

# Structure and Allusion in Horace's Book of *Epodes*

R. O. A. M. LYNE†

## I THE SPECIAL PLACE OF *EPODE* 13

First, a text.<sup>1</sup> The one I print differs significantly in two places from the Oxford Classical Text of Wickham and Garrod (1901) and Shackleton Bailey's Teubner (1985). I adopt Bentley's *amice* for *amici* in l. 3, but reserve discussion of this for Section iv. In l. 13 the manuscripts describe Homer's 'great', 'deep-eddying', 'fair-flowing' Scamander,<sup>2</sup> which gives Achilles such a tremendous battle in *Iliad* 21, as 'small', *parui*, and nothing can defend this corruption.<sup>3</sup> For Heinsius' *flau*, *Odes* 1.2.13 *flauum Tiberim* is of small moment; the crucial point is that it calques Scamander's other designation Χάνθος, which is in fact the one most used in *Iliad* 21. Horace is fond of bilingual plays,<sup>4</sup> a shrouded allusion suits the prophet Chiron, and a reference to this more overtly divine twin-name<sup>5</sup> suits the rhetoric of the passage. Chiron's purpose here is to allude to an outstanding example of Achilles' invincibility, as I shall amplify below; so the more his foe is built up, the more that point is made. Bentley in his edition of 1711 proposed *proni*, objecting to the sound of *frigida flau* ('scabre & dure exhibit'), but the alliterative pattern *fr fl f . . . fl* suits Horace's virtual addiction to this figure, an addiction which this very poem evidences.

horrida tempestas caelum contraxit et imbres  
niuesque deducunt Iouem; nunc mare, nunc siluae  
Threicio Aquilone sonant. rapiamus, amice,  
occasionem de die, dumque uirent genua

<sup>1</sup> References to Archilochus and Hipponax follow M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci Volumen I* (2nd edn, 1989); West's numeration is preserved in the Loeb of D. E. Gerber, *Greek Iambic Poetry* (1999); testimonia (T) to Archilochus are in Gerber. For Alcaeus' fragments, I refer to the accessible Loeb of D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric, Vol. I* (1982), and for Anacreon to *Vol. II* (1988); Campbell's numeration for the most part follows E. Lobel and D. L. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (1955) and D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (1962), and (for Alcaeus) it virtually overlaps with the edition of E.-M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus* (1971). The following commentaries on the *Epodes* have proved most useful: L. C. Watson, *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (2003), D. Mankin, *Horace Epodes* (1995), and A. Cavarzere, *Il libro degli Epodi* (1992). Watson's immensely scholarly work was still in proof when I did most of my work on this article, and he generously sent me a preview of his notes on *Epodes* 13 and 14. I owe great thanks to Professor G. O. Hutchinson, who read a draft of my article and offered his usual acute criticisms and suggestions. He will observe and I hope forgive that I have resisted some of his scepticism.

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad* 20.73, 21.1, 15, 603, and other similar passages. Cf. [δὶνῶ]ντα in the passage of Bacchylides cited below.

<sup>3</sup> *parui* is printed by Wickham-Garrod, obelized by Shackleton Bailey. There is a balanced discussion of the textual problem in Mankin, *op. cit.* (n. 1), ad loc., but his text too prints *parui*. *parui* is also defended by e.g. C. Giarratano, *Q. Orazio Flacco. Il libro degli Epodi* (1930), 93. The context at Lucan 9.974f., 'inscius in sicco serpentem puluere riuum / transierat, qui Xanthus erat' needs to be noted: Caesar is visiting the miserable present-day remnants of great Troy, and the unnoticed stream that he crosses is what great Xanthus *was*. I argue against one of the main 'defences' of *parui* in n. 45 below. G. Davis provides a predictable late twentieth-century argument from genre in *Polyhymnia. The Rhetoric of Horatian Discourse* (1991), 15: a 'contradiction of Homer — the deliberate inversion of scale from "great" to "small"'. Why should Horace do this and make nonsense in dramatic terms of Chiron's speech? A scholiast's variant *prau*i is printed and defended by Cavarzere, *op. cit.* (n. 1) and Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), ad loc.

<sup>4</sup> *exilis Plutonia* (πλοῦτος) at *Odes* 1.4.17, *dulces . . . Licymniae / cantus* ([γ]λυκ-, ὕμνος) at 2.12.13f. (with R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (1978), ad loc.), 2.16.17 (Nisbet and Hubbard). Cf. Lucretius' *Scipiades, belli fulmen* at 3.1034, picked up by Vergil at *Aen.* 6.842–3 (owed ultimately to Ennius?). Cf. too Vergil's own *Ceraunia* (κεραυνός) *telo* at *Georg.* 1.332, and so on.

<sup>5</sup> At *Iliad* 20.74 we hear of the river 'whom the gods call Xanthos, but men call Scamander', and it is as Xanthus that he is known when we learn that 'Zeus bore him' (14.434, 21.2).

et decet, obducta soluatur fronte senectus. 5  
 tu uina Torquato moue consule pressa meo.  
 cetera mitte loqui: deus haec fortasse benigna  
 reducet in sedem uice. nunc et Achaemenio  
 perfundi nardo iuuat et fide Cyllenaea  
 leuare diris pectora sollicitudinibus, 10  
 nobilis ut grandi cecinit Centaurus alumno:  
 ‘inuicte mortalis dea nate puer Thetide,  
 te manet Assaraci tellus, quam frigida flauī  
 findunt Scamandri flumina lubricus et Simois,  
 unde tibi reditum certo subtemine Parcae 15  
 rupere, nec mater domum caerulea te reuehet.  
 illic omne malum uino cantuque leuato,  
 deformis aegrimoniae dulcibus alloquiis.’

There is already much bibliography on this atypical epode.<sup>6</sup> My discussion will be selective, and its thrust will be to show that the poem is not only special, but special in such a way as to merit an important structural position in the book. More exactly, if it had been a closing poem, it would have performed that role admirably.

I shall talk of ‘Horace’ as the speaker in the sympotic setting, since there is a very clear invitation to do so. I gather my comments under headings.

### 1 *Genre and Symposium*

The poem is a striking example of generic ‘crossing’, *Kreuzung*. In the *Epodes* book as a whole, Horace makes his official literary descent clear. He writes in the genre of *iambi*, and his models are Archilochus and Hipponax; *iambi* is indeed the title he gave to his collection (‘Epodes’ is grammarians’ talk, though since it is conventional I shall use it).<sup>7</sup> Alignment with both Archilochus and Hipponax is advertised in *Epode* 6.13–14, while Archilochus is focused upon in *Epist.* 1.19.23–5. Of available models, Archilochus does indeed seem to have been the most important. If we consider text, it is Archilochus’, so far as we can tell, that is more frequently echoed than Hipponax’s; *Epode* 2 perhaps owes a debt to Archilochus that has not been spotted.<sup>8</sup> Hipponax is, however, recognized as the author of

<sup>6</sup> A good place to start is with Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 417–37, Mankin, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 214ff., and Cavarzere, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 199ff. Differences in interpretation between Mankin and the author, especially as regards the point of the *exemplum*, will be manifest. I shall point to some detailed points where we differ, but some only. On many occasions our differences may co-exist: a Horatian text is very open. The commentary of O. Tescari, *Quinto Orazio Flacco, I Carmi e gli Epodi* (1936) is still worth consulting. N. Rudd, ‘Patterns in Horatian lyric’, *AJP* 81 (1960), 373–92 is not solely devoted to *Epode* 13 of course, but is a classic article with much to say on our poem. See too Giarratano, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 89ff. S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace* (1962), 173 is brief in his comments, but highly suggestive. Cf. too R. S. Kilpatrick, ‘An interpretation of Horace, Epodes 13’, *CQ* 20 (1970), 135–41; Kilpatrick has a curious idea about the occasion of the poem (see below), but other interesting things to say; C. Babcock, ‘Epodes 13. Some comments on language and meaning’, in *Wege der Worte: Festschrift für Wolfgang Fleischhauer* (1978), 107–18; A. Traina, *Poeti latini (e neolatini). Note e saggi filologici* (1986), ‘Semantica del *carpe diem*’, 227–51; M. Lowrie, ‘A sympotic Achilles, Horace Epode 13’, *AJP* 113 (1992), 413–33, a very helpful piece; E. Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (1998), 96 offers brief comment, entirely different from anything I say.

<sup>7</sup> See below and n. 77 for the title *iambi*. The genre of *iambi* is of course to be distinguished from metrical iambs: M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (1974), 22ff., e.g. ‘iambic metre got its name from being particularly characteristic of ἴαμβοι, not vice versa’. Our first occurrence of the word ἴαμβος itself is in Archilochus fr. 215 καὶ μ’ οὐτ’ ἴαμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει, where certainly more than metre is meant: West (p. 25) thinks that Archilochus’ ἴαμβοι, coupled with τερπωλαί, points to an occasion; I might have said, with conscious and perhaps suggestive anachronism, to a genre.

<sup>8</sup> On Horace’s use of Archilochus see G. O. Hutchinson in the forthcoming *Cambridge Companion to Horace*; Mankin’s and Watson’s, *op. cit.* (n. 1), indexes s.v. ‘Archilochus’. As for *Epode* 2, when Archilochus in fr. 19 makes ‘Charon the carpenter’ express in direct speech indifference to the wealth of Gyges etc., it seems to me likely that he is setting him up for an ironic revelation of hypocrisy just as Horace sets up Alfius in *Epode* 2; but it must be admitted that neither Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1418b.23–31 nor Plutarch, *Moralia* 470b–c point to any such denouement in their references to the piece.

the 'First Strasbourg Epode' by West (fr. 115) and others, and this poem seems to be behind *Epode* 10. As for metre, nearly all Horace's are demonstrably Archilochean,<sup>9</sup> and he eschews choliambics, Hipponax's metrical blazon.<sup>10</sup>

An Archilochean iambist he may be, but *Epode* 13 is clearly sympotic in its setting, the first and only epode to be so, and neither Archilochus nor Hipponax, so far as we can tell, situate poems in this way.<sup>11</sup> *Epode* 13 is not only sympotically situated, but follows a well-known sympotic pattern. Taking stimulus from an external event, the poet issues convivial instructions in the first person, and these instructions then merge with moralizing. Here we are on familiar but uniambic ground. Indeed, apart from its epodic Archilochean metre, *Epode* 13 most resembles a sympotic type from monostrophic lyric.<sup>12</sup> It anticipates *Ode* 1.9 in particular, and shows affinities to the Alcaean sympotic poem behind that ode (fr. 338), and to other Alcaean sympotic poems besides: cf. frs 38A, 346, 347(a),<sup>13</sup> 352, 367.<sup>14</sup>

Issuing instructions, Horace is modelling his voice on that of the symposiarch, συμποσιάρχος.<sup>15</sup> The sense of generic intrusion is, as we shall see, thereby reinforced. But since the use of the symposiarch voice is not appreciated in *Epode* 13<sup>16</sup> and in other lyric, sympotic poems, and since material on the role of the symposiarch is not as easy to come by as one might have thought, the point is worth elaborating.

The fullest texts on the role of the symposiarch are Plutarch, *Moralia* 620A–622B (*Quaestiones Coniuales*) and Plato, *Laws* 639 d–641, and another fascinating snippet occurs in Plato's *Symposium*. The first two are, of course, tendentious, especially Plato's, but we can identify important emphases. In Plutarch it is an assumption that one chooses the symposiarch (αἰρεῖσθαι, 620B): the location and its owner do not dictate who it is. For the purposes of his discussion on the symposiarch's function, itself convivially set, Plutarch accepts pressure and 'chooses himself' (620A); he appears to be at his own house, but the role clearly does not automatically go with the territory. True to the title, the symposiarch is, according to Plutarch, to take authority and give orders, prescribe (κελεύειν, προστάττειν, 620B); but he must know and understand his συμποταί so that he can, for

<sup>9</sup> See Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), 14–22.

<sup>10</sup> Hipponax and choliambics: see Hipponax T8, T12, T13, and the fragments themselves; Theocritus' *Epigram* 19 Gow = AP 13.3 on Hipponax is, significantly, written in choliambics. In contrast to Horace, Callimachus parades choliambics in his *Iambi*. While Callimachus presents himself as a genially reborn Hipponax (*Iambus* 1), Horace gives more the impression of a relatively genial Archilochus: cf. A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (1999), 275–6, but note too Hutchinson, op. cit. (n. 8).

<sup>11</sup> Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), 8 and 214 is misleading, likewise Cavarzere, op. cit. (n. 1), 33. In the elegiac fr. 4.6–9 drinking on board ship is envisaged, as in *Epode* 9 (R. G. M. Nisbet in T. Woodman and D. West, *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (1984), 10–18, esp. 17; Nisbet's note 62 is useful for Archilochus 4). Hipponax fr. 60 seems to refer to a sympotic occasion, but in the past tense. For a reconstruction of the occasion when archaic *iambi* were delivered (nothing to do with symposium), see M. L. West, *Greek Elegy and Iambus* (1974), 23ff.

<sup>12</sup> A. Pardini, *RFIC* 119 (1991), 271f. argues plausibly that there was no Greek term for a 'sympotic' poem in the way that that term is used now, i.e. to describe a poem that brings to the fore its sympotic occasion and talks of the typical concerns of symposia — pouring the wine, celebrating an event, enjoying the moment, etc. When Aristotle talks of Alcaeus' 'drinking songs' (σκόλια μέλη) at *Pol.* 1285.a.38, he is referring (says Pardini) to all Alcaeus' poems, on the assumption that all were destined to be uttered at symposia. But the absence of a limiting and technical term for a type of poem does not mean that that type of poem did not exist. Labelling lags behind creation. D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (1955), 299f. argues against employing a separate modern label, but usefully groups and comments upon sympotic fragments, at 299–310.

<sup>13</sup> This is closely based on Hesiod, *Op.* 582ff., which allows us to conjecture how Alcaeus' fragment continued.

<sup>14</sup> With this fr., cf. Horace, *Ode* 4.12.

<sup>15</sup> For other titles of the symposiarch (ἄρχων, βασιλεύς of the symposium), see Pellizer in O. Murray, *Symptotica* (1990), 178 n. 7. When the Romans adapted the symposium to their culture, the Latin terms reflected the Greek: Varro in Book 20 of his *Res Romanae* (Nonius Marcellus p. 142 M, 206 L), 'in conuiuuis qui sunt instituti potandi modimperatores magistrī'; Hor., *Odes* 2.7.25, 'arbiter bibendi'; *Odes* 1.4.18, 'rex (regnum) uini'.

<sup>16</sup> Kilpatrick, op. cit. (n. 6), 136, citing little evidence, and repeated by Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), ad loc., explains Horace's instructions regarding the wine in *Epode* 13 thus: it seems 'proper etiquette for a guest to specify the vintage to his host'. Watson, op. cit. (n. 1) on *Epode* 13.6 assumes that Horace's addressee (*tu*) is 'the host or symposiarch' and quotes the same remark of Kilpatrick's.

example, get the right strength of wine for each drinker.<sup>17</sup> In Plato, a symposium's need for a ruler is (no surprise) very emphatically stressed: οὐκοῦν πρῶτον μὲν καὶ τούτοις ἄρχοντος δεῖ (640C). For Plato too the identity of the symposiarch does not go with the location: in his words, he must be 'provided', 'appointed' (ἐκπορίζεσθαι, καθιστάναι, 640C and D). We hear again the need to understand the company: καὶ μὴν περί γε συνουσίας, ὡς ἔοικεν αὐτὸν φρόνιμον εἶναι δεῖ (640C). Particularly vivid then is Plato, *Symp.* 213e: here the tipsy, late arrival, Alcibiades, perceives an excess of sobriety in the assembled company, appoints himself ἄρχων τῆς πόσεως, and, in Agathon's house, gives an order for drink to be produced, and generally takes over. Alcibiades' self-appointment as symposiarch is funnily narrated, but the comparative material from Plato and especially Plutarch shows that it is not essentially transgressive. And once we have appreciated this point, we can appreciate that the conventional punctuation of Alcibiades' order for drink in Plato is importantly wrong.<sup>18</sup> In sum, Plato, *Laws*, Plutarch, and indeed by implication Plato, *Symp.* all suggest that an authoritative symposiarch, holding sway, who is neither the host nor on home turf, may be quite normal practice.

The symposiarch's voice is part of lyric sympotic poetry. In several odes we find Horace issuing advice and orders for present or imminent sympotic occasions, not necessarily at his own domicile, and to his social superiors as well as equals and inferiors: 1.4 (the consul Sestius); 1.9, 11, 36, 2.3 (Q. Dellius); 2.14 (Postumus,<sup>19</sup> and the implied sympotic setting there is clearly Postumus' own gardens: note '*harum* quas colis arborum'); 3.19 (to 'Telephus'; a party for the 'augur Murena'); 3.28. The situations vary and are more or less blurred, but the role of the elected and authoritative *symposiarchus* is the one to which Horace most approximates. So too in *Epode* 13. A forerunner of this symposiarch voice may be sensed in many fragments of Alcaeus: see most obviously frs 338, 346, 347, 352, also (though the context is often beyond certainty) 38A, 335, 362, 367, etc. In some of Horace's odes, and some of Alcaeus', we may get the impression of a party for two, as we do in *Epode* 13 (*Odes* 1.9, 11, for example) — how consonant with reality, we cannot tell.

The poem also employs a mythical *exemplum*. Again this is like Alcaeus' sympotic lyric. In the sympotic 38A Alcaeus uses a mythical paraenesis (Sisyphus), and he features myth elsewhere.<sup>20</sup> Fable, αἶνος, is much more typical of Archilochus than myth; about Hipponax

<sup>17</sup> ἔτι τοίνυν αὐτῷ δεῖ προσεῖναι τὸ μάλιστα μὲν ἐκάστου τῶν συμποτῶν ἐμπείρωσ ἔχειν τίνα λαμβάνει μεταβολὴν ἐν οἴνῳ καὶ πρὸς τί πάθος ἀκροσφαλῆς ἐστι καὶ πῶς φέρει τὸν ἄκρατον... ἀνθρώπου δὲ πρὸς οἴνον οὐκ ἔστ' ἰδία κράσις, ἦν τῷ συμποσιάρχῳ γινώσκειν προσήκει καὶ γινώσκοντι φυλάττειν... etc. (620E).

<sup>18</sup> The text of Alcibiades' order for drink is conventionally printed with the following punctuation, ἀλλὰ φερέτω, Ἀγάθων, εἴ τι ἔστιν ἔκπομα μέγα... and the sense abstracted is 'Agathon, let <some slave> bring...'. But this is very forced, especially in view of the 'abnormal' (Dover, ad loc.) omission of τις to indicate a slave; and, enlightened by comparative material on the symposiarch, we can correct it. Editors punctuate thus, avoiding Ἀγάθων as subject of φερέτω, because 'even when drunk Alcibiades would not give orders to his host as if to a slave' (Dover). But there must be some transgressive behaviour to indicate Alcibiades' tipsiness; his taking over the role of symposiarch does *not*, as we have seen, sufficiently constitute it; and it is precisely in his issuing of orders to Agathon that the amusing presumption of the drunk is revealed. The text should precisely show him ordering Agathon about: ἀλλὰ φερέτω Ἀγάθων... He then supplants this order with one to a *slave*, and the sentence as a whole is, or should be, unambiguous: ἀλλὰ φερέτω Ἀγάθων εἴ τι ἔστιν ἔκπομα μέγα. μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲν δεῖ ἀλλὰ φέρε, παῖ, φάναι, τὸν ψυκτήρα ἐκείνον... (213E).

<sup>19</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. (n. 4), 223 document the plausible identification of this Postumus with the successful magistrate (*ILS* 914) Propertius (Postumus) identified behind Prop. 3.12.

<sup>20</sup> In fr. 42 he contrasts the stories of Helen and Troy on the one hand and Peleus and Thetis on the other: our fr. starts 'as the story goes', ὡς λόγος. Fr. 283 — a fine piece — tells the story of Helen and her disastrous elopement to Troy. In fr. 298 the story of Locrian Ajax's impious rape of Cassandra is told, as, it seems, an *exemplum* in a political poem. These together with fr. 44 are given commentary and discussion as 'the principal examples of a practice seldom observable in the remains of Sappho and Alcaeus, the adaptation of Homeric themes to Lesbian dialect and metre' by Page, op. cit. (n. 12), 275–85. 'Seldom' perhaps gives the wrong emphasis: these poems certainly leave a lasting impression. At 387, too, there is a reference to the other Ajax and to Achilles.

in this respect little can be said.<sup>21</sup> Horace does not use mythical paraenesis in *Odes* 1.9, but he does in the generically related *Odes* 1.7 (Teucer) and *Odes* 4.11 (Phaethon); cf. too Itys in *Odes* 4.12.

Horace brings the lyric symposium into *iambi*, an arresting innovation, enough to make us pause.

## 2 *The Special Nature of the Symposium*

The symposium set in motion is very much out of the ordinary. The wine (13.6) is a vintage from the year of Horace's birth, a fact that we will note again below. For now we may make two inferences. A vintage *circa* thirty years old must be a very good vintage, implying grand status in the *amicus*:<sup>22</sup> it is one that in *Odes* 3.21 will be deemed worthy of the great M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (3.21.6: 'moueri digna bono die'). The choice by Horace of a vintage precisely from the year of his birth also implies a special relationship between him and the friend: it must have a sentimental value which would not be shared with just any (grand) person. Then too the balsam deemed proper in l. 8f. is ostentatiously luxurious.<sup>23</sup> The verb *moue* (13.6) is also important. The imperative ultimately denotes 'bring out', 'move from its storage place' (cf. *depromere* in *Odes* 1.9.7), but it is not an obvious word for the context, and the only parallel to be adduced is *Odes* 3.21.6. In that ode (a hymnic parody) many see, and Syndikus documents, a play on uses of (*com*)*moueo* for the moving of a sacred object for a ceremony on a religious day. This is a most effective connotation, even more effective in *Epode* 13 than in *Odes* 3.21.<sup>24</sup> The verb *ceremoniously* marks both wine and occasion. So Horace presides over a rich and singular symposium, with a friend who seems both grand and intimate: a climactic occasion and poem. The identity of the *amicus* will be discussed in Section IV, where the reading *amice* is defended.

## 3 *More Generic 'Mixing'. Other Contributors*

The mythical story in *Epode* 13 is couched explicitly as (Chiron's) *prophecy*, unlike Alcaeus' *exemplum* in 38A and unlike Horace's later mythical examples. A Chiron prophecy about Achilles is reported, in direct speech, by the Centaurs who are said to have come to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis at Eur., *IA* 1062–75. Prophetic direct speech is a feature of choral lyric,<sup>25</sup> and Pindar, *Pyth.* 9.39–65 stages a prophecy by Chiron to Apollo, of all characters (and Chiron is conscious of the incongruity). But most relevant to us is a fragment of Bacchylides (*Dithyramb* 27.34–45 Maehler), in which someone reports in indirect speech what Chiron is prophesying concerning Achilles himself. It seems plain that Horace actually alludes to, even merges with, this choral lyric poem:

<sup>21</sup> For (Aesopian) fable in Archilochus, see T44, frs 172–81 (fox and eagle), 185–7 (fox and monkey), 201 (fox and hedgehog): Archilochus actually uses the word αἴβοϋς in frs 174 and 185. Cf. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), 743–4. References are, however, made to Archilochus' telling the story of Hercules, Nessus, and Deianeira, frs 286–9, but there is no hint that it provided some sort of paraenesis at a symposium. There is no trace left of fable in Hipponax (Fraser, *ibid.*, 744); myth in an unknown context in Hipponax fr. 72 (Rhesus) and 75, 77 ('Odysseus', as a title apparently, fr. 74), perhaps in the context of Bupalus.

<sup>22</sup> Contrast the drinking companion and the wine deemed suitable in *Odes* 1.9. Note the apologetics and wine snobbery, fitted to the greatness of Maecenas, in the invitation poem to him, *Odes* 1.20.

<sup>23</sup> See Watson and Mankin, *opp. cit.* (n. 1), ad loc.

<sup>24</sup> H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Band II* (2nd edn, 2001), 183, on 3.21.6, with references and bibliography; Syndikus compares *Epode* 13.6. In the hymnic parody of *Odes* 3.21, I am inclined to think that a play on the sense 'influence', 'move to softer feelings', *OLD* s.v. *moveo* 14 and 15, is more likely.

<sup>25</sup> See R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu der Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik* (1967), 112ff., esp. 117–29.

ξανθάς νιν εὔβ[ο]υλ[ο]ς θαμ[ᾶ Φ]ιλλυρί[δας  
 ψαύων κεφ[αλ]ᾶς ἐνέπει· 35  
 φατί νιν [δινά]ντα φοινίξειν Σκά[μανδρον  
 κτείνον[τα φιλ]οπτολέμους  
 Τρώας· π.[...]. .... ἰ.α[ ]ματ[  
 ξείναι τε.[ ] ]  
 ἀλκίμουσ[ ]τ' ἐπ[ 40  
 Μυσῶν τ' α[ ] [ ]  
 ταύτ' ἐνέπ[ ]  
 καρδίαν π[ ]  
  
 φίλα[ι]ς δεχ[ ]  
 δ' εὐφυλλ[ο]

(when I remember what?) the wise son of Philyra (Chiron) often says of him, touching his fair head: he declares that he will crimson eddying Scamander as he kills the battle-loving Trojans; ... and (will lie in a) foreign (land) ... valiant ... Mysians ... That is what he says ... (?his) heart ... in loving (hands?) ... leafy ...

Note in particular that Bacchylides' Chiron focuses upon the battle by the river Scamander, unlike Euripides' Chiron, but in the same area as Horace's: in Horace the lack of detail like φοινίξειν allows us to think of Achilles' duel with Scamander himself, rather than the initial fouling of his waters with mortal corpses. And Bacchylides' Chiron not only prophesies to Achilles in person, but with affection, as does Horace's: in Bacchylides the affection is conveyed clearly by gesture (l. 34f., touching his head),<sup>26</sup> in Horace by the mode of address (most obviously, l. 12, *puer*). My hunch would be that the 'heart' in question (l. 43) is Achilles': so that Chiron's 'encouragement' of Achilles was actually mentioned, picking up the opening affectionate gesture. Other material can be conjectured.<sup>27</sup>

The presentation of Chiron *instructing* Achilles may also engage — who knows, may allude to — the Hesiodic Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι. But if so, there is likely to be some irony in an interchange with a seemingly grave and moral text.<sup>28</sup>

The incorporation of Bacchylides (at least) is another arresting display.

<sup>26</sup> cf. how, a little more intimately, a parent may stroke her child's head (Hdt. 6.61 τὴν δὲ καταψῶσαν τοῦ παιδίου τὴν κεφαλὴν), or a teacher a pupil's (Plato, *Phaedo* 89B καταψήσας σὺν μου τὴν κεφαλὴν). The Homeric formula χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξεν in comparably intimate situations probably signifies the same gesture (*Iliad* 1.361, *Odyssey* 5.181 etc.). More information in C. Sittle, *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer* (1890), 33f.

<sup>27</sup> See H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides, Zweiter Teil. Die Dithyramben und Fragmente* (1997), 47–8, 280–2. Maehler, after Barrett, suggests that Thetis or Peleus is calling to mind this prophecy ('Ich erinnere mich daran, was ...') to help explain the two adjacent verbs of saying in ll. 35f.; G. O. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (2001), 428 n. 3 thinks that this takes too little account of the present tenses. Maehler also thinks that the reference to Mysians accords with a possible implication of *Iliad* 2.858–61: that Mysians were slain in the waters of Scamander, though this is not explicitly stated in *Iliad* 21. Snell's φίλαις ζε χερσίν in l. 44 is attractive.

<sup>28</sup> The surviving fragments are Hesiod frs 283–5 Merkelbach and West; fr. 285 is Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.15 attributing to this work the view that boys should not be taught to read before the age of seven, but also recording that the Alexandrian scholar Aristophanes denied that Hesiod was the author. Fr. 283 preserves the first three lines, and it is indeed a grave opening (e.g. 2–3, πρῶτον μὲν, δτ' ἂν δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι / ἔρδεν ἱερὰ καλὰ θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησι; Pindar, *Pyth.* 6.19–27 may give us a further sense of its tone (so Davis, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 13). For more references and bibliography on the Ὑποθήκαι, see Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 431, Lowrie, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 420.

#### 4 *The Occasion for the Symposium*

The occasion is apparently a storm (ll. 1–3). But the appearance in the storm's description of images of human frowning (ll. 1–2)<sup>29</sup> suggests straight away that we are concerned with less literal circumstances; and the symbolic possibilities of storm were manifold. For example, storms at sea in Alcaeus and Archilochus were read in antiquity as political allegories, and were surely designed as such.<sup>30</sup> But the suggestiveness in *Epode* 13 is open: I see nothing in the text to limit the suggestion to a political situation, much less to a specific event, or even day of the month.<sup>31</sup> As Nisbet and Hubbard say on *Odes* 2.9.1, with documentation worthy of true scholars, 'The vicissitudes of human happiness are often compared with the weather':<sup>32</sup> storms figure trouble, and this is a mysterious and general suggestiveness. The poem looks outwards, rather than inwards to something specific. Trouble, anxiety, and, as we shall see, death are in the air.

#### 5 *The Chiron Prophecy*

Factors strongly encourage us, *pace* e.g. Mankin,<sup>33</sup> to see the mythical *exemplum* as *like*, and enlarging upon, Horace's own paraenesis. The syntax is tight: *ut* (l. 11), 'just as', relates in the immediate instance to *iuuat* (l. 9), 'it is helpful . . . just as the Centaur sang. . .' (Mankin himself compares *Epode* 1.19 etc.), and the natural inference is that the following myth provides authority for, and illumination of, what has just been said: cf., for example, how Bacchylides supports his proposition at 3.7ff. with the speech of Apollo to Admetus, in his case paratactically. Since Chiron is a seer and prophesies as well as advises, we should expect his utterance to be denser than the symposiarch's and to adumbrate points not explicitly made in it. In fact, the 'just as Chiron. . .' section works in Horace's context rather like a Homeric simile in the *Iliad*. Horace's paraenesis is taken up and 'runs on in' the Chiron-Achilles story.<sup>34</sup> There could indeed be contrasts in the story, as in Homeric simile, but our first expectation should be for justification and enlargement.

<sup>29</sup> For the images of frowning, see Rudd, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 384, referring to Hor., *Serm.* 2.2.125, Quint. 11.3.79; cf. too Lowrie, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 416, and Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), ad loc., Ov., *Am.* 2.2.33, Sen., *Ben.* 1. The 'frowning' in the weather is then matched by weather imagery in the human description of l. 5: Horace talks of a 'clouded brow', 'obducta . . . fronte': see Watson, ad loc. With 'νιυεσque deducunt louem', Lowrie, like many, compares Anacreon fr. 362 μεις μὲν δὴ Ποσειδῆϊον / ἔστηκεν ἡνεφέλη δ' ὕδωρ / < > βαρὺ δ' ἄγριοι / χειμῶνες κατάγουσσι, a corrupt text, cited by Schol. T on *Iliad* 15.192, which Bergk corrected and filled out (with Δία) on the assumption that Horace was using it. The verb κατάγουσι is certainly interesting. (Eustathius rewrites it, employing παταγούσι). The passage could well be noting an occasion for a symposium like ours, but as we have no context, the crucial part must remain between obeloi, and a connection with Horace a matter of conjecture.

<sup>30</sup> Alcaeus frs 6, 208, Archil. 105; for political symbolism in the epode storm, see further Lowrie, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 416 with n. 13, Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 417ff.

<sup>31</sup> Some are keen to fix the poem on the eve of Philippi: Giarratano, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 89–90 puts arguments for and against. Kilpatrick, *op. cit.* (n. 6), n. 8 places it at the headquarters of C. Cassius Longinus on 2 October 42 B.C. By contrast H. Hierche, *Les Epodes d'Horace. Art et signification* (1974), 22 has Horace 'parmi ses compagnons d'armes' before Actium, and groups *Epode* 13 with 7 and 16. Mankin, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 214 favours a setting in 'the time of uncertainty after Actium and before the Alexandrian war,' maybe indeed on 31 December 31 B.C. More sensitive to the generality of the imagery was E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957), 66. Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 417–20 well criticizes such attempts to pin the poem too specifically, but favours the inference of 'a contemporary war setting'. He provides much useful material: his splendid n. 13 allowing for a 'symbolic import' without necessarily 'a political reference' should have found a place in the text!

<sup>32</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 139.

<sup>33</sup> Mankin, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 214f.: 'the differences may be as important as the similarities', referring to his own article in *WS* 102 (1989), 133–401. A full survey of the question, inclining finally towards Mankin's view, in Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 420–2.

<sup>34</sup> The unmatched book on the way Homeric similes work is still H. Fränkel, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (1921): summarizing remarks at 98f., 104–7. Fränkel, 77 n. 22 remarks that *Iliad* 15.263–8 is another example 'wie die Erz<ählung> im Gl<eichnis> weiter läuft'. It is hard to imagine a more succinct and penetrating statement of the truth. Fränkel, 99–114 are translated into English in G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones, *Homer. German Scholarship in Translation* (1997), 103–23, as 'Essence and Nature of the Homeric Similes'.

The phrase ‘dumque uirent genua’ (l. 4), which puzzles some, also urges likeness. It recalls Homeric images of mortal vigour,<sup>35</sup> so that the present symposium is linked in advance into the world and truths of Chiron’s Achilles; this is akin to ‘interaction in poetic imagery’.<sup>36</sup> And there is the verb *cecinit* of Chiron (l. 11). It obviously suits the prophesying Chiron (Catull. 64.383 etc., OLD s.v. *cano* 8). But it also suggests a kind of twinning between Chiron — and therefore his whole message — and Horace. Horace is not yet (explicitly) the singing bard of the *Odes*, but he seems a potential lyrist at *Epode* 13.9; he can call himself, with suggestive ambiguity, *uates* in 16.66;<sup>37</sup> and he calls his book of *iambi* a *carmen* at 14.7 (see below).

A myth in support of a sympotic paraenesis not only makes it denser, but increases our sense that the poem looks outwards (1, 4) rather than being limited in what it addresses.

### 6 *Death*

Chiron is above all stressing death and its inevitability, indeed imminence. Not even the great son of a goddess will escape, and the beginning of the prophecy is already pregnant with the message: note especially the oxymora, centring upon *mortalis*, in the first three words (‘inuicte mortalis dea natē puer Thetide’, l. 12). Horace’s direct paraenesis (ll. 1–10) ‘runs on’ in the myth, and the imminence of death is added to his direct words, despite the apparent allowance of ll. 7f. In this way the conventional preoccupation of symposium with death emerges: cf. Alcaeus 38A, Asclepiades G-P XVI = *Anth. Pal.* 12.50, Lucret. 3.912–15.<sup>38</sup> And what of ‘deus haec fortasse benigna / reducet in sedem uice’ (ll. 7–8)? Compare what Chiron says at l. 15f., ‘unde tibi reditum certo subtemine Parcae / rupere’: no home-coming. In l. 8 there is a play on the sense ‘bring home’ in *reduco* and *sedes* ‘home’, as Mankin ad loc. documents. He infers a suggestion that the *deus* may grant the symposiasts a metaphorical ‘home-coming’, denied by the Fates to Achilles. Temporarily, perhaps. But Chiron’s larger message intrudes into ll. 7f. in retrospect, and his language reconfigures Horace’s language. Whatever passing turns for the good there may be, there will be a time when none of us ‘reducet in sedem’.<sup>39</sup> There is something whence, for Horace, his *amicus*, and for all of us, ‘reditum certo subtemine Parcae / rupere’. Death stops all change, ends everything, ‘unde negant redire quemquam’ (Catull. 3.12).

### 7 *Beginning, Middle as well as End*

So, via Chiron’s prophecy and its reverberations, Horace is — in the symposiast’s frequent way — introducing the gloom of The End to drink away, a weighty and conclusive topic. But the poem refers to ‘beginning’ and ‘middle’ as well as the end. The ‘middle’ is especially interesting.

In the middle, the meanwhile, there will be the sympotic comfort of music and wine, and so on (ll. 8–10, 17–18). But Achilles’ ‘middle’ is much more significant: it will be glorious. The opening word of Chiron’s prophecy — *inuicte*, ‘invincible’, ‘undefeated’ —

<sup>35</sup> The strength and activity of the knees was almost synonymous with being alive in the *Iliad*: note Achilles’ phrases at *Iliad* 9.610 εἰς ὃ κ’ . . . μοι φίλα γούνατ’ ὀρώρη, and 22.388. The speed of Hector’s knees is focused on to demonstrate his restored health at 15.269. In death, one’s knees are ‘loosed’ (5.176, 11.579, 13.360, etc.), and so on. Theocritus picks up the idiom at 14.70 and adds the notion of greenness (γόνυ χλωρόν).

<sup>36</sup> cf. M. S. Silk, *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (1974), 138ff., R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Words and the Poet* (1989), 92ff. Cf. ll. 1f. and 5 of this *Epode* with n. 29 above.

<sup>37</sup> *Vates* was a term used disparagingly by Ennius of Naevius (*Ann.* 206–7 Sk.), but resuscitated by Vergil for the elevated poet: *Ecl.* 7.28, 9.33f., *Aen.* 7.41; Horace uses it of Stesichorus at *Epode* 17.44 and for the canon of lyric poets at *Odes* 1.1.35. Cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace. Behind the Public Poetry* (1995), 185.

<sup>38</sup> See further Lyne, op. cit. (n. 37), 66. A very different view of the relevance of death in the Chiron myth in Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), 214f.

<sup>39</sup> cf. Rudd, op. cit. (n. 6), 385f., bringing ‘nec mater domum . . . te reuehet’ into the discussion.

must presage, in spite of the immediate oxymoron (*mortalis*), some glorious event(s) in which the Centaur's illustrious fosterling will indeed be unconquered. As Mankin ad loc. says, 'since Achilles is still a "child", the epithet [*inuicte*] is proleptic ... or, rather, prophetic'. We should expect Chiron to complement *inuicte* by prophetically alluding to an episode of invincibility. 'Te manet Assaraci tellus ...' looks forward — in a loaded way (below) — to Troy, but by the end of the Trojan War Achilles will not be unconquered, as Chiron is swiftly going to say. An appropriate event is brought to mind by the relative clause, 'quam frigida flui / findunt Scamandri flumina lubricus et Simois' (ll. 13f.), especially if we do not allow textual corruption to mar it (*parui*, p. 1): Achilles' duel with Xanthus-Scamander, narrated in *Iliad* 21, with an interesting bit-part role for Simois. This was indeed an example of Achilles' glorious invincibility, arguably his greatest triumph: a unique scene in which the hero actually takes on a *god* and *prevails*, even if with eventual divine assistance.<sup>40</sup>

Bacchylides' Chiron also centred Scamander, but brought to mind the earlier scenes of corpses in the river ([δινᾶ]ντα φοινίξειν Σκά[μανδρον]). Horace's Chiron allows us to think mostly of the duel with the god, but not entirely. His wording *subtemine Parcae* (l. 15) and *Scamandri flumina* (l. 14) recalls another prophecy of the earlier scenes, that of the *Parcae* in Catull. 64:<sup>41</sup>

ueridicos <i>Parcae</i> coeperunt edere cantus	306
.....	
testis erit magnis uirtutibus unda <i>Scamandri</i> ,	357
quae passim rapido diffunditur Hellesponto,	
cuius iter densis angustans corporum aceruis	
alta tepefaciet permixta <i>flumina</i> caede.	
currite ducentes <i>subtemina</i> , currite, fusi.	

The *Parcae* too conceived of Scamander as the climactic witness to the living prowess of Achilles. But they too — and with greater gusto — concentrate on the early scenes of human carnage, in which Achilles chokes the river's waters with corpses.<sup>42</sup> The final episode they cite in Achilles' career is the sacrifice of Polyxena on his tomb (ll. 362ff.). Once memory of Catullus' *Parcae* is triggered, this tragic scene is available for recall too.

In Chiron's prophecy of a glorious 'middle' for Achilles — as well as the end — we can see Horace's paraenesis being enlarged, 'running on'. Horace and his 'friend's' future may too have glory — and carnage and tragedy.

Spare a thought for Achilles. All the above information is available to Horace's *amicus* and to us. For the young Achilles there was, beyond *inuicte* and sympotic comforts,<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> The status given to Xanthus contributes to the glory of Achilles in this episode: in the prelude scene of the *Theomachia*, Xanthus is ranged on the Trojan side with the Olympians Ares, Apollo, Artemis, Leto, and Aphrodite (*Iliad* 20.38–40). *Iliad* 21.212–382 sees the great confrontation in speech and action between Achilles and Xanthus-Scamander; for a sample of the heroic scale of the Scamander-Achilles combat, see 21.233ff. Divine assistance: Poseidon and Athena encourage a dismayed Achilles at 21.284–97; Hera brings in Hephaestus to assist at 21.330, but calls him off at 382 when Scamander backs down. At 21.264 the narrator reminded us that 'gods are better than men'. Simois' bit-part: at 21.307ff. Scamander appeals emphatically to his brother river Simois to assist him against Achilles. The text does not state that he in fact does so. One inference might be that he does not. *Lubricus* could contain a covert allusion to this (Chiron is given to occult utterance): one of its senses is 'shifty', 'deceitful'. *Iliad* 5.330ff. offers interesting comparative material for Achilles' battle with the male divinity Xanthus-Scamander. Diomedes wounds and drives off a relatively unwarlike goddess, Aphrodite; Dione tells her stories of gods — outside the narrative of the *Iliad* — who have been temporarily discomfited by heroes; back in the narrative Diomedes then confronts a god, Apollo, and finds his come-uppance. Cf. too Apollo and the more conclusive defeat of Patroclus in *Iliad* 16.

<sup>41</sup> cf. Lowrie, op. cit. (n. 6.), 426f. The plural *flumina* in both calques Homer's καλὰ ῥέεθρα (*Iliad* 21.361); Catullus' prosody *unda Scamandri* is ostentatiously Homeric.

<sup>42</sup> Scamander sums this up in *Iliad* 21.218–20. It is to these lines that Catullus alludes.

<sup>43</sup> Achilles does not neglect them. The embassy finds him playing the lyre and singing at *Iliad* 9.186ff. After welcoming the visitors Achilles instructs Patroclus to bring a bigger bowl of wine, 9.202.

nothing but death and topography. Chiron does not even grant the gruesomely available point that Achilles will ‘warm’ (*tepefaciet* of the Parcae) the ‘chill’ (Chiron’s own *frigida*)<sup>44</sup> waters of Scamander with corpses, or, more graphically, ‘redde[n] them, φοινίξειν, as Bacchylides’ Chiron. Chiron’s policy of withholding such hints from Achilles renders one popular but unacceptable defence of the mss. *parui* in l. 13 unlikely from the start.<sup>45</sup> (Chiron also withholds one item of bad news available to us: he alludes to the successor kingdom which will one day conquer Greece, the line of Assaracus.)<sup>46</sup>

## 8 Beginnings

Lines 11f. reach back to the beginnings of Achilles. In ‘grandis ... alumnus’ (l. 11), the epithet shows — whatever it may imply about Achilles’ size<sup>47</sup> — that Achilles is now on the threshold of manhood, ‘grown-up’ (*OLD* s.v. 1a), but for Chiron he is still a child, *puer* (l. 12), and the noun *alumnus*, ‘fosterling’, reminds us that Chiron has brought him up since he was a baby.<sup>48</sup> In the present, Roman time Horace reaches back to his own beginning: he orders the wine of the year of his birth to be produced.<sup>49</sup>

## 9 Sympotic Comfort. But No Talk, Locutio

The prophetic Chiron — with a suitable future imperative — tells Achilles ‘illic omne malum uino cantuque *leuato*...’ (l. 17), ‘lighten every ill with wine and song’. This injunction is in a dark position, just following the prophecy of Achilles’ death: its power to cheer is therefore severely limited. Chiron’s phrasing reflects back on Horace’s own ‘iuuat ... *leuare* diris pectora sollicitudinibus’ (ll. 9f.), and his context, especially the defined temporariness of the cheer offered, colours Horace’s context.<sup>50</sup> At the time of utterance, ll. 9f. might have seemed quite hopeful; but we could have made inferences from the extraordinary way in which ‘disquiets’, *sollicitudinibus*, dominate l. 10.<sup>51</sup>

There is a further fascinating connection between the two passages. ‘Cetera mitte *loqui*’ (l. 7), says Horace, ‘forbear to talk of other things’, with *cetera* referring to what may be symbolized by the storm, to what is causing *sollicitudines*. ‘Deformis aegrimoniae dulcibus *alloquiis*’,<sup>52</sup> says Chiron in the closing line (l. 18). ‘Forebear to talk’: we may note that Horace nowhere makes any provision for talk in the present time of the epode *at all*: wine

<sup>44</sup> At *Iliad* 22.147ff. Scamander’s springs are both hot and icy cold.

<sup>45</sup> I refer to the attempt to defend *parui* by seeing it as an allusion to the ‘narrowing’ (Catull. 64.359 *angustans*, *Iliad* 21.219 στεινόμενος) of Scamander’s waters with corpses: O. Vox, *RbM* 136 (1993), 190–1 sees an allusion most immediately to Alcaeus 395 στενω[.].] Ξάνθω ῥό[ος] ἐς θάλασσαν ἵκανε, cited by a papyrus scholion on *Iliad* 21.219. This approach entails seeing a reference to Achilles’ triumphant slaughter, but Chiron is elsewhere withholding any such hint, and in any case neither Homer nor Catullus’ Parcae talk of a Scamander made ‘smaller’, but, precisely, narrowed and yet still deep (*alta*) and, in Homer, awesome. In the huge individual combat that takes place with Achilles after his ‘narrowing’, Scamander is hardly ‘small’! See e.g. *Iliad* 21.233ff., and at 21.268 the μέγα κῦμα διπετέος ποταμοῖο beats down on Achilles’ shoulders.

<sup>46</sup> Assaracus features in Aeneas’ long genealogical self-description (*Iliad* 20.232ff.) delivered, ironically and tellingly — for Horace’s context — to Achilles. Assaracus is then a surprisingly resonant figure in the Trojan past and future in the *Aeneid*: Verg., *Aen.* 1.284, 6.650, 6.778, 9.259, and others.

<sup>47</sup> Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), ad loc.

<sup>48</sup> Pind., *Pyth.* 6.21ff., *Nem.* 3.43ff., Eur., *IA* 708–10, 926–7, Apoll. Rhod. 1.554–8; cf. Hom., *Il.* 11.832.

<sup>49</sup> He does so more explicitly in *Odes* 3.21.1, ‘o nata mecum consule Manlio [Torquato]. . .’ The Suetonian life puts his birth in the year in which L. Cotta and L. Torquatus were consuls (65 B.C.), and that year is indicated by *Epist.* 1.20.27–8.

<sup>50</sup> There is a change in the way the ablatives are construed with *leuo* in ll. 10 and 17, but this does not allow the optimist a great deal of room for manoeuvre, *pace* Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), on l. 17.

<sup>51</sup> *Sollicitudinibus* fills the entire hemiepes, a metrical event unparalleled in surviving epodic verse, and rare in general. It is also — unsurprisingly — a prosaic word. See Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), on l. 10.

<sup>52</sup> I have followed conventional punctuation. Shackleton Bailey’s Teubner puts the comma, not at the end of l. 17, but after *aegrimoniae*.

(l. 6), balsam and music (l. 9): maybe song therefore, but no *talk*. What of Chiron and his 'sweet consolations (*alloquiis*) of ugly melancholy'? It is vital to see that, unless we add *ac* before *dulcibus* with Bentley, *alloquiis* is in apposition to *uino cantuque*. Now this is in fact the first occurrence of the word in surviving Latin: we infer the sense 'consolation' and it 'ought to involve "conversation"', as etymology and later references suggest;<sup>53</sup> and most critics seem to assume that Chiron does indeed refer to conversation.<sup>54</sup> But at the top level of the text, at any rate, the appositional construction *excludes* that: the wine and song *are* the 'sweet-talk', the consolations of melancholy.

So Horace in his present and Chiron in Achilles' future close down talk. The poem ends with a word, *alloquiis*, which paradoxically ousts *locutio*. *Loquor* had been the defining term of utterance of *Epode 2*, given to Horace's surrogate narrator: 'haec ubi locutus' (l. 67), the only other parallel for a *loquor* or cognate in the book.

## II EPODE 13 AND CLOSURE

The intention of Section I was in the first place to show that *Epode 13* was special enough to merit an important structural position. I hope I have fulfilled the more particular aim which was to show that the poem might well have been closural. It may not actively assert itself as closural, and I have phrased myself tendentiously at times, but the factors are there. The extraordinary generic surprises (Section I, 1 and 3) are, so to speak, a hard act to follow. After much iambic specificness (*Epodes* 8–12), the poem has a generality that lifts us up and potentially out: 'horrida tempestas. . .' (Section I, 4), 'cetera mitte loqui', and then the most significant and extended departure in the *Epodes* into the world of myth (Section I, 5),<sup>55</sup> from which the poem does not return. It is a poem of beginnings, middles, and ends (Section I, 6, 7, 8). In the beginning is birth, in the middle is the darkened glimpse of glory; the prophesied death of Achilles picks up links in the Horatian present, and infuses the whole poem with that most closural of all signs (Section I, 5–8). And finally, though music (*fide / cantu*) may linger, talk (*locutio*), the key term in *Epode 2*, is here explicitly sidelined (Section I, 9). When all is taken into account, it will not overstate the case to say that *Epode 13* encourages expectations of closure.

There is also a metrical pattern to notice.<sup>56</sup> The first ten poems of the book are all in the same epodic combination of iambic trimeter and dimeter. *Epodes* 11–16 employ more complex Archilochean systems (*Epode 17* is then in stichic iambics). The shift to the more complex metres is interestingly managed, and a structure over *Epodes* 11–13 reinforces the sense of closure at *Epode 13*. To make my point I shall have to touch on material familiar to many.

The 'Third Archilochean' of *Epode 11* consists of an iambic trimeter, and then a hemiepes plus iambic dimeter. The hemiepes-dimeter combination is conventionally printed as one line, and is so written in the Cologne papyrus (fr. 196a West) where Archilochus uses this same system, but the whole may be seen as a three-line strophe. The fact is that the hemiepes-dimeter elements are, in the ancient metrician's word, *asynarteta*,

<sup>53</sup> cf. Varro, *Ling.* 6.57, cited by Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), in his note on l. 18, whence the quotation comes. Mankin has a very suggestive comment on the word. L. Mueller, *Quintus Horatius Flaccus, Oden und Epoden* (1900), ad loc. compares Catullus' use of *allocutio* at 38.4.

<sup>54</sup> cf. notably Lowrie, op. cit. (n. 6), 430–2: e.g. '*Dulcibus alloquiis* (18), the last two words of Chiron's song, and of the poem as a whole, highlight the importance of talking in consolation. . .'

<sup>55</sup> *Epode 3* amusingly adduces Medea and Jason at ll. 9–14, similarly Deianira and Hercules at ll. 17–18; and *Epode 10.12–14* does the same with Athena and Ajax son of Oileus.

<sup>56</sup> There is useful information on Horace's epodic metres at Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), 14–22, to which I am indebted.

i.e. the first element is treated as a separate measure.<sup>57</sup> In Archilochus, and in Horace who imitates him, we find hiatus after the hemiepes or a *breuis in longo* to close it: in Horace, at *Epode* 11.6, 10, 14, 24. From this we should note the following. Since the iambic trimeter of 11.1 signals no change at all from *Epode* 10, the hemiepes which then follows does so with surprise. Should the reader have any sense of the asynartete nature of the line, that surprise is focused. It may be focused too by the fact that *uersiculos* in the hemiepes flirts with a different type of poetry (elegy),<sup>58</sup> though the amorous Horace poses as disinclined to write anything at all at the moment (see further below).

The metre of *Epode* 12 ('First Archilochean', cf. Archilochus fr. 195 West) is then wholly in essence dactylic — as it were, picking up the hemiepes: dactylic hexameter plus tetrameter. The metre of *Epode* 13 ('Second Archilochean', cf. frs 199 and 193 West)<sup>59</sup> then seems to continue this dactylic pattern: its first line is also a dactylic hexameter. But its second line is a combination of an iambic dimeter plus hemiepes, also *asynarteta*: see ll. 8, 10, 14.

There is, therefore, a kind of metrical ring-composition from 11.2, where the surprise starts, through to *Epode* 13: hemiepes, iambic dimeter (*Epode* 11.2), dactylic hexameters and tetrameters, picking up the hemiepes (*Epode* 12), dactylic hexameter, iambic dimeter, and finally hemiepes again (*Epode* 13). The sense of ring is strengthened by the fact that *Epode* 12, the centre poem, stands out as the only epode with no iambs at all. It is worth adding too that the metrical shape of the words comprising the hemiepes in 13.18 is exactly the same as in 11.2, and other lines in *Epode* 11, but has no precursor in *Epode* 13 itself. The end of the metrical ring is affirmed. Ring-composition gives an obvious effect of closure.<sup>60</sup>

It should be noted finally that the metre of *Epode* 13 may have been a rarity, something special: we can point to the suggestive fragments of Archilochus above, but we cannot actually show the whole system in surviving Archilochus.

### III EPODE 14, THE EPODES AND CALLIMACHUS

*Epode* 13 is suited to closure, but the book does not close. *Epode* 14 therefore needs special attention. I shall keep my comments to the minimum.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> For the publication of the Cologne Archilochus, see R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *ZPE* 14 (1974), 97–113, with pl. V. Merkelbach (102) expresses the belief that we have actually to do with a short three-line strophe, and that the practice of writing the second two elements as one line was due precisely to the ancient theory of 'asynartete' verses. Hephaestion attributes the invention of 'asynartete' junctions to Archilochus (*Encheiridion* 15.1–3), quoted by West at the head of frs 168–71.

<sup>58</sup> The diminutive may suggest elegy, whose metre the hemiepes 'invades' (the graphic word is from Hutchinson, op. cit. (n. 8)). Horace is, of course, toying with Roman elegy's subject matter (*amor*). Diminutives are used judiciously, and in varying degrees by the Latin elegists: see R. Maltby in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer (eds), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (1999), 387–8, building on B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* (1945), 41–3. But *uersiculos* itself is not specific in its implications (cf. Hor., *Serm.* 1.10.58 as well as Catull. 16.3 and 6, 50.4). S. J. Heyworth, 'Horace's *Ibis*: on the titles, unity, and contents of the *Epodes*', *PLILS* 7 (1993), 85–96, at 87f., sees continuing attention being (metatextually) drawn to the metrical shift at 11.20 *incerto pede*.

<sup>59</sup> Fr. 199: Diomedes testifies to Archilochus' use of the iambelegus. In fr. 193 we find a dactylic hexameter combined with iambic dimeter.

<sup>60</sup> cf. Call., *Aetia* frs 2 and 112, the prologue and epilogue with the same motifs, Mealeager I G-P = AP 4.1 and CXXIX = AP 12.257, the open and close of the *Garland* (note esp. 1.3 and CXXIX.5), Catull. 16, 36, 52 etc., G. Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (1980), 98–9 ('Ring-composition was frequently used by Roman poets of the late Republic and of the Augustan Age to effect poetic closure'), and index, s.v., E. J. Kenney, *Lucretius De Rerum Natura Book III* (1971), 79f.

<sup>61</sup> A very useful discussion of this poem is offered by V. Grassmann, *Die erotischen Oden des Horaz* (1966), 122–44, though we differ on many points. See too especially Watson, op. cit. (n. 1), 438–57. Cavarzere, op. cit. (n. 1), 206–7 offers a heterodox view. The poem is in iambic character, aimed at Maecenas: Horace is not actually having any problems with love; it is Maecenas who is (and 'recusatio' has no part here); interesting, but I cannot subscribe to it.

mollis inertia cur tantam diffuderit imis  
 obliuionem sensibus,  
 pocula Lethaeos ut si ducentia somnos  
 arente fauce traxerim,  
 candide Maecenas, occidis saepe rogando:                   5  
 deus, deus nam me uetat  
 inceptos olim, promissum carmen, iambos  
 ad umbilicum adducere.  
 non aliter Samio dicunt arsisse Bathyllo  
 Anacreonta Teium,   10  
 qui persaepe caua testudine fleuit amorem  
 non elaboratum ad pedem.  
 ureris ipse miser. quodsi non pulchrior ignis  
 accendit obsessam Ilion,  
 gaude sorte tua: me libertina nec uno                         15  
 contenta Phryne macerat.

Besides allowing Horace his arch allusions to Maecenas' love affair with the actor Bathyllus (for which, besides the name, note the torch imagery and the neglected feminine gender in ll. 13–14),<sup>62</sup> the poem has two main thrusts, parodying 'recusatio'. The key component of the parody is the *deus, deus* who *uetat*, 'forbids': as the poem soon confirms, this *deus* is Love,<sup>63</sup> and he is substituting for the admonishing Apollo of Vergil's 'recusatio' in *Eclogue* 6.3–9 (and Callimachus' Apollo behind Vergil).<sup>64</sup> By Horace's time the 'recusatio' had wider currency than surviving examples show,<sup>65</sup> and its standard functions are to *excuse* the poet from the duty to do one thing (epic), and *license* him to do another (essentially, to continue his present course; in Vergil's case, bucolic). Horace's parody 'recusatio' naturally has twists. Rather than excuse him from attempting another type of poetry, Horace's 'recusatio' seeks to explain why he does not finish the present ongoing book (ll. 7–8 clarify the vaguer ll. 1–4), and hand it over for production in publishable form. The cause: Love (not Apollo). Horace's 'recusatio' does then, in an amusingly unexpected way,<sup>66</sup> appear to seek to *license* a path of poetry. When Horace first adduces Anacreon as a parallel to himself (*non aliter*, l. 9), we expect the Greek lyricist to be matching his literary inaction. We are in fact shown how Anacreon's love (l. 9, *arsisse*) was

<sup>62</sup> For Maecenas' Bathyllus, see Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.54.2, J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (1985), 25, Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 449 with bibliography, and excellent argument and bibliography in Cavarzere, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 206, 208–9. Grassmann, *op. cit.* (n. 61), 131–2 correctly sees an allusion to Maecenas' Bathyllus, but at 138–9 interprets the imagery of *ignis* etc. (14.13–14) as referring to Helen, and talks in those lines of a female lover of Maecenas; cf. Watson, 449 and 452–3. The usual assumption concerning the imagery of l. 13 (*pulchrior ignis*) is indeed that in one way or another it refers to Helen: cf. Mueller, *op. cit.* (n. 53), ad loc., Giarratano, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 98, H. Dettmer, *Horace: a Study in Structure* (1983), 93, Cavarzere, 206; Mankin, *op. cit.* (n. 1), ad loc. hedges. But many do see that *ignis* most immediately evokes torches, and therefore better suits Paris (the dream of Hecuba) than Helen; see Watson, 453 for references, though he himself prefers an allusion to Helen. Lines 13–16 therefore not only permit but encourage an allusion to a *male* lover of Maecenas: Bathyllus himself, more beautiful than Paris. Following these suggestions of Paris and a male lover, we should pay attention to 'obsessam Ilion'. 'H. seems to be the first in Latin to use the fem. *Ilios* ...', Mankin, ad loc. Giarratano, 98 points out that no metrical advantage accrues — as in Horace's other sure example of the fem., *Odes* 4.9.18. This latter example incidentally protects the reading *-am* in *Epode* 13.14. It is surprising that no-one appears to see the additional innuendo (passivity in the affair, cf. Catullus 16 etc.) which the feminine gender of the object adds.

<sup>63</sup> Some play too on the Caesarian *dei*: cf. Verg., *Ecl.* 5.64 'deus, deus ille Menalca', also 1.6–7.

<sup>64</sup> On 'recusatio', the Roman practical adaptation of Callimachus' Apollo preface (*Aetia* fr. 1), see Lyne, *op. cit.* (n. 37), 31–9. Horace parodies the topos elsewhere, e.g. *Serm.* 1.10.31ff., where he also uses the verb *ueto* (again at *Odes* 1.6.10). The parody in *Epode* 14 is like Propertius' in 2.13.3–8. (For Cavarzere, *op. cit.* (n. 1), ad loc., any thought of Apollo is 'fuorviante', because the *Epode* is not a 'recusatio'; cf. n. 61.)

<sup>65</sup> cf. Lyne, *op. cit.* (n. 37), 34–5.

<sup>66</sup> Watson, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 447–9 makes much of this 'inconsequentiality', giving three possible explanations of it. His second and favoured explanation is quite close to the account I give above.

accompanied by, if not led to, frequent love poems. Our natural inference now must be that Horace is himself seeking to license love poems on his own part. But what love poems? Not some 'erotic lyric' outside the *Epodes*, I think.<sup>67</sup> 'Recusatio' licenses something in progress, and a ready deduction would be that Horace is licensing a shift into love poetry *within* the *Epodes* which has already begun, and which could I suppose be seen as a threat to the conclusion of a book of 'real' *iambi*, be they of the aggressive Archilochean-Hipponactean sort (e.g. *Epodes* 8, 10, and 12) or of the new-wave type suited to the patronised Roman iambist (*Epodes* 1 and 9). Love interest had already appeared in *Epode* 11, where Horace feigned in consequence a disinclination to write at all, while simultaneously flirting with thoughts of elegy (ll. 1–2 and *uersiculos*, see above). *Epode* 14 more decisively declares erotic involvement, literary and biographical, and an inability to complete a book of (real) *iambi*.

The new erotic direction is very much a humorous feint: love surfaces again in *Epode* 15, but not thereafter. And Horace's alignment (*non aliter*) with Anacreon is funnily fleeting, indeed specious. Anacreon himself was, of course, a desirable introduction because of the convenient overlap between the name of one of his lovers and Maecenas's Bathyllus — permitting innuendo. But how much of an Anacreontic Horace do we actually sense and for how long? Nothing that bears serious scrutiny.<sup>68</sup> The formal alignment itself is neatly but tenuously based. The facts which Horace exploited and to which he refers are as follows. Anacreon wrote love poems, matching the supposed new Horace, and some were about Bathyllus, though none of these survive.<sup>69</sup> Anacreon wrote metrical iambs, as Horace did in much of his *iambi*, and some at least of Anacreon's iambs were love poems:<sup>70</sup> the relative simplicity of the iambic *metron* is surely what Horace refers to with 'non elaboratum ad pedem'.<sup>71</sup> And presumably some of Anacreon's Bathyllus love poems were in iambs. Horace taking a temporary amorous turn in his often iambic *iambi* could

<sup>67</sup> cf. Watson, op. cit. (n. 1), 448.

<sup>68</sup> Watson, op. cit. (n. 1), 440f. finds features from Anacreon's lyric in *Epode* 14 itself, but they are not to me impressive. Nor is there significant evidence of an Anacreontic Horace in the *Epodes* outside *Epode* 14 (cf. n. 29). But, in view of *Epode* 14.11 *fleuit amorem*, Dioscorides XIX.3–4 G–P (AP 7.31.3–4) is slightly interesting: ὁ πῖ Βαθύλλῳ / . . . πολλάκι δάκρυ χέας.

<sup>69</sup> These are known to us only by the (many) later testimonia and epigrams devoted to Anacreon and his loves; e.g. Maximus of Tyre cited at Anacreon 402, 'His poems are full of the hair of Smerdies and the eyes of Cleobulus and the youthful beauty of Bathyllus'. Bathyllus also occurs frequently in the *Anacreontea*. See Campbell's index (*Greek Lyric Vol. II*, n. 1) s.v. 'Bathyllus'.

<sup>70</sup> For iambic metre in Anacreon, see fr. 427 (four stichic iambic dimeters), 428 (two dimeters), 425 (two trimeters), 426 (trimeter), and, in combinations, 424, 431, 432. Hephaestion, *Ench.* 5.3 says that 'the (iambic) dimeter catalectic is the so-called anacreontean (τὸ καλούμενον Ἀνακρεόντειον)', citing fr. 429. (Anacreon also arguably wrote *iambi* in the generic sense, poems of abuse and invective: this is an additional, complicating factor, and not I think very relevant to our context. The *Suda* A 1916 (T 1 Gerber) reports ἔγραψεν ἐλεγεία καὶ ἰάμβους, Ἰάδι πάντα διαλέκτω, but it is hard to know if that reference is generic rather than metrical. See C. Brown, *Phoenix* 37 (1983), 1–15, interpreting Anacreon's Artemon poem 388, whose metrical system is two choriambic tetrameters anapaestic and an iambic dimeter, and other frs in this way.)

<sup>71</sup> Tescari, op. cit. (n. 6), ad loc. takes 'non elaboratum ad pedem' to mean 'in versi non perfecti', as many do: Grassmann 'nicht ausgefeilt', discussed at length, op. cit. (n. 61), 134–6; Cavarzere, op. cit. (n. 1), ad loc. It is unlikely that Horace would gratuitously criticize Anacreon like this: in the *Odes* (1.23) he elegantly and honorifically adapts him. A long discussion of this 'verso oscuro' in Giarratano, op. cit. (n. 3), 90; my own view is close to Nauck's. *TLL* V.2.321.7ff. on the use of the perf. part. *elaboratus* as an adjective is informative. It can be paired with *ornatus*, *elegans*, *perfectus* (Cic., *Verr.* 4.126, *Orat.* 36 (of Pacuvius' verses)) and there can be degrees of *elaboratus* (Tac., *Dial.* 18 'Cicerone mitior Coruinus et dulcior et in uersibus magis elaboratus'): the negation would not therefore necessarily be 'imperfect'; it could just be 'not ornate', 'simple'. And this fits iambs very well, whose proximity to speech is remarked upon (and makes them suitable to drama): Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.408b, discussing appropriate prose rhythms, calls the iambus 'the actual speech of the many', ὁ δ' ἰάμβος αὐτῆ ἐστὶν ἢ λέξις τῶν πολλῶν; in consequence 'of all metres iambs are what people most use when they talk', πάντων τῶν μέτρων ἰαμβεῖα φθέγγονται λέγοντες. Most scholars assume that Callimachus, *Aetia Epilogue*, fr. 112.9 Μουσέων πεζῶν . . . νομόν, 'the prose pasture of the Muses', refers to his often (chol-)iambic *iambi*, but Hutchinson has argued strongly and succinctly that the reference there is simply to prose works: see *ZPE* 145 (2003), 58 with n. 31.

passingly pretend an alliance with Anacreon — and be constrained to mention Anacreon's conveniently named lover.

Love causing *iambus*-block, Horace in the *Epodes* lining up with Anacreon, innuendos, these are amusing enough, but the wit is more fundamental. How seriously can we take a poem which stands in a finished book which explains why the poet cannot finish that same book? Catullus expresses difficulty in writing in 65, and at the same time introduces 66 as compensation for something notionally more desirable, and Pindar at *Ol.* 1.17 issues an instruction to take the lyre from the hook seventeen lines into the song, but apologetics and circumstantial references like these have nothing to match the delightful implausibility of *Epode* 14.<sup>72</sup> We should note just how concretely Horace brings to mind *published books* by the phrase he uses for 'finishing', 'ad umbilicum adducere'.<sup>73</sup> To take *Epode* 14 at its face value, we have to assume a reader-attitude of truly extreme ingenuousness: we have to turn our attention away from books and from the object in our hands, and buy into a dramatic illusion that the composition of *iambi* is happening actually in front of us, and, at the dramatic moment of the fourteenth poem, is encountering deep trouble because of love. And Horace apologizes for the delay.

The witty implausibility of this, plus the other literary feints, pushes us to find a more sophisticated explanation of the poem. We go back to *Epode* 13. Horace gave many signs that *Epode* 13 was closural. And now: 'I'm sorry I cannot finish'. This witty apology metatextually draws attention to the fact that he has not closed with the 'closing' poem: it is a metapoetic acknowledgement that he has not finished his book of *iambi* at the point, where, we infer, he both ought and (as it were) intended to. The reference to physical books of poetry and publication actually encourages us to think out beyond the supposed dramatic circumstances to a literary question and answer. Why doesn't the book close at *Epode* 13?

There is a pleasing little detail contributing to the undoing of closure. The sombre end of death in *Epode* 13 is now dissolved, first in the non-deathly forgetfulness of *Lethaeos* (14.3, 'Lethaeos *ut* si...'),<sup>74</sup> and then, completely, in the jokingly colloquial use of *occidis* (14.5) 'you'll be the death of me with your questions'.<sup>75</sup>

Well, why doesn't Horace finish his *iambi* with *Epode* 13? 'Love' is hardly the answer, with the implied diversion into erotic, uniambic *iambi*: we only get one more 'love' poem, and two others that are completely different. And why did Horace encourage expectations of closure (now seen to be 'false closure')<sup>76</sup> at the thirteenth poem, and allow us to deduce that this was the 'right' place to close?

<sup>72</sup> And yet E. Lefèvre says of *Epode* 14 (*Horaz. Dichter in augusteischen Rom* (1993), 82) 'Die Epode ist im übrigen ein seltenes Zeugnis dafür, in welchem Mass Horaz von Maecenas zur Veröffentlichung gedrängt wurde'. Cf. too Mueller, op. cit. (n. 53), ad loc., Grassmann, op. cit. (n. 61), 122, 126f., and elsewhere. Watson, op. cit. (n. 1), 438ff. has excellent material on published literary apologetics, but nothing parallels a poet in a book explaining that he cannot finish that book. For an appreciation of the humour in Horace's position, see Hutchinson, op. cit. (n. 8).

<sup>73</sup> The phrase seems to be Horace's own concoction, but it is built around a technical term. Watson's (op. cit. (n. 1)) note here is very useful. The *umbilici* refer strictly or originally to the knobs on the ends of the rod around which the end-product, the physical papyrus roll book, was wound, though the exact details of how this was done are disputed. But *umbilicus* seems to be used, here and elsewhere, by synecdoche, for the rod itself. Cf. Catullus 22.7, Ovid, *Trist.* 1.18, Tränkle on [Tib.] 3.1.13, as well as Watson. Martial loves making reference to the physical object of the book, and in the last poem of Book 4 (4.89.1–2) writes 'ohe, iam satis est, ohe, libelle, / iam peruenimus usque ad umbilicos' — what Horace is unable yet to say. Cf. referring to the reader, Sen., *Suas.* 6.27, 'ergo, ut librum uelitis usque ad umbilicum reuoluere...'. *Carmen* incidentally — within the 'Schema Cornelianum' appositional pattern of 'inceptos, olim promissum carmen, iambos' (I prefer this punctuation to a comma after *olim*) — must surely refer to the *Gedichtbuch* of *Epodes*, as Bentley already affirmed. Mankin, 229–30 (good notes on ll. 7 and 8) and Grassmann, op. cit. (n. 61), 130 question the interpretation.

<sup>74</sup> Lethe had been situated in the Underworld since Theognis (705, 1215): see Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), note on l. 3.

<sup>75</sup> For the colloquial use of *occido*, cf. Plaut., *Pseud.* 931, Horace, *Ars Poetica* 475, etc. Mueller, op. cit. (n. 53), ad loc. compares Horace's use of *exanimis* at *Odes* 2.17.1: an interesting passage, because here too we may see Horace defusing the topic of death with a similar colloquialism. Cf. uses of ἀπόλλυμι, LSJ. s.v. 2.

<sup>76</sup> On 'false closure', cf. D. Fowler, *Roman Constructions* (2000), 259–63, D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn and D. Fowler, *Classical Closure* (1997), index s.v. 'closure', 'false'.

At *Epode* 14.7 Horace for the first and only time within the body of this text suggests the *title* for what we call the ‘Epodes’: *Iambi*.<sup>77</sup> Previously he has advertised alignment with Hipponax and, especially, Archilochus. What editions of these poets Horace used, and with what titles, is hard to say. Archilochus had referred to his ἰάμβοι<sup>78</sup> but there is no sign of an Archilochean Book entitled by scholars *Iambi*. Archilochus’ works were, where specified, cited by metre: elegiacs, trimeters, tetrameters, and epodes.<sup>79</sup> Two of Hipponax’s books seem to have borne the title ἰάμβοι in later times at any rate.<sup>80</sup> But there were of course well-known *Iambi* which we know to have been composed as a book by their author and actually entitled Ἰάμβοι by him: the *Iambi* of Callimachus. Now with this hellenistic book Horace surreptitiously aligns himself at *Epod.* 1.16. He makes very little use of Callimachus’ text itself, indeed takes steps *not* to be identified with the hellenistic rather than the archaic iambists besides this allusion<sup>81</sup> — and the matter of structure, to which I attend. But when *iambi* is floated as the designation of Horace’s book at 14.7, this may re-stir memory of Callimachus’ book. Kerkhecker’s dauntingly authoritative edition of Callimachus’ *Iambi* presents us with *thirteen* poems and argues forcefully for this total. There is a mass of evidence to be weighed, but an outstanding factor is the impression of closure provided by *Iambus* XIII, in ring-composition with *Iambus* I.<sup>82</sup>

Thirteen *Iambi* and closure provided by *Iambus* XIII. Here is why Horace provides a closural poem in *Epode* 13. But why is it *false* closure? What game is he playing?

Here we must acknowledge the debate about the extent of Callimachus’ *Iambi*, and register the bare minimum of facts. The Milan *Diegeseis* of Callimachus’ work, the papyrus of which dates from c. A.D. 100, are summaries of *Aetia*, *Iambi*, *Hecale*, *Hymns* in that order, and they show *seventeen* poems between the *Aetia* and *Hecale* without differentiation, Kerkhecker’s I–XIII and four more, a potential 14–17, frs 226–9 Pf.; the *Diegeseis* provide lemmata as well as summaries, and other papyri have supplemented 227–9. It is a natural inference that the *Diegeseis* summarized a papyrus roll with I–XIII plus 14–17. More evidence: a second-century A.D. papyrus roll also contained the *Iambi* (frs of IV, V, VI, and VII survive) and concluded with ‘17’.<sup>83</sup> So a book containing I–XIII and 14–17 was early in existence. But was this a book of seventeen Callimachean *Iambi*?

<sup>77</sup> cf. elsewhere, with varying degrees of directness, *Ode* 1.16.3 and 24 (though not all agree about the point of this ode), *Epist.* 1.19.23, 2.2.59. Horace surely officially titled the book thus. ‘Epodes’ is grammarians’ metrical talk. Cf. Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), 12. But Cavarzere, op. cit. (n. 1), 9–14 is much more cautious.

<sup>78</sup> For the alignment with Archilochus and Hipponax, see *Epode* 6 (above Section 1, 1). For Archilochus’ use of ἰάμβοι, see fr. 215 and n. 7.

<sup>79</sup> We have glimpses of scholarly work on Archilochus by Apollonius of Rhodes, and, more substantially by Aristarchus: Fraser, op. cit. (n. 21), 452, 462. For citations from Archilochus’ ‘elegiacs’ (ἐν ἐλεγείοις), see West at the head of frs 1–17; for citations from his ‘trimeters’, the head of 18–87; trochaic ‘tetrameters’, 88–167; ‘epodes’, 168–204.

<sup>80</sup> See West at the head of frs 1–114a: ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ (τῶν) ἰάμβων, ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν ἰάμβων; metrically, Hipponax also wrote epodes, tetrameters, and dactylic hexameters besides choliambics.

<sup>81</sup> In Callimachus’ opening and programmatic poem, Hipponax *rediuuius* returns ‘bearing an *iambus* that does not’ — paradoxically — ‘sing of battle (with Bupalus)’, οὐ μάχην ἀείδοντα ... (1.3). Horace alludes to the unexpectedly genial iambic Callimachus in his opening poem, when he calls himself *imbellis* (*Epode* 1.16). This idea, surely unassailable, belongs to Denis Feeney, and is as yet unpublished. But besides this, a possible connection between *Epode* 15.7–9 and *Iambi* XII = fr. 202 Pf. 69–70 (E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957), 67; Heyworth, op. cit. (n. 58), 86), and the allusions in *Epode* 13 and, conceivably 14, suggested below, Horace avoids the Callimachean text (but Heyworth, loc. cit. sees an allusion to Callimachus’ *Ibis* in the opening word of the book; cf. too Hutchinson, op. cit. (n. 8)). Most noticeably, indeed ostentatiously, he does not use Callimachus’ metres, in particular Callimachus’ favoured Hipponactean choliambics. By contrast he makes noticeable use of Archilochus’ metres and text: see above p. 12. Publicly he is no Roman Callimachus: rather, Archilochus. But a public face does not preclude the surreptitious alignment mentioned; nor does it preclude play with Callimachean structure.

<sup>82</sup> See Kerkhecker, op. cit. (n. 10), 255ff., 272–82, esp. 269, 278f. Kerkhecker argues the case for thirteen *Iambi*, and argues against the supposition of seventeen (see below). Cf. too C. M. Dawson, ‘The *Iambi* of Callimachus’, *YCS* 11 (1950), 1–168, esp. 132–3.

<sup>83</sup> The papyrus book is *P. Oxy.* 2171 + 2172. See R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus. Volumen II* (1949), xi and xxxvii for the evidence of this papyrus and of the *Diegeseis*.

Long before Kerkhecker, Pfeiffer,<sup>84</sup> though he believed in the existence of the seventeen-poem book, did not believe that the 'lyric' frs 226–9 belonged to Callimachus' *Iambi*, and his edition conjecturally entitles them Μέλῃ. The possibility that frs 227–9 had their own titles quite early on ('Pannychis', 'Apotheosis of Arsinoe', 'Branchus') may increase support for their separation.<sup>85</sup> But there is room for debate. A collection of Callimachus' 'Lyrics' is not reliably known from any source (the Suda's testimony is insubstantial).<sup>86</sup> While the content of '14–17' may seem uniambic, the content of the core I–XIII is not iambic in any way resembling Callimachus' formal model (Hipponax), indeed is very various.<sup>87</sup> The 'lyric' metres of '14–17' may likewise seem unsuited to *Iambi*, but this can be argued to and fro,<sup>88</sup> and it must be remembered that 'iambic' originally referred to a type of poetry rather than a metre.<sup>89</sup> There is indeed room therefore for debate. Thirteen or seventeen poems in Callimachus' *Iambi*? Four miscellaneous 'lyrics' or not? Pfeiffer's and Kerkhecker's authority has not, one suspects, stilled all discussion forever. Cameron deploys forceful arguments in the contrary direction.<sup>90</sup>

The parallel between Horace's seventeen *Epodes*, a strange total by all accounts, and the seventeen Callimachean poems has of course been seen, and assistance with the Callimachean problem sought therein. And there has surely to be some relation between the two totals of seventeen and some explanation of Horace's number.<sup>91</sup> Cameron championed the simple answer: seventeen *Iambi* mirrored by seventeen *Epodes*, with Horace's total deployed as part of the evidence for a Callimachean seventeen; the polemically literary XIII may be seen as 'warning of' surprises to follow.<sup>92</sup> Another way of dealing with the facts: Callimachus' book of thirteen *Iambi* was later 'filled out' with four poems before Roman times, by the poet himself or a copyist, and Horace's seventeen mirrors this expanded book.<sup>93</sup> But the thirteen *Iambi* are calculated to have provided sufficient text for a hellenistic book (c. 1,000 lines),<sup>94</sup> so that there was no actual stimulus for padding.

But let us focus on Horace. There is a very interesting explanation of what he might be up to. Horace saw that *Iambus* XIII provided satisfying closure for a book of *Iambi*. But the edition he read, like the one summarized by the *Diegeseis*, continued on, and gave four more poems. A puzzle. Is XIII 'closure' followed by heterogeneous material or 'false closure' followed by more *Iambi*? Unlike an editor, Horace did not have to declare himself. He could transform the puzzle into art, and self-consciously replay what he found in front of him. He provides a sense of closure in *Epode* 13, but starts up again in *Epode* 14, and metapoetically advertises the fact that he had not closed the book; and he then provides three more poems to make up the total of seventeen that he found in his edition. Perhaps there was debate about the number of *Iambi* among *cognoscenti* in Horace's time, to

<sup>84</sup> Pfeiffer, *op. cit.* (n. 83), esp. vol. II, xxxvii.

<sup>85</sup> A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (1995), 164 argues against the titles having such force, even granted they are genuine. (For Pannychis we rely on Athenaeus, for Branchus on Hephaestion, but Ἐκθέσις Ἀρσινόης heads the entry in the *Diegeseis*.)

<sup>86</sup> Cameron, *op. cit.* (n. 85), 163 with n. 107, more mutedly Kerkhecker, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 276f.

<sup>87</sup> Kerkhecker, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 278 and 291ff.

<sup>88</sup> Kerkhecker, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 278, Cameron, *op. cit.* (n.85), 164–5.

<sup>89</sup> See above n. 7.

<sup>90</sup> Cameron's main discussion is *op. cit.* (n. 85), 163–73.

<sup>91</sup> It is hardly sufficient explanation of the relation to say that seventeen is chosen as the next prime number after Callimachus' thirteen: Heyworth, *op. cit.* (n. 58), 86.

<sup>92</sup> For the idea that XIII 'warns of' what is to follow, see Cameron, *op. cit.* (n. 85), 167; cf. too C. Gallavotti, *Antiquitas* 1 (1946), 12, and a rebuttal in Kerkhecker, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 279f. Cameron, 170 n. 139 also interestingly points out that there were (probably) seventeen Aetia in Book 4 of the *Aetia*. It is perhaps worth focusing the interesting fact that Branchus (Call. fr. 229) occurs in Hipponax fr. 105.

<sup>93</sup> D. L. Clayman, *Callimachus's Iambi*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 59 (1980), 7.

<sup>94</sup> Dawson, *op. cit.* (n. 82), 133–6 calculated a minimum of 800 lines in I–XIII, a probable 950–75, and a possible 1100–25.

match that of, say, Cameron and Kerkhecker. The creatively non-committal mimicry of the *Epodes* would be an amusing contribution to it.

What is Horace's foundational principle, a unit of thirteen or seventeen? Both. And there is a third: see Section v. How many *Iambi* did Horace think Callimachus wrote? He sits on the fence, making art of it. How many *Iambi* did Callimachus write? That is for Callimachean scholars to decide.

I have said that Horace makes little use of the text itself of Callimachus' *Iambi*. But there are two ways in which we can see *Epode* 13 and *Iambus* XIII related, in spite of the general complete difference of their subject matter. First, *Epode* 13 is the first and only poem in the book that is sympotic in setting, and, as I have said, this does not seem to be in the manner of the archaic iambists. But it is in the manner of Callimachus, *Iambus* XIII, also sympotically situated.<sup>95</sup> Second, Callimachus is defending himself in XIII against the charge, *inter alia*, of composing in too many genres, of, as the *Diegeseis* put it, πολυεΐδεια.<sup>96</sup> Now 'Kreuzung der Gattungen' is not πολυεΐδεια, but in his masterly merging of contributing genres and texts in *Epode* 13 (Section 1, 1 and 3), Horace may wish to parade a versatility analogous to the one which Callimachus defends. And Callimachus himself was of course a magician of *Kreuzung*.

The *Diegeseis* say that in *Iambus* 14 πρὸς τοὺς ὠραίους φησί, 'Callimachus speaks to boys blooming with youthful beauty'. There could have been some interesting Callimachean background for *Epode* 14 and Bathyllus.

#### IV THE ADDRESSEE OF EPODE 13

The manuscripts offer *amici* in *Epode* 13.3; the reading is surely corrupt. The movement from plural to singular (*tu*, l. 6) is hard to make good sense of, and the supposed parallels in Horace and others do not stand up.<sup>97</sup> It is natural to seek a proper name in place of the corruption, since it is Horace's later practice to name addressees in sympotic poetry, unless the addressee be (we infer) a slave;<sup>98</sup> we might indeed seek a grand name, since the symposium planned is very special (Section 1, 2). Horace's later practice with vocative *tu* might also lead us to expect a named person, but not irresistibly.<sup>99</sup> Housman ingeniously advanced an Amicius, hence *Amici*, printed by Shackleton Bailey. But Nisbet points to the inartistic and surely unacceptable ambiguity this would produce in an ancient text;<sup>100</sup> nor is any grand Amicius known. Bentley's *amice* is I think right, cf. incidentally Alcaeus' ἄλλα in fr. 346.2, though this seems to have amorous flavour. But this is not a proper name. Nor

<sup>95</sup> See Kerkhecker, op. cit. (n. 10), 252 on the sympotic setting of *Iambus* XIII.

<sup>96</sup> See Kerkhecker, op. cit. (n. 10), 251ff. on the charges against and the defences made by Callimachus in *Iambus* XIII.

<sup>97</sup> In *Ode* 1.27.10 the change to singular is fully explained by the unfolding drama. In *Ode* 3.14.17 the address is to a slave conveying orders for the private party that is to follow the public celebration which Horace has, as it were, been directing. In Archilochus' elegiac fr. 13 the movement of the paraenesis is from singular to plural (1 Περικλέεος, 6 ὦ φίλ' 10 τλήτε) in a piece that is firmly contextualized in, and makes earlier references to, the surrounding civic group. These are the supposed parallels for *amici* ... *tu* cited by Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), 217. Cavarzere, op. cit. (n. 1), ad loc. cites Alcaeus 346 in favour of *amici*: if anything, it supports *amice*.

<sup>98</sup> A slave boy may be inferred in *Ode* 1.38. See Mueller, op. cit. (n. 53), note on l. 3, for the naming of addressees in *Odes*. Writing before Housman, whose suggestion is cited in the text above, Mueller offers in place of *amici* Scheibe's *Apici* or his own *Anici*.

<sup>99</sup> Vocative *tu* occurs in sympotic or similar contexts with a named addressee at *Odes* 1.7.17, 1.9.16, 1.11.1, 3.29.25. But at 1.28.25 the unnamed dead person addresses the unnamed passing sailor as 'at tu, nauta...' At 2.18.17 the unidentified nominative *tu* may in fact be aimed at Maecenas: cf. Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. (n. 4), 289; Lyne, op. cit. (n. 37), 126ff., overstating his case.

<sup>100</sup> The proper name vocative *Amici* is proposed by A. E. Housman, *Classical Papers* (1972), 1087, and defended by Lowrie, op. cit. (n. 6), 417 n. 14. Two other proper name vocatives that have been suggested are cited in n. 98. R. G. M. Nisbet, *CR* 36 (1986), 232 raises the question of ambiguity, discounted by Brink (see next note). For plural addresses to companions in the *Odes*, Horace uses *sodales*: 1.27.7, 1.37.4.

does it visibly accompany a proper name, Horace's later practice when he does use a vocative *amice*.<sup>101</sup> So what is going on?

If we set the problem of the reading in the context of 'false closure', we can see that *amice* functions as a designed tease. The End impends, the party is special, the *poem* is special, and yet: To whom is it addressed? Who is this 'friend'? But of course the final close is actually four poems away: *Epode* 14 wittily restarts the book. And in *Epode* 14 the mystery identity is revealed, though still tantalisingly postponed until l. 5: 'amice ... *Maecenas*'. Here at last is the proper name and the specification for *amice*. And, across the *Epode* that appears to close the book and the *Epode* that then amusingly restarts it, we have the same pattern of address that opened the *Epodes* book: *Epode* 1.2-4, 'amice ... // *Maecenas*'.

#### V STRUCTURES IN THE BOOK OF EPODES<sup>102</sup>

Horace plays with at least two co-existing structures in *Odes* Book 1 (1-38 and 9-38), as I show in another paper. In *Epodes* he operates with at least three:<sup>103</sup> we can read a book of ten (plus seven), a book of thirteen (plus four), or a book of seventeen.

The first ten poems are distinct, forming a decimal group like the *Eclogues*. Each is written in exactly the same epodic metre, iambic trimeter and iambic dimeter; with *Epode* 11 comes radical metrical change, as we have seen. Here is the first unit. Roman poets who wrote even-numbered sequences considered the opening of the second half a position of importance. Thus Vergil in the *Aeneid* and Lucretius in the *DRN* — granted that the placing of 4.1-25 reflects Lucretius' final intention — give us 'Proems in the Middle' at this point.<sup>104</sup> In Vergil's ten *Eclogues*, the sixth poem sets out Vergil's literary images and programmes: Vergil as the first Roman Theocritus, the Callimachean who must refuse epic, and, through the surrogate figure of Silenus, the arbiter of modern employment of the epic metre. Similarly *Epode* 6 sets out Horace's image and supposed programme: Horace the real Roman Archilochus and (here) Hipponax.

'Closure' at *Epode* 13 then gives us a sense of a group of thirteen to match Callimachus' thirteen *Iambi*. Odd-numbered collections put focus on the centred poem, whose topic may patently reflect the importance of such a position: Prop. 4.6 (Apollo and Actium) for example, or *Eclogue* 5 (the apotheosis of Daphnis-Caesar) in Vergil's competing concentric structure built out of *Ecl.* 1-9.<sup>105</sup> *Epodes* 1-13 centre the important political *Epode* 7, the first to reflect serious political concerns since the opening *Epode* 1.

And finally, taking *Epode* 13 as 'false' closure, we have seventeen poems, from *Ibis* to *exitus*, as Heyworth sees.<sup>106</sup> This encompassing structure centres the even more important Augustan victory poem, *Epode* 9.

*Balliol College, Oxford*

<sup>101</sup> An objection to Bentley's *amice* made by C. O. Brink, *PCPS* 28 (1982), 41-2.

<sup>102</sup> For different ways of looking at the structure of the *Epodes* book, see W. Port, 'Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern augusteischer Zeit', *Philologus* 81 (1925-6), 291-6; Dettmer, op. cit. (n. 62), 77-109 (for comments on the place of *Epode* 13 — no sense of closure — see 93); Heyworth, op. cit. (n. 58), esp. 91; Mankin, op. cit. (n. 1), 10-12; Oliensis, op. cit. (n. 6), 91ff.

<sup>103</sup> As Professor Hutchinson points out to me, *Epode* 11 also plays with closure (touched on above). See esp. 11.1-2 'Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuuat / scribere uersiculos', 5 'destiti', but then 23 'nunc', and the witty thought (25ff.) that ending can only be achieved by new beginning, 'sed alius ardor'.

<sup>104</sup> 'Proemi al Mezzo'. For phrase and discussion, see G. B. Conte, *Il genere e i suoi confini* (1984), 121ff., idem, 'Proems in the middle', in F. M. Dunn and T. Cole (eds), *Beginnings in Classical Literature* (1992), 147-59. See too A. Barchiesi's interesting reflections on the proem to *Fasti* Book 4 in *The Poet and the Prince* (1997), 56, and esp. 265-6 with n. 6.

<sup>105</sup> The most sensible discussion of this unmistakable structure is O. Skutsch, 'Symmetry and sense in the *Eclogues*', *HSCP* 73 (1969), 153ff., esp. 158f.

<sup>106</sup> The first and last words of the book: Heyworth, op. cit. (n. 58), 92.