*Carmina***: *Odes* and *Carmen Saeculare*

Forthcoming in S. Harrison (ed.),
The Cambridge Companion to Horace, Cambridge 2007

Version 1.0

June 2006

Alessandro Barchiesi

Stanford University

Abstract: This is obviously a generalizing piece, not a research paper, but Horace is frequently taught at college level, so I offer it as an anticipation of the new Companion, and as an attempt to summarize some of the most recurring problems about Horace and the genre of Roman Lyric (if indeed there was a genre).

ALESSANDRO BARCHIESI

Carmina: Odes and *Carmen Saeculare*

Oliver Lyne, in memoriam

Modernity hit downtown Berlin on October 3, 1760, driven and unstoppable like a cannonball. Actually, it was a cannonball. The Russian gun established a very provisional record for long-distance bombing of a city, just at the end of the Seven Years war. The Prussian Horace, Karl Wilhelm Ramler, rose to the occasion. He was ready for it. Thanks to his favourite poet, he knew how to sing about private and public destinies, and the unforeseen dangers of life; he knew that the best poetic strategy for a successful lyric was none other than apostrophe:

Ode *Auf ein Geschütz* (*Lyrische Gedichte*, Reuttlingen 1782, 69)
Ode to a Cannon

O du, dem glühend Eisen, donnernd Feuer
Aus offnem Aetnaschlunde stammt,
Die frommen Dichter zu zerschmettern, Ungeheuer,
Das aus der Hölle stammt!

O thou, whose glowing iron and thundering fire
Comes from Etna's open jaws,
To shatter virtuous poets – monster,
That comes from Hell itself !

War technology made progress over the next 150 years, and at the end of this cycle another poet steeped in Horace realized that gas attacks were making traditional lyric not only impossible, but poisonous: however, he still needed Horace to make this contradiction felt:

My friend, you would not tell with such high zest

To children ardent for some desperate glory,

The old Lie : Dulce et decorum est

Pro patria mori   (Wilfrid Owen, *Dulce et decorum,* 1917)

This had been the quotation whispered by Quentin Battye as he fell mortally wounded during the Great Mutiny on the Delhi ridge, as R.S. Conway had mentioned in his appropriative talk 'Horace as Poet Laureate' (1903).

How was Horace himself upgraded to such prominence? He was more important as a lyric author in modern Europe than he had ever been in Roman culture. His rise as a model of lyric in the early modern age seems to be connected to a strategic positioning: occasions in life, mediating between private and public. Thus Ramler is helped by Horace to triangulate between the personal response of the 'pious poet', the communal spirit of Prussia, and the occasional effect of the Russian Blitzkrieg. The other substantial reason is that Horace was widely read as a text that guarantees access to 'one of us' – the people who really matter in this world: the modern, European, middle age, male, empowered citizens of a nation-state. The concept of literature as a way of meeting exceptional individuals of the past has later been exposed as a tendentious and pathetic fiction (how and why are certain individuals more important than others? the worst possible canon is a canon of 'very important *persons*' – not just texts - of the past). In the history of this misconception, a significant one for European culture, H. has a place qua lyric poet, as well as poet of epistles and satires.

The success of his lyric has to do with the perception that there is 'one of us' behind the poems: an 'honorary Englishman' and an ideal clubman (Don Fowler) for an English reader. An upwardly mobile southern Italian intellectual if you happen to be a southern Italian intellectual. A Harvard man of the world if the reader is E.K. Rand:

Horace is the prince of club men…he is a pleasant counsellor, a perfect Freshman adviser, always at home, always at leisure, ever ready to pour out for us a glass of one of the mellower brands and to expound the comfortable doctrine of *nil admirari*…The *sprezzatura* of the Renaissance, French wit in any period, Oxford reserve, and, rightly understood, Harvard indifference, these are the links in a golden chain.[1]

Those are of course self-serving stereotypes, but Horatian lyric has been instrumental in answering some of the crucial issues in European intellectual history: how can we design a

---

[1] Rand (1937) 31 (quoted in Fowler in Martindale-Hopkins (1993) 269, a fundamental discussion).

mundane ethics as separated from a religious one? Is it possible to be a Christian with Epicurean inflexions? Equally important, Horace is one of the few Classical authors for whom it would make some sense to attempt a psychological biography [2]: for all our diffidence, we have to admit that this possibility is related to a very personal tone of voice in his published work. Yet before we return to personality and individual voice, we have to face the specific textual nature of the *Odes*: the enormous importance of form.

Lyric form: models, meter, collection

When Horace asks to be classified among the *lyrici vates* (1,1,35) he is being innovative and surprising on various levels. *Lyricus* had still been used as a Greek word, in Greek letters, by Cicero, while after Horace it is already normal as a genre indication (presumably as a consequence of the *Odes*) in Ovid's Latin. In Hellenistic Greek, *lyrikos* had become the standard learned expression for the more traditional *melikos* or *melopoios*, a poet of songs. The request itself is both ambitious and unrealistic [3]: by the late second century BCE, and presumably much earlier, the corpus of the old 'lyric' poets in Alexandrian editions had become the approved canon of the Big Nine. The youngest (and most admired) of the Nine was Pindar, active more than 400 years before Horace, and it was proverbially impossible to be included in the canon (1,1,35 *inseres*) after it had been closed forever, and sealed with the number of the Muses: even Corinna, the famous Greek poetess, had become 'tenth' in the shortlist only at a metaphorical level. As is often the case in Horace's work, the relationship to Classical Greece expresses ambition but also occludes competition with Republican Roman culture: as 'lyric' predecessors Catullus, and even Laevius, not to mention the forgotten heroes of Republican scenic *cantica*, had been important and are now voluntarily eclipsed. The main thrust of the argument is elegant *eironeia* 'like my Greek models, I will be a classic and reach for the sky – if you shelve me among them, Maecenas', but the undercurrent is self-serving 'unlike Catullus and the others, *I* will be the first of the lyric poets in Latin'.

On the other hand it is a fact that the 9 poets of the canon are all demonstrably present in Horace: they undergo a further selection into fragmentary models.[4] Horace's approach to the Greek tradition is unashamedly formalistic. He can transplant into Latin, with Catullan precedent, the strophic meters of the poets from Lesbos, Sappho and Alcaeus, and so he proceeds

[2] On the idea of 'morale mondana europea' see La Penna (1969); on psychology and the literary career, Traina (1993).
[3] Feeney, in Rudd (1993) 41-2.

to write 'Aeolian' poems. The effort contributed by Horace is about perfecting a clear and repeatable metrical pattern, and making it work in a different language. Pindar, by contrast, is impossible to imitate because his system is based on triadic stanzas that tend to be unique to each composition, not stabilized and repeatable like the Alcaics and Sapphics. The difference is enhanced in vitro at 4,2,11-2 [Pindarus] *numerisque fertur / lege solutis,* with *lege solutis* filling up the regulated measure of the *Sapphic* strophe in the standard 'autonomous' format [5] of the *adonius*, precisely when the reference is to the uncontrollable triadic structures, spillover effects, and proliferating variety of cola in Pindar. We are reminded that the most conspicuous adaptation in Horace's handling of the Alcaic and Sapphic strophe is the systematic introduction of a caesura (see below) – in his hands the Greek meter is certainly not lawless, it undergoes a process of regulation and even mechanization (on consequences for the issue of musical performance, see below).

The Alcaic and Sapphic strophe form the most substantial part of the Odes (37 Alcaic, 25 Sapphic, out of 103 poems, plus the *Carmen Saeculare* in Sapphics; a total output of 205 Sapphic stanzas and 317 Alcaics; most of the Asclepiad-based system are also found in Alcaeus, cf. Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) xxxviii-ix), and their importance is so great that most people accept that four-line groupings are valid also for poems in (di)stichic meters. In fact, the number of lines of every Horatian ode is a multiple of 4: the so-called 'Meineke's law Meineke', the only exception being the problematic 4.8. This does not happen in the *Epodes*, even when some meters overlap with epodic systems used in the *Odes*, and in the *Epodes* Horace's praxis presupposes intense and formalistic study of Archilochus as much as the *Odes* bear witness to intense and formalistic studies of Alcaeus/Sappho and their learned editions. In other words, the Aeolic stanzas become a normative model even for non-Aeolic lines. Ironically, the idea that Alcaics and Sapphics are four-liners is not a natural fact, but the product of a rather artificial interpretation. There is much to be said, in the Greek tradition, for an interpretation as a three-line stanza with a final line formed by two cola, but the four-line interpretation was made canonical by the regular editorial praxis of the Alexandrians, and this is confirmed by an examination of the manuscript tradition of Horace, one that presupposes a learned edition in a book-roll format, with a graphic grid specifically designed to represent the strophic arrangement on the page, and clearly itself the result of a self-editing activity by Horace himself.[6] Even the

---

[4] For details on the Greek models see Hutchinson in this volume and my piece on Roman receptions of Greek lyric in F. Budelmann (forthcoming), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric.*
[5] Cf. what West labels 'the Sapphic effect': West (1998) 33.
[6] On the grid and the 'mise en page' cf. C. Questa in Enc. Oraziana I (1996) 329-44; on the idea of 'self-edition', Rossi (1998) 165.

names 'Alcaic' and 'Sapphic' for the two kinds of strophe are likely to predate Horace and to be relevant to his programmatic allegiance to the two poets [7].

Behind these formal issues there is a hyper-formalistic aspect: it is all about the music – the absent music. All the metrical and formal choices are motivated and conditioned by the choice to reinvent Greek lyric without its osmosis between the verbal and the musical [8]. The music is present (and richly so) at the level of *theme*, not of *performance*, just like, as we shall see, the treatment of time in the poems provides a thematic Ersatz, a thematization, of the missing performance culture. The 'live' performance of the *Carmen Saeculare*, intervening between the publication of books I-III and of book IV, only reinforces the distinction between text and song: book IV is frequently fascinated by various aspects of choral performance, but it refers to the *Carmen* as the true realization of this ideal in Rome, and the *Carmen* was pointedly excluded by the self-edition of that book.

Insisting on formalism only means that the opus is presented to us initially as the expression of a coherent formal language: I am not implying that Horace had no interest in the Greek poets as 'wholes', as personalities, as texts endowed with biographical depth. [9] In fact, he wants the *Odes* to express a consistent sense of the self, and even a sense of a career: as if the *Odes* were episodes.

Variation is combined with coherence: Alcaics and Sapphics are dominant and become signature forms, but sequences of two-three consecutive poems in the same meter are very unusual (1,16-17; 1,26-7; 1,34-5; 2,13-5; 2,19-20; 4,14-5, all in alcaics; 3,24-5 in asclepiads; and as a case apart, the grand sequence of 84 alcaics stanzas usually called 'The Roman Odes' and printed as poems 1 to 6 of book 3 [10]). Variation is in fact maximized at the beginning of book 1 and then never again, as if to ensure that readers of the collection grasp the entire spectrum of metrical forms and their Greek pedigree, before entering a process of selection and concentration: the so-called 'parade odes', showing 9 examples of different meters, the sequence culminating with 1,9, the first alcaic poem, followed by 1,10, the first repeated meter, in sapphics like 1,2 [11]. After this initial display of variation, the collection accepts a growing amount of uniformity and discipline, until, as we mentioned, the grand topics and serious political references of the Roman Odes are matched by the regular use of the most frequent measure, the Alcaic stanza, and the *Carmen*, although external to the collection, confirms the versatility of the

---

[7] Cf. Lyne (1995) 98-9 and Woodman in Woodman & Feeney (2002) 214 n.9. Against attempts to downplay the importance of Sappho alongside Alcaeus in Horace's 'Aeolic' programme, see Woodman in Woodman & Feeney (2002) 53-64.

[8] Rossi (1998) 164-71.

[9] Cf. Macleod (1983) 245, 249, 257-8; Barchiesi (1996) 5-8.

[10] On the history of the debate on poem-division see Heyworth in Pecere-Reeve (1995).

Sapphic stanza. The most interesting metrical innovation, in this context, is the routinization of a pause after the fifth element in Sapphic and Alcaic hendecasyllables, when caesura had been non-existent in the Greek authors: this gives Alcaic and Sapphic line a regular but also monotone pace, one that would be intolerable in a cantata, and belongs to a text as a place where structures are regularized and the pleasure of order dominates over the need for modulation. Then it is surely significant that the caesura becomes much more mobile in the sapphics of the *Carmen Saeculare* (once again the watershed) and remains mobile in the late book IV [12], now that the poet has been through the watershed of a song-and-dance event. [13]

The study of compositional arrangement also confirms that the lyric work is a textual opus where a culture of performance still resonates. There have been many studies of structure and ordering of poems, and some are sceptical, with reason, about far-fetched nuances and symmetries. As a definitive objection, it has been asserted that the design cannot have affected the text of the individual poems once they had been fixed in writing, since that was a *ne varietur* because of the complexity of lyric meters, but this is to overestimate the technical difficulty of Aeolic rhythms, and more importantly, Horace knew perfectly well that it was possible, without rewriting one syllable of the authorial verses, to create effects of positioning and complex linkages by editing *other people's work*, and that in a culture of the book the mentalité of readers is the decisive factor.

The important point is surely that Horace is aware of the potential of books as devices for additional signification; but it is also important to note that he has resisted the impact of book-form on the autonomy of individual poems [14]. He must have learned from epigram collections, but he also resists their model of pan-textualism: he wants every poem to be marked by a different occasion and addressee.

Those considerations do not excuse indifference toward hidden, implied continuities among poems: the addressees of 2, 1-3 are respectively Pollio, the great historian of the civil wars in the Roman world, Sallustius, son of Pollio's main predecessor, and Dellius, adventurer and historian of Antony's Parthian wars, the other half of the orbis Romanus. The poems remain, of course, very different from each other, but their author is the editor.

---

[11] On other links between 1,2 and 1,10 via Alcaeus and his Alexandrian edition, see Barchiesi (2000)   172.

[12] Rossi (1998) 171-75, a crucial argument against the *Odes* as librettos.

[13] All this presupposes intense direct study of Greek meter through the colometry made systematic and available to non-professional readers by the Alexandrian editions, but it is not clear whether Horace had a specific metrical theory as a guide: identifying this theory is deemed impossible in the influential discussion of Heinze (1972) 227 ff. (original publication 1918).

[14] This important aspect is well argued by Krevans (1984); see also Santirocco (1986).

Lyric unity: I and thou

The tendency to disregard addressees, especially in New Criticism, has been a snag for interpretation. One exception, in that generation, is the admirable attention in Nisbet's commentaries to inflexions in ethical arguments and existential or political topoi as pointers towards individual addressees and their taste or agenda. In close readings, the erasure of pronouns is a mistake, even when it is a shortcut towards convincing symbolism. [15] Ironically, in the meantime, criticism of modern lyric [16] had come to reappraise apostrophe: Ramler was right, it seems, in his Horatian address to the cannon. Lyric is poetry that says 'O', apostrophe defines lyric as a genre. We can see the trend at work already in the early transmissional history, since headings of the type 'Ad Maecenatem' must have been inserted very early on as ways of singling out poems in the books.

Lyric can be tentatively (transhistorically) defined as <u>a first-person utterance whose performative conditions are reconstructed by a 'reperforming' reader</u>, who typically positions herself somewhere in a continuum whose extremes are a generic voice and some individual idea of the author. Extreme positions are of course possible: one can certainly prefer a *very* author-centered reading. To choose a painfully clear example, if one knows that Celan wrote *Todesfuge* while in a Nazi labour camp, it is likely that a reperformance of the poem will include a memory of its compositional context. Even formal aspects will be affected, for example the way one reperforms the heavy metrical pattern at the beginning – a mnemotechnnics of suffering and fatigue; it will thus be easy to stay away from unfair appropriations, such as aestheticism, or the decision to include the poem as a metrical example in German textbooks of meter, or the comment that it should be forbidden to write lyric poetry after Auschwitz.

In less clear-cut cases, readers will opt for a very generic reading, e.g. when we are in love and perform a love song from the point of view of our present situation, taking for granted some sort of loose assimilation between the composition of the song and its performance, but without much interest in the specifics of the author's love life. In order to play the blues, a blues singer does not have to feel blue, but to convey to the audience the idea that he knows about that certain feeling and is able to perform it. Most reperformances of lyric will happen somewhere in the intermediate spectrum between those extremes: the idea of an author in a specific, unrepeatable occasion, and 'some' notion of the author as the source of the utterance.

---

[15] Dunn (1995) 165-76 (with good points against different 'closures' imposed in turn by New Criticism, textual, and by New Historicism, cultural).
[16] Culler (1981); Lowrie (1996) 20-4.

Not for the last time, we see the importance of Apostrophe. The figure creates 'poetic events', makes something happen, exposes that event as based on verbal devices[17], and by its artificial status invokes the supplement of tradition and convention, precisely when it is so 'direct'.

Lyric opposes the missing context (e.g. a longer conversation, a history of previous contacts: Horace sometimes writes about divine epiphanies, but never about first-time encounters with humans) vs a sense of textual wholeness (incipit is marked, closure strategic). Ironically, Greek poetry did not come to the Romans in fragments as it visits us, but Horace does turn his models into fragments: models become initial mottoes, poems never presuppose a complete one on one imitation.[18] The only complete poem we have from Greek monodic lyric, Sappho 1, has been reduced to a fragment to be incorporated into *Odes* 4,1.

The whole ideology of Horatian lyric is "phonocentric", according to the illuminating definition by Michele Lowrie [19]: it centers on the presence of a voice, and occludes writing and reading as the foundational practice.

The poet "does not meditate or introspect but exhorts, questions, invites, consoles, prays, and orders…As Horace's *Odes* profess to be directed at somebody, they naturally use the techniques of rhetoric"[20] .

The prevalent modes of discourse associated with his lyric are admonition, persuasion, greeting, farewell, praise and consolation: they all have some relationship to address and are different from soliloquy or epic narrative; they are also different from the modes of discourse typical of the iambic poems in the *Epodes*: in the *Epodes* discourse is closer to speech act, and typical modes include curse, abuse, oath, magic spell, and straightforward questioning.

If we combine the idea of reperformance with the preferred types of utterance, what is the result? He does not recreate an act of meditation (although a certain inwardness was important in turning Horace into a leading influence in European modernity); instead, he recreates an act of communication, often with temporal marker, framed by an occasion. Now it is hard to be more precise about the semiotic status of those lyric utterances. Is it more like a melancholic 'This is what I might / should have said' (Herrnstein-Smith (1979): fits the epideictic aspect of ancient lyric rather well)? Or is it the classical insight of lyric situations as Over-hearing (John Stuart-Mill), minus its Romantic overtones? [21] Dialogic (Heinze) is an even more difficult category,

---

[17] Culler (1997) 76-77.
[18] Cavarzere (1996); Feeney in Rudd (1993) 44-45 on mottoes as imitation of Greek originals *and* of the learned practice of cataloguing their poems by incipits.
[19] Lowrie (1996) 58 and 75-6, usefully adapting the Derridean concept of 'logocentrism'.
[20] Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) XXIV. See also Davis (1991).
[21] Oliensis 1998, 5-6.

available in too many versions, and confusing, because it would merge lyric with the epistolary mode.

Thoughts about the reprocessing of Greek lyric in its reception history can help. [22] After some time, through reperfomance and canonization, the reception of lyric becomes almost an act of quotation: 'those were the words of old, immortal Sappho' against the backdrop of the new performance occasion. Sappho's success among male authors (including Catullus and Horace – contrast the charming pieces by Posidippos on Sappho in women's private lives, *epigr*. 8,24; 9,2 B.-G.) shows that the difference can be a source of aesthetic pleasure. Other categories of song (often, so-called choral songs) were marked as occasional by paratexts, accessible to Horace as such: 'for the Aeginetans, at Delphi'. In short, Horace knew that lyric works in a series of reperformances at growing degrees of separation from a point of origin – and that being at the point of origin would not terribly matter.

Perhaps, with such a self-conscious strategist, we can make progress by focusing on things he does not do. In general, he moves away from effects of writtenness – they are Alexandrian and Neoteric [23]. He absorbs much of epigram culture but stays at an arm-length from speaking objects (contrast Catullus) and from ecphrasis (contrast most of other Augustan poets) [24], and from (a related issue in terms of representation) the new Rome of Augustus and its monuments [25]. He avoids self-consciousness of the text as a detachable written object, and pits the coherence of utterance and song vs the alternative of other authors as 'writers' (1,6,1 *scriberis*). Only later, writing as an authorial activity is reinscribed in the Pindaric praise poetics of book IV, as it never was in the Alcaic-Sapphic poetics of books 1-3 (cf. 4, 8,21; 9, 31). He never confuses melic poetry with epistolarity [26]. He dislikes static forms of discourse, static form being an obvious link with the epigram, a reneged model from which he learns so much: he experiments with very subtle forms of dynamic (not static) ring-composition, and gliding from argument to image, then to argument again [27]. He avoids naming himself: the only example, 4,6, 44, points outwards, towards the *Carmen Saeculare*, which is anonymous but is in turn ascribed to Horace by a public inscription.

As an author, he eschews travelling (a significant link with the self-representation of Callimachus): other people do travel and migrate, Horace is bound to fixed spaces, especially

---

[22] For Horace and Greek lyric see Hutchinson, Chapter 3 above.

[23] At the level of book composition, cf. Krevans (1984), on resistances against the 'written' texture of the tradition culminating in the Bucolics and in Horace's own book I of *Satires*.

[24] Hardie (1993).

[25] Dyson-Prior (1995) and Jaeger (1995).

[26] Note Ferri in this volume, p.   , on 'epistolary' moments in Pindaric poetry.

[27] For a refined example of close reading see Tarrant in Harrison (1995) 32-49 ('da capo' structures).

some sort of suburban/heartlandish countryside. Most places mentioned with affection, with the intention of immortalizing them, are within a day-trip from central Rome (Tibur, the Anio, Bandusia, the Sabine farmland, the Soracte), and some of the unnamed locales profile like suburban villas rather than urban mansions: so lyric is not urban, the way satire is. Horatian lyric celebrates and monumentalizes places that people in his generation would link to Republican *otium* and philosophical dialogues in prose. In fact, if we want to look at his poetic originality, we have to study a certain striking coherence in the representation of time and of space.

Coherence in time and space

In terms of time-perception, Horace differs from all Greek poets known to us: he works on the interplay, or clash, between "the impersonal grid of the state's time"[28] and the subjective perception of individual experience (4,13,14-6 *termpora quae semel / notis condita fastis / inclusit volucris dies*). So he intensifies what we call the subjective element of time by bringing in the culturally specific, Roman resource of public time-reckoning. Greek lyric had been achieving similar effects by the common strategy of contrasting linear human time-perception and recursive, cyclic time: in practice, by linking the themes of aging and of seasonal return (itself another conceptual pair that Horace loves to rewrite in some of his best poems, such as 1,4 and 4,7).

He is also unique in ancient lyric for his love of setting the time in calendrical terms – not just the rhythm of seasons that are a perennial resource from Simonides to Kavafy. The poem I just mentioned, 1.4, a combination of a spring song with Totentanz, is actually for Sestius the consul of 23 BCE (23 is our language, but for a Roman the year was identified as the Year of Sestius Consul): a very economical and intense way of indicating the publication year of the collection (the dedication to Sestius being in fact our main evidence for that date) exactly when time becomes a problematic, existential content of his poetics.

3. 8 provides a date [29], March 1, 25 BCE, for the symposion: how frequent is this in a poem? I am not aware of any equivalent in Greek poetry. 3,8 as a poem and as a symposion in fact celebrates the anniversary of the tree incident that had been described in 2.13.1 ff., and *consule Tullo* at 3,8 11-12 allows a dating at 33 BCE – not only an accident but a *locus* in the text of Horace is now being situated in time! We also have celebrative, public versions of

---

[28] Feeney in Rudd (1993) 58: a splendid discussion at 57-60.

[29] Nisbet-Rudd (2004) 124-5; Id.-Hubbard (1978) 201.

anniversaries: in 4.14,.34-40 the Alpine victory on Sextilis 1, 15 BCE 'commemorates' an Alexandrian victory on Sextilis 1, 30 BCE: th*e domus Augusta* controls time [30], the grid of time links public and private [31]. We also receive updates on the age of the poet at the moment of writing: over forty in 25 BCE = 2.4.23-4; circa fifty = 4.1.6, both times with the very Roman measure in *lustra* [32]. The point is not just an obsession with time, but a search for marked, single occasions and for marked, ritualized times of life: it also matters that a number of occasions are therefore special but also repeatable (anniversaries, festivals), therefore eminently lyrical time if we think about (re)performance.

Those superficial instances are more than skin-deep if we realize that this is the poet of *carpe diem*, the most misquoted Latin tag ever, scandalously mistranslated 'seize the day' not only on spring-break shirts but also in professional books by Classicists. It is *carpere* (*carm.* 1,11,8) not *rapere* (*epod.* 13,3) nor *capere* (*carm.* 3,8,27) nor *sumere* (*epist.* 1,11,23): it conveys not rushed pleasures but the attempt to slow down the present, as if by plucking and grazing.[33] If we consider how time is interiorized in the *Odes*, we may conclude that for the poet time is the part of him that is outside his full control.

Defensive control over anxieties is also crucial to the representation of space: the equivalent of *carpe diem* is the defensive *angulus* [34], a protected economy based on patronage, separated from the center and far from the borders: far enough to be fenced from the satiric mess and rat race of the capital, and absolutely remote from exotic wars. The new state is a warlike empire, but warlike at the borders; often barbarians and exotic images are controlled by the poem structure, imprisoned in the outer frame of the song[35], while the Romans are made doubly safe now that war is not civic but professional. Hence the irony of the tree incident, a static in-house danger, when death strikes at home through one's private property, and targets Horace who, as a poet, has a professional habit of seeking shelter under trees, *sub tegmine*. The poet does not travel, nor hawk around his skills; it is the friends who offer patterns of departure and return, particularly useful in a genre that needs to demarcate significant occasions within the temporal continuum of private life.

---

[30] Johnson (2004) 187.

[31] The coexistence of public and private has been a crucial aspect for controversies on sincerity, cf. Fraenkel (1957), La Penna (1963), Lyne (1995).

[32] Nisbet-Hubbard (1978) 76 on parallels: in Greek epigrams by Philodemus and Asclepiades. most unusual in lyric tradition.

[33] Traina (1986) 227-52.

[34] Cf. 2,6,13 sg. and the analysis of Traina (1985) 16-19.

[35] On the imperialist poetics of 'margins', Fowler in Harrison (1995) 257; Oliensis (1998) 111-13.

The addressees

If one has to choose, Heinze's 1923 *The Horatian Ode* is perhaps the single most important short text on Horatian lyric [36]. It must have been one of the first papers on Latin poetry that are a consequence of the rise of literary criticism, accepting the idea that a literary theory of modernity is inescapable and needs to be integrated with philology. Heinze also accepts the important idea that the genesis of 'new' Latin studies must be influenced from 'new' Greek studies and take for granted the influence of Greece over Rome. Finally, his paper is still important because he has an appetite for generalization that is absent from the more empirical and fragmented Nisbet-Hubbard and Fraenkel. His argument proceeds in five easy steps:

1. In the *Odes*, there is always the same lyric voice, which is 'him himself' in terms of voice. At least, there is compatibility with his persona: he, Q. Horatius Flaccus, might have said, or can be imagined as saying, such words as… Very few episodic exceptions (none of them, as it happens, in the Alcaic or Sapphic meter): 1.15, the narrative on Paris, with no reference to the modern, Roman world; 1.28, the speaker is the spirit of a dead sailor addressing Archytas of Tarentum; 3,.9 is amoebaean, thus containing utterances by Lydia as well as 'Horace'.

2.there are almost always addressees.

3. the addressees are not absent in the sense that epistolary addressees are, and the ode frequently strives to influence and modify the addressee, without the ceremonies of written communication and contact.

4. therefore there is a limited space and interest for what 'we' tend to imagine as lyric: the expression of inwardness, as a progress towards the modern idea of lyric.

5. the poem is not imagined as text and is consistently offered as 'live' and 'musical'.

The upshot of the five principles is: Horace is singing to his addressees. Equally important is the next step: 'it is all a fiction'. It is a necessary step, especially for those who agree that Horace is not a performance poet and does not compose for musical recitals. This conclusion

---

[36] Reprinted in the (unpleasantly titled) collection *Vom Geist des Römertums*, Heinze (1972); never translated in English or French; Italian edition with preface, Santini (2001).

by subtraction reveals what Heinze's true agenda had been all the time: understanding Roman lyric through opposition to Greek lyric (artificial following after natural, and obsessed with it) and through incomplete analogy with modern lyric (personal and inward expression, the quintessence of modernity, had been limited by rhetoric and praise).

The weak aspect of Heinze's thesis is this absolute opposition between Greek and Roman, Roman and European (esp. point 4). The problem is not so much the existence of individual exceptions: some of the objections made on this count against Heinze are not serious, since they presuppose verisimilitude as the standard, or focus on poems that are clearly, like 1,1, the odd ones out. There are also advantages. This kind of abstract formalism helps us to realize a certain coherence in the way Horace balances the use of the second person with forms of deixis. Explicit deixis of a dramatic kind is very low, while the second person is ubiquitous. Even in sympotic poems, there are very few examples of demonstrative deixis (otherwise only 'bland' deictic pointers such as '*nunc*', '*huc*'): the only examples I know are both, as it happens, about trees [37]: 2.11.13-14 *cur non hac sub alta vel platano vel hac / pinu iacentes...potamus*; 2.4.22 *neque harum, quas colis, arborum.* It did not have to be that way. There are three poems in Catullus that would probably qualify as lyric in the modern sense, 65, 68 and 101: the first two are very rich in address, but they are clearly epistolary, while 101 is very rich in deixis but the only interlocutor is dead and buried.

The thesis also works well in linking the form of discourse with thematizations of occasion through time-frames (anniversaries, festivals, sacrifice, arrival and departure)
Where the approach ceases to work is in the neat oppositions vs modern lyric, at the price of devaluing apostrophe in the modern genre, and vs Greek lyric, constructed as a poetry of presence, by ignoring reperformance, the metapoetic atmosphere of *symposia*, and the effect of Hellenistic textualization on Horace [38].

A socially grounded approach is not really an answer to Heinze [39], it is a radically alternative route: in Heinze's ultraformalistic terms it makes no difference whether the addressee is a tree, a ship, a slave, a prostitute, a millionnaire, a consul or Agrippa. Where those approaches agree, in a constructive way, it is in stressing that addressees always matter: compare for example the absence of addressees in two strikingly exceptional poems, 2,15 and 3, 24, where moralizing is tough and post-Sallustian, and the involvement of individuals is necessarily absent:

---

[37] On the possible significance, Barchiesi (2004), 155-7.
[38] Still very much an open debate, cf. the different projections of the dualism in Johnson (1982); Miller (1994).
[39] In the fundamental revision by Citroni (1995) 271-376; Edmunds (2001) 83-93 triangulates between Heinzian formalism, Citronian sociology, and deconstruction.

it is instructive to try to imagine those poems as a difficult no-man's land between the Roman odes and the regular 'second person' poems, especially the sympotic ones.

The sociological approach has its own rewards: a statistics of characters in the *Odes* is a highly useful control of literary interpretation. Greek names are erotic, often women; they also sound real, if we compare the epigraphical record [40]. Greek male names tend to occur in eroticized atmospheres, especially when Horace is a spectator of other people's love affairs. Private friends with verifiable citizen names are eroticized only indirectly, via a Greek proxy. Private friends are never really a group, and here we must contrast Neoteric coteries, even the *Epodes*, and the whole sympotic tradition. To talk about a circle of friends is not really a helpful metaphor, not realistic [41], yet to a certain extent the *form* of the Odes does construct the centrality of one person – Horace: the power belongs to the author who plays fast and loose with biographies and interactions, in spite of modesty. Even the 'club' idea, then, has its own justification. The restrictive field in which *amici* are invited to play, songs of wine and/or love, colours their presence, restricts information. The names are frequently significant and motivated in a positional kind of way, even when they are referential: the addressee of 2,16, the Ode on tranquillity, Grosphus, has a name which is the Greek for a javelin, and the name follows after a mention of the restless Medi with their quivers (6-7 *Medi pharetra decori / Grosphe…*). At the social level, we can verify a certain coherence the in selection of addressees. In the *Odes*, Horace does not routinely sing for the aristocracy of *nobiles*. [42] There is a polarization between a careful selection of top dedicatees, strategically placed at the beginning of book I and at the end of book III, and dominant in book IV, versus a larger a group of 'friends' mostly *homines novi*, or loosely definable as élite but not senatorial or very prominent in politics. There are careful differences of genre: with the *Epistles*, addressed to a group of younger élite Romans, excluding protagonists of politics and the cultural scene [43]; with the panoramic, multi-tier society of satire; with the world of the *Epodes,* consisting basically of Maecenas plus anonymous targets and figureheads, and weak specifics on undistinguished 'friends'.

On philosophy & love

The other significant context for the interpretation of the *Odes* is the diffusion of Greek philosophy. In general, Horace (just like Virgil) depends on Greek prose not only poetry.

---

[40] Lyne (1980) 198 sg
[41] White (1993) 82-3.
[42] Nisbet in Woodman-Feeney (2002) 81, quoting Syme (1986) 382-95.
[43] See Ferri in this volume, p. 000.

Perhaps the most direct way to approach this context is a reading of *Satire* 1,4. In that foundational poem, his father (the satiric poet now remembers) understood the importance of philosophical education and had him schooled; but there is more, his father is actually 'reformed', obviously in retrospect, through Greek philosophy (Plato's *Laws*, in particular) [44]. The son is now translating his father's image into the kind of cultural capital that had been made available by him.

The absorption of ethical debate into life and into lyric has one important side effect: Horace is perhaps the first Roman *literatus* who does not have a relationship of intensified pathos, of Pathetisierung, vis-à-vis his chosen Greek models. This tendency had been characteristic of Roman developments throughout Republican history, and holds true, with various degrees and inflections, in tragedy, comedy, epic and personal poetry. Horace's inversion of the trend is a pointed one and has to do with his ambitious revision of the society of letters and of politics in Rome: his favourite attitude is more ethics, less pathos. He is programmatically less passionate than Sappho, less violent than Archilochus or Alcaeus, less grand than Pindar, less vicious than Anacreon. His poetry privileges ethos over pathos, in spite of occasional sallies into Dionysiac territory.

Polemical too is the approach to love, and here elegy is the foil. In contrast with elegy, we find little pragmatics of seduction, little *Werbung*; the polemical substitute is an emphasis on the confessional mode, on the precariousness and mobility of desire, and on other people's love affairs. Once again the intersection with Time is important. The antielegiac mode is based on rotation and change, a different vision of love in time, open to relativism, ready to compare and contrast previous and present opportunities for love. [45] As if to enhance the opposition, the poet, after focusing on desirable women in *Odes* I-III, decides to alternate women *and boys* in book IV, now that the un-paederastic Propertius, and perhaps the young Ovid, are probably the most visible love poets in Rome. Lyric love can be observed from its margins: it begins and ends (1, 19,4 *finiti amores*) and starts again (3, 9, 17 *quid, si prisca redit Venus / diductosque iugo cogit aeneo*) or moves to another object: *vacui sive quid urimur* (1, 6, 19) - in elegiac terms like being simultaneously inside and outside the genre, impossible although tempting for the elegist (compare Ovid, *Amores* I 1, 26 *uror, et in vacuo pectore regnat Amor*)

---

[44] Citroni Marchetti (2004); on the importance for Boccaccio, Marchesi (2004) 58-66. On ethics and lyric, Macleod (1983) 225-91.
[45] Labate (1994), developing Lyne (1980) 204, 215.

The symposion

Greek lyric was in large part composed for the symposion, and in even larger part consumed and reperformed in sympotic situations. Horace depends on this model of social interaction, and on its real-life Italic adaptations, for a majority of his poems, and almost all of them are compatible with a sympotic performance of some kind. Yet as we saw there are differences: unlike Greek lyric, his texts are not dependent on musical performance, and the circulated text does not mirror the actual circumstances of performance. (The difference should not be exaggerated, as it has been in Heinze and also later: Greek sympotic poetry easily becomes meta-sympotic, and references to the 'original' occasion become very effective markers of 'literariness' once the poem is being reperformed. But then of course epigram is in a sense closer – no music, sympotic and emphatically textual – yet Horace does not want to be nailed to that tradition either). In particular, Horace often mentions or implies 'symposia for two' in some of his most characteristic and programmatic poems (especially in book II): if we want to imagine some Roman cena and/or symposion as a frame, then the picture offered by the poem is selective and streamlined. As we saw, the use of time, space and occasion thematises precisely the loss of a communal musical performance.

An approach to the Horatian symposion as a symbolic fiction is on the other hand a mistake, if we are implying that real symposia were 'real life' because they had nothing to do with symbolic exchange. The Roman symposion was in fact the place for exchange among unequal individuals [46]: the traffic included material gifts, rewards in terms of power, visibility, intellectual success, protection, continuation of 'friendship'; the interactive behavior could move through a spectrum of flattery and praise, vituperation and mockery, entertaining performance and poised self-control: a social game. Horace's game is about outstripping, paring away the social structure of the Roman cena-cum-symposion: hence the importance of programmatic poems like 1,38 and 4,1, and of the restricted use of deixis.

One final difference is significant if we think about Horace's intensive and distinctive cultivation of a professional career. Symposion culture had been about an in-group where the audience is filled by potential performers. In Horace, there is very little openness to this potential confusion of the amateur and the professional. Of course, even in the *Odes*, fellow-poets do exist, but they are never 'insiders' of the genre: we glimpse epic and elegiac authors of the Roman world, such as Virgil, Tibullus, Valgius, and surely there are other implicit presences, but there is no sense that other voices of poets can be active *within* the symposion context. (Iullus

Antonius in 4,2 is a confirmation that no 'school of lyric' is forthcoming [47]). If Greek poets perform live, it must be Hades (2.13. 21 ff.). Horace is alone [48] and the surprising success of the *Carmen saeculare* is a confirmation by exception. The only point where the poet names himself in the *Odes* is in fact a reported speech [49] by one of the performers of the *Carmen*:

"vatis Horati"   (4.6.44). The final adonaean is a replacement for the final adonaean of the *Carmen*, where the social function of the performance – praise - had been stated by the chorus, without any mention of the author, who can only be named in the public inscription:

dicere laudes   (*carm. saec.* 76)

FURTHER READING

Commentaries on individual books of the Odes: Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) and (1978) and Nisbet-Rudd (2004) are indispensable on the first three books; useful are also West (1995), (1998) and (2002), again on books I-III, and Williams (1969) on book III; Quinn (1980) on the complete Odes. A commentary on book IV on the scale of Nisbet-Hubbard-Rudd is a desideratum: Putnam (1986) is important. In languages other than English, Kiessling-Heinze (1964) is still influential; Italian commentary by E. Romano (1991: includes the neglected *Carmen Saeculare*); Syndikus (1972-3) on the complete *Odes* is also very rich and balanced.

The crucial books for the history of interpretation are Heinze (1972) (includes seminal early twentieth-century discussions of the lyric genre and of meter); Pasquali (1964) (reprint of the 1920 edition, with rich updates); Fraenkel (1957). Recent volumes of essays with emphasis on evolving critical approaches are Klingner (1965), Pöschl (1970, new ed. 1991), Cairns (1972), Macleod (1983), Davis (1991), Lowrie (1995), Oliensis (1998). Important and accessible collections of essays: Ludwig (1993); Rudd (1993); Harrison (1995); *Arethusa* 28, special number on Horace (1995); Woodman-Feeney (2002); the 2002 issue of Rethymno Classical Studies (ed. by M. Paschalis). Historical contexts: La Penna (1963) and (1969); Griffin (1986); Armstrong (1989); White (1993); Lyne (1995); Bowditch (2001).

Selected topics: allusion and 'mottoes', Cavarzere (1996); reception, Edmunds (1992); Martindale-Hopkins (1993); book structure, Santirocco (1986); poem division, S. Heyworth in Pecere-Reeve (1995) 117-48; symposion culture, Murray (1990), Murray in Rudd (1993) 89-105; Roller (2001) 135-53; Dunbabin (2005); meter, Rossi (1998); patronage, Saller (1982),

---

[46] Roller (2001) 146-54.
[47] And he may even be an epic poet: Harrison in Harrison (1995) 118-22.
[48] On programmatic 'uniqueness' of the *Carmen Saeculare*, Barchiesi in Woodman-Feeney (2002).

White (1993); addressees and social context, White (1993) (summarizing what is known of the social status of identifiable 'friends'); Citroni (1995); style, Wilkinson (1945), Traina (1985); philosophy and ideas, Traina (1973) and (1986); *Carmen Saeculare*, Feeney (1998); Putnam (2000); Schnegg-Köhler (2002); praise, T. Johnson (2004); love, Lyne (1980); Labate (1994).

On comparing different theories and ideologies of lyric, Smith (1968), W. Johnson (1982), Culler (1997), with further selective bibliography; on the relationship with Greek lyric, see Hutchinson in this volume, and the forthcoming *Cambridge Companion to Greek lyric* (F. Budelmann, ed.). The entire territory is covered by the impressive *Enciclopedia Oraziana* (Mariotti 1996-8): deplorably, the work is very difficult to find even in specialized libraries.

---

[49] Mention of the author's name in reported speech is in fact a Sapphic preference, cf. fr. 1,19-20; 65,5; 94,5; 133,2 LP.