Arethusa 31.1 (1998) 43-74

Personal and Communal Memory in the Reading of Horace's *Odes,* Books 1-3 [1]

Eleanor Winsor Leach

Evocations of the River Tiber in flood figure conspicuously in the odes located next to the beginning and ending of Horace's three books. In both instances, the image creates anxieties. Ode 1.2 dramatizes the river's turbulence amidst an ominously tempestuous season to foreground public fears for the future of Rome. As readers, we watch (*vidimus*) the churning waters dashed back from the Janiculum bank leaving their channel and advancing towards the Forum to cast down the monuments of the kings and the sacred buildings of the Vestals (1.2.13-16). Ode 3.29 addresses Maecenas' personal obsession with Rome's welfare by comparing human anxieties with the seasonal alterations of the current between violence and tranquility (3.29.32-41). Thus the river that borders the city creates inner boundaries for Horace's three books.

This framing of the collection by a physical image establishes the city of Rome as the spatial framework of the poetry's experiences. The *monumenta regis templaque Vestae* of Ode 1.2 stand at the ancient center of **[End Page 43]** the city; Ode 3.29 positions Maecenas on some eminence with a view of the surrounding hills to marvel at the smoke and wealth and clamor that are *beata Roma* (3.29.6-12). Thus physical territory furnishes discursive space. But the two odes also embrace time in a number of ways. Rhetorically located in the immediacy of its historical moment, the action of the first vignette remains open-ended. As the Tiber turns threateningly towards the city, we see him cast suddenly as "the avenger of an overly complaining Ilia" (1.2.17-20). Fictive mythology distances the moment and immobilizes the action. With Jupiter "disapproving" of Tiber's "uxorious" partisanship, the flood itself disappears from the text, leaving the outcome of its menacing march ambiguously suspended. [2] By contrast, the vignette in Book 3 poses an end to its action within a context of natural time. Here we first see the river slipping quietly on its course to the Mare Etruscum; then, swollen, it roars through its channel laden with debris: worn stones and tree-stems, herds and houses, until the words *quietos amnis* make it subside again. No longer imbued with portentous significance, the flood has become an event within a natural cycle that leaves the city effectually unharmed. Appropriately, the picture of Rome in this Ode is not focussed within a moment of collective anxiety. In the very production of its characteristic smoke, riches, and clamor, the city is now fortunate (*beata*). Thus the second of the two poems, diminishing the urgency of its moment through a paradigm of familiar experience, gives a delayed resolution to the action left open-ended by the first.

Between the two vignettes, time has advanced by a progression of seasons. With its hail and thunder, the wintry flood of Ode 1.2 precedes spring, but Ode 3.29 evokes a parched summer landscape amidst which flocks and shepherds seek sheltering shade. Only the responsible mind of Maecenas, brooding on dangers at the borders of the empire, harbors anxieties that it is the poet's intention to dispel. [3] The *deus* who veils the **[End Page 44]** future laughs when mortal fears exceed just cause (3.29.29-33). Counseling equanimity, the poet heralds poetic closure. In the following Ode, he will proclaim the completion of his *monumentum* outlasting bronze but coterminous with the Capitoline, the pontifex, and a silent Vestal.

These symmetrically placed allusions with their ultimate sense of resolution suggest to me, as they have to many others, a concern for principles of unity underlying the diversity of the *Odes*. As a topic that has recently attracted much attention from Horatian scholars, the design of the *Odes* has been envisioned according to a variety of schemes: some symmetrical, some linear, and still others a blending of the two. [4] Based primarily on thematic cross-referencing, and highlighting the intricate verbal artistry of the

poems, the majority of such studies represent the poet as speaking to himself or to selected intimates--whose implied taste uncannily resembles the appreciative sensitivity of the modern literary critic. [5] While I scarcely want to deny the inexhaustible fascination to be derived from tracing the figures within the "mosaic of words," my effort here is to grasp a bigger picture, conceivably accessible to a larger Roman audience, that I believe the poems themselves define through modes of **[End Page 45]** temporal and topographical representation that appeal to common experience. [6] On the evidence of the historians, the year 23 B.C. that, by received opinion, saw the poems brought together as a collection, was a precarious one in the Augustan program, a year in which the *princeps'* endurance and ingenuity were tested not only by the rampages of the Tiber, but also by sickness and conspiracy. [7] With attention to subject rather than style, I intend to consider how the shape that Horace gave to the collection might have addressed the concerns of an audience in that year.

An item of scholarly revival furnishes my point of departure. In an essay that long antedates widespread interest in the ordered poetry collection, the nineteenth-century scholar A. W. Verrall found an organizing principle in a sequence of "historically based" poems that establish a frame for the reader's experience of the book (Verrall 1884.90-120). Verrall's "historically based" poems are those whose internal date--"the time at which the lyric speaker is supposed to speak"--establishes itself by reason of some conspicuous, publicly significant event that will have made an impression upon everyone's mind. To foreground the element of re-enactment in such poems, I prefer to think of their "internal dates" as "dramatic moments," but what I find important is Verrall's suggestion that these visible events, available to the contemporary reader through memory, stand out as temporal markers to be grasped in their relationship to the moment of reading. From this it follows that the collection itself may build a temporal structure that supplies an overarching pattern of continuity to unite its diverse topics and occasions. Verrall proposes such a continuity, which, as he sees it, is further enforced by the incorporation into each book of seasonal cycles procured by allusion and scene painting.

At this point, where it comes to specific dates and happenings, I part company from Verrall, whose notion of temporal structure replicates chronology by arranging the milestones of three decades in a progressive series that unfolds as an historical review of Augustus' stage-by-stage consolidation of power. [8] To my mind, the temporal structure, whose **[End Page 46]** conclusion is linked through topographical allusion to its beginning, is one that foregrounds the present by the force of rhetorical immediacy while revisiting the past to engage the reader as a member of the Roman community through the stimulus of social memory. That is also to say that the collection does not attempt to replicate historical time, but instead reformulates it. By building a sense of participation in shared historical memories, Horace develops a new means to embody the communal dimension traditional within the lyric genre as he had inherited it so as to convey a new form of cultural authorization upon his subject.

A few preliminary remarks brought together from recent theoretical writings about social memory are in order. Memory, however commonly conceived as a property of individual minds, has an inherently social aspect related to the circumstances and conduct of day-to-day life (Mitchell and Edmunds 1990.1-11). People acquire memories as members of society; memories of recent events seem to us fresh and coherent when we remain in the everyday presence of other persons involved in them. The passive retention of events in memory can be transferred into active recall by the stimulus of communal discourse. As the originator of the scholarly concept of collective memory, Maurice Halbwachs, observed, "the greatest number of personal memories come back to us when other persons recall them to us" (Halbwachs 1992.38). Similarly, communities or groups can influence the restructuring of memories. Remembering is a process of construction, not a retrieval of stored information, but the putting together of a claim about past states of affairs by means of a framework of shared cultural understanding (Radley 1990.46-47). Present experience shapes our interpretive construction of past events (Mitchell and Edmunds 1990.8). Thus individual memory operates within a variety of communal or institutional frames which determine its concerns in relation to their specific values and priorities. In addition to political communities, there are frameworks of family, of religion, of social class or tradition, and these contexts may determine not only what is remembered but also what is forgotten (Fentress and Wickham 1992.36). **[End Page 47]**

In its processes of subjective transformation, memory weakens the boundaries between self and the public world. Although events which are independent of oneself often appear memorable as narrative histories possessing their own causal-thematic structure, these may also be assimilated as episodes into the subjective chronology of an individual life story (Rubin 1986.138, Fentress and Wickham

1992.20-21). When did *you* hear about Caesar's assassination? The memory of an historically significant event may blend facts about the public circumstances wherein the event occurred and facts about the personal matrix in which the information was acquired (Rubin 1986.137). Both artefacts and places operate within the network of recollection. While public commemorations recommend historical events to individual perception, persons may also remember their engagement with material objects (Radley 1990.47). Likewise, local geography and familiar environments provide structures for remembrance moving outward from family to community (Fentress and Wickham 1992.113).

Upon this principle of visual and conceptual interassociation, Roman rhetorical writers based their "Art of Memory," a system intended to assist an orator in retaining the unified structure of his planned speech. This system taught the practitioner to construct an associative syntax by assigning idea value to "images" mentally distributed against visual back-grounds within an imagined framework of space. "An *aedes*, an intercolumniation, a corner, an arch" provided markers that could call the high points of an argument *seriatim* to mind. [9] The principle upon which the speaker is to select and arrange these pictorial backgrounds called *loci* is one of routine familiarity that will facilitate ready recall. Buildings, columns, and arches are stable products of culture appropriated through projection for the purpose of cultural reformulation. From this interaction of point and idea it is a natural move to the larger sense in which images function as generators of cultural memory (Küchler and Melion 1991.1-6). **[End Page 48]**

The interassociation of spatial and temporal organization observed in the processes of social memory can be seen as a cultural and psychological analogy to the diverse interfaces of space and time that Bakhtin, in *The Dialogic Imagination*, proposes as strategies that various literary genres have developed in order to achieve their characteristic semblances of reality, making time "artistically visible" and space "responsive to the movements of time, plot and history" (Bakhtin 1981.84-85, 136-37, 206-08). As treated in discussion of ancient genres oriented towards the evolution of the novel, such fusions of time and space are, of course, narrative constructions, but their development proceeds alongside that within non-narrative genres in the matter of locating and defining the sense of an individual life. Social and civic space are the framework within which Bakhtin's account of the evolution of autobiographical and biographical representation unfolds (Bakhtin 1981.108-10, 130-46).

Within this context, we may regard the assimilation of social memory into Horace's lyric discourse as mediating the integration of what Bakhtin calls the separate temporal sequences of individual life and historical events (Bakhtin 1981.216-17). The interassociation of place and historical event in Horace's boundary poems defines the visible Roman world as the context. Horace represents contemporary Augustan Rome in two ways: through its position as the geographical center of empire and through topographical allusion. Such representations belong to what Bakhtin calls the "real-life chronotope of the public square, the area where in ancient times the autobiographical and biographical self-consciousnesses were first laid bare and formed." [10] Within this "public square" of rhetorical autobiography, Horace undertakes that renegotiation of social bonding between speaker and audience that is his basis for the transformation of lyric. [11] In the concluding lines of Ode 1.1, the poet advances this self-defined **[End Page 49]** challenge as an appeal to the judgement of his dedicatee as audience (1.1.34-35: *quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres, sublimi feriam sidera vertice*). By the future tense of the verbs, he implies a deferred judgement. He has not yet appropriated the title of "lyric poet," but only made application for it to be granted by the receiver of his poems. Nor indeed, has he yet told us what the title signifies, but only remarked on the need for "segregating" (32) himself from the populace as symbolically represented by the social panorama that fills out the greater part of the poem. To achieve the identity of lyric poet demands something more than refining aesthetic skills; it requires the poet in dialogue with tradition to appropriate the position which Bruno Gentili calls one of leadership "in integrating the individual into his social context" (Gentili 1988.55). For such a position, Horace's Roman world supplied no previous model.

Greek lyric is a poetry of performance. [12] Several persons recently writing on the *Odes* have treated the Roman lyricist's bid to establish a social identity in appropriately rhetorical terms as a simulation of performance. Two approaches are useful to compare. The first is Ralph Johnson's notice of Horace's success in achieving "an overwhelmingly persuasive illusion of music for these spoken poems," and, through music, an illusion of performance (Johnson 1982.126-27). The other is Oswyn Murray's identification of sympotic occasions as among the primary frameworks for performance that Horace's situational rhetoric creates (Murray 1993.89-105). The Horace presented by both these scholars is aware of the role of the Greek lyric poet as a communal spokesman and is ambitious about executing the cultural self-transformation needed to fulfill that role, yet the two presentations differ in how they

define both the conduct of that role and its social parameters. Johnson, extrapolating the artist's point of view, characterizes an "Alexandrian" Horace who wants contrary things, "to be for Rome what Pindar and Simonides had been for Thebes, Sicily and **[End Page 50]** Aegina . . . and also to continue to perfect his difficult art and to protect his privacy and integrity" (Johnson 1982.131). As a backhanded proof of artistic integrity in poet and poems alike, Johnson cites the contemporary rhetorical "failure" of the *Odes*. Disappointed by his "inability to create an audience responsive to these literary lyrics," Johnson's romanticized Horace remains an isolated aesthete who comes to take refuge in poems of disenchantment and spiritual withdrawal. [13]

Murray, however, proceeds as a social historian investigating context and audience with reference to the social genesis of genres. "Born of historical circumstances as they transform human needs," genres derive their distinctive characters from differences of occasion and purpose. [14] This formulation allows for the persistence of "dead" genres upon the disappearance of their engendering circumstances as decontextualized artistic forms or "memory patterns," but it also recognizes the potential for a revivifying cross-cultural accommodation of a genre to new social contexts. Most valuable here is the idea that the poet's claim to engage in social dialogue can be seen as the effective structuring of a contextual reality. As Murray puts it, "the question of actual performance is subordinate to the deliberate intent to invoke the image of sympotic performance." [15] Accordingly, the sympotic spokesman may function as an impresario of contemporary cultural aspirations who is able to provide privileged contemporaries with their tickets of admission into Hellenic conviviality while concomitantly remaking the ritual characteristics of such occasions to reflect the realities of Roman society. **[End Page 51]**

Additionally, Murray proposes that Horace's Roman transformation of the sympotic genre furnishes the modern reader with an interpretive context within which to reconcile two aspects of Horace's persona often perceived as dichotomous: the *vates* of serious moral intent and the master of revels. When the lyric speaker calls for symposia to celebrate public events, the performative dimension is his way to recreate the vanished bond between himself and a community (Murray 1993.100-02). Thus sympotic performance, which is the reverse of privatization, can be seen as a Roman latter-day approximation of what Bakhtin, with reference to individual self-consciousness in classical Greece, called the "exterior depiction of autobiographical wholeness within the chronotope of the public square" (Bakhtin 1981.131-32).

Granted that Horace's mode of fictionalizing his occasions may indicate his effort to redefine a cultural context for his poems, the question remains of relating these simulations of performative interaction to the artifice of the poetic collection. By arranging a collection, the creator arbitrarily freezes a moment when the simulation of performance changes from mimesis into preservation. Although the arrangement does not preclude oral readings, and may even be seen to facilitate them through increased opportunities, it nonetheless distances these readings from the immediacy of an authorial presence. Murray (1993.95) speaks of publication, or preservation, as an alternative Roman mode of performance that is only one step beyond circulating the poem to a wider group than the primary one, but, in fact, the compilation of the collection is a final, absolute occasion--a "death of the speaker," one might say, in the form of his enrollment among dead authors.

Enrollment among dead authors is in itself an act of imitation because collections are the form in which the poet has received and confronted his predecessors. His papyrus rolls of Alcaeus, Anacreon, Sappho have enabled him to reconstruct the vocal identities that, in turn, enable his dialogues with the past. [16] Insofar as these dialogues have occurred within single poems they are themselves aspects of performance: moments of textual intersection where the transformation of words engages **[End Page 52]** the historical-social context. As Kristeva noted in her own adaptation of Bakhtinian principles, when text enters into earlier text through the historical moment, then history itself becomes a part of textuality. The relationship is necessarily dialogic (Kristeva 1980.61). But the fabrication of a collection complicates dialogue since its composite nature is a point where individual intertexualizations, single poems in the Alcaean, Anacreontic, Sapphic modes, engage in a composite intertextual relationship with a collective lyric past.

Similarly, the transmutation of performance complicates historical dialogue. By its heterodox juxtapositions of individual poems, the collection allows the diverse performative voices its speaker employs--host, patron, lover, *amicus, vates*--to challenge each other's authenticity and compete for authority. [17] Likewise, the dramatic occasions challenge each other for supremacy. Hierarchies are

dishonored and boundaries dissolved as public ceremonies contrast with symposia, sexual negotiations compete with political. This intermingling of public and private voices and subjects is an aspect of Horace's often discussed *recusationes*, the ostensible disclaimers that many contemporary scholars have come to view as a cross-referencing of genres. [18]

From the accumulation of addressees, an expanded audience enters into the collection bringing with it such a diversity of experiences and points of view as to offer each and every reader a potential position with which to identify. Being at one moment the spectator of a public action, at another the reader becomes the captive voyeur of a private **[End Page 53]** confession through which he may recognize shared experience. From this competition of performances played out before an enlarged collective audience, new points of intersection between literary and historical textuality must be formulated. No longer vested in the temporal consciousness of the poet but transferred to that of the audience, they cease to be moments with a clear temporal definition. Temporal consciousness entering into the structures of poems themselves in actions of remembering and forgetting blurs the order of history by establishing private points of reference. Both personal and public calendars measure the passage of time; it is marked by cycles of the seasons, by festivals and anniversaries, by departures and returns, and, above all, by contrasts of youth and age. [19]

Through the interplay of public moments and subjective awareness, the lyric speaker draws his communal audience into a dialogue with memory, revisiting history and constructing the experience of the personal "I" as a model for examining the manner in which the present acts upon and transforms the past. By this method, the poet addresses the immediate contemporary issue of adjustment to change that variable human politics has imposed upon the natural flow of time. This need is shared by members of his audience across the various circles in which he will have moved and, therefore, it is also a need which the collection as a whole may be thought to answer. [20]

Chronology

In turning to the practical part of this paper that concerns itself with specific functions of time and place within Horace's structure of memory, I must reinvoke the long-standing philological question of the dating of the *Odes* as an effort towards surmounting the distance between ourselves and a Roman audience. How teasingly their multiple references **[End Page 54]** to events and persons can provoke a modern reader's desire to know their historical grounding is evidenced by the extensive speculation about dates and alternative dates filling the pages of Nisbet and Hubbard's commentaries on Books 1 and 2, but curiosity on this point deserves more respect from the standpoint of literary interpretation than the frequently applied label of "positivism" concedes to it. Is it only an illusion of history Horace gives us? An illusion doubly falsified by the projection of dramatic urgency: *"Iam satis terris." "Quid dedicatum possit Apollinem vates?" "Nunc est bibendum." "Albi ne doleas." "Poscimur." "Quo me, Bacchis, rapis, tui plenum?"* Words cannot more insistently seize a moment. Yet where do we locate the moment within the continua of history, of personal consciousness, of the collection?

Granted that Horace's contemporary audiences will have possessed factual knowledge that escapes us, all the same, our separation from these audiences should seem less if we allow for the part that reconstructive memory may also have played in their informed responses. Such reconstruction, I suggest, bears a relationship to event that is comparable to the relationship between performance and text. To consider that the *Odes* are not embodiments of events but rather exhortations to recollect them should not induce us to throw away our commentaries, but rather to scrutinize them even more carefully while asking somewhat different questions. In the pages that follow, I want to demonstrate my idea of how such questions may work, first, by reading two Odes whose temporal groundings have always seemed problematic and then following this with a brief outline of patterns--historical, seasonal, and personal--that engage an individual reader's sense of shared participation in a dialogue of remembrance with the speaking voices of the *Odes*.

Ode 1.2

Following directly after the timeless Roman social panorama of the introductory poem, Ode 1.2 plunges its reader into recent history through the associative fluidity of memory. By its urgent opening words, *iam satis*, the first stanza obtains rhetorical immediacy that it intensifies by descriptive *enargeia* and by repetition: *terruit urbem / terruit gentes*. Caught up in the barrage of rough hail and fierce lightning, the

reader may not immediately inquire why *terruit*, in company with the parallel verbs *misit* and *vidimus,* appears in the past tense, but the question has seemed worth asking to generations of scholars who have debated both the dramatic **[End Page 55]** and the compositional dates of the poem. The ancient commentator Porphyry explained the thunderbolts threatening the *arces* as those very same portents of 44 B.C. presaging the murder of Caesar that had already achieved literary remembrance in Vergil's *Georgics*. Verrall (1884.95) followed this precedent in proposing a date between 40-36 B.C. for the poem in the belief that Horace's historical record of the era ought logically to commence with its beginning, but Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.17 correct the historical picture by pointing out that no floods are recorded for this more distant date, while several occurred closer to the time of Horace's publication.

Historians' notices show what options were available to the Roman reader. In January of 27 B.C., according to Dio Cassius, the Tiber flooded three days after Octavian had relinquished his extraordinary powers and accepted the name Augustus (53.20.1-2). As soothsayers interpreted it, this event was a benevolent sign that presaged his supreme command of the city, but favorable interpretations were less possible for the floods occurring in 23 and 22 which were followed by plague and famine. In the second of these years, thunderbolts did strike objects in the city, including Augustus' own statue at the Pantheon. In the summer of 23, Augustus recovered from the illness that came near to ending his regime and took thought for potential crises of leadership in the future. He resigned his consulship in July appointing the one-time Republican L. Sestius in his place, but he also appropriated life-time tribunician powers for himself (Dio Cassius 53.2-6). In 22, the plebs demanded his supervision of the grain distribution. Perhaps it is because these later instances of flood were so inauspicious that Nisbet and Hubbard omit their dates from consideration, yet this very inauspiciousness might well serve to give them first place in a reader's mind. The commentators themselves open the door to such possibilities when they judiciously refrain from final arbitration among the options for dating with the suggestion that a "poet may compress a series of events and even distort their order . . . not describing the attitudes of a moment but summarizing the fears and hopes of several years" (Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.18).

This formulation describes very accurately how the Ode engages the reader in a process of recall that is the first step to his reconstructing his own intermingled public and subjective memories within the ambivalent time frame of the book. While the immediacy of the speaker's rhetoric seems to dramatize a flood in progress, or still fresh in memory (23 or 22 B.C.), this portentous moment fades into indefinite past time by evoking memories of previous floods that had similarly been taken to mark crises **[End Page 56]** and turning points in the fortunes of the state. Once mythological personification has halted the action of the flood on the verge of the Forum, as it were, another kind of temporal indefiniteness enters into the poem in the seemingly dislocated tenses *audiet . . . audiet* that project the screech of sharpening steel as a sound of Civil War into the ears of the future (21-24). The past, it seems, is not over as the Vestals perceive their goddess' increasing weariness of their prayers. But the poem does reach an ingenious solution for the future when Mercury assumes Octavian's form "enduring to be called *Caesaris ultor*." [21] Many scholars have felt compelled to construct apologies for the encomiastic note they perceive in these lines. [22] In fact, the divine identification is not eulogy, but an allusion to Augustus' practical strategy in adopting permanent tribunician powers and therefore becoming, like the god Mercury himself, an official patron of the plebs. [23] By this reference, the poem finally establishes its dramatic moment in the present, 23-22 B.C., after Augustus has restructured his political role-taking.

Ode 1.37

The Cleopatra Ode is different because it is the primary example of a poem whose critical event had incontestably occurred some years before publication of the collection. With its opening call to convivial celebration--*nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero / pulsanda tellus*--it is conventionally taken to enshrine the dramatic moment when the news of Octavian's victory reached Rome. From this perspective, however, there appears a peculiar distortion in its accelerated recital of events that eclipses the year filled both with military action and with diplomatic negotiations that intervened between Actium and the fall of Alexandria. The factual imprecision seems less conspicuous if the festival occasion can be imagined **[End Page 57]** in a later year, perhaps at the dedication of the Palatine temple of Apollo in 28 that Ode 31 has just commemorated or during any of the repeated August anniversaries of Actium. [24] Propertius' poem 4.6 marking such an Actian anniversary celebration includes a poetic symposium. Most important, however, is the manner in which the poem, within the temporal structure of the collection, appropriates its commemorative function by a rhetoric of immediacy.

As an historical recollection modelled upon an Alcaean occasion, the death of the tyrant Myrtilus, [25] the poem strikes a communal note by its symposiast evocation. Its address to *sodales* carries implications of colleagueship and consensual opinion that may even remind us of Alcaeus' lyrical politics. Perhaps we should even take seriously our speaker's invocation of members of the elite religious brotherhood of the Salii as an approximation of Alcaeus' like-minded sympotic fellowship. [26] The legitimating urgency of the gerundives signals release, and is reinforced by the image of the free foot striking the earth, but this festive release is constructed as a return to some temporarily suspended former status. To legitimize the drinking of wine from ancestral cellars is to reestablish continuity with an interrupted past.

Since the period of anxiety (*antehac*) has passed, its sensations can only be reconstructed by narrative, yet retrospective narrative purporting to represent social memory entails simplification and narrowing of focus: the process in which, as theorists observe, the sharp outlines of events become blurred and lose their factuality. [27] Portraits of Cleopatra structure the account. Nilotic decadence confronts Roman energy. In a New Critical exegesis that highlighted the antithetical operations of the imagery, **[End Page 58]** Steele Commager admired the way in which Horace's language engaged historical interpretation. His essentially structuralist reading traced a "moral progress" in the narrative as Cleopatra's unreal world of fantasy, conveyed by images of drunkenness, disease, and delusion, yields to the realistic terror of Caesar's pursuit, but also he remarked how the interweaving of images in the simile of hunter and quarry turns Caesar's *fatale monstrum* into harmless prey. [28] The transformation is indeed dramatically abrupt, but also intertextually complicated. It involves the politicization of a traditionally erotic image--*venator* and *leporem*--that Horace himself had once employed for the lover and the elusive object of his desire. But if the erotic quarry is elusive, no less is this *monstrum* Cleopatra, whose refusal to wear her pursuer's chains leaves political desire also unsatisfied. One might ask whether the succession of interpretive images here is scripted for one voice or many and whether the poet speaks his candid opinion or reproduces some kind of publicly circulated speech. On the side of outspoken candor, Commager argues that Horace has rendered Caesar unheroic, that Cleopatra triumphs in the face of his victory. Similarly, Murray sees the literary distancing of the sympotic convention as permitting the poet to express real admiration for Caesar's heroic opponent (Murray 1993.99). The tradition of noble enemies is long-standing and Gregson Davis regards this same turn of thought as an encomiastic strategy that executes a dialectical reversal to procure the heroization of Cleopatra needed to heroize Augustus (Davis 1991.238).

All these readings appear naive when placed beside Ralph Johnson's argument that the image of the courageous enemy and thwarted triumph incarnated Augustus' own sponsored version of events with a coloring that greatly oversimplified the deviousness of his own negotiations and the **[End Page 59]** potential dangers of bringing a living Cleopatra to Rome. For Horace sincerely to have swallowed such propaganda runs contrary, as Johnson sees it, not only to his own, but also to Commager's idealization of Horace's artistry. Thus Horace "neither believed nor condoned nor constructed," but "ridiculed and dismissed." [29] To pursue Johnson's line of argument further, this reading of the Ode as a performative charade might sharpen our sense of the reformulation of meaning contingent upon the interaction of memory and time. Each reader's right answer seems inevitably to be a personal construction, but whatever the specifics of these answers, the act of recreating the story in the present moment reveals the surprisingly variable chameleon coloring of the past.

Historical Time

Consideration of the manner in which these poems telescope immediate and remembered experience raises a larger question of the function of chronology within the books. Should the placement of the Cleopatra Ode at the end of the first book be considered primarily as a thematic choice, or does it serve as some kind of temporal marker signalling the backwards drifting of memory itself? For a schematic approximation of the trajectory that readers' memories might follow, I have noted on the appended chart as many dates as historical evidence furnishes with reasonable probability. From this outline, it should appear that poems referring to specific historical actions do loosely describe a chronological pattern, although it is not the progressively narrative pattern that Verrall suggested. Rather, by beginning and ending with the immediate historical year, chronological allusion brings the collection full circle and reinforces that symmetrical outline inscribed by the Tiber vignettes. Thus what has been called Horace's poetic journey may be seen as a reconstructive journey into remembered time. **[End Page 60]**

First, the initial poems of Book 1 foreground a dramatic date for the collection in a year when Augustan

political affairs had not run smoothly. Such a year of flood, plague, and famine will surely have involved the ordinary Roman citizen in fears for his community. The rhetoric of the poem gives voice to such fears while its structure operates to assuage them within a broader historical perspective. Thus, as I have suggested, the chronological ambiguities of Ode 1.2 offer the possibility of assimilating its Tiber flood to previous occurrences as one in a series of coincidences between natural phenomena and political crises. That the reader should ultimately be certain that the event belongs to the current moment of 23/22 B.C. is suggested by the dedication of Ode 4 to L. Sestius, an ideologically unreconstructed follower of Brutus, whom Augustus had appointed consul suffectus upon his own resignation of the office during that year. [30] The poem itself tempers exuberance with caution. While its initial springtime vignettes proclaim release, the liberation is soon counterbalanced by images of restraint. A myrtle garland "shackles" the brow (*impedire caput*). In Vulcan's workshop, the Cyclopes are forging thunderbolts (4.7-9). Faunus demands a youthful victim, and the poet invokes a sudden apparition of Death to restrain long hopes.

After this seasonal poem there follows a gap in the series of clear public occasions, although the dates of certain personal events mentioned will obviously have been remembered by those who experienced them. Ode 1.20 offers Maecenas a wine laid down when he received applause in the theater [31] and 1.24 pleads with Vergil to cease from protracted mourning for Quintilius. These two exhortations, the one to retain and revive the past, the other to relinquish it, may alert the reader to a retrospective drifting of temporal consciousness. When publicly conspicuous events re-enter the book, we find that their dramatic dates have moved backward into past time. First comes Iccius' projected departure on the Arabian expedition of 26/25 (Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.338). In Ode 31, the poet contemplates the newly dedicated Temple of Apollo (28 B.C.) and, in its companion piece **[End Page 61]** Ode 32, he calls upon his lyre to perform *Latinum carmen* in an Alcaean mode. Ode 35 entreats the goddess Fortuna of Antium to favor Caesar's projected expeditions to Britain and the East in 27/26. Finally, the victory celebration of 1.37 closes the book by re-enacting an inaugural moment whose events, subsequently recreated by a succession of anniversaries, can now be seen subjectively with the variable colors of meaning that intervening history has given them.

Opening with an even further reaching retrospective, Book 2 obtains a double vision of immediate and past time by its stunning evocation of Asinius Pollio's Civil War history. Perhaps, as Quinn speculates, Horace imagined an actual reading from the history (Quinn 1980.197 ad 17-24), but whatever the occasion, the poem graphically dramatizes the force of *enargeia* in awakening memory and, by this same token, warns against such revivals. The undisguisedly perilous act of recreation is comparable to treading on fires beneath covering ash (2.1.7-8). Pollio's severe, tragic Muse is only on vacation from the stage. Horace's concluding invitation to enter the Dionean cavern--certainly a Julian place as much as an erotic one--brings Pollio back to the present world that the remainder of Book 2 proceeds to display in a synchronic and celebratory manner. The preponderance of poems in direct address, many of them hortatory, but others teasing, suggests a performative model for the entire book in the simulation of a symposium at which the host pays compliments to his many guests. [32] Prominent persons appear, several obliged to Augustus for their pardons. [33] A beneficiary of lesser status is Horace's friend Pompeius, a *commilito* in the army of Brutus, whose sudden reappearance from exile prompts another retrospective view of the Civil Wars, this time including the speaker's own fiction of personal salvation (2.7). [34] The recurrent exhortation to savor present advantages, the *carpe diem* motif so often characterized as low-grade philosophy, tends to place emphasis on the quality of life to be enjoyed in the Augustan moment. Culture, both literary and material, is foregrounded. Wars, however, are remote, and the **[End Page 62]** focus is on the good order of the Augustan world. The moment itself is located close to 25 B.C. by three allusions: one to the poet's own age nearing 40 (2.4) and two to the unconquered Cantabri against whom Augustus was planning a campaign during that year (2.6, 2.11). To this same year might also belong the poet's alleged narrow escape in 2.13 from a falling tree on his Sabine property, a story told once and soon after recapitulated (2.17) as proof of the poet's favored status with fortune. [35]

These same Cantabri make it possible to assign somewhat later dramatic dates to certain poems in Book 3. Still "unmastered" in 2.6 and *bellicosus* in 2.11, they are represented in 3.8 as "recently brought into chains." [36] Soon afterwards, Ode 3.14 hails the safe, if not unequivocally triumphant, return of Augustus from the Cantabrian Wars. [37] The celebration, which took place on 13 August of 24 B.C. was a splashy event in connection with which Augustus offered a donation to the plebs (Dio Cassius 52.28), the constituency to which the poem itself is appropriately addressed. In fact, this partially successful

provincial campaign seems to take over from those never completed expeditions of 27/26 against Britain or Parthia anticipated by the prayer to the Fortune of Antium of Ode 1.35. [38] When the poet, in 3.8, celebrates the anniversary of his escape from the falling tree, his autobiographical chronology fixes time in relationship to Book 2, adding an implicit narrative dimension to the progress of the collection. Mention, in 3.27, of a wolf running down from the Lanuvian fields might remind readers of the recent capture of a wolf within the city that Dio Cassius mentions as a portent preceding the inauspicious events of 23 B.C. (53.33). According to Porphyry, the source of Maecenas' anxiety in 3.29 was his responsibilities as urban **[End Page 63]** prefect at the moment of writing, which, if true, would locate the poem during one of Augustus' absences. [39]

Seasonal and Personal Time

The interactive engagement of public and private events in this historical retrospect is facilitated by two complementary modes of representing temporal passage: through the recurrence of seasons and the awareness of advancing age. Subject to certain modifications, Verrall's perception of seasonal cycles as a measure of time was accurate. These cycles play two roles; on the one hand, they link history and human affairs and, on the other, they move the reader through the collection. Attention to the often pathetic link between natural processes and alterations in human life is among Commager's major contributions to reading the *Odes*. He perceived these themes as occasional, however, rather than as an aspect of Horace's underlying "plot" (Commager 1962.365-91).

Two kinds of notation designate seasons: one, the alterations of nature itself, the other, the civic measure of religious festivals. In Book 1, the natural predominates. The introductory sequence, often termed the "Parade Odes" because of their metrical display, also unfolds a sequence of seasons. After the late winter storms of Ode 1.2, the opening of navigation in Ode 3 heralds spring, which advances further in the rural vignettes of the fourth poem. Then Ode 5, with its grotto and garlanded lovers, followed by the snowy, stormy prospects of 9 and 11, continue the progress of seasons into winter while advocating equanimity in anticipation of the future. [40] Late summer closes the book. Augustus' triple triumph had taken place in mid-August, while the annual celebrations of the Apollo temple took place on 1 August. August will be advancing towards autumn when the speaker of the epilogue orders his attendant to stop seeking out the late, lingering rose.

Seasonal references do not play a conspicuous role in Book 2, where poems, even those including topographical or landscape vignettes, seem to unfold in a kind of timeless present, [41] and a similar timelessness surrounds the Roman Odes, but directly after these poems there follows in 3.8 **[End Page 64]** a specific calendar reference to the Matronalia on the Kalends of March. The bachelor Horace appropriates this festival and gives it personal significance as the anniversary of his escaping the nefarious tree. Between Odes 3.7 to 3.19, Verrall found a complete cycle of seasons closely following the calendar from late winter to the *nova luna* of another year. [42] In fact, a concentration of ceremonial occasions, both sympotic and sacrificial, occurs from 13-23. The majority lack precise temporal attributions. Augustus' Cantabrian triumph, however, took place on 13 August and Henderson, in connection with the dedication and sacrifice of a pig to Diana in 3.22, has proposed a coincidence between the Augustan anniversary and the festival of Aventine Diana (Henderson 1995.134-37). Since the penultimate poems are clearly situated in summer months, the entire book might seem to encompass two years: Ode 3.28 celebrates the Neptunalia of 23 July and the Maecenas Ode vividly pictures the Dog Star season. Shepherd and flock seek shade and a stream, yet even on the river bank no breezes stir. For the reader, vicariously baking in the hot sun of the Campagna, the recollection of spring floods signifies the advance of the year. Some readers have seen the invitation of poem 29 as a long-standing one that Maecenas had not yet accepted. If so, it would enforce the circularity of time.

With the anniversary reprise in Ode 3.8 of Horace's escape from the Sabine tree, as we also have encountered it 2.13 and 2.17, the book enters into still another mode of time counting that is self-referential by the measure of its own calendar. This form of interior retrospection heralds the completion of the collection. When festivals are linked with the poet's own life, then the progress of seasons will also carry reminders of advancing age. Two first-person erotic poems, with their professions of experienced detachment from youthful passion, reinforce this self-reflexive consciousness of time. [43] Historical event and personal time unite with memory in 3.14 as the poet commands his own personal victory celebration, musing that he is no longer the hot-headed youth he was in the consulship of Plancus. When the speaker of 3.26 relinquishes the *arma* of his successful erotic soldiery, all previous

love poems become part of an (almost) outgrown past. Some events in the life of a man or a wine-jar, however, can occur only once. With their stamped **[End Page 65]** consular dates, the jars also inscribe history, and the opening of Massic from the poet's birth year in honor of Messala Corvinus entails a consummation of time. Finally, the detachment gained through experience colors the penultimate poem in which the seasonal fluctuations of the Tiber figure as the model for philosophical patience. With its assertion that whatever swift hours have carried away passes beyond any power of misfortune to infect, the ode supports the integrity of personal memory (3.29.45-48).

From the perpetual recreation of time and event through memory rises the triumphant paradox of the epilogue *monumentum aere perennius*. Now the poet lives remembered by the reception of his poems (7-8: *ego postera / crescam laude recens*)--a life that is coterminous with the ritual life of the city. *Dum Capitolium / scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex*. Perishable mortals perform traditional offices. As the succession of anonymous figures perpetuates ritual, likewise we may understand that performance extending beyond the living presence of the speaker recreates his memory within the *annorum series*. At the same time, this bond with the physical monuments of the city would seem to undercut the initial claim of the intangible *monumentum* to outlast the tangible, unless we understand that the collection itself has come to contain the city not only as the space of social memory for its immediate audience, but also as the medium in which its life and institutions will be preserved.

It is interesting that Wallace-Hadrill has specified the control of time through regularization of the calendar as one aspect of Augustus' new centralization of power because time in the *Odes* is not Augustan time as measured by calendar or by sundial. [44] Unpredictably, Ovid became the poet to codify this official and public version of time. Even when state holidays are included, Horace's measures of time remain centered within the experiencing subject. By sharing with his readers the inevitable entanglement of history and personal life, he invites each individual's reconstruction of past experience. The linking of personal events with public life may even suggest changing relationships between individual and state of which Horace, whose poetic *auctoritas* was indebted to the system, was a primary example.

Indiana University

Table: Times and Seasons in Horace's Odes, Books 1-3.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented in March 1993 at the Princeton University Colloquium "The Roman Cultural Revolution." I wish to thank Professors Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro, the program organizers, and the Princeton Classics Department for the hospitality of that conference. Subsequent versions were presented at Bristol (with thanks to Professors Susanna Morton Braund of Royal Holloway College in the University of London and Charles Martindale, University of Bristol) and at the University of Pennsylvania (with thanks to Professors Joseph Farrell and Ralph Rosen). While writing this paper, I was a Fellow at the National Humanities Center in Research Triangle Park; the theme of "social memory" is an appropriate tribute to the stimulating collegiality of the Center.

2. Partly, the diversion afforded the reader by such humorous characterizations arrests the progress of the flood. I pass over the whimsical allusions in vss. 6-8 to the mythological flood when Pyrrha complains of *nova monstra* and Proteus leads his amphibious flock to the mountain tops. Especially, the implied tourism of *pecus egit altos / visere montes* undercuts the dire solemnity of the initial storm scene. While many scholars have criticized Horace's levity as a lapse of poetic decorum, a few have understood its qualifying effect, most recently Parker 1992.291-302. As he puts it, Horace turns the flood from a literal into a literary event.

3. The historical reasons for his uneasiness are uncertain. It is suggested that Augustus had placed him in charge of the city while in Spain. Pucci 1988.80-87 revives a suggestion of Verrall (1884.26ff.) that Maecenas was experiencing genuine danger in the aftermath of Licinius Murena's apprehension for conspiracy.

4. Santirocco 1986.5 argues that the heterogeneity of the collection must be respected, but also draws an analogy between the structural principles on which the individual ode is built and those operative in the creation of the larger collection (174-75). Porter 1987.6-8 has characterized the development of the

book with resort to the metaphor of a journey to indicate a certain narrative progress towards artistic or social discovery. He describes a "unified series . . . a narrative in which the protagonist moves from a sense of deep insecurity--about Augustus, about his poetry, above all about himself--to a sense of assurance." Two recently published studies conduct freer-ranging explorations of unity by focussing upon the repetition of culturally charged themes: Miller 1994.141-68 approaches the interaction of public and private discourses in "lyric consciousness" theoretically in studying how Horace's structural and thematic concerns engender "an open-ended dialectic between the poems themselves, their social context and the reader who strives to understand them." Henderson 1995.103-51 explores the ramifications of sacrifice in 3.22 as paradigmatic of the way in which "the dynamic stability of cultural order is embodied in the reticulation of habits, all our little deals with ourselves, and our big deals with the world."

5. Porter 1987.49-55 exemplifies the complexity in his exposition of thematic correspondences based upon concentric symmetry. Miller 1994.144 assesses the search for patterns as "more often represent[ing] the reader's will to fix a variegated and diverse group of poems within the confines of a preconceived pattern than the real complexity of Horace's collection." Thus, as he concludes, "there are virtually as many patterns of arrangement operative in the *Odes* as there are trajectories of reading."

6. Edmunds 1992.41 observes, as a preliminary to reconstructing a Roman "horizon of expectations," that detailed interpretation of single poems was not an ancient mode of experiencing poetry.

7. Syme 1985.385 notes how much confidence in the present order was needed that year in the face of Augustus' nearly fatal illness and the conspiracy of Licinius Murena.

8. Verrall 1884.93-94. "The event," as he puts it, "in one sense spread over many years and developed in several stages, in another sense was consummated on a single day, the day of Octavian's triumphant entry into Alexandria, the final overthrow of his last rivals." The readings he uses to establish this chronology often deny the obvious, as when he insists that Odes 1.31 and 32 cannot refer to the dedication of the Palatine Temple of Apollo, since the time span of Book 1 is from 44 b.c. to the Battle of Actium. Instead, he pins these Odes to the dedication of Asinius Pollio's library as an occasion creating the first demand for a "truly national lyric poetry" (1884.112-13).

9. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 3.16.29-20.32. Later, Quintilian recommends that one follow the order of spaces and decorations within an atrium, but, alternatively, to trace a path through a city. Contemporary scholars frequently invoke the artificial memory system as a paradigm of Roman proclivities towards conceptualizing visual experiences. Leach 1988.74-79 discusses the system as evidence of a Roman facility for building mental images of landscape; Fentress and Wickham 1992.11-12 refer to it as an elaborate demonstration of the self-conscious cultivation of memory. Favro 1993.232-35 invokes the importance of memory systems within rhetorical education as a basis for her discussion of the interrelationship between monument and idea in Augustus' ideological urban landscape.

10. Bakhtin 1981.131-40. Presumably he does not mean literal autobiography. Horace does not employ what Bakhtin defines as the Roman mode of autobiography, based upon the structure of the family, but he does use the chronology of his works as a means of shaping a personal history. Davis 1991.78 discusses his autobiographical mythologizing.

11. Bakhtin 1981.142-43 cites Horace as one example of an alteration of consciousness from public to private self that occurred in the Roman Republic and Empire, with emphasis on the parodic treatment of public and heroic forms within contexts of "ironic autobiography," as well as a new importance given to the details of a personal life, as seen in Cicero's *Letters*. Of course these formulas are more appropriate to the *Satires* than to the *Odes* where only the amatory experience is ironic and the sense of an autobiographical self is developed within the framework of a dialogue with the literary past. Miller 1993.183-85 discusses the general problem of adapting Bakhtin's observations to other genres, and especially lyric.

12. In commenting on this well-known fact, Feeney 1993.55 remarks not only on the difficulty of the challenge that Horace set himself, but also on the way in which scholarship has turned his boldness to disadvantage, "loading the dice" against him by recalling the "spontaneity, sincerity, the organic social setting" and the "perennial lure of the original, the natural, and (perhaps most formidable of all) the oral." "It is most striking," he observes, "that the most robustly anti-Romantic readers of Horace are

remarkably Romantic in their reading of Greek lyric."

13. Johnson 1982.129. The notion that Horace's *Odes* received a disappointing reception is a commonly accepted reading of *Epistles* 1 and 19 (e.g., Fraenkel 1957. 310, 350; Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.xxxvii), a reading that some scholars have recently challenged as a misconstruction. Shackleton Bailey 1982.49-51 questions the attribution of such attitudes as "anger" and "bitterness" as being averse to the self-praising tone of *Ep*. 19. Smith 1984.255-72 demonstrates by his detailed reading of this epistle that the nature of poetic imitation is the real issue.

14. Murray 1993.90. From this point of view, he notes, literature constitutes itself "as a form of ritual, a response to the human desire for regularities and for the communication of shared experience."

15. Murray 1993.94-95. Similarly, and with specific reference to odes of Book 4, Nagy 1994.415-17 places Horace within a tradition of lyric performance that he defines as a mimesis or re-enactment of the entire series of dramatic occasions that are his poetic predecessors with one qualification: "following the pattern of Alexandrian poetics, the occasion might not be 'real'--to the extent that there need not be a real performance. Still, the occasion is presented by the poet as absolute, and it is indeed 'real' on the strength of that presentation."

16. On these collections as received from Alexandrian editing, see Santirocco 1986.6-13. More recently, Feeney 1993.42-43 reminds us, by citing names and counting papyrus rolls, of "the monumental scale of the body of work he had to contend with." That one aspect of the linear progress of the collection is to show the poet's development of vocal identity through a dialogue with the traditional contents of lyric and the roles played by lyric poets of the past is an idea recently developed in detail by Davis 1991 and by Feeney 1993.43 who rejects the commonly employed terms "influence" and "imitation" as inappropriate descriptions of the complex and interactive relationship that Horace conducts with his predecessors. Miller 1994.150-51 comments on the ideological and temperamental transformation attending Horace's "reinvention" of Alcaeus who "becomes [his] ideal predecessor only by not being Alcaeus."

17. Many scholars regard Horace's voice as unitary, but Lowell Edmunds 1992.44 formulates a useful distinction between the reading of an individual poem, which shows more about the speaker than about Horace, and the sequential reading, which, in producing a series of "Horaces," will show more about the Horace behind the single poem.

18. It is surprising how recently this idea has come into play. Fraenkel 1957.220-21 regards the refusal as straightforward. Zetzel 1982 is a key argument. Davis 1991.28-29, coining the term "generic disavowal" for the figure known as *recusatio*, explains very precisely its function as a form of assimilation. It is, "the preliminary gauntlet in a highly sophisticated dialectical strategy. The speaker begins with a deferral and ends with a synthesis."

19. Henderson 1995.134-37 likewise considers the complex interrelationship between cultural and biological time measurements as a pervasive element of Horace's continuity, characterizing the poet as a *vates* who "re-plays the atavistic 'tribal' role of the poet-priest charged with a new temporality; he embodies the declaration of 'the right moment' ordained from on high to integrate all life's activities; he stands in for the power to determine the regulation of the homeorhythms to which must be geared all planning in each domain, all thinking at every level."

20. Syme 1986.382-93 discussing *nobiles* in the *Odes* indicates the inclusion of many who were disaffected.

21. In 22, the storms were more violent and followed by a shortage of grain; the plebs demonstrated in favor of Augustus.

22. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.34-37 summarize the written and visual evidence that such an identification existed and offer their own apologia: "Horace's words show blurred traces of the eastern belief in a divine savior."

23. Livy 2.27.4 highlights the dedication of the Temple of Mercury (495 b.c.) amidst the on-going struggle of patricians and plebeians. When the consuls quarrel over the privilege of dedication, the

choice goes to the populace who are to select a man suitable to preside over the *annona*, to be a supporter of the collegia, and to stand in for the Pontifex. A plebeian is chosen.

24. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.412 ad vs. 3 cite *fasti Amiternini inscr. Ital.* 13.2.25 making reference to this holiday celebration of deliverance established *ex senatus consultu*.

25. Alcaeus 322. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.411 see the imitation primarily as a cue to the reader that the tyrant is dead.

26. Since Horace cannot himself have belonged to the Salic brotherhood, the tendency has been to understand the address with some latitude of application, but it might be taken to characterize the poem's fictive speaker as a member of the group. Their elite status and traditional contributions to public ceremony have recently been reconsidered by Zorzetti 1991.316-17.

27. Fentress and Wickham 1992.47-48: "Social memories are conventionalized as transmitted to an entire group." Murray 1993.99 finds the sympotic convention in itself a form of distancing. Gurval 1995 examines the contribution of Augustan propaganda to this distancing. Reassessing both material and written evidence for the emphasis Augustus gave to Actium, he challenges commonly held opinions by proposing a certain propaganda of silence or suppression that deferred to the negative implications of victory in Civil War. With specific reference to Horatian retrospective concerning Actium, he observes the dramatization of anxiety rather than the elevation of triumph in *Epode* 9 (137-59) and notes (160-61) the perfunctory mention of the battle in Ode 1.37.

28. Commager 1962.88-91. New light is cast upon this passage by Hendry 1993.143-46 who identifies a source for the phrase *fatale monstrum* in Cicero's *De Divinatione* 1.98 with reference to an androgyne, but this background does not diminish the incongruity of Cleopatra's transformation into a bunny-rabbit, nor does it banish the competing associations of the image with erotic contexts, especially Callimachus *Epigram* 33 and Horace *Sat*. 1.2.105.

29. Johnson 1967.399; Wyke 1992 challenges this anti-propagandist interpretation from a feminist point of view. Inquiring into the reasons for the "ideological potency" of the queen, she investigates a number of generally neglected angles on Cleopatra such as her employment of Ptolemaic strategies for empowering women as benevolent rulers and the Greco-Roman iconology of defeated female barbarians. "The depiction of Cleopatra in the poetic narratives of Augustan Rome," as she writes in conclusion, "work to construct a reader" whose viewpoint is both Roman and male.

30. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.68 s.v. "Sesti" provide the biographical sketch, citing Dio 53.32.4 to suggest that Augustus has selected Sestius to display his forgiveness and liberality.

31. Cairns 1992.91-93 makes the interesting suggestion that the dramatic date of the poem might be established by determining the interval needed to age varied grades of Sabine wine.

32. Leach, "Horace and the Material Culture of Augustan Rome: A Revisionary View" forthcoming in Habinek and Schiesaro, eds., *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge, treats this idea more extensively.

33. As Santirocco 1986.84-85 notes, the combination of Pollio's history with mention of Q. Dellius and Sallustius Crispus, conspicuous recipients of Augustan clemency, can scarcely be fortuitous.

34. Quinn 1980.211 suggests 25 b.c. as a dramatic date for the return to encompass the prolonged absence of Pompeius that the poem seems to imply.

35. The poem held crucial for dating is 2.10 giving advice to Licinius Murena, generally thought to be the conspirator against Augustus punished in late 23 b.c. Discussion in Nisbet and Hubbard 1978.151-58 turns on the date of Murena's fall. But this is not necessarily a dated poem, rather it is cautionary and can be back dated. As a malcontent, Murena fills out the gallery of Augustan personalities in the book.

36. Verrall 1884.103-05 seems correct in his observation that sequential references to the Cantabrians

serve as temporal markers. Within a series of military actions, the campaign of 26/25 in which Augustus personally took part, was the critical event.

37. As Dio Cassius (53.29) reports, Augustus had no sooner left the country than the Cantabri rebelled against his deputy, L. Aemilius, and massacred a number of Roman soldiers provoking due action in revenge.

38. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970.398 ad vs. 30 point out the sound evidence for Augustus' intentions, however, the projected expedition to Britain never occurred.

39. Quinn 1980.294 suggests Augustus' ill heath as the cause of concern.

40. The pace seems even more deliberate and measured if we accept the suggestion of Clay 1989-90 that the snow on Soracte is autumnal.

41. Verrall 1884.108 argues the contrary, but the majority of natural allusions and landscape vignettes are categorical and oblique instead of specific and immediate.

42. Verrall 1884.109-11. Noting that there are not seasons enough here to provide an historically correct structure for the events to which various poems refer, he proposed the incorporation of two complete annual cycles between 3.7 and 3.19.

43. Santirocco 1986.153-58 also finds an implied temporal dimension in the poet's developing relationship with Maecenas.

44. Wallace-Hadrill 1987.223-27 notes that inscribed Augustan calendars as representations of Augustan time provided a primary level of propaganda that reached the people directly. The calendar of Verrius Flaccus, as he suggests, may have represented an attempt to integrate Augustus into Roman life by this route.

Bibliography

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. "Forms of Time and Chronotype in the Novel," in M. Holquist, ed., *The Dialogic Imagination* (C. Emerson,
M. Holquist, trans.). Austin. 84-258.

Bedon, Robert. 1988. "Sur les pas d'Horace dans la Rome proto-Augustéene," in R. Chevallier, ed., *Présence d'Horace* (Collection Caesarodunum 23bis). Tours. 25-33.

Cairns, Francis. 1992. "The Power of Implication: Horace's Invitation to Maecenas (*Odes* 1.20)," in Tony Woodman and Jonathan Powell, eds., *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Cambridge. 84-109.

Clay, Jenny S. 1989-90. "Ode 1.9: Horace's September Song," *CW* 83.102-05.

Commager, Steele. 1962. *The Odes of Horace*. New Haven. rpt. Norman, Ok. 1995.

Davis, Gregson. 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley.

Edmunds, Lowell. 1992. *From a Sabine Jar: Reading Horace* Odes *1-9*. Chapel Hill.

Favro, Diane. 1993. "Reading the Augustan City," in Peter Holliday, ed., *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*. Cambridge. 230-57.

Feeney, Denis. 1993. "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," in Niall Rudd, ed., *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium*. Ann Arbor. 41-63.

Fentress, James and Chris Wickham. 1992. *Social Memory*. Oxford.

Fraenkel, Eduard. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.

Gentili, Bruno. 1988. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece from Homer to the Fifth Century* (trans. Thomas Cole). Baltimore.

Gurval, Robert. 1995. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory* (ed. and trans. Lewis A. Coser). Chicago.

Henderson, John. 1995. "Horace, Odes 3.22 and the Life of Meaning: Stumbling and Stampeding Out of the Woods, Blinking and Screaming into the Light, Snorting and Gorging at the Trough, Slashing and Gouging at the Death," *Ramus* 24.103-51.

Hendry, Michael. 1993. "Three Problems in the Cleopatra Ode," *CJ* 88.137-46.

Johnson, W. R. 1967. "A Quean or a Great Queen? Cleopatra and the Politics of Misrepresentation," *Arion* 6.387-402.

------. 1982. *The Idea of Lyric: Lyric Modes in Ancient and Modern Poetry*. Berkeley.

Kristeva, Julia. 1980. "Word, Dialogue and Novel," in Leon S. Roudiez, ed., *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez, trans.). New York. 64-91.

Küchler, Susanne and Walter Melion. 1991. *Images of Memory: On Remembering and Representation*. Washington.

Leach, Eleanor Winsor. 1988. *The Rhetoric of Space: Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton.

Leopold, H. M. R. 1936. "Roma quale la vide Orazio," *Mnemosyne* 4.129-42.

Miller, P. A. 1993. "Sappho 31 and Catullus 51: The Dialogism of Lyric," *Arethusa* 26.183-200.

------. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. London.

Mitchell, David and Derek Edmunds (eds.) 1990. *Collective Remembering*. London.

Murray, Oswyn. 1993. "Symposium and Genre in the Poetry of Horace," in Niall Rudd, ed., *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium*. Ann Arbor. 89-105. Originally published *JRS* 86 (1985) 39-50.

Nagy, Gregory. 1994. "Copies and Models in Horace *Odes* 4.1 and 4.2," *CW* 87.415-26.

Nicolet, Claude. 1990. *Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor.

Nisbet, R. M. G. and Margaret Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on The Odes of Horace: Book One*. Oxford.

------. 1978. *A Commentary on The Odes of Horace: Book Two*. Oxford.

Parker, Holt. 1992. "Fish in Trees and Tie-dyed Sheep: A Function of the Surreal in Roman Poetry," *Arethusa* 25.293-324

Porter, D. H. 1987. *Horace's Poetic Journey*. Princeton.

Pucci, Joseph. 1988. "*Voces liquatae:* A Re-Reading of Horace's Ode 3.29," *Ramus* 17.75-89.

Quinn, Kenneth (ed.) 1980. *Horace: The Odes*. London.

Radley, Alan. 1990. "Artefacts, Memory and a Sense of the Past," in David Mitchell and Derek Edmonds, eds., *Collective Remembering*. London. 46-59.

Richardson, Lawrence, Jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.

Rubin, David. 1986. "Public Memories and their Personal Contexts," in Rubin, ed., *Autobiographical Memory*. Cambridge.

Santirocco, Matthew. 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes. Chapel Hill.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1982. *Profile of Horace*. Cambridge, Mass.

Smith, Warren S., Jr. 1984. "Horace Directs a Carouse: *Epistle* 1.19," *TAPA* 114.255-72.

Syme, Ronald. 1986. *The Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford.

Verrall, A. W. 1884. "The Historical Poems and the Arrangement of the Three Books," *Studies Literary and Historical in the* Odes *of Horace*. London.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1987. "Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*," in M. Whitby and Philip Hardie, eds., *Homo Viator: Essays in Honor of John Bramble*, Oak Park, Ill. 221-30.

Wyke, Maria. 1992. "Augustan Cleopatras: Female Power and Poetic Authority," in Anton Powell, ed., *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. Bristol. 98-140.

Zetzel, J. G. 1982. "The Poetics of Patronage in the Late First Century B.C.," in B. Gold, ed., *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Austin. 87-102.

Zorzetti, Nevio. 1991. "Poetry and the Ancient City: The Case of Rome," *CJ* 86.311-29.

.