these words appear, it seems probable that Bennett speaks with reference to 3. 24. If this is the case, then, according to Bennett, the invective in 3. 24 is "staged"—the lover/poet expects through such invective to lead this girl (deceitfully) back to himself, the girl being already lost or in danger of being lost to another lover (or lovers) through her *superbia-perfidia*. Nothing can be more arbitrary than to make the invective a mere "gimmick."

True, Propertius in 2. 14. 9 reads "despise her and she will come," but most certainly we only rewrite 3. 24 (and, so far as I can judge, we rewrite it in the spirit of a pseudo-Ovid), if we see in the lover/poet the embodiment of the *sententia* of 2. 14. 9. Of this *sententia* (as of *perfidia* and Jove Horkios) there is nothing, absolutely nothing, in the text of 3. 24.

George L. Koniaris
University of Massachusetts, Boston

TYRTAEUS AND HORACE *ODES* 3. 2

Simonides 12 D., ὁ δ'αὖ θάνατος ἔκιχε καὶ τὸν φυγόμαχον, and 38 D., ἔστι καὶ σιγᾶς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας,[1] have long been recognized by Horatian scholars as providing the two common expressions which are rendered at *Odes* 3. 2 as "mors et fugacem persequitur virum" (v. 14) and "est et fideli tuta silentio / merces" (vss. 25–26). It has long been recognized also that these two common sayings are the main themes of this bipartite Ode. Verse 13 of the same Ode runs, "dulce et decorum est pro patria mori." This sentiment has seemed such a commonplace that few commentators have taken the trouble to mention its possible source.[2] The idea certainly finds expression as far back as Homer (*Il.* 15. 496), and traces of it are found in Alcaeus (61 D.) and Callinus (1. 6–7 D.). The same idea, as Gow mentions in his Horace commentary, appears again in Tyrtaeus (6. 1–2 D.). It is impossible to conclude, from this fact alone, that Horace is in any way indebted to Tyrtaeus for the peculiar turn he gives to such a commonplace idea. One can only show that there is a high probability of this dependence by examining in detail the remains of Tyrtaeus and comparing them with the Horatian Ode in question. If one finds similarities of word and idea in what might be called the background or non-critical areas of the Horatian poem, if one can identify common phrases or turns of expression or similar emphases on

specific priorities, then one can submit that such similarities cannot be put down to mere coincidence but that there is a clear case of dependence. I think that this is true.

It is now generally accepted that the first six Odes of Book 3 form a cycle, the only one in Horace's *Odes*.[3] The order of composition and the order of importance need not concern us here; what is important is that they deal with some of the virtues which Horace and Augustus and all sympathizers of the Augustan reforms wished to see inculcated in Roman life. Fraenkel, in his monumental work on Horace, observes that several of the Odes in this cycle can be related, in manner and content, to Greek poets, notably Pindar.[4] In *Odes* 3. 2, where Horace deals with virtue, especially military prowess, his logical model would be a Greek poet who wrote in the same vein on war and the requirements of war. Such a poet was Tyrtaeus. According to Lycurgus, he was an Athenian who was invited by the Spartans to lead them against the Messenians.[5] Lycurgus goes on to relate that he did this with conspicuous success and that he left behind him elegiac poems to which the Spartan youths might listen and be taught courage. It would appear that Horace's aim was exactly the same, and in this case he could certainly choose no better model than Tyrtaeus. When we examine the three long fragments,[6] probably complete elegies, which survive of

---

1. References are to E. Diehl, *Anthologia lyrica Graeca* (Leipzig, 1925). For Simonides, see II.v, text and notes. See also L. P. Wilkinson, *Horace and his Lyric Poetry*[2] (Cambridge, 1951), p. 113, n. 3.
2. See J. Gow, *Q. Horati Flacci carminum liber III* (Cambridge, 1896), pp. xl and 46.

3. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 260.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 265, 269.
5. Lycurg. *Leocr.* 106.
6. Diehl, *op. cit.*, I.i, Frags. 6–9. Also J. M. Edmonds, *Elegy and Iambus* (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1931) I, Frags. 10–12.

the poetry of Tyrtaeus, we find enough verbal and ideological similarities to put the question of Horace's dependence on Tyrtaeus beyond argument.

Τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα / ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧι πατρίδι μαρνάμενον (6. 1–2 D.) is answered by "dulce et decorum est pro patria mori." It has already been conceded that this in itself is a commonplace sentiment and that parallelism here is not conclusive proof. But consider Tyrteaus 8. 27 D., ἔρδων δ' ὄβριμα ἔργα διδασκέσθω πολεμίζειν, and compare Horace, "robustus acri militia puer / condiscat" (vss. 2–3). From *Odes* 4. 6. 43–44, we know that Horace envisioned himself in the role of a teacher; in the very first stanza of his third book of *Odes*, he claims the part of a *Musarum sacerdos* singing songs for boys and girls. According to Lycurgus, Tyrtaeus aided the Spartans in setting up their system of education.[7] From the passages quoted above we see that both poets had in mind a period of training (διδασκέσθω, *condiscat*) in the practical aspects of warfare, the best method for training being active service (ἔρδων δ' ὄβριμα ἔργα, *acri militia*). Differences in the nature and experience of the two poets suffice to explain the difference of emphasis. We have seen from Lycurgus that Tyrtaeus was actively engaged in the Spartan military program; he naturally stresses the doughtiness of the deeds (ὄβριμα ἔργα). Horace's single military adventure, on the other hand, met with disaster; being a man of great sensitivity and a humanist and individualist as well, he lays emphasis on the strength of the man (*robustus puer*).

The importance of gaining experience in warfare is further emphasized by both poets. In lines 5–6, Horace continues, "et trepidis agat / in rebus." Tyrtaeus, in 9. 10–11 D., expresses much the same idea of gaining experience by participation: οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίγνεται ἐν πολέμωι / εἰ μὴ τετλαίη μὲν ὁρῶν φόνον αἱματόεντα.

A further pair of parallel passages shows

the purpose and aim of this training. Tyrtaeus, καὶ δήιων ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενος (9. 12 D.), implies rather than states explicitly the presence of an enemy. Horace, in his preference of the particular to the general, mentions the Parthians, the enemy *par excellence* of the Romans of the Augustan era. Tyrtaeus, in his ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενος, had in mind the close fighting tactics of the Spartan unit of infantry, the phalanx; whereas Horace chooses the arm of the forces with which alone Rome could hope to defeat the Parthians, the cavalry. ". . . et Parthos ferocis / vexet eques metuendus hasta" is the wording of lines 3–4, where the introduction of the spear provides the idea of close fighting.

Further details in Horace which can be traced to parallels in Tyrtaeus are worth mentioning. The passage, "illum ex moenibus hosticis / matrona bellantis tyranni / prospiciens et adulta virgo / suspiret" (vss. 6–9), certainly recalls the famous scene in Homer, in which Helen and the Trojan leaders watch the Greek warriors from the walls of Troy.[8] Tyrtaeus, at 6(7). 27–29 D., νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν / ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχηι / ἀνδράσι μὲν θηητὸς ἰδεῖν, ἐρατὸς δὲ γυναιξίν, emphasizes the beauty of the young fighter, and makes him the cynosure of all eyes. In Horace, he is still the object of attention of the maiden and of the mother of the opposing fighter, but the maiden's sigh is one of worry and fear rather than of love or admiration. Horace may have wished to avoid the consequences of emphasizing that his hero was ἐρατός, given the Augustan preoccupation with Roman morality. The Latin passage does, however, reflect some of the poet's feelings of pity and frustration at the wastefulness and destructiveness of war. The disgrace of flight and its inability to guarantee safety are mentioned by both poets with a mass of physical detail in which wounds in the back predominate. Tyrtaeus' αἰσχρὸς δ' ἐστὶ νέκυς κακκείμενος ἐν κονίηισι / νῶτον ὄπισθ' αἰχμῆι δουρὸς ἐληλαμένος (8. 19–20 D.), is answered by Horace's "nec parcit

---

7. *Leocr.* 106.
8. *Il.* 3. 146 ff. Cf. also *Il.* 22. 369–74, where the Greeks gaze upon the dead Hector. The humanist in Horace prefers to admire the living warrior.

imbellis iuventae / poplitibus timidove tergo" (vss. 15-16).

The repeated mention of *virtus* by Horace further strengthens the verbal and ideological parallel with Tyrtaeus. Compare lines 17-24 of the Horatian Ode with the following extract from Tyrtaeus (9. 13-15 D.): ἥδ' ἀρετή, τόδ' ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἄριστον / κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίγνεται ἀνδρὶ νέωι / ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόληί τε παντί τε δήμωι. The prize (ἄεθλον) of the Greek games is transmuted by Horace into the prize of office (*honoribus*); but Horace rejects this prize in favor of other *honores* which are *intaminati*. Tyrtaeus' man of virtue serves his country well by his prowess in war. Horace also expects his man of virtue to serve his country in any capacity, civil or military, but warns him of the risks of a *repulsa sordida* in the elections, where he would be dependent on the whim of a fickle populace (*arbitrio popularis aurae*).

Finally, compare "virtus recludens immeritis mori / caelum" (vss. 21-22) with Tyrtaeus 9. 31-32 D., οὐ δέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται

9. *Odes* 3. 5. 2-3, 3. 3. 12.

οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ / ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἐὼν γίγνεται ἀθάνατος. The idea of immortal glory is equally emphasized by both poets; the difference is in the imagery and the manner of expression. Horace uses the thoroughly Roman idea of deification as a reward for virtue. In another Ode of the same cycle, he hints at divine honors for Augustus[9] and elsewhere pictures the deified emperor drinking nectar *purpureo ore*. Tyrtaeus, more practical (ὑπὸ γῆς) and certainly less superstitious, is content to promise undying glory to those who die on behalf of fatherland and children (9. 34 D.). The idea of immortal glory which separates the *meriti* from the crowd ("coetus vulgaris et udam / spernit humum fugiente penna" [vss. 23-24]) is the Horatian counterpart of the fame which Tyrtaeus bestows on those who honorably survive a victorious battle:

γηράσκων ἀστοῖσι μεταπρέπει, οὐ δέ τις αὐτόν
    βλάπτειν οὔτ' αἰδοῦς οὔτε δίκης ἐθέλει,
πάντες δ' ἐν θώκοισιν ὁμῶς νέοι οἵ τε κατ' αὐτόν
    εἴκουσ' ἐκ χώρης οἵ τε παλαιότεροι [9. 39-42 D.].

<div align="right">Locksley I. Lindo</div>

University of the West Indies

PLAUTUS *RUDENS* 902

In digitis hodie percoquam quod ceperit. "'I'll fry on my fingers,' i.e. he will catch nothing," wrote E. A. Sonnenschein, taking the difficulty in his stride. More realistically F. Marx said, "Noch nicht erklärt." I believe this is a case for the prescription of F. Skutsch: "Es ist ja bekannt genug, dass man bei Plautus gelegentlich zurück übersetzen muss, um Witz, ja um Sinn in eine Stelle hineinzubekommen" (*RhM*, LV [1900], 278, n. 2; cf. F. Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*[2], pp. 104 ff. and 124 f.; and P. Legrand, *Daos*, pp. 601 ff.).

If, as a rendering of the original Greek, the expression *in digitis percoquam* was one of those "maculae, quas aut incuria fudit / aut humana parum cavit natura," Plautus will have been in no different case from another voluminous writer, Livy (see P. G. Walsh, *G and R*, N.S. V, XXVII [1958], 83 ff., on

"Livy's Howlers"). We should perhaps remember, too, the difficult script of the third century B.C. (W. Schubart, *Papyruskunde*, pp. 24 f.), since, in the domain of paleography, even able modern scholars have not been immune from error (R. Merkelbach and H. van Thiel, *Gr. Lesehefte*, p. vi). But Plautus may have had a defective text (cf. L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* [Oxford, 1968], pp. 4 f.).

The meaning is surely that the fish will be εὐαρίθμητοι, capable of being counted ἐπὶ δακτύλων, rather than, as with large numbers, by the hands: see Friedländer on Juvenal 10. 249, [*Nestor*] *dextra computat annos*, and cf. Marquardt-Mau, *Privatleben*, page 98. As with ourselves, "the fingers of one hand" seems to have been proverbial for a small number: Lysias *apud* Athenaeus 612, γραῦς