

THE PUBLICATION AND INDIVIDUALITY OF HORACE'S *ODES* BOOKS 1–3¹

Horace's *Odes* Books 1–3, on the standard view of them as an entity, rather resemble Aristotle's animal ten thousand stades long (*Poet.* 1451a2–3): the resulting assemblage is so complicated that the mind can hardly take it in. Studies of the whole mostly tend to dissolve into studies of the individual books. And yet contemplation of the individual books is inhibited by the notion that 1–3 are the real entity, and, more specifically, by the idea that Horace first composed all the poems and then organized them into books. The opening part of this article will examine the chronology of composition and publication. It will particularly scrutinize the central thesis, which has long held the field, that the three books were published together for the first time in 23 B.C. The second part of the article will sketch some critical consequences of looking at the books of the *Odes* in a different fashion.²

I

At first sight, *Epistles* 1.13 (discussed below) might seem to show that the three books were published simultaneously. But various types of internal evidence should give us pause. First, aspects of language and metre indicate that the books were at least composed sequentially.

1. A notable feature is the use of *atque* with the second syllable unelided.³ My figures for instances in Horace are as follows:

<i>Epodes</i>	9 in 624 lines = 1.4 per cent
<i>Odes</i> 1	9 in 1060 lines = 0.8 per cent ⁴

¹ This piece grew out of e-mail correspondence with Professor D. Feeney; it owes its existence to his generous encouragement and aid. Thanks are due to other friends, especially Professors A. J. Woodman and O. Zwierlein, and to *CQ*'s referee and Professor R. Maltby.

² The decisive account of the chronology may have been A. Kiessling, 'Horatius', in A. Kiessling and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (edd.), *Philologische Untersuchungen* 2 (1881), 48–75 (though many of the ideas are much older). Some views of Books 1–3 as a whole: e.g. F.-H. Mutschler, 'Beobachtungen zur Gedichtanordnung in der ersten Odensammlung des Horaz', *RhM* 117 (1974), 109–32; H. Dettmer, *Horace: A Study in Structure* (Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York, 1983); M. S. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes* (Chapel Hill and London, 1986), a very helpful book; D. H. Porter, *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of Odes 1–3* (Princeton, 1987); E. Lefèvre, 'Die Komposition von Horaz' erstem Oden-Buch', in L. Belloni, G. Milanese, and A. Porro (edd.), *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata* (2 vols, Milan, 1995), 507–8.

³ Cf. B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Lund, 1945), 82–5 (he goes astray on Horace by considering the wrong question, the proportion of *atque* before a vowel to *atque* before a consonant: once it is accepted that, as other evidence confirms, only unelided *atque* is a remarkable feature, its absolute frequency should be investigated); M. Platnauer, 'Elision of *atque* in Roman poetry', *CQ* 42 (1948), 91–3; J. A. Richmond, 'A note on the elision of final *e* in certain particles used by Latin poets', *Glotta* 43 (1965), 78–103; R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (Oxford, 1978), 4, 322; O. Zwierlein, *Die Ovid- und Vergil-Revision in tiberischer Zeit*, I. *Prolegomena* (Berlin and New York, 1999), 435–8.

⁴ 1.25.18 should perhaps be discounted, if *atque* there means *quam*; then: eight instances, 0.755 per cent rather than 0.849 per cent.

<i>Odes</i> 2	4 in 572 = 0.7 per cent
<i>Odes</i> 3	1 in 1004 (or 1000) = 0.1 per cent ⁵
<i>carmen</i>	0 in 76
<i>Odes</i> 4	2 in 580 = 0.3 per cent
<i>Satires</i> 1	38 in 1030 = 3.7 per cent
<i>Satires</i> 2	22 in 1083 = 2.0 per cent
<i>Epistles</i> 1	11 in 1006 = 1.1 per cent ⁶
<i>Epistles</i> 2	8 in 486 = 1.6 per cent ⁷
<i>Ars</i>	5 in 476 = 1.1 per cent

Three of the instances in *Odes* 2 occur close together, two of them in a single stanza (18.37, 40, 19.11). The change between *Odes* 1 and 3 is very striking, and made more so by the *Epodes*; probably the big division should be seen as falling between Books 2 and 3, with some reversion in 4. The picture is made even more striking by the context of changes over the period between Catullus and Ovid.⁸ Lucretius has ninety-four instances (one by supplement, *simul atque* excluded) = 1.3 per cent. Catullus has eight in his polymetrics = 0.9 per cent, one in 61–8b (68b.48) = 0.1 per cent, three in his epigrams = 0.9 per cent; perhaps the longer poems show a refinement here. Propertius and Tibullus certainly use the feature very little; whether they use it at all depends on one's view of the text (Tib. 2.2.8 is the most promising instance). The position is similar with Ovid's elegiacs: *Fast.* 3.363 looks the most plausible instance. There are five in the *Metamorphoses* (0.04 per cent). (Grattius has no instances in 541 lines.) Plainly, then, some Augustan poets avoided this element. In Virgil there is a notable shift, scarcely explicable by genre, from the *Eclogues* (six, 0.7 per cent) to the *Georgics* (nine, 0.4 per cent) to *Aeneid* 1–6 (six, 0.1 per cent, without Helen episode); a change in *Aeneid* 7–12 (twenty-seven, 0.5 per cent) is due to a concentration of grandeur in Books 10 and 12 and in certain divine speeches. In Horace, there is an obvious difference in quantity of occurrence between the hexameter works and the lyric and epodic. It may be added that most of the instances in the lyric and epodic works can be described as appearing in grandiose, mock-grandiose, or at least solemn contexts (the most obvious exceptions are in the *Epodes* and *Odes* 1); this is not the case with the hexameter works. But in both types we see a diminution. In the hexameter works, it coincides with differences in time of publication; in the case of the later hexameter poems, difference in genre may also be relevant. At all events, the change in the *Odes* cannot possibly be random, and clearly indicates sequential composition.

2. In the sapphic stanza the two main types of ending change in popularity: they are virtually equal in Book 1, but one is twice as common as the other in Books 3 and 4 and in the *carmen saeculare*. The significance of this change is confirmed by the high preponderance of the winner in Statius' sapphics, and also in Catullus' (though the figures for both are small).⁹

⁵ 3.11.18 is excluded as spurious or corrupt; with it the percentage becomes 0.2.

⁶ 1.16.78 *simul atque* is excluded.

⁷ 2.1.32 (doubtful) and 2.1.226 *simul atque* are excluded.

⁸ On the date of Lucretius, see the argument in G. O. Hutchinson, 'The date of *De Rerum Natura*', *CQ* 51 (2001), 150–62. As to the end of Catullus' poetic activity, poem 52 only works properly in 47 B.C. Cf. A. A. Barrett, 'Catullus 52 and the consulship of Vatinius', *TAPA* 103 (1972), 23–38.

⁹ This finding suggests that the phenomena in the alcaic stanza discussed by R. G. M. Nisbet

<i>Odes</i> 1	type 1 (<i>terrui urbem</i>): 23; type 2 (<i>rara iuuentus</i>): 20; sapphic stanzas: 55
<i>Odes</i> 2	type 1: 21; type 2: 16; stanzas: 40
<i>Odes</i> 3	type 1: 29; type 2: 15 (or 14, without 3.11.20); stanzas: 56 (or 55)
<i>carmen</i>	type 1: 10; type 2: 4; stanzas: 19
<i>Odes</i> 4	type 1: 21; type 2: 10; stanzas: 35
Cat. 11 and 51	type 1: 5; type 2: 0; complete stanzas: 9
Stat. <i>Silv.</i> 4.7	type 1: 11; type 2: 3; stanzas: 14

3. What we may call prepositive monosyllables at the end of the line, words like *et* or *qui* which run on to what follows, show a notable pattern of distribution between metres in the *Odes*.¹⁰

<i>Epodes</i>	0
<i>Odes</i> 1	alcaic 4; sapphic 0; other 4; ¹¹ total 8 = 0.8 per cent of lines in book
<i>Odes</i> 2	alcaic 3; sapphic 3; other 0; total 6 = 1.0 per cent
<i>Odes</i> 3	alcaic 9; sapphic 6; ¹² other 0; total 15 = 1.5 per cent
<i>carmen</i> (sapphic)	1 = 1.3 per cent
<i>Odes</i> 4	alcaic 1; sapphic 2; ¹³ other 1; total 3 = 0.5 per cent

Books 2 and 3 thus show a different approach to the feature from Book 1 in respect both of the sapphic metre (now allowed) and of metres other than sapphic and alcaic (now avoided, but the restriction will be lifted in Book 4). The significance of the difference is confirmed by the treatment of related disyllables (*neque*, *unde*, and so on): three instances in *Epodes*; two in Book 1, both in metres other than alcaic and sapphic; one in Book 2, in sapphics; four in Book 3, three in alcaics, one in sapphics; three in Book 4, one in alcaics, none in sapphics, two in other metres. Confirmation is suggested for sapphics by the appearance of synaloepha between lines 1-2 or 2-3 in Books 2 (twice) and 4 (once), but not in Book 1. The confinement to the two main metres is clearly significant in Book 3, where there are seventy-eight stanzas not in sapphics or alcaics (excluding the unusual stanzas of poem 12). The failure to use the feature in sapphics is likely to be significant in Book 1, where there are fifty-five sapphic stanzas and sixty alcaic stanzas. The general frequency of the feature is probably not random, either; but it should be noted that seven of the instances in *Odes* 3 come in two long poems at the end, 27 and 29. The pattern of usage in particular metres not only confirms the composition of one book after another, but also shows a difference in practice between books. The partial reversion in Book 4, together with the reversion in frequency, supports further the notion of separate practice in distinct books; here it is not simply a linear development.

So far the argument has shown that the books must have been composed one after another: the poems were not all written and then arranged between books. It has also

and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford, 1970), xxviii-xxix, xl-xliii, should indeed be related to chronology, as they originally suggested (a change of view in ii.4-5).

¹⁰ Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard, i, p. xlv, in relation to sapphics.

¹¹ One of these, 1.7.6, might be corrupt; if so, total 7 = 0.7 per cent of lines in book.

¹² One of these at end of third line.

¹³ One of these at end of third line.

indicated marked differences between the books. It is tempting to see here a series of books published separately: one may compare the treatment of endings to the pentameter in Propertius. But even if the reality was only continuous composition and separate conception of the books, without separate publication, that would be enough for the critical argument that is to follow. However, some pointers suggest a different time of publication for the books.

1. The number of poems in each book forms a curious sequence if they are published together: the random-seeming 38, followed by 20 and 30. The numbers of poems look significant in *Satires* 1, *Epistles* 1, and no doubt *Odes* 4 (half 30). One can see that a collection of a large number of poems in different metres might not at first seem to call for precision, but that a tighter idea might appear with the smaller Book 2. Such a notion seems greatly preferable to the odd juxtaposition of random and elegant numbering.¹⁴
2. 2.4, the first poem in its book to deal with Horace, makes clear his age at the time of writing. One sees the same gesture, with different degrees of exactness, at the end of *Epistles* 1, and the beginning of *Odes* 4 (1.6). The placing has little point if the books are published simultaneously.¹⁵
3. 3.8 seems to mark the anniversary of an event made much of in 2.13, the falling of a tree which nearly killed the poet. It is presumably the first such anniversary, since Maecenas is surprised.¹⁶ It is an anniversary because there is no cultic reason for the date, and it will recur year after year (9). 2.13 is written to give the air of immediacy, like the reaction to the garlic in *Epod.* 3. 2.17.32 looks like sacrifice not long after the event, to parallel Maecenas', not the annual offering

¹⁴ The argument would fall if, as is to be argued, one should make any consecutive poems which share the same metre into a single poem. (Cf. S. J. Heyworth, 'Horace's *Ibis*: on the title, unity, and contents of the *Epodes*', *PLILS* 7 [1993] 85–96, 96, n. 40, with reference to forthcoming work by A. Griffiths, to appear in a volume edited by A. J. Woodman and D. Feeney.) This thesis, though imaginative and exciting, has little positive point to recommend it (consecutive poems can have the same metre in the collection of Alcaeus, cf. frs. 68 and 69 Voigt [sapphics], P. Oxy. 1360). Presumably *Epod.* 1–10 and 14–15 should not be made into single poems (with 14–15 a weak but not impossible case could be made, as with the *Odes*). It is suspicious that instances occur only with alcaics, the commonest metre, or, in 3.24–5, $2 \times (\text{gl} + \text{ascl min})$, one of the commonest metres in that part of 3 (19, 24, 25, 28). Belief is strained by an ode of 336 lines (3.1–6), or of 88 (2.13–15) (and 56, 2.19–20) in a book where all the other poems are between 24 and 40 lines. The argument cannot be supported by links within these alleged poems, for these occur frequently between poems of different metres, and could be argued to be all the more noticeable when the metre is the same. On the other hand, some of the links would seem unsatisfactory if internal. So in 1.35 a request related to the poet would be needed sooner if the poem is to be fused with 1.34, cf. Cat. 36. The change of argumentative tack at 3.2.1 would not be marked by any adversative particle; it works excellently as a new but connected opening. 2.15 does not really form a convincing sequence of argument with 2.14 (it looks quite different). At 3.3 a continuation of moralizing and return to the good man (3.2.17–24) would be dull and awkward. Conspicuous opening and closing gestures, not all of which can have caused a disjunction by scribes, would have to be bravely ignored: openings e.g. 1.27 (motto from Anacreon), 1.34, 2.14 (the opening name is otherwise left for 40 lines), 3.4, 3.6, 3.25 (cf. 2.19); closes e.g. 3.3.69–72 (cf. 2.1.37–40), 3.4.79–80 (cf. 4.7.27–8), 3.5.56.

¹⁵ The phrasing *circa lustra decem* in *Odes* 4.1.6 is vaguer than *octauum trepidauit aetas / claudere lustrum*; but the general link with 2.4.23–4 is hard to resist (Book 4 is particularly related to Book 2). The wish for a link may indeed explain the vagueness. Horace finished his fiftieth year in December 15; the dramatic date of *Odes* 4.2 and 5 is before summer 13, and 4.14 and 15 celebrate peace; early 13 B.C. is the most plausible date of publication. On *Epistles* 1, see below.

¹⁶ Cf. e.g. M. C. J. Putnam, 'Horace's arboreal anniversary', *Ramus* 25 (1996), 28. On the cross-referencing, cf. H. Belling, *Studien über die Liederbücher des Horatius* (Berlin, 1903), 147.

of 3.8. One is not forced to assume that either 2.13 or 3.8 is to sound recent at the time of its reading. But an interval in time between the books seems more called for than if the poems were merely re-creating the mood of particular historical moments (cf. 1.37). On the external chronology of 3.8, see below.

4. A related instance of pseudo-biographical cross-reference may be thought to occur at the start of 3.5, *caelo tonantem credidimus Iouem / regnare. credidimus* can certainly be taken as a perfect with present meaning, 'we have come to the belief'. But it seems hard not to make a more specific cross-reference, to 1.34, where Jupiter's thunder in a clear sky shakes the poet from the Epicurean beliefs espoused at the end of *Sat.* 1.5. The emphasis on Horace's biography in 3.4 encourages the link. A separation from Book 1 in time of publication makes the point more effective, and sharpens the play on the tense and the person of the verb.¹⁷
5. The title *Augustus*, conferred in 27, appears in Books 2 (9.19), 3 (3.11, 5.3), and 4 (2.43, 4.27, 14.3), and *Epist.* 1 (four times) and 2 (2.48). It does not appear in Book 1, where six poems refer to him. One may not unreasonably postulate a change over time at least in Horace's poetic choice to use the name; Book 2 underlines the difference in the first of its two references to Caesar (9.19–20).¹⁸
6. Although one cannot always press identity and chronology for the names of mistresses, and so on, the passage of time may plausibly be suggested for the reader when two names from previous books appear together: in 3.7.5 and 10 both Gyges (only a boy in 2.5.20–4) and Chloe (still afraid of love in 1.23); in 3.15 both Pholoe and Chloris (both of them again from 2.5 [17–20]; in 3.15 Pholoe is less shy, Chloris too old).¹⁹

These are pointers only, some more notable than others; but together they lend colour to the idea of separate publication. We must now consider the absolute chronological indications in each book, or the places most likely to yield such indications. The object is partly negative, to see whether the chronological references exclude separate publication; it is also positive, to see whether they present a general picture which makes separate publication attractive. Different types of date can come into question: the dramatic date, the date of composition, the date of reading (that is, of publication).²⁰

¹⁷ This would be the only certain instance of this use of *credidi* in Horace: one could have an epistolary perfect in *Epist.* 1.2.5 (authorial perfect Liv. 33.10.10). Subjunctives are another matter. The idiom is first clearly seen in Silver Latin: so Sen. *Ep.* 78.14; Ov. *Fast.* 5.623 would be a questionable example. For the plural, and *regnare*, cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.842–4, Luc. 7.446–51. Also relevant may be the plans, realized in 22, to dedicate a temple to Iuppiter Tonans after a miracle during Augustus' Cantabrian campaign.

¹⁸ The name appears in Prop. 2 (or 2a).10.15; the poem probably precedes the campaign of Aelius Gallus in 26–5 or 25–4 (below).

¹⁹ Some names of mistresses recur between books, not always as Horace's own mistress; but none appears more than once in more than one book. Note especially Chloe once in Book 1 (where she is very young), three times in Book 3; Glycera three times in Book 1, once in Book 3; Lydia three times in Book 1, once in Book 3 (3.9, which looks back). The general effect for the reader, though it cannot always be applied in detail, is to suggest both continuity and change in the scene of love.

²⁰ The fundamental discussion of the chronology is the masterly account of Nisbet and Hubbard, i, pp. xxvii–xxxviii, with some developments in ii, 4.

Book 1

2 would suitably be referred to 27 for its dramatic date: the favourable interpretation of the flood by the soothsayers (Dio 53.20.1) only underlines the sense of hope in which the poem ends. There were floods on other occasions, and not all may be reported; but the poem evokes a time when things are uncertain. Mercury's guise is as a *iuuenis* (41–4); since the god is famed for imitating very young men, this does not suggest a forty-year-old princeps (as Augustus was in 23). Cf. Hom. *Il.* 24.347–8 (with Sch. 348a), *Od.* 10.277–9. The reader is also likely to think of the *iuuenis* in Verg. *G.* 1.500. 27 is thus a suitable time, later less suitable.²¹

4.14 *o beate Sesti*. The poem is held to be addressed to L. Sestius, who became suffect consul in 23, probably in July. This is supposed to date the publication of Book 1, and 2–3, to the second half of that year. It was a common practice (so it is averred) to dedicate works to consuls in their year of office, and 1.4 has a prominent position in the collection. The argument is far from compelling. The supposedly conventional practice does not seem to be supported by many examples: *Eclogue* 4; Velleius, presumably published in 30; Mart. 12.2 (a problematic book). Possibly too, if Lollius in *Epist.* 1.2 and 18 is the son of the consul of 21, *Epistles* 1, published in 20 (note 1.18.56–7) celebrates a recent triumph of the family (1.20.27–8). But the strange thing in *Odes* 1.4 would be that the consulship is not mentioned, as it is in all these examples (with emphasis in *Eclogue* 4, and indefatigable reiteration in Velleius). *beate* in the context stresses simply Sestius' wealth; the advice not to begin long hopes does not seem especially apt to the actual time of his consulship. How will posterity be conscious of the honour done to Sestius? The year of publication would not be apparent to any subsequent reader (it is surely asking too much of the alleged convention to expect a later reader to divine the point from position alone). It would be highly exaggerated to assert that only a consulship could account for so prominent a position in the book, together with Augustus (2), Virgil (3), and Agrippa (6). Pyrrha did not hold a consulship (5); Plancus was not a consul at the time (7), and 1.6 and 1.7 are closely related. The range of addressees in poems 1–9 may even suit the character of this book.²²

12.45–8 *crescit occulto uelut arbor aeuo / fama Marcelli (Marcellis Peerlkamp); micat inter omnis / Iulium sidus uelut inter ignis / luna minores*.²³ Horace has been citing other memorable individuals from Roman history, and the reference to the Julian star either provides or includes a reference to one individual. The singular, then, may be accepted. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.855–9, Prop. 4.10.39–44, Man. 1.787–8, where this Marcellus is named

²¹ Note the change to a less youthful portrait type of Augustus around 27: P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro (Ann Arbor, 1988), 98–100.

²² See Section II below. 'Conventional practice': Nisbet and Hubbard, i, p. xxvi, referring to R. Syme, *Tacitus* (2 vols, Oxford, 1958), 2.672. On Velleius, cf. A. J. Woodman, 'Questions of date, genre, and style in Velleius: some literary answers', *CQ* 25 (1975), 273–82. R. Mayer, *Horace's Epistles Book I* (Cambridge 1994), 8–9, argues that the Lollius of *Epist.* 1.2 and 18 is the son of *cos.* 21. Something of the strangeness of the address to Sestius, if consul, is felt by R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (Oxford, 1995), 75. (The reader of *Ov. Pont.* 4.1 is to suppose that the poet does not yet know of Pompeius' consulship [cf. 4.5].) If we still want to stress politics, the role of the Republican Cn. Piso as consul for 23 might suggest that even before July 23 Sestius, a quaestor of Brutus, might be a good choice for Horace, marking his own past and the indulgence of the regime (cf. *Odes* 2.7). If the argument on Sestius is not accepted, it would remain the easiest of suppositions that Horace slightly rewrote the poem after the initial publication of Book 1 to include Sestius' name in the later joint publication of 1–3.

²³ On the passage, see R. D. Brown, 'Catonis nobile letum and the list of Romans in Horace *Odes* 1.12', *Phoenix* 45 (1991), 326–40.

together with Fabricius, Curius, and others (cf. *Odes* 1.12.40–2; for *crescit* note 3.30.8). The princeps' nephew Marcellus will naturally be borne in mind; but we need not think such a reference first possible in 25, when he was married to Augustus' daughter. He was already a member of the family, and had had an extremely conspicuous role in the triumph of 29 (Dio 51.21.3, Suet. *Tib.* 6.4). At the other end, there is force in the point that this reference would seem rather unfeeling, without further qualification, after the young Marcellus' death in 23.

26.5–6 *quid Tiridaten terreat / unice securus* will be taken by readers from 27 on (see below on 1.29) to refer to the period of Tiridates' attempted kingship witnessed to by coins from January 28 to May 26. The phrasing, the perspective, and the parallel *rex* in line 4 suggest he is viewed as king. The worrying developments, for Tiridates and Rome, are the attempts of Phraates, whom Tiridates sought to displace, to displace Tiridates. The exact date can hardly be defined.

29 most likely refers to a specific expedition, Aelius Gallus' to Arabia Felix. The expedition may be dated 26–5, or 25–4.²⁴ The expedition could be spoken of with pride at a later date (*RG* 26.5, cf. Plin. *NH* 6.160); but it was actually a failure. This is clear from Strabo's close and friendly account (16.4.22–4), and was publicly acknowledged much later at the trial of Syllaes. Horace's bantering presentation would appear rather tactless and unpleasant if the result of the expedition were known at the time of publication. So an imagined date 27–5, and a date of publication perhaps earlier than 24.

31 is set at the time of Augustus' dedication of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine in 28. **33** will refer to Tibullus' elegies, but they need not have been published yet (his Book 1 after 25 September 27). **35.29–32** are written as if Augustus were setting out for Britain: perhaps a dramatic date of 27 or 26,²⁵ though British expeditions continue later as an object of fantasy (cf. Prop. 4.3.9). **37**: the dramatic date is 30. The immediacy is a pose borrowed from Alcaeus (fr. 332 Voigt); and the poem forms a suspiciously neat link with the *Epodes*, which brought us to the victory of 31.²⁶ *Epode* 9 itself seems to offer us on a smaller scale an instance of difference between the notional time of the poem and the time of reading. Finally, 30 as a date of composition would bring us suspiciously close to the publication date of *Epodes* and *Satires* 2. It remains interesting that this is the earliest date in which the *Odes* affect to be set.

Thus Book 1 offers dramatic dates of 30, 28, 27, 27–6, 27–5; 30 seems doubtful as a date of composition. 24 may be too late for publication.

²⁴ On this expedition, see A. Dihle, *Umstrittene Daten: Untersuchungen zum Auftreten der Griechen am Roten Meer* (Cologne, 1964), 80–5; S. Jameson, 'Chronology of the campaigns of Aelius Gallus and C. Petronius', *JRS* 58 (1968), 71–84; G. W. Bowersock, *Roman Arabia* (Harvard, 1983), 46–8; J. W. Rich, *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement* (Roman History 53–55.9) (Warminster, 1990), 164–5; P. Mayerson, 'Aelius Gallus at Cleopatra (Suez) and on the Red Sea', *GRBS* 36 (1995), 17–24; D. Dueck, *Strabo of Amisus: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* (London and New York, 2000), 87. The rhetorical purposes of Augustus and Dio, and Dio's errors on the overall length of the expedition, should be borne in mind in considering the support they appear to give to the later date (*RG* 26.5, Dio 53.29.3–8; cf. also Jos. *Ant.* 15.317).

²⁵ Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard on 35.30.

²⁶ Cf. A. Loupiac, 'La trilogie d'Actium et l'Épode IX d'Horace: document historique ou carmen sympoticum', *REL* 75 (1997) 129–40, 130–2.

Book 2

2.5–8 *Procleius . . . notus in fratres* [note plural] *animi paterni* . . . is unlikely to allude to the conspiracy of 23 or 22 (cf. Dio 54.3.5), and presumably precedes it. **17** *redditum Cyri solio Phraaten*. There are likely to be at least two restorations of Phraates to rule. Phraates takes over from his father in c. 38 (reportedly after murdering him). Tiridates appears to be active and coining at Seleucia from January 28 to May 26 (coins minted at Seleucia are dated by month). He is *ΦΙΛΟΠΩΜΑΙΟΥ* on some coins; this suggests previous contact with Rome and fits well with Dio's report of Tiridates' defeat and flight to Octavian around 30 (51.18.2–3; cf. *reges* in *RG* 32.1, where *post[ea]* suits Dio's version better than Justin's, 42.5.6.) A gap in Phraates' own coinage in 282 Sel. = 31/30 B.C. would suit a period of ascendancy by Tiridates. Phraates is certainly in charge again before 20.²⁷ The earlier return to rule (c. 30) could be in question here: the event need not just have happened. The apparent circumstances of Phraates' original ascent to the throne (cf. Just. 42.4.14–5.2) make the earlier restoration especially pointed for Horace's argument. On the other hand, there are some attractions in supposing recent news of Phraates' recovery of his rule; the ending of Tiridates' coinage may mark a significant stage. There would then be an advance in time, for the reader, on 1.26.5. However, internal considerations in 3.8 (below) would still prevent us from seeing here a confirmation of Justin's dating, whereby Tiridates actually flees to Augustus before 24 (42.5.6). If, then, Horace is alluding in 2.2 to a recent success by Phraates, this would be less final than the ending of all war (this would hardly surprise, and announcements of conquests of the irrepressible Cantabrians form a more than ample parallel).

4.21–4 offer a very clear date, shortly after Horace's fortieth birthday in December 25. This ought not to be far removed from the date of publication (especially if the argument on the passage above is accepted). **6.2** *Cantabrum indoctum iuga ferre nostra* sounds like the rebellion of 25 or 24, 'as soon as' (*ὡς τάχιστα*) Augustus leaves (Dio 53.29.1).²⁸ **9.18–20** *noua / cantemus Augusti tropaea / Caesaris* is hard to date, but perhaps implies triumphs won since Actium (though it blurs these with his actions in the East, or perhaps rather projects forthcoming triumphs against Parthia, cf. 2.13.18–19, Prop. 2.10.13–14). **10**, as scholarly discussion has shown, is very unlikely to counsel the 'conspirator' Murena in mid-downfall (and he should not be addressed as *Licini*). Since the conspirator and the consul are evidently different people, the balance falls in favour of 22 not 23 for the conspiracy, as in Dio 54.3 (preferably early 22, to help Vell. 2.93.1).²⁹ **11.1–2** *quid bellicosus Cantaber et Scythes . . . cogitet*: the dramatic

²⁷ On the coinage, see B. Simonetta, 'Sulla monetazione di Fraate IV e di Tiridate II di Partia', *Riv. It. di Numismatica* 6th ser. 23 (1976), 19–34 (on overstriking and its possible significance cf. 27–8); D. Sellwood, *An Introduction to the Coinage of Parthia* (London, 1980), 159–81; F. B. Shore, *Parthian Coins and History: Ten Dragons Against Rome* (Quarryville, 1993), 30–3, 129–36. With regard to the argument from 'warts', note that some of the coins of Phraataces show warts, some not. 289 = 24/3 seems the latest datable year for Phraates' own coinage (Phraataces' begins in 3 or 2 B.C.).

²⁸ The question of tact relates principally to the time of publication, and so cannot be used as an argument against applying the phrase in this way. Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard, ii, 93–4.

²⁹ Cf. M. Swan, 'The consular *Fasti* of 23 B.C. and the conspiracy of Varro Murena', *HSCP* 71 (1966), 235–48; G. V. Sumner, 'Varrones Murenæ', *HSCP* 82 (1978), 187–99; J. Griffin, review of Nisbet and Hubbard, ii, *JRS* 70 (1980), 183; A. J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41–93)*, Edited with a Commentary (Cambridge, 1983), 270–1, 278; R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 387–92; J. W. Rich (n. 24), 174–5; J. S. Arkenberg, 'Licinii Murenæ, Terentii Varrones, and Varrones Murenæ', *Historia* 42 (1993), 349–51.

date will be shortly before the end of 25 (if the Scythian expedition indeed comes in 25), or possibly in 24.

The dramatic dates for the book fall in 25 or 24, and publication of poem 4 soon after the end of 25 seems attractive.

Book 3

5.2–4 *praesens diuus habebitur / Augustus adiectis Britannis / imperio grauibusque Persis*. This need not be related to concrete plans for expeditions to Britain (the last we know of is in 26). Campaigns to Parthia and Britain are imagined as late as Prop. 4.3; cf. Prop. 2.27.5, and so on. **6.1–4**: the Romans are urged to rebuild their temples. Augustus claimed to have done this in 28, to all the temples that needed it then (*RG* 20.4, cf. Liv. 4.20.7 *templorum omnium*). And yet this group of poems in particular is addressed to an audience now. However, Prop. 2.6.35–6, probably published after 28, likewise refer to neglect of the temples now; Prop. 3.13.47–8, published in or after 23, also appear to do so. A similar point is implied by Hor. C. 2.15.18–20. We should either suppose a dramatic date for 3.6 before 28, or else a deliberate vagueness. The parallel material makes it clear that this is a special case.³⁰

8.17–24 appear to mark an advance on 2.11.1–2: Scythians and Cantabrians are a worry no longer. The Dacians are hard to date, save that the reference is probably later than the campaign of M. Crassus (*cos.* 30) in 29–28 B.C.³¹ The reference to Scythians would fit any time after 25, if that was indeed when the embassy came to Augustus. **21–2** *seruit Hispanae uetus hostis orae / Cantaber, sera domitus catena* suits a time after 25 (*sera* relates to *uetus*, not events in 26–24). *seruit* indicates that Augustus has completed his conquest.³² This makes it difficult to harmonize 19–20 *Medus infestus sibi luctuosus / dissidet armis* with Justin's account of Parthian affairs. In Justin Tiridates flees from Parthia and comes to Augustus, who is still waging war in Spain (42.5.6). In Dio Tiridates comes to Rome in, or after, 23 (53.33.1). The coins from January 28 to May 26 are positive evidence for Tiridates' claiming to rule (they most clearly show Tiridates in 286 = 27/6); they cannot reveal when he abandoned his claim, when he actually left Parthia, and when civil strife ceased there. One would imagine Tiridates' arrival in Rome, his great source of hope, would have occurred fairly soon after his leaving Parthia. On Dio's chronology, there are few difficulties to this poem being imagined as a year later than 2.13, and later than the publication of *Odes* 2, if that comes soon after December 25. We could none the less accommodate Justin's chronology, should we really wish to, if war can be thought of as still in progress when Tiridates has left (after all, Tiridates' mere absence is not enough for Phraates' wishes), or if Horace is using events vaguely or loosely. **29.27–8** *quid Seres et regnata Cyro /*

³⁰ E. Kraggerud, 'The sixth Roman ode of Horace: its date and function', *SO* 70 (1995), 54–67, rightly sees that the ode will have a date of composition after 28. Actual social legislation is not very relevant to the date of the poem: sexual morals are a concern throughout the period and before (e.g. Cic. *Marc.* 23), and social legislation in 28 is unlikely.

³¹ See Nisbet and Hubbard, i, pp. xxxiii–xxxiv.

³² Even if it was only in 26 that Augustus fought the Cantabrians themselves (cf. R. Syme, 'The conquest of north-west Spain', *Roman Papers* ii [Oxford, 1979], 825–54), it is improbable that Horace, who ignores the Asturians, would treat the conquest as settled before Augustus' departure from Spain and the closing of the gates of Janus at the end of 25. *sera* also bears relation to Spain in general (Liv. 28.12.12, Vell. 2.90.1–4). Cf. Syme, 848. Readers in 24 or 23 would naturally refer the phrase to after the crushing of the rebellion, Dio 53.29.1–2, and certainly not to 26. The new inscription throws light on Augustus' wider handling of Spain: G. Alföldy, 'Das neue Edikt des Augustus aus El Bierzo in Hispanien', *ZPE* 131 (2000), 177–205.

Bactra parent Tanaisque discors is unlikely to bear on the question: the three names suggest in *Tanais* a reference to Scythia.

14: a clear and important date, the return of Augustus to Rome from Spain in 24. This comes after the beginning of the year (Dio 53.28.1), perhaps after June 13: the poem suggests a direct return from abroad rather than a long period in Italy, Augustus is evidently in Italy on June 13 (*Fast. Fer. Lat.* V.27, *Inscr. It.* xiii.1, p. 150), and on his glorious return to Rome he will not still be incapacitated by illness as he was both in January and on June 13 (cf. Dio 53.28.3). We appear to have the latest date in Books 1–3.³³

Book 3, for all the Roman generalization of 1–6 and 24, is sparser than the other books in identifiable dates. One poem may have a dramatic date of 28, but if so belongs in a particular category of material. The dramatic date of poem 8 seems to come after the end of 25; 14 proclaims a dramatic date of 24.

The discussion of dates within the poems has shown that the dramatic dates tend to be later from book to book. An earlier dramatic date need not be an argument against later publication; and in fact 3.6 appeared to be one of several poems which treated this subject after 28. The broad pattern seems to support the successive publication of the books. It remains possible that the semblance of chronological sequence is a literary construct. It is also possible that the books were written more or less as the pattern of dates suggests but were not published until later. But let us first consider the principal grounds for believing in simultaneous publication.

1. 3.30 takes up the metre of 1.1, used nowhere else in *Odes* 1–3, and shows that Horace has fulfilled the ambition expressed in that opening poem for canonization as a lyric poet.³⁴ As a point against the original separate publication of Books 1 and 2 this is no argument at all. As will be seen, the successive books build up an entity. No device is more common than a link between the beginning and end of a sequence of published books to establish cohesion, or (in weaker cases) connection. On the most plausible view of the *Aetia*, Books 3–4 are published later; fr. 112.5–6 Pf. exactly repeat *παρ' ἔχνηον ὀξέος ἵππου* from fr. 2.1 Pf. = fr. 4.1 Massimilla, second half of the prologue.³⁵ The last poem or pair of poems in Prop. 3 (24–5), the ending of the affair, clearly looks back to 1.1 in numerous ways. After the unifying gesture of *C.* 3.30, *Odes* 4 presents itself as an unlooked-for resumption; but its exact quotation of *Odes* 1.19.1 at 4.1.5 displays the same technique of recall. Similarly, it purposefully reuses the metre of 1.1 and 3.30 in 4.8.³⁶ The end of the *Georgics* looks back with exact citation to the start of the *Eclogues*. The last line of *Satires* 2 names Canidia, who links *Satires* 1, 2, and the *Epodes*, is the last speaker in the *Epodes*, and comes in the first poem of *Satires* 2 (48).

³³ The *Fasti Feriarum Latinarum* mention Augustus' being in Spain as the reason for his absence from the festival in 26 and 25; that need not mean, as is often assumed, that he is actually at Rome in June 24 (so e.g. D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle* [Darmstadt, 1990], 63). Return to Rome in June is supposed by R. Syme (n. 29), 38. The illness is not of course certainly the same in January and in June. Suet. *Aug.* 26.3 (or the scribes) must in any case make an error in omitting this consulship from those not entered upon at Rome.

³⁴ On the relation of 1.1 and 3.30, see e.g. M. Putnam, 'Horace *C.* 3.30: the lyricist as hero', *Ramus* 2 (1973), 1–19, 13–17.

³⁵ Cf. P. J. Parsons, 'Callimachus: Victoria Berenices', *ZPE* 25 (1977), 48–50. A different view of the chronology in Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), esp. chs. 4, 6, and 7. The discussion here leaves aside the theoretical possibility that *C.* 1.1 was first composed when Books 1–3 were published together, to form a ring with 3.30.

³⁶ W. Ludwig, 'Die Anordnung des vierten Horazischen Odenbuchs', *MH* 18 (1961), 10; S. J. Harrison, 'The praise singer: Horace, Censorinus and *Odes* 4.8', *JRS* 80 (1990), 43.

It is not surprising that the metre of 1.1 is not repeated in Books 1 or 2: Book 2 only has four metres, Book 1 has two other unrepeated metres, and the first poem is marked off as a prologue (cf. Persius' choliambics) and is very different in structure from the other poems. It does, however, have some metrical connections within Book 1: the two brief poems of short-term hedonism in stanzas of major asclepiads (11, 18) contrast with the slow pace and long-term views of 1.1, in minor asclepiads.

2. Another internal point which is felt to be important is the placing of odes to Maecenas at the beginnings, ends, and middles of books (1.1, 20; 2.12, 17, 20; 3.8, 16, 29).³⁷ But this feature can equally well be seen as part of the entity accumulated in sequential publication. It is visible too in *Sat.* 1 (1, 6) and *Epist.* 1 (1, 7, 19). There is a certain lack of absolute neatness: no poem to Maecenas at the end of 1 or the beginning of 2; 2.17 between the middle and end of 2; 3.8 not really at the beginning of 3. This actually suits the idea of books taking up and reworking each other's patterns better than that of a grand instantaneous architecture. In content, the differences between the three books in their poems to Maecenas fit at least as well the distinctness of each book which will be argued for below. To my mind, the most salient difference is the more intimate and affectionate language used to Maecenas in Book 2. Other internal points, it will be apparent, can be treated along similar lines: for example, the way 3.1 takes up 1.1 (which takes up *Sat.* 1.1), and 3.30 takes up 2.20 (but not so much 1.38).

3. In *Epist.* 1.13 Vinnius is told to take *uolumina, libelli, libri* containing *carmina* to Augustus. Let us grant that these *carmina* are *Odes* Books 1–3.³⁸ Is it implied that the poems have not been previously published? In 16–18 *neu uulgo narres te sudauisse ferendo / carmina quae possint oculos aurisque morari / Caesaris* the occupation of Augustus' eyes and ears is likely to come after the presentation, not before; the present (not perfect) subjunctive and *posse* suggest the perspective of Horace now. The 'ears' may be because these are lyric poems, or could be read to him; a reference to previous recitations would be intrinsically awkward too, since the eyes are naturally referred to the books brought now.³⁹ The language thus suggests that the poems, or at any rate a large part of them, have not been read by Augustus before. Two main possibilities may be postulated: (i) Augustus has not read Books 1, 2, or 3; (ii) Augustus has read one or two of those books. Either possibility can be met by the supposition that Book 3 is now being published for the first time, and Books 1 and 2 are being republished with it. For Augustus can be deemed, for Horace's purposes, not to have read Book 1 or even Book 2.

The *Epistle* seems to posit a journey within Italy (10), that is, Horace is allegedly sending the works from the country to Rome. Now, Augustus has been absent from Rome from summer 27 until some point in 24 (summer?). It may be assumed, by a polite fiction, that he will not have had time for literature while ordering the affairs of the world. He may well have been absent for the first appearance of both Book 1 and Book 2. (The poem celebrating his return in Book 3 would be especially apt if it was the first book published after the return.) This would make still easier the fiction (or reality) of his not having read those books, and his request for the complete *Odes* (*si denique poscet* in *Epist.* 1.13.3 might seem to imply a previous request). If he returned

³⁷ See Santirocco (n. 2), 153–68.

³⁸ Cf. Mayer (n. 22), 3–4. Another idea: M. L. Clarke, 'Horace, *Epistles* i.13', *CR* n.s. 22 (1972), 157–9.

³⁹ If previous recitations were referred to here, that could be adopted into the argument. *Epist.* 1.19.43–4 in fact suggest, in context, the possibility of some *Odes* being recited to Augustus; if before publication, one might think especially of Book 3.

before the publication of Book 2, we could at the least suppose a strong version of (ii), in which he has not read Books 1 or 3. But regardless of the time of publication, it is still a natural fiction that he has not read Books 1 or 2 (or of course 3). In *Epist.* 2.1.1–4, Horace affects to fear that Caesar may be kept from valuable public duties if Horace goes on too long. When Caesar is evidently in Rome, seemingly in the period 29–28, Vitruvius professes his initial anxiety *ne non apto tempore interpellans subirem tui animi offensionem*, when Caesar had so much to think of (1 pr. 1). Horace is nervous within *Epist.* 1.13 that even now his emissary may choose an inopportune time.⁴⁰

So Book 3, we suppose, is being published for the first time when *Odes* 1–3 are issued in a collected edition and the whole presented to Augustus. (Another possibility would be a set of all three for Augustus alone, at the time when Book 3 is published.) The request for, or the presentation of, such an edition would seem apt gestures, and good publicity for Horace, further promoted by the *Epistle*. The hypothesis of republication is unproblematic (Ovid's *Amores* are an example). Callimachus' *Aetia* (see above) probably provides a good model for a work of which some books were published earlier (1–2); most likely a complete edition, comprising all four books, is published later.⁴¹

So far, the argument has demonstrated that the books of poems were composed as a sequence, and that in some features of metre and language we see different approaches from Horace in different books. Enough has been said to make it plausible that Books 1 and 2 were published separately, and to show that the chronological indications present a picture broadly encouraging to this hypothesis. One possible pattern might be: Book 1 published 26, Book 2 published early 24, Book 3 published (and Books 1 and 2 republished) early 23.⁴² One might, however, contend that the books were written successively and distinctly, but an imaginary chronology conferred, or publication simply avoided. The notion of imaginary chronology does not suit the statistics above. The mere avoidance of publication does not fit, in particular, the point above on the indication of age in 2.4. Neither notion meets the point on the number of poems. And neither seems so characteristic of contemporary collections of poems, where each book appears to be first published separately. (Propertius indeed offers evidence, unless it is more construction, for the separate publication of books, 2.24.1–2, and so on.) Stat. *Silv.* 1–3, which probably were first published together, appear a genuine collection, re-edited, of poems composed and performed as

⁴⁰ Note that if Augustus did return before June 24, then he certainly had an illness, presumably of some significance, after returning (*Inscr. It.* xiii.1, p. 150). Date of the preface to Vitruvius 1: *Augusti* in Vit. 5.1.7, which also conflicts with Suet. *Aug.* 52, is commonly thought to be part of an interpolated passage. 1 pr. 2 *publicaeque rei constitutione* suggests 28 or 27.

⁴¹ The *Ars Amatoria* may be another instance. By 'republished', 'collected edition', and so on, no more is meant in the case of *Odes* 1–3 than the distributing of the three books in a set (with relatively little change, the statistics above suggest). Obviously sets of rolls could be distributed as belonging together (the *Georgics*, say, or the *De Finibus*).

⁴² Conceivably Augustus' grave illness, his major changes in constitutional arrangements, and the grave illness and then death of Marcellus, make the months from say May rather less promising for a presentation. In *Epist.* 1.13.3 *si ualidus* does not in context suggest the major illness of 23, but slighter illnesses; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 81. 23 B.C. itself has advantages over the first part of 22; it would be not essential, but welcome, to have the book published before the arrival of Tiridates and the death of Marcellus (treated by Virgil and Propertius). The interval between c. 30 and 26 would be readily explained by the need to work at evolving the new style and genre. If there is indeed a greater interval between 1 and the shorter 2 than between 2 and the longer 3, one may point to the considerable rethinking of the genre which Book 2 involves. But the productivity of poets cannot be plotted too minutely.

separate entities; that is, different from poems composed as part of a book.⁴³ Yet the sceptical position on separate publication, though it seems implausible, cannot ultimately be refuted. The difference between the two views (separate publication or not, but certainly sequential composition of distinct entities) is not of fundamental importance for the critical argument that is now to be developed. It is of some importance, for the idea of separate publication affects the original readers' conception of the books and of the combined edition. But the basic argument could still stand without that support.

II

The successive books of individual Augustan poets, in the same, separate, or related genres are characterized by innovation and exploration of new areas, as well as by continuity and the accumulation of a cohesive *œuvre*. An obvious example is Propertius' third book (much influenced by Horace's third), with its new use of programmatic mythology, its moves into indirectness, and its closing of the affair; his fourth book is a still more radical instance. Tibullus' incomplete second book switches mistress, by contrast with other elegists, drops the homosexual strand of the first book, creates a novel sort of elegy about the Roman past. The second book of Horace's *Satires* moves into indirectness, other speakers, philosophical investigations, in a way that is highly paradoxical for his genre (Propertius' fourth book likewise). The second book of *Epistles* is more difficult, and less epistolary, than the first, and markedly unlike it. Horace is the most daring of the Augustan poets in his cultivation of different genres, in two related groups; the *Epodes*, first book of *Odes*, and first book of *Epistles* are themselves surprises. This makes the changes within these genres from book to book all the more characteristic.

The survey here is intended merely to signal some paths. Space compels concentration on the difference between the books of *Odes* rather than on their relation to Horace's other works. Particular areas are singled out, and considered with regard to all three books; detailed criticism is impossible here. Some of the points and aspects are by no means novel: despite the notional unity of the three books, the individual identity of the books has often in fact made itself felt to readers. Yet the three books will be seen to appear in an altered light.⁴⁴

Book 1

1. It is well known that the book begins with nine poems all in different metres; and the sequence 9-18, or perhaps 9-23, presents a great stream of conspicuous imitations of different poets (9, 10 Alcaeus, 12 Pindar, 13 Sappho, 14 Alcaeus, 15 Bacchylides, 16 Stesichorus, 18 Alcaeus, 21 Catullus, 22 Alcaeus, 23 Anacreon).⁴⁵ All this display acquires a different appearance if we think of the book originally appearing on its own, rather than as simply the first act in a three-act play. The work

⁴³ See K. M. Coleman, *Statius Silvae IV, Edited with an English Translation and Commentary* (Oxford, 1988), xvi-xvii. Ov. *Pont.* 1-3 seem to form another case of original simultaneous publication, in particular circumstances.

⁴⁴ The footnotes to what follows necessarily present only a small selection of bibliographical material, mainly from recent years.

⁴⁵ Cf. M. Lowrie, 'A parade of lyric predecessors: Horace *C.* 1.12-1.18', *Phoenix* 49 (1995), 33-48. For 1.22, cf. G. Burzacchini, 'Alc. 130b ~ Hor. Carm. I 22', *QUCC* 22 (1976), 39-58, and 'Some further observations on Alcaeus fr. 130B Voigt', *PLLS* 5 (1985), 373-81.

embodies, rather than merely promising for the collection as a whole, its own virtuosity and generic range. (One may remember the contiguity of *Odes* 1.1–9 to the sudden explosion of different metres in *Epodes* 11–17; the metres of *Odes* 1.4 and 7 [same as *Epode* 12], recall the *Epodes*.) At the same time, the complexities of the book's use of lyric tradition are more visibly brought out.

Poem 1 has stressed Horace's place within the lyric tradition: the canon of poets, his debt to the Lesbian poets, but also the choral *tibia*. After displaying his metrical range in 1–9, Horace emphasizes his special connection with Alcaeus (and Sappho) in 9 and 10, by marked imitations of Alcaeus (more marked than in 4), and the book's first alcaic stanza (9)—perhaps the first in Latin—followed by its second sapphic stanza (10). The eponymous alcaic and sapphic stanzas, little used so far, recall Sappho and Alcaeus with especial force: Alcaeus uses both, and Sappho uses the sapphic, very frequently; the other metres in Book 1, though mostly reminiscent of the Lesbians, do not evoke their freer creation of cola.⁴⁶ These stanzas are to become the foremost stanzas of the book (alcaic ten in all, sapphic eight, three other stanzas four times each). But shortly after the underlining of Lesbian tradition in 9–10, Horace embarks on a series of imitations that ranges widely among the poets. Particularly interesting is the late and striking appearance of imitations of Anacreon (23, 27; cf. 17.18): Anacreon is in fact a much more significant model than Alcaeus or Sappho for the Horatian narrator, and his age and tone. None the less, Alcaeus dominates among the imitations; the last large poem (37) begins from him. The sapphic and alcaic stanzas become more and more common as the book progresses: note the alcaic pairs 16–17, 26–7, 34–5, the alternating alcaics and sapphics at 29–32, 37–8, the alternations with sapphics at 9–12, 19–22. The relation of Horace to Alcaeus is dwelt on in 32. It is a relation of contrast as well as similarity; yet here the theme of love is not associated with Sappho, but, rather unrepresentatively, with Alcaeus. The book thus explores its own complicated relationship to a complicated tradition, which it both spreads out to view and draws into coherence. Books 2 and 3 are far less interested in imitations of lyric poets, particularly of the kind that trumpets a connection at the start of a poem.

1a. Other genres are highly important in this book, as in the others. One point may be singled out: Book 1, the first lyric book after the *Epodes*, explicitly confronts the change from the *Epodes* in poem 16 (note the connection with *Epode* 17.42–4).⁴⁷

2. There are speakers other than the narrator in 1.7.25–32 (Teucer), 15.5–36 (Nereus), 25.7–8 (Lydia's lovers), 28 (dead man—but there are other possibilities). Extended mythical narrative is seen in 15 (though speech dominates). In its penultimate poem the book goes beyond 15, and perhaps beyond lyric tradition, to an elaborate and tragic narrative of a recent event.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ The point is independent of the names 'alcaic' and 'sapphic', but cf. Lyne (n. 22), 98–9. On the metres of 4 and 8, see Alc. fr. 455 Voigt; D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), 326. Papyri suggest that Alcaeus and Sappho were the most read of the lyric poets, Pindar apart; indeed, there are two copies, or a copy and a related commentary, for each of Alcaeus' three best-preserved poems.

⁴⁷ Cf. G. Davis, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford, 1991), 74–6; Heyworth (n. 14), 93–4, and 'Horace's Second Epode', *AJP* 109 (1988), 80–2, for this and other links between *Epodes* and *Odes* 1.

⁴⁸ On the tradition behind 1.15, see I. C. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paean: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford, 2001), 233–9. On 1.37: M. Wyke, 'Augustan Cleopatras: female power and poetic authority', in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (London, 1992), 98–140; M. Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford, 1997), 144–64. Cleopatra breaks the rather fixed roles of men and women in the book hitherto; for other points on gender, cf. on Book 3, points 2 and 6, and n. 61 below.

3. The political poems are forcefully placed, and carry weight at the end and middle as well as the beginning of the book (contrast Book 2). As is well known, the sombre but finally hopeful poem 2 is answered by the politically triumphant 37.⁴⁹ But again this point looks different when the book is considered as an isolated entity. 37 further appears to reverse the grim implications of 35 on Fortune, which ends with politics: appears, for the generality of 35 remains (note *triumpho* at the end of the last stanza of 37 and the first of 35), and the dramatic date of 37 is earlier. 12 sets the present in a large context of Roman history. 15, we may add, presents the fall of the ancestral city; 7 recalls the foundation of a city, and may gesture towards Aeneas.⁵⁰

4. The theological dimension of the book is important. 2 begins with Jupiter's anger against Rome; 3 ends with his anger against the human race; 12 presents a more encouraging image of his rule, though at the end of the poem he punishes the impure with thunderbolts (59–60). Jupiter's thunder supposedly converts the narrator to religious belief in 34. Jupiter has a far smaller and less conspicuous part to play in Book 2.⁵¹ Venus is prominent, in a book where love is important, and her deity is apparent (19, 30, 33.10–12). 10, 21, 30, 35 are addressed to gods, though Fortune (35) is in various senses a most uncertain goddess.

5. Philosophically, despite the references to Jupiter, the most conspicuous strand is a stress on enjoying the present which recalls Epicureanism: for example, 7.32, 11.6–8 (4.15 and 11.8 are the only occurrences of *spes longa* in the *Odes*).⁵² There is little sign of Stoicism (*uirtus* does not appear). The 'conversion' from Epicureanism in 34, moving on from the *Satires*, is the more striking; 35 goes on to modify it.

6. The country, as the place where the narrator lives, is fairly inconspicuous. It had been made prominent in *Sat.* 2.6, about the new estate (contrast *Epode* 2). It makes its first appearance as late as 17, then obliquely in 20, fleetingly in 22.9–12 (cf. Alc. fr. 130b Voigt), perhaps in 38.7–8. But it is hardly a major theme.

7. Death is significant throughout the *Odes*, but is treated differently in each book.⁵³ Here it accompanies hedonism at 4.13–14, 11.3–4, theology at 3.32–3, history at 12.35–6, mythology at 15.10–11. But it comes into its own as an aspect of the closure in the last part of the book. A series of actual deaths confronts us: 24, the death of Quintilius (contrast 3: Virgil is known to escape death there, but must lament here); 28, a death at sea (contrast 3 and 7), and the death of the philosopher Archytas; 37, the death of Cleopatra. 37 in particular expands the range of the book. The group of poems has much more power in a book that is a separate entity.⁵⁴

8. Love receives different treatment in each book. A notable aspect of Book 1 is the use of *puer* to depict youths attractive to women (unlike the narrator), and in the

⁴⁹ For the connection, cf. Mutschler (n. 2), 109–32, 111; Lefèvre (n. 2), 509.

⁵⁰ Allusion to the unpublished *Aeneid* 1 seems possible enough in say 26 B.C. 1.14 is in my opinion best seen as a deliberately elusive allegory: cf. Santirocco (n. 2), 46–9.

⁵¹ The theme of storms and sailing, important throughout the *Odes*, is particularly important and thematic in Book 1: so 2, 3, 7, 11, 14, 15, 28, 37. An especially charming twist is the movement after 2 and 3 to metaphorical storms of love in 5; the name Pyrrha is surely humorous (cf. 1.2.6).

⁵² Cf. e.g. Epic. 6.14 Arrighetti, and more widely 4 (*Men.*) 122, 125, 128. Being 'present' is for Epicurus a matter of psychology and perception as well as time.

⁵³ Cf. Porter (n. 2), 222–3, and the excellent article of D. Feeney, 'Horace and the Greek lyric poets', in N. Rudd (ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium* (London, 1995), 41–63.

⁵⁴ 35 too brings an impressive expansion in scope. The closing throwaway gesture of 38 is much more telling if it is not merely the end of Part I. Cf. D. P. Fowler, *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford, 2000), 259–60.

heyday of love: cf. 5.1, 9.15–18, 13.11, 27.20. Otherwise in *Odes* 1–3 the word is so used only at 3.9.16, a retrospective poem. The narrator's own love, suggested in 11, first comes to the fore in 13, where he grotesquely dons the masks of Sappho and Catullus, and stresses his age through contrast with Telephus; similarly in 17. Contrasts of the narrator with specific younger male lovers are less sharply made in Books 2 and 3 (3.9 again excepted). 16 shows how he has changed from the *Epodes*.

Book 2

1. The book forms a considerable surprise; perhaps it is the book whose individual identity has been most appreciated.⁵⁵ The book is virtually half the length of Book 1 (572 against 1060 lines) and has virtually half the number of poems (20 against 38). The brevity of the book and its more forbidding content can be related: the severe concision of Book 2 contrasts with the genial abundance of Book 1.⁵⁶ In sharp contrast to the paraded metrical range of Book 1, the metres of Book 2 are almost entirely alcaic and sapphic, with only two exceptions (12; 18, a metre not seen in Book 1, cf. Alc. fr. 456 Voigt). The alcaics and sapphics alternate from 1 to 11; but after that the alcaics predominate: in 11–20 there are seven alcaic poems, and one sapphic, with blocks of three and two consecutive alcaic poems, 13–15 and 19–20. The book again explores tradition, but in markedly different ways from Book 1. A poem in the middle of the book (13) presents the Lesbian tradition, through a mock-*κατάβασις* which gives the poet a surprising role. In this poem, unlike 1.32, Sappho and Alcaeus both appear as if models, and the political and the amorous are separated; Alcaeus, however, is given the preference (though by a crowd). There are, so far as we are aware, few flagrant 'imitations' of lyric poets of the kind displayed with such exuberant opulence in Book 1, and none of Alcaeus or Sappho. One, arrestingly, is of the crucial Anacreon (2.5). Another is of Bacchylides (18): the unusual metre, related to that of the original, marks out an unusual choice. 16 echoes Catullus' sapphics, again an unusual choice from the possibilities of Book 1. However, poem 1 introduces one famous lyric poet not directly alluded to in Book 1 (only very indirectly in the lament of 1.24): Simonides.⁵⁷ His style of lamentation (*Ceae*) is marked out as generically unsuitable to the *ioci*, lightness, and love (*Dionaeo*) of Horace's poetry (1.37–40). But the book will then promptly prove its heaviness; and, despite this stanza, it will give a small place to love, and a large one to death. Thus a divergence from book 1 on tradition marks a larger divergence.

1a. Again an isolated point on other genres: explicit engagement with works in prose (history in poems 1 and 12) makes an interesting development.⁵⁸ And philosophy, a genre of prose, is vital to the book.

2. There are no mythical narratives (some exempla). There are no speakers in the book other than the narrator.

3. Politics, at least direct and intense confrontation of Roman politics, comes only

⁵⁵ Characterizations of Book 2: Nisbet and Hubbard, ii.1–6; D. A. West, *Horace, Odes II: Vatis Amici* (Oxford, 1998), xi–xviii. On 2.1–12, W. Ludwig, 'Zu Horaz, C. 2, 1–12', *Hermes* 85 (1957), 336–45.

⁵⁶ A more necessary brevity of book is defended in the preface to Vitruvius 5.

⁵⁷ He looks increasingly important in Book 4; cf. A. Barchiesi, 'Poetry, praise and patronage: Simonides in book 4 of Horace's *Odes*', *CA* 15 (1996), 5–47.

⁵⁸ On 1, see J. Henderson, 'Polishing off the politics: Horace's Ode to Pollio, 2, 1', *MD* 37 (1996), 59–136; A. J. Woodman, 'Poems to historians: Catullus 1 and Horace, *Odes* 2.1', in a Festschrift for T. P. Wiseman (forthcoming).

in the opening poem, again on the borders of the book. Moral confrontation of the present, with history also in view, is seen in 15 and 18, and is more characteristic of the book. Wealth in general is much more of a concern in this book; in Book 1 it had appeared mostly in relation to the narrator.

4. The gods are of little importance in the book, until the hymn to Bacchus at the end (19). (Venus and her helpers have a little colour at 8.13–16.)

5. The metrical plainness of the book is matched by its relative intellectual austerity. The movement into greater severity and difficulty is very reminiscent of *Satires* 2 after *Satires* 1. Generalized moralizing comes much more to the foreground in Book 2 of the *Odes* than in Book 1. The moralizing itself makes a link back to the *Satires*. The language of Stoicism, in particular, is now deployed, and without the irony frequent in the *Satires*. Poem 2 sets the tone: the wise man is the true king; *virtus* appears, personified (in the *Epodes* it comes only in the sense of ‘courage’). Poem 3 begins with serious moralizing instruction unlike the beginning of any poem in Book 1 (nearest come 22, which turns out to be playful in application, and 18, which is on wine). 9 again opens in generalizing gravity unlike the openings of *Odes* 1; so does 10, which uses language of Peripatetic (5) and wider philosophical (14–15) resonance. 11.5 *poscentis aevi pauca* is much more blatantly philosophical than *frui paratis* (1.31.17). 16.9–12 move to metaphor and the mind in true Stoic style; the handling of the self in 19–20 recalls Stoics and others. *uiuitur paruo bene* in 16.13 has a strongly philosophical quality. 16.25 dwells on the present, in the Epicurean vein seen in Book 1.

6. The country is much more important in this book. 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 l 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).⁵⁹

7. Death, as is obvious, is a still more important concern than in 1. There is now a much stronger interest in death as something universal, and hence as something which is coming to addressee and speaker (a theme foreshadowed at 1.4.13–20; cf. 1.28.15–16). Poem 1 depicts the carnage of the Civil Wars far more drastically than 1.35.33–4. 2.3.4 starkly calls its addressee *moriture Delli*. The end of 2.6 movingly contemplates the narrator’s own death (2.7 presents his escape from death, with some allusion to Alcaeus). Death comes forward especially in the later part of the book, 13–20, and so again is involved in aspects of closure. 13 presents the narrator’s near-death and near-descent into Hades, not without humour; universal death is dwelt on even here (13–20). The poignant poem that follows confronts the death that must be faced by all, including the speaker (who laments), and the addressee.⁶⁰ The death of both speaker and addressee is touched on lightly in 16 (17–18, 29–32), and then elaborately and emotionally in 17. 18.17–19 biting reminders (nameless and generalized)

⁵⁹ On trees in Horace, cf. J. Henderson, *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1999), ch. 5. The tree incident, like the poem on Horace in the Civil War (2.7), presents an occurrence in the narrator’s biography; the humorous intellectual ‘conversion’ in 1.34 was less of a concrete event. The lyric poet is now, in Book 2, ironically giving his life a few incidents as if in weak imitation of the turbulent existence of Alcaeus (1.32, 2.13.27–32; ancient scholars toiled on it).

⁶⁰ On the name Postumus, cf. M. Paschalis, ‘Names and death in Horace’s *Odes*’, *CW* 88 (1994–5), 181–90, 181–2. The repetition at this point in the alcaic line is a device taken up in 2.17.10, 3.3.18, 4.4.70 (cf. in another metre 4.13.18); the alcaic examples are related to death. There is no instance in Book 1.

wealthy addressee that he is forgetting his death. After all this, the final poem provides a spectacular reversal. The poet is exempted from universal death by poetic immortality; his becoming a swan is described with no less humour than his near-destruction by the tree. It is a marvellous twist for this specific book. The final avoidance of lament looks back to the end of the first poem, and uses the same word *nenia*.

8. Love, as we have seen, is not of great moment in the book. In the second half, the poems on love (4, 5, 8) fade from view (12 is partly on love); death then becomes even more prominent. A particularly interesting feature of the poems on love, if we see the book separately, is the ambiguous position of the narrator. In the first of these poems he explains, in an obviously unpersuasive fashion, that he is too old for love himself (4.21–4). 5 deliberately leaves it unclear whether the person in love he is addressing is himself.⁶¹ In 8 he does not indicate whether he himself is in love with Barine. In 11.21–2 he summons Lyde, affecting contempt. In 12 he finally indicates that he loves Licymnia;⁶² but the last two stanzas make it sound as if, for all her fidelity, she could readily be made over to Maecenas.

Book 3

1. This book, appropriately if Books 1 and 2 were republished when it was published, joins the first and the second book together. It also makes many innovations. The first poem emphasizes novelty at the start; it also conspicuously draws together themes from Books 1 and 2: Jupiter, universal death, storms, trees, and so forth.⁶³ The length of the book (1004 or 1000 lines) and the number of poems (30) return us nearly to those of Book 1. In metre as in content, it at first appears to outdo the austerity of Book 2, with a series of six poems in alcaics on weighty themes. Some of them (3, 4) are substantially longer than any in Book 1 or 2 (3, 72 lines, 4, 80 [5, 56]; 1.2, 52 lines; 1.12, 60; no other in 1 or 2 over 40). For the repetition of metre, to be followed by change, we may compare *Epodes* 1–10. With an important shift in content, poems 7–16 return to a variety of metres reminiscent of Book 1 (five different metres, including one not seen in Books 1 or 2). There are three sapphic poems here but (understandably) no alcaics. Poems 17–29 produce something in between Books 1 and 2: only three metres occur, alcaic (five poems), sapphic (four poems) and $2 \times (\text{gl} + \text{ascl min})$ (four poems). In general, it is a notable difference from Book 1 that in Book 3 only three metres occur more than twice; it could be said that $2 \times (\text{gl} + \text{ascl min})$ grows at the expense of $2 \text{ ascl min} + \text{pher} + \text{gl}$ and $3 \text{ ascl min} + \text{gl}$ (all have four poems each in 1). The last poem makes the link with 1.1.

There are relatively few of the conspicuous lyric imitations of Book 1. We have one of Alcaeus (12), by contrast with Book 2; but, by contrast with Books 1 and 2, there is little direct discussion of the Lesbian poets: there is only the mention of *Aeolium carmen* at the end. A subtle imitation is the reworking of the supposed amorous dialogue between Sappho and Alcaeus (Sapph. fr. 137 Voigt) into a dialogue with only one poet, the male Horace somewhat in the role of Alcaeus. 3.30 itself conspicuously imitates Pindar, as does, less conspicuously, 3.4. In this book, the poet claims priority

⁶¹ The name Lalage in 5.16, cf. 1.22.10, 23, provides a suggestion but not a proof that it is he; Pholoe in 5.17 teasingly cross-refers to a woman loved by others in 1.33.5–9; the boy Gyges in 5.20 plays on the confinement of the narrator's amorous interest in Book 1 to women (but a boy indistinguishable from a girl: the poem ends stressing puzzlement).

⁶² Cf. Lyne (n. 22), 104.

⁶³ On 3.1, see F. Cairns, 'Horace's first Roman Ode (3.1)', *PLILS* 8 (1995), 91–142.

in the transference of Aeolic song; the imitations of Catullan lyric in Books 1 and 2 are forgotten.

1a. The generic contrast at the end of 3.3 is not with history, as at the related end of 2.1, but with epic.⁶⁴ Narrative is of great concern to the book.

2. The book reverts to and exceeds Book 1 in using speakers other than the poet: 3.3.18–68 Juno, 5.18–40 Regulus, 9 Lydia (and Horace as a dramatic character), 11.37–52 Hypermetra, 27.34–66 Europa (57–66 imaginary speech of her father inset), 69–76 Venus, 29.43–8 speech for wise man. Extended narrative, especially mythological narrative, is much more important in this book than in Book 1: Juno poem 3, Gigantomachy 4, Regulus 5, Hypermetra 11, Europa 27. The importance of female figures is striking. (Regulus' state-centred heroism is to be contrasted with the family-centred heroism of Hypermetra [note 3.5.41–8], and also with the individualistic heroism of Cleopatra.)⁶⁵

3. Politics has a much more dominating presence than in Book 2; but it gains most emphasis in the first part of the book. The opening sequence 1–6, which ranges vastly, is concerned with present campaigns, past tradition, wealth, social mores, and Augustus. (The relationship with Troy in 3 makes more explicit the connection with Troy seen in Book 1.) Around the middle, Augustus' return is celebrated (14); near the end, a poem deals with the need for social legislation and the present obsession with wealth (24); the next poem, as if taking off into another but imaginary genre, contemplates the future praise of Augustus.⁶⁶ For all the importance which this structure gives to politics, the change after 1–6 marks, as we shall see, a change of outlook; this creates a sense of clashing. Such clashes in outlook are much more important in this book than in Books 1 and 2; they show the poet's interest in exploiting the complexities which those books put together have presented.⁶⁷

4. Jupiter, as we have seen, appears conspicuously as ruler of the universe at the start of 1 (5–8); so he does in 4.42–8, at the beginning of 5, and, as god of weather and fortune, at 29.43–5. The rule of the gods is important to Rome in 6.5–8. Here cult enters in; cult, both public and private, urban and rustic, is particularly important in this book. (13 and 14 juxtapose these types of cult, just as 14 itself juxtaposes public and personal.) There is also a hymn to Bacchus (25); Mercury is invoked at the beginning of 11. The gods are particularly important for their part in mythology: Juno in 3, all the gods in the Gigantomachy of 4, Mercury and Amphion at the start of 11, Hercules at the start of 14, Jupiter and Venus with Danae in 16, Jupiter and Venus with Europa in 27.

5. Philosophical language and generalized moralizing are particularly evident in the political poems mentioned; they form part of the strenuous stance in those poems. 16 also deals with wealth and need. 3.2.17–24 present a personified Virtus; 3.3.1–8 are highly Stoic in thought; the figure of Regulus in 3.5 has much Stoic resonance.⁶⁸ 24 too

⁶⁴ For the connections with Ennius and *Aeneid* 12, cf. D. Feeney, 'The reconciliations of Juno', *CQ* 34 (1984), 179–94. *Aeneid* 1 is likely to be relevant.

⁶⁵ Cf. E. Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge, 1998), 140–2.

⁶⁶ Oliensis (n. 65), 129 describes the poem beginning as the reverse of a *recusatio*. We should not be too definite about what Bacchus represents: the new type of poetry is to be mysterious. Cf. E. Batinski, 'Horace's rehabilitation of Bacchus', *CW* 84 (1990/1), 361–78. On the poem, see W. Wimmel, *Die Bacchus-Ode C. 3,25 des Horaz*, *AAWM* 1993.11.

⁶⁷ Propertius Book 3, which is slightly later, shows a similar interest in clashes: cf. Prop. 3.4–5, 11–14.

⁶⁸ Lowrie (n. 48), 252; see also S. J. Harrison, 'Philosophical imagery in Horace, *Odes* 3.5', *CQ*

dwells on *uirtus* (21–2, 30–2). The narrator's stress on his own *uirtus* at 3.29.54–5 is deliberately elusive in tone. The end of 1 presents a relaxed Epicureanism which purposefully clashes with the involvement in the state at the beginning of 2; acceptance of 'poverty' unites the narrator and the desired behaviour of young men, but the ethos is different. The abnegation of riches in 16.21–44 is much coloured by philosophical language, of a sort not particular to one school (*nil cupientium* 22 is not just Epicurean: cf. Sen. *Vit. Beat.* 4.3, 5.1). An Epicurean stress on the present is important in 3.29.29–48. The range and diversity of Horace's philosophizing is much more apparent in this book.

6. The country, as in Book 2, is a highly important motif. The narrator's own life in the country appears in the first poem (45–8), with philosophical point (cf. 17–32), and in the penultimate poem (1–12), again with point (cf. 49–64). The country is drawn into the argument on Roman history and morality in 6.33–44. Country ritual, as we have seen, plays an important part in the book, much more so than in Books 1 and 2: cf. 13, 18, 22, all to do with Horace's estate. In 23 he gives his role to a woman; the use of the country there again has a wider point.⁶⁹

7. Death and its universality appear by suggestion in the first poem (14–16), in a manner now particularly reminiscent of Book 2. The inescapability of death is grimly presented at 24.1–8 (the language recalls 1.35.17–20; but death is now introduced). Regulus' noble decision to die meets us in 5; his death recalls and contrasts with that of Cleopatra. (A mythical patriotic death [19.2] is not of great interest to the party-loving narrator: another dissonance of outlooks.) But already in 1–6 the idea of apotheosis for outstanding mortals is dwelt on (3.2.21–4, 3; more briefly and inexplicitly 1.12.25–32; in 1.2.41–52 we have disguise more than apotheosis). 8 reverts to the narrator's escape from death; 11 deals with an escape from death (but also with a memorial, 51–2); 14 touches on freedom from death. This theme gathers force in the last part of the book. 27, like 11, dwells on escape from death, but more genially: lurid possibilities are imagined, but the reality is safety, with suggestions of immortal fame (73–6).⁷⁰ 25 hints at apotheosis, and perpetual fame, for Caesar, both of these in or through poetry. 26 perhaps speaks as if the narrator's life had ended, but humorously; in 29 the same word, *uixi* (43), displays the unimportance of death to the wise man. Death is being reduced and evaded; the *merita . . . nenia* lamenting the end of the *festus dies* (28.16) should be seen in this light, as tinged with humour (contrast the word at 2.1.38). All this leads up to the final poem. This is not, as in 2.20, a bold undoing of universal death. The narrator proclaims, not that he will not die (2.20.5–8, 21–4), but that his death will only be partial (3.30.6–7). As he celebrates his immortality through praise, we feel not a reversal, as in 2.20, but a culmination: death has been persistently escaped and transcended.

8. The treatment of love particularly highlights the clashes of the book. The last in the sequence 1–6 harangues the deplorable sexual morals of the present in disgusted tones. Poem 7, which at first seems impeccably moral in tone, in the end treats the wife's hinted inclination to yield with a wry humour quite unlike the thunderings of 3.6.⁷¹

36 (1986), 502–7; an interesting twist in J. Arieti, 'Horatian philosophy and the Regulus Ode (*Odes* 3.5)', *TAPA* 120 (1990), 209–20.

⁶⁹ The narrator's biography, as a series of events, is important in 4, which develops the idea considerably (playfully, of course; cf. e.g. Davis [n. 47], 102). Poem 8 returns to the tree; 14.25–8 allude to Horace's Republican past, and give him white hair.

⁷⁰ Lowrie (n. 48), 313–14. H. Zehnacker, 'Horaz, carmen III 27', *RhM* 138 (1995), 68–82, 78, sees 3.26–8 as all a farewell to love-poetry.

⁷¹ For discussions of 3.7, see F.-H. Mutschler, 'Kaufmannsliebe: Eine Interpretation der

Not much later, in poem 10, the narrator himself is depicted in the position of the would-be adulterer in 3.7, begging for the favour of a woman who is married (cf. 1–2, 15–16, esp. *paelice*). It is of course a humorous poem; but the humour highlights a radical difference of approach from poem 6, and the role of ‘Horace’ makes it cheekier.⁷² This poem itself relates interestingly to 24, where Scythians are models not of barbarity (10.1–4) but of virtue (24.9–24). So it does to 16, the only poem of Book 3 in the same metre as 10. 16 begins from Jupiter’s entering the tower as an *adulter* (*risissent* in 7 has generic implications too); but it turns to moralizing on wealth. Europa in 27 strikes very moral, and Roman, attitudes (*pater—o relictum / filiae nomen pietasque . . . / uicta furore!*—, 34–6); but Venus, like the reader, laughs at her (66–76). In this book, unlike Book 2, the narrator’s own involvement with love is not in doubt. After the first poem about his own love (9), where he appears to favour Lydia more than Chloe, he professes love for Lyce and Lyde in 10 and 11. His behaviour as a lover sounds more youthful and active than hitherto, in the comedy of 3.10 and 26. But in 26 he professes at last to end his ever-ending career.

Book 4, though there is no space to consider it here, would reveal closely related techniques of adaptation and fresh invention. It comes after the sealing gesture of 3.30; but it follows Book 2 in size (580 lines), as Book 3 had followed Book 1.

Even this sketch should indicate that a different approach to the genesis and production of Books 1–3 leads to a more distinct perception of the individuality of each book. It also enables us to see more clearly how the books relate to each other, and how the cumulative entity of Books 1–3 is built up. The prodigious animal may even emerge as an elegant and satisfying creature.

Exeter College, Oxford

G. O. HUTCHINSON

gregory.hutchinson@exeter.ox.ac.uk

Horazode “Quid fles Asterie” (c. 3.7), *SO* 53 (1978), 111–31; S. J. Harrison, ‘Horace, *Odes* 3.7: an erotic *Odyssey*?’ *CQ* 38 (1988), 186–92; F. Cairns, ‘Horace, *Odes* 3. 7: elegy, lyric, myth, learning, and interpretation’, in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillennary Celebration* (Oxford, 1995), 65–98.

⁷² On 3.10, note R. Seager, ‘Horace and Augustus: poetry and politics’, in Rudd (n. 53), 28.