

Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics

Dux reget examen (Epistle 1.19.23): Horace's Archilochean Signature

Version 1.0

July 2007

Joshua T. Katz

Princeton University

Abstract: This paper compares Horace the Honeybee to his iambic predecessor Archilochus the Wasp. In particular, I argue that a hitherto unrecognized way in which Horace promotes himself as the *Italicus Archilochus* is through his “signature” [*qui sibi fidet, /] dux reget examen* (Epistle 1.19.23) “[Who trusts himself] will rule the swarm as leader”—an innovative Latin calque on the Greek name Ἀρχι-λοχος (*Arkhi-lokhos*), literally “Rule-swarm.”

© Joshua T. Katz. jtkatz@princeton.edu

This paper, which was largely written in December 2006 (with minor revisions made through June 2007), will be appearing in print in *Materiali e Discussioni* 59 (2007).

In *Epistle* 1.19, addressed to Maecenas and concerned principally with the subject of literary imitation, Horace confronts a problem well known to poets everywhere, namely how to chart a fair course between acknowledging one's predecessors and asserting one's own originality and greatness*. The central section — verses 21 to 34 — begins with boasts about the poet's own achievements in the *Epodes* and then explicitly names Archilochus as his model:

libera per uacuum posui uestigia princeps,
non aliena meo pressi pede. qui sibi fidet,
dux reget examen. Parios ego primus iambos
ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
Archilochi, non res et agentia uerba Lycamben. (21-25)

After this, Horace compares his own dependence on Archilochus to the debt Sappho and Alcaeus owe the same poet, going on to note that he himself is, as it happens, a follower of Alcaeus as well (in the *Odes*)¹. But Horace is no mere epigone of either Archilochus or Alcaeus: the great achievement of this self-described *Latinus* / ... *fidicen* (32-33) «Latin lyre-player» (cf. *Carm.* 4.3.23) is to have turned what was Greek into Latin².

Horace as the bringer of Greek iambic and lyric verse-forms to Rome and Latium — this is a topos, and there is a considerable body of secondary literature on it³. Scholarly discussions

* «MD» for 'AMD' (βασιλεύς [μελιττῶν], expert on personal names, and Italian bringer of Greek language and linguistics to England): a version of this paper was delivered as «B» at «Greek from A to Ω: An Interdisciplinary Symposium in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies» (Oxford, June 2007).

¹ A. J. Woodman, *Horace, Epistles 1, 19, 23-40*, «Mus. Helv.» 40, 1983, pp. 75-81 discusses the interplay here between *Epodes* and *Odes* and proposes an attractive reading of *Epist.* 1.19 according to which the central section actually consists of verses 23b to 40 (rather than 21-34 [thus now R. Mayer, *Horace, Epistles, Book I*, Cambridge 1994, pp. 84 and *ad loc.*] or 23b-34).

² Mixing the two, as Lucilius did, was evidently not a good idea in Horace's eyes: cf. *Sat.* 1.10.27-30 (plus 31-35 on Horace's own early attempts to write just in Greek). J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 19-20 and 77 makes some helpful observations about Lucilius' Greco-Latin 'code-switching' and Horace's practice of translation.

³ On the Greek background of Horace's iambic poetry (cf. *Ars* 79), see a number of papers in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi (eds.), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, Lanham (MD) 2001, esp. A. Barchiesi, *Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian* (pp. 141-164); see also Barchiesi, *Palingenre: Death, Rebirth and Horatian Iambos*, in M. Paschalis (ed.), *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, Rethymnon 2002, pp. 47-69 and A. Morrison, *Advice and Abuse: Horace, Epistles 1 and the Iambic Tradition*, «MD» 56, 2006, pp. 29-61. For Horace's arrogation of a position in the canon of Greek lyric poets (most famously in *Carm.* 1.1.35-36), see above all D. Feeney, *Horace*

of *Epist.* 1.19, a poem that may seem scattered but whose fundamental unity was defended most thoughtfully by C. W. Macleod⁴, have tended to concentrate on verses 23b-25 («I was the first who showed Parian [i.e., Archilochean] iambs to Latium ...»; cf. *Carm.* 3.30.10-14) and, even more, on the nature of the relationship asserted to exist between Archilochus and the two lyric poets of Lesbos, especially Sappho⁵. But what about the «transitional passage»⁶ 21-23a, in which Horace, before admitting that he has followed the metrical feet of others, gives credit to his own feet: «I was the first to put free steps on virgin soil; I have pressed my foot on ground not owned by others» (21-22a)⁷? And in particular, what is the significance of the «*sententia*

and the Greek Lyric Poets, in N. Rudd (ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium*, London 1993, pp. 41-63 and T. Woodman, *Biformis uates: The Odes, Catullus and Greek Lyric*, in T. Woodman and D. Feeney (eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, Cambridge 2002, pp. 53-64 + 213-218; see also Feeney's paper in the volume edited by Paschalis, *The Odiousness of Comparisons: Horace on Literary History and the Limitations of Synkrisis* (pp. 7-18, esp. at 12), as well as Barchiesi, *Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition*, in M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge (MA) 2000, pp. 167-182 + 290-294. A.-E. Peponi, *Fantasizing Lyric: Horace, Epistles 1.19* (also in the Paschalis volume, pp. 19-45) is the latest to talk of Archilochus as a lyric poet. M. C. J. Putnam, *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*, Princeton 2006 now considers in detail what we are to make of the fact that Horace mentions his iambic and lyric Latin forebear Catullus but once (in *Sat.* 1.10.19).

⁴ *The Poet, the Critic, and the Moralizer: Horace, Epistles 1.19*, «Class. Quart.» 27, 1977, pp. 359-376 (= *Collected Essays*, Oxford 1983, pp. 262-279, with addenda and corrigenda on 343-344).

⁵ The classic discussion of *Epist.* 1.19 is E. Fraenkel, *Horace*, Oxford 1957, pp. 339-350, with 341-348 on verses 21-34; A. Thill, *Alter ab illo: recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personnelle à l'époque augustéenne*, Paris 1979, pp. 440-446 is fundamental. Useful literature since Horace's bimillennium includes J. L. Moralejo, *Horacio y sus modelos griegos (En torno a Epi. 1.19, 21-34)*, in E. Falque and F. Gascó (eds.), *Graecia capta: De la conquista de Grecia a la helenización de Roma*, Huelva 1995, pp. 45-81; A. Cucchiarelli, *Hor. Epist. 1, 19, 28: pede mascula Sappho, «Hermes»* 127, 1999, pp. 328-344; Barchiesi, *Horace and Iambos* (n. 3), pp. 149-152 and *passim*; K. Freudenburg, *Solus sapiens liber est: Recommissioning Lyric in Epistles I*, in Woodman and Feeney (eds.) (n. 3), pp. 124-140 + 232-235, esp. 134-137 + 234; and Peponi (n. 3).

⁶ W. S. Smith, Jr., *Horace Directs a Carouse: Epistle 1.19*, «Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.» 114, 1984, pp. 255-271, at 263.

⁷ There is a large bibliography on the Callimachean imagery in this verse and a-half and on Horace's appropriation of Lucretius (quoted below in the text). Freudenburg (n. 5), pp. 136 + 234 gives some orienting references, and see also Mayer (n. 1), *ad* 19.21 (but read «Lucr. 1.926-7 [= 4.1-2]» for «Lucr. 1.925-6»). The beginning of Book 3 of *De rerum natura* is particularly important, as Freudenburg notes, since Lucretius there speaks not of stepping on untrodden turf (as in 1.926-927 = 4.1-2), but instead of being a follower (of Epicurus: *te sequor* [3] «I follow you»), of placing his feet where his predecessor walked (*inque tuis nunc / ficta pedum pono pressis uestigia signis* [3-4] «and now I put down my firm footsteps on the tracks left by you»), and indeed of being an imitator (*quod te imitari aueo* [6] «because I wish to imitate you»). On

[that] enunciates the self-reliance theme»⁸, *qui sibi fidet, / dux reget examen* (22b-23a) «Who trusts himself will rule the swarm as leader»⁹?

This phrase has attracted modest attention on two grounds. For one thing, Horace seems with his choice of words to be assuming for himself quite a number of ‘political’ roles: *dux* (23) and *rex* (cf. *reget* [23]) and for that matter also *princeps* (21; cf. *Carm.* 3.30.13)¹⁰. And for another, *examen* «swarm» typically refers to bees, noble creatures whose honeyed activity is often likened to the poetic enterprise¹¹. Indeed, these two ideas can be combined: Horace is presenting himself as the ‘king’ bee, called by Aristotle both βασιλεύς «king» and ἡγεμῶν «leader» (cf. *Hist. an.* 553B6 for the juxtaposition of the two terms)¹². Compare the phrase *cum*

Lucretius’ ‘*imitatio Epicuri*’ and the ‘*primus motif*’ here, see K. Volk, *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*, Oxford 2002, pp. 86-88 and 105-116, esp. 115, with reference to D. Clay.

⁸ Mayer (n. 1), *ad* 19.22-3.

⁹ Horace’s poetry is filled with kings, but there may be a significant connection between this maxim and the proverbial jingle that Horace quotes in *Epist.* 1.1.59-60: *at pueri ludentes ‘rex eris’ aiunt, / ‘si recte facies.’* «But ‘You will be king’, boys at play [*ludentes*] say, ‘if you do the right thing’» (for fuller versions of this would-be «skipping-rope song» [K. Reckford, *Pueri ludentes: Some Aspects of Play and Seriousness in Horace’s Epistles*, «Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.» 132, 2002, pp. 1-19, at 8] — e.g., *rex erit, qui recte faciet; qui non faciet, non erit* «He will be king who does the right thing; who does not, won’t!» — see A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig 1890, p. 300 [#1537]); see also *Epist.* 1.1.107 (*rex ... regum* «king of kings»). It is well known that the first *Epistle* in Book 1 (which opens with the playful phrase *includere ludo* [3] «restrain in training») makes a ring with the last (*Epist.* 1.20, the concluding poem, is an epilogue addressed to the book itself, not a letter), where in the end Horace literally calls for a ludic time-out (*diludia* [1.19.47] «intermission»); see most recently Reckford, pp. 2-4 and 7-9, who refers particularly to O. A. W. Dilke.

¹⁰ Compare now Freudenburg (n. 5), pp. 134-140 + 234-235, who discusses Horace’s self-representation as *triumphator* in *Epist.* 1.19.

¹¹ See J. H. Waszink, *Biene und Honig als Symbol des Dichters und der Dichtung in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Opladen («Rhein.-Westfäl. Akad. der Wiss.», Vorträge G 196) 1974, M. Davies and J. Kathirithamby, *Greek Insects*, New York 1986, pp. 70-72, and also R. Nünlist, *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1998, pp. 60-63 and 300-306; see as well, e.g., Mayer (n. 1), *ad* 19.22-3 and 44. Davies and Kathirithamby, pp. 47-75 provide the fullest discussion of bees in classical (but especially Greek) antiquity (plus pp. 75-83 on wasps and wasp-like creatures); see also O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, vol. 2, Leipzig 1913, pp. 421-431 + 607-608 (plus pp. 431-435 + 608 on wasps).

¹² Compare W. R. Johnson, *Horace and the Dialectic of Freedom: Readings in Epistles I*, Ithaca 1993, p. 90 (verses 22b-23a are a «nice poetic expropriation of the political metaphor for “trivial” artistic ends») and Smith (n. 6), p. 263 (who, however, considers Horace as a «mighty general who presides over a swarm of bees» and Horace as «“king” of the bees» to be «[a]lternative[s]»). On ‘kings’, see, e.g., Davies and Kathirithamby (n. 11), pp. 62-63, who note that «[i]t is notorious that Greek and Roman writers mistook the sex» of the leader (62); only in the 17th century was it properly established that the king bee is actually a queen, though there is evidence that some ancient Greeks imagined the leader as female (T. Hudson-Williams, *King*

... *ducent examina reges* «when kings lead swarms» in verse 21 of the greatest Latin poetic treatment of bees, Vergil's fourth *Georgic*, which was published a decade before the first book of *Epistles* and (as we shall see below) acted as a source for Horace, three of whose letters (1.1, 1.7, and our 1.19) and most of whose other works, are addressed to Maecenas, just as the *Georgics* are.

We can take this thought further, both within the epistle itself (and its reflection of earlier Latin poetry) and in connection with Archilochus. As to the former, the ancient Greeks and Romans were aware that there were three kinds of honeybees: the leader (king or queen; βασιλεύς or ἡγεμών, *dux* [Varro+] or *rex* [e.g., Verg. *Georg.* 4 *passim*; note also *ductores* in verse 88, as well as *duces* in verse 4]); the usual (to us today 'worker') bees (μέλιτται, *apes*), who (among other things) go from flower to flower; and the drones (κηφήνες, *fuci*), who stay put in the hive¹³. Not only is Horace the *dux/rex apium* (cf. Porph. *ad Epist.* 1.19.23), but an allusion right before the central section on which I am concentrating makes it clear that he, unlike the mindless imitators against whom he rails, is definitely not a parasitic drone: he addresses them, *o imitatores, seruum pecus*, ... (19) «O [you] imitators, servile herd, ...», where the implied referent of *pecus* is not sheep or other barnyard animals, as it usually is, but rather bees since it clearly recalls Vergil's *ignauum ... pecus* (*Georg.* 4.168 [= *Aen.* 1.435]) «lazy herd», said explicitly of drones (*fucos* [168])¹⁴. Furthermore, as noted above, Horace's verses 21-22a, *libera per uacuum posui uestigia princeps, / non aliena meo pressi pede*, owe much to Lucretius' Callimachean pronouncements, *auia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante / trita solo* (1.926-927 = 4.1-2) «I roam through the pathless places of the Pierides, never before trodden by any foot» and especially *inque tuis nunc / ficta pedum pono pressis uestigia signis* in the 'imitatio Epicuri'-section (3.3-4; see n. 7)¹⁵, both of which have bees as part of their larger context¹⁶. In 3.11,

Bees and Queen Bees, «Class. Rev.» 49, 1935, pp. 2-4 collects the evidence): e.g., Aristotle speaks of τῶν βασιλέων γόνος (*Hist. an.* 554A24) «the kings' brood» while noting, καὶ καλοῦνται ὑπὸ τινῶν μητέρες ὡς γεννῶντες (553A29) «Some people call them "mothers," implying that they produce the young» (trans. of A. L. Peck's 1970 *Loeb*); Xenophon's ἡ τῶν μελιττῶν ἡγεμών (*Oec.* 7.32) «the leader-ess of the bees», to whom the good Athenian wife is likened, «results from the metaphor he is constructing rather than from scientific knowledge» (S. B. Pomeroy, *Xenophon, Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary*, Oxford 1994, *ad loc.* [p. 278]).

¹³ This is a convenient simplification of a significantly more complex picture: e.g., Aristotle (*Hist. an.* 553A26 and 553B7-11 [~ 624B21-27]) reports that there are two kinds of kings and four other sorts of bees.

¹⁴ Compare Smith (n. 6), pp. 262-263; see also, e.g., R. F. Thomas, *Virgil, Georgics*, vol. 2, Cambridge 1988, *ad Georg.* 4.168 («*pecus* has a strongly derogatory tone» in both Vergil and Horace), as well as R. A. B. Mynors, *Virgil, Georgics*, Oxford 1990, *ad Georg.* 4.167-8. Macleod (n. 4, 1977), pp. 370 and 374 (= Macleod [n. 4, 1983], pp. 273 and 277) believes Horace to be proclaiming himself king of the imitators (i.e., the drones), but this does not seem to me to be correct.

¹⁵ Note the emphasis on *p*'s in all three; compare R. Ferri, *I dispiaceri di un epicureo: Uno studio sulla poetica oraziana delle Epistole (con un capitolo su Persio)*, Pisa 1993, pp. 50-51, with references on 51 n. 44.

Epicurus' followers take in their master's precepts just «as bees drink everything in the flowering meadows» (*floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant*); in the passage about Lucretius' poetics (1.921-950, esp. 1.926-950 ~ 4.1-25), the poet says, «and it is pleasing to gather new flowers» (*iuuatque nouos decerpere flores* [1.928 = 4.3]) and then moves on to a lengthy account of poetic honey (1.935-947 ~ 4.10-22)¹⁷.

What, now, is the link between Archilochus and Horace's self-presentation as leader of the swarm? Since ancient texts sometimes confuse bees and wasps¹⁸, it is tempting to think that Horace's aphorism neatly brings his similarity to the famously waspish Archilochus (Callimachus [*fr.* 380 Pfeiffer = 357 Asper] refers to Archilochus' κέντρον / σφηκός «wasp's sting»)¹⁹ together with his own poetic sweetness²⁰. At the end of *Epist.* 1.19, a scornful critic says of Horace something he himself does not wish to deny, namely, '*rides*' ait '*et Iouis auribus ista / seruas: fidis enim manare poetica mella / te solum, tibi pulcher*' (43-45) «'You laugh', he says, 'and keep those [works] of yours for the ears of Jupiter [i.e., Augustus]. For you believe that you alone, pleased with yourself, drip poetic honey'». In effect, the poet puts into someone else's mouth his one-upmanship of Archilochus: certainly Horace has been an aggressive wasp himself, but he is really a honeybee, able to *manare poetica mella*. He really has no poisonous sting at all since, as already Aristotle (*Hist. an.* 553B6-7, 626A23, and 628B2-3) knew, the king bee, unlike others bees and of course unlike typical wasps, «does not use h[is] sting on a human

¹⁶ It is amusing to realize that at least some Romans — including Vergil and Ovid — connected *apis* with ἄπους «foot-less»; see, e.g., A. Michalopoulos, *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon*, Leeds 2001, pp. 32-33, with references.

¹⁷ G. Warmuth, *Autobiographische Tierbilder bei Horaz*, Hildesheim 1992, pp. 89-93 + 191-195 discusses Horace's self-presentation as a poetry-creating *apis* in *Carm.* 4.2.27-32. Nowhere in the book, however, does he appear to mention *Epist.* 1.19.

¹⁸ The Greek evidence is briefly sketched in Davies and Kathirithamby (n. 11), p. 75; on wasps of various types, see also I. C. Beavis, *Insects and other Invertebrates in Classical Antiquity*, Exeter 1988, pp. 187-198 and 212-217. Already in the *Iliad*, the Achaeans are likened simultaneously to wasps and bees (ὥς τε σφήκες ... ἢ μέλισσαι [12.167] «like wasps ... or bees»). Note that both animals have kings (cf., e.g., Arist. *Hist. an.* 629A3-7; but Pliny [*Nat.* 11.74] denies that wasps have kings) and can travel in swarms: the Greek troops are compared to bees in the first extended simile in the *Iliad*, 2.87-93 (ἡύτε ἔθνεα εἶσι μελισσάων ἀδινάων [87] «just as the tribes of swarming bees go ...»; for the use of ἀδινός «thick; thronging» of bees, see C. Watkins, *Old Irish saithe, Welsh haid: Etymology and Metaphor*, «Étud. Celt.» 16, 1979, pp. 191-194 [= *Selected Writings*, ed. L. Oliver, Innsbruck 1994, pp. (II.)622-625]), and the Myrmidons to wasps in a later simile, 16.259-267 (αὐτίκα δὲ σφήκεσσιν εὐικότες ἐξεχέοντο [259] «and immediately like wasps they poured forth ...»); compare, e.g., Davies and Kathirithamby, pp. 7 and 75-76, and note also *examen uesparum* «swarm of wasps» in Liv. 35.9.4.

¹⁹ Wasps (σφήκας [acc.]) are mentioned in verse 6 of Gaetulicus' epigram for Archilochus' tomb (*Anth. Pal.* 7.71); on this poem, see now C. G. Brown, *Arrows and Etymology: Gaetulicus' Epitaph for Archilochus*, «Class. Philol.» 96, 2001, pp. 429-432.

²⁰ For Horace as a 'softened Archilochus' in the *Epodes*, see S. J. Harrison, *Some Generic Problems in Horace's Epodes: Or, on (not) being Archilochus*, in Cavarzere, Aloni, and Barchiesi (eds.) (n. 3), pp. 165-186.

being»²¹. Note that *rides* (43) picks up *iocum* (20), *Iouis* (43) picks up *princeps* (21) as well as *dux* (23), *seruas* (44) picks up (the sound of) *seruum* (19), and *fidis enim manare poetica mella / te solum, tibi pulcher* (44-45) picks up the phrase with which I am particularly concerned, *qui sibi fidet, / dux reget examen* (22-23): *fidis ~ fidet, te solum ~ dux reget* (cf. also *solo* in Lucr. 1.927 = 4.2), *tibi ~ sibi*, and *poetica mella ~ examen*²².

To be sure, some scholars have detected Greek antecedents in Horace's *dux reget examen*. Most significantly, Alessandro Barchiesi (anticipated by Adolf Kießling, whom Barchiesi does not cite²³) suggests that Cratinus' depiction of prior poets as a σοφιστῶν συμῆνος «swarm of literati» in his *Archilochoi* (fr. 2 Kassel—Austin) is «perhaps the stingy [i.e., having a sting!] model»²⁴. But what appears to have gone unnoticed, in both ancient commentaries and modern criticism²⁵, is that Horace's verse-initial «clever phrase»²⁶ *dux reget examen* — the bridge between his boasts of independence and his admission of a Greek debt — is nothing less than an innovative Latin calque on the name of the poet to whom he owes that debt, named for the first time just two verses later and in the same metrical position: *Archiloch[us]*, Ἀρχί-λοχος, literally «Rule-swarm»²⁷.

²¹ Davies and Kathirithamby (n. 11), p. 63; they note that «in fact ... the [king] bee's sting has fewer and shorter barbs in comparison with worker bees ... and is not employed except against rival [king]s». Pliny (*Nat.* 11.52) has a good brief account of whether the *rex* actually lacks a sting (as even Aristotle himself claims elsewhere: *Hist. an.* 629A25) or merely does not use it; cf. also Ael. *NA* 1.60.

²² Compare M. J. McGann, *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles*, Brussels 1969, p. 84 and Macleod (n. 4, 1977), p. 374 (= Macleod [n. 4, 1983], p. 277). Also reminiscent of *examen* is *spissis ... theatris* (41) «in close-packed theaters» (trans. of Macleod, *Horace, The Epistles*, Rome 1986, p. 55), which Emily Gowers suggests to me may be a reference to Aristophanes' *Wasps* (Σφήκες). The sibilant-heavy *spissis* — whose cognates in Baltic refer specifically to swarming bees (see Watkins [n. 18, 1979], p. 193 [= n. 18, 1994], p. 624) — sounds like the buzzing of wasps.

²³ See A. Kießling, *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Briefe*, ed. by R. Heinze, with additions by E. Burck, Berlin 1961⁷, *ad Epist.* 1.19.21 (already in Kießling's 1st ed. of 1889).

²⁴ Barchiesi, *Horace and Iambos* (n. 3), p. 150; Horace mentions Cratinus by name in the first line of our poem (as also in the first line of *Sat.* 1.4). Differently, Freudenburg (n. 5), pp. 136-137 suggests that «*examen* = Gk θίασος» (136), arguing that the Bacchic imagery evident in the first part of the poem (verses 1-11) continues into this section.

²⁵ Though my colleague Denis Feeney, whom I thank for his comments on this paper, has shown me his marginal note to the same effect in his copy of the *OCT* of Horace. Seeing this was both reassuring and a tad depressing.

²⁶ Smith (n. 6), p. 263.

²⁷ While λόχος does not appear to be used of bees (or other insects) anywhere in Greek literature, hosts of warriors in Homer are on three occasions referred to with the collocation πυκινὸν λόχον (*Il.* 4.392 and 24.779 and *Od.* 11.525) «close-packed ambushade/battalion *vel sim.* (acc.)» (see *LfrgE* s.v. λόχος/λόχεος [G. C. Wakker] and the literature cited there). Note that *examen* in Latin has a human sense already in Plaut. *Truc.* 534; in addition to referring to bees, Old Irish *saithe* «swarm», glossed as *examen*, is used, «by extension, for a host or throng» (Watkins [n. 18, 1979], p. 193 [= n. 18, 1994], p. 624). As for ἀρχ-, see also the mention of

In the next book of *Epistles*, Horace notes that Ennius, famous for his epic hexameters, is *alter Homerus, / ut critici dicunt* (2.1.50-51) «a second Homer (as the critics call him)». Perhaps Horace, here writing in hexameters, wishes to hold this title himself; as far as his *Odes* are concerned, he probably «s[ees] himself, and represent[s] himself as being seen, as a second Alcaeus» (and Sappho)²⁸; but in any case, the playful ‘signature’ in *Epist.* 1.19.23 announces to the cognoscenti that his *Epodes* have already earned him the right to be called Rome’s king of the iambic genre, the leader of the swarm, the *Italicus Archilochus*²⁹.

«θιασάρχης» on p. 137 of Freudenburg’s paper cited in n. 5 (compare n. 24). One of the anonymous referees points out that on the level of diction, Horace is here literally «following» his «leader»: *secutus / Archilochi* (24-25).

²⁸ Woodman, *Biformis uates* (n. 3), p. 58 (said, though, of the *Epistles*); cf. *Epist.* 2.2.99.

²⁹ As one of the anonymous referees notes, Horace’s verbal play is especially appropriate since Archilochus himself is notoriously fond of ‘speaking names’; see, e.g., M. G. Bonanno, *Nomi e soprannomi archilochei*, «Mus. Helv.» 37, 1980, pp. 65-88.