A PARADE OF LYRIC PREDECESSORS:
HORACE *C.* 1.12–1.18

M. LOWRIE

THE SEQUENCES that are generally accepted in Horace's *Odes* show both formal linkage and a shared subject or purpose. Metrical patterning has been a favored clue to a deeper connection between groups of poems. The Parade Odes opening the first collection of *Odes* are characterized by metrical diversity; an alternation of Sapphics and Alcaics joins the first eleven poems of book two into a significant whole; the Roman Odes at the beginning of book three comprise the largest group to share a single meter, Alcaics.[1] In each group an identifiable metrical pattern signals a common purpose, whether based on similarity or the principle of *variatio*. I would like to propose a sequence that has gone unnoticed presumably because the formal feature linking it is not metrical. In *C.* 1.12–18 Horace alludes successively to a number of important Greek lyric predecessors and the combined weight of these allusions establishes a poetic program, an internal connection revealing a purpose outside shared subject matter. This sequence follows on the Parade Odes and extends their program. Horace's roll-call of *lyrici vates* defines the tradition he reinvents with *Odes* 1–3; in inscribing himself

---

The following will be cited by author's name alone: S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study* (New Haven 1962); G. Davis, "*Ingenii cumba?* Literary aporia and the rhetoric of Horace's *O navis referent* (C. 1.14)," *RhM* 132 (1989) 331–345 = Davis, "*Ingenii cumba*"; G. Davis, *Polyhymnia, The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley 1991) = Davis, *Polyhymnia*; E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957); G. L. Hendrickson, "The First Publication of Horace's *Odes*," *CP* 26 (1931) 1–10; A. Kiessling, "Horatius I: Zur Chronologie und Anordnung der Oden," *Philologische Untersuchungen* 2 (1881) 48–75; A. Kiessling and R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus*[6] (Berlin 1917); R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1* (Oxford 1970); D. Porter, *Horace's Poetic Journey* (Princeton 1987); W. Race, " 'That Man' in Sappho fr. 31 L–P," *CA* 2 (1983) 92–101; M. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes* (Chapel Hill 1986); B. Seidensticker, "Zu Horaz, *C.* 1.1–9," *Gymnasium* 83 (1976) 26–34; H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz, Eine Interpretation der Oden, Band I, Erstes und zweites Buch* (Darmstadt 1972); A. J. Woodman, "Horace, *Epistles* 1,19,23–40," *MusHelv* 40 (1983) 75–81.

[1]Parade Odes: Santirocco 42; Porter 15; also see discussion below, n. 5. Book two: W. Port, "Die Anordnung in den Gedichtbüchern der augusteischen Zeit," *Philologus* 81 (1926) 299–300; W. Ludwig, "Zu Horaz, C. 2,1–12," *Hermes* 85 (1957) 336–345; H. Eisenberger, "Bilden die Horazischen Oden 2.1–12 einen Zyklus?," *Gymnasium* 87 (1980) 262–274; Santirocco 85; Porter 12, 109. Roman Odes: C. Witke, *Horace's Roman Odes: A Critical Examination* (Leiden 1983, *Mnemosyne* Supp. 77); Santirocco 110–112 (bibliography 203, n. 7); Porter 13, 152.

into this tradition, he asserts both his similarity to and difference from his predecessors.

The two most recent treatments of arrangement in the *Odes* have re-opened the question of where the Parade Odes end and, since my proposed sequence follows on the recognized parade, the articulation of the two will be at issue. M. Santirocco favors a narrow definition: in a group defined by metrical diversity, the first repetition of a meter (Sapphics) at *C*. 1.10 signals closure.[2] D. Porter views the repetition of Sapphics in *C*. 1.10 and again in *C*. 1.12, with a new meter in between, as a flourish bringing the sequence to an end; responsion to *C*. 1.2 accounts for *C*. 1.12's climactic position.[3] Santirocco does grant that Horace blurred the edges of the sequence: the issues of the parade continue beyond its formal end, with *C*. 1.12 providing a second closure to the group.[4] The two views differ more in emphasis than radically disagree.[5] Since the parade of lyric predecessors begins with *C*. 1.12 and is defined according to a formal principle different from the metrical parade, I suggest that the poems between the two sequences allow the first formal principle, metrical variety, to fade while preserving an essential connection. In the first sequence we find a series of different lyric meters, shortly thereafter we find a series of different lyric predecessors; the common denominator is lyric and the lyric tradition. This second sequence continues the lyric parade on the programmatic level while shifting the formal terms in such a way that formalists and essentialists should both be satisfied.

[2] Santirocco 42.

[3] Porter 15.

[4] Porter 58–77; Santirocco 42–43. Since these two books were written without knowledge of each other, my juxtaposition of their views is strictly for the sake of the argument.

[5] W. von Christ, "Über die Verskunst des Horaz im Lichte der alten Überlieferung," *SBMünch* (1868, 1) 1–44, at 36, n. 12, called attention to the principle of metrical variety in the first nine odes. Kiessling argued that the Sapphics in *C*. 1.10 are a variant on the usual meter and that the sequence extends until the first real repetition in *C*. 1.12. Although Seidensticker argues for a more narrowly formal definition, Kiessling added a thematic element to the discussion by suggesting that the ring formed by *C*. 1.12 and *C*. 1.2 in subject matter as well as meter continues the sequence. While Porter emphasizes content over form and Santirocco the opposite, they each recognize a link between *C*. 1.2, 1.10, and 1.12 in both theme and form—all in Sapphics and distributing the terms Augustus and Mercury between them. Another recent work on arrangement in the *Odes*, H. Dettmer, *Horace: A Study in Structure* (Hildesheim 1983) has other interests and does not really add to the debate about the Parade Odes. The actual term "parade" appears as a metaphor later than the idea of a metrically determined sequence, apparently for the first time in W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*[7] 2 (Leipzig 1920) 55. Since the word does not appear in earlier editions, it seems to have been added by W. Kroll or F. Skutsch, who reworked this edition: see L. Edmunds, *From a Sabine Jar: Reading Horace, Odes 1.9* (Chapel Hill 1992) 43, n. 5.

By and large the allusions in the seven odes from *C.* 1.12 through *C.* 1.18 are to passages that were not only famous in antiquity, but could and still can be seen as representative of their authors. In each ode a single lyric poet predominates; in *C.* 1.16 and 1.17 an additional non-lyric poet is set against the lyric. In order, Horace alludes to Pindar in *C.* 1.12, Sappho in *C.* 1.13, Alcaeus in *C.* 1.14, Bacchylides in *C.* 1.15, Stesichorus and Archilochus in *C.* 1.16, Anacreon and Homer in *C.* 1.17, Alcaeus again in *C.* 1.18. Archilochus and Homer contribute to Horace's lyric definition by the contrast first with iambic poetry, stylistically lower than lyric, secondly with epic, stylistically higher. The repetition of Alcaeus, analogous to the repetition of the Sapphics in the metrical parade, signals closure.

Some of these allusions are more secure than others, but all have been proposed independently from my thesis and hold their own in commentaries.[6] I mean "allusion" in its broadest sense: Horace can evoke a predecessor with a verbal reminiscence, or simply point to the predecessor by a topos originating with him or her, or mention the poet so to speak by name (e.g., *fide Teia, C.* 1.17.18). For the sake of the argument, I assume that lack of absolute security in several cases is the fault of the Greek lyric transmission rather than due to fantasy on the part of ancient (or modern) commentators.

Another caveat: the proposed sequence is a surface feature linking these poems in a static arrangement. Allusion to a Greek lyric predecessor in this parade is the formal equivalent of the metrical variety in the Parade Odes; I will return to the dynamic readings of these poems by Santirocco and Porter, and while this sequence does not by and large conflict with either of their views, I would not be disturbed if the static arrangement turned out to have slightly different boundaries from the groupings we perceive on reading the poems in order. As a surface feature the sequence of allusions should not affect the interpretation of the individual odes as wholes, even if participation in the sequence may highlight a given ode's programmatic function or endow it with a previously unrecognized programmatic role (*C.* 1.15). I do not mean to suggest new interpretations of these seven poems except to the extent that linking them sheds new light on the group.

C. 1.12 opens with a motto from Pindar: *quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio? / quem deum?* (1–3).[7] Horace virtually translates Pindar's τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ'ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; ...

---

[6]E.g., Nisbet and Hubbard. I take their views to establish the *communis opinio* unless otherwise stated.

[7]Nisbet and Hubbard 143. On the "motto," see Fraenkel 159, n. 2: "This sort of limited adoption will often be found when a classicistic school of poetry insists on its connexion with some admired forerunners."

(*O.* 2.2), with the exception of a complete transposition of the order of god, hero and man.[8] Pindar answers the question in the same order over the next three lines: Zeus, Heracles, and Theron.[9] Horace takes the rest of the poem to answer and his answer is chiastic. A variety of gods (with Jupiter preeminent) and heroes (starting with Hercules) culminate in the man par excellence: Caesar Augustus. Horace begins and ends with the man—a mark of the distance between his Roman reinvention and the archaic hymnic form, which, if it focuses on Theron, at least begins with the god. The poem's ending further distances Horace from Pindar: the first and last terms of the tricolon meet in the melding of a conditional epinician to Augustus with a hymn to Jupiter. Man and god are no longer distinct.

In the first two lines of this poem Horace joins the lyre, the emblem of monody, with the tibia, that of choral lyric. Sapphics ground the poem in the monodic tradition and the allusion to Pindar in the choral. The evocation of the two branches of lyric functions as a complementary or merism which stands for the genre as a whole.[10] This conjunction of the tibia with the lyre recalls their joint appearance at the end of *C.* 1.1 (*si neque tibias / Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia / Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton* 32–34), the first poem not only of the collection but of the metrical parade. *C.* 1.12, first in this second parade, recalls the programmatic fusion of monody and choral lyric in *C.* 1.1. Horace's *Odes* are monodic in form, but sometimes rise to choral heights. The two instruments are conjoined again in the opening of *C.* 3.4 (*tibia . . . seu fidibus citharave Phoebi* 1–4), where Horace alerts us to the sublimity to follow.

Just as Pindar is the key predecessor to a combined hymn to Jupiter and epinician to the head of state, Sappho is the key predecessor to a love poem. The nature of the allusion, however, is different. Instead of a motto we find rather the descendent of an "illustrious prototype."[11] The physical manifestations of violent emotion in *C.* 1.13 along with the triangular

---

[8]Kiessling and Heinze *ad loc.*; T. Oksala, *Religion und Mythologie bei Horaz, eine literarhistorische Untersuchung* (Helsinki 1973) 92, also notes the chiastic answer.

[9]See the proposed scheme by B. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1890) *ad loc.*

[10]I take it for granted that Horace distinguished between these branches whether or not they were separated by the Greeks: M. Davies, "Monody, Choral Lyric and the Tyranny of the Hand-Book," *CQ* NS 38 (1988) 52–64. For the importance of the complementary, or "dichotomized whole" as a rhetorical device in Horace, see Davis, *Polyhymnia passim.*

[11]Nisbet and Hubbard 169; "una libera ripresa," E. Cavallini, "Saffo e Alceo in Orazio," *MCr* 13–14 (1978–79) 377–380, at 377. Commager (152) thinks that the primary impetus for Horatian imitation was Catullus' translation of Sappho in poem 51; maybe, but one would then expect more specifically Catullan traces in the poem.

relationship of the poet, a female erotic object as the addressee (Lydia) and a male third person (Telephus) recall Sappho 31. The extent to which Horace evokes Sappho herself, as opposed to the tradition of imitation of this poem, is a question which will recur for the role of Alcaeus in the next poem.[12] I assume that when a tradition of imitation intercedes between a famous passage and a later imitation, the history of the topos does not dilute the force of the association with the original author. Clearly it is a question of degrees. In this case, as for Alcaeus in the next poem, the originals were not only famous in themselves, but much more famous than the interceding imitations. The situation would be different if the earliest version were already a topos and did not stand out with the vividness of Sappho's catalogue of symptoms. If anything, a strong history of imitation burnished the reputation of the original.

Additional evidence for Horace's dependence on Sappho is the triangular relationship between the characters in both poems. A difference, however, obtains in the nature of the two triangles. If we accept Marcovich's arguments that Sappho 31 does not represent a love-triangle but that the dispassionate man in the poem is a foil for the poet's own passion, Horace's love-triangle still bears a greater resemblance to Sappho than to the intervening imitations in the presence of three characters, whatever their roles.[13] Horace playfully misreads Sappho 31 as a poem about jealousy— anticipating, or even eliciting one strand of modern interpretation.[14] The reduction of noble feeling to the crass jealousy of a rival is in line with the overall tone of self-mockery that colors the poet's description of his emotion.[15] Horace's ironic treatment of himself sets him apart from Sappho; his refusal to present passion "straight" posits a difference between his

---

[12] H. W. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets* (New York 1963) 234 lists as imitations or descendents Phaedra's love illness in Eur. *Hipp.*, Plato *Phdr.* 251a, Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.962 ff., Theoc. 2.106 ff., Lucr. 3.152, Valerius Aedituus in Gellius 19.9 = Courtney frg. 1.

[13] M. Marcovich, "Sappho fr. 31: Anxiety Attack or Love Declaration?," *CQ* NS 22 (1972) 19–32. In none of the imitations cited by Smyth (above, n. 12) are the symptoms motivated by the presence of a rival, or even of a third person. These imitations strengthen Marcovich's argument that the symptoms in Sappho 31 are those of love, not of jealousy. See also Race 92–101 with other relevant bibliography 94, nn. 8 and 9.

[14] E.g., D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 19–33, especially 28; G. Devereux, "The Nature of Sappho's Seizure in fr. 31 LP as Evidence of Her Inversion," *CQ* NS 20 (1970) 17–31. Race (93, n. 4) suggests that the jealousy interpretation may derive from Hellenistic and Latin love elegy but does not name *C.* 1.13 in particular.

[15] D. West, *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh 1967) 65–71; Nisbet and Hubbard 170 note the colloquialisms; Santirocco 45. P. Keyser, "Horace *Odes* 1.13.3–8, 14–16, Humoural and Aetherial Love," *Philologus* 133 (1989) 75–81, traces medical and philosophical language in the poem. These distancing clinical terms contribute to the poet's light-hearted treatment of his emotion.

lyric and hers.[16] Not of course that Sappho's poem lacks irony and a sense of play, but her passion in itself does not lack dignity.[17]

It is remarkable that Horace shuns the vocabulary of Catullus' translation of Sappho in poem 51; if Horace's self-differentiation from Sappho exposes his poetic debt, his neglect of Catullus here vaunts his originality on his home turf.[18] In addition to self-mockery, a second characteristically Horatian gesture establishes a difference between his love poetry and that of his predecessors and elegiac contemporaries. The closing emphasis on mature love (*felices ter et amplius / quos irrupta tenet copula* ..., 17–18), particularly after the outburst, lends an aura of sophistication to the erotic persona in the *Odes* and distinguishes him from the complaining lover typical of elegy. Horace assimilates Sappho to elegy when he characterizes her as "querentem" (*C.* 2.13.24) and while the lyric lover of the *Odes* may complain, as here (*vae* 3), he does so tongue in cheek. Even Horace's "maturity" turns out to be ironic, since its function as a seductive ploy compromises its authority.[19]

---

[16] I do not mean that Horace trivializes or disparages Sappho either in general or here. Her taking second place to Alcaeus and Horace's ambivalence to passion can both be overstated as a negative reaction to her. See A. La Penna, "Sunt qui Sappho malint," *Maia* 24 (1972) 208–215 on the comparison of Sappho to Alcaeus in *C.* 2.13. Horace appears to leave Sappho behind in *Epist.* 1.19.23–33 (passage cited below), where she falls between Archilochus and Alcaeus. The dependence of both Lesbians on Archilochus is a parallel proving Horace's originality in the *Epodes*, Fraenkel 339–350; see Woodman. Once the Lesbians have been named, Alcaeus provides the transition to the assertion of originality in the *Odes* (*hunc*, 32), but the greater emphasis on Alcaeus, Horace's single most important lyric model, by no means precludes a positive attitude toward Sappho. Why mention her if unimportant?

[17] See Race 95 on Sappho's play.

[18] Syndikus (156) stresses the greater freedom of Horace's poem than Catullus' from its Greek predecessor but does not then consider Horace's relation to his Latin predecessor, which is complex. Horace makes programmatic gestures of excluding Catullus as a predecessor: e.g., not using the Phalaecian hendacasyllable signals a distance from Catullus and from Hellenistic epigram, even though both clearly not only influenced the *Odes* but are objects of allusion. M. O. Lee, "Catullus in the Odes of Horace," *Ramus* 4 (1975) 33–48 sees Catullan influence in *C.* 1.13 (and *C.* 1.25, also addressed to Lydia) as well as allusion to Catullus 51 elsewhere: ". . . [Horace's] Lydia is cast as Catullus' Lesbia (the desire for her causing jealousy and extreme physical sensations in the hapless poet, her last days spent *levis, in angiportu* . . .)" (36); *C.* 1.22.24 *dulce loquentem* alludes to Catullus 51.5 *dulce ridentem*, adding by the way ἆδυ φωνείσας from Sappho 31.3–4, omitted by Catullus (38). What I find interesting is that this latter type of allusive cleverness is displaced onto a poem other than Horace's imitation of Sappho, where we might expect it. See Santirocco 20 on the relation of Catullus and Horace with bibliography at n. 19.

[19] Davis, *Polyhymnia* 39 (maturity in Horatian erotic lyric), 58 (*querela* as a catch phrase for elegy), 85 (the reduction of Sappho) with n. 8 (on *queror*), 39–71 (Horace's complex relation to elegy and the elegiac stance). C. Segal, "Felices ter et amplius, Horace, Odes, I 13," *Latomus* 32 (1973) 39–46, pursues the dialectical relationship be-

The ship imagery of *C.* 1.14 evokes Alcaeus. The derivation of the imagery is separate from its allegorical import, although the issues are closely tied in the scholarship.[20] For my purposes it is sufficient that the poem look to Alcaeus no matter what the ship stands for. Allegorical interpretations of Alcaeus' several ship poems are found in Heraclitus and the scholiasts, and the favored interpretations are the ship of state or political party and the ship as woman.[21] I think that, given the remarks in Heraclitus and the Alcaeus commentaries, we can assume that Alcaeus was known for ship allegories, regardless of whether the commentators interpreted the tenor correctly or even whether their identification of these poems as allegories was in itself correct.[22] There are two aspects to this observation. The first is the particular association of Alcaeus with ship imagery over and above the sizeable tradition of such imagery.[23] Horace certainly associated Alcaeus with ships (*C.* 1.32.8, 2.13.27, both passages cited below). Secondly, a striking aspect shared by the Alcaeus fragments—as far as we can tell—

---

tween the irony and the seriousness of the final lines of the poem in the "pull between the poet as a troubled participant and the poet as wise, aloof spectator" (45). The difference between Horace and Sappho could be that for the latter, irony lies in the gap between the participant and the spectator, for the former, *both* positions are already in themselves rhetorically constructed and ironized.

[20]For the standard version of the ship of state interpretation, deriving from Quintilian, see Fraenkel 154–158; Nisbet and Hubbard 179–182; Syndikus 162–170. Against this view, see W. S. Anderson, "Horace *Carm.* 1.14: What Kind of Ship?," *CP* 61 (1966) 84–98; O. Seel, "Zur Ode 1,14 des Horaz, Zweifel an einer communis opinio," in D. Ableitinger and H. Gugel (eds.), *Festschrift Karl Vretska* (Heidelberg 1970) 204–249; N. K. Zumwalt, "Horace's *Navis* of Love Poetry (*C.* 1.14)," *CW* 71 (1977–78) 249–254; A. J. Woodman, "The Craft of Horace in *Odes* 1.14," *CP* 75 (1980) 60–67; Davis, "*Ingenii cumba*." Anderson shows that *C.* 1.14 is inconsistent with the conventions of the ship of state; Seel objects that Asclepiadeans, especially the third, point to a private meaning; Zumwalt argues for a ship of erotic poetry; Woodman traces the imagery within the ship-of-love conventions; Davis alters the ship of erotic poetry to a self-referential ship of Horace's own poetry. Woodman is the only one to deny the particular influence of Alcaeus. H. J. Jocelyn, "Boats, Women, and Horace *Odes* 1.14," *CP* 77 (1982) 330–335, offers a critique of the ship/woman allegory on the grounds that the topos is not flattering to the woman. Santirocco 46–49, takes further Commager's remark (169) that nothing in the poem tells us what the ship represents, and suggests that the allegory is open.

[21]Page (above, n. 14) 179–197. Woodman ([above, n. 20] 62) points out that whether or not one agrees with Page that the fragmentary commentary of *POxy.* 21.105 has Alcaeus 73 as its subject, the commentary indicates that "Alcaeus was thought in antiquity to have exploited the identification of women with ships."

[22]Davis ("*Ingenii cumba*" 344) calls attention to Pasquali's remark (*Orazio lirico* [Florence 1920] 21) that Horace would have been likely to use a commentary in reading Alcaeus and that such a commentary would have been likely of the Hellenistic, allegorizing variety; see also Fraenkel 156, n. 4.

[23]Woodman ([above, n. 20] 62, n. 14 and 64 with n. 26) emphasizes the tradition of ship imagery and denies a peculiar role to Alcaeus within that tradition.

and Horace's ship poem is their openness to allegorical interpretation: that
is, unlike the ship metaphors cited by Anderson and Woodman, there is no
internal revelation of their tenor.[24] It is in fact the referential indetermi-
nacy of Horace's poem that links it specifically to Alcaeus' ship poems and
distances it from the erotic ship epigrams of the tradition closer to Horace.
Furthermore, the ship poems of Alcaeus were presumably much more fa-
mous than the intervening epigrams.

Short of positing an entirely self-referential "ship of allegory," I would
accept Zumwalt's suggestion that Horace misleads his readers into initially
assuming a political allegory and then, by using imagery consistent with
an erotic allegory, calls into question the appropriateness of "serious," i.e.,
political poetry within lyric.[25] It is the openness of the allegory that allows
for such a shift in meaning.

Under this interpretation the juxtaposition of the ship/war side of Al-
caeus with his love poetry in another Horatian poem has significance for
C. 1.14:[26]

> Lesbio primum modulate civi,
> qui ferox bello, tamen inter arma
> sive iactatam religarat udo
> > litore navim,

> Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
> semper haerentem puerum canebat
> et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque
> > crine decorum.   C. 1.32.5–12

In this passage a "serious Alcaeus" is followed by a "sympotic/erotic Al-
caeus," a movement analogous to the internal progression in C. 1.14 from a
political allegory to metapoetics. The juxtaposition of Sappho and Alcaeus
in C. 2.13 likewise contrasts the erotic with the serious, but here each poet
stands for one term, as in the juxtaposition of the Sapphic C. 1.13 with

---

[24]Anderson ([above, n. 20] 93–94) cites Theognis 457–460 and Cat. 64.97–98, both
of which are formally similes. Woodman ([above, n. 20] 62–63) quotes three epigrams,
Anth. Pal. 5.44, 161, 204, that use the ship-woman metaphor, but each epigram contains
the name of at least one woman and Woodman rightly speaks of metaphor in these cases,
not allegory.

On the openness of C. 1.14, see Santirocco 48. R. G. M. Nisbet in the opening
lecture of the annual meeting of the Classical Association in Durham, England, April
1993, attacked those who would see Horace's allegory as open. He believes that an
allegory must have a single, determinate meaning and that the ship of state remains the
most likely.

[25]Zumwalt (above, n. 20) 254; Davis ("Ingenii cumba" 332 and 344) sees this shift as
an implicit subversion of the political reading and of the critical clichés that produced
such a reading of Alcaeus, and indeed of Horace himself.

[26]Zumwalt (above, n. 20) 254.

the Alcaic and—at least at first reading—political *C.* 1.14:[27] in *C.* 1.13 the poet complains about a female love-interest; *C.* 1.14 treats the travails of a ship:

> *Aeoliis fidibus querentem*
> *Sappho puellis de popularibus,*
> *et te sonantem plenius aureo,*
> *Alcaee, plectro dura navis,*
> *dura fugae mala, dura belli!*   *C.* 2.13.24–28

Each of these passages reveals something about our sequence. *C.* 2.13 polarizes the Lesbian poets in a complementary: erotic and serious topics cover the range of monody and this range is likewise suggested by *C.* 1.13 and 1.14 taken together. A similar complementary obtains in the portrait of Alcaeus on his own, both in *C.* 1.32 and within the dynamic internal to *C.* 1.14.[28]

Porphyrio informs us that *C.* 1.15's model was a dithyramb by Bacchylides: *hac ode Bacchylidem imitatur. nam ut ille Cassandram facit vaticinari futura belli Troiani ita hic Proteum.*[29] This uniquely narrative Horatian ode makes a ring with *C.* 1.12, the choral poets encircling the Aeolic, and rather than representing the most characteristic side of Bacchylides *qua* poet, the poem embodies the aspect of choral lyric that went unrepresented in *C.* 1.12, namely mythological narrative.[30] *C.* 1.15 is emblematic for many Horatian narratives within his discourse-centered lyric:

---

[27]Horace often links individual predecessors with a conspicuous aspect of their tradition in such a way as to simplify both the tradition and the predecessor's role within it. Archilochus is synonymous with iambic poetry, which itself is simplified and means invective (*numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi, Epist* 1.19.24–25; *Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo, Ars P.* 79), Pindar stands for loftly lyric (*C.* 4.2; in *C.* 4.9.6, he follows immediately after Homer; *Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus, Epist.* 1.3.10), Sappho is strictly a love poet (*Aeoliis fidibus querentem / Sappho puellis de popularibus, C.* 2.13.24–25; *spirat adhuc amor / vivuntque commissi calores / Aeoliae fidibus puellae, C.* 4.9.10–12). On Horace's simplification of predecessors as paradigms, see Davis, *Polyhymnia* 85, 139–140.

[28]On the contrast between Horace's simplification of Alcaeus as representative of high monody and the fuller view expressed in *C.* 1.32, as well as on complementaries, see Davis, *Polyhymnia* 85–86, 139–140.

[29]Nisbet and Hubbard 188–189.

[30]F. Cairns, "Five 'Religious' Odes of Horace," *AJP* 92 (1971) 447–448 calls attention to the syntactical structure of the opening of Simonides 13D = *PMG* 38 (543) as a parallel for the syntax of the first strophe of *C.* 1.15. He concludes that this form represents a distinct category of poem characteristic of early Greek lyric and that Porphyrio was probably right to look back to Greek lyric as a model for this ode and almost certainly right about Bacchylides. If Horace was imitating the subject matter of an ode by Bacchylides and the syntax of one by Simonides—if Cairns's pattern should be less common than he supposes—the joining of these poets reinforces the importance not of a single lyric predecessor, but of the branch of the genre.

a brief narrative introduction yields to a speech by a character so that discourse reasserts its control.[31] Dithyramb was generally associated with narrative in antiquity, and Horace certainly associates dithyramb with the high style of choral lyric (*C*. 4.2.10).[32]

Within the four poems of the sequence we have looked at so far, two salient aspects of choral lyric, praise of men and of gods on the one hand and mythological narrative on the other, enclose Horace's complementary for monody. Various elements in these poems (hymnic form, epinician to Augustus, mythological narrative, allegory) are fully integrated only later in the Roman Odes. The juxtaposition of choral with monodic lyricists here is paradigmatic for the mixture of public and personal throughout Horatian lyric. It is the isolation and definition of different lyric elements within these individual poems that constitutes their programmatic burden.

The operative lyric predecessor in *C*. 1.16 is Stesichorus. Porphyrio and Ps.-Acro recognize the Stesichorean background of *recantare* in line 27, which calques *palinodein*,[33] and it has been suggested that the first line of the poem *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior* has the form of a "typical Horatian motto"[34] and also the form of taking something back.[35] Neither of the first lines of Stesichorus' palinodes to Helen nor the line from the Cologne Archilochus, which has also been suggested as the source for the motto, is close enough in my view to Horace's line to be the actual source.[36]

[31]Compare *Epodes* 13, *C*. 1.7, 3.3, 3.5, 3.11, 3.27, 4.4. *C*. 3.3 is unusual in ending with authorial comment, *C*. 3.5 in that narrative ends the poem. Who speaks the final stanza in *C*. 4.4 is disputed. For speeches in the *Odes* see R. Helm, "Reden in den Oden des Horaz," *Philologus* 90 (1935) 353–371.

[32]A. E. Harvey, "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry," *CQ* NS 5 (1955) 173. A. Hardie's suggestion that dithyramb lies behind *nunc est bibendum* ("Horace Odes 1,37 and Pindar Dithyramb 2," in Francis Cairns [ed.], *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 1976* [Liverpool 1977] 113–140) supports the high-style associations of the genre.

[33]Ps.-Acro: *imitatus* [*est*] *Stesichorum poetam Siculum, qui uituperationem Helenae scribens caecatus est, at postea responso Apollinis laudem eius scripsit et oculorum adspectum recepit. cuius rei et in Epodon libro poeta meminit* (17.42): *infamis Helenae Castor offensus vice / fraterque magni Castoris uicti prece / adempta uati reddidere lumina.* Porphyrio: *hac ode* παλινῳδίαν *repromittit ei in quam probrosum carmen scripserat Tyndaridae cuidam, amicae suae, id est recantaturus ea quae dixerat dicitque se iracundia motum haec scripsisse.*

[34]Nisbet and Hubbard ad loc. refer to F. Ritter, *Q. Horatius Flaccus* 1 (Leipzig 1856–57) ad loc., who thinks that the words of Horace's first line were *ad exemplum Stesichori expressa.* Also Hendrickson 4 and 6.

[35]Syndikus 181. See F. Cairns, "The Genre Palinode and Three Horatian Examples: *Epode*, 17; *Odes*, I, 16; *Odes*, I, 34," *Antiquité classique* 47 (1978) 546–552.

[36]For the Stesichorus, see Nisbet and Hubbard 202; for Archilochus, see Davis, *Polyhymnia* 76, n. 78. M. Marcovich, "A New Poem of Archilochus: *P. Colon.* inv. 7511," *GRBS* 16 (1975) 5–14, at 8, ad line 7 gives the first line of *C*. 1.16 as a parallel for addressing a daughter in a way that pays a compliment to her mother (which of course

Nevertheless even without an identifiable motto this poem strongly evokes not just one but two archaic predecessors. Archilochus underlies the *iambi* from which the poet now distances himself (3; 24). The palinode is generic and Horace's recantation has everything to do with lyric definition.[37] Horace makes a point of disavowing the iambic, Archilochean poetry of the *Epodes* in the service of generic definition in the *Odes*. In *Epistles* 1.19 meter and the proper names of his generic predecessors (my emphasis below) identify Horace's shift from iambic poetry to lyric.

> *Parios ego primus iambos*
> *ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus*
> *Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben.*
> *ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes*
> *quod timui mutare modos et carminis artem,*
> *temperat Archilochi Musam pede mascula Sappho,*
> *temperat Alcaeus, sed rebus et ordine dispar,*
> *nec socerum quaerit quem versibus oblinat atris,*
> *nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit.*
> *hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus*
> *vulgavi fidicen.*   *Epistles* 1.19.23–33

The emphasis on meter and generic forebears accords with the opening programmatic sequences in the *Odes*: a parade of meters and a parade of predecessors. In *C.* 1.16 Horace embraces lyric over the iambics of the *Epodes* not only by his rhetoric of recantation, which in itself alludes to Stesichorus, but by the generic application of the technique: affirmation of Stesichorus goes hand in hand with disavowal of Archilochus, the pre-eminent Greek predecessor of the *Epodes*. *C.* 1.17 has a number of features that link it to *C.* 1.16: they are both in Alcaics; Tyndaris, the addressee, continues the covert references to Helen;[38] and this poem also engages in generic definition by setting two poets against each other. In each case lyric scores a rhetorical point over a rival genre. Here the genre is epic and Anacreon is instrumental to converting Homer into lyric. Tyndaris' transformation from the epic Helen of Troy to a Greek slave girl is one sign of lyric's ascendency over epic, but it is the song that she will sing that is most telling for the genre:[39]

---

reverts back to the daughter), but does not suggest that Horace's line was modeled on Archilochus.

[37]The lyric program in this poem in combination with the next was suggested by Hendrickson and taken up more recently by Syndikus 180–187, Santirocco 51, and Davis, *Polyhymnia* 74–77. Kiessling and Heinze (103) had already suggested the generic relevance of the lyric distance from epodic anger in *C.* 1.16.

[38]Hendrickson 7.

[39]Santirocco 52 and Davis, *Polyhymnia* 203.

> fide Teia
> dices laborantis in uno
> Penelopen vitreamque Circen.   C. 1.17.18–20

The plot of the Odyssey is reduced to a love-triangle that reflects—genders reversed—the love-triangle in the poem between Tyndaris, the poet, and Cyrus. That Tyndaris is to sing this song on the lyre of Anacreon follows the pattern where one of the canonic lyric poets has served as the locus for establishing Horace's own lyric task.

The sequence closes with a repetition. A secure motto from Alcaeus opens C. 1.18: *nullam, Vare, sacra uite prius severis arborem*; μηδ' ἐν ἄλλο φυτεύσῃς πρότερον δένδριον ἀμπέλω, Alcaeus 342 LP.[40] Closure is signalled by returning to a poet who has already figured in the sequence, and by the return to the pattern of the first four poems that announce their allegiance in the first strophe. If the opening of C. 1.16 is in fact a motto of Stesichorus, it conforms to the pattern of the preceding four poems (it certainly announces its relation to Archilochus with *iambis* in the third line); without a Stesichorean motto, it falls more in line with C. 1.17, where the model poet appears closer to the end.

Why do I not include C. 1.19 in the sequence? It opens with a reminiscence of Philodemus, if not a motto in the strict sense: *mater saeua Cupidinum*; Κύπρι Πόθων μῆτερ ἀελλοπόδων, AP 10.21.2.[41] The phrase, however, seems to be conventional and Horace's poem does not bear an additional mark of similarity to the epigram, as we saw in the case of possible conventions in C. 1.13 and 1.14.[42] C. 1.19 brings us halfway through the first book of *Odes* and closes the door on the opening parades; C. 1.20 provides a new start with the address to Maecenas. As we saw in the Parade Odes, however, it is characteristic of Horace to blur the boundaries of sequences. Here the blurring consists first of a convention in the place of a more firm allusion, and secondly, even with a secure reference, Philodemus would mark a category shift. Instead of an archaic lyric predecessor, we find a contemporary epigrammatist. While Horace clearly owes as much, if not more, to Hellenistic epigram as to archaic lyric, the epigrammatists function differently from the archaic predecessors as normative figures. Horace brings the canonical lyric poets to the fore as influences by naming them; the proper names of the Hellenistic poets go unmentioned in the *Odes* and

---

[40]Nisbet and Hubbard 228. My arguments from here to the end of the paper owe much to A. J. Woodman, who suggests an analogy between the metrical ring composition in the Parade Odes and the allusive one here (see below, 46).

[41]J. A. Richmond, "Horace's 'Mottoes' and Catullus 51," *RhM* 113 (1970) 202. He defines a motto as a first line that alludes to another first line, although he is not bothered by τίνα θεόν ... of Pindar O. 2 being a second line.

[42]Nisbet and Hubbard *ad loc.* also cite Pindar fr. 122.4 ματέρ' ἐρώτων, Bacch. 9.73, Orph. *Hymn.* 55.8, Babrius 32.2.

the contemporary poets who are mentioned are Latin poets (Vergil, Varius, Albius—whether or not identical with Tibullus—, Pollio, Valgius, Iullus Antonius).

It does not appear coincidental that the catalogue of poets listed by Horace in the fourth book of *Odes* correponds closely to the catalogue established in this second parade:

> *non, si priores Maeonius tenet*
> *sedes Homerus, Pindaricae latent*
>   *Ceaeque et Alcaei minaces*
>   *Stesichorique graves Camenae;*
>
> *nec, si quid olim lusit Anacreon,*
> *delevit aetas; spirat adhuc amor*
>   *vivuntque commissi calores*
>   *Aeoliae fidibus puellae.*   *C.* 4.9.5–12

There are two differences between the poets listed here and those of *C.* 1.12–18. Archilochus has been left out – appropriately since only positive models occur here; Bacchylides has been replaced by Simonides, in line with my suggestion that it is not the individual poet at issue in *C.* 1.15 but rather some representative of choral lyric.[43] One choral poet substitutes for another, but the subject matter of *C.* 1.15 returns under the guise of a narration of the Trojan War, starting in line 13. The two versions yield a number of resemblances: the opening focuses on adultery; a periphrasis denotes Paris and mention is made of his hair; the proper names Helene, Teucer, Sthenelus are shared; focus falls briefly on one hero after another within the narration, which is compressed. Homer is included, as he and the elevated subject matter reflect well not only on Lollius, but on the poet. If Horace can openly assert Homer's preeminence here, it is because he has already incorporated him within his lyric earlier. The catalogue in itself establishes the tradition to which Horace belongs, but by looking back to the second parade in his first collection of *Odes* he reminds his audience of his credentials as a *vates sacer* (28).[44]

---

[43]See above, n. 30. Fraenkel (424) suggests that Ceos denotes both Simonides and Bacchylides. The functional interchangeability of these two poets may be facilitated by their belonging not only to the same genre, but to the same family.

[44]Syndikus (2.379) remarks that these six names stand for the entire canon of Greek lyric poets—a type of synecdoche. It is noteworthy that Horace's shorter canon corresponds to Dionysius of Halicarnassus' shorter canon (*de imitatione* Usener-Radermacher 421 ff.), at least of the serious poets. Horace separates the two lighter erotic poets Anacreon and Sappho from the stanza containing Pindar, Simonides, Alcaeus, and Stesichorus. These last four are the lyric poets Dionysius recommends for imitation, as does Quintilian (10.1.61 ff.), who is dependent on Dionysius. See J. Cousin, *Études sur Quintilien* (Amsterdam 1967) 552–554 and *Quintilien, Institution Oratoire* 6 (Paris 1979) *ad loc.* The order of the poets seems to be according to stylistic height, not according

The sequence of meters in these seven poems offers tangential support to their constitution as a group. *C.* 1.12 in Sapphics is followed by three poems in differing kinds of Asclepiadeans, in order fourth, third, second. *C.* 1.16 and 1.17 in Alcaics bring us back to *C.* 1.12 with a complementary Lesbian meter. The fifth Asclepiadean in *C.* 1.18 recalls the same meter— the only instances in *Odes* 1–3—in the most recent purely sympotic poem, *C.* 1.11, which articulates this sequence with the Parade Odes.[45] *C.* 1.11 falls between the first repetition of a meter (Sapphics) in *C.* 1.10, the signal of a turn away from the pattern of metrical variety, and the return of Sapphics in *C.* 1.12, which signals some kind of continuation and is the first poem in the next sequence. It is hardly fortuitous that the poem that provides the hinge between the two parades is *C.* 1.11, the "*carpe diem*" poem that defines so much of Horatian ideology. I would suggest that while no neat pattern connects these sequences, they are somewhat interwoven. Porphyrio calls *C.* 1.10 a *hymnus in Mercurium ab Alcaeo lyrico poeta*. Alcaeus' hymn to Hermes was also in Sapphics and told of the theft of Apollo's cattle and possibly quiver, although the extant first stanza does not have a motto's verbal similarity to Horace.[46] If *C.* 1.10–12 winds down the metrical parade, the Alcaic allusion in *C.* 1.10 prepares for the next sequence.

Alcaeus' influence in *C.* 1.10 raises some inevitable questions: But doesn't Horace use mottoes and allusions in the Parade Odes? What about the Alcaic mottoes in *C.* 1.4 and 1.9 in particular?[47] How do the allusions here differ from those in the first sequence, or indeed from anywhere else? The answer lies not in the exclusivity of allusions to these poems, any more than that of the meters to the Parade Odes. All odes have meter and it is a rare Horatian ode, if any, that does not allude to someone. What differentiates any sequence from its surroundings is the establishment of a pattern, whether metrical, or, as I suggest here, allusive. In this section of the *Odes*, the allusions to lyric predecessors come together to a highly

---

to chronological order, *pace* Cousin in the commentary. Wilamowitz characteristically posits a common Hellenistic source for Dionysius and Quintilian, *Die Textgeschichte der Griechischen Lyriker* (Berlin 1900) 6. Was Horace reading Dionysius (or the common source) or does this narrower selection from among the nine lyrists represent a second canon? For the canon, see H. Färber, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (Munich 1936) 25–26.

[45]Seidensticker (34) calls attention to the tendency of the sequences opening each of the books of the *Odes* to form rings. His criteria are thematic and I am generally sceptical about schemes determined by simplified reductions of poems' subject matter (spring, sympotic, erotic). If the proposed sequence forms a ring, it is not thematic but metrical: 5 Asclep. / Lesbian / Asclep. / Asclep. / Asclep. / Lesbian / Lesbian / 5 Asclep.

[46]Nisbet and Hubbard 125–126; Richmond (above, n. 41) 202.

[47]Richmond (above, n. 41) 200–201.

dense degree and the systematic covering of monodic and choral lyrists argues for a certain unity. Neither the Parade Odes, taken jointly, nor this sequence is set apart as sharply as the Roman Odes, where the change of meter and radical switch in subject matter of C. 3.7 leave no doubt that the collection is moving on.[48] Nor does either sequence display the same degree of internal unity as the Roman Odes, understood as consistency of subject matter and educational purpose. The bond has to do rather with Horace's program and his definition of his own lyric, as he does elsewhere, through meter and tradition.

The parade of predecessors as I define it is compatible with the most recent treatments of arrangement in *Odes* 1.[49] My suggestion of an interwoven transition between the two parades accords with Santirocco's view that the poems in the aftermath of the Parade Odes continue with some of the same themes. At *C*. 1.13 he leaves off tracing this aftermath with the observation that connections with the Parade Odes could be made indefinitely, given that the initial group introduces the major concerns of the first collection of *Odes*. He then pursues a dynamic progression between poems until we reach the midpoint of the book: *C*. 1.15 follows on another ship poem; the change from *tristia* to *mitia* in *C*. 1.16 paves the way for the contrast of Cyrus with the poet in *C*. 1.17; Cyrus' violence likewise prepares for the insistence on moderate drinking in *C*. 1.18. With *C*. 1.20 and the three poems that follow he sees a new beginning and something of a recapitulation of *C*. 1.1–1.4.[50] The end of the parade of predecessors at *C*. 1.18 with something of a blurring at *C*. 1.19 coincides with a new start in *C*. 1.20. My views in no way contradict his and add only a static link to dynamic development.

I am less convinced by Porter's more mechanistic arrangement of *C*. 1.13–1.19 (the first and last poems of this group have to do with passion, as does the central poem *C*. 1.16; *C*. 1.14 and 15 form a pair of ship poems that balances another pair in *C*. 1.17 and 18, both about wine's inspiration of peace as well as of violence), but the parade of predecessors is if anything more of a piece with this scheme than with Santirocco's.[51] Since Porter continues the Parade Odes to *C*. 1.12, it would be easy to make *C*. 1.12 a hinge connecting the first group with the second, which Porter likewise

---

[48]Even in this instance Horace blurs the boundaries of his sequences to some extent. Santirocco 125 remarks that despite *C*. 3.7's function as a formal break, it can be seen as offering a specific case of the danger of sexual degeneracy, an issue in the preceding poem, *C*. 3.6.17–32.

[49]Dettmer's (above, n. 5) preoccupation with ring composition on a large scale makes her study idiosyncratic. Her closest grouping to those of Santirocco and Porter is *C*. 1.15–19, which ostensibly forms a ring with *C*. 3.12–16 (128 and 171–173). I find her criteria for such a correspondence too schematic.

[50]Santirocco 42–57.

[51]Porter 20–21.

brings to the midpoint of the book. Although Porter's interest in "the inefficacy of human agency" in *C.* 1.13–19 gives me pause,[52] the rough correspondence of a group of poems following the Parade Odes and ending with the midpoint of the book in Porter, Santirocco, and also my own scheme bolsters my confidence in such a group, particularly since we each use different criteria for its isolation.[53]

Evoking predecessors, whether overtly or by allusion, is a favorite Horatian method for establishing his literary filiation. The chiastic pattern of choral and Lesbian poets in *C.* 1.12–15 expands on the compressed statement of *C.* 1.1.32–34: *si neque tibias / Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia / Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.* What makes this sequence stand out is the technique, consistent from poem to poem, of alluding to one lyric poet after another—a formal pattern that in itself creates a message beyond the subjects of individual poems or even of these poems taken together. In his parade of lyric predecessors Horace's juxtaposition of erotic, sympotic, and political poetry conveys for a second time the point made in the metrical parade: that his lyric subsumes all aspects, high and low, of the genre he reinvented.[54]

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003–6790

[52]Porter 77.

[53]My own view of this group has expanded organically from my first observation of the chiastic order of choral and Lesbian poets in *C.* 1.12–15, to include *C.* 1.16, then *C.* 1.17, and most recently *C.* 1.18 with a definite halt at *C.* 1.19. I did not look for the midpoint of the book and then find continuity.

[54]The idea behind this article originated in R. J. Tarrant's seminar on Horace's *Odes* at Harvard, spring 1988, and was inspired by reading Santirocco. It was given as a paper at the spring meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, 1992. I offer thanks to Matthew Santirocco in person for his support and encouragement, as to A. J. Woodman, whose prompt and painstaking criticism challenged and helped me enormously. I am also grateful for the suggestions made by Martha A. Davis and by the anonymous readers.