards linking that god with a genre of poetry, and this association will then be reinforced by other poems throughout the *Odes* that prominently feature the divinity in question. Oftentimes this will require us to recognize dialogues Horace has created between poems, a possibility for which Horace has already prepared us by asking us to compare *Odes* 2.13 to *Odes* 1.32 in order to bring out the significance of both. Additionally, we will also note the important role that tree symbolism plays throughout this process.

## 2.0 GENRE, GENERIC ENRICHMENT, AND AUDIENCE EXPECTATION

The goal of this chapter is to provide a foundation for our subsequent treatments of Horace's practice of generic enrichment.<sup>1</sup> We will begin by considering the origin of the genres in western literature and the development of genre theory from Plato, to Alexandria, and ultimately to the *Ars Poetica* of Horace himself. In doing so we will reveal the paradox that lies at the heart of genre theory for Horace and his fellow Roman poets: although genres strictly prescribe the form and subject matter of texts, ancient poets nevertheless allow for, and in some cases even demand, significant deviations from these "sacrosanct" guidelines. In an effort to resolve this paradox we will review prior scholarship on genre in Horace's *Odes*, specifically that which treats this phenomenon of generic enrichment, and identify why and how authors like Horace "contaminate" their texts with materials borrowed from other genres. This will allow us to develop a new understanding of genre not as a set of arbitrarily-obeyed rules but rather as a set of expectations, shared between reader and author and derived from their prior experiences with the genre, which a poet can defy or uphold in accordance with his programmatic needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "generic enrichment," taken from Harrison (2007) was discussed in Chapter 1 and will be further defined in section 2.3.

## 2.1 GENRE: ORIGINS TO ALEXANDRIA

Although little can be known with certainty with regard to genre theory in the oral culture of early antiquity, the concept of literary kinds is believed to have originated in the writings of Plato,<sup>2</sup> whose *Republic* presents a division of literary works based on mode of representation (3.394b-c):

Ὄρθότατα, ἔφην, ὑπέλαβες, καὶ οἶμαί σοι ἤδη δηλοῦν ὃ ἐμπροσθεν οὐχ οἶός τ' ἦ, ὅτι τῆς ποιήσεώς τε καὶ μυθολογίας ἡ μὲν διὰ μιμήσεως ὅλη ἐστίν, ὥσπερ σὺ λέγεις, τραγωδία τε καὶ κωμῳδία, ἡ δὲ δι' ἀπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποιητοῦ—εὐροῖς δ' ἂν αὐτὴν μάλιστα πού ἐν διθυράμβοις — ἡ δ' αὖ δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἐν τε τῇ τῶν ἐπῶν ποιήσει, πολλαχοῦ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοθι, εἴ μοι μανθάνεις.

“You understood me most correctly,” I said, “and I think now I can make clear to you that which I was unable to before, namely, that one type of poetry and storytelling is entirely accomplished through representation, just as you say, tragedy and comedy, but another type is accomplished through the narration of the poet himself – you would find this perhaps best in dithyramb – and still a third type is accomplished through both, as in epic poetry and many other types, if you understand me.”

This tripartite division according to mode appears in the writings of Aristotle, whose *Poetics* similarly classifies acts of μίμησις according to whether they feature narration, dramatic impersonation, or a combination of the two (1448a.19-24):

Ἐτι δὲ τούτων τρίτη διαφορὰ τὸ ὡς ἕκαστα τούτων μιμήσασθαι ἂν τις. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ μιμεῖσθαι ἔστιν ὅτε μὲν ἀπαγγέλλοντα, ἢ ἕτερόν τι γιγνόμενον ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος ποιεῖ ἢ ὡς τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ μεταβάλλοντα, ἢ πάντας ὡς πράττοντας καὶ ἐνεργοῦντας ττοὺς μιμουμένους†.

“Beside the two already cited, there is a third distinction: namely, the mode in which the various objects are represented. For it is possible to use the same media to offer a mimesis of the same objects in any one of three ways: first, by alternation between narrative and dramatic impersonation (as in Homeric poetry); second, by employing the voice of narrative without variation; third, by wholly dramatic presentation of the agents.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Harrison (2007) 2.

<sup>3</sup> Translations of Aristotle’s *Poetics* are taken from Halliwell (1986).

In the opening of this passage Aristotle makes plain that mode of representation is but one of several criteria used to categorize acts of μίμησις. He first introduces the other two, means of representation and subject matter, at the start of the *Poetics* (1447a.13-8):

ἐποποιία δὴ καὶ ἡ τῆς τραγωδίας ποίησις ἔτι δὲ κωμῳδία καὶ ἡ  
διθυραμβοποιητικὴ καὶ τῆς ἀλητικῆς ἢ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικῆς πᾶσαι  
τυγχάνουσιν οὐσαὶ μίμησις τὸ σύνολον· διαφέρουσι δὲ ἀλλήλων τρισίν, ἣ  
γὰρ τῶ ἐν ἑτέροις μιμῆσθαι ἢ τῶ ἕτερον ἢ τῶ ἑτέρως καὶ μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον.

“Now, epic and tragic poetry, as well as comedy and dithyramb (and most music for the pipe or lyre), are all, taken as a whole kinds of mimesis. But they differ from one another in three respects: namely, in the *media* or the *objects* or the *mode* of mimesis.”

Dividing poetic works according to media involves determining how they use features such as rhythm, language, and melody, and whether or not they employ prose or verse.<sup>4</sup> Division by objects, on the other hand, concerns whether the characters being represented are morally better, worse, or similar to the audience of the work in question.<sup>5</sup> This Aristotelian system is important not only because it includes a useful expansion of Plato’s more limited treatment, but also because it establishes the idea that each genre acquires its own appropriate mode, means, and subject matter as a result of natural developmental processes. This focus on the idea of appropriateness (τὸ πρέπον/*decorum*), is cited by scholars as the feature of Aristotle’s theory of genre which gives rise to one of the most well-known elements of conventional genre theory, namely, that certain subjects are suited to particular meters and vice versa.<sup>6</sup>

Aristotelian genre theory eventually entered into the literary culture of Alexandria, where it experienced a mixed reception. Alexandrian philologists, driven by their intense study of the literature of archaic and classical Greece, strove to categorize and define the works they idolized into literary kinds based on subject and form. As Fantuzzi and Hunter point out, however, the writings of the Alexandrians themselves often defy categorization by these same standards.

---

<sup>4</sup> Discussed at *Poetics* 1447a.18-1447b.29.

<sup>5</sup> Discussed at *Poetics* 1448a.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Harrison (2007) 3; Conte (1994) 35.

Callimachus, they explain, “abandoned the lyric tradition of Simonides and Pindar” by composing epinicians in iambics and elegiac couplets, and three of his hymns (to Apollo, Athena, and Demeter) “appear to be a sort of cross between narrative Homeric hymns and motifs and forms of presentation which had been peculiar to archaic choral hymnody.”<sup>7</sup> Theocritus’s mimic poems, meanwhile, are a “prime example of the contamination of genres because they combine the epic metre, the metre *par excellence* of third-person narrative presentation, with various important elements of first- and second-person mimetic or mimetic-lyric performances.

Thus, *Idyll* 22 even combines epic narrative with stichomythic dialogue; in *Idyll* 10, elements from the mime tradition are translated into popular songs in hexameters; in *Idylls* 3 and 11, the same thing happens with love serenades, in the second part of *Idyll* 15 with a hieratic hymn, and in *Idyll* 24.7-9 with a lullaby; *Idyll* 1 presents a sort of mimesis of the strophic structure of ancient lyric through the pauses marked by the refrains, and something similar might be true of *Idyll* 3; *Idyll* 16 contaminates *Bettelgedicht*, mime and encomium. The Theocritean corpus is in fact a veritable Noah’s ark of mimetic-lyric forms which have been adapted to, and hence saved by, their transference to recitative metre.”<sup>8</sup>

Literature of the Hellenistic period therefore presents a paradoxical view of genre in which the conventions of the literary kinds are known, but not respected.<sup>9</sup> To borrow a phrase from Halperin, “it is almost as if the Alexandrians undertook to analyze and define the rules of classic genres in order to be able to violate them all the more vigorously.”<sup>10</sup>

To make sense of the complexity of their literary culture we must understand both the nature of the Alexandrians’ experimentation and the rationale which justified it. As to the former, many earlier scholars of Hellenistic literature view this disregard for generic conventions

---

<sup>7</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 30. See also their evaluation of Callimachus’s “inappropriate” use of elegiac meter in his Hymn to Athena.

<sup>8</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 33. Harrison (2007) 19 corroborates Fantuzzi and Hunter’s view by summarizing Rossi (1971): “An influential voice here has been that of Rossi, whose article on the written and unwritten laws of genre in Greek literature stressed the importance of Hellenistic writers such as Callimachus and Theocritus in subverting and mixing genres: a hybrid poem such as Theocritus 22, which combines the hymn and epyllion with some elements of dramatic form, or Callimachus’ *Aetia*, which combines aetiology with erotic elegy and epinikion, demonstrates how the Hellenistic poets could renew and create genres by creative transgression of post-Aristotelian generic categories.”

<sup>9</sup> An oft-referenced formulation from Rossi (1971) 83 states that in the archaic period the laws of genre were respected, but not written down, whereas in the Hellenistic age they were written down, but not respected.

<sup>10</sup> Halperin (1983) 204.

negatively, believing that the Alexandrians were merely toying with their inheritance in sterile literary exercises.<sup>11</sup> Kroll, however, is one of the first scholars to advance the idea that the “Kreuzung der Gattungen” characteristic of Alexandrian literature stemmed from more than meaningless intellectualism. Instead, Kroll utilizes biological imagery of cross-breeding to show that the Alexandrians were attempting to create new literary kinds either through unconventional pairings of subject and form or by mixing whole existing genres. The purpose of these generic transgressions, he maintains, was the creation of surprisingly original works of literature:<sup>12</sup>

Die Dichter aber benutzen sie für ihre Zwecke, die in der Hauptsache darauf hinauslaufen, in die alten Gattungen und Stoffe neue Variationem zu bringen und dem, was früher schon gesagt war, entweder aus dem Wege zu gehen oder es so umzumodeln, daß es ein neues Antlitz zeigt. Dieses Streben, um jeden Preis modern zu erscheinen und überraschende Effekte zu erzielen...

Why this insistence upon originality? In the archaic and classical periods literary endeavors, and poetry in particular, were deeply rooted in the social occasions during which they were performed or for which they were produced. The symposium, for instance, and the Pan-Hellenic festivals, the dramatic competitions, and even the royal courts of earlier Greece all provided contexts in which the development of specialized literary kinds could occur.<sup>13</sup> In the Hellenistic period, however, these social institutions no longer existed or, if they did exist, did so in a radically changed way. In their place appeared an increasing focus on the physical text as source of poetic activity, medium of transmission, and site of critical analysis. The ramifications of this transition from oral, occasional poetry to written poetry did not escape the Alexandrians, who out of necessity developed a new perspective on the genres they had so intensely studied:<sup>14</sup>

An increased understanding of the nature and contexts of archaic and classical poetry led also to the realization that such contexts were things of the past; the classification of the genre norms of archaic and classical poetry led almost automatically to an awareness of the

---

<sup>11</sup> For a list of such works see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 18, which is quoted in Chapter 1.

<sup>12</sup> Kroll (1924) 202–3. For summary of and perspective on Kroll’s theory see Barchiesi in Harrison (2001) 142–63.

<sup>13</sup> On the importance of occasion with regard to genre and the loss/change of occasion in the Hellenistic period see Rotstein (2012); Griffin (1997) 63; Murray in Rudd (1996) 89; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xix.

<sup>14</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 25–6.

impossibility of writing anything else in those genres, at least if the same norms, which included metrical and melodic norms, were to be followed...What remained was a heritage of linguistic and metrical conventions, which had often lost their functional contact with particular subjects and occasions: thus did the possibility of new combinations appear.

In short, although it is true that the intense philological activity of the Hellenistic period is responsible for the Alexandrians' defiance of generic conventions, their transgressions were committed out of a sincere belief that such actions were necessary for the meaningful continuation of literature in a changing Greek world.

How do scholars arrive at this conclusion when, as Harrison reminds us, outside of the passages in the works of Aristotle and Plato which treat the subject, "Greek and especially later Hellenistic theory is notoriously thin on the ground"?<sup>15</sup>

The categorizing of Greek literature and the formation of its canon in the post-Aristotelian Peripatos and in Hellenistic Alexandria clearly included some account of literary genres and their differences, but little trace remains. In Latin, some generic theory seems to have emerged by the time of the well-known fragment of Accius' *Didaskalica* (fr.VIII Dangel) towards the end of the second century BC:

*nam quam varia sunt genera poematorum, Baebi,  
quamquam longe distincta alia ab aliis, <sis>, nosce.*

For know, Baebius, how different are the types of poems, and how widely differentiated they are from each other.

There is some chance that this fragment introduced an extensive discussion of the different literary genres, and that it formed part of a controversy with Lucilius, but there is unfortunately no further evidence.

Instead, scholars use metapoetic interpretations of the works of the Alexandrians themselves in order to understand the generic milieu of Hellenistic literature. Callimachus's *Iambi*, for example, provides evidence for the complex balancing act between revering older models and updating them according to newer literary sensibilities. *Iambus* 1 begins not in the voice of Callimachus, but of Hipponax, the sixth-century poet whose verse Callimachus adopts as a model for his own iambic project:<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Harrison (2007) 3.

<sup>16</sup> Text and translations of Callimachus *Iambi* taken from Acosta-Hughes (2001).

Ἀκούσαθ' Ἰππώνακτος· [οἶ] γὰρ ἀλλ' ἦκω  
 ἐκ τῶν ὄκου βοῦν κολλύ[βου πι]πρηήσκουσιν,  
 φέρων ἰαμβον οὐ μάχην [ἀεῖδ]οντα  
 τὴν Βο]υπ[άλλ]ειον...

1

“Listen to Hipponax. For indeed I have come from the place where they sell an ox for a penny, bearing an *iambus* which does not sing of the Bupalean battle...”

Note how clearly these lines establish their generic affiliations: they cite an established practitioner of the genre (Hipponax)<sup>17</sup> as well as one of his main literary antagonists (Bupalus); they do so in the third person (a regular technique in Hipponactean verse); they are composed in a choliambic meter and Ionic dialect typical of Hipponax’s works; and they overtly name their genre (ἰαμβον, 3; again at line 21).<sup>18</sup> Yet Callimachus qualifies his “resurrection” of Hipponax (i.e. his revivification of the genre) by telling us that his *iambus* “does not sing of the Bupalean battle” (3-4), a disclaimer which severs the link between Callimachean iambic and its original performance context:

Callimachus’ Hipponax clearly maintains his customary critical and polemical spirit; thus, in addressing the philologists of the Museum, he uses expressions that verge on contempt for the abusive *psogos* of the archaic iambic (vv. 26-31), *but at the same time he states that he is ‘bringing’ to his place of performance, the Alexandria of the third century, iambic which are ‘singing not the warfare against Bupalus’ (vv. 3-4)*. In other words, the new *iambi* are purified from the biting personal aggressiveness with which, according to the biographical tradition, the archaic Hipponax drove his enemies, Bupalus and Athenis, to commit suicide (just as the other principle archaic iambic poet, Archilochus, was believed to have done to his beloved, Neobule, and/or her father). *In doing so, Callimachus’ Hipponax has not only reveals, with a keen sense of history, that he knows that invective poetry was closely linked to the specific context where it was produced (the culture of archaic Ionia)*, but he also reflects, within the scope of his new poetic programme (and that of Callimachus), a sense of the progressive elimination of personal polemic, which had marked the evolution of comic and satirical literature from iambic poetry to Middle and New Comedy.<sup>19</sup>

It is only in the third and fourth lines of the poem that the image of an *iambos* that does not sing of the “Bupalean battle” makes the audience aware of the unusual nature of the opening of the work. These lines serve a twofold purpose in providing a reference to the kind of invective for which Hipponax became celebrated, and at the same time a rejection

<sup>17</sup> Callimachus was so successful in this regard that the first line of his *Iambi* was long attributed to Hipponax himself. See Acosta-Hughes (2001) 37.

<sup>18</sup> See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 10: “Callimachus’ use of Hipponax as his spokesman clearly adopts a familiar technique of archaic iambic. Moreover, Hipponax or his characters regularly speak of Hipponax in the third person, and this too is a mode aped by Callimachus’ Hipponax, who from the very beginning speaks of himself in the third person...*Iambi* 1-4 are in choliambics, the metre expressly connected with Hipponax in *Iambus* 13.”

<sup>19</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 8-9 (emphasis added).

of that invective. The speaker continues to invoke the image of Hipponax and of Hipponactean verse with the words φέρων ἰαμβόν. At the caesura, however, a change in sense intervenes, and the *iambos*, the metrical type associated more than any other with the language and imagery of personal invective, is characterized as οὐ μάχην ἀείδοντα [not singing of battle].<sup>20</sup>

Having established the novelty of his verse in *Iambus* 1 Callimachus then gradually adapts his iambic project through the addition of non-iambic material. Thus, even though *Iambi* 1-5 include “the clearest elements of continuity with Hipponax,”<sup>21</sup> the *Iambi* gradually begin to take on meters, dialects, and *topoi* drawn from other literary kinds:

In the other *Iambi* [6-12], by contrast, the poetic voice of Callimachus imposes itself with a higher degree of autonomy than we find in the better attested forms of archaic iambic poetry: a *propemptikon* to a departing friend leads to an *ekphrasis* of the statue of Zeus at Olympia by Phidias; there are a few *aitia*, an epinician, a poem celebrating the birth of a friend’s daughter, etc. We also find, starting with *Iambus* 5...a gradual move away from the metrical uniformity of the first four poems towards a series of more or less marked variations on the theme of the iambic and epodic meters developed by Hipponax and Archilochus...together with occasional Doric (*Iambi* 6, 9) or Doric-Aeolic dialectal colouring (*Iambus* 7).

This process of gradual generic blending comes to a close in *Iambus* 13 which returns to the “proper” choliambic meter of Hipponactean iambic while at the same time mounting a defense of the generic deviancy in which Callimachus has indulged. Though Callimachus’s apology can be pieced together from the fragmentary remains of *Iambus* 13 itself, it is the diegesis to *Iambus* 13 which provides the most succinct summary of the charge leveled against him:<sup>22</sup>

Μοῦσαι καλαὶ κάπολλον, οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω·	32
Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς καταμεμφομέ-	
νους αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδεῖα ὧν	
γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπαντῶν φησιν ὅτι	35
Ἴωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν·	
ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῆ	
σκεύη τεκταινόμενον.	

“Fair Muses and Apollo, to whom I make my libation.’ In this he [Callimachus] says to those who fault him for the variety of poems he writes that he is imitating Ion the tragic poet. Nor does anyone find fault with a builder for creating a variety of artifacts.”

<sup>20</sup> Acosta-Hughes (2001) 38-9.

<sup>21</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 10.

<sup>22</sup> *Scholia in Callimachum, Diegeseis in Iambos* 203. Translation taken from Acosta-Hughes (2001) 69.

The key here is the accusation of πολυειδεια, of writing “in a variety of forms” (i.e. generic forms), which Callimachus’s imagined assailant has leveled against him in *Iambus* 13. But Callimachus, who already in *Iambus* 1 began the process of differentiating his verse from that of his model Hipponax, openly defends his actions (*Iambus* 13.30-3, 63-6):

τίς εἶπεν αὐτ[...].	30
σὺ πεντάμετρα συντίθει, σὺ δ' ἠ[ρῶ]ν,	
σὺ δὲ τραγῶδες[iv] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκλήρωσω;	
δοκέω μὲν οὐδεὶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ το.δ..κεψαι	
...	
	ἄειδω
οὔτ' Ἐφεσοῖν ἐλ[θῶ]ν οὔτ' Ἴων[ο]σι συμμίξας,	
Ἐφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες	65
τὰ χολὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται.	
“who said αὐτ[...].	
you compose pentameters, you the [heroic],	
it is your lot from the gods to compose tragedy?	
In my opinion no one, but [consider] also [this]	
...	
	I sing
neither going to Ephesus nor associating with the Ionians,	
to Ephesus, whence they intending to produce the limping	
metra, are not unlearnedly inspired.”	

These passages embody the spirit of generic creativity which has come to be associated with Alexandrian poetics. Callimachus’s claim that he need not travel to Ephesus in order to sing (63-6) is a declaration of his freedom from the occasional context and, thus, the generic restrictions of Hipponactean iambic.<sup>23</sup>

The meaning behind Callimachus’s rhetorical question (30-3), however, is more complicated because scholars dispute whether these lines are meant to answer the charge of

---

<sup>23</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 16: “Callimachus himself, however, does not need [to go to Ephesus], as he had initially presented himself, in *Iambus* 1, as ‘invested’ by a resurrected Hipponax, who no longer had any interest in the historical context of the real Hipponax and no bellicose intentions towards his ancient rival, Bupalus; Callimachus’ Hipponax himself was interested only in the historical and geographical horizon of Callimachus (the scholars of the Museum at Alexandria and their squabbles). Furthermore, with the metrically and linguistically varied book of *Iambi* behind him, Callimachus has clearly demonstrated that it was not his intention to produce only ‘limping’ verses or to recreate faithfully the social and linguistic environment of Hipponax by means of pure Ionic.”

πολυείδεια in the *Iambi*, specifically, or the entire Callimachean corpus. Scodel summarizes the debate:<sup>24</sup>

The poem [*Iambus* 13] appears to have continued with the theme [sc. Callimachus' writing in a variety of poetic genres] for some time. According to the *Diesgesis* (9.35-38), Callimachus adducted the example of Ion of Chios as a poet who was successful in many genres (43-47), and compared poets to carpenters, who are not blamed for making different kinds of goods. It is not clear whether πολυείδεια refers to the collection of *Iambi* alone, whose poems encompass a wide range of tones, subjects, and meters, or the Callimachean corpus as a whole; the first alternative fits better with the preceding theme of dialect mixture, where choliambics are explicitly mentioned; the issue is not just how to write verse, but how to write in this genre. But the denial that there is a "one poet, one genre" rule and the example of Ion of Chios fit the second better, for Ion is praised for his work in different genres, not for expanding the boundaries of these forms.

Yet as Acosta-Hughes points out, these interpretations are not mutually exclusive: the πολυείδεια of the Callimachean corpus validates the generic diversity of the *Iambi* and *vice versa*:<sup>25</sup>

The relationship of the *Iambi*, as individual poems and as a collection, to other works of Callimachus is a complex one, as the many verbal and thematic parallels attest. The *Iambi* also exhibit, for example in the rhetorical stratagem of a fictional critic, a multiplicity of intended audience; the poet intends his self-defense in *Iambus* 13 for both the critic within the poem and for a larger audience. Callimachus could thus answer the direct criticism his opponent offers here, clearly criticism of the *Iambi* and their composition, with a defense he draws from his entire poetic oeuvre. In this way he would answer criticism of *polyeideia* in one collection of poems with a defense of *polyeideia* drawn from all his work; Ion of Chios is then a sort of transparent paradigm of variety in a larger context (composition in many genres) as an exemplar for variety in a smaller one (this collection of iambic poems).

Callimachus's *Iambi* therefore provides us with a text which both reflects and champions, through its defense of πολυείδεια in *Iambus* 13, the Alexandrians' quest for originality at the cost of generic purity.

---

<sup>24</sup> Scodel (1987) 208 as quoted by Acosta-Hughes (2001) 83. For the debate see also Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 17 n.63; Kerkheckler (1999) 268-70.

<sup>25</sup> Acosta-Hughes (2001) 83-4.

## 2.2 HORACE AND GENRE: *ARS POETICA* 73-88

The Alexandrian conception of genre theory eventually influenced the sensibilities of Roman poets, including Horace whose *Ars Poetica* acts as “perhaps our best source for late Hellenistic genre theory” in the absence of detailed treatments of the subject after Plato and Aristotle.<sup>26</sup> *Ars Poetica* 73-88, for example, shows that Horace’s conception of genre includes a prescriptive element similar to that found in Plato and Aristotle:

*res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella  
quo scribi possent numero, monstravit Homerus.* 75  
*versibus inpariter iunctis querimonia primum,  
post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos:  
quis tamen exiguos elegos emisit auctor,  
grammatici certant et adhuc sub iudice lis est.*  
*Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo;* 80  
*hunc socci cepere pedem grandesque cothurni,  
alternis aptum sermonibus et popularis  
vincentem strepitus et natum rebus agendis.*  
*Musa dedit fidibus divos puerosque deorum  
et pugilem victorem et equum certamine primum  
et iuvenum curas et libera vina referre.* 85  
*descriptas servare vices operumque colores  
cur ego si nequeo ignoroque poeta salutor?  
cur nescire pudens prave quam discere malo?*

Homer showed with what measure the deeds of kings and commanders and grievous wars could be written. In verses joined unevenly were enclosed first laments and then, afterwards, the sentiment of a granted prayer. Which man, as their creator, first sent forth small elegies, however, the grammarians argue over and the dispute is still a matter of debate. Fury armed Archilochus with its own iambus. Comic socks and grand tragic boots chose this foot which suits dialogue, conquers the common din, and is born for doing deeds. The Muse granted to lyres the task of recounting the gods and the children of gods, victorious boxers and the horse that places first in contest, the loves of youths and abundant wine. Why am I hailed as poet if I am unable or unknowing of how to preserve the prescribed functions and tones of works of literature? Why do I prefer to be ignorant out of improper shame than to learn?

---

<sup>26</sup> Harrison (2007) 4. On the scarcity of ancient treatments of the subject of genre theory between Aristotle and Horace see the passage from Harrison cited above in section 2.1 (note 15).

Here Horace clearly pairs certain subjects with particular meters: heroic deeds with hexameters, laments with elegy, abuse with iambic verse, and so on. Note particularly how, like the Alexandrians, Horace insists that proper poetic ability is marked by a thorough understanding of generic characteristics.<sup>27</sup> Also like the Alexandrians, Horace strives to identify certain poets as the inventor or exemplar (*auctor*, 77) of their chosen genres:<sup>28</sup>

The search for an *auctor*...is a post-Aristotelian development which is likely to derive from the literary researches of Alexandria and its generation of the poetic canon, which naturally sought to attach ancient and authoritative names to literary forms. By the Roman period it has clearly become standardized in defining genres, something evident not only from this passage of Horace, where Homer and Archilochus are named as generic founders and the dispute about the *auctor* of elegy is highlighted, but also from the literary catalogue of Quintilian's tenth book, which proceeds by setting the auctores of Greek literature against their Latin counterparts, and which plainly shows traces of Peripatetic and Hellenistic influence in the identification of its Greek exemplars.

Yet after Horace's rigorous generic taxonomy and warning to those who would neglect the sanctity of genre there immediately follows a passage which that nevertheless allows for the mixing of literary kinds (89-98):

<i>versibus exponi tragicis res comica non vult;</i>	
<i>indignatur item privatis ac prope socco</i>	90
<i>dignis carminibus narrari cena Thyestae.</i>	
<i>singula quaeque locum teneant sortita decenter.</i>	
<i>interdum tamen et vocem comoedia tollit,</i>	
<i>iratusque Chremes tumido delitigat ore;</i>	
<i>et tragicus plerumque dolet sermone pedestri</i>	95
<i>Telephus et Peleus, cum pauper et exsul uterque</i>	
<i>proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba,</i>	
<i>si curat cor spectantis tetigisse querela.</i>	

A comic subject does not wish to be set forth in tragic verses; likewise the Banquet of Thyestes disdains to be told in private songs and in those close to comedy. Let every allotted thing properly keep to its place. Nevertheless, sometimes even comedy lifts its voice and angry Chremes rails with swelling speech, and often tragic Telephus and Peleus, when either is a poor exile, casts away his bombast and words half a yard long if he is eager to touch the heart of the spectator with his lament.

<sup>27</sup> Compare this, for instance, with Callimachus's reminders in *Iambus* 1 and 13 that he is certainly aware of the generic commonplaces of Hipponactean iambic even if he has no intention of "going to Ephesus."

<sup>28</sup> Harrison (2007) 6.

In this, too, Horatian genre theory reveals its debt to the Alexandrians, who likewise believed that alterations to the genres were permissible when done for some greater purpose:<sup>29</sup>

That works in particular genres can incorporate elements of a different or opposing genre...[is] one of the central elements of Augustan poetry. Once again, like the search for the *auctor* of a genre, the idea clearly derives from the Hellenistic period: the ‘crossing of genres’ (*Kreuzung der Gattungen*) famously identified by Wilhelm Kroll in Latin poetry has been repeatedly shown to be a major creative feature of Hellenistic poetry.

In this instance, Horace tells us that poets can allow humorous characters like Chremes to adopt grand, tragic diction by means of “swelling speech” (*tumido...ore*, 94) and tragic characters like Telephus or Peleus to cast aside their bombast (*Telephus et Peleus cum...proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba*, 96-7) so that they may have a more profound effect upon their audiences (*cor spectantis tetigisse*, 98).<sup>30</sup> Although Horace limits his examples in *Ars Poetica* 89-98 to comedy and tragedy, the Alexandrian principles at work here just as easily apply to all genre categories.<sup>31</sup>

The notion of genre presented in Horace’s *Ars Poetica* is therefore fully in accord with that of the Hellenistic period, but it is not an easy one to understand. On the one hand Horace clearly espouses the Alexandrian belief in originality and innovation in poetic works at the expense of clearly defined generic boundaries. On the other, Horace maintains that there is a prescriptive function to genre and that it is a poor poet who fails to revere “the prescribed functions and tones of works” (*descriptas...vices operumque colores*, 86). These contradictory imperatives may have been easily understood by Horace and the Alexandrians, but reconciling them is not such an easy task for modern scholarship. Was compulsory originality the only

---

<sup>29</sup> Harrison (2007) 6.

<sup>30</sup> In these lines Horace uses figures that are overtly called “tragic” (*tragicus*, 95). Later in section 4.7 we will see Horace employ a similar tactic of mentioning characters evocative of the genre but without the use of obvious generic watchwords like “*tragicus*.”

<sup>31</sup> Harrison (2007) 6: “The Horatian examples (paratragedy in comedy, homely diction in tragedy) are relatively modest in scope; as we shall see in the analyses of this volume, the principle of incorporating elements from a different, ‘guest’ genre while retaining the overall framework of the primary, ‘host’ genre can be considerably extended.”

reason for poets like Horace to engage in generic enrichment, or were there other reasons for engaging in this practice? Additionally, what mechanism allowed authors who so clearly respect the idea of separate literary kinds to blend the genres with one another? One method of answering these questions is to consider how the subject of genre is treated by earlier Horatian scholars and whether their analyses can be synthesized into a comprehensive account which accommodates generic enrichment while, at the same time, preserving the unique identities of the literary kinds.

### 2.3 PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ON GENRE IN HORACE

Such an act of synthesis is required thanks to the sheer variety of divergent scholarly opinions on the subject of generic enrichment in the Horatian corpus. Fraenkel, for instance, generally portrays literary kinds in the prescriptive sense, depicting Horace as a poet bound by generic conventions. A noteworthy example of this trend appears in Fraenkel's comparison of *Odes* 1.37.9-10, a description of Cleopatra's forces (*contaminato cum grege turpium / morbo virorum*), to a similar description found in *Epodes* 9:<sup>32</sup>

A comparison with the analogous passage in the epode (13f.) *spadonibus...rugosis*, provides an excellent opportunity to learn that in any polished piece of ancient poetry the rules (Horace would say the *leges*) of the different literary genres and especially the difference in their stylistic level are strictly observed. The coarse directness suitable to the character of Archilochean *iambus* proved impossible in the style of dignified lyrics: here the poet had to resort to allusive paraphrase.

Fraenkel also deems Horace to be "a true artist" because of his ability "to make a virtue of necessity" when faced with the limitations imposed upon him by his chosen genre.<sup>33</sup> Such praise derives from Fraenkel's characterization of lyric as a demanding genre which requires poems be

---

<sup>32</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 159–60.

<sup>33</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 401–2.

composed according to recognized prototypes<sup>34</sup> and whose laws are not broken lightly, as seen in Fraenkel's treatment of *Odes* 4.6:<sup>35</sup>

So it came to pass that once, and once only, Horace allowed his name to appear in one of his odes. The severe standards of these lyrics excluded the possibility of the poet's name being mentioned in a casual way as was suitable for minor genres such as Catullus' *choliamb*s and hendecasyllables or Horace's own *iambi*...

Interestingly, Fraenkel does not view this unique instance of "rule breaking" in *Odes* 4.6 as a sign of Horace's ability to alter or defy generic boundaries. Instead, he defends Horace with a reminder that "this ode...remains to the end a hymn to Apollo...in this context the *vates Horatius* is to be regarded as the god's mouthpiece."<sup>36</sup> Horace only broke the rules of the lyric genre, Fraenkel claims, because the conventions of another genre, hymn, allowed Apollo to speak the poet's name for him.

This tendency to explain away or excuse instances of generic transgression is a common feature of Fraenkel's study. When the style of an ode begins to veer towards epic, for example, Fraenkel insists that Horace's dalliances into the *genus grande* are well within the scope offered by his lyric predecessors who treated epic themes in a thoroughly lyric manner. So, for example, he says that the tone of *Odes* 1.37 "rises to the level of great epic, or *Pindaric*, poetry,"<sup>37</sup> and he compares the unusual amount of Homeric material in 1.15, considered by some a quintessential example of Horace's incorporation of the epic genre,<sup>38</sup> to that found in certain poems of Bacchylides.<sup>39</sup> In short, although Fraenkel eagerly points out times when Horace draws upon

---

<sup>34</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 400.

<sup>35</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 406.

<sup>36</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 407.

<sup>37</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 160 (emphasis added).

<sup>38</sup> See e.g. Lowrie (1997) 123–37.

<sup>39</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 188–9.

material from other genres, he does not consider these transgressions threats to the generic purity of Horace's *Odes*.<sup>40</sup>

Fraenkel also treats generic *recusationes* in the *Odes* as genuine disavowals of ability or interest. A telling example is Fraenkel's proposed solution to difficulties inherent in *Odes* 1.6, which emphasizes Horace's "powerlessness" when faced with non-lyric themes and subject matter:<sup>41</sup>

The point which most of the commentators seem to have missed is that Horace, after the initial stanza, is far less concerned with what Varius might be able or unable to achieve than with what he, Horace, *feels absolutely unable to undertake*....In i.6 [there exists] the suggestion that Varius might undertake a work which Horace, by implication, declares to be one of *insurmountable difficulty*.

Later in his study Fraenkel softens this assessment of Horace's abilities, claiming that Horace enjoyed downplaying his significant talents,<sup>42</sup> but the idea that Horace was compelled to offer an excuse for not writing epic or panegyric poetry remains a common theme throughout Fraenkel's study. At its core this belief implies that Horace saw non-lyric material as something foreign and unwelcome in his poetry rather than as an opportunity for generic experimentation. Fraenkel's study does not portray the *Odes* as completely devoid of generic innovation, of course. He praises Horace's ability to turn the praise of contemporaries, for instance, into a major theme of whole poems when traditional lyrics had only included such praise in occasional remarks, citing it as one of the truly novel aspects of Horace's works.<sup>43</sup> Overall, however, Fraenkel's apparent disinterest in the multi-generic potential of the *Odes* downplays the significance of Horace's generic enrichment.

---

<sup>40</sup> For other examples of Fraenkel's ready acceptance of non-lyric material see Fraenkel (1966) 257 (on Euripides *Bacchae*), 413 (elegy).

<sup>41</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 234 (emphasis added). See also Fraenkel's discussion of *Odes* 2.12. On the subject of disingenuous *recusationes* see Davis (1991), discussed below.

<sup>42</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 434.

<sup>43</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 413.

Commager also considers questions of genre, particularly with regard to Horace's use of epic and elegiac poetry in the *Odes*. "Where Horace's martial career is invincibly Homeric," he writes, "his amatory one is in the best elegiac tradition."<sup>44</sup> Commager treats epic in great detail in his discussion of Horace's use of *recusatio*, which, unlike Fraenkel, he believes functions more like a rhetorician's *praeteritio*. Commager even goes so far as to claim that Horace "shows us fools for believing him" when he speaks of his inability to handle heroic subjects.<sup>45</sup> The subject of parody, on the other hand, grants Commager the opportunity to discuss Horace's use of both epic and elegiac material.<sup>46</sup>

Commager's study both supports and frustrates attempts to find programmatic meaning in Horace's dalliances with non-lyric material. To say that Horatian *recusationes* are disingenuous, for example, is an important first step towards showing that Horace wishes to enlarge the scope of lyric poetry. But Commager believes that Horace's use of *recusatio* is part of a larger trend of Horace trying to include everything in his lyric poetry without presenting a constant argument of any kind:<sup>47</sup>

Horace stands as the classic example of the man who manages to eat his cake and have it too. Indulging in the most extravagant of pastoral fantasies, he escapes charges of sentimentality; dispensing moral unction, he avoids the reproach of sermonizing; rising to an epic grandeur, he denies pretensions of sublimity; summoning all wealth's sensuous reality, he receives credit for banishing it. To maintain a single attitude throughout an Ode is frequently impossible – Horace does not so much confront any given subject as surround it.

To claim that Horace includes non-lyric material in the *Odes* out of a desire "to eat his cake and have it too" undercuts the significance of these inclusions, robbing them of any meaningful programmatic sentiment. To be fair, Commager believes that at times Horace does allow his true

---

<sup>44</sup> Commager (1966) 129.

<sup>45</sup> Commager (1966) 114.

<sup>46</sup> On parody see Commager (1966) 120–41.

<sup>47</sup> Commager (1966) 116.

sympathies to be revealed in his poetry, but he also says that these glimpses into Horace's real thoughts are only interesting precisely because they "run counter to his formal attitude."<sup>48</sup>

Similarly, Commager's explanations of the purpose of generic parody only hint at its usefulness as a form of sincere generic transformation. Commager writes, "[Horace's] laughter remains gentile, since he perceives the beauty as well as the absurdity of the conventions he exploits. And he knew, too, that to demonstrate the latter is frequently to heighten our sense of the former."<sup>49</sup> These words imply that Horace could be using parody as a means of critiquing non-lyric genres and including their best elements into his own poetry. But this implication is spoiled by Commager's following words, which state that Horace frequently uses parody "for a discernible practical effect upon the person he addresses."<sup>50</sup> Choosing to highlight the latter purpose over the former shows that Commager's focus is not on generic boundaries, despite his willingness to note Horace's treatment of genres in general. If we wish to find a detailed treatment of generic enrichment itself, we must look elsewhere.

The commentaries of Nisbet-Hubbard and Nisbet-Rudd claim that Horace, like all writers influenced by the literary theories of Alexandria, obeys the *lex operis*, the rules of genre, while at the same time striving for originality through generic enrichment.<sup>51</sup> They maintain that one of Horace's primary methods of generic enrichment revolves around a distinction made between genres, such as lyric, and their subdivisions or subcategories, such as paeon or hymn. By combining multiple subcategories of poems in a single ode they argue that Horace was able to "give new life to the old forms."<sup>52</sup> Thus *Odes* 1.3, for example, begins as a *propempticon* is

---

<sup>48</sup> Commager (1966) 116.

<sup>49</sup> Commager (1966) 136.

<sup>50</sup> Commager (1966) 136.

<sup>51</sup> On the subject of genre in these commentaries, see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) xxvi–xxvii; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xix.

<sup>52</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xix.

transformed into a warning against the dangers of human daring, and 3.11 combines a hymn, a courtship poem, and a mythological narrative all in one. Nisbet, Hubbard, and Rudd also show that Horace's poems frequently incorporate non-lyric genres in order to reevaluate them. Perhaps the best examples of this trend are found in Horace's love poems, which treat the commonplaces of elegy with "factitious realism" that mocks the absurdities typical of the genre,<sup>53</sup> but Nisbet, Hubbard, and Rudd's analyses show us that Horace also reinterprets genres like epigram and epic in a similar way. This provides us with an excellent first step towards resolving the conflicting imperatives of and establishing a greater purpose for generic enrichment.

Another scholar who focuses heavily on this reevaluative use of generic material is West, whose commentaries on the first three books of the *Odes* often point out Horace's humorous inclusions of non-lyric material. West argues that Horace parodies epic, for instance, through either minor allusions or complete odes such as *Odes* 2.4, an entire poem devoted to "fun with epic" through misapplication of stock epithets and heroic exempla.<sup>54</sup> Elegy, too, receives a similar tongue-in-cheek treatment. In *Odes* 1.25 Horace uses "a short snatch of [a *paraclausithyron*], beginning with a mock-poignant juxtaposition," to transform a familiar elegiac trope into a parody attacking "the silliness of the love poets and giving a realistic picture of the behavior of young men and the career expectations of women like Lydia."<sup>55</sup> Similarly, in *Odes* 3.10, a *paraclausithyron* is stripped of its standard elements ("no tears, no kisses for the door or doorstep, no garlands, no suggestion of suicide, no fetid self-absorption") in order to create "a mischievous poem, one of many in which Horace mocks lovers' excesses."<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> On Horace's use of elegy see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) xxiii; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xvi–xvii.

<sup>54</sup> West (1998) 30-33. See also West's treatments of epic parody in *Odes* 1.6, 8, 10, 16, 23; 2.9, 12; 3.10.

<sup>55</sup> West (1995) 118, 119.

<sup>56</sup> On *Odes* 1.25 see West (1995) 116-9. On *Odes* 3.10 see West (2002) 98-101.

Yet despite this readiness to recognize times when Horace draws from works in other genres West does not consider the notion of generic enrichment to be of much worth. Instead, West typically downplays the inclusion of non-lyric material, stripping it of its programmatic importance. One of the earliest examples of this trend in West's study is found in his analysis of pastoral elements in *Odes* 1.17, where he writes:<sup>57</sup>

*This explanation of the poem as a blend of two genres is the usual scholastic heresy. Poets often respond to technical challenges and they are often aware of the work of their predecessors, but writing poetry is not simply a matter of shuffling and redealing the old cards. Good poets blend their experience of literature and their experience of life in a hugely complex operation which they themselves do not fully understand. As Horace might have put it, the poet is under the guidance of the Muse who led him where he did not know he wanted to go. The interweaving of poetic elements, forms, or genres is only a tiny part of the business which is most accessible to scholarly analysis... We have not gone very far when we have traced his work to previous work which it resembles.*

The skepticism on display here stems from West's oft-professed dislike of metapoetic theories in general. His discussions of *Odes* 1.33 and 2.9 include criticism of what he calls the "pansemantic fallacy"<sup>58</sup> and he ends his study of 2.6 with a critique of intertextuality, a concept of major importance for the subject of generic enrichment.<sup>59</sup> For West, generic transgressions are not meaningful in and of themselves. Instead, he believes that Horace's dalliances with material outside the realm of lyric poetry are always used to support some other argument expressed in an ode. Thus, the pastoral elements of *Odes* 1.17 are included as part of a grateful nod to Maecenas, rather than out of any desire to enrich lyric.<sup>60</sup>

Horace is the master of tact. Not for him to write: "I am terribly grateful to you for this farm. I am enjoying it very much and writing well. I enclose a specimen." These are sophisticated people and they speak in a sophisticated code. When Horace writes that the gods love him and his Muse and that Faunus protects his flocks, Maecenas knows perfectly well what was meant. Faunus protects. Maecenas gave.

---

<sup>57</sup> West (1995) 82-3 (emphasis added).

<sup>58</sup> West (1998) 65. See also West (1995) 160-1.

<sup>59</sup> For a response to West's arguments against metapoetry and literary theory see Ancona (1999) 139-40.

<sup>60</sup> West (1995) 83-4.

Similarly, West believes Horace's parodic incorporation of elegiac material into the *Odes* also lacks generic significance, as evidenced by his analysis of *Odes* 3.7:<sup>61</sup>

There are several different ways of reading this poem. Horace may be playing games with literary genres, setting elegy against lyric. He may be producing a vindication of the Augustan concern for sexual fidelity and a commendation of Augustan military training. This note has not accepted these interpretations. *The poem is not an exercise in the crossing of genres* or a defense of monogamy, but a light-hearted satire on the silliness of lovers in Latin elegy.

West's stubbornness hinders our quest to understand generic enrichment in the *Odes*. How can Horace satirize Roman elegy in a lyric ode, for instance, without implicitly inviting us to make comparisons between the two genres? Parody necessitates metapoetic analysis, and it is for this reason that many who study genre theory identify parody as one of the most powerful methods available for generic enrichment.<sup>62</sup> If we abandon the notion that generic enrichment has a worthwhile programmatic goal, as West would have us do, then we run the risk of devaluing Horace's skill and reducing him to an eyebrow-wagging jokester who waits with baited breath for his readers to "get the joke" after each meaningless allusion.<sup>63</sup>

One of the most recent works expressly devoted to Horace's defiance of generic conventions is that of Harrison. Harrison analyzes the elements of Hellenistic genre theory inherent in the *Ars Poetica* in order to claim that Horace willingly engaged in generic enrichment, defined as "the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres."<sup>64</sup> Harrison's study identifies two major effects that generic enrichment, identified as one of the most important principles of poetics among

---

<sup>61</sup> West (2002) 77 (emphasis added).

<sup>62</sup> See e.g. Davis (1991) 36–60.

<sup>63</sup> For West's depiction of "Smiling Horace" see e.g. West (1995) 47, 119.

<sup>64</sup> Harrison (2007) 1.

Augustan authors,<sup>65</sup> has on the work of any author. First, the incorporation of material from a “guest” genre to a “host” genre<sup>66</sup> expands the scope not only of the original poem in which this incorporation occurs, but also for future poems, “thus opening up new horizons within an established genre.”<sup>67</sup> Second, works that utilize this broadening effect tend to become exemplars of their genre.<sup>68</sup>

“What is striking for the Augustan period is that in most cases this expansion marks the climax of a genre in Roman literary history: it is difficult to argue that the generic enrichment effected in Vergil’s *Eclogues*, Horace’s *Epodes*, Vergil’s *Georgics*, or Horace’s *Odes* led to further developments in their respective genres in classical Latin. This could be said for the genre of Augustan elegy, not treated in this book: the generic complexity developed in Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid does not lead to a continuation of the genre. In a few cases, however, this sets an agenda for the genre which is picked up by later texts: the *Aeneid*’s model of universal epic inclusivity is taken even further by Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, while the generic interaction of Horace’s *Satires* can be seen to be continued in Juvenal.”

Having established the groundwork for his study of generic enrichment, Harrison then goes on to analyze several odes with the intention of showing how Horace is able to use material from epic, elegy, epigram, and tragedy to elevate, redefine, and enhance lyric.<sup>69</sup>

The great strength of Harrison’s study lies in the fact that, unlike some earlier commentaries, it uses Horace’s own writings, particularly the *Ars Poetica*, as the basis for his discussion of generic enrichment in the *Odes*. Cairns, for instance, whose theory of generic composition is driven by the rhetorical handbooks of later authors such as Menander the Rhetor, advances the idea that generic analysis of ancient texts “can illuminate the logic and thought processes of classical writers, by showing what connexions of thought were built into the formulae behind particular writings, and can also solve major traditional problems.”<sup>70</sup> Cairns’

---

<sup>65</sup> Harrison (2007) 6-8.

<sup>66</sup> The terminology of “guest” and “host” genres is from Harrison (2007) 6.

<sup>67</sup> Harrison (2007) 18.

<sup>68</sup> Harrison (2007) 18.

<sup>69</sup> See Harrison (2007) chap. 6.

<sup>70</sup> Cairns (2007) 31.

goal is to develop an interpretive system which can provide a framework for the objective study of originality and “quality of thought” in Greek and Roman literature.

Cairns begins his treatment by defining his terminology. For Cairns, genres “are not classifications of literature in terms of form as are epic, lyric, elegy, or epistle, but classifications in terms of content; for example *propemptikon* (the farewell to the departing traveler), and *komos*, often incorrectly termed *paraclausithyron* (the song and actions of a lover who is usually excluded).”<sup>71</sup> Each of these genres includes what Cairns calls primary elements, those characteristics which distinguish one genre from another, and secondary elements or *topoi*, “the smallest divisions of the material of any genre useful for analytic purposes.”<sup>72</sup> *Odes* 1.5 and 3.26, for example, are members of what Cairns calls the “*renuntiatio amoris* genre,” whose three primary elements include the speaker (a lover), the addressee (the beloved), and an act of renunciation of the addressee by the speaker. Some *topoi*, such as the lover’s present state of mind, are shared by both poems, while others are not, such as the lover’s previous sentiments for the beloved or the lover’s reasons for rejecting love.<sup>73</sup>

Using this framework Cairns then addresses the concept of generic enrichment. According to Cairns the primary and secondary elements of any genre can be manipulated in any number of ways. *Topoi*, for instance, can be altered, inserted into unexpected genres, or uniquely arranged,<sup>74</sup> and primary elements can be transformed through processes of omission, inversion, reaction, inclusion, speaker-/addressee-variation, and formal adaptation.<sup>75</sup> The purpose of these types of changes is what Cairns refers to as “the ancient insistence on originality within generic

---

<sup>71</sup> Cairns (2007) 6.

<sup>72</sup> Cairns (2007) 6.

<sup>73</sup> Cairns (2007) 80-1.

<sup>74</sup> Cairns (2007) 99.

<sup>75</sup> Each process is treated in its own chapter in Cairns (2007) 127-245.

composition,”<sup>76</sup> that is, the notion that although poets must work within well-established generic boundaries they must nevertheless strive to create something meaningfully novel.

Cairns cites *Odes* 3.7 as an example of Horace’s ability to achieve originality by using several of the techniques of generic enrichment. The poem is, at its core, a *komos*, exhibiting both the primary elements (a lover, a beloved, the lover’s attempts to come to the beloved, and an appropriate setting)<sup>77</sup> and familiar *topoi* of the genre (e.g. the shutting of the door, the peeking out of the beloved, the lover’s music, and the harshness of the beloved).<sup>78</sup> Horace has made several alterations to the standard *komos* form in this poem. First, Horace uses speaker-variation to speak in place of Enipeus, but in doing so he acts to discourage Asterie from admitting the prospective lover and thereby inverts the purpose of the *komos*. A second inversion occurs when Horace pleads with Asterie not to admit Enipeus despite his athletic prowess, which Cairns takes as a sign of the lover’s attractiveness. By downplaying Enipeus’ beauty Horace has thus altered the standard *topos* that the physical appearance of the lover acts as reason for his admission. Finally, through the process of inclusion, Horace inserts a more typical *komos*, that of Chloe and Gyges (lines 5-22), in the midst of the inverted *komos* of *Odes* 3.7 as a whole. The implicit comparison between these two *komos* scenes not only heightens the humorous effects of the inversion but also proves Horace’s skill and originality in his ability to manipulate generic conventions.

While Cairns’s treatment of *Odes* 3.7 provides excellent proof of his theory’s ability to recognize genre enrichment as a vehicle for poetic originality, his methods have been the subject of a number of critical scholarly responses.<sup>79</sup> One of the main flaws of his study, particularly in

---

<sup>76</sup> Cairns (2007) 99.

<sup>77</sup> Cairns (2007) 6.

<sup>78</sup> For Cairns’ treatment of this ode, see Cairns (2007) 208-11.

<sup>79</sup> For examples see Uhlig (2009).



that of Davis, who claims that throughout the *Odes* there is an overarching “lyric argument” regarding a convivial worldview of which Horace is attempting to persuade his reader through a complex use of “motifs, topoi, recurrent metaphors, and rhetorical conventions.”<sup>82</sup> Davis specifically singles out generic enrichment as one of the main strategies of lyric argumentation, particularly in his first chapter, “Modes of Assimilation,” which enumerates a number of techniques by which Horace incorporates elements of non-lyric genres into his lyric poetry. These include generic remodeling, generic pseudo-imitation, assimilation by trope, and assimilation by parody. Also included in this chapter is a novel redefinition of *recusatio* as a tool for generic enrichment “by which the speaker disingenuously seeks to *include* material and styles that he ostensibly precludes.”<sup>83</sup>

Davis provides several examples of these strategies at work in the *Odes*. In *Odes* 1.7, for example, Teucer, a notable character in both epic more generally and Roman tragedy in particular is remodeled, through his wine-soaked address to his friends (21-32), into a sympotic figure whose exhortation parallels the convivial message at the start of the poem (1-21).<sup>84</sup> Another example, *Odes* 2.12, begins with a *recusatio* of unsuitable epic material and themes, such as the Punic wars or the Gigantomachia (1-9), which in reality hints to the exploitation of epic tropes later in the ode when Horace repurposes imagery of warlike savagery by saying that Licymnia acts “with good-natured ferocity” (*facili saevitia*, 26).<sup>85</sup> Finally, in *Odes* 1.16, Horace disavows iambic poetry, specifically his own *Epodes*, through intertextual allusion, in order to create a mature *persona* of love-lyric who can transform anger into seductive charm.<sup>86</sup> Regardless of their specific use, however, Davis maintains that all of these strategies of

---

<sup>82</sup> Davis (1991) 2-3.

<sup>83</sup> Davis (1991) 11.

<sup>84</sup> Davis (1991) 18.

<sup>85</sup> Davis (1991) 30-3.

<sup>86</sup> Davis (1991) 74-7.

assimilation share a common function: the “[privileging] of lyric discourse at the expense of other genres.”<sup>87</sup>

Davis’s remaining chapters each treat a distinct method used by Horace to further his goal of rhetorical persuasion, each of which employs the principles of assimilation laid out in the first chapter of Davis’s study. Thus, in his discussion of “Modes of Authentication,” the process whereby Horace justifies and defines both himself and his chosen genre, Davis points to Horace’s allusions to earlier Greek and Latin authors from non-lyric genres such as iambic, epic, and hymn (kletic and dithyramb).<sup>88</sup> In his treatment of “Modes of Consolation,” Horace’s use of sympotic and “*carpe diem*” themes, Davis shows us how a complex interweaving of genres can promote the ethical messages of Horace’s lyric worldview. His example, Philomela’s lament in *Odes* 4.12, combines a thematic allusion to *Eclogues* 6.78-81, a bucolic poem which also treats the Philomela story, with elegiac diction used in Horace’s retelling of the episode (e.g. *flebiliter gemens, aeternum opprobrium*, etc.) to strengthen the effectiveness of Horace’s invitation to Vergil at the end of the poem to engage in sympotic activity consistent with “convivial wisdom in the *Carmina*.”<sup>89</sup> Finally, in “Modes of Praise and Dispraise,” which focuses on Horace’s encomium and invective towards those who do and do not live in accordance with his convivial worldview, Davis shows how Horace’s ode in praise of Tyndaris (1.17), for example, is primarily motivated by issues of generic enrichment:<sup>90</sup>

“In sum, the female singer whose very name “Tyndaris” assimilates a notorious epic patronymic (Helen of Troy was commonly so designated) will not balk at accommodating well-known figures from Homer’s world into her lyric cosmos, *mutatis mutandis*. The generic interplay (Homeric *epos* / Anacreontic *melos*) is carefully nuanced, as so often in the *Odes*, and Horace’s convivial partner is there to sponsor his own lyric agenda.”

---

<sup>87</sup> Davis (1991) 78.

<sup>88</sup> See Davis (1991) 78-144.

<sup>89</sup> Davis (1991) 184-8.

<sup>90</sup> Davis (1991) 203.

In short, Davis' study of Horace's *Odes* not only identifies Horace's various techniques for generic enrichment but also tells us that Horace can use these techniques for such wide-ranging purposes as self-promotion, self-definition, and rhetorical persuasion.

Harrison's second major source for generic enrichment in the *Odes* is Lowrie's study treating problematic use of narrative in his lyric poetry. According to Lowrie the lyric mode of discourse, which is grounded in the present and deals with "you and I," is theoretically incompatible with narrative, which is concerned with the past and third persons.<sup>91</sup> Generic enrichment enters into her treatment in the light of the realization that narrative is a key feature of many non-lyric genres, and the fact that Horace is able to successfully incorporate narrative into his lyric discourse reflects a larger trend of generic assimilation:<sup>92</sup>

"When Horace uses narrative in a genre that primarily enacts [i.e. lyric], the switch in discourse and manner of representation necessarily affects the constitution of the genre. The somewhat alien nature of narrative in Horace's *Odes* makes it a vehicle for including other 'alien' elements. Narrative form often goes hand in hand with content primarily associated with genres other than lyric (epic especially, but also elegy). Inversely, Horace manipulates his mode of discourse as a technique to open his lyric to other genres."

An example of this line of thought in Lowrie's work is seen in her discussion of *Odes* 1.6, a *recusatio* excusing Horace from having to compose panegyric epic for Agrippa. For Lowrie, this ode is "a poetic statement about lyric utterance"<sup>93</sup> that accomplishes its aims by means of generic associations attributed to lyric and narrative. Horace announces his preference for singing common, everyday events (*convivia; proelia virginum*, 17) rather than the once-in-a-lifetime victories of Agrippa which are more suited to being written (*scriberis*, 1) rather than sung (*cantamus*, 19) by Varius. Yet this *recusatio* also contributes to a larger pattern of contrasts in this ode. "Writing, historical time, military events, praise, the *grande* all fall on the same side

---

<sup>91</sup> Lowrie (1997) 14.

<sup>92</sup> Lowrie (1997) 38.

<sup>93</sup> Lowrie (1997) 56.

over against singing, iterable time, symposia, and erotic topics, *ego*-centered poetry, the *tenue*. Epic contrasts with lyric, narrative with enactment.”<sup>94</sup> Horace then brings these categories together by means of the question, “who will write worthily?” (*quis...digne scripserit*, 13-4), whose answer, if we rightly recognize the insincerity of Horace’s *recusatio*, is Horace himself, the poet whose tongue-in-cheek recreation of epic themes within the ode successfully adapts the lofty topics of Homeric epic to his more playful “unwarlike lyre” (*imbellis lyrae*, 10).<sup>95</sup>

Davis and Lowrie’s works are crucial for anyone seriously interested in understanding Horace’s methods of and reasons for engaging in generic enrichment even though some odes with great generic potential receive little or lopsided treatment. *Odes* 1.12, for instance, which will appear later in this study as part of our discussion of Horace’s incorporation of epic poetry in the *Odes*, receives almost no consideration by Davis,<sup>96</sup> and Lowrie includes no treatment of 3.15 even though others believe the poem’s adaptation of elegiac material can fulfill a variety of programmatic needs.<sup>97</sup> To a certain extent this “flaw” is the result of nitpicking since it would be ludicrous to expect any scholar to provide a detailed account of the generic significance of every poem in the *Odes*. Additionally, by limiting their analyses to those poems that directly impact the overarching arguments of their studies Davis and Lowrie improve the overall quality of their works. For our purposes, however, this means that there is ample room to expand upon and refine the arguments contained in these seminal works. Chapter 4 of this study, for instance, is at its core an expansion of Davis’s original study of Horace’s transition from iambic to lyric poetry as dramatized in *Odes* 2.13.

---

<sup>94</sup> Lowrie (1997) 58.

<sup>95</sup> Lowrie (1997) 68.

<sup>96</sup> On *Odes* 1.12 see Davis (1991) 99-100, which merely draws a comparison between the end of *Odes* 1.1 and the opening lines of 1.12. The programmatic significance of this comparison will be treated in greater detail in section 5.2 of this study.

<sup>97</sup> See e.g. Nadeau (2008) 361-9; Davis (1991) 222-3.

Though Davis and Lowrie's studies are particularly concerned with the concept of generic enrichment in Horace's *Odes*, other authors not focused on this particular subject have nevertheless treated it with positive results. Nadeau, for instance, in his study of Horace's love poems in *Odes* 1-3, attempts to secure a place for Horace's erotic poetry within the context of the strict morality of Augustan marriage laws. His ultimate answer to this traditional problem is that those who remain in Augustus's *amicitia* have no reason to fear retribution for their illicit affairs, when those who threaten the authority of the princeps or the stability of his reign will be punished by means of the Julian laws.<sup>98</sup> Nadeau uses several lines of analysis in order to come to this conclusion, but one of the most crucial of these concerns is the inclusion of non-lyric genres, elegy and epic, in the amatory odes.

Horace's use of elegy in the *Odes*, as portrayed by Nadeau, could be described as following a process of inversion (to use Cairn's terminology). The typical lover of elegy is youthful, poor, and jealous, the victim of a mercenary lover to whom he has pledged fidelity in vain, and men of this type are seen throughout the *Odes* in named and unnamed figures. Nadeau argues, however, that Horace consistently portrays himself in the amatory odes in the persona of an older, more experienced lover, who uses his wealth, authority, and influence to get the girl. Horace has, in essence, taken great pains to portray himself in the *Odes* as the stereotypical villain of elegy who steals the *puella* from her besotted boy.<sup>99</sup>

Horace enacts this strategy of inversion throughout the amatory odes, but a brief example will better highlight this use of generic remodeling. In *Odes* 1.5, the first love poem of the *Odes*, Horace presents, both explicitly and through implication, what appears to be a characteristically elegiac love affair: an attractive youth (*puer*, 1) enamored with a beautiful girl will soon lament

---

<sup>98</sup> Nadeau (2008) 498.

<sup>99</sup> For a summary of the trend see Nadeau (2008) 443-58 and 471-4.

her faithless betrayal (*heu quotiens fidem...flebit*, 5-6). Nadeau, however, believes that Horace is here pleading his own cause to Pyrrha by describing himself as a survivor of the stormy seas of love.<sup>100</sup>

“The *gracilis puer* is naïve, he hints. He does not know that love changes. Quintus is an experienced lover, and he knows that love does not last, says Quintus. Pyrrha too knows that love does not last, hints Quintus. There is only one fool in the triangle and that is *gracilis puer*, hints Quintus. Using experience and worldliness as arguments, Quintus persuades Pyrrha that it is the way of the world that love ends and that those who think otherwise are naïve. Subtly, Quintus influences Pyrrha to side with him and so prove how sophisticated she is, rather than be faithful to *gracilis puer* and thereby show herself a rustic or a foolish ‘ingénue.’”

Despite the fact that the familiar trappings of elegy abound in the ode, Horace has nevertheless managed to modify the genre in a unique way which reverses his audience’s expectations in a highly original way.

Horace also incorporates epic material into the amatory odes, usually by means of intertextual allusions to Vergil’s *Aeneid* which, in turn, are used to refer to Augustus and Horace’s relationship with Augustus.<sup>101</sup> Using *Odes* 1.5 as an example once more, Nadeau believes that the storms, both stated and implied, in 1.5 are meant to remind the reader of the opening of the *Aeneid*, where Vergil’s storm symbolizes the chaos of civil war. In making this reference, Horace intends his readership to likewise make a connection between storm and civil war in his own poetry.<sup>102</sup> Horace then uses this connection to prove a point: just as he has survived the storms of love, so too did he survive the “storms” of civil war, thanks in no small part to his friendship with Augustus, a subject broached in many subsequent odes. Horace’s closeness to the most powerful man in Rome is then used by the poet as a subtle and sophisticated means of luring Pyrrha away from her *gracilis puer* and into the arms of a more

---

<sup>100</sup> Nadeau (2008) 12.

<sup>101</sup> For an overview see Nadeau (2008) 462-6.

<sup>102</sup> Nadeau (2008) 28, 463-4.

influential man, one whose position as a public poet can enshrine her among the “top seven” famous personages that open Horace’s lyric collection.<sup>103</sup>

## 2.4 REFLECTION ON PRIOR SCHOLARSHIP

We established two questions at the outset of our review of selected scholarship on genre in Horatian lyric. The first of these asked whether Alexandrian and Roman poets engaged in generic enrichment for purposes other than mere compulsory originality. The scholars discussed above whose studies support the idea of generic enrichment have provided numerous additional rationales for why authors like Horace would engage in generic enrichment. Firstly, even though generic enrichment is indeed one of the main tools available for poets to imbue their works with the originality required by the standards of Hellenistic literary culture, it was certainly not practiced merely out of necessity. The Alexandrians and Romans both recognized the benefits of creating generically enriched works whose impact would be greater than the sum of their parts. In fact, authors of the Augustan era in particular were so successful in this regard that their “hybrid” poems often became exemplars which brought an end to further development in their respective genres.<sup>104</sup>

Second, poets practiced generic enrichment for the purpose of expanding the potential scope of their works. In the case of Horace, for instance, the incorporation of themes and subjects from non-lyric genres allows Horace to expand the range of topics he can treat within

---

<sup>103</sup> Nadeau (2008) 25.

<sup>104</sup> This coincides with modern scholarship’s understanding of the process of *imitatio* in Greco-Roman literature. As Russell explains in West and Woodman (1979) 1-16, poets did not simply create intertexts for their own sake, but purposefully adapted what they believed was best in their source materials and “made it their own” in a new generic context. See also Horace’s own disdain for uninspired *imitatio* at *Ars Poetica* 132-4 and *Epistles* 1.19.19-20.

the *Odes* as well as the number of techniques by which he can address these topics. Later in this study, for instance, we will learn how Horace's incorporation of tragic material into the *Odes* provides him with a means of treating the "inappropriate" subject of Roman civil war within lyric poems,<sup>105</sup> a feat made possible only because of the beneficial effects of generic enrichment. Interestingly, this broadening of scope not only affects the individual poem or work in which the manipulation took place, but also opens up new horizons for all subsequent poems of the enriched genre.

Third, poets employ generic enrichment for the purpose of promotion, a tactic which takes multiple forms. On the one hand this can involve the promotion of their chosen genre over those from which he has coopted elements. On the other, the poet's ability to seamlessly blend genres in this way can be used to promote the authority of the poet, his persona, or any idea espoused by the poet. This use of generic enrichment is the primary focus of Davis's study and is well-exemplified by his analysis of *Odes* 2.13, in which he believes Horace's skillful juxtaposition of iambic and lyric responses to death are used by the poet to prove that he is "worthy of the Greek melic tradition whose mantle he has assumed."<sup>106</sup>

Finally, by continually vacillating between respectful acknowledgement of and subversive disrespect for generic boundaries poets can develop a greater level of engagement with their readers. The poet's apparent struggles with the conventions of his chosen genre draw us deeper into his work as we find ourselves noting his transgressions and evaluating his abilities. This process of engagement is further aided through intertextual and intratextual allusions, two major tools for generic enrichment, because we feel rewarded when our preexisting familiarity with one author or portion of a text enlightens our understanding of

---

<sup>105</sup> See section 5.3.

<sup>106</sup> Davis (1991) 89. For Davis's full treatment of *Odes* 2.13, which will be reviewed in sections 4.1, 4.4, and 4.5, see Davis (1991) 78-89.

another. Put simply, generic enrichment allows poets like Horace to create riddles, paradoxes, or “trails of breadcrumbs” which demand our attention as readers and guide us towards unlocking the deeper programmatic significance of even the most unassuming texts.

These four rationales for engaging in generic enrichment answer the first of the questions established at the end of section 2.2. The second, however, which tasks us with determining a means by which we can reconcile the conflicting imperatives of Alexandrian and Roman genre theory, has not been addressed. How do we make sense of the fact that aspiring poets must preserve “the prescribed functions and styles of works of literature” (*descriptas...vices operumque colores, Ars Poetica* 86) while at the same time cherry-picking the best from all genres in an attempt to create poetry of substance and meaning?

## 2.5 GENRE AS AUDIENCE EXPECTATION

The solution to this problem lies in moving away from the notion that genres are merely rules for composition or categories for organization. Instead, scholars now study literary kinds with a more reader-centric focus.<sup>107</sup> Genre, according to this view, is a tool which allows an author to enter into a dialogue with his audience for the purpose of imparting greater meaning to the literary experience as a whole. When an author composes within a genre he does so in order to establish a set of expectations within the minds of his readers derived from past experiences with prior works in the same genre. The author then defies and manipulates these shared generic assumptions and, in so doing, highlights the originality of his transgressions while at the same time inviting the reader to find meaning in them. The great benefit of this approach is that it

---

<sup>107</sup> For this transition in thought see Beebe (1994) 3 which makes the point that this development mirrors the debate over the location of textual meaning.

explains why Horace and the Alexandrians would continue to stress the importance of familiarity with generic conventions. Without this knowledge authors and readers lack a common ground upon which they might begin the process of literary communication. Viewed in this light, then, generic conventions are transformed from restrictive guidelines at odds with Hellenistic originality into enticing stimulants which narrow an author's focus just enough to allow for creative experimentation.<sup>108</sup>

Reader-centric understandings of genre have become a mainstay of modern literary scholarship. Fowler, for instance, in his detailed study of literary kinds and their ability to transform over time, concludes that genre is "a communication system, for use of writers in writing, and readers and critics in reading and interpreting."<sup>109</sup> Classicists who specialize in genre theory have also adopted theories of this kind and have created numerous definitions for genre which, though different in their particulars, nevertheless emphasize author-audience communication and reader expectation:

"Tradition, code, and genre mediate between the self-enclosed, autonomous system of literary discourse and the referential language of social discourse. The specific functions of literature as system include the coherence and interrelation of literary works within a given context. Literary code and genre dictate the nature of the tacit communication between the poet and the audience. The two are the means by which the author signals to the reader how a particular part of the tradition is being used, and they govern the expectations that the reader may have regarding the level of style that the author may be using for a given content. By calling attention to the code, the author is able to indicate both his place in the continuum and his divergences from it."<sup>110</sup>

"We should view genre...not as something external to the work or as a category that modern critics impose for their convenience, but rather as the ancient poet's instrument for reaching the reader, organizing content and projecting thought in forms intelligible to the audience."<sup>111</sup>

"If a text's intention is considered as an active tension between virtuality and its actualization, the literary genre can be well defined as the sign of this intention. A means of signification incorporated into the text to give form and meaning to the discourse and

---

<sup>108</sup> On prescriptive genre's liberating effects see e.g. Santirocco (1986) 21; Fowler (1982) 29-31.

<sup>109</sup> Fowler (1982) 256.

<sup>110</sup> Segal from forward to Conte (1986) 9-10.

<sup>111</sup> Segal from forward to Conte (1994) xiii.

instructions to its reader, the genre is in fact the horizon marking the boundaries of its meaning and delimiting its real possibilities within the system of literary codification.”<sup>112</sup>

“Interest in genre makes other works by other authors more relevant than works in other genres by the same author, and similarly entails a greater focus on the act of communication: genre is a contract with the reader.”<sup>113</sup>

“a conceptual, orienting device that suggests to an audience the sort of receptional conditions in which a given fictive discourse might have been delivered or produced.”<sup>114</sup>

“The closest analogy that occurs to me is that provided by computer games where you become a character in a story and play a part in ‘writing’ that story from the narrative components that are offered, and may easily find yourself moving in all directions and not only forwards but also backwards in time. Genre, on this model, is the *interactive computer programme*...”

“Audiences clearly have a role...the audience/readers become detectives in search of clues. That the text constructs its audience in the sense that it creates a literary competence in its readership presents an ideal...which is not invariably realized.”

“Finally, then, a call for dialogue – and not just the dialogue between author and audience which takes place during performance and reading. We need not be reduced to a stark choice between seeing genre as description or prescription or as a process of either deduction or induction. What is happening is always a dialogue, both synchronic and diachronic, between the actual texts and the hypostasized genre...”<sup>115</sup>

“An audience, in whatever era it may encounter a literary work, must be familiar with the text’s genre and must be able to predict what the author’s contemporaries expected of that genre.”<sup>116</sup>

“The fundamental concept of a literary genre as applied in this book is that of a form which can be identified through a particular generic repertoire of external and internal features.”<sup>117</sup>

“We may, thus, define a system of genres as a cultural system of meaning shared by a community, consequently functioning as a means of communication.”<sup>118</sup>

This reader-centric understanding of generic expectations is important because it will provide an interpretive lens through which the remainder of this study will analyze Horace’s efforts at generic enrichment. In Chapter 3, for instance, we will reflect on the ancients’ use of tree and ship imagery as a means of enacting and representing their interactions with their audience’s generic expectations. When we consider the generic impact of the series of poems leading up to

---

<sup>112</sup> Conte (1994) 36.

<sup>113</sup> Lowrie (1997) 5.

<sup>114</sup> Depew and Obbink (2000) 168.

<sup>115</sup> Braund in Harrison (2001) 140-1.

<sup>116</sup> Sutherland (2002) 13.

<sup>117</sup> Harrison (2007) 11.

<sup>118</sup> Rotstein (2010) 4.

*Odes* 2.13 in section 4.2 we will do so with an eye towards how Horace has arranged them in such a way as to create an expectation in his readers which will encourage a proper reading of the ode. Finally, in our attempt to make sense of the conflicting accounts of Horace's salvation in Chapter 5.0, we will see how Horace creates dialogues between poems to shape his audiences expectations regarding the generic significance of his savior divinities.<sup>119</sup>

## 2.6 LYRIC EXPECTATIONS

If Horace's acts of generic enrichment are, at their core, founded on his readers' generic expectations, the last task this chapter must be to establish what readers in Horace's time would have expected of lyric poetry. To define lyric in such a way is a difficult task, however, and was

---

<sup>119</sup> This understanding of genre as a set of expectations also addresses a thorny issue which scholars seem to overlook. The phenomenon of generic enrichment is almost universally attributed to the Alexandrians, but I am grateful to Edwin Floyd for pointing out that some form of generic enrichment may have been operational even in earlier periods of Greek literature. Sappho 44, for instance, which treats the wedding of Hector and Andromache, is a lyric poem that clearly incorporates epic material. Homer too may be defying Indo-European epic expectations by presenting epic poetry as song that celebrates the deeds of contemporary heroes (e.g. *Odyssey* 1.325-52, Telemachus's defense of the song of Phemius – note that Telemachus says it is the “newest” (νεωτάτη, 352) song (i.e. generically new/enriched?) that is most praised by men – and 8.470-531, Odysseus's request to hear about the Trojan Horse). Is this generic enrichment and, if so, why do scholars not treat it as such? Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 18-9 briefly considers this possibility by pointing out that “generic ‘contamination’ was not the exclusive prerogative of the learned poetry of third-century Alexandria,” a point which they support through reference to a complaint found in Plato *Laws* 700 a-e: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου, ἄρχοντες μὲν τῆς ἀμούσου παρανομίας ποιηταὶ ἐγίγνοντο φύσει μὲν ποιητικοί, ἀγνώμονες δὲ περὶ τὸ δίκαιον τῆς Μούσης καὶ τὸ νόμιμον, βακχεύοντες καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ δέοντος κατεχόμενοι ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, κεραυνύντες δὲ θρήνους τε ὕμνοις καὶ παιῶνας διθυράμβοις, καὶ αὐλωδίας δὴ ταῖς κιθαρωδαῖς μιμούμενοι, καὶ πάντα εἰς πάντα συνάγοντες, μουσικῆς ἄκοντες ὑπ' ἀνοίας καταψευδόμενοι ὡς ὀρθότητα μὲν οὐκ ἔχει οὐδ' ἠντινοῦν μουσική, ἡδονὴ δὲ τῆ τοῦ χαίροντος, εἴτε βελτίων εἴτε χειρώων ἂν εἴη τις, κρίνοιτο ὀρθότατα. But Fantuzzi and Hunter later call the kind of generic enrichment denounced by Plato only “a partial analogue” for the “reconfiguration of the generic system” undertaken by the Alexandrians (21). This view likely stems from the fact that the concept of breaking generic rules (i.e. generic “contamination” or “corruption”) could not exist before said rules were rigidly established by the Alexandrians. If we reorient ourselves to think in terms of generic expectations we are able to avoid this problem of chronology and expand the reach of generic enrichment even into pre-Hellenistic Greek literature.

so even for the ancient Greeks and Romans themselves.<sup>120</sup> The incredible diversity exhibited by lyric ensures that ambiguity remains one of the most fundamental characteristics of the genre: it is sacred and secular, public and private, lofty and lowly. Even the name “lyric” itself is of little aid in this regard since some believe the lyre was used to accompany many types of poetry in ancient Greece.<sup>121</sup> Despite these difficulties, however, it is possible to develop an understanding of the general characteristics typical of the genre which would have been known to Horace and his readers, and knowledge of these characteristics will allow us to better identify moments when Horace has engaged in generic enrichment.

The style of poetry called “lyric” (λυρικός/*lyricus*) in Horace’s time was first defined as such in the Hellenistic period when the scholars of Alexandria brought together the wide array of occasion poems found in archaic and classical Greece into a single literary kind. The common characteristic shared by these poems was meter, specifically the fact that they did not feature the same metrical forms as other established genres such as epic, drama, elegy, and iambic.<sup>122</sup> In addition to defining the first collected corpus of lyric poems, the efforts of the Alexandrians also led to the creation of a list of nine poets – Alcaeus, Alcman, Anacreon, Bacchylides, Ibycus, Sappho, Simonides, Stesichorus, and Pindar – who forever afterwards were considered the canonical exemplars of the genre. Based on these origins it is logical to assume that two of the greatest expectations which Horace’s readers would have had when reading poetry which called itself “lyric” are connected to meter and authorial models. Proof of the validity of these

---

<sup>120</sup> Harrison (2005) 189: “Lyric poetry, notoriously fluid in modern literary categorization, was not much easier to pin down in the Graeco-Roman world.” On the absence of “lyric theory” in the ancient world see Johnson (1983) 76-95.

<sup>121</sup> See e.g. Harrison (2005) 189: “Even the idea originally fundamental to the genre that lyric poetry was to be sung by its performer(s) to the lyre was not a unique generic marker, even in archaic and classical Greece when such performances were frequent, since rhapsodes who recited Homeric epic poetry also used the lyre as accompaniment (e.g. Homer *Odyssey* 8.66).” We should point out, however, that the scene cited by Harrison actually involves a φόρμιγξ. Though the φόρμιγξ is an obvious relative of the lyre, we could argue against Harrison by pointing out that these are in fact two different kinds of instruments.

<sup>122</sup> Pfeiffer (1968) 182.

expectations can be found in the writings of Horace himself. In *Ars Poetica* 73-98, where Horace characterizes the various kinds of poetry, each genre is defined according to three criteria, two of which are meter used and famous practitioners (*auctores*). Therefore, in the minds of Horace and his readers, lyric poetry should metrically resemble the works of the established canon authors and should, either overtly or through subtle allusion, assert its connection to those authors.

Horace's *Odes* clearly make use of meters found in the works of the canonical nine, albeit with some changes born of the difficulties inherent in adapting Greek meters for use in Latin poetry.<sup>123</sup> The addition of a regular caesura to Alcaic and Sapphic hendecasyllables was equal parts Horatian personalization and metrical necessity.<sup>124</sup> Other changes, such as the abandoning of choral lyric's tripartite structure of strophe, antistrophe, and epode in favor of the repeated stanzas found in monodic lyric, came about as a result of natural tendencies towards metrical simplification in the Roman era.<sup>125</sup> Despite these alterations Horace maintains that he is nevertheless using the same meters as his lyric predecessors, as evidenced by his boast of being "the first to apply Aeolian song to Italic measures" (*princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*, 3.30.13-4). Horace reiterates this assertion throughout the *Odes* by pairing words of Greek and Latin origins in descriptions of his poetry, such as in 1.1 where Horace will be successful only if his Muses play the *tibia* (32) and *barbitos* (34, = βάρβιτος) together.<sup>126</sup> Similarly, in *Odes* 4.3, Horace claims that he is now famed as "a lyricist of the Roman lyre"

---

<sup>123</sup> On the technical difficulties of Horace's metrical achievement see Johnson (1983) 123-6.

<sup>124</sup> See Barchiesi in Harrison (2007) 148-9; Wilkinson (1940).

<sup>125</sup> Harrison (2005) 189.

<sup>126</sup> According to West (1967) 80 this pairing also reinforces the idea that Horace's poetry has combined choral and monodic lyric into a single entity: the *tibia* traditionally accompanied the chorus whereas the *barbitos* accompanied solo performers. See also Rudd (1996) 42; West (1995) 6.

(*Romanae fidicen lyrae*, 23), a phrase which contrasts the Latin word “*fides*” against the Greek word “*λύρα*” to reassert his success in naturalizing (*Romanae*) the meters of the Greek lyricists.

Horace does not merely state that he employs the meters of the Greeks, but also draws attention to his mastery of them. Perhaps the best known example of this is found in the “Parade Odes” of book 1, in which nine different meters are utilized over nine consecutive poems to prove Horace’s connection to his predecessors.<sup>127</sup> It should be noted, however, that just as Horace customized aspects of individual lyric meters according to his needs, so too did he personalize his usage of the meters over the course of his collection. Book 1, for example, features the greatest amount of metrical variation of all the books of the *Odes*, but over time Horace gradually narrows his focus until Alcaics and Sapphics become his dominant meters, used with the most frequency and in his most serious poems.<sup>128</sup> In this way Horace fulfills his readers’ expectations with regard to the manifold meters of Greek lyric while also providing himself with a means of establishing a distinct poetic identity.

Horace also openly acknowledges his status as a successor to the nine Greek lyric poets, all of whom appear in some way in the *Odes*.<sup>129</sup> By far the most obvious instance of this is in the opening poem of the *Odes*, in which Horace makes the bold claim that he will be included among the “lyric bards” (*lyricis vatibus*, 1.1.35), but Horace also acknowledges his place in the lyric tradition in a number of more subtle ways. Sometimes, for instance, Horace attempts to show his similarity to his models, such as in *Odes* 1.26 where he will sanctify Lamia “with a Lesbian plectrum” (*Lesbio...plectro*, 11) or in 1.32 where he speaks as if he has inherited his lyre from Alcaeus himself (3-12). At other times, however, Horace highlights his differences

---

<sup>127</sup> Santirocco (1986) 19-23.

<sup>128</sup> See Barchiesi in Harrison (2007) 148-9.

<sup>129</sup> For Horace’s connections to earlier Greek models see e.g. Clay in Davis (2010) 128-46; Hutchinson in Harrison (2007) 40-9; Barchiesi in Depew and Obbink (2000); Feeny in Rudd (1996); Johnson (1983) 134-9.

from a particular member of the canon, albeit in a way which demonstrates that he is no less versed in their methods or style. This is best seen in 4.2, where Horace contrasts his delicate technique of composing “in the custom and manner of a Matine bee” (*apis Matinae / more modoque*, 27-8) to that of Pindar who, “like a river running down a mountain” (*monte decurrens velut amnis*, 5), sings “with a profound mouth” (*profundo...ore*, 7-8). Despite these differences, Horace proves his mastery of the Pindaric tradition by summarizing the subject matter of Pindaric song in the style of the Greek poet himself (9-20).<sup>130</sup> Horace also hints at his connection to earlier poets through the use “mottos,” retranslations of lines from earlier Greek lyric poems, at the start of his own odes.<sup>131</sup> *Odes* 1.12 provides a classic example wherein a series of deliberative questions (*Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio? / quem deum?* 1-3) clearly alludes to the opening of Pindar’s *Olympian* 2 (Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι / τίνα θεόν, τίνα ἥρωα, τίνα δ’ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; 1-2). Horace typically uses these mottos not as a prelude to faithful Latin reproductions, however, but rather as a point of departure which introduces a uniquely Horatian reinterpretation after reasserting Horace’s familiarity with his Greek models.<sup>132</sup> In short, whether Horace includes them by some complex means such as a programmatic arrangement of songs,<sup>133</sup> or whether he simply has them appear in person within a single poem (2.13), the presence of the Greek lyricists is always felt in the *Odes*, and Horace always makes it clear to his audience that he is a successor to their achievements.

Horace also says at *Ars Poetica* 73-98 that genres are characterized by their subject matter, and as such we may assume that Horace’s readers would have expected lyric poetry to

---

<sup>130</sup> See Harrison (2005) 108-15.

<sup>131</sup> On “mottos” in Horace see Fraenkel (1966) 159 n.2.

<sup>132</sup> As Harrison (2005) 196 rightly points out, the fragmentary nature of the majority of extant Greek lyric means that it is difficult to know whether or not Horace ever engaged in “translations” along the lines of Catullus 51. On Horace’s use of “mottos” see also Cavarzere (1996).

<sup>133</sup> See Lowrie (1995).

concern itself with particular topics. Scholars commonly divide these topics between the two types of lyric found in archaic and classical Greek poetry. The more general themes of love, wine, politics, war, and abuse of enemies are attributed to monadic lyric and its practitioners, like Alcaeus and Sappho. Choral lyric, however, is connected to more specific categories or subgenres of songs such as hymns (paean, dithyramb, kletic) processional songs, maiden-songs, dirges, wedding songs, encomia, and epinicia.<sup>134</sup> Common to both, however, is the understanding that the subject matter of these songs is derived from their original performance contexts. Archaic monodic lyric, for instance, was almost exclusively performed at symposia where men of varied social backgrounds enjoyed the liberty of free speech (*παρρησία*) during a communal drinking event. Naturally such a setting became a forum for poetry concerned with contemporary politics as well as the pleasures of love and wine.<sup>135</sup>

By Horace's time, however, these occasions were no longer the wellspring of lyric activity, a change which brought about a number of alterations to Horace's treatment of the genre's subjects. Hymns, for instance, once removed from their original ritual contexts, can be combined with other categories of lyric songs or be addressed to atypical persons and objects, such as a fountain (3.13) or a wine jar (3.21). Additionally, since many of the lyric categories are shared with other genres, Horace's lyric treatment of these common subgenres occasionally comes to resemble treatments found in poems of other literary kinds. The "spring poem," for instance, is a song type common to both lyric and epigram, and many times a Horatian spring ode will draw from established models in both genres, as seen in *Odes* 1.4, which imitates an epigram by Leonidas after beginning with a motto taken from Alcaeus.<sup>136</sup> Similarly, Nisbet and

---

<sup>134</sup> Harrison (2005) 191. See also OCD s.v. Lyric poetry.

<sup>135</sup> Clay in Davis (2010) 129.

<sup>136</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 58-9.

Hubbard claim that the style of Horace's convivial poems, too, owes as much to Greek epigram as to the lyrics of Alcaeus.<sup>137</sup>

Several additional expected characteristics of lyric poetry are not addressed in Horace's three-part definition of genre according to meter, models, and subjects. One of these, identified by many scholars as one of the fundamental characteristics of the genre, is that lyric commonly consists of a dialogue between the speaker of the poem and an addressee. Johnson writes, "the most usual mode in Greek lyric (probably) and in Latin lyric (certainly) was to address the poem (in Greek, the song) to another person or to other persons," and he supports this claim with statistics showing that 87 percent of Horace's odes may be categorized as what he calls "I-You poems."<sup>138</sup> Lowrie, who summarizes this trend aptly by calling lyric "poetry that says 'O'" which is "between an 'I' and a 'you,'"<sup>139</sup> confirms Johnson's analysis by saying that all but three poems in the *Odes* include either an expressed or implied addressee.<sup>140</sup> Although these conversations technically take place between characters within the poems, the dialogue form may also create an extended dialogue between the author and his audience:<sup>141</sup>

Because lyric assumes a dialogue, Horace's lyricists expect that, when they speak, someone will hear and respond to their words. We may find that the *ego* of a given ode acknowledges an external audience (for example, those of us reading the poem) or an internal audience (an addressee or fictional audience that he delineates within the poem). The speaker may even entangle his audiences with one another by allowing his external audience to identify with an ode's addressee.

The prominence of dialogue in lyric poetry often leads to moments where the speaker of a poem attempts to influence the mind of his addressee and sway him towards a particular worldview. As a result ethical instruction in the form of direct advice, the use of gnomic

---

<sup>137</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xiv.

<sup>138</sup> Johnson (1983) 4.

<sup>139</sup> Lowrie (1997) 14, 20.

<sup>140</sup> Lowrie (1997) 22 n.3. The lack of an addressee in these odes (1.15, 1.34, 2.15) may result from the high degree of generic "contamination" within the poems in question. See e.g. Lowrie's discussion of the epic nature of *Odes* 1.15.

<sup>141</sup> Sutherland (2002) 12. See also Johnson (1983) 127: "Horace...makes sure, through his metaphoric second-person pronouns, that we are present to him."

sententiae, or appeals to idealized *exempla*, may also be considered a recurring element of the lyric genre. This comes as no surprise to any reader of Horace's *Odes*, which features whole poems dedicated to promoting the tenets of Epicurean, Stoic, and Peripatetic philosophy, but some scholars believe such moralizing is a uniquely Horatian addition to the genre which was not inherited from his Greek models.<sup>142</sup> Johnson's comparison between oratory and lyric, however, asserts that even among the Greeks lyric poetry included an epideictic function:<sup>143</sup>

In short, the epideictic orator, like the lyric poet, is concerned to offer paradigms of identity, patterns of schooled volition, and he does this by exalting or by censuring certain traits in human character with vivid, dramatic examples of what these traits are like, *may be* like, when we experience them in others or in ourselves. Similarly, in the Greek idea of lyric, then, the business of the lyric poet is to provide a criticism of human passion that will indicate which passions are to be embraced and which are to be shunned: the purpose of this demonstration is the education of the hearer, a process of education that functions not by the poet's stating what must be done or learned but rather by his showing what sorts of behavior, what configurations of identity, are possible or preferable.

Johnson's interpretation is supported by that of Miller, who maintains that even in the archaic period one of the primary goals of the Greek lyric poets was "to provide both entertainment and paradigms of personal behavior, the forms of deviance and the norm, of excellence, ἀρετή, and inadequacy."<sup>144</sup> Horace's injunctions to live in accordance with the golden mean (e.g. *Odes* 2.10), therefore, or to espouse the "*carpe diem*" lifestyle are not innovative additions to his genre, but rather a continuation of a trend which likewise encouraged Pindar to temper his praise of the victor with constant warnings against the dangers of improper actions brought on by satiety.<sup>145</sup> Whether Horace's lyric moralizing should be taken seriously in every instance, however, is an entirely different matter. Moles's study of philosophy and ethics in *Odes* 1-3 asserts that although approximately a third of the collection is "varyingly philosophical,"

---

<sup>142</sup> E.g. Harrison (2005) 197.

<sup>143</sup> Johnson (1983) 31.

<sup>144</sup> Miller (1994) 6.

<sup>145</sup> E.g. Pindar *Olympian* 1.54-7; *Isthmian* 4.11-3, 5.11-6; *Nemean* 4.69.

Horace's characteristic "avoidance of [an] exclusive commitment" to any particular school of thought will always leave the sincerity behind his pronouncements in doubt.<sup>146</sup>

The importance of occasion has already been discussed with regard to the question of the subject matter of lyric. Also important, however, is the notion that the occasional nature of the genre creates the expectation that each lyric poem represents an utterance delivered at a particular event or moment in time: a victory celebration, a symposium, a religious rite, etc. The circumstances of the event need not be given in great detail, and more often than not they are purposefully left vague in order that the impact of the utterance may transcend the "here and now" of the poem and extend its reach into the past and future. Little can be known with certainty about the occasion of Sappho 31, for instance, but the emotional and physical response of the narrator during her encounter with the "man equal to the gods" is understood to reflect not only her feelings at that particular instant, but also a state of affairs which is universal to the human experience.<sup>147</sup> In fulfillment of this expectation, Horace's includes a number of similarly unspecific events of this type, such as vaguely contextualized symposia (e.g. 1.27, 1.38) and hymns (e.g. 1.10, 1.30, 1.32, 2.19, 3.22). Barchiesi rightly points out, however, that Horace is equally capable of contextualizing lyric events with a degree of specificity atypical in Greek lyric.<sup>148</sup>

In terms of time perception, Horace differs from all Greek poets known to us: he works on the interplay, or clash, between "the impersonal grid of the state's time" [Feeney (1993) 58] and the subjective perception of individual experience (4.13.14-16 *tempora quae semel / notis condita fastis / inclusit volucris dies*). So he intensifies what we call the subjective element of time by bringing in the culturally specific, Roman resource of public time-reckoning....He is also unique in ancient lyric for his love of setting the time in calendrical terms – not just the rhythm of the seasons which are a perennial resource from Simonides to Kavafy....Poem 8 of Book 3 provides a date, 1 March 25 BCE, for the symposion: how frequent is this in a poem? I am not aware of any equivalent in Greek poetry.

---

<sup>146</sup> Moles in Harrison (2007) 171-4.

<sup>147</sup> On Sappho 31 and the universality of occasions see Johnson (1983) 40: "Sappho has dared a glance at them, and she has suffered like this before, has lived this moment before and lived through it. But in its essential strategy the poem dramatizes a particular moment with its particular passions and sudden clarity of knowledge and volition."

<sup>148</sup> Barchiesi in Harrison (2007) 153-4.

Another poem with a similarly dateable occasion is 3.28, which describes Horace's actions during the Neptunalia festival on 23 July, and many other odes, although their exact dramatic date cannot be known with certainty, nevertheless feature strong temporal markers.<sup>149</sup> Thus Horace both fulfills the expectation of ambiguous occasionality established by Greek lyric while at the same time personalizing his lyric events with sporadic moments of specificity drawn from the Roman calendar and contemporary history.

A final expectation of lyric poetry concerns the inherent musicality of the genre. Even though by the time of Catullus there appears to be no indication that Latin lyric poetry was intended to be performed as an accompanied song,<sup>150</sup> its reliance on the Greek meters, originally developed as part of a musical performance, necessitated a continued illusion of musicality at a thematic level rather than in reality.<sup>151</sup> Thus Horace's readers would have expected the *Odes* to style themselves as songs rather than as pieces of literature. Accordingly, Horace consistently depicts himself as a singer rather than an author, save for a single moment in the entirety of the *Odes* where he hints at the physical, literary reality of his poetry, speaking of silent "pages" (*chartae*, 4.8.21) which bring no fame to the subjects of song. We could assert that this lapse in the façade of orality is a sign of Horace's self-assurance in the wake of his former lyric collection and his prestigious appointment as poet of the Augustan Secular Games. Horace was so encouraged by his poetic success, according to this view, that he felt safe in stepping away, if only for a brief moment, from an expected convention of the lyric genre.<sup>152</sup> It is safer to assume,

---

<sup>149</sup> E.g. *Odes* 1.29 = Arabian expedition (26-25 BC), 1.31 = Dedication of Palatine Temple of Apollo (9 October 28 BC), 1.36 = Spanish campaign (27-25 or 24 BC), 1.37 = Actium/Suicide of Cleopatra (30 BC), 3.18 = Lupercalia and Faunalia. For dates see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) and Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad. loc.

<sup>150</sup> Harrison (2005) 191.

<sup>151</sup> On the illusion of musicality see e.g. Barchiesi in Harrison (2007) 148; Johnson (1983) 126-7.

<sup>152</sup> Such a view might also explain several other formal oddities in the ode, including the absence of a caesura in line 17 and the ode's total number of lines (34) which does not conform to "Meineke's Law." On these and other difficulties around which "a large deal of literature has accumulated" see Shorey and Laing (1960) 444-5.

however, that the poem's focus on material gifts provided Horace with a fitting reason to subvert the expectation of orality in favor of a brief reminder of the physical reality of his text.

### 3.0 TREES AND GENERIC ENRICHMENT

In the previous chapter we laid the groundwork for our discussion of generic enrichment in Horace's *Odes*. In this chapter we will reflect on a specific tool, tree imagery, through which Horace engages with his audience's expectations and dramatizes his program of generic enrichment. After briefly redefining several important items (vine, ivy, and ships) as trees, we will detail the metapoetic potential of trees and ships in classical poetry more broadly and in Horace's *Odes* specifically. We will consider each item not only in terms of its general use as a programmatic symbol but also in terms of its ability to represent generic enrichment more specifically. We will then conclude this chapter by demonstrating how Horace uses trees and ships alongside one another throughout his lyric collection to create a large-scale program of generic symbolism.

#### 3.1 PRELIMINARY NOTES ON UNUSUAL TREES

Before we begin our discussion of Horace's programmatic use of trees in earnest we must comment briefly on several items whose classification among trees in the ancient world may surprise modern thinkers. Although this may seem like a point of minor importance, the frequent reappearance of these items throughout the remainder of this study necessitates such a defense of their arboreal nature.

### 3.1.1 Unexpected *Arbores*: Vine and Ivy

Though the idea runs counter to common botanical classifications the ancients considered vine and ivy to be trees.<sup>1</sup> The writings of two classical authors make this point clear. The first of these is Theophrastus, author of both the *Historia Plantarum* and the *De Causis Plantarum*, who is typically considered the founder of botany. The second is Pliny the Elder whose *Naturalis Historia* contains six books devoted to plants. Together these works constitute the best sources of information for insight into Greek and Roman views on trees.<sup>2</sup>

Both authors declare that vine is a tree without qualification. Theophrastus explicitly lists it alongside the olive and the fig in his definition of a δένδρον (*Hist. Pl.* 1.3.1) and Pliny includes it among trees in a number of passages. He lists wine as a product of trees (12.2), the vine as a type of tree with watery sap (16.72), and claims that vine has traditionally been included among trees thanks to its tendency to grow to great size (14.2). Ivy's classification as a tree, however, is slightly more complicated, partially because both Theophrastus (*Hist. Pl.* 3.18.9-10) and Pliny (16.62) describe the harmful, parasitic effects that some varieties of ivy can have on trees. Though Theophrastus originally lists ivy as a shrub (θάμνος) rather than a tree (1.3.1) he later claims that it is an example of the types of plants which can become trees (γίνεται δένδρα, *Hist. Pl.* 1.3.2; ἀποδενδροῦται, *Hist. Pl.* 3.18.9) if allowed to grow unchecked. Pliny, who also notes the ivy's potential for growth, lists it among the "civilized trees" (*urbanae arbores*) which do not lose their leaves (16.32-3).

Poets like Horace, his predecessors, and his contemporaries, all subscribe to these classifications of vine and ivy. Horace, for example, explicitly calls the vine a tree in *Odes* 1.18

---

<sup>1</sup> This section follows closely the information found in Fenton (2008) 560 n.2.

<sup>2</sup> See Meiggs (1998) 17-29. Text of Pliny taken from Mayhoff.

where he commands, “plant no tree, Varus, before the sacred vine” (*nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem*, 1), an imitation of a line of Alcaeus which features a similar sentiment.<sup>3</sup>

In *Georgics* 2.47-72 Vergil includes the vine among trees whose growth can be improved through proper care,<sup>4</sup> and the story of Orpheus from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* includes both ivy and vine in the catalogue of trees charmed by Orpheus’s song (10.86-105, emphasis added):

*Collis erat collemque super planissima campi  
area, quam viridem faciebant graminis herbae.  
umbra loco deerat; qua postquam parte resedit  
dis genitus vates et fila sonantia movit,  
umbra loco venit. non Chaonis abfuit arbor, 90  
non nemus Heliadum, non frondibus aesculus altis,  
nec tiliae molles, nec fagus et innuba laurus,  
et coryli fragiles et fraxinus utilis hastis  
enodisque abies curvataque glandibus ilex  
et platanus genialis acerque coloribus inpar 95  
amnicolaeque simul salices et aquatica lotos  
perpetuoque virens buxum tenuesque myricae  
et bicolor myrtus et bacis caerulea tinus.  
vos quoque, flexipedes hederæ, venistis et una  
pampineae vites et amictae vitibus ulmi 100  
ornique et piceae pomoque onerata rubenti  
arbutus et lentæ, victoris præmia, palmae  
et succincta comas hirsutaque vertice pinus,  
grata deum Matri; siquidem Cybeleius Attis  
exiit hac hominem truncoque induruit alto. 105*

There was a hill, and on the hill was a great open space that was made green by blades of grass. The site was devoid of shade. After the bard, descendant of the gods, sat in that place and roused his sounding strings shade came to the site. The Chaonian oak was not missing, nor the grove of the Heliades, the oak with its lofty leaves, the soft linden, the beech, the unmarried laurel, the brittle hazel, the ash, suited for spear-hafts, the smooth silver-fir, the ilex weighed-down by its acorns, the pleasing plane, the maple of many colors, the river-growing willows, the watery lotus, the boxwood evergreen, the slender tamarisk, the two-colored myrtle, the viburnum blue with berries. *You came also, grasping-footed ivy, and alongside you came the many-tendrilled vine* and elms covered in vines, mountain-ashes and forest-pines, the arbutus heavy with red fruit, the pliant palm, the victors reward, and the bare-trunked pine with its shaggy peak, pleasing to the mother of the gods since Attis, dear to Cybele, cast off his human form for this and grew hard inside the tree’s tall trunk.

<sup>3</sup> Alcaeus frag. 342: μηδ’ ἐν ἄλλο φυτεύσης πρότερον δένδριον ἀμπέλω.

<sup>4</sup> See also Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 230.

### 3.1.2 Unforgotten *Arbores*: Ships

Greco-Roman literary conventions put forth the idea that ships, the byproducts of trees, are in many ways considered to be trees themselves. Poets often used the names of specific types of trees as substitutes for words like *navis*, such as when Virgil's use of the word "fir" (*abies*) in the *Aeneid* to mean "ship" (5.662-3, 8.91).<sup>5</sup> Poets also speak of nautical "pines," a type of tree frequently used in the construction of warships and merchantmen alike,<sup>6</sup> as seen in the opening of Catullus 64 where "pines once sprung from the peak of Pelion are said to have swum through the flowing waves of Neptune" (*Peliaco quondam prognatae vertice pinus / dicuntur liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas*, 1-2).<sup>7</sup> Horace would later use a similar image in *Odes* 1.14 where he addresses a ship as "Pontic pine, daughter of a noble forest" (*Pontica pinus, / silvae filia nobilis*, 11-2).<sup>8</sup> Additionally, many words associated with trees also serve as metaphors for boats, such as the Latin word for "beam" or "timber" (*trabs*).<sup>9</sup> In *Odes* 1.1, for instance, a timid sailor rides upon a "Cyprian timber" (*trabe Cypria*, 13), and in the *Aeneid* Mercury tells Aeneas, "Soon you will see the sea troubled by timbers" (*iam mare turbari trabibus...videbis*, 5.66). "*Carina*," meanwhile, which is often translated as "hull" or "keel," is etymologically connected to the Greek word "κάρυον," which refers to the seeds of certain trees.<sup>10</sup>

Mere wordplay is not the fullest extent of this trend. Classical authors often capitalized on the connection between ships and trees in order to create meaningful, and occasionally

---

<sup>5</sup> See also Vergil *Georgics* 2.68: *nascitur...casus abies visura marinos*.

<sup>6</sup> Meiggs (1998) 142.

<sup>7</sup> See also Vergil *Aeneid* 10.206; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 14.88.

<sup>8</sup> See also Martial's portrayal of a table in *Epigrams* 14.90: *non sum crispa quidem nec silvae filia Maurae, / sed norunt lautas et mea ligna dapes*. "*nobilis*" translated as genitive as per Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 186.

<sup>9</sup> Vergil *Aeneid* 9.86-7 indicates that, in addition to its more general meanings of "timber" and "tree," *trabs* can also refer specifically to the branches of trees: *lucus in arce fuit summa, quo sacra ferebant, / nigranti picea trabibusque obscurus acernis*.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. Theophrastus *Historia Plantarum* 1.11.3; LSJ s.v. κάρυον.

humorous, scenes. Ovid’s description of the great flood in *Metamorphoses* 1.291-312, for instance, uses its portrayal of ships and submerged trees to emphasize the confusion of the natural order of the world. Farmers, planters of trees, are transformed into sailors and “ply oars there where recently they had plowed” (*ducit remos illic, ubi nuper ararat*, 294), ships sail amongst trees as “curved keels wear down the buried vineyards” (*subiecta terunt curvae vineta carinae*, 298), fish and dolphins swim amongst the branches of trees rather than around ships (296, 302-3), and “Nereids marvel at groves beneath the water” (*mirantur sub aqua lucos...Nereides*, 301-2) rather than at ships.<sup>11</sup> Vergil, too, brings humor to *Aeneid* 4.397-400 by capitalizing on the verbal similarity between *ramus* (“branch”) and *remus* (“oar”):<sup>12</sup>

*tum uero Teucri incumbunt et litore celsas  
deducunt toto navis. natat uncta carina,  
frondentisque ferunt remos et robora silvis  
infabricata fugae studio.*

400

Then indeed did the Teucrians set about their work and draw down their tall ships all along the shore, and in their eagerness for flight they brought forth oars still covered in leaves and unwrought oak.

Two lighthearted passages in Pliny show that even prose authors enjoyed setting ships and trees against one another in this way. The first, at *Naturalis Historia* 16.23, concerns a particularly useful type of pitch called “zopissa.” Unlike other types of pitch zopissa is not taken from trees but is instead scraped off the bottoms of seagoing ships. These “ships which act like trees” by continuing to provide pitch even after their transformation into sailing vessels are countered by another episode at *Naturalis Historia* 16.2, which describes “another marvel from the forests” (*aliud e silvis miraculum*) which occurs on the shores of two lakes in Germany:

---

<sup>11</sup> See Ahl (1985) 102: “Ovid emphasizes the odd presence of marine life in forests and the surprise of sea nymphs who normally encounter ships of oak, not forests of oak, as they swim.”

<sup>12</sup> My thanks to my student, Sophia Taborski, for bringing this passage to my attention.

*litora ipsa optinent quercus maxima aviditate nascendi, suffossaeque fluctibus aut propulsae flatibus vastas complexu radicum insulas secum auferunt, atque ita libratae stantes navigant, ingentium ramorum armamentis saepe territis classibus nostris, cum velut ex industria fluctibus agerentur in proras stantium noctu, inopesque remedii illae proelium navale adversus arbores inirent.*

The shores themselves are possessed by oaks with a very great desire for growth, and when they have been undermined by waves or driven by blasts of wind they carry off with them huge islands in the embrace of their roots, and thus balanced they sail along, upright, and our fleets are often terrified by the rigging of their huge branches when they are driven by the waves, as if on purpose, into the prows of ships docked at night which, with no other alternative, enter into a naval battle with trees.

What is the source of these literary conventions? The simplest explanation lies in the obvious realities of ship construction. The ancients possessed a detailed understanding of the physical properties of different varieties of wood and their usefulness not only for building various kinds of ships, but also for building specific parts of ships.<sup>13</sup> Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* says that fir, for example, is especially prized for shipbuilding in general (16.18) and for making masts in particular thanks to its lightness and tendency to grow tall and straight (16.76), while black thorn is valuable when crafting the sides of ships because of its ability to resist water damage (13.19).<sup>14</sup> It is not only the necessity of wood for ship construction which connects trees to ships. Many overlook the fact that non-timber tree products played a crucial role in ship construction and maintenance, such as pitch extracted from certain varieties of pine trees which Pliny tells us was used "for the strengthening of rigging" (*navalibus muniendis*, 16.21).

A more eloquent explanation for the deep connection between trees and ships appears in Fantham's interpretation of a particular scene in the *Aeneid* that similarly blurs the line between trees and ships.<sup>15</sup> At *Aeneid* 9.69-122 the fleet of Aeneas escapes fiery destruction at the hands of Turnus because the ships, which once were pine trees in a grove sacred to Cybele, are transformed into nymphs (117-22):

---

<sup>13</sup> For a detailed treatment of trees and shipbuilding in the ancient world see Meiggs (1998) 116-53.

<sup>14</sup> For other tree types and their uses in naval construction, see also Theophrastus *Historia Plantarum* 5.7.1-3.

<sup>15</sup> Fantham (1990).

*et sua quaeque*  
*continuo puppes abrumpunt vincula ripis*  
*delphinumque modo demersis aequora rostris*  
*ima petunt. hinc virgineae (mirabile monstrum)* 120  
*reddunt se totidem facies pontoque feruntur.* 122

And immediately each ship tore her line from the bank and, like dolphins, sought the depths of the sea with diving beaks. Then (strange wonder!) just as many returned in the shape of virgin girls and swam upon the sea.

The ultimate goal of Fantham’s analysis is to prove that Vergil intends this passage to act as equal parts literary allusion and Augustan moralization, but along the way her study teaches us that in the minds of the ancients a tree, even after it has been fashioned into a ship, nevertheless retains its former nature. On the subject of Vergil’s literary influences in this scene, she writes:<sup>16</sup>

There is no doubt that both Catullus and Apollonius provided a tradition that privileged the ship as something more than an artifact, still carrying the life of the trees it had been, whether constructed by men alone or with divine assistance.

...

Thus Vergil had precedent for retaining the identity of his trees while describing their experiences as ships, and for portraying these ships as personalities.

...

Not only has Vergil traced the creation of the fleet from trees and its recreation as nymphs, but through the use of *formabat* (80) and *mortalem...formam* (101) he has stressed from the beginning the transitional nature of the ships' manufactured form....The ships have a form imposed by man, and this is doomed to perish; but their raw material (*silva* and *materies* are the ancient terms for both timber and matter) has a soul capable of taking on a new, immortal existence, at the will of a god.

So, too, when the nymphs emerge from the sea, the reflexive verb *reddunt se* (122) carries a double meaning: not only do they return to the surface, they are also restored to their proper nature.

This ancient conceit therefore allows us to claim ships as “trees” just as easily as we might consider trees to be “ships *in potentia*.” Thus even though for the sake of convenience this study will sometimes speak of “metapoetic trees” or “generic trees” as something separate from “metapoetic ships” or “generic ships,” we must never lose sight of the fact that in the minds of the ancients, and in particular the minds of poets, these terms effectively refer to the same thing.

---

<sup>16</sup> For these quotes and Fantham’s discussion of the fleet’s requisition of its true form see Fantham (1990) 106-8.

### 3.2 METAPOETIC TREES

The world of nature provided an abundance of symbols which poets could employ for the purpose of self-expression. Horace himself is so adept at manipulating nature imagery for programmatic goals that oftentimes the complexity of a single image can give rise to multiple, and even contradictory, interpretations. Many, for instance, are agreed that Horace's attempt to enroll the font of Bandusia among the famous springs of Greek literature in *Odes* 3.13 is a metapoetic statement about the power of literary immortality connected to his own wish in *Odes* 1.1 to be enrolled amongst the Greek lyric poets.<sup>17</sup> On the question of the spring's meaning with regard to his literary models, however, opinions vary greatly. To some the poem's depictions of gentle waters serve to compare and contrast Horatian poetics with the rain-swollen torrent of Pindaric verse,<sup>18</sup> to others its complex allusions to Callimachus are designed to reflect Horace's Callimachean outlook,<sup>19</sup> and still others claim that Horace distorts Callimachus's imagery in order to align himself with Alcaeus instead.<sup>20</sup> This multiplicity of possible interpretations derived from a single image acts as sound proof of Horace's skill at adapting features of the natural world to suit his own ends, and his success in doing so is often cited as one of the greatest features of Horace's poetry.<sup>21</sup>

Naturally a capable poet such as Horace can likewise use nature as a vehicle for generic enrichment. Consider, once again, the Bandusian spring of *Odes* 3.13. Horace's description of

---

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Fraenkel (1966) 203, 423.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. Commager (1966) 323: "The limpid water might be viewed as a counter-image to the turbulent stream that represents Pindar's inspired verse (C. 4.2.5 ff.)."

<sup>19</sup> See e.g. Curley (2003).

<sup>20</sup> See e.g. Morgan (2009) 139-40; Curley (2004).

<sup>21</sup> E.g. Lefkowitz (1962) 66. "Horace's ability to convert landscape into imagery is surely one of the most original and enduring aspects of his poetic genius."

the spring includes a clear focus on the juxtaposition of opposites: the waters of the font are cold (*gelidos*, 6; *frigus*, 10) and clear (*splendidior vitro*, 1) yet they will be clouded by warm blood (6-8),<sup>22</sup> Horace's poetic art will enroll these Italian waters among the famous Greek springs (*fies nobilium tu quoque fontium, / me dicente*, 13-4),<sup>23</sup> the Bandusian font brings refreshment to some animals (10-2) but death to the kid (3) whose newfound virility and power cannot prevent its imminent demise (4-6).<sup>24</sup> Such obvious overtones of mixing, when considered in the light of the metapoetic interpretations of *Odes* 3.13 already mentioned above, cannot help but suggest that this ode also treats the subject of generic enrichment. As Mader's genre-focused interpretation of the poem shows, Horace's praise of the *fons Bandusiae* is in fact a celebration of the generically enriched style which Horace employs throughout the *Odes*:<sup>25</sup>

Horace's homage to the *fons* is also a tribute to the poetry that will immortalize its subject. The ode that begins with the pure Callimachean waters and the emblems of lyric conviviality rises to an "epic" note with the promise of future fame for the spring. If beginning and end fix the ode's generic coordinates, the second strophe synthesizes the two voices: the spring's clear water stained with the kid's blood, literally an act of sacrifice, as metaphor suggests also the blending genres, the fusion of epic and lyric strains, and to that extent effectively prefigures the "epic" prediction at the climax of the ode.

Springs like the *Fons Bandusiae* are but one of the elements of the natural world frequently used by poets as a vehicle for metapoetic self-representation. Trees are yet another, and their symbolic use can be traced to Indo-European literary conventions which likened the poet to a carpenter, a man who could manipulate words as skillfully as a craftsman shapes timber.<sup>26</sup> Many poets use this trope overtly, such as Pindar who speaks of "carpenters of sweet-voiced songs" (*μελιγαρύων τέκτονες / κόμων*, *Nemean* 3.4-5) and of stories learned "from the

---

<sup>22</sup> On the antitheses in Horace's depiction of the waters see Hexter in Whitby, Hardie, and Whitby (1987) 131-9.

<sup>23</sup> West (2002) 120: "The famous fountains were all Greek....Horace's Bandusia now joins this company. And the syntax enacts the message, *fies nobilium tu quoque fontium*, 'you, too, will become of the famous fountains'. This use of the genitive plural after the verb 'to be' or 'to become' is not Latin but Greek....As he confers Greek status on an Italian spring, he glides into Greek syntax."

<sup>24</sup> On these and other contrasts in the poem see Wilson (1968).

<sup>25</sup> Mader (2002).

<sup>26</sup> See West (2007) 38-40.

resounding words such as skilled carpenters have joined together” (ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί / ἄρμωσαν, *Pythian* 3.113-4), but the connection between poetry and trees can be seen in a number of literary conventions. Certain trees and their foliage, for example, are typically associated with the poet’s craft, especially (but not exclusively) the laurel. Greco-Roman poets use forest imagery to refer to their collected works, speaking of their *silvae*, *prata*, or λεμιῶνες,<sup>27</sup> and words like *materia/materies* or ὕλη, which literally mean “timber” and “forest,” respectively, also can refer to the subject or theme of a poem. Trees therefore provide poets like Horace with yet another metapoetic symbol with which to discuss not only poetic activity in general, but also the specific topic of generic enrichment.<sup>28</sup>

### 3.2.1 General Metapoetic Trees in Horace

Horace’s works reflect all of the common connections between trees and poetry. Horace tells his readers that the laurel, for instance, has been and always will be a fixture of his life, from his infancy when he was so cherished by the Muses that a blanket of laurel and myrtle kept him safe from wild beasts in *Odes* 3.4.9-20 to his eventual escape from death through song, signified at *Odes* 3.30 in his request that Melpomene “crown [his] hair with laurel” (*lauro cinge...comam*, 16). In the *Ars Poetica* Horace twice uses *materia* to refer to poetic subject material, first in his command to “take up a subject equal to your abilities” (*sumite materiam vestris...aequam / viribus* 38-9) and again in his claim that “a common subject will become your private property” (*publica materies privati iuris erit*, 131) if handled properly. Horace’s advice in the *Ars Poetica* to poets on the creation of new vocabulary also includes a simile which likens words to leaves (58-62):

---

<sup>27</sup> Fenton (2008) 563.

<sup>28</sup> For additional analysis of metapoetic trees outside of Horace see Henkel (2009).

*licuit semperque licebit  
signatum praesente nota producere nomen.  
ut silvae foliis pronos mutantur in annos,  
prima cadunt: ita verborum vetus interit aetas,  
et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigentque.*

60

It has been and always will be allowed to bring forth a word stamped with a modern mark. Just as forests through flying years are changed by their leaves, and the oldest fall, so too will the old age of words perish, and the newborn, in the manner of youths, will flourish and thrive.

In *Satires* 1.10.31-5 Horace describes his early attempts at Greek verse using another tree proverb:

*atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra,  
versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus,  
post mediam noctem visus cum somnia vera,  
'in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si  
magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas.'*

35

But when I would write little verses in Greek, though born on this side of the sea, Quirinus, having appeared after midnight, when dreams are true, forbade me with such a voice: “You could not be guilty of more madness by carrying logs into a forest than if you wished to fill the great ranks of the Greeks.”

Horace does not merely parrot these poetic conventions regarding trees but instead uses them to make profound statements about himself and his poetry. *Odes* 1.38, for example, is often interpreted as a profession of Horace’s preference for a simpler lyrical style<sup>29</sup> because the “Persian pomp” (*Persicos...apparatus*, 1) he disdains possesses a “literary-generic association with protracted composition...best glossed from the prologue to Callimachus’s *Aetia* – the canonic text for Augustan critical programs – where the Persian *schoinos* (a unit of land measurement) is dismissed as a criterion of artistic excellence.”<sup>30</sup> The various trees mentioned in *Odes* 1.38 also contribute to this espousal of Callimachean aesthetics. Davis, for instance, calls the poem a “poetic manifesto” which hinges on the fact that the leaf crown (*corona*) frequently acts as a metaphor for poetry itself.<sup>31</sup> With this in mind, we can reinterpret Horace’s

<sup>29</sup> See e.g. Fraenkel (1966) 297-9.

<sup>30</sup> Davis (1991) 120. The relevant passage of Callimachus comes from *Aetia* 17-8: ἔλλατε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένοισι· αὐθι δὲ τέχνη / κρίνετε,] [μὴ σχοίνω Περσίδι τῆ] [ν] σοφίην·

<sup>31</sup> Davis (1991) 118-20.

preference in garlands as a profession of stylistic values. The rejected “garlands woven with linden” (*nexae philyra coronae*, 2) represent “poems of an ambitious scope and grandiloquent texture”<sup>32</sup> and the “late rose” (*rosa...sera*, 3-4) “represents a seeking after ornateness and preciousity in a context that requires an unpretentious elegance.”<sup>33</sup>

Instead of these, Horace desires nothing more than a garland made with “simple myrtle” (*simplici myrto*, 5), a plant with two levels of stylistic meaning. First, myrtle’s connections to Venus and its use in the symposium make it an ideal representation of the amatory and sympotic themes characteristic of Horace’s poetry. This sympotic aspect is reinforced yet again by Horace’s final words, where he speaks of himself “drinking beneath the close-packed vine” (*sub arta / vite bibentem*, 8). Second, myrtle’s status as one of the commonest plants means that it can also represent everyday activities and simple living, common *topoi* of Horatian lyric which coincide with the generic expectations of Horace’s audience.<sup>34</sup> In short, Davis asserts that Horace uses the trees referenced in *Odes* 1.38 to make a comment about his poetry, namely, that he desires to espouse a simpler, more Callimachean style devoid of grand themes and overwrought presentation.

West also interprets *Odes* 1.38 by way of its plants, but comes to a slightly different conclusion. Like Davis, West recognizes myrtle as a symbol of the erotic through its connection to Venus, and he uses this to emphasize a romantic undercurrent running throughout the scene:<sup>35</sup>

‘Do no added work (*nihil allabores*) on the simple myrtle. Myrtle looks not bad on you as you [*sic*] my cupbearer or on me as I drink beneath the vine.’ From this we know that Horace is alone with the boy, that Horace and the boy are each wearing a garland of Venus’ plant and that Horace finds that it suits the boy as it is – he does not need to go and work at it to make it more elaborate. After all these statements how can we not hear the quiet compliment, the hint of consideration and of gentle bibulous and amatory impatience?

---

<sup>32</sup> Davis (1991) 122-3.

<sup>33</sup> Davis (1991) 124.

<sup>34</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 425.

<sup>35</sup> West (1995) 192.

This reinterpretation of Horace's intentions is not without stylistic impact. West believes that the depiction of homosexual love, a generically-expected subject here hinted at through the shared myrtle crowns, is meant to invoke the poetry of Alcaeus, which frequently dealt with this theme. For West *Odes* 1.38 thus embodies Horace's attempt to align his poetry with that of one of his oft-professed lyric models.<sup>36</sup>

Horace's ability to impart meaning through metapoetic trees is not limited to single poems. Instead, intricate patterns involving trees span the entirety of the *Odes* which can be used for a variety of programmatic purposes. Commager, for instance, believes that Horace uses the natural world, and in particular tree symbolism, to address issues of time and change and to teach his addressees, as well as his readers, about the inevitability of aging, the necessity of accepting its limitations, and the difficult vicissitudes of life. Throughout the *Odes* Horace praises those who learn to accept these fundamental truths and criticizes those who do not, all the while using trees and their seasonal cycles of bloom and decay to make his point.<sup>37</sup>

In *Odes* 1.25, for example, Horace warns Lydia that she will be abandoned by her youthful lovers as her beauty fades, until the time comes when she will complain (17-20)

*laeta quod pubes hederæ virenti  
gaudeat pulla magis atque myrto,  
aridas frondes hiemis sodali  
dedicet Hebro.*

20

because happy youth delights more in green ivy and dark myrtle and dedicates dry leaves to Hebrus, winter's companion.

The contrast between verdant and dried leaves is a clear metaphor for youth and age, but Horace's imagery is more complicated. By reminding his audience of the seasons through the phrase, "winter's companion" (*hiemis sodali*, 19), Horace emphasizes the progression of the

---

<sup>36</sup> West (1995) 192-3.

<sup>37</sup> See Commager (1966) 235-306.



symbolized by the laboring, “white-haired” trees at the start of the poem, and youth, which is verdant and remote from old age (*virenti canities abest*, 17).

### 3.2.2 Horatian Trees and Generic Enrichment

Commager’s examples show that Horace was fully aware of the tree’s metaphoric potential and as such we should expect that Horace also uses them in the *Odes* as part of his program of generic enrichment. One of the most detailed studies on this subject is that of Fenton, who believes that the beginning of *Odes* 1 contains a “parade” of twelve separate kinds of trees over the course of the first fourteen poems. The large number of trees mentioned combined with Horace’s predilection for creating meaningful patterns at the start of each book of the *Odes*, such as the Parade Odes of book 1, the genre-focused series which opens book 2,<sup>40</sup> or the Roman Odes of book 3, suggests that Horace intends these early trees to have programmatic significance. For Fenton, Horace’s intent in creating this complex arrangement of trees is to reflect his mastery over the genre of lyric and its varied assortment of themes and subjects.<sup>41</sup>

Fenton’s analysis begins with *Odes* 1.1, where Horace uses the connotations of three different types of trees in order to define his lyric persona. The first is the palm, which Horace links to Pindaric epinikian through its association with athletics and Horace’s description of the charioteer. The palm, however, and hence the style of poetry that it represents, is rejected over the course of the poem’s priamel, and Horace later presents a second tree, the arbutus, in a scene of leisurely bucolic wine drinking. Though more preferable than the palm and its poetic subject matter, this tree is also rejected in favor of a final tree, the ivy (29-32):

---

<sup>40</sup> On this series see Sutherland (2002) 74-130 and this study’s treatment in section 4.2.

<sup>41</sup> Fenton (2008) 564.

*me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium  
dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus  
Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori  
secernunt populo...*

30

Ivy, reward for learned brows, mixes me with the gods above. The chilly grove and light choruses of Nymphs and Satyrs separate me from the masses.

At first glance, the style of poetry presented here is similar to that in the arbutus scene since both feature highly bucolic subjects (groves, satyrs, nymphs, etc). In lines 29-32, however, Fenton believes that Horace has qualified the bucolic nature of the scene through the unique qualities of ivy. As the plant of Bacchus, ivy strongly represents the sympotic aspects of Horace's lyric in a way that the simple arbutus does not. Bacchus is also the god of ecstasy who transports his worshipers from the human to the divine realm, and his plant thus acts as a representation of Horace's role as a prophetic *vates* figure. This point is strengthened further by Horace's claim that "ivy mixes me with the gods above" (*me...hederæ...dis miscent superis*, 29-30). In short, the connotations of the trees in *Odes* 1.1 are used by Horace to reject certain types of lyric subjects in favor of a more sympotic lyric which can also allow him to develop a divine, vatic persona.<sup>42</sup>

The remaining trees in *Odes* 1 are then used to bolster the sympotic character of Horace's lyric, to downplay other genres, or to expose Horace's stylistic ideals. Myrtle, for instance, appears in *Odes* 1.4 and 1.25 as a symbol of convivial enjoyment, and its status as a common, simple tree makes it an ideal symbol for Callimachean poetics in *Odes* 1.38. Callimachus again appears in *Odes* 1.7, where the olive wreath, representing poetry concerned with hackneyed subjects treated at inappropriate length, is contrasted with Teucer's poplar wreath which represents the more original and learned verse of Horace.<sup>43</sup> The vine, with its obvious connections to wine, clearly acts as an analogue for sympotic poetry, and thus Fenton interprets

---

<sup>42</sup> Fenton (2008) 566.

<sup>43</sup> Fenton (2008) 568.

Horace's command in *Odes* 1.18, "plant no tree, Varus, before the sacred vine" (*nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem*, 1), as a claim for the superiority of sympotic themes over all other lyric topics. This primacy of the vine is reinforced by its prominent placement in the final line of book 1, where the sympotic quality of Horace's last words (*vite bibentem*, *Odes* 1.38.8) makes even more clear the obvious connection between the vine and sympotic poetry. Finally, Horace uses allusions to Vergil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid* in *Odes* 1.2 and 1.3, respectively, to connect the elm and oak to warfare. The former represents real civil strife, which makes the lyric lifestyle impossible, and the latter represents epic poetry, whose subject matter is antithetical to lyric themes.<sup>44</sup>

Fenton continues by examining *Odes* 1.12 and 1.24, a matched pair of odes which focus on the incredible power of Orpheus whose songs are able to control the natural world and, more specifically, trees. In *Odes* 1.12 "forests followed singing Orpheus" (*vocalem...insecutae / Orphea silvae*, 7-8) and Orpheus is able "to lead listening oaks with singing lyre" (*auritas fidibus canoris / ducere quercus*, 11-2). In *Odes* 1.24 Horace once again praises Orpheus' power by saying that Vergil would be unable to bring back the dead Quintilius "even if [he] could harmonize the lyre heard by trees more pleasantly than Thracian Orpheus" (*si Theicio blandius Orptheo / auditam moderere arboribus fidem*, 13-4). By highlighting Orpheus' ability to control trees through song, Horace is attempting to pronounce his own greatness as a poet who can likewise manipulate trees within songs.

Fenton's final level of analysis shows how Horace's mastery of lyric through tree imagery appears in two poems in books 2 and 3 of the *Odes*. In *Odes* 2.13, which Fenton calls "an ironic coda," Horace's self-professed control over trees is threatened when he is almost killed by one. Horace's ability to transform the incident into a lyric ode featuring a near-death

---

<sup>44</sup> Fenton (2008) 568-9.

encounter with his lyric predecessors shows that he nevertheless remains in firm control of his poetic faculties.<sup>45</sup> Later, in *Odes* 3.30, Horace uses the imagery of grafting to link the end of his poetic collection with his opening poem. In *Odes* 1.1 Horace uses the ambiguous phrase “*quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres*” (35) which is frequently translated as, “but if you insert me among the lyric bards.” Fenton points out, however, that it could also be translated as, “but if you graft me to the lyric bards,” an alternative that lays the groundwork for a re-envisioning of *Odes* 3.30.7-16 which now can be interpreted in the light of the abundance of tree imagery preceding it in the *Odes*:

<i>usque ego postera</i>	
<i>crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium</i>	
<i>scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex.</i>	
<i>dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus</i>	10
<i>et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium</i>	
<i>regnavit populorum, ex humili potens</i>	
<i>princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos</i>	
<i>deduxisse modos. sume superbiam</i>	
<i>quaesitam meritis et mihi Delphica</i>	15
<i>lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam.</i>	

I will grow continually, fresh with future praise, while the pontiff will ascend the Capital with a silent virgin. Where violent Aufidus resounds and where Daunus, poor in water, ruled the country people, I will be spoken of as the first to have applied Aeolic song to Italian measures, a powerful man from humble origins. Take up the honor deservedly sought, Melpomene, and willingly crown my head with Delphic laurel.

Fenton believes that Horace here presents his everlasting achievement as a successful “grafting” of Greek meters to the Latin language. This imagery is strengthened by a number of additional tree related metaphors. Though he began “from a lowly place” (*ex humili*, 12), a phrase typically used of low-lying plants, Horace will grow (*crescam*, 8) through fame like a tree thanks to his “more evergreen” (*perennius*, 1) monument.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, in a moment that echoes his unusual use of *vertex*, a word which can mean both “head” and “the top of a tree,”<sup>47</sup> in *Odes* 1.1.36, Horace asks Melpomene to crown his “*comam*” with laurel, a word which can mean both “hair”

<sup>45</sup> Fenton (2008) 574-5. Further generic analysis of *Odes* 2.13 will be provided in Chapter 4 of this study.

<sup>46</sup> Fenton (2008) 577.

<sup>47</sup> E.g. Vergil *Aeneid* 3.678-9: *cum vertice celso / aeriae quercus*.

and “foliage.”<sup>48</sup> Thus, Horace uses the language of trees and grafting in *Odes* 3.30 as a means of creating a ring structure in his first three books of the *Odes*, stylizing himself as a new, Roman shoot grafted to the stock Greek lyric and bringing an end to a programmatic use of tree imagery in the *Odes*.<sup>49</sup>

Fenton’s study provides an indispensable foundation for anyone attempting to link trees and genre in Horace. It proves not only that trees can represent specific genres in Horace but also that Horace uses these trees to comment on his ability to engage in generic enrichment. Several aspects of Fenton’s work nevertheless require expansion. Fenton ignores book 4 of the *Odes* entirely, for example, and limits his discussion of books 2 and 3 to a mere pair of poems because he sees no significant tree patterns outside of *Odes* 1. These books are not devoid of trees, however, and Horace surely would not have established such an elaborate pattern in *Odes* 1 only to make token references to it later in his collection. Even more pressing is the question of metaphorical trees. Although Fenton recognizes that many trees appear through metonymy, such as in *Odes* 1.38 where a myrtle wreath symbolizes the myrtle tree, he does not explore instances where less obvious objects allude to trees. In particular, Fenton’s study overlooks the fact that Horace’s generic trees could also be working in conjunction with ships, another tree-related symbol with great metapoetic potential.

---

<sup>48</sup> OLD s.v. *coma*.

<sup>49</sup> For more on the symbolic use of grafting see Lowe (2010).

### 3.3 METAPOETIC SHIPS

The ship is yet another metapoetic tree through which poets can represent their creative endeavors and reference their adherence to or departure from prescribed generic boundaries.<sup>50</sup>

One of the most well-known forms used for this purpose is the “Ship of Poetry” motif, an image whose traditionally-established potential as an affirmation of the poet’s skill becomes, in the hands of Horace, yet another means of representing his ability to engage in generic enrichment in the *Odes*.

#### 3.3.1 General Usage of the Ship of Poetry

At its most basic level, the Ship of Poetry likens the poet’s ability to control his song to that of a helmsman who directs the course of a vessel. The metaphor may be extended further in order to address other aspects of the poetic process such as sources of inspiration, the difficulties of composition, and the everlasting renown of the poet.<sup>51</sup> Pindar, who is often cited as the earliest classical author to make significant use of the Ship of Poetry,<sup>52</sup> provides abundant examples of the trend. Oftentimes he likens the beginning of song to the start of a sea voyage, such as in *Pythian 2* where he says, “I will mount a flower-decked prow, singing of excellence” (εὐανθέα δ’ ἀναβάσομαι στόλον ἄμφ’ ἄρετᾶ κελαδέων, 62-3) or in *Nemean 5* where he commands, “lift up the voice and stretch the sails to the yard-arm” (δίδοι φωνάν, ἀνὰ δ’ ἰστία τεῖνον πρὸς ζυγὸν

---

<sup>50</sup> On the false distinction between metapoetic trees and metapoetic ships established earlier in this chapter see subsection 3.1.2.

<sup>51</sup> On the sea voyage as a metaphor for a poetic activity see e.g. Cody (1976) 82-5; Kambylis (1965) 149-55.

<sup>52</sup> See e.g. West (2007) 41; Gruzelić (1993) 81; Péron (1974); Anderson (1966) 91.

καρχασίου, 50-1). Pindar also speaks of loading his poetic craft with themes taken from the families of his subjects “who carry the cargo of their own praises” (ἴδια ναυστολέοντες ἐπικώμια, *Nemean* 6.32). Once a poetic voyage is underway, Pindar sometimes asks a Muse to aid his travels, requesting that she “send a straight fair wind of words” (εὐθυν’...οὐρον ἐπέων εὐκλέα, *Nemean* 6.28-30) or telling her that she must stand beside his subject “in order to swell the wind of songs” (ὄφρα...αὔξης οὐρον ὕμνων, *Pythian* 4.2-3).

Even when Pindar’s songs have been “blown off course,” that is, when he has indulged in a mythic digression or extended treatment of some topic tangential to his main theme, Pindar presents himself as a successful helmsman who recognizes that he has strayed and can still correct the course of his wayward ship:

θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἄλλοδαπὰν  
ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβ<εα>;  
Αἰακῶ σε φαμί γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν.

Spirit, to what foreign headland do you direct my voyage? I bid you to summon the Muse to Aeacus and his race. (*Nemean* 3.26-8).

ἀπότρεπε  
αὐτίς Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός  
ἄπορα γὰρ λόγον Αἰακοῦ  
παίδων τὸν ἅπαντά μοι διελεθεῖν

70

Turn back again the rigging of the ships towards the mainland of Europe, for it is impossible for me to recount the whole story of the sons of Aeacus. (*Nemean* 4.69-72).

κώπαν σχάσον, ταχὺ δ’ ἄγκυραν ἔρεισον χθονί  
πρῶραθε, χοιράδος ἄλκαρ πέτρας.

Cease rowing and quickly cast the anchor, safeguard against the sunken rock, from the prow to the ground. (*Pythian* 10.51-2).

ἦρ’, ὦ φίλοι, κατ’ ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην,  
ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν  
τὸ πρὶν· ἦ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου  
ἔβαλεν, ὡς ὅτ’ ἄκατον ἐνναλίαν;

40

O friends, I was whirled around at a path-shifting crossroad, though before I was travelling a straight path, or did some wind throw me off course, just like a sea-going ship? (*Pythian* 11.38-40)

Regardless of whether his journey is interrupted, the everlasting glory bestowed by Pindar's songs remains, and this, too, is described using naval metaphors. In *Nemean 5*, for instance, Pindar contrasts the fame brought about by his songs with that created by sculptors (1-5):

Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-  
 ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος  
 ἐσταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας  
 ὀλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτω, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,  
 στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι  
 Λάμπωνος υἱός Πυθέας εὐρουσθενῆς  
 νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον,...

5

I am not a sculptor, to make statues which stand idly upon the same base. Sweet song, go forth on every merchantman and on every boat from Aegina, announcing that mighty Pytheas, son of Lampon, won a victory crown for the pankration at the Nemean games,...

Unlike motionless statues Pindar's songs travel across the seas, within ships and more importantly in the manner of ships, increasing the renown of his subject at every port of call and with each passing retelling.<sup>53</sup>

Pindar's use of the Ship of Poetry thus achieves several important ends.<sup>54</sup> First, it acts as a means whereby Pindar can assert his mastery and skill of every stage of poetic composition, from the selection and organization of his topics to the successful completion of his song. Second, Pindar's application of the metaphor to his sources of inspiration, both divine and human, strengthens his poetry in two ways. The claim that the Muses directly aid in the completion of his poetic journey reinforces Pindar's status as a divinely-inspired poet, bolstering the power of his praise, while applying the image to the mortal men whose deeds he relates, as he does in *Nemean 6.32*, adds additional honor to his human subjects. Finally, by likening the fame

<sup>53</sup> Race (1987) 150: "Pindar dramatizes the mobility of song by envisioning it as being carried across the sea from Aigina. The doublet 'on board every ship and in every boat,' by sketching the range of boats from the large mercantile cargo carriers to small craft, amplifies the dispersion of the news."

<sup>54</sup> See Lefkowitz (1963) 197-201.

generated by his poetry to ships which travel the world, Pindar reemphasizes the power of his art and the unrivaled greatness of his own poetic achievement.<sup>55</sup>

Though Pindar is most frequently cited as the originator of the Ship of Poetry in Greek literature he is not its undisputed creator.<sup>56</sup> Rosen's study of the metapoetic potential of Hesiod's *Nautilia* (*Op.* 618-94), for instance, concludes that the passage is a complex programmatic statement on the nature of Hesiod's poetry embedded within an account of the dangers of seafaring:<sup>57</sup>

The portrait of Hesiod that emerges from this interpretation of the *Nautilia* presupposes a degree of literary self-consciousness and gamesmanship that we normally reserve for Hellenistic poets. Yet Hesiod's interest in the nature of poetic inspiration, poetic authority, and poetic truth is undeniable, and it should not surprise us to find evidence of this interest in new places; nor should it surprise us to find a Greek poet using sailing as a poetic metaphor. The "autobiographical" kernel of the *Nautilia*, the *sphragis*, with its effort to associate sailing with poetic competition, inspiration, and investiture, was the first indication that Hesiod's motives transcended the textual veneer of practical advice. The diction of the *Nautilia* and of the surrounding passages has suggested that Hesiod has turned the entire *Nautilia* into an *ἀντιγύμα* that compares the poetics of *Works and Days* to the poetics of the Homeric epic. We may, in short, view the *Nautilia* as a pictorial triptych: two sidepanels depict the activity of sailing literally, while the central panel, the *sphragis*, by encouraging a metaphorical interpretation of sailing, acts as an exegetical pivot and bestows on the side panels another level of meaning.

Regardless of whether Hesiod or Pindar was the first to utilize the Ship of Poetry<sup>58</sup> the image became a popular conceit in Greek literature which, over time, was adopted by Roman authors who recognized its potential as a vehicle for discussing their own endeavors. Thus Roman authors began to call their poems ships and likened the difficulties of composition to troubled seas. The final lines of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* provide an oft-cited and succinct example of the pattern (811-4):

---

<sup>55</sup> As per the discussion in section 2.4 of this study, this promotive power of the Ship of Poetry image foreshadows its potential as a tool for enacting and representing generic enrichment. Additional Ship of Poetry passages from Pindar include *Olympian* 6.103, 13.49; *Pythian* 3.68.

<sup>56</sup> For even earlier Indo-European origins for the Ship of Poetry see West (2007) 41.

<sup>57</sup> Rosen (1990) 112-3.

<sup>58</sup> E.g. Theognis *Elegies* 969-70; Alcman 1.94-5.

*hoc opus exegi: fessae dateserta carinae;  
contigimus portus, quo mihi cursus erat.  
postmodo reddetis sacro pia vota poetae,  
carmine sanati femina virque meo.*

I have completed this work. Give garlands to my tired ship. We've arrived at the harbor from which my course was set. Soon, man and woman, you will render pious vows to a sacred poet made sound by my song.

Here Ovid invokes the Ship of Poetry, depicting his poem a ship (*carinae*) which has successfully made it through the laborious process of composition (*contigimus portus*) after great effort (*fessae*). The quality of Ovid's poetic achievement, already implied by his command to deck his ship with garlands (*dateserta*), is then extracted from the metaphor and repeated in the last two lines of the poem, where Ovid's real-world praise mirrors the honors paid to his poetic vessel. In this way Ovid uses the Ship of Poetry not only to describe his poetic process, but also to assert his value as a poet in much the same way as Pindar, Hesiod, and other Greek poets.

### 3.3.2 Ships as Generic *Recusationes*

The heightened sense of self-awareness characteristic of Roman literature imparted an additional function to the Ship of Poetry separate from its more general use as a symbol of the poet's labors. Callimachean aesthetics, and in particular the distinction between the *genus grande* and the *genus tenue*, came to be represented by means of naval imagery as a result of sea and ocean imagery in Callimachus's programmatic passages. At the end of his *Hymn to Apollo*, for instance, Callimachus champions the *genus tenue* through a dramatization of a conversation between Apollo and Envy (105-12):

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὐατα λάθριος εἶπεν· 105  
'οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν αἰδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος αἰεῖει·  
τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὠδὲ τ' εἶπεν·  
'Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ  
λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.  
Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι, 110  
ἀλλ' ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει  
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.

Envy spoke secretly into the ears of Apollo: "I admire not the singer who does not sing as loud as the sea." Apollo struck Envy with his foot and spoke thus: "Great is the stream of the Assyrian river, but much of earth's filth and refuse does it carry along in its waters. And the bees do not carry water from everywhere to Demeter, but rather from that small stream which springs up, pure and undefiled, from the holy font, choicest and best."

Inspired by metapoetic passages like these, Roman authors espousing the stylistic tenets of Callimachus came to associate the sea with epic projects of great size and serious themes. If they wished to disavow any intention of composing in the *genus grande* they could invoke the Ship of Poetry and portray themselves as steersmen avoiding the stormy waters of the open sea in favor of calmer, safer waters near the shore.<sup>59</sup> In this way, the Ship of Poetry took on a secondary role as a tool for generic *recusatio* in Roman poetry.<sup>60</sup>

Propertius and Vergil, contemporaries of Horace, provide several examples of this more specialized, *recusatio*-type Ship of Poetry metaphor. In a highly Callimachean passage from Propertius 3.3, for instance, the poet is chided by Apollo for his epic aspirations (15-7, 22-24):

*'quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te  
carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?  
non hinc ulla tibi speranda est fama, Properti:  
...  
non est ingenii cumba gravanda tui.  
alter remus aquas alter tibi radat harenas;  
tutus eris: medio maxima turba mari est.'* 15

What is your business with that river, madman? Who ordered you to undertake a work of heroic song? No hope for any fame for you from there, Propertius....The skiff of your talent must not be burdened. Let your one oar brush the waters and the other scrape the sands. You will be safe. The greatest uproar is in the middle of the sea.

Similarly, in Propertius 3.9 the poet asks Maecenas, "Why do you send me on so vast a sea of writing? Great sails are not fit for my boat" (*quid me scribendi tam vastum mittis in aequor? / non sunt apta meae grandia vela rati*, 3-4). Vergil, too, tells Maecenas of his inability to compose in the *genus grande* in *Georgics* 2.39-46:

---

<sup>59</sup> Cody (1976) 82-4.

<sup>60</sup> On ship of poetry as a tool for *recusatio* see also Zissos (2004) 416; Rosen (1990) 112 n.47; Mynors (1990) 106.

*tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem,*  
*o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae,* 40  
*Maecenas, pelagoque volans da vela patenti.*  
*non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto,*  
*non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum,*  
*ferrea vox. ades et primi lege litoris oram;*  
*in manibus terrae. non hic te carmine ficto* 45  
*atque per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo.*

Be present, Maecenas, and sail with me through this already started task, O my glory, O you who are deservedly the greatest portion of my fame, and set sail, flying along on the open sea. I have no hope of treating all things in my verses, no, not even if I had a hundred tongues and a hundred mouths, a voice of iron. Be present and sail along the edge of the first shore. The land is at hand. I will not detain you here with false song and digressions and long preambles.

While both Propertius and Vergil provide evidence for the *recusatio* version of the Ship of Poetry, they never lose sight of its more general use as a metaphor for composition. Vergil announces in *Georgics* 4 that he could sing of many additional topics “if I, already at the final end of my labors, were not furling my sails and hastening to turn my prow towards land” (*extremo ni iam sub fine laborum / vela traham et terris festinem advertere proram*, 116-7), and in Propertius 3.17 the poet promises verses to Bacchus on a single condition: “give me favorable sails” (*da mihi...vela secunda*, 2).

Ovid, who deserves a special mention among Augustan poets for the sheer volume and variety of Ship of Poetry passages spread throughout his works,<sup>61</sup> also uses this metaphor both in its traditional form and as a tool for *recusatio*. Having completed book 1 of his *Ars Amatoria*, for instance, Ovid states, “Part of my undertaking remains, part of the work is finished. Here let the cast anchor hold our ships” (*pars superat coepti, pars est exhausta laboris. / hic teneat nostras ancora iacta rates*, 771-2). These words are an example of the typical usage of the Ship of Poetry, a creative re-envisioning of the poetic process. Later, in the *Tristia*, Ovid ironically alludes to this description of his poetry safely moored at harbor by contrasting it with his current

---

<sup>61</sup> For an extensive list see Bömer (1957) 7–8.

ship of song, which is now instead “struck by a huge storm” (*vasta percussa procella*, 1.1.85).<sup>62</sup> If we combine Kovacs’s and Lee’s analyses of *Metamorphoses* 1.1-4 we can claim that, like Vergil and Propertius, Ovid also exhibits the ability to invoke the genre-focused *recusatio* version of the metaphor even without explicitly describing a ship.<sup>63</sup>

### 3.3.3 Horace’s Use of the Ship of Poetry

Despite Ovid’s success in manipulating this conceit it is Horace’s *Odes* 1.3 which commonly takes the title of most famous use of the Ship of Poetry.<sup>64</sup> The poem takes the form of a *propempticon* for Vergil as he departs on a sea voyage, but some interpreters struggle when confronted by what they believe are inconsistencies in Horace’s use of the *propempticon* form,<sup>65</sup> believing that the entire second half of the poem seems inappropriate in light of what precedes.<sup>66</sup> One of the most successful methods of making sense of this poem is to understand that Vergil’s voyage is in fact a poetic voyage, that is, a representation of the composition of the *Aeneid*.<sup>67</sup> If we interpret the poem in this way we find that Horace’s alterations to the *propempticon* are in fact purposeful,<sup>68</sup> and that the tangential digression which ends the poem is actually a complex, allusive tribute to Vergil’s own *Georgics*.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> For discussion of this line and of *Tristia* 1.2 as an extended ship of poetry metaphor see Ingleheart (2006) 85.

<sup>63</sup> For *Metamorphoses* 1.1-4 as a *recusatio* of love poetry see Kovacs (1987). For the naval connotations of “*adspirare*” and “*deducite*” see Lee (1968) ad. loc.

<sup>64</sup> E.g. Zissos (2004) 416: “By the Roman imperial period, the use of the ship as a reflexive trope for the literary project was a familiar device, already commonplace in Pindar, and perhaps most famously employed by Horace in *Ode* 1.3 to allegorize Vergil’s epic project.”

<sup>65</sup> On the identification as a *propempticon*, the expected elements of the form, and Horace’s departures from them, see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 40-5.

<sup>66</sup> E.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 44-5: “The poet may protest his affection for Vergil, but he shows none of his usual tact and charm...the trite and unseasonable moralizing seems out of place in a poem of friendship.” See also West (1995) 16: “‘I do not understand this poem at all,’ said the German professor. ‘It must be humorous.’”

<sup>67</sup> See e.g. Pucci (1992); Santirocco (1986); Basto (1982); Kidd (1977); Cody (1976); Commager (1966).

<sup>68</sup> On Horace’s deliberate “violation” of the norms of *propempticon* see Lockyer (1967).

<sup>69</sup> See Campbell (1987).

Horace provides two additional examples of the Ship of Poetry motif. The more obvious of the two, an example of the *recusatio* type, comes at the start of *Odes* 4.15, where Horace is forbidden to sing of subjects more suited to the *genus grande* (1-4):

*Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui* 1  
*victas et urbis increpuit lyra,*  
*ne parva Tyrrhenum per aequor*  
*vela darem.*

Phoebus rebuked me with his lyre when I was wishing to speak of battles and conquered cities lest I set small sail on the Tyrrhenian sea.

The other is found at *Odes* 1.14, a poem with a well-known history of conflicting interpretations.<sup>70</sup> While commentators agree that the *navis* of *Odes* 1.14 is meant to be allegorical, opinions are divided over what type of allegory is intended. For many the poem is an example of the Ship of State metaphor, primarily as a result of ancient testimony<sup>71</sup> and similarities to earlier Greek poems with clear political messages.<sup>72</sup> Others believe that the ship is actually the representation of a woman and that Horace's address is in fact an impassioned plea to a former lover.<sup>73</sup> A third school of thought, however, rejects both of these views and claims that the ship of *Odes* 1.14 is meant to represent a Ship of Poetry, and that in this ode Horace uses naval imagery as a metaphor for generic limitation. According to this line of argumentation, Horace's plea to the ship to return to the safety of a port (*occupa / portum*, 2-3) rather than test the dangerous waters of the sea is a Callimachean reminder that Horace's poetry should concern itself with the lighter themes of love more suited to lyric rather than the more weighty and serious themes of genres such as epic.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> For a recent summary of the conflicting views of this poem see Knorr (2006).

<sup>71</sup> See Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.44.

<sup>72</sup> For "ship of state" interpretations see West (1995) 64-71; Syndikus (1972) 162-70; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 179-80; Commager (1966) 163-9; Fraenkel (1966) 154-8.

<sup>73</sup> For "ship as woman" see Knorr (2006); Woodman (1980); Anderson (1966).

<sup>74</sup> See Davis (1989); Zumwalt (1977).

In all of these Ship of Poetry odes (1.3, 1.14, 4.15) Horace uses the *recusatio* version of the metaphor, ostensibly out of a sincere desire to limit the scope of his lyric and exclude traditionally non-lyric subject matter. As the theories of Davis and others have shown, however, a *recusatio* in any form can function as an inclusive force, paradoxically adapting and incorporating the material of the *genus grande* to “lesser” genres.<sup>75</sup> As a result, ships may also act as means by which Horace may engage with his readers’ generic expectations. Adamitis, for instance, shows how the ship of *Odes* 1.3 acts not as a metaphor for Vergil’s poetry but as a representation of Horace’s own program of generic enrichment.<sup>76</sup> According to Adamitis intratextual allusions to the preceding two odes impart a self-referential quality to the end of *Odes* 1.3. Horace’s claim that mankind “seeks the sky itself” (*caelum ipsum petimus*, 38) mirrors his own statement in *Odes* 1.1, “I will strike the stars with an uplifted head” (*sublimi feriam sidera vertice*, 36). Similarly, Jupiter’s vengeful lightning, prominently featured at the start of *Odes* 1.2, returns again at the end of 1.3, proving correct Horace’s assertion that “through our evil we do not allow Jove to set aside his wrathful bolts” (*neque / per nostrum patimur scelus / iracunda Iovem ponere fulmina*, 1.3.38-40). These allusions, combined with the Horace’s use of first person verbs (*petimus*, 38; *patimur* 39) and the fact that his other Ship of Poetry odes (1.14 and 4.15) are self-referential, lead Adamitis to the conclusion that the ship of *Odes* 1.3 must also refer to Horace’s own literary endeavors.

After determining that the ship of *Odes* 1.3 represents Horace’s own poetry, Adamitis then shows how the entirety of the ode acts as a metaphor for generic enrichment. Horace’s lyric ship carries Vergil, who symbolizes epic poetry and the *genus grande*, in the same way that *Odes* 1.3, a lyric poem, purposefully includes elements drawn from Vergilian epic. The divine

---

<sup>75</sup> On Davis’s reinterpretation of *recusationes* see section 2.3 of this study.

<sup>76</sup> See Adamitis (2003) 60-9 for her complete treatment of *Odes* 1.3.

addressees of Horace's opening prayer, for instance, all possess strong connections to the *Aeneid*, and Adamitis cites numerous authors who have identified verbal echoes between Horace's language in *Odes* 1.3 and that of the *Aeneid*.<sup>77</sup> Taken together these Vergilian elements impart an epic character to the ode, and Adamitis maintains that the image of the split coin in *Odes* 1.3 (*animum dimidium meae*, 8) parallels this generic assimilation: "Vergil is the *dimidium* of Horace's lyric soul inasmuch as allusions to his grand poetry comprise part of Horace's lyric verse."<sup>78</sup>

Once Horace has defied his audience's generic expectations by incorporating epic allusions into this lyric poem by means of the Ship of Poetry, he then uses the trope again to promote his generically enriched verse. According to Adamitis, the act of sailing is negatively portrayed in *Odes* 1.3 as a crime of transgression which circumvents proper established boundaries, as evidenced by Horace's declaration that ships are "impious" (*impiae...rates*, 23-4). As a result, Horace's lyric ship, which seeks to flout established literary boundaries, could likewise be accused of wrongdoing:<sup>79</sup>

Horace too is a *primus nauta* in that he is an innovator in Latin poetry: he experiments with the lyric genre by expanding its boundaries in order to include as much of the *genus grande* as he can without losing the lyric integrity of the poem....In the light of this interpretation of the story of the *primus nauta*, lines 21-24 take on a new significance...the boundaries imposed by the god and the impiety of the lyric ship can now be interpreted in terms of genre. The separation of the epic sea from the land, which is representative of the *tenue*, is pointless since lyric *rates* can sail the epic sea by incorporating epic elements into their structures; the schism between lyric and epic implied in lines 21-24 echoes the generic divide implied earlier in *dimidium* (8). In this context, the impiety of Horace's ship can be interpreted as a literary offense, not a moral one: the bark is impious in that it challenges Horace's competence as a lyric poet. Will Horace's poetry be able to maintain its lyric integrity when it sails on an epic sea – even if it remains in the shallows?

Thankfully, however, Horace provides us with a means of uniting literary transgression with exemplary achievement through Prometheus, Daedalus, and Hercules, all of whom represent

---

<sup>77</sup> E.g. Basto (1982); Kidd (1977); Putnam (1971).

<sup>78</sup> Adamitis (2003) 65.

<sup>79</sup> Adamitis (2003) 66-7.

figures who strived for immortality by breaking boundaries. By comparing himself to these characters Horace implies that he, too, will be rewarded with immortality as a result of his bold literary transgression. While the negative connotations of these archetypal “sinners” could provide a stumbling block for this interpretation, Adamitis asserts that the mention of “foolishness” (*stultitia*, 38) in the final lines of 1.3 acts as a self-deprecatory gesture which downplays the severity of Horace’s “crime” and preserves his well-earned poetic glory.<sup>80</sup>

Adamitis’s study of *Odes* 1.3 therefore provides us with an invaluable perspective on the generic potential of Horatian ship imagery, specifically with regard to her thoughts on sailing as a representation of generic transgression/enrichment. Yet Adamitis’s treatment is primarily developed through a close reading of *Odes* 1.2 and 1.3, in part because her study focuses on the Parade Odes of book 1. In actuality this notion of “dangerous generic sailing” has a much larger reach even beyond the opening series of the *Odes* because Horace further develops this *topos* through a greater program of generic trees and ships which spans the entirety of his lyric collection. We will therefore devote the remainder of this chapter to exploring this concept not only because it will be of much use in later portions of our study<sup>81</sup> but also because it will offer an example of how these symbols can work alongside one another on a larger scale to engage with the generic expectations of Horace’s readers.

---

<sup>80</sup> Adamitis (2003) 69: “It is quite likely that Horace is being self-deprecatory in *c.* 1.3 as well. Having enumerated the dangers of his lyric enterprise, Horace immediately downplays them by reducing his poetry to foolishness.”

<sup>81</sup> This idea will reappear in our analyses of both the unrecognized generic content of *Odes* 2.13 in Chapter 4 and Horace’s savior divinities in Chapter 5

### 3.4 GENERIC TREE/SHIP INTERACTION IN THE *ODES*

Horace brings trees and ships together as part of a larger program designed both to confirm and subvert the generic expectations of his readers. Thanks to Adamitis we already understand one important element of this program: sailing acts as a metaphor for the potential dangers inherent in the act of generic enrichment. Horace has already shown us in *Odes* 1.3 that his superior poetic abilities ensure that he is in no real danger when incorporating non-lyric material into his lyric odes, so further reiterations of the dangers of sailing will only increase the glory of his generic accomplishments. To this end, Horace continually revisits this theme in odes which contrast unsafe ship activity to safer, tree-centered activities. Because these tree activities typically promote a worldview consistent with that expected of the lyric genre, these joint tree-ship odes also promote the superiority of Horace's chosen genre.

To begin, let us consider some additional poems in which Horace makes explicit the deadly nature of seafaring. In *Odes* 2.13, for instance, Horace likens the possibility of unexpected death he may have received because of a falling tree to that which sailors must face on the sea (13-6):

*quid quisque vitet numquam homini satis  
cautum est in horas: navita Bosporum  
Poenus perhorrescit neque ultra  
caeca timet aliunde fata;...*

15

Whatever thing anyone might avoid, it is never adequately provided for by men from hour to hour: the Phoenician sailor is terrified of the Bosphorus, but, once beyond, fears not the unseen dooms from another place...

Horace's use of the adjective "*Poenus*" here strongly emphasizes the dangers of sea travel. Even Phoenician sailors, he asserts, whose naval prowess was well-known in classical literature,

cannot assume that their legendary skill will protect them from an unforeseen death at sea.<sup>82</sup> If they are not safe on the waves, who is?

Dangerous sailing scenarios of this sort are typically presented alongside safer, alternative lifestyles which frequently involve trees. This pattern first emerges as early as *Odes* 1.1 when Horace describes the plight of a storm-tossed merchant who braves death on the sea for the sake of material gain (15-8):

*luctantem Icaris fluctibus Africum  
mercator metuens otium et oppidi  
laudat rura sui; mox reficit ratis  
quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati.*

15

The merchant, fearful of the African wind struggling with the Icarian waves, praises the leisure and fields of his own town. Soon he rebuilds his shaken rafts, not having learned to endure poverty.

Horace highlights the danger involved in the merchant's lifestyle in a number of ways. He opens the passage by describing the dangerous conditions of the sea and reinforces their threat through the enjambment of "shaken" (*quassas*, 18) in first position. Horace also reveals his personal disregard for the merchant's ways by ending this section of the priamel with a moralizing descriptor (*indocilis pauperiem pati*, 18).

Horace's reference to the preferred "fields" (*rura*, 17), meanwhile, invites us to search the rest of the poem for tree-centered alternatives to the foolhardy life of the merchant sailor, of which there are several. The palm (*palma*, 5) uplifts the athlete, the farmer refuses to become a "timid sailor" (*pavidus nauta*, 14) who rides upon a "Cyprian timber" (*trabe Cypria*, 13), and the man at ease drinks "cups of Massic" (*pocula Massici*, 19) and lies "beneath an arbutus tree" (*sub arbuto*, 21). The remaining lifestyles of the politician, the soldier, and the hunter, all of which are described as containing some element of danger, do not include trees in their descriptions.

---

<sup>82</sup> See Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 211 for discussion of the rationale behind the textual variant "*Poenus*" and the proverbial reputation of Phoenecian sailors.

The best lifestyle, however, is that of Horace himself, the culminating figure of the priamel, who not only avoids death and danger by refraining from sailing but also achieves poetic immortality because of his connection to ivy (*hederae*, 29) and groves (*nemus*, 30). In this way Horace thus establishes at the outset of the *Odes* a pattern which contrasts safer tree activity with dangerous naval activity.

Another merchant sailor continues this pattern in *Odes* 1.31.10-6:

<i>... dives et aureis</i>	10
<i>mercator exsiccet culullis</i>	
<i>vina Syra reparata merce,</i>	
<i>dis carus ipsis, quippe ter et quater</i>	
<i>anno revisens aequor Atlanticum</i>	
<i>impune. me pascunt olivae,</i>	15
<i>me cichorea levesque malvae.</i>	

...and let the rich merchant drain dry his golden cups of wine purchased with Syrian profits, a man dear to the gods themselves since he revisits the Atlantic sea three and four times a year, unharmed. Olive, chicory, and light mallow feed me.

Here Horace uses two strategies to emphasize the dangerous nature of sailing. First, he colors his description of the wealth of the merchant in such a way as to make it appear decadent and gaudy, a tactic which simultaneously discredits seafaring, the means by which the merchant acquires this wealth. Second, as in *Odes* 1.1, Horace uses poetic technique to inject his personal opinions of this lifestyle into the poem. The enjambment of *impune*, as well as its prominent placement at the start of its line, heightens the sense of Horace's astonishment at the merchant's continued survival. When it comes time to expressly state his rejection, however, it is noteworthy that Horace does so by means of a tree, the olive (*olivae*, 15).

Merchants are not the only sailors whose lives Horace believes are at risk. The dangers of naval combat also are explored in the *Odes* and are similarly contrasted to the security of trees. *Odes* 2.7, for instance, is Horace's song in honor of the return of his friend, Pompeius,

whom a “swallowing wave” (*resorbens / unda*, 15-6) drew back into continued naval struggles.<sup>83</sup> The exuberance of Horace’s celebration not only reveals his relief at the survival of his friend, but also allows Horace to contrast the dangers of the sea with less dangerous tree objects. The wine, wreaths, and oils mentioned in lines 6-8, which signify their friendship in times of peace, are mirrored at the end of the ode in lines 19-28, where Horace calls for wine, unguents, and garlands of myrtle to be brought to his friend who now rests his war-weary body beneath Horace’s laurel tree (*sub lauru mea*, 19). Another poem, *Odes* 3.16, shows that even naval commanders who are not currently engaged in active combat on the seas are still in danger of death when Horace proclaims, “Gifts entrap the fierce leaders of ships” (*munera navium / saevos illaqueant duces*, 15-6), a reference to a well-known ship captain, Menas, whose wavering political allegiances eventually led to an untimely death by hanging from the yardarm.<sup>84</sup> Horace, of course, has no fear of such a horrific end because, unlike Menas, “a forest of a few acres” (*silvae iugerum / paucorum*, 29-30) brings contentment enough for him.

There are three poems in which tree activities and ship activities seem to coexist peacefully. Two of these, *Odes* 1.4 and 4.12, are “spring odes” in which the change of seasons acts as an incentive to both ship- and tree-centered activity. In *Odes* 1.4 spring is both the time when “machines draw dry hulls” (*trahunt...siccas machinae carinas*, 2) back into the seas and the time when “it is fitting to bind a shining head with green myrtle...and sacrifice to Faunus in shady groves” (*deceat aut viridi nitidum caput impedire myrto...et in umbrosis Fauno deceat immolare lucis*, 9-11). Similarly, in *Odes* 4.12, “the Thracian breezes, companions of spring which calm the seas, are driving the sails” (*veris comites, quae mare temperant, / impellunt*

---

<sup>83</sup> For the possibility that this line refers to Pompeius’s involvement in the naval campaign of Sextus Pompeius see Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 116.

<sup>84</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 205; West (2002) 145.

*animae lintea Thraciae*, 1-2) while the season itself brings about a thirst (*adduxere sitim tempora*, 13) that incites Horace and Vergil to drink wine.

On the surface these poems appear to make allowance for a peaceful coexistence between ship and tree activity at a particular time of year, but the details of each ode show that Horace still intends for us to recognize tree activity as preferable to ship activity. In *Odes* 1.4, for instance, Horace devotes a larger number of lines to tree activity than to ship activity, implying at the very least that Horace intends tree activity to be considered the more important of the two. Moreover, when Horace tells Sestius of the pleasantries impossible to enjoy in the underworld, he chooses to speak of wine drinking rather than any ship related activity. *Odes* 4.12 also devotes more lines to trees than to ships, but the extended invitation to Vergil to join Horace in drinking wine constitutes an explicit statement of preference not found in *Odes* 1.4. Tree activities, therefore, are meant to be seen as superior alternatives to ship activities in the spring odes regardless of the fact that the calming effect of the season has lessened the threat posed by the sea.

The third tree/ship ode without overt disregard for sailing is *Odes* 4.5, a poem addressed to Augustus and detailing the spring-like (*instar veris*, 6), ameliorative affect that the emperor has upon the world and, in particular, the seas, since Augustus's presence ensures that "sailors fly through the peaceful sea" (*pacatum volitant per mare navitae*, 19). Yet even in this case tree activity once again emerges superior over sailing because in addition to pacifying the seas, Augustus has also pacified Rome's enemies, providing her citizens an opportunity to engage in viticulture and "apply the vine to bare trees" (*vitem viduas ducit ad arbores*, 30). This renewed interest in the vine also allows the Romans, including Horace himself, to make libations "with wine poured out from bowls and mingle [Augustus's] spirit with their Lares" (*mero / defuse*

*pateris et Laribus tuum / miscet numen*, 33-5). Thus Augustus's promotion of peace (and hence the promotion of agriculture and trees) is able to achieve far greater goals, namely the deification of the man responsible for the salvation of Rome, than his pacification of the sea which engenders no greater consequence. In fact, the image of the anxious mother concerned for a son delayed at sea for over a year (9-12), though intended as a parallel to Rome's longing for Augustus, undercuts the feeling of security imparted by the emperor's control over the seas by reminding Horace's audience of the deadly nature of sailing.

The most obvious proof of Horace's contempt for sailing is found in tree/ship odes in which Horace portrays himself as a sailor. In *Odes* 2.6, for example, Horace proclaims, "let Tiber be the end for me, now tired from sea and roads and soldiering" (*Tibur...sit modus lasso maris et viarum / militiaeque*, 5-8). But if Horace cannot be buried at Tibur, he asks that his friend Septimius scatter his ashes at Tarentum, which is appealing, in no small part, because of the place's noteworthy trees. Tarentum is the land where "Aulon, friend to fertile Bacchus, in no way envies Falernian grapes" (*amicus Aulon / fertili Baccho minimum Falernis / invidet uvis*, 18-20) "and the olive is a match for green Venafrum" (*viridique certat / baca Venafro*, 15-6). Though not stated openly, Horace's tone here implies that he would rather be dead among the trees of Tarentum than alive upon a ship.

Horace also depicts himself as a sailor in *Odes* 3.4, albeit briefly, in his claim to the Muses that, "whenever you will be with me, I, as a sailor, will happily essay the raging Bosphorus" (*utcumque mecum vos eritis, libens / insanientem navita Bosporum / temptabo*, 29-31). Horace's use of words like "*libens*" and "*insaniens*" shows that even in the midst of divinely inspired boldness Horace nevertheless recognizes the hazards involved in sea travel. More important, however, is the fact that this profession is in reality a way of emphasizing a

connection between Horace and the Muses which has already been described by extensive tree imagery. Earlier in the poem Horace's Muse-inspired mind causes him to believe that he is "wandering through pious groves" (*pios / errare per lucos*, 6-7), leading him to a reminiscence of his infancy in which "doves covered him, a boy, with fresh leaves" (*fronde nova puerum palumbes / texere*, 12-3), a marvelous event known to those in many locales, including the "Bantine woodlands" (*saltusque Bantinos*, 15). Horace refers to the incident again several lines later, saying that men were amazed "that I was covered with sacred laurel and gathered myrtle" (*ut premerer sacra / lauroque conlataque myrto*, 18-9). Collectively these story elements promote the idea that Horace's status as a poet is signaled, even since his infancy, by his close connection to the world of trees, and his willingness to sail in *Odes* 3.4 represents an acknowledgement of this fact rather than a sincere change of heart regarding the dangers of ships.

These examples demonstrate how Horace uses poems which prominently feature trees and ships together in order to create an expressly negative view of sailing which, when combined with the notion of generically "impious ships" first mentioned in *Odes* 1.3, reemphasizes the scale of Horace's achievement in generic enrichment. In other words, we should be impressed that Horace's lyric craft not only ventured into the waters of the *genus grande*, but also returned no worse for wear. Implicit in this is the notion that even though Horace successfully incorporates non-lyric material into the *Odes* his poems nevertheless maintain a staunchly lyric quality which conforms to his audience's expectations of the genre. To emphasize this, Horace's tree/ship odes set trees which promote modes of thought expected of lyric against inferior or unwelcome ships.

Some poems, for instance, reinforce the notion that wine, a product of trees, can serve as a remedy for cares, a thought stemming from the sympotic nature of lyric poetry.<sup>85</sup> Oftentimes it is specifically the anxiety brought about by sea travel which must be overcome, as evidenced most succinctly in *Odes* 1.7 where Teucer, crowned with a poplar wreath, encourages his comrades with the words, “Banish your cares with wine now, men, tomorrow we will once again sail the vast sea” (*virī, nunc vino pellite curas; / cras ingens iterabimus aequor*, 31-2). More frequently, however, the sea journey in question is a metaphor for death itself. In *Odes* 2.3, for instance, Horace encourages Dellius to enjoy wine (*huc vina...ferre*, 13-4) now, in the present, before fate removes him from his “purchased woodlands” (*coemptis saltibus*, 17) and sends both him and Horace “into the eternal exile of the boat” (*in aeternum / exsilium...cumbae*, 27-8).

Charon’s boat appears again in *Odes* 2.14 when Horace tells Postumus of the underworld and its “wave which all those who feed upon the bounty of the earth know must be crossed” (*unda, scilicet omnibus, / quicumque terrae munere vescimur, / enaviganda*, 9-11). Unlike *Odes* 2.3, however, this poem does not cite wine or other tree objects as potential tools for combating the anxiety caused by mankind’s looming mortality. Instead, they are symbols of missed opportunities for such consolation (21-8):

*linquenda tellus et domus et placens  
 uxor, neque harum quas colis arborum  
 te praeter invisas cupressos  
 ulla brevem dominum sequetur:  
 absumet heres Caecuba dignior  
 servata centum clavibus et mero  
 tinget pavementum superbo,  
 pontificum potiore cenis.*

25

The earth and house and pleasing wife must be left behind, and none of those trees which you tend, except for the hated cypresses, will follow you, their short-lived master. Your worthier heir will finish off your Caecuban, kept safe behind a hundred keys, and will stain the pavement with proud wine too good for the feasts of priests.

---

<sup>85</sup> On wine as a theme expected of lyric because of its use in the symposium see section 2.6.

Horace's approach may be altered but his message remains the same: wine and trees should be enjoyed now, when their influence is greatest and most helpful for the dispersing of cares.

Horace also contrasts ships and trees in poems encouraging moderation and simplicity, another common theme engendered by the epideictic quality of lyric poetry.<sup>86</sup> *Odes* 2.10 begins by using the dangers of sailing as a vehicle to discuss "the golden mean" (*auream mediocritatem*, 5):

*Rectius vives, Licini, neque altum* 1  
*semper urgendo neque, dum procellas*  
*cautus horrescis, nimium premendo*  
*litus iniquum.*

You will live better, Licinius, neither by driving constantly towards the deep sea nor by pressing unsuitably too much to the shore while cautiously fearing storms.

Horace ends this ode with a sailing analogy as well: "You will also prudently shorten the sail swollen with too much favorable wind" (*sapienter idem / contrahes vento nimium secundo / turgida vela*, 22-4). Horace emphasizes this main point with additional symbolic trees as he did in his consolation poems, saying, "A huge pine is more often disturbed by the winds" (*saepius ventis agitatur ingens / pinus*, 9-10). Another ode praising moderation, *Odes* 3.1, employs a similar tactic, claiming that (25-31):

*desiderantem quod satis est neque* 25  
*tumultuosum sollicitat mare*  
*nec saevus Arcturi cadentis*  
*impetus aut orientis Haedi,*  
*non verberatae grandine vineae*  
*fundusque mendax arbore nunc aquas* 30  
*culpante,...*

The tumultuous sea does not disturb a man who desires what is enough, nor does the fierce onset of falling Arcturus or the rising Kid, nor vineyards beaten by hail and the treacherous farm with tree now blaming the waters...

Here Horace uses the vineyard and the complaining tree immediately after his original ship-centered argument, and he continues to employ symbolic trees elsewhere in the ode to the same

---

<sup>86</sup> On the moralizing expected of lyric see section 2.6.

effect. So, for instance, at the start of *Odes* 3.1 Horace contrasts his man of moderation with the state of affairs in which “it is such that a man arranges his orchards in furrows more broadly than another man” (*est ut viro vir latius ordinet / arbusta sulcis*, 9-10), and asserts that there is no need to drink costly Falernian wine (*Falerna / vitis*, 43-4) when more simple pleasures suffice.

Lest we miss the forest for the trees, let us conclude by reviewing the two most significant points made over the course of this chapter. First, it is clear that Horace uses trees (and tree-like objects such as ships) to carry out and represent his acts of generic enrichment. Second, tree symbolism of this sort can appear not just within single poems but also in large-scale metapoetic programs spanning multiple odes. Horace’s juxtaposition of trees and ships designed to glorify his successful acts of generic enrichment while simultaneously reassuring us of the thoroughly lyric quality of his *Odes* is one example of such a program, but there could be any number of additional ways in which our recognition of the profound generic significance of Horace’s trees can improve our understanding of Horace’s *Odes*. With this in mind, the remainder of our study will be devoted to another generically significant program which emerges from a reinterpretation of a particular tree poem, *Odes* 2.13.

#### 4.0 GENERIC ENRICHMENT IN *ODES* 2.13

In his characterization of each of the books in Horace's original lyric collection, Hutchinson tells us that *Odes* 2 includes a particular focus on trees.<sup>1</sup> We are therefore not surprised when we discover this book includes a poem specifically addressed to a tree (*arbos*, 3), *Odes* 2.13, in which Horace rails against a "miserable log" (*triste lignum*, 11) that came so close to crushing him to death that he experienced a near-death vision of the Greek lyricists, Sappho and Alcaeus, singing in the underworld. The poem's inclusion of Horace's lyric predecessors along with the programmatic potential of trees<sup>2</sup> have led many to the conclusion that Horace designed this poem to make a variety of metapoetic statements about the nature of Horatian lyric. Some scholars, in particular, have decided upon conducting a generic analysis of this ode, a suggestion fully supported by the prior chapters of this study. If trees are so frequently used throughout the *Odes* in the context of generic enrichment, Horace's contemporary audience, which sought the deeper meaning of this tree-centric ode no less than his modern readers do today, would likewise consider a generic analysis of this ode to be a worthwhile starting point for their interpretive efforts. By expanding upon these existing treatments of generic enrichment in *Odes* 2.13 we will come to recognize that Horace's falling tree ode is in fact a small-scale rendition of a much

---

<sup>1</sup> Hutchinson (2002) 533 (emphasis added): "The country is more important in this book [*Odes* 2]. The narrator includes *parua rura* as a defining feature in his lot (2.16.37); the well-known tree incident (2.13, 17) is emphatically a country event. *Trees are most important in the book*, not least to rest under (3.9-12, 7.19 *sub lauru mea*, 11.13-17 *hac / pinu*). Cf. also 2.10.9-10, now more significant thematically than 1.9.2-3 and 11-12; 2.14.22-4, 15.4-10 (both related to wealth)."

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter 3 of this study.

larger program of engagement with his audience's generic expectations which takes place throughout the *Odes*.

#### 4.1 PRIOR GENERIC ANALYSIS OF *ODES* 2.13

Currently the most detailed generic interpretation of this ode comes from Davis, who believes that in addition to its “far from modest claim” that Horace’s poems should be held in as much honor as those of his Lesbian predecessors, Alcaeus and Sappho, *Odes* 2.13 makes a statement about the superiority of the lyric genre.<sup>3</sup> Davis begins by dividing the poem into two halves (lines 1-20 and 21-40), each composed of matching pairs of three and two stanzas: curse against the tree-planter (1-12) and reflections on death (13-20), Sappho and Alcaeus (21-32) and underworld inhabitants (33-40). Davis explains that although many note a similarity between lines 1-12 and *Epodes* 3.1-12, few have explored “the literary ramifications of the self-imitation,”<sup>4</sup> which suggest that Horace has deliberately crafted the opening of *Odes* 2.13 as a recreation of the iambic genre in lyric form.<sup>5</sup> We are to derive Horace’s intent by comparing the epodic nature of *Odes* 2.13.1-12 to that of the following stanzas in lines 13-20, wherein the irate invective typical of the iambic genre is replaced by “mellow generalization” through the use of characteristically lyric devices like gnomic *sententiae* and *exempla*.<sup>6</sup> The abruptness of Horace’s transition from iambic rage to lyric acceptance of mortality is meant to reflect the superiority of the lyric response and, by extension, the lyric genre itself, and having made this claim Horace then uses the remaining two sections of the poem to define his now-vindicated lyric poetry.

---

<sup>3</sup> Davis (1991) 78-89.

<sup>4</sup> Davis (1991) 82 n.3. On the similarity between the ode and epode see also Hutchinson (2002) 520.

<sup>5</sup> Davis’s own assessment of the iambic quality of *Odes* 2.13.1-12 will be discussed below in section 4.4.

<sup>6</sup> On the use of *sententiae* and *exempla* as an expected feature of the lyric genre see section 2.6 of this study.

Thus the portrayal of Alcaeus and Sappho reflects the nature of his song (“mainly light, but capable of sounding *plenius*...lacking in mass appeal but appreciated by the *docti*”) and their effect upon the denizens of the underworld illustrates the “the miraculous and universal *dynamis* inherent in lyric.”<sup>7</sup>

Davis’s well-received interpretation of *Odes* 2.13 has provided a strong foundation for those seeking to analyze the generic significance of this poem. Lowrie, for instance, draws heavily upon Davis’s account in her generic analysis of personal narratives featured in *Odes* 2.13.<sup>8</sup> Yet Davis’s study does not account for the possibility of other genres making their presence known as Horace’s reader progresses through this ode. If one genre may be “put on trial” within *Odes* 2.13, it is equally possible that additional genres may be incorporated into those stanzas Davis has rightly identified as metapoetic characterizations of Horatian lyric. With this in mind, let us attempt an expanded analysis of the generic content of *Odes* 2.13 along the same lines of Davis’s study, one which illustrates how Horace subtly guides his audience’s generic expectations in order to recast this poem as a reflection, in microcosm, of a greater program of generic enrichment taking place throughout the entirety of the *Odes*. Our analysis will consider three aspects of Horace’s presentation of *Odes* 2.13: the genre-focused series of poems leading up to the tree ode (*Odes* 2.1-12), the generic complexity of the Alcaic strophe, and the generic content of each stanza of *Odes* 2.13 itself.

---

<sup>7</sup> Davis (1991) 86-7.

<sup>8</sup> Lowrie (1997) 199-205.

#### 4.2 A GENERIC PRELUDE: *ODES* 2.1-12

Horace's penchant for creating programmatic opening series at the start of each book of the *Odes*, such as the Parade Odes of book 1 and the Roman Odes of book 3, has already been mentioned earlier in this study.<sup>9</sup> Typically these series are set off by distinct metrical patterns that contribute to the shared programmatic goal of their constituent poems.<sup>10</sup> The metrical diversity of the Parade Odes, for example, is meant to parallel the diversity inherent in Horatian lyric,<sup>11</sup> while insistent Alcaic strophes impart an elevated tone befitting the serious subject matter of the Roman Odes.<sup>12</sup> Meter thus allows Horace's readers to easily identify groups of poems whose greater significance emerges when considered collectively or compared amongst each other. *Odes* 2 likewise includes a metrically distinct opening, a regular alternation between the Alcaic (odes 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11) and Sapphic (odes 2, 4, 6, 8, 10) strophes capped by a single poem in second Asclepiadean (ode 12), designed to unify the poems in question and encourage readers to find meaning in their arrangement.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> See subsection 3.2.2. Another "lesser" parade is the "parade of lyric predecessors" discussed by Lowrie (1995) which provides further bibliography on the generally accepted sequences of the *Odes* at 33 n.1.

<sup>10</sup> Lowrie (1995) 33: "The sequences that are generally accepted in Horace's *Odes* show both formal linkage and a shared subject or purpose."

<sup>11</sup> On the effect of the Parade Odes, see Porter (1987) 14-20; Santirocco (1986) 14-42.

<sup>12</sup> See e.g. Porter (1987) 39-42, 152-71; Santirocco (1986) 110-125; Witke (1983). On the gravity of the Alcaic strophe see e.g. West (2002) xviii-xix: "The Alcaic...is the metre of the majestic Roman Odes and of 3.29, the greatest of Horace's lyrics, and yet it is used also for light and cheerful poems. This could be a species of Horatian irony, using a mighty organ to play cheerful tunes, or it may act as in 3.23, to lend gravity to a simple matter." This alternation between Sapphic and Alcaic also foreshadows the appearance of Sappho and Alcaeus in *Odes* 2.13, a move which allows Horace to establish 2.13 as a generic climax towards which 2.1-12 builds.

<sup>13</sup> This study treats *Odes* 2.12 as the final member of the opening series of book 2. On the question of whether 2.12 marks the end of the series or the start of a new series see Sutherland (2002) 76, 125-30; Santirocco (1986) 85, 95-6; Eisenberger (1980) 272; Anderson (1968) 45; Ludwig (1957) 336, 342; Port (1925) 299-300.

Many commentators have attempted to reveal the underlying purpose of this series. One such reader, Port,<sup>14</sup> asserts that the patron poems (1 and 12) enclose pairs of odes, each devoted to a particular subject matter, which are themselves arranged within a ring structure.<sup>15</sup> Ludwig furthers Port's assessment by illuminating the connections and patterns between and across these pairs, showing how the erotic poems, for instance, are ordered chiastically, and the philosophical pairs are arranged in parallel.<sup>16</sup> Santirocco, content with the general outline of Port and Ludwig's scheme, argues that certain defects in their interpretations can be solved by comparing Horace's treatment of poems 1-12 with two additional sets of thematic ring structures found in book 2 (poems 7-13 and poems 13-20).<sup>17</sup> Porter likewise seeks to show how the patterns established in poems 1-12 are best understood when considered alongside the remainder of book 2, ultimately coming to the conclusion that the poems in book two create a trajectory of tone which moves from grandeur to despair and back again.<sup>18</sup>

Common to all of these lines of thought regarding the metrical arrangement of poems 1-12 in *Odes 2* is a focus on thematic content: meter functions as a means of demarcating a sequence of poems whose subject matter, when considered collectively, advances some greater programmatic idea. But far less attention is paid to the possible generic impact of Horace's careful ordering of Alcaic and Sapphic poems. We should remember that meter is one of the foremost criteria for genre identification not only in the minds of Horace's readers but also according to the words of Horace's himself in *Ars Poetica* 73-88,<sup>19</sup> and therefore any skillful

---

<sup>14</sup> Port (1925).

<sup>15</sup> For summaries of Port and Ludwig's analyses see Santirocco (1986) 85-6.

<sup>16</sup> Ludwig (1957).

<sup>17</sup> Santirocco (1986) 87-109.

<sup>18</sup> Porter (1987) 106-50.

<sup>19</sup> See Chapter 2 of this study.

manipulation of meter can function as a means of transmitting an author's views on generic propriety to his audience.

One modern commentator who does expound upon the generic import of *Odes* 2.1-12 is Sutherland whose audience-oriented analysis of the *Odes* claims this group of poems has “an overarching concern with defining lyric and the world of lyric against non-lyric genres and against the larger non-lyric world.”<sup>20</sup> After first identifying the disingenuous *recusatio* found in *Odes* 2.1, Sutherland moves through her analysis of these poems while highlighting moments in the metrically alternating pairs of poems when Horace strays from “pure” lyric and incorporates elements from other genres for some greater programmatic purpose. These generic dalliances, Sutherland explains, are treated with characteristic Horatian subtlety to the effect that “while genre was not explicitly treated in *Odes* 2.2-11, it was never far in the background.”<sup>21</sup> She concludes her study by showing how *Odes* 2.12, a final *recusatio* poem which inverts the patterns of the opening song in the series, “gathers the eleven poems preceding it and presents them to us as Licymnia,” who personifies this now completed sub-collection of poems opening *Odes* 2 and “offers us a digest of everything of which Horace was capable.”<sup>22</sup>

Sutherland's treatment of the topic of genre in *Odes* 2.1-12 is excellent for many reasons. Theme-focused analyses of *Odes* 2.2-11 tend to reduce these poems to cleverly-ordered ruminations on broad lyric topics like love, friendship, philosophy, and death, oversimplifying them at the risk of overlooking their understated generic content, but Sutherland focuses on showing how these poems act as “a didactic series”<sup>23</sup> in which Horace, through continual dialogue between poems, interacts with his audience's generic expectations to inculcate a deeper

---

<sup>20</sup> Sutherland (2002) 75. For Sutherland's complete treatment of *Odes* 2.1-12 see 75-130.

<sup>21</sup> Sutherland (2002) 125.

<sup>22</sup> Sutherland (2002) 130.

<sup>23</sup> Sutherland (2002) 75.

understanding of the diversity and power of lyric poetry. That which remains to be explored, however, is how this newfound understanding progressively comes about over the course of the series in the minds of Horace's readers and, more importantly, how it will eventually affect these readers' reception of *Odes* 2.13, the poem that immediately follows.

To begin, Horace's readers would immediately recognize the overtly generic character of Horace's dedication to Pollio (*Odes* 2.1). The poem opens with praise for Pollio's now-lost *Historiae* (line 1-8) before next complimenting his efforts in two additional genres of literature, tragedy (9-12) and oratory (13-14). Horace's use of the word *tragoediae* (9) is significant since neither it nor similarly explicit words for tragedy (e.g. *tragicus*) appear anywhere else in the *Odes*. Upon returning to Pollio's current project Horace envisions the *Historiae* using diction reminiscent of his other forays into epic material (17-36).<sup>24</sup> This "unintended" jaunt into the *genus grande* ultimately necessitates one of the most dramatic *recusationes* in the *Odes* (37-40):

*sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis  
Caeae retractes munera neniae,  
mecum Dionaeo sub antro  
quaere modos levioere plectro.*

40

But do not, O headstrong Muse, handle anew the duties of the Cean dirge once you've left your jests behind. With me beneath a Dionaeon cave seek strains with a lighter plectrum.

Placing this emphatic statement regarding thematic propriety in such a momentous place, the final stanza of the first poem in a new book of the *Odes*, strongly prepares Horace's readership to expect the topic of generic enrichment to be of great importance in the following poems. In addition, the wording of the *recusatio* encourages Horace's readers to establish a similarity between Horace and Pollio. Both men are said to "handle" (*tractas*, 7; *retractes*, 38) their literary endeavors, considered "duties" (*munus*, 11; *munera*, 38) by both, using verbs in the

---

<sup>24</sup> For similar moments where Horatian *recusationes* of epic take on a distinctly epic character themselves see e.g. *Odes* 1.6.5-16 and 2.12.1-12.

second person,<sup>25</sup> and both men are guided by a Muse (*Musae*, 9; *Musa*, 37) who occasionally wanders away from her accustomed genre. Horace uses these verbal similarities to suggest that, like Pollio, he too should be considered a prodigy whose talents are likely to cause him to extend his reach beyond a single genre. Thus, from the very outset of *Odes* 2 Horace's readers would have been focused on the notion of genre and, more specifically, would have been keenly intent on seeking out future deviations by Horace and his "headstrong Muse" in the poems following *Odes* 2.1, especially in the light of their already-acquired awareness of the disingenuous nature of Horatian *recusationes* in *Odes* 1.

Horace's forewarned readers are therefore unsurprised when the very next words they encounter after Horace's *recusatio*, the opening of *Odes* 2.2, are modeled after a tragic fragment,<sup>26</sup> an allusion which sets in motion the generic program outlined by Sutherland's reading of the paired poems beginning *Odes* 2. Horace establishes his credentials as an authoritative instructor in an audience-oriented dialogue in poems 2 and 3 and then exploits this persona while engaging in generic enrichment in subsequent pairs, combining the tropes of elegy and epic whimsically in odes 4 and 5, introducing epic values into lyric song only to replace them with lyric values in odes 6 and 7, and presenting lyric poetry's reinterpretation of the elegiac *domina* and the superior lyric response to love in odes 8 and 9. Poems 10 and 11 begin the process of closure for this series and "pull together the strands of the entire run of poems"<sup>27</sup> while once again presenting Horace as an authoritative speaker possessed of a mastery of the

---

<sup>25</sup> It would technically be more accurate to say that Horace's Muse is the one who "handles the duties of the Cean dirge," although the implied agency of Horace is obvious. Horace's use of the Muse figure allows him to employ the second person form of the verb *retracto*, which in turn creates an even greater parallelism with the second person verb "*tractas*" used of Pollio.

<sup>26</sup> *Trag. Adesp.* 389 N. See Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 34.

<sup>27</sup> Sutherland (2002) 118. Note that the three non-lyric genres which Sutherland highlights (epic and elegy) and that which we singled out in *Odes* 2.1 and the start of 2.2 (tragedy) foreshadow those which we will discuss in connection with the meter of *Odes* 2.13 (section 4.3). They will also be the three previously unrecognized genres found in *Odes* 2.13.21-40 (sections 4.4-4.7) and the three genres symbolized by Horace's savior divinities (section 4.8 and Chapter 5).

golden mean and, at the same time, preparing the way for poem 12, which closes the series by reinforcing the generic superiority of lyric poetry. By the time we have finished *Odes* 12 we have come to accept, as a result of his ongoing interaction with his readers' generic expectations, that Horace possesses a mastery of both the commonplaces of lyric and the intricacies of non-lyric genres.

Sutherland's analysis of this generic program in *Odes* 2.1-12 can be further improved through the realization that the "philosophical poems"<sup>28</sup> (2, 3, 10, 11) are rife with generic symbolism not fully explored by Sutherland. Lowrie, for instance, links Horace's expression of the theme of the golden mean to his consistent representation of lyric poetry as an intermediary between other opposing genres.<sup>29</sup> This being the case, Horace's insistent promotion of the mean as a superior lifestyle in poems 2, 3, 10, and 11 also amounts to the promotion of lyric over more excessive genres like epic and elegy. Even more interesting is these odes' inclusion of programmatic trees which advance generic ideals. In some cases this is accomplished through parallels to earlier odes with strongly generic trees. *Odes* 2.10, for example, presents the image of a wise sailor who neither hugs the shore nor wanders too far into the deeper sea (1-4). In the context of this poem this figure embodies the principles of the golden mean, but Horace's readers would undoubtedly see a similarity between this ode and the generic implications of *Odes* 1.3, which likens successful generic enrichment to a ship sailing between the shoreline and the deeps.<sup>30</sup> In the light of the generic import of specific species of trees in *Odes* 1,<sup>31</sup> the image of the pine and poplar which "love to unite their branches in hospitable shade" (*umbram hospitalem*

---

<sup>28</sup> On the dangers of treating these poems as purely philosophical see Santirocco (1986) 86.

<sup>29</sup> See Lowrie (1997) 77-93.

<sup>30</sup> Adamitis (2003) 60-9.

<sup>31</sup> See Fenton (2008), as discussed earlier in this dissertation.

*consociare amant / ramis*, 10-1) in order to create an inviting space for lyric activity in *Odes* 2.3 signifies that it is the generically diverse nature of Horatian lyric which makes it appealing.<sup>32</sup>

We must remember, however, that despite the high level of generic enrichment involved in *Odes* 2.1-12, these poems nevertheless maintain a staunchly lyric quality. They treat expected themes such as death, friendship, and love, and with the exception of *Odes* 2.1, which must deviate in order to provide Horace an opportunity for *recusatio*, refrain from overt reference to subjects such as civil war that would invariably cause Horace to veer into inappropriate genres.<sup>33</sup> Also adding to the lyric quality of *Odes* 2.1-12 is their comparatively large number of identifiable, contemporary addressees, an emphatic nod to one of lyric's expected characteristics as a genre grounded in occasional address to a second person,<sup>34</sup> and an emphasis on moralizing.<sup>35</sup> For this reason Horace's ancient audience, like some of his modern commentators, may have been tempted to believe that Horace had truly changed his generic *modus operandi* between books 1 and 2 of the *Odes*, and this recognition would impart meaning to the unique metrical scheme at work in the first 11 poems of *Odes* 2: Horace's regular alternation of Alcaics and Sapphics reflects his supposed newfound rededication to the lyric genre and the seeming truthfulness of his reigning-in of his wayward Muse.

This expectation is soon shown false, however, in *Odes* 2.12 where Horace's reader, conditioned to expect a steady diet of lyric themes in the same two lyric meters, is shocked to discover the abrupt termination of the Alcaic/Sapphic pattern. Suspecting a possible change in subject matter, Horace's reader finds that *Odes* 2.12 begins (1-4), just as *Odes* 2.1, with battles

---

<sup>32</sup> See also *Odes* 2.11.13-7, where, in a similar scenario, Horace invites Quinctius to join with him in drinking wine beneath the shade of the plane or pine tree.

<sup>33</sup> See e.g. *Odes* 2.1-12 is not entirely lacking in political implications, but it is certainly true that these poems (and in fact the entirety of *Odes* 2) place politics in the background of odes primarily concerned with other issues. On the subject see e.g. Hutchinson (2002) 532-3; Santirocco (1986) 84-5; Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 1.

<sup>34</sup> On the expected themes and "I-you" nature of lyric see section 2.6 of this study.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. Hutchinson (2002) 533: "Generalized moralizing comes much more to the foreground in Book 2 of the *Odes* than in Book 1."

drawn from Rome's bellicose history. It is only after continued reading that Horace's audience discovers that *Odes* 2.12 is yet another *recusatio*, the twin of *Odes* 2.1, which likewise espouses themes better suited to lighter lyric while assigning warlike subjects of both the real and mythic past to another more suitable author, Maecenas. On the surface, then, Horace's generic stability seems to be maintained, but several nagging doubts plague his readers' minds. The image which the *recusatio* of *Odes* 2.1 and the metrical and overt thematic constancy of *Odes* 2.2-11 present is one of inadvertent generic deviation rectified by an atypically wholehearted dismissal of the *genus grande* and verified by deliberate adherence to lyric expectations. In the mind of Horace's readership the inclusion of non-lyric elements in *Odes* 2.12 therefore represents a "corruption" of the lyric genre every bit as purposeful as his switch to second Asclepiadean meter. In addition, Horace here says that it is his Muse (*Musa*, 13) who prevents him from ranging into improper subjects, but Horace's readers already know from *Odes* 2.1 that this is the same "headstrong Muse" (*Musa procax*, 37) who is equally capable of driving Horace into improper genres.<sup>36</sup>

Horace's reader is thus left in a state of generic confusion after their first reading of the metrically unique pattern in *Odes* 2.1-12. What seems like a straightforward series of lyric odes introduced by an uncharacteristically genuine *recusatio* has been brought to an abrupt close by another *recusatio* of the more familiar and paradoxically inclusive type. Horace's readership would naturally wonder whether they were mistaken in their original assessment of *Odes* 2.2-12 and would seek out an explanation for the ambiguity that plagues their assessment of this opening series. It is during this search for understanding that Horace's reader recognizes that Horace's supposed lyric purity is in fact a charade, and that the program of generic enrichment already described above has been at work throughout these odes all along, kept in the background but nevertheless exerting itself subtly as we move through *Odes* 2.1-12.

---

<sup>36</sup> On the word "*Musae*" as a signal for the incorporation of epic into the *Odes* see section 5.2.

By toying with his readers' generic expectations in this manner Horace, "intent as always on training his audience,"<sup>37</sup> ensures that by the time we arrive at *Odes* 2.13, the poem immediately following this complex generic sequence, our minds are focused on questions of genre and generic propriety. In particular we find ourselves attuned to those three genres of poetry (tragedy, epic, and elegy), which Horace used in *Odes* 2.1-12 to prepare us in this manner.<sup>38</sup> As we move on to consideration of the falling tree ode itself we will discover that a similar effect is created by the Alcaic meter of *Odes* 2.13.

#### 4.3 THE GENERICALLY SUGGESTIVE METER OF *ODES* 2.13

The content of *Odes* 2.13 will understandably contain the majority of the poem's generic import, but Horace's readers would comprehend the poem's metrical form more quickly and easily than the import of the complete poem. As such we must not overlook the poem's meter as a potential contributor to the program of generic enrichment already at work in *Odes* 2 so far. In a very general sense the mere fact that meters used in lyric poetry appear in non-lyric genres suggests that at a formal level any lyric poem may have something in common with another genre. Several poems of the *Odes* employ meters also found in Horace's own iambic *Epodes*,<sup>39</sup> for example, and "the choruses of tragedy and comedy are, of course, lyric poems."<sup>40</sup> At best we could perhaps claim that the generic ambiguity which results from the multigenic application

---

<sup>37</sup> Sutherland (2002) 119.

<sup>38</sup> See note 27, above.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. First Archilochean shared between *Epodes* 12, *Odes* 1.7, and *Odes* 1.28. On the epodic meters of the *Odes* see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xlv-xlvi. On "Lyric Iambic" in the *Epodes* see Rosenmeyer, Ostwald, and Halporn (1963) 84-6.

<sup>40</sup> See Johnson (1983) 146-7.

of certain lyric meters could reinforce the feeling of generic uncertainty produced in the wake of *Odes* 2.1-12, but this does little to aid our current analysis of *Odes* 2.13.

Thankfully, however, the Alcaic strophe used in *Odes* 2.13 makes a much more meaningful contribution to the generic dialogue taking place between Horace and his readers by this point in their reading of *Odes* 2. The Aeolic meters which Horace adapted to the Latin language, including the Alcaic strophe, typically contain a single choriamb that forms their core.<sup>41</sup> To this nucleus, however, can be appended a wide variety of metrical prefixes and suffixes, and the entire Aeolic line can be subject to resolution, catalexis, and expansion. This means that the Aeolic meters, though theoretically built from a choriamb, can at times resemble the metrical patterns found in other genres of poetry. A single core choriamb, for instance, can be expanded into a dactylic series or followed by an extended iambic measure. Both of these effects are found in the Alcaic strophe:<sup>42</sup>

The Alcaic strophe is composed of four lines: two alcaic hendecasyllables, followed by an iamb and penthemimer, and then by a hemiepes and bacchiac.

...

The penthemimer is actually the iambic trimeter before the caesura after the second anceps; that is, the iambic trimeter will yield a penthemimer, if one takes the metrical scheme up to the caesura after the fifth syllable

...

The hemiepes is the part of the dactylic hexameter before the caesura after the long syllable of the third foot....It is used in the second line of the Latin elegiac couplet. The bacchiac is an iambic foot followed by a longum. The hemiepes and bacchiac together form an alcaic decasyllable, the fourth line of the Alcaic strophe.

The Horatian Alcaic strophe is therefore capable of reproducing or, at the very least alluding to, alternative metrical schemes, notably the hexameters of epic and elegy and the iambic trimeter of tragedy.<sup>43</sup> Interestingly, these are the same three non-lyric genres which we identified in our

---

<sup>41</sup> This section uses information taken from Rosenmeyer, Ostwald, and Halporn (1963) 29–34, 97–106; Raven (1962) 69–83.

<sup>42</sup> Oberhelman and Mulryan (1983) 131 with n.5 and 6. See also Talbot (2004) 202.

<sup>43</sup> On the fundamental connection between genres and their meters see Chapter 2.

discussion of the generically enriched content of *Odes* 2.1-12.<sup>44</sup> The meter of *Odes* 2.13 therefore reinforces the effect achieved by the opening series of *Odes* 2, but what possible purpose could lie behind Horace's insistence upon these three specific genres?

The answer is that Horace is conditioning us so that when we read *Odes* 2.13 we will not only recognize the overt contrast between iambic poetry and lyric found in the poem's first half, but also the more subtle inclusion of epic, elegy, and tragedy in the poem's second half. In this way *Odes* 2.13 reflects the process of generic enrichment taking place in *Odes* 2.1-12 and, by extension, Horace's programmatic engagement with his audience's generic expectations throughout the entirety of the *Odes*. With this in mind, we will now move through the constituent sections of *Odes* 2.13<sup>45</sup> and detail the generic affiliations Horace has imparted to each through his fulfillment of and deviation from generic expectations.

#### 4.4 ODES 2.13.1-12: IAMBIC

<i>Ille et nefasto te posuit die</i>	1
<i>quicumque primum, et sacrilega manu</i>	
<i>produxit, arbos, in nepotum</i>	
<i>perniciem opprobriumque pagi;</i>	
<i>illum et parentis crediderim sui</i>	5
<i>fregisse cervicem et penetralia</i>	
<i>sparsisse nocturno cruore</i>	
<i>hospitis; ille venena Colcha</i>	
<i>et quidquid usquam concipitur nefas</i>	
<i>tractavit, agro qui statuit meo</i>	10
<i>te triste lignum, te caducum</i>	
<i>in domini caput immerentis.</i>	

That man, whoever it first was, planted you on an abominable day, and with a sacrilegious hand raised you, tree, as a bane of descendants and a disgrace to the district. I would believe that that man snapped the neck of his own parent and spattered the shrine of the Penates with the nocturnal gore of a guest. That man, who set you in my field, you miserable log destined to fall upon the head of your undeserving master, dealt with Colchic poisons and with whatever other abominable deed is anywhere devised.

<sup>44</sup> See section 4.2 with note 27.

<sup>45</sup> The divisions used in this study are those of Davis's treatment of the ode, explained above in section 4.1.

Many of Horace's odes begin with what have been termed "mottos," opening lines or stanzas which strongly allude to (and sometimes even translate) lines from the works of Horace's Greek predecessors,<sup>46</sup> and *Odes* 2 is no exception to this trend.<sup>47</sup> But it is not Greek literature to which Horace directs his readers' thoughts at the start of this ode but instead his own iambic *Epodes* (3.1-12):<sup>48</sup>

<i>Parentis olim si quis impia manu</i>	1
<i>senile guttur fregerit,</i>	
<i>edit cicutis alium nocentius.</i>	
<i>o dura messorum ilia!</i>	
<i>quid hoc veneni saevit in praecordiis?</i>	5
<i>num viperinus his cruor</i>	
<i>incoctus herbis me fefellit, an malas</i>	
<i>Canidia tractavit dapes?</i>	
<i>ut Argonautas praeter omnis candidum</i>	
<i>Medea mirata est ducem,</i>	10
<i>ignota tauris illigaturum iuga</i>	
<i>perunxit hoc Iasonem;...</i>	

If anyone should ever break his old man's neck with an impious hand, let him eat garlic, more harmful than hemlock. O hardy bellies of reapers! What sort of venom rages in my guts? Have I been tricked by vipers blood cooked in with these herbs, or did Canidia have a hand in this heinous feast? When Medea was smitten with the leader more beautiful than all the Argonauts she smeared this stuff on Jason just before he bound an unfamiliar yoke to the bulls...

Davis, who as we have already seen provides his own explanation of the literary ramifications of this self-imitation, summarizes the points of contact between these two passages:<sup>49</sup>

The parricide comparison with its reference to filial impiety (*impia manu*) reappears with minor variations in the opening stanzas of C. 2.13.1-12. The reworking of motifs from the epode is far from trivial: *sacrilega manu* directly recalls *impia manu*; the grisly assassination is depicted in similar anatomical detail (cf. "parentis...sui *fregisse cervicem*" and "senile *guttur fregerit*"); the mention of poison (*venenum*) is common to both, as is its association with the arch-sorceress Medea (alluded to anonymously in the ode in the phrase *venena Colcha*, though explicitly named in the epode); the verb *tractavit*, applied to the planter's hypothetical potions, has earlier described the imaginary confections of Canidia. In sum, we are confronted with what looks like a deliberate intertextual stratagem: the ode commences with an imitation, in Alcaics, of the earlier manner of "iambic" invective.

<sup>46</sup> On "mottos" in Horace see Fraenkel (1966) 159 n.2; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xii.

<sup>47</sup> E.g. *Odes* 2.18 which begins with an overt imitation of Bacchylides frag. 11.

<sup>48</sup> For further information on how the belligerence and feeling of powerlessness found in the opening of *Odes* 2.13 connects with Horace's earlier iambic work see Oliensis (1998).

<sup>49</sup> Davis (1991) 83. For our review of Davis's explanation see section 4.1. Since Davis already explains the generic import of the first two sections of *Odes* 2.13 the bulk of our analysis will be spent on the overlooked non-lyric content of the poem's second half.

From a reader-response perspective, Horace's imitation of his own poetry provides a potential lifeline amidst the generic uncertainty created in the wake of *Odes* 2.1-12: Horace's reason for expanding his readers' generic horizons is to prepare them for the unexpectedly iambic opening of *Odes* 2.13.

Unfortunately, deeper consideration spoils this early assessment of *Odes* 2.13 as a purely iambic masterpiece since many of the *topoi* contained within these lines are shared among numerous literary kinds. Nisbet and Hubbard's assessment of the complicated literary pedigree of the tree poem identifies several genres besides iambic from which Horace may have drawn inspiration when composing *Odes* 2.13.<sup>50</sup> Death from falling objects, for instance, was a common subject of epigrammatic poetry and lighthearted curse-poems of this type, sometimes considered a minor genre in their own right, frequently appear in elegiac works before and after Horace's *Odes*. Additionally, the ode's inclusion of the ἀρχὴ κακῶν motif functions as a nod to epic and tragedy, both of which frequently employed this theme and often did so with an eye towards trees (or ships, their byproducts) as a source of great ills.<sup>51</sup> Even seemingly small touches, such as Horace's gemination<sup>52</sup> of the pronoun *te* in line 11, would send conflicting generic signals to Horace's well-versed readership. Such second person pronoun geminations combined with direct address are likely to return Horace's readers' thoughts to subgenres like hymn and panegyric which are perfectly suited to Horace's lyric collection,<sup>53</sup> but then again,

---

<sup>50</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 202, 206.

<sup>51</sup> For trees/ships as the source of evils see e.g. Homer *Iliad* 5.59-64 (Alexander's ships); Euripides *Medea* 1-6; Ennius *Medea Exul* 208-14 (trees made into the Argo).

<sup>52</sup> Terminology is taken from Wills (1996) 84 which reminds us that even "slight" words like pronouns nevertheless contain strong allusive potential.

<sup>53</sup> See Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 210; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 131; Norden (1913) 149-60.

such hymnal repetitions of the pronoun *tu* are especially common in hymns to goddesses rather than upstart trees.<sup>54</sup>

Therefore, even though overt allusion to *Epodes* 3 ensures that iambic remains the focus of these lines, the generic universality of the literary *topoi* on display here ensures that Horace's readers will nevertheless remain open to the appearance of other genres in this ode, particularly the three (epic, elegy, and tragedy) which engendered a similar generic open-mindedness in *Odes* 2.1-12.

#### 4.5 *ODES* 2.13.13-20: LYRIC

<i>quid quisque vitet numquam homini satis</i>	
<i>cautum est in horas: navita Bosporum</i>	
<i>Poenus perhorrescit neque ultra</i>	15
<i>caeca timet aliunde fata;</i>	
<i>miles sagittas et celerem fugam</i>	
<i>Parthi, catenas Parthus et Italum</i>	
<i>robur; sed improvisa leti</i>	
<i>vis rapuit rapietque gentis.</i>	20

Whatever anyone should avoid, it is never adequately provided for by men from hour to hour. The Punic sailor is terrified by the Bosphorus, but once beyond fears not the unseen dooms from another place. Soldiers fear the arrows and swift flight of the Parthians, Parthia fears the chains and oak of Italy; but the unforeseen force of death has carried off, and will carry off, the nations.

As Horace's readers move on to section 2 of *Odes* 2.13 they are immediately struck by a dramatic change in tone. What began as a bitter and aggressive attack against the tree and its planter is transformed into a more subdued and accepting rumination on the inevitability of human mortality. As Davis explains, this shift in tone reflects a generic change in Horace's response to the threat posed by unforeseen death.<sup>55</sup> While section 1 depicted a speaker whose

---

<sup>54</sup> Wills (1996) 82-3.

<sup>55</sup> Davis (1991) 83-5.

reaction is distinctly iambic in tone, these lines present a more resigned voice reflecting a proper lyric response to such concerns,<sup>56</sup> one which would be more at home amidst similar reflections found earlier in *Odes* 2.1-12. Compare, for instance, Horace's thoughts on the universality of death in *Odes* 2.13.17-20 with a similar sentiment found in *Odes* 2.3.25-8:

*omnes eodem cogimur, omnium  
versatur urna serius ocius  
sors exitura et nos in aeternum  
exilium inpositura cumbae.* 25

We are all gathered into the same place. Every man's lot is turning in the urn, destined to emerge sooner or later and put us into the eternal exile of the boat.

Additionally, Horace's words in lines 13-20 of *Odes* 2.13 follow much more closely the advice which Horace himself dispenses in 2.3 and 2.10 regarding the importance of a measured response to difficulties encountered in life. Horace's tonal shift therefore represents the espousal of lyric ideals expected of the genre and just recently displayed in the series leading to *Odes* 2.13.

The overtly lyric tone of these lines, extensively treated by Davis's study, is further enhanced by technical features which conform to the generic expectations of lyric.<sup>57</sup> While the general theme of these lines concerns a well-trodden subject of Greek lyric, commentators are quick to point out that Horace's treatment hearkens back to a poem from one of his lyric predecessors, Simonides:<sup>58</sup>

ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν μὴ ποτε φάσης τί γενήσεται αὔριον,  
μηδ' ἄνδρα ἰδὼν ὄλβιον ὅσσον χρόνον ἔσσεται·  
ὠκεῖα γὰρ οὐδὲ τανυπτεροῦγου μυίας  
οὕτως ἅ μεταστάσις.

Being a man, never say what tomorrow will be, nor, when you have seen a man happy, how long he will be so. For not even the turning of the long-winged fly is so swift a change as this.

<sup>56</sup> On the progression from iambic rage to lyric serenity see also Syndikus (1972) 418.

<sup>57</sup> See section 2.6 of this study and Davis (1991) 84-5.

<sup>58</sup> Greek text of Simonides 521 taken from Bowra (1961).

Additionally, the moral quality of the two *sententiae* enclosing lines 13-20 coincides with the expectation that the conversational nature of lyric often leads to moments of ethical instruction, a fact which also accounts for Horace's use of *exempla* in this passage (the Punic sailor, the Parthians, etc.). Davis also explains that these lines include a "decapitated" priamel form which progresses from sailor to soldier before replacing the poet, the expected culmination of the series, with the figures of Sappho and Alcaeus in the following section.<sup>59</sup> The presence of any form of priamel, a poetic technique made famous by lyric poets,<sup>60</sup> strongly aligns this passage with the lyric tradition.

To assert that these lines adequately reflect the formal and thematic nature of the lyric genre is not, therefore, a difficult task. What is challenging, however, is to explain how Horace's readers can continue to identify additional genres at work in *Odes* 2.13 when the following section (lines 21-32) seems, at first glance, to possess an equally strong lyric character.

#### 4.6 ODES 2.13.21-32 : EPIC AND ELEGY

<i>quam paene furvae regna Proserpinae et iudicantem vidimus Aeacum sedesque descriptas piorum et Aeoliis fidibus querentem</i>	
<i>Sappho puellis de popularibus, et te sonantem plenius aureo,</i>	25
<i>Alcaee, plectro dura navis, dura fugae mala, dura belli!</i>	
<i>utrumque sacro digna silentio mirantur umbrae dicere; sed magis pugnans et exactos tyrannos densum umeris bibit aure vulgus.</i>	30

---

<sup>59</sup> Davis (1991) 84.

<sup>60</sup> See e.g. Sappho frag. 16; Pindar *Olympian* 1.

How nearly did we see the kingdoms of gloomy Proserpina and Aeacus as he was judging, and the assigned seats of the pious, and Sappho lamenting her native girls with the lyre, and you, Alcaeus, singing with fuller sound and golden plectrum the cruel hardships of ships, the hardships of flight, the hardships of war. The shades are enthralled that both sing things worthy of sacred silence, but the throng, close-packed shoulder to shoulder, drinks more deeply with their ear the songs of battles and expelled tyrants.<sup>61</sup>

#### 4.6.1 “Lyric” Models: Sappho and Alcaeus

Lyric continues to assert itself as we move from one section of this poem to the next, this time in the form of Horace’s Greek predecessors, Alcaeus and Sappho, singing to the inhabitants of the underworld. It is easy to take the appearance of these two poets for granted given that their presence is constantly felt throughout the *Odes* either through allusion, their eponymous meters, or Horace’s self-portrait as a successor to the canon lyricists. We should remember, however, that this passage is the only time within the entirety of the *Odes* where Sappho is explicitly named, and Alcaeus is named in only one other poem (*Odes* 4.9) which was published after Horace’s original three-book lyric project. Additionally, this is the only moment in the entirety of the *Odes* where Sappho and Alcaeus appear as characters in a narrated scene, albeit as the spirits of their living selves. The rarity of such an appearance *in propria persona* thus strengthens the existing lyric link between the preceding sections of the poem and lines 21-32.

On the subject of interpretation, this scene has been a favorite among those wishing to address the subject of Horace’s relationship with these two lyric predecessors. Perhaps the most popular line of argumentation believes that this section of *Odes* 2.13 dramatizes Horace’s attempt to align his poetry with that of Alcaeus rather than Sappho, although the details of each

---

<sup>61</sup> In accord with Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) I read “*descriptas*” in line 23 rather than “*discriptas*” or “*discretas*.” Their commentary summarizes the arguments for and against each reading, but I would add to their treatment the following consideration. In the midst of his discussion of genre in the *Ars Poetica* Horace claims that it is a poor poet who does not know how “to preserve the assigned offices and styles of works” (*descriptas servare vices operumque colores*, 86). Perhaps Horace’s “assigned seats of the pious” (*sedes descriptas piorum*, *Odes* 2.13.23) are yet another generically charged element in this already highly-generic poem, a parallel to the idea that just as every pious soul has its assigned place, so too does every literary work.

commentator's analysis varies. Some believe that the σύγκρισις presented in these lines is antagonistic to Sappho and that Alcaeus's song is meant to seem vastly preferable not only to the shades in the underworld, but also to Horace and his readership.<sup>62</sup> Others, like Fraenkel<sup>63</sup> and La Penna,<sup>64</sup> perhaps hoping to let Sappho down more gently, claim that despite his obvious respect for both singers Horace felt compelled to side with Alcaeus for any number of practical or personal reasons. In the case of La Penna, for instance, it is because Sappho has been transformed into a metaphor for Catullus and neoteric love poetry, and therefore any denigration of the poetess is an unfortunate consequence of Horace's need to distance himself from a brand of amatory poetics unsuitable to his *Odes*.<sup>65</sup>

More recent commentary on *Odes* 2.13 has begun to cast doubt on this seemingly well-established preference for Alcaeus. Woodman, called "a rare dissenting voice" by Clay,<sup>66</sup> ultimately concludes through analysis of both the *Odes* as a whole and *Odes* 2.13 specifically that "Sappho refuses to be eclipsed in the very passages which appear, or have been thought, to privilege Alcaeus"<sup>67</sup> and that Horace uses his imitations of both Alcaeus and Sappho "to produce the balanced and harmonious whole which we know as the *Odes*" through a union of male and female perspective.<sup>68</sup> Clay herself takes an even more radical position, arguing that the scholarly consensus that *Odes* 2.13 is a glorification of Alcaeus constitutes a complete misreading of

---

<sup>62</sup> E.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xii: "like the shades in the underworld...[Horace] rightly found Alcaeus more interesting." See also Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 205, 219; Hutchinson (2002) 532: "Alcaeus, however, is given the preference (though by a crowd)."

<sup>63</sup> E.g. Fraenkel (1966) 167: "In this ode Horace does not speak of the role he has marked out for himself as the renewer of Lesbian lyric, but is content with praising the old master whom he has chosen as his principal model. By the side of Alcaeus there appears in a moving attitude Sappho, whom Horace was wise enough never to imitate, for the very reason that he understood her so well and admired her so much."

<sup>64</sup> La Penna (1972) 208: "Saffo e Alceo sono ambedue profondamente ammirati, ma Orazio ci tiene a far notare che la palma tocca ad Alceo."

<sup>65</sup> Feeney in Rudd (1996) 49 says that in doing so Horace has acted "very unfairly, it need hardly be said, but poets have no obligation to be fair in matters so important to them."

<sup>66</sup> Clay in Davis (2010) 145 n.24.

<sup>67</sup> Woodman in Woodman and Feeney (2002) 55.

<sup>68</sup> Woodman in Woodman and Feeney (2002) 63.

Horace's poetic strategy.<sup>69</sup> Clay maintains that the songs (*illis carminibus*, 33) praised for their miraculous power to soothe both the denizens of the underworld and the irate Horace himself are in fact Sappho's, and that it is Sappho, not Alcaeus, to whom Horace "awards the palm" at the conclusion of this ode.<sup>70</sup> Most Sappho sympathizers, however, are merely content to point out that the negative connotations of the word *vulgus* (32) in Latin poetry<sup>71</sup> mean that those who base Alcaeus' superiority on his mass appeal are ignoring a potential danger in the non-Callimachean quality of his songs.<sup>72</sup>

Regardless of which side one takes in this Alcaeus/Sappho debate, one cannot help but agree with West when he says that "some game is going on here" independent of the question of Horace's authorial affiliations:<sup>73</sup>

First of all, Sappho is roughly handled. If Horace's intention is to praise lyric poetry and claim affinity with it, why is Sappho still complaining down there in the Underworld about the girls of Lesbos....Horace has often let us know that lovers' complaints give him no pleasure....if praise of Alcaeus as an inspiration for Horace's own poetic work is part of the purpose of this poem, there is another surprise. The music which the shades enjoy in line 32 is devoted to battles and exiled kings, and this fits well with Alcaeus' part in the uprising against Myrsilus, tyrant of Mytilene. But what sense does it make with lines 1 and 10-12 of the previous ode where Horace specifically declines to sing of wars, battles, and defeated kings? If Horace is claiming some affinity with Alcaeus why does he not mention Alcaeus' poems of love, as he has already done at 1.32.9-12?

West's concerns regarding misrepresentation are echoed by many. Lowrie reminds us that earlier poems in the *Odes* reflected a much more complex thematic range in Alcaeus' poems,<sup>74</sup> and given this oversimplification it is natural to assume that a similar process is at work in Horace's treatment of Sappho despite the fact that a great amount of her poetry is concerned with issues of love.<sup>75</sup> The real question to be answered in these lines is not, therefore, which poet

---

<sup>69</sup> Clay in Davis (2010) 135.

<sup>70</sup> Clay in Davis (2010) 136 with n.27. Her phrasing is a response to that of La Penna (1972) 208, cited above.

<sup>71</sup> C.f. *Odes* 3.1.1: *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo*.

<sup>72</sup> Lowrie (1997) 205; Feeney in Rudd (1996) 49; Nicoll (1986) 605.

<sup>73</sup> West (1998) 92-3.

<sup>74</sup> Lowrie (1997) 204.

<sup>75</sup> For a dissenting view see Page (1955) 133 n.1: "Horace presumably knew Sappho's poetry incomparably better than we do; his summary judgment on its contents, given in *carminibus* ii. 13.24f., must be thought very unfair by her

does Horace prefer, but rather why Horace presents his predecessors in such a reductive and incomplete manner.

To determine the reasoning behind this oversimplification we must recognize that Horace intentionally misrepresents these Greek lyricists for a greater programmatic purpose. Horace's goal, as Davis explains, is the characterization of Horatian lyric:<sup>76</sup>

The speaker's description of the two poets in performance is both polarized and reductive: his "Sappho" intones plaintive love-songs and his "Alcaeus" relates the hardships of the soldier's life. The thematic reduction is deliberately severe. The educated reader is expected to be aware of the much wider range of subjects in the historical corpus of Sappho, no less than in that of her compatriot Alcaeus. In the case of the latter, Horace might have opted for the sympotic poetry, for example, as representative of that poet's muse. Why then does he choose baldly to assign war to Alcaeus and love to Sappho, with a concomitant antithesis between a grander (*plenius*) and plainer style (*querentem*)? If Horace reduces in order to achieve starker polarity, we must further inquire as to the *raison d'être* of such a bifurcation of the tradition. The answer lies, in part, in the innate rhetoric of polar description: we tend to interpret the two extremes as co-defining a whole. Thus Alcaeus and Sappho here stand, not so much for the historical *lyrici*, as for two complementary generic poles available to Horace within the Lesbian tradition – namely, a more public-oriented variety, concerned with the welfare of the *polis* (tyrants, wars, etc.), and a more inner-directed, personal one, involved with light, and often erotic subject matter.

Here Davis mentions Horace's desire to isolate two "generic poles" through his depictions of Alcaeus and Sappho, but he names no specific genres. Instead, Davis speaks in terms of generic characteristics (public/private, grander/plainer, etc.), ultimately reaching the conclusion that this scene reflects "Horace's assessment of the scope of his own lyric (mainly light, but capable of sounding *plenius*) and his forecast of its future reception (lacking in mass appeal, but appreciated by the *docti*)."<sup>77</sup> The appeal of Davis' line of thought lies in its shift of focus away from the unnecessary (and apparently unanswerable) question of which author Horace "prefers" and back to the more relevant question of why Horace has chosen to present Alcaeus and Sappho in such a

---

modern champions. But I do not see how we can determine exactly what he meant by *popularibus*." Page is correct in identifying love as a principal theme in Sappho's extant poetry, but if one were to follow the same line of argumentation with regard to Horace's oversimplified rendition of Alcaeus in this passage one would conclude that Alcaeus was merely a singer of *dura mala* and nothing more, an incorrect assumption by both Horace's and Page's own estimations.

<sup>76</sup> Davis (1991) 85-6.

<sup>77</sup> Davis (1991) 86.

reductive manner.<sup>78</sup> Yet Davis does not take the logical next step which Horace expects of his audience in this genre-focused poem, namely, the identification of Sappho and Alcaeus with whole genres rather than just vague generic characteristics. For Horace's readers, already well-prepared to think in generic terms thanks to their reading of both the generically charged poems of *Odes* 2.1-12 and the preceding lines of *Odes* 2.13, the attribution of genres to these figures is an easy task: Alcaeus, who sings of martial hardships (*dura navis, / dura fugae mala, dura belli*, 27-8) with a fuller sound (*plenius*, 26), functions as a clear stand-in for epic poetry while the amorous Sappho who sings "about her local girls" (*puellis de popularibus*, 25) represents elegy.<sup>79</sup>

In order to help his reader better establish these identifications, Horace uses a plural verb (*vidimus*, 22) to encourage his audience to join him in recognizing the other features of this scene with a strongly generic tone. An envisioned descent to the underworld, for instance, would undoubtedly call to his readers' minds the archetypal *katabasis/nekua* found in Homer's *Odyssey* 11 and that which would eventually appear in Vergil's *Aeneid* 6.<sup>80</sup> Horace's use of the

---

<sup>78</sup> See also Clay in Davis (2010) 136-7: "Once we dispense with interpreting 2.13 as a pledge of allegiance to either of Horace's models (while incorporating both), we can begin to see how the poem works as a whole."

<sup>79</sup> Those who insist on Sappho's inferiority in this scene could use this identification with elegy as an explanation for her seeming inferiority. Throughout his *Odes* Horace repeatedly expresses his distaste for the tropes of elegiac poetry, and this being the case Horace would naturally present Sappho (elegy) as the inferior of the two poets. The tortured nature of the argument regarding Sappho's preeminence over Alcaeus nevertheless ensures that this identification of an "elegiac Sappho" cannot fully solve the Alcaeus/Sappho debate.

<sup>80</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) claims that for chronological reasons *Odes* 2.13 is "unlikely to have been influenced by the *Aeneid*" (202), yet they also claim in their discussion of 2.9 that Horace's ode may have been influenced by *Aeneid* 8.725-8 (137-8), a point also noted by Putnam (in Raaflaub and Toher (1990) 231) and Collinge (1962) 3 n.1 ("Puzzle: which was written first – ii.9.22 or Virg. *Aen.* viii.726?"). Since allusion between Horace and other poets, notably Vergil and Propertius, will be a major topic in the remainder of this study let us indulge in an extended footnote in order to consider the complicated question of "publication dates" in the Augustan period. The conventional publication timeline for the works of these three authors which will be relevant to this study is as follows: *Odes* 1-3 were published either together in the latter half of 23 BC (Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xxxvii) or individually and sequentially in 26, 24, and 23 BC (Hutchinson (2002) 528; Barsby (1974) 130); the composition of Propertius 1-3 spans the years from 30-23 BC (Barsby (1974) 129), so *Odes* 1-3 was likely published between Propertius 2 and 3 (Solmsen (1948) 105); the *Aeneid* postdates *Odes* 1-3 and Propertius 1-3, but was published only a few years before Propertius 4, which scholars date to sometime after 16 BC (Ingleheart (2007) 63). Though there are merits to establishing literary timelines such as these, we must not lose sight of the fact that the Augustan poets did not work in total isolation, secretly composing verses only to reveal them dramatically in a perfect "final draft."

word “complaining” (*querentem*, 24), meanwhile, which Lowrie calls “a code word for elegiac lament,”<sup>81</sup> would easily call to mind the notoriously grief-stricken character of Roman elegy. In this way Horace ensures that his intended target genres for this section of *Odes* 2.13 are recognizable not only through his subtly caricatured Greek models but also through more obvious generic signposts found in both the setting and content of these lines.

Devoting a section of *Odes* 2.13 to this specific pair would have been a natural choice for Horace because his poems frequently blur the line between these two genres. In *Odes* 1.6, for instance, Horace declines to write an epic for Agrippa because he would prefer to sing of the “battles of virgin girls” (*proelia virginum*, 17), and in *Odes* 3.26 Horace speaks of giving up his amorous pursuits in the manner of a war veteran (1-8):

<i>Vixi puellis nuper idoneus</i>	1
<i>et militavi non sine gloria;</i>	
<i>nunc arma defunctumque bello</i>	
<i>barbiton hic paries habebit,</i>	
<i>laevum marinae qui Veneris latus</i>	5
<i>custodit. hic, hic ponite lucida</i>	
<i>funalia et vectis et arcus</i>	
<i>oppositis foribus minacis.</i>	

Recently I have lived my life as one suited to young girls, and I have soldiered not without glory. Now this wall, which watches over the left side of Venus of the sea, will hold my arms and lyre, discharged from love’s wars. Here, here set down the brilliant torches and crowbars and bows threatening to opposing doors.

---

Instead, Roman literary culture included abundant opportunities for authors to share – in whole or in part, in public or in private, orally or in written form – the fruits of their labors with friends and fellow poets long before their works were considered “complete” (see e.g. Fantham (2013) 7-8, 82, 104-6, 201-9; Barsby (1974) 130 n.4). Thus Santirocco, for instance, in discussing allusions to Vergilian epic in *Odes* 1.3, says, “That the *Aeneid* postdates the *Odes* presents no real problem since the Augustan poets all show familiarity with parts of it from prepublication readings or recitals” (Santirocco (1986) 28). Similarly, Hutchinson (2002) 531 n.50 tells us that Horace could have alluded to the *Aeneid* as early as 26 BC. Propertius himself reveals his familiarity with the unfinished *Aeneid*: “Make way, Roman writers! Make way, Greeks! Some work greater than the *Iliad* is being born.” (*cedite, Romani scriptores, cedite, Grai! / nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*, 2.34.65-6). On Horace’s familiarity with Propertius see Fantham (2013) 105-7.

<sup>81</sup> Lowrie (1997) 204. See also Davis (1991) 256 n.8.

The motif Horace employs in these and similar odes is that of *militia amoris*, an extremely popular conceit in Roman elegy.<sup>82</sup> Murgatroyd, however, notes in his study of *militia amoris* that this theme appears throughout Greek and Roman poetry of all eras, most likely because the ancients recognized “the extensive similarities between love and war.”<sup>83</sup> This being the case, it is logical that Horace’s readership would have expected these two genres to be paired together once they had determined the highly generic quality of *Odes* 2.13, and Horace encourages this line of thought through other devices as well. Lowrie’s study on Horace’s programmatic use of narratives in the *Odes*, for instance, asserts that narrative was most commonly found in two genres, epic and elegy.<sup>84</sup> Horace’s abrupt transition into a narrative passage here in section 3 of *Odes* 2.13 therefore brings these genres to the fore of his readers’ thoughts while at the same time reinforcing their traditionally-established connection within the literary expectations of his audience.

Horace thus uses quintessentially lyric figures to direct his readers’ thoughts to non-lyric genres through generically “unexpected” terminology, motifs, and themes, but this is not the extent of Horace’s incorporation of epic and elegy. Instead, Horace reinforces the generic effect of Sappho and Alcaeus through the other three characters mentioned in these lines: Proserpina, Aeacus, and the *vulgus* of shades.

---

<sup>82</sup> Ovid’s treatment in *Amores* 1.9 is perhaps the most well-known example of this theme. See also Tibullus 1.10.53ff, 1.1.75-6; Propertius 4.1.137-8, 3.8.33-4. It should be noted, however, that according to Murgatroyd (1975) 60 the first appearance of the *militia amoris* motif occurs within a poem by Sappho. If Sappho is the origin of the trope in classical literature then her status as a stand in for elegy, which made heavy use of the theme, seems even more assured.

<sup>83</sup> Murgatroyd (1975) 79.

<sup>84</sup> Lowrie (1997) 15, 38. See also Booth (1999) xiv. For studies on narrative in elegy see also Liveley and Salzman-Mitchell (2008).

#### 4.6.2 Epic Proserpina

The first generically charged phrase in section 3 is “the realms of gloomy Proserpina” (*furvae regna Proserpinae*, 21). One means of unpacking the generic meaning behind these words comes from comparing it with a similar Horatian expression, “by the realms of Proserpina”

(*regna per Proserpinae*), found in *Epodi* 17.1-18:

<i>Iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae,</i>	1
<i>supplex et oro regna per Proserpinae,</i>	
<i>per et Dianae non movenda numina,</i>	
<i>per atque libros carminum valentium</i>	
<i>refixa caelo devocare sidera,</i>	5
<i>Canidia, parce vocibus tandem sacris,</i>	
<i>citumque retro solve, solve turbinem.</i>	
<i>movit nepotem Telephus Nereium,</i>	
<i>in quem superbus ordinarat agmina</i>	
<i>Mysorum et in quem tela acuta torserat:</i>	10
<i>unxere matres Iliae additum feris</i>	
<i>alitibus atque canibus homicidam Hectorem,</i>	
<i>postquam relictis moenibus rex procidit</i>	
<i>heu pervicacis ad pedes Achillei:</i>	
<i>saetosa duris exuere pellibus</i>	15
<i>laboriosi remiges Ulixei</i>	
<i>volente Circa membra; tunc mens et sonus</i>	
<i>relapsus atque notus in voltus honor.</i>	

Now do I yield to your powerful skill, and I beg you as a suppliant by the realms of Proserpina and by the unwavering power of Diana and by the books of songs mighty enough to call down the stars fixed in the heavens, O Canidia, finally leave off from your magic spells and let the wheel which once was roused go back, go back. Telephus moved the grandson of Nereus against whom he had haughtily arranged the ranks of the Mysians and flung pointed missiles. Trojan mothers anointed the body of man-slaying Hector, though it was given over to wild birds and dogs, after the king, having left his walls behind, fell prostrate, alas!, at the feet of stubborn Achilles. By Circe's will did the rowers of Ulysses set aside the limbs shaggy with tough hides, and then, with mind and voice restored, did their known dignity return to their faces.

The opening of this poem is noteworthy because Horace has corrupted one genre, iambic epode, with material borrowed from another, namely, hexameter epic. Two of the three events found in lines 8-18, the return of Hector's body and the restoration of Odysseus' men, are prominently featured in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, respectively. Telephus' plea to Achilles for healing,

meanwhile, which once completed Telephus repaid by leading the Greek forces to Troy, was recounted in other epic works like the *Cypria*.<sup>85</sup> Horace's *exempla* are therefore an attempt to tap into the epic tradition for the purpose of providing an alternate generic cast to his epode, and it is likely that his earlier phrases, including the "realms of Proserpina," share the same intention.<sup>86</sup>

The question remains, however, as to why any mention of Proserpina's realms, and in particular the expression "the realms of gloomy Proserpina" (*furvae regna Proserpinae*) in *Odes* 2.13.21, would constitute an epic allusion. Examined out of context, the phrase emphasizes Proserpina's status as the queen of the underworld through both mention of her "realms" (*regna*) and her dark coloration (*furvae*), a common chthonic trait.<sup>87</sup> One genre which consistently depicts Proserpina in her royal guise is epic poetry. Whenever Proserpina is named in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, for instance, it is always in the context of her position as queen of the underworld and bride of Hades<sup>88</sup> and Vergil similarly emphasizes Proserpina's regal status in the *Aeneid*.<sup>89</sup> Horace's expressions "*regna per Proserpinae*" and "*furvae regna Proserpinae*" are therefore epic because they reflect a recognizable stylistic pattern found in Homeric and Vergilian epic which consistently depicts Persephone in her queenly guise.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Gantz (1993) 576.

<sup>86</sup> See also the end of *Satires* 2.5, another strongly epic poem within a non-epic collection, which is brought to an end by means of Proserpina (lines 109-10). Her last-minute inclusion in the poem emphasizes the necessity of her presence for the success of Horace's adaptation of his epic source material (the conversation between Tiresias and Odysseus in *Odyssey* 11).

<sup>87</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 214. Interestingly, Nisbet and Hubbard's examples, Aeschylus's *Furies* (*Choephoroi* 1049) and Euripides's *Thanatos* (*Alcestis* 843-4), are drawn from works which will be of great import when discussing section 4 of *Odes* 2.13, perhaps indicating that Horace is already preparing us for the tragic allusions to come.

<sup>88</sup> See Homer *Iliad* 9.457, 569; *Odyssey* 10.491, 494, 509, 534, 564, 11.47, 213, 217, 226, 386, 653.

<sup>89</sup> See *Aeneid* 4.698, 6.138, 142, 251, 402.

<sup>90</sup> Further support for the epic connotation of this epithet comes from D'Angour (2003) 215 which claims that a similar phrase found at *Odes* 1.28.20, "*saeva Proserpina*," which also emphasizes the frightening power of the queen of the underworld, is an "epic-style usage." Proserpina and the word *furvus* do appear near one another in one other epic text, Statius's *Thebaid* (*necdum illum aut trunca lustrauerat obuia taxo / Eumenis, aut furuo Proserpina*

Proserpina's allusive potential is not limited to this general pattern, however. Many scenes in Vergilian and Homeric epic that include Proserpina are also prime candidates for intertextuality with *Odes* 2.13 because their content mirrors the themes found in Horace's ode. In *Odyssey* 10.494-5, for example, Circe explains that Proserpina's position of authority in the netherworld allows her to permit some souls, like that of Tiresias, to retain their intellectual capabilities even in death, while others must merely flit about as mindless shadows (σκιαί, 495). Such power is also on display in *Odes* 2.13 where Alcaeus and Sappho, as capable poets in death as they were in life, still possess the ability to enrapture a faceless mob of shadows (*umbrae*, 30). The most striking similarity between Horace and the epic poets' depictions of Proserpina is that both connect her royal authority with trees, specifically with regard to how a mortal man is able to travel to the underworld in order to engage in a *nekuia*. In *Odyssey* 10, for instance, Odysseus must travel to a grove sacred to Persephone in order to enter to the netherworld (509-12):

ἔνθ' ἄκτῃ τε λάχεια καὶ ἄλσεα Περσεφονείης  
μακράι τ' αἴγειροι καὶ ἰτέαι ὠλεσίκαρποι, 510  
νῆα μὲν αὐτοῦ κέλσαι ἐπ' Ὠκεανῶ βαθυδίνῃ,  
αὐτὸς δ' εἰς Αἴδεω ἰέναι δόμον εὐρώεντα.

Where there is a fertile shore and the groves of Persephone, tall poplars and willows that shed their fruits, there beach your ship beside deep-eddying Oceanus and go into the dank house of Hades.

An even better point of comparison between epic and *Odes* 2.13 is found in the story of Aeneas's descent to the underworld as described at *Aeneid* 6.136-43:

*accipe quae peragenda prius. latet arbore opaca  
aureus et foliis et lento vimine ramus,  
Iunoni infernae dictus sacer; hunc tegit omnis  
lucus et obscuris claudunt convallibus umbrae.  
sed non ante datur telluris operta subire  
auricomos quam quis decerpserit arbore fetus.  
hoc sibi pulchra suum ferri Proserpina munus  
instituit.* 140

---

*poste notarat / coetibus adsumptum functis*, 8.9-11), but because the adjective does not modify the goddess this particular example only reinforces the chthonic quality of Proserpina.

Hear what must be done first: upon a shady tree there hides a branch with golden leaves and pliant golden stem, said to be sacred to the infernal Juno. The entire grove hides it and the shadows in the darkened valleys enclose it. It is not possible to travel beneath the secret places of the earth until someone will have plucked the golden-leaved bough from its tree. Beautiful Proserpina has ordained that this gift be brought to her.

Vergil's scene is an excellent candidate for intertextuality with *Odes* 2.13. Like Horace, Vergil highlights Proserpina's royal status not only through context, but also by her title of "infernal Juno" (*Iunoni infernae*, 138). More important are the scene's arboreal features: it is only by means of a tree's sacred (*sacer*) branch that Aeneas may travel to the underworld, yet Horace, in a playful twist on the same theme, was nearly sent there by an impious tree. Strengthening the possibility that Horace is directly alluding to these lines of the *Aeneid* is the fact that Horace's transferred epithet "gloomy" (*furvae*) conflates the under-worldliness (*infernae*, 138) of Vergil's Proserpina with the twice-mentioned darkness (*opaca*, 136; *obscuris*, 139) of her chosen tree. Horace's inclusion of Proserpina in *Odes* 2.13 is therefore an attempt to remind his readers of other tree-based methods of descent to the underworld taken from depictions of Proserpina in epic poetry, specifically the story of Aeneas' *katabasis* in *Aeneid* 6.

#### 4.6.3 Elegiac Aeacus

Regarding the next figure Horace presents to his readers, Aeacus, we are told only that he is "judging" (*iudicantem*, 22), a reference to his role as one of the three famous arbitrators in the underworld along the brothers Minos and Rhadamanthys.<sup>91</sup> We might assume that the image of

---

<sup>91</sup> According to Gantz (1993) 220-1 the earliest source for Aeacus as a man of great wisdom (and thus a fitting judge) is Pindar, who calls him "the best in deeds of hands and counsels" (χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος, *Nemean* 8.8) and wisest of all those upon the earth (κεδνότατον / ἐπιχθονίων, *Isthmian* 8.22-3) whose talent for discernment bestowed upon him the honor of being the one who "settled the disputes of the gods" (δαίμονεσσι δίκας ἐπέιρανε, *Isthmian* 8.24). These Pindaric origins for his famed judgment ensure that even though Horace uses him to bolster the elegiac quality of this portion of *Odes* 2.13 Aeacus will nevertheless contribute to the overall lyric unity of the tree ode. Aeacus is also traditionally believed to play the role of an underworld judge in Aristophanes's *Frogs*, wherein he attempts to determine which of Dionysus or Xanthias is the slave and which is the god (464-673). If we accept this traditional interpretation then perhaps Horace includes him here as a means of foreshadowing his later

“Aeacus in judgment” is included in the *katabasis* scenes found in Homeric and Vergilian epics and that this would be the likely target for any epic allusions Horace hoped to create through Aeacus in *Odes* 2.13. Surprisingly, however, Homer and Vergil do not include Aeacus in their renditions of the underworld, relying instead upon Minos and Rhadamanthys.<sup>92</sup> Instead, Homer and Vergil use Aeacus most often in patronymic expressions designed to embellish his famous descendants. This familial connection could be considered a source for epic intertextuality in *Odes* 2.13, given the importance of Aeacus’ descendants (Peleus and his son, Achilles, Telamon and his sons, Teucer and Ajax, Menoitius and his son, Patroclus)<sup>93</sup> to the story of the Trojan war. We should also remember that according to a story first recorded in Pindar Aeacus’s involvement during the construction of Troy’s walls ultimately allowed for the destruction of the city itself (*Olympian* 8.31-46):

τὸν παῖς ὁ Λατοῦς εὐρυμέδων τε Ποσειδάν, Ἰλίῳ μέλλοντες ἐπὶ στέφανον τευ- ξαι, καλέσαντο συνεργόν	32
τείχεος, ἦν ὅτι νιν πεπρωμένον ὀρνυμένων πολέμων πτολιπόροισι ἐν μάχαις	35
λάβ’ ῥον ἀμπνεῦσαι καπνόν. γλαυκοὶ δὲ δράκοντες, ἐπεὶ κτίσθη νέον, πύργον ἐσαλλόμενοι τρεῖς, οἱ δύο μὲν κάπετον, αὐθι δ’ ἀτυζόμενοι ψυχὰς βάλον, εἷς δ’ ἐνόρουσε βοάσαις.	40
ἔννεπε δ’ ἀντίον ὀρμαίνων τέρας εὐθύς Ἀπόλλων· Ἰέργαμος ἀμφὶ τεαῖς, ἦρωσ, χερὸς ἐργασίαις ἀλίσκεται· ὦς ἐμοὶ φάσμα λέγει Κρονίδα πεμφθὲν βαρυγδούπου Διός· οὐκ ἄτερ παίδων σέθεν, ἀλλ’ ἅμα πρώτοις ἄρξεται καὶ τερτάτοις’.	42 45

---

allusions to the dramatic contest in the *Frogs* which will appear in the tragic portion of *Odes* 2.13, discussed in section 4.7 below. Since Aeacus is never explicitly named in the *Frogs*, however, his presence in that comedy should not be taken for granted. On the dubious inclusion of Aeacus in the *Frogs* see Dover (1993) 50-5.

<sup>92</sup> For Minos see e.g. Homer *Odyssey* 11.568-71; Vergil *Aeneid* 6.431-2. For Rhadamanthys see e.g. Vergil *Aeneid* 6.566-9. Aeacus appears once in Hesiod’s *Theogony* 1004-5, where he is listed only as the father of Phocus, and several times in the Hesiodic fragments (203, 205, 211) although never as a judge.

<sup>93</sup> For the sources which list these characters as Aeacus’s descendants see Gantz (1993) 220-2.

The child of Leto and wide-ruling Poseidon, when they were going to encircle Ilium with a wall, summoned him [Aeacus] as a fellow worker, since it was fated that when war had arisen the wall would breathe forth great smoke in the city-destroying battles. And when the wall was newly built, three blue-grey serpents came rushing against it, and two of them fell, stunned, and immediately gave up their lives, but one leapt over it as it cried aloud. Pondering this adverse omen, Apollo immediately said, "Pergamus is taken at the place fashioned by your hand, hero. Thus speaks to me the omen sent by the son of Cronus, loud-thundering Zeus. Not without your children, but it will be ruled by the first and the third generation."

Details such as these are tempting to take as acceptable sources of epic (or lyric) allusion in Horace's ode, but unfortunately they do not fulfill the requirements of this study's current approach to analysis of *Odes* 2.13, which focuses on the precise wording of Horace's descriptions. It is in his post-death role as an arbitrator that Aeacus appears in *Odes* 2.13, not in his guise as a famous progenitor or fated wall-builder,<sup>94</sup> both of which would be more suitably alluded to by *Odes* 3.19, for example, which speaks of "the race of Aeacus and the wars fought beneath sacred Ilium" (*genus Aeaci / et pugnata sacro bella sub Ilio*, 3-4). In order to unlock the allusive meaning behind Horace's "judging Aeacus" we must seek out a closer match than those which can be found in extant epic.

Thankfully, elegy provides just such a match. Aeacus appears as an arbitrator in the underworld in two of the elegies of Propertius whose relevance to *Odes* 2.13 cannot be ignored.<sup>95</sup> The first of these (2.20.27-32) includes Aeacus as an underworld judge while also featuring two groups, underworld sinners (Sisyphus and Tityus, specifically) and the Erinyes, which likewise appear in the following section of *Odes* 2.13. The second, however, Cornelia's meditation upon her own death, even more closely resembles the scenario found in Horace's ode and is a strong candidate for intertextuality (4.11.19-28):

---

<sup>94</sup> It should be noted that even in Homer Aeacus is omitted from any accounts of the building of Troy's walls. See Homer *Iliad* 7.452-3, 21.441-57.

<sup>95</sup> On the conditions of Roman literary culture allowing for potential allusion between Horace and Propertius despite conventional "publication dates" see subsection 4.6.1 note 80.

*at si quis posita iudex sedet Aeacus urna,*  
*is mea sortita iudicet ossa pila;* 20  
*assideant fratres, iuxta et Minoida sellam*  
*Eumenidum intento turba severa foro.*  
*Sisyphæ, mole vaces; taceant Ixionis orbes;*  
*fallax, Tantaleo corripere ore, liquor;*  
*Cerberus et nullas hodie petat improbus umbras,* 25  
*et iaceat tacita laxa catena sera.*  
*ipsa loquar pro me: si fallo, poena sororum,*  
*infelix umeros urgeat urna meos.*

Or if some Aeacus, with urn set by, sits as judge, let him judge my bones according to my allotted ballot. Let his brothers sit with him, along with a stern pack of Eumenides by the seat of Minos in an attentive forum. Sisyphus, be free of your burden, let the wheel of Ixion be silent, let the treacherous water be taken by the mouth of Tantalus. Let monstrous Cerberus seek no souls today, and let his chain lie slack while the bar is silent. I will speak on my behalf. If I am false may the sisters' punishment, the futile urn, press upon my shoulders.

The obvious first similarity between both works is their shared characters: Aeacus, the Eumenides,<sup>96</sup> Tantalus, and Cerberus. Both poems also feature an enthralled, anonymous crowd, with Propertius' ear-straining forum-full (*intento foro*, 22) reflected in Horace's eagerly listening throng (*bibit aure vulgus*, 32). More important, however, is the thematic similarity between both poems. The calming effect of the speaker's words on the inhabitants of the underworld in Propertius's poem is clearly paralleled by the soothing power of song in Horace's ode, a fact which reinforces the idea that it is this particular poem of Propertius to which Horace intends to allude. Finally, it is noteworthy that this poem depicts a female speaker who would sing a plaintive song of love even in death, just as Sappho, Horace's personification of elegy, still sings of her own former loves in *Odes* 2.13.<sup>97</sup> Horace's Aeacus therefore opens the way towards forging an intertextual connection between section 3 of *Odes* 2.13 and a particular elegiac poem of Propertius, which also reinforces his audience's identification of Sappho with the elegiac genre.

<sup>96</sup> Note that Propertius and Horace both use the word "*Eumenides*" rather than one such as "*Erinyes*" (as in Propertius 2.20).

<sup>97</sup> Such an interpretation would be extremely useful for those wishing to assert that Sappho is in fact the one whose songs charm the figures in *Odes* 2.13.33-40.

Horace has thus created a balanced structure in the first two stanzas of section 3. He begins by contrasting Proserpina, a female character who alludes to epic poetry, with Aeacus, a male character who represents elegy. In his next stanza Horace reverses this paradigm, presenting his reader with Alcaeus, a male who epitomizes epic, and Sappho, a female who embodies elegiac poetry.

#### 4.6.4 The Epic *Vulgus*

The final stanza in section 3 treats the crowd of shades (the *vulgus*). Crowds like the *vulgus* of Horace's ode were an integral part of epic poetry, so much so that O'Bryan is able to rightly call them a "neglected character" of Homeric and Vergilian verse.<sup>98</sup> O'Bryan notes, however, that Vergil's desire to represent a recognizably "Roman" crowd in the *Aeneid* ensures that his crowds do not share the same personality as that found in Homer's works. Homeric crowds, O'Bryan explains, are passive, easily swayed, and tend to be overshadowed by their more glorious leaders to whom they serve as accessories.<sup>99</sup> In addition, although Homer may have attempted to present his crowds in a manner which would allow his audience to identify with the masses found in his epics, he in no way comes close to "the resolute intent that Vergil showed in connecting his Roman audience to their Trojan and Italian progenitors."<sup>100</sup> Vergil's crowds, on the other hand, display a range of characteristics also identified by other Roman authors across all genres in both prose and poetry:<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> O'Bryan (2011) 10.

<sup>99</sup> O'Bryan (2011) 3-4.

<sup>100</sup> O'Bryan (2011) 6.

<sup>101</sup> O'Bryan (2011) 14. See also O'Bryan's specific treatment of each point on pages 15-50.

In both the history of Rome and in the *Aeneid*, the Roman crowd is portrayed as (1) inclusive of others and therefore capable of sustaining a unified, multi-ethnic society; (2) possessed of a basic political virtue whereby they are conscious of their constitutional importance and therefore protective of their rights (This trait often makes itself known as a natural exuberance that is tempered by a willingness to obey good leaders.); (3) pious; (4) competitive and therefore fond of spectacles; (5) hardworking and enduring; and (6) able to act as a unified collective in all of the above circumstances.

As varied as these authors' representations are, Horace nevertheless manages to incorporate both Homer and Vergil's crowds into his own *vulgus* in *Odes* 2.13. Their Homeric qualities are the easiest to identify. Their passivity and willingness to be controlled are clearly evidenced by their rapturous attentiveness to the songs of Alcaeus and Sappho, who, like the heroes of the *Iliad*, are made more glorious by the power they command over the masses. The reaction of Horace's *vulgus* functions more like an extension of his treatment of Alcaeus and Sappho, that is, an alternative means of deepening his description of the lyricists, rather than a genuine report of their songs' effects on an audience composed of individuals important in their own right.<sup>102</sup> Additionally, Horace's use of the word *vulgus*, whose negative connotations as a Callimachean term for a less refined audience have already been mentioned, would provoke an instinctive, non-Vergilian desire in his readers to disassociate themselves from the crowd of silent shades, regardless of the fact that there would be nothing inherently wrong in enjoying the music of Alcaeus and Sappho.

Thus far Horace's *vulgus* appears, through its general character, to be a Homeric crowd, but when specific attention is paid to Horace's diction a more thoroughly Vergilian quality begins to emerge. O'Bryan's characterization of the Vergilian crowd as possessed of political virtue (point 2, above) includes an intense interest in evaluating and, if necessary, combatting

---

<sup>102</sup> Compare Horace's uniform treatment of the inconsequential *vulgus* to that of the more individualized characters found in *Odes* 2.13.33-40.

unjust political acts and, more specifically, tyrants.<sup>103</sup> Horace's claim that his crowd "more eagerly drinks up with its ear battles and expelled tyrants" (*magis / pugnas et exactos tyrannos...bibit aure*, 30-2) therefore reflects the expected political leanings of Vergilian crowds. Their interest in battles (*pugnas*), specifically, can also be linked to the Vergilian crowd's enduring nature (point 5) since warfare was thought to be the Romans' best opportunity for encountering, and overcoming, hardship.<sup>104</sup> Furthermore, Horace's *vulgus* listens to the songs in "sacred silence" (*sacro...silentio*, 29), displaying a sense of piety (point 3) which recognizes the importance of avoiding ill-omened speech in moments of great religious significance,<sup>105</sup> such as a poetic performance between two *vates* figures which would no doubt appeal to the Vergilian crowd's fondness for competitive spectacle (point 4). With regard to point 1, Horace's *vulgus* is undeniably large, as emphasized by Horace's expression "dense packed, shoulder to shoulder" (*densum umeris*, 32), and its multi-ethnic quality is both implied, since the underworld would naturally contain souls from every racial group, and made explicit by Horace's earlier reflections on the universality of death for all men, whether they be Phoenician, Parthian, Roman, or otherwise (*Odes* 2.13.13-20).<sup>106</sup> Finally, the unified nature of the *vulgus* itself necessitates that its representation of these elements (points 1-5) also reflects the collectivity inherent in the Vergilian crowd (point 6).

---

<sup>103</sup> O'Bryan (2011) 25: "The Roman people from the beginning exhibit a rather feisty character; they do not suffer tyrants."

<sup>104</sup> O'Bryan (2011) 45: "But the Romans need a theatre in which to demonstrate their hardworking and enduring nature, and in the sweep of Roman history, war provides them with one."

<sup>105</sup> See Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 218 on the εὐφημία of the shades in *Odes* 2.13.

<sup>106</sup> Note in particular Horace's highly generalized and unspecific phrase, "*inprovisa leti / vis rapuit rapietque gentis*" (19-20).

#### 4.6.5 Final Thoughts on *Odes* 2.13.21-32

Our analysis of lines 21-32 has demonstrated how Horace uses a two-stage process to incorporate epic and elegy into this portion of *Odes* 2.13. Horace first creates a representation of his lyric predecessors, Alcaeus and Sappho, whose appearance in a metapoetic ode such as *Odes* 2.13 would, under normal circumstances, conform to generic expectations; we expect Horace to present himself as a successor to the Greek lyric tradition whose own future poetic glory will parallel the enduring and miraculous power of Sappho and Alcaeus's songs. But by presenting his models in a reductive manner which incorporates unexpected non-lyric touches (e.g. the elegiac "code word" *querentem*, an epic *katabasis/nekua*, etc.) Horace brings epic and elegy to the fore of his readers' minds. Horace then reinforces our successful identification of his act of generic enrichment by presenting us with additional mythic characters also designed to allude to epic and elegy.

Before we move on to the final portion of *Odes* 2.13 and its incorporation of tragedy we should reflect on two potential questions which relate to these characters. First, are we right to believe that Horace would place so much generic significance on characters like Proserpina or Aeacus who are of comparably minor importance in the poem in comparison to other figures like Sappho and Alcaeus? As it turns out, modern scholars cite "programmatic mythology" such as this as one of the features of Horatian verse so endearing to his audience that it was incorporated into the works of his contemporaries.<sup>107</sup> Second, is there any particular reason why Horace would include two epic figures (Proserpina and the *vulgus*) in this scene but only one elegiac figure (Aeacus)? There is, of course, no reason why Horace would have to provide a

---

<sup>107</sup> On Propertius's use of Horatian programmatic mythology see e.g. Hutchinson (2002). Extensive proof of Horace's use of programmatic mythology will be seen in Chapter 5 of this study.

balanced pairing of generic supporting characters in these lines, but we should remember that Horace's *Odes* typically presents elegy in a negative light. Horace (supposedly) disavows epic only because its inclusion within the *genus grande* makes it incompatible with the form and content of lyric verse; there is no inherent flaw in epic, it simply cannot be fully contained or expressed by lyric. Elegy, on the other hand, is presented as an inferior "poetics of excess...to be contrasted with the more moderate and balanced approach to erotic passion (and life in general) which is characteristic of Horatian lyric."<sup>108</sup> It is for this reason that Horace's erotic persona, for instance, always appears more experienced and successful than his rivals, the violent and impulsive boys typical of Roman elegy.<sup>109</sup> Horace even goes so far as to denounce elegy overtly in *Odes* 1.33, a poem addressed to none other than Tibullus himself.<sup>110</sup> Perhaps it is this "distaste" for elegy in the *Odes* which can be cited as the rationale for Horace's inclusion of only a single elegiac figure in *Odes* 2.13.21-32.<sup>111</sup>

#### 4.7 ODES 2.13.33-40: TRAGEDY

<i>quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens</i>	
<i>demittit atras belua centiceps</i>	
<i>auris et intorti capillis</i>	35
<i>Eumenidum recreantur angues?</i>	
<i>quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens</i>	
<i>dulci laborem decipitur sono,</i>	
<i>nec curat Orion leones</i>	
<i>aut timidos agitare lyncas.</i>	40

<sup>108</sup> Harrison (2007) 175.

<sup>109</sup> On the contrast between Horace and the typical elegiac lover in the *Odes* consult the discussion of Nadeau (2008) in section 2.3 of this study.

<sup>110</sup> On *Odes* 1.33 and the disavowal of elegy see Harrison (2007) 174-6; Lowrie (1997) 79-82; Davis (1991) 39-43; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 368-70.

<sup>111</sup> We should be wary of misrepresenting Horace's feelings towards elegy. Fantham (2013) 300 n.71 reminds us that Horace's works (notably *Odes* 1.31 and *Epistles* 1.4) show us that he was on friendly terms with Tibullus. Yet Fantham also suggests that Horace may have resented the literary success of Propertius and Tibullus at a time when his revolutionary Latin lyric was receiving little public acclaim. On this resentment and the popularity of elegy see Fantham (2013) 105; Griffin (1976).

What wonder is it, since the hundred-headed beast, spell-bound by those songs, lets fall his dark ears, and the twisted snakes in the hair of the Eumenides are refreshed? Nay, even Prometheus and the parent of Pelops are made forgetful of their labors by the sweet sound, and Orion cares not for hunting lions or timid lynxes.

At the start of section 4.6 we claim that Horace uses Sappho and Alcaeus to carry over the lyric tone of lines 13-20 into lines 21-32 and maintain the lyric unity of *Odes* 2.13 even after epic and elegy have been incorporated into the poem. Similarly, as we move from lines 21-33 into lines 33-40 another lyric transition occurs, this time in the form of the demonstrative phrase “*illis carminibus*” (33), which connects Horace’s description of the themes of the songs to their effect upon the infamous denizens of the underworld.

We know from our earlier discussion of the generic content leading to *Odes* 2.13 that Horace has already conditioned us to expect tragedy to be the final genre on display in *Odes* 2.13.<sup>112</sup> We should ask ourselves, however, whether there is any device within *Odes* 2.13 itself which would lead us to tragedy, just as Horace used his presentation of Sappho and Alcaeus to guide our thoughts to epic and elegy independent of this conditioning. One possible answer comes from Aeschylus,<sup>113</sup> whose lost *Bassarides* tells the story of Orpheus’s dismemberment at the hands of Dionysus’s crazed female worshippers.<sup>114</sup> Undoubtedly this tragedy at some point included a description of Orpheus’s descent to the underworld and the miraculous effect of his song upon its inhabitants. The *Bassarides* also likely included a lyric component not only because of Orpheus’s role as a singer but also because of its conflict between Dionysus and Apollo, a god associated with lyric poetry, which was fundamental to the action of the play. Perhaps Horace’s account in *Odes* 2.13.33-40, then, is an attempt to reproduce a passage from this highly lyric tragedy within his own description of the Orphic effects of Alcaeus’s songs.

---

<sup>112</sup> See sections 4.2 and 4.3 of this study.

<sup>113</sup> Aeschylus will be the object of many of Horace’s intertextual references in lines 33-40. See subsection 4.7.2.

<sup>114</sup> On the *Bassarides* and Aeschylus’s interest in Orphism see Guthrie (1952).

As tempting as this explanation may be, it relies too heavily on conjecture and, in any event, fails to account for Horace's inclusion of Euripides, whose eclectic intellectualism Guthrie believes would have possessed little interest in Orphism.<sup>115</sup> The best possible motivation behind Horace's treatment of tragedy in lines 33-40, however, not only accounts for the presence of both tragedians, but also explains an overlooked allusion which was introduced in the previous section of *Odes* 2.13. The lyric contest between Sappho and Alcaeus would have undoubtedly recalled to the minds of Horace's readers another famous poetic competition which took place in the underworld, that between Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs*.<sup>116</sup> Comedy, however, which has already been handled to some extent by the iambic opening section of *Odes* 2.13, would have been out of place amidst the treatments of epic and elegy found in section three.<sup>117</sup> Rather than let a perfectly good allusion fall to the wayside unutilized, Horace instead transforms it into a foreshadowing device which places Aristophanes's tragedians,<sup>118</sup> rather than comedy itself, in the forefront of his readers' minds. Having reminded us of Euripides and Aeschylus in this manner, Horace subtly prepares our generic expectations so that we will recognize the abundance of Aeschylean and Euripidean allusions found in lines 33-40.<sup>119</sup>

We know, then, from either *Odes* 2.13 itself or Horace's other preparatory devices that tragedy is the genre we should expect to encounter in lines 33-40. From here we possess two

---

<sup>115</sup> Guthrie (1952) 237–8: "Euripides might be called an eclectic, not in the sense that he was a philosopher who constructed a system out of the various elements of earlier thought, but because he studied all earlier thought with avidity, and threw out a hint now of his belief and now of that according to his mood, or his sense of the dramatic, might suggest. The adherent of an elaborate religion like the Orphic, in which dogmatic certainty was of the essence, he could never have been."

<sup>116</sup> E.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 218: "Horace is giving dramatic form to a comparative judgment between Sappho and Alcaeus...σύγκρισις was a common technique in rhetoric, biography, and literary criticism (cf. the *certamen Hesiodi et Homeri* and the *ἀγών* in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes)." See also La Penna (1972).

<sup>117</sup> Note the bracketing effect created by Horace's placement of comedy at the start of *Odes* 2.13 and tragedy at its end.

<sup>118</sup> This line of interpretation also explains why no allusion to Sophocles, who is absent from Aristophanes's *Frogs*, appears in the tragic section of *Odes* 2.13 (see analysis below). Aeacus, too, could function as a foreshadowing device in a similar manner, but because of the fact that his presence in the *Frogs* is not sound (see note 91 above) we will refrain from serious consideration of this possibility.

<sup>119</sup> For these Aeschylean and Euripidean allusions see subsections 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.

potential lines of inquiry for determining how Horace's act of generic enrichment occurs. We can focus on the potential allusions engendered by the scene as a whole or, bolstered by our success in interpreting Horace's programmatic mythology in lines 21-32, consider the generic potential of the individual characters named in the scene (Cerberus, the Eumenides, Prometheus, Tantalus/Pelops, and Orion). Most readers of the *Odes*, ancient and modern, employ the former method since their familiarity with similar *katabasis* scenes from other poems establishes an expectation that one of these must reveal the generic significance of lines 33-40. We will see, however, that Horace deliberately avoids meaningful generic allusion to these well-known passages in order to dash one set of generic expectations and replace them with another.

#### 4.7.1 Unhelpful Underworld Allusions

Many believe that Horace's primary model for this section of *Odes* 2.13 is Vergil's account of the musician Orpheus's effect upon the denizens of the underworld found in *Georgics* 4.481-4:

*quin ipsae stupuere domus atque intima Leti  
Tartara caeruleosque implexae crinibus anguis  
Eumenides, tenuitque inhians tria Cerberus ora,  
atque Ixionii vento rota constitit orbis.*

Nay, even the very houses and innermost Tartarean chambers of Death stood amazed along with the Eumenides, their hair entwined with cerulean snakes, and gawping Cerberus kept still his three mouths, and the wheel of Ixion's turning stopped in the wind.

It is easy to draw comparisons between these two scenes. Both passages highlight the soothing effects of song, with Horace's lyricists pacifying the inhabitants of the underworld in a manner similar to Vergil's Orpheus. Horace strengthens this allusion by means of verbal reminiscences: both authors include *quin* in first position (*Odes* 2.13.3; *Georgics* 4.48), *angues* in final position (2.13.36; 4.482), participles describing Cerberus's amazement (*stupens*, 2.13.33; *inhians*, 4.483)

and the entwined snakes of the Eumenides (*intorti*, 2.13.35; *implexae*, 4.482), the verb *stupere* (2.13.33; 4.481), and color words (*atras*, 2.13.36; *caeruleos*, 4.483).

With regard to the characters portrayed in both scenes, however, Horace's parallels are not as consistent. Vergil's serpent-haired Eumenides (*implexae crinibus anguis / Eumenides*, 482-3) do appear in Horace's version of the underworld, but in Vergil their snakes are lulled by the sound of Orpheus's song, rather than refreshed as they are in Horace (*recreantur angues*, 2.13.36). In addition, Vergil's Cerberus has markedly fewer heads (*tenuitque inhians tria Cerberus ora*, 483) than Horace's hundred-headed beast, and Tantalus, Prometheus, and Orion are missing entirely from Vergil's scene, replaced by a single figure, Ixion (484).<sup>120</sup> Although Horace clearly wishes to recall this specific passage from *Georgics* 4, this allusion is primarily thematic. Horace calls our attention to Orpheus in order to legitimize the narrative featured in the second half of *Odes* 2.13: Alcaeus and Sappho can charm the underworld with song because it has worked in the mythic past.<sup>121</sup> But if we wish to determine the generic meaning which lies behind these charmed characters named in *Odes* 2.13.33-40 we must look elsewhere.

A likely alternative in this continuing search for meaning comes from *Odyssey* 11.572-626, a description of the famous figures encountered by Odysseus during his visit to the underworld. The shared setting and characters common to both poems make this *nekuia* scene another potential candidate for intertextuality with *Odes* 2.13.33-40:<sup>122</sup>

τὸν δὲ μέτ' Ὠρίωνα πελώριον εἰσενόησα	572
θηρᾶς ὁμοῦ εἰλεῦντα κατ' ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα,	
τοὺς αὐτὸς κατέπεφνεν ἐν οἰοπόλοισιν ὄρεσσι,	
χερσὶν ἔχων ῥόπαλον παγχάλκεον, αἰὲν ἀαγές.	575
...	

<sup>120</sup> On Horace's other purposeful departures from aspects of Vergil's account, see e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 205.

<sup>121</sup> The "verbal reminiscences" discussed above may be designed to reinforce this notion. Perhaps by using similar words in similar line positions the songs of Alcaeus and Sappho will be able to reproduce the miraculous effects of Orpheus's song.

<sup>122</sup> Here quoted are only those lines pertaining to the characters also mentioned in Horace's ode.

καὶ μὴν Τάνταλον εἰσείδον χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα, ἔσταότ' ἐν λίμνῃ· ἢ δὲ προσέπλαζε γενεῖω. στεῦτο δὲ διψᾶων, πῖεῖν δ' οὐκ εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι·	582
ὄσάκι γὰρ κύψει' ὁ γέρον πῖεῖν μενεαίνων, τοσσάχ' ὕδωρ ἀπολέσκειτ' ἀναβροχέν, ἀμφὶ δὲ ποσσὶ γαῖα μέλαινα φάνεσκε, καταζήνασκε δὲ δαίμων. δένδρεα δ' ὑψιπέτηλα κατὰ κρηθὲν χέε καρπόν, ὄγχναι καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι	585
συκέαι τε γλυκεραὶ καὶ ἐλαῖαι τηλεθόωσαι· τῶν ὀπότη' ἰθύσει' ὁ γέρον ἐπὶ χερσὶ μάσασθαι, τὰς δ' ἄνεμος ῥίπτασκε ποτὶ νέφεα σκιόεντα. ... τὸν δὲ μέτ' εἰσενόησα βίην Ἡρακληεῖην, εἶδωλον· ... ... καὶ μ' ὀλοφυρόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα· ... 'Ζηνὸς μὲν πάϊς ἦα Κρονίου, αὐτὰρ οἴζυν εἶχον ἀπειρεσίην· μάλα γὰρ πολὺ χεῖροσι φωτὶ δεδμήμην, ὁ δέ μοι χαλεποὺς ἐπετέλλετ' ἀέθλους. καὶ ποτέ μ' ἐνθάδ' ἔπεμψε κύν' ἄξοντ'· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄλλον φράζετο τοῦδέ γέ μοι κρατερώτερον εἶναι ἄεθλον. τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἀνένεικα καὶ ἠγαγον ἐξ Αἴδαο· 'Ερμείας δέ μ' ἔπεμπεν ἰδὲ γλαυκῶπις Αθήνη.'	590 601 616 620 625

And after him [Minos] I saw mighty Orion driving together over a meadow of asphodel beasts which he himself had slain on the lonely hills, holding in his hands a club all of bronze, ever unbroken....And I saw Tantalus enduring harsh pains, standing in a pool. The water touched to his chin. He looked as if he was thirsty, but he was not able to take a drink, for as often as the old man would lean forward, longing to drink, just as often would the water recede, sucked away, and the black earth appeared around his feet, and a god made it dry. And trees with high foliage poured down fruit above his head, trees of pear and pomegranate and apple with shining fruit, trees of sweet fig and luxuriant olive. But whenever the old man tried to take one in his hands the wind would toss them towards the shadowy clouds....And after him I saw mighty Heracles, a phantom,...and, lamenting, he addressed me with winged words, ... "I was the son of Zeus, son of Cronus, but I had woes beyond measure. For I was made subject to a man far lesser than myself, and he prescribed me difficult labors. Once he even sent me here to bring back the hound, for he thought there to be no task mightier than this for me. I brought the hound up and led him out of Hades, and Hermes and bright-eyed Athena were my guides."

Just as with the *Georgics* scene, initial observations reveal several meaningful verbal similarities between Horace and Homer, such as the purposeful omission of Cerberus's name in both passages. Orion's mere presence in the underworld as a shade is likewise significant since the majority of classical literature depicts him solely as a constellation in the heavens.

When scrutinized more closely, however, these few correspondences are overwhelmed by a great number of inconsistencies. Out of all the characters mentioned in the full roster in *Odes*

2.13.33-40, for example, the *Odyssey* passage does not include Prometheus or the Eumenides. Cerberus, who is only mentioned in passing by Hercules, also fails to appear *in propria persona*, and the importance of Homer's refusal to name Cerberus is diminished by the fact that this is a consistent policy throughout the Homeric corpus, and indeed all of Greek poetry, rather than a purposeful, one-time omission.<sup>123</sup> Meanwhile, those characters which are shared by Homer and Horace, Tantalus and Orion, are represented in contradictory ways. Homer makes Orion the focus of his scene, lavishly describing the physical attributes of the hunter and his weapon as he actively pursues the beasts which can only be characterized with reference to Orion himself. Horace, on the other hand, cannot spare even a single adjective for his inactive Orion, and he emphasizes this paucity by giving a token descriptor instead to his lynx (*timidos lynxas*, 40), whose unexpected masculine gender draws even more of the reader's focus away from the neglected Orion.<sup>124</sup>

Similarly, Homer richly details the plight of Tantalus over a span of eleven lines, even going so far as to list the different varieties of fruit which the tormented man cannot enjoy, but he refuses to mention Tantalus's crime in any way. Horace, meanwhile, refrains from even identifying Tantalus by name, calling him instead "the parent of Pelops," (*Pelopis parens*, 2.13.37), a periphrastic construction which shifts his reader's focus towards the crime of Tantalus and away from his punishment.<sup>125</sup> Horace further downplays the severity of Tantalus's punishment by using a singular word, "labor" (*laborem*, 38), which is grammatically shared between Tantalus and Prometheus, perhaps humorously alluding to the fact that neither is really

---

<sup>123</sup> Gantz (1993) 127; Bond (1981) 69.

<sup>124</sup> On the expected gender of "lynx" and the ancients' interest in Horace's alteration of the lynx's gender see Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 222.

<sup>125</sup> See e.g. D'Angour (2003) 210 on the similar phrase "*Pelopis genitor*": "Tantalus enjoyed the privilege of sharing his table with gods; but having served his son up for dinner (the locution *Pelopis genitor* highlights the grisly tale)..."

suffering now that they have been given a reprieve by the singing lyricists. It appears, then, that Horace is deliberately avoiding Homeric allusions between this scene in the *Odyssey* and his description of the underworld figures in *Odes* 2.13.33-40, contrary to his highly intertextual treatment of material from the *Georgics* for the purpose of thematic allusion.

This pattern remains valid even if one compares Horace's underworld scene with that found in *Aeneid* 6.<sup>126</sup> Unlike Horace, Vergil distributes those characters relevant to *Odes* 2.13 throughout the underworld rather than gathering them together in a single location. Cerberus (417, 421) and the "iron chambers of the Eumenides" (*ferrei Eumenidum thalami*, 280) appear outside of Tartarus proper, the gate of which is guarded by Tisiphone (555, 571), a named Fury. She, along with her "ranks of sisters" (*agmina...sororum*, 572), administer punishments to those within, including Tantalus, whom the eldest Fury (*Furiarum maxima*, 605) torments.<sup>127</sup> Despite their shared presence in both *Odes* 2.13 and *Aeneid* 6, the specifics of Horace's depiction of these figures nevertheless prevent strong allusion to Vergil's epic. Horace's Cerberus has a hundred heads, unlike Vergil's three-headed hound,<sup>128</sup> and the Eumenides/Furies in the *Aeneid* merely hold their snakes (6.571-2) rather than wear them in their hair as in *Odes* 2.13.

Horace's readers, both ancient and modern, must therefore confront the fact that even though the overall setting of lines 33-40 is, in theory, readily connected to famous passages from the *Georgics*, *Odyssey*, and *Aeneid*, inconsistencies in Horace's adaptation of these works dissuade us from seeing any one of them as a suitable model for *Odes* 2.13. Horace's "failure" in this regard is deliberate. Since the previous section of *Odes* 2.13 already functions as his

---

<sup>126</sup> On the possibility of Horace's familiarity with Vergil's *Aeneid* despite conventional publication dates see note 80 above.

<sup>127</sup> Orion makes no appearance in Vergil's reworking of the Homeric episode, nor does Prometheus, who is absent from both authors' underworld scenes (a fact which will be discussed in detail below).

<sup>128</sup> Both versions cited here contrast with yet another epic author, Hesiod, whose Cerberus has fifty heads (*Theogony* 311-2).

reflection on epic's incorporation into the *Odes* Horace must refrain from unnecessarily revisiting the genre he has already treated by closely mimicking the *Odyssey* or the *Aeneid*. Additionally, because bucolic or pastoral poetry is not one of the three genres which emerge from the generically enriched series of poems which lead up to *Odes* 2.13, Horace must avoid close identification with Vergil's *Georgics* lest he sabotage his own program of generic enrichment.<sup>129</sup> We know, then, what Horace is not doing in lines 33-40, but where do we go from here?

At the start of our discussion of lines 33-40 we said that a potential alternative to analysis of the entire underworld scene is a deeper consideration of the generic significance of the programmatic mythology in lines 33-40.<sup>130</sup> Our next task, therefore, is to explain how Prometheus, the Eumenides, Tantalus, Orion, and Cerberus fulfill the generic expectation that tragedy will be the focus of these lines. To a certain extent this task is a simple one since even the mere mention of a character famously treated in a tragic work can provide us with a link to the genre,<sup>131</sup> but as we will see Horace's method is more complex than simple "name dropping." We will begin with the three characters whose connections to tragedy are more easily established (Prometheus, the Eumenides, and Tantalus) before considering the remaining two figures (Cerberus and Orion) whose tragic associations are more obscure.

---

<sup>129</sup> See section 4.2 of this study. We could argue that the rustic quality of Horatian lyric poetry (defined at *Odes* 1.1.29-32) already incorporates motifs and themes associated with bucolic/pastoral poetry. See e.g. Davis (1991) 131 on *Odes* 3.13: "The numinous fountain, we learn, has the capacity to ward off excessive heat and to offer cool shade to the flocks. The *umbra* that protects the members of the larger community of man and animals is a pastoral motif that Horace often assimilates into his version of latinized Aeolic." Harrison (2007) Lowrie (1997), and Davis (1991), the three studies which provide the foundation of this study, spend little (if any) time on bucolic/pastoral poetry's incorporation into the *Odes*. The didactic quality of lyric (see section 2.6) also aids in making allusion to Vergil's *Georgics* unnecessary in the case of *Odes* 2.13.

<sup>130</sup> Our treatment of Proserpina, Aeacus, and the *vulgus* in lines 21-32 has already shown us the validity of this approach. On Horatian programmatic mythology see Hutchinson (2002).

<sup>131</sup> On "the association between tragedy and specific houses" see Lowrie (1997) 98 which cites Aristotle *Poetics* 1453a 18-22: πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς τυχόντας μύθους ἀπηρίθμουν, νῦν δὲ περὶ ὀλίγας οἰκίας αἰ κάλλιστα τραγωδίαι συντίθενται, οἷον περὶ Ἀλκμέωνα καὶ Οἰδίπουν καὶ Ὀρέστην καὶ Μελέαγρον καὶ Θυέστην καὶ Τηλέφον καὶ ὅσοις ἄλλοις συμβέβηκεν ἢ παθεῖν δεινὰ ἢ ποιῆσαι. Horace's own *Ars Poetica* also suggests that specific figures (*Telephus et Pelus*, 96) can be evocative of tragedy.

#### 4.7.2 Prometheus, Eumenides, and Tantalus

Prometheus's middle position amongst the underworld figures and his absence from analogous scenes in Homer and Vergil's works make him the central character of Horace's scene both literally and figuratively. Although Horace provides little description of Prometheus himself beyond the fact that the music of Alcaeus allows him to forget his labor, the most shocking aspect of his circumstances is his mere presence in the underworld. Many authors follow the convention of placing the site of Prometheus's sufferings at the Caucasus or some other remote, earthly location,<sup>132</sup> but in *Odes* 2.13 Horace follows an older tradition<sup>133</sup> in which Prometheus was at some point during his sufferings located in the underworld. This version of the Prometheus myth most notably appears in Aeschylus's *Prometheus Vincetus* (1014-52):<sup>134</sup>

Ερ.  
σκέψαι δ', ἐὰν μὴ τοῖς ἐμοῖς πεισθῆις λόγοις,  
οἴος σε χειμῶν καὶ κακῶν τρικυμία 1015  
ἔπεισ' ἄφυκτος. πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ ὀκρίδα  
φάραγγα βροντῆι καὶ κεραυνίαι φλογὶ  
πατὴρ σπαράξει τήνδε καὶ κρύψει δέμας  
τὸ σόν, πετραία δ' ἀγκάλη σε βαστάσει.  
...  
τοιούδε μόχθου τέρμα μὴ τι προσδόκα 1026  
πρὶν ἂν θεῶν τις διάδοχος τῶν σῶν πόνων  
φανῆι, θελήσῃ τ' εἰς ἀναύγητον μολεῖν  
Ἄϊδην κνεφαῖά τ' ἀμφὶ Ταρτάρου βάθῃ.  
...  
Πρ.  
εἰδότι τοί μοι τάσδ' ἀγγελίας 1040  
ὄδ' ἐθώυξεν, πάσχειν δὲ κακῶς  
ἐχθρὸν ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν οὐδὲν ἀεικές.  
πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ῥιπτέσθω μὲν

<sup>132</sup> See e.g. Vergil *Eclogues* 6.42: *hinc lapides Pyrrhae iactos, Saturnia regna, / Caucasiasque refert uolucris furtumque Promethei*; Propertius 2.1.69-70: *idem Caucasia solvet de rupe Promethei / braccia*.

<sup>133</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 221: "Horace's Prometheus is punished not on the Caucasus but in Tartarus....There was an old form of the legend by which Prometheus was sent to the underworld like the other Titans."

<sup>134</sup> Some argue that Aeschylus also located Prometheus on the Caucasus, either in *Prometheus Vincetus*, *Prometheus Lyomenos*, or both. Allen (1892) explains that the upperworld location of these two tragedies is not undoubtedly the Caucasus.

πυρὸς ἀμφήκης βόστρυχος, ...

...

ἔς τε κελαινὸν

1050

Τάρταρον ἄρδην ῥίψει δέμας

τοῦμὸν ἀνάγκης στερραῖς δίναις.

Hermes:

But if you will not listen to my words, consider what sort of storm and triple wave of woes, inescapable, will come upon you. For first the father will rend this rugged chasm with thunderbolt and flame of lightning and hide your body away, and the rocky fold will hold you....Expect no end to this suffering until some god shall appear as a relief for your pains and willingly go into sunless Hades and the dark depths of Tartarus.

Prometheus:

This one has spoken these messages to me, though I already knew them. And it is nothing strange for an enemy to suffer badly at the hands of an enemy. Therefore let him throw the forked bolt of fire at me...and let him cast my body all the way into black Tartarus in cruel whirls of necessity.

Many commentators believe that Aeschylus's use of "Tartarus" in these lines is merely hyperbolic,<sup>135</sup> but the repetition of the word by two separate characters (1029, 1051), the second of which is in first position and followed by the intensifying adverb ἄρδην, strongly implies that Tartarus itself will be the location of Prometheus's hardships. In addition, earlier in the tragedy Prometheus bewails the public nature of his current punishment, saying, "If only he [Zeus] had sent me under the earth and beneath Hades, receiver of the dead, into limitless Tartarus" (εἰ γὰρ μ' ὑπὸ γῆν νέρθεν θ' Αἴδου / τοῦ νεκροδέγμονος εἰς ἀπέραντον / Τάρταρον ἦκεν, 152-4) in order that he might be with his fellow Titans, since "the vault of darkly deep Tartarus hides the aged Cronus and his allies" (Ταρτάρου μελαμβαθῆς / κευθμῶν καλύπτει τὸν παλαιγενῆ Κρόνον / αὐτοῖσι συμμάχοισι, 219-21). If we assert that Prometheus is not cast into Tartarus at the end of the tragedy, Prometheus's wish at 152-4 loses all of its potential as a foreshadowing device and as a tool for dramatic irony. It appears, then, that Horace's similar placement of Prometheus in the underworld is meant to allude to Aeschylus's tragedy, a proposition which gains further

---

<sup>135</sup> E.g. Griffith (1992) 265.

support thanks to “a typically dense and allusive Horatianism”<sup>136</sup> in *Odes* 2.19 where the steward of Orcus refuses to “unbind” Prometheus (*non...revinxit*, 33-35).

This link to Aeschylus in lines 33-40 is our first clue that Horace intends for this section to reflect his incorporation of tragedy into lyric, and this realization enlightens our understanding of other details in this section of Horace’s ode. Horace’s Eumenides, for instance, could not help but remind his audience of another Aeschylean work, the *Eumenides*, whose titular “Gorgon-like” goddesses (46-8) also dwell in the underworld (72) and closely resemble the snake-haired creatures of Horace’s ode.<sup>137</sup> Horace continues this allusion to Aeschylus through his unusual use of the verb *recreantur*,<sup>138</sup> which subtly connects the rousing of the Eumenides’ snakes in *Odes* 2.13.36 to the awakening of the Eumenides themselves by Clytemnestra in *Eumenides* 124-42.

Tantalus is another character in *Odes* 2.13 whose presence alludes strongly to tragedy despite the fact that little can ever be known about the eponymous plays which Sophocles, Phrynichus, and other tragedians are known to have composed about him.<sup>139</sup> As a result one must look elsewhere for reasons why his brief appearance in *Odes* 2.13 as the “parent of Pelops” (*Pelopis parens*, 37) functions as a reminder of the genre of tragedy. One explanation is given by Nisbet and Hubbard who claim that Horace’s decision to refer to Tantalus in this way, rather than by name as he does in similar situations,<sup>140</sup> creates an alliterative pair (*Prometheus et Pelopis parens*) which “is unusually obvious for Horace, and gives the archaic coloring of

---

<sup>136</sup> West (1998) 135.

<sup>137</sup> See also Aeschylus *Choephoroi* 1048-50: δμοιαὶ γυναῖκες αἶδε Γοργόνων δίκην / φαιοχίτωνες καὶ πεπλεκτανημένοι / πυκνοῖς δράκουσιν.

<sup>138</sup> West (1998) 93: “it is strange that the same music as soothes Cerberus enlivens the snakes in the hair of the Furies, presumably an allusion to the coiling motions induced by snake-charming (contrast Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.754, where Umbro puts snakes to sleep by singing to them).” For the controversy surrounding *recreantur* see Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 220.

<sup>139</sup> Gantz (1993) 534.

<sup>140</sup> E.g. *Odes* 2.18.36-8: *hic superbum / Tantalum atque Tantali / genus coerces*.

Roman tragedy.”<sup>141</sup> A second, more intertextual explanation is derived from the emphasis that this phrase places upon Tantalus’s crime and its effect on his son. By highlighting the generational effect of his misdeed, Horace invites us to recall the many tragedies featuring Tantalus’s descendants which prominently treat their ancestor’s famous crime or punishment. Aeschylus’s *Agamemnon*, for instance, primarily focuses on the hereditary pollution resulting from the actions of Atreus, but the tragedy’s identification of his family as the “sons of Tantalus” (Τανταλίδαισι, 1469) and the “descendants of Pelops” (Πελοπίδαις, 1600) indicate that the original crime of Tantalus, also cannibalistic according to many versions of his story, is never far from Aeschylus’s mind.

Aeschylus is by no means the only tragedian who treats the myth of Tantalus in such a fashion. Euripides, for instance, begins the *Iphigenia Taurica* with the words “Pelops, the son of Tantalus” (Πέλοψ ὁ Ταντάλειος, 1) during Iphigenia’s recounting of her ancestry, and later the same character denounces the story of Tantalus’s grisly banquet as untrue (386-8). The *Orestes* likewise begins by mentioning Tantalus, specifically by means of Electra’s description of his punishment and his fathering of Pelops (4-11), and Menelaus outlines his own descent from Pelops and the infamous banquet in *Helen* 386-92. Thus, even though he never appears in extant Greek tragedies, “Tantalus, father of Pelops” was a well-known topic of tragic productions thanks to his descendants’ consistent reminders of their parentage and Tantalus’s misdeeds.

Tragedy, then, so far accounts for the presence and descriptions of three out of the five characters mentioned in lines 33-40 of *Odes* 2.13. Interestingly, however, these tragically allusive characters also possess a certain lyric quality which aids in maintaining the lyric unity of *Odes* 2.13. Immediately following the passage from the *Prometheus Vincetus* discussed above, in

---

<sup>141</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 221.

which Hermes and Prometheus discuss the eventual transfer of the Titan to Tartarus, Hermes abandons his attempts to persuade Prometheus and addresses the Chorus instead (1054-7):

τοιάδε μέντοι τῶν φρενοπλήκτων  
βουλεύματ' ἔπη τ' ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι·  
τί γὰρ ἐλλείπει μὴ <οὐ> παραπαίειν  
ἢ τοῦδ' εὐχή;

1055

Such indeed are the thoughts and words one hears from those who are crazed. In what does this one's wish fall short of being mad?

Most striking in Hermes's words is his use of metaphors concerned with lyre-playing.<sup>142</sup> The verb παραπαίω literally means “to strike a false note,”<sup>143</sup> and φρενόπληκτος is etymologically related to the word πλῆκτρον (Latin: *plectrum*), the tool used to play the lyre.<sup>144</sup> Horace may even be taking advantage of the fact that the words which Hermes characterizes as un-lyrical were delivered in anapests, a metrical foot expected as Aeschylus's tragedy nears its end<sup>145</sup> but generically unexpected in Horatian lyric. In any case, it is clear that Horace chooses to allude to this particular scene in the *Prometheus Vincetus* because he believes his readers will recognize the lyric quality of Aeschylus's diction.

A similar process is at work in Horace's allusion to Aeschylus's *Eumenides*, who likewise come across as “bad lyricists” throughout the *Oresteia*. They sing a “lyreless song” (μέλος...ἀφόρμικτος, 329-33, 342-6) to bind Orestes in the *Eumenides*, and in *Agamemnon* 990-1 the Chorus intones, “Yet the soul within me sings, self-taught, the lyreless dirge of the Erinyes” (τὸν δ' ἄνευ λύρας ὅμως ὑμνωδεῖ / θρηῖνον Ἐρινύος αὐτοδίδακτος ἔσωθεν / θυμός, 990-2). Fraenkel, in his discussion of these lines, writes, “Here it becomes particularly clear...that a fundamental theme of the whole trilogy is expressed in these two stanzas. It is carried farther in

---

<sup>142</sup> Griffith (1992) 273.

<sup>143</sup> LSJ s.v. παραπαίω A.II.

<sup>144</sup> LSJ s.v. πλῆκτρον A.I.

<sup>145</sup> Griffith (1992) 269-70.

1191 ff. and especially in the choruses of the *Eumenides*.”<sup>146</sup> That Aeschylus would choose to unite this theme of looming dread with the absence of the lyre in such a critical passage, and then continue to employ this connection throughout the *Oresteia*, shows just how important it was for Aeschylus that his readers connect the Eumenides with poor lyric song, an association Horace utilizes for his own generic purposes in *Odes* 2.13.<sup>147</sup>

References to Tantalus’s story are frequent in lyric poetry,<sup>148</sup> with perhaps the most famous found in the revisionist account given by Pindar in *Olympian* 1. When looking for suitable “lyric” references within tragedies in the same vein as those found in *Prometheus Vinctus* and the *Eumenides*, however, one need look no further than the Chorus’s words at *Agamemnon* 1468-74:

δαῖμον, ὃς ἐμπίτνεις δῶμασι καὶ διφυ-  
οῖσι Τανταλίδαισιν,  
κράτος <τ’> ἰσόψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν  
καρδιόδηκτον ἐμοὶ κρατύνεις·  
ἐπὶ δὲ σώματος δίκαν  
κόρακος ἐχθροῦ σταθεῖσ’ ἐκνόμως  
ῥῆμον ὕμνεῖν ἐπεύχεται < >.

1470

O *daimon*, you who falls upon this house and the two descendants of Tantalus and who through like-minded women wields strength that gnaws at my heart, perched upon the body like a hateful raven boasts of discordantly singing her song.

Like Horace’s “*Pelopis parens*,” Aeschylus’s “*Τανταλίδαισιν*” not only includes Tantalus but also highlights the generational nature of his crime, here embodied in the form of a raven-like *daimon*. The lyric connotations of its discordant singing (ἐκνόμως / ῥῆμον ὕμνεῖν ἐπεύχεται, 1473-4) are self-evident, and build upon other passages wherein *daimones* are similarly described in musical terms.<sup>149</sup> Aeschylus’s particular choice of bird, however, is equally

<sup>146</sup> Fraenkel (1950) 446.

<sup>147</sup> This line of interpretation adds another level of humor to Horace’s *Eumenides*: they are bad lyricists listening to better lyricists, Sappho and Alcaeus, in a poem written by another (best?) lyricist, Horace.

<sup>148</sup> E.g. Alcman 79; Alcaeus 365; Pindar *Isthmian* 8.

<sup>149</sup> E.g. *Agamemnon* 1173-6: ἐπόμενα προτέροισι τὰδ’ ἐφημίσω, / καὶ τίς σε κακοφρονῶν τίθη- / σι δαίμων ὑπερβαρῆς ἐμπίτων / μελίζειν πάθη γοερά θανατοφόρα.

meaningful. According to a tradition preserved in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*,<sup>150</sup> the raven lost both its white color and its status as “the bird of Phoebus” (*ales...Phoebeius*, 2.544-5) because of its inability to control its speech. In fact, the raven’s voice was powerful enough to make the god of poetry himself abandon his lyric emblems, the plectrum and the laurel wreath (2.598-602):

*dominoque iacentem  
cum iuvene Haemonio vidisse Coronida narrat.  
laurea delapsa est audito crimine amantis,  
et pariter vultusque deo plectrumque colorque  
excidit;...* 600

When the raven recounted to its master how it saw Coronis lying with the Haemonian youth, his laurel slipped down as his lover’s crime was heard, and the face and plectrum and complexion of the god all fell away equally...

This dissonant voice of the raven not only makes it an excellent symbol for all that is non-lyric, but it also makes the bird surprisingly like Tantalus himself. A lesser known tradition argues that it was not a cannibalistic act which doomed Tantalus, but his inability to control his speech in the presence of the gods, a fault described by Electra in *Orestes* 7-10:<sup>151</sup>

καὶ τίνει ταύτην δίκην,  
ὡς μὲν λέγουσιν, ὅτι θεοῖς ἀνθρώπος ὢν,  
κοινῆς τραπέζης ἀξίωμ’ ἔχων ἴσον,  
ἀκόλαστον ἔσχε γλῶσσαν, αἰσχίστην νόσον. 10

And he [Tantalus] pays this penalty, so they say, because even when he had the equal honor of a common table with the gods, despite being a mortal man, he was possessed of an unbridled tongue, a shameful flaw.

To say, then, that the *daimon* is like a raven characterizes it not only as a non-lyric bird, but also as a manifestation of Tantalus which encompasses an alternative source for the hereditary bloodguilt passed down through his family line.

<sup>150</sup> Ovid *Metamorphoses* 2.531-632.

<sup>151</sup> For other sources for Tantalus’s treacherous tongue see Gantz (1993) 533-4.

### 4.7.3 Orion and Cerberus

The remaining two characters of *Odes* 2.13.33-40, Cerberus and Orion, are not so easily connected to tragedy, a difficulty caused in great part by modern scholarship's fragmentary knowledge of many works which may have concerned themselves with these figures. Orion's myths, for instance, although known by many prominent classical authors and spanning multiple genres, were never standardized<sup>152</sup> and a great majority of his exploits survive by way of fragments and scholia rather than in complete works, resulting in many conflicting accounts of his mythic career.<sup>153</sup> Orion's recovery from blindness may have been the subject of *Cedalion*, a lost satyr play by Sophocles of which little is known.<sup>154</sup> As for Cerberus no known tragedy bears his name and, as Griffith explains, there appears to be a clear avoidance of Cerberus and other multi-limbed beasts at all levels of Greek tragedy:<sup>155</sup>

Myth is a veritable sideshow of teratological excess, featuring the many-limbed Argus (cf. *ARV* 874,2), Cerberus, Geryon, the Hecatoncheires, the Hydra, Typhon, yet these are absent from the stage (perhaps mainly for practical reasons) and, with the notable exception of Euripides *Heracles*, absent also from speech and song, although some figure as shield-emblems of the Seven (Aesch. *Sept.* 493; Eur. *Phoen.* 1115, 1136), and the shapeshifting bogey Empusa manages a couple of appearances in Aristophanes (*Eccl.* 1056-57, *Ran.* 288-295; cf. Achelous in Soph. *Trach.* 1-17).

We seem, therefore, to be at an unavoidable disadvantage from the very outset of our quest to find tragic significance in these two characters since any possible allusions we might unearth will never be as sound as those of Prometheus, the Eumenides, and Tantalus. Yet finding a suitably

---

<sup>152</sup> Rose (1928) 116-7.

<sup>153</sup> Gantz (1993) 271.

<sup>154</sup> Gantz (1993) 272.

<sup>155</sup> Griffith (1998) 240. We will leave aside the question of whether the ancient Greek stage, which already required a fair amount of imagination on the part of both actors and audience, could have feasibly represented such fantastic beasts as the Hydra or Hecatoncheires. It should also be pointed out that, *pace* Griffith, the *Heracles* is not the only tragedy in which Cerberus and other multi-limbed monsters appear in tragic song. See e.g. Sophocles *Trachiniai* 1090-100.

tragic Orion or Cerberus is not an impossible task, merely one which requires a more roundabout method of analysis that lacks the directness of Horace’s appealing treatment of the other three characters. Thankfully, the effect which Prometheus, the Eumenides, and Tantalus have upon our tragic expectations is strong enough that Horace can successfully achieve his goal of incorporating tragedy into the final lines of *Odes* 2.13 even without major help from Orion and Cerberus. With this in mind, let us attempt to unearth what tragic allusions we can from Horace’s inclusion of these two figures and, if possible, determine whether these allusions also include a lyric component just as we saw with regard to the more significant trio already discussed.

The best possible candidate for tragic intertextuality in Horace’s description of Orion comes from a choral passage in Euripides’s *Alcestis* which includes the animals Orion hunts, the lion and lynx (568-87):<sup>156</sup>

ὦ πολύξεινος καὶ ἐλευθέρου ἀνδρὸς αἰεὶ ποτ’ οἶκος, σέ τοι καὶ ὁ Πύθιος εὐλύρας Ἀπόλλων	570
ἤξιωσε ναίειν, ἔτλα δὲ σοῖσι μηλονόμας ἐν νομοῖς γενέσθαι, δοχμῶν διὰ κλειτύων	575
βοσκήμασι σοῖσι συρίζων ποιμνίτας ὑμεναίους. σὺν δ’ ἐποιμαίνοντο χαρᾶι μελέων βαλιαί τε λύγκες, ἔβα δὲ λιποῦσ’ Ὀθρυος νάπαν λεόντων	580
ἄ δαφεινὸς ἴλα· χόρευσε δ’ ἀμφὶ σὰν κιθάραν, Φοῖβε, ποικιλόθριξ νεβρὸς ὑψικόμων πέραν	585
βαίνουσ’ ἐλατᾶν σφυρῶι κούφωι, χαίρουσ’ εὐφροني μολπαῖ.	

<sup>156</sup> Horace’s earliest possible source for an Orion who is present in the underworld and is a hunter (specifically a hunter of lions and lynxes) is *Odyssey* 11, but this passage has already been revealed as a poor match for *Odes* 2.13 (subsection 4.7.1). Another potential candidate, Corinna’s *Kataplous*, reportedly portrays Orion as a man “who went around to many places to reclaim them and cleanse them of beasts” (ἐπελθόντα πολλοὺς τόπους ἡμερῶσαι καὶ καθαρῖσαι ἀπὸ θηρίων, *Scholia in Nicandri theriaca* 15a), but the complete lack of Corinna’s actual text means that this general plot description leaves much to be desired.

O home of a man always hospitable and open, even Pythian Apollo, skilled in the lyre, deigned to dwell in you, and allowed himself to become a shepherd in your pastures, playing shepherds' marriage songs upon his syrinx to your herds on the slanting hillsides. Spotted lynxes were tended in the joy of his songs, and a tawny band of lions came, having left the glen of Othrys, and a dappled fawn danced to the song of your kithara, stepping beyond the high-leafed firs with its light foot, rejoicing in your cheerful song.

At first glance these lines may seem a poor fit since they do not include Orion in any way,<sup>157</sup> yet as we have already seen Horace purposefully downplays Orion in the final two lines of *Odes* 2.13, meaning that Orion himself may not be the intended subject of Horace's allusion. In fact, once we abandon our focus on Orion we discover that this passage contains a surprising number of commonalities with Horace's ode. First, the Chorus here depicts what has been termed "Apollo Nomius," a pastoral form of the god of poetry which later became the model for similar figures who use song to charm wild beasts.<sup>158</sup> This power, similar to that wielded by Orpheus in *Georgics* 4, is the very same as is reflected in lines 33-40 of *Odes* 2.13. In this way Horace uses a strong thematic allusion to make up for the absence of his less important Orion.

Second, this scene also continues Horace's pattern of alluding to famous tragic passages with a strongly lyric quality. Lyric code words like μελέων and κιθάραν (and, to a lesser extent, χόρευσε and μολπαῖ) abound, with εὐλύρας, perhaps the most explicit of these, deserving particular attention because of its surprising rarity in ancient Greek. Except for a single use by Aristophanes meant to allude to this exact passage of the *Alcestis*,<sup>159</sup> εὐλύρας appears elsewhere only in lyric poetry.<sup>160</sup> Furthermore, Parker believes that Euripides's phrase "χαρᾶι μελέων" is in itself an allusion to an insult found in the *Agamemnon* (1629-32):<sup>161</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> Seaford (1975) 198–9. argues that similarities of character between Orion and Heracles suggest potential verbal similarities between Euripides's *Alcestis* and Sophocles's *Kedalion*, which may have treated Orion's miraculous recovery from blindness. If so, then perhaps Orion's presence is felt throughout the *Alcestis* in some small way simply because he and Heracles share common heroic traits.

<sup>158</sup> On Apollo Nomius in the *Alcestis* see Berg (1965) 12.

<sup>159</sup> *Thesmophoriazousai* 969. For analysis see Parker (2007).

<sup>160</sup> See Sappho frag. 44 line 33; Limenius 4; *Carmina Delphis Inventa* 3.4-6.

<sup>161</sup> Parker (2007) 173.

Αἴγισθος  
Ὀρφεὶ δὲ γλῶσσαν τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔχεις·  
ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἦγε πάντ' ἀπὸ φθογγῆς χαρᾶι,  
σὺ δ' ἐξορίνας νηπίοις ὑλάγμασιν  
ἄξι-

1630

Aigisthos [to Chorus]:

You have a tongue opposite that of Orpheus, for he led all things with the joy of his songs, but you who have exasperated us with your childish yelping will be led away.

The fact that this complex intertextual web ultimately culminates with the magical powers of the lyricist Orpheus proves that Horace's potential allusion to the *Alcestis* not only has a subtle lyric quality, but also suits an ode describing the soothing power of song.<sup>162</sup>

Finally, the *Alcestis* passage includes lions and lynxes, the same animals found in *Odes* 2.13.39-40. Throughout our reinterpretation of *Odes* 2.13.33-40 great attention has been paid to the exact descriptors used by Horace during his allusions, and similar analysis here reveals a discrepancy between Euripides's lynxes, which are "spotted" (βαλιαί, *Alcestis* 579), and Horace's, which he calls "timid" (*timidos*, *Odes* 2.13.40). If Horace is truly attempting to suggest this passage of the *Alcestis* to his readers, then some explanation must be given for why Horace would change the original adjective, especially given the fact that Horace's lynx has no particular reason to be timid now that his pursuer has given up the chase. Thankfully, an answer to this dilemma is provided by Euripides's fawn which Horace omits from his ode, most likely because such a harmless animal would be unsuitable prey for so mighty a hunter as Orion. In fact, this proverbially meek nature of the fawn is exactly what Euripides portrays when he describes how it creeps out from safety "stepping beyond the high-leafed firs with its light foot" (ὕψικόμων πέραν / βαίνουσ' ἐλατᾶν σφυρῶι κούφωι, 585-6). Thus, in Euripides it is the fawn that is "timid" rather than the lynx, and Horace has decided to conflate the two creatures rather than include the "out of place" fawn in his underworld pursuit. The mechanism which allows Horace

---

<sup>162</sup> We should also remember that the meter of this choral song would also contribute to the scene's overall lyric quality. See section 4.3 with note 40.

to combine these animals in this way is the fact that in the *Alcestis* scene both the lynx and the fawn are dappled or spotted (βαλιαί, 579; ποικιλόθριξ, 584), and by bringing both beasts together into a single “timid lynx” in *Odes* 2.13 Horace reminds his readers of this shared coloration as displayed in his Euripidean source material.

So much for Orion. We must now turn to the most difficult figure in *Odes* 2.13.33-40, Cerberus. As Griffith explains, if there is any place in extant Greek tragedy where we will likely encounter the legendary hound of Hades it is Euripides’s *Heracles*.<sup>163</sup> When they decide to celebrate the deeds of Heracles, including his still ongoing quest to fetch Cerberus,<sup>164</sup> the Chorus sings a song rife with lyric watchwords (348-58):

αἴλινον μὲν ἐπ’ εὐτυχεῖ	
μολπαῖ Φοῖβος ἰαχεῖ	
τὰν καλλίφθογγον κιθάραν	350
ἐλαύνων πλήκτρῳι χρυσέῳ·	
ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν γὰρ ἐνέρω·	
ἔς ὄρφναν μολόντα παῖδ’,	
εἴτε Διὸς νιν εἶπω	
εἴτ’ Ἀμφιτρύωνος Ἴνιν,	355
ὑμνήσαι στεφάνωμα μό-	355
χθων δι’ εὐλογίας θέλω.	
γενναίων δ’ ἀρεταὶ πόνων	
τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἄγαλμα.	

Phoebus, striking his beautiful-voiced lyre with golden plectrum, sings a dirge after a song of good fortune. I too wish to sing with praise of the child, whether I am to call him son of Zeus or son of Amphitryon, who has gone into the darkness of the earth and those beneath it, a crown for his labors. The valorous completion of noble toils is a glory for the dead.

In addition to the obvious lyric connotations found in words such as μολπαῖ, πλήκτρῳι, and κιθάραν, much of Euripides’s vocabulary in this passage (ὑμνήσαι, στεφάνωμα, μόχθων/πόνων, ἀρεταὶ, ἄγαλμα) is reminiscent of that found in epinikian odes.<sup>165</sup> Similarly, upon Heracles’s successful return the Chorus proclaims that they will sing of his triumphs “along with the song of

<sup>163</sup> See Griffith (1998) 240, quoted in full at the start of subsection 4.7.3.

<sup>164</sup> See *Heracles* 425-9: δρόμων τ’ ἄλλων ἀγάλαματ’ εὐτυχῆ / διήλθε τὸν <τε> πολυδάκρυον / ἔπλευσ’ ἐς Ἄϊδαν, πόνων τελευτάν, / ἴν’ ἐκπεραίνει τάλας / βίσιον οὐδ’ ἔβα πάλιν. The fact that Cerberus is the reason for Heracles’s absence at the start of the play means Cerberus is in a sense responsible for the dramatic action of the tragedy so far (i.e. the unlawful rule of Lycus and the danger to Heracles’s family).

<sup>165</sup> For detailed analysis see Bond (1981) 153.

the seven-toned lyre and the Lybian flute” (παρά τε χέλυος ἑπτατόνου / μολπὴν καὶ Λίβυν αὐλόν, 683-4), and Madness, who threatens, “I will soon make you [Heracles] dance and play you a fearsome flute” (τάχα σ’ ἐγὼ μᾶλλον χορεύσω καὶ καταυλήσω φόβωι, 871), only does so because Hera was forbidden to interfere with Heracles until his final labor, Cerberus, was completed (827-32).<sup>166</sup>

Unfortunately, however, the passages which mention Cerberus in this play consistently represent him as a three-headed beast (24, 611, 1277) rather than as a hundred-headed hound as in Horace’s ode, a fact which, at first, appears to preclude any further possibilities for intertextuality between *Odes* 2.13 and the *Heracles*.<sup>167</sup> There is, however, another beast in the *Heracles*, the Hydra, which is not only described as hundred-headed (ἑκατογκεφάλου...ὔδρας, 1188),<sup>168</sup> but also is called a “dog” (κύων) just like Cerberus, perhaps most significantly in lines 1274-8 when Heracles uses the same word (κύνα) to describe both monsters in a single sentence.<sup>169</sup>

τὴν τ’ ἀμφίκρανον καὶ παλιμβλαστὴ κύνα  
 ὔδραν φονεύσας μυρίων τ’ ἄλλων πόνων  
 διήλθον ἀγέλας κᾶς νεκροῦς ἀφικόμην,  
 Ἄϊδου πυλωρὸν κύνα τρίκρανον ἐς φάος  
 ὅπως πορεύσαιμ’ ἐντολαῖς Εὐρυσθέως.

1275

Having slain that dog with regrowing heads all around it, the Hydra, I went through a herd of countless other toils and arrived among the dead in order to bring into the light by the commands of Eurystheus the gate-keeper of Hades, the three-headed dog.

<sup>166</sup> Additional links between lyric and Cerberus could come from poems composed by two of the canonical Greek lyricists, Stesichorus’s *Cerberus* and Bacchylides *Epinician* 5, but the loss of the former and the brevity of the latter’s treatment of Cerberus hinder our use of them. Another lyric connection is found in the number of heads Cerberus is said to possess (see note 168, below).

<sup>167</sup> Horace was aware of the tradition attributing three heads to the watchdog of Hades and even makes use of it later in *Odes* 2 when Cerberus licks the feet of Bacchus “with his three-tongued mouth” (*trilingui / ore*, 2.19.31-2). Why does Horace choose to deviate here in *Odes* 2.13? One of Pindar’s fragmentary dithyrambs contains the earliest known reference to a hundred-headed (ἑκατογκεφάλας, 249b) Cerberus. Perhaps, then, Horace’s use of a hundred heads is designed as an additional lyric allusion. On Cerberus’s heads in Pindar see Finglass (2005) 42.

<sup>168</sup> Note that this is the same adjective, ἑκατογκεφάλας, used in the Pindaric fragment cited above.

<sup>169</sup> For other uses of κύων with these monsters see also *Heracles* 24, 1386 (Cerberus) and *Heracles* 420 (Hydra).

Tragedians apply the word κύων to a wide variety of beasts, both the mundane and the magical, but as Bond points out Euripides consistently uses the term in the *Heracles* as a γοῖφος, one among many such allusive riddles scattered throughout the tragedy, purposefully designed to toy with his audience's expectations.<sup>170</sup> Horace, in a deliberate attempt to mimic this practice within his own highly allusive ode, uses the Latin word *belua* (*Odes* 2.13.34) to capture the same sense of ambiguity implied in Euripides's κύων.

In fact, the entirety of Horace's description of Cerberus is so ambiguous that, in the light of Euripides's tragedy, it could easily refer to either of these underworld monsters.<sup>171</sup> In their comments on the phrase "*belua centiceps*" Nisbet and Hubbard insist that "Horace can only be thinking of dogs' ears" in this passage, even though "similar expressions may sometimes refer to snakes' heads."<sup>172</sup> If, however, Horace is purposefully obscuring the distinction between Cerberus and the Hydra for the purpose of Euripidean allusion, this "coincidence" of language, dismissed by Nisbet and Hubbard, takes on a whole new significance and imparts greater meaning to Horace's evocative Greek compound. We should also remember that, perhaps as a result of their familial connection,<sup>173</sup> Cerberus was often represented in Greek art as having certain Hydra-like qualities. The earliest known artistic representation of Cerberus, for instance, depicts him with numerous snakes growing all over his body,<sup>174</sup> and this trend continued throughout subsequent artistic and literary representations in the classical world.<sup>175</sup>

Horace's carefully-crafted descriptions of all five underworld inhabitants in lines 33-40 thus function as intertextual allusions to Greek tragedy arranged within a brief ring structure.

---

<sup>170</sup> Bond (1981) 174.

<sup>171</sup> The Hydra, already a guardian of a passage to the underworld according to some accounts, is also explicitly described as an inhabitant of the underworld by Vergil in *Aeneid* 6.576-7.

<sup>172</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 220.

<sup>173</sup> See Hesiod *Theogony* 295-315.

<sup>174</sup> Gantz (1993) 22.

<sup>175</sup> Bloomfield (1905) 1-7.

The presence of Prometheus in the underworld, the most unique addition to Horace's scene in comparison with those passages from *Georgics* 4, *Odyssey* 11, and *Aeneid* 6 commonly considered alongside this section of *Odes* 2.13, summons up Aeschylean tragedy in the mind of Horace's readers. This Aeschylean link is then strengthened by the allusive figures, Tantalus and the Eumenides, which surround Prometheus. This Aeschylean core is then bracketed by two Euripidean allusions which require Horace's reader to use descriptive words from *Odes* 2.13 (*belua centiceps*, *timidos*) to conflate creatures in the Euripidean works (Hydra/Cerberus, lynx/fawn).<sup>176</sup> More importantly, however, all five of these characters and the allusions to which they give rise also feature a strong lyric character, ensuring that the lyric unity preserved throughout the earlier portions of the ode is maintained even in its concluding lines.

#### 4.8 MOVING BEYOND *ODES* 2.13

We have argued that Horace's engagement with his readers' generic expectations in *Odes* 2.13 is designed to reflect an even greater program of generic enrichment which takes place throughout the *Odes*, but how does Horace accomplish this? How does Horace, who has been directing our thoughts even from the very outset of *Odes* 2, guide us toward applying the pattern found in *Odes* 2.13 to the entirety of his lyric collection? The answer lies in one last piece of programmatic mythology not yet considered in our analysis of *Odes* 2.13 so far, the identities of Horace's divine saviors.

---

<sup>176</sup> Another potential similarity lies in the fact that both Euripidean allusions involve figures, the Hydra and Orion, who reside either in the underworld or in the night sky as constellations after their deaths.

#### 4.8.1 The Puzzle of Horace's Salvation

One of the final mysteries surrounding *Odes* 2.13 revolves around the fact that this poem, Horace's longest treatment of the falling tree incident, does not specify which divinity saved him from the tree, a detail upon which Horace's later versions of the story are ambiguous. At *Odes* 2.17, Horace claims that "Faunus diverted the blow of the falling tree with his right hand" (*Faunus ictum / dextra levasset*, 28-9). Later, at *Odes* 3.4, Horace addresses the Muses as his protectors, saying "the accursed tree did not destroy me, a friend to your fonts and dances" (*vestris amicum fontibus et choris...[me] devota non exstinxit arbos*, 25-7). Shortly thereafter, however, in *Odes* 3.8, Horace describes the offerings he promised to Bacchus when he was "nearly killed by the blow of the tree" (*prope funeratus / arboris ictu*, 7-8). This multiplicity of patrons makes it nearly impossible to narrow responsibility to any one god, although some have tried. Ensor, for instance, believes that Faunus is Horace's true "patron saint" since Horace's birthday falls two days before the Faunalia,<sup>177</sup> but Horace himself says that he has belonged to the Muses since infancy.<sup>178</sup> Moreover, though Faunus and Bacchus are both promised a sacrifice for their aid, Horace makes no mention in the *Odes* of any future offering for his "friends," the Muses. In short, one cannot reasonably attribute Horace's salvation to any one god, since all three are given equal status as savior.<sup>179</sup>

That Horace would omit the identity of his rescuer from his earliest poem concerned with the tree event is not unsettling on its own, nor does it come as a surprise that Horace would subsequently present three alterations to this particular element of his personal narrative – by this

---

<sup>177</sup> Ensor (1902) 209-10. For the date of the Faunalia see *Odes* 3.18.10.

<sup>178</sup> See *Odes* 3.4.20-2: *non sine dis animosus infans. / vester, Camenae, vester in arduos / tollor...*

<sup>179</sup> Parker (1993) 201.

point we have come to understand that such toying with reader expectations is typical of Horatian verse. What is perplexing, however, is the question of whether Horace intends this ambiguity to have programmatic significance or whether it is merely the result of some poetic caprice.

As we read the tree poems in sequence Horace's lack of continuity between odes entices us to seek out deeper meaning. Horace first presents the tree scenario in *Odes* 2.13 and then furthers his audience's understanding of the earlier-described event in his ode to Maecenas (2.17) by introducing the notion of a savior deity. This act of expansion permits Horace to interweave his personal narrative with that of Maecenas, thus allowing him to impart greater significance to the event by tying it to the patron-client bond shared by these two men.<sup>180</sup> Content with this unexpected, but not unwelcome expansion to what we thought would be a one-time anecdote, we continue through the remainder of the *Odes*, perhaps not expecting to revisit the tale of Horace's escape, until it resurfaces yet again in *Odes* 3.4. This time, however, Horace now attributes his salvation to the Muses,<sup>181</sup> curiously changing the details of his story and potentially undoing the significance of his efforts in *Odes* 2.17. We naturally begin to question this modification only to discover that Horace changes his story one final time in *Odes* 3.8, another poem addressed to Maecenas, the very same individual to whom he earlier rendered a now-conflicting account of the tree episode. If the simple differences between each rendition of the tree story were not enough to spark an examination for the meaning behind these changes in the minds of Horace's readers, then surely his apparent "lying" to Maecenas would.

---

<sup>180</sup> On Horace's relationship to Maecenas as described in the *Odes* see e.g. Griffin (1997) 58; Santirocco (1986) 153-68; Santirocco (1984).

<sup>181</sup> The name Horace uses for the Muses in *Odes* 3.4 is actually "*Camenae*." This significance of this word will be discussed in section 5.2 below.

Also enticing is the apparent forethought which Horace has employed in his arrangement and interweaving of these tree event poems. *Odes* 2.13 and 2.17 are separated by three intervening poems, as are 3.4 and 3.8, a fact which encourages us to think of these as two sets of matched pairs. This is perhaps most apparent when comparing the two Maecenas odes (2.17 and 3.8) whose common addressee would naturally imply a potential for similarity between the two poems. Shared thematic commonalities are also readily apparent between the two odes, with both featuring injunctions against anxiety set amid such topics as the enduring strength of friendship and the importance of the joys and obligations of the present. Of specific interest are the poems' shared focuses on time as embodied in the astrological calculations of *Odes* 2.17 and the datable events in 3.8. These thematic similarities are paralleled by structural ones: an opening question directed to the addressee introduces the main point of the ode which is then followed by an extensively detailed line of argumentation featuring abundant use of named exempla concluding in paired imperative commands (*reddere...memento*, 2.17.30-1; *parce...cape*, 3.8.26-7). Although not as overt, a similar process is at work in *Odes* 2.13 and 3.4, with the themes of the former being expanded and reincorporated into the latter: poetic vision,<sup>182</sup> divine salvation of the poet, famous/infamous underworld inhabitants, and the restorative effects of music.<sup>183</sup> Verbal allusions, such as Horace's repeated mentioning of a sailor of the Bosphorus (*navita Bosporum*, 2.13.14 = 3.4.30) or Orion (2.13.39-40, 3.4.70-72),<sup>184</sup> strengthen these shared

---

<sup>182</sup> In *Odes* 2.13 it is the unforeseen descent of the tree which leads Horace to envision the underworld. Interestingly, in *Odes* 3.4, it is the requested descent of the Muse Calliope which causes the same effect.

<sup>183</sup> Lowrie (1997) 216-7 details all of the verbal parallels and motifs found both between these two poems and among all of the personal narrative poems. Included in her list are *arbor/arbos* (2.13.3, 3.4.27), *recreantur* (2.13.36) and *recreatis* (3.4.40), Orion (2.13.39, 3.4.71), controlled madness, marvel (*mirum*), danger, divine protection, poetic vision, underworld, sacred place for poetic recreation, *labor*.

<sup>184</sup> It is important to note that in both 2.13 and 3.4 Orion appears in his corporeal form rather than in his katasterized form, as he does in 1.28.21-2 and 3.27.17-8. Their shared use of Orion's non-constellation form further encourages us to seek responson between 2.13 and 3.4.

thematic bonds. Structure is likewise mirrored between the poems, with personal narratives couched in hymnal language leading to the presentation of mythic scenes.

These coincidences of theme and structure evidenced in the four tree incident poems encourage us to find meaning in his change in divinities, yet few believe there to be much use in such an inquiry. Instead, most commentators believe the individual identity of each divinity is unimportant in the light of their shared statuses as gods of poetry and poetic inspiration.<sup>185</sup> Any inconsistencies in the various formulations of Horace's personal narrative are therefore unproblematic because all the divinities can serve the greater purpose of providing Horace a means of reflecting on the nature of his own poetry.

Some examples will illustrate the general trend. Davis, whose generic analysis of *Odes* 2.13 forms the foundation for this study's reinterpretation of the tree ode, focuses on the idea of the poet as a divinely protected figure. Horace's goal in the tree odes, Davis asserts, is to show that the gods protect him because of his status as a *vates*, and he is therefore able to achieve a kind of immortality through his poetry. Thus, after showing how Faunus, the Muses/Calliope, and Liber are all patrons of poets, Davis says:<sup>186</sup>

In view of the recurrent motif of rescue, why the odd variation, one might legitimately ask, in the particular divinity who is allotted the role of the poet's savior? The impression Horace seems to convey is that [Faunus], Calliope (with the Muses), and Bacchus are, for the purposes of an exemplary salvation function, interchangeable. In other words, the episode acquires its meaning only in respect its emblematic character. The rescuing *numen* varies, but the significance of the rescue remains constant.

The change of deities, he claims, is meaningless, merely a tool in the service of a poetic motif. Similarly, Griffin explains that the versatility of the tree episode, including its variation with

---

<sup>185</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 126; Commager (1966) 342.

<sup>186</sup> Davis (1991) 87-8. Davis's text actually reads "Mercury (with Faunus), Calliope (with the Muses) and Bacchus," but I have altered his wording to better suit the context of my current discussion. Below I will explain how Faunus and Mercury are connected and interchangeable for Horace's purposes within *Odes* 1.32 and 2.13.

regard to the savior divinities, allows Horace to tailor his reflections upon the incident to the addressee and dramatic occasion of each poem.<sup>187</sup>

But Horace – to borrow a massive understatement from West<sup>188</sup> – is a great poet, and there is no reason to assume that he would make such a significant change to his personal narrative without considering how it could suit other purposes as well. Could the identities of Horace’s divine saviors not contribute to some other programmatic goal? Having already identified the generic focus of *Odes* 2.13 we are already one step closer to answering this question: we know Horace’s refusal to mention the divinities in this poem connects to his program of generic enrichment in the *Odes*. We can reveal the meaning behind this omission by comparing *Odes* 2.13 to another poem, 1.32, whose similarities to the falling tree ode create a dialogue which will attribute a non-lyric genre to each of the savior divinities.

#### 4.8.2 A Clarifying Comparison with *Odes* 1.32

<i>Poscimus, si quid vacui sub umbra</i>	1
<i>lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum</i>	
<i>vivat et pluris, age dic Latinum,</i>	
<i>barbite, carmen,</i>	
<i>Lesbio primum modulate civi,</i>	5
<i>qui ferox bello tamen inter arma,</i>	
<i>sive iactatam religarat udo</i>	
<i>litore navim,</i>	
<i>Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi</i>	
<i>semper haerentem puerum canebat</i>	10
<i>et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque</i>	
<i>crine decorum.</i>	
<i>o decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi</i>	
<i>grata testudo Iovis, o laborum</i>	
<i>dulce lenimen, mihi cumque salve</i>	15
<i>rite vocanti.</i>	

---

<sup>187</sup> Griffin (1997) 58.

<sup>188</sup> West (1995) 16.

We pray, if we, idle in the shade, have ever played along with you something which might live through the end of this year and more, come, sing a Latin song, O lyre, first harmonized by a citizen of Lesbos who, though fierce in war, whether amid arms or whether he had moored his storm-tossed ship upon the wet shore, nevertheless was singing of Liber and the Muses and Venus and the boy always clinging to her and Lycus, beautiful with dark eyes and dark hair. O glory of Phoebus and tortoise-shell welcome at the feasts of supreme Jove, O sweet solace of labors, give heed to me whenever I duly call upon you.<sup>189</sup>

This ode shares a surprising number of similarities with *Odes* 2.13. Both poems employ a modified hymnal form addressed to an inanimate object rather than a divinity,<sup>190</sup> and with regard to the narratives of the poems we find similar elements deployed to create different effects. Thus in *Odes* 1.32 Horace's fond remembrance of a moment spent beneath a tree<sup>191</sup> leads to a description of his Greek predecessor, Alcaeus, which includes Alcaeus's exploits with war (*bello*, 6) and ships (*navim*, 8). In *Odes* 2.13, however, a petulant recollection of a near-death experience beneath a falling tree leads to a similar envisioning of Alcaeus singing the hardships of war (*dura belli*, 28) and ships (*dura navis*, 27). Finally, and most importantly, both poems highlight the difference between one type of poetry, public or political verse (*genus grande*), and its opposite, private or amatory song (*genus tenue*).<sup>192</sup>

It is on this final element that many commentators focus when dealing with *Odes* 1.32, particularly those concerned with questions of genre and generic appropriateness. Davis, for instance, describes how Horace's depiction of Alcaeus is an oversimplification designed – in a manner counter to Horace's depiction in 2.13<sup>193</sup> – to emphasize one aspect of poetry over

---

<sup>189</sup> For the rationale behind the use of “*poscimur*” rather than the OCT's reading, “*poscimur*,” see below.

<sup>190</sup> On hymnal elements of *Odes* 2.13 see Wills (1996) 82–5 and section 4.4 above. For the more well-known hymnal form of *Odes* 1.32 see West (1995) 152–4; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 359.

<sup>191</sup> No tree is mentioned explicitly, but it is clear that a tree is the source of the shade in line 1 just as it is in every ode where the Latin word *umbra* is used without reference to the shades of the underworld. See *Odes* 1.4.11, 1.7.21, 1.12.5, 2.3.10, 3.1.23, 3.6.42, 3.29.21.

<sup>192</sup> One additional feature which indicates that these poems form a matched pair is the meters. *Odes* 2.13 presents Horace's audience with a vision of two poets, Alcaeus and Sappho, in the underworld. Readers would immediately connect the Alcaic meter of *Odes* 2.13 with the former poet, and if pressed to identify a complementary poem for 2.13 would naturally seek out one composed in the Sapphic meter, such as 1.32, as prompted by the presence of the latter poet.

<sup>193</sup> See subsection 4.6.1.

another,<sup>194</sup> and Lowrie adds that Horace's intention is to make us wonder what subject matter truly belongs to lyric before concluding that lyric must exist in the mean.<sup>195</sup> The fact that these two poems both have the potential to make strong statements about generic propriety, combined with the fact that they do so in such similar ways, encourages us to consider them a complementary pair. But Horace surely would not write two poems in the same way to say the same thing; some detail must justify their separation. The most easily overlooked difference between the two odes is that found in the opening lines of each poem. In *Odes* 1.32 the tree is Horace's ally, providing shade and embodying the arboreal elements conventional in Roman poetics, but in 2.13 a tree is attempting to kill our poor poet, the same man who from the very outset of the *Odes* linked his poetic skill with the natural world. We must ask ourselves what has changed between the two poems in order to explain why a tree is Horace's enemy at one stage of his personal narrative and no threat at all in another.

The answer lies in Horace's description of the lyre, which he addresses as "*modulate*" (*Odes* 1.32.5). This verb, *modulari*, in the context of music and song can simply be translated as "play," but in its most basic sense signifies managing or measuring things, regulating them with an eye towards some concept of propriety or balance.<sup>196</sup> For this reason we can translate it using the English word "harmonized," which encapsulates both senses of the word. Lexical quibbling is not the sole reason for adopting such a translation, however, since deeper consideration of *Odes* 1.32 suggests that this idea of harmonization is the major theme of the entire poem. In addition to the overt contrast made between public and private poetry and their harmonization in the person of Alcaeus, Horace's current ownership of Alcaeus's lyre implies a fusion between the Roman poet and his Greek predecessor. The lyre itself, which Horace names using the Greek

---

<sup>194</sup> Davis (1991) 140.

<sup>195</sup> Lowrie (1997) 86, 93.

<sup>196</sup> LSJ s.v. *modulari* I.

word “*barbitos*” (βάριβιτος), is instructed to sing a “Latin song” (*Latinum, barbite, carmen*, 3-4), a hybridization of Greek and Latin employed elsewhere in the *Odes*.<sup>197</sup> The harmonizing lyre also acts as an intermediary between the divine and human world, not only participating in both realms itself but also allowing human beings to petition the gods. The subjects of Alcaeus’s songs are likewise presented as joined or linked: Lycus’s eyes are made to be just as dark as his hair (*Lycum nigris oculis nigroque / crine decorum*, 11-2) and Cupid does not merely attend his mother but is “always clinging” (*semper haerentem*, 10) to her.

This focus on the idea of harmonizing disparate elements even offers an explanation for many lexical and grammatical features of the poem. “We pray” (*Poscimus*, 1) is not simply a poetic plural in place of a singular verb but a means of asserting, from the very first word of the poem, the union between Horace and his instrument.<sup>198</sup> This sense of joint cooperation is carried over into words like “*tecum*” (2) and the much debated “*mihi*” (15) whose place in the manuscripts gains more support thanks to this recognition of the themes of unification and “togetherness” featured in *Odes* 1.32. Finally, the polysyndeton at work in the lines describing of the songs played by the lyre (9-12) emphasizes that its verse is manifold, yet nevertheless unified.

Harmonization is therefore the lyre’s most important characteristic, and in this genre-focused poem it is natural to think that the type of harmonization Horace is most concerned with here is generic harmonization, the bringing together of the *genus grande* and the *genus tenue*. Given that generic enrichment of this kind is frequently represented through tree imagery, as

---

<sup>197</sup> E.g. *Odes* 4.3.23: *Romanae fidicen lyrae*. For the significance of this juxtaposition of Greek and Latin words see McDermott (1977).

<sup>198</sup> On the debate between reading “*poscimus*” or “*poscimur*” in *Odes* 1.32.1 see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 360, which states: “*poscimus* is certainly right. It suits alike the prayer-formula *si quid*...and *λίσσομαι* in the Greek parallels; this cannot be due to palaeographic accident. On the other hand *poscimur* is intolerably abrupt; the poem has to make a fresh start after the first word.”

explained above,<sup>199</sup> the peaceful interaction between Horace and the tree in *Odes* 1.32 makes sense. When Alcaeus was in possession of the harmonized lyre (i.e. the symbol of successful generic manipulation) he was able to withstand a dangerous sea voyage, a tree-related symbol used in the context of generic manipulation.<sup>200</sup> Now that this lyre belongs to Horace he, too, is able to live safely in harmony with trees, a metaphor for his own success in the notoriously dangerous business of generic enrichment. Contrast this image with that found in *Odes* 2.13 where Horace, without his lyre, is nearly killed by a tree, a potential symbol for a failed attempt at generic enrichment. But *Odes* 2.13 is, as we have seen, a generic tour de force which harmonizes such genres as iambic, epic, elegy, and tragedy into a single, undeniably lyric masterpiece. How can Horace achieve such a feat in *Odes* 2.13 without his inherited harmonized lyre?

The answer to this is, of course, the divinities who save him from the falling tree (Liber, the Muses, and Faunus) a list which is surprisingly close to that found in the subjects of the Alcaean lyre's songs (Liber, the Muses, and Venus) in *Odes* 1.32. Typically the gods of *Odes* 1.32 have been understood to represent themes typical of the *genus tenue* such as love affairs and the symposium, but what if, instead, they represent whole genres of non-lyric poetry?<sup>201</sup> In this scenario the salvation of Horace from the tree in *Odes* 2.13 represents his very first success in the realm of generic enrichment, a moment when the gods (i.e. the various non-lyric genres) worked together in harmony to ensure that his burgeoning lyric career would not be undone by his generic transgressions. Once saved, that is, once he has learned how to successfully integrate these genres into a lyric framework, Horace is able to envision his still-singing lyric

---

<sup>199</sup> See Chapter 3 of this study.

<sup>200</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 363: “*udo*: in the tideless Mediterranean wet sand suggests that there has been a storm.” On the dangerous voyage as a metaphor for generic enrichment see subsections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3.

<sup>201</sup> This would coincide with the reductive representations of Alcaeus and Sappho found in *Odes* 2.13, which likewise represent complete genres rather than themes (see subsection 4.6.1).

predecessors, a representation of his own future poetic immortality garnered through the positive reception of his new, hybridized lyric. *Odes* 2.13 thus presents the birth of Horace's career as a lyric poet, as would befit a poem already shown by Davis to represent a shift from iambic to lyric verse, while 1.32 shows us Horace at the height of his lyric ability. If Horace's possession of a lyre which can sing of all three gods (i.e. the same non-lyric genres) reflects his continued ability to successfully engage in generic manipulation without fear of reprisal, the next question is what genres are being represented in this manner. Working again from the principle that *Odes* 1.32 and 2.13 are meant to be considered as a matched pair, it is logical to assume that the genres in question are those foreshadowed in 2.1-11 and incorporated into 2.13. Thus Liber symbolizes tragedy, the Muses, who served as sources of inspiration for Homer and Hesiod, represent epic poetry, and Faunus and Venus, love deities, represent elegy.<sup>202</sup>

While common knowledge may be enough to prove the validity of some of these claims – few would deny, for instance, that Liber is the god most relevant to tragedy – Horace does not leave us to our own devices to make these associations. Instead, Horace uses the three additional poems which treat the falling tree incident to reveal a greater program of generic enrichment at work in *Odes* 1-3, one which uses trees as the primary tool for interacting with his readers' generic expectations.

---

<sup>202</sup> Some may argue that the lack of correspondence between naming Venus in *Odes* 1.32 and Faunus in 2.13 hinders such an interpretation of 2.13. It should be remembered, however, that because the gods symbolize genres their actual identities matter little as long as they can plausibly represent those genres. That Faunus is not only connected to Venus in the *Odes* but also is capable of representing elegiac verse independently of Venus is discussed in section 5.1 which treats Faunus in detail.

## 5.0 THE GENERIC GODS OF HORACE'S *ODES*

In the previous chapter we considered the overlooked multi-generic content of *Odes* 2.13 in order to show that the poem reflects a greater program of generic enrichment at work in Horace's *Odes*. In this chapter we will explain how this process occurs. We will find that Horace uses symbolic trees in poems featuring his savior divinities to associate each divine patron (Faunus, the Muses, and Liber) with a non-lyric genre incorporated into the *Odes*. For this reinterpretation of the symbolic meaning of Horace's savior divinities to be valid several points must be true. First, all of the divinities involved in the tree episode must be shown to possess some connection to poetry and, more specifically, the particular genres of poetry to which Horace alludes in *Odes* 2.13. Second, the divinities in question must also be shown to have some degree of control over the world of trees or their closely related byproducts, ships.

### 5.1 FAUNUS AND ELEGY

The first poem following *Odes* 2.13 which refers to the tree event is 2.17 (27-32):

*me truncus illapsus cerebro  
sustulerat, nisi Faunus ictum  
dextra levasset, Mercurialium  
custos virorum. reddere victimas  
aedemque votivam memento:  
nos humilem feriemus agnam.*

30

The trunk would have fallen on my head and done me in if Faunus, guardian of Mercury's men, had not averted the blow with his right hand. Remember to offer victims and a votive shrine. We will sacrifice a humble lamb.

Our working hypothesis claims that Faunus represents Horace's integration of elegy, a point which we have developed through analysis of a number of poems but not *Odes* 2.17 itself. We will see throughout the remainder of this study that the poems which revisit the tree episode each provide their own clues to the generic significance of their named divinity, and *Odes* 2.17 is no exception. The ode begins with a direct question to Maecenas which includes the word "complaints" (*querelis*, 1) an elegiac code word like "*querentem*" in *Odes* 2.13.<sup>1</sup> Elegy would therefore be at the forefront of Horace's readers' minds upon starting this poem, and this provides one additional justification for the elegiac significance of Faunus. The bulk of our effort must now be spent on proving the appropriateness of Faunus in accord with the criteria listed above.

#### 5.1.1 Faunus, God of Trees, Ships, and Love

While Faunus may seem familiar enough to Horace's modern readers we should recognize that he is in fact an enigmatic divinity whose character is derived from a surprisingly small number of sources. Beyond Horace only a few ancient authors – Livy, Vergil, and Ovid – speak of Faunus<sup>2</sup> and there is virtually no iconographical evidence for the god.<sup>3</sup> Faunus' role in the Lupercalia festival, although widely accepted, remains hotly contested among scholars<sup>4</sup> and the Romans' tendency to conflate him with similar deities, such as Pan and Silvanus,<sup>5</sup> means that it can be extremely difficult to isolate Faunus' true nature, if such a thing even exists. Combined, these factors lead Dorcey to claim that Faunus is "an obscure and enigmatic divinity whom the

---

<sup>1</sup> See subsection 4.6.1.

<sup>2</sup> Johns in Henig and King (1986) 94.

<sup>3</sup> Dorcey (1992) 34; Johns in Henig and King (1986) 94.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Johns in Henig and King (1986) 95; Dorcey (1992) 33 n.2 (which lists a number of additional sources).

<sup>5</sup> For detailed comparison between Faunus and Silvanus see Dorcey (1992) 33-40.

ancients themselves may have misunderstood” and that “by Augustan times Faunus evidently was little more than a vague folk memory employed as a literary topos, perhaps even devoid of cultic significance.”<sup>6</sup> Despite these difficulties we may still reach some small degree of consensus with regard to the general character of Faunus and how this character is specifically reflected in Horace’s *Odes*.

Faunus’s origins lie in a local god, an early king of Latium, or perhaps both.<sup>7</sup> He was primarily known as a god of rustic places such as woods and fields who watched over flocks and herdsmen. As is typical in Greco-Roman myth, Faunus’s ability to promote the fertility of flocks was balanced by a corresponding power to threaten such fertility, and it is for this reason that he acquired his association with wolves and the Lupercalia festival. His herdsman persona ensured that the Romans eventually conflated Faunus with Pan, the Greek god of rural spaces, and endowed the Roman god with the goatish appearance of his Greek counterpart<sup>8</sup> along with his association with nymphs and satyrs.<sup>9</sup> This rustic, Pan-like guise is most apparent in *Odes* 1.17 where Horace describes Faunus’s benevolence towards his Sabine farm (1-12):

<i>Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem</i>	1
<i>mutat Lycaeo Faunus et igneam</i>	
<i>defendit aestatem capellis</i>	
<i>usque meis pluviosque ventos.</i>	
<i>inpune tutum per nemus arbutos</i>	5
<i>quaerunt latentis et thyma deviae</i>	
<i>olentis uxores mariti,</i>	
<i>nec viridis metuunt colubras</i>	
<i>nec Martialis haediliae lupos,</i>	
<i>utcumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula</i>	10
<i>valles et Vsticae cubantis</i>	
<i>levia personuere saxa.</i>	

---

<sup>6</sup> Dorsey (1992) 33-4.

<sup>7</sup> Johns in Henig and King (1986) 94.

<sup>8</sup> Parker (1993) 200.

<sup>9</sup> For nymphs see *Odes* 1.4.6, 3.18.1. For Faunus and satyrs see Babcock (1961) 15.

Swift Faunus often exchanges Lycaeus for lovely Lucretilis and always keeps the fiery heat and rainy winds from my she-goats. Unharméd, the wandering wives of the smelly spouse seek hidden arbutus and thyme through the safety of my grove, and my kidlings fear neither the green snakes nor the wolves of Mars whenever the valleys and smooth rocks of sloping Ustica resound with the pipe, O Tyndaris.

All of Horace's odes that explicitly name Faunus<sup>10</sup> portray him in his herdsman persona. He receives sacrifices of lambs and kids,<sup>11</sup> protects the flocks,<sup>12</sup> and haunts the wild spaces of the world.<sup>13</sup> It is in this final regard that we see Faunus's control over trees since the rustic areas over which he holds dominion are typically wooded, and Horace makes this point explicit when he tells us in *Odes* 3.18 that even the trees themselves recognize Faunus' authority when "the forest scatters rustic leaves" in honor of the god's return (*spargit agrestis tibi [Fauno] silva frondes*, 14).

Faunus is also a god of love, a fact which stems from both his connection to the lusty god Pan and the fact that without some modicum of erotic power he would be unable to fulfill his duties as patron of animal fertility.<sup>14</sup> Horace explicitly refers to him as an erotic god throughout the *Odes*. In hymns, for example, a god's name in the vocative is often followed by a phrase in apposition which references an attribute of the god.<sup>15</sup> Thus, when Horace addresses Faunus as "lover of the fleeing nymphs" (*Faune, Nympharum fugientum amator*, 1) in *Odes* 3.18, he is deliberately emphasizing the erotic nature of this rustic deity. This pattern continues in *Odes* 3.18 if, as Holleman suggests, we also take "*Veneris sodali*" (6) to refer to Faunus instead of the

---

<sup>10</sup> *Odes* 1.4.11, 1.17.2, 2.17.28, 3.18.1.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. *Odes* 1.4.11-2, 2.17.32, 3.18.5-6.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. *Odes* 1.17.1-9, 3.18.9-13.

<sup>13</sup> E.g. *lucus* (1.4.11), *nemus* (1.17.5), *valles* (1.17.11), *rura* (3.18.2), *campus* (3.18.9), *pratium* (3.18.11), *silva* (3.18.14)

<sup>14</sup> E.g. *Odes* 1.17.1-7 where Faunus's arrival provides safety for Horace's animals who are described as "wives of a smelly husband" (*olentis uxores mariti*, 7), an appellation which to some degree points to the sexual nature of the beasts. Further sexual implications may be at work in these lines, particularly with reference the snake preying upon Horace's "*haediliae*," a *hapax legomenon* in the feminine presumably derived from *haeda*, another feminine word which never occurs in Latin. On "*haediliae*" rather than "*Haediliae*" see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 220. On the snake as a phallic symbol see Adams (1990) 30-1.

<sup>15</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 221. See also *Odes* 1.10.1; 3.22.1.

cratera,<sup>16</sup> but we need not rely on a debated point of interpretation in order to find further Venus/Faunus parallels throughout the *Odes*. Bartoletti, for instance, believes that *Odes* 3.18 shares structural, metrical, and thematic similarities with Sappho 1, a hymn to Aphrodite, which opens up the possibility of conscious imitation meant to encourage a pairing of these two gods.<sup>17</sup>

Another, much earlier Faunus poem, *Odes* 1.4, uses a chronological argument to make a similar point, with Horace telling us that the start of spring is both the time when “Cytherean Venus leads the choruses” (*Cytherea choros ducit Venus*, 5) and the time when “it is fitting to make sacrifice to Faunus in shady groves” (*in umbrosis Fauno decet immolare lucis*, 11). The erotic nature of this connection is emphasized both through the regenerative powers of spring and the poem’s amorous closing lines (19-20). Furthermore, Nisbet and Hubbard show that Horace’s adaptation of earlier Greek spring poems in *Odes* 1.4 involves using Faunus as a stand-in for Priapus, a notoriously erotic deity who also possessed strong ties to Venus.<sup>18</sup> Finally, Horace’s pairing of these two gods in his lyric project is likely to have been an attempt to capture, in literature, a similar Venus/Faunus link at work throughout Julian propaganda.<sup>19</sup>

Venus is not the only god whom Horace connects to Faunus, however. At *Odes* 2.17 Horace refers to Faunus as “the guardian of Mercury’s men” (*Mercurialium custos virorum*, 29-30), a phrase with multiple levels of meaning. At a simple mythological level it refers to the fact that Faunus, as a son of Mercury, would naturally be concerned for the well-being of those in whom his father took an interest. Nisbet and Hubbard assert, however, that Horace calls himself a *vir Mercurialis* in order to emphasize his status as a poet,<sup>20</sup> an interpretation which gains

---

<sup>16</sup> See Holleman (1973) 265 n.20.

<sup>17</sup> Bartoletti (1938). For a view which downplays the idea of conscious imitation between these poems see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 220.

<sup>18</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 60, 67. See also Gantz (1993) 104.

<sup>19</sup> See Holleman (1973) 265.

<sup>20</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 286.

credibility thanks to many well-established metapoetic readings of the various Mercury poems in the *Odes*. Horace's insistence that Faunus protects "Mercury's men" therefore amounts to an additional identification of both gods as patrons of poetry.<sup>21</sup> This association with Mercury, god of culture and inventor of the lyre, combined with Faunus's own status as a god who could deliver prophesies in dreams or in forest settings,<sup>22</sup> would make Faunus an ideal candidate for presentation as a poetry god capable of vatic inspiration.

It may come as a surprise to those familiar with his better-known pastoral persona that several facets of Greek and Roman culture support of the notion that Faunus was a sea god or, at the very least, a god whose sphere of influence extended to naval activity. Borgeaud, for example, explains that the Greeks attributed to Pan the liminal spaces of the world, the *eschatai* or "edges" that "represent the limits beyond which human expertise, *techne* or *sophia*, loses its hold on reality" and where human beings must "surrender themselves to activities that are at best of doubtful value, or dangerous; they are exposed here to powers greater than themselves and must respect a multitude of ritual precautions."<sup>23</sup> The wooded areas frequented by Pan and his herdsmen which bridge the gap between the safety of the civilized world and the manifold terrors of the wilderness are easy to classify among such *eschatai*, but we should remember that the Greeks would identify the shoreline, which separates the security of dry land from the unpredictable dangers of the open sea, in a similar manner. For this reason the Greeks also assigned coasts and beaches to Pan, transforming him into a patron of fisherman<sup>24</sup> whose skill with a net not even Typhon could escape.<sup>25</sup> The Greeks may also have been enticed by the

---

<sup>21</sup> Miller (1991) 383.

<sup>22</sup> For sources in Roman literature featuring an oracular Faunus see Dorsey (1992) 35 n.9.

<sup>23</sup> Borgeaud (1988) 60.

<sup>24</sup> Borgeaud (1988) 214 n.154: "God of fishermen and coastal rocks: Pi. Fr. 98 Snell (τῶν ἀλιέων [Πᾶνα] φρογνίζειν); *EM* 54, 27 (Πάν ἄκτιος); schol. *Opp. H.* 1.20 (see *Theoc.* 5.14-16 and schol. *ad loc.*)."

<sup>25</sup> Borgeaud (1988) 113-4.

inherent similarities between the herdsman and the fisherman, men who minister to their respective “flocks,” although a later account from Oppian described by Borgeaud shows that the line between these two professions may have been blurry from the start:<sup>26</sup>

In the *Halieutica*, Oppian tells us that a certain type of deep-sea fish, the bream, approach the shore during the dog days; they are helplessly attracted by the goats that come down from the mountain during the hot season. Bream and goats, says the poet, are ‘species of one heart and mind’ (ὁμόφρονα φύλα), and their annual meeting is a joyful one. Fisherman have a technique for taking advantage of this curious phenomenon:

Here comes the man, his limbs dressed in goatskin,  
Two horns fixed upon his own temples;  
He approaches, planning a pastoral ruse; in the sea he throws,  
Along with goatflesh and roasted meat,  
Barley meal.

The bream crowd up to the smell, which enchants them, and the goatman simply catches them with a cast of his net.

Pan’s power also extends beyond the shoreline and into the sea itself, likely due to a natural expansion of his coastal authority. Several small proofs support this claim, such as the Greeks’ etymological play on the word αἶγες which can mean both “goats” and “waves,” or the goat-like qualities of the aquatic Capricorn (αἰγόκερως),<sup>27</sup> but more complex literary references bolster this theory as well. In the *Ajax*, for instance, Sophocles’ sailor-chorus entreats the god to aid them in their dancing by first invoking him as “sea-roaming Pan” (Πάν ἀλίπλαγκτε, 695), and in the *Iphigenia Taurica* the chorus tells Iphigenia that her voyage to Athens will be accomplished with Pan’s aid.<sup>28</sup> Pan’s warlike qualities, in particular his association with panic, meant that the god also had a place in naval warfare, and it is for this reason that Aeschylus’s *Persians* includes an allusion to the Athenians’ belief that Pan played an important role in their victory at Salamis.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Borgeaud (1988) 114, citing Oppian *Halieutica* 4.308-74.

<sup>27</sup> LSJ s.v. αἶξ I and IV. See also Borgeaud (1988) 214 n.154.

<sup>28</sup> Euripides *Iphigenia Taurica* 1123-7: καὶ σὲ μὲν, πότνι, Ἀργεῖα / πεντηκόντερος οἶκον ἄξει· / συρίζων θ’ ὁ κηρόδετος / Πανὸς οὐρείου κάλαμος / κώπαις ἐπιθώξει.

<sup>29</sup> Aeschylus *Persians* 447-9: νησός τις ἔστι πρόσθε Σαλαμῖνος τόπων / βαῖά, δύσορμος ναυσίν, ἦν ὁ φιλόχορος / Πάν ἐμβατεῦει ποντίας ἀκτῆς ἔπι. On Pan and Salamis see Hall (1996) 125, 141; Borgeaud (1988) 59–60.

Based on these observations and given that Horace's Faunus is so strongly conflated with the Greek Pan<sup>30</sup> it is entirely possible to posit a naval aspect to the Faunus presented in the *Odes*, but Horace and his contemporaries provide evidence for a naval Faunus even without the need of Greek syncretisms. In *Aeneid* 12 Vergil describes a tree-stump with understandably anti-Trojan sympathies (766-71):

*Forte sacer Fauno foliis oleaster amaris  
hic steterat, nautis olim uenerabile lignum,  
seruati ex undis ubi figere dona solebant  
Laurenti diuo et uotas suspendere uestis;  
sed stirpem Teucris nullo discrimine sacrum  
sustulerant, puro ut possent concurrere campo.*

770

By chance a wild olive with bitter leaves, sacred to Faunus, had stood here, wood once venerable to sailors, where those rescued from the waves used to fasten gifts and hang votive clothing to the Laurentian god. But the Teucrians had indiscriminately destroyed the sacred trunk so that they could wage war upon a clear field.

This description perplexed ancient commentators for the same reason it perplexes us. The action of making a dedicatory offering of thanks for an escape from danger is not unusual in itself,<sup>31</sup> but why does Faunus, presumably a god of woodlands and flocks, have a special status as a god of shipwrecked sailors?<sup>32</sup> The answer to this confusion lies in the fact that Vergil is alluding to a contemporary Roman religious practice. According to Ulback there was “a wood consecrated to Faunus along the coast of the Mediterranean in the territory of Laurentum...in an opposite direction to that of Jupiter Indiges” at which sailors would leave votive offerings hung upon trees.<sup>33</sup> Holland also discusses this practice, but adds that it also occurred on Tibur Island in a temple to Faunus whose construction is described by Livy.<sup>34</sup> It was here that, according to Holland, Faunus would watch over herdsmen and their flocks as they were ferried across the

<sup>30</sup> On the Pan-like qualities of Faunus in the *Odes* see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 219-21; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 218.

<sup>31</sup> See e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 78 on the tabula of *Odes* 1.5, to which we will return later.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. Servius Auctus ad 768: *et quaeritur, cur terreneo deo nautae dona suspenderent?*

<sup>33</sup> Ulback (1934) 600-1.

<sup>34</sup> Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 33.42.11.1, 34.53.4.2. See also Ovid *Fasti* 2.193-4.

Tiber, and where less fortunate river boatmen, called “*nautae*” by poets like Propertius and Ovid,<sup>35</sup> would make thank-offerings to Faunus for their rescue.<sup>36</sup>

If we are willing to look beyond such contemporary sources to the fourth century AD we may also consider physical artifacts from the most famous archeological find connected to Faunus, known as the Thetford treasure, which also indicates that Faunus retained these aquatic associations in later Roman cult practice. The find, which includes a large collection of spoons inscribed with the name of Faunus, includes two spoons with sea iconography, the first of which depicts a goat-legged Triton. The other, more problematic spoon bears the simple image of a fish, and scholars have struggled to explain why such a symbol would be relevant in the “uncompromisingly pagan” nature of the Thetford treasure.<sup>37</sup> If we recall Pan’s association with shores and fishermen, however, and translate this association to Faunus, an act completely appropriate within the context of the Thetford treasure, we can account for what would otherwise remain a seemingly incongruous element.

Faunus therefore fits all of the criteria required for our generic reinterpretation of *Odes* 2.13. His rustic persona provides a mythological explanation for his ability to control trees and thus, from a narrative perspective, save Horace from arboreal death. Roman religious practices, along with an analysis of Pan’s overlooked aquatic aspects, shows us that Faunus is likewise a god who mattered greatly in the affairs of sailors, and Faunus’s role as a poetry god, derived both from his own presentation in the *Odes* and through his association with the god Mercury, ensures that his control over trees and ships can be translated into the realm of metapoetic analysis through generic interpretation of tree and ship imagery. Finally, his connections to Venus both

---

<sup>35</sup> Propertius 4.9.6; Ovid *Fasti* 6.408.

<sup>36</sup> Holland (1961) 157–9 with n. 68. See also Dyson (2001) 119. Horace’s use of this element of Faunus’s divine portfolio in *Odes* 1.4 will be discussed below.

<sup>37</sup> Johns in Henig and King (1986) 98.

in and outside Horace's lyric collection suggest that we should consider him an ideal candidate for the discussion of Horace's incorporation of elegy into the *Odes*. Our next task, therefore, is to show how Horace's Faunus odes represent the incorporation of elegiac material into lyric through the use of tree and ship imagery.

### 5.1.2 Lyric, Elegy, and the Sea of Love

One strong tool for the incorporation of elegiac material into the *Odes* is what Murgatroyd calls "Sea of Love" imagery, "a convenient heading under which to group the various marine and nautical metaphors, similes, parallels, allusions, and analogies applied to love and sex."<sup>38</sup> Even independent of the question of Horace's inclusion of elegiac material in the *Odes* it is not surprising that Horace would employ this motif. The most likely initial instance of this figure comes from Alcaeus, one of Horace's lyric predecessors,<sup>39</sup> and even though it appears throughout subsequent Greek and Roman literature it was the efforts of the Augustan poets, "who employed it more frequently and more regularly than it was at any other time," which brought the trope to its highest level of development.<sup>40</sup> The fact that this image appears most commonly in the erotic works of Ovid and Propertius,<sup>41</sup> however, means that Horace's own use of the Sea of Love is likely to occur in moments when Horace wishes to blend lyric and elegy. Consider, for instance, *Odes* 1.27.17-22, where Horace bewails the plight of his love-struck friend:

---

<sup>38</sup> Murgatroyd (1995) 9.

<sup>39</sup> Murgatroyd (1995) 9. This particular fragment, Alcaeus 326, is the same one cited as the inspiration for Horace's *Odes* 1.14.

<sup>40</sup> Murgatroyd (1995) 9, 19.

<sup>41</sup> Murgatroyd (1995) 19.

*quidquid habes, age  
depone tutis auribus. a! miser,  
quanta laborabas Charybdi,  
digne puer meliore flamma.  
quae saga, quis te solvere Thessalis  
magus venenis, quis poterit deus?*

20

Whatever you're dealing with, come, entrust it to my discreet ears. Ah, my poor boy! How vast a Charybdis you've been involved with all this time, poor boy worthy of a better flame! What sorceress, what sage, what god will be able to free you from these Thessalian poisons?

Here a young male lover is compared to a sailor who has unwisely steered his “ship of love” towards a rapacious Charybdis, who by analogy represents a *hetaera*. This formulation of the Sea of Love is common enough,<sup>42</sup> but the manner in which Horace deploys this conceit deserves our attention. As we saw in Nadeau’s analysis<sup>43</sup> one way Horace adapts elegy to lyric in the erotic odes is by casting himself as a superior *praeceptor amoris* figure whose prior experience in love affairs makes him appear more like the suave villains of Roman elegy rather than the overly-emotional and violent youths who vacillate between intense love and hatred for the object of their desire. It is this “anti-elegiac lover...[who]...moves in the same world as the elegist”<sup>44</sup> which we find on display in the Sea of Love imagery in *Odes* 1.27.17-22, but Horace’s attempt to hybridize lyric and elegy in this scene does not rely on this measure alone. Immediately after reminding us of this anti-elegiac persona Horace poses a triple question that recalls not only Pindar *Olympian* 2 (Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι, / τίνα θεόν, τίν’ ἦρωα, τίνα δ’ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; 1-2) but also to Horace’s own imitation of Pindar in *Odes* 1.12 (*Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio? / quem deum?*, 1-3). This thoroughly lyric double allusion cannot help but imply that Horace’s revamped elegiac persona has been fully incorporated into the lyric genre.

---

<sup>42</sup> For examples with variants see Murgatroyd (1995) 13–4, 18–9, 20, 22–3.

<sup>43</sup> See Nadeau (2008) 474 and our summary of Nadeau in section 2.3.

<sup>44</sup> Nadeau (2008) 474.

This example clearly shows that Horace is capable of using ships to dramatize the enrichment of lyric poetry through elegy, but none of Horace's hybridized elegiac odes mention Faunus or his associated divinities in any way. In fact, out of the four Faunus poems only *Odes* 1.4 includes ships in any meaningful way and very little in the ode lends itself to an interpretation that touches on the subject of elegy specifically or generic enrichment more generally. Harrison, the originator of the term "generic enrichment," does not treat *Odes* 1.4 at all, and Davis and Lowrie only mention *Odes* 1.4 as part of secondary or preliminary topics.<sup>45</sup> Even without relying upon these studies critical to our analysis of generic enrichment in the *Odes*, we are hard pressed in this poem to find elements typical of Horace's adaptations of elegy. The final lines of the ode do feature an erotic scenario, but Horace is not playing the role of *praeceptor amoris* to Sestius here as he does in nearby odes like *Odes* 1.8 and 1.9 which also include lyric adaptations of such common elegiac tropes as *militia* and *servitium amoris*.<sup>46</sup> Instead, Horace's mention of Lycidas and his current and future admirers is meant to reinforce the "*carpe diem*" theme by adding yet another temporal argument to the second half of the poem. But if *Odes* 1.4 is not meant to function as a hybrid of elegy and lyric itself, then either this Faunus ode must somehow contribute to our understanding of another hybridized ode, or there is another ship ode in which Faunus appears but is not explicitly named. Both of these conditions are fulfilled by the following poem, *Odes* 1.5, a previously unrecognized Faunus ode which works alongside its partner to create a generic dialogue which combines elegy, lyric, and the Sea of Love motif.

---

<sup>45</sup> Davis (1991) treats *Odes* 1.4 briefly in his discussion of the "*carpe diem*" motif and lyric poetry's ability to address questions of human mortality. Lowrie (1997) 50-55 examines *Odes* 1.4 in her discussion of the "kinds of *now* in Horatian lyric." For both authors analysis of the poem is used to define the character of lyric poetry independently of generic enrichment.

<sup>46</sup> Nadeau (2008) 30-48.

### 5.1.3 Faunus, “the God who Controls the Sea” in *Odes* 1.5

This new interpretation of *Odes* 1.5 requires significant explanation. To begin, we have already mentioned the idea of Faunus as a god who protects sailors, particularly those who sail the Tiber and who must ferry their animals across it. Horace does not discuss this association explicitly in the *Odes*, but *Odes* 1.4 strongly alludes to this aspect of Faunus. The opening of the poem not only mentions ships but presents a very specific naval scenario: sailors’ preparations for the first voyages after winter (*trahuntque siccas machinae carinas*, 2). The prominent placement of this scene in the opening couplet<sup>47</sup> and the technical language<sup>48</sup> used firmly establishes naval activity as an important element of the poem. We also learn that the activity of the sailors takes place at the same time when the herds are no longer compelled to remain in a single place (*neque iam stabulis gaudet pecus*, 3). By linking these two events together in the opening lines of the poem while, at the same time, telling us “now too it is fitting to sacrifice to Faunus in shady groves” (*nunc et in umbrosis Fauno decet immolare lucis*, 11),<sup>49</sup> Horace is encouraging us to think that it is Faunus’s influence which oversees both of these activities, as would be the case when he oversaw herdsmen’s river crossings from his temple on Tiber Island.

Some may argue that this interpretation places too strong an emphasis on the naval element of this poem, but its place in the *Odes* encourages such a reading. In its immediate context it is preceded and followed by poems discussing ships and shipwreck (*Odes* 1.3 and 1.5), and Santirocco believes that within the original three books of Horace’s lyric collection *Odes* 1.4

---

<sup>47</sup> Horace likely placed this key phrase in the second line of the poem since the first line which mentions the change of seasons establishes the subgenre of the poem and promotes the ode’s overt temporal themes and espousal of the “*carpe diem*” lifestyle. In fact, Horace needs the poem’s overt cyclical treatment of time in order to make an important point about the potential wreck of these ships (see discussion below).

<sup>48</sup> Drachmann (1963) 95. “*Machina*” is used only one additional time by Horace in *Epistulae* 2.2.73.

<sup>49</sup> Note that although many divinities are mentioned in the lines leading up to Faunus in *Odes* 1.4 he is the only divinity whose goodwill is actively being sought with sacrifices.

forms a ring structure with 3.38, a poem delivered on the Neptunalia which sings of a host of aquatic divinities.<sup>50</sup> Additionally, if the celebration described in *Odes* 1.4.11-2 is that which took place in the temple of Faunus on Tiber Island on the Ides of February, as some commentators claim,<sup>51</sup> then these lines remind Horace's audience of a very specific location connected to Faunus's aquatic power. Through both its content and its placement *Odes* 1.4 therefore charges us not to overlook the important function that Faunus played in the realm of sea travel.

But is Faunus really so important in *Odes* 1.4 that a single mention of his name in line 11 could engender such a reading of lines 2-3? Many believe the answer is yes,<sup>52</sup> including Lee who argues that Horace uses meter, sound, and word repetition to make Faunus the literal and figurative center around which *Odes* 1.4 revolves.<sup>53</sup> Lee's ring-based analysis of Faunus in this poem offers us a way in which we can tie the god's role in sailing to the poem's already well-established concern with cyclical time. As Sylvester reminds us, the poem's focus on repeating cycles means that "the gaunt specter of Death" is not confined to line 13 or the ominous warnings that follow, but is instead present throughout the poem, casting its shadow even over the seemingly pleasant first half.<sup>54</sup> If we apply this idea to the ships specifically, we can make the claim that the vessels of line 2, given new "life" by the arrival of spring may nevertheless suffer an unforeseen "death" despite the change in season, and that these hopeful sailors may soon find themselves in danger of shipwreck and require the intervention of Faunus, thus explaining the necessity of propitiating the god at this critical time.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Santirocco (1986) 151.

<sup>51</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 66.

<sup>52</sup> See e.g. Babcock (1961).

<sup>53</sup> Lee (1965).

<sup>54</sup> Sylvester (1953).

<sup>55</sup> On the potential for shipwreck as indicated by a cyclic interpretation of this ode see Sylvester (1953) 262. See also Babcock (1961) 13 n.2.

There are many benefits to this line of interpretation. First, it unifies the overt temporal themes of *Odes* 1.4 with more understated ideas regarding Faunus and ships which Horace is encouraging his readers to reflect on through poem structure, diction, and the overall organization of his lyric collection. Second, it coincides with the general depiction of sailing as a dangerous activity in the *Odes*, a point already discussed in detail earlier in this study.<sup>56</sup> Third, it reminds Horace's audience of the dangers of sea travel and in turn the idea that Faunus, the focus of *Odes* 1.4, is a god connected to shipwreck and rescue at sea. *Odes* 1.4 therefore functions not only as a unified poem in and of itself, but also as a preparatory piece which will condition Horace's readers for a new reading of the subsequent poem, *Odes* 1.5, Horace's first use of the Sea of Love *topos* for the purpose of generic enrichment.

It is therefore with Faunus and his naval significance fresh in our minds that we begin

*Odes* 1.5:

<i>Quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa</i>	1
<i>perfusus liquidis urget odoribus</i>	
<i>grato, Pyrrha, sub antro?</i>	
<i>cui flavam religas comam,</i>	
<i>simplex munditiis? heu quotiens fidem</i>	5
<i>mutatosque deos flebit et aspera</i>	
<i>nigris aequora ventis</i>	
<i>emirabitur insolens,</i>	
<i>qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,</i>	
<i>qui semper vacuum, semper amabilem</i>	10
<i>sperat, nescius aurae</i>	
<i>fallacis! miseri, quibus</i>	
<i>intemptata nites. me tabula sacer</i>	
<i>votiva paries indicat uvida</i>	
<i>suspendisse potenti</i>	15
<i>vestimenta maris deo.</i>	

What slender boy drenched in liquid perfumes paws at you, Pyrrha, upon many roses within a pleasant cave? For whom do you bind your blond hair, simple in your adornments? Alas, how often he will bewail your faithlessness and forsworn gods, and, inexperienced, will marvel at seas made rough by dark winds, he who now enjoys you, believing you golden, who hopes you are always available, always loveable, unaware of the deceptive breeze! Poor fools for whom you shine, untested. The sacred wall with its votive tablet declares that I have hung my soaked garments to the god who controls the sea.

---

<sup>56</sup> See sections 3.2 and 3.3 of this study.

The presence of elegy is felt strongly in this ode, beginning with its cast of characters. The besotted young lover (*gracilis puer*, 1), the cruel yet alluring demimonde (*Pyrrha*, 2), and an experienced older lover (*me*, 13) are all present, and Horace's language used to describe these characters coincides with elegiac diction.<sup>57</sup> The boy is *miser* (12), for instance, a word used by the elegiac poets to describe their own helplessness in love,<sup>58</sup> he "hopes" (*sperat*, 11)<sup>59</sup> and "will cry" (*flebit*, 6)<sup>60</sup> because of Pyrrha's lack of "faithfulness" (*fidem*, 5).<sup>61</sup> Pyrrha's future betrayals and the boy's naiveté likewise suit the standards of elegy, and Horace's presentation of this scenario using the Sea of Love motif, already cited as a commonplace of Augustan elegy, adds a level of authenticity to his recreation of the genre.<sup>62</sup>

But Horace's goal in this ode is not simply to recreate elegy. Instead, he adapts this elegiac material to lyric as part of a program of generic enrichment that allows him to make any number of generic claims, the simplest of which is that his current literary project differs from earlier Roman love poetry.<sup>63</sup> Horace can also expand this disavowal into an evaluative statement that contrasts lyric and elegiac verse such as that identified by Davis who believes that the lyric speaker of *Odes* 1.5 who understands and accepts change is meant to appear preferable to the insistent foolish *puer* who characterizes elegy's inferior response to change.<sup>64</sup> Nadeau, on the other hand, analyzes Horace's generic enrichment in terms of his connection to the principate, concluding that Horace's self-depiction as the experienced villain of elegy who threatens the relationship between the *puer* and his beloved is meant to teach his audience about the place of

---

<sup>57</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 73-80 provides many examples of Horace's verbal parallels to other elegiac authors.

<sup>58</sup> Quinn (1963) 73.

<sup>59</sup> On hope in elegy and Horace see Ullman (1912) 158-9.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. *Odes* 2.9.9: *flebiles modi*.

<sup>61</sup> On the use of "*fides*" in elegy see Conte and Most (1989).

<sup>62</sup> On "Horace's stylized echoes of Catullus" in this poem see Commager (1966) 144-5.

<sup>63</sup> West (1995) 24: "Horace is saying goodbye to Pyrrha (if there ever was a Pyrrha in his life) and the kind of love she has to offer. He is also informing his readers and his patrons Maecenas and Augustus (no doubt to their relief) that he will not be writing elegiac poetry."

<sup>64</sup> Davis (1991) 224-33.

Horace and love itself in the Augustan regime.<sup>65</sup> Common to these interpretations is an implied dialogue between Horace and his audience which Sutherland, whose reader-response analysis has already improved our understanding of the generic significance of *Odes* 2.13, rightly recognizes at work in *Odes* 1.5 as well.<sup>66</sup> *Odes* 1.5 therefore reflects Horace's greater program of generic enrichment through metapoetic ships in a reader-author dialogue, but how does Faunus fit into this hybridized elegiac ode?

The answer lies in the end of the poem where Horace describes his *renuntio amoris* in terms reminiscent of a rescued sailor: he has "hung up his soaked garments" as an offering to "the god who controls the sea" (*uvida / suspendisse potenti / vestimenta maris deo*, 13-6). Commentators have long struggled to identify which divinity Horace has in mind here. The manuscript tradition reads "*deo*" but as Nisbet and Hubbard rightly point out Neptune "has nothing to do with the metaphorical Sea of Love."<sup>67</sup> "*Deae*," an emendation referring to *Venus Marina* first proposed by Zielinski<sup>68</sup> and championed by Nisbet and Hubbard, better addresses the erotic elements of Horace's poem but remains dubious with regard to Venus's textual, mythological, literary, and religious appropriateness in this context.<sup>69</sup> Fredricksmeier provides a succinct overview of many of these objections:<sup>70</sup>

Thus none of the passages cited by Campbell and Nisbet lends any real support to their choice. For in none of them, nor anywhere else (so far as I know) in Greek and Latin literature, is there a parallel to the situation envisioned by them in 1.5: Venus has rescued a man from the shipwreck of love, not in the sense of granting him success (by reaching the κόλπος, of the beloved) but in the sense of securing his disengagement from love. It is easy to see why there is no parallel. Such an act would be a contradiction of the very nature of Venus. Furthermore, not only has Venus (if we read *deae*) asserted her power (*potenti*) over Pyrrha to rescue the poet from his love entanglement with her, but now her

---

<sup>65</sup> Nadeau (2008) 485-98. See also our discussion of Nadeau in section 2.3.

<sup>66</sup> Sutherland (2002) 42-50; Sutherland (1995).

<sup>67</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 79.

<sup>68</sup> Zielinski (1901).

<sup>69</sup> For readings in favor of "*dea*" see e.g. Nadeau (2008); Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 91; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970). Against "*dea*" see e.g. Waterhouse (1987); Vessey (1984) 468 n.31; Griffin (1980) 185; Fredricksmeier (1972) 126 with n.12; Putnam (1970); Fredricksmeier (1965) 185 n.9; Quinn (1963) 75 with n.19; Levin (1961).

<sup>70</sup> Fredricksmeier (1972) 125.

temple displays the evidence of his continued disengagement. For the last stanza emphasizes not the past incident of the poet's shipwreck and rescue but his present state and attitude: "As for me, the sacred wall [of Venus' temple] with its votive tablet declares (*indicat*) that I have hung up [once and for all; note the force of *suspendisse*] my dripping clothes to the goddess who has power over the sea." We might say, therefore, that not only has Venus, against her nature, secured the poet's disengagement from love but now, just as unlikely, presides symbolically over his continued independence.

Those who denounce "*dea*" must nevertheless defend Horace's "poor choice" of Neptune in this erotic ode. Typically this is accomplished either through a grammatical argument that "*deo*" can be used by Roman poets to refer to female goddesses, including Venus,<sup>71</sup> or by asserting that Horace is intentionally being ambiguous here for any number of reasons literary, religious, or otherwise.<sup>72</sup>

While it is true that one of Horace's most endearing qualities is his judicious use of ambiguity, Horatian scholarship seems to have overlooked a simpler possibility. We remember from our earlier discussion of Faunus's naval character that Vergil mentions grateful offerings left at the sacred tree of Faunus offerings by shipwrecked sailors (*Aeneid* 12.766-9):

*Forte sacer Fauno foliis oleaster amaris  
hic steterat, nautis olim venerabile lignum,  
servati ex undis ubi figere dona solebant  
Laurenti divo et votas suspendere vestis;*

By chance a wild olive with bitter leaves, sacred to Faunus, had stood here, wood once venerable to sailors, where those rescued from the waves used to fasten gifts and hang votive clothing to the Laurentian god...

The similarity between Horace's dedicatory act and the custom described in Vergil's scene is obvious, and verbal connections suggest that there may even be conscious allusion at work between these two poems.<sup>73</sup> Could Faunus be Horace's "god who controls the sea?" He certainly fits the necessary profile. Faunus's divine portfolio, unlike that of Neptune or Venus, suits both the erotic and the naval character of *Odes* 1.5 and, more importantly, does so

---

<sup>71</sup> E.g. Vergil *Aeneid* 2.632.

<sup>72</sup> Hoppin (1984) 56 n.7.

<sup>73</sup> Note the repetition of an infinitive form of *suspendere* in both passages and the etymological games at work in Horace's *vestimenta* for Vergil's *vestes*, *deo* for *divo*, and *votiva* for *votas*.

specifically through the idea of shipwreck central to the poem's *renuntio amoris*.<sup>74</sup> Faunus's Italian origins and strong connection to the Tiber would also suit the local character of Horace's lyric better than Neptune or Venus, divinities with well-established Greek counterparts and wider areas of influence. Surprisingly, however, no one argues that Faunus is the god mentioned in *Odes* 1.5 even though many recognize the parallels between Vergil's scene and Horace's ode. Huxley, in his treatment on storm and shipwreck in Roman literature, mentions the Faunus passage in the *Aeneid* but immediately afterwards cites *Odes* 1.5 as a separate, "more familiar" instance of sailors' salt-caked offerings,<sup>75</sup> and Nisbet and Hubbard briefly consider the idea of a naval Faunus but ultimately conclude that Faunus has no connection with navigation save for that which he is able to coopt from Priapus.<sup>76</sup>

The progression of imagery and ideas in this sequence of poems nevertheless encourages Horace's readers to make this identification. First, Horace constructs *Odes* 1.4 in such a way as to bring Faunus to the fore of both the poem and his readers' minds, and he does so while simultaneously emphasizing the idea of shipwreck. We then begin *Odes* 1.5, Horace's first use of the Sea of Love topos and, more importantly, the first poem of the *Odes* in which elegiac material is used for the purpose of generic enrichment. After witnessing Horace's adaptation of elegy we come to the final lines of the poem and, like Horace's ancient readers, encounter the ambiguous "*deo*" only to ask, "*Quis?*"<sup>77</sup> Recognizing the inadequacy of Neptune and Venus we recall how insistently Horace promoted Faunus in the previous ode and, so prompted, consider whether Faunus may be relevant in *Odes* 1.5. Drawing on both our own preexisting knowledge

---

<sup>74</sup> On the importance of the shipwreck theme in *Odes* 1.5 see Putnam (1970).

<sup>75</sup> Huxley (1952) 123.

<sup>76</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 60: "It should be further observed that all the eight poems on spring in the tenth book of the Anthology end with a mention of Priapus, in his capacity as a god of navigation (1.7, 2.7, 4.7, 5.7, 6.7, 14.9, 15.7, 16.11). It looks as if in Horace's ode [1.4] Faunus, though he has no connection with navigation, in some way represents Priapus."

<sup>77</sup> Sutherland (2002) 43: "The ode opens with two questions, which together immediately demand a high degree of involvement from the external audience."

of Faunus as well as that which Horace presents in *Odes* 1.4, we realize that Faunus is indeed a suitable match, thus establishing a connection between elegy and Faunus which Horace will exploit for the remainder of the *Odes*.

#### 5.1.4 Conclusion: Faunus

In the wake of this new interpretation of *Odes* 1.5 and the necessary length<sup>78</sup> of our treatment of Faunus it will be worthwhile to review our analysis with an eye towards understanding its place within the greater context of this study as a whole. In Chapter 2 we explored the concept of generic enrichment in Horace's *Odes*. Our goal was not only to determine what previous scholars of the *Odes* have said about this subject but also to consider the broader question of what classical poets meant when they spoke of genres. Our analysis showed that genre, both for the ancients and moderns, consists of a set of literary expectations which are shared between author and audience, and that through dialogue with their readers poets like Horace can fulfill or thwart these expectations to engage in generic enrichment. In Chapter 3 we focused on one tool, the tree, which Horace employs to create just such a dialogue with his audience. We began by examining the idea of metapoetic trees and their use for both general programmatic and specifically generic purposes before next looking at the Ship of Poetry motif which likewise functions as a means of discussing generic enrichment both in Horace's *Odes* specifically and ancient poetry as a whole. Having done so, we explained that given the strong connection between trees and ships in the classical worldview it is not unreasonable to posit that Horace

---

<sup>78</sup> Faunus, being the least represented deity in Greco-Roman literature out of the three patrons to whom Horace attributes his salvation, requires the longest cataloguing of his “acceptability” for the purposes of this study. Additionally, the new interpretation of *Odes* 1.5 engendered by our study also adds considerable length to the Faunus section. Our treatments of the Muses and Liber (sections 5.2 and 5.3) will be briefer.

would use these images together as part of a larger program of generic enrichment, and through an analysis of the trees and ships found in the *Odes* we validated this approach.

Chapters 4 and 5 attempted to prove that *Odes* 2.13 acts as a representation, in microcosm, of a larger tree-centered program of generic enrichment in the *Odes*. To accomplish this we first identified the multi-generic nature of *Odes* 2.13 and showed that through a continual process of defying and upholding generic expectations Horace incorporates three as yet unrecognized genres into this poem: elegy, epic, and tragedy. This revelation allowed us to claim that Horace's inconsistent attribution of his salvation to three different divinities is in fact a representation of his successful integration of elegy, epic, and tragedy into the lyric *Odes*, and each divinity represents one of these non-lyric genres. For this interpretation to be possible we claimed that each of Horace's savior divinities must be equally relevant to trees (and ships), poetry, and the specific genre they represent. If any of these elements were found lacking then the mythological or metapoetic inadequacy of the god in question would negate their potential as a generic symbol.

This is one reason why we have spent so much time discussing the minutiae of Faunus in the *Odes*. If Faunus cannot influence ships or has no erotic significance then how can he be “the god who controls the sea” in *Odes* 1.5, the first poem to incorporate elegy into the *Odes*? There is a second and more important reason to have spent so much time with Horace's depiction of Faunus. Our overarching thesis from the first half of this study states that Horace employs an elaborate program of metapoetic trees in order to create an extended generic dialogue throughout the *Odes* which is encapsulated by *Odes* 2.13. Our analysis of Faunus has shown that just such a dialogue exists. Through his imagery Horace leads us from one clue to the next as we gather information from complementary poems until we come to a new understanding of a single fact,

Faunus's generic significance, and this new understanding then informs our subsequent reading of the remainder of the *Odes*. Our treatment of Faunus thus constitutes one of three potential proofs of the greater program of generic tree imagery in Horatian lyric, and with this in mind we can now move on to the second which concerns the Muses and their symbolic connection to epic poetry.

## 5.2 THE MUSES AND EPIC

Horace's second variation on the savior divinities comes in *Odes* 3.4, where an address to Horace's Muses recounts the many times they have intervened in order to preserve his life (25-8):

*vestris amicum fontibus et choris* 25  
*non me Philippis versa acies retro,*  
*devota non extinxit arbos*  
*nec Siculo Palinurus unda.*

The battle line turned backwards at Philippi did not kill me, the accursed tree did not kill me, friend to your fonts and dances, nor Palinurus with his Sicilian wave.

Even in these four brief lines we find our sought-after combination of Muses, trees, ships, and epic. Alongside the near-fatal “accursed tree” (*devota...arbos*, 27) of *Odes* 2.13 we see the threat of death in military conflicts on land (26) and at sea (28), and the real-life military event described here imparts an epic character to these lines, as does the possibility of allusion to *Aeneid* 5.833-71 and 6.337-83, in which Vergil provides a detailed etiology for the name of Cape Palinurus. The symbolism in these lines mirrors that suggested by our earlier analysis of *Odes* 2.13 itself – the Muses' act of preserving Horace from these tree and ship scenarios signifies his successful integration of epic into lyric – and Horace encourages this link through a unique verbal reminiscence shared between the two poems (*navita Bosporum*, 2.13.14 = 3.4.30, in

similar line position).<sup>79</sup> *Odes* 3.4.25-8 thus functions as an important first step in exploring the “tree salvation signifies generic integration” model with regard to the Muses as a symbol for epic. We saw, however, in our treatment of Faunus that Horace's discussion of elegy's incorporation into the *Odes* spanned the entirety of the collection and often required dialogue between poems. *Odes* 3.4.25-8 is therefore likely a smaller piece of a much larger and more complex program dramatizing the integration of epic, and as such we must seek out a means of expanding our continuing investigation beyond this single stanza.

The most promising avenue of inquiry revolves around the language Horace uses to talk about the Muses. In *Odes* 3.4 Horace does not refer to the Muses as “*Musae*,” but instead calls them “*Camenae*” (21), and his repeated use of the adjective “*vester*” (21, 25) encourages us to think that it is specifically the Camenae whom Horace addresses in both strophes even if the word is suppressed in the account of Horace's rescue. The rarity of “*Camena*” not only in *Odes* 1-3, where the word appears only three times (*Odes* 1.12.39, 2.16.38, 3.4.21), but also in all Latin literature prior to Horace,<sup>80</sup> considered against the relative frequency of the word “*Musa*,” which appears eleven times in *Odes* 1-3, suggests that these words are not simply interchangeable in Horace's mind but instead possess some greater programmatic meaning. “*Camena*” is not the only interesting lexical feature of *Odes* 3.4, however. The poem is also one of a small number of odes (*Odes* 1.1, 1.12, 1.24, 3.4, 3.30) in which Horace names a specific Muse, Calliope (3.4.2), apart from her sisters. The fact that *Odes* 3.4 includes both of these rare forms of address in a single poem connected to the tree episode suggests that their significance

---

<sup>79</sup> Other verbal parallels may also exist between the two passages (*Odes* 2.13.13-20; 3.4.29-36) which enclose Horace's sailor of the Bosphorus. Both scenes mention horses and arrows and both include a catalogue of locations, but there is little in the way of exact verbal correspondence between odes. In Horace's mind “*navita Bosporum*” was strong enough either to impart better connective power to these weaker links or to remain on its own without the need for more exact cross-poem allusions.

<sup>80</sup> This point will be discussed in greater detail in subsection 5.2.3.

goes hand in hand with Horace's arboreal program of generic enrichment, and as such we must next determine what the generic import of each of these words must be.

### 5.2.1 The Epic Connotations of “*Musa*”

Although the Muses are connected with all forms of poetry in the Greco-Roman world, our reinterpretation of the tree episode posits that the intervention of the Muses represents Horace's successful integration of epic into lyric. This identification is much more straightforward than linking Faunus with elegy thanks to the Muses' well-known role as sources of poetic inspiration in the archetypal epic works of Homer and Hesiod. While it is safe to assume that Horace's ancient audience would make this association between the Muses and epic poetry, we should not overlook the fact that Horace's own use of the word “*Musa*” in the *Odes* also encourages us to make this connection. Horace's accidental forays into epic material, for instance, typically feature the word “*Musa*” in some way. In some cases a Muse is blamed outright for Horace's generic transgressions (e.g. *Odes* 2.1.37, 3.3.70) while in others a Muse is ironically said to forbid or prevent grand verse in poems paradoxically featuring a large amount of epic material.<sup>81</sup> Pollio's Muse (*Odes* 2.1.9) sings of battles and political disturbances so convincingly that it inadvertently causes Horace's to do the same (2.1.37-40), and we have already successfully identified the Muses of *Odes* 1.32.9 as a programmatic stand-in for the epic genre.<sup>82</sup> Finally,

---

<sup>81</sup> Sometimes these disavowals of epic material are overt (*Odes* 1.6.10 and 2.12.13) while at other times the disavowal is implied (*Odes* 1.17.14). For specific explanations of how these odes make use of epic material see Davis (1991), ad loc.

<sup>82</sup> See section 4.8 of this study.

Horace calls himself a “priest of the Muses” (*Musarum sacerdos*, 3.1.3) at the start of the Roman Odes, a series containing some of the most overtly epic material in Horace’s lyric collection.<sup>83</sup>

Horace’s use of the word “*Musa*” therefore connotes epic and the *genus grande* more generally, but in those moments of the *Odes* when Horace speaks most openly of his own poetic achievement he does not use the word “*Musa*.” Consider, for instance, the two poems in which Horace’s readers, both ancient and modern, expect overt discussion of Horace’s lyric project, *Odes* 1.1 and 3.30. In these poems Horace names specific Muses as his helpmates in his endeavors rather than a band of Muses or an unspecified “*Musa*.” In *Odes* 1.1 Horace tells us that he will be able to “strike the stars” only if Euterpe and Polyhymnia provide musical accompaniment (32-4) and in 3.30 Horace commands Melpomene to “take up the honor deservedly sought” (*sume superbiam / quaesitam meritis...Melpomene*, 14-6) as a reward for her aid in the completion of his original lyric project. Given the strong epic connotations which he has imparted to this word it makes sense that Horace would abandon “*Musa*” in these programmatic poems for fear of tainting his “pure” lyric collection, but we must ask ourselves whether there is a greater significance in Horace’s diction which specifically relates to our study of generic enrichment.

---

<sup>83</sup> Three remaining instances of the word *Musa* are not included in this analysis because they lack programmatic significance. In *Odes* 2.10 a Muse appears only as part of an analogy designed to make a more important point about the vicissitudes of life: “Sometimes Apollo rouses a silent Muse with his cithara and does not always draw his bow” (*quondam cithara tacentem / suscitavit Musam neque semper arcum / tendit Apollo*, 18-20). In *Odes* 1.26 and 3.19 Horace uses the word “*Musa*” in periphrastic expressions that speak of poets. Thus Horace defines a poet as one “who loves the unequal Muses” (*qui Musas amat imparis...vates*, 3.19.13-5) and calls himself a “friend to the Muses” (*Musis amicus*, 1.26.1). *Odes* 1.26 also includes one additional word connected to the Muses, “*Pipilei*” (9). That Horace would resort to using such an unusual word which would later cause so much difficulty for interpreters (see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 306-7) proves just how important it was in Horace’s mind to avoid using the word “*Musa*” in situations where he wished it to avoid generic significance.

## 5.2.2 Named Muses, Harmonization, and Instruments

The answer to this lies in recognizing that while the *Musae* represent epic, Horace associates individual Muses with acts of hybridization, including the generic hybridization symbolized by his rescue from the falling tree. Horace first lays the groundwork for this association at the close of *Odes* 1.1 (29-36):

*me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium*  
*dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus* 30  
*nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori*  
*secernunt populo, si neque tibia*  
*Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia*  
*Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.*  
*quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,* 35  
*sublimi feriam sidera vertice.*

Ivy, reward for learned brows, mixes me with the gods above. The chilly grove and light choruses of Nymphs and Satyrs separate me from the masses if neither Euterpe withholds her *tibia* nor Polyhymnia refuse to tune her *barbitos*, But if you place me among the lyric bards I will strike the stars with a sublime head.

Here Horace presents the goddesses' aid in terms of musical accompaniment on the *tibia* and *barbitos* (32-4). We could overlook these words as a mere nod to an expected convention of the lyric genre or Horace's thoughtful attempt to present an image of the Muses which is consistent with their traditional depiction in ancient art and literature,<sup>84</sup> but deeper consideration reveals an interesting set of contrasts. That the *barbitos*, a lyre-like instrument, would appear within a monadic lyric project like the *Odes* is not surprising, but the *tibia* is better suited to the performance context of choral lyric. Adding to this incongruity is the fact that the *barbitos*, the

---

<sup>84</sup> Todd (1931) 216 n.5.

“more appropriate” instrument, bears a strikingly Greek name compared to that of the “inappropriate” Latin *tibia*.<sup>85</sup>

Such juxtaposition of opposites is not unusual for Horace. In fact, many scholars recognize that Horace deliberately creates such “clever combinations” (*callidae iuncturae*), as he calls them in his advice to aspiring poets in *Ars Poetica* 47-8, to convey deeper programmatic meaning to his readers. McDermott, for instance, uses her analysis of such oxymoronic pairings to discuss Horace’s conflation of the Greek and Roman literary traditions and “the development from the *poeta* to the *vates*...[which] recapitulates the progress of the poet from simple Greek inspiration to the complex role by which he uses his Greek lyric meters and his Alexandrian poetic ideals to sing of the *res Romanae* in Augustan Rome.”<sup>86</sup> In the context of this study, however, the type of hybridization we have come to expect is generic in nature, and so Horace’s request in *Odes* 1.1.32-4 takes on an additional level of meaning: these traditionally “epic” goddesses must play lyric instruments, thereby uniting two disparate genres into a single poetic project. Since his desired outcome is not a pure epic song, Horace therefore addresses individual Muses by name rather than invoking a “*Musa*.” Horace reinforces this idea of harmonization through strong overtones of blending in these lines. Horace is mixed with the gods (*me...miscent superis*, 29-30), will be inserted amongst the canonical lyric poets (*me lyricis vatibus inseres*, 35), and will be placed among the stars (*sublimi feriam sidera vertice*, 36). Even the Nymphs and Satyrs form peaceful choruses (31) without any sign of their typical disruptive eroticism.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> McDermott (1977) 367: “the foreign flavor of the word [*barbitos*] is emphasized by the fact that it retains the Greek inflexional endings *-os/-on* rather than appearing in the Latinized form *barbitus (-um)*.” On the use of these instruments in choral and monadic lyric see Rudd (1996) 42; West (1995) 6; West (1967) 80.

<sup>86</sup> McDermott (1977) 380.

<sup>87</sup> This peaceful coexistence endures throughout the remainder of the *Odes*, with none of the Horace’s subsequent poems portraying the inimical relationship typical of nymphs and satyrs elsewhere in classical literature and art. The closest Horace ever comes to referencing this tradition comes in his description of Faunus, whose connections to satyrs have been discussed above, as a “lover of the fleeing nymphs” (*Nympharum fugientum amator*, 3.18.1). Horace’s act of diverging from his usual portrayal of peaceful coexistence between satyrs and nymphs in this

As expected, a similar pattern appears in *Odes* 3.30:

<i>Exegi monumentum aere perennius</i>	1
<i>regalique situ pyramidum altius,</i>	
<i>quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens</i>	
<i>possit diruere aut innumerabilis</i>	
<i>annorum series et fuga temporum.</i>	5
<i>non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei</i>	
<i>vitabit Libitinam: usque ego postera</i>	
<i>crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium</i>	
<i>scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex.</i>	
<i>dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus</i>	10
<i>et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium</i>	
<i>regnavit populorum, ex humili potens</i>	
<i>princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos</i>	
<i>deduxisse modos. sume superbiam</i>	
<i>quaesitam meritis et mihi Delphica</i>	15
<i>lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam.</i>	

I have completed a monument more lasting than bronze and higher than the regal decay of the Pyramids which neither devouring rain nor powerless Aquilo shall be able to destroy, or the numberless series of years and the flight of time. I will not wholly die and a great part of me will escape Libitina. I will grow continually, fresh with future praise, while the pontiff will ascend the Capital with a silent virgin. Where violent Aufidus resounds and where Daunus, poor in water, ruled the country people, I will be spoken of as the first to have harmonized Aeolic song with Italian measures, a powerful man from humble origins. Take up the honor deservedly sought, Melpomene, and willingly crown my head with Delphic laurel.

Just as in *Odes* 1.1 the triumph of Horatian lyric is portrayed through the union of opposites. “Powerless” Aquilo (*impotens*, 3) cannot ruin the achievement of “powerful” Horace (*potens*, 12), who will paradoxically both die (*moriar*, 6) and grow (*crescam*, 8). Daunus, who is called “poor” (*pauper*, 11) yet nevertheless “ruled” (*regnavit*, 12), mirrors Horace himself whose future fame defies his humble origins (*ex humili*, 12). The Pyramids which Horace’s work will outlast are a perplexing mix of kingly (*regali*, 2) and crumbly if we translate “*situ*” (2) as “grave” or “decay.”<sup>88</sup> Horace’s temporal markers create an auditory contrast: his verse will last while a virgin is silent (*tacita virgine*, 9) and while Aufidus roars (*obstrepit Aufidus*, 8-10). Finally, in

---

appellation strengthens the identification of Faunus as an erotic deity whose ineffectual pursuit of the nymphs would aptly represent the elegiac poet’s pursuit of his fickle mistress.

<sup>88</sup> One objection to this interpretation, according to Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 369, is that “‘regal decay’ would strike a satirical note at odds with the gravity of the context, and it would be rhetorically inept to compare the height of H’s monument to something that was crumbling.” Our interpretation of *Odes* 3.30, which highlights exactly these kinds of oxymoronic pairings, provides a plausible rationale for Horace’s “satirical note.”

an utterance reminiscent of his comment on the *tibia* and *barbitos* in *Odes* 1.1, Horace claims he is “the first to have harmonized Aeolic song with Italian measures” (*princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*, 13-4). Through it all, Horace identifies a specific Muse, Melpomene (16), as responsible for his hybridized achievement, telling her to “take up the honor deservedly sought” (*sume superbiam / quaesitam meritis*, 14-5).<sup>89</sup> But in *Odes* 1.1 the Muses’ powers of hybridization are signified through musical instruments – Euterpe and Polyhymnia will play their instruments alongside one another in order to create a mixed work of poetry. *Odes* 3.30, on the other hand, clearly presents Horace’s completed lyric project as just such a work but does not explicitly show Melpomene to be capable of this kind of feat. She is merely tasked with receiving the credit for the project’s completion. Has she truly earned her prize?

Thankfully, Horace provides us with not one, but two poems wherein Melpomene is invoked by name. In *Odes* 1.24 Horace asks Melpomene for aid in delicately persuading his friend, Vergil, to lay aside his grief for Quintilius (1-4):

*Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus  
tam cari capitis? praecipe lugubris  
cantus, Melpomene, cui liquidam pater  
vocem cum cithara dedit.*

1

What shame or limit should there be on feeling of loss for such a dear life? Teach us mournful songs, Melpomene, to whom the father gave a clear voice accompanied by the cithara.

Here we see Melpomene possessed of the same unifying ability displayed by her sisters in *Odes* 1.1. Instead of depicting her as a single Muse playing two instruments at once, a potentially absurd feat, Horace tells us that Melpomene is able to unite her instrument, the cithara, with her voice (*vocem cum cithara*, 4) in order to produce mournful songs. Included among these songs

---

<sup>89</sup> The meaning of “*superbia*” has been a point of contention. Although a more neutral meaning along the lines of “pride” may be possible, the word’s negative connotations remain unsettling. Since Horace’s past discussions of generic enrichment typically portray the act as dangerous, impious, or threatening, however, it is conceivable that Horace deigns to refer to his achievement with a word like “*superbia*” in order to remind us, one last time, of the scope of Melpomene/Horace’s achievement. For past treatments of “*superbia*” see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 376-7.

is *Odes* 1.24 itself, which Horace presents as a fusion in multiple ways. Putnam, for instance, remarks that the poem “is at once *epicedium* and *consolatio*, a lamentation for the death of Quintilius Varus, Horace's critic and friend, and an offering of condolence to the great poet who was likewise Varus's intimate.”<sup>90</sup> Putnam also points out, as do many others, that the poem also combines allusions drawn from all of Vergil’s poems in order to create a personalized appeal to his fellow poet constructed from Vergil’s own language.<sup>91</sup> Melpomene’s ability to draw from so many varied genres in order to produce a single lyric poem therefore proves that she, like her sisters, can bring dissimilar items together into a unified whole.

Two brief yet significant points remain before we leave behind our analyses of *Odes* 1.1 and 3.30. First, the overarching claim of this study is that Horace’s treatment of generic enrichment in the *Odes* is suffused with tree-related imagery, and as such we would be remiss if we did not recognize that these two poems critical for understanding the generic import of the Muses in the *Odes* conform to this expectation through their abundant use of generic tree symbolism (the laurel, the ivy, groves, grafting, etc.) which has already been treated at length in our discussion of Fenton.<sup>92</sup>

Second, in spite of the harmonization theme which takes center stage in these poems, Horace insists upon the uniqueness of his achievement by describing himself, and his future poetic glory, as something unique and outstanding. Thus his act of harmonizing allows him to be separate from the people (*me...secernunt populo*, 1.1.29-32) and to escape death partially rather than fully join Libitina (*non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei / vitabit Libitinam*, 3.30.6-7). Successfully unifying disparate genres like epic into a single collection of lyric poems is the very act which allows Horace, paradoxically, to set himself apart. On its own this idea is not

---

<sup>90</sup> Putnam (1992) 123.

<sup>91</sup> E.g. Lowrie (1994); Putnam (1992) 128-31.

<sup>92</sup> See Fenton (2008) and Chapter 3 of this study.

surprising since the *Odes* consistently presents Horace as an experienced, worldly figure whose superior lyric worldview mirrors his own superiority as both poet and human being. The admonishments of the “*carpe diem*” odes are a classic example of this kind of superiority, as are the ethically charged Roman Odes whose opening disavowal of the *vulgus* presents Horace as a moral and poetic authority. The individualized Muses therefore function as a parallel for Horace himself. Just as these goddesses may be named and singled out for their ability to accommodate one thing to another, so too is Horace removed from his fellow human beings, and specifically other poets, because of his blending of epic and lyric in the *Odes*.

Our analysis of the generic impact of Horace's terminology for the Muses has so far accounted for every instance of the word “*Musa*” in the *Odes* as well as two of the four poems in which individual Muses are named. We must next explain the significance of the term “*Camena*” which we have discussed only in passing above, and having done so we will then be able to treat the two remaining “Muse poems” not yet discussed in detail, the remainder of *Odes* 3.4 and its partner in dialogue, 1.12.

### 5.2.3 The Meaning of “*Camena*”

Horace's use of the term “*Camena*” is surprisingly novel. As McDermott explains, the word was first employed by Livius Andronicus in his translation of the *Odyssey* and then later used by Naevius in a criticism of Ennius's adoption of the Greek hexameter and the *Μοῦσαι* as his source of inspiration. After this, however, the word virtually disappeared from Latin until Horace revived it for some programmatic purpose:<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> McDermott (1977) 365-6.

After Naevius, the Camenae more or less disappeared from Latin poetry until the Augustan age, when we glimpse them once in the *Eclogues* and then once in the first book of *Satires*. But it is with the publication of *Odes* 1-3 that the Camenae make a systematic return to Latin poetry, appearing once in each book as the sources of Horace's inspiration. It seems apt that the Italian Muses banished by Ennius in his original Grecizing movement should return to share the stage with their Greek counterparts in the Romanized *Aeolium carmen* of Horace. At any rate, this return of a term closely connected with an earlier literary polemic is certainly striking enough to rule out the view generally taken by commentators that *Camena* here is simply an alternate word for *Musae*. When Horace adopted the Camenae as symbols of his own lyric inspiration, he did so with a definite purpose. What is that purpose?

McDermott answers her own question by claiming that the Camenae are yet another representation of Horace's multidimensional assimilation of Greek to Roman poetics in the *Odes*, a mythical representation of the idea behind statements like "Come, sing a Latin song, *barbitos*" (*age dic Latinum, / barbite, carmen*, 1.32.3-4) and "I will be spoken of as the first to harmonize Aeolic song to Italian measures" (*dicar...princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*, 3.30.10-4), or even the conjunction of the *tibia* and *barbitos* already mentioned in conjunction with *Odes* 1.1.32-4. The key to McDermott's interpretation lies at *Odes* 2.16, where Horace speaks of his poetic humility (37-40):

*mihi parva rura et  
spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae  
Parca non mendax dedit et malignum  
spernere vulgus.*

40

A trustworthy Fate has granted me small fields and the fine breath of a Greek Camena and  
a disregard for the malicious crowd.

By referring to his source of poetic inspiration as a "Greek Camena" Horace reminds us of the Latin origin of the word and, in doing so, reminds us of his named Muses. Like the named Muses, the Camenae symbolize harmonization and provide Horace with a means of removing himself from the masses. The word "*Camena*" therefore functions in a manner similar to addressing single Muses by name while at the same time providing Horace with a means of addressing all of the goddesses of poetic inspiration as a group without having to resort to the epic word "*Musa*."

#### 5.2.4 Epic and Lyric in *Odes* 3.4 and 1.12

With this newfound appreciation for the word “*Camena*” in the *Odes* we now possess the tools to consider the full generic import of *Odes* 3.4 itself, where we expect to see Horace's tree-laden incorporation of epic in full force, and *Odes* 1.12, the only other poem in the odes which includes both the word “*Camena*” and a specifically named muse, Clio (1.12.2). It should come as no surprise that there would be a pair of poems that share this feature. Throughout this study we have noted that dialogues (between speaker and addressee, between poet and audience, etc.) are an expected component of the lyric genre, and in our discussion of Faunus we saw that Horace created a dialogue between two poems, *Odes* 1.4 and 1.5, in order to direct us towards a deeper understanding of his incorporation of elegy. Here in *Odes* 1.12 and 3.4 Horace likewise gives us clues (“*Camena*” and named Muses) to identify two poems that work alongside one another to illustrate how epic and lyric come together in the *Odes*.<sup>94</sup>

Beginning with *Odes* 3.4, we have already shown how the stanza which attributes Horace's salvation to the *Camenae* (lines 25-8) presents a succinct summary of Horace's program of epic incorporation. Horace reinforces this by giving the entirety of *Odes* 3.4 a strong epic cast in spite of its undeniably lyric pedigree. Horace begins the poem with an invocation to a Muse, a feature which could aptly point toward either epic or hymnal verse. Nisbet and Rudd point out, however, that the specific command to “descend” (*Descende*, 1) is more in keeping with early Greek invocations of Homer and Hesiod which typically place the Muses on high on

---

<sup>94</sup> It must also be pointed out that the meters of the poems (Sapphic for *Odes* 1.12, Alcaic for 3.4) may also encourage us to see them as a matched pair since the section of *Odes* 2.13 which speaks of Horace's integration of epic presents Sappho and Alcaeus in the underworld.

Mount Olympus.<sup>95</sup> Once established, Horace maintains this illusion of epic inspiration through an appeal to his audience that simultaneously draws attention to his use of the topos and challenges us to consider its generic relevance (5-8):<sup>96</sup>

*auditis an me ludit amabilis  
insania? audire et videor pios  
errare per lucos, amoenae  
quos et aquae subeunt et aerae.*

5

Do you hear it or does a lovely madness play with me? I seem to hear it and to wander through sacred groves which pleasing waters and breezes enter.

The invoked Muse, Calliope (2), is asked to perform a “long song” (*longum...melos*, 2) and does not fail in her duty – *Odes* 3.4 is the longest poem in Horace’s lyric collection and its unusual size would naturally make Horace’s readers question the appropriateness of such an outpouring of lines in what purports to be a poem of the *genus tenue*.<sup>97</sup> The identity of the invoked Muse also points to epic.<sup>98</sup> Not only was Calliope considered the Muse of epic poetry<sup>99</sup> but her title, “Queen” (*regina*, 3.4.2) brings to mind *Theogony* 79, where Hesiod places Calliope above her sisters by calling her “προφερεστάτη.”

This intertext prepares Horace’s readers for an abundance of further Hesiodic allusions throughout *Odes* 3.4. Some scholars are quick to dismiss these as unimportant to the overall

---

<sup>95</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 56-7. Although Horace lists a host of other poetic sites in the poem he makes it clear, by defying our generic expectations, that these locations are his own favored haunts rather than those of the heavenly Muses themselves. See e.g. Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 64: “*seu liquidae placuere Baiae*: normally in a hymn *seu placuere* would refer to the deity’s choice of residence (N-H on 1.30.2), but here the sacral formula is transferred to the poet.” A similar poem in which a request to descend implies a god’s Olympian dwelling place is Sappho 1, in which the poetess entreats Aphrodite to come from her father’s house (πάτρος δὲ δόμον λίποισα, 7) just as she has come down from heaven (ὠράνωϊθερος, 11-2) in the past. Does this contradict the idea that the requested descent of a god is epic? We might argue that because Aphrodite is not a Muse Sappho’s request is not a proper parallel, but a better response comes from Campbell (2003) 265 which points out that the stanzas describing Aphrodite’s descent “have strong epic influence.”

<sup>96</sup> The abruptness of Horace’s direct question in the second person (*auditis*, 5) combined with the rarity of such inspirational scenes in the *Odes* both contribute to our reconsideration of the generic meaning of these lines.

<sup>97</sup> Davis (1991) 99-100.

<sup>98</sup> Hornsby (1962) 97 argues that because Horace’s invocation to Calliope occurs so soon after the close of *Odes* 3.3, where Horace chides his unnamed Muse for wandering into “stories of the gods and great things” (*sermones deorum et / magna*, 71-2), Calliope is likely responsible for the epic elements in both poems.

<sup>99</sup> Todd (1931) 216. Todd’s article specifically treats Vergil’s use of Erato, but also includes a discussion of the attributes and genres associated with all of the Muses, including Calliope.

meaning of the poem, but Thornton believes that Horace's incorporation of the *Theogony*, signaled by the invocation of "Queen Calliope," explains many of the ode's interpretive difficulties:<sup>100</sup>

I suggest that the difficulties [of *Odes* 3.4] can be solved in a reasonably simple manner when the second line of the poem, *regina longum Calliope melos* is understood as an allusion to Hesiod's *Theogony*. The relevant passage is quoted by Heinze, but without comment. Steele Commager compares the invocation to Calliope at the beginning of the ode and the central stanzas...about the activity of the Muses with Hesiod's description of the Muses and their powers, and points out the similarity of thought in the two poems. But he considers such 'possible allusions to Hesiod' as 'beguiling rather than necessary', since the Horatian lines are 'self-explanatory'. The above-mentioned difficulties, however, can only be solved by reference to Hesiod's *Theogony*, which means that the allusion was intended by Horace himself.

What are these Hesiodic allusions? One of the most obvious is the Muses' protection of the infant Horace (3.4.9-20) which takes place on Mount Voltur, a clear imitation of Hesiod's poetic investiture upon Mount Helicon (*Theogony* 22-34). In both stories the Muses' patronage is signified by "marvelous" laurel. Hesiod receives "a staff, a branch of flourishing laurel" (σκήπτρον...δάφνης ἐριθιλέος ὄζον, 30) which he calls "wondrous" (θηητόν, 31), and Horace is covered with laurel and myrtle by wood-pigeons, an occurrence "which was a marvel for all" (*mirum quod foret omnibus*, 13).

The second allusion concerns Horace's depiction of the Muses as givers of sure council (*Odes* 3.4.37-42):

*vos Caesarem altum, militia simul  
fessas cohortis abdidit oppidis,  
finire quaerentem labores  
Pierio recreatis antro.  
vos lene consilium et datis et dato  
gaudetis almae.*

40

As soon as great Caesar, seeking to end to his labors, set aside his cohorts, tired from war, in towns, you restore him in a Pierian cave. You kindly give gentle council and rejoice in council given.

---

<sup>100</sup> Thornton (1965) 97-8. On the Hesiodic background of *Odes* 3.4 see also Marg in Lefèvre (1975) 385-99.



Despite these Hesiodic allusions in *Odes* 3.4 we cannot overlook the obvious debt this poem owes to Horace's lyric predecessor, Pindar. Miller's study of *Odes* 3.4, for instance, provides not only an examination of the poem's "elaborate Pindaric architecture" but also a detailed catalogue of its borrowings from Pindar's victory odes, in particular *Pythian* 1 and 8.<sup>102</sup> Some of these, such as the fact that Calliope is summoned rather than simply invoked,<sup>103</sup> actually draw us away from epic and back towards lyric. How, then, do we reconcile Horace's "heavy-handed" borrowing from these two distinct authors?

According to Miller Horace's coopting of Pindar is designed to make Apollo the central figure of the poem and embodiment of the moderating power which Horace puts forth as the "moral" of *Odes* 3.4 (65-8):

*vis consili expers mole ruit sua:* 65  
*vim temperatam di quoque provehunt*  
*in maius; idem odere viris*  
*omne nefas animo moventis.*

Force lacking council crumbles under its own bulk. The gods themselves make moderate force better. Likewise do they hate force that undertakes the unspeakable with its entire mind.

Moderation is key, says Horace, and this is the expected wisdom provided by the council (*consilium*, 41) of the Camenae, divinities Horace has transformed into representations of the hybridization of genres. The negative language used to characterize the Titans and all those who fail to understand the importance of *vis temperata* (66) is similar to that which Horace employs to describe the dangerous nature of generic enrichment elsewhere in the *Odes*. Consider, for instance, the similarities between the Titans of *Odes* 3.4 and the human sailors of 1.3, whose generic significance has already been discussed in our treatment of Adamitis.<sup>104</sup> The Titans are "impious" (*inpios* / *Titanas*, 42-3) and their self-destructive tendencies (*vis consili expers mole*

<sup>102</sup> Miller (1998). For other treatments of the Pindaric elements of this poems see also West (2002) 44–7.

<sup>103</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 53.

<sup>104</sup> See subsection 3.3.3.

*ruit sua*, 65) cause them to engage in *nefas* (68) so terrible that Jove was forced to unleash his thunderbolt (*fulmine*, 45) against them. Similarly, in *Odes* 1.3, Jove is unable to set aside his “wrathful thunderbolts” (*iracunda fulmina*, 40) thanks to the Titan-like wickedness of human seafaring, a metaphor for the dangers of generic enrichment (21-8, emphasis added for comparison with 3.4.65-8):

*nequiquam deus abscidit  
prudens Oceano dissociabili  
terras, si tamen impiæ  
non tangenda rates transiliunt vada.  
audax omnia perpeti  
gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas.*

25

In vain did the prudent god separate the lands with a dividing ocean if *impious ships* nevertheless jump across deeps not to be touched. The human race, bold enough to dare everything, *rushes* through forbidden *nefas*...

*Odes* 3.4 therefore presents itself as an ideal union of epic and lyric verse in which Horace unites Hesiodic and Pindaric song into a single *longum melos* inspired by the hybridizing Camenae. The reference to the tree episode in lines 25-8 ensures that Horace’s readers will read the poem with a mind focused on questions of genre, as do his purposeful allusions to earlier odes concerned with the dangers of generic enrichment. Our final task is to see how the programmatic message contained in *Odes* 3.4 compares to that found in 1.12, the final element in our consideration of the Muses.

*Odes* 1.12, like its partner poem, begins with an invocation to a named Muse, Clio, set within one of the most famous mottos ever adapted by Horace (1-3):

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

1

What man or hero do you choose to celebrate, Clio, with lyre or shrill tibia? What god?

Even after only reading these three opening lines Horace’s readers immediately understand two things, the first being that this poem will make heavy use of Horace’s Greek predecessor, Pindar,

whom Horace has recreated here (Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι, / τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; *Olympian* 2.1-2).<sup>105</sup> The remainder of Horace's ode continues in the strongly Pindaric vein established by its opening. With regard to content, *Odes* 1.12 includes both further allusions to *Olympian* 2 (in particular its emphasis on horses and charioteering, its use of the name of Olympia, and its focus on the motif of victory) and other Pindaric victory odes.<sup>106</sup> The structure of *Odes* 1.12 has likewise been of great import for those looking to discuss Horace's adaptation of Pindar's three-part choral lyric, and more specifically the five triads of *Olympian* 2, to Latin monadic verse, although scholarship is divided on the precise means by which Horace accomplishes this feat.<sup>107</sup> The lyric genre therefore makes itself quite apparent in *Odes* 1.12 through Horace's overt remodeling of Pindar which contrasts strongly with his more subtle adaptations in *Odes* 3.4.

The second thing we learn from Horace's opening lines is that the presentation of Clio in *Odes* 1.12 is consistent with that of Calliope in 3.4. Like Calliope, Clio is represented as a harmonizing goddess (like all her named sisters) through her equal skill with two instruments: the lyre and the tibia (1-2). To "prove" Clio's ability in this regard Horace then composes the remainder of 1.12 in two distinct halves, one which elaborates on places, heroes, myths, and gods drawn from Greek culture (lines 1-32) and another which focuses upon figures and events from the more recent history of Rome (lines 33-60). Although her end result presents a more stark contrast between its constituent parts, as opposed to Calliope's "more subtle" effort in *Odes* 3.4 in which epic and lyric, Hesiod and Pindar, Greek and Roman, or Augustus and Jupiter are

---

<sup>105</sup> On Horace's use of Pindar in *Odes* 1.12 see e.g. Hardie (2003); Lowrie (1995) 35-6; Highbarger (1935) 229-34.

<sup>106</sup> Pace Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 143, which says that "Pindaric allusions are few and unimportant" after the opening motto. For a detailed analysis of Horace's allusions to Pindar in *Odes* 1.12 see Hardie (2003) 373-6.

<sup>107</sup> For a recent consideration of this dilemma see Hardie (2003) 384-8; Jocelyn (1993) 108-15 provides a history of the scholarship surrounding the question of Horace's adaptation of Pindar's structure.

interwoven with one another in a less binary fashion,<sup>108</sup> 1.12 nevertheless presents a unified work which joins the typical features of Pindaric lyric with the poetic sensibilities of Augustan Rome.

But if *Odes* 1.12 is a match for the lyric/epic hybrid that is *Odes* 3.4, where is Clio's treatment of epic? The poem's strong, almost heavy-handed reliance upon Pindar runs a dangerous risk of overshadowing the genre which we expect to see paired with lyric in this ode and which must be present if our new generic interpretation of the named Camenae is to remain intact. One could argue, perhaps, that the general theme of warfare and battle that suffuses the ode could amount to an "epic feel" which at the very least places the genre in the forefront of our minds, but this is hardly the strongest argument. There is a great difference between Horace speaking in a vague sort of way about the Olympians as potential fighters in *Odes* 1.12 and Horace's very specific discussion of a particular divine battle, the Gigantomachy, in *Odes* 3.4, and the ever-useful treatments of generic enrichment by Davis, Lowrie, and Harrison, include no treatment of the presence of epic in *Odes* 1.12.

Thankfully, however, Horace himself has given us all we need to recognize that as overtly as the Greek half of *Odes* 1.12 represents lyric poetry, just as subtly does the Roman section embody a particular brand of contemporary Latin epic from which Horace halfheartedly excuses himself throughout the *Odes*. In *Odes* 1.6, for instance, Horace told Agrippa that he would be unable to properly compose epic verses on the deeds of his fellow Romans, including "the praises of glorious Caesar" (*laudes egregii Caesaris*, 11), but by now we know such *recusationes* are fictions. We need look no further than the Regulus Ode (3.5), or indeed the entire sequence of the Roman Odes to see how Horace is clearly capable of incorporating past

---

<sup>108</sup> The subtlety of *Odes* 3.4 does not detract from its presentation of these pairs. West (2002) 44-53, for instance, recognizes that *Odes* 3.4 is designed to present itself as both "a Greek poem" and "an Italian poem."

and present Romans into his lyric/epic hybrid poems.<sup>109</sup> The Roman half of *Odes* 1.12 therefore subtly includes the epic genre, and thus validates its status as a matched poem for *Odes* 3.4, by alluding to a particular brand of epic poetry, Roman historical epic, which is treated throughout the *Odes*. It is for this reason, perhaps, that Clio, the muse of history, is invoked in *Odes* 1.12, while Calliope, the muse of epic, is summoned in context of traditional Greek epic found in 3.4.

### 5.2.5 Conclusion: Muses

Of all the members of the *genus grande* incorporated into Horace's *Odes* there is perhaps none more easily recognized or more analyzed than epic. Thus the main task of this study was not to prove that this incorporation occurs, but rather to point out how the tree-laden poems in which the Muses appear contribute to the well-documented program of epic enrichment in the *Odes*. Our analysis has given us a newfound respect for the terminology Horace uses to speak about the Muses and has ultimately reinforced our recurring argument: generic dialogues between Horace and his readers and between the poems themselves (i.e. *Odes* 1.1 and 3.30, 3.4 and 1.12, 3.30 and 1.24) bring us to new understanding of Horace's integration of epic into the lyric *Odes*. In our final treatment of Liber and his role as a symbol for tragedy in the *Odes* we will see this pattern brought to bear once again to bring closure to the "mystery" of Horace's escape from the tree.

---

<sup>109</sup> See e.g. Lowrie (1997) chapter 7: "History and Epic: The Roman Odes." We could even extend our consideration of Horace's use of Roman heroes in lyric poems with strong epic overtones to his second lyric project, *Odes* 4, which features several poems composed in exactly this fashion.

## 5.3 LIBER AND TRAGEDY

### 5.3.1 Liber's Generic Potential

The final deity Horace credits with his salvation is Liber (*Odes* 3.8.1-8):

<i>Martiis caelebs quid agam Kalendis,</i>	1
<i>quid velint flores et acerra turis</i>	
<i>plena miraris positusque carbo in</i>	
<i>caespite vivo,</i>	
<i>docte sermones utriusque linguae?</i>	5
<i>voveram dulcis epulas et album</i>	
<i>Libero caprum prope funeratus</i>	
<i>arboris ictu.</i>	

What shall I, a bachelor, do on the March Kalends? What might the flowers mean? Do you marvel at the censer full of incense and the coals placed upon the living turf, you who are learned in dialogues of both languages? I vowed sweet feasts and a white goat to Liber the day I was nearly done in by the blow of a tree.

The generic affiliations of Liber (and his Greek counterpart, Dionysus) were well-established in the minds of Horace and his readers. He was the subject of the dithyramb, a subgenre of lyric poetry,<sup>110</sup> and Dionysian religious festivals provided a context for the performance of tragedy, the genre assigned to Liber by our new interpretation of the tree episode. To assert that Liber functions as a symbol for the incorporation of tragedy into lyric thus seems an easy task, as we shall demonstrate below. Aiding us in this identification is the fact that in both Greco-Roman myth more generally and in Horace's *Odes* specifically<sup>111</sup> Liber functions as the "god of opposites" who combines what is seemingly disparate (male and female, Greek and barbarian, madness and clarity, anxiety and security, etc.). Thus while Horace must prove to his reader that the Camenae, for example, possess the ability to harmonize genres through analogies involving

---

<sup>110</sup> Lowrie (1997) 128: "Dithyramb is the lyric subgenre associated with pure narrative..."

<sup>111</sup> For Horace's use of Bacchus as a reconciler of opposites in the *Odes* see e.g. Commager (1966) 337-43.

instruments, his use of Liber requires a much less involved treatment of the god's hybridizing power.

Liber is also a god of poetry more generally insofar as his role as the god of wine means that he provides both a source of inspiration and an occasional context (i.e. the symposium) which are conducive to poetic activity.<sup>112</sup> Horace makes this point clear in *Odes* 2.19.1-4 where Liber acts as a teacher of songs or, more specifically, a *chorodidaskalos*:<sup>113</sup>

*Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus* 1  
*vidi docentem – credite posterī –*  
*Nymphasque discentis et auris*  
*capripedum Satyrorum acutas.*

I have seen Bacchus among the remote crags teaching songs – believe it, posterity – and nymphs learning them and the keen ears of the goat-footed satyrs.

Finally, Liber also possesses a well-established connection to trees, primarily because of his association with the vine in the *Odes*.<sup>114</sup> His relationship with ivy,<sup>115</sup> however, and the fact that Dionysus bore epithets such as “of the tree” (δενδρίτης) or “in the tree” (ἐνδενδρος)<sup>116</sup> ensure that his arboreal connections exist even outside of his purview as the god of wine. Liber thus seems to fulfill the necessary criteria in order to function as a metaphor for the process of generic enrichment. But what form does Horace's use of the god take?

---

<sup>112</sup> On Liber/Bacchus and his connection to poetry see Batinski (1991) 361-72; Maass (1896).

<sup>113</sup> Fraenkel (1966) 199.

<sup>114</sup> See e.g. odes in which Liber's various names are used as substitutes for the word “wine”: *Odes* 1.7.22, 2.6.19, 3.16.34.

<sup>115</sup> For “Dionysus of the Ivy” see Pausanias 1.31.6: ἔστι δὲ Ἀχαρνᾶι δῆμος...τὴν δ' Ἰππίαν Ἀθηναίων ὀνομάζουσι καὶ Διόνυσον Μελοπόμενον καὶ Κισσὸν τὸν αὐτὸν θεόν, τὸν κισσὸν τὸ φυτὸν ἐνταῦθα πρῶτον φανῆναι λέγοντες. Ivy also appears as a common symbol of Dionysian worship throughout Euripides's *Bacchae*. For ivy's status as a tree see subsection 3.1.1.

<sup>116</sup> On δενδρίτης see e.g. Plutarch, *Quaestiones convivales* 675f: καὶ Ποσειδῶνι γε Φυταλίῳ Διονύσω δὲ Δενδρίτη πάντες ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν Ἕλληνας θύουσιν. On ἐνδενδρος see Janda (2010) 16-44.

### 5.3.2 Political Anxiety in *Odes* 3.8

As with the previous two divinities, Horace provides us with the keys to understanding in the poem which revisits his escape. After first explaining his seemingly odd religious behavior (*Odes* 3.8.1-8), Horace invites Maecenas to join him in sympotic activity befitting a day in honor of Liber (9-28):

<i>hic dies anno redeunte festus corticem adstrictum pice dimovebit amphorae fumum bibere institutae consule Tullo.</i>	10
<i>sume, Maecenas, cyathos amici sospitis centum et vigiles lucernas perfer in lucem: procul omnis esto clamor et ira.</i>	15
<i>mitte civilis super urbe curas: occidit Daci Cotisonis agmen, Medus infestus sibi luctuosis dissidet armis,</i>	20
<i>servit Hispanae vetus hostis orae Cantaber sera domitus catena, iam Scythae laxo meditantur arcu cedere campis.</i>	25
<i>neglegens ne qua populus laboret parce privatus nimium cavere et dona praesentis cape laetus horae ac linque severa.</i>	

As the year returns this festal day will unseal the pitch-sealed cork of an amphora made to drink in the smoke when Tullus was consul. Raise a hundred ladles, Maecenas, in honor of the escape of your friend and keep the lamps awake until dawn. Let all racket and rage be far off. Send away your civilian cares for the city. The ranks of Dacian Cotiso have fallen. The hostile Mede will perish by weapons injurious to himself. Cantabria, our ancient foe from the Spanish shore tamed by late chains, serves us. Now the Scythians with bows unstrung plan to yield the field.

The poem seems straightforward enough, but Nisbet and Rudd point out several oddities in Horace's presentation. One of these concerns the wine that Horace and Maecenas will drink, which was laid down "in the consulship of Tullus" (*consule Tullo*, 12):<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 128.

When they were laid down, wines were regularly labelled by the names of the consuls. H. is probably referring to L. Volcaci<sup>u</sup>s Tullus, cos. 33 BC (*RE* Suppl. 9. 1838f.) rather than his homonymous father, the consul of 66; the reader would think first of the more recent and familiar Tullus....At first sight his description might suggest a more venerable vintage, but 66BC has no relevance to the occasion, and there is humor in applying such language to a recent tradition. Uncaring if the Roman people struggle anywhere, as a private man leave off from being too wary and happily enjoy the gifts of the present hour; leave serious affairs behind.

Nisbet and Rudd are right to claim that Horace would appreciate the humor in describing a newer wine like “a more venerable vintage,” but when Horace’s language is ambiguous there is usually more than mere humor at stake. If the older wine would be more suitable, what other clue might be hidden in this poem that could permit us to find the wine from 66 BC more suitable?

Our answer lies in Horace’s repeated injunctions against social and political anxiety (*mitte...curas*, 17; *parce...nimium cavere*, 26) which surround his descriptions of conflicts both domestic and foreign (18-24). The revolt against Phraates IV and the defeat of Cotiso are both connected to civil war, the former through Horace’s outright description as such<sup>118</sup> and the latter through Cotiso’s involvement in the machinations of Antony during his civil war against Augustus.<sup>119</sup> Modern scholars know that Cantabria, despite having been “tamed with late chains” (*sera domitus catena*, 22), nevertheless continued to be a source of concern for Rome long after their original pacification, and the menacing tone of the Scythians’ “plotting” (*meditantur*, 23) suggests to Horace’s reader both past misdeeds and potential future betrayals.<sup>120</sup>

What do these foreign and domestic conflicts have to do with Horace’s wine? The elder Tullus, whose earlier consulship would impart greater years more suited to such a “venerable vintage,” is primarily known for his involvement in several notable civil disturbances. He denied

---

<sup>118</sup> See e.g. the translation from West (2002) 81: “the Medes are their own enemies, divided / in a bloody civil war.”

<sup>119</sup> According to Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 129, some believe that the word *civilis* (17) “does not lead well to the campaigns of vv. 18-24.” Recognizing the influence of Cotiso in Octavian’s civil wars goes some way towards overcoming this objection, as could recognition that the ongoing resistance of the Cantabrians to Roman domination might constitute a “civil war” of sorts. Sadly, the lack of information concerning the embassy of the Scythians (see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 124) means that we have no hope of connecting their appearance here to civil war.

<sup>120</sup> On the sinister overtones of “*meditantur*” see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 131.

Catiline's nomination for consulship in 65 BC, thus helping to put down the first Catilinarian conspiracy,<sup>121</sup> and he was a vocal supporter of Cicero's methods in the wake of the second.<sup>122</sup> After his consulship Tullus was also drawn into the clash between Pompey and Julius Caesar despite his attempts to avoid becoming a pawn in their political machinations.<sup>123</sup> The dating of Horace's wine therefore contributes to the overall theme of civic upheaval on display overtly in the second half of *Odes* 3.8.

This interpretation of the poem also sheds light on Horace's other lexical irregularities. Nisbet and Rudd point out, for instance, that injunctions such as "let all racket and rage be far off" (*procul omnis esto / clamor et ira*, 15-6), although expected by sympotic convention, were "not always observed by Horace" in his convivial odes.<sup>124</sup> The presence of such a strong socio-political undercurrent in a sympotic poem such as this provides Horace with an added incentive to include such injunctions against chaos and violence. This interpretation also makes sense of Horace's description of Maecenas as "private" (*privatus*, 26). "It could seem curious to the Romans that a private citizen should worry about political problems," say Nisbet and Rudd,<sup>125</sup> but Horace shows us in *Odes* 1.37, for example, that civil conflict affects all members of Roman society, regardless of their degree of involvement in public affairs.

*Odes* 3.8 therefore presents Horace's rescue at the hands of Liber within a poem with a heavy emphasis on political and civic discord, but how does this relate to Horace's program of generic enrichment? One possible explanation stems from the fact that scholars commonly believe that tragedy possessed a unique political and ethical dimension which distinguished it

---

<sup>121</sup> Broughton (1952) 150; Holmes (1923) 1: 234.

<sup>122</sup> Smith (1849) 1190.

<sup>123</sup> Holmes (1923) 3: 41.

<sup>124</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 129.

<sup>125</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 129, 131.

from other genres.<sup>126</sup> We could argue, therefore, that by incorporating tragedy into the *Odes* Horace can take advantage of the genre's political and ethical quality in order to translate lighter poems of the *genus tenue* into serious treatments on civic or political matters. Liber, the god of tragedy, is thus named in *Odes* 3.8 in order to aid Horace's readers in making a connection between this genre and any politically charged scenarios which Horace may discuss in the *Odes*. This line of interpretation not only confirms the general unity of *Odes* 3.8 as well as its generic significance within the context of our study, but also explains why several other elements in the poem seem to contribute to its "tragic feel," such as Horace's insistence on removing Maecenas's fear and anxiety (i.e. *κᾶθαρσις*).<sup>127</sup>

To simply state that all of Horace's political poems therefore incorporate tragedy would nevertheless be an untrue assertion. Augustan military ideology, for instance, provides the subject matter of *Odes* 1.8, but Horace uses elegy and epic, not tragedy, as his non-lyric foils in this poem.<sup>128</sup> Instead, it is more likely that Horace uses tragedy when commenting on a particular type of civic issue, and Lowrie, who studies Horace's use of tragedy extensively, argues that the particular form of political upheaval tragedy is associated with in the *Odes* is civil war. "Tragedy," she claims, "makes the trauma of civil war (almost) utterable" in lyric verse because it provides a "generic locus for the ethical problem of individual death for the well-being of the state."<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> The exact nature of this political and ethical element has been a great source of debate. For review of this issue see e.g. Griffin (1998).

<sup>127</sup> Given Aristotle's discussion of the importance of *φιλία* relationships in Greek tragedy (e.g. *Poetics* 1453b 19-22) Horace's use of the word "friend" (*amici*, 13) may function similarly to these repeated injunctions against anxiety.

<sup>128</sup> See Nadeau (2008) 30-8.

<sup>129</sup> Lowrie (1997) 138, 158.

### 5.3.3 Examples of Tragic Civil War in the *Odes*

An example drawn from Lowrie's analysis of an earlier poem in the *Odes* will better illustrate how Horace incorporates tragedy into his treatments of civil war. *Odes* 1.37 announces in its opening words that it is a sympotic poem (*Nunc est bibendum*, 1), yet after its opening stanza the convivial tone of the ode falls away in favor of an extended treatment of the death of Cleopatra, one of the final events of the civil war between Augustus and Antony. Normally so recent a historical event, one in which Romans killed fellow Romans, would be difficult to incorporate into lyric poetry. To avoid this problem Horace tempers the harshness of his real subject matter, the defeat of Cleopatra, by transforming her into a "tragic heroine" removed from her true human self. By inserting tragic tropes into his lyric treatment of the Egyptian queen in order to soften the harsh realities of a historical event, Horace ensures that his generically unexpected dalliance with civil war poetry will not leave a sour taste in our mouths. Lowrie, citing several scholars, provides a summary of Cleopatra's tragic qualities:<sup>130</sup>

Leeman summarizes Cleopatra's tragic features (1985: 233): she is first a victim of *hybris*, *ate*, *mania*, then sobered by a *peripeteia* and an *anagnorisis* (*veros timores* 15), and finally rises to a tragic-heroic death, which inspires *eleos* and *phobos* in the reader. It is common to cite Aeschylus' *Persians* as a parallel for sympathy toward a defeated foreign enemy, as does Fraenkel [(1966: 161)]...Davis's interpretation uses the pattern of late learning (1991: 233-42). Cleopatra at first makes an error (*hamartia*) in entertaining what Horace calls a *spes longa* – the hope for immortality that fails to understand the *convivium*: we must rejoice in full acceptance of death. Her drunkenness signals this misunderstanding. Conflict with Octavian teaches: her *anagnorisis* via *veros timores* (15) results in her acceptance of death and correct drinking. The appropriate drink is not fortune, but poison (*atrum venenum*, 27-8)

Davis's point shows us that Horace does not simply add tragedy to the ode but rather fully incorporates these tragic elements into the sympotic framework so they reinforce the "*carpe*

---

<sup>130</sup> Lowrie (1997) 159, citing Davis (1991); Leeman (1985); Fraenkel (1966).

*diem*” philosophy which lies at the heart of convivial poetry. Similarly, Lowrie explains that Horace’s coopting of tragedy is likewise integrated into the topic of civil war:<sup>131</sup>

To elicit tragic emotion Aristotle recommends that a *philos* harm or intend to harm a *philos*. Cleopatra kills herself, the person most ‘*philos*’; she enacts civil war on herself, killing where *philos* kill *philos*. The ‘noble suicide’ in itself offers a paradigm for civil war, and it is tragic.

We might be tempted to think that Horace’s successful integration of tragedy in the Cleopatra poem would signify an end to civil war in the *Odes*. In fact, Lowrie suggests that this is exactly the reaction we are meant to have upon reading *Odes* 1.38, which “clears the palate and restores the poetics of the small” and assures us that such grave matters have been put to rest.<sup>132</sup> This is not to be, however, since the next poem, *Odes* 2.1, is “a high-style treatment of tragic history, also having to do with civil war” addressed to Pollio, a literary figure who “brings together tragedy and history – paradigmatic for civil war.”<sup>133</sup> Ullman tells us that Horace’s language in *Odes* 2.1 coincides with that used by other Romans, most notably Cicero, to describe the tragic touches they believed were integral to moving historiography.<sup>134</sup> As such, Horace’s presentation of Pollio’s history as “tragical”<sup>135</sup> combined with the *recusatio* of the poem’s final stanza also reflects Horace’s ability to enrich his verse with tragedy safely when he wishes to discuss civil war.<sup>136</sup>

So far our analysis has given examples of Horace’s use of tragic civil war within a sympotic and dedicatory poem, but Harrison tells us that Horace is able to enrich his erotic odes with tragedy as well. Harrison draws attention to Horace’s use of the Danaid myth in *Odes* 3.11,

---

<sup>131</sup> Lowrie (1997) 159-60.

<sup>132</sup> Lowrie (1997) 164.

<sup>133</sup> Lowrie (1997) 165-6, 177.

<sup>134</sup> See Ullman (1942) 50-1 and *passim*.

<sup>135</sup> Original quote from Ullman (1942) 50-1: “The classification of Pollio’s history of the Civil War among the monographs written in tragic fashion gives particular point to Horace’s line “*Paulus severae musa tragoediae desit theatri*”: Pollio will return to the writing of *tragedy* when he has finished his *tragical* history.”

<sup>136</sup> For a more recent treatment of Horace’s ability to conflate tragedy and history in this ode see e.g. Johnson (2009).

for example, and specifically the virtuous love of Hypermnestra, as a means of persuading Lyde to “opt for love” using a multi-level application of tragic material.<sup>137</sup> On the one hand the greatest treatment of the Danaid myth comes from an Aeschylean trilogy, and as such Horace’s lyric re-envisioning of the story would undoubtedly put Horace’s readers in a tragic mindset. On the other hand, the specific wording of lines 33-52 contains a variety of touches, such as the lioness analogy, which allude to the tragic corpus more broadly:<sup>138</sup>

This urgent speech addressed by Hypermnestra to Lynceus suggests a dramatic context in general terms; but the simile used by Hypermnestra of her murderous royal sisters as lionesses tearing calves in this family killing has a particular tragic analogue. It recalls the ecstatically murderous royal sisters of Euripides’ *Bacchae*, who rip up calves with their hands (*Bacchae* 737-9) and then hunt down and murder their male relative Pentheus who is compared to a bullock once he has been torn apart (1185). In the *Bacchae* it is the victim Pentheus who is famously compared to a lion (1196, 1278), but the characterization of the female murderer of her male relatives as a wild lioness is another standard image from tragedy, used of Clytemnestra (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1258, Euripides, *Electra* 473, 1163; cf. Lycophron, *Alexandra* 1107) and Medea (Euripides, *Medea* 1358, 1407). Thus the tragic origin of the Danaid story is here noted through imagery which recalls parallel tragic situations and perhaps even the lost tragedy of Aeschylus itself.

Similarly, in *Odes* 3.27, Europa envisions her father’s harsh criticisms (lines 57-66) with language which has a “distinctly tragic coloring:”<sup>139</sup>

As has been noted, these lines are rich in colouring from Greek tragedy. Europa’s fear of her father’s opinion echoes the similar fears of Euripides’ Medea (*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* 500-4, 1008-16; Euripides, *Alcestis* 954-5, *Phoenissae* 500-3). Further, the debate (53-8) about which mode of suicide to choose (*Selbstmordwege*) recalls a notable feature of Euripidean tragedy (*Heracles* 1148-52, *Orestes* 1035-6, *Helen* 299-302, *Andromache* 841-50, and especially *Troades* 1012-15).

For Harrison these tragic allusions in *Odes* 3.11 and 3.27 are yet another example of Horace’s ability to adapt the *genus grande* to the lighter themes of lyric verse, but his analysis understates the political ramifications of these adaptations. Harrison acknowledges, for instance,

---

<sup>137</sup> Harrison (2007) 190.

<sup>138</sup> Harrison (2007) 191-2.

<sup>139</sup> Harrison (2007) 195-6 and 197, where Harrison discusses the tragic “*deus ex machina*” effect of Venus’s appearance at the end of this ode; Harrison (1988).

that the Danaids were popular in Augustan iconography and literature,<sup>140</sup> but he does not mention to what use these infamous women were put by the emperor and his poets. Harrison's sources, Nisbet and Rudd, explain in their treatment of *Odes* 3.11 that Danaus and his daughters became mythical representations of Cleopatra and Antony:<sup>141</sup>

According to one view, Danaus is present [in the portico in front of Apollo's Palatine temple] as an ancestor of Anthony's, and the murderous Danaids, who came from Egypt, represent the much-hated forces of Cleopatra as well as symbolizing a hostile attitude towards marriage.

The mention of Augustan marriage values is significant because it reminds us that Augustus's plans for sexual and marital reform were presented alongside his triumph over Antony and more specifically Cleopatra. This provides Horace with a rationale for including tragedy (i.e. civil war) in erotic poems like *Odes* 3.27 with undertones relevant to Augustus's Julian laws. This association is further strengthened by the dramatic occasion of the original Liber poem (*Odes* 3.8) which takes place on the Matronalia, an important holiday for married women.<sup>142</sup>

Considered in this light, then, the tragic presentation of Europa becomes a comment on marriage and sexuality in Augustan Rome whose exact meaning differs between scholars. Clay, for instance, who believes *Odes* 3.27 presents "the adventure and destiny of every young girl on the brink of womanhood"<sup>143</sup> highlights the fact that Europa's "virginal girdle (*zona...secuta*, 59) remains intact."<sup>144</sup> If Europa is indeed still a virgin even after an encounter with the transformed Jupiter, then the "marriage settlement"<sup>145</sup> pronounced by Venus could be interpreted as a pro-Augustan message (i.e. "I, Venus, goddess of the Julian line, command you, chaste girl, to abandon your childish ways and prepare yourself for a proper marriage."). Nadeau, on the other

---

<sup>140</sup> Harrison (2007) 190.

<sup>141</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 150. See also Harrison in Stahl (1998); Kellum in Winkes (1985).

<sup>142</sup> Griffin (1997) 58 discusses additional ways in which Horace's mention of the Matronalia in *Odes* 3.8 brings the concept of marriage to the fore of his readers' minds.

<sup>143</sup> Clay (1992) 177.

<sup>144</sup> Commentators debate whether or not Europa's virginity remains intact in this poem. For a detailed summary of the treatments on this subject see Clay (1992) 176 n.35.

<sup>145</sup> The terminology is from Nadeau (2008) 422.

hand, believes that the subtext in this poem contradicts, or at the very least pokes fun at, Augustus's moral reforms by making his rival for Galatea's affection none other than a lascivious version of the emperor himself:<sup>146</sup>

...let us remember that Quintus is speaking to Galatea and telling *her* the tale. Galatea knows very well that if she goes off with Caesar intercourse will take place on board a ship. He will not wait until they set foot in Cranaë, or Crete, or Phaeacia, like Jason. But will the wedding be a *iustum matrimonium*? – that is the question.

Regardless of whether Horace is promoting or parodying the Augustan reforms in this poem, there is clearly some form of socio-political commentary at work here which connects to the emperor's success in civil war, an opportunity made possible only because of the political and ethical dimension of tragedy as suggested by *Odes* 3.8.<sup>147</sup>

#### 5.3.4 Linking Liber to Civil War in the *Odes*

Based on the examples provided above, it is clear that Horace employs tragedy as a vector for the discussion of civil war in the *Odes*. One could argue, however, that Liber's conspicuous absence from these politically charged poems detracts from our greater argument. Is Liber's second-hand association to tragedy through his Greek counterpart Dionysus strong enough to constitute a link between Horace's savior in the *Odes* and civil war? At first we may begrudgingly have to admit that it is not, primarily because no extant Greek tragedy treats the subject of civil war. Therefore, in order for our assessment of Liber's generic symbolism to remain valid we must unearth some line of analysis which demonstrates that Horace directly connects Liber to civil war within the *Odes*.

---

<sup>146</sup> Nadeau (2008) 422.

<sup>147</sup> Consider also *Odes* 3.6 which likewise combines a tragic presentation of history with sexual immorality (17-32) and a more overt discussion of civil war.

Thankfully, Batinski's study on Horace's "rehabilitation of Bacchus" provides just such an interpretation.<sup>148</sup> After showing how Horace's Bacchus is presented as a god paradoxically symbolizing both the *ars* and *ingenium* of poetic activity, Batinski continues by saying that this hybridizing poetry god "guides the poet into new avenues of poetry unexplored by others. For Horace these avenues include political poetry in support of the Augustan regime."<sup>149</sup> This process begins in *Odes* 2.19 where "Horace challenges the common assumption that Bacchus is a frivolous god fit only for dance and light-hearted games"<sup>150</sup> by reminding us of Liber's more fearsome side (7-28):

<i>Euhoe, parce Liber,</i>	
<i>parce gravi metuende thyrsos!</i>	
<i>fas pervicaces est mihi Thyiadas</i>	10
<i>vinique fontem lactis et uberes</i>	
<i>cantare rivos atque truncis</i>	
<i>lapsa cavis iterare mella:</i>	
<i>fas et beatae coniugis additum</i>	
<i>stellis honorem tectaque Penthei</i>	
<i>disiecta non leni ruina</i>	15
<i>Thracis et exitium Lycurgi.</i>	
<i>tu flectis amnis, tu mare barbarum,</i>	
<i>tu separatis uvidus in iugis</i>	
<i>nodo coerces viperino</i>	
<i>Bistonidum sine fraude crinis:</i>	20
<i>tu, cum parentis regna per arduum</i>	
<i>cohors Gigantum scanderet inopia,</i>	
<i>Rhoetum retorsisti leonis</i>	
<i>unguibus horribilique mala;</i>	
<i>quamquam choreis aptior et iocis</i>	25
<i>ludoque dictus non sat idoneus</i>	
<i>pugnae ferebaris: sed idem</i>	
<i>pacis eras mediusque belli.</i>	

Euhoe! Spare me, Liber! Spare me, O fearsome god of the harsh thyrsus! It is right for me to sing of your willful Thyiades and the font of wine and the rich streams of milk, and to celebrate the honey that fell from hollow trunks. Right too it is to sing of the honor granted to your wife in the stars and the palace of Pentheus ruined by no gentle fall and the destruction of Thracian Lycurgus. You change the course of rivers, you tame the barbarian sea. On remote mountain ridges you drunkenly bind the hair of Bistonian women with

<sup>148</sup> Batinski (1991). Batinski's analysis typically names the god as "Bacchus" but just as easily applies to his alter-ego "Liber." Horace himself provides us with the means to conflate the two together in *Odes* 2.19, where Liber is asked to bring relief to the poet whose breast is full of Bacchus (*Euhoe, recenti mens trepidat metu / plenoque Bacchi pectore turbidum / laetatur: Euhoe, parce Liber, 5-7*).

<sup>149</sup> Batinski (1991) 375.

<sup>150</sup> Batinski (1991) 372.

harmless knots of vipers. When the impious band of Giants climbed aloft to your father's realm you cast back Rhoetus with the claws and jaws of a terrible lion. Though they said you were more suited to dances and jests and play, and they claimed you were not fit enough for battle, you were nevertheless the center of both peace and war alike.

This description of the god's violent deeds includes a number of elements drawn from Greek tragedy. His snake-haired followers (19-20), their miraculous liquids (9-12), and the fall of Pentheus's palace (14-5) provide obvious allusions to Euripides's *Bacchae*, and the mention of Lycurgus (16) could reference Sophocles's *Antigone* 955 but more likely would remind Horace's readers of the Aeschylean tetralogy of which Lycurgus was the subject.<sup>151</sup> Note that these fearsome events and those which surround them appear only after Horace has invoked the god by the name "Liber" (7), an important initial step which links the name used in the salvation poem (*Odes* 3.8) to tragedy.

Rather than considering the tragic nature of these events, Batinski instead chooses to focus on the final element related in these lines, Dionysus's pivotal role in the defeat of the Giants, which receives an entire stanza unto itself (21-4). This curious but not uncommon variant on the story of the Gigantomachy has always drawn the interest of commentators, including that of Batinski herself who argues that the reference is intended to impart a political message. The key to her interpretation lies in the fact that Bacchus, whose attributes Antony symbolically adopted before and during his conflict with Octavian, is presented as a victor in the Gigantomachy, a mythical battle adopted by Augustus as a symbol for his victory over Antony and Cleopatra in the civil war:<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> Gantz (1993) 113-4; Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 323.

<sup>152</sup> Batinski (1991) 372 along with n.32: "See V. Buchheit, 'Mythos und Geschichte in *Ovids Metamorphosen I*,' *Hermes* 94 (1966) 94-100, for Augustus' adoption of the Gigantomachy for political purposes. Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 200, notes that Bacchus' 'achievement in the Gigantomachy [is] a surprising feat for this particular god and therefore deserving of two full stanzas.' The amazement Horace expresses suggests he anticipated a comparable astonishment from his Roman reader."

For Horace's audience the Gigantomachy would have had immediate ramifications beyond the simple mythological event. This contest had become a symbol for the Augustan regime of its triumph over Antony. Thus, in the odes, Bacchus has now abandoned Antony's camp and has been brought into alliance with Augustus.

For Batinski *Odes* 2.19.21-4 therefore presents Horace's attempt to "rehabilitate," through his poetry, a god who was once an enemy of Augustus. She reiterates this point in her discussion of *Odes* 3.3.11-5, where Bacchus appears once again in order to lend support to the ideals of the Augustan regime (9-15):

<i>hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules</i>	
<i>enisus arces attigit igneas,</i>	10
<i>quos inter Augustus recumbens</i>	
<i>  purpureo bibet ore nectar.</i>	
<i>hac te merentem, Bacche pater, tuae</i>	
<i>vexere tigres indocili iugum</i>	
<i>  collo trahentes;</i>	15

By this art did Pollux and wandering Hercules ascend and reach the fiery citadels. Between them reclining Augustus will drink nectar with a purple mouth. By this art you, Father Bacchus, were deservedly borne by your tigers dragging the yoke on necks untamable...

Here, Batinski claims, "Antony's political symbol has been transmuted and absorbed into Augustan propaganda to support the divinity of the emperor" and this re-appropriation of the god "demonstrates the healing of political factions within the state."<sup>153</sup>

But for the purposes of this study the Gigantomachy reference has an even greater significance because it finalizes a generic characterization of the god that evolves as we move through *Odes* 2.19. We first see the god, called Bacchus (1, 6, both in oblique cases), as a *chorodidaskalos* and general god of poetry (1-7). Next, when Horace invokes the god directly in the vocative, he does so using a different name, Liber (7), which we already expect to be associated with tragedy thanks to Horace's reinterpretation of the tree episode in *Odes* 3.8. This association is subsequently strengthened by the tragic figures which follow (Pentheus, the Bacchae, Lycurgus), until Horace finally presents us with his "rehabilitated" Liber whose

---

<sup>153</sup> Batinski (1991) 374.

newfound connection to Roman politics allows him to represent the assimilation of tragedy into lyric odes treating the subject of civil war.

### 5.3.5 Conclusion: Liber

At the start of this section we showed that Liber's association with tragedy, his status as a poetry god, and his authority over trees are all easily verified in both the *Odes* and Greco-Roman literature more generally. Our real task, we claimed, was to determine how *Odes* 3.8 is designed to direct us toward deeper understanding of Horace's use of tragedy in his lyric poems. Once we revealed the emphasis on political unrest at the heart of *Odes* 3.8 civil war presented itself as a promising target for Horace's adaptation of tragedy backed by strong support from Horatian scholarship. To finalize this interpretation we relied upon the same dialogue process which has served us well during our analyses of Horace's other two divine patrons. By creating a dialogue between *Odes* 2.19 and our initial assumptions gained from 3.8, we were able to chart the progression of Liber from a god of Greek tragedy to a hybridized Horatian poetry god who applies the political and ethical character of Greek tragedy to discussions of Roman civil war within an ostensibly lyric project, the *Odes*.

## 5.4 LOOKING BACK TO *ODES* 2.13

In our treatment of *Odes* 2.13 we argued that Horace's escape from the falling tree symbolizes the beginning of his career as a lyric poet capable of enriching his *Odes* with material drawn from a wide variety of non-lyric genres. In doing so we put forth the idea that *Odes* 2.13

represents, in a single poem, a much larger program of generic enrichment that spans the entirety of *Odes* 1-3. Our analysis of the generic significance of Horace's divine saviors has revealed the web of interconnected poems which make up this program. More importantly, we have also seen how metapoetic trees function as the primary tool used by Horace to defy and uphold his readers' generic expectations within this program.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Texts, Translations, and Commentaries

- Bond, Godfrey William, ed. *Heracles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Bowra, C. M. *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*. 2nd Revised Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Campbell, David A. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 2003.
- Dover, K. J., ed. *Aristophanes Frogs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Fraenkel, Eduard, ed. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Griffith, Mark, ed. *Aeschylus: Proetus Bound*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hall, Edith, ed. *Persians*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1996.
- Halliwell, Stephen. *Aristotle's Poetics*. London: Duckworth, 1986.
- Heyworth, S. J. *Sexti Properti Elegi*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007.
- Kenny, E. J. P. *Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995
- Mayhoff, C. C. *Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVII*. Vols. 1-5. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 1892-1909.
- Mynors, R. A. B. *Vergil: Georgics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- . *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and Margaret Hubbard. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- . *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and Niall Rudd. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Shorey, Paul, and Gordon J. Laing, eds. *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1960.

Tarrant, R. J. P. *Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.

West, David. *Horace Odes I: Carpe Diem*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 1995.

———. *Horace Odes II: Vatis Amici*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 1998.

———. *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2002.

Wickham, E. Q. *Horati Flacci Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1901.

### Secondary Sources

Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin. *Polyeideia: The "Iambi" of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Adamitis, Jana. "Accommodation and Self-Representation in Horace's Parade Odes." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2003.

Adams, James Noel. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Ahl, Frederick. *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Allen, Frederic D. "Prometheus and the Caucasus." *The American Journal of Philology* 13, no. 1 (January 1, 1892): 51–61.

Ancona, Ronnie. "Review: Horace, Odes, Book 2: Vatis Amici. Text, Translation and Commentary by David West." *Vergilius (1959-)* 45 (1999): 138–43.

Anderson, William S. "Horace 'Carm.' 1. 14: What Kind of Ship?" *Classical Philology* 61, no. 2 (April 1, 1966): 84–98.

———. "Two Odes of Horace's Book Two." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1 (January 1, 1968): 35–61.

Babcock, Charles L. "The Role of Faunus in Horace, Carmina 1.4." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 92 (January 1, 1961): 13–19.

Barsby, John A. "The Composition and Publication of the First Three Books of Propertius." *Greece & Rome* 21, no. 2 (October 1, 1974): 128–137.

Bartoletti, Vittorio. "Saffo Ed Orazio." *Studi Italiani Di Filologia Classica* 15, no. 1 (1938): 75–77.

- Basto, R. "Horace's Propempticon to Vergil: A Re-Examination." *Vergilius* 28 (1982): 30–43.
- Batinski, Emily E. "Horace's Rehabilitation of Bacchus." *The Classical World* 84, no. 5 (May 1, 1991): 361–378.
- Beebee, T. O. *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of Generic Instability*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.
- Berg, William. "Daphnis and Prometheus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 96 (January 1, 1965): 11–23.
- Bloomfield, Maurice. *Cerberus, the Dog of Hades the History of an Idea*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 1905.
- Bömer, Franz. *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Wissenschaftliche Kommentare Zu Lateinischen Und Griechischen Schriftstellern. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1957.
- Booth, Joan. *Catullus to Ovid, Reading Latin Love Elegy: A Literary Commentary with Latin Text*. Rev. ed. Classical Studies Series. London: Bristol Classical, 1999.
- Borgeaud, Philippe. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Broughton, T.R.S. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Brunetière, Ferdinand. *L'Evolution Des Genres Dans L'histoire de La Littérature: Lecons Professees A L'Ecole Normale Superieure*. Paris: Hachette, 1890.
- Buchheit, Vinzenz. "Mythos Und Geschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen I." *Hermes* 94, no. 1 (January 1, 1966): 80–108.
- Cairns, F. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Revised Edition. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Classical Press, 2007.
- Campbell, John Scott. "Animae Dimidium Meae: Horace's Tribute to Vergil." *The Classical Journal* 82, no. 4 (April 1, 1987): 314–318.
- Cavarzere, Alberto. *Sul Limitare: Il "Motto" E La Poesia Di Orazio*. 1. ed. Venice: Patron Editore, 1996.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. "Providus Auspex: Horace, Ode 3.27." *The Classical Journal* 88, no. 2 (December 1, 1992): 167–177.
- Cody, J. V. *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics*. *Latomus Revue D'Etudes Latines*, 1976.
- Collinge, N. E. *The Structure of Horace's Odes*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Commager, S. *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

- Conte, Gian Biagio. *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- . *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Edited by Charles Segal. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology v. 44. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Conte, Gian Biagio, and Glenn W. Most. "Love without Elegy: The Remedia Amoris and the Logic of a Genre." *Poetics Today* 10, no. 3 (October 1, 1989): 441–469.
- Curley, Dan. "Splendidior Vitro: Horace and Callimachus." *Classical Philology* 98, no. 3 (July 1, 2003): 280–283.
- . "The Alcaic Kid (Horace, 'Carm.' 3.13)." *The Classical World* 97, no. 2 (January 1, 2004): 137–152.
- D'Angour, Armand. "Drowning by Numbers Pythagoreanism and Poetry in Horace Odes 1.28." *Greece & Rome* 50, no. 2 (October 1, 2003): 206–219.
- Davis, G., ed. *A Companion to Horace*. 1st ed. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- . "Ingenii Cumba? Literary Aporia and the Rhetoric of Horace's O Navis Referent." *RhM* 132 (1989): 331–345.
- . *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Depew, Mary, and Dirk Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 4. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Dorcey, Peter F. *The Cult of Silvanus: A Study in Roman Folk Religion*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition v. 20. Leiden; New York: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Drachmann. *The Mechanical Terminology of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 1963.
- Dyson, Julia T. *King of the Wood: The Sacrificial Victor in Virgil's Aeneid*. Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture v. 27. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.
- Eisenberger, H. "Bilden Die Horazischen Oden 2.1-12 Einen Zyklus?" *Gymnasium*, no. 87 (1980).
- Ensor, Ernest. "On Horace, Odes II. 17 and I. 20." *The Classical Review* 16, no. 4 (May 1, 1902): 209–211.
- Fantham, Elaine. "Nymphas...e Navibus Esse: Decorum and Poetic Fiction in 'Aeneid' 9. 77-122 and 10. 215-59." *Classical Philology* 85, no. 2 (April 1, 1990): 102–119.
- . *Roman Literary Culture: From Plautus to Macrobius*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.

- Fantuzzi, Marco, and R. L. Hunter. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Fenton, Andrew. "The Forest and the Trees: Pattern and Meaning in Horace, 'Odes' 1." *The American Journal of Philology* 129, no. 4 (December 1, 2008): 559–580.
- Finglass, P. J. "Erinys or Hundred-Hander? Pindar, Fr. 52i(a). 19-21 Snell-Maehler = B3.25-7 Rutherford ('Paeon'8a)." *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 154 (January 1, 2005): 40–42.
- Forster, E. S. "Trees and Plants in Herodotus." *The Classical Review* 56, no. 2 (June 1, 1942): 57–63.
- . "Trees and Plants in Homer." *The Classical Review* 50, no. 3 (July 1, 1936): 97–104.
- . "Trees and Plants in the Greek Tragic Writers." *Greece & Rome* 21, no. 62 (June 1, 1952): 57–63.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- . *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Fredricksmeyer, Ernest A. "Horace Odes 1. 5. 16: God or Goddess?" *Classical Philology* 67, no. 2 (April 1, 1972): 124–126.
- . "Horace's Ode to Pyrrha (Carm. 1. 5)." *Classical Philology* 60, no. 3 (July 1, 1965): 180–185.
- Freudenburg, Kirk. *The Walking Muse*. Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Gantz, Timothy. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Gold, Barbara K. "Mitte Sectari, Rosa Quo Locorum Sera Moretur: Time and Nature in Horace's Odes." *Classical Philology* 88, no. 1 (January 1, 1993): 16–31.
- Gowers, Emily. "Trees and Family Trees in the Aeneid." *Classical Antiquity* 30, no. 1 (April 1, 2011): 87–118.
- Griffin, Jasper. "Augustan Poetry and the Life of Luxury." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 66 (January 1, 1976): 87–105.
- . "Cult and Personality in Horace." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 87 (January 1, 1997): 54–69.
- . "Lyrical Moralizing." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 70 (January 1, 1980): 182–185.

- . “The Social Function of Attic Tragedy.” *The Classical Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (January 1, 1998): 39–61.
- Griffith, R. Drew. “Corporality in the Ancient Greek Theatre.” *Phoenix* 52, no. 3/4 (October 1, 1998): 230–256.
- Gruzelier, Claire. *Claudian: De Raptu Proserpinae*. Oxford Classical Monographs. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 1993.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *Orpheus and Greek Religion; a Study of the Orphic Movement*. 2nd revised edition. Methuen’s Handbooks of Archaeology. London: Methuen, 1952.
- Haight, Elizabeth Hazelton. “The Feeling of the Ancients for Nature, with Special Reference to Quintus Horatius Flaccus.” *The Classical Weekly* 3, no. 29 (May 28, 1910): 242–247.
- Halperin, David M. *Before Pastoral, Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Hardie, Alex. “The Pindaric Sources of Horace ‘Odes 1.12.’” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101 (January 1, 2003): 371–404.
- Harrison, S. J., ed. *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.
- . *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2007.
- . , ed. *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 1995.
- . , ed. *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2001.
- . *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Harrison, Stephen J. “A Tragic Europa?: Horace, Odes 3.27.” *Hermes* 116, no. 4 (December 1, 1988): 427–434.
- Heath, Malcolm. “Receiving the Κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician.” *The American Journal of Philology* 109, no. 2 (July 1, 1988): 180–195.
- Henderson, J. “Be Alert (Your Country Needs Lerts): Horace Satires 1.9.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39 (1993): 67–93.
- Henderson, John. *Writing down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Henig, Martin, and Anthony King, eds. *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire*. Monograph Number 8. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 1986.

- Henkel, John H. "Writing Poems on Trees: Genre and Metapoetics in Vergil's Eclogues and Georgics." Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009.
- Highbarger, Ernest Leslie. "The Pindaric Style of Horace." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 66 (January 1, 1935): 222–255.
- Hight, Gilbert. *Poets in a Landscape*. 1st edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.
- Holland, Louise Adams. *Janus and the Bridge*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome v. 21. Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1961.
- Holleman, A. W. J. "Ovid and the Lupercalia." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 22, no. 2 (June 1, 1973): 260–268.
- Holmes, T.R. *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire*. Vol. 1, 1923.
- . *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire*. Vol. 3, 1923.
- Hoppin, Meredith Clarke. "New Perspectives on Horace, Odes 1.5." *The American Journal of Philology* 105, no. 1 (April 1, 1984): 54–68.
- Hornsby, Roger A. "Horace on Art and Politics (Ode 3.4)." *The Classical Journal* 58, no. 3 (December 1, 1962): 97–104.
- Howe, George. "Nature Similes in Catullus." *Studies in Philology* 7 (January 1, 1911): 3–15.
- Hutchinson, G. O. "The Publication and Individuality of Horace's 'Odes' Books 1-3." *The Classical Quarterly* 52, no. 2 (January 1, 2002): 517–537.
- Huxley, H. H. "Storm and Shipwreck in Roman Literature." *Greece & Rome* 21, no. 63 (October 1, 1952): 117–124.
- Ingleheart, Jennifer. "Ovid, 'Tristia' 1.2: High Drama on the High Seas." *Greece & Rome* 53, no. 1 (April 1, 2006): 73–91.
- . "Propertius 4.10 and the End of the 'Aeneid': Augustus, the 'Spolia Opima' and the Right to Remain Silent." *Greece & Rome* 54, no. 1 (April 1, 2007): 61–81.
- Janda, Michael. *Die Musik Nach Dem Chaos: Der Schöpfungsmythos Der Europäischen Vorzeit*. Vol. 1. Innsbrucker Beiträge Zur Kulturwissenschaft. Innsbruck, 2010.
- Jocelyn, H. D. "Carm. 1.12 and the Notion of a 'Pindarising' Horace." *Sileno* 19 (1993): 101–29.
- Johnson, Timothy S. "Lyric, History and Imagination: Horace as Historiographer (C. 2.1)." *The Classical Journal* 104, no. 4 (April 1, 2009): 311–320.
- Johnson, W. R. *The Idea of Lyric: Lyric Modes in Ancient and Modern Poetry*. University of California Press, 1983.

- Kambylis, Athanasios. *Die Dichterweihe Und Ihre Symbolik, Untersuchungen Zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz Und Ennius*. Bibliothek Der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften n. F., 2. Reihe. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1965.
- Kerkheckler, A. *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Kidd, D. A. "Vergil's Voyage." *Prudentia* 9 (1977): 97–103.
- Knorr, Ortwin. "Horace's Ship Ode ('Odes' 1.14) in Context: A Metaphorical Love-Triangle." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 136, no. 1 (April 1, 2006): 149–169.
- Kovacs, David. "Ovid, Metamorphoses 1.2." *The Classical Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (January 1, 1987): 458–465.
- Krasser, Helmut. *Horazische Denkfiguren: Theophilie Und Theophanie Als Medium Der Poetischen Selbstdarstellung Des Odendichters*. Hypomnemata Heft 106. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- Kroll, Wilhelm. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1924.
- La Penna, A. "Sunt Qui Sappho Malint: Note Sulla Σύγκρισις Di Saffo E Alceo Nell' antichità." *Maia*, no. 24 (1972): 208–15.
- Leach, Eleanor Winsor. "Horace's Pater Optimus and Terence's Demea: Autobiographical Fiction and Comedy in Sermo, I, 4." *The American Journal of Philology* 92, no. 4 (October 1, 1971): 616–632. doi:10.2307/292667.
- . "Nature and Art in Vergil's Second Eclogue." *The American Journal of Philology* 87, no. 4 (October 1, 1966): 427–445.
- Lee, A. G. *Metamorphoseon, Liber I*. Pitt Press Series. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.
- Lee, M. Owen. "Horace, Odes 1. 4: A Sonic Circle." *The Classical Quarterly* 15, no. 2 (November 1, 1965): 286–288.
- Leeman, A.D. "Die Dramatische Form Der Cleopatra-Ode." In *Form Und Sinn. Studien Zur Römischen Literatur (1954-1984)*, 231–3. Frankfurt am Main, 1985.
- Lefèvre, Eckard, ed. "Zum Musengedicht Des Horaz (Carm. 3,4)." In *Monumentum Chiloniense. Studien Zur Augusteischen Zeit. Festschrift Fur E. Burck*, 385–99. Amsterdam, 1975.
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. "The Ilex in 'O Fons Bandusiae.'" *The Classical Journal* 58, no. 2 (November 1, 1962): 63–67.
- . "ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ: The First Person in Pindar." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 67 (January 1, 1963): 177–253.

- Levin, Donald Norman. "Thought-Progression in Horace, 'Carmina' 1. 5." *The Classical Journal* 56, no. 8 (May 1, 1961): 356–358.
- Liveley, Genevieve, and Patricia B. Salzman-Mitchell, eds. *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2008.
- Lockyer, Charles W. "Horace's 'Propempticon' and Vergil's Voyage." *The Classical World* 61, no. 2 (October 1, 1967): 42–45.
- Lowe, Dunstan. "The Symbolic Value of Grafting in Ancient Rome." *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 140, no. 2 (October 1, 2010): 461–488.
- Lowrie, Michèle. *Horace's Narrative Odes*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 1997.
- . "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace 'C'. 1.12-1.18." *Phoenix* 49, no. 1 (April 1, 1995): 33–48.
- . "Lyric's 'Elegos' and the Aristotelian Mean: Horace, 'C.' 1.24, 1.33, and 2.9." *The Classical World* 87, no. 5 (May 1, 1994): 377–394.
- Ludwig, Walther. "Zu Horaz, C. 2, 1-12." *Hermes* 85, no. 3 (November 1, 1957): 336–345.
- Maass, Ernst. "Untersuchungen Zu Properz Und Seinen Griechischen Vorbildern." *Hermes* 31, no. 2 (January 1, 1896): 375–434.
- Mader, Gottfried. "That St(R)ain Again: Blood, Water, and Generic Allusion in Horace's Bandusia Ode." *The American Journal of Philology* 123, no. 1 (April 1, 2002): 51–59.
- McDermott, Emily A. "Horatius Callidus." *The American Journal of Philology* 98, no. 4 (December 1, 1977): 363–380.
- Meiggs, Russell. *Trees & Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Miller, John F. "Horace's Pindaric Apollo (Odes 3.4.60-4)." *The Classical Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (January 1, 1998): 545–552.
- Miller, Paul Allen. "Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of Odes 1-3." *The American Journal of Philology* 112, no. 3 (October 1, 1991): 365–388.
- . *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Morgan, Llewelyn. "The One and Only Fons Bandusiae." *The Classical Quarterly (New Series)* 59, no. 1 (2009): 132–141.
- Murgatroyd, P. "Militia Amoris and the Roman Elegists." *Latomus*, no. 34 (1975): 59–79.

- . “The Sea of Love.” *The Classical Quarterly* 45, no. 1. New Series (January 1, 1995): 9–25.
- Nadeau, Yvan. *Erotica for Caesar Augustus: A Study of the Love-Poetry of Horace, Carmina, Books I to III*. Collection Latomus v. 310. Bruxelles: Latomus, 2008.
- Nicoll, W. S. M. “Horace’s Judgement on Sappho and Alcaeus.” *Latomus* 45 (1986): 603–8.
- Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos; Untersuchungen Zur Formengeschichte Religiöser Rede*. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- O’Bryan, Erin Elizabeth. “From Ignobile Vulgus to Rerum Dominos: The Emergence of the Roman Crowd in Vergil’s Aeneid.” Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2011.
- Oberhelman, Steven M., and John Mulryan. “Milton’s Use of Classical Meters in the ‘Sylvarum Liber.’” *Modern Philology* 81, no. 2 (November 1, 1983): 131–145.
- Oliensis, Ellen. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Page, D. L. *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Parker, Hugh C. “Romani Numen Soli: Faunus in Ovid’s Fasti.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 123 (January 1, 1993): 199–217.
- Parker, L. P. E. *Euripides Alcestis: With Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Peradotto, John J. “Some Patterns of Nature Imagery in the Oresteia.” *The American Journal of Philology* 85, no. 4 (October 1, 1964): 378–393.
- Péron, Jacques. *Les Images Maritimes de Pindare. Études et Commentaires ; 87*. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1974.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Port, Wilhelm. “Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern Augusteischer Zeit.” *Philologus* 81 (1925): 280–308.
- Porter, David H. *Horace’s Poetic Journey: A Reading of Odes 1-3*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Pucci, Joseph. “Horace and Virgilian Mimesis: A Re-Reading of ‘Odes’ 1.3.” *The Classical World* 85, no. 6 (July 1, 1992): 659–673.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. “Aes Triplex (Horace, Odes 1. 3. 9).” *The Classical Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (1971): 454.

- . “Horace Carm. 1. 5: Love and Death.” *Classical Philology* 65, no. 4 (October 1, 1970): 251–254.
- . “The Languages of Horace ‘Odes’ 1.24.” *The Classical Journal* 88, no. 2 (December 1, 1992): 123–135.
- Quinn, Kenneth. “Horace as a Love Poet: A Reading of ‘Odes’ 1. 5.” *Arion* 2, no. 3 (October 1, 1963): 59–77.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A., and Mark Toher, eds. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Race, William H. “Pindaric Encomium and Isokrates’ Evagoras.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 117 (January 1, 1987): 131–155.
- Raven, D. S. *Greek Metre: An Introduction*. London: Faber and Faber, 1962.
- Rose, H. J. *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. New York: Routledge, 1928.
- Rosen, Ralph M. “Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod’s ‘Works and Days.’” *Classical Antiquity* 9, no. 1 (April 1, 1990): 99–113.
- Rosenmeyer, Thomas G., Martin Ostwald, and James W. Halporn. *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry*. Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc., 1963.
- Rossi, L. “I Generi Letterari E Le Loro Leggi Scritte Nelle Letterature Classiche.” *Bulletin of The Institute of Classical Studies* 18, no. 1 (1971): 69–94.
- Rotstein, Andrea. “*Mousikoi Agones* and the Conceptualization of Genre in Ancient Greece.” *Classical Antiquity* 31, no. 1 (April 1, 2012): 92–127.
- . *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2010.
- Rudd, Niall, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Santirocco, Matthew. “The Maecenas Odes.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 114 (January 1, 1984): 241–253.
- Santirocco, Matthew S. *Unity and Design in Horace’s Odes*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.
- Sargeaunt, John. *The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil*. First Edition edition. Longmans, Green and Co., 1920.
- Schwinge, Ernst-Richard. *Künstlichkeit von Kunst: zur Geschichtlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie*. München: C. Beck, 1986.

- Scodel, R. "Horace, Lucilius, and Callimachean Polemic." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 91 (1987): 199-215.
- Seaford, Richard. "Some Notes on Euripides' Cyclops." *The Classical Quarterly* 25, no. 2 (December 1, 1975): 193–208.
- Smith, William. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography & Mythology*. Vol. 3, 1849.
- Solmsen, Friedrich. "Propertius and Horace." *Classical Philology* 43, no. 2 (April 1, 1948): 105–109.
- Stahl, Hans-Peter, ed. *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*. London: Classical Press of Wales, 1998.
- Sutherland, Elizabeth H. "Audience Manipulation and Emotional Experience in Horace's 'Pyrrha Ode.'" *The American Journal of Philology* 116, no. 3 (October 1, 1995): 441–452.
- . *Horace's Well-Trained Reader: Toward a Methodology of Audience Participation in the Odes*. Studien Zur Klassischen Philologie Bd. 136. Frankfurt am Main ; New York: Lang, 2002.
- Sylvester, William. "A Note on Horace 'Odes' 1, 4." *The Classical Journal* 48, no. 7 (April 1, 1953): 262.
- Syndikus, Hans Peter. *Die Lyrik Des Horaz: Eine Interpretation Der Oden. Band I, Erstes Und Zweites Buch*. 1st Edition. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
- Talbot, John. "Tennyson's Alcaics: Greek and Latin Prosody and the Invention of English Meters." *Studies in Philology* 101, no. 2 (April 1, 2004): 200–231.
- Thornton, A. H. F. "Horace's Ode to Calliope (III,4)." *AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 23 (1965): 96–102.
- Todd, F. A. "Virgil's Invocation of Erato." *The Classical Review* 45, no. 6 (December 1, 1931): 216–218.
- Uhlig, Anna S. "Review of: Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry. Corrected and with New Material. First Edition Published in 1972," May 25, 2009.  
<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-05-25.html>.
- Ulback, Edward. "The Sacred Groves of Latium and Their Divinities." *The Classical Journal* 29, no. 9 (June 1, 1934): 658–662.
- Ullman, B. L. "History and Tragedy." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 73 (January 1, 1942): 25–53.
- . "Horace and Tibullus." *The American Journal of Philology* 33, no. 2 (January 1, 1912): 149–167.

- Vessey, D. W. Thomson. "Pyrrha's Grotto and the Farewell to Love: A Study of Horace Odes 1.5." *The American Journal of Philology* 105, no. 4 (December 1, 1984): 457–469.
- Waterhouse, William C. "The Unnamed God of the Pyrrha Ode." *The Classical World* 80, no. 5 (May 1, 1987): 369–370.
- West, M. L. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2007.
- Whitby, Michael, Philip R. Hardie, and Mary Whitby, eds. *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*. Oak Park, IL.: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1987.
- Wilkinson, L. P. "Accentual Rhythm in Horatian Sapphics." *The Classical Review* 54, no. 3 (September 1, 1940): 131–133.
- Wills, Jeffrey. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Wilson, John R. "O Fons Bandusiae." *The Classical Journal* 63, no. 7 (April 1, 1968): 289–296.
- Winkes, Rolf, ed. *The Age of Augustus: Interdisciplinary Conference Held at Brown University, April 30-May 2, 1982*. Publications D'histoire de L'art et D'archéologie de l'Université Catholique de Louvain 44. Providence, R.I. : Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium: Center for Old World Archaeology and Art, Brown University ; Institut Supérieur d'Archéologie de d'Histoire de l'Art, Collège Érasme, 1985.
- Witke, Charles. *Horace's Roman Odes: A Critical Examination*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava 77. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
- Woodman, A. J. "The Craft of Horace in Odes 1. 14." *Classical Philology* 75, no. 1 (January 1, 1980): 60–67.
- Woodman, Tony, and Denis Feeney, eds. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Zielinski. "Marginalien I." *Philologus*, no. 60 (1901): 1–16.
- Zissos, Andrew. "Navigating Genres: Martial 7.19 and the 'Argonautica' of Valerius Flaccus." *The Classical Journal* 99, no. 4 (April 1, 2004): 405–422.
- Zumwalt, N. K. "Horace's 'Navis' of Love Poetry ('C.'1.14)." *The Classical World* 71, no. 4 (December 1, 1977): 249–254.