

# THE PRAISE SINGER: HORACE, CENSORINUS AND ODES 4. 8\*

By S. J. HARRISON

Donarem pateras grataque commodus,  
 Censorine, meis aera sodalibus,  
 donarem tripodas, praemia fortium  
 Graiorum; neque tu pessima munerum  
 ferres, divite me scilicet artium 5  
 quas aut Parrhasius protulit aut Scopas,  
 hic saxo, liquidis ille coloribus  
 sollers nunc hominem ponere, nunc deum.  
 sed non haec mihi vis, non tibi talium  
 res est aut animus deliciarum egens. 10  
 gaudes carminibus; carmina possumus  
 donare et pretium dicere muneri.  
 non incisa notis marmora publicis  
 per quae spiritus et vita redit bonis  
 post mortem ducibus, non celeres fugae 15  
 reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae  
 [non incendia Carthaginis impiae]  
 eius, qui domita nomen ab Africa  
 lucratus rediit, clarius indicant  
 laudes, quam Calabriae Pierides; neque, 20  
 si chartae sileant quod bene feceris,  
 mercedem tuleris. quid foret Iliae  
 Mavortisque puer, si taciturnitas  
 obstaret meritis invida Romuli?  
 ereptum Stygiis fluctibus Aeacum 25  
 virtus et favor et lingua potentium  
 vatium divitibus consecrat insulis.  
 dignum laude virum Musa vetat mori,  
 caelo Musa beat. sic lovis interest  
 optatis epulis impiger Hercules, 30  
 clarum Tyndaridae sidus ab infimis  
 quassas eripiunt aequoribus rates,  
 [ornatus viridi tempora pampino]  
 Liber vota bonos ducit ad exitus.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The criticism of the eighth ode of Horace's fourth book has been bedevilled by three major uncertainties: probable interpolation in its text, confusion about the identity of its addressee, and doubt as to its literary quality.<sup>1</sup> These issues will form the central concerns of this discussion. Earlier critics have been consistently scathing in their view of *Odes* 4. 8: some editors have even gone so far as to deny Horatian authorship,<sup>2</sup> many have made dismissive judgements, following the verdict of Wilamowitz ('really very bad'), and a recent commentator has classed 4. 8 as 'the least lyrical of the *Odes* ... much of it, indeed, reads like prose—limpid, logical, but

\* My thanks to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet and to the Editorial Committee for useful criticism, and to Dr D. P. Fowler for bibliographical aid.

<sup>1</sup> Significant treatments of the poem (outside commentaries) are K. Lachmann, *Philologus* 1 (1846), 164-6 (= *Kleine Schriften* (1876), 1. 84-6); A. Elter, *Donarem Pateras* (1907) [eccentric but highly informative monograph—see the review by Heinze, *BPhW* 1908, 1332-41]; G. Pasquali, *Orazio Lirico* (1920), 755-62; G. Jachmann, *Philologus* 90 (1935), 331-40; K. Büchner, *Zur Form und Entwicklung der horazischen Ode und zur Lex Meinekiana*, Ver. Sächs. Ak. Wiss.,

Phil. Hist. Kl., 91. 2 (1939), reprinted in his *Studien zur römischen Literatur*, 3—*Horaz* (1962), 52-101; C. Becker, *Hermes* 87 (1958), 212-22; W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zum Selbstdarstellung alterer römischer Dichter*, *Spudasmata* 19 (1968), 176-200, 215-28; K. E. Bohnenkamp, *Die horazische Strophe* *Spudasmata* 30 (1972), 301-20; and H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz* (1973), 2. 364-74. Other periodical literature for the period 1936-75 may be found in *ANRW* 11. 31. 2, 1513.

<sup>2</sup> This was done by at least one nineteenth-century editor (K. Lehrs in 1869).

pedestrian'.<sup>3</sup> I shall not claim that the poem is a previously unacknowledged masterpiece of inspiration, but that it has been underestimated as a poetic artefact: as a careful analysis will show, it is a well-conceived, well-finished and allusive piece, relevant to its addressee and cohering well both with the following ode to Lollius and with the purposes of Book 4 as a whole.

## II. INTERPOLATION?

In the manuscript tradition *Odes* 4. 8 has come down to us with a total of 34 lines; it is thus unique amongst the *Odes* of Horace, all the rest of which have line-totals divisible by four, including the other two poems in the rare metre of stichic asclepiads (1. 1 and 3. 30). Since the edition of Meineke (1843), who first stressed this phenomenon, editors have naturally wished to emend 4. 8 so as to concur with this apparent rule, which may be justified by evidence from the practice of archaic Greek lyric;<sup>4</sup> since at least one line in the poem is suspect on other grounds (line 17, which will be discussed in its place in the analysis below), they have usually resorted to excision of lines rather than the postulation of a lacuna, removing either two or six lines.<sup>5</sup> Removers of six lines have usually included some part of the central section, especially lines 15b–19, since these include a number of apparent difficulties (see below);<sup>6</sup> the pair of lines most often removed by the ejectors of two are lines 17 and 33.<sup>7</sup> Any account of the poem must take a position on this issue, and here the last-mentioned view will be maintained: as the analysis below will show, lines 17 and 33 can in fact be removed with little difficulty, and the poem reads convincingly when separated into four-line stanzas (as above).

## III. THE ADDRESSEE

The identity of the Censorinus addressed by Horace in this poem is still a matter of scholarly disagreement. Is it L. Marcius Censorinus, cos. 39 B.C., or C. Marcius Censorinus, cos. 8 B.C., very likely his son?<sup>8</sup> Of three recent writers, one goes for the elder Censorinus, another for the younger, and the third regards either as possible.<sup>9</sup> There seems little doubt that one of the two was meant; the Marcii were one of the great noble families of Rome, and in the period of the fourth book of *Odes* (17–13 B.C.) both Censorini were in the public eye—the elder Censorinus, now in his sixties or older and at the end of a long and varied career,<sup>10</sup> was amongst the senior consulars in the Senate, and stood second to Agrippa in the list of the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis* at the time of the Ludi Saeculares in 17 B.C.,<sup>11</sup> while the younger Censorinus was a rising star of the young nobility, to become consul in 8 B.C., some five years after the publication of Horace's collection.<sup>12</sup> Decision between the two is made difficult by apparently contrary indications in the poem itself: the familiar tone and the implication that Censorinus is a 'sodalis' of the poet (2) might be taken to suggest the younger man rather than the senior consular, while the contrary inference could be

<sup>3</sup> Wilamowitz' verdict is to be found in his *Sappho und Simonides* (1913), 321; the recent commentator is K. Quinn, *The Odes of Horace* (1980), 313. A characteristically crisp adverse judgement may be found in James Gow, *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina, Liber Epodon* (1896), 341.

<sup>4</sup> The stichic asclepiads of Alcaeus fr. 70 L/P seem to be divided into four-line stanzas—cf. Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrynchus Papyri* x (1914), 71.

<sup>5</sup> Removers of two (e.g.): A. Kiessling and R. Heinze, *Q. Horatii Flaccus: Oden und Epoden* [12th ed.] (1966); Pasquali, loc. cit. (n. 1); K. Büchner, loc. cit. (n. 1); F. Klingner, *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera* [3rd ed.] (1959); Bohnenkamp, loc. cit. (n. 1); S. Borszák, *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera* (1984). Removers of six (e.g.): Lachmann, Jachmann, Becker and Syndikus, op. cit. (all n. 1); D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera* (1985).

<sup>6</sup> First suggested by Lachmann, op. cit. (n. 1).

<sup>7</sup> So Kiessling/Heinze and Pasquali, followed by

Büchner, Klingner and Borszák, op. cit. (all n. 5).

<sup>8</sup> For the career of L. Censorinus cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 223, for that of C. Censorinus, *ibid.*, M 222.

<sup>9</sup> Elder: M. C. J. Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (1986), 155. Younger: R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (1986), 396–7. Either: Quinn, op. cit. (n. 3), 313–15.

<sup>10</sup> He had been one of only two senators to offer aid to Julius Caesar at his assassination, and was subsequently promoted by Antony—praetor (43), governor of Macedonia and Achaea (42–40), consul (39). Cf. Nicolaus, *Vita Augusti* 96, Plutarch, *Antony* 24. 1 with Pelling's note.

<sup>11</sup> *CIL* 6. 32323. 44.

<sup>12</sup> The standard date of 13 B.C., upheld most recently by Syme, op. cit. (n. 9), is to be preferred to the later dating of the book offered by G. W. Williams, *Horace, Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics* 6 (1972), 44–9.

made from lines 20–21, which seem to suggest that Censorinus has some military or political achievements behind him, fitting for the consul of 39 B.C. who had celebrated a Macedonian triumph, but not perhaps for the younger man still in the earlier stages of his political career. However, some evidence on the career of the younger Censorinus, evidence never yet connected with Horace's ode, provides a possible solution, suggesting that both the familiar tone of the poem and its allusion to military success suit the younger man, the kind of relevance to the addressee common in the *Odes*.<sup>13</sup>

G. W. Bowersock suggested in 1964 that various strands of evidence, literary and epigraphical, conspired to suggest that the younger Censorinus had served as a *legatus Augusti* while still a praetor, i.e. he had commanded an army, probably in aid of Agrippa's suppression of a Bosphoran rebellion; in 1958, K. M. T. Atkinson had already argued that Censorinus had served as proconsul of Asia as praetor, somewhat improbably (as Bowersock points out) since this top proconsular province was unlikely to fall to a non-consular, and Censorinus seems to have been *proconsul Asiae* in the normal way in A.D. 2.<sup>14</sup> On either hypothesis, this military activity of Censorinus is to be dated to the year 14 or 13 B.C.,<sup>15</sup> since a decree of the Koinon of Asia thanking Augustus and Censorinus for good service and quoted by Josephus (*AJ* 16. 165) is now generally believed to belong to 13/12 B.C. rather than to Censorinus' proconsulship. Here we have a real military command, and some evidence of success; Censorinus' activities in the province of Asia in 14/13 no doubt made him a fitting and topical recipient of an ode in Horace's fourth book, as well as smoothing his path to the consulship some five years later.

This suggestion is made more probable by a consideration of some other recipients of the odes in Book 4. The progress of Roman arms is, of course, a major theme in the book, particularly in the odes concerning Drusus and Tiberius (4 and 14) which celebrate the brothers' victory over the Raeti and Vindelici in 15 B.C. Although, as Syme has noted, no direct allusions to the achievements of generals other than members of the imperial house are found in *Odes* 4, perhaps for reasons of prudence as well as flattery,<sup>16</sup> at least one poem in the book appears to rely on background knowledge of the military affairs of this period. This is *Odes* 4. 9, linked with 4. 8 by both position and subject-matter, and addressed to Marcus Lollius, consul in 21 B.C. Lollius was best known for his command in the so-called 'clades Lolliana', a set-back against the German Sygambrians in 17/16 B.C. in which a legionary standard appears to have been lost.<sup>17</sup> It has been plausibly supposed that *Odes* 4. 9, with its stress on the transience of political achievement and the immortality conferred by poetry, is a kind of consolation or even rehabilitation of Lollius after this reverse in his otherwise successful military career.<sup>18</sup> If the paired ode 4. 9 reflects the wars of the Empire, why not 4. 8? The reverse suffered by Lollius, like the success apparently achieved by Censorinus, needs to be supplied by the reader, but this kind of indirect allusion to contemporary events is far from foreign to the *Odes*;<sup>19</sup> indeed, there is an excellent example of it in the opening poem of *Odes* 4, whose subtle epithalamian allusions have been persuasively shown to be compliments to the marriage of its addressee, Paullus Fabius Maximus, to Augustus' cousin Marcia.<sup>20</sup>

The mention of Fabius Maximus suggests a final argument for preferring the younger Censorinus as addressee of *Odes* 4. 9. A number of the identifiable addressees in the fourth book of *Odes*, especially those at the beginning of the book, belong to the young nobility of the time: Fabius Maximus himself, the future consul of 11 B.C., would not be much over thirty at the time of the publication of the fourth book of *Odes* in 13 B.C., and was close in age to Iullus Antonius, addressee of 4. 2, son of the

<sup>13</sup> For the frequent relevance of the addressee for the material of the poem cf. e.g. M. Hubbard in C. D. N. Costa (Ed.), *Horace* (1973), 18–21.

<sup>14</sup> G. W. Bowersock, *HSCPh* 68 (1964), 207–10. Atkinson (*Historia* 7 (1958), 326) is followed by R. K. Sherck, *ANRW* 11. 7. 2. 1036 ff. For the proconsulship of Censorinus in A.D. 2, cf. now Syme, op. cit. (n. 9), 405.

<sup>15</sup> To 13 by Atkinson and Bowersock, to 14 by Syme, op. cit. (n. 9), 399 n. 99.

<sup>16</sup> Syme, op. cit. (n. 9), 399.

<sup>17</sup> Cassius Dio 54. 20. 6. 17 B.C. is preferred to 16 as the date by R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (1978), 1–2.

<sup>18</sup> Syme, op. cit. (n. 17), 153.

<sup>19</sup> e.g. the subtle allusions to the marriage between Marcellus and Julia in *Odes* 1. 12—cf. G. W. Williams, *Hermathena* 118(1974), 147–55.

<sup>20</sup> cf. A. T. von S. Bradshaw, *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970), 142–53.

triumvir and the future consul of 10 B.C., and to the imperial princes prominent in 4. 4 and 4. 14—Drusus, to be consul in 9 B.C., and Tiberius, consul in 13 B.C., the year of the book's issue. There is only one certain consular addressee in the book (apart, of course, from Augustus himself)—Lollius, who is considered above. The younger Censorinus, the future consul of 8 B.C., rising rapidly in 13, is surely a better companion for this collection of noble youths than the elder Censorinus, the veteran associate of Caesar and Mark Antony.

In this connection we must also consider patronage in relation to *Odes* 4. 8. Even after the publication of the first three books of *Odes* and the poet laureate status conferred by the commission and performance of the *Carmen Saeculare*, association with such members of the *jeunesse dorée* is likely to have involved some form of patronage for Horace, the freedman's son from Apulia; such exalted connections may have been particularly significant in this period after Maecenas' political eclipse, though there is some evidence of personal patronage from the princeps himself.<sup>21</sup> The friendship between Horace and Censorinus is advertised in this poem with the word 'sodalibus' (2); such language of *amicitia* is the standard way of expressing the Roman poet's relation to his patron,<sup>22</sup> and is commonly used by Horace himself of his relations with Maecenas.<sup>23</sup>

#### IV. ANALYSIS

Structurally, the poem falls neatly into two sections of three and five stanzas apiece, the first stating the theme of the value of poetry with overt relevance to Censorinus, and the second illustrating it with further examples. The twelve-line opening section is marked off by ring-composition: the opening 'donarem', repeated in 3, is picked up by 'donare' in line 12, and 'munere' in line 4 by 'muneri' in line 12, the linguistic movement skilfully following the movement of the poet's thought from one form of gift to another ('I would give you valuable artefacts, Censorinus; but you do not need them and my talent does not lie there—it is poetry you like, and poetry I will give you'). Scholars have relevantly enquired why Horace is giving Censorinus a gift at all; many have assumed that the poet is talking about *strenae*, the gifts exchanged by Romans on the Kalends of March or the Saturnalia and sometimes the occasion for a poem (e.g. Tibullus 3. 1, Statius, *Silvae* 4. 9<sup>24</sup>), or that he is simply honouring Censorinus for friendship's sake. *Strenae* seem unlikely because no reciprocal present, central to that notion and occasion, is mentioned, and because there is no other hint of a particular festival:<sup>25</sup> but if a connection is made with the military achievements of Censorinus as suggested above (Section III), a natural occasion for a celebratory gift arises.

The list of gifts first envisaged and then rejected by Horace might seem to have some connection with the military career of Censorinus, though no commentator has suggested it. The first gifts bypassed by Horace in favour of poetry are libation-bowls ('pateras') and tripods. Unlike the statues and paintings of lines 5–8, they do not belong to the world of the Augustan connoisseur-collector, but, as editors have noticed, closely recall the gifts awarded to victorious athletes in Pindar,<sup>26</sup> as Horace confirms in 3–4 'praemia fortium/Graiorum'. Why this Pindaric colouring, which will be found to continue throughout the poem? Pindar is echoed for the same reason in 4. 2, 4. 4 and 4. 14: in this fourth book of odes Horace is turning the victory-ode of Pindar into a celebration of Roman military success.<sup>27</sup> Horace is willing to offer Censorinus the typical reward of the Pindaric victor because Censorinus too has been victorious, but in the military sphere: 'fortium' can apply as much to the courage of

<sup>21</sup> As evidenced in the 'Suetonian' *Vita Horati* (best found in A. Rostagni, *Suetonio De Poetis* (1944), 113–17), though this may not be wholly reliable.

<sup>22</sup> cf. P. White, *JRS* LXVIII (1978), 74–92, esp. 78–82.

<sup>23</sup> e.g. *Epodes* 1. 2, *Odes* 3. 8. 13, *Epistles* 1. 1. 105, 1. 7. 12.

<sup>24</sup> cf. K. Coleman's note on the Statius passage.

<sup>25</sup> If Horace writes on the occasion of an anniversary,

birthday or festival, there is usually an explicit statement of this or a broad hint—cf. *Odes* 1. 20. 1, 1. 31. 1, 3. 8. 1, 4. 11. 17–20.

<sup>26</sup> cf. Pindar, *Isthm.* 1. 18–22: ἐν τ' ἀέθλοισι θίγον πλείστων ἀγώνων, / καὶ τριπόδεσσιν ἐκόσμησαν δόμον/καὶ λεβήτεσσιν φιάλαισι τε χρυσοῦ, γευόμενοι στεφάνων/ νικαφόρων.

<sup>27</sup> cf. especially E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957), 426 ff.

soldiers as to the physique of athletes, and 'neque tu' implies an equivalence between Censorinus and an athletic victor. 'Pateras', prominently placed in the poem's first line, may also contain a further hint at this: the libation-bowl will be used to pour thank-offerings to the gods, and even perhaps in the symposiastic celebration of the victory itself, as Propertius had celebrated Actium and Augustus with an all-night drinking-session (4. 6. 85-6): 'sic noctem patera, sic ducam carmine, donec/iniciat radios in mea vina dies'. This suggestion of thank-offerings and of celebratory drinking may be picked up by the appearance of Liber at the end of the poem (see below).

As hinted above, the gifts mentioned in lines 5-8 belong not to the Pindaric past but to the Augustan present. Horace names and praises two classic artists of Greece—the painter Parrhasius of Ephesus, contemporary of Socrates and appearing in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (3. 10. 1 ff.), and the fourth-century sculptor Scopas of Paros. These are not simply great names from the annals of art history: some of their most famous works were on show in Rome at the time Horace wrote, especially Scopas' statue of Apollo citharoedus, placed inside Augustus' Palatine temple of Apollo and described by Propertius.<sup>28</sup> The mention here of a statue as a possible gift, followed by its prompt rejection in favour of poetry on the grounds of the mutual taste of Horace and Censorinus (9-12) surely anticipates the pattern of lines 13-24, where poetry and statues again compete, this time not as suitable gifts but as purveyors of immortality, with poetry once more the victor; as we shall see, this too recalls a motif from Pindar.

Pindaric influence is in fact manifold. First of all, it has become clear by lines 9-12 that the catalogue of gifts in lines 1-8 is a rhetorical device, something like a 'priamel' of Pindaric type, with various choices being rejected before the right selection is reached: bronze vessels, painting and statues serve as 'foil' to the correct gift of poetry.<sup>29</sup> Secondly, the rejection of sculpture in favour of poetry is itself a Pindaric motif. *Nemean* 5 begins with the assertion that Pindar is no statue-maker, and goes on to state that the poet uses song (and not statues) to spread the praise of the victor he is honouring; as if to confirm his appreciation of this Pindaric notion, Horace alludes to it in his own praise of Pindar's epinicians at *Odes* 4. 2. 19-20 'centum potiore signis/munere donat', and it is, of course, the major thought behind lines 13-24 of 4. 8.<sup>30</sup> Thirdly, the way in which Horace describes the skills of painter and sculptor in fact points to the Pindaric view of poetry: Parrhasius and Scopas are skilled in depicting both gods and men (8 'sollers nunc hominem ponere, nunc deum'), while Pindar can sing in praise of 'men, heroes and gods' (*Olympian* 2. 2), as Horace well knew (he echoes the last-mentioned passage of Pindar in the opening of *Odes* 1. 12).<sup>31</sup> Finally, even Horace's statement that he is not capable of painting or sculpture has a Pindaric edge; his claim 'non haec mihi vis' (9) suggests that he has in mind a different kind of 'vis', the poetic vehemence which he had earlier in the fourth book of odes ascribed to Pindar himself (cf. 4. 2. 5-8, and for Horace's own approval of poetic 'vis' cf. *Sat.* 1. 4. 43-8).<sup>32</sup>

Pindar is a constant presence in the poem, more constant than scholars have thought; 4. 8 is not only a covert epinician ode for Censorinus but also makes much of the central Pindaric topic of the fame conferred on great men by poetry.<sup>33</sup> Lines 9-12 stress, in somewhat ironic vein, that, like the Pindaric epinician, Horace's ode is a gift tailored for its addressee: Censorinus does not want the plastic arts, being unconcerned for such luxuries ('non tibi talium/res est'—'res' surely implies that Censorinus, a senator, is rich enough to have these things anyway<sup>34</sup>), but is an enthusiast for

<sup>28</sup> Works of Parrhasius and Scopas in Rome: Pliny, *Nat.* 35. 67-72 (Parrhasius), 36. 25-6 (Scopas). Propertius on Apollo citharoedus: 2. 31. 5-6.

<sup>29</sup> For the 'foil' and the priamel structure cf. W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 74 (1982), 1-30. Note too that a well-known poem of Pindar begins like Horace's ode with a first-person verb expressing an impossible condition: *Pythian* 3. 1 ἴθελον/*Odes* 4. 8 'donarem'.

<sup>30</sup> This assertion that poetry is better than stone monuments becomes a motif in late Horace (cf. Brink on *Ep.* 2. 1. 248), no doubt stressing his increasing affinity

with Pindar (in whom cf. also *Nem.* 4. 79 ff.). It is also found in the *Panegyricus Messallae*, probably without reference to or echo in Horace—cf. Suerbaum, op. cit. (n. 1), 190-3.

<sup>31</sup> cf. Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1. 12. 1.

<sup>32</sup> Thus 'vis' does not mean 'copia' as argued by Quinn, ad loc. (n. 3).

<sup>33</sup> cf. C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (1964), 36-41.

<sup>34</sup> It is just possible that a play is intended on his name: Censorinus is a man possessed of senatorial wealth or 'census'.

the alternative 'deliciae' of poetry: 'gaudes carminibus'. Thus the recipient conveniently wants the only thing the giver can give. The polyptoton 'carminibus; carmina' seems highly emphatic, and has led to suggestions that this poem, like *Epistles* 1. 13, accompanies the gift of a copy of the *Odes*,<sup>35</sup> but the 'carmina' promised by Horace are surely the lines of this particular poem, which honours Censorinus as its addressee and (if Section III above is right) praises him for his military achievements; such an allusion to the poem in progress is another Pindaric motif.<sup>36</sup> The final assertion of the opening section, that Horace will 'pretium dicere muneri',<sup>37</sup> not only gives the theme of the remainder of the poem (the real immortality conferred by great poetry) but also suggests that the 'pretium' of poetry is greater than the vast 'pretium' of the antique works of art already mentioned.

The central section which follows (13–21) has raised the poem's most notorious difficulties. The argument of the passage seems to be: 'neither public inscriptions to and statues of great generals, nor their great deeds themselves, are better at perpetuating their praise than poetry'. This is not an easy sequence of thought. As Jachmann noted, the poet should be concentrating on the contrast between public inscriptions and poetry as means of perpetuating great deeds, and the additional notion that poetry is a better perpetuator of the fame of deeds than the deeds themselves seems both gratuitous and illogical:<sup>38</sup> how can 'celerēs fugae' or 'reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae' proclaim Scipio's glory? The easiest way out has been to adopt Lachmann's excision of lines 15b–19b ('non celerēs ... rediit') as an interpolation. But what interpolator, hoping no doubt to provide a successful and permanent addition to a classic, would have introduced such a *non sequitur*? The lines can be kept, and made sense of in context, though Horatian scholars have largely despaired of them.

The essential problem has been that the second 'non' clause ('non celerēs fugae/reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae') has been taken to say (rather oddly) that the deeds themselves promote their own fame in contrast to the marble inscriptions of the first 'non' clause ('non incisa notis marmora publicis'), a contrast which is then undesirably followed by the further contrast with the fame-giving powers of poetry. But what if both 'non' clauses were to be taken as referring to inscriptions, presenting together a single contrast with poetry? This would solve both difficulties. 'Incisa notis marmora publicis' could refer to the general appearance of the honorific inscriptions envisaged by the poet, while 'celerēs fugae/reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae' could paraphrase the actual content of the inscriptions, the 'notae publicae' already mentioned, thus referring not to Scipio's actual deeds (as traditionally thought) but rather to their specific commemoration in an epigraphic text. Horace's argument would then be: 'it is not public inscriptions or their recording of routs<sup>39</sup> and of the defeat of Hannibal's threats which have made Scipio famous, but the poems of Ennius'—much more straightforward and appropriate to the context.

A minor textual change might help to articulate the argument. As Jachmann has pointed out, 'celerēs fugae' is a phrase used elsewhere by Horace but which is not particularly at home here and might even be viewed as historically inaccurate.<sup>40</sup> In addition, the sequence of thought here requires emphasis not on the celerity of Scipio's defeats of Hannibal but on their celebrity, their glorification through the means of an inscription: I therefore propose emending 'celerēs' to 'celebres', the

<sup>35</sup> So Elter, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 9, followed by Quinn, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 314.

<sup>36</sup> For such references to the poem in progress in Pindar cf. *Ol.* 1. 8 ff., 2. 1 ff., 6. 7 ff., 11. 4 ff. etc. Horace's plural 'carmina' is simply convenient and poetic (as e.g. at Catullus 65. 16, 'mitto haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae', referring to Poem 66; cf. further *TLL* 3. 4. 73. 71 ff.).

<sup>37</sup> Some editors prefer the genitive 'muneris', found in an eleventh-century MS, but the dative seems more select and is perhaps confirmed by the similar dative after 'pretium facere', 'fix a price (for)'—cf. Martial 7. 17. 8 'haec illis pretium facit litura'. The genitive would be an easy simplification.

<sup>38</sup> So Jachmann, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 333.

<sup>39</sup> Though 'celerem fugam' at *Odes* 2. 7. 9 clearly refers to running away, i.e. flight seen from the point of view of the fugitive, 'celerēs fugae' (if that reading is kept) at *Odes* 4. 8. 15 could just as easily refer to running away as seen from the point of view of the pursuer, i.e. 'routs', and need not go with 'Hannibalis' in grammar, but allude to Scipio's many victories against other enemy commanders, especially those in Spain.

<sup>40</sup> Jachmann's accusation of historical inaccuracy in 'celerēs fugae' (*loc. cit.* (n. 38)) in fact seems ill-founded—'fugae' need not necessarily go with 'Hannibalis', and could easily refer to Scipio's routing of enemies other than Hannibal (see n. 39 above).

easiest of changes, with concomitant emendation of the above paraphrase: 'it is not public inscriptions of their *well-known* recording of routs or of the defeat of Hannibal's threats which have made Scipio famous, but the poems of Ennius'. This seems a perfectly acceptable interpretation of the Latin of lines 15–16: 'celebres' would go with both 'fugae' and 'reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae', dismantling the apparent balance between 'celeris' and 'reiectaeque retrorsum' but allowing 'fugae' to include defeats other than those of Hannibal himself, highly appropriate for Scipio who met and defeated Hannibal himself only the once, at Zama.<sup>41</sup> The apparent oxymoron of 'celebres fugae' would also be characteristically Horatian.<sup>42</sup>

This interpretation naturally depends on the recognition by the reader that lines 15–16 echo the language of Roman honorific inscriptions, something which has been suggested before of these lines but not used to solve the poem's problems.<sup>43</sup> In fact, 'fugae reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae' makes good sense as a colourful and poetic version of an epigraphic formula marking military achievement, which in prose might read '[hostes populi Romani] fugavit Hannibalisque minas retrorsum reiecit'; one might compare the mention of the enemy commander subjugated in existing archaic *elogia* (e.g. *CIL* 1. 12. 5 'pater regem Antioco subegit'), and rather more elaborate epigraphic accounts of victories are known from the Republic, particularly on the *columna rostrata* marking the naval victories over Carthage of C. Duilius, cos. 260 B.C. (for its long text cf. *ILLRP* 319), visible in the Forum in Horace's day.<sup>44</sup>

The change from 'celeris' to 'celebres' also adds interest to the formal structure of Horace's argument in lines 13–19. Through the epithet 'celebres' some glory and power to confer fame is conceded to public inscriptions, but this is simply used to assert that the praise of poetry is even more glorious and long-lasting. This looks like a form of rhetorical *concessio*, where points are ceded to the opposition in order to make one's own case,<sup>45</sup> and adds edge to a conventional argument: Scipio Africanus, famous though his deeds are in the inscriptions of Horace's Rome,<sup>46</sup> could (to use the words of Horace's next and closely-linked ode) have gone the way of the forgotten 'fortes ante Agamemnona' without the 'vates sacer' Ennius (cf. 4. 9. 25–8).

The arguments against interpolation in lines 13–16 are supplemented by considerations of contemporary allusion, unstressed by modern commentators. The marble memorials to generals mentioned in these lines are not merely inscriptions ('incisa ... notis') but portrait statues too ('spiritus et vita redit'<sup>47</sup>), and as Mommsen saw,<sup>48</sup> the poet evokes not merely the inscribed epitaphs of Republican heroes<sup>49</sup> but also a great Augustan building. The Forum Augustum with its centrepiece of the temple of Mars Ultor, vowed back in 42 B.C., was to be officially dedicated in 2 B.C., a decade after the publication of *Odes* 4, but had probably opened for business by the time Horace wrote, and must certainly have been a visible construction.<sup>50</sup> The great colonnades which enclosed the Forum Augustum were filled with marble statues of the great military leaders of Rome, each with a celebratory inscription, and any reader

<sup>41</sup> The occasion when Hannibal made a tactical withdrawal on hearing of the advance of Scipio towards Locri (Livy 29. 7. 9 ff.) should not be counted as a defeat.

<sup>42</sup> For Horace's fondness for the oxymoron of juxtaposed words in the artful word-order of the *Odes* cf. 1. 19. 7 'grata protervitas', 1. 22. 16 'arida nutrix', 2. 5. 23 'discrimen obscurum', 2. 12. 26 'facili saevitia', 3. 11. 35 'splendide mendax', 3. 27. 28 'palluit audax'.

<sup>43</sup> Links between Horace's language and that of the *elogia* were stressed by Elter, op. cit. (n. 1), but to very different effect.

<sup>44</sup> cf. Pliny, *Nat.* 34. 20, Quintilian 1. 7. 12.

<sup>45</sup> For rhetorical *concessio* cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (1960), 425–6.

<sup>46</sup> There are no extant inscriptions celebrating Africanus in Rome, but there must have been a number of them—he was surely included in the *summi viri* of the Forum Augusti, and there may have been laudatory inscriptions of his on his Capitoline arch (Livy 37. 3. 7) and his tomb outside the Porta Capena (Livy 38. 56. 3–4).

<sup>47</sup> The mention of 'spiritus' and 'vita' recalls the platitudes of ancient art criticism, according to which statues were so realistic that they 'breathed' or 'lived'—cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 6. 847–8 'spirantia aera ... vivos ... vultus' with Austin's commentary, and Suerbaum, op. cit. (n. 1), 185 n. 553.

<sup>48</sup> cf. Mommsen in *CIL* 1, 186.

<sup>49</sup> Such as the *elogia* of the Scipiones, mentioned below and collected at *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>, 6–16.

<sup>50</sup> Suetonius, *Aug.* 29. 1 relates that the Forum Augustum was opened before its dedication in 2 B.C. owing to the pressure of business (though it does not tell us when), and such a massive project must have taken recognizable shape years before completion. For recent discussions of the Forum Augustum and its contemporary impact, cf. E. Simon, *Augustus: Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitwende* (1986), 46–51; P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (1988), 194–215; and J. Gonzert and V. Kockel's pieces in *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* (1988), 149–99.

of lines referring to marble inscriptions and statues of great generals in 13 B.C. would surely have made a connection with the princeps' great project. The connection is perhaps implicit rather than explicit for reasons of tact as well as artistry; after all, it was hardly polite for an Augustan poet, even (or perhaps especially) the author of the Roman Odes and the *Carmen Saeculare*, to claim too openly that his poetical mode of praising great military men was more effective than the more tangible means employed by Augustus.

In these central lines (13–21) the poetry of Ennius achieves the importance to the poem which had belonged to the poetry of Pindar in its opening section (1–12), an importance generally underestimated in modern discussions.<sup>51</sup> 'Calabrae Pierides' (line 19), naming Ennius' *patria*, makes it clear that the poet is in play, just as 'Graiorum' (4) had confirmed the reference to Pindar. The Ennian reference is also particularized by allusion to the praise of Scipio Africanus the Elder, who had not only been an important character in Ennius' narrative of the later stages of the Second Punic War in the *Annals* but had also received a special panegyric from the poet, the *Scipio*. Few fragments of this latter work survive, but one of them is of clear relevance here (Ennius, *Var.* 1–2 v.):

quantam statuum faciet populus Romanus,  
quantam columnam quae res tuas gestas loquatur !

What Ennius went on to say next can only be guessed at, but it seems likely that some kind of relation was drawn between the public recognition of Scipio's achievements in statuary and inscriptions ('res tuas gestas loquatur') and Ennius' own offering of poetry: it may be that Ennius claimed that poetry was complementary to these monuments, or perhaps that it exceeded them in permanence as a mode of praise. In either case, a link with Horace's ode is clear; both poets talk of Scipio, and set up a relation between the public recognition of military achievement in monumental form (compare Ennius' 'populus' with Horace's 'notis ... publicis' (13)) and the personal gift of immortality from the poet.

It is worth considering for a moment the relevance of this allusion to Scipio and Ennius to the addressee of Horace's ode. One implication surely is that Horace, the poet purveying immortality, resembles the Ennius whom he is here imitating; the natural inference from this is that Censorinus resembles Scipio as recipient of praise, and is thus paired with one of the greatest generals of Roman history. If we assume some military achievement of Censorinus which Horace is celebrating in this poem (cf. Section III above), that equation makes good sense, as does its implicit nature (the praetorian Censorinus has a long way to go before openly meriting such a comparison). There is also some reflection on their personal relations. At *Pro Archia* 22, Cicero, admittedly with an axe to grind concerning the importance of poets to Rome and Romans, tells us that, 'our poet Ennius was dear to the elder Africanus, and consequently is even supposed to have been set up in marble effigy in the tomb of the Scipiones', and it seems reasonably clear that the two enjoyed a cordial relationship.<sup>52</sup> The Horace who in the *Satires* had compared his own relations with great men to the friendship of Lucilius with Laelius and Scipio Aemilianus (*Sat.* 2. 1. 62–80) would hardly hesitate to think of himself as an Ennius to Censorinus' Scipio Africanus, especially as the term 'sodalibus' in line 2 implies a familiar relationship between Censorinus and himself. Thus the reference to Ennius and Scipio contains literary learning, is probably relevant to Censorinus, and effectively dignifies both poet and addressee by an elevated comparison.

It is important to understand the precision and care of Horace's evocation of Scipio Africanus the elder before approaching the particular problem of line 17. As already argued above, a change from 'celerēs' to 'celebres' in line 15 would help considerably in clarifying Horace's argument here, but from the historical point of view the references to routs and Hannibal's defeat are clear enough allusions to the

<sup>51</sup> An honourable exception is Suerbaum, op. cit. (n. 1).

<sup>52</sup> cf. O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (1985), 1–2.



victories of the elder Africanus. Then comes line 17 'non incendia Carthaginis impiae'; Horace is apparently asserting that the elder Scipio Africanus burnt Carthage. This cannot be right: Horace may have been a poet rather than a historian, but he was surely aware that the burning and destruction of Carthage was the deed of Scipio Aemilianus, the younger Africanus, not the elder. The fundamental choice facing editors has, therefore, been either to emend this line or to follow Bentley in ejecting it ('ego vero cum prisco Catone Carthaginem delendam esse censeo'<sup>53</sup>); the emendations so far proposed are unconvincing,<sup>54</sup> and for those who hold that the poem has too many lines anyway (see Section II above), ejection is naturally desirable.

Ejection seems also to be supported by the fact that the line is metrically dubious, a point first raised by Bentley. In Horace's *Odes*, as often tightening up on the metrical practice of archaic Greek lyric,<sup>55</sup> the rule is that the Asclepiad line, in which this poem is written, has a caesura after the sixth syllable; in line 17 'non incendia Carth/aginis impiae' this is not so. This infraction is matched in Horace only at *Odes* 2. 12. 25 'cum flagrantia de/torquet ad oscula', where the separation of a prefix is less difficult than the breaking-up of a proper name (cf. similarly 1. 18. 16), and there may be some sense-element in the unusual rhythm, not the case at *Odes* 4. 8. 17.<sup>56</sup> Interpolation in Horace, regarded with horror by some, is just as possible as in other poets, and this is not the only instance;<sup>57</sup> the notion that a later hand might have foisted on Horace a line containing both a historical howler and a metrical infelicity is certainly more attractive than ascribing the line to the poet himself.

Having disposed of line 17, we turn to the difficulties of 18. Here critics have objected to the prosaic 'eius qui', rightly pointing to the fact that this is the only certain instance of this form of 'is', particularly rare in high poetry, in the *Odes*.<sup>58</sup> they wish to include this line in any interpolation, arguing that it is a poor version of *Sat.* 2. 1. 65-6, 'Laelius aut qui/duxit ab oppressa meritum Carthagine nomen'. The argument from similarity to another passage of Horace can cut either way (it could be a natural self-echo), but the prosaic register of the phrase seems indubitable; that, however, is no reason to reject it. As Büchner stressed,<sup>59</sup> Horace is here using the rugged prose of the Republican epitaph, which favoured such locutions and particularly the use of the relative pronoun; it is particularly appropriate that parallels should be found in the archaic *elogia* of Scipio Africanus' own family—cf. *CIL* 1. 7. 1-4 'Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus / Gnaiod patre prognatus, fortis vir sapiensque, / Quoius forma virtutei parisuma fuit, / consol censor aidilis quei fuit apud vos ...', 1. 11. 4 (L. Cornelius Scipio) 'Is hic situs quei nunquam victus est virtutei'. This echo is far from incidental. As argued above, Horace appears to have the language of inscriptions praising Scipio in view in lines 13-16, and a more obvious imitation of their formulae here comes naturally in line 18. There is also the point that Horace is here arguing that Ennius' poetry is a better purveyor of fame than the very inscriptions whose style he is hitting off, and the prosaic phrase hints that stylish poetry is more likely to be read than angular prose. In any case, 'eius qui' has considerable point, and should not be ejected.

Another argument for retaining lines 18-19 is the metaphor of 'lucratus'; as commentators have pointed out, this is doubly skilful, since it not only provides a commercial metaphor which echoes the previous 'pretium muneri' at 12 and anticipates 'mercedem' (22) and 'meritis' (24), but also alludes to a supposed apophthegm of the elder Scipio Africanus himself. Valerius Maximus (3. 7. 1) relates that Scipio, accused of corruption, pointedly argued that his name was all the wealth he had earned from his African campaigns ('cum Africam totam potestati vestrae

<sup>53</sup> R. Bentley (Ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (1711), 169.

<sup>54</sup> The only realistic choice is to emend 'incendia', but 'dispendia' (Hermann), 'impendia' (Cunningham) and 'stipendia' (Doring) all seem desperate remedies.

<sup>55</sup> cf. especially R. Heinze, *Die Lyrischen Verse des Horaz*, Ver. Sachs. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl. 70. 4 (1918), reprinted in his *Geist der Römertums* (3rd ed., 1960), 227-94, and R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard,

*A Commentary on Horace Odes: Book 1* (1970), xxxviii-xlvi.

<sup>56</sup> See the commentary of Nisbet and Hubbard, ad loc.

<sup>57</sup> cf. R. J. Tarrant in L. D. Reynolds (Ed.), *Texts and Transmissions* (1983), 184-5.

<sup>58</sup> cf. B. Axelson, *Unpoetischer Wörter* (1945), 71, who gives useful statistics.

<sup>59</sup> K. Büchner, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 267 (1939), 142-4.

subiecerim, nihil ex ea quod meum diceretur praeter cognomen rettuli'). This is a motif found elsewhere: Cicero says of L. Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus that though he captured the fabulous treasures of the kings of Macedonia, 'hic nihil domum suam intulit praeter memoriam nominis sempiternam' (*Off.* 2. 76), which presumably means the glory of being called 'Macedonicus'.<sup>60</sup> Horace's reference to a supposed saying of Scipio here is a pointed allusion which deserves to be kept.

Lines 19–21 deserve some notice, for they not only conclude the argument about the superiority of poetry over stone as a preserver of fame but also raise once again the achievements of the poem's addressee. The use of 'clarius' is highly pointed, playing on the full range of the meanings of 'clarus'; deeds are not only more *famous* through poetry, but poetry can illuminate them more *brightly* even than the white marble of statues and can proclaim them more *loudly* than the dumb testimony of the plastic arts.<sup>61</sup> The idea of poetry overcoming other forms of celebration because it is not silent, and the highly undesirable possibility that it might be silent and thus lose its role, are central here (21 'si chartae sileant'); the Pindaric notion of poetry as the loud proclaiming of praise<sup>62</sup> is carried on both in this poem (22–3 'si taciturnitas/obstaret ... invida')<sup>63</sup> and in the next ode to Lollius (esp. 4. 9. 30–31, which echoes line 21 here). The use of the second person singular ('neque,/si chartae sileant quod bene feceris/mercedem tuleris'), though that is a frequent mode of generalizing in Horace, does seem to suggest some particular relevance to the poem's addressee, and if we once more suppose that Horace is alluding to the military successes of the younger Censorinus (cf. Section III above), the reference to 'bene facta' acquires a particular point and finesse.

The poem concludes (22–34) with a veritable gallery of gods and heroes. The individuals in this list clearly increase in importance: we move from the relatively recent figure of Scipio, only figuratively 'immortalized' by the verses of Ennius, to the distant heroic figure of Romulus, who achieved actual immortality as the god Quirinus, to Aeacus, immortal judge of the dead, and to the divine figures of Hercules, the Dioscuri and of Liber/Bacchus, who according to the Romanized version of Greek mythology achieved immortality through their services to men.<sup>64</sup> The general point is clear; all the figures mentioned are famously celebrated in poetry, and Horace's hyperbolic claim is that they are saved from mortality by the Muse and her spokesman the poet.<sup>65</sup> The Muse can grant good men apotheosis ('caelo Musa beat'), the 'vates', appropriately given his status as priest/prophet/bard,<sup>66</sup> can consecrate them as immortal ('lingua potentium/vatum divitibus consecrat insulis'); poetry can in effect create gods—'di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt', as Ovid put it (*Pont.* 4. 8. 55).

The claim that poets confer immortality and divine status is of course natural in the argument of the poem, which has lauded the preservative powers of poetry over those of stone inscriptions. The poet fleshes this out by conscious cross-references to other poetry, just as he has already made use of Pindar and Ennius: the list and its language are a clear invitation to the reader to look for literary sources here, though no commentator has done this in a systematic way. The search for a poetic source is simple in the case of Romulus, the mention of whose deification inevitably recalls the famous scene of his admission to heaven at the end of the first book of Ennius' *Annales*,<sup>67</sup> an episode already used by Horace in the *Odes* (3. 3. 15 ff.). Even a detail of Horace's language recalls the older poet: this is the only time that Horace uses the

<sup>60</sup> Not strictly true (as was no doubt also the case with Scipio): Paullus had at least taken the Macedonian royal library for himself (Plutarch, *Aem.* 24).

<sup>61</sup> Some of these nuances of 'clarus' are seen by Putnam, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 151.

<sup>62</sup> Usually characterized by the verb κλαδίζειν—cf. Pindar, *Ol.* 1. 9, 2. 2, 6. 88, 10. 79, *P.* 1. 58, 11. 10, *Nem.* 9. 54, *Isthm.* 1. 54.

<sup>63</sup> 'Invida' might also recall the common Pindaric topic of φθόνος, the envy felt towards the glory of the successful (*P.* 1. 85, 7. 19, 11. 29).

<sup>64</sup> *Odes* 1. 12. 21–33, 3. 3. 9–16 and *Ep.* 2. 1. 5–14; cf.

further Pease on Cicero, *Nat.* 2. 62, Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1. 12. 25.

<sup>65</sup> As Kiessling/Heinze point out ad loc. (n. 5), this notion comes from the similar catalogue and argument in Theocritus 16. 40–70.

<sup>66</sup> For this (and other) aspects of the term 'vates' cf. J. K. Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry*, Collection Latomus 85 (1967), 99–206. 'Consecrat', the standard verb for deification (*OLD* s.v. 3), makes clear the god-making role of the 'vates' here in Horace's poem.

<sup>67</sup> cf. Ennius, *Annales* fr. 51–5 Skutsch.

archaic 'Mavors', found in Ennius (*Annales* fr. 99 Skutsch), for the usual 'Mars'. Thus, as before, Horace draws the parallel between himself and Ennius, and (implicitly) between Ennius' subject and his own—assimilating the divine Romulus and Censorinus as individuals immortalized by poetry.

The search for a poetic account of the apotheosis of Aeacus is not so easy. One thinks readily once again of Pindar, who frequently gives Aeacus honourable mention in odes to his descendants the Aeginetans; but though Aeacus is credited by Pindar as being the best of men, given the role of judging between the gods though a mere mortal and even assigned worship as a hero,<sup>68</sup> the extant poems of Pindar contain nothing to match Horace's picture of him lordling it as an immortal in the Isles of the Blest. The location of Aeacus as a judge in Hades, mentioned by Horace elsewhere (*Odes* 2. 13. 22) is first found in Plato, but may be confidently assigned to an earlier period;<sup>69</sup> it may well be that Horace is recalling a lost passage of Pindar or another poet, though it is possible that Quinn is right in claiming that he has taken the location of the Isles of the Blest from that assigned in the *Odyssey* (4. 564) and Pindar (*Ol.* 2. 70 ff.) to Rhadamanthys, Aeacus' fellow-judge in Plato and later sources.<sup>70</sup> Whatever his antecedents, the mention of Aeacus is meant to give us pause. Placed in a list with Romulus, Hercules, the Dioscuri and Bacchus, he is clearly the odd man out. The others all appear together on three further occasions in Horace as parallels for the forthcoming deification of Augustus, and are all celebrated in Roman tradition and cult as heroes who became gods.<sup>71</sup> Aeacus is strongly Greek, and given that it is particularly stressed that he (again like Censorinus and Scipio) owes his immortality to poets (cf. 26), the reader is surely invited to remember a particular Greek poetic source, very likely one lost to us.

At this point the final textual problem of the poem raises its head. Given the assumption that two lines should be ejected (cf. Section II above), the choice of the second line for excision still remains. Some editors, most recently Shackleton Bailey, have followed Lachmann's example in ejecting 28 'dignum laude virum Musa vetat mori', but this involves not only the removal of an effective line which echoes Theocritus<sup>72</sup> but also the destruction of a recurring pattern important in the movement of the poem. In his urging of song over other artefacts as a gift for Censorinus, Horace had used an emphatic polyptoton 'carminibus; carmina' (11); in lines 28–9, having made the argument for the superiority of song on the more general level of its capacity to immortalize, a word for poetry receives similar stress in anaphora—'dignum laude virum *Musa* vetat mori, / caelo *Musa* beat'. The value of poetry, and of the poet writing these lines, is once again asserted by repetition, and this is an important strand in the poem which should not be removed. A preferable solution to the need for excision here is the loss of line 33, which will be discussed below.

*Odes* 4. 8 finishes with the triad of Hercules, the Dioscuri and Bacchus (29–34), all, as already noted, celebrated god-heroes of Greece fully adopted by Roman tradition and cult. The argument of the poem once again urges us to look for particular poetic sources, even for this traditional triad; just as Romulus was deified by Ennius and Aeacus by Greek poets, just so ('sic', 29) these figures too owe their divine glory to the transfigurative powers of verse. This is easily asserted of Hercules, whose deeds were the subject of a great deal of poetry; as commentators have noted, Horace's description of him attending the feast of the gods, 'Iovis interest/optatis epulis impiger Hercules', specifically recalls two famous passages where Hercules is awarded this sign of acceptance into the divine community—*Odyssey* 11. 602–3, αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι/τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς (imitated at Theocritus 17. 22) and Pindar, *Nemean* 1. 72 δαΐσαντα πᾶρ Διὶ Κρονίδῃ. The description of the Dioscuri seems to derive from the language of the literary hymn: their protection of seamen, celebrated

<sup>68</sup> *Isthm.* 8. 24–6, 26–8, and *Nem.* 5. 53.

<sup>69</sup> Aeacus is found as a figure of the Underworld in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (465 ff.), a notion which clearly goes back to earlier tragedy; cf. further Van Leuwen on *Frogs* loc. cit. and Dodds on Plato, *Gorgias* 523 a 1–524 a 7.

<sup>70</sup> cf. Dodds, loc. cit. (n. 69.)

<sup>71</sup> cf. *Odes* 1. 12. 20–33, 3. 3. 9–16, *Ep.* 2. 1. 5–12.  
<sup>72</sup> cf. n. 65 (above); the phrase echoes in particular Theocritus 16. 58 ἐκ Μοισῶν ἀγαθὸν κλέος ἔρχεται ἀνθρώποισιν.

elsewhere by Horace,<sup>73</sup> is the central feature of their praise in the thirty-third Homeric Hymn, where they are invoked as σωτήρας .../ώκυπόρων ... νέων (6–7), and of Theocritus' hymn to them, whose ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔλκετε νῆας (22. 17) seems to be echoed by Horace's 'infimis/quassas eripiunt aequoribus rates'. Horace's description also cleverly parallels their saving powers with the preserving capacity of the poet which has given them immortality and which is the central theme of the ode: they can save ships from the ocean (32 'eripiunt aequoribus') just as a poet saved Aeacus from the waters of Styx (25 'ereptum Stygiis fluctibus').<sup>74</sup>

The final description of Bacchus includes line 33, 'ornatus viridi tempora pampino', which (as has already been suggested) is the preferred candidate here for the second line which must be excluded (cf. Section II above); this and 28 are the only lines after 19 which can be omitted without harm to grammar, and 28 is clearly to be kept (see above). The exclusion of 33 is perhaps made easier by the fact that it is very close to another line of Horace in the same metre and at the end of an ode (in that case the last line rather than the penultimate)—*Odes* 3. 25. 20 'cingentem viridi tempora pampino'. A motive for interpolating a form of that line here is apparent, for the need might have been felt to fill out the description of Liber, who otherwise (in fact unexceptionally) gets no epithet,<sup>75</sup> and to make good an apparent imbalance in treatment—Hercules gets a line and a half, the Dioscuri two lines, and Bacchus only one line, a type of ascending tricolon *manqué* which can be paralleled in Horace,<sup>76</sup> but might have upset the rhetorical notions of a scribe or early editor.<sup>77</sup> If 33 is to be rejected,<sup>78</sup> then a literary source for 34 alone is harder to find; perhaps the most that one can say is that the notion of Bacchus as a fulfiller of prayers belongs like the treatment of the Dioscuri to the tradition of the literary hymn—we may compare the conclusion of the twenty-sixth Homeric hymn, where Dionysus is asked to grant the wish of his worshippers to reach another vintage next year and in the years to come.<sup>79</sup>

But what of the addressee of the poem in lines 25–34? Has Censorinus been forgotten after the close analogy drawn in lines 13–24 between Horace and Ennius, and by inference between Scipio and Censorinus? Far from it. These further examples of immortality conferred by poets naturally reflect on Censorinus, on whom immortality is similarly being conferred by Horace. The technique is typical of Pindaric epinician lyric, where victors are regularly praised through implicit and explicit comparison with legendary heroes in the 'myths'; even Hieron's suffering from the stone can evoke a comparison with the wound of Philoctetes.<sup>80</sup> Even more specific connections may be tentatively suggested. As already noted, in the other three cases in Horace where the god-heroes Romulus, Hercules, the Dioscuri and Bacchus appear as a group, their immortality is presented as a parallel for the reward which awaits the heroic military exploits of Augustus. Horace is applying to Censorinus the comparisons he has used for the princeps and for a similar reason, to celebrate the military success argued for in Section III above, but naturally enough he does so in an indirect manner, citing them merely as *exempla* from the poets. It would not do to laud too explicitly the minor victories of an ex-praetor, however grand his lineage, in a book dominated by the triumphs of the Imperial family and the prospect of the glorious return of the princeps himself, a *reditus* to be marked by the *constitutio* of the Ara Pacis on 4 July 13 B.C. Indeed, it could be argued that these familiar comparisons are by this period so immediately associated with the public and poetical image of Augustus that the princeps himself would be gratified by their appearance here, since they recall his own supreme glory even in a poem which honours another.

The last line of the poem throws particular emphasis on to the figure of Liber/Bacchus, set in final isolation. His prominence seems to point to his role,

<sup>73</sup> cf. Nisbet and Hubbard on *Odes* 1. 12. 27.

<sup>74</sup> This point is made by Putnam, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 153.

<sup>75</sup> This is fine in Horace (cf. *Odes* 1. 12. 22, 16. 1, 32. 9, 3. 8. 7, 21. 21, *Ep.* 1. 19. 4), and unsurprising, since 'Liber', whatever its true etymology, was thought by some at least in antiquity to be itself an adjective, matching the Greek title ἐλευθέρος, used of Dionysus—cf. A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymo-*

*logique de la langue latine* (1939), 545.

<sup>76</sup> For the failed tricolon *ascendens* cf. *Odes* 1. 19. 1–3, 1. 21. 6–7.

<sup>77</sup> As it upsets Syndikus, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 2. 367–8.

<sup>78</sup> See the additional arguments against line 33 in Büchner, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 98–9.

<sup>79</sup> *Hom. Hymn.* 26. 11–13.

<sup>80</sup> *P.* 1. 47–57.

stressed by Horace in the *Odes*,<sup>81</sup> as god of lyric verse, and is highly appropriate in a poem largely about the value of poetry. The particular function of Bacchus chosen by the poet also seems to fit the end of the poem itself; like the prayers of men, *Odes* 4. 8 is brought 'bonos ... ad exitus' under the patronage of the lyric Bacchus, and the fact that the poem ends with a phrase which itself designates an ending ('ducit ad exitus') seems to be a clever touch. Horace is aware of the effect of 'poetic closure' obtainable through the use at the end of a poem of the language of ending ('closural allusion'),<sup>82</sup> and employs it here to round off the ode.

#### V. CONCLUSION

The above analysis has tried to tackle the essential problems of the poem—the probability of interpolation, the identity and relevance of the addressee, and (above all) the issue of the poem's merits as a piece of careful writing. It is not a masterpiece, but neither is it unworthy of Horace. After all, *Odes* 4. 8 appears to be given some prominence by the poet: not only is it placed emphatically in the centre of its fifteen-ode book,<sup>83</sup> but it is also written in a metre otherwise reserved for two highly significant points in the *Odes*—1. 1 and 3. 30, the first and last poems in Horace's first lyric collection. It seems no accident, too, that like those two poems 4. 8 is largely concerned with the role and value of poetry. Here it coheres well not only with the following ode to Lollius, with which it seems purposely juxtaposed, but also with the general outlook of the fourth book of *Odes*. In this final lyric volume Horace, laureate of Rome after the *Carmen Saeculare* and famed author of the first three books of *Odes*, becomes more and more concerned with the function of the poet, but also celebrates the progress of Roman arms: subtle praise in *Odes* 4. 8 of the Asian successes of Censorinus through the praise of poetry itself would be a true reflection of those twin themes.

*Corpus Christi College, Oxford*

<sup>81</sup> cf. esp. *Odes* 2. 19 and 3. 25 (on Bacchus/Dionysus as god of poetry in general, popular in the Augustan period, cf. Nisbet and Hubbard's introduction to the former).

<sup>82</sup> cf. P. H. Schrijvers, *Mnemosyne* 26 (1973), 140–59, esp. 150–51 (on 'closural allusion' in Horace). On the 'poetics of closure' cf. B. H. Smith, *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End* (1968) and D. P. Fowler,

*Materiali e Discussioni* 22 (1989), 75–122.

<sup>83</sup> Poems placed approximately at the centre of each of the other books of *Odes* may be seen as prominent: so 1. 20 (out of 38), 2. 12 (out of 20) and 3. 16 (out of 30), all of which are addressed to the patron of *Odes* 1–3, Maecenas. Just so the sixth poem out of eleven forms an evident centrepiece to Propertius' fourth book, probably published a few years before Horace's.