THE LYRIC LOVER IN HORACE *ODES* 1.15 AND 1.17

REBECCA NAGEL

ODES 1.17 IS ONE OF SEVERAL ODES in which Horace creates a relationship between himself, a woman, and another man. In this paper I wish to explore the nature of that relationship in the context of Horace's practice of art and erotics. I argue that, in 1.17 at least, the poet is presenting himself as a charming and irresistible seducer, comparable to Paris in *Odes* 1.15. The Paris of 1.15 is a make-believe pastoral figure who promises a woman a peaceful, luxurious life away from a rival. The tone of 1.17 is altogether lighter than the tone of 1.15, but the parallel is clear: just as Paris won Helen for himself, violating laws of hospitality and causing a war, so Horace attempts to seduce Tyndaris away from her jealous lover, Cyrus.

I. THE TONE OF *ODES* 1.17

Horace begins *Odes* 1.17 by saying that the god Faunus comes to his farm and protects the goats from predators and bad weather. Then he invites a woman named Tyndaris to join him in the enjoyment of the gods' favour. In this bucolic paradise blessed by the gods she will play the lyre, recite poetry, and drink wine in moderation. In the last few lines Horace reveals that Tyndaris will have nothing to fear from Cyrus. Who is this Cyrus? He seems to be a lover, at least he might feel jealous and treat Tyndaris roughly, tearing the garland from her head and her dress. Although changes in tone are common in the *Odes*, the change in tone in this ode from innocent and bucolic to violent and menacing is particularly striking. Syndikus (1995) gives many examples in the *Odes* of transitions from public or serious themes to private or light-hearted ones, or bad to good, or noisy to quiet. The transition in 1.17 is somewhat unusual because the tone changes from gentle to violent. Most interpretations of the ode begin with some statement on this change in tone.

The change of tone is a useful place to begin because the treatment of the transition is dictated by the critic's choice of themes to highlight in the ode. Later, I will relate the implications of these critical judgements for our assessment of the character and intentions of the lyric persona. But first, let us consider how the audience experiences the change of tone. As in any text, the text as it stands, line-by-line, is always there as a guide to remembering the first reading, but it is almost at once overlaid by the intellectual and aesthetic activity of the reader,

I am grateful to audiences at Mount Holyoke College and the University of Alberta, Cynthia Damon, Richard Tarrant, and the anonymous readers for *Phoenix* for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

PHOENIX, VOL. 54 (2000) 1–2.

who rearranges the elements into other patterns, for example, by reconstructing the narrative situation of the ode.[1]

If we take the images and events of the poem in the order in which they are described we find a hymn to Faunus which develops into an invitation to Tyndaris. How does Horace make this first transition and does it have any relationship to the eventual transition from gentle to violent? Both Pucci and Dunn read the ode as a poem of seduction in which the seducer starts his campaign discreetly and only gradually reveals his predatory nature. They differ on the extent to which the violence of Cyrus is real and how complicit in that violence Horace really is. Pucci (1975: 273) says that the "expressions which describe Cyrus' assault ... could describe a heated flirtation, a pleasant *proelium Veneris*." Dunn (1990: 205), on the other hand, says, "not only do we discover that the speaker's erotic intentions are similar to those of his rival, but the threatening tone of his words comes to resemble the threat of force he attributes to Cyrus." Holleman (1972) is also attentive to the eroticism of the ode, but his focus is on Faunus rather than Cyrus. He looks at Faunus' frustrated pursuits of the nymphs in 1.17 and 3.18 for a key to the interpretation of Faunus' presence in 1.17.

If we reorder the poem chronologically, then we may focus on Tyndaris' movement away from the violence of Cyrus and into the enchanted safety of Horace's farm. Klingner (1935: 289) points out how many threats to Tyndaris are mentioned only to be removed: heat, rain, drunkenness, Cyrus. Davis (1991: 204–205), on the other hand, argues that the focus of the ode is the place Lucretilis rather than the woman Tyndaris. According to him, the more violent and unpleasant Cyrus is, the more peaceful and inviting is Lucretilis, because Cyrus is the foil to the praise of Lucretilis. West (1995: 84–85) also identifies a sharp contrast between Lucretilis and Cyrus, but he puts the contrast into more philosophical terms. He interprets Horace as an Epicurean, enjoying the peaceful artistic life at the villa, aloof from the blazing passions and jealousy of a Cyrus. In *Die Lyrik des Horaz* Syndikus (1972: 197) defines the contrast in poetic terms, claiming that Horace in 1.17 defends lyric against elegy.

It is clear that, depending on how one organises the poem, the lyric persona can be either an Epicurean poet favoured by the gods of rural fertility or an erotic poet using the gods' advantages as a screen for his campaign of seduction. Clearly the dichotomy is artificial and unnecessarily reductionist. I propose that the middle ground is to be found through music and poetry. Poetry is the medium of seduction, while poetry and erotic pleasure are both the gifts of the gods. Like all gifts from the gods they may be mixed blessings.

II. MUSIC AND POETRY

The first music explicitly named in the ode is the sound of the *fistula* which echoes through the area (line 10).[2] The unnamed musician on the pipe is

[1] On the tension between lyric and narrative ways of making sense, see Lowrie 1997: 300.

[2] For themes raised in this section, see also Holleman 1970.

presumably Faunus; it could also be Horace, even Tyndaris. Of course, the very first music is the ode itself. In this sense its addressee is Maecenas (West 1995: 83–84). If we were to follow West and take gratitude to Maecenas as the primary significance of the ode, then the real recipient is Maecenas, not Tyndaris, and Tyndaris' role is to be Horace's own "private Sabine muse," in Putnam's words (1994: 358), and not an invited guest in the usual sense.

Tyndaris, however, is not simply Horace's inspiration for his own poetry; like any muse she is a poet herself.[3] Horace promises Tyndaris that on his farm she will perform lyric poetry: *dices laborantis in uno / Penelopen vitreamque Circen* (lines 19–20). Like Horace himself, Tyndaris will incorporate Greek epic into Roman lyric and she will change the material to suit the genre. It is clear that Tyndaris' genre is lyric, because she will recite with *fide Teia* and Teos is the home of the Greek lyricist Anacreon (line 18). Penelope and Circe do not meet in the Homeric *Odyssey*, and their rivalry is hardly even expressed in the epic, but the idea of their rivalry is certainly appropriate for a lyric.

Tyndaris' poem about two women vying for the love of one man is particularly appropriate to the situation of 1.17, in which the two men Horace and Cyrus are vying for the love of one woman, Tyndaris herself. More specific connections can be made between Tyndaris' song and the lyric situation. The triangle Ulysses, Penelope, and Circe, which is the subject of Tyndaris' song, brings to mind the other Homeric triangle of Helen, Menelaus, and Paris as well as the triangle in 1.17 of Tyndaris, Cyrus, and Horace. Not much has been made of this. Pucci (1975: 264) noted the multiple triangular relationships in passing over twenty years ago (see also Toohey 1982: 121). Lowrie (1995: 43–44) observes that the modern Tyndaris and her song are both signs of "lyric's ascendancy over epic." Yet Horace's suggested topic for Tyndaris' song is not only part of Horace's campaign for lyric, although that is clearly an important theme throughout the *Odes*. First, Tyndaris is seen turning her own life into the subject of art. The reference to the world of myth enriches the short lyric and creates scope for allusion and intertextuality. (I will return to this topic in Section IV below.) Second, the repeated reference to love triangles tells us that there must be conflict somewhere in the world of the poem. The problem remains, however, whether the conflict is foreign to Horace or not.

III. PHILOSOPHICAL DETACHMENT AND EROTIC VIOLENCE

The invitation to Tyndaris and the intimation of Cyrus' tearing her crown and dress are plainly erotic. Yet the poem begins as a hymn to Faunus and at the centre is Horace's claim to divine favour: *di me tuentur, dis pietas mea / et musa cordi est* (lines 13–14). Most earlier readings of the poem have assumed that because Faunus visits Horace's farm, Horace must be acting in a way that is suitable for

[3] There is some question whether a *docta puella* ever composed her own pieces or only performed the work of others. I am inclined to believe that the example of Sulpicia or Ovid's daughter Perilla (*Trist.* 3.7) proves that Roman women could be poets as well as performers.

a pious *vates*. They conclude that the erotic details at the end are purely for contrast, that Horace separates himself from that kind of passionate relationship and behaves with Epicurean innocence from irrational passions. Porter (1987: 81), for example, cites the reference to *pietas* at line 13 as one of the few references in the poems of the group 1.13–1.19 which "carry an implicit moral concern." In the context of an erotic poem, however, it is doubtful whether we can be so solemn about *pietas* as to call it a moral concern. More plausibly, Toohey (1982: 116) and Davis (1991: 202) relate *pietas* to *musa*, the correct object of devotion for any poet. However, they oppose *musa* to *amor*, the object of devotion for the elegiac lover such as Tibullus or Propertius, as if Horace could only be interested in Tyndaris as a musician, and not also as a lover.[4] What do we make of the fact that Horace stresses that Tyndaris will be safe with him—that she will enjoy leisure in the shade and that even the wine she drinks will be *innocentis pocula Lesbii* (line 21)?

Horace often undermines his own claims to being self-composed and detached from passion. Consider, for example, *Odes* 2.4 in which he assures a friend that he could not possibly be interested in his friend's mistress because he is much too old (at forty) to be interested in that sort of thing. In 4.1 Horace, now aged about fifty, says that he had thought he was too old for Venus, but he finds himself disturbed by an unexpected attraction to Ligurinus. In 1.13 Horace tells Lydia how much he hates to hear her praising Telephus and to see where Telephus has left a mark on her skin. Although Horace explicitly admits that he is jealous, he repudiates violence in a relationship. As in 1.17, however, it is not clear whether Horace disapproves in principle of love-bites or whether he disapproves because he wishes to entice Lydia away from Telephus with a sly offer of a relationship *nec malis / divulsus querimoniis* (lines 18–19). In all these examples the lyric persona easily combines philosophical detachment with unruly passion. So even if *pietas* and *musa* are equivalent, as Toohey and Davis suggest, it is not clear that Horace's fondness for poetry and music precludes eroticism.

In this context, we must consider what the gods' blessing means for a lover. Faithlessness, the transience of beauty, the fickleness of attraction—all these are characteristics of lovers and love affairs in Horace's *Odes*, even when, or because, they are sponsored by the gods.[5] In 1.17 the gods' blessing to Horace is unquestionably the magically-protected landscape. The gods' gift of a bucolic paradise with protection from harm is not inconsistent with erotic intentions on the part of the lyric persona. The idyllic setting, where nanny goats and their kids do not have to fear heat, rain, snakes, or wolves, and the land gives abundant produce, is not itself a guarantee of moral purity, because its beauty only makes it all the more fitting for an erotic encounter.[6]

[4] See also Gagliardi 1982.

[5] Barine, for example, grows more beautiful with each false vow (2.8.5–7).

[6] Consider, for example, the beautiful rose arbor of the faithless Pyrrha (1.5).

In other odes, for example 1.16 and 1.22, the idea of protection and avoidance of harm is intimately tied to lyric poetry, especially erotic lyric. In 1.16 Horace claims to have traded his former fierce iambs for a verse form which is milder and friendlier, namely lyric. In 1.22 Horace boasts of being protected from harm because he sings of his beloved Lalage. Horace's farm is already protected by his own lyric poetry and Tyndaris will share in that protection. She also has an active role in inviting the gods' blessing to Lucretilis because she is a lyric poet herself.

Attractive as the promise of protection on Horace's farm is, it is not destined to last. From the beginning of the poem there is a suggestion of escapism and temporary asylum. The poem opens with Faunus' frequent *visits* to Lucretilis. Just as Faunus will return to Lycaeus in Arcadia, Tyndaris will presumably return to Cyrus. Even the highlight of the attractive life on the farm, namely the creation and enjoyment of poetry, is tinged with loss, separation, and rivalry, because Tyndaris' poem describes the rivalry of Penelope and Circe: *laborantis in uno* (line 19). Edinger (1971: 309) points out that in the *Odyssey* Penelope and Circe are dignified and self-controlled, not stormily passionate. He concludes from this that when Tyndaris says *laborantis in uno*, "one may well conclude that a rather low-keyed, non-erotic meaning for *laborantis* is true to the facts: 'Penelope and Circe, worrying about the same man'."

Horace, however, makes a point of adapting material when he moves from one genre to another, adapting epic into his lyrics and also into his epistles.[7] *Epistle* 1.2 begins with a moralising reading of Homer. Horace tells us that Paris is made foolish by *amor* and Achilles and Agamemnon are made foolish by *ira*. Ulysses, by contrast, is an exemplar of *virtus* and *sapientia*. The second part is a discourse on the merits of doing work now and tempering one's desires for wealth. Heroic material is used to draw rather homely moral lessons because the ethical voice is the appropriate voice for the *Epistles*.

In a lyric situation, on the other hand, a relationship is far more important than in an epic situation and merits correspondingly stronger feelings. It cannot be right, therefore, to use the epic situation, as Edinger does, to define the nature of the lyric situation. Horace uses *laboro* elsewhere in the *Odes* to refer explicitly to a difficult relationship. In 1.27 Horace says to the brother of Megilla: *a! miser, / quanta laborabas Charybdi, / digne puer meliore flamma* (lines 18–20). *Laborantis* is not the only word suggesting trouble in Tyndaris' song. The exact connotation of *vitream* is disputed, but according to Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 224–225) it likely implies "complex, enigmatic, sinister."

The protection for wayward creatures promised at the beginning of the ode is a natural part of the imagery of the golden age. The first part of the ode is

[7] Compare 1.6, in which Horace deliberately plays the fool, writing *gravem / Pelidae stomachum* (5–6) or *duplici ... Ulixei* (7). Horace demonstrates the truth of his claim that he is not fit to write epic by humorously getting the epic words wrong.

connected to the last part, the struggle between lovers, by the situation of the entire ode, namely an invitation which is really a seduction. Pucci (1975: 264) notes the surprising silence of commentators on the rivalry between Horace and Cyrus. The silence is surprising because the rivalry is central to the ode, no matter how Epicurean or erotic one's reading is, for Tyndaris' situation with Cyrus is the foil to what she will enjoy with Horace. It is, therefore, in Horace's interest to represent Cyrus as an unpleasant person. Fraenkel (1957: 207; see also West, 1995: 84), however, says rather improbably: "At the end, as a foil to the calm that awaits Tyndaris at the Sabinum, a lively little scene is pictured with the loving intensity which Horace likes to apply to his finales."

Some commentators have seen how ironic it is that Horace offers Tyndaris protection from Cyrus since it is, of course, Horace's seduction that causes Cyrus' jealous anger. For Reckford (1969: 59) this irony is simply mildly humorous. Connor (1987: 29) attempts to address the question of Horace's attitude to Cyrus' violence, but ends up saying, rather unsatisfyingly, that the reference to Cyrus is made with "an amused grimace." Although Pucci (1975: 271, 274–275) finds some humour in the situation, he sees a darker side also, thinking that Horace perhaps enjoys the erotic violence he imagines. Dunn (1995: 166–167 and 1990: 205), on the other hand, in reaction to the readers of a mild-mannered Horace, claims that Horace is just as violent and threatening to Tyndaris as Cyrus is.

Horace, however, regularly uses violent images in his erotic poetry, and not because he recommends violence in personal relationships. Two odes of Book 1, for example, use the language of physical violence to describe the force of passionate love. In 1.6 Horace declines to write encomiastic epic of battles in favour of *proelia virginum* and in 1.19 he invokes Venus as *mater saeva Cupidinum.* The strong emotions of war naturally have something in common with the strong emotions of physical passion, and war, or at least the language of war, is mischievously appropriated by all the Roman erotic poets. Dunn (1995: 166) is guilty, therefore, of a degree of anachronism when he suggests that Horace is aggressively threatening to Tyndaris: "if we read the invitation literally, we find the promise of seclusion and security both clinched and betrayed at the end by the graphic threat of rape by a rival."

IV. IDENTIFYING THE CHARACTERS

The conventional language of erotic poetry partly explains Horace's apparent complicity with the threat of Cyrus. The other part of the explanation for Horace's complicity may be found in the network of allusion created by the suggestive names of the poem. First, a note on methodology. In his discussion of 1.16 and 1.17 Fraenkel (1957: 207–209) uses the occasion not only to reject associating the two poems, but also to argue more generally that every ode is self-contained. I am willing to agree with Fraenkel that 1.16 is not as closely connected to 1.17 as the

ancient commentators believed,[8] yet an ode may be read in light of another ode without actually requiring the other ode to complete the sense of the first.[9]

I will begin with the implications of the name Tyndaris for the relationships between the three human characters of 1.17. Apart from Nisbet and Hubbard, most commentators are agreed that the name Tyndaris must recall Helen of Troy, the daughter of Tyndareus.[10] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 221) surprisingly do not even mention the famous Tyndaris. Instead, they suggest that the name "may strike a pastoral note," and refer to one of Leda's sisters: "the Arcadian Evander was son of Timandra, daughter of Tyndareus."

Within this ode there is a pattern of Greek motifs translated into Roman motifs (as in the work of Horace generally) and other references to Tyndaris in Latin poetry certainly refer to Helen.[11] Other references to Helen of Troy by Horace are negative—she is a figure of the destructive nature of beauty and passion. I have already referred to the moralising version of the *Iliad* in *Epistle* 1.2. In *Odes* 1.15 and 3.3 Helen is (like Cleopatra) the wicked woman of the east who destroys the men and the cities she is involved with (Carbonero 1989: 384–386). If we associate the Tyndaris of 1.17 with her namesake, then her match with the violent Cyrus is not so jarring, and the match with an Epicurean Horace, detached from passion, is unlikely. Dunn (1990: 205) points out that the expression *deviae / olentis uxores mariti* (lines 6–7) suggests adultery in the animal world and is a prelude to the later suggestion of human adultery, or at least informal affairs. Statius appears to allude to this line when he says in his Horatian ode in praise of his farm: *nec vacca dulci mugit adultero* (*Silv.* 4.5.18). In context, Statius is describing the bare simplicity of his farm, which lacks even the smallest herds, but it is curious to use the word *adulter* for a bull.

The name Cyrus has a wider range of associations than Tyndaris, but there are three main possibilities: one based on word-play, another on reference to other odes, and the third based on the situation within the ode. The verbal similarity of Cyrus and Circe suggests that there is some association between the two, but this is playfully misleading. As I will suggest below, the connection between Circe and Horace is rather stronger than the connection between Circe and Cyrus, and Horace has an interest in partly concealing his connection to the witch of the *Odyssey*. The second significance for the name Cyrus is in his identity in other odes. Cyrus the Persian is named twice in the *Odes* (2.2.17 and 3.29.27) as a model of the wealthy king. The disparity in wealth between a king and a farmer (Horace's position in 1.17) is representative of the usual disparity in wealth between the lover Horace and his rival and also suggests a higher status or greater

[8] For further discussion, see Toohey 1982: 119–121.

[9] A nice example of Horace's art of juxtaposition is the pairing of 3.6 with 3.7. Both poems work with the subject of adultery, but they use very different tones.

[10] E.g., Toohey 1982: 120; Putnam 1994: 371.

[11] Lucr. 1.464, 473; Virg. *Aen.* 2.601, 569; Prop. 3.3.31, 4.7.30; Ov. *Ars am.* 1.746.

legitimacy for the rival. The third and most relevant Cyrus in the *Odes* is the Cyrus of 1.33. *Odes* 1.33, addressed to a friend named Albius, often assumed to be the poet Albius Tibullus, is about the perversity of sexual attraction. Albius loves Glycera, who is making him unhappy by taking a younger lover; Lycoris is in love with Cyrus, who loves Pholoe, who in turn will have nothing to do with Cyrus, a *turpi ... adultero* (9).[12] As in *Odes* 1.17, a man named Cyrus is unfavourably presented as mismatched in love. It is unlikely that the Greek names of the *Odes* can be confidently assigned to any particular person in Rome or that Horace would feel constrained to use the same name to refer to the same person throughout the *Odes*. The most we can say is that there is a suggestion of similarity between the two figures called Cyrus.

The last means for identifying Cyrus lies in his situation in this ode. It is implied at the end of the poem that Cyrus feels the right to be angry with Tyndaris. This in turn suggests that he is the regular lover of Tyndaris or at least loved her before she met Horace. If Tyndaris alludes to Helen, then Cyrus should allude to Menelaus. The association of Cyrus with Menelaus, of course, is not so specific as the association of Tyndaris with Helen. This may not be accidental, however. Helen is taken by Theseus when she is still a child and later courted by all the kings of Greece. It hardly matters whom she marries because the suitors pledge to enforce the marriage of the one who does marry her. Helen is primarily identified in the tradition as an adulteress.

Finally, there is the lyric persona himself, whom it is convenient, if misleading, to call Horace. Since we do not have a name for him, his identity rests entirely on the circumstances of the ode. One thing that is sure is that he is in possession of a farm blessed by the gods. Since he is inviting Tyndaris, he must also be a lover, or at least a host. Another clue to his identity lies in the Homeric triangular relationship of Tyndaris' song: Ulysses, Circe, and Penelope, which in turn evokes in her name the triangle of Helen, Paris, and Menelaus. We have, then, three triangles: one from the *Iliad*, one from the *Odyssey*, and one contemporary. Beginning with the contemporary situation, Tyndaris is the love object, analogous to Ulysses and Helen, Cyrus is analogous to the lawful spouses Penelope and Menelaus, and Horace is analogous to the seducers Circe and Paris. Does the association of the lyric persona with Circe and Paris help with the issues of seduction and conflict raised so far? The admittedly surprising resemblance between Circe and Horace as seducers is suggested by the fact that they are both musicians and poets, and that they both offer unusual wine to their guests.[13] In the tradition, Circe may turn some men into animals, but she does not kill them, and she is delightful to her favourite, Ulysses. Paris is obviously more problematic. Selfish and cowardly, he sacrifices Troy for the love of Helen. The resemblance between Horace and Paris is the subject of the next section.

[12] For further discussion, see Toohey 1872: 115; Putnam 1994: 364.
[13] *Epistle* 1.2.23; Pucci 1975: 267.

V. *ODES* 1.15 AND 1.17

Odes 1.15 and 1.17 have much in common, in particular a startling transition from pastoral imagery to violence. *Odes* 1.15 is the prophecy of the sea god Nereus to Paris as Paris is carrying off Helen. Nereus declares that the seduction of Helen will bring a terrible war down upon Troy and will ultimately result in Paris' own death. The first word of the poem, *pastor*, alludes ironically to Paris' former role in the countryside as an elegant shepherd-prince. According to Nereus he apparently hopes for a return to this luxurious and cultivated life with Helen: *pectes caesariem grataque feminis / imbelli cithara carmina divides* (lines 14–15). Towards the end of the prophecy, Nereus describes Paris' panic in war with a simile from the countryside: *cervus uti vallis in altera / visum parte lupum graminis immemor, / sublimi fugies mollis anhelitu* (lines 29–31). Nereus continues: *non hoc pollicitus tuae* (line 32). The pastoral tranquillity and cultured leisure promised to Helen do not last because her husband Menelaus is prepared to use violence to get her back.

The references of *Odes* 1.17 are less definite than those of 1.15 because 1.17 does not describe a well-known mythological story; nevertheless, there are strong similarities between the two poems. In both poems a woman is asked to leave one lover and join another in a bucolic setting complete with lyric poetry and the jilted lover is violently jealous. There are also some important differences between the two poems: *Odes* 1.17 is an invitation, whereas 1.15 is the prophecy of the disaster attendant on an already successful seduction. In addition, it is not clear whether Cyrus has been violent earlier towards Tyndaris or whether Horace will protect her from future violence from Cyrus. In *Odes* 1.15, however, the Trojan War is definitely the consequence of the seduction. Another difference is that in 1.15 Paris, not Helen, is threatened with violence in Nereus' dire prophecy, but in 1.17 it is Tyndaris and not Horace who is threatened. Paris and Tyndaris share the role of poet-performer.

In his discussion of 1.15, Davis (1991: 27) sees that there is a likeness between Paris and the lyric poet, but he calls it a spurious likeness (see also Lowrie 1997: 133). Davis's reading rests on the assumption that the lyric persona of 1.17 is to be identified with an Epicurean, high-minded Horace. His discussion of the *Odes* in general emphasises the use of rhetorical structures to create a high moral tone. For example, he describes "lyric arguments" such as "the futility of trying to avoid death" as central to the whole work. According to him, 1.17 is primarily a poem of praise to Lucretilis and the style of life to be enjoyed there: "The *positive* bucolic symposium ... is first epitomised in a few pregnant words; then, in glaring contrast to this image of tranquillity, a *negative* symposium—one radically perverted by violence from within—is portrayed in vivid detail" (204). *Odes* 1.15, on the other hand, is about someone who pretends to be a lyric poet, but is found out: "Horace is able to exploit the Homeric original by renarrating a nodal episode in terms that differentiate the true from the false, the genuine lyric poet from the opportunist *poseur* who performs his *carmina* in the service of seduction" (27).

According to the reading which I have presented, however, 1.17 is precisely a poem in the service of seduction. If we take Horace as a kind of Paris in 1.17, it is clear that we cannot entirely accept the moral and philosophical seriousness of Davis's reading of the ode. Yet there is one way in which Paris' action in taking Helen accords well with Davis's description of 1.17: it is a declaration that beauty and love are more important than traditional morality or international diplomacy. The seducer of 1.17 can argue just as well as Paris that time spent on the Sabine farm is worth the danger of being suspected of infidelity by Cyrus. The question remains whether Horace, unlike Paris, can fulfil his promise of protection to Tyndaris. Not surprisingly, Horace does not risk raising the question in his invitation.

CONCLUSION

The role of music and poetry is central in either reading of the ode, whether one focuses on the peacefully Epicurean resonance of the artistic life or on the role of music in seduction. The explicit naming, in Tyndaris' song, of Penelope and Circe and the naming of Ulysses by allusion create a Homeric framework, which is supported by the name Tyndaris, the patronymic of Helen. The primary situation in 1.17 is the seduction of a woman and is analogous to the situation of Helen being seduced away from Menelaus by Paris. The reader, therefore, is encouraged to think in terms of associating Horace and Paris. Other commentators have noted the similarity of the two triangles and concluded that in part the poem is an adaptation of an epic situation into lyric, but they have not looked further for development of the theme in Horace's poetry. Yet comparison with 1.15 suggests a very close relationship between the epic Paris and the lyric poet lover. The persona of *Odes* 1.17 is a pastoral, Italian Paris inviting a modern Helen to join him. The repercussions of the affair may be unpleasantly violent for Tyndaris, because her lover Cyrus suffers from jealousy; yet the gods will be generous and protective towards her while she stays on Horace's farm.

Department of History and Classics
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2H4

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carbonero, O. 1989. "La figura di Elena di Troia nei poeti latini da Lucrezio a Ovidio," *Orpheus* 10: 378–391.
Connor, P. 1987. *Horace's Lyric Poetry: The Force of Humour*. Berwick.
Davis, G. 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley.
Dunn, F. 1990. "An Invitation to Tyndaris: Horace, *Ode* 1.17," *TAPA* 120: 203–208.
—— 1995. "Rhetorical Approaches to Horace's *Odes*," *Arethusa* 28: 165–176.

Edinger, H. G. 1971. "Horace, *C.* 1.17," *CJ* 66: 306–311.
Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace.* Oxford.
Gagliardi, D. 1982. "Pietas et musa in Hor. *Carm.* 1.17," *Vichiana* 11: 139–142.
Holleman, A. W. J. 1970. "Horace (*Odes* 1.17) and the 'Music of Love'," *Latomus* 29: 750–755.
—— 1972. "Horace and Faunus: Portrait of a *Nymparum fugientum amator*," *L'Antiquité Classique* 41: 563–572.
Klingner, F. 1935. "Horazerklärungen," *Philologus* 90: 289–293.
Lowrie, M. 1995. "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace *C.* 1.12–1.18," *Phoenix* 49: 33–48.
—— 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes.* Oxford.
Nisbet, R. G. M. and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace* Odes, *Book 1.* Oxford.
Porter, D. H. 1987. *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of* Odes *1–3.* Princeton.
Pucci, P. 1975. "Horace's Banquet in *Odes* 1.17," *TAPA* 105: 259–281.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1994. "Structure and Design in Horace *Odes* 1.17," *CW* 87: 357–375.
Reckford, K. J. 1969. *Horace.* New York.
Syndikus, H. P. 1972. *Die Lyrik des Horaz.* Darmstadt.
—— 1995. "Some Structures in Horace's *Odes*," in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace.* Oxford. 17–31.
Toohey, P. G. 1982. "The Structure and Function of Horace, *Odes* 1.17," *ICS* 7: 110–124.
West, D. ed. and tr. 1995. Carpe diem: *Horace* Odes *1.* Oxford.