

HORATIAN ECHOES

T. C. W. STINTON

AS WINTER THAWS beneath the mild breezes of spring, ships are hauled down to the water and on the farm men and beasts emerge from their refuge.

*Iam Cytherea choros ducit Venus imminente luna,
iunctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes
alternò terram quatunt pede, dum gravis Cyclopum
Vulcanus ardens visit officinas.* (C. 1.4.9–12)

Nisbet-Hubbard¹ stress the contrast here, which “reminds us of the contrast between field and castle in medieval books of hours” (p. 59). The contrast has a further function: “the activity of spring is opposed to the sluggishness of winter, the gaiety of Venus to the heavy industriousness of her husband” (p. 61). “Venus can frolic gaily while her lame and ponderous husband is superintending his thunderbolt factory” (on v. 7).

All this is very well, and it might be that Hephaestus’ absence gives Venus the opportunity to dance with the Nymphs and Graces just as in Apollonius (3.41) his departure for the forge makes possible her cosy chat with Hera. But the poetical logic demands that Vulcan’s visit to his factory be regarded as yet another side of the universal activity which starts again in spring, for nature, man and even gods, as in the dogged epilogue to *Mother Courage*:

Das Frühjahr kommt; Wach auf, du Christ!
Der Schnee schmilzt weg, die Toten ruhn;
Und was noch nicht gestorben ist,
Das macht sich auf die Socken nun.

We might then ask: why should Vulcan’s particular activity be seasonal? The question is perhaps rather a prosaic one, and Nisbet-Hubbard give rather a prosaic answer: “There was an exceptional demand for his product in the springtime,” because thunder is more frequent in spring and autumn, cf. Lucr. 6.357 ff., Pliny *NH* 2.136. A mock-scientific allusion is not foreign to Horace in his philosophical vein (cf. 1.34 *Parcus deorum cultor*), but it seems a little out of place here.² Horace’s

¹R. G. M. Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (1970). Throughout this paper I am indebted to Miss Hubbard and Professor Nisbet for valuable criticism and advice.

²Miss Hubbard objects to the implication that Lucretius is less “poetical” than Ibycus or Apollonius (see below), and points out that this would not be the only echo of Lucretius

readers would be as likely to remember the lightning-slashed winter wind that brought unseasonable frenzies of passion from Aphrodite to Ibycus (fr. 5 [286] P):

ἦρι μὲν αἶ τε κυδώνιαι | μηλίδες . . . θαλέθοισιν. ἐμοὶ δ' ἔρος | οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος
 ὥραν | . . . ὑπὸ στεροπᾶς φλέγων | Θρηϊκίος Βορέας αἰσῶν παρὰ Κυπρίδος
 ἀζαλέαις μανίαισιν ἐρεμνὸς ἀθαμβῆς | ἐγκρατέως πεδόθεν φλάσεν (?) | ἡμετέρας
 φρένας.

That allusion would indeed be almost as remote, but there is one closer to hand which in this highly sophisticated poem might well be intended. In Apollonius 3.41 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν εἰς χαλκεῶνα καὶ ἀκμόνα ἦρι βέβηκεν: Hephaestus, like any other working husband, sets off in the morning (ἦρι), leaving his wife to her own devices. But ἦρι, as Ibycus has just reminded us, also means "in the spring." I am not suggesting that Horace "mistranslated" Apollonius, any more than Virgil mistranslated Theocritus' πάντα δ' ἐναλλα γένοιτο (*Id.* 1.134, cf. *Virg. E.* 8.58), but that the humour, though slightly less obvious than Virgil's, is of the same kind; and it is important to see that the tone of this ode, in which the element of παίξιεν has rightly been stressed by Fraenkel,³ makes such humour appropriate.

It is also vital to recognize the tone of the "thrilling suddenness" with which Death kicks at the door:

*pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas
 regumque turis. . . .*

"Our poem," say Nisbet-Hubbard, "combines an intense awareness of the joys of spring with the horrors of the underworld." This I believe to be a critical error. It is shared by nearly every commentator and critic, who speak of this powerfully alliterative line as though it were the opening of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. It is tempting to think that because Death is indeed terrible, a poet who refers to it must be speaking in

in the ode; though she allows that Horace may well have Ibycus in mind too, and perhaps Apollonius. It is true that v.1 *acris hiems* could be a reminiscence of the same passage in Lucretius, cf. 6.373 *acres . . . hiemes* (though both might be after Ennius, *Ann.* 424 *acres . . . hiemes*, perhaps in a similar context), and that such a "cross-reference" is not foreign to Horace. Nor do I wish to undervalue Lucretius as a poet. But his didactic exposition seems less in keeping with the spirit of this ode than the other passages to which I suggest Horace is alluding, though I would equally allow that he may have had Lucretius in mind also.

Nisbet sees no allusion to Lucretius: the "prosaic" tone of scientific allusion is justified by the business-like phrase *visit officinas*. He would however allow that a Hellenistic epigram about thunder in spring would make this easier, and might also have been a more direct source for the word-play on ἦρι, if Horace intends one. But he feels an allusion to Ibycus to be too remote.

³Horace (1957) 420-421.

solemn and fearful tones, with an effect of gloom or horror. Now when Shirley writes:

The glories of our blood and state
Are shadows, not substantial things;
There is no armour against Fate:
Death lays his icy hand on kings.
Sceptre and crown
Must tumble down,
And in the dust be equal made
With the poor crooked scythe and spade,

there is some pathos, certainly, as might be expected in a dirge, but the principal tone here is almost one of triumph, or even of gloating.⁴ What is the tone of “*pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas*”? The clue is given by the phrase *pulsat pede*: it comes straight out of comedy, and Greek comedy at that. It cuts Death the Leveller down to size, as Callimachus, with a quite different intention, gives a pleasingly domestic dimension to Apollo in *H.* 2.3 καὶ δὴ πον τὰ θύρετρα καλῶ ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει. The effect of the alliteration can now be appreciated: Horace, like the fat boy at Dingley Dell, wants to make our flesh creep, and he does it so obviously that we can practically see the tongue in the cheek. This is not to deny that there is feeling in what follows, but it is pathos, not tragedy: the intensification of *O beate Sesti* is kept in scale by the gay world of parties and boys which will be the measure of Sestius’ loss.

But why does Death knock at this point at all? “The literary critic,” say Nisbet-Hubbard, “will point to the poetical effectiveness of the theme, and with his usual indifference to facts inquire no further. . . . The most promising approach is surely a further investigation of the poem’s literary antecedents.” Let us leave aside the tendentious implication that critics are not scholars, and perhaps that scholars are not critics, and see how the “facts” help to answer the question. The facts on which Nisbet-Hubbard rightly insist are the poems in the literary tradition which make clear the transition from the yearly renewal of life in spring, by contrast, to the life of man, which some day, closer year by year, will not be renewed. They aptly quote the *Epitaphion Bionis*, 99 ff. αἶται μαλάχαι μὲν . . . ὕστερον αὖ ζῶντι καὶ εἰς ἔτος ἄλλο φέοντι. | ἄμμες δ’ οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ καρτεροὶ . . . εὐδομες εὖ μάλα μακρὸν . . . ὕπνον, Catullus’ *soles occidere et redire possunt*; | *nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux*, | *nox est perpetua una dormienda* (5.4–6), and Horace’s own later *damna tamen*

⁴In context only pathos is relevant: Calchas mourns over the dead Ajax (*The Contention of Ajax with Ulysses*, sc. iii). But the tone of such a song is not wholly determined by its dramatic context, any more than that of “Fear no more the heat of the sun” in *Cymbeline* (IV.ii).

celeres reparant caelestia lunae; | nos ubi decidimus, etc. (C. 4.7). In these examples, and doubtless many more in Hellenistic poetry, the logic of the transition is made explicit by the contrast between the yearly cycle of life and the linear progression of man towards death. Horace simply omits this step. He can do so because of the literary tradition, which enables his readers to fill the gap for themselves. This gives his poem a concision, and an element of surprise, that transforms it. In an analogous way, reliance on and contrast with the traditional theme of yearly renewal and the joys of spring is what enables Eliot to make his shock opening: "April is the cruellest month, breeding | Lilacs out of the dead earth . . ."

There is a puzzle in the last two lines of the ode that is commonly ignored:

*nec tenerum Lycidan mirabere, quo calet iuventus
nunc omnis, et mox virgines tepebunt.*

Nisbet-Hubbard remark: "*tepebunt*: less strong than *calet*," comparing Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.139–40 *ipsam iam cedere sensi | inque vicem tepuisse viro*.⁵ So the lines mean:

‘nor gaze on Lycidas, for whom all youth is now on fire,
and presently the girls will feel a less intense desire’

(the doggerel is not meant to match Horace, but it serves my purpose). What on earth is the point? Not, presumably, that Lycidas is a “manly mesomorph, | showing his splendid biceps off, | whom social workers like to touch, | though the loveliest girls do not care for him much.”⁶ Auden may expect his readers to take an allusion to Kretschmerian classifications, but in Horace we must look for the literary antecedent. Nisbet-Hubbard explain: “he illustrates the lapse of years by remarking that Lycidus will soon be loved by women instead of men. The theme is found in the Anthology,” comparing Phanias, *AP* 12.31.3–4 *ἤδη γὰρ καὶ μῆρὸς ὑπὸ τρίχα καὶ γένος ἡβῆ | καὶ πόθος εἰς ἐτέρην λοιπὸν ἄγει μανίην*. But if this is the only point, why did Horace write *tepebunt* not *calebunt*? Or if he wanted *variatio*, why pick on one which blurs his point instead of sharpening it?

The answer is to be found in another relevant “fact.” In Theocr. 7.117 ff., Simichidas, after asking the loves to strike with their arrows the boy Philinus who rejects Aratus’ suit, continues:

*καὶ δὴ μὲν ἀπίοιο πεπαίτερος, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες,
‘αἶται,’ φαντί, ‘Φίλινε, τό τοι καλὸν ἄνθος ἀπορρεῖ.’*

⁵Cf. also Ovid, *RA* 7 *saepe tepent alii iuvenes, ego semper amavi*; *Am.* 2.2, 53.

⁶W. H. Auden, “Footnotes to Dr. Sheldon,” *Nones* (1952).

"Let us no longer sit outside his door, Aratus," he goes on. I shall look at this passage more closely below. All we need note now is that Philinus is not worth pursuing because he is getting past it, and the girls too remark that he has lost his bloom.⁷ Gow tells us: "he is well past the age of Lycidas at Hor. C. 1.4.19." But he is not past the age of Lycidas in v. 20, and that is precisely the point: with the very last word *tepebunt* Horace brings Lycidas to the same stage of maturity and (by this convention) loss of attractiveness as Philinus. It is not simply that Lycidas is now loved by men and will soon be loved by girls, but that he will soon be too old for that too;⁸ only Horace has left out the intervening step—just as he has left out the logical link for *pallida Mors*. . . . The effect of this wry *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is, as it were, to accelerate the passage of time, and by its quiet humour to confirm the general tone of the poem.

Let me add that I do not intend, by this less serious and intense reading, to detract from the ode, nor by toning down the sharp contrast which others see do I in any way mean to belittle its vividness, subtlety and point. I am indeed prepared to agree with Nisbet-Hubbard and Quinn⁹ that 1.4 is perhaps better even than 4.7 *Diffugere nives*. But it is not better because it is more complex, as Nisbet-Hubbard seem here to imply (p. 61). Nor, emphatically, is it better because "the metre is more inter-

⁷Dover (ad loc.) takes this to mean that the girls are mocking the *ἐρώμενος* because his charms are fading for his male lover. I take it to mean that his charms are fading for the girls also. (Sir Kenneth would however agree with my general line of interpretation below [p. 165 f.], as against Gow.)

⁸This interpretation is adopted by A. J. Woodman (*Latomus* 31 [1972] 775–776), who attributes it to J. Bramble. But Mr Bramble tells me that this is not quite his position: he holds that *tepebunt* is weaker than *calet*, but that it means "grow warm" rather than "grow cool"; the point being that the ardour of the young men gives way to the lukewarm love of the girls, which by implication will be succeeded, as time passes, by a still more frigid stage. In other words, he makes Horace omit the last term, rather than the middle one, as I do (and I take it Woodman does).

This may be right: the contrast in intensity between homosexual and heterosexual love is found in Greek poetry, though not often (*AP* 12.17 = Asclepiades 37 Gow-Page, *ib.* 12.86 = Meleager 18; cf. *ib.* 5.6 = Callimachus 11: I owe these references to Sir Kenneth Dover). But there seems little point in it here. Nisbet, who shares Bramble's view, remarks that *tepebunt* must mean "grow warm," not "grow cool," because the parallels in the Anthology for the transition from homosexual to heterosexual love give no hint that the *ἐρώμενος* will at last lose his charms so that the girls grow tired of him. But *tepere* surely means "grow cool" in Ovid, *RA* 7 (see n. 4)—at least, it is best so taken; and Horace could develop and combine traditional motifs (cf. Theocr. *l.c.*) as well as repeat them: that is no small part of his originality.

Another possibility is that *tepebunt* simply means *calescent*, of the onset of love (so Heinze). There is then no ultimate difference in intensity, but presently Lycidas will begin to attract the girls. *RA* 7 makes against this also; and after *calet*, *tepebunt* is a strange way of saying "begin to grow hot": why did Horace not simply write *calescent*?

⁹Kenneth Quinn, *Latin Explorations* (1963) 27 f.

esting" (Shakespeare wrote some passable poetry in blank verse, a very dull metre). But I feel with Fraenkel and Quinn that 4.7, for all the beauty of its controlled movement and sombre close, is marred by an alien note (19–20 *cuncta manus avidas fugient heredis, amico | quae dederis animo*); whereas 1.4 is arguably the most perfectly conceived and expressed ode in all Horace.

It is generally understood that in 3.26 *Vixi puellis nuper idoneus* Horace first dedicates the weapons of love to Venus in token of his resignation from her disciplines, and then in the closing lines *sublimi flagello | tange Chloen semel arrogantem* he goes back on his resolve and asks Venus to allow him one more chance with Chloe. Professor C. P. Jones¹⁰ has challenged this orthodoxy: *tange Chloen semel arrogantem* means simply "make Chloe suffer from unrequited love at another's hands as I suffer at hers." Horace's resignation holds, and his resolve is unaltered.

Jones' arguments are (1) that the *volte-face* in the closing lines of 4.1 *Intermissa diu, Venus*, sometimes cited as a parallel, is not a complete *volte-face* at all, since Horace tells us plainly from the start that he is in love, though he asks Venus to spare him. (2) The theme of the unrequited lover wishing his heartless beloved to suffer a similar pain is a familiar one in Hellenistic poetry. (3) So interpreted, 3.26 corresponds exactly in sentiment with 1.5 *Quis multa gracilis*, in which Horace also claims to have finished with love—or at least with Pyrrha¹¹—and this corresponson has an architectural purpose: it gives a further point of symmetry between the opening and the close of books 1–3, which we see in 1.1 and 3.30 (exordium and epilogue), 1.2 and 3.29 (Roman theme), etc. Horace's dedication of his lyre has a wider meaning than resigning from the works of love: he is withdrawing from love poetry, which here stands for lyric poetry in general. This intention is explicitly revoked in erotic terms in 4.1 *Intermissa diu, Venus | rursus bella moves*, etc.

(1) is strictly correct, but the relevance of 4.1 is greater than he allows, since after the long middle section in which Horace directs Venus to more suitable targets, the return to himself with *sed cur, heu, Ligurine, cur | manat . . .* comes as a deliberate surprise. (3) is true within limits, but the limits are such as to invalidate it as an argument. Certainly there is a corresponson between 1.5 and 3.26: in both of them Horace resigns from

¹⁰HSCP 75 (1971) 81–83. D. Gagliardi (*Bolletino di Studi Latini* 2 [1972] 255 n. 4, 256 f.) adopts the same interpretation independently, but argues the case less fully than Jones.

¹¹I take Horace to mean the former; Jones implies that he means the latter. It makes little difference for the interpretation of 3.26: the lesson Horace learns from Pyrrha in 1.5 is forgotten when he embarks on the perils of other amours.

the works of Venus, in the one by dedicating his dripping clothes to her¹² after his shipwreck, in the other by dedicating to her the old campaigner's weapons. But of course it need not extend to every detail, and in particular does not make against his implied resumption of love in *tange Chloen*. Even if we allow the argument from symmetry in Jones' extreme form, it still does not help his interpretations: Horace's inability to stick to his resolve of 1.5 is shown by the many love poems which follow, until in 3.26 the resolve and the inability to stick to it actually occur in the same poem.

Jones' best argument is (2), and it is not a strong one. "It is a familiar idea of Hellenistic poetry that the nemesis of an unrequited passion awaits those who refuse to gratify the passion of others." This idea, he tells us, takes its origin from everyday life, which he illustrates by a *graffito*;¹³ "it is particularly appropriate when a scorned lover prays or predicts such a fate for the beloved." He refers to Gow on *Theocr.* 7.118, who gives examples of the ἐρώμενος becoming the ἐρών. The passage runs as follows: "But do you leave the sweet stream of Hyetis and Byblis, and Oecus, that steep seat of golden-haired Dione, ye Loves as rosy as apples, and wound with your bows the lovely Philinus:

βάλλετέ μοι τόξοισι τὸν ἱμερόεντα Φιλῖνον,
βάλλετ', ἐπεὶ τὸν ξείνον ὁ δύσμορος οὐκ ἐλεεῖ μεν.
καὶ δὴ μὰν ἀπίοιο πεπαίτερος, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες,
'αἶαι,' φαντί, 'Φιλῖνε, τό τοι καλὸν ἄνθος ἀπορρεῖ,'
μηκέτι τοι φρουρέωμες ἐπὶ προθύροισιν, "Ἄρατε,
μηδὲ πόδας τρίβωμες,

but let the morning cock with his crowing deliver up another to the numbing pain, and one alone, Molon (Aratus' rival), be throttled in that school (παλαίστρας)." (Tr. Gow). Gow says on 118: "the meaning is no doubt *make Philinus himself the victim of an unrequited passion*, not *make him love Aratus*." Of the unique combination καὶ δὴ μὰν he says: "(it has) sometimes been understood to mean 'and yet' . . . It is improbable however that, while καὶ δὴ and καὶ μὰν have in most uses much the same force, . . . καὶ δὴ μὰν should be used in the adversative sense which belongs only to the latter." We need not dwell on this mysterious piece of grammatical algebra, since the context shows it to be wrong.¹⁴ Gow makes Simichidas

¹²The case for *deae* now presented by Nisbet-Hubbard is conclusive.

¹³εἴ τις καλὸς γενόμενος οὐκ ἔδωκε πυγίσαι, ἐκεῖνος καλῆς ἐρασθεὶς μὴ τύχοι βινήματος (L. d'Orsi, *PdP* 120 [1968] 228–230). Jones is right to correct d'Orsi's *πυγίσαι* to *πυγίσαι*, since as we should expect the *ι* is short, cf. *AP* 9.317.3, 5. I am less confident than he is about the "crude trochaic tetrameters catalectic" he blames d'Orsi for not seeing.

¹⁴δὴ is best taken as ἤδη; see Dover *ad loc.*

say: "wound Philinus (and make him suffer unrequited love for another); and truly he is riper than a pear (and so of an age for his love to be unrequited)—already the girls remark that he has lost his bloom. (He is not therefore worth your notice, so) do not let us wait upon his threshold, but *let your rival suffer instead.*" This is obviously nonsense. The logic of the passage demands that it mean: "wound Philinus, Loves, (and make him love his lover); and yet (he is not worth bothering about, since) he has already lost his bloom; do not let us waste time on him, but let your rival suffer instead." Gow's positive arguments are (1) "between Aratus and Philinus the passion cannot well be reciprocal," which begs the question; (2) Oikus, the shrine of Aphrodite from which the Loves are to come, is further from Cos and less famous than Cnidos, so it must have been chosen for the unhappy love of Byblis and Caunus, which rules out requital. Since Posidippus mentions the shrine along with Cyprus and Cythera, it was hardly obscure (*AP* 12.131); while the love of Caunus for Byblis, or *vice versa*, while certainly unrequited, being incestuous, is not a good example of unrequited love as such (*Byblis in exemplo est, ut ament concessa puellae*, Ovid *Met.* 9.454), and has nothing to do with the punishment of a proud lover.

Of course this is not to say that the theme of the biter bit and in turn suffering from unrequited love is not often found. With homosexual love it means that the ἐρώμενος will in course of time become the ἐρῶν, whether of boys or girls, and the prediction or wish is part of the lover's attempt to make the other grant his favours (e.g., Theocr. 23.33). In a heterosexual context it generally takes the form: "be kind to me now, for one day you will be old and ugly, and look for lovers in vain"; it is a common motif in the *paraclausithuron* (e.g., Callim. ep. 63).¹⁵ There is also the simple revenge theme: "you are old and ugly now, it serves you right for rejecting me before" (the principal theme of *C.* 1.25), which owes something to the χαρακτήρ 'Αρχιλόχειος and to Hipponax, besides Catullus and Hellenistic models.¹⁶

Now Horace, when he begins in triumph '*Audivere, Lyce, di mea vota, di | audivere*' (*C.* 4.13), speaks simply of "the gods"; and in a sixth-century epigram (Julianus), the lover's prayer that his beloved may pay for her pride in time runs: ἀλλὰ μετέλλθεις | κείνης, πότνα Δίκη, κόμπων ἀγνηροίης (*AP* 5.298, 1–2). But the prayer to Venus to touch the heart of the loved one most obviously expresses a desire for requital, not vengeance, as it does in the archetype of such prayers, Sappho's ποικιλόθρον' ἀθάνατ' 'Αφροδίτα. That requital not vengeance is what Sappho is asking for is shown by 18–19 τίνα δηῦτε πείθω | ἄψ' ἴσ' ἄγην ἐς σὰν φιλότατα, whatever the exact text there: the wrong done to Sappho (τίς σ', ὦ Σάπφ', ἀδικήει;)

¹⁵For a concise treatment of the relevant motifs in this genre see Nisbet-Hubbard on 1.25 (pp. 290–291).

¹⁶Cf. Fraenkel, *Horace*, 58, 415 ff.

is to be righted not by the punishment of the wrongdoer, the faithless beloved, but by her making amends¹⁷. Horace's elaborate invocation of Venus in 3.26 suggests that he is thinking of Sappho and requital, rather than Callimachus and revenge; compare the invocation of the Loves at Theocr. 7.117–8, as I interpret it. There is perhaps another pointer in *Memphin carentem Sithonia nive*: despite the raised whip, Venus is to touch Chloe with a gentle love, not the cruel frenzy, ἀζαλέαις μανίαισιν, which Thracian Boreas brought from her to Ibycus (fr. 286; see above, p. 160).¹⁸

The resulting contradiction, the surprise turn-round in the close, is familiar in Horace, as in 3.9, *tecum vivere amem, tecum obeam libens*, or in the opposite sense in 3.10 *non hoc semper erit liminis aut aquae | caelestis patiens latus*, or, in a rather different way, 1.16. I have no doubt it gives the poem far more point than would Professor Jones' interpretation. We might compare, for all the differences in situation, tone and poetic form, Drayton's passionate outburst:

Since there's no help, come let us kiss and part;
Nay, I have done, you get no more of me,
And I am glad, yea, glad with all my heart,
That thus so cleanly I myself can free.
Shake hands for ever, cancel all our vows,
And when we meet at any time again,
Be it not seen in either of our brows
That we one jot of former love retain.
Now at the last gasp of Love's latest breath,
When, his pulse failing, Passion speechless lies,
When Faith is kneeling by his bed of death,
And Innocence is closing up his eyes:
Now if thou would'st, when all have given him over,
From death to life thou might'st him yet recover.

¹⁷Page argues (*Sappho and Alcaeus* [1955] 12 ff.) that there is no promise of action by Aphrodite, but merely a consoling prediction that with the fickleness of love the situation will soon be reversed: the unresponsive beloved will presently suffer in her turn by pursuing an unresponsive Sappho, who now pursues someone else. This eccentric view has been succinctly refuted by Professor A. Cameron (*Harvard Theological Review* 57 [1964] 237–239; cf. G. L. Koniaris, *Philologus* 109 [1965] 30–38), who argues (1) that καὶ γάρ, after τίνα πείθω . . . , τίς σ' ἀδικήσει; must introduce a promise of action; (2) that διώξει, balancing φεύγει, need only apply to the beloved—Sappho does not have to be running away; (3) that κούκ ἐθέλοισα does not imply unrequited love, but simply "hints at Aphrodite's power" (Campbell). That nonetheless Sappho's poem is not meant to be entirely serious was suggested by Cameron in an earlier article (*ib.* 33 [1939] 1 ff., esp. 15 f.).

¹⁸Doubtless there is also a reference to Bacchylides, fr. 30 Σ τὰν ἀχείμαντόν τε Μέμφιν (Heinze), and *Sithonia* might possibly refer to the Thracian origin of Chloe in C. 3.9 (Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman poetry* [1968] 207), though I doubt if Horace is so consistent in his use of names; but the significance of the allusions need not end there.

It is true that an interpretation is not necessarily right because it seems more effective: if it is uncharacteristic of the author or alien to the genre or runs counter to precedent, we must reject it. But here literary precedent and the poet's manner alike favour the interpretation which makes the better poem.

In *C. 1.25 Parcius iunctas quatiunt fenestras* Horace tells Lydia that her charms are failing: she is courted less and less, and the time will come when she will weep in a lonely alley as the north wind rages, full of desire, and

*non sine questu
lacta quod pubes hedera virenti
gaudeat pulla magis atque myrto,
aridas frondis hiemis sodali
dedicet Euro.*

Nisbet-Hubbard translate "rejoices in green ivy rather than dark myrtle," and explain that three ages are involved: "*virenti* means 'fresh and young' (like evergreen leaves in the spring), *pulla* 'dark', almost 'dingy', while *aridas* obviously refers to the 'sere and yellow leaf' of autumn." For the threefold division, they quote *A.P.* 12.215 (Strato), *ib.* 5.304, and Donne's "Yong Beauties," "Autumnall face" and "Winter-faces." Others take *atque* to mean "and", not "than," and see the opposition of *virenti hedera*, *pulla myrto* as ornamental. This, say Nisbet-Hubbard, is much less "compressed and forceful," and "blurs the much more significant contrast between *viridi* and *aridas*."

A fragment of Anacreon, quoted by the scholiast on Soph. *Ant.* 134 *τανταλωθεῖς*, which he explains as *ἀνασεισθεῖς*, runs:

μελαμφύλλω δάφνη χλωρῇ τ' ἐλαίᾳ τανταλίζει (fr. 98[443] Page).

No satisfactory interpretation of these words has been given. But if we assume that their context was something like that of the Horace passage, we get good sense: *τανταλίζω* will mean "set swinging," "stir up" with love, and *μελαμφύλλω*, *χλωρῇ* will correspond to *pulla*, *virenti*. Their conjunction (τε) would signify the bloom of youth, and be followed by some contrast, perhaps between youth and old age as in Horace.¹⁹ There would

¹⁹Anacreon's words as they are quoted make no plausible metre (Alcman fr. 16 P is the nearest). But if we suppose a gap after *δάφνη*, they fit readily enough into the scheme of fr. 2 (347) P καὶ κόμης ἢ τοι τὸν ἄβρὸν|ἐσκίασεν αὐχένα, with *δάφνη* at verse-end: (-) μελαμφύλλω δάφνη|(- -) χλωρῇ τ' ἐλαίᾳ τανταλίζει (- -) etc. Fr. 98 might thus come from the same poem about Smerdies. That it does not immediately precede fr. 2 is however shown by an unpublished Oxyrrhyncus papyrus in which some letters of the following three lines are preserved. (I owe this information to Mr Lobel, who thinks the lines too fragmentary for restoration.)

then be a presumption that *atque* means "and," not "than," though not a strong one, since Horace could perfectly well improve on his original. But would it be an improvement?

A mere ornamental conjunction, say Nisbet-Hubbard, blurs a significant distinction between spring and high summer, since *pullus*, "almost 'dingy'," is contrasted with *virenti*. Varro (*R.R.* 3.12.5) uses it of the colour of a hare's back; Columella (1. *praef.* 24) of good, dark soil; Horace uses it of ripe figs, a colour most people find attractive, and so evidently did he (*Epod.* 16.46 *suamque pulla ficus ornat arborem*). Ovid (*Am.* 2.4.41) so describes the hair of a dark girl, as opposed to one who is *candida* or *flava*, but even so he can be fired by her (39–44). Since he is stressing his susceptibility, the sense might be: "I can fall in love even with a mousy-haired girl." But Ovid has more vanity than the lovers in Lucretius 4:²⁰ clearly it means "dark," with no pejorative overtones, and is contrasted with the conventional blonde. It is true that in some contexts the word has a negative tone: used of dark clothing, it implies "poor" or "funereal." But there is no evidence that this special implication carries over into the literal usage.

If *pullus* is not in itself pejorative, the contrast is not blurred if *atque* means "and" not "than": the opposition is between women in their youth and prime on the one hand, and women in the sere and yellow leaf on the other. There is indeed a contrast which is not simply one of colour (hence the rather heavy conjunction *atque*), but it is between "young" and "mature" rather than between "fresh" and "dingy." But *atque*, say Nisbet-Hubbard, is better taken as "than," because the sense it gives is more forceful and compressed. This would perhaps follow from their apparent conviction, already noted, that the merits of a poem vary directly with its complexity, but this is a conviction we need not share. Which interpretation best suits the context?

There are two ways of reading this ode. According to the first, favoured by Nisbet-Hubbard, the main point throughout is that the poet is asking for Lydia's favours, and that she has reached an age when fewer and fewer men do so. In 1–8 Horace tells her that her charms are fading; so, he implies, she would be wise not to reject him. In the last stanza the same implication is present: Lydia is no longer young enough for the *laeta pubes*; Horace, who does not himself spurn *pulla myrtus*, is her last chance—if she rejects him, she will regret it when she is too old for anyone. *Pulla myrtus* is then contrasted with *hedera virens* and *aridae frondes* as the intermediate stage in which this last chance is lost. This may be right, but it has far more point if we are to think of Horace as being no

²⁰The implication of *Ars Am.* 1.269, 343, etc. that all is grist to the aspiring lover's mill, is rather more suitable when Ovid is assuming the rôle of instructor.

longer young and contrasting himself with the *laeta pubes*.²¹ There is nothing in the poem to suggest this, however, and the persona of the ageing lover should not be imported from other odes. (C. 4.13 is quite different, since there the motif of revenge gives place to reminiscence of the poet's own past.) Moreover, although the *paraclausithuron* underlies the first two stanzas, the ode as a whole, as Nisbet-Hubbard point out, is not a *paraclausithuron*. We need not therefore regard the request for favours, implied at the beginning, as implicit also in the close.

As I read it, the poet has accepted his rejection: at v.9 the revenge motif takes over. By the time Lydia weeps in her alley, she is old (*anus*), and her charms are gone completely. It is nothing to her whether her unresponsive gallants are pursuing girls rather than women in their prime; her complaint is that they are not pursuing *her*. It is true that in v.6 Horace implies that Lydia is losing her charms gradually, and it is true that poets sometimes distinguish three ages, corresponding to the seasons, instead of the usual contrast between youth and old age. But the first point is relevant only to the first two stanzas, and the second does not arise at all. The logic of the poem, as I interpret it, requires in the last stanza a straight contrast between desirable youth or maturity and undesirable old age, and it is this contrast that is blurred by the threefold distinction which Nisbet-Hubbard seek to impose on it.²²

C. 3.6. *Delicta maiorum immeritus lues* begins with the need for Rome to restore her decayed temples if she is to regain the favour of the gods which recent disasters have shown to be in abeyance; then moves on to the inner corruption which also needs reform, if the rebuilding is to have any real significance. Precocious girls think of nothing but sex; soon they put their desires into practice, as they look for young lovers at their husbands' parties. Then comes the final depravity: they are prostituted by their own complaisant husbands, and that too to casual and socially inferior strangers:

*Mox iuniores quaerit adulteros
inter mariti vina, neque eligit
cui donet impermissa raptim
gaudia luminibus remotis,*

²¹That Horace's age is relevant is (as she tells me) Miss Hubbard's view; it does not figure in Nisbet-Hubbard's commentary, and I understand from Professor Nisbet that he does not share it.

²²Nisbet replies that since in any case *myrtus* = maturity is on my interpretation distinguished from *hedera* = youth, so as to avoid a merely inert and ornamental contrast, and since there is a known topos (*AP* 12.215, 5.304) in which three ages are distinguished, it is natural to see the topos in play here: *magis atque* therefore means "more than." But this argument is met by my main point: when Lydia is old, the comparative neglect of middle-aged women is irrelevant.

*sed iussa coram non sine conscio
surgit marito, seu vocat institor
seu navis Hispanae magister,
dedecorum pretiosus emptor.*

The theme of the *leno maritus* as the ultimate degradation of marriage is naturally a motif of satire. Juvenal (1.55 ff.) describes such a husband

doctus et ad calicem vigilanti stertere naso,

an evident allusion to Lucilius, who puts the phrase *non omnibus dormio* (1223) into the mouth of a certain Cippius, called the "snoring partner" (Pararenchon) because he feigned sleep so that his wife could carry on with impunity²³. Now Suetonius says of Augustus (*Div. Aug.* 69) *adulteria quidem exercuisse ne amici quidem negant*, and adds that Mark Antony, among other attacks, *super festinatas Liviae nuptias obiecit et feminam consularem e triclinio viro coram in cubiculum abductam, rursus in convivium rubentibus auriculis incomptiore capillo reductam*. He goes on to quote further remarks of Antony about Octavian's liaisons, said to be from one of Antony's letters to him. Some hostile letters of Antony were common property: one is quoted by Cicero (*Phil.* 13.10.22), and others were referred to by Cremutius Cordus at his trial in A.D. 25 (*Tac. Ann.* 4.34); and Antony certainly attacked Octavian's morals (*Cic. Phil.* 3.6.15). But if there was any letter, real or fictitious, on which this intimate piece of abuse was based, it cannot have been current when Horace wrote *C.* 3.6, since in that case he could hardly have used the words *sed iussa coram non sine conscio surgit marito*; that would be too near the bone.

The background of *C.* 3.6 is Augustus' move to restore the temples in 28 B.C. At the same time he tried to carry through the moral reforms at which Horace hints in 17 ff., but failed; it was not until 18 B.C. that the status of marriage was given additional sanctions by the *Lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis* and *de maritandis ordinibus*. These sanctions were strongly opposed before they became law, and frequently broken afterwards (*Dio* 54.19). It would not be surprising if they provoked a smear campaign against their author, in which the relevant aspects of his private life were exposed to view, and if necessary invented. One way of safely authenticating such scandals would be to project them into the past and attribute them to Antony, whose attacks were well known. It is in this guise that Suetonius (*loc. cit.*) presents the scandal of Augustus and Maecenas' wife Terentia: *quid te mutavit, quod reginam in eo? uxor mea est . . . tu deinde solam Drusillam inis? ita valeas, uti tu, hanc epistolam*

²³*Festus*, 173.5; cf. *Cic. Fam.* 7.24.1. In Plutarch's *Amatorius* (*Mor.* 760a), the buffoon Gabbas, the butt of Augustus, gives his wife a free hand with Maecenas and adapts Lucilius to the occasion when a slave tries to steal the wine: Μαικήνη μόνω καθεύδω.

cum leges, non inieris Tertullam aut Terentillam . . . aut omnes. That Octavian should have seduced Terentia at the age of, say, fifteen is not likely to be true,²⁴ any more than the story that he had *matres familiae et adultas aetate virgines* stripped for inspection as though at an auction sale (*ib.*) These are the traditional outrages of tyrants.²⁵ The stories about Augustus and Terentia must have started much later; the rumours reached a climax of extravagance in 16 B.C., when, Dio tells us, it was said that Augustus left for Gaul to avoid them, or even to have Terentia live with him there.

It would be tempting to see C. 2.12 against this background: Augustus returns from Spain in 24, his name is linked with Terentia's, and Horace defends both—and perhaps Maecenas too (cf. n. 23)—in a poem which describes in intimate detail the passionate relationship between Maecenas and his wife. But the equation of Licymnia with Terentia, favoured by commentators ancient and modern,²⁶ is very unlikely. To describe a married couple in such terms would be a breach of decorum extraordinary even in an epithalamion, which this ode manifestly is not. The literary analogies for the priamel of topics, particularly Propertius 2.1,²⁷ strongly suggest that we are to understand Horace's subject to be his own mistress, not Maecenas' wife.²⁸ It is just conceivable that besides this primary intention there is an enigmatic reference to Terentia, robbed of offence by its allusiveness. But I doubt if allusions of this kind are to be looked for in Horace's poetry. The metrical identity of Licymnia and Terentia is best regarded as a mere accident.

There is then no need to suppose that the scandal blew up so soon after Augustus' return from Spain, before the publication of Odes 1–3. A politically plausible time for the smear campaign, which underlies all Suetonius' scandals in *Div. Aug.* 69,²⁹ is shortly before the passing of the *Leges Juliae* in 18, when the execution of Licinius Murena was already past history and Maecenas had retired from public life. The smoke had still not cleared when Augustus left for Gaul in 16; whether there was in

²⁴Terentia might indeed be older than this and already married to Maecenas in 32. But in that case, if it was a well-known fact that Octavian had seduced her then, it is surprising that he remained on such good terms with Maecenas; though it is true that the private attitudes of Augustus and his circle to such matters may not have conformed very closely to his public policy.

²⁵Cf. e.g., Hdt. 5.80.5; Eur. *Suppl.* 452–455, with Collard's note.

²⁶Most recently by Gordon Williams (above, note 18) 300 ff.

²⁷As Miss Hubbard points out to me, cf. W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (1960) 34.

²⁸Nisbet would stress the fact that Licymnia is evidently older than the nymphs (*non . . . dedecuit*): she must therefore be a real person. Perhaps she was, but that does not make her the wife of Maecenas.

²⁹Cf. the story in Dio 54.19 that Augustus insisted on a beauty contest between Terentia and Livia, which looks like a variation on the theme of stripping *matres familiae*, etc. in Suet. *Div. Aug.* 69 (quoted above).

fact any fire it is perhaps pointless to speculate. The story in Plutarch about Gabbas' complaisance, *Μακρήνq μόνw καθέδω*,³⁰ might be an earlier sighting shot in this campaign, a milder attack directed not at Augustus himself but at his close associate. It would be a nice irony if *C.* 3.6.29 *sed iussa coram non sine conscio | surgit marito* inspired the words attributed to Antony in Suetonius. But perhaps that too is idle speculation.

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD

³⁰See above, note 23.