

not one but two points (the one made by all three writers about borrowing; the reference to the oracles at Delphi and Dodona) suggests that they are somehow connected to a shared source. Demand (above, n. 2) has suggested that the *Speeches* were directed by orthodox Pythagoreans against a 'Pythagoreanizing' Socratic circle: whether that is true or not, a 'Socratic' source for Euripides seems plausible—note, for example, Euripides' emphasis (P. Ber. 9772 [= fr. 660M] 9–10) on women's skill in preserving stores and their contribution to household prosperity, paralleled in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* at 7.20–32 (esp. 7.25). But the agreement of Euripides and Aristophanes on four points, as well as the fact that both assert the superiority of women over men, surely demonstrates that *Melanippe* (*Desmotis*), not the *Speeches*, was Aristophanes' source. It seems, however, that Aristophanes was not particularly anxious to have his source identified as Euripidean, since the tragedian is not named and there seem to be no really striking verbal echoes (of course a better text of *Melanippe*'s speech might change our minds about this). This is perhaps because the gap in time between *Melanippe* (*Desmotis*) and *Ecclesiastus* was a long one, probably even greater than that between the *Telephus* of 438 and its parody in *Acharnians* of 425;⁴ or perhaps it is because Euripides himself was now long dead and therefore a much less entertaining target.

Memorial University of Newfoundland

J. L. BUTRICA

jbutrica@morgan.ucs.mun.ca

⁴ In M. Cropp and G. Fick, *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary Tragedies*. Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement 43 (London, 1985), *Melanippe* (*Desmotis*) is dated 426–412.

ENNIUS, SUETONIUS AND THE GENESIS OF HORACE, *ODES* 4

The first part of this paper demonstrates that Ennius, *Annals* 16 was a more important model for Horace, *Odes* 4 than has been realized. The second part of the paper uses this connection with *Annals* 16 to explain a puzzling inaccuracy in Suetonius' description of the genesis of *Odes* 4.

The only critic truly to have appreciated the influence of Ennius on *Odes* 4 is Suerbaum, who demonstrates that the theme of immortality conferred through commemoration in poetry derives from Ennius as much as from Pindar.¹ Suerbaum² concentrates on *O.* 4.8, which begins with a comparison of poetry and the plastic arts and proceeds to mention Ennius³ as a crowning example of the superiority of poetry to marble inscriptions. The extant fragment of Ennius⁴ which refers to kings striving to establish physical monuments to themselves (and which presumably went on to contrast the more lasting monument which could be conferred by poetry)⁵ is securely located in the sixteenth book of the *Annals* by the testimony of Macrobius 6.117:

¹ See W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter* (Hildesheim, 1968), 167, n. 510, 177ff.

² Loc. cit. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 423, n. 1, had already noted in passing the importance of Ennius in *O.* 4.8.

³ Cf. *O.* 4.8.20 *Calabrae Pierides*.

⁴ O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), *Ann.* 404–5.

⁵ Cf. the argument of Suerbaum (n. 1), 151ff. and Skutsch, ad loc. Both scholars agree that *Ann.* 406 *postremo longinqua dies confecerit aetas* almost certainly refers to the impermanence of these lapidary monuments.

Ennius . . . in sexto decimo 'reges per regnum statuasque sepulcraque quaerunt, aedificant nomen, summa nituntur opum vi'.

The influence of Ennius, *Annals* 16 is evident, too, in the preceding ode, where the reference to the cyclicity of the seasons is a clear echo of *Annals* 16.xx:

frigora mitescunt Zephyris, ver proterit aestas,
interitura, simul
pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit, et mox
bruma recurrit iners. (O. 4.7.9–12)

aestatem autumnus sequitur, post acer hiems it. (Ann. 16.xx [420 Skutsch])

Most significant of all, however, is the fact that the opening lines of *Odes* 4 appear to allude to a fragment located at the beginning of *Annals* 16. Surprisingly, this key parallel has rarely been noticed:⁶

quippe *vetusta* virum non est satis *bella moveri*. (Ann. 16.iii [403 Skutsch])

intermissa, Venus, diu / rursus *bella moves*? (Hor. O. 4.1.1–2)

The parallels between the two passages are obvious, not only in terms of their positioning at the beginning of a new collection, but also in terms of the vocabulary used. Just as *vetusta bella* refers to the content of the previous books of Ennius' *Annals*, so *intermissa . . . bella* refers to the erotic poetry of the first collection of *Odes* as much as to love itself.⁷

There are further parallels between the introductions of the two poets.⁸ The first fragment of *Annals* 16 begins with a reference to the poet being too old to return to poetry: *post aetate pigret sufferre laborem*.⁹ Likewise, Horace protests that he is not the man he used to be and that at fifty he is too old to be troubled by Venus (O. 4.1.3–7):

non sum qualis eram bonae
sub regno Cinarae. desine, dulcium
mater saeva Cupidinum,
circa lustra decem flectere mollibus
iam durum imperiis.

Many commentators have seen the metaphor of the horse being governed by reins in *flectere*.¹⁰ If this is correct, then it suggests another parallel with the Ennian introduction, since, as Skutsch has pointed out, the famous simile of the racehorse which *nunc senio confectus quiescit*,¹¹ may well belong at the beginning of the sixteenth

⁶ P. R. Hardie, 'Ut pictura poesis? Horace and the visual arts', in N. Rudd (ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration* (Michigan, 1993), 120–39, at 129 notes the reference to 'wars' in both passages but does not print the text of Ennius; had he done so, he would surely have highlighted the further specific verbal similarities.

⁷ See the discussion of G. Davis, *Polyhymnia* (Berkeley, 1991), 65–71.

⁸ Cf. Hardie (n. 6), 129.

⁹ Fr. 401 Skutsch.

¹⁰ Kiessling–Heinze (following Orelli) compare O. 3.7.25 *flectere equum*, Prop. 3.2.7–8 *Galatea . . . / ad tua rorantis carmina flexit equos* (see further TLL 6.1.896.14–15 for *flectere* applied to horses).

¹¹ *Sed. Inc.* lxix Skutsch.

book.¹² Furthermore, if we accept Skutsch's suggestion that 401 should read *durum sufferre laborem*,¹³ then there is another parallel with *O.* 4.1.7: *iam durum imperiis*.¹⁴

That *Annals* 16 was an important model for *Odes* 4 should not surprise us, for we know that the biographical circumstances were similar: both poets were returning to add a supplement to a work that had previously appeared to be decisively 'finished'.¹⁵

The connection between *Annals* 16 and *Odes* 4 may be at the root of a puzzling and previously unexplained inaccuracy in the description of the genesis of *Odes* 4 given in Suetonius' *Vita Horati*. Suetonius describes Horace's return to composing lyric poetry as follows:

scripta quidem eius usque adeo probavit mansuraque perpetua opinatus est, ut non modo saeculare carmen componendum iniunxerit, sed et Vindelicam victoriam Tiberii Drusique privignorum suorum, eumque coegerit propter hoc tribus carminum libris ex longo intervallo quartum addere . . .
(Suetonius, *V.H.* 2.20–5 [ed. Klingner])

Discussion of these lines has typically centred around the question of literary patronage¹⁶ and the force of the verb *coegerit*.¹⁷ Ultimately, these issues are unresolvable and the interpretations put forward are inevitably based on *a priori* notions of Horace, Augustus, and the nature of artistic creativity.¹⁸ Most critics are in agreement, however, that whatever the validity of Suetonius' account of Horace's relationship to the emperor, he is misleading in his implication that the request for poems celebrating the victories of Tiberius and Drusus over the Vindelici prompted the whole of *Odes* 4.¹⁹ The chronological improbability of this is obvious: it is usually assumed that *O.* 4.6²⁰ was written during or immediately after the composition and performance of the *Carmen Saeculare*,²¹ which was performed on 3 June 17 B.C., that is a full two years prior to the Vindelician victory of 1 August 15 B.C. From the manner of the references to the *Carmen Saeculare*, which is depicted as a particular poetic

¹² See Skutsch, ad loc. Horace also uses the retired racehorse image at the beginning of *Epistles* 1 (1.1.8–9), to justify his retirement from writing lyric poetry; cf. Suerbaum (n. 1), 124, Hardie (n. 6), 129, n. 38.

¹³ Skutsch (n. 4), 565 cites Lucr. 3.999 *durum sufferre laborem* as a parallel.

¹⁴ I owe this point to the anonymous reader.

¹⁵ On Horace's retirement from writing lyric, cf. *Epist.* 1.1 and n. 12 above.

¹⁶ See e.g. Fraenkel (n. 2), 364–5; M. C. J. Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity* (Cornell, 1986), 20ff.; I. M. Le M. Du Quesnay, 'Horace, *Odes* 4.5: *Pro Reditu Imperatoris Caesaris Divi Filii Augusti*', in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace* (Oxford, 1995), 128–87, at 129ff.; E. Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge, 1998), 152. G. Williams, 'Phases in political patronage of literature in Rome', in B. K. Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin, 1982), 3–27, at 16ff. and J. Zetzel, 'The poetics of patronage in the late first century B.C.', in Gold (ibid.), 87–102, at 92–3 discuss the question of Augustus' patronage and *Odes* 4 without specific reference to this passage.

¹⁷ See C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry*, iii. *Epistles Book II* (Cambridge, 1982), 243.

¹⁸ Witness, for example, the Romantic anxiety expressed by Putnam (n. 16), 21: 'If Horace, one of the most notoriously independent writers in our tradition, has surrendered his imagination to the emperor's compelling desires, what level of quality can we expect from the resultant poetry?'

For the opposite extreme, see Fraenkel (n. 2), 453, where *Odes* 4 is described (in equally Romantic terms) as the result of the poet 'listening all the time to the voice of his own true self'. For an overview of the recent reception of Horace, see D. P. Fowler, 'Postscript: images of Horace in twentieth-century scholarship', in C. Martindale and D. Hopkins (edd.), *Horace Made New* (Cambridge, 1993), 268–76.

¹⁹ Cf. Fraenkel (n. 2), 365; Du Quesnay (n. 16), 131–2.

²⁰ And possibly *O.* 4.3.14ff., 22–3.

²¹ On the relationship of *O.* 4.6 to the *Carmen Saeculare*, cf. A. Hardie, 'Horace, the Paean and Roman *Choreia* (*Odes* 4.6)', *PLLS* 10 (1998), 251–93, at 285–91.

triumph, it is reasonable to infer that it was partly the success of this commission which prompted Horace to resume his lyric career.²²

Why, then, does Suetonius fall into chronological error in attributing the genesis of *Odes* 4 to Augustus' request for a poem on the recent Vindelician victory, and why does he place so much emphasis on Augustus' stepsons, who are referred to in just two of the fifteen poems in the book? Surprisingly, no one has ever explicitly posed these questions.

It is well known that as part of his office of *ab epistulis* Suetonius had access to some form of imperial archive which included letters of earlier emperors;²³ indeed, in the preserved *Vita Horati* he quotes directly from four bantering letters of Augustus to Horace. Moreover, there is every likelihood that when Suetonius refers to Augustus' high estimation of the quality and potential immortality of Horace's *scripta*, he is quoting or summarizing views which were expressed by the emperor in his letters. Augustus may also have explicitly asked for an ode celebrating the Claudii to be included in a new collection of odes that Horace was already engaged in writing. Suetonius may then simply be reflecting a request in a letter from Augustus for a pair of odes celebrating the recent victories of his stepsons and then somewhat sloppily presenting this (*propter hoc* . . .) as the genesis of the book of odes in which they were included.

Given, however, that we have established the central importance of Ennius, *Annals* 16 as a model for *Odes* 4, there may be a more specific explanation of Suetonius' curious account. Of particular relevance is Pliny the Elder's description of the genesis of Ennius, *Annals* 16 (*N.H.* 7.101):

fortitudo in quo maxime exstiterit immensae quaestionis est, utique si poetica recipiatur fabulositas. Q. Ennius T. Caecilium fratremque eius praecipue miratus propter eos sextum decimum adiecit annalem.

The similarity to Suetonius' description of the genesis of *Odes* 4 is remarkable, not only in the verbal parallels of *propter hoc* / *propter eos*, *addere* / *adiecit*, but also with respect to the subject-matter, the martial deeds of a pair of brothers.²⁴ Whether or not Suetonius has consciously modelled his description on Pliny is a moot point,²⁵ but it would be perfectly natural for Suetonius, who after all produced a biographical sketch of Ennius in his *De Viris Illustribus*, to recognize the circumstantial and thematic similarities between the final books of the respective poets and to frame his description of the genesis of *Odes* 4 in a manner that reflected this.

Thus we can see that the numerous verbal, thematic, and circumstantial connections between *Odes* 4 and Ennius, *Annals* 16, taken together with the similarities between Pliny the Elder's description of the genesis of the latter work and Suetonius' account of the genesis of *Odes* 4, provide a plausible explanation of the curious and chronologically improbable account given by Suetonius of the genesis of *Odes* 4.

Jesus College, Cambridge

P. D. HILLS
pdh1000@hermes.cam.ac.uk

²² See Fraenkel (n. 2), 400, 410.

²³ See A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius* (London, 1983), 1–2, 91ff.

²⁴ Suerbaum (n. 1), 151, n. 472, notes the verbal similarities and the return of both poets to a work that had been considered finished but makes no comment on the theme of the brothers.

²⁵ We know for a fact that Suetonius was a *familiaris* of Pliny the Elder's nephew, who refers to Suetonius' membership of his *contubernium* (*Ep.* 1.24.1, 10.94.1); cf. Wallace-Hadrill (n. 23), 4–5. Moreover, according to Jer. *Chron.* s.a. 2125, Suetonius included the *vita* of Pliny the Elder in the *De Historicis*. Wallace-Hadrill (n. 23), 65, claims that 'the Elder Pliny was a kindred spirit, and surely appealed to him'.