

PROBLEMS IN *EPODE* 11¹

Commentators on *Epode* 11 generally begin by comparing the opening couplet with Archilochus (frg. 215 West): καί μ' οὐτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει, and sometimes also Catullus 68. 1–40. In both of these the poet explains that grief at the death of a loved one has expelled all desire to compose verses.² According to the comparison, Horace, in 1–2, is stating that the onset of love ('amore percussus gravi', 2) has, similarly, so absorbed his attention that he cannot write verse. The translation will then run 'Pettius, I have no pleasure any longer in writing verse, smitten as I am with a heavy love'.³

The comparison is entirely misleading, and several objections can be raised to it. The least is that Archilochus' and Catullus' reaction is provoked by grief: Horace is suffering from love.⁴ Furthermore, Archilochus' and Catullus' loss of interest in writing poetry represents a novel response to an unfamiliar, non-recurring situation, the death of a treasured relative; whereas for Horace, being in love is an all too familiar experience, cf. 2–4 'amore... amore, qui me praeter omnis expetit'⁵ | mollibus in pueris aut in puellis urere'. But what above all makes it hard to accept the comparison, and the view of 1–2 which it entails, is vv. 11–12, where Horace is recounting the difficulties faced in a previous love-affair, 'contrane lucrum nil valere candidum | pauperis ingenium?'. In a poem saturated, as *Epode* 11 is, with motifs familiar from Roman Elegy,⁶ these words should surely be read as the stock complaint of the poor poet, whose gifts of verse celebrating the girl, the products of his 'ingenium', are rejected by her in favour of the tangible gifts of the 'dives amator'. What this means is that Horace wrote poetry (in praise of his girl) at least once before when in love. Given this, and the complaint of 3–4 that he is the perennial target of love, would it not be odd for Horace to say in 1–2 that love's onslaught has blotted out all interest in poetic

¹ Considerations of space prevent me from reproducing the text of *Epode* 11 here, but readers may find it helpful to have it in front of them.

² In Archilochus' case, his brother-in-law; cf. the testimonium of Tzetzes, who cites the fragment, in West, loc. cit. This makes improbable O. Immisch's suggestion ('Zu griechischen Dichtern', *Philologus* 49 (1890), 193–8) of combining frg. 215 with frg. 196W: ἀλλά μ' ὁ λυσιμελής ὤταίρε δάμναται πόθος, as the model for *Epod.* 11. 1–2.

³ So the verses have most recently been interpreted by G. Luck, 'An Interpretation of Horace's Eleventh Epode', *ICS* 1 (1976), 123, E. Degani–G. Burzacchini, *Lirici Greci* (Florence, 1977), p. 5, and P. Fedeli, 'Il V Epodo e i Giambi d'Orazio come Espressione d'Arte Alessandrina', *MPhL* 3 (1978), 118; cf. also E. A. Schmidt, 'Amica vis pastoribus: der Jambiker Horaz in seinem Epodenbuch', *Gymnasium* 84 (1977), 413 f.

⁴ This has often been pointed out, e.g. Kiessling–Heinze ad loc., V. Grassmann, *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz* (Munich, 1966), p. 9, and M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin/N.Y., 1974), pp. 135–6.

⁵ The fact that 'me...expetit' makes sense on its own and 'urere' comes much later tells against Axelson's suggestion that 'me...expetit...urere' = 'cupit urere me' (*Ut Pictura Poesis: Studia... P. J. Enk...oblata* (Leiden, 1955), p. 48). The sense is 'Love attacks me above all (for the idea, cf. *AP* 5. 215. 3–4, *ibid.* 198 and 98, *Prop.* 2. 12. 13–20) to burn me': thus K. Büchner, 'Dichtung und Grammatik', *Mnemosyne* 4. 10 (1957), 30 f., and Grassmann ad loc. Also possible, if less vigorous, is Dillenburger's explanation 'me prae omnibus elegit quem urat'.

⁶ For this aspect of the poem see F. Leo, 'De Horatio et Archilocho' in *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* ii (Rome, 1960), 146 ff., supplemented by Grassmann, pp. 34 ff. and Luck, op. cit. pp. 122 ff.: cf. also B. Kirn, 'Zur literarischen Stellung von Horazens Jambenbuch' (Diss. Tübingen, 1935), pp. 55 ff.

composition? Yet this is the view to which the comparison with Catullus and Archilochus impels us.

We therefore require for 1–2 a meaning different from the one that is usually given. I suggest that the lines should be translated with a somewhat altered emphasis. That is, not, on the conventional view, ‘Pettius, I have no pleasure, as I did before, in composing verses, because I am smitten with heavy love’ (i.e. love robs me of my interest in composing) but ‘Pettius, it does not please me as before to write verses when smitten with a heavy love’⁷ (i.e. I no longer get any pleasure from writing when I’m in love). This alternative rendering views ‘amore percussus gravi’ as temporal, rather than causal (that is, appended to ‘nihil . . . versiculos’ as an explanation of why Horace takes no pleasure in writing). It also gives a sharper sense than the usual interpretation to ‘sicut antea’, which emphasizes Horace’s divergence from his previous practice:⁸ in the past when in love he had written verses; no longer has he any interest in doing so.

The interpretation offered here is supported by the general scheme of the poem, which develops an interplay between the Inachia affair, belonging to the past (5–22), and the current Lyciscus affair (1–2; 23–8), with particular emphasis on each tactic, or ‘remedium amoris’, which proved ineffective in the Inachia affair – wine, the advice of friends, and poetry⁹ – thereby leading to the realistic, if unheroic, conclusion that the sole effective ‘remedium’ for the current passion is ‘alius ardor’¹⁰ aut puellae candidae | aut teretis pueri’ (27–8) (other methods having been tried, and failed). Therefore Horace’s resolve in 1–2 to write poetry no longer when in love is the first occurrence of a significant theme of the poem, devices which have proved ineffective against love. The closing remedy (effective) balances the opening one (ineffective), giving a pleasing effect of ring composition.

The following may also be considered. We have seen that, on the usual view of 1–2, Horace is saying that love robs him of interest in writing. In that case, is it not strange that this supposed loss of interest is never mentioned again in the course of the poem?¹¹ Compare the supposedly parallel Catullus 68. 1–40, where C. repeatedly returns (19 ff., 25 ff., 31 ff.) to his initial topic, that grief has put a stop to his writing poetry. Compare too *Epode* 14, which *is* about Horace’s inability to write ‘iambi’ because of love; the theme is pursued from start to finish. It does not appear consistent with this pattern, or with a feeling for poetic form in general, that Horace should state a theme in the opening couplet, only to let it then vanish without trace. By contrast 1–2, if interpreted as suggested, do integrate satisfactorily with the thought-development of the poem.

A further point on 1–2, and the conventional interpretation thereof. That Horace – or any other ancient poet – should voice the sentiment that being in love inhibits the

⁷ A similar interpretation was proposed by K. Büchner, ‘Die Epoden des Horaz’ in *Werkanalysen* (Wiesbaden, 1970), p. 60² (‘wenn ich, wie z. B. jetzt, der Liebe verfallen bin’). But Büchner does not develop his argument in any detail, or relate verses 1–2 to the poem as a whole.

⁸ Th. Plüss, *Das Jambenbuch des Horaz* (Leipzig, 1904), p. 76² was the only person to see that ‘sicut antea’ was in any way significant, although his interpretation of it differs from mine. ‘Übrigens meine ich, wenn *sicut* hier seine Kraft und Bedeutung wahren solle und wenn V. 11 ff. und 16 ff. so zu verstehen seien, dass dem Sprecher schon vor zwei Jahren seine Verse nichts halfen und ihn verdrossen, dann dürfte man nicht mit Kiessling u. a. verstehen “jetzt anders oder weniger als früher” [sicut antea sc. iuvavit], sondern “jetzt wieder ganz ebensowenig wie früher” [sicut antea sc. nihil iuvavit].’

⁹ See the discussion of these below.

¹⁰ This ‘remedium’ is hardened into a precept by Ovid *Rem. Am.* 462 ff.

¹¹ Indeed, on this line of interpretation, 1–2 are little more than an exotic way of saying that Horace is in love.

writing of poetry might seem unlikely.¹² In Roman Love Elegy, indeed, with which *Epode* 11 has so much in common,¹³ the experience of being in love, and poetic composition, become almost inseparable.¹⁴ (Grassmann¹⁵ affirms, against Wili, that a belief in the incompatibility of love with poetic activity is not alien to ancient poetic theory; in support of his contention he cites three Hellenistic epigrams,¹⁶ *AP* 12. 98–100.¹⁷ But his evidence is not convincing).

Before leaving vv. 1–2, mention should be made of a different explanation of these lines: that by ‘versiculos’ Horace means the reader to understand the sort of verses which he has been composing up till now, namely *iambi*. This suggestion, raised briefly in some of the commentaries,¹⁸ was developed in earnest by W. Wili, who remarks of vv. 1–2 ‘Natürlich meint er mit diesem Nichtkönnen das Versiegen der Spottverse, denn über den holden Irrsinn, dass Liebe den Dichterdrang töte, sei kein Wort verschwendet’, and speaks of ‘das...Thema, dass die Liebe die iambischen Verse nicht zur Vollendung gedeihen lässt’.¹⁹ Wili’s thesis has recently been expanded by E. A. Schmidt,²⁰ who, starting from the premise, ‘Setzen wir für *versiculos* also “Satiren und Epoden”’, takes 1–2 to mean that love-sickness robs Horace of the desire for the ‘Sittenkorrektur’ which was, Schmidt supposes, the poet’s primary motive for composing the *Epodes*, and views the whole as a ‘Jambus gegen...Nicht-Jamben-Dichtenden’.

Any such explanation of vv. 1–2 seems to place an intolerable strain on ‘versiculos’.²¹ More important, it succumbs to an objection which has already been mentioned in connection with the conventional view of these verses: if Horace wished to say in the

¹² K. Quinn, ‘Two Crises in Horace’s Poetical Career’ *AUMLA* 5 (1956), 37 classifies Horace’s supposed claim that love takes away his taste for writing with the familiar idea that love’s onset interferes with all other activities; for illustration of the topic Guillemin (*REL* 17 (1939), 282 ff.) is referred to. Neither writer points to an instance where falling in love is said to terminate poetic activity. Virgil *Ecl.* 10. 62–3, appealed to by Luck, *op. cit.* p. 123, is equally unhelpful. Kiessling–Heinze note that Prop. 2. 16. 33–4, which are sometimes compared with 1–2, are in no sense parallel to Horace’s verses (as conventionally understood).

¹³ When speaking, as many have done, of elegiac elements in *Epode* 11, it must however be kept in mind that, of the Roman elegists, only Cornelius Gallus wrote before the composition of the *Epode* (cf. Grassmann, p. 36).

¹⁴ cf. E. Burck, ‘Römische Wesenszüge der Augusteischen Liebeselegie’, *Hermes* 80 (1952), 182 ff.

¹⁵ pp. 37 ff., 90, followed by Fedeli, *op. cit.* p. 118.

¹⁶ Appeal to such sources on *Epode* 11 forms part of his attempt to show that Leo overstressed its background in Elegy and Comedy at the expense of Hellenistic Epigram (pp. 34 ff.).

¹⁷ The first of these represents the poet as proof against the onslaught of love, not vulnerable to it (see Gow–Page *HE* ii. 3074 ff.). The remaining two examples do oppose poetry and love – but in a specialized way. Love is seen overmastering the intellectual, bookish, Callimachean poet – in essence, emotion conquering intellect. The closing line of *AP* 12. 100, τὸν σοφὸν ἐν Μούσαις Κύπρις ἔτρωσε μόνῃ, illustrates the point. Although the primary meaning of σοφός in the context is the technical one of ‘poet’, the epigrammatist is more interested in playing with the original sense of ‘wise’, in order to set up a contrast with its inverse, the power of emotion (represented by love). Lines 3–4 of the well-known succeeding epigram (*AP* 12. 101, Meleager) exploit the same notion. Similarly *AP* 12. 117 (Meleager).

¹⁸ cf. Ritter (‘versiculos nunc dicit versus epodorum’), Giarratano (‘allude ai giambi’), Villeneuve, and Kiessling–Heinze, *ad loc.*

¹⁹ W. Wili, *Horaz* (Basel, 1948), p. 61. The situation in 11, as Wili sees it, is then precisely equivalent to *Epode* 14, where Horace states that love makes him unable to get on with writing, specifically, his *iambi*.

²⁰ *op. cit.* pp. 413 ff.

²¹ Why should Horace say ‘versiculos’ if he meant ‘iambos’? (Contrast *Epod.* 14. 6–8 ‘deus (sc. Amor) nam me vetat | inceptos, olim promissum carmen, iambos | ad umbilicum adducere’.)

opening couplet that love puts a stop to his writing *iambi*, why is there no trace of this topic in the rest of the poem?

This is not to dispute an assumption which, it appears, goes hand in hand with the above interpretation: that *Epode* 11 in some way represents a watershed in the iambist's career (Wili's sub-chapter on it is significantly entitled 'lyrisches Vorspiel').²² For *Epode* 11 does announce a new orientation for Horace within the *Epode*-book (here the numerical position of the poem is suggestive).²³ Above all there is the appearance for the first time in the *Epodes* of a personal love-theme handled seriously and subjectively, as well as the poem's subject-matter, which one associates more readily with elegy than iambic – not to mention the clear break, by the introduction of a fresh metre (Third Archilochian = iambic trimeter plus elegiacus: the same system as in the Cologne Archilochus),²⁴ with the natural grouping *Epodes* 1–10 (all composed in iambic trimeter plus dimeter). There is also the first address to a friend other than Maecenas – to Pettius, the poet's spiritual counsellor.

I should like now to set my interpretation of lines 1–2 in the broader context of the poem, in particular the reminiscences of the Inachia affair which occupy the bulk of the *Epode* (5–22). It has already been suggested that Horace's current disillusionment with the writing of verse while in love is tied up with his awareness, based on past experiences with Inachia, that various 'remedia amoris' – wine-bibbing, the sensible advice of friends, and poetry – are of no use in his case. If each of these 'remedia' is taken in turn, it emerges that they all failed of their purpose in the Inachia affair.

(1) Wine (8 'conviviorum' ... 10, 12–14). 'conviviorum' 8 establishes the sympotic setting, 'calentis...fervidiore mero' (13–14) suggests that Horace was trying that age-old remedy of distraught lovers, drowning his sorrows in drink.²⁵ Unfortunately the results were not as intended. Rather than diminishing, the drink *increased* the lover's anguish (cf. Ov. *Her.* 16. 231–2), making Horace disclose unmistakable signs of love-sickness²⁶ ('amantem...arguit' 9–10):²⁷ for the poet's deep sighs ('latere petitus imo spiritus'), 'langor' and 'silentium' (9–10), Leo²⁸ pointed to Callim. *AP* 12. 134²⁹ and Asclep. *AP* 12. 135,³⁰ where repeated drinks plunge the lover into maudlin advertisement of his anguished condition.³¹ Worse, the wine induced

²² Schmidt sees *Epode* 11. 1–2 as 'der Anfang...<eines> Neueinsatzes'. For a similar view of the poem, see Quinn, op. cit., and especially F. Olivier, *Les Épodes d'Horace* in his *Essais dans le domaine du monde gréco-romain antique* (Geneva, 1963), pp. 111 ff.

²³ See O. Skutsch, 'The Structure of the Propertian *Monobiblos*', *CPh* 58 (1963), 239.

²⁴ For suggested links between *Epode* 11 and the new Archilochus, see Degani-Burzacchini, op. cit. pp. 4 ff.

²⁵ Meleager, *AP* 12. 49 urges such a course on the unhappy lover: Ζωροπότει, δύσερως, καὶ σοῦ φλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα | κοιμάσει λάθας δωροδότας Βρόμιος· | ζωροπότει, καὶ πλήρες ἀφυσάμενος σκύφος οἶνας, | ἔκκρουσον στυγερὰν ἐκ κραδίας ὀδύνην; cf. also Asclepiades *ibid.* 50, Prop. 3. 17. 1 ff.; Tib. 1. 2. 1 ff.; [idem] 3. 6. 1 ff.; Ov. *Rem. Am.* 805 ff.

²⁶ cf. Alciphron, *Epp.* 1. 35. 2: καίτοι γε ὦμην τὸν ἄκρατον ἔσεσθαι μοι παρηγόρημα ὃν παρ' Εὐφρονίῳ τρίτην ἑσπέραν πολὺν τινα ἐνεφορησάμην, ὥς δὴ τὰς παρὰ τὴν νύκτα φροντίδας διωσόμενος· τὸ δὲ ἄρα ἐναντίως ἔσχεν· ἀνερρίπισε γάρ μου τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὥστε κλαίοντά με καὶ βρυχώμενον ἐλεεῖσθαι μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιεικεστέροις, γέλῳτα δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις παρέχειν.

²⁷ Past tense. The verb shows that Horace's secret was revealed against his will: cf. ἐρὰν ἀρνεύμενον ἡμῖν in *AP* 12. 135 quoted n. 30 below.

²⁸ op. cit. p. 147.

²⁹ cf. esp. 1–3: "Ἐλκος ἔχων ὁ ξείνος ἐλάνθανεν· ὡς ἀνιηρὸν | πνεῦμα διὰ στηθέων, εἶδες, ἀνηγάγετο, | τὸ τρίτον ἦνικ' ἔπινε.

³⁰ Οἶνος ἔρωτος ἑλεγχος· ἐρὰν ἀρνεύμενον ἡμῖν | ἤτασαν αἱ πολλαὶ Νικαγόρην προπόσεις· | καὶ γὰρ ἐδάκρυσεν καὶ ἐνύστασε, καὶ τι κατηφές | ἔβλεπε, χῶ σφιγχθεὶς οὐκ ἔμενε στέφανος.

³¹ For more detailed discussion of these two pieces see G. Giangrande in *L'Épigramme grecque*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 14 (Geneva, 1968), pp. 120–2.

embarrassing revelations of amatory secrets;³² 'promorat loco' 14 implies forcible dislocation of what should properly have stayed hidden, and 'inverecundus' (13) complains that the wine-god, because he loosens men's tongues,³³ is no respecter of Horace's (or anyone else's) secrets.³⁴ 'Applorans' too, l. 12 (noteworthy because the word occurs only once again, in Seneca, *QNat.* 4. 2. 6, and because uncompounded 'plorare' is a strong term),³⁵ suggests a degree of emotional excess in Horace's revelations, now regretted. No doubt this was provoked by too much wine.

(2) *consilia amicorum*. For most of *Epode* 11, Pettius' role is confined to receiving Horace's amatory confidences, both in the past and in the present. However, in the Inachia affair he took a hand by bidding Horace, after the brave self-exhortation of 15–18, to take himself off home ('iussus abire domum' 20). But this useful advice goes for naught. No sooner does Horace leave the banquet than he is carried inexorably ('ferebar': *φέρομαι* is similarly used in Greek amatory epigram)³⁶ to his mistress's door, to spend an uncomfortable night on the threshold (20–2). This little incident points a telling moral. The well-intentioned advice of friends can have no impact upon Horace's 'gravis ardor', and it is with hard-won self-knowledge that he says that neither the 'libera' ('outspoken', cf. 'libera bilis' 16) *consilia* nor the 'contumeliae'³⁷ graves of his 'amici' can disentangle him from his current involvement with Lyciscus (25–6).

(3) Poetry (11–12). My interpretation of these lines, and their significance for the meaning of vv. 1–2, has already been outlined. It remains to discuss them in detail.

Both 'candidum' and 'ingenium' need careful consideration. According to Kiessling–Heinze, 'ingenium' means Horace's moral character, although they themselves note that the word elsewhere in Horace always refers to intellectual qualities.³⁸ However, the opposition 'lucrum/pauperis ingenium' inevitably recalls a familiar situation in the Roman elegists, where the poor poet,³⁹ seeking to possess his girl, pits his 'ingenium', his poetic talents,⁴⁰ against the (usually successful) counter-attractions of the rich lover's gifts. Thus Propertius, in one of the happier phases of the Cynthia affair, proclaims l. 8. 39–40 'hanc ego non auro, non Indis flectere conchis, | sed potui blandi

³² The banquet was traditionally the place where revelations took place about one's love-life; cf. F. Cairns, *Hermes* 98 (1970), 40 f.

³³ e.g. Eratosthenes frg. 36 Powell: *Οἶνος... τὰ δὲ καὶ κεκρυμμένα φαίνει | βυσσόθεν*, Ath. 37e; cf. Theogn. 479 ff.; Ath. 38b.

³⁴ The comparison with *Od.* 1. 27. 3 'verecundumque Bacchum' is misleading; 'verecundia' there relates to restrained behaviour, not to holding one's tongue. Grassmann sees in 'inverecundus deus... arcana promorat loco' a sophisticated jest. Bacchus keeps his own 'arcana' (viz. 'orgia') secret, but is less scrupulous when it comes to others'. He compares Meleager *AP* 12. 119. 5 ff.: *ἡ προδότας (sc. Bacchus) κάπιστος ἔφυσ' τεὰ δ' ὄργια κρύπτειν | αὐδῶν, ἐκφαίνειν τὰ μὰ σὺν νῦν ἐθέλεις*.

³⁵ Seneca makes a significant distinction between 'lacrimare', decorous shedding of tears, and 'plorare', abandoning oneself without restraint to distress, *Epp.* 63. 1 'Nec sicci sint oculi amisso amico nec fluant; lacrimandum est, non plorandum'.

³⁶ cf. Meleager *AP* 5. 190. 3 and 12. 85. 6: *αὐτομάτοις δ' ἄκων ποσσὶ ταχὺς φέρομαι*.

³⁷ An intensification of 'libera consilia'. When advice has no effect, the friends adopt a more censorious approach. For 'contumeliae' addressed to a lover, cf. Plaut. *Trin.* 641 ff.; for the unsuccessful attempts of friends to prise the lover from his affair, cf. Prop. 1. 1. 25–6; 3. 24. 9.

³⁸ D. Bo, *Lexicon Horatianum* (Hildesheim, 1965–6), s.v. 'ingenium', is misleading.

³⁹ For the traditional poverty of poets, and the prominence of the theme in Hellenistic and Roman verse, see F. Cairns, *Tibullus* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 20–1, with the bibliography there given.

⁴⁰ This is by far the most common meaning of 'ingenium' in Horace: *Sat.* 1. 4. 43; 1. 10. 63; 2. 1. 67; 2. 1. 75; 2. 6. 15; *Epp.* 1. 3. 22; 2. 1. 88; 2. 2. 81; *Ars Poet.* 295; 323; 410; *Od.* 1. 6. 12; 2. 18. 9. For this interpretation of 'ingenium', see Ps.-Acro. ad loc. and Büchner, *Epoden*, loc. cit.; cf. Leo, op. cit. p. 149.

carminis obsequio', where 'aurum' refers to the offerings of the rich rival which Cynthia has, on this occasion,⁴¹ rejected in favour of Propertius' 'carmina'; cf. idem 4. 5. 53–8, Tib. 1. 4. 61–2, and esp. Ov. *Am.* 3. 8. 1 ff. for the same opposition of 'ingenium' and 'aurum'. Perhaps the best comment on the convention being described is Ovid's inversion of it, *Am.* 1. 8. 61–2, where the 'lena', urging on the girl the theme 'Exploit your beauty for profit', states that a poet will give you nothing but verses. Therefore 'qui dabit, ille tibi magno sit maior Homero; | crede mihi, res est ingeniosa dare' – giving gifts is the *true* sign of 'ingenium', of genius.

Since much of *Epode* 11 can be illuminated by reference to Roman elegy,⁴² and since it can further be shown that the topic just discussed appears in its fully developed form as early as Callimachus (*Iamb.* 3),⁴³ from whom Horace could have borrowed it direct, there is a strong case for understanding 11–12 as suggested.⁴⁴

Next, 'candidum'. The clue to its meaning must lie in an opposition with the 'dives amator'. This suggests the sense 'benevolum' (or perhaps 'innocent', sc. of deception) – in contrast to the rival, who wishes only to exploit. (Both senses of the adjective are common enough: for the first, cf. *Epp.* 1. 4. 1, ibid. 6. 67–8 'si quid novisti rectius istis, | candidus imperti', Scrib. Larg. praef. 5. 26–7 Helmreich 'candidissimo animo et erga me benevolentissimo'.)⁴⁵ In conjunction with 'ingenium' (if interpreted as suggested) the meaning should be that the poet shows his good will by praising her in his verse (thus at the end of the Cynthia and Marathus relationships Propertius and Tibullus complain that they have thrown away their 'laudes' on one who did not appreciate the gesture).⁴⁶

The couplet is crucial for the interpretation of the poem as a whole. Experience has shown Horace that poetry is no good to a lover when faced with a greedy *puella*. This takes us back to the opening statement that he no longer ('nihil... sicut antea') wishes to write 'versiculi' when in love, by providing a reason for that decision, the proven uselessness of the tactic.

In the course of the Inachia affair, then, Horace utilized three tactics to help him cope with his love – wine, 'amicorum consilia', and versification. The first of these, instead of lulling Horace's sorrows, tricked him into amatory disclosures, the second proved quite unequal to the allure of the beloved, and the third seemed to the girl paltry beside a rival's gifts.⁴⁷

⁴¹ But for the general rapaciousness of elegiac *puellae*, see S. Lilja, *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women* (Helsinki, 1965), pp. 143, 145 f., and 149 f.

⁴² See n. 6 *supra*.

⁴³ See C. M. Dawson, 'An Alexandrian Prototype of Marathus?', *AJP* 67 (1946), 1 ff.

⁴⁴ Grassmann, p. 40, rejects any such view; for him, lines 11–12 are an instance of 'das Thema Geld-Liebe'; he cites as parallels numerous Hellenistic epigrams which handle the complaint of the lover against the beloved's venality.

⁴⁵ See further Petron. 129. 11, Val. Max. 8. 15 praef., Sen. *Epp.* 7. 7, Mart. 4. 86. 3–5 'ut docto placeas Apollinari. | nil... est... candidius benigniusque', and, for the adjective in both senses, *TLL* 3. 244. 44 ff.

⁴⁶ Prop. 3. 24. 3–4 'noster amor talis tribuit tibi, Cynthia, laudes: | versibus insignem te pudet esse meis', Tib. 1. 9. 47–8. The elegiac poets often allude to their power to make famous (Prop. 2. 5. 5–6; 2. 25. 3–4; 3. 2. 17–18; 3. 24. 3–4; Ov. *Am.* 1. 10. 59–60; 3. 12. 9–10) or celebrate (e.g. Prop. 2. 1. 7–8; 2. 34. 93–4; 3. 24. 3 ff.) the beloved.

⁴⁷ It is possible that vv. 7–8 'heu me, per urbem – nam pudet tanti mali – fabula quanta fui!' demonstrate another respect in which writing poetry proved unsatisfactory for Inachia's lover. Horace's language is remarkably similar to Ov. *Am.* 3. 1. 21–2, 'fabula, nec sentis, tota iactaris in urbe, | dum tua praeterito facta pudore refers' and Prop. 2. 24. 1–8, "'Tu loqueris, cum sis iam nota fabula libro | et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro?' | cui non his verbis aspergat tempora sudor? | aut pudor ingenuis aut retinendus amor. | quod si iam facilis spirares, Cynthia, nobis, | non ego nequitiae dicerer esse caput, | nec sic per totam infamis traduceret urbem, | urerer et

It remains to discuss the meaning of 'fomenta', 17. This question cannot be divorced from interpretation of the vexed and elliptical 15–18 ('quodsi meis inaestuet praecordiis | libera bilis, ut haec ingrata ventis dividat | fomenta vulnus nil malum levantia, | desinet imparibus certare summotus pudor') – a task worth attempting in itself.

These lines in my view run: But if the anger Horace feels at Inachia's cruelty could be given free rein, i.e. if he could break with her,⁴⁸ so as to dispense with – because they would no longer be necessary – the palliatives ('fomenta') with which he tries to ease the pain of unhappy love ('vulnus...malum'), then his cause for shame ('pudor'), that is to say, the degrading behaviour to which love reduces him, will be got rid of ('summotus'), and he will give up the struggle against a rival who, though his inferior ('imparibus'), clearly has the upper hand.

The paraphrase just given obviously needs defence: 15–18 are positively cryptic (tipsy lovers do not really talk like this).

I begin with a point which has not been mentioned in previous discussions of the lines. The sequence protasis–apodosis is broken by the intervening 'ut' clause ('ut...levantia'). The content of the result clause presumably has a bearing, therefore, on the meaning of 'desinet imparibus certare summotus pudor' 18: for another instance where an apodosis is only fully intelligible in the light of the subordinate clause which stands between it and the protasis, cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 335 ff. 'sed tandem si tu Iuppiter sis mortuos, | quom ad deos minores redierit regnum tuom, | quis mihi subveniet tergo aut capiti aut cruribus'?⁴⁹ This might suggest that the 'pudor' which is 'summotus' falls under the umbrella of the 'fomenta' to be dispensed with. The point becomes clearer if we note that the 'fomenta' administered against the pain of love – the wine-bibbing, the pouring out of the heart to friends (but see further below) – are in themselves decidedly shameful: the emotional outbursts (cf. 'applorans') which accompanied the revelations could well be so described: the word 'invirecundus' and, in particular, the doublet 'pudet...paenitet' (7–8) with which Horace prefaced the sympotic setting where the maudlin lover betrayed his condition, are most suggestive. All of which means that 'pudor' must be concrete, in the well-attested sense of 'that which causes shame'; though the commentators would disagree with this interpretation.⁵⁰ Furthermore, 'certare' clearly implies the struggle against the rival (cf. 'contrane lucrum...valere?' 11). The literal sense of 18 will run something like this: 'my source of shame (i.e. the humiliating activities in which I indulge to console

quamvis non bene, verba darem' (Text of D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956) pp. 110 ff., whom see on the crucial v. 4). Both elegists, like Horace, exploit the motif of *pudor* in connection with the notoriety of their *amor*. Both, *apropos* of the topic of publicizing their unhappy love in verse, offer close parallels to his 'per urbem...fabula'. Although Horace does not disclose how he became a 'fabula', it may be that he is implying the same process of poetic self-betrayal. In that case he offers an additional reason for his initial decision not to write poetry while in love: it makes you notorious.

⁴⁸ For outspoken anger betokening a *discidium*, cf. Tib. 1. 5. 1 ff.

⁴⁹ The slave Olympio is speaking to his master Lysidamus ('Iuppiter'). The 'di minores' are his family, of whom Olympio has just said 'they all hate me'. Therefore, if you die, says O., once the household passes into the control of your family, who will protect me from the blows I can expect from them? The idea contained in the apodosis (that O. will be exposed to blows) depends for its sense more, if anything, on the 'quom'-clause than on the protasis.

⁵⁰ 'Pudor' is usually explained as 'my feeling of shame lest I be defeated by an unworthy rival (which keeps me therefore from bowing out of the contest for I.'s affections)'. This cannot be right. What keeps Horace embroiled with Inachia is not his *amour propre* in face of a rival, but his helpless thralldom to her: witness his involuntary backsliding at 19 ff., and the unspoken implication, in his wish 'quodsi...inaestuet...libera bilis' (15–16), that Horace is in a condition of *servitium*. For other interpretations of this much-discussed phrase see Wickham, Schütz, and Ritter ('modesty'), Desprez, and Kiessling-Heinze, and further n. 52 below.

myself for lack of good fortune in love)⁵¹ will be removed, and so will cease the ineffective struggle against my rival's success'. This explanation assumes 'desinet...summotus pudor' to = 'pudor submovebitur et desinet'.⁵²

Next, 'imparibus' (18). This refers to the rival (the plural is generalizing), as 'certare' (cf. 'contrane...valere') shows. Various interpretations must be rejected: 'ill-matched', referring to the girl (Grassmann),⁵³ i.e. the opposite of 'par' in the sense familiar from love-poetry:⁵⁴ 'with unequal weapons', i.e. unable to match the wealth of the 'dives amator'.⁵⁵ In particular, the obvious interpretation that Horace refuses any longer to vie with a rival who *surpasses* him in wealth, etc. will not do;⁵⁶ 'impar' cannot mean 'superior, potior', only 'inferior'. This leaves us with the widely canvassed view that 'imparibus' means that the rival (may be wealthier but) is morally inferior, or the like, to Horace.⁵⁷

This translation is consistent with the attitude of moral superiority elsewhere struck by the impoverished lover towards his richer, more successful rival (notably Prop. 2. 16 and Ov. *Am.* 3. 8; cf. also Tib. 1. 9), and already suggested here by the opprobrious 'lucrum' (cf. Ov. *Am.* 3. 8. 36, Tib. 1. 9. 7 ff. 'lucra petens...lucra petituras freta per parentia ventis | ducunt instabiles sidera certa rates: | muneribus meus est captus puer...'). Normally 'impar' has attached to it a noun explaining wherein the inferiority lies, but another substantive use at Liv. 1. 46. 7 comes fairly close to the presumed meaning here: 'et se rectius viduam et illum caelibem futurum fuisse contendere, quam cum impari (sc. ingenio) iungi, ut elanguescendum aliena ignavia esset'.

Finally, 'fomenta': once again, the commentators disagree on what this refers to. The most popular view is that Horace means the laments he has been uttering.⁵⁸ More likely is that Horace means wine and the conversation of friends. It was conventional in the literary tradition on which Horace is drawing for the disappointed lover to seek consolation in wine, in the company of friends. Such an interpretation fits better into the scheme of the whole, because the 'fomenta' are described as 'vulnus nil malum levantia', unable to assuage the wound of love and, if Grassmann's translation of 'ingrata' is correct, 'ineffectual';⁵⁹ we have already seen that Horace's wine-bibbing, far from drowning his pain, exacerbates it, making him talk to Pettius, to be sure – but in a manner that Horace feels to be embarrassingly self-revelatory.

⁵¹ For 'pudor' = 'cause of shame', see *OLD* 4a s.v. For the noun in this sense applied to behaviour, Ov. *Her.* 19. 202 'nil tua, Cydippe, facta pudoris habent', Luc. 3. 148–9 'Venia est haec sola pudoris degenerisque metus'.

⁵² In view of *Epp.* 1. 9. 12 'depositum...pudorem', there is something to be said for Lambinus' interpretation 'my pushing aside of self-respect' (which I should refer to the disreputable behaviour of the disappointed lover as seen in vv. 7–14, though Lambinus himself did not). However, coming after 'ventis dividat' and 'desinet', 'summotus' surely ought to refer, like them, to a departure from Horace's previous behaviour: in which case 'summotus' = 'submovebitur et', and so the commentators (including Lambinus in an alternative explanation) have generally construed it.

⁵³ This interpretation founders on 'imparibus certare'. A lover may 'certare' with a rival: it is difficult to see in what sense he could 'certare' with a girl who does not spend time with him.

⁵⁴ cf. R. Pichon, *Index Verborum Amatoriorum* (Paris, 1902), s.v. 'par'.

⁵⁵ Orelli rejects this and the preceding suggestion in his useful note ad loc.

⁵⁶ Thus Porphyrio, Lambinus, Desprez, Mitscherlich, Doering, and Tescari.

⁵⁷ e.g. L. Müller ('me indignis'), Kiessling-Heinze, Giarratano, Turolla.

⁵⁸ cf. Dillenburger, Schütz, Wickham, Orelli, L. Müller, Giarratano.

⁵⁹ For 'ingratus' in this sense he compares Plaut. *Asin.* 136 'ingrata atque irrita esse omnia intellego' (cf. *TLL* 7. 1. 1560. 19 ff.). Alternatively, 'ingrata' means simply 'displeasing'. Unhappy love calls for such remedies as wine-drinking, but Horace dislikes the results.

But 'fomenta' could have a quite different, or at least an additional, meaning: poetry (as Büchner briefly suggested).⁶⁰ The medical metaphor ('fomentum' is properly a bandage or poultice for the relief of external symptoms) of poetry as a cure for love's wound is familiar from Theocritus 11 (poetry is a φάρμακον... οὐτ' ἔγχριστον... οὐτ' ἐπίπαστον 1 ff., cf. 17, for the ὑποκάρδιον ἔλκος 15 of love), and from Callimachus' follow-up epigram (46 Pf.). It is possible that the whole phrase 'fomenta vulnus (nil) malum levantia' is derived from the epigram: cf. v. 4 poetry is πανακὲς πάντων φάρμακον; poetry (and poverty) charm away τῷ χαλεπῷ τραύματος (10) of love ('vulnus... malum'). Most arresting is v. 3 αἱ Μοῖσαι τὸν ἔρωτα κατισχναίνοντι, where, by a bold metaphor,⁶¹ love is pictured as a disease which is susceptible of reduction:⁶² both κατισχναίνω and uncompounded ἰσχναίνω are met, in this sense of 'reducing' a swelling, in the Hippocratic corpus.⁶³

Similarly 'fomenta' were applied to swellings (Theodor. Priscian. *Euporista* 1. 77–8 Rose) and wounds (ibid. 67; Tac. *Ann.* 1. 65 and 69; 15. 55) to counter swelling, Cael. Aurel. *acut.* 2. 86 Drabkin 'est autem improprium atque loco carens (sc. in cases of catalepsy) in initiis frigidis uti fomentis, in declinationibus vero calidis atque ferventibus iuxta imitationem recentium vulnere. in his enim priusquam tumor emerit frigida probantur...'

In other words, both the language of v. 17, and the metaphor of love as a malady which may be treated externally,⁶⁴ are reminiscent of Callimachus' epigram. Horace may owe both to Callimachus. The possibility of direct indebtedness is strengthened given that, in addition to duplicating the imagery of κατισχναίνω, 'fomentum' appears here for the first time in Latin poetry in a transferred sense, given too that Horace has already, at v. 9, imitated an epigram of Callimachus.

If then Horace has borrowed both language and metaphor from Callimachus, has he also taken over the central thesis of his epigram, that poetry has power to cure the sorrows of love? That is to say, is Horace, by the elusive 'fomenta' of 17, thinking of poetry? Some confirmation of this may be sought in the fact that, in a similar metaphorical use of 'fomentum' in Horace, 'frigida curarum fomenta' *Epp.* 1. 3. 26, 'ineffectual remedies for cares',⁶⁵ 'fomenta' is used with reference primarily to

⁶⁰ *Epoden*, loc. cit. The remarks of Plüss quoted above in n. 8 show that he also understood 'fomenta' thus.

⁶¹ A. W. Mair, in the Loeb ed. ad loc., translates 'reduce the swollen wound of love'. Gow–Page, *HE* 2. 157 and P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 2. 545 ff. also give 'reduce' (in the medical sense).

That we are not dealing here with an attenuated metaphor (LSJ s.v. note κατισχναίνειν... ὁσμὴν Theophr. *de odor.* 47) is strongly suggested by the high incidence of medical language in the poem (see Gow–Page and Fraser locc. cit.), and the possibility that Callimachus' addressee Philippus is, like Theocritus' Nicias, a doctor (C. C. Edgar, *Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection* (Ann Arbor, 1931), p. 126).

⁶² Just as, in v. 6, ἐκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον, we have a surgical metaphor: ἐκκόπτω, 'cut out', is quite frequent in the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, e.g. Galen *de atra bile* 5. 11: ὅταν ἐκκόψῃ τὸ πεπονθὸς μόριον ὅλον ἐν κύκλῳ περιτεμὼν ἄχρι τῶν ἀπαθῶν, Soran. *Gynaec.* 4. 7. 7: διὰ χειρουργίας ἐκκόπτειν.

⁶³ κατισχναίνω: Hippocr. *Progn.* 23. ἰσχναίνω: *Liqu.* 3: sea-water ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ ἰσχναίνειν εὖ [sc. ἔλκεα]; *Aph.* 5. 25: τὰ ἐν ἄρθροισιν οἰδήματα... ψυχρὸν πολλὸν καταχέμενον ῥηίζει τε καὶ ἰσχναίνει; *de fist.* 10: τούτων τῶν καταπλασμάτων... τὰ... ἐς ἑωυτὰ ἔλκοντα ξηραίνει καὶ ἰσχναίνει (sc. abscesses); *de loc. hom.* 38: τῶν φαρμάκων... τὰ... ἰσχναίνοντα.

⁶⁴ Contrast e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 4. 1–2 'At regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura | vulnus alit venis et caeco carpitur igni', or the remarkable picture at Ap. Rhod. 3. 761 ff.

⁶⁵ For this meaning, cf. M. J. McGann, *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles* (Brussels, 1969), p. 41².

poetry.⁶⁶ Also, 'ingrata', 'ineffectual', and 'nil...levantia' (said of the 'fomenta') appear to echo 'nil valere' v. 11 (said of poetry, if 'ingenium' is correctly interpreted thus). This might suggest, by inference, that 'haec fomenta' are the poems he was there alluding to.

In what sense, then, can poetry be an ineffective remedy for love? Either because it fails to win the girl or, more likely, in this most allusive of poems, the situation is as in Theocritus 11, where poetry is at once an attempt to win the girl (cf. Horace 11–12) and a cure for the Cyclops' love-sickness (cf. Horace 16–18).⁶⁷ Of course in the *Epode* Horace has contradicted Callimachus' and Theocritus' claim that poetry is an effective 'remedium' for love, but such an *Umkehrung*⁶⁸ of a literary motif need hardly worry us.

On this interpretation 'pudor' will be concrete, as before, in the sense of 'that which causes shame', but the shame will now consist in the fact that the superior occupation of composing poetry loses out to the wealth of a morally inferior ('imparibus') rival.⁶⁹

But however we understand 'fomenta' – wine and the conversation of friends, or poetry, or both – it is clear that, in 'fomenta vulnus nil malum levantia', Horace is once more registering his disillusionment with failed 'remedia amoris'. These, as I have tried to show, are a cardinal theme of the poem, from its very outset. And it is the proven ineffectiveness of such 'remedia' for Inachia's lover that leads directly into the conclusion, erroneously dubbed 'surprising' by Kiessling–Heinze, that the only way of mastering his current passion for Lyciscus is to indulge in a fresh *amor* (27–8).⁷⁰

University of Sydney

L. C. WATSON

⁶⁶ Note the subject of the poem in general, the image of the bee 21 (a symbol of poetic inspiration, cf. *Od.* 4. 2. 27 ff.), mention of the ivy crown 25, and the significant positioning of 'seu condis amabile carmen' last in the list of Florus' activities.

For 'fomenta' referring to poetry, the comment of Porphyrio on *Epp.* 1. 1. 10 'nunc itaque et versus et cetera ludicra pono' is also of interest: 'depositis levibus fomentis animi id est iocis et versibus'.

⁶⁷ For the thought cf. H. Erbse, 'Dichtkunst und Medizin in Theokrits 11. Idyll', *MH* 22 (1965), 232 ff.

⁶⁸ For a later inversion of Theocritus' and Callimachus' prescription for curing love cf. Longus 2. 7 fin.: "Ερωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον, οὐ πινόμενον, οὐκ ἐσθιόμενον, οὐκ ἐν ῥῥαῖς λεγόμενον, ὅτι μὴ φίλημα καὶ περιβολὴ καὶ συγκατακλιθῆναι γυμνοῖς σώμασι.

⁶⁹ For the *pudor*-motif in connection with poetry misspent, cf. Tib. 1. 9. 47 ff. 'quin etiam attonita laudes tibi mente canebar, | at me nunc nostri Pieridumque pudet. | illa velim rapida Vulcanus carmina flamma | torreat et liquida deleat amnis aqua'.

⁷⁰ I am grateful to the editors and an anonymous referee for *CQ* for suggesting various improvements to an earlier version of this article.