Classical Quarterly **55.2** 542 558 (2005) *Printed in Great Britain*
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi049

HORACE *ODES* BOOK 1 AND THE ALEXANDRIAN EDITION OF ALCAEUS[1]

The prime purpose of this paper is to show how our small knowledge of Alcaeus' Book 1 can give much more illumination to Horace *Odes* 1 than we at present permit it to. And Horace's first book may reflect back some little light on Alcaeus.

I. EDITIONS OF *ODES* 1 AND ALCAEUS BOOK 1

I first give some basic information about these books, in order to make a preliminary point.

The traditional view of Horace's *Odes* is that the first three books were issued together as a unit in 23 B.C.[2] *Ode* 1.4, addressed to the suffect consul of that year,[3] still inclines me to believe in a joint publication in 23 B.C. But there is much to support the view that the books were at least written in sequence; and it has been argued that the books were not just written but published sequentially in the 20s B.C.[4]

When we open Book 1, Horace quickly offers a literary alignment:

> ... si neque tibias
> Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
> *Lesboum* refugit tendere barbiton. (1.1.32 4)

But the reference to the Lesbian lyre is not conclusive. There were two outstanding Lesbian poets, and an interesting paper has even argued for a 'biformis uates' with Sappho and Alcaeus jointly forming Horace's lyric model.[5] But the most probable alignment that looms is between Horace and the Lesbian male Alcaeus, and *Odes*

[1] For Alcaeus' fragments I generally use the edition of E.-M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam, 1971) = V. For the most part Voigt's numeration overlaps with the useful and accessible Loeb of D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* 1 (Cambridge, MA, 1982), who followed the numeration of E. Lobel and D. L. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1955). Occasionally Campbell provides fuller citations of *testimonia*, and on these and other special occasions when it is necessary to cite his edition, his name is appended to the reference.

Professor G. O. Hutchinson has throughout advised me, and his remarks on an early draft of this paper caused it to be radically reshaped. The expertise of Dr Bruno Currie and Dr Obbink was also indispensable. It is not of course to be supposed that these scholars agree with all I say. I delivered a version of the paper to the Corpus Christi Graduate Seminar, and owe thanks to that company—in particular to Claudia Strobel—for incisive comment as well as for organizing the occasion.

[2] See the summarizing remarks of R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace* Odes, *Book 1* (Oxford, 1970), xxxv vi.

[3] Cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (New Haven and London, 1995), 73 5.

[4] See G. O. Hutchinson, 'The publication and individuality of Horace's *Odes* Books 1 3', *CQ* 52 (2002), 517 37, a piece to be reckoned with.

[5] T. Woodman, '*Biformis Vates*: the *Odes*, Catullus and Greek lyric', in T. Woodman and D. Feeney (edd.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge, 2002), 53 64. Woodman argues for Sapphic allusions in *Ode* 1.32 where, as he admits, 'the reference is exclusively to Alcaeus' (54). Not too much should be built on the fact that Horace writes in the 'Sapphic' metre, which was very popular with Alcaeus, as I document below.

1.32, *Epist.* 1.19.32–3, and indeed *Ode* 1.9 and other evidence which I will adduce, will fix this latter alignment (at 1.26.11 *Lesbio . . . plectro*, any ambiguity of implication is gone). First and foremost Horace emerges as the 'Roman Alcaeus'. So how did he read his Greek Alcaeus? We may assume that his text followed the sequence and book divisions of the 'standard edition', however customized by commentary his own copies may have been.[6] Coincidence of facts will bear this assumption out.

We know that there was a standard edition, dating from the great period of Hellenistic scholarship, and we know something about it.[7] Hephaestion in his work 'On Critical Signs', writing about peculiarities in the way strophes and poems are marked off in texts of Alcaeus, distinguishes between the edition of Aristophanes (*c.* 257–180 B.C.), and 'the now current edition of Aristarchus' (*c.* 216–144 B.C.).[8] So, in the second century A.D. there was a standard edition, Aristarchus', and this had presumably long prevailed, offering a canonical sequence of poems. Should we feel haunted by Aristophanes' edition, and the possibility of a rival ordering of poems, an authoritative opinion is that Aristarchus did not change Aristophanes' sequence.[9]

It is clear that Alcaeus' books were not, like Sappho's, arranged by metre.[10] Papyrus remains show this, as well as one aspect of the information provided by Hephaestion.[11] The influential Bergk, back in 1883, suggested a clear generic scheme of arrangement (ὕμνοι, στασιωτικά, ἐρωτικά, and σκόλια), and was followed

[6] It is educational to see– in my case, thanks to Professor Hutchinson—how inescapable commentary in some texts was. In Alcaeus fr 71V (*POxy.* 1234 fr. 2), for example, the commentary, including the fascinatingly specific τὸν τοῦ Ἀλκαίου ἐρώμ<εν>ον, is alongside the text on the right hand side, in generously available space, a characteristic of the whole papyrus. The way such 'scholia' are now relegated to the apparatus gives a misleading impression of the impact commentary might have made.

[7] I am indebted in all my remarks on Alcaeus' Aristarchan edition to Professor P. J. Parsons (in correspondence) and to A. Pardini, 'La ripartizione in libri dell'opera di Alceo', *RFIC* 119 (1991), 257 84, esp. 260ff. See too A. Porro, *Vetera alcaica, l'esegesi di Alceo dagli Alessandrini all' età imperiale* (1994), 239 41, summarizing, reviewing, and adding slightly to Pardini.

[8] T11 Campbell = Hephaestion 'On Critical Signs' 2s. (p. 73s. Consbruch). The essential phrase is κατὰ δὲ τὴν νῦν (sc. ἔκδοσιν) τὴν Ἀριστάρχειον, but the whole passage of Hephaestion is interesting. Hephaestion tells us (i) that in the lyric poets, if the poem is monstrophic, the *paragraphos* is placed after each strophe, (ii) that the *coronis* is placed at the end of each poem, (iii) that the *asteriskos* is usually employed if the next poem is in a different metre, 'which happens in the monostrophic poems of Sappho, Anacreon and Alcaeus'. And he concludes (iv) 'The poems of Alcaeus are peculiar in this, that in the edition of Aristophanes the asterisk was used only to mark a change of metre (ἑτερομετρία), but in the now current Aristarchan edition it marks every fresh poem.' Papyri do not suggest that Aristarchus' precise selection of the asterisk swept the board, but Hephaestion is testimony to a standard edition. We infer too that adjacent Alcaean poems in the *same* metre did occur: not every change of poem was accompanied by ἑτερομετρία; see further n. 11 below. (Ἑτερομετρία could not have occurred in the first three books of Sappho, each of which was written in the same metre: T29 and 30 Campbell. For Sappho's edition in nine books, ordered by metre, see Pardini [n. 7], 261 2, and n. 10 below.)

[9] Pardini (n. 7), 259; cf. too P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 462 3. In the section following his remarks on Aristarchus' and Aristophanes' order, Pardini begins: 'In ogni caso, il riscontro dei nostri dati, dove possibile, ci conferma l'esistenza di un ordinamento stabilizzato dell' opera alcaica . . .' etc., with evidence.

[10] On Sappho's books, see Pardini (n. 7), 261 2, Page (n. 28), 112 16.

[11] Hephaestion in n. 8 above. Papyri of Alcaeus show a high incidence of change of metre with change of poem; on one occasion (only) poems in the same metre are certainly collocated (*POxy.* 1234 fr. 1.1 6 and 7 14, frs 68V and 69); on many occasions, however, we are not in a

by Crusius in 1894 who assigned these categories to the supposed ten books (for which see below): Hymns in Books 1–2 and so on.[12] The evidence for a number of poems with the designation *stasiotica* is quite firm (see for a start, T1 Campbell [Strabo 13.2.3] *τὰ στασιωτικὰ καλούμενα*). But the evidence is against a book or books actually entitled *Στασιωτικά*,[13] and twentieth-century papyrus discoveries confute in particular the most enduring part of Bergk's legacy, a 'Book of Hymns'.[14] And a single, important fact is that all ancient citations of Alcaeus (collected in fr. 453V) which make any specification do so not by generic titles but by book numbers; on three occasions it is added these are books of Alcaeus' 'songs' (*μέλη*). The highest book number known to us is Book 10. A chance reference to a receptacle that contained Alcaeus' works supports the conclusion that there were no more than ten books in all. They were contained in a 'a triangular case, of wood':[15] 4, 3, 2, 1 fits a triangle nicely.

There is a simple but important point to emphasize here. Alcaeus' standard edition was in *numbered* books of 'songs'. 'Alcaeus Book 1' is therefore a way of thinking that Horace would share with us, and with select Roman readers.[16] We can phrase this point more exactly. References show that Horace's own title for his *Odes* was 'Songs', *carmina*;[17] and his sense of synonymity between Alcaeus' *μέλη* and his own *carmina* is suggested by his summarizing reference to Alcaeus' (stasiotic) songs as *carmina* at *Odes* 2.13.13. When therefore he came to write his *liber primus-carminum*, 'Alcaeus *in libro primo*', 'Alcaeus *ἐν πρώτῳ*', indeed Alcaeus *ἐν πρώτῳ μελῶν*, *in libro primo carminum*'[18] would have been both a ready text *and* concept: invitingly and challengingly there. But not it seems for his later commentators, a fact worth bringing out into the open.[19]

position to judge: Pardini (n. 7), 265 6. Hephaestion (n. 8 above) clearly knows both *ἑτερομετρία* and *ὁμοιομετρία* in adjacent Alcaean poems.

[12] Th. Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* 2 (Berlin, 1883), 277ff; O. Crusius, *RE* 1.1501: Books 1 2 *Hymnoi*, 3 4 *stasiotika*, 4 6, *erotica*, 7 10 *skolia*.

[13] See Pardini (n. 7), 267 9 for an assessment of Strabo's and other evidence, and for the reasons for rejecting the proposal of a book or books actually entitled *Στασιωτικά*.

[14] The evidence against the Book of Hymns is provided *in primis* by Lobel Page's B (*POxy.* 1233): this collocates the sympotic B6A = 38a V and the hymnic B2 = 34 and 34A V (Pardini [n. 7], 279). Pardini 283 infers that the diverse types of poem covered by *POxy.* 2734 all came from Book 1; on the fascinating *POxy.* 2734 see the text below. Horace seems to refer to (in effect) the *stasiotica* at *Odes* 2.13.26 8, and to sympotic and erotic poems at 1.32.9 11, but there need be no implication that he read them in a group, let alone a book.

[15] T10 Campbell, an inscription in Delos, talking it seems of the treasury of Andros and listing its 'wooden objects': among them, *τρίγωνον θήκην ἔχουσαν βυβλία Ἀλκαίου*.

[16] Cicero, unless we take him too literally, had not been one: see the famously contemptuous opinion attributed to him at Sen. *Ep.* 49.5: *negat Cicero, si duplicetur sibi aetas, habiturum se tempus, quo legat lyricos*.

[17] E.g. *Ep.* 1.13.17, 2.2.25, 59, 91, cf. 2.1.138, 227; *Odes* 4.2.32, 4.8.11; cf. *Odes* 3.1.2, 2.19.1.

[18] Cf. references like *ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Ἀλκαίου*, *Ἀλκαῖος ἐν πρώτῳ*, *ἐν δευτέρῳ μελῶν*, *ἐν ἑνάτῳ μέλει*, *ἐν δεκάτῳ*, etc. to be found in 453 V. Cf. Porphyrio's methods of citation in his commentary on Horace's *Odes*: at 1.12.46, *Vergilius in libro sexto*; 1.22.10, *scilicet et liber Lucilii XVI*; 1.27 *pr*. . . .*cuius sensus sumptus est ab Anacreonte ex libro tertio*; 3.30 *pr*. ha<e>c ὠ<ι>δή, *qua tertius liber consummatur*.

[19] Porphyrio refers to no book numbers of Alcaeus. Indeed, his tentative method of referring to Alcaeus, on the rare occasions that he does so, suggests to me that he had no text of the poet available, certainly that he consulted none, and this is a fact worth bringing out into the open. The closest he gets in his references is 1.10 *pr*., *hymnus est in Mercurium ab Alcaeo lyrico poeta*, 1.10.9, *fabula haec autem ab Alcaeo ficta*, 1.32.11, *hunc Lycum puerum Alcaeus dilexit*, 3.30.13–14, *Aeolid[a]e dialecto Alcaeus lyricus poeta usus est*. For an invaluable

II. THE 'PARADE ODES', 1.1–9: DISORIENTATION BEFORE ORIENTATION

In the first nine odes in Book 1, known to us as the 'Parade Odes',[20] Horace displays his astonishing metrical dexterity. All nine poems are composed in different metres, a feat he will not attempt again.[21] 'Metrical dexterity', yes; but he provides us with a considerable tease too.[22] We are waiting for a firm alignment with a Greek poet, the poet who will provide his new image, as well as a basis for his text: what Theocritus had been to Virgil, and Archilochus and Hipponax to the younger Horace. An alignment between Horace and Alcaeus may seem to be in prospect (*Lesboum*, the not conclusive hint at 1.1.34), and we are accustomed to delay before alignments are made explicit.[23] But the opening of *Odes* 1 provides a particularly dazzling and surely bemusing postponement. When and how will this metrical gymnast settle down?

We can try to recreate the reader's sense of orientation, or lack of it, as the Parade Odes progress. *nec . . . Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton . . . quodsi me lyricis uatibus inseres* . . . (1.1.34–5). A new Alcaeus? Sappho? The first ode is in stichic asclepiads: used by Alcaeus (112, 117(b).1–12, and so on),[24] but hardly Alcaeus' metrical blazon.[25] The second ode is in sapphics: Alcaeus prominently used sapphics (34V, 68, 69, and so on), but so of course did Sappho.[26] No sure examples of the asclepiad

condensation of material on Porphyrio, see Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), xlvii xlix, who point out conspicuous deficiencies in his knowledge of Alcaeus: 'He fails to record fundamental Greek influences, Alcaeus on 1.9, 1.14, 1.18, 1.37 . . .'. There might be many reasons why Porphyrio—*c.* A.D. 200?; living in a province less favoured than Egypt?—might not have a text of Alcaeus, but it is perhaps strange that he carries no tralatician references: for earlier, non extant scholarly work on Horace, see Nisbet and Hubbard, xlvii. Porphyrio can however tell us on *Ode* 1.15 'hac ode Bacchylidem imitatur. nam ut ille Cassandram facit uaticinari futuri belli Troiani ita hic Proteum', a slip, as N. H. say, for 'Nereum'. As for pseudo Acro (N. H., xlix li), 'There is even less than in Porphyrio on Horace's Greek models'.

[20] This useful way of talking about *Odes* 1.1 9 goes back, it appears, to W. v. Christ, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Band 1 (1868), 1 44, esp. 36 n. 12. The reference, which rather surprisingly I have not been able to check, comes from M. S. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes* (Chapel Hill and London, 1986), who defends (14 41, and 42 3) the limitation of the term to the first nine odes. Rightly. Others have sought to seek a close to the 'Parade' in 1.12: W. Port, 'Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern augusteischer Zeit', *Philologus* 81 (1925 6), 301, referring back to Keissling; D. Porter, *Horace's Poetic Journey* (Princeton, 1987), 15, 58 77. Others, to ring the changes, have sought to close the main Parade Odes at 1.10 or 11: Porter, 15 n. 5.

[21] There is a useful overview of Horace's metres in Book 1 in Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), xxxviii xlvi.

[22] Differently in Santirocco (n. 20), 14: 'these poems [1.1 9] are an elaborate attempt to place the *Odes* both within Horace's oeuvre and within a larger poetic tradition'.

[23] Virgil in *Eclogue* 6, Horace in *Epode* 6.

[24] A full list of examples of Alcaeus' uses of each metre that he employs is given by Voigt (n. 1), 20 3.

[25] This, for the Romans at least, was what is legitimately termed the 'alcaic stanza': cf. Lyne (n. 3), 98 9; cf. too Hutchinson (n. 4), 530. The fact that Aristarchus put a poem in alcaics at the head of his edition of Alcaeus (see below) suggests that he had the same opinion of the metre.

[26] Hephaestion (citing Alcaeus fr. 308V) points out that 'the so called sapphic eleven sylla ble line' is found in Alcaeus too, and even says that 'it is uncertain which of the two invented it, even if it is called Sapphic'. This is where he cites the whole first stanza of Alcaeus' hymn to Hermes, on which more below. While Alcaeus used sapphics, it is unlikely that Sappho used alcaics: see M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 33; possibilities are: 103A V 137, and 168C. On the metrical relations of Alcaeus and Sappho—on what they do and do not share—see Voigt's note at Alcaeus 137, and G. O. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 2001), 141. On the 'sapphic stanza', Hutchinson comments 'Neither poet is likely to be deriving this whole metrical system from the other; there is evidently . . .some poetic tradition.'

stanzas of *Odes* 1.3 and 1.5 are known in Alcaeus or Sappho, but this may well be due to the paltry nature of fragments left to us, for Alcaeus certainly liked asclepiad metres: we know, for example, that the asclepiad stanza of *Ode* 1.6 was used by him (5V, ?67). But none of these metres—to our knowledge—actually anchors us in Alcaeus. Jumping to *Ode* 1.8 for a moment, no example of the so-called 'greater sapphic'[27] (*Ode* 1.8), nor of either of its two component lines, survives in the fragments of Alcaeus, or indeed of Sappho; Latin *grammatici* supposedly attributing the second and longer line (a regular Sapphic line with choriambic expansion) to Alcaeus have been misinterpreted, by very influential scholars.[28] It may be, however, that Archilochus used the first and shorter measure, the 'aristophanean'.[29] And mention of Archilochus can move us to *Odes* 1.4 and 7 and the most striking fact about the Parade metres. The ambitiously lyric (1.1.35) Horace uses epodic metres with definite Archilochean imprint. *Ode* 1.7 is written in the first Archilochean: cf. Hor. *Epod.* 12, Archilochus fr. 195 W, also anon. *GLP* 91. The third Archilochean of 1.4 is known from Archilochus 188–192 W, and Theocritus suggests it had a particularly Archilochean stamp;[30] it has indeed been argued that Horace alludes to the text of 188–92W.[31] These clearly and exactly Archilochean metres are the most disconcerting and teasing in the Parade, even if the belief

[27] This aeolic compound is well analysed by D. S. Raven, *Latin Metre* (1965), 145.

[28] At Alcaeus 455, Voigt lists passages from the *grammatici* supposedly attributing the pair of lines, or the second of them, to Alcaeus. These and other 'evidence' can be all tracked back to a metrical discussion by the lyric poet and metrician of the Neronian Age, Caesius Bassus, Keil, *GL* 6.270.3ff.; Voigt has Bassus third in her list, but omits the important part. Discussing *Ode* 1.8.2 (*te deos oro* ...), easily analysed as a regular sapphic line with choriambic expansion, Bassus says that Horace has erroneously *tampered with* an Alcaean metrical colon consisting of three choriambs and an 'antibacchius' (for him, ⏑ – – –), by turning the iamb in the first foot into a spondee. Whether he is right or not about Horace's tampering (I very much doubt it, unlike Garrod below: surely Horace found this metre somewhere), Bassus is *not* evidence for Alcaeus' using this line: on the contrary. The whole of Bassus' section must then be read carefully. To push his point home, Bassus concocted a metrically 'correct' version of Horace's line (*hoc, dea, uere, Sybarim* ..., line 15 K). This then infected later tradition. It infected Bassus' own text too: at line 14 K, he is surely quoting Horace as he found him (*te deos oro*), and as the text still stands in his own initial quotation (line 5 K), but the quotation in line 14 has been infected in transmission by the nearby line of Bassus' own composition. Atilius Fortunatianus 6.300.19ff. effectively repeats Bassus. Dependent on Bassus, too, is Marius Victorinus 6.165.25ff. K, Voigt's lead *testimonium*, but with him the nuance of Horace's 'tampering' with Alcaeus' metrical colon has been lost: but his dependence on Bassus is suggested by his infected text (*hoc deos uere*). Diomedes 1.520.25 7 calls *Ode* 1.8.2 a 'metrum alcaicum', but he too quotes it with *uere* and is surely dependent ultimately on Bassus. A full and clear discussion of Caesius Bassus and his effects on the text of Horace is that by H. W. Garrod, *CR* 35 (1921), 102–3. D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), 326 also gives a wrong impression of the 'evidence' provided by Diomedes loc. cit.

[29] Fr. 318 W, which is among West's 'Testimonia de metris fide minus digna'. *Lydia dic per omnes* is called an 'Anacreonteum metrum' by Diomedes, 1.520.20 1 K.

[30] In *Epigram* 21 Theocritus writes in praise of Archilochus. The metre he employs can be seen as the third Archilochean with an iambic trimeter inserted between the greater Archilochean line and the iambic trimeter catalectic. Theocritus' triplet combination itself 'does not occur elsewhere and there is no evidence that it was used by Archilochus himself though it may well have been so ...' (Gow ad loc.). Caesius Bassus 6.306.9 cites the first lines of *Ode* 1.4.1 and says: *alcaicon ἑπτακαιδεκασύλλαβον commissum est ex heroice et ithyphallico*: Alcaeus may have used the line (in what combination?), but the Archilochean hue of the epodic pair will surely have blocked out any colour which that may have imparted.

[31] For the supposition of allusionto the *text* of Archilochus 188 92W in *Odes* 1.4 and 5, see E. Bowie in *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. M. Whitby, P. Hardie, and M. Whitby (Bristol, 1987), 13 23, esp. 21 3.

existed that Lesbian metres derived from Archilochean elements.[32] But then, at the end and climax of the Parade, at 1.9, we can feel a sense of arrival: an alcaic stanza, Alcaeus' blazon metre.[33] There is a recall of Alcaeus' actual text too (on which I shall comment below), giving us a further sense of orientation and alignment: Horace as a Roman Alcaeus.

III. THE ARISTARCHAN ALCAEUS. THE FIRST THREE POEMS

At *Ode* 1.9, therefore, Alcaeus looks set to be Horace's top model. We should now return to what we know about the standard edition of Alcaeus Book 1.

Fragment 307aV is the first line of the poem that opened Alcaeus' first book: this information is clearly given to us by a scholiast on Hephaestion.[34] The poem was a hymn to Apollo, in, it must have been, alcaic strophes. The surviving first line is:

ὦναξ Ἄπολλον, παῖ μεγάλω Δίος

The second poem in the book is equally well known, its position identified by the same source. It is a hymn to Hermes of which we have the first stanza: 308V.[35] This time the poem is in sapphics, a more 'Alcaean' metre than the name implies (see above).

χαῖρε, Κυλλάνας ὀ μέδεις, σὲ γάρ μοι
θῦμος ὔμνην, τὸν κορύφαισ' ἐν αὔταις
Μαῖα γέννατο Κρονίδᾳ μίγεισα
παμβασίληϊ

A text was then given to the world in 1968 which should have caused Horatian scholars much more excitement than it did: *POxy.* 2734 (306C Campbell), edited by E. Lobel.[36] Fragment 1 of this papyrus gives summaries of Alcaean poems, with citation by first line. Lines 5 and 11–12 of fr. 1 of the papyrus are remnants of 307aV and 308V line 1, that is, the first lines of the first two poems. We then hear of 'the third' (ἡ δὲ τρίτη), and the lemma in line 21 is recognizably fr. 343V. So we now know what the first *three* poems in Alcaeus' Book 1 were like. If a reasonable emendation to fr. 343 is accepted, this poem was a hymn to Nymphs:

Νύμφαι,[37] ταὶς Δίος ἐξ αἰγιόχω φαῖσι τετυχμέναις

The metre is the 'greater asclepiad'. Hephaestion provides the information that 'the whole of Book 3 of Sappho is written in this metre and many songs of Alcaeus

[32] Cf. *Ep.* 1.19.26 9 with E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957), 342 7. I think Fraenkel's interpret ation is convincing; but cf. too R. Mayer, *Horace* Epistles *Book I* (Cambridge, 1994), 264 5, a different route to (substantially) the point I need; Marius Victorinus 6.141.143ff., cited by Mayer, is useful. For further confirmation of the sense of Archilochean imprint on the 'Archilochean' metres just mentioned, we may remember the ancient belief that Archilochus *invented* epodic systems: see T47 and T50 in D. E. Gerber's Loeb, *Greek Iambic Poetry* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1999).

[33] See above n. 25.

[34] See the *testimonium* listed with Alcaeus fr. 307 V and Pardini (n. 7), 259.

[35] The *testimonium* is cited again with fr 308V; see too Pardini loc. cit. The text printed adopts Meineke's correction of the MSS κορύφαισιν αὐγαῖς.

[36] *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 35 (1968), 2ff. The economic reporting of the papyrus by Voigt (at fr. 343) and Pardini (n. 7), 259 60 should not obscure how fascinating it is. Lobel's edition is well worth looking up still. Supporting evidence for the sequence suggested by this papyrus can be inferred in Hephaestion: Pardini (n. 7), 260.

[37] Edmonds; Νύμφαις codd. Voigt prints Edmonds's correction.

too'.[38] And indeed there are many surviving Alcaean examples: 50V, 340–8, 349b, and others.[39]

We can see why an Alexandrian editor should have placed these hymns—if such they be—at the head of Alcaeus' first book, otherwise heterogeneous. They honour deities special to a lyric poet. Extensive information is provided on Alcaeus' extraordinary hymn to Apollo by Plutarch and especially—to the extent that he can be trusted—by Himerius: this material is most fully cited by Campbell under his frs. 307(b) and (c);[40] the five-line *H.hymn* 21 to Apollo should also be noted. If anyone wonders why a lyric poet in particular should write a hymn to Nymphs (to take the poems out of order), the Homeric Hymn to Pan is enlightening,[41] and so indeed is Horace *Odes* 1.1.31. The surviving passage of Alcaeus' Hermes hymn overlaps with the amusing *H.hymn* 4 to Hermes: this almost certainly post-dates Alcaeus, but will contain traditional material known to him.[42] There are specific glints of information about Alcaeus' poem in *POxy*. 2734 306C Campbell, fr.1. Fragment 447V should perhaps not be neglected (where Hermes is wine-pourer, οἰνόχοος, of the gods). And a lot more information is provided by the passages listed under fr. 308V, more fully by Campbell at his 308(a)–(d), which include of course Horace *Odes* 1.10 and Porphyrio.[43] A star item in Alcaeus' hymn was certainly Hermes' theft of Apollo's cattle. The additional theft of the quiver and Apollo's laughter, which we find in Horace, is also probably owed to Alcaeus.[44]

IV. HORACE'S ALCAEAN 'SIGNATURE SEQUENCE', *ODES* 1.9–11

At the end of the Parade Odes, we at last arrive at an anchor poem: *Ode* 1.9, an ode written in Alcaeus' blazon metre and alluding to an Alcaean text. There will be an abundance of further models for individual poems, and further allusions, but *Ode* 1.32 reaffirms the impression for the time being at least:[45] Horace is the Roman Alcaeus. It is therefore a fascinating and under-remarked fact that, when we arrive at this identifying poem (1.9), Horace then mirrors not only the metre of Alcaeus' first poem in the Aristarchan book (alcaic stanza), but the metres of the second and third poems too. 1.9, 10 and 11: alcaic stanza, sapphics, and the 'greater asclepiad': the metres of Alcaeus' 'Apollo', 'Hermes', and 'Nymphs'. If we are inclined to miss this, the last metre mentioned should hit us in the face: the 'greater asclepiad', common in Alcaeus, rare in Horace[46] and occurring here for the first time, is one of only three instances in all of *Odes* 1–3 where a metre is *not* introduced in the

[38] Hephaestion, *Ench.* 10.6, cited at fr. 343 V. Cf. too Sappho T30 Campbell. Hephaestion calls the 'greater asclepiad' the 'Sapphic sixteen-syllable'. Theocritus 28 is in stichic greater asclepiads, and he uses the metre elsewhere: see A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus II* (Cambridge, 1950), 495. Catullus uses it in poem 30.

[39] Cf. Voigt (n. 1), 23.

[40] Cf. too Page (n. 28), 244 52.

[41] Note especially *H.hymn* 19.3, 19ff. The nymphs in Pan's company are χοροήθεις, λιγύμολποι, they μέλπονται, and so on.

[42] Cf. Page (n. 28), 252 8; a summary in M. L. West, *Homeric Hymns* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2003), 12 14.

[43] Cf. too Page (n. 28), 252 8.

[44] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 132 citing, besides Porphyrio, the scholium on *Iliad* 15.256 and Philostr. *Imag.* 1.26.

[45] On *Odes* 1.32 (significantly paired with 1.33), see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford, 1980, 1996), 201 3; a slightly different view in Hutchinson (n. 4), 530 ('a relation of contrast as well as similarity').

[46] Three occurrences in all: *Odes* 1.11, 1.18, 4.10.

Parade Odes.[47] Meshing, therefore, with the Parade Odes (1.1–9), which dazzle and bemuse until their last poem, there is a small and more specific Alcaean Signature Sequence (1.9–11), a sequence of metres mirroring the opening of the standard edition of Alcaeus Book 1. The very conspicuous appearance of Pindar in *Odes* 1.12 (*Ol.* 2, also *Isthm.* 7, *Nem.* 10, and so on)[48] suggests that this twinning relationship with Alcaeus ends, for the time being, with *Odes* 1.11. The three poems obviously deserve closer inspection, individually, but then as a putative group.

V. THE SIGNATURE SEQUENCE: SOME DETAILS

The first of the sequence, 1.9, gives us both alcaic metre and Alcaean text. But not, in any overt way, the text of the Apollo hymn. Horace employs another poem. 'The first two stanzas, perhaps the first three, are modelled on an ode by Alcaeus',[49] which is in fact the sympotic 338V. But 1.9 contains an *allusion* to Apollo. Here is an important reason why Horace chose precisely Soracte as his location. At Verg. *Aen.* 11.785 Arruns prays *summe deum, sancti custos Soractis Apollo.* Arruns then refers to fire-walking performed in Apollo's honour (786–8), a ritual among the Hirpi attested elsewhere, but not necessarily linked to Apollo.[50] But in Pliny both fire-walking and Soracte are linked to Apollo: *HN* 7.19, *haud procul urbe Roma in Faliscorum agro familiae sunt paucae quae uocantur Hirpi. hae sacrificio annuo, quod fit ad montem Soractem Apollini, super ambustam ligni struem ambulantes non aduruntur* ... Incidentally, as 1.9 is inceptive, we may be justified in seeing a meta-poetic allusion in the way the wine is described (*deprome quadrimum Sabina,/o Thaliarche, merum diota*); cf. 1.20, the poem that opens the second half of the entire sequence of 38 odes, where there is surely some such play (1.20.1–2 *uile* ... *Sabinum* ... *Graeca* ... *testa*). *Thaliarchus*, 'beginning of blooming', also bears reflection.

The second in the sequence, 1.10, repeats both metre and subject matter of Alcaeus' second poem ('Hermes'): Horace's hymn to Mercury features the story of Mercury's theft of Apollo's cattle which we know to have been in Alcaeus' hymn. The third, 1.11, repeats the metre, but not the content, of Alcaeus' number three, the Hymn to the Nymphs. Indeed it relates in content to no discernible text of Alcaeus at all. But like Horace's Soracte ode it makes, I think, an allusion to the Alcaean text it does not substantially employ.

The puzzlingly named addressee Leuconoe in *Odes* 1.11 is passed over in silence by some, given honest and lavish discussion by Nisbet and Hubbard,[51] but no explanation for the choice of name is found. In myth the name was given to one of the daughters of Minyas, and to a daughter of Lucifer, mother of Philammon by Apollo.[52] But rather than these figures, we should think of nymphs. Catalogues of nymphs are constructed with freedom and invention: see for example the Nereids at Homer *Il.* 18.38–51, at Hesiod *Theog.* 243–62, which has overlaps, but only

[47] The others are *Odes* 2.18 and 3.12.

[48] Cf. H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, Band I (2001[3]), 137 and ff., Fraenkel (n. 32), 291ff.

[49] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 116.

[50] For example, Strabo 5.2.9 describes the ritual in detail, places it below Soracte, but ascribes it to Feronia.

[51] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 136 8.

[52] See Ov. *Met.* 4.168 for the Minyad (the majority MSS reading *Leucothoe* is corrupt), Hyg. *Fab.* 161 for the daughter of Lucifer and mother of Philammon.

overlaps, with Homer, and at Verg. *G.* 4.334–44. Four of Hesiod's end in *-noe* (none of Homer's does), suggesting qualities of *νόος*: Hipponoe, Poulynoe, Autonoe, and Pronoe. I suggest that a propitious-minded, fresh-water nymph named Leuconoe, unknown to us,[53] was available to, or invented by, Alcaeus and featured in his 'Nymphs'. Horace, by his choice of the nymph's name, would be alluding to the poem whose content he is not actually following. Cf. LSJ s.v. *λευκός*, 3 'bright', 'fortunate', 'happy', Aesch. *Pers.* 301...*καὶ λευκὸν ἦμαρ νὺκτος ἐκ μελαγχίμου*, *Ag.* 668, Callim. fr. 178.2 *ἦμαρ Ὀρέστειοι λευκὸν ἄγουσι χόες*, and uses of *λευκός* of clear (spring-) water: Hom. *Il.* 23.282, *Od.* 5.70 *κρῆναι ... ῥέον ὕδατι λευκῷ*, Aesch. *Supp.* 23 *ὦ πόλις, ὦ γῆ καὶ λευκὸν ὕδωρ*, Eur. *Herc.* 573 *Δίρκης τε νᾶμα λευκόν*, Callim. fr. 546 *κρήνη/λευκὸν ὕδωρ ἀνέβαλλεν*.[54] Note too Virgil's candid nymph, *Ecl.* 2.46 *candida Nais*. It may be relevant that Leuconoe was also the name of an Attic deme.[55]

Horace has one further surprise waiting. The 'greater asclepiad' of 1.11 stands out on various accounts, as we have seen: common in Alcaeus, very rare in Horace himself, and highlighted by its lack of preparation in the Parade Odes. It is given its second of three exposures—in Horace's entire *oeuvre*—at *Ode* 1.18. And 1.18.1 is a virtually verbatim translation of Alcaeus fr. 342V, also in the 'greater asclepiad':

μηδὲν ἄλλο φυτεύσῃς πρότερον δένδριον ἀμπέλω
nullam, Vare, sacra uite prius seueris arborem

How Alcaeus then progressed we do not know, but Horace swiftly locates his poem, following a favoured policy of his,[56] in the Roman world of Tibur and P. Alfenus Varus.[57] By a metrical link, therefore, *Ode* 1.11 eventually (in 1.18) takes us to Alcaean text as well as metre, and our sense that this is an *Alcaean* Signature Sequence is again strengthened.

Horace treats and teases for eight poems, and then the Roman Alcaeus proper gets going. There is a particular reason why he chooses a light Alcaean poem for his first alcaic and does not, for example, calque Alcaeus' Apollo hymn in *Ode* 1.9 (see section VII below). But for the moment it will suffice to say that, generally, he wants to play the part of Alcaeus entertainingly, allusively, unexpectedly, keeping us on our toes. After 1.11, in spite of the now almost exclusively Alcaean metres,

[53] See J. Larson, *Greek Nymphs* (Oxford, 2001), 359–64 for a catalogue of nymphs which is 'necessarily incomplete'. No sign of Leuconoe (but Larson does not include—for example—Hesiod's Nereids).

[54] But the force of the Leuco- element in the name prompts much inconclusive discussion in Nisbet and Hubbard loc. cit. As they say, it cannot have any connection with whatever Pindar derogatorily means by *λευκαῖς ... φρασίν* at *Pyth.* 4.109. If N.-H.'s canvass of a force 'guileless' has any weight, then cf. Hor. *Odes* 2.8.14 *simplices Nymphae*.

[55] Cf. Oinoe which was both Attic deme and the name of an Arcadian nymph: see Larson's catalogue (n. 53) for Oinoe, the nymph. Most of the names of the Attic demes are argued to be pre-Cleisthenic and old: cf. D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton, 1986), 24–5, 27.

[56] When Horace alludes to or quotes Alcaean text, he then very swiftly situates himself and the poem firmly in Italy. Think of *Soracte* in line 2 of *Ode* 1.9, of *Saliaribus* in line 2 of 1.37, as well as *Vare* and *Tibur* in lines 1 and 2 of 1.18. And whatever else may be happening in 1.10, the words *facundus* and *catus* are pretty uncompromisingly Latin, indeed prosaically so.

[57] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 227–8 are surely right in their identification of Horace's Varus in 1.18: P. Alfenus Varus, the jurist and suffect consul of 39 B.C. Among the most decisive arguments is that Horace decides to put Varus into this very distinctive metre, and Catullus, who had also once employed it, wrote in it to Alfenus (poem 30). One family of MSS heads *Ode* 1.18 'Varus Quintilius', but one suspects that this is infection from the illustrious and disastrous Quintilius Varus who lost Germany for Augustus. The manuscripts' Q. V. is defended by Syndikus (n. 48), 195.

he embarks on a series of allusions to different poets; starting, as we said, with Pindar.[58]

VI. THE SIGNATURE SEQUENCE AS A GROUP

Alcaeus 1.1–3 give us three hymns: 'Apollo', 'Hermes', 'Nymphs'. In Horace, two 'Enjoy the day' poems centre one hymn, 'Mercury' (1.10).

If one hymn only was to be selected, why Hermes-Mercury? Mercury was two special things to Horace. In the second poem of the whole book, the god had achieved Augustan dignity as the emperor incarnate: 1.2.43–4 *filius Maiae patiens uocari/ Caesaris ultor*. He was also Horace's personal protector: the *Mercurialis uir* of *Odes* 2.17.29–30 had attributed his good fortune to Mercury back in *Serm.* 2.6.4–5 *nil amplius oro,/Maia nate*, and does so again in *Odes* 2.7.13. And of course Horace exploits interplay between these two Mercurial roles—in for example *Odes* 2.7. If only one of Alcaeus' gods was to be hymned, here are two pressing reasons why it should be the son of Maia (*Maia nate, filius Maiae*, τὸν ... Μαῖα γέννατο), now given a different genealogy, to ring the changes: grandson of Atlas, *nepos Atlantis*. And, to mark Mercury's selection and pride of place in the centre poem of the Signature Sequence, he is here given his own name, in the vocative first word, *Mercuri*.

But why the light content for this important and honoured god? The *testimonia* guarantee that the theft of Apollo's cattle was in Alcaeus' hymn, and we may be fairly sure that the theft of the quiver and Apollo's laughter were there too; but there was no compulsion to repeat Alcaeus' subject-matter. Horace is performing a tactical shift in tone, compared with the loudly Augustan *Ode* 1.2. In the Mercury poem of his own Signature Sequence he decides to give this august *and* personal god impeccably civilian and sophisticated advertisement, a pleasing and quite characteristic move. And so we have the witty story (Mercury and Apollo), and we are informed of Mercury's enlightened and enlightening talents: *facunde, feros cultus uoce formasti ... et decorae more palaestrae, curuaeque lyrae parentem*. Even as ψυχοπομπός Mercury's duties are phrased benignly: 1.10.17–18 *tu pias laetis animas reponis/sedibus ...*; no troubling mention of anything other than the 'happy abodes'. The shift in tone from 1.2 is acutely focused by the repetition of the phrase *duce te*. Applied to Augustus-Mercury at the end of 1.2, it was climactically military: *te duce Caesar* (1.2 52). In 1.10.13 Mercury as *dux* (*duce te*) is a kindly conductor in a mythical context.

We may now say that Horace fixes on only *one* of Alcaeus' hymned gods *because* of Mercury's outstanding personal and political importance to him; while the flanking poems merely allude to 'Apollo' and 'Nymphs'. And *one* centred *god* sets in relief the brevity of human life, key theme in the flanking 'Enjoy the day' poems, 1.9 and 1.11.

Background Alcaean texts enhance both these poems. In 1.11 we may recall the conjectured allusion in 'Leuconoe'.[59] Horace's short-lived Leuconoe tellingly separates from her presumed counterpart among Alcaeus' Nymphs. Cf. for example *H.hymn* (5) *to Aphrodite* 259ff., of mountain-nymphs, 'They belong with neither

[58] Cf. M. Lowrie, 'A parade of lyric predecessors: Horace *C.* 1.12 1.18', *Phoenix* 49 (1995), 33 48. I should put it much less potently than Lowrie—but Lowrie 35 is more cautious than her title—or indeed than Hutchinson (n. 4), 529 'conspicuous imitations of different poets'. Allusions, glances, witty plays (esp. in 1.13, and with Catullus as well as Sappho), but no parades.

[59] The point that follows springs from a suggestion of Professor Hutchinson.

mortals nor gods. They have long lives, δηρὸν μέν ζώοισι . . ., and eat divine foot, and ply the beautiful dance with the immortals; Sileni and the keen-sighted Slayer of Argus unite with them in love, μίσγονθ' ἐν φιλότητι . . .'. In 1.9 Horace alludes to Alcaeus' 'Apollo' via Soracte, but does not actively use Alcaeus' hymn. But we may see an effect of separation here too. Horace's icily winter setting massively contrasts with what appears to be a heavy and joyous summer emphasis in Alcaeus' poem, and the cold-of-*death* subtext[60] of this 'Enjoy the day' poem is underscored thereby. Himerius' summary (*Or.* 48, lines 120ff., fr. 307 (c) Cambell) includes the following: 'Now it was summer and indeed the very middle of summer when Alcaeus brings back Apollo from the Hyperboreans: so, what with the blaze of summer and the presence of Apollo, the poet's lyre has a summer delicacy in the account of the god: nightingales sing for him. . . [*et cetera*].'[61]

There are links between 1.9 and 11, giving a sense of ring-composition in the Sequence. Both focus 'day', *quem Fors dierum cumque dabit* . . . (1.9.14), *carpe diem quam minimum credula postero* (1.11.8); they both advise to 'seek' no further, *fuge quaerere* (1.9.13), *ne quaesieris* (1.11.1). There is a clear pointer in both poems to enjoy *Love*. In 1.11.4–5 'winters', 'storms' (*hiemes*) adumbrate 'years', far from obviously; and they are storms *at sea*. This recalls 1.9.9–11, where Horace's example of gods' omnipotence is their power to still the stormy oceans. Both passages stand out enough to attract commentator's attention.[62] And 1.11 as well as 1.9 alludes to Alcaeus 338V: the most clearly documented parallels are between 1.9 and 338,[63] but Horace has brought 338.1 ὔει μὲν ὁ Ζεύς, ἐκ δ' ὀράνω . . ./χείμων down to 1.11.4.

And 1.11 meshes with 1.10. In the last stanza of 1.10, Horace opens up a huge perspective, conjuring up, albeit benignly, the realm of the mortal dead (see above). The conclusive sense of *finem* in 1.11.2, its clear intimation of death (cf. *OLD finis* 10a), links with the final place reached in 1.10.17–20 before, we hope, being eliminated from serious consideration.

All in all this trio of poems makes a co-operating sequence, with more than merely formal relations to Alcaeus' opening trio.

VII. THIRTY ODES: 1.9–38

There is another reward for the realization that Horace mirrors the opening metres of Alcaeus' Book 1 in 1.9, 10, and 11. After the fireworks and diversions of the Parade Odes, the Signature Sequence marks a determined beginning. The total number of odes in Book 1—thirty-eight—has caused some puzzlement, as I shall discuss below. But if we count from *Ode* 1.9 we find that we have a preferred Roman type of total, a decimal number: thirty. Indeed, from the Signature Sequence on, we have thirty odes in Book 1, we have twenty in Book 2, and then thirty again in Book 3. It is worth briefly considering the structure of this group of thirty odes in

[60] The way Horace summarizes the opening winter stanza is pregnantly expressed: *dissolue frigus* . . . Cf. Lucr. 4.924, etc., *OLD* s.v. *frigus* 4a.

[61] ἦν μὲν οὖν θέρος καὶ τοῦ θέρους τὸ μέσον αὐτό, ὅτε ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων Ἀλκαῖος ἄγει τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα. ὅθεν δὴ θέρους ἐκλάμποντος καὶ ἐπιδημοῦντος Ἀπόλλωνος θερινόν τι καὶ ἡ λύρα περὶ τὸν θεὸν ἁβρύνεται. ἄδουσι μὲν ἀηδόνες αὐτῷ. . . .

[62] See Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 117, 121, 139. Alcaeus is suspected behind both passages.

[63] 338.2 πεπάγαισιν δ' ὐδάτων ῥοαι (1.9 3 4), 338.5 6 κάββαλλε τὸν χείμων', ἐπὶ μὲν τίθεις/πῦρ (1.9.5 6), 338.6 ἐν δὲ κέρναις οἶνον ἀφειδέως/μέλιχρον (1.9.6 7).

the first book. I shall be selective, since this sort of discussion is always more persuasive and interesting to the writer than to the reader.

Consider the first poem again, 1.9. Throughout his lyric career, Horace subscribes to a continuing, disingenuous self-presentation, and for this 1.9 is an invaluable opener. The poet claims the position of Roman Alcaeus, but in passage after passage he urges the point that essentially, deep down, he is the sympotic, erotic rather than the *engagé* version of Alcaeus, and this constructed image served him well.[64] It was therefore suitable for the *Roman* Alcaeus, unlike the original item, to parade a sympotic, erotic poem as his first essay in alcaics—and even more pointed for him to put such a poem where his Alcaean Signature starts.

The first decade of the thirty odes closes (1.18) with Horace's second essay in the 'greater asclepiad', the metre which was common for Alcaeus, rare for Horace. 1.18 starts, as we saw, with a clear quotation of Alcaeus 342V. So the first ten poems of the thirty open and close with odes (1.9 and 18) which allude to Alcaeus metrically *and* textually. *Ode* 1.18 is also the poem to which the second ode in Horace's Signature Sequence (1.11) is linked. Since it is the one that actually takes us from 1.11 to a substantial piece of Alcaeus' text, it merits a focused place on this account alone.

The poem that opens the second decade (1.19) is a parody *recusatio*: perfectly good closure of the first half of the total 1–38 structure, it can also suitably stand at the head of a group. Cf. Propertius' programmatic use of *recusatio* in 2.1, and Horace himself will playfully feint a replay of 1.19 in *Ode* 4.1.[65] The poem that closes the decade (28) is a box of surprises, among other things a masterpiece of generic *Kreuzung* (two types of sepulchral epigram, diatribe) and reader-manipulation.[66] It is not until you have read the poem a couple of times that you have some sense of what is going on, of ground beneath your feet. A sentence from Nisbet and Hubbard[67] gives a flavour of the complexity that awaits: 'The structure of the poem causes perplexity because we do not know till 21 that the speaker is not Horace but a corpse.' And back now comes for the second and last time the first Archilochean metre, paraded at *Ode* 1.7, reinforcing one's sense of exhibitionism and *Kreuzung*; the other strongly Archilochean metre in the Parade, that of 1.4, never recurs. All this technical dazzle befits a position of structural importance, and its generic display recalls the tactics of the 'falsely' closural *Epode* 13.[68] The ode is also the *second* of the 'series of actual deaths' which confront us in the book[69]—the first opens the second half of the structure of thirty (1.24)—and death is this time in a more obvious closural position; the third and last of the series is Cleopatra in the *penultimate* poem of both the structures operative in *Odes* Book 1. Horace is fond of exploiting penultimacy where we might have expect him to choose the actual last place.[70]

[64] Cf. Lyne (n. 3), 95 7, 78.

[65] The exact repetition of 1.19.1 at 4.1.5 underscores the mischievously misleading impression given by 4.1 that it is *declining* a grander literary project in favour of love poetry.

[66] It is excellently introduced and explained by Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 317ff.

[67] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 318.

[68] I illustrate and explain 'false' closure in *Epode* 13 in a paper forthcoming in *JRS*.

[69] Hutchinson (n. 4), 531.

[70] On Horace's displacement of apparently important poems from an expected position of closure to penultimacy, see Lyne (n. 3), index s.v. 'penultimacy'; on 1.37 and 38, see 88. On the closural function of 1.38 itself, Fraenkel (n. 32), 297 9 is not to be missed. More recently, E. Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (1998), 176 7 has interesting discussion of the same topic. Cf. too M. Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford, 1997), 164 75, overdoing the metapoetics for my taste; Syndikus (n. 48), 332 4, esp. 332; Don Fowler, *Roman*

The third decade opens with two poems that engage great public events (1.29 and 31), wrapped around a poem, the second in the decade, of apparent erotic triviality (1.30, *O Venus* ...). The public events are: the impending Augustan expedition into Arabia under Aelius Gallus (26–5 B.C., 1.29) and the recent dedication of the Temple of Apollo (28 B.C., 1.31). But both these events are approached from a very personal angle, allowing a highly unexpected view of them. By the third decade Horace may feel it timely to open with Augustan poems that, unlike 1.2 and 1.12, treat their topics with witty independence. *Ode* 1.29[71] joshes the apparently intellectual Iccius on his participation in a military affair unsuited to, and indeed *beneath*, a person of his quality, *pollicitus meliora* (29.16): we are given a disconcerting view, we may infer a disconcertingly unofficial opinion, of an event of which Augustus will boastingly present a very different picture in the *Res Gestae* (26). The details are interesting.[72] Then, 1.31.[73] After the impressive and misleadingly grand opening *quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem/uates?*, bringing to mind both the Horace the public poet and Augustus' dedication of his great showcase and ideologically loaded Palatine Temple of Apollo,[74] we find no Roman state request, which might match such a start. Instead, the ode turns to consider what Horace personally is to ask of Apollo—and not on the Augustan day (9 October), the anniversary of the Temple's dedication, but on a day close to it (11 October), the homely festival of the Meditrinalia. And his prayer is first for something which a self-regarding philosopher, particularly the anti-political Epicurus, might wish: simple self-sufficient enjoyment (3–17); and then for things which any ordinary fellow would wish: health of body and mind, a decent and musical old age (17–20). The *cithara*

Constructions (2000), 259–60, in trenchant mode. Port (n. 20), 303 and Santirocco (n. 20), 79–81 discuss 1.36–8 as a closural sequence.

[71] For excellent information on the historical background to 1.29 and discussion of the poem, see Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 337ff. See too Syndikus (n. 48), 264–9: Syndikus well brings out the joshing irony of Horace in 1.29, but underestimates the amusingly unofficial window which Horace opens on the great Augustan expedition.

[72] Augustus, *Res Gestae* 26 includes the Arabian expedition in his section on imperial expansion. Extension of empire was, we may assume, the justification for the expedition publicly given at the time, and a grand and Roman reason to conquer; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.851–3 *tu regere imperio populos* ...etc. Augustus also presents the campaign as a resounding success, which it was not (Dio 53.29.4, Strabo 16.4.24). *Res Gestae* 6: *omnium prouinciarum populi Romani, quibus finitimae fuerunt gentes quae non parerent imperio nostro, fines auxi. meo iussu et auspicio ducti sunt duo exercitus eodem fere tempore in Aethiopiam et in Arabiam, quae appellatur Eudaemon, maximaeque hostium gentis utriusque copiae caesae sunt in acie et complura oppida capta* .... *in Arabiam usque in fines Sabaeorum processit exercitus ad oppidum Mariba. Aegyptum imperio populi Romani adieci* .... Horace is careful to include a reference to the official motive for the campaign (extension of empire): *non ante deuictis*.... (3–5), but he alludes too to a less salubrious motive, anyway on Iccius' part, namely profit (*Icci, beatis nunc Arabum inuides/gazis* ...), which is the one that the poem develops. The poem does not impose the interpretation that profit was the motive of anyone besides Iccius, but the ode gets close to the bone. For, as Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 338 say, 'Strabo, who was a friend of Aelius Gallus ...gives the show away': on top of strategic reasons moving Augustus, Strabo mentions the Arabians' reputation for huge wealth (16.4.22).

[73] For historical background and discussion, see Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 347ff., also Syndikus (n. 48), 274–81.

[74] The misleading effect of *uates* (pointing to the *public* poet Horace) is excellently observed by Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 347. *Dedicatum* is unmistakable in its reference: there was only one temple that had been 'dedicated' to Apollo which was of any contemporary moment, Augustus' temple on the Palatine in 28 B.C. On this masterpiece of visual propaganda, the showcase of the early reign, see P. Zanker, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (Munich, 1987), 90–6 = *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1988), 85–9; also K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (Princeton, 1996), 213ff.

is of course in Apollo's gift: the cult statue of Augustus' Apollo temple was indeed Apollo *Citharoedus*, but one doubts that the imperial image-maker was much concerned with the old age of a self-indulgent poet when he erected this temple and statue.[75] Health too is in Apollo's gift, but there is quite probably a designed inappropriateness in asking the *Palatine* Apollo for this.[76] One doubts most particularly that Augustus' Apollo was quite the right god to ask for Epicurean contentment.[77] And overall it might seem amusing that Horace should so personally presume upon the god's time, when he might have asked, indeed we expected him to ask, for the safety of the empire or the like. Or is this a fitting acknowledgement of the Peace that allows such private interests to make themselves heard?—an interpretation open to us.[78] Horace likes to hedge his bets, but we can imagine how (say) Propertius would have read the poem. We should note incidentally that here finally is a Horatian Apollo poem in alcaics: much domesticated compared with Alcaeus' Apollo hymn, we may surmise, as well as with the expectations that it itself arouses.

That apparently trivial poem (1.30) inserted between 1.29 and 31 may remind us of the Pyrrha ode (1.5), placed among much more serious company in the Parade Odes. But it has two interesting details. Second in its decade, it brings back Mercury (*Mercuriusque*) in its last line, the recipient of the second poem in the Signature Sequence, and the Augustan god of the second poem in the whole book. Mercury is mentioned in 1.30 among the desired companions of Venus, among whom are also the *Nymphae* (1.30.6), allusively behind the third poem of the Signature Sequence, 1.11.[79]

[75] For the cult statue in the Temple of Apollo being particularly *citharoedus*, see Prop. 2.31.15 15, surely unequivocal, also 4.6.69. Tibullus 2.5.1ff. is an under advertised piece of evidence: this cletic address is not likely to picture Apollo in a guise that does not reflect the cult figure of the Temple in question. See too Zanker (n. 74), 90 = 85. The sculpture was, incidentally, by Scopas (Plin, *HN* 36.25).

[76] See Syndikus (n. 48), esp. 278 81, particularly enlightening on the prayer for health, and so on; also E. Lefèvre, *Horaz, Dichter in augusteischen Rom* (Munich, 1993), 219. But there is an impishness here that they miss. The festival of 11 October, the Meditrinalia, which closed the vintage with offerings of new and old wine, was cognate with health (Varro, *Ling.* 6.21), and Apollo as the Healer had a cult title *Medicus*. But *Apollo Medicus* was actually honoured in *another* temple, one primarily associated with *another* Roman benefactor and not Augustus. See G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich, 1912[2]), 294 5; K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1960), 222 3; A. Viscogliosi in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (a cura di E. M. Steinby, Rome, 1993[2]), 1.49 54 The temple to *Apollo Medicus* was vowed in 433 B.C. following plague (Livy 4.25.3, 29.7), and consecrated in 431 B.C. It was the only temple of Apollo in Rome until Augustus (Asconius, *Tog. Cand.* 81). The consul who consecrated the temple was a Cn. Iulius, but it was repeatedly renewed during the centuries, and rebuilt in 32 B.C. or a little later by C. Sosius. After this rebuilding, it was so attached to Sosius' name that Plin. *HN* 36.28 calls the Apollo of the temple *Apollo Sosianus*, and Latte assumes this was the general appellation after Sosius. (The title *Apollo Medicus* comes from Macrobius 1.17.15 who tells us that the Vestal virgins appealed to *Apollo Medice, Apollo Paean.* The appellation is assumed to date right back to the foundation of the temple.) C. Sosius was consul in 32 B.C., but Antonian in sympathy, absconding to Antonius for the Battle of Actium, and becoming one of his two principal admirals. He was spared by Octavian after the victory, and gained position in the Augustan state: R. Syme, *Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 296, 349, etc. (index *sub nom.*, also index to R. Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy* [Oxford, 1986]). But however much Augustus annexed Sosius and this other temple (Syme, and esp. Viscogliosi 50 1), it was a man ingenuous in politics who mentioned health in a request to the Apollo of the Palatine Temple. And Horace was not ingenuous.

[77] See Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2.) 357 8 on the meaning and philosophical tone of *paratis* (17), and on the sense of the last stanza, necessitating Lambinus' *et precor.*

[78] Cf. Syndikus (n. 48), 274.

[79] *Nymphae* in *Odes* 1 also at 1.1.31 (in poetic function) and 1.4.6.

Self-denyingly, I shall call a halt to this section. The structural positions I point to in the sequence of thirty (*Odes* 1.9–38), and the arguments I make about the poems favoured to occupy them, do I think make plausible sense—more plausible sense than some of the suggestions made for the book of thirty-eight, even more sense than some made for the overarching 'unit' of eighty-eight.[80] But the book of thirty-eight, at least, is a structure that Horace exploits, at the beginning as well as the end, and at the close of the first half, and the opening of the second, to mention the most obvious places. Book 1 of the *Odes* offers two chances of structure: one based on the total number of poems, one based on a decimal block which started with Horace's Signature Sequence. Horace likes chameleon structures, as he has already shown in the *Epodes*.[81]

VIII. THE ARISTARCHAN ALCAEUS BOOK 1

Working back from Horace, I can draw two possible inferences about the edition of Alcaeus which Horace used.

The first concerns the number of poems in Alcaeus Book 1. It often strikes scholars that the thirty-eight poems of Horace's first book of *Odes* is a strange number.[82] Ten Vergilian *Eclogues*, ten poems in Horace's first book of satires, ten elegies in Tibullus Book 1. A decimal trend seems to be under way. Playing on this, Propertius organizes two sequences of ten elegies in his first book, with main but 'false' closure in what would have been his 1.20.[83] There are of course only eight poems in Horace's second book of satires, but the total number of lines in the book is 1083, slightly above the total for *Satires* 1 (1030); the abnormal length of *Serm.* 2.3, which serves a clear literary purpose, so to speak precludes Horace's proceeding beyond eight, and the closure at eight may productively draw attention to the obtruding and amusing length of 2.3.[84] Then, twenty odes in Book 2, thirty in Book 3, fifteen—

[80] For suggestions on structural patterns in the larger Book 1, see e.g. Port (n. 20), 296 304; Santirocco (n. 20), 42 82; Porter (n. 20), 56ff. Hutchinson *op. cit.* (n. 4), 529 32 surveys contents and organization with brevity, sense, and sensibility. H. Dettmer, *Horace: A Study in Structure* (1983), is more concerned to demonstrate ring composition structure over Books 1 3 as a whole: see e.g. preface and 141ff.

[81] This is a topic that I treat in a paper forthcoming in *JRS*.

[82] After noting the decimal numbers in *Odes* Books 2 and 3, Port (n. 20), 297 remarks, 'fällt die Zahl 38 im ersten Buch auf', and he refers to the 'merkwürdige Zahl' later on the page; but he offers no satisfactory explanation. Santirocco (n. 20), 81 says 'an irregular number ... as opposed to the other books' multiples of ten'; S. also notes that the number of poems is much larger in 1 than in 2 and 3, 43 per cent of the total in the three books. Fraenkel (n. 32), 112 with n. 1 notes the decimal trend which I outline below (the *Eclogues* 'ushered in a new era ... ten, or a multiple of it, seems to have been considered by Horace, and by some contemporary poets as well, the ideal number for the poems of a book'); 'in the case of Book I', he says, 'there was an overflow,' hardly a sufficient explanation of an anomaly. Fowler (n. 70), 259–60 observes the odd total, and 'know[s] no reason' for it.

[83] I am using what would have been the ancient numeration: poems 8a and b are rightly divided, so that our poem 19 would have been 20 in Propertius' edition. So, Book 1 contained a sequence of twenty 'Cynthia' poems, and, in the final poem, Propertius squarely confronts the question 'Can Love Conquer *Death*?', a heavily closural topic, and ends the poem with a superbly final couplet. And then we get a coda of completely different, non Cynthia material. Poem 10 (=11 in the ancient edition) takes on new significances when one absorbs the fact that it opened the second half of the Cynthia sequence.

[84] To explain eight instead of ten poems in *Satires* Book 2, I think we should try 'to avoid the conclusion that Horace, as he went on writing *sermones*, began to run out of suitable subjects and settings' (Fraekel [n. 32], 137). In the dialogue of the third satire, 326 lines long, we are swiftly informed that Horace is struck by incapacity to write: as a dramatic and humorous

half thirty—in Book 4 to ring the changes. And twenty *Epistles* in Book 1. The strange total of *Epodes* has its own explanation, to which I shall attend in another paper. As I have shown, from the point where the Signature Sequence starts we have thirty structured odes (30, then 20 and 30 in Books 2 and 3). But why the strange *total* in Book 1?

A heroic effort has been made to cut down this total number in order to produce a more rational-seeming number:[85] adjacent poems in the same metre (1.16 and 17, 26 and 27, 34 and 35, all alcaics) should be regarded as one poem, a simple expedient. But it disregards evidence for adjacent poems in the same metre in Alcaeus (see note 11), and more importantly defies sensible reading. We have a total of thirty-eight to explain, irreducibly.

The random-seeming total of poems is strange for an Augustan book, but not for an Alexandrian book. Aristophanes of Byzantium was content with fourteen Olympians, twelve Pythians, and perhaps eleven Isthmians. Eight Nemeans, giving a book of merely 908 verses, had three more non-Nemeans (as later ancient scholars noted) added, to produce a total of 1,273 lines (more in keeping with standard Alexandrian book length), and eleven poems.[86] Callimachus produced his own *Gedichtbuch* of *Iambi*, most probably thirteen in number, though seventeen has its adherents. If it was thirteen, then Callimachus or someone else subsequently bulked out the book to seventeen.[87] And seventeen was the number of *Aetia* in Book 4 of Callimachus' *Aetia*.[88] Why not therefore a Book 1 of Alcaeus with thirty-eight poems, with an average of, say thirty-two lines each?[89] When the lyric

reflection of this he utters extremely few lines in the poem in his own voice. Damasippus dominates the dialogue, and he in turn is dominated by a huge speech which he quotes from the Stoic philosopher Stertinius (38 295). The Stoicism uttered by Damasippus Stertinius is not as extreme as that sharply put down in *Satires* Book 1 (*Serm.* 1.3.77ff., summed up in 96 98); following tactics of Book 2 Horace allows figures to make their own case and leaves us to assess. But there is a joke in the length of the speech quoted from Stertinius, especially in relation to the number of lines Horace gives to himself. Crispinus was not the only philosopher who could go on and on (1.1.120 1), and both Sterninius' wordiness *and* poor Horace's lack of words are emphasized by the inordinate span of the satire and its distri bution. In his other works, including *Odes* 1 as this paper shows, Horace proves himself so aware of structure and number that we will reasonably seek a literary explanation of the *appar ent* shortfall of poems in *Satires* 2, and our search swiftly takes us to the great length of 2.3 and to the function of that great length.

[85] See A. Griffiths, 'Just where do you draw the line?', in Woodman and Feeney (n. 5), 65 79. Stirring stuff, but some decisive contrary points are made in advance by Hutchinson(n. 4), 520 n. 14. Griffiths carries his metrical policy through to the Roman Odes (which become one 'monster mega-poem'), and thus cuts Book 3 to 25 odes, still obedient to what he engagingly calls the 'five and dime' principle (66). He does not tell us what he would do with 2.13 15 and 19 20, all alcaics. The same sort of procedure would wreck the nicely decimal total at present in that book.

[86] See J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris, 1952), 31 50, esp. 40 2; see too R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 183ff. and P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandra* (Oxford, 1972), 1.459 60.

[87] For the thirteen Callimachean *Iambi*, see A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (1999), esp. 272 6. A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), 163 73 argues for seventeen Callimachean *Iambi* (the number of poems between *Aetia* and *Hecale* in the Milan *Diegeseis*). D. L. Clayman, *Callimachus's Iambi*, Mnemos. Suppl. 59 (1980), 7 supposes the thirteen *Iambi* were filled out with four more poems, by Callimachus himself or a copyist.

[88] Cameron (n. 88), 170 n. 39.

[89] Sappho's first book apparently contained 1,320 lines, and we have stichometric signs in Alcaean papyri compatible with this sort of total. For the stichometric subscription in

Horace confirms that it is Alcaeus with whom he most especially wishes to align himself, he might have liked his readers to discover that the total number of poems in his Book 1 equalled the number of the master's poems in his standard edition Book 1. We remember that 'Alcaeus Book 1' was a way of thinking which Horace could share with his readers, ancient and modern (Section I).

The second inference I draw concerns the provenance of Horace's Alcaean models. Horace matches the metres of Alcaeus' first three poems in the Signature Sequence 1.9, 10 and 11, but he only matches metre *and* content in 1.10. However, he picks up a replacement Alcaean text in 1.9 for content, and alludes to another Alcaean text, via the metre of 1.18 and *its* quoted Alcaean line, in 1.11. I think it more likely than not, considering Horace's apparent preoccupation with 'Alcaeus Book 1'—for him, both a ready text and way of thinking—that these replacements came from that Book 1. I would make the same suggestion for any other poems of Alcaeus that may be behind odes in Book 1. The most promising candidates are as follows. Fragment 208V, a main model of *Ode* 1.14: this is a good candidate for pride of place in Alcaeus in its own right, since it appears to have been well known: it attracted (correctly) an allegorical interpretation from Heraclitus, *quaestiones Homericae* 5, and is the subject of commentary/summary in two surviving papyri (*POxy.* 2306 col. II 305bV and *POxy.* 2734 fr. 6 306C (c) Campbell). I infer from Pardini that he thinks the summary of 208V in *POxy.* 2734 is argument in itself for a position in Book 1 for that poem.[90] Then, fr. 6V also behind *Ode* 1.14,[91] fr. 332V the model at the start of *Ode* 1.37, and fr. 286V, quite probably a model for *Ode* 1.4.[92]

'Imitations of Alcaeus ... are concentrated in <Horace's> first book (except for the metrical tour de force 3.12)', say Nisbet and Hubbard.[93] If the papyrus evidence is representative in this respect, and I am right that the poems which Horace imitated were in Alcaeus Book 1, it opens an interesting window on Horace's strategy and his reading.

Balliol College, Oxford R. O. A. M. LYNE
oliver.lyne@balliol.ox.ac.uk

Sappho, see fr. 30V (*P. Oxy.* 1231) and Irigoin, (n. 86), 39. In an Alcaean papyrus, there is a marginal kappa beside fr. 120.4 V marking line 1,000 of its book; at 143.12 there is a marginal theta, marking the 800th line in its book, perhaps the same book, perhaps another. This suggests at least one book of Alcaeus in excess of 1,000 lines, and in all probability Alcaeus' books met the Alexandrian norm in number of lines (like Sappho Book 1). But Dr Obbink warns against trusting stichometric markers *per se*, since they may have been carried over from non colometrically written editions of the poems. He refers to A. Blanchard and A. Bataille, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 3 (1964), 162; R. Kassel, *Eranos* 43 (1965), 12 13 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin and New York 1991), 283, bibliographical items also referred to by W. G. Arnott, *Menander Volume III* (Cambridge, MA, 2000), 198 n. 5, making this same sceptical point about stichometric numbers in Menander papyri. The bibliographical *P. Oxy.* 2294 = fr. 103V seems to point to a Sappho Book 8 of almost incredible brevity: ten poems and between 130 and 140 lines *in toto*: cf. Page(n. 28), 116 19. But since Sappho was ordered by metre (above n. 10), it is possible that strange bibliographical things happened.

[90] Pardini (n. 7), 283.

[91] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 179.

[92] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), 58.

[93] Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 2), xxix.