4

RICHARD THOMAS

Horace and Hellenistic poetry

At first sight the early poetry of Horace may appear to be revisionist in comparison with what was happening to Roman literature in the middle third of the first century BCE. The experimentation of Catullus, Calvus and Cinna, for instance, looks programmatically to Alexandria, with each poet producing epyllion and erotic epigram, and with an interest in aetiological topics – some of the chief genres or modes whose development in the third century gives us much of what we consider essential to the Alexandrian poetic achievement. Cornelius Gallus, Propertius and Tibullus created Roman elegy, a genre whose roots are likewise in erotic epigram, Catullan elegiacs and Callimachean poetics; and Virgil's *Eclogues* stand as a comprehensive act of Roman Alexandrianism, tied formally to Theocritus, spiritually to Callimachus, and frequently in a complex polemical relationship to Gallus and the nascent genre of elegy. Next to all of this we have Horace's revival of Archilochean iambic, his new embracing of the Roman genre of satire (if we care to follow Quintilian's ultimately unuseful taxonomy, *satura quidem tota nostra est*, *Inst.* 10.1.93), even his transference to Rome of archaic Greek lyric. All of this might seem to go against the grain. Horatian tastes in the 40s and 30s might on the face of it even seem more Ciceronian than Catullan.[1]

Callimachus, *Recusatio* and *Dichterweihe*

In distinction from the early poetry of Virgil, and from that of Propertius, whose Alexandrianism is very much on as well as beneath the surface, Horatian Alexandrianism emerges more subtly. He would name Callimachus only at *Epistle* 2.2.100, with some irony referring to a writer of elegy,

---

1 So Hutchinson (1988) 289–91 devotes fewer than two pages to Horace in his 78-page chapter 'Roman poetry' [and Hellenistic poetry].

perhaps Propertius, as 'Callimachus', himself as 'Alcaeus' precisely because that is how Propertius, around the same time, had defined himself (4.1.64 *Romani . . . Callimachi*). While Propertius so identified himself, both prospectively at the start of a largely aetiological book of elegies (Book 4), and retrospectively with reference to the poetics of his previous works (implicit in Book 1, stated in Books 2 and 3), Horace on the other hand limits his overt claims to fame to the formal and metrical achievement of having converted the genres of his source models: for the *Satires* Lucilius at *Satires* 1.4.6–7, for the *Epodes* Archilochus at *Epistle* 1.19.23–25, for the *Odes* Sappho and Alcaeus at *Odes* 3.30.10–14, Alcaeus at *Epistle* 1.19.32–33. But in precisely these contexts, he describes his own involvement in those genres in terms that suggest renovation by way of Callimachean poetics, particularly through the expectations of *leptotes* and *techne*, and with a view to writing not for the crowd but only for those on the inside of such poetics (*Satires* 1.10.50–91; *Epistle* 1.19.37–40; *Odes* 3.30.13–14). Nisbet and Rudd have denied the Callimachean possibilities implied by the last of these (*Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*), where, however, *carmen . . . deduxisse* naturally implies a Callimachean treatment of the genre model, as is demonstrably the case in Virgil's adaptation of the *Aetia* preface at *Eclogues* 6.4–5 *deductum dicere carmen* (and later at Ovid *Met.* 1.4 *perpetuum . . . deducite carmen*). It is certainly hard to deny the Callimacheanism of Virgil in *Eclogues* 6 or Propertius 2.1.39–42, but many readers have had difficulty seeing beyond Horace's named genre models. This is of course an old prejudice, perhaps not confined to modern readers. Horace himself would draw attention to the under-reading of his verse at *Epistle* 2.1.224–5 *cum lamentamur non apparere labores / nostros et tenui deducta poemata filo* ('when we lament the fact that people don't get our lucubrated poems spun out with slender thread').

Although Horace avoids the naming of Propertius 2.1 and 3.1 and the near-translation we find at the opening of the sixth *Eclogue*, he nevertheless incorporates Alexandrian, and specifically Callimachean, programme words and phrases at a number of prominent beginnings and endings. At *Odes* 2.20.4 his prediction for himself (*invidiaque maior* 'greater than envy') mirrors Callimachus' judgement of his own song at *Epigram* 21.4 Pf. ('his song was better than envy'); at 3.1.1 *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* stakes out a sacral version of the same poet's (*Epigram* 28.4 Pf.) 'I hate everything vulgar'; similar to this is Horace's claim to be distinct from the mob by virtue of his association with the cool poetic grove and choruses of nymphs and Satyrs (*Odes* 1.1.30–32, cf. 32 *secernunt populo*); towards the end of *Satires* 1.10 he enjoins careful composition for poets who want to be read more than

once, and by the right people (73–5, cf. 73 *turba*); and in the envoi to the first book of *Epistles*, he expresses anxiety about the book's fate (1.20.11–12 *contrectatus ubi manibus sordescere vulgi / coeperis*). The Callimachean preference for the artful and small-scale (*Aetia* 1, fr. 1.1–9, *Hymn* 2.105–12, *fr. gram.* 465 Pf.) finds precise expression in Horace, and in contexts suggesting a direct engagement with and affiliation to the Hellenistic poet. So at *Satires* 1.4.6–25 Lucilius is to be faulted for writing 200 lines an hour while standing on one foot, as if that were a great achievement. The point is repeated at *Satire* 1.10.9 *est brevitate opus* 'brevity is what's needed'.

Although more oblique than the sixth *Eclogue*, to which it may be alluding by position, the sixth poem of Horace's first lyric collection is a clear instance of the Callimachean *recusatio*, establishing the poet's 'incompetence' in the area of political encomium, as well as in the higher genres, likewise eschewed by Callimachus in the *Aetia* preface (*Aet.* 1, pref. 17–24), Virgil in his *Eclogue*, and Propertius 2.1.[2] Horace's version is in fact as close to the *Aetia* preface as any in Latin poetry – *Odes* 1.6.5–12:

> nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem
> Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
> nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei
>   nec saevam Pelopis domum
>
> conamur, tenues grandia, dum pudor
> inbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
> laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
>   culpa deterere ingeni.

We don't try to tell of these things, Agrippa, nor of the bad temper of Peleus' son, who didn't know how to yield, nor two-faced Ulysses' sea travels, nor the savage house of Pelops, big topics for slender types like me, so long as my shyness and the Muse who rules over the unwarlike lyre forbid me to detract from the praises of splendid Caesar and yourself through want of poetic talent.

The display of high-register incompetence proves the point. Epic and tragic themes are lumped together; low-register *stomachus* represents Homeric *menis*; *duplicis* uncomplicates Homeric *polytropos* – as had Tityrus' confusion of the Scylla's and mixing up of Philomela and Procne at *Eclogue* 6.74–81.[3] Moreover, the flip-side of a lack of *ingenium* is an abundance of *ars*, precisely what the Callimachean poet wants. So it is that Horace's theme will be dinner-parties, his battles those of girls against young men, fought, however, with clipped nails – never too serious (1.6.17–20):

2 See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 80–3, with references to Wimmel (1960) passim.
3 See R. F. Thomas (1998) 295.

52

nos convivia, nos proelia virginum
sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium
cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur,
 non praeter solitum leves.

The *recusatio*, and the ultimate presence of the *Aetia* preface and other Callimachean sites, is not confined to this programmatic poem, but is in fact embedded throughout the corpus. *Odes* 2.12 opens with the lyric poet rejecting the suitability of military and mythological themes (1–9). Maecenas is rather to do a prose account of the battles of Caesar (10 *proelia Caesaris*), while Horace will sing of the erotic appeal of Licymnia, probably to be seen as Maecenas' wife Terentia, *pace* those who feel this would be beyond the bounds of taste. Elsewhere (*Odes* 2.1.37–40, 3.3.69–70), Horace recovers his Callimachean stance (*leviore plectro*, *desine . . . magna modis tenuare parvis* respectively) at the close of poems that had become involved in martial and epic themes. Even the *Epistle to Augustus* (2.1) turns out to be a *recusatio*. The poem responds to a real or fictitious protestation from the *princeps* that the poet never addresses him (Suetonius *Life of Horace*). But here too in the end praise of Augustus will have to be done by those who have the poetic stamina, Virgil and Varius for instance (247). Horace is not up to it and again fears detracting:

sed neque parvum
carmen maiestas recipit tua, nec meus audet
rem temptare pudor quam vires ferre recusent.

But your greatness shouldn't get a little song, not does my sense of shame dare
to try out a topic that is beyond my strength.

Again, in the world of Callimachus *parvum* is good, while *maiestas* (too big?) can be problematic. Perhaps the final form of the Horatian *recusatio* comes at the end of the return to lyric, *Odes* 4.15, where Apollo interrupts him (as he had Callimachus at *Aetia* fr. 1.21–2 Pf.) and stops him singing of battles and conquered cities, and so his song becomes, somewhat surprisingly, a paean to the *aetas Augusta*. Irony returns at the end as Horace predicts for himself a poem on Troy, Anchises and Aeneas.

Horace would in fact imbed such refusals into the *Satires*, in spite of one view that 'Hellenistic convention is a cock that will not fight in the *Satires*'.[4] The fact is that these poems fundamentally uphold Callimachean principles of composition against the Lucilian looseness that it is Horace's enterprise to trim back, all in the interests of attention to artistry. *Satires*

---

4 Shackleton Bailey (1982) 75.

53

1.4 and 1.10 stipulate that Horatian satire is to avoid turgidity and artlessness and will be redirected through the tenets of Callimachean polemics and the principles of brevity, with an emphasis on *techne* and exclusivity.[5] In these poems he even plays on the agricultural context of the Callimachean *recusatio*, in the poem recording the acquisition of his farm. Where the Hellenistic poet was instructed by Apollo to rear his sacrificial victim to be 'as fat as possible' but to keep his Muse 'slender', Horace thanks Mercury for his good fortune, and offers up a prayer: 'make the master's herd fat along with everything else, except his poetic talent (*ingenium*)' (*Satires* 2.6.14–15).

Perhaps the closest intertext with Callimachus comes at *Odes* 4.3.1–16, where Horace, addressing the Muse Melpomene, declares that the one – himself – on whose birth the Muse serenely looked (2 *nascentem placido lumine videris*) will be made famous, not on Rome's Capitoline for success in boxing, chariot-racing or conducting the affairs of war, but rather because of Aeolic song, away from Rome by the waters and groves of Tibur. The Callimachean impulse is evident: at *Aetia* 1 fr. 1.37–8 the poet notes of himself that the Muses do not reject in their old age those 'on whose childhood they looked with benign eye'. Fraenkel ((1957) 449) writes of the 'echo' of Callimachus, who 'in his turn is indebted to Hesiod' (*Theogony* 81ff.). But more is going on here. From the texts cited it is clear, as Fraenkel noted, that Horace is referring to the specific Callimachean passage, but his use of the present participle *nascentem*, where Callimachus simply had the noun, constitutes a direct reference to the Hesiodic text, where the Muses pour sweet dew on the tongue of the one they honour 'and look upon as he is being born' (82). Hutchinson ((1988) 288) also notes that Horace's subsequent mention of the defeat of envy, already noted elsewhere in both authors, is essentially Callimachean: 4.3.16 *et iam dente minus mordeor invido*, 'and now I am less bitten by the tooth of envy'.

This marks a good place of transition from discussion of Hellenistic and Callimachean tags, and programmatic utterances, and overt intertexts, to the more subtle but fundamental Hellenistic principles that underlie Horace's works, and that communicate and renovate those principles in a Roman and Horatian context. *Odes* 4.3, in conflating the Hesiodic proem with the *Aetia* preface of Callimachus, establishes Horace in a tradition that had been operative for him since the first book of the *Satires*. But here, towards the end of his literary career, he provides a demonstration of how that tradition works in its Horatian context. What follows the Hesiodic-Callimachean opening to the poem is a priamel, the signature Horatian means of 'getting started'

---

5 Scodel (1987).

54

(as in *Epodes* 1.1–6, *Odes* 1.1, with variations at *Satires* 1.1, *Epistles* 1.1.1–12): the poet on whose birth Melpomene smiled will not be made famous by games, chariot-racing or war (themselves generic as well as professional activities), but rather will be fashioned as noble and known (12 *nobilem* connotes both) through his Aeolic song, in Tibur's idyllic setting. Specification of Tibur renovates the Callimachean trope into an Italian setting. Where Callimachus closed the loop by asserting the Muses' continued support in his old age, Horace gives us Tibur, but in doing so he alludes to the full Callimachean context, for Tibur is to be, in the Aeolic song that secured the status of Horatian lyric *Odes* 1–3, precisely the dwelling-place of the poet in his old age, at least in his wishes (*Odes* 2.6.5–6 *Tibur . . . / sit meae sedes utinam senectae*). That earlier poem, moreover, had implicated Virgilian poetics by putting forward as an alternative retirement-place the Galaesus river and the countryside of Tarentum (*Odes* 2.6.10–12), the river being the locale of Virgil's appealing and literarily mysterious *senex Corycius* (*Georgics* 4.125–48).

The issues of allusivity, poetics and traditional affiliation and distinction again come to the fore in Horace's chief statement of his poetic initiation or *Dichterweihe*. Poetic initiation, particularly where the Muses are involved, suggests a higher register, and that may be the reason that Horace sets his own initiation, in the Hesiodic-Callimachean mode, in the middle of the Roman Odes, at the start of a poem that explores the Pindaric function of Horatian lyric (*Odes* 3.4). His version is also emphatically Italian, making the Roman Odes a good site for this poem. Hesiod encountered the Muses while shepherding on Mount Helicon (*Theogony* 22–9), while Callimachus, at the start of the four-book *Aetia*, seems to have been transported in a dream to Helicon, where he met the Muses of Hesiod (*Aetia* 1, fr. 2 Pf.), who either legitimised his aetiological endeavours, or, as now seems likely, may have continued in conversation with the dreaming poet for the duration of *Aetia* 1–2. In Horace's version, we find the poet first invoking Calliope (*Odes* 3.4.1–4), whose appearance is to be accompanied by vocals, lyre or cithara. The epiphany seems to occur, and Horace finds himself wandering in pious groves (5–8). We are then transported to his youth, with the account of his early initiation, not on Helicon, and not in a dream-journey to Helicon, but while sleeping in his native Apulia on Mount Vultur. Here doves cover him with leaves, a miracle to the locals of Acherontia, Bantia and Forentum, Apulian and Lucanian towns barely known to fame but witnesses to the initiation of this Italian poet (3.4.9–20). As a result Horace belongs not to the Muses of Greece, of Hesiod and Callimachus, but now to the Italic Camenae, as he functions in the fashionable and favoured towns of Latium and Campania (3.4.21–4).

Polyeideia and complexity of voice

This is the essence of Horace's Alexandrianism: visible traces and affiliations, but innovation and originality. So far we have been dealing chiefly with Callimachus, and it has always been the case that the terms 'Hellenistic', 'Alexandrian', and 'Callimachean' blend into each other, particularly in discussions of poetics. It is also the case that Horace resembles Callimachus in a number of ways, first in his practice of *polyeideia*, or the writing of different genres, a practice defended by Callimachus in *Iambi* 13.

There is also something Hellenistic about the voices or personas Horace creates, situated in the establishment of a base voice, a sympathetic personal character that works throughout the corpus. The satires establish this voice, but it is to be found also throughout the iambic and lyric. If we think of the Sapphic, Archilochean or Pindaric voices, for instance, we find an infinitely more straightforward voice or set of voices than those of the lyric Horace. The reading public of Horace met the poet by way of a reported conversation with Maecenas: 'Maecenas, how come nobody can live content with the life chance or intellect has given him, but praise people who get a different break?' (*Satires* 1.1.1 *Qui fit, Maecenas, ut nemo, quam sibi sortem / seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa / contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentis?*). Regardless of addressee, and whether in the *Satires*, *Epistles* or the lyrics, the voice of Horace always speaks to us, and engages us as participants in the game that is Horatian poetry. This conspiratorial and intimate relationship between poet and reader is particularly a feature of all Hellenistic poetry except epic. It is particularly a feature of epigram, in which text and reader are at least putatively in physical contact.[6]

The *Odes* and Hellenistic epigram

It is a notable fact that epigram, erotic, sepulchral, dedicatory or satirical, immensely popular with Catullus and the Neoterics, is not to be found in the Augustan poets. If the poems from Meleager's anthology had been successfully adapted and transferred into the Roman context of these poems, it may be that the genre was felt as having played itself out. There is also the case that elegy had already shown that epigram might be expanded. Propertius 1.1.1–4 translates the homoerotic Meleager 105 Page while launching the Monobiblos, the first book of the elegies.

But epigram remained important as a mine for poetic figures and themes, and the genre is to be found, transformed, throughout the poetry of Horace.

6 See Pasquali (1964) 317–25 for the Hellenistic poets' predilection for talking of themselves.

At times, particularly in the *Odes*, the connection to Greek epigram is straightforward and unmediated. So 4.10, the second Ligurinus poem (*O crudelis adhuc*), for all its textual problems, amounts to little more than an epigram of the type found at *Anth. Pal.* 12.24–41, almost all Meleagrian and therefore available to Horace. But 4.10 has a connection to the opening poem of the book, and the reader who arrives at it immediately connects with the notorious Ligurinus of 4.1 and asks what has happened in the interval – that is in the nature of Horatian intratextuality. Like many of the Greek models, the poem addresses a younger man whose current resistance to the older lover will be a source of regret when the former grows old and hirsute. Likewise 1.5, the Pyrrha Ode, and 3.26 (*Vixi puellis nuper idoneus*) resemble dedicatory 'retirement' epigrams, with Horace giving up the life of the lover, and giving thanks for his salvation. However, in 3.26 we get a creative complication: *vixi* invokes the sepulchral tradition, Hellenistic as well as Roman. This is a doubling that had already occurred in the Greek tradition. In *Odes* 1.20 we have a dinner-invitation poem (*Vile potabis*), and Nisbet and Hubbard rightly point to an example by Philodemus (*Anth. Pal.* 11.44) which was doubtless familiar to Horace. Of course Catullus had already admitted the subgenre to his hendecasyllables (Catullus 13 *Cenabis bene*), and the Catullan intertext (cheap drinking: *vile potabis* / fine dining: *cenabis bene*) is an acknowledgement on Horace's part. Whether Catullus' poem preceded that of Philodemus cannot be known.

Just as epigram is accommodated to larger lyric purposes in the *Odes*, we find different modification in the *Epistles*. So *Epistle* 1.5, at least in its first eleven lines, is indistinguishable from *Odes* 1.20 or Catullus 13; indeed, it is closer to the latter, with the ingredients of the invitation-poem present: a modest, vegetarian meal, a presumably unpretentious wine – unless Torquatus brings a better one – figured with the same future tense (4 *vina bibes*), and the opportunity to talk well into the summer night, since the next day is Caesar's birthday. The poem then continues with a brief *laus convivii*, specification of the details of the party, and a further guestlist, as the poem ends with the admonition that Torquatus drop his legal business (the defence of Volcacius Moschus) and indeed come to dinner. So the invitation, with an attendant exhortation to enjoy the day, is integrated into the collection of *Epistles*. Horace would return to a lyric expression of the theme in *Odes* 4.12, inviting Virgil (or 'Vergilius', for those who do not believe we are dealing with the poet) to a similar party (cf. 16 *nardo vina merebere*).

This process of integration in fact is part of the genre creation that is at the heart of Horatian poetry, and is a mark of its affinity with Hellenistic literature. Hellenistic epigram is itself an expansion of a prior tradition. This

is particularly the case with sympotic and erotic in epigram, but also with a variety of other types, as we can now see from the 'Posidippus' papyrus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309). These epigrams, with multiple poems on each of a series of topics (gemstones, bird augury, shipwrecks, statues, etc.), stand as demonstrations of the way subgenres came into being, tied to no performative genre in archaic or classical Greek poetry. We can now see how a poem like *Odes* 1.28, the Archytas ode, is situated precisely in this genre of shipwreck epigrams (*nauagika*).[7]

In his monumental *Orazio lirico* Giorgio Pasquali sought to answer whether the *Odes* looked to archaic Greek, Hellenistic or contemporary literary and liturgical – in the case of hymns – practice. His conclusions were generally mixed but he did in the case of a number of poems show the clear or likely presence of Hellenistic elements. This is particularly the case with erotic poetry: the lovers' exchange and reconciliation in *Odes* 3.9 is indebted to archaic lyric but also to playful exchange such as we find in Philodemus *AP* 5.46; 3.10 is an example of the demonstrably (though not exclusively) Hellenistic genre of paraclausithyron; spiteful poems on aged or ageing women (1.25, 3.10, 4.13), also Propertian (3.25), are found in numerous poems in the Greek Anthology; I have already mentioned 4.10, the poem to the fastidious Ligurinus; 3.7, warning Asterie not to be tempted during the absence of her husband Gyges, shows similarities to Theocritus 3.40–51 and Propertius 2.20 (which like Horace's poem begins with the question *quid fles . . . ?* 'Why do you weep . . . ?'). Pasquali is surely right to note that the use of mythological paradigms in all three poems is essentially Hellenistic; the second part of 1.22 to Lalage adopts and transforms the topos of the faithful lover who will endure the elements to continue his *komos* (Asclepiades *AP* 5.64, adesp. 5.168); 2.8, on the perjury on the beloved, shares much with Roman elegy, but also with epigrams of Callimachus (*AP* 5.6 = *Epigram* 25 Pf.) and Dioscorides (*AP* 5.52). Similar claims are made for 2.4 (love of a slave), 1.33 (unreciprocated love), 3.26 (farewell to love), 1.30 (prayer to Venus), and 1.27 (the bashful lover). Some of these poems surely look as much to Roman elegy as to Hellenistic impulses, and, as Pasquali notes, they are all integrated into their new Horatian, lyric contexts, but the Hellenistic essence is present throughout.

Another ode which shows clear signs of Horatian invention in the setting of a specific archaic model that is interrupted and complicated by Hellenistic intertexts is 1.14 (*O navis*). Nisbet and Hubbard point to allegorical treatments, going back to Quintilian, that take the poem as an allegory for the ship of state, a status already apparent in the genre models of Alcaeus

---

7 See R. F. Thomas (2004) 261–4 for the connections.

58

(fr. 6, 326). In this reading the ship is enjoined not to go back out on to 'new waves', a reference to civil war, since it is unseaworthy, with planking, mast, stays, keel and sails all worn out, the sailor now lacking trust in its ornate but unreliable decks. Horace's involvement becomes personal in the final stanza:

> nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium,
> nunc desiderium curaque non levis,
>   interfusa nitentis
>   vites aequora Cycladas.

> I was once bothered by you and sick and tired of you; now you're my heart's desire, my heavy care, so avoid the waters that are poured among the shining Cyclades.

Although Nisbet and Hubbard note (ad 17, 18) '*taedium* is a lover's word' *desiderium* 'a lover's word for his heart's desire', they insist on the integrity of the political allegory: 'Horace is an ἐραστὴς τῆς πόλεως (['lover of the state'] Thucydides 2.43.1), having previously rejected the view as a 'strange theor[y]' that we might here be dealing with a 'ship of love' allegory.[8] But it is a strange theory only if one does not want it to be true, and the reasons for not wanting it to be true have to do with preconceived views of what Horace could or could not have written. Anderson's argument would have been strengthened had he brought into play, as A. J. Woodman subsequently did,[9] the two Hellenistic epigrams that will have been available to Horace in Meleager's anthology, one by Asclepiades (*AP* 5.161), the other by Meleager himself (*AP* 5.204). If we allow Horace to have read particularly the latter of these two, it becomes impossible to read 1.14 as anything but a poem in this erotic tradition:

> No longer, Timo, do the timbers of your spruce corsair hold out against the strokes of Cypris' oarsmen, but your back is bent like a yard-arm lowered, and your gray forestays are slack, and your relaxed breasts are like flapping sails, and the belly of your ship is wrinkled by the tossing of the waves, and below she is all full of bilge-water and flooded with the sea, and her joints are shaky. Unhappy he who has to sail across the lake of Acheron on this old coffin galley.
> (Loeb trans.)

As Anderson noted, the final couplet of 1.14, mysterious at best with the political-allegorical reading, fits this interpretation: the ship/prostitute is to avoid the waters of the shining Cyclades, because that is where Venus has several cult-places, in reality and in Horace (*Odes* 3.28.13–14 *quae Cnidon* /

---

8 As proposed by Anderson (1966).   9 Cf. Woodman (1980) 62–3.

fulgentisque tenet Cycladas 'she who inhabits Cnidus and the gleaming Cyclades', the only other appearance of the islands in his poetry.[10] In Catullus 36.15 the final 'cult place' of Venus was Durrachium, the 'tavern' of the Adriatic, already a flesh-pot in the time of Plautus and the source of *Menaechmi* 258–62, and doubtless even more so in Horace's time when it was the port city for the via Egnatia. So it is that, as with other cases we have seen, *Odes* 1.14, unless we forbid readers to see the Hellenistic intertexts (a fruitless enterprise anyway, once they have been pointed out), becomes an exquisite combination of archaic, Hellenistic, and specifically Horatian, Horatian in the surprising empathy for the prostitute whose amorous days are now over, as his own will be in 3.26, 4.1, and in his constant awareness of the fleeting nature of time.[11]

Epodes and iambic

A useful and balanced assessment of the importance of Callimachus and Hellenistic poetry for the *Epodes* has recently been provided by Lindsay C. Watson, in the introduction to his commentary on Horace's *Epodes*.[12] While he rightly notes that the variety of topics in Horace's collection need not point exclusively to the variety of Callimachean iambus (as advertised in *Iamb.* 13, for instance), given that the remains of Archilochus demonstrate similar variety, he nevertheless points to a number of features that indicate the presence of Callimachus, in particular the softening of Archilochean invective that has been associated with the Hellenistic poet's *Iamboi*, and also embraced in *Epistles* 1.19.25 (*non res et agentia verba Lycamben* 'not the themes and the words that goaded Lycambes').[13] Although there are very few identifiable Callimachean intertexts in the *Epodes*, Watson (p. 12) is correct to see in the Horatian *Epode* book a reflection of the 'modernizing iambic *Gedichtbuch*' of the Hellenistic poet whose presence is so abundantly clear in the poetry of the Neoterics and early Augustans.

---

10 Anderson (1966) 96–7.

11 Jocelyn (1982) 335, who argues against the allegorical reading, claims that 'neither in the life nor in the literature of pagan antiquity did males display sympathy for females exhausted by sexual use'. How he can know this I do not know, nor do I believe it to be true. The allegory is not unrelated to the fact that such empathy is unusual.

12 Cf. L. Watson (2003) 11–18.

13 Catullus may well have shown Horace the way; for Catullus' competing Archilochean and Callimachean invective stances see Wray (2001), esp. chapter 5, 'Code models of Catullan manhood'.

The *Satires* and epyllion

Much of the literary manifesto of Horace was, as we saw, embedded in the *Satires*, particularly in the first book, but we also saw the enactment of this manifesto in the *Epistles*, for instance in *Epistle* 2.1, the *Letter to Augustus*. As in the *Odes*, so in the hexameters, we find not only Hellenistic theory, but also practice, and practice in the area of the quintessentially Alexandrian narrative mode, the epyllion (the term is not ancient but it is a convenient one), as well represented by surviving fragments or works of Callimachus (the *Hecale*, *Hymn 6*, to Demeter), Theocritus (*Idyll 24*, the *Heracliscus*), Moschus (the *Europa*). On the Latin side examples are to be found in the works of the Neoterics: Catullus 64 (the marriage of Peleus and Thetis), the fragments of Calvus' *Io* and Cinna's *Zmyrna*, and later in the Appendix Vergiliana (*Ciris* and *Culex*). Length varies, but the genre does not extend beyond a single book, and the treatment is characterised often by subversion of the heroic, by attention to and delight in artistic perfection and leptotes, and by a disjunction between high register style and the subject-matter at hand. The dactylic hexameter is the preferred mode.

Although Horace famously distinguishes his *Satires* (*Sermones* or 'conversations') from the resounding sort of thing Ennius produced (*Satire* 1.4.38–62), we find epyllion embedded into at least one of these poems, and in one case an entire poem that can best be seen as post-neoteric engagement with this Hellenistic genre. *Satires* 2.6.77–117, the dinner-party narrative of Horace's aptly named rustic neighbour Cervius is an exquisite example of the genre, parallel in style and in disjunction between theme and style to Callimachus' *aetion* of the mousetrap (*Aet*. inc. lib. fr. 177 Pf. = fr. 259 *SH*). The setting, in which hospitality and conviviality are the backdrop for the narrative, is a prominent marker of the genre: Callimachus' *Hecale* (fr. 230–52, Diegesis x–xi Pf.), and the Molorchus inset of the *Victoria Berenices* (*SH* 256–61); Baucis and Philemon at Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.626–78. The archetype is Eumaeus at Homer, *Odyssey* 14.410–56.

In Horace's version, the tale begins with a temporal marker (*olim*) in the last foot of the line (79), with the 'Alexandrian' *fertur* closing the next line, in an opening couplet whose chiastic and enclosing elegance and artfully constructed doublets are in marked contrast to the theme: *rusticus urbanum murem mus paupere fertur / accepisse cavo, veterem vetus hospes amicum* ('a country mouse a city mouse is said to have taken into his poor cave, an old host his old friend'). Nothing could be more artful, in marked contrast to the identity of the speaker, and the theme. The journey of the mice to the city is described in high style, with the country symposium (83–9) followed by the moralising *sententia* of the hedonistic town mouse,

61

who suggests that since all the earth's creatures (93 *terrestria*) have been allotted mortal souls (96 *mortalis animas*), they should live for pleasure. They head for town, with a cum-inversum marking the time, a characteristic of high narrative art (100–1 *iamque tenebat / nox medium caeli spatium, cum . . .*), three golden lines in a row (103–5) equal any concentration from Catullus 64, the *Eclogues* or the *Metamorphoses*, and epic language continues to the end of this delightful 41-line epyllion.

Cervius' tale is a compression of an earlier instance of the genre, the journey to Brundisium (*Satire* 1.5), which likewise begins in high style, with mention of hospitality (2 *hospitii*), with epic touches throughout: 9–10 elegant temporal markers, 11 chiastic anaphora, 25 apostrophe, 27–8, 31–3, 40 mini-catalogue invocation to the Muse to recall the genealogy of Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus before their epic contest, 73–4 metonymy and high-register language, 85, 94 golden or otherly elegant word-order functioning as closural markers. All of this is in marked contrast to the low subject-matter with which it forms a contrast typical of the genre, much of it having to do with bodily function and other matters absolutely outside the bounds of epic decorum (7–8, 18–19, 21–3, 30–1, 56–70, 71–4, 80–1, 84–5). As with the country mouse, we end with philosophical rumination, and with the 104-line epic drawing attention to its great length: *Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est* 'Brundisium is the end of our long journey and scroll'. The journey is likely to have happened, Octavian's delegation to Tarentum to meet with Antony in 37 BCE, in a world still uncertain as Sextus Pompey's fleet was causing real problems particularly with the Italian food supply. Cornelius Severus was in these years at work producing his epic *Bellum Siculum*, an encomiastic poem on the future *princeps*' achievements. Horace, who does not even mention Octavian, and whose long journey does not even reach its destination of Tarentum, could only manage 104 lines. Politics partially explain things, but ultimately this is the only epic Horace could manage, and for that the poetics of Alexandrianism are largely to be credited.

FURTHER READING

Wimmel (1960) and Cody (1976) are still indispensable for gathering and discussing the instances of Callimachean literary aesthetics in Horace. Scodel (1987) is the standard work on Horace's Callimachean refinement of Lucilian satire, while Freudenburg (1993) extends this topic in his book on the *Satires* in general. Pasquali (1964) is still valuable on the extent and limits of Horace's debt to Hellenistic poetry in the *Odes*, whose general affiliation with Callimachean *leptotes* is well characterised by Santirocco (1986) passim.

Horace modelled these poems on the poetry of Archilochus. Social bonds in Rome had been decaying since the destruction of Carthage a little more than a hundred years earlier, due to the vast wealth that could be gained by plunder and corruption.[33] These social ills were magnified by rivalry between Julius Caesar, Mark Antony and confederates like Sextus Pompey, all jockeying for a bigger share of the spoils. Horace's Hellenistic background is clear in his Satires, even though the genre was unique to Latin literature. Greek poetry, Hellenistic. See also what's at your library, or elsewhere. Broader terms To which are added remarks on Shakespere, &c. and a comparison between Horace and Lucian. / (London: : Printed by T. Bensley; for White Egerton, Whitehall, Lee and Sotheby ... The poets and the poetry of the ancient Greeks; with an historical introduction, and a brief view of Grecian philosophers, orators, and historians. (Boston, Phillips, Sampson, and company; New York, J. C. Derby., 1854), by Abraham Mills (page images at HathiTrust). The theology of the Greek poets / (Andover : W.F. Draper, 1870), by W. S. Tyler (page images at HathiTrust). Horace's Hellenistic background is clear in his Satires, even though the genre was unique to Latin literature. In the opening poem, he professed a deeper interest in moral philosophy than poetry[48] but, though the collection demonstrates a leaning towards stoic theory, it reveals no sustained thinking about ethics.[49] Maecenas was still the dominant confidante but Horace had now begun to assert his own independence, suavely declining constant invitations to attend his patron.[50] In the final poem of. Horace, outstanding Latin lyric poet and satirist under the emperor Augustus. The most frequent themes of his Odes and verse Epistles are love, friendship, philosophy, and the art of poetry. Horace was probably of the Sabellian hillman stock of Italy's central highlands. His father had once been a. Horace develops his vision with principles taken from Hellenistic philosophy: metriotes (the just mean) and autarkeia (the wise man's self-sufficiency). The ideal of the just mean allows Horace, who is philosophically an Epicurean, to reconcile traditional morality with hedonism. Horace used his commitment to the ideals of Alexandrian poetry to draw near to the experiences of Catullus and other poetae novi (New Poets) of the late republic.

David Sider Didactic poetry: The Hellenistic invention of a pre-existing genre For all that it is almost a clichÃ© that Hellenistic poets were acutely aware of genre â€"who before Callimachus would or could have boasted of his Ï€Î¿Î»Ï…ÎµÎ¯Î´ÎµÎ¹Î±?â€",Â¹ discussions, let alone definitions, of didactic poetry as a genre are scarce.Â of Hesiod, for all that it draws on Hellenistic prose treatises on the nature of poetry, it is meant to represent Horaceâ€™s own views on the matter. In form, it may not differ from Horaceâ€™s two literary epistles, but this is in harmony with the ease with which Romans slipped between didactic and other genres. A test case for all this is Ovidâ€™s Metamorphoses, which many modern scholars do not regard as at all di- dactic. I think, though, that an original reader would have no doubts. Horace modelled these poems on the poetry of Archilochus. Social bonds in Rome had been decaying since the destruction of Carthage a little more than a hundred years earlier, due to the vast wealth that could be gained by plunder and corruption.[34] These social ills were magnified by rivalry between Julius Caesar, Mark Antony and confederates like Sextus Pompey, all jockeying for a bigger share of the spoils.Â Horace's Hellenistic background is clear in his Satires, even though the genre was unique to Latin literature. Horace and Augustan Poetry. A statue of Horace in Venosa, the poet's hometown. Hello, and welcome to Literature and History. Episode 51: Horace and Augustan Poetry. This is the second of two programs on the Roman poet Quintus Horatius Flaccus, a writer who lived from 65-8 BCE and witnessed firsthand the fall of the republic and the birth of the empire. In our previous show, we learned about Horaceâ€™s life â€" how he was the son of a former slave, how his father helped set him up with a good education in Rome and Athens, and how while studying in Athens in the late 40s, Horace joined the losing side of the civil war, eventually fleeing the battle of Philippi in October of.