

GENERIC ENRICHMENT IN VERGIL & HORACE



S. J. HARRISON

OXFORD

GENERIC ENRICHMENT IN VERGIL
AND HORACE

This page intentionally left blank

Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace

S. J. HARRISON

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford ox2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© S. J. Harrison 2007

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn, Norfolk

ISBN 978-0-19-920358-1

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

In memoriam
Oliver Lyne
† 17.3.2005

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

This book sets out to sketch one answer to a key question in Latin literary history: why did the period c.39–19 BC in Rome produce such a rich range of complex poetical texts, above all in the work of Vergil and Horace? The political cycle of crisis and stability offered by the upheavals of the triumviral period and the following *pax Augusta* might provide some sociological and historical explanation: interesting literature is often the product of interesting times. But my concern here is with generic enrichment, the way in which the different poetic kinds of the Augustan period confront and react with one another (and with previously significant genres) with remarkably fruitful results; the intensity and detail of this interaction has much to contribute to the study of literary texture and literary history, and constitutes another type of explanation for the complexity and density of Augustan poetry. The book is firmly focused on interpreting particular stretches of text, often familiar ones, and presents a series of case studies rather than a vast inclusive account. My hope is to provide suggestive and creative models of detailed reading in Latin poetry.

I have many debts and obligations to record. To Oliver Lyne and Jasper Griffin, who first encouraged me in the scholarly study of Augustan poetry and provided inspiring examples; to the late Don Fowler, who made me take literary theory seriously; to Robin Nisbet and Stephen Heyworth, who have generously discussed many ideas on Latin poetry with me over the years (and to the latter for his useful comments on Chapters 2 and 3); to Adrian Hollis and Dirk Obbink, for kindly allowing me pre-publication access to forthcoming work; to Chris Kraus, for helpful comments on a partial draft of Chapter 1; to my Corpus colleagues Ewen Bowie, Philip Hardie, and Michael Winterbottom, for kind help and encouragement in many ways, and to my students at Oxford over the last twenty years, who have made me focus on the key issues and often suggested ways forward. Two anonymous referees for OUP also helped me clarify the argument at a later stage and suggested a number of points which I have thankfully

incorporated into the final version, and I am again grateful to Hilary O'Shea and her staff at the Press for their collaboration.

I would also like to thank a number of audiences who heard earlier versions of parts of the book as lectures or seminars and made useful comments, at Oxford, the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, the University of Crete at Rethymnon, Baylor University and the University of Texas at Austin (Chapter 2); at the Fondation Hardt, the Université Paul Valéry (Montpellier III), and the Universities of Otago, Padova, Lausanne, and Geneva (Chapter 6); and at the conference 'La poesia giambica in Grecia e Roma' in Trento (Chapter 4). An earlier version of Chapter 4 was previously published as Harrison (2001), one of Chapter 6 as Harrison (1993); that same chapter also uses some minor elements from Harrison (1988), (1995*b*), and (2004*b*).

This book has been (too) long in the making and especially in completion, partly due to the intervention of other, collaborative book projects with shorter deadlines, especially Harrison (2005*a*). The first major work was conducted in a year of research leave in 1997–8, funded by a British Academy/Leverhulme Senior Research Fellowship, for which I am most grateful; the main bulk of the writing was done in a year of sabbatical leave from Corpus Christi College in 2001–2 and the final touches applied in a further sabbatical term in summer 2006, for both of which warm thanks are likewise due.

Oliver Lyne, acknowledged above as an inspiring tutor, died suddenly and prematurely during the latter stages of my writing. His unrivalled enthusiasm and generosity as a teacher, his warm and encouraging personality, and his great gifts as a scholarly interpreter of Latin poetry make him much missed by students, colleagues, and friends alike. This book is dedicated to his memory, in the hope that he would have liked at least some of it.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford
May 2006

S. J. H.

Contents

1. Introduction: Generic Groundwork	1
2. Beyond Pastoral? Generic Pressures in Vergil's <i>Eclogues</i>	34
3. Ambition to Rise: Horace, <i>Satires</i> 1	75
4. On Not Being Archilochus: Horace's <i>Epodes</i>	104
5. Intra-Epic Debate: Vergil's <i>Georgics</i>	136
6. Lyric Flexibility: Literary Form in Horace's <i>Odes</i>	168
7. Epic Inclusivity: Vergil's <i>Aeneid</i>	207
<i>Bibliography</i>	241
<i>Index locorum</i>	255
<i>General Index</i>	259

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction: Generic Groundwork

1. GENERIC ENRICHMENT

This book sets out to analyse in detail the literary effect of generic enrichment in the poetry of Vergil and Horace. I define ‘generic enrichment’ as the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres. Though I here focus on two poets, this kind of interaction can also involve the operation of prose texts within verse texts and *vice versa*.¹ I will argue that this feature of generic enrichment is characteristic of the poetry of these two authors; the argument could be extended to the Augustan period as a whole, especially to Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid,² and can also be identified in the poetry of Catullus and Lucretius,³ but my argument here is that it is especially strong in Vergil and Horace and a key feature of their particular poetic achievements. Such an argument requires a clear notion of what constituted literary or poetic genre in the Augustan period and of how it could be manipulated within individual poetic texts and perceived by their readers.

The general concept of generic enrichment, of the creative confrontation of different literary genres, is not a radical innovation,

¹ For some material on the impact of prose genres on Vergil, Horace, and other Augustan poets see e.g. Harrison (1991: 285–6); Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: pp. xiv–xv), Levene and Nelis (2002); Gibson (2003: 11–19); Rossi (2004).

² For Tibullus see e.g. Maltby (2002: 55–66), for Propertius see e.g. De Brohun (2003), for Ovid e.g. Harrison (2002).

³ For Catullus and generic enrichment see Harrison (2004*b*), for Lucretius Kenney (1970).

either in classical scholarship or in wider genre theory; the name is a convenient new label for a familiar general idea, to which this book will seek to give a new and analytically helpful articulation. This construction of the concept will then be carefully applied to the analysis of particular texts, the key test for any literary theory. This chapter looks at the background of generic enrichment in genre theory both ancient and modern, its existing modelling in the study of Augustan poetry, the specific ideological and literary-historical background to the Augustan period which especially allowed it to flourish, and ends by setting out a detailed model repertoire for readerly detection of generic markers which will form the working method for this book.

2. GRAECO-ROMAN GENERIC THEORY

Though the relative vagueness and paucity of Greco-Roman genre theory has been rightly emphasized,⁴ it is possible to identify at least in general terms the key generic ideas and implicit theory which an Augustan reader is likely to have known and applied.⁵ As elsewhere in Western literary theory,⁶ the history of ideas on genre begins effectively with Plato and Aristotle. In the well-known discussion of the morally enervating effects of poetry in the third book of the *Republic* (3.394b–c), Plato's Socrates divides literature into three types according to its mode of narrative presentation: that which presents only speech uttered by characters (e.g. tragedy and comedy), that which presents only the poet reporting events (e.g. dithyramb,⁷ and lyric in general), and that which is a mixture of both (e.g. epic). This creates the tripartite generic taxonomy of epic, drama, and lyric which has been so influential in the Western tradition, and which still

⁴ See especially Rosenmeyer (1985).

⁵ On implicit generic theory in antiquity see Farrell (2003).

⁶ e.g. in narratology: cf. Genette (1980: 162–6).

⁷ Genette (1992) stresses the narrativity of dithyramb and that the post-classical tradition has been wrong in assigning it to lyric. Of course lyric (and dithyramb) can include narrative and character-speech, but the stress on performing first persons is strong.

figures prominently in generic theory.⁸ Aristotle in the *Poetics* (1448a) adds the crucial further idea of appropriateness: each literary kind has a naturally appropriate medium (prose or verse, metre, music, harmony, kind of speech) and appropriate subject-matter (of fitting length, dignity, realism). Epic, for example, differs from tragedy not in its subject-matter (for it has everything that epic has, ch. 26, 1462a) but in length and metre (ch. 24, 1459b). Here as often in Aristotelian literary criticism the leading idea is τὸ πρεπόν, *decorum*, or the notion that everything has its own appropriate place and function. This place is felt to be natural and intuitive; nature and experience teaches poets the naturally appropriate kind of metre for the subject (ch. 24, 1460a), implying that there is a fundamental connection between topic and type of metre.

Outside these well-known passages, Greek and especially later Hellenistic genre theory is notoriously thin on the ground. The categorizing of Greek literature and the formation of its canon in the post-Aristotelian Peripatos and in Hellenistic Alexandria clearly included some account of literary genres and their differences, but little trace remains. In Latin, some generic theory seems to have emerged by the time of the well-known fragment of Accius' *Didascalica* (fr.VIII Dangel) towards the end of the second century BC:

nam quam varia sunt genera poematorum, Baebi,
quamque distincta alia ab aliis, <sis>, nosce.

For know, Baebius, how different are the types of poems, and how widely differentiated they are each from the other.

There is some chance that this fragment introduced an extensive discussion of the different literary genres, and that it formed part of a controversy with Lucilius,⁹ but there is unfortunately no further evidence.

The recent publication of more of the literary-critical work of Philodemus suggests that generic issues were a lively source of debate in late Hellenistic scholarship. Philodemus himself seems to have upheld traditional Aristotelian views on the separation of poetic genres by appropriate content and style against the more radical theories

⁸ e.g. in Genette (1992).

⁹ Cf. Koster (2001).

of writers like Pausimachus and Heracleodorus, who suggested that generic categories were unimportant or vacuous.¹⁰ Perhaps our best source for late Hellenistic generic theory is the *Ars Poetica* of Horace, which seems to concur with Philodemus' ideas on genre in the previous generation in a number of ways. Whether or not this work relies in detail on the lost theories of Neoptolemus of Parium,¹¹ it is clear that it represents a consolidation in the Peripatetic tradition of the key ideas put forward by Aristotle in the *Poetics*, and that it emphasizes elements which will be particularly relevant in the analysis of Augustan generic enrichment. This work, perhaps because of the view that its content is skewed by Peripatetic rather than contemporary considerations (e.g. its bias towards drama), has been less prominent than it deserves in modern discussions of Augustan literary poetics;¹² after all, it was written soon after the main efflorescence of Augustan poetry treated in this book and by one of its leading exponents. The crucial passage on the topic of genre is AP 73–98, given by Brink in his commentary the heading of 'norms of diction in poetic genres' (his text is cited below) and by Donald Russell in his translation (also cited below) that of 'metre and subject':¹³

res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella quo scribi possent numero, monstravit Homerus.	
versibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum,	75
post etiam inclusa est uoti sententia compos;	
quis tamen exiguos elegos emiserit auctor,	
grammatici certant et adhuc sub iudice lis est.	
Archilochum proprio rabies armauit iambo;	
hunc socci cepere pedem grandesque coturni,	80
alternis aptum sermonibus et popularis	
uincens strepitus et natum rebus agendis.	
Musa dedit fidibus diuos puerosque deorum	
et pugilem uictorem et equom certamine primum	
et iuuenum curas et libera uina referre.	85
descriptas seruare uices operumque colores	
cur ego, si nequeo ignoroque, poeta salutor?	

¹⁰ Cf. Janko (2000: 151–60, 417, 435).

¹¹ For the debate see e.g. Brink (1971: pp. xii–xxi).

¹² For typical brief mentions see Conte (1994: 35); Depew and Obbink (2000: 2).

¹³ Brink (1971: 160); Russell in Russell and Winterbottom (1972: 281).

cur nescire pudens prae quam discere malo?
 versibus exponi tragicis res comica non uult;
 indignatur item priuatis ac prope socco 90
 dignis carminibus narrari cena Thyestae.
 singula quaeque locum teneant sortita decentem.
 interdum tamen et uocem comoedia tollit,
 iratusque Chremes tumido delitigat ore
 et tragicus plerumque dolet sermone pedestri, 95
 Telephus et Peleus, cum pauper et exul uterque
 proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia uerba,
 si curat cor spectantis tetigisse querella.

Histories of kings and generals, dreadful wars: it was Homer who showed in what metre these could be narrated. Lines unequally yoked in pairs formed the setting first for lamentations, [75] then for the expression of a vow fulfilled; though who first sent these tiny ‘elegies’ into the world is a grammarians’ quarrel and still *sub iudice*. Madness armed Archilochus with its own iambus; that too was the foot that the comic sock and buskin held, [80] because it was suitable for dialogue, able to subdue the shouts of the mob, and intended by nature for a life of action. To the lyre, the Muse granted the celebration of gods and the children of gods, victorious boxers, winning race-horses, young men’s love, and generous wine. [85] If I have neither the ability nor the knowledge to keep the duly assigned functions and tones of literature, why am I hailed as a poet? Why do I prefer to be ignorant than learn, out of sheer false shame? A comic subject will not be set out in tragic verse; likewise, the Banquet of Thyestes disdains being told in poetry of the private kind [90], that borders on the comic stage. Everything must keep the appropriate place to which it was allotted. Nevertheless, comedy does sometimes raise her voice, and angry Chremes penetrates with swelling eloquence. Often too Telephus and Peleus in tragedy lament in prosaic language, [95] when they are both poor exiles and throw away their bombast and words half a yard long, if they are anxious to touch the spectator’s heart with their complaint.

Here we find the familiar Aristotelian idea of appropriateness (*decorum*, τὸ πρέπον), with the clear fitting of content to metrical and generic form: wars fit hexameters and epic, lamentations and offerings elegiacs, abuse iambics, tragic and comic dialogue iambics, and lyric a range of topics from epinician to sympotic (clearly looking here to Horace’s own *Odes*). These forms are clearly deemed to be part of a natural, accepted and prescriptive generic taxonomy, *descriptas*

vices... operumque colores (86), the ‘duly assigned functions and tones of literature’ which the poet can recognize and should observe; similarly normative is the notion that ‘everything must keep the appropriate place to which it was allotted’ (*singula quaeque locum teneant sortita decentem*, 92). But two post-Aristotelian aspects stand out particularly too: the use of an inventor or chief exemplar (*auctor*) of a genre as part of its definition, and the admission that genres may incorporate elements from other genres for special effects.

The first idea, the search for an *auctor*, is a post-Aristotelian development which is likely to derive from the literary researches of Alexandria and its generation of the poetic canon, which naturally sought to attach ancient and authoritative names to literary forms.¹⁴ By the Roman period it has clearly become standard in defining genres, something evident not only from this passage of Horace, where Homer and Archilochus are named as generic founders and the dispute about the *auctor* of elegy is highlighted, but also from the literary catalogue of Quintilian’s tenth book, which proceeds by setting the *auctores* of Greek literature against their Latin counterparts, and which plainly shows traces of Peripatetic and Hellenistic influence in the identification of its Greek exemplars.¹⁵

The second idea, that works in particular genres can incorporate elements of a different or opposing genre, is a key idea for this book and one of the central elements of Augustan poetry. Once again, like the search for the *auctor* of a genre, this idea clearly derives from the Hellenistic period: the ‘crossing of genres’ (*Kreuzung der Gattungen*) famously identified by Wilhelm Kroll in Latin poetry has been repeatedly shown to be a major creative feature of Hellenistic poetry.¹⁶ The Horatian examples (paratragedy in comedy, homely diction in tragedy) are relatively modest in scope; as we shall see in the analyses of this volume, the principle of incorporating elements from a different, ‘guest’ genre while retaining the overall framework of the primary, ‘host’ genre can be considerably extended.

Confirmation of the persistence of this fundamentally Aristotelian framework for generic theory in the Augustan period can be found in

¹⁴ See Zetzel (1980*a*), and Vardi (2003).

¹⁵ See e.g. Steinmetz (1964); Zetzel (1980*a*: 97–9).

¹⁶ Cf. Kroll (1924: 202–24); Rossi (1971); Fantuzzi (1980); Harder *et al.* (1998); Rossi (2000); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 17–41).

the poetry of Ovid, itself supremely generically self-conscious.¹⁷ In *Amores* 1.1, when Cupid removes a foot to transform epic into elegy, there is a clear reference to the Aristotelian generic notion that form should correspond to content (*Am.* 1.1.1–4):

Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam
edere, materia conveniente modis.
par erat inferior versus: risisse Cupido
dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem.

I was preparing to utter in solemn rhythm of arms and violent wars, my subject-matter fitting my metre. The second line was of the same length: Cupid (they say) laughed and stole one foot away.

This use of *material* or *materies* for the subject-matter of literature (a use common in Ovid¹⁸) is shared with Horace's *Ars Poetica* (38, 131), while the idea of appropriateness to the metre is clearly Aristotelian, and is repeated again in line 19 of the same poem, *nec mihi materia est numeris levioribus apta*, 'nor do I have subject-matter fitting lighter metre'; *apta* there reflects Aristotelian notions of literary propriety, while *levioribus* echoes *gravi numero* in line 1, which in turn picks up the point made in the *Poetics* that the hexameter is the 'weightiest of metres' (*ὀγκωδέστατον τῶν μέτρων*, *Poetics* 1459b).

The key Aristotelian idea of matching subject-matter to metrical form in generic choice is clearly standard in the Augustan period; it is regularly paraded in Augustan *recusationes*, passages in which another genre is rejected in favour of the one in which the poet is already writing, for example, Propertius 2.1.39–42 and 3.3.15–24 and Ovid *Fasti* 2.125–6, all rejecting epic subject-matter as too 'big' for elegy;¹⁹ or in other metagenerically reflexive moments where the subject-matter seems to be becoming inappropriate for the metre, for example, Horace *Odes* 3.3.69 *non hoc iocosae conveniet lyrae*, 'this will not suit my frivolous lyre', where the material is getting too 'heavy' for lyric (cf. p. 188 below); or in passages where the controversial choice of material in a previous work is defended by the argument

¹⁷ For metageneric discourse in Ovid see e.g. Hinds (1992); Harrison (2002).

¹⁸ See McKeown (1989: 13).

¹⁹ Wimmel (1960) remains the standard collection of Augustan *recusationes*; for a more compact account see Lyne (1995: 31–9).

that the subject-matter matched the generic form, for example, Ovid's defence of his erotic topics at *Remedia Amoris* 371–88, ending with *si mea materiae respondet Musa iocosae, / vicimus*, 'if my Muse fits its frivolous material, victory is ours' (387–8), a wickedly triumphant assertion of Aristotle's doctrine of the matching of form and content. Such ideas are still standard at the end of the first century AD: Quintilian (10.2.22), picking up Horace's argument in the *Ars Poetica* that paratragedy is possible in comedy and paracomedy in tragedy, opposes it with a more conservative view which nevertheless works within the same Aristotelian framework:

suo cuique proposito lex, suus decor est: nec comoedia in coturnos adsurgit,
nec contra tragoedia socco ingreditur

Each genre has its own rules and proprieties. Comedy does not rise high on tragic buskins, nor does tragedy stroll about in the slippers of comedy (tr. Winterbottom).²⁰

Another key element of Aristotelian genre theory implicit in these ancient accounts, and crucial for the Augustan context, as we shall see, is that of the hierarchy of genres. This notion, later to become even more influential through its role in the formation of the literary canon,²¹ goes back once again to the *Poetics*, where the three main genres discussed (epic, tragedy, and comedy) appear to be ranked according to three criteria (*Poetics* ch. 4.1448b ff.): length, metre, and the dignity of the characters represented (a particular way of looking at content). Epic is the most prestigious genre because of its length, its 'heavy' hexameter metre (see above), and the dignity of its characters; tragedy comes next, also describing dignified characters, but at lesser length and in a more conversational metre; and comedy comes last, with its treatment of lower characters. This kind of thinking clearly underlies the language of the passages of Horace and Quintilian (above) in describing comedy 'rising' to the heights of tragedy, and the order in which both these authors in fact treat the genres (beginning with Homer and epic).²² Many of the detailed effects of generic interaction which are analysed in the following chapters of this book rely on a readerly knowledge of the hierarchy of genres.

²⁰ Winterbottom in Russell and Winterbottom (1972: 403).

²¹ Cf. Zetzel (1980a), Fowler (1982: 212–34).

²² Cf. Fowler (1982: 219–21).

Moreover, the whole poetic careers of both Vergil and Horace can plausibly be constructed as generic ‘ascents’: Vergil’s ascent is within the hexameter genres, beginning with the slightest in Theocritean pastoral (*Eclogues*), passing through the middle stage of Hesiodic didactic epic (*Georgics*), and concluding in the highest form of Homeric heroic epic (*Aeneid*).²³ Some of this is clear from the end of the fourth *Georgic* (4.559–66), where the poet marks off the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* as ‘early’ works by pointedly echoing the opening line of the *Eclogues* in the very last line of the *Georgics* (G. 4.566 ~ *Ecl.* 1.1); the two are thus segmented together as a propaedeutic for the epic work which has been (obliquely) sketched in the proem to the third *Georgic*, a passage which clearly uses the language of poetic ascent in envisaging the move into encomiastic epic (see Chapter 5 below, p. 149). Horace, for his part, begins with satiric *sermo*, represented as not even poetry, passes through the transitional stage of iambus in the *Epodes*, a lowly first-person form, and rises to the loftier tones of lyric in the first three books of *Odes*. This hierarchy comes out clearly in statements in the *Epistles*, which look back on the ‘completed’ Horatian poetic career: *Ep.* 1.19 omits the *Satires* but claims originality in the *Epodes* and *Odes* (in that order: 1.19.23–4 *Parios ego primus iambos/ostendi Latio*, 32–3 *hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus / vulgavi fidicen*), while *Ep.* 2.2 cites the three main Horatian genres, claiming that each finds its own enthusiasts, but in fact preserving generic hierarchy in inverse order, with *sermo* as the climax since it is the form in which he is actually writing these lines (2.2.58–60):

denique non omnes eadem mirantur amantque:
carmine tu gaudes, hic delectatur iambis,
ille Bionis sermonibus et sale nigro.

Then, not everyone admires or likes the same works: you rejoice in lyric, another delights in iambic, yet another in the *sermones* in the style of Bion and their dark biting humour.

Thus the conception of genre available in the Augustan period was clearly Aristotelian, and was especially concerned with the appropriateness of subject-matter to metrical and literary form and with the

²³ Cf. Theodorakopoulos (1997: 155); Farrell (2002).

demarcation and relative hierarchy of the individual genres. Since (as already noted) we cannot be sure that much had happened in genre theory since Aristotle, this tradition was no doubt similar to that inherited by Alexandrian literature in the third century, and as we shall see (p. 19 below), the reaction of Alexandrian poets provided an important model for their Augustan counterparts in seeking innovation through the overt and explicit interaction of the genres which traditional theory was concerned to keep so separate.

3. LITERARY GENRE: A WORKING DEFINITION

Though modern (and postmodern) generic theory, in a more fluid literary environment, understandably finds the definition of genre problematic,²⁴ it seems clear from the ancient evidence just surveyed that in the Graeco-Roman world, or at least in the context of the Latin poetry of the Augustan period, genres could be clearly deployed by writers and recognized by alert readers, and post-Aristotelian generic categories were readily understood.²⁵ This is not to deny that genre could be a fluid and contested concept for both writers and readers of ancient texts, or that much interest in ancient poetry derives from generic indeterminacy and interplay;²⁶ that is indeed a central contention of this book. In the Roman period, the literary genre of a particular text could be loosely defined as depending on a combination of thematic material and formal features, at least for contemporary educated readers (who will serve as the model reader in my investigation); such a reader need not even be conscious of applying previously institutionalized generic categories, as Todorov stresses: ‘readers read in function of the generic system, with which they are familiar thanks to criticism, schools, the book distribution system, or simply by hearsay; however, they do not need to be conscious of this system.’²⁷ Such a definition can be plausibly equated with Alastair Fowler’s notion of the ‘generic repertoire’: ‘the repertoire is

²⁴ See e.g. Cohen (1987) and some of the essays in Strelka (1978).

²⁵ Cf. especially Zetzel (1980*a*).

²⁶ For some good examples see Hinds (1992).

²⁷ Cf. Todorov (1990: 19).

the whole range of potential points of resemblance that a genre may exhibit . . . Every genre has a unique repertoire, from which its representatives select characteristics. These distinguishing features may be either formal or substantive.²⁸ This combination of internal and external form is also presented as the chief feature of genre in the still valuable chapter on genre in Wellek and Warren's *Theory of Literature*.²⁹ The fundamental concept of literary genre as applied in this book is that of *a form which can be identified through a particular generic repertoire of external and internal features*. This in turn enables the recognition of generic enrichment, where one genre confronts, includes, and gains from another, the chief topic of this book, to which I now turn.

4. GENERIC ENRICHMENT AND GENERIC THEORY

The development of literary theory on genre has shown considerable interest in the general idea of generic development through generic interaction, the idea which I have labelled 'generic enrichment'. As we have just seen, the larger idea of generic interaction is already prominent in Horace's discussion of genre in the *Ars Poetica* and in some metagenetic passages of Ovid. It is also important in twentieth-century genre theory, no doubt due to the widespread notion that the traditional boundaries between genres, the demarcations which go back ultimately to the Aristotelian model outlined above, have in some sense finally broken down or are the objects of continual interpenetration, that we are at the end of coherent generic history. This view is buttressed by the tendency of modern literary texts themselves to break down and subvert generic boundaries; hence the deconstructive inclination of much (post-)modern critical discourse to liberate texts from the hermeneutic restraints of classification. In its most extreme form, this can extend as far as Derrida's claim that generic systems are in effect meaningless in the analysis of modern literature,³⁰ and the kindred notion that an individual text

²⁸ Fowler (1982: 55). Roughly the same conclusion emerges from Genette (1992) 84.

²⁹ Wellek and Warren (1963: 226–37). ³⁰ Derrida (1980/1992).

is a unique artefact which resists any significant kind of generic classification (implicit in much New Criticism) in fact goes back to Croce's view that genres are purely nominal labels which make no meaningful statements about the character of individual works of literature, since 'every true work of art has violated some established kind and upset the ideas of the critics'.³¹

On this key issue of the importance of genre for interpretation, I would agree with Jonathan Culler that genre classification is vital for meaning in providing 'a set of literary norms to which texts may be related and by virtue of which they become meaningful and coherent',³² and with E. D. Hirsch that it is generic boundaries which in fact make the critical reading of a work possible by providing a matrix against which to set an interpretation.³³ In an Aristotelian context such as that of the first century BC, a generic label is usually informative and applicable to a literary work and helps to generate part of its interpretation, by creating generic norms and expectations on the reader's part: to cite the most recent and most helpful book on Graeco-Roman genre, 'genre in antiquity is a matter of authorial positioning and readerly conditioning with regard to a coherent tradition'.³⁴

As we shall see, modern genre theory offers a number of interesting views of the ways in which literary genres interact and develop to creative and enriching effect.³⁵ It also offers encouraging support for those who want to argue for the importance of this phenomenon in Greek and Latin literature, since some of the most effective contributions to the modern theory of generic interaction actually treat distinctly pre-modern texts from the medieval and Renaissance periods,³⁶ showing that the tendency to innovate and enrich by breaking or compromising generic boundaries goes back a long way. The two concepts of generic interaction and generic enrichment

³¹ Croce (1922: 37); Duff (2000: 25–8); cf. further Croce (1922: 436–49).

³² Culler (1975: 145). ³³ Hirsch (1967: 68–126).

³⁴ Depew and Obbink (2000: 2–3).

³⁵ For recent overviews of genre theory see e.g. Duff (2000) and the special numbers of *New Literary History*, 34 (2003) 2 (Theorising Genres 1) and 3 (Theorising Genres 2).

³⁶ e.g. Jauss (1982: 76–109); Colie (1973).

and development are crucially interconnected. It can indeed be argued that any significant literary work adds to or enriches the present and future possibilities of its own literary category: as Alastair Fowler puts it, 'to have any artistic significance, to mean anything distinctive in a literary way, a work must modulate or vary or depart from its generic conventions and consequently alter them for the future'.³⁷ Within the Aristotelian literary universe of the first century BC, as we shall see, the primary form of such departure from convention is generic interaction, confrontation with and incorporation of 'guest' elements which are then absorbed into the 'host' genre; this is a vital source of the creative expansion of literary genre.

One key idea which has been raised in theories of generic development is that of generic evolution. The nineteenth-century work of Brunetière sought to trace the development of literary genres as (essentially) a process of Darwinian natural selection, with genres coming into being, modifying through interbreeding, and passing away according to the needs and requirements of differing cultural circumstances.³⁸ This positivistic, biological model was a primary target for the opposition to genre as a 'pseudo-concept' famously advanced by Croce, but also (as Barchiesi has recently stressed³⁹) provided the intellectual underlay for the classical work of Wilhelm Kroll in the celebrated chapter 'Die Kreuzung der Gattungen' ('The Crossing of Genres') in his *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*.⁴⁰ For Kroll, as for Brunetière, the potential problem of generic exhaustion is obviated by a continuing renewal of literary genres through a process of cross-fertilization which creates new hybrids. This idea has been more recently picked up by Ralph Cohen, who has argued that literary genres are basically collocations of various features that shift in relative importance as literary purposes alter over time;⁴¹ both see the development of literary genre as comprising rearrangement within existing generic systems. A different view of evolutionary generic development was highlighted in turn by the Russian formalists, who in the 1920s argued that literary genres were renewed not by cross-breeding or endogamic exchange within the existing generic system, but by exogamy, by the inclusion

³⁷ Fowler (1982: 23).

³⁸ Brunetière (1890).

³⁹ Barchiesi (2001).

⁴⁰ Kroll (1924: 202–24).

⁴¹ Cohen (1987).

of themes previously deemed to be non-literary, the 'minor branches' of the textual 'family': the 'new blood' of marginal and subliterary material was infused into obsolescent traditional genres, thus revivifying them for a new generation.⁴²

All these views have as their common feature the notion that generic structures develop and evolve creatively in response to a range of literary stimuli; this is the key notion underlying the idea of generic enrichment promoted in this book. All of them also look to the author as the key agent of evolution. I have no desire to deny the crucial importance of the author in a work's generic positioning, but the approach I have chosen in this book is largely reader-centred, believing as I do that it is an easier task to attempt the reconstruction of the cultural horizons of the collective model readership⁴³ of a classical text than of the mental processes of its single historical author. Here a central role is played by reader-response theory, with its notions of the reader's 'horizon of expectation' or 'repertoire', what structuralist theory has called 'literary competence',⁴⁴ the knowledge which a model reader needs to bring to a text in order to achieve a full or effective interpretation. The perception of genre in a newly experienced literary work, and of its variation or evolution, depends to a large extent on readerly repertoire and expectation, and is built up through the reception of a succession of related texts: as Jauss has put it,

the relationship between the new text and the series of texts formative of a genre presents itself as a process of the continual founding and altering of horizons. The new text evokes for the reader (listener) the horizon of expectation and 'rules of the game', familiar to him from earlier texts, which as such can then be varied, extended, corrected, but also transformed, crossed out, or simply reproduced.⁴⁵

This naturally entails that genres will develop and enrich themselves over time and lead eventually to changed horizons and expectations: as Ruurd Nauta has put it in his discussion of Jauss from a classical perspective, 'a genre changes over time: a literary work is

⁴² See Duff (2000: 6–8 and 29–49).

⁴³ i.e. the readership constructed or imagined by the text in its original context: cf. e.g. Conte (1986: 30).

⁴⁴ Culler (1975: 113–30).

⁴⁵ Jauss (1982: 88).

always received within existing generic expectations, but the reception of this work also always changes these generic expectations'.⁴⁶

This historical aspect of reader-response theory is entailed by its focus on the particular reader, or reading/interpretive community,⁴⁷ in the construction of meaning. It seems especially useful for dealing with texts more than two millennia old and with issues of literary history. If we can reconstruct enough of the cultural horizons and expectations of a particularly situated group of readers, we can begin to analyse what might then have been perceived as generic evolution and change. Of course, our own responses and repertoires as twenty-first-century readers are also inevitably involved here, and it is impossible to claim that any reconstruction of the cultural horizons of an original, implied readership of an ancient text is a purely historical or scientific enquiry independent of our own contemporary concerns, or indeed that it is the only route to seeking its interpretation; but in what follows an implied original readership, reconstructed through a range of evidence on Augustan literature and culture, will be the primary point of reference.

Finally, I turn to the mechanics of generic enrichment. If such enrichment through generic interaction is a central aspect of the development of genres, and if readerly recognition and response is crucial to the process, how can such interaction be identified in texts by readers, ancient or modern? Though occasionally in an ancient literary work a passage can be identified as having the complete range of the repertoire of a genre other than that in which the work is overtly written, extending even to employing an 'alien' metre, for example the use of 'prophetic' hexameters in a Greek tragedy,⁴⁸ such generic 'intrusions' normally rely on the use of a more limited range of the features constituting a generic repertoire. In many cases, of course, it will be debatable whether generic interaction is taking place, and this is one reason why this book in its subsequent chapters sets out to examine poems and passages in considerable detail.

⁴⁶ Nauta (1990: 119: my tr.).

⁴⁷ On reading/interpretive communities see Fish (1980); for their role in the contemporary interpretation of classical literature see Harrison (2001a: 11–12).

⁴⁸ At Sophocles, *Phil.* 839–42 (see Webster (1970: 119)); for 'prophetic' hexameters see Ch 2, p. 38 below; see also the elegiacs at Euripides, *Andr.* 103–16, with Page (1936).

Generic enrichment is the intergeneric form of intertextuality, and as Stephen Hinds has recently shown, intertextual issues are best tackled by the close consideration of particular texts.⁴⁹

Generic theorists have certainly been alive to the issue of how to identify the situation where one genre can be seen operating at a subsidiary level within the dominant overall framework of another. This situation, where a primary genre dominates but others appear in subordinate roles, is crucial to my idea of generic enrichment. In his chapter on 'Mode and Subgenre',⁵⁰ Alastair Fowler argues that 'mode' can usefully be employed for the situation where a text which belongs fundamentally to one genre includes a limited number of elements from another genre, the situation which in fact pertains in almost all the examples discussed in this book. Genres, or 'kinds' as Fowler also calls them, show a more or less complete range of the appropriate generic repertoire; modes, argues Fowler, 'have always an incomplete repertoire, a selection only of the corresponding kind's features, and one from which overall external structure is absent'. While genres can be described by nouns ('tragedy'), modes can be described by adjectives ('tragic'). Much the same idea is argued by Hans-Robert Jauss in his distinction between 'a generic structure in an independent or constitutive function, and one in a dependent or accompanying function':⁵¹ the first is the dominant element which sets the specific generic framework, while the second varies and broadens that framework. Both these formulations refer to what one might call the evocation in a 'receiving' genre, which constitutes the dominant generic framework of a text, of another 'visiting' genre, an evocation achieved by using enough of the features of the 'other' generic repertoire to achieve readerly recognition that another genre is in play. In what follows I will sometimes use the metaphor of hospitality to describe this relationship: in this sense the dominating genre of the text is the 'host' which entertains the subordinate genre as a 'guest'. The 'guest' genre can be higher or lower than the 'host' in the conventional generic hierarchy (e.g. tragic elements in lyric or epigrammatic elements in epic), but the 'host' in all cases retains its dominant and determining role, though the 'guest' enriches and enlarges its 'host' genre for now and for the future.

⁴⁹ Hinds (1998).

⁵⁰ Fowler (1982: 106–29).

⁵¹ Jauss (1982: 8).

A key aspect of generic enrichment as perceived by modern readers of Augustan poetry is the way in which generic issues are thematized in the texts and themselves become the subject of poetic discourse. A major contribution has been made here by Gian Biagio Conte, whose analyses of scenes of metageneric confrontation and debate have been deservedly influential.⁵² A good example is his analysis of Vergil's tenth *Eclogue*, a text raised already which will be further treated in Chapter 2. Conte argues that the evocation of love-elegy in this pastoral poem is not simply an example of Krollian generic fusion, but enables a confrontation and exploration of the two distinct literary kinds and their boundaries: 'the sense of the tenth *Eclogue* is actually founded on a display of the difference between these two genres'.⁵³ But I would go further than Conte here: the separation of the two genres cannot ultimately be maintained, and (as I will argue in Chapter 2) there are clear textual signals that some sort of generic mixture is at issue here. Conte's analysis is crucial, however, in identifying intergeneric confrontation and tension as the source of the poem's literary energy: 'the confrontation between two adjacent genres makes their relationship come to life, rescuing both from the conventionally static nature of literary institutions'.⁵⁴ I would add that this clearly expresses the ambivalence between the entertainment of a 'guest' form and the resulting expansion of the 'host' form, my notion of generic enrichment; love-elegy is indeed not pastoral (and the love-poet Gallus thus symbolically renounces his supposed ambitions for the pastoral life by returning to it), but the pastoral book of the *Eclogues*, at its climactic point of closure, is expanded and indelibly enriched by imported elegiac material.

Thus the use of a 'guest' genre, in the form of a mode, a partial evocation of the other literary form, has an ambivalent effect within the 'host' genre. On the one hand, its dominant generic identity remains clear through the preponderance of the 'host' material: *Eclogue* 10 is still a bucolic/pastoral poem in a bucolic/pastoral collection, though it clearly includes love-elegy in modal form. On the other hand, there is an overall result of generic enrichment: the bucolic/pastoral genre expands its world-view and topics to include

⁵² See esp. Conte (1986).

⁵³ Ibid. 126.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 128.

(at least partially and temporarily) those of love-elegy, thus opening up new horizons within an established genre. The key argument of this book is that the literary works undertaken by Vergil and Horace in the Augustan period use literary genres in a way which expands and deepens their texture through the inclusion in modal form of material from 'guest' genres, material which thus enriches the 'host' forms. As noted above, this clearly happens in Hellenistic and earlier Latin poetry,⁵⁵ but what is striking for the Augustan period is that in most cases this expansion marks the climax of a genre in Roman literary history: it is difficult to argue that the generic enrichment effected in Vergil's *Eclogues* (see Chapter 2), Horace's *Epodes* (see Chapter 4), Vergil's *Georgics* (see Chapter 5), or Horace's *Odes* (see Chapter 6) led to further developments in their respective genres in classical Latin.⁵⁶ The same could be said for the genre of Augustan elegy, not treated in this book:⁵⁷ the generic complexity developed in Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid does not lead to a continuation of the genre. In a few cases, however, this sets an agenda for the genre which is picked up by later texts: the *Aeneid's* model of universal epic inclusivity (see Chapter 7) is taken even further by Ovid's *Metamorphoses*,⁵⁸ while the generic interaction of Horace's *Satires* (see Chapter 3) can be seen to be continued in Juvenal.⁵⁹

Thus there is a clear link between the major efflorescence of Roman poetry in 39–19 BC and the phenomenon of generic enrichment, which seems to be uniquely active in this period. There are of course further cultural reasons for this efflorescence, which will be explored in section 5 below: the literary culture of Augustan Rome is in many ways responding to and repeating the reactions of the literary culture of Hellenistic Alexandria, and the patronage and political needs of Caesar/Augustus, routed via Maecenas, are an important influence on the way in which generic issues are discussed and confronted in Vergil and Horace.

⁵⁵ See s. 5 below for Hellenistic precedents, and n. 3 above for examples before Horace and Vergil in Latin.

⁵⁶ Medieval and Renaissance reception is of course a different matter.

⁵⁷ For some basic references see n. 2 above.

⁵⁸ Cf. conveniently Harrison (2002: 88–9).

⁵⁹ On interaction with epic in Juvenal see Braund (1996: 21–4).

5. AUGUSTAN AND ALEXANDRIAN GENERIC ENRICHMENT: LITERARY-HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL ASPECTS

Kroll's account of the 'crossing of genres' (noted above) has been highly influential in linking the phenomenon of Augustan generic enrichment with the literature of the Hellenistic age. It is now standard in scholarship to seek the origins of the Augustan phenomenon in its Alexandrian counterpart, and to see it as a key feature of the renewal of potentially obsolescent literary genres in two similar periods, where the 'anxiety of influence'⁶⁰ from archaic and Classical Greek exemplars was strong and innovation consequently required for traditional literary categories to continue to have significant life. An influential voice here has been that of Rossi, whose article on the written and unwritten laws of genre in Greek literature stressed the importance of Hellenistic writers such as Callimachus and Theocritus in subverting and mixing genres: a hybrid poem such as Theocritus 22, which combines the hymn and epyllion with some elements of dramatic form, or Callimachus' *Aetia*, which combines aetiology with erotic elegy and epinikion, demonstrates how the Hellenistic poets could renew and create genres by creative transgression of post-Aristotelian generic categories.⁶¹ In a later article, Rossi has christened this generic interaction 'necessary play'; the resulting hybrid texts recall older forms but also, in their play with established forms, answer a Darwinian need to revivify generic categories in response to contemporary pressures for relevance and originality, thus ensuring a form's long-term survival.⁶² Recent research on Hellenistic poetry has emphatically confirmed this as a central focus of interest: the most recent contribution to the debate firmly states that 'Hellenistic poets . . . were interested both in the history and traditional function of the inherited generic system . . . and in how that system might be modernised to meet a new reality';⁶³ *mutatis mutandis*, Augustan Latin poets were interested in much the same thing.

⁶⁰ For this idea cf. Bloom (1973); for its application to Latin literature cf. Hardie (1993).

⁶¹ Rossi (1971). ⁶² Rossi (2000).

⁶³ Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 37); for more on the Hellenistic interest in generic play see Harder *et al.* (1998).

In an important article,⁶⁴ James Zetzel has argued that the Hellenistic poets ‘constantly and consciously removed the connections between the formal characteristics of a genre and its subject and style’ (99–100), and that consequently Augustan poets were in effect liberated from generic constraints: ‘the ultimate import of the Alexandrian definition of genre in strictly formal terms was that genre no longer mattered. The true poet could shape his chosen genre or genres in whatever way he chose’ (100). While I would agree emphatically with Zetzel that such circumstances led to ‘expanding the poetic genres to include a much wider spectrum of styles and subjects’ (89), the balance between generic convention and generic innovation in the Augustan period is for me much more finely drawn. In fact, much of the literary interest of both Hellenistic and Augustan texts, as I see it, derives precisely from the tension between pre-existing generic expectation and striking generic novelty, the situation described by Rossi where generic ‘laws’ and conventions are ‘written but not respected’.⁶⁵

The cultural parallels of Augustan Rome with the high literary age of third-century Ptolemaic Alexandria, a city brought back to prominence as Rome’s major political rival in the 30s BC under Antony and Cleopatra, clearly extend beyond literature to the historical and political situation.⁶⁶ Both the Roman dominions and Ptolemaic Egypt were large and wealthy states centring on a major metropolis, ruled by a monarchy which wished to project an image of victorious stability and peace. The metropolis was the home of a complex and impressive literary culture which largely cooperated with the monarchy’s political needs, through the medium of patronage, which seems in Alexandria to have been exercised directly by the Ptolemies themselves, in Rome at least partly by trusted agents such as Maecenas. In both literary cultures the most distinguished poets avoided works wholly dedicated to straightforward political panegyric of the monarchy, but honoured the monarchy nevertheless through the inclusion of honorific passages or poems in other works; in Rome this was often accompanied by a rhetorical refusal and wish

⁶⁴ Zetzel (1980a).

⁶⁵ Rossi (1971: 83). See again Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 17–41) on this topic.

⁶⁶ Cf. e.g. Galinsky (1996: 332–63).

that the poet had the capacity to write the panegyric epic which the monarchy clearly desiderated (the so-called *recusatio*).⁶⁷

The *recusatio* and the perceived pressure for court-poetry as well as for the renewal of traditional classical genres (largely unmonarchical) raises an important link between generic enrichment and political exigency. The *recusatio*-poem, with its traditional pattern of 'I would write X if it were possible', where 'X' is usually panegyric epic on Augustus, often leads by a form of rhetorical *praeteritio*, the mentioning of what the speaker is not going to discuss, to some degree of pastiche of the genre thus disavowed.⁶⁸ A good example is Horace *Odes* 1.6, discussed in detail in Chapter 6, where the lyric poet Horace's inability to write epic for Agrippa in the style of Varius is stressed through a catalogue of Homeric topics comically treated.⁶⁹ As in this example, the pastiche of the disavowed genre may more than adequately demonstrate the supposed inadequacy of the poet to pursue it, but there seems no doubt that through the act of detailed and extended disavowal the relevant genre has in fact been appropriated in modal form: Horace's poem remains lyric but is enriched (even if ironically) by epic texture. Thus the political pressure for panegyric, which was clearly a key feature of the Augustan literary landscape, is a natural locus for the metagenic confrontation and debate which is the key focus of this book.

6. AUGUSTAN GENRE: A MODEL REPERTOIRE

I have suggested that identifying the genre(s) of a poetic work in the Roman world depended in practice on a 'repertoire of features' which could be recognized by its readers. I have also argued that generic enrichment involves the perceptible coexistence of more than one repertoire in a single text: the 'host' genre is the dominant element, and the 'guest' genre is deliberately included in subordinate, modal form for the purposes of perceived expansion and variation of the 'host' genre. I now turn to the idea of a 'repertoire of features' in

⁶⁷ See n. 19 above.

⁶⁸ On generic disavowal see Davis (1991: 28–30).

⁶⁹ See p. 170 below.

detail, since it is this which will form the framework for the detailed analyses in the chapters which follow. These are the features which enable a model reader to detect generic signs in a particular text, and especially to detect where a text is operating with more than one generic code. I should like to divide generic repertoire into three basic aspects:

- A Formal repertoire: formal or technical features recognizable by readers as associated with a distinct literary genre;
- B Thematic repertoire: thematic features recognizable by readers as associated with a distinct literary genre;
- C Metageneric signals: direct statements recognizable by readers which specifically raise the issue of which literary kind(s) a text might belong to.

A. Formal Repertoire

The technical features which constitute the formal repertoire of an ancient poetic text include the following: title, metre, linguistic register, length and structure, rhetorical framework, and narrative voice.

(1) Title

Though there are many works where the preserved title is a later accretion, or where more than one title is preserved, or where there are other problematic issues of titulature,⁷⁰ an original title is clearly a major generic indicator. No ancient reader could have doubted that the *Aeneis* was an epic, referring like *Odyseia* to the narrative of the deeds of a particular epic hero; on the other hand, entitling a poem *Ars Amatoria* clearly invoked the prose handbook as well as love-elegy.⁷¹ Double or disputed titles can reflect different generic perceptions and complexities: Horace's *Epistles* seem to have been known as *sermones* but also as *epistulae*, which reflects both their

⁷⁰ For this issue see Horsfall (1981a).

⁷¹ For *Ars* as a handbook title cf. *ThLL* 2.671.54 ff. and for links with Ovid cf. conveniently Barsby (1978: 19).

continuation of the satirical hexameter form and their innovation of epistulary form, while the attachment of the relatively unspecific title of *Eclogae* to the poems consequently known to English readers as Vergil's *Eclogues* obscures the clear generic statement made by the authentic title *Bucolica*.⁷² The choice of title, its resonance in literary history, and its consequent recognition by readers are clearly major elements in the authorial and readerly construction of genre.

(2) *Metre*

The initial issue here is naturally whether the genre characteristically uses prose or verse. Thus prose tragedies and verse histories are not serious categories in the Roman world, while other genres can be created by the switch from one to the other, for example in epistulary poetry, appropriating a prose genre into verse.⁷³ By the Augustan period, metrical form and choice was clearly a key part of readerly recognition of genre, based on a knowledge of literary history and consequent readerly expectations. The hexameter, sanctioned by Homer and Hesiod as well as Ennius and Lucretius, was the metre for epic, whether heroic or didactic, and its looser and less restrained satiric subform, sanctioned by Lucilius, was the metre for satire. The metres found in Republican drama, whether iambic or trochaic, of similar length to the hexameter but perceptibly different in rhythm, marked out the dramatic forms, and the shorter and more flexible lyric metres were seen as appropriate for lyric on the Lesbian and Catullan model. Some metres such as the elegiac couplet were more versatile, and in the hands of an Ovid could encompass different genres from Gallan love-elegy (*Amores*) to erotic didactic (*Ars Amatoria*), Callimachean poetic antiquarianism (*Fasti*) and romantic/tragic epistulary poems (*Heroides* and the books of exile poetry),⁷⁴ while in the *Ars Poetica* Horace, looking back at Greek literary history, thinks of lament (sepulchral epigram) and inscriptions to the gods (dedicatory epigram) as the primary elegiac poetic kinds (*Ars Poetica* 75–6).

⁷² See Horsfall (1981a) on this development.

⁷³ For this effect in Horace's epistles see briefly Edwards (2005: 274–5).

⁷⁴ See Harrison (2002).

(3) *Linguistic register*

Again, by the Augustan period, particular poetic kinds had developed particular ranges of linguistic register. Epic looked back to Ennius with its use of dignified and archaic words, especially distinct types such as compound adjectives;⁷⁵ its didactic subgenre, especially after Lucretius, developed key didactic words and phrases, which can then be used to mark subsequent texts as belonging to or having elements of that tradition.⁷⁶ Drama used either comic colloquialism and exaggeration or tragic elevation and intensity, while the register of lyric could vary from the lofty to the relatively colloquial.⁷⁷ Gallan love-elegy developed its own romantic idiolect which could be easily echoed, though versatile Ovidian elegy had no specific linguistic colour outside Ovidian neatness and point, and itself looked to acquire depth and interest through interaction with other genres.⁷⁸

(4) *Length and structure*

The number of books and length of poems were important generic signs in antiquity. The different types of epic, for example, could comprise large numbers of books if in the heroic manner of Homer (e.g. the *Aeneid*), but could comprise smaller numbers or even a single book if in the didactic manner of Hesiod, Empedocles, or Aratus (e.g. Lucretius and the *Georgics*) or in the manner of the Hellenistic epyllion (e.g. Catullus 64, the only remaining representative of a form which was clearly widespread in the first century BC).⁷⁹ Continuousness or its lack was also an important determining feature: ever since Callimachus stood out against the ‘single, continuous poem’ (fr.1.3 Pfeiffer) and demonstrated in *Aetia* books 3 and 4 how to set out a collection of a number of shorter poems in a single book,⁸⁰ the ‘single, continuous poem’ was generally the mark of epic (including the

⁷⁵ The best account of the formation of Latin epic language is still that of Cordier (1939).

⁷⁶ See e.g. Kenney (1958) and Gibson (2003: 9–11) on how this tradition is exploited by Ovid.

⁷⁷ On the language of Horace’s *Odes* cf. Axelson (1945: 98–113); Williams (1968: 743–50).

⁷⁸ See e.g. Harrison (2002).

⁷⁹ For other examples see Lyne (1978*b*), and for the tradition in general Perutelli (1979).

⁸⁰ On the structure of *Aetia* 3 and 4 see Parsons (1977).

Callimacheanizing epyllion) or of poems which sought some epic flavour (e.g. the *Ars Amatoria* or the *Fasti*, both imitating didactic and following the earlier books 1 and 2 of the *Aetia*). The poetry-book, the lower *libellus* composed of several or more shorter poems, remained the mark of non-epic genres.

(5) Addressee

Another distinguishing mark can be whether or not a genre characteristically makes use of an addressee or addressees. As in other cases, there are often grey areas: the address of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to the Muse is largely an initial formal gesture, and these poems function largely as if an addressee did not exist, while the addressee of a didactic poem, though varying often between a named individual and a more general second-person reader, is a much more constant and influential presence, one of the key differences between heroic and didactic epic.⁸¹

(6) Narrative voice

Genres commonly differ from each other in whether they use predominantly the first or third person (e.g. lyric or epic); whether that narrator is foregrounded (e.g. love-elegy) or recessive (e.g. epic); or whether the genre is entirely devoted to representing character-speech (e.g. tragedy or comedy), almost entirely so (e.g. dialogue), or does so only sometimes (e.g. epic or lyric). In narrative theory this distinction goes back to discussions by Plato and Aristotle and to their transmission to the Middle Ages through Latin grammarians such as Diomedes.⁸²

B. Thematic Repertoire

This is the collection of thematic features recognizable by readers as associated with a distinct poetic kind. This can be subdivided into three categories.

⁸¹ For the didactic addressee see Schiesaro *et al.* (1993); Volk (2002).

⁸² See Genette (1980: 162–9); Jauss (1982: 96–7); Plato, *Republic* 2. 392c–395a; Aristotle, *Poetics* 3. 1448a; Diomedes, *Ars* 3 (GLK I.482–92).

(1) *General theme*

This is obvious but important: heroic epics characteristically treat the battles of heroes, but the battles of frogs and mice in the Hellenistic *Batrachomomachia* turn the genre to that of mock-epic.⁸³ Some (sub)genres are very broad, such as didactic epic, which can cover themes from atomic physics (Lucretius) to gastronomy (Ennius' *Hedyphagetica*);⁸⁴ others are more narrow, e.g. love-elegy, which usually retains some element of the description of the speaker's love-affair.

(2) *Thematic and plot conventions*

Like general thematic area, this is an important implicit generic signal (for explicit signals see C below). Thus the depiction of a locked-out lover or the assertion that the lover is a slave points to love-elegy,⁸⁵ a conclusion in marriage to comedy, a hymn to lyric, an epitaph to epigram. One major way to achieve generic complexity is to incorporate these conventions as 'guest' elements within 'host' genres.

(3) *Tone*

This, in the sense of 'level of seriousness', is another obvious crucial criterion. Plautus' tragicomic *Amphitruo* differs from contemporary tragedy in this aspect (as well as in a number of formal features),⁸⁶ just as the *Batrachomomachia* (using Homeric war-narrative to describe frogs fighting mice) differs from the *Iliad* or Ausonius' *Cento Nuptialis* (using Vergilian war-narrative to depict the sexual 'battles' of a wedding-night) differs from the *Aeneid*.⁸⁷ Once again, genres can be very flexible in this respect: love-elegy can treat its

⁸³ On the genre of mock-epic see Olson and Sens (1999); on the *Bat.* see West (2003b: 229–93).

⁸⁴ See the range of material catalogued by Toohey (1996), and for the definition of didactic epic as a separate subgenre of epic see conveniently Gale (2005).

⁸⁵ On the locked-out lover see still Copley (1956), on the slavery of love Lyne (1979) and Murgatroyd (1981).

⁸⁶ See conveniently Christenson (2000: 13–45).

⁸⁷ For Ausonius' *Cento* see McGill (2005: 92–114).

subject-matter with apparent gloomy romanticism in the hands of a Propertius, with humorous cynicism in the hands of an Ovid, and the often relaxed and humorous approach of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* does not prevent its classification as an epic poem.⁸⁸

(4) *Narrativity*

The degree to which a text incorporates the primary features of narrative, especially the element of plot-line, is often a useful criterion. Drama and heroic epic normally have a strong narrative structure, with the plot and action directed teleologically towards a clear conclusion. Didactic epic, on the other hand, does not usually have an overt or evidently structured plot, though an interesting case can be made for the recurrence of particular 'plot-motifs',⁸⁹ which would then fall under thematic and plot conventions (B2 above). Non-continuous genres (see A4 above) such as lyric, love-elegy, pastoral, and satire have similarly limited narrativity, though a recent argument that book 1 of Horace's *Satires* has an overt narrative structure is highly attractive,⁹⁰ and Ovid's first book of *Amores* can be argued to present a narrative plot-line.⁹¹

C. Explicit Metagenetic Signals

The poetic texts of the Augustan period often use metagenetic signals as explicit suggestions of their own generic character, usually in prominent locations; these need not be fixed, essentialist markers of genre but often indicate a generic starting-point for negotiation and expansion. The most extensive kind of generic marker is the extended scene or passage of metagenetic debate; these are the primary indications of generic enrichment and the key focus of this book, and will be dealt with in detail in the chapters which follow. For the moment I offer a short taxonomy of the most common types of briefer metagenetic signal to be found in the poetry of Horace and Vergil.

⁸⁸ See conveniently Harrison (2002: 87–9).

⁸⁹ Fowler (2000).

⁹⁰ Zetzel (1980b).

⁹¹ Cf. e.g. Lyne (1980: 242–3).

(1) *Generic exemplars: auctores*

As Horace makes clear in the *Ars Poetica* (see p. 4 above), one way of signalling the intended literary genre of an ancient text is by validating reference to a genre's founder or *auctor*, thus alluding to a 'model as code' in Conte's terms,⁹² an existing literary institution with which the new text wishes to establish a creative relationship.⁹³ A clear example is *Eclogue* 6.1–2, the programmatic 'proem in the middle'⁹⁴ of the *Eclogue* book:

prima Syracosio dignata est ludere *versu*
nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea.

My earliest Muse deigned to sport in Syracusan verse, and did not blush to inhabit the woods.

Here 'Syracusan' clearly alludes by toponym to the Syracusan poet Theocritus, who is otherwise not openly named in the *Eclogues*. The same toponymic mode of reference is found in *Eclogue* 4.1 *Sicelides Musae*, 'Muses of Sicily', and *Eclogue* 10.51 *carmina pastoris Siculi*, 'poems of the Sicilian shepherd'. A similar allusion occurs in the programmatic passage at the climax of the *laudes Italiae* or encomium of Italy in the second *Georgic* (2.173–6):

salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
magna uirum: tibi res antiquae laudis et artem
ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis,
Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida *carmen*.

Hail, great mother of crops, land of Saturn, great mother of men: it is for you that I embark on these matters of ancient renown and my art, daring to open up the holy springs, and that I sing the song of Ascras through the towns of Rome.

Here the reference to Ascras, the Boeotian birthplace of Hesiod, indicates that the *Georgics* is in the Hesiodic tradition of moralizing agricultural didactic epos, following the Hesiodic *Works and Days*. The *Aeneid* does not follow this pattern, perhaps because its enterprise

⁹² See Conte (1986: 31).

⁹³ On the function of *auctores* in the Roman construction of genre see p. 6 above.

⁹⁴ See Conte (1992).

of Homeric *imitatio* excludes this kind of literary self-reflexiveness as un-Homeric, though Ennius in the *Annales* seems to have presented himself explicitly as the successor of Homer.⁹⁵

Horace's texts all allude much more openly to their key model authors, though as with the Vergilian texts not quite at the beginning;⁹⁶ as the next section shows, that is a location where different types of initial generic indications can be found. Horace's first book of *Satires*, which clearly owe so much to Lucilius, mention him explicitly in 1.4 and 1.10 as a model, making clear at the same time that Horatian *sermo* is more subtle and Callimachean than the Lucilian version. In Horace's *Epodes*, the first open allusion to his main model authors in the Greek iambic tradition occurs at *Epode* 6.11–14:

cave, cave, namque in malos asperrimus
parata tollo cornua,
qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener
aut acer hostis Bupalus.

Beware, beware, for it is against villains that I am most rough and raise my horns at the ready, just like the son-in-law spurned by faithless Lycambes or the fierce enemy of Bupalus.

Here the allusions are to Archilochus and to Hipponax, but once again made in an indirect manner which resembles that of the toponym: each of the two iambists is defined by the name of his main victim (Lycambes for Archilochus, Bupalus for Hipponax).

The first book of Horace's *Odes* makes an open allusion to his main model in archaic lyric, Alcaeus,⁹⁷ in a very detailed statement at *Odes* 1.32 (3–12):

age, dic Latinum,
barbite, carmen,
Lesbio primum modulate ciui,
qui, ferox bello, tamen inter arma,
siue iactatam religarat udo
litore nauem,

⁹⁵ Cf. Skutsch (1985: 147–53).

⁹⁶ *Odes* 1.1.35 refers to *lyricis vatibus*, but we have to wait until *Odes* 1.32 for the identification of an individual.

⁹⁷ On Alcaeus in Horace see Feeney (1993).

Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
semper haerentem puerum canebat
et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque
crine decorum.

Come, my lyre, utter a Latin song, you who were first played by that citizen of Lesbos, who, though ferocious in war, yet amidst fighting, or whether he had moored his storm-tossed ship on the wet shore, used to sing of Bacchus and the Muses, and Venus and the boy that always clings to her, and Lycus, handsome with his dark eyes and dark hair.

Here once again the identifying allusion is indirect, with Alcaeus named toponymically through the reference to his native island of Lesbos, though the list of poetic subjects which follows (politics, symposium, love) clearly identifies Alcaeus as the individual intended (as well as marking out his thematic similarity to Horace's own lyrics).

(2) *Initial indications: programmatic openings*

The programmatic openings of poems are a natural location for generic signals. A dense and detailed set of such signals is found at the beginning of Vergil's *Eclogues* (1.1–2):

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena.

Tityrus, you, reclining under the cover of a spreading beech-tree, practise the woodland Muse on slender oat-stem.

The general situation of rustic singing in the shade of trees irresistibly recalls the scenarios of Theocritean pastoral poetry, and this is supplemented with detailed echoes of both form and metre of Theocritus' opening poem. The address of a herdsman in the opening line of the book and the mention of a tree looks back to Theocritus 1.1 'Ἀδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἀπίτυς, ἀϊπλόε, τήνα, 'pleasant is the rustling of this pine tree, goatherd', while the name Tityrus is that of a Theocritean shepherd in *Idylls* 3 and 7, and the phrase *silvestrem... Musam* recalls a Theocritean line (1.20 καὶ τᾶς βουκολικᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἴκεο μούσας, 'and reached mastery of the bucolic Muse'. Metrically, *Eclogues* 1.1 is highly musical and has five dactyls, yielding the maximum number of short syllables permitted in the Latin

hexameter, both features which recall the pastoral hexameters of Theocritus, and it ends with the so-called ‘bucolic diairesis’, where a word begins at the beginning of the fifth foot, a common pattern in Theocritus⁹⁸ which Vergil deliberately imitates in the *Eclogues*.⁹⁹ In the *Georgics* we find a different type of initial generic indication, an allusion not to the opening of the key model text but to its title (1.1–2):

quid *faciat* laetas segetes, quo *sidere* terram
vertere, Maecenas . . .

What makes crops luxuriant, under what star to turn the earth, Maecenas . . .

As commentators since Servius have noted,¹⁰⁰ *faciat*, ‘do, produce’ alludes semantically to the ‘Works’ element in Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, picking up Greek *ἔργα*, while *sidere* alludes to the ‘Days’ element which lists the times at which agricultural operations should be performed, governed by the astronomical calendar. Finally for Vergil, the *Aeneid* famously begins with allusions to both its key models in Homeric heroic epic: in *arma virumque* (*Aeneid* 1.1), *arma* looks to the battles of the war-centred *Iliad*, *virumque* to the more biographical and hero-centred *Odyssey*. Horace’s texts, on the other hand, have opening indications of this kind only in the most general sense: the scenario in *Epodes* 1 of a comrade departing by sea has some Archilochean overtones,¹⁰¹ and *Odes* 1.1 with its major priamel and allusions to epinician topics shows some indications of Greek lyric, reinforced only at the end of the poem by the reference to ‘lyric poets’ in general (1.1.35 *lyricis vatibus*), while the beginning of *Satires* 1.1 seems to have little to connect it with Lucilian *sermo*.

(3) *Symbolic metonyms: woods and love*

My final category of generic indication involves something of a thematic shorthand. This is the largely Vergilian technique by which a particular genre can be characterized in a single word which stands metonymically for its characteristic themes or scenario. A good example of this is Vergil’s supposed self-epitaph as reported by the *Vita Donati* (136–7):

⁹⁸ Cf. Hunter (1999: 20–1).

⁹⁹ Nisbet (1995: 332–3).

¹⁰⁰ See Farrell (1991: 134).

¹⁰¹ See Ch. 4 below, p. 106.

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere. Tenet nunc
Parthenope: cecini pascua rura duces.

Mantua bore me, the Calabrians carried me off. Naples now holds me: I sang of pastures, the country, and of generals.

The three nouns ‘pasture, country, generals’ clearly summarize in ascending sequence the three Vergilian genres of pastoral, agricultural didactic, and heroic epic. The *Eclogues* provide three good examples of this shorthand technique. First, *Eclogue* 4.1–3:

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus.
non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae;
si canimus silvas, silvae sint consule dignae.

Muses of Sicily, let us sing of topics somewhat greater. Not all are pleased by plantations and lowly tamarisks. If we sing of the woods, let the woods be worthy of a consul.

Here *silvae*, ‘woods’, recalling the arboreal shade for pastoral singing with which the *Eclogues* began (see last section) is clearly a generic indicator for the pastoral form from which this poem is about to depart in a major instance of generic enrichment.¹⁰² Likewise at *Eclogue* 6.1–2, a passage cited above, *silvae* performs a similar role, there bolstered by the toponym ‘Syracusan’ (already discussed above):

prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu
nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea.

My earliest Muse deigned to sport in Syracusan verse, and did not blush to inhabit the woods.

Once again this label occurs in a context where the boundaries of pastoral are themselves an issue.¹⁰³ This is also clearly the case in the third example, from *Eclogue* 10, where the elegist Gallus again uses *silvae* in the sense of ‘pastoral’ in his farewell to the pastoral world (10.62–3):

iam neque Hamadryades rursus nec carmina nobis
ipsa placent; ipsae rursus concedite, silvae.

Now again neither the tree-nymphs please us, nor their songs; you too, you woods, yield again.

¹⁰² Cf. pp. 36–44 below (Ch. 2).

¹⁰³ Cf. pp. 44–59 below (Ch. 2).

He also (at 10.53 and 10.69) uses the words *amores* 'love-object' and *amor* 'love' to indicate the genre of love-elegy, which is presented in this poem as entering at least momentarily the world of pastoral.¹⁰⁴

7. CONCLUSION

This discussion of genre in the Augustan period makes it clear that recognition of a particular generic repertoire makes considerable but not unrealistic demands on the reader; the implied reader is one of high sophistication, for example, Horace as a reader of Vergil's work and vice versa. Many generic indicators, especially the metageneric signals just discussed, require a considerable literary competence in the reader in order to function fully as signs of genre. This chapter has tried to set out the basic generic toolkit with which the reader can approach the complex and dense functioning of generic enrichment, and to set out its methodological and literary-historical context; examples of this phenomenon, explored in a series of metageneric scenes and passages, will now form the core of this book.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. pp. 59–74 below (Ch. 2).

Beyond Pastoral? Generic Pressures in Vergil's *Eclogues*

1. INTRODUCTION: THE *ECLOGUES* AND THEOCRITICAN PASTORAL

Vergil's *Eclogues* or *Bucolics*,¹ the earliest surviving significant poetry book written under the political domination of the young Caesar/Augustus,² has a crucial role as the founding text of Augustan generic debate. Here for the first time full generic dramas are played out against the background of expectations generated by both Roman political circumstances and Greek literary models. In looking at the topic of generic enrichment in the *Eclogues*, it is first crucial to establish the literary tradition of pastoral available to a Roman poet in the first century BC. This means a particular scrutiny of the Theocritean collection, since as we have already seen this Sicilian poet of the third century BC is several times indicated as the model for the *Eclogues* (4.1, 6.1, 10.51).³ The *Eclogues* echo a wide range of poems in the Theocritean collection: this includes the poems we number as Theocritus, *Idylls* 1–14, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 26 as well as several poems by Moschus and Bion.⁴ Even on the minimalist assumption that

¹ For the issue of the title's collection (*Bucolica* collectively, *Eclogae* singly?) see Horsfall (1981a).

² I date the *Eclogues* to 38 BC, agreeing with Tarrant (1978) that *Eclogue* 8 refers not to Caesar/Augustus' Illyrian campaigns of 36–5 but to those of Pollio in 39; for a recent reassertion of the opposite view see Clausen (1994: 233–7).

³ See p. 28 above.

⁴ Cf. e.g. the convenient list of Theocritean echoes to be found in Carl Hosius' (1915) edn. of the *Eclogues*. For useful modern discussion see Posch (1969) and Rudd (1996/2005)—the latter's approach is close to my own.

Vergil knew only the Theocritean poems he seems to allude to directly, he had access to at least eighteen of the thirty-one poems which have come down to us.

More importantly, those eighteen, all in hexameters, provided a considerable variety of content, and certainly not just bucolic poems about shepherds. Theocritus 12 is plainly an expansion of a pederastic epigram, 13, the Hylas poem, is a version of an epic narrative found in Apollonius, 14 is a hexameter version of a mime-scene between two young city men which has some affinities with New Comedy, 17 is an encomium of Ptolemy, 18 is a mythological epithalamium, 24 another miniature epic narrative, this time about the young Herakles, while 26 is a hexameter version of the story we find in Euripides' *Bacchae*. Thus we find in some sense versions of epic, epigram, mime, comedy, epithalamium, and tragedy, all adapted into the Theocritean framework of short hexameter poems. Though it is at least possible that a separate collection of the purely 'bucolic' poems of Theocritus existed before Vergil,⁵ the mixed generic nature of the Theocritean collection as a whole presents generic enrichment in our sense as already part of Theocritean tradition, and is indeed an established feature of modern scholarly discussion of Theocritus.⁶

Though generic enrichment is clearly Theocritean, its highlighting as a theme for debate and dialogue is equally clearly Vergilian. Where the *Eclogues* innovate is in foregrounding and thematizing the issue of generic appropriation, and in setting up a creative tension between pastoral genre and non-pastoral modes. Many of the non-pastoral types of poem to be found in the Theocritean collection are echoed in the Vergilian collection. But where the Theocritean collection as we have it brings together strongly pastoral poems with others which have no pastoral connection and little enough in common except their hexameter metre and attribution to Theocritus, the Vergilian collection, by contrast, makes great efforts to incorporate non-pastoral material into the book's overall pastoral content, and overtly flags potential 'deviations' from the straightforwardly 'pastoral'.

This highlighting of generic complexity within the *Eclogue* collection is partly effected by the book's careful architecture.⁷ Poems 1 and 9 can

⁵ See e.g. Gutzwiller (1998); Nauta (1990).

⁶ See Harder *et al.* (1996); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 133–90).

⁷ See e.g. Rudd (1976); Van Sickle (1978).

be paired as the two which talk about the land confiscations of 41 BC, while poem 10 (as we shall see) has many features of an epilogue. This leaves poem 5 as the centre, appropriately enough given Menalcas' statement at its end that he is the singer of poems 2 and 3, placing this quasi-authorial statement in the middle of the collection. This statement in itself pairs 2 and 3, which can also be linked as strongly Theocritean, and 7 and 8 might be an answering Theocritean pair. This leaves 4 and 6; these are clearly the least pastoral of all the poems, framing 5 in the centre of the book. This makes it clear that the least pastoral poems, 4, 6, and 10, are located in significant positions within the collection (framing the centre and last), and that 4 and 6 are set in tandem. This is surely not accidental, for these are the three poems in the collection which specifically mark themselves out as presenting material which pushes most explicitly at the previously perceived boundaries of the pastoral genre.

2. *ECLOGUE* 4: PROPHECY, EPITHALAMIUM, AND ENCOMIUM

The opening of *Eclogue* 4 makes a statement which is clearly generically programmatic (1–3):

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus.
non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae:
si canimus silvas, silvae sint consule dignae.

Muses of Sicily, let us sing of topics somewhat greater. Not all are pleased by plantations and lowly tamarisks. If we sing of the woods, let the woods be worthy of a consul.

It is natural to suppose that the Muses of Sicily, representing Theocritean pastoral tradition, are here invoked in order to go beyond Theocritean thematic bounds to talk of greater (*maiora*) Roman topics, such as consuls, prophecy, and contemporary politics. As in the opening of *Eclogue* 6, where *silvae* occurs again in a similar metapoetical context (see below), the flora of the pastoral landscape represent the pastoral genre:⁸ note *humiles*, pointing to the traditional

⁸ For *arbusta* cf. *Ecl.* 1.39, 2.13, 5.64, for *myricae* cf. 6.10, 8.54, 10.13.

position of pastoral at the bottom of the hexameter hierarchy.⁹ It is true that no poem in the Theocritean collection uses prophetic discourse in the way that this poem does (see below); but the extant Theocritean collection certainly contains poems in praise of consular-type great public men, since *Idylls* 16 and 17 are encomia respectively of Hieron of Syracuse and Ptolemy II Philadelphus, two of the greatest political figures of the third-century Mediterranean world, and although Vergil does not seem to have imitated either poem closely in the *Eclogues*, there is every chance that they were available to him as they undoubtedly were to Horace.¹⁰ Theocritus thus provides models for poems in praise of great contemporaries; Vergil marks this by his address to the Sicilian Muses, suggesting familiar Theocritean origins for this apparently new departure within the collection. There are consular *silvae* in the works of Theocritus if we search hard for them. The consular praise for Pollio here is in fact only a frame for the current poem, not a poem in itself like those for Hieron and Ptolemy in Theocritus; but there is also praise of other great men in the prophecy of the child (see below).

The lines, then, can be viewed as a reclaiming and revisiting of an important but non-bucolic mode already available in the Theocritean collection: the Sicilian Muses are asked for help with a type of poetry with which they are thoroughly familiar. But an original readership without a close knowledge of the Theocritean corpus may have felt that there was in fact a generic departure here: the coexistence of encomium and pastoral would be innovative indeed in a contemporary Roman literary context, where as the opening of *Eclogue* 6 makes clear (see section 3 below), pastoral poetry is clearly perceived as a lower genre which is not compatible with the more serious business of the epic praise of the military deeds of the great man, the standard content of most pre-Vergilian Roman epic.

But the rhetoric of generic departure can in fact be justified from another angle. Another set of 'topics rather larger' is prominent in *Eclogue* 4, and this material is very clearly non-Theocritean. Modern scholarship has no doubt that this poem is fundamentally influenced

⁹ Cf. Theodorakopoulos (1997: 155–9).

¹⁰ For echoes of 17 in Horace in particular see Ch. 3 below and Hunter (2003: 95–6, 185).

by both the content and language of Sibylline prophecy, of which we possess some specimens probably later than Vergil, but which clearly transmit Sibylline topics and conventions which were available to the writers of Augustan poetry. This Sibylline colouring of the poem is heavily stressed in lines 4–7:

ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas;
 magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo.
 iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
 iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto.

The last age of Cumaean prophecy has now arrived: the great order of ages is born anew. Now the Virgin returns, there returns the sway of Saturn, now a new progeny is sent down from heaven on high.

Cumaei with its reference to the famous Cumaean Sibyl so memorably depicted in the *Aeneid* (6.35 ff.) points explicitly to the Greek tradition of Sibylline oracles, and it has been convincingly argued that ‘Virgil must have expected from his readers a familiarity with Sibylline oracles of the relevant type’.¹¹ Some of the extant collection of Sibylline oracles may possibly treat Roman political issues of the period of *Eclogue* 4 (41–40 BC), even an Egyptian queen who may be Cleopatra,¹² and it is a fair assumption that these topical oracles underlie Vergil’s use of the Sibylline tradition here. This had indeed been recognized as early as the third century, when Lactantius compared several passages of *Eclogue* 4 directly with passages from the extant collection of Sibylline oracles.¹³

What is still less well appreciated is that oracles generally formed a recognizable poetic genre in antiquity. In the *Ars Poetica* Horace, considering the public functions of various genres of poetry, states *dictae per carmina sortes*, ‘oracles were pronounced in poetry’ (405).¹⁴ Thus *carminis* can refer to both prophecy and poetry at *Eclogue* 4.4. The characteristic metre of oracles was the hexameter, the metre of all the Sibylline oracles in the extant collection; the

¹¹ Nisbet (1995: 50).

¹² *Orac.Sib.* 3.350–488, for recent scepticism on the identification see Emen (1998).

¹³ *Div.Inst.* 7.24; on Lactantius’ extensive use of Sibylline oracles cf. Ogilvie (1978: 28–33).

¹⁴ See Brink (1971: 392).

poetic oracles collected in poems 65–100 in the fifteenth book of the *Palatine Anthology* are also overwhelmingly in hexameters, and hexameter is the standard medium for the recorded or imagined responses of the Pythian oracle at Delphi.¹⁵ The detailed parallels shown by this poem with the Sibylline oracles¹⁶ thus constitute generic enrichment of a particular kind not featured in Theocritus: the discourse of poetic prophecy is here incorporated modally into pastoral and expands its generic boundaries.

Here as often we can see a connection between generic enrichment and political circumstances. As already suggested, Sibylline oracles might have had some prominence in the Triumviral period, and it is likely that *Eclogue* 4 marks a central political event, the so-called Treaty of Brundisium of September 41 BC by which the differences of Caesar/Augustus and Antony, which had escalated to the extent of skirmishing, were settled through an agreement about spheres of command and influence which also involved the marriage of Antony to Caesar/Augustus' sister Octavia.¹⁷ This context is supported by the epithalamial elements in the poem, especially the way in which, as commentators have noted, the song of the Fates in *Eclogue* 4.46–7 echoes the repeated epithalamial refrain of the same Fates in Catullus 64:

‘talìa saecla’ suis dixerunt ‘currìte’ fuis
concordes stabili fatorum numine Parcae

‘Run, you ages, in this form’ said the Fates to their spindles, in agreement with the firm power of destiny.

Cf. Catullus 64.326–7:

sed vos quae fata sequuntur
currìte ducentes subtegmina, currìte, fusi.

But run, you spindles, drawing your threads, [tell] what destiny is to follow.

¹⁵ See Fontenrose (1978).

¹⁶ Cf. Nisbet (1995: 48–52).

¹⁷ Pelling (1996: 17–19), the best modern account of this episode, argues (19) that *Ecl.* 4 belongs not to 40 but to 41; this in my view underplays the epithalamial aspect of this poem and that *Ecl.* 4.11–12 indicates that the child's pregnancy will begin in Pollio's consulship, fully consistent with a date in autumn 40 BC given the ancient *fable convenue* of instant post-marital pregnancy.

There is a neat inversion here: the ultimately disastrous marriage of Peleus and Thetis in Catullus 64, which is presented as leading to the birth of their son Achilles, the mindless slaughter of the Trojan War and the general decline of the heroic world into modern internecine strife,¹⁸ is recalled in Vergil's poem in the context of the Treaty of Brundisium where a marriage and the expected birth of a child forms part of a package to ensure peace and a future golden age where recent civil wars will be forgotten. Once again the epithalamial element is both an echo of Theocritus and an innovation: the Theocritean collection contains *Idyll* 18, a hexameter epithalamium for Helen and Menelaus, but the application of the epithalamial form (whose appearance in hexameters goes back through Catullus as well as Theocritus to Sappho¹⁹) to the realities of contemporary politics is a strongly Vergilian touch.

The generic enrichment of *Eclogue* 4 through its appropriation into the pastoral genre of both hexameter Sibylline prophecy and hexameter epithalamium in modal form allows it to handle diplomatically a key political issue of the Triumviral period, how to flatter both Caesar/Augustus and Antony when the two notional colleagues were in fact rivals for supreme power.²⁰ Debate has of course raged since antiquity as to the identity of the child (notionally male) who will be born to usher in the new Golden Age.²¹ The most helpful hint is at 15–17:

ille deum vitam accipiet divisque videbit
permixtos heroas et ipse videbitur illis,
pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem.

He will enjoy the life of the gods and will see the heroes mingling with the gods, and will himself be seen by them, and will rule over a world pacified by his father's virtues.

Once again this passage presents an inversion of Catullus 64, which begins with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, where gods and mortals mix, and ends with the bleak modern era when the gods

¹⁸ Here I follow the dark account of the poem in Bramble (1970).

¹⁹ Sappho fr.104(a), 105(a) and (c) L/P.

²⁰ See the contemporary observation of Nepos on the prudence of Atticus' cultivation of both sides in this uncertain situation of the thirties BC—Nepos, *Atticus* 20.5.

²¹ See e.g. Clausen (1994: 121–3).

have abandoned mortals to their vices (64.384–6, 407–8); the miraculous child will also experience and promote a world of peace, unlike Achilles, who will be born into and advance a world of war. But the key element here is the ambiguity of the child's identity. The *puer* is presented as the child of a man who can be realistically viewed as having already pacified or being likely to pacify the world.

In the political and historical context of 41/40 BC and the Treaty of Brundisium, the realistic candidates for such a victorious parent are two: Antony and the young Caesar/Augustus, who could both be said to have pacified the world after defeating the Republicans at Philippi in 42, and whose reconciliation is celebrated in this poem. Now it is clear that in 41/40 BC both men could be presented as expecting the birth of an heir. This is true for Antony because he is getting married and is likely to beget children instantly, at least in the conventions of the marriage-poem;²² Octavia did in fact bear him a child in 39, the elder Antonia, grandmother of the emperor Nero.²³ It is true for Caesar/Augustus because his wife Scribonia (recently married in 41) could be reasonably expected to produce a child; her daughter Julia was also born in 39. Thus the reference can be taken to include both dynasts and sensibly does not decide between them.²⁴ Above *patriis virtutibus* was translated as 'his father's virtues', the most persuasive translation given the similar lines 26–7 (addressed to the child):

at simul heroum laudes et facta parentis
iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere virtus,

But as soon as you are able to read the praises of the heroes and of the deeds of your father and realize what true courage is . . .

But even if the phrase is translated alternatively as 'his ancestral virtues',²⁵ this could again apply to a child of either dynast. On Antony's side, the reference to an ancestrally pacified world and to achieving divinity could allude in complimentary fashion to his claimed descent from Hercules, pacifier of the world and mortal hero who became a god, through a putative son Anton;²⁶ if a son of Caesar/Augustus is the

²² Cf. e.g. Catullus 61.204–5.

²³ Dio 48.54.4 records her betrothal in 37 BC.

²⁴ Well observed by Williams (1968: 282–3) and Hardie (1998: 21).

²⁵ Clausen (1994: 122).

²⁶ Plutarch, *Antony* 4.2 with Pelling (1988: 124).

puer, then his grandfather Julius Caesar had more claim than most to have conquered the world, with victories in the west and east as well as in the civil war, and Caesar's descendant might also naturally look to obtain divinity as Julius had done before him.

There is a crucial link here between this determined ambiguity and the incorporation into the poem through generic enrichment of the poetic genre of Sibylline prophecies. All prophecies in the ancient world, and especially those in the less clear medium of verse, were liable to be ambiguous: ambivalence naturally ensured a high accuracy rate and consequent credibility.²⁷ The ambiguity is appropriate to the genre of poetic prophecy which we have already noted in this poem, and it is wholly explicable in the political context; for it would be a brave poet who would have made a firm choice in 40 BC between Antony and Caesar/Augustus as the more likely sire of a great dynasty. Here, then, generic enrichment has clear benefits for both literary texture and political convenience.

As already emphasized, a key feature of this poem (and of the technique of generic enrichment as a whole) is to incorporate 'guest' material while maintaining the boundaries of the 'host' genre. Despite the apparent rhetoric of departure from pastoral with which *Eclogue 4* begins (see above), the poem in fact keeps very close to pastoral character. After the first apocalyptic announcement of the coming of the last age, the address to the *puer* is couched in terms of flora and fauna familiar from the other *Eclogues* (4.18–30):²⁸

At tibi prima, puer, nullo munuscula cultu
errantis hederas passim cum baccare tellus
mixtaque ridenti colocasia fundet acantho.
ipsa tibi blandos fundent cunabula flores.
ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae
ubera nec magnos metuent armenta leones;
occidet et serpens et fallax herba veneni
occidet . . .

But, child, the earth will pour forth small gifts for you without cultivation, wandering ivy everywhere with cyclamen, and lotus mixed with smiling acanthus; your cradle too will itself pour forth charming flowers. The

²⁷ See e.g. the material collected for Delphi by Fontenrose (1978: 12–23).

²⁸ *hedera*: 7.25, 8.13. *baccar*: 7.27. *acanthus*: 3.45. *capellae*: 1.74, 77, 2.63–4, 3.96, 8.33, 9.23, 10.7, 30, 77. *armenta*: 2.23. *leones*: 5.27.

she-goats will bring home of their own accord their udders filled with milk, and the flocks will have no fear of great lions; the snake will be no more, no more too the deceptive poison plant.

But the familiar flora and fauna are here transformed: plants will grow without cultivation, goats will herd themselves, lions will not attack flocks, and poisonous animals and plants will no longer form a threat as before. These utopian impossibilities, as has been noted, derive again from the discourse of Sibylline prophecy: miraculous fertility, the ceasing of the need for animal husbandry, and the transformation of inter-species predation into peaceful coexistence are all features specifically found in the third Sibylline oracle (744–50, 788–95). Thus the enrichment of the pastoral genre by the genre of hexameter prophecy is matched at the thematic level by the miraculous metamorphosis of the everyday flora, fauna, and agricultural work of the pastoral world.

A final element of generic enrichment here is that of panegyric. The poems of the Theocritean collection with bucolic settings are careful to exclude the encomia of great contemporary men found elsewhere in the collection (Theocritus 16 and 17), but again the Vergilian collection takes non-pastoral elements in Theocritus and incorporates them fully into its own expanded pastoral framework. The promise of divine communion and peaceful world rule for the child (lines 15–16, cited above) picks up in particular the compliments to Ptolemy II Philadelphus in Theocritus 17, representing him as currently in communion with the gods in heaven while still alive (13–25), and praising his rule over a pacified Egypt (98–101). A further element of political panegyric is found at lines 53–4, addressed to the child:

O mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima vitae,
spiritus et quantum sat erit tua dicere facta.

May the last part of my long life then still remain, and enough inspiration to speak of your great deeds.

That singing of future military deeds, appropriate to the son of a Roman leader, is meant here is confirmed by verbal parallels with the address to Pollio in the eighth *Eclogue* (8.7–8), plainly referring to his just-completed military campaigns.²⁹

²⁹ Cf. Tarrant (1978).

en erit umquam
 ille dies, mihi cum liceat tua dicere facta?

Will that day ever be, when I can sing of your deeds.

Here again we have the incorporation of a non-pastoral mode (the epic praise of military achievement) into a pastoral context, if only in potential form: note that epic panegyric is seen as a future project for the pastoral poet. The following lines frame this extra-pastoral suggestion firmly within the pastoral world, by suggesting that in such songs the poet will rival specifically pastoral musical gods, Orpheus, Linus, and Pan (55–9). Thus the potentially non-pastoral mode, the singing of military achievements in epic form, is kept within pastoral generic boundaries, just as the earlier epithalamial, prophetic, and encomiastic material is carefully fitted into the same framework. The genre of pastoral is thus enriched without overt violation of the generic code.

3. *ECLOGUE* 6: METAMORPHOSING PARTHENIUS?

I have already argued that *Eclogue* 6 is balanced against *Eclogue* 4 in the structure of Vergil's collection, and that this balance reflects the fact that both poems make intensive explorations of the boundaries of pastoral. As in *Eclogue* 4, the topic of generic debate is marked at the opening of the poem:

prima Syracosio dignata est ludere uersu
 nostra neque erubuit siluas habitare Thalia.
 cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
 uellit, et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
 pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen.'

My earliest Muse deigned to sport in Syracusan verse, and did not blush to inhabit the woods. When I began to sing of kings and battles, Apollo plucked my ear, and warned me: 'Tityrus, a shepherd should feed his sheep fast, but pronounce a thin-spun song.'

The supposed attempted move from existing pastoral into future epic is prevented by the intervention of Apollo, who ensures that the

poet remains within pastoral boundaries. In context, of course, this generic drama presents a *recusatio* or polite refusal of an inappropriate genre for the poem's addressee, Varus, whose preferred praise would be panegyric epic, as the parenthesis in 6–7 shows:

(namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes
Vare, cupiant et tristia condere bella)

For others will be left who will yearn to pronounce your praises, Varus, and to compose works of grim war.³⁰

In the end Varus, whose military campaigns were perhaps at this point prospective for his future proconsulate of 38,³¹ will have to settle for praise in the context of pastoral, perhaps more appropriate if the reason for the address of this poem is (as we might surmise) some patronage shown by Varus as one of the commissioners for the land confiscations which clearly formed one of the starting-points for Vergil's *Eclogue* book.³²

Si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis
captus amore leget, te nostrae, Vare, myricae,
te nemus omne canet; nec Phoebus gratior ulla est
quam sibi quae Vari praescripsit pagina nomen.

But if anyone should read these lines too, entranced with love, all our tamarisks, Varus, our whole grove will sing of you; and no page is more pleasing to Apollo than that which begins with the name of Varus written.

Here the symbolic metonyms *myricae* and *nemus* mark out pastoral, a mode of generic label common in the *Eclogues*.³³ Once again, as in *Eclogue* 4, the politically motivated praise of an individual can be accommodated within the pastoral frame.

This generic manipulation here takes place in the context of an element of generic enrichment. The scene with Apollo famously modifies the polemical prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*, thus incorporating a didactic elegiac poem (*Aetia* fr.1.21–4 Pf.):

³⁰ Note the close parallel with the compliments to Pollio at 4.3 and 8.6–13.

³¹ See Nisbet (1995: 411–12) for some suggestions.

³² See Wilkinson (1966); Winterbottom (1976).

³³ Cf. *arbusta*, *myricae*, and *silvae* at 4.2–3 (see above).

καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρόωιστον ἔμοις ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
 γούνασιν, Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·
 “.]. . . αἰοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
 θρέψαι, τῆ]ν Μοῦσαν δ’ ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·

And when first of all I laid my writing-tablet upon my knees, Lycian Apollo said to me: ‘. . . singer, feed your sacrificial victim as fat as possible, but, my friend, keep your Muse slender. . . .’

The Callimachean original is incorporated in *Eclogue* 6 in a neatly pastoralized form: the poet is referred to by the god as a shepherd rather than addressed as a singer, and the sacrificial victim is made more specifically pastoral as a sheep. Indeed, there is further literary play here, since Vergil’s pastoralization reminds the alert reader that the Callimachean passage is itself reworking the shepherd Hesiod’s encounter with the Muses on Mt Helicon while pasturing his sheep at the beginning of the *Theogony* (22–34), a token of the elegiac *Aetia*’s own didactic ancestry in the poetry of Hesiod.³⁴

This opening generic drama opens the way for the main section of the poem, the song of Silenus. Controversy has raged over the content of the song and its principles of selection, but most scholars would probably accept that it had something to do with providing a catalogue of the topics of non-pastoral Hellenistic poetry—principally unhappy and bizarre love and metamorphosis.³⁵ Here, then, there is likely to be further generic enrichment. This is consistent with the programmatic incorporation of a famous passage of non-pastoral Hellenistic poetry already seen in its opening frame. As it stands, the song begins with a cosmogony in very Lucretian style (31–40), passes to the narration of various erotic and metamorphic mythological episodes (41 ff.), and includes near its end praise of a living individual, the poet Gallus (64–73). It has been perceptively noted by Peter Knox³⁶ that this is essentially the structure of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, and he consequently suggests that the plan of *Eclogue* 6 influenced the plan of Ovid’s poem.³⁷

³⁴ Note how the Muses in Hesiod address Hesiod (and his unmentioned friends) as *poimenes*, ‘herdsmen’ (26), perhaps the ancestor of Vergil’s *pastorem*.

³⁵ See esp. Stewart (1959); Coleman (1979: 203–6).

³⁶ Knox (1986: 11–14).

³⁷ It could be added that both the *Metamorphoses* and *Eclogue* 6 begin with metapoetic passages.

It is worth considering the issue from a different angle, and arguing that the similar plans derive at least partly from a common source rather than one another. This entails tackling the key issue of the figure of Silenus in the poem. Servius suggested that Silenus here was a symbol for Vergil's Epicurean teacher Siro,³⁸ but apart from his Lucretian cosmogony (31–40) the contents of Silenus' song are remarkably un-Epicurean in their concern with disturbing passion. The description of Silenus in lines 15–30, though it preserves many of the usual features of the drunken director of satiric revels, suggests that he is a poet: his reveller's garland (16) could also be poetic, and he is twice seen in the poem as a source of *carmen* or *carmina* (18, 25). It has been argued that the *carmen* here is one of prophecy, matching the appearance of Silenus as a mouthpiece for prophetic revelation in Cicero's *Tusculans*,³⁹ but his song again has little prophetic content apart from the consecration of Gallus, which seems to be happening in the future from the time-perspective of the poem.

Which poet then can Silenus represent? Franz Skutsch argued long ago that the themes of the song of Silenus were the themes of Gallus' poetry, a theory now generally rejected;⁴⁰ but he also briefly suggested that at least some of them derived from a Greek poet associated with Gallus, and who is even recorded by Macrobius (*Sat.* 5.17.18) as Vergil's teacher of Greek—Parthenius of Nicaea.⁴¹ The notion that the character Silenus might symbolize the poet Parthenius has twice been argued, but on both occasions briefly and in books whose other controversial arguments have perhaps obscured this contention.⁴² Parthenius matches the character Silenus not just as a poet, but also as an old man (*Ecl.* 6.18, *senex*): if Parthenius was (as seems likely) brought to Rome in 73 BC, he must have been of advanced years by the time of the publication of the *Eclogues* in the 30s BC.⁴³ He also matches Silenus in terms of geographical links: Silenus is

³⁸ Servius on *Ecl.* 6.1 *et quasi sub persona Sileni Sironem inducit loquentem, Chromin autem et Mnasydon se et Varum vult accipi.*

³⁹ Hubbard (1975).

⁴⁰ Skutsch (1901: 28–49). For a recent attempt to revive Skutsch's view see Gall (1999).

⁴¹ Skutsch (1901: 45–6). For what Parthenius might have done in his possible instructor role cf. Francese (1999).

⁴² Herrmann (1930) and Brown (1963); cf. Lightfoot (1999: 165) on the general possibility.

⁴³ See Lightfoot (1999: 9–16) on the life of Parthenius.

associated with Phrygia and especially with Lake Ascania, the lagoon on which stands Parthenius' home city of Nicaea.⁴⁴

But much more significant is the content of Silenus' song. I return to the similarity noted earlier between the structure of the sixth *Eclogue* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and to the suggestion that this similarity is the consequence of a common source. That source may well have been the *Metamorphoses* of Parthenius, homonymous with Ovid's poem. Our knowledge of Parthenius' *Metamorphoses* is so exiguous that we are unsure whether it was a prose or poetic work, though the latter seems more likely, and it is a fair guess that this was a hexameter narrative poem.⁴⁵ The only firm testimony we have about its contents states that it included the story of Scylla the daughter of Nisus and her metamorphosis.⁴⁶ The metamorphosis of Scylla does occur in the song of Silenus (*Ecl.* 6.74–8), but in a version plainly different from that of Parthenius;⁴⁷ the variation of version need not mean that this is not an allusion to the occurrence of this story in Parthenius' *Metamorphoses*.

I do not want to argue that the song of Silenus draws all its contents from Parthenius' lost *Metamorphoses* (this, like Skutsch's hypothesis of Gallan origin or any other single-source thesis, would be improbable as well as unverifiable), though I would be keen to suggest echoes of that lost poem throughout, both in the song's general structure and in its strong metamorphic interests. The character Silenus, I would argue, could be presented in this poem as performing Parthenius' actual role in literary history, forming a crucial conduit between the Roman poets of the mid-first century BC and the great Hellenistic poetry of Alexandria.⁴⁸ This seems to be borne out by the preface of Parthenius' extant *Erotica Pathemata*, until recently neglected by scholars.⁴⁹ Parthenius introduces this collected handbook of erotic and metamorphic stories largely

⁴⁴ Brown (1963: 131 n. 4).

⁴⁵ Lightfoot (1999: 164–5). For a recent fascinating suggestion that the *Metamorphoses* was in elegiacs and may be represented by the brief fragments of P.Oxy. 4711, which would then give further evidence for its contents (none matching *Eclogue* 6, sadly, but close to some Ovidian stories), see Hutchinson (2006).

⁴⁶ Fr 24 (a) and (b) Lightfoot.

⁴⁷ Lightfoot (1999: 165).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 50–76.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 215–302.

drawn from Hellenistic poetry by saying that he has put it together for Gallus to use in his poetry, both hexameter and elegiac⁵⁰ In the sixth *Eclogue*, it could be argued, the song of Silenus has a similar collection of material, and perhaps even a similar function; if Silenus is to be seen as Parthenius, then we might wish to see the two youngsters Chromis and Mnasyllus, clearly rustic and musical herdsmen,⁵¹ as representing the Roman poets influenced by him, a suggestion made by Servius.⁵² Likewise, the themes which the song introduces are typical of Parthenius' interests, whether in the extant anthology of the *Erotica Pathemata* or the lost *Metamorphoses*; as in the *Erotica Pathemata* itself, we might expect a combination between Parthenian and other sources. In terms of generic enrichment, this is certainly a case of incorporation of non-pastoral material; Silenus' song undoubtedly provides a series of non-pastoral topics, though as we shall see it is also strongly concerned to locate these 'guest' themes within a 'host' pastoral framework.

The song's opening cosmogony of 31–40, as already noted, matches that at the beginning of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1.5–88), though unlike Ovid's version it matches its Lucretian style and partly Lucretian physics with a Lucretian lack of a divine creator:⁵³

namque canebat uti magnum per inane coacta
 semina terrarumque animaeque marisque fuissent
 et liquidi simul ignis; ut his exordia primis
 omnia, et ipse tener mundi concreuerit orbis;
 tum durare solum et discludere Nerea ponto
 coeperit, et rerum paulatim sumere formas;
 iamque nouum terrae stupeant lucescere solem,
 altius atque cadant submotis nubibus imbres,
 incipiant siluae cum primum surgere, cumque
 rara per ignaros errent animalia montis.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 309.

⁵¹ Chromis has the name of a Theocritean herdsman/singer (*Theocr. Id.* 1.24).

⁵² Servius on *Ecl.* 6.1 proposes Vergil (not improbably) and Varus (much less probably) as behind the two of them—see n. 38 above. This seems too specific an approach (though if specific candidates are to be sought, Vergil, Parthenius' supposed pupil in Greek, and Cinna, his first Roman patron, would be plausible).

⁵³ Cf. Lipka (2001: 73–5) and Clausen (1994: 189–92).

For he sang how through the great void were driven together the seeds of earth and air and sea, and of liquid fire with them; how all beginnings and the soft globe of the world grew together from these first elements; then how the ground began to harden and shut off Nereus in the sea, and gradually to take on the forms of things; and now of how the earth was taken aback at the shining of the strange sun, and how the showers fell from on high at the stirring of the clouds, when the woods began to arise first of all, and when scattered animals wandered through the unknown mountains.

We might regard a cosmogony as an unusual way of beginning a metamorphosis-poem, even as unique to Ovid's conception in the *Metamorphoses* which involves a chronological progression from the beginning of time to the present day and beyond. But Ovid's use of the motif makes it clear that the creation process can itself be portrayed as a metamorphosis or indeed series of metamorphoses, with a stress on change of state, and this could be true for a previous text such as Parthenius; for all we know, Parthenius, too, may have had a chronological structure in his work and a cosmogonical opening.

Crucially, too, this cosmogony is modified for its modal inclusion within a pastoral context. The first things to appear on the earth once the initial stages of creation have passed are woods, *silvae* (6.39); this term (as we have seen) is the standard setting for and thus a common metonym of the pastoral genre, and indeed occurs as such at the beginning of this poem (6.2 *silvas*).⁵⁴ The first animals to appear wander in sparse numbers over the mountains (6.40 *rara per ignaros errant animalia montis*); these seem to be the lesser ancestors of the extensive mountain-wandering flocks of Polyphemus in *Eclogue* 2.21, *mille meae Siculis errant in montibus agnae*, 'a thousand lambs of mine wander on the mountains of Sicily' and *errare* is used again of animal movement at *Eclogue* 1.9–10, where the wandering of flocks and pastoral song are seen as interdependent:

ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum
ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti.

He permitted my cows to roam, as you see, and me to play what I liked on my rustic reed.

⁵⁴ There may be a hint here of Lucretius 5.1379–87, where the invention of pastoral is a specific part of man's early cultural history.

This recognition of the overall pastoral colouring of the poem, and the concern to accommodate this 'guest' material into the 'host' pastoral framework, is a persistent feature of the song of Silenus.

The first (brief) topic in Silenus' song after the cosmogony is the metamorphosis of the stones thrown by Pyrrha into men to repopulate the world after the great flood (41), another story also found in the first book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1.313–415) and clearly a possible topic for Parthenius. The stories of the golden age of Saturn's reign, Prometheus and Hylas, likewise summarized in the briefest terms (41–2), can be similarly viewed as covering the early age of man, though not really as metamorphic;⁵⁵ Saturn's reign at least has a pastoral aspect, since Tibullus and others present the age of Saturn as a prelapsarian bucolic paradise.⁵⁶ Prometheus and Hylas are of course linked in the Argonaut saga, where Hercules rescues Prometheus and loses Hylas, but Hylas also has Theocritean precedent, being the subject of *Idyll* 13, and here we can once again see a recognition that Theocritus as a model offered a wide range of poetic possibilities.

The story of Hylas comprises a first allusion to the topic of unhappy love which (after metamorphosis, and often conjoined with it) forms the second main thematic strand of the song of Silenus. The conjunction of metamorphosis and unhappy love can be seen as particularly Parthenian, given that the only known story from the *Metamorphoses*, that of Scylla, combined these two elements, and that a number of the extracts in the *Erotica Pathemata* show the same combination.⁵⁷ This combination of metamorphosis, unhappy love, and pastoral framework come together in the story which receives most detailed treatment, that of Pasiphae (6.45–60):

et fortunatam, si numquam armenta fuissent,
 Pasiphaen niuei solatur amore iuenci.
 A! uirgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit!
 Proetides implerunt falsis mugitibus agros;
 at non tam turpis pecudum tamen ulla secuta
 concubitus, quamuis collo timuisset aratrum,
 et saepe in leui quaesisset cornua fronte.

⁵⁵ It is interesting that none of these stories is found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

⁵⁶ See Maltby (2002: 195).

⁵⁷ See Lightfoot (1999: 240–5) for a good account.

A! uirgo infelix, tu nunc in montibus erras:
 ille, latus niueum molli fultus hyacintho,
 ilice sub nigra pallentis ruminat herbas,
 aut aliquam in magno sequitur grege. 'Claudite Nymphae,
 Dictaeae Nymphae, nemorum iam claudite saltus,
 si qua forte ferant oculis sese obuia nostris
 errabunda bouis uestigia: forsitan illum
 aut herba captum uiridi aut armenta secutum
 perducant aliquae stabula ad Gortynia uaccae.'

and he consoles Pasiphae, she who would have been fortunate had herds never existed, with the love of a snow-white steer. Alas, unhappy girl, what madness overtook you! The daughters of Proetus filled the fields with lowings not their own, but none of them pursued shameful congress with animals, though they would have feared the plough on their neck, and would often have sought for horns on their smooth foreheads. Alas, unhappy girl, you now wander across the mountains: he, pillowing his snow-white side on soft hyacinth, crops the paling grass under a dark holm-oak, or pursues a mate in the great herd. 'Close, Nymphs, Nymphs of Dicte, close the passes to the glades, if the wandering tracks of a bull strike our eyes: perhaps he has been entranced by the green grass or has followed the herd, and some cows will bring him back to the Cretan fold.'

Metamorphosis is central here: though Pasiphae is not transformed into a cow, in other sources she undergoes a para-metamorphosis by climbing into the wooden cow manufactured by Daedalus in order to be impregnated by the bull,⁵⁸ and here her desire for the bull amounts to a longing for this change of state. The two mythological stories adduced as analogues (that of the daughters of Proetus, and, more implicitly, that of Io) are both metamorphic (the daughters of Proetus are transformed into thinking they are cows, while Io actually becomes one).⁵⁹ Pasiphae's story is also a tale of unhappy love which, though drawn from very different literary traditions,⁶⁰ can be accommodated well to a pastoral framework. The generally bovine

⁵⁸ Apollodorus, *Bibl.*3.2.4.

⁵⁹ Note that both these stories occur in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Io is a key story in *Met.* 1.583–750, while that of the Proetides is briefly narrated at 15.326–9, with Ovid, *Met.* 1.632 *amara pascitur herba* picking up the other half of Calvus fr.9 Courtney *a virgo infelix, herbis pascetur amaris*.

⁶⁰ Especially the *Cretans* of Euripides, where Pasiphae's passion for the bull was a central feature (Eur. *TGFr* 471–2 Kannicht).

character of her story and of the analogue stories is clear, and her passion for the bull allows the introduction of key pastoral terms (*armenta*, 'flocks', *iuveni* 'bull', *grege* 'herd')⁶¹, while her wandering on the mountains makes her sympathetically mirror the behaviour of pastoral flocks which I noted at line 40 above. Her bovine lover, for his part, reclines (53) in anthropomorphic comfort and feeds under the shade of a holm-oak (54 *ilice sub nigra*), a location for pastoral song in the next poem of the *Eclogue* book (7.1 *forte sub arguta consederat ilice Daphnis*, 'as it happened, Daphnis had sat down under a rustling holm-oak'). This passage tells an unpastoral tale of strange erotic practice, but the bestiality is at least etymologically 'bucolic' and is narrated within a pastorally coloured framework.

The implicit presence here of the story of Io, another mythological heroine who endured an unhappy love affair with bovine connections (Io was transformed into a cow by her rapist Jupiter in a vain attempt to shield the adulterous act from Juno), also contributes to this nexus of pastoral, metamorphic, and erotic themes, and reinforces the element of generic enrichment. This story is activated by the repeated exclamation *a virgo infelix* (47, 52), which the Servian commentary tells us is part of a line from Calvus' *Io: a virgo infelix, herbis pasceris amaris* (Calvus fr.9 Courtney), 'alas, unhappy girl, you will feed on bitter grass', confirmed by Ovid's echo of the other part in his version of the Io-story (*Met.* 1.632 *frondibus arboreis et amara pascitur herba*, 'she feeds on the branches of trees and on bitter grass'). Calvus' *Io*, in which Io's rape by Jupiter and her transformation into a cow was narrated, was clearly a neoteric narrative poem in the manner of Catullus 64, an epyllion,⁶² and its incorporation into pastoral is clearly an act of generic appropriation, though helped again by its overall bovine character.

After the lengthy Pasiphae myth, two briefer allusions follow (61–3). The first (61) is to Atalanta's reaction of astonishment to the golden apples of the Hesperides which made her lose the bridal race against Hippomenes. Though not itself a metamorphic story,

⁶¹ Cf. *Ecl.* 2.23, 4.22; 1.15, 2.30, 3.32 etc.; 2.66, 7.11, 7.44, 8.85.

⁶² For a partial reconstruction of the *Io* see Lyne (1978a: 154–5), for the epyllion in general Perutelli (1979).

this detail is narrated in the context of such a story (Venus and Adonis) in Ovid (*Met.* 10.560–707), opening up perhaps the possibility of a Parthenian origin;⁶³ but it also modifies a passage in Theocritus. At Theocritus *Idyll* 3.40–2 we find again the story of Atalanta's astonishment, but there her reaction is derived not from the apples but from falling in love with Hippomenes:

Ἴππομένης, ὅκα δὴ τὰν παρθένον ἤθελε γάμαι,
μᾶλ' ἐν χερσὶν ἐλὼν δρόμον ἄνυεν· ἃ δ' Ἀταλάντα
ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὺν ἄλατ' ἔρωτα.

Hippomenes, when he wished to marry the maiden, took the apples in his hands and completed his course of running; but Atalanta saw, and was maddened, and plunged into a deep love.

Once again an apparently non-pastoral story finds partial roots in Theocritean precedent, retaining it within the framework of pastoral. The second allusion in 61–3 is to the myth of Phaethon's sisters changing into alder trees (63 *alnos*), clearly metamorphic, and indeed found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (2.340–66), where their tree of metamorphosis is the poplar; the poplar is also their tree of metamorphosis in the other Vergilian reference to this story, which we know draws details (including the poplar) from the Hellenistic poet Phanocles (*Aeneid* 10.190–1), and in most other versions.⁶⁴ Given the common Vergilian practice of using different forms of the same myth from different sources,⁶⁵ this leads to the ready conjecture that the alder is drawn from another source; Parthenius' *Metamorphoses* is as likely as any.⁶⁶

These swift allusions are followed by the second extended scene of the song, the poetic consecration of Gallus (64–73):

Tum canit errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum
Aonas in montis ut duxerit una sororum,
utque uiro Phoebi chorus adsurrexerit omnis;

⁶³ It is worth noting that the recently published elegiacs attributed by Gregory Hutchinson to Parthenius' *Metamorphoses* narrate some part of the myth of Adonis—see Hutchinson (2006) and n. 45 above.

⁶⁴ Harrison (1991: 121).

⁶⁵ See Horsfall (1981*b*).

⁶⁶ Though Clausen (1994: 199) prefers Vergilian autobiographical allusion to the alders of the Po valley.

ut Linus haec illi diuino carmine pastor,
 floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro,
 dixerit: 'hos tibi dant calamos, en accipe, Musae,
 Ascraeo quos ante seni; quibus ille solebat
 cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.
 His tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo,
 ne quis sit lucus quo se plus iactet Apollo.'

Then he sang of how Gallus, wandering by the streams of Permessus, was escorted by one of the Sisters to the Aonian mountains, and of how the whole band of Phoebus rose to the great man; of how Linus, the shepherd of divine song, his hair decked with flowers and bitter celery, spoke these words to him: 'The Muses give to you the pipes—come, take them—which they gave to Hesiod of old; singing with these he used to bring the sturdy ash-trees down from the mountains. With these may you proclaim the origin of the Gryneian grove, in such a way that no other grove may be a greater source of pride to Apollo.'

This scene famously and explicitly looks back to the consecration of Hesiod by the Muses on Mt Helicon at the beginning of the *Theogony* (22–34) and also to the allusion to that Hesiodic scene in Callimachus *Aetia* fr.2 Pf., thus picking up the reference to the linked Callimachus fr.1 Pf. at the beginning of the eclogue (see above).⁶⁷ Though the pastoral element of Hesiod's herding his sheep in the original scene is here replaced by the erotic wandering of Gallus about the Permessus which seems to allude to his career as a love-elegist,⁶⁸ another modal element of generic complexity here which will be much more prominent in *Eclogue* 10 (see 4 below), the divine figure chosen to initiate Gallus is Linus, here presented as a poetic shepherd. Linus is another Hesiodic element, since he was presented by Hesiod as a legendary poet (fr.305–6 M/W), but he is also found in Theocritus, where he is the teacher of the young Heracles (*Idyll* 24.105), and his presentation as a herdsman here, and the use of the strongly pastoral *calami*, the standard instrument for the herdsmen's songs in the *Eclogues*,⁶⁹ provides a retaining pastoral framework for the otherwise unpastoral material in this scene.

⁶⁷ See Clausen (1994: 199–201).

⁶⁸ Cf. Propertius 2.10.26 *sed modo Permessi flumine lavit Amor*.

⁶⁹ 1.10, 2.34, 3.13 etc.

There may also be a Parthenian aspect here. The poem on the Gryneian grove which Gallus is urged to compose was, Servius claims, a translation by Gallus of a poem of Euphorion.⁷⁰ This is the only evidence for such a Euphorionic poem, and like many Servian statements on literary sources should be treated with some scepticism.⁷¹ Parthenius, however, certainly used the phrase *Γρύνειος Ἀπόλλων*, ‘Gryneian Apollo’, in his poem *Delos* (fr.10 Lightfoot = *SH* 620), and it seems reasonable to argue with Lightfoot that ‘the subject of Gryneium, whatever Gallus made of it, was almost certainly suggested by Parthenius.’⁷² This scene of poetic consecration, then, presents Gallus with a topic associated with Parthenius, and it is tempting to see in the presentation of the poetic pipes by Linus to Gallus a parallel to Parthenius’ own provision of poetic themes for Gallus, as clearly documented in the preface to the *Erotica Pathemata*, where Parthenius offers Gallus his stories as material for Gallus’ own poetry both hexameter and elegiac. Given the Hesiodic elements here, the origin of the Gryneian grove, though clearly an aetiological subject in the Callimachean style, was perhaps envisaged as a hexameter and not an elegiac poem. Thus this scene of poetic consecration replays and matches the overall framework of the song of Silenus itself as argued above: in both a Parthenian poetic tradition is passed on to the next generation.

The next section of the song is highly metamorphic (74–81):

Quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi, quam fama secuta est
 candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstris
 Dulichias uexasse rates, et gurgite in alto,
 a, timidos nautas canibus lacerasse marinis,
 aut ut mutatos Terei narrauerit artus,
 quas illi Philomela dapes, quae dona pararit,
 quo cursu deserta petiuerit, et quibus ante
 infelix sua tecta super uolitaerit alis?

Why should I speak of [how he sang of] Scylla the daughter of Nisus, who (so tradition has claimed), her white loins girded with yelping beasts,

⁷⁰ See the discussion in Clausen (1994: 203–4).

⁷¹ Cf. Lightfoot (1999: 61–2).

⁷² *Ibid.* 61.

troubled the ships of Odysseus, and, alas, in the deep ocean tore at frightened sailors with her sea-going dogs; or of how he told of the transformed limbs of Tereus, and of the feast and gifts prepared for him by Philomela, of the speed at which she made for uninhabited territory, and of the wings on which before that she flew unhappily over her own home?

As noted already, the story of Scylla was the one story certainly found in Parthenius' *Metamorphoses*, though clearly in a different version: Parthenius used the bird-metamorphosis familiar from Ovid (*Met.* 8.145–51) and the pseudo-Vergilian *Ciris*, while Vergil identifies Scylla the daughter of Nisus with the Scylla of the *Odyssey*, whose semi-canine metamorphosis is separately narrated by Ovid (*Met.* 14.1–67). Any imitation of Parthenius here would involve a manipulation of the original, but this could be indicated by the arch *quam fama secuta est* (74), an 'Alexandrian footnote' which indicates that some complexity of source-material is here involved.⁷³ The story of Philomela and Tereus again appears in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (6.424–674) and may well have been featured at least briefly in Parthenius' *Metamorphoses*. The hexameter fragment of Parthenius on Byblis cited in his own *Erotica Pathemata*, 11.4, covering another Ovidian metamorphic story (cf. *Met.* 9.450–665) and thus likely to be from his *Metamorphoses*, includes a simile which refers to Philomela's lament for her son Itys, the content of the feast she prepared for her adulterous husband Tereus (fr.33 Lightfoot = *SH* 646):

ἦ δ' ὅτε δὴ < ῥ' > ὄλοιο κασιγνήτου νόον ἔγνω,
 κλαίειν ἀηδονίδων θαμινώτερον, αἶ τ' ἐνὶ βήσσης
 Σιθονίῳ κούρῳ πέρι μυρίον αἰάζουσιν.

And once she knew her cruel brother's mind
 Her shrieks came thicker than the nightingales'
 In woods, who ever mourn the Thracian lad.⁷⁴

Though this melodramatic pair of stories may bring us closer than any other part of the song to the *Metamorphoses* of Parthenius, they are strongly unpastoral. The pastoral frame is however firmly re-asserted in the lines which close both song and poem (82–6):

⁷³ On the 'Alexandrian footnote' see Horsfall (1990).

⁷⁴ The translation is that of Lightfoot (1999: 121).

omnia, quae Phoebō quondam meditante beatus
 audiit Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros,
 ille canit (pulsae referunt ad sidera ualles),
 cogere donec ouis stabulis numerumque referre
 iussit et inuito processit Vesper Olympo

He sang of everything that the river Eurotas was privileged to hear as Phoebus practised and commanded his bay-trees to learn, and the valleys, struck by the sound, carried it to the stars, until the evening-star appeared from an unwilling sky and bid them gather their sheep in the folds and count their numbers.

In this generalizing and closural summary Silenus' song is said to replicate all the (unspecified) topics included in a song of Apollo; this must be additional to and not inclusive of the other topics mentioned.⁷⁵ Here again we have the three elements of unhappy love, metamorphosis, and pastoral framework noted earlier as the core elements of the song.

In terms of unhappy love, though a recent interesting argument has suggested that this passage is primarily an allusion to the story of Daphne,⁷⁶ the mention of Apollo and the Eurotas points for me to the story of Hyacinthus, and to Apollo's honouring in song the river associated with his dead beloved.⁷⁷ The framing structure of Apollo's song, whereby a singer weaves together a number of themes in a lament following the death of his beloved, finds a significant echo in the tenth book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, largely composed of the unhappy stories of homoerotic love sung by Orpheus as the consequence of the death of Eurydice (10.143–739); the link is reinforced by the fact that the second of these stories is in fact that of Apollo and Hyacinthus (10.162–219). In terms of metamorphosis, Ovid's Hyacinthus story is of course metamorphic, the *aition* of the plant which springs from the boy's blood (10.209–16), and the Vergilian allusion to *laurus*, 'bay-tree' casually recalls the story of Daphne, transformed into that plant form (cf. Ovid, *Met.* 1.452–567). The story of Hyacinthus was certainly dealt with by Euphorion's hexameter poem

⁷⁵ So Clausen (1994: 207–8).

⁷⁶ See Knox (1990: 185).

⁷⁷ For the Eurotas as the haunt of Apollo during Hyacinthus' life cf. e.g. Ovid *Met.* 10.169.

Hyacinthus, a possible source,⁷⁸ but both stories might also have occurred in Parthenius' *Metamorphoses*, and the additional feature of the frame-narrative technique which appears in a similar context in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* could suggest that this is a structural feature also taken from Parthenius.

Finally, in terms of pastoral framework, Apollo's singing has a bucolic air: like the herdsmen of the *Eclogues*, he sings in the open landscape of unhappy love. This semi-pastoral element prepares for the strongly pastoral close: as at the end of the tenth *Eclogue* and of the *Eclogue* book, the appearance of the evening star calls the herdsmen to marshal their flocks and head home (10.77 *ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae*, 'go home full, she goats, the evening star is coming, go'). As also in *Eclogue* 1.83, the end of the pastoral day is the end of the pastoral poem; in the case of *Eclogue* 10, the end of the day and of the poem is also the end of the pastoral book. In *Eclogue* 6, the homeward return of the flock is a figure for the generic reversion of the poem at its very end to its pastoral 'home', for this is by far the most typical pastoral element which the poem contains; here we realize that Chromis and Mnasyllus, Silenus' listeners, were herdsmen all along and, as it has been throughout, the apparently generically 'deviant' material of Silenus' song with its deployment of other literary modes, whether or not Parthenius is specifically involved, has been carefully accommodated at the poem's end within a typically pastoral frame.

4. ECLOGUE 10: PASTORAL AND LOVE-ELEGY

The tenth *Eclogue* provides the most extensive intergeneric engagement in the whole *Eclogue* book. The key interpretative perception here, that the poem presents a form of confrontation between the literary genres of pastoral and love-elegy in which the two contemplate merger but ultimately remain independent, has been famously

⁷⁸ *Coll.Alex.* 39; another likely source for the Hyacinthus story would be Phanocles' pederastic *Erotes* or *Kaloi*, certainly drawn on by Vergil elsewhere—see n. 64 above and Hollis (1992).

set out by Conte;⁷⁹ this treatment aims to argue that case with fuller attention than Conte to detailed textual signals, and to apply in addition the concept of generic enrichment. The poem begins with an explicit statement about moving on from pastoral (this is to be the last poetic *labor* of the book), but also sets the stage in several ways for intergeneric debate (1–8):

Extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem:
 pauca meo Gallo, sed quae legat ipsa Lycoris,
 carmina sunt dicenda: neget quis carmina Gallo?
 Sic tibi, cum fluctus subterlabere Sicanos,
 Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam,
 incipe; sollicitos Galli dicamus amores,
 dum tenera attendent simae uirgulta capellae.
 Non canimus surdis: respondent omnia siluae.

Permit me, Arethusa, this last task: I must voice a few songs for my dear Gallus, but such as Lycoris herself can read: who would deny songs to Gallus? As you hope that, when you flow under the Sicilian waves, bitter Doris may not intermingle her waters with yours, begin: let us speak of the disturbed loves of Gallus, while the snub-nosed she-goats crop the tender undergrowth. It is not to the deaf we sing: the woods re-echo everything.

The fountain-nymph Arethusa is here addressed as if she were the pastoral Muse; as a feature of Theocritus' Sicilian landscape, she is a natural symbol of his pastoral poetry, as Servius' commentary stresses here: *per Arethusam autem musam Siculam, id est bucolicum Theocritium invocat carmen*.⁸⁰ In the anonymous *Lament for Bion*, Bion as a pastoral poet in the Theocritean tradition is said to have 'had his drink from Arethusa' ([Moschus] 3.77 ὁ δ' ἔχεν πόμα τᾶς Ἀρεθούσας), and in the same line her fountain is paired with that of Hippocrene as a source of poetic inspiration. In particular, the address to Arethusa keys the reader into the context of Theocritus' first *Idyll*, where Daphnis, dying of love, bids farewell to the fountain (1.117): χαῖρ', Ἀρεθούσα, 'farewell, Arethusa'; *Idyll* 1 will be the main Theocritean model for this poem, with Gallus cast in the role of

⁷⁹ Conte (1986: 100–29). See also the useful treatment by Perkell (1996), with which my approach shares some features.

⁸⁰ Notwithstanding the interesting arguments of Kennedy (1987), who sees Arethusa as representing love-elegy. My debt to the ways of thinking of this article will be apparent in what follows.

the erotically perishing Daphnis, and the opening poem of the Theocritean collection is thus neatly echoed in this closing poem of its Vergilian counterpart.

But this pastoral poem under the patronage of Arethusa will be different, since it is written for the love-elegist Gallus and is to be read by his mistress Lycoris; this introduces the world and genre of love-elegy, especially since (as scholars have pointed out⁸¹) the mention of Lycoris as reader recalls Gallus' own apparent dedicatory poem from the Qasr Ibrim fragment, fr.4.1–2 Blänsdorf (fr.2.6–7 Courtney), which refers to Lycoris:

... tandem fecerunt carmina Musae
 quae possem domina deicere digna mea

at last the Muses have made songs for me to utter as worthy of my mistress.

This sets up the key literary confrontation of the poem: the texture of pastoral will here be generically enriched by a modal encounter with Gallan love-elegy. This encounter could have been suggested by the elegies of Gallus himself, into which it has been plausibly suggested that he introduced pastoral elements.⁸² As Duncan Kennedy has indicated,⁸³ this generic interaction must be somehow thematized in the undersea voyage of Arethusa to Syracuse from her original home in Arcadia when pursued by the river Alpheus, and in the non-blending of her fresh waters with the salt waters of the sea (4–5).⁸⁴ Kennedy himself argues that Arethusa represents Gallus' elegy with its Arcadian connotations, that the Sicilian sea stands for Theocritean pastoral and that the non-blending of the two represents a concern that the Gallan elegiac themes should not be spoilt or corrupted by their transposition into Vergilian pastoral.⁸⁵ But there are several arguments to be made against the Sicilian sea as symbolizing pastoral here. It is difficult to detach Arethusa from pastoral given the evidence of Theocritus and the *Lament for Bion* cited above;⁸⁶ the usual

⁸¹ First perhaps Hinds (1983).

⁸² See Skutsch (1901: 25); Ross (1975: 85–107).

⁸³ Kennedy (1987: 49).

⁸⁴ For a full narrative of the mythological story alluded to here see Ovid *Met.* 5.572–641, Pausanias 8.54.1–3.

⁸⁵ Kennedy (1987: 48–9).

⁸⁶ Kennedy (1987: 48) cites the Δώριον ὕδωρ of the *Lament's* first line as evidence for 'Dorian water' meaning 'pastoral'.

genre symbolized by the sea is not pastoral but epic;⁸⁷ and the term used for ‘Sicilian’ here (*Sicanus*) is unique in the *Eclogues*, does not render an equivalent Theocritean epithet, and differs from the symbolic Sicilian toponyms for pastoral found elsewhere in Vergil (*Siculus*, *Sicelides*, *Syracosius*).⁸⁸

If Arethusa is pastoral, *Doris amara* could point to the more tumultuous mode of love-elegy. *Doris*, the Oceanid mother of the Nereids, here standing metonymically for the sea, might also suggest an elegiac *puella* (10.2); the rhyme with ‘Lycoris’ is notable, and Doris may well have been a *hetaira*-name.⁸⁹ The unusual *amara*⁹⁰ could suggest not just salt water but the bitterness of unrequited love, perhaps drawing on lost Gallan material: compare Catullus 68.17–18 *non est dea nescia nostri, / quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiam*, ‘the goddess who mixes sweet bitterness with erotic cares [i.e. Venus] is not unacquainted with us’, and the common use of *noctes amarae*, ‘bitter nights’, for the nights of suffering endured by the unrequited elegist-lover.⁹¹ The waves, doubly emphasized here (10.4 *fluctus*, 10.5 *undam*), could suggest the grand passions of love; we may compare the description of Ariadne at Catullus 64.62 *magnis curarum fluctuat undis*, ‘she was awash with the mighty waves of emotion’, and note that 10.6 *sollicitos... Galli amores* may carry the same stormy imagery—compare *Georgics* 4.262 *mare sollicitum stridit refluentibus undis*, ‘the sea stirred up roars with back-flowing waves’. The symbolic argument would then be not that elegiac themes should be preserved as a separate literary tradition despite their inclusion in pastoral, but rather that the pastoral Arethusa, though she may link the Theocritean world of Sicily and the Gallan world of Arcadia,⁹² the two interacting genres of *Eclogue* 10, should in the end (like Vergil’s poem) avoid the world of the *puella* and of grand elegiac passions for which Gallus stands and from which the quieter world of pastoral cannot grant him relief.

⁸⁷ See e.g. Morgan (1999: 32–40, 46–9).

⁸⁸ *Sicanus* and its cognates are indeed otherwise found in Vergil only in the *Aeneid* (seven times).

⁸⁹ The mysterious Doris of Petronius (*Sat.* 126.18) looks like a *hetaira*.

⁹⁰ Clausen (1994: 295).

⁹¹ Cf. Propertius 1.1.33, 2.17.3–4, 4.3.29; Tibullus 2.4.11; Ovid, *Her.* 12.169.

⁹² Here I accept Kennedy’s arguments (49–55) that Arcadia was a significant location in Gallus’ poetry.

The symbolic plot of *Eclogue* 10 on this reading is as follows.⁹³ The pastoral genre of the *Eclogue* book is disturbed by the irruption of the love-elegist Gallus; the prospect of Gallus' love-elegies being disturbed in turn and redirected towards pastoral is entertained, but in the end Gallus returns to love-elegy and the *Eclogue* book finally returns to Theocritean pastoral.⁹⁴ Thus the non-contamination of Arethusa is ultimately successfully maintained, though of course the pastoral genre has been enriched with its material through the detailed description of the encounter. This eventual outcome is clearly foreshadowed not just in the non-contamination of Arethusa, but also in the poet's instructions to her (10.5–7):

incipere; sollicitos Galli dicamus amores,
dum tenera attendant simae uirgulta capellae.
non canimus surdis: respondent omnia siluae.

begin: let us speak of the disturbed loves of Gallus, while the snub-nosed she-goats crop the tender undergrowth. We do not sing to the deaf: the woods reply to everything.

Here it is hard not to see *sollicitos... amores* ('disturbed loves') as metapoetical: the poem will indeed speak of the disruption of Gallus' loves, literally in terms of the emotional impact of Lycoris' departure with a rival, but also metaphorically in terms of the disruption of his love-poetry by a determined attempt to be a pastoral poet. As at lines 34 and 53–4 later in the poem (see below), *amores* refers not only to Gallus' love-affairs but also to the *Amores*, the likely title of his four books of elegies, a Hellenistic title later continued by Ovid.⁹⁵

This metapoetical aspect can also be seen in 10.21–3, where the pastoral figures who have gathered to sympathize with Gallus, imitating the pastoral figures who attend Daphnis in a similar situation in *Idyll* 1, ask the poet some pertinent questions:

⁹³ This is essentially the pattern implied in Conte (1986), though my analysis of the textual signals is more detailed.

⁹⁴ This is not the first time love-elegy has appeared in the book: there are clear echoes of it in *Eclogue* 2—see Du Quesnay (1979).

⁹⁵ Servius' report on Gallus' poems is our only evidence for Gallus' title, but clear enough (10.1): *et amorum suorum de Cytheride scripsit libros quattuor*. For the title before and after Gallus see McKeown (1987: 103–7).

omnes 'unde amor iste' rogant 'tibi?'. venit Apollo:
 'Galle, quid insanis?' inquit. 'tua cura Lycoris
 perque nives alium perque horrida castra secuta est'

all asked 'where does that love of yours come from?' Apollo came: 'Gallus, what is this insanity of yours for? your dear care Lycoris has followed another through the snows and through the fearful camp'

Though, as commentators point out, these concerned enquiries are recognizable versions of the similar questions asked in the Theocritean model (1.77–98), they also operate on a metageneric level. Gallus' love comes in literary terms from his own elegies, just as his appearance in the pastoral world imports the figure of the elegiac poet-lover; this *amor* thus derives from Gallus' *Amores*. Likewise, his madness is elegiac too, for *insanus* and its cognates are often used in elegy for the extreme passion of love:⁹⁶ Propertius, also addressing a Gallus,⁹⁷ asks *quid tibi vis, insane? meos sentire furores?* (1.5.3), 'what do you want for yourself, you madman—to feel my insanity', and triumphantly proclaims in another poem that Lynceus has at last given in to the lover's madness (2.34.25): *Lynceus ipse meus seros insanit amores*, 'my Lynceus is himself mad with a love that has come late'. These elegiac elements are strongly confirmed by long-standing scholarly suggestions that the details of 22–3 are taken directly from Gallus' elegies, given the resemblance to Propertius' similar treatment in 1.8 of the same theme of the *puella* going off to cold foreign parts with a more military lover. It is interesting that these details are put in the voice of Apollo, replacing Hermes in the Theocritean original as the first god to accost the suffering lover; here there is likely to be a reminiscence of the metageneric role of Apollo in *Eclogue* 6 (see above).

Just as the Theocritean Hermes is replaced by Apollo in Vergil's version, so Priapus and Aphrodite, the two other Theocritean gods who converse with Daphnis, are replaced in Vergil by Silvanus and Pan (24–30). These two gods, unlike the Theocritean pair, are clearly selected for their connections with the literary genre of pastoral:

⁹⁶ Pichon (1902: 172–3).

⁹⁷ Probably not the elegist (see e.g. Fedeli, 1980: 153), since there are no hints in the poem that Gallus is Propertius' elegiac predecessor, though see the interesting arguments of Cairns (1983) for that proposition.

Silvanus suggests the *silvae* of pastoral seen in *Eclogue* 4, and Pan is specifically described as *Pan deus Arcadiae* (26), the god of Arcadia, home of amoebian rustic song.⁹⁸ Pan's words to Gallus again have a metaliterary and metageneric aspect (28–30):

‘Ecquis erit modus?’ inquit ‘Amor non talia curat,
nec lacrimis crudelis Amor nec gramina riuus
nec cytiso saturantur apes nec fronde capellae.’

‘Will there be any limit?’ he said. ‘Love does not care for such things, and cruel Love cannot be sated with tears, nor grass with streams, nor bees with clover nor goats with branches.’

Pan's words seem to speak to the generic elements here. His question raises the issue of how much elegiac material can be imported into a pastoral poem: this is the key question of generic enrichment, of how much ‘guest’ material can be absorbed by the ‘host’ genre before the latter loses its identity. His statement that ‘Love does not care for such things’, primarily a reference to Love's hard-heartedness, also seems to anticipate the result of the generic drama: in the end, love-elegy can tolerate only so much of the pastoral elements which the plot of this poem attempts to introduce wholesale, and Gallus will ultimately surrender to love and return to love-elegy (69 *omnia vincit Amor, et nos cedamus Amori*; see below). As often, Amor personified represents the elegiac genre: we may compare Propertius' programmatic defeat by Amor in his opening elegy (1.1.3–4), or the foot-stealing Amor of Ovid *Amores* 1.1 who turns the poet from epic to elegy. Lines 29–30 seems also to describe the ultimate separateness of the two genres. Love cannot have too many tears, just as love-elegy is obsessed with *lacrimae*, perhaps here also a pointer to the traditional etymological association of elegy with lament; and the flora and fauna which dominate and define the pastoral landscape (especially the symbolic *capellae*, standing here as at the end of the poem for pastoral poems) cannot get too much of their normal sustenance, and do not need the alien food of love-elegy.

⁹⁸ Kennedy (1987) argues that Pan and Arcadia are not pastoral symbols here. While I agree with him and Jenkyns (1989) that Arcadia as a pastoral landscape is essentially a post-Renaissance construction, Arcadia as the home of amoebian bucolic song, the key mode of the *Eclogues*, is to be found in the detailed description of Arcadian pastoral singing by the native Arcadian Polybius (4.20.10), a passage which explains *Ecl.* 7.4–5 *Arcades ambo, / et cantare pares et respondere parati*.

The opening of Gallus' reply to Pan is equally metageneric (31–4):

tristis at ille: 'tamen cantabitis, Arcades,' inquit,
 'montibus haec uestris, soli cantare periti
 Arcades. o mihi tum quam molliter ossa quiescant,
 uestra meos olim si fistula dicat amores!'

but he said sadly 'yet you will sing these themes to your mountains, Arcadians, Arcadians uniquely skilled in singing. How easily would my bones rest, if your pipe were some day to speak of my loves.'

Gallus is appropriately *tristis* as an elegiac poet-lover,⁹⁹ but the prospect that he opens up is the transmutation of his elegiac themes into the 'Arcadian' mode of pastoral. Even here he still seems immovably rooted in love-elegy: the idea that his bones will rest easy not only expresses the typical morbidity of the elegiac lover but also employs a particular formula for resting in death common in love-elegy,¹⁰⁰ and as Clausen has noted, *molliter* (literally 'softly') is highly appropriate for the genre of elegy, traditionally described as 'soft'.¹⁰¹ The juxtaposition of love-elegy and pastoral is of course clearest in line 34, where the *fistula* is the typical instrument of pastoral poetry,¹⁰² while *amores* not only evokes erotic subject-matter in general but Gallus' own elegiac *Amores* in particular; as in lines 50–1 (see below), Gallus here envisages the ultimately impossible transposition of his elegiac verse into pastoral.

This fantasy continues in lines 35–44, where Gallus imagines himself as a happy pastoral lover with a Phyllis or Amyntas; this is even extended to wishing that Lycoris herself would join him in this *locus amoenus*, surely a genuine Gallan element given the similarly fantastic idea presented by Tibullus that the urban *puella* Delia will collaborate in the menial work on his farm.¹⁰³ But at lines 44–9 Gallus recalls himself at least momentarily from this intergeneric fantasy to the intrageneric reality of love-elegy:

nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis
 tela inter media atque aduersos detinet hostis.
 tu procul a patria (nec sit mihi credere tantum)

⁹⁹ Pichon (1902: 283–4).

¹⁰⁰ See Clausen (1994: 302).

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² *Ecl.* 2.37, 3.22, 3.25, 7.24, 8.33.

¹⁰³ Tibullus 1.5.21–34.

Alpinas, a, dura, niues et frigora Rheni
 me sine sola uides. A, te ne frigora laedant!
 a, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!

Now mad love holds me back in the battles of a tough war, amid arms and opposing enemies. You, far from your country (and may I not believe such a thing), view the Alpine snows, harsh one, and the cold of the Rhine, alone, without me. May the cold not harm you! May the rough ice not cut your soft feet!

Though a literal reading of lines 44–5 is still sometimes maintained,¹⁰⁴ I find it difficult to believe that Gallus is presented here as being on service with the Roman army in Greece. As Kennedy has argued, the Arcadian location must be an allusion to Gallus' own poetry, and a similarly literary reading of *duri me Martis in armis* seems to be required; the details of lines 44–5 are likely to be as Gallan as those of 46–9, confirmed as Gallan by Servius' famous note and the well-known parallels with Propertius 1.8.¹⁰⁵ Since Gallus has (as we have seen) already been strongly self-characterized as an elegiac lover, the most natural interpretation here is that the war is the metaphorical *militia amoris*, or rather *militia in Amorem*;¹⁰⁶ while Lycoris is far away in actual military locations herself, the campaign waged by Gallus is the metaphorical one of the poet-lover against the pains of love, and the weapons and enemies with which he is surrounded are clearly those of Cupid/Amor, who is here as often depicted as a military commander engaged with the lover and who in the end will win the victory in this war (69 *omnia vincit Amor*).

This is confirmed by close analysis of the details here. The imagery of 44–5 in general recalls Propertius' (very Gallan) opening elegy, where his claim (1.1.8) *adversos cogor habere deos*, 'I was compelled to have the gods against me', clearly includes Cupid amongst the lover's divine enemies (cf. *adversos* . . . *hostis*), and Propertius' later claims in 2.12 that Cupid is a difficult enemy who strikes from afar with his deadly weapons (2.12.11 *hostem*, 2.12.18 *tela*). The link of *insanus amor* (44) with the earlier *Galle, quid insanis?* (22) is clear: both

¹⁰⁴ e.g. Clausen (1994: 304); on the history of the issue see Ross (1975: 85–7).

¹⁰⁵ Servius on 10.46 *hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus*; for the links with Propertius 1.8 see Skutsch (1901: 2–27); Ross (1975: 85–6).

¹⁰⁶ Coleman (1979: 287).

represent the literary madness of the poet-lover of love-elegy. The use of both *durus* and *Mars* seems paradoxical here, but makes the elegiac point that the battles of love are the truly tough battles (cf. Propertius 3.5.2 *sat mihi cum domina proelia dura mea*; ‘there are enough tough battles for me with my mistress’). There also seems to be some reference to the conceit that Cupid/Amor is like his mother’s lover Mars as a tough fighter, the theme of an epigram by Meleager which is likely to have been known to Vergil (*AP* 5.180):

Τί ξένον, εἰ βροτολογὸς Ἔρως τὰ πυρίπνοα τόξα
 βάλλει καὶ λαμυροῖς ὄμμασι πικρὰ γελᾷ;
 οὐ μήτηρ στέργει μὲν Ἄρη, γαμέτις δὲ τέτυκται
 Ἀφαίστου, κοινὰ καὶ πυρὶ καὶ ξίφεσι;
 ματρὸς δ’ οὐ μήτηρ ἀνέμων μᾶστιξι Θάλασσα
 τραχὺ βοᾷ; γενέτας δ’ οὔτε τις οὔτε τινός,
 τοῦνεκεν Ἀφαίστου μὲν ἔχει φλόγα, κύμασι δ’ ὄργαν
 στέρξεν ἴσαν, Ἄρεως δ’ αἵματόφυρτα βέλη.

Why is it strange if Eros, the curse of men, lets fly his fire-breathing arrows and laughs bitterly with cruel eyes? Is his mother not both the lover of Ares and the wife of Hephaestus, shared between fire and sword? And does not the sea, his mother’s mother, shout hoarsely under the whipping of the winds? And his father is no-one nor the son of anyone; it is for this reason that he has the flame of Hephaestus, and desires anger like the waves, and the blood-smearred darts of Ares.

The last phrase of Meleager’s poem, describing Cupid’s arrows as the ‘blood-smearred darts of Ares’, and its whole conceit of identifying Cupid and Mars (note how Ares’ Homeric epithet *βροτολογὸς*, ‘the curse of men’,¹⁰⁷ is applied here to Eros) is surely helpful in arguing that *duri Martis in armis* refers to the onslaught of the arrows of Mars’s warlike ‘stepson’.¹⁰⁸

The metageneric aspect of Gallus’ speech continues in 50–1:

Ibo et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita uersu
 carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor auena.

I shall go and play the songs I wrote in Chalcidic verse on the reed of the Sicilian shepherd.

¹⁰⁷ *Iliad* 5.31 and twelve other Iliadic occurrences.

¹⁰⁸ An Ovidian joke; for Cupid as Mars’s ‘stepson’ cf. McKeown (1989: 46).

These much discussed lines¹⁰⁹ are most persuasively taken as referring to rewriting the hexameter poetry of Euphorion of Chalcis in the Sicilian pastoral of Theocritus, as Servius saw long ago (*ibo et Theocritico stilo canam carmina Euphorionis*); not only Gallus' elegies but his hexameter poems as well will undergo this new transformation. Though Euphorion clearly treated some erotic subjects within his poems (cf. Parthenius, *Erot.Path.* 12 and 26), these lines seem not to refer (as the rest of the Vergilian poem does) to Gallus' planned (or even partly accomplished) generic innovation in transferring his erotic elegies to the pastoral dimension; it is very hard to make *Chalcidico* refer to love-elegy, though scholars have tried. Several other pieces of evidence suggest that a reference to Euphorionic hexameter works is plausible here: Cicero's famous reference to *cantores Euphorionis* in 45 BC, which could hit at Gallus, Servius' repeated assertion that Gallus produced versions of Euphorion, and above all the preface to Parthenius' *Erotica Pathemata*, which strongly suggests that Gallus' works divided into the two categories *ἑπη* (hexameter poems) and *ἑλεγείαι* (elegies). Here, then, Gallus would be claiming that his affection for the pastoral genre is so great that he wishes to transform his whole previous output into the framework of Theocritus; this is a rhetorical statement of an impossibility, and we need not worry overmuch about what a Euphorionic hexameter poem rewritten in Theocritean pastoral terms might look like. This promise to transform even his Euphorionic poetry into pastoral is a hyperbolic expression of Gallus' new-found literary enthusiasm.

Lines 52–4 clearly return to the transformation of love-elegy:

Certum est in siluis inter spelaea ferarum
malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, amores.

It is my fixed resolve to prefer to suffer in the woods, amongst the lairs of the wild beasts, and carve my loves on yielding trees: when they grow, you my loves will grow.

The rare repetition here of a word in the same final position in consecutive Vergilian lines¹¹⁰ puts a striking emphasis on *amores*

¹⁰⁹ For some history of the debate see Ross (1975: 40–2).

¹¹⁰ Wills (1996: 422) lists only nine examples in the Vergilian corpus (add *Aeneid* 8.271–2).

and must (as in line 34, see above) point the reader to Gallus' *Amores*. The image of carving *amores* on trees, famously taken from Callimachus' narrative of Acontius and Cydippe (*Aetia* fr.73 Pf.) and probably a Gallan motif (note *teneris*, which suggests the tenderness of elegy¹¹¹ as well the softness of green wood), here suitably stands for the transforming of Gallus' books of love-elegies into pastoral: love-elegies, in the same metre as most inscriptions, are transformed by their pastoral relocation in the woods (*silvae*).

The next lines expand the fantasy of erotic actions in pastoral settings, and again return to realism with the idea that love is unyielding and no cure can be found for erotic madness: the third mention of the latter topic at 60 (*nostri... furoris*) confirms that we are in conventional territory here, as do the parallels with Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*. But it is the close of Gallus' speech which provides the most explicitly metageneric material (62–9):

Iam neque Hamadryades rursus nec carmina nobis
 ipsa placent; ipsae rursus concedite, siluae.
 Non illum nostri possunt mutare labores,
 nec si frigoribus mediis Hebrumque bibamus,
 Sithoniasque niues hiemis subeamus aquosae,
 nec si, cum moriens alta liber aret in ulmo,
 Aethiopum uersemus ouis sub sidere Cancri.
 Omnia uincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori.

Now again neither the tree-nymphs please us, nor their songs; you too, you woods, yield again. He cannot be changed by our labours, not if we were to drink the river Evro amidst the frosts, or endured the Thracian snows of rain-filled winter, nor, when the dying bark shrivels high on the elm, if we were to herd the sheep of the Ethiopians under the star of Cancer. Love conquers all; let us too yield to Love.

The repeated *rursus* marks a return to previous literary identity; Gallus, having attempted to import his love-elegy into pastoral, falls back into unmixed love-elegy, and the tree-nymphs, their pastoral songs and the pastorally metonymic *silvae*¹¹² are all bid farewell. The ambitious generic experiment implicit in 64 *labores* (clearly picking up the metaliterary *extremum...laborem* of the poem's

¹¹¹ Maltby (2002: 467).

¹¹² See p. 31 above.

opening)¹¹³ is here relinquished; the pastoral nature of the *adynata* of 65–8 and the extreme climates proposed for herding (as so often metaphorical for pastoral poetry) suggests that even the most flexible interpretation of pastoral will not allow its coexistence with or appropriation of Gallan love-elegy. Amor/Cupid as the patron deity of love-elegy is an all-conquering warrior, as Propertius was famously to claim perhaps a decade later, no doubt following Gallus, 1.1.4 *caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*, 'Love pressed my head down, treading on me with his feet', evoking the traditional pose of a military victor in ancient art.¹¹⁴ Just as the pastoral *silvae* must retreat before elegy (63 *concedite, silvae*), so Gallus as poet must yield to the poetics of Love (69 *et nos cedamus amori*).

Thus the symbolic plot of *Eclogue* 10 has run its course; Gallus in the guise of love-elegist has been introduced into the pastoral world, the fantastic idea of completely transposing his elegiac and perhaps other works into pastoral has been mooted, and the final result is that the power of Love and love-elegy is too great and Gallus returns to his erotic literary origins. Likewise, too, the final lines of the poem in the poet's own voice mark the return of *Eclogue* 10 and of the *Eclogue* book to Theocritean pastoral (70–7):

Haec sat erit, diuae, uestrum cecinisse poetam,
 dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco,
 Pierides: uos haec facietis maxima Gallo,
 Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas,
 quantum uere nouo uiridis se subicit alnus.
 surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra,
 iuniperi grauis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.
 Ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite, capellae.

This will be enough, divine Muses, for your poet to sing, as he sits and weaves a basket from slender hibiscus; you will make this as great as can be for Gallus, Gallus, my love for whom grows as much by the hour as the green alder pushes itself up at the beginning of spring. Let us get up; the shade of the juniper can be harmful for singers, and the shadows can damage the crops. Go home full, goats, the evening star is coming.

¹¹³ See p. 60 above.

¹¹⁴ For the idea elsewhere see Fedeli (1980: 67).

The address to the Muses (*divae... Pierides*) clearly balances that to the *Sicelides Musae* and *Pierides* at the beginning of *Eclogue* 6 (6.1, 6.13), rounding off the second half of the *Eclogue* book and pairing this poem with another in which non-pastoral material is a primary concern. Equally clearly, the basket of marsh-mallow stands for the current poem; the *pauca meo Gallo*, ‘a few songs for my dear Gallus’ of the opening (10.2) is here repeated in a final dedication. The material of the basket is significant: marsh-mallow is part of the pastoral landscape (cf. *Ecl.* 2.30), stressing that this poem, though it is concerned with the ‘guest’ mode of elegy, is ultimately contained in and bounded by the ‘host’ genre of pastoral. The adjective *gracili*, like the address to the Muses, picks up the opening of *Eclogue* 6, and is evidently metapoetical in its reference to Callimachean slenderness, just like the programmatic *deductum... carmen*, ‘thin-spun song’ of 6.5; this symbolic interpretation is found as early as Servius’ commentary here, *allegoricos autem significat se composuisse hunc libellum tenuissimo stilo*, where *tenuis* would seem to have its Callimachean programmatic significance.¹¹⁵ The type of artefact chosen also has literary significance: as Coleman notes, the basket is clearly a rustic item appropriate to the pastoral genre, but it also recalls the *Europa* of Moschus, a short hexameter narrative poem or epyllion, in which Europa famously holds a basket which depicts the parallel and prophetic story of Io, also an erotic victim of Zeus (37–62).¹¹⁶ This literary echo is highly significant; not only are both baskets clearly symbolic literary artefacts, but, since the echo of Moschus’ basket recalls a non-pastoral poem by a poet normally classed as pastoral,¹¹⁷ it is also emblematic of the way in which pastoral and non-pastoral elements are combined in *Eclogue* 10.

The closing lines (72–7) are careful to seal the poem with pastoral colour, though not without traces of the generic enrichment of both poem and genre through its confrontation with love-elegy. The growing of the poet’s love for Gallus is compared to the growth of

¹¹⁵ See e.g. Clausen (1994: 175).

¹¹⁶ See conveniently Harrison (2001*b*: 83–4).

¹¹⁷ Note too how the Io story in Moschus itself recalls a different generic tradition again, that of Greek tragedy in the *Prometheus Vinculus* (561–886), Io’s most substantial previous literary appearance.

the alder in spring, an image incorporating a pastoral tree (*Ecl.* 8.53) and the preferred season of the pastoral *locus amoenus* (*Ecl.* 9.40), but the picture of synchronized increase of love and tree clearly looks back to the earlier conceit that Gallus' love will grow at the same rate as the growth of his beloved's name inscribed on a young tree (53–4), already identified as a symbol of the potential merger of pastoral and love-elegy. Gallus' *Amores* will not be successfully transcribed into the pastoral mode, but the pastoral poet's *amor Galli* will grow unabated by this failure.

The call (75) to rise from reclining in the shade, the classic pastoral location, naturally suggests the conclusion of Vergil's pastoral book. This suggestion is confirmed by its ring-compositional recall of the opening of *Eclogue* 1, where the piping Tityrus is *patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*, 'reclining under the shade of the spreading beech' (1.1) and *lentus in umbra*, 'relaxed in the shade' (1.4),¹¹⁸ though other elements (appropriately in this closural position) pick up the ends of other *Eclogues*; the coming of the evening star (*Hesperus*) and the return of flocks home recalls the close of *Eclogue* 6 (6.85–6), while *ite capellae* looks back to Meliboeus' farewell to pastoral in the same phrase at *Eclogue* 1.74. In the context of 'farewell to pastoral' at the end of *Eclogue* 10, it is hard to resist the idea that *surgamus* indicates not simply rising from pastoral relaxation but also generic rising towards the *Georgics*.¹¹⁹ Vergil's future work will be in higher hexameter genres, and 'rising' is a natural metaphor for 'moving up' generically; we may compare Ovid's complaint to Cupid that the latter never let him rise from elegy to encomiastic epic (*Pont.* 3.3.31–2): *nec me Maeonio consurgere carmine nec me / dicere magnorum passus es acta ducum*, 'nor did you allow me to rise in Homeric song or speak of the deeds of great leaders'.¹²⁰ The full she-goats (77 *saturae* . . . *capellae*) are a clear symbol of poetic completion, picking up the explicit statement of *sat* . . . *ceciniſe* (70) and the way in which the full irrigation

¹¹⁸ Cf. e.g. Clausen (1994: pp. xxv–xxvi).

¹¹⁹ So Hardie (1998: 28). Here the famous ending of Milton's *Lycidas* provides acute commentary on the *Eclogues*, bringing out this metapoetical aspect of Vergil's lines (*Lycidas* 192–3): 'At last he rose, and twitch'd his mantle blue: / Tomorrow to fresh woods, and pastures new.' See Hubbard (1998: 330). On poetic concerns with generic rising in the *Georgics* themselves see Ch. 4.

¹²⁰ For literary 'rising' see also McKeown (1989: 21).

of the pasture meadows achieved at the end of *Eclogue* 3 marks the end of the singing-contest and the poem.¹²¹

Thus *Eclogue* 10 presents us with something of a cyclical set of movements. Beginning with a statement that this is the last of a collection of pastoral poems, and with an implication in the figure of the uncontaminated Arethusa that it will keep its pastoral character despite other generic pressures, the poem proceeds to open up the revolutionary possibility of the incorporation of love-elegy into a pastoral framework in the figure of the pastoralized Gallus. That possibility is then closed down with the reassertion of the power of love and love-elegy over the elegist-lover, but the end of the poem, having reasserted its pastoral identity, once again suggests satiety with pastoral and an implicit turn to other literary genres. In this structure the non-contamination of Arethusa and the pastoral genre is ultimately represented as being successfully maintained; but a considerable element of generic enrichment has taken place through the sustained dialectic with love-elegy in modal form. Though the incompatibility of Gallan elegy and Vergilian pastoral has finally been shown in the overt argument of the poem, the ‘host’ pastoral poem, figured as a basket by the poet (71), has also succeeded in containing and framing the ‘guest’ love-elegiac mode which (as in the similar appropriations of non-pastoral modes in *Eclogues* 4 and 6) expands and varies the pastoral genre as received from Theocritus. The *Eclogue* book is concerned to keep ‘guest’ modes firmly within the recognizably pastoral boundaries of the ‘host’ genre; but by the highlighting of confrontation with such material, a form of thematic *praeteritio* in which directions not ultimately to be followed in their unadulterated form are in fact fully surveyed,¹²² those boundaries have undoubtedly been extended and the pastoral genre lastingly enriched.¹²³

¹²¹ See Servius on *Ecl.* 3 111: ‘sat prata biberunt’ aut intellegimus hunc exisse, ut iuberet pueris suis ut arva inrigarent, quod illis cantantibus factum est, et re vera dicit ‘rivos claudite’: aut certe allegoricos hoc dicit: iam cantare desinite, satiati enim audiendo sumus.

¹²² This is closely akin to the ‘generic disavowal’ discussed by Gregson Davis in his work on Horace’s *Odes*—see Ch. 1 above, n. 59.

¹²³ Especially in Renaissance pastoral, a wonderfully mixed literary framework—cf. e.g. Chaudhuri (1989); Alpers (1996); Hubbard (1998: 247–341).

Ambition to Rise: Horace, *Satires* 1

1. HORACE, *SATIRES* 1: LITERARY TRADITION AND GENERIC ENRICHMENT

The publication of Vergil's *Eclogue* book, in perhaps 38 BC, was a significant literary event.¹ Two elements must have been particularly striking: its configuration as a well-crafted poetic book of ten poems, the first such to survive intact in the Latin tradition,² and its evident combination of literary tradition and originality in the generically adventurous treatment of Theocritean pastoral which we have examined in the previous chapter. Both these factors are major influences on the next major Augustan poetry-book to survive, Horace's first book of *Satires*, published about 35 BC.³ James Zetzel has convincingly shown how the shape of *Satires* 1 is closely influenced by that of the *Eclogue* book, consisting similarly of ten skilfully arranged poems,⁴ and the *Eclogue* book is overtly complimented at *Sat.*

¹ The *Eclogues* formed the object of critical study at Rome already in Vergil's lifetime, in the teaching of Q. Caecilius Epirota: cf. Suetonius *Gramm.* 16.3 with Kaster (1995: 188).

² The surviving poems of Catullus must have constituted at least one poetry-book (1.1 *cui dono lepidum novum libellum*), though whether any book-structures can be detected in them now is famously controversial. Gallus' lost four books of *Amores* (see p. 63 above) presumably had some significant internal arrangement (fr.2 appears be part of a final sequence to a book—see Nisbet, 1995: 120–4).

Laevius is known to have produced a poetic collection called *Erotopaegnia* in at least six books a generation before Catullus (Courtney, 1993: 118–20), but we know nothing of the internal structure of its books.

³ On the dating of *Satires* 1 see e.g. Brown (1993: 3). For another analysis of Horace's *Satires* which focuses on genre in a more general way see Keane (2006).

⁴ Zetzel (1980b).

1.10.44–5 (see p. 92 below). Perhaps the most open imitation of the *Eclogues* in *Satires* 1 comes in the comic vision at 1.10.31–5 of Quirinus forbidding Horace to write Greek poetry:

atque ego, cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra,
versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus,
post mediam noctem visus cum somnia vera,
'in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si
magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas'

And for my part, when I tried to compose Greek verses though born this side of the sea, I was prevented by Quirinus, seen after midnight when dreams are true, with the following exclamation: 'You would be no more mad to carry wood to forests than to prefer to swell the mighty hordes of the Greeks.'

This vignette of an appropriate god interrupting a (fictional) misguided poetic career with instructions containing a pithy metaphor is clearly a version of *Ecl.* 6.3, similarly reworking Callimachus:⁵

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
vellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen.'

When I began to sing of kings and battles, Apollo plucked my ear, and warned me: 'Tityrus, a shepherd should feed his sheep fast, but pronounce a thin-spun song.'

My particular concern here will be to show how *Satires* 1 picks up the issue of generic enrichment put on the literary agenda by the recent appearance of the *Eclogues*. Horace in his first book of satires, I shall argue, expands and varies the work of his second-century predecessor Lucilius in the light of post-Lucilian literary developments in various other kinds of writing, and by this expansion of horizons raises the literary ambitions of the supposedly humble hexameter *sermo*, 'talk', the self-deprecatory name given by Horace (following Lucilius, fr.1039 W.) to the literary kind which covered both his *Epistles* and *Satires*, just as Vergil had lately raised the literary ambitions of the supposedly humble pastoral. To appreciate this, we

⁵ On the Vergilian passage see Ch. 2, p. 44 above. Note how Horace's *cum... facerem... vetuit... Quirinus* plainly closely echoes *Vergil's cum canerem... Cynthius... admonuit*.

need to look at Horace's handling of his imitation of Lucilius, his explicit model in the writing of Latin hexameter satire.⁶

In 1.4, the first poem in the first book of *Satires* which deals overtly with literary themes,⁷ Horace sets about both criticizing Lucilius and attempting to find an ultimate Greek model for a genre which was famously later claimed to be wholly Roman in origin (Quintilian 10.1.93). He begins with the latter idea by suggesting Lucilius' frank and comic moral criticism derives from Greek Old Comedy (1–7):

Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae
atque alii quorum comedia prisca virorum est,
si quis erat dignus describi quod malus ac fur,
quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.
hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus
mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque . . .

The poets Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes, and the other heroic authors of Old Comedy, criticized a man with great freedom if he deserved attack as a worthless thief, or a lecher or murderer or as being infamous for some other reason. The whole of Lucilius depends on this, and it was these poets he followed, changing only the type of foot and the number of measures.

Here Horatian satire pictures Lucilian satire as a transposition of Old Comedy with its humorous but moralizing pillorying of transgressive individuals and tendencies to the overall benefit of the city; the moral etymologies of the names of the three great Greek comedians are strongly felt here (*Eu-polis*, 'good for the city'; *Crat-inus*, 'man of strength'; *Aristo-phanes*, 'best appearance').⁸ Though we find few actual appropriations of Old Comedy in Horace's *Satires* (New Comedy is more frequent, see below p. 94), the notion that post-Lucilian satire uses or is dependent on other related genres is here prominently and programmatically displayed.

More significant perhaps for Horace's own satiric practice is the criticism levelled at Lucilius in 1.4 and 1.10, where he attacks Lucilius for careless and overprolific composition, natural enough given

⁶ On Horace and Lucilius Fiske (1920), though speculative, is still useful; see also Rudd (1966: 86–131); Freudenburg (2001: 15–71).

⁷ Though 1.1 has an implicit literary programme—see Freudenburg (2001: 23–44).

⁸ For the name-plays see Freudenburg (2001: 20).

Lucilius' huge output of thirty books of satires and his professions of relative stylistic crudity: at 1131 W. Lucilius characterizes his poetry as a roughly constructed raft, *schedium*, and the best-preserved fragment, the lines on *virtus* (1196–1208 W.) does not suggest close attention to stylistic polish.⁹ Horace's own approach is more exclusive and Callimachean, aesthetically and socially: he writes rarely and for a few (1.4.18, 1.10.74) and stresses the importance of poetic labour and polish (1.10.67–74). Callimachean aesthetics are activated not just in imitation of the *Eclogues* (see above) but as a consistent strategy to correct Lucilius—cf. e.g. 1.4.8–13:

nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,
 ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno;
 cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles:
 garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,
 scribendi recte: nam ut multum, nil moror.

For he was at fault in this respect: he often dictated two hundred lines an hour, standing on one foot, thinking it a major achievement; when he was in his muddy flow, there was material you would like to exclude; he was talkative and too lazy to endure the pains of writing, that is of writing well—for I have no hesitation in accepting that he wrote much.

The muddy flow here, as scholars have often remarked,¹⁰ directly adapts the well-known literary polemic of the end of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, where larger and rougher forms of poetry are described as the muddy Euphrates, smaller and more exquisite (i.e. Callimachean) forms as pure spring-water (*Hymn* 2.107–12):¹¹

τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὠδέ τ' εἶπεν·
 “Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλά
 λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.
 Διοὶ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
 ἀλλ' ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
 πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.”

Apollo kicked Envy with his foot and spoke as follows: ‘Great is the stream of the Assyrian river, but it drags along many off-scourings of the land and much rubbish on its waters. The water which the bees carry to Demeter is

⁹ For helpful brief observations on Lucilian style see Braund (1992: 13–14).

¹⁰ Brown (1993: 128–9).

¹¹ On this passage see conveniently Cameron (1995: 405–9).

not from every source, but is whatever comes pure and uncontaminated from the holy spring, a small trickle, the very best.⁷

Thus in both 1.4 and 1.10 elements of Callimachean aesthetic statements are to be found in the Horatian criticism of Lucilius.¹² This can be seen not only as the promotion of exquisite form over rapid and prolific composition (as also in Catullus in the previous literary generation),¹³ but also as representing an interest in literary and generic variation. Such an interest has been argued as operative for Lucilius too as an imitator of Callimachus;¹⁴ though it is difficult to see how Lucilius' evidently rough and loose literary textures respond well to the tighter canons of Callimachean aesthetics, it is plain that Lucilius uses elements from other literary genres freely and often with parodic purpose, as one would expect in the comic genre of satire—for example, epic, New Comedy, tragedy and comedy (see sections 3 and 4 below). But the inclusion of such material in Lucilius is much more likely to be derived from the traditionally mixed and various content of Roman satire, something linked by later critics with the name *satura*, through the analogy with the gastronomic *lanx satura*, a mixed dish.¹⁵ Horace's choice of Lucilian *sermo* in *Satires* 1 thus gave double authorization for generic experiment and enrichment—from both his Roman model with his taste for comic parody and from the Hellenistic aesthetics and poetics which had been made fashionable in Rome by the generation of Catullus and recently honed in Vergil's *Eclogue* book.

2. HORATIAN SATIRE AND HEXAMETER DIDACTIC: NOT BEING LUCRETIUS

As well as the recent *Eclogue* book, the existence since the mid-50s of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*¹⁶ provides another important poetic

¹² See further on this topic Scodel (1987).

¹³ e.g. Catullus 23, 95, both attacking long and crude poems.

¹⁴ By Puelma Piwonka (1949), recently opposed by Bagordo (2001).

¹⁵ For a helpful discussion see Gowers (1993a: 110).

¹⁶ Cicero, *Ad Q.Fr.* 2.9 (Feb. 54 BC.) famously refers to *Lucreti poemata*, usually taken to be the *De Rerum Natura*; for a recent discussion which suggests a date c.49 see Hutchinson (2001).

predecessor for the first book of Horace's *Satires*. The *DRN* provided a model for hexameter discussion of philosophical doctrines (though this is only one part of the *Satires*' varied content), especially as it was concerned with Horace's favoured Epicureanism, and a number of important Lucretian passages are echoed in *Satires* 1. This material from Lucretius, working in the Hesiodic tradition of didactic epic, receives suitable modification for transposition into a satiric context: what Ovid famously termed the *carmina...sublimis Lucreti*, 'the songs of sublime Lucretius' (*Am.* 1.15.23), are appropriated to the Horatian purpose of humorous moralizing, but nevertheless enrich the generic texture of the *Satires*.¹⁷ This is clear from several prominent uses of Lucretian images in the programmatic *Satires* 1.1; the first is near the beginning, where the poet justifies the use of laughter as an ethical instrument (1.1.24–6):

quamquam ridentem dicere verum
quid vetat? ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi
doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima.

Though what is there to prevent one who is laughing from telling the truth? Just as sometimes teachers are charming and give cakes to boys, in order to make them wish to learn their first letters.

This plainly echoes perhaps the key programmatic image in Lucretius' poem (1.936–47 = 4.11–22):

sed veluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes
cum dare conantur, prius oras pocula circum
contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore
ut puerorum aetas improvida ludificetur
labrorum tenuis, interea perpetet amarum
absinthii laticem deceptaque non capiatur,
sed potius tali facto recreata valescat,
sic ego nunc, quoniam haec ratio plerumque videtur
tristior esse quibus non est tractata, retroque
volgus abhorret ab hac, volui tibi suaviloquenti
carmine Pierio rationem exponere nostram
et quasi musaeo dulci contingere melle.

¹⁷ For earlier treatments of the use of Lucretius in Horace's *Satires* see Freudenburg (1993: 19).

But just as when doctors, when they try to give bitter wormwood to boys, smear the edges of the cup with the sweet, golden syrup of honey, so that the guileless age of boyhood should be deceived as far as the lips, then drink up the bitter juice of wormwood and though taken in not be taken ill, but rather be refreshed by such an intervention and grow well; just so I now, since this scheme of thought seems largely rather severe for those who have had no dealings with it, and since the common people recoils with disgust from it, I have conceived the wish to expound our system to you in the sweet speech of the Muses' song, and to smear it (as it were) with the sweet honey of the Muses.

The Lucretian image is suitably compressed and lowered for the context of satire: the deceptive but healing sugared medicine is replaced by open bribery with sweet bakery products, and the purpose of the transaction is not life-saving medication but learning to read. And yet the moral weight of the Lucretian image stresses the ethical seriousness of the *Satires*: these like the *DRN* are concerned with the exposition of truth, but aim to do so through humour and wit rather than philosophical didactic. This wit is partly intertextual; thus in Horace's three lines we see not just the comic modification of the Lucretian image but a clever play on Lucretian style. The Horatian *elementa* (letters of the alphabet) remind the alert reader of the frequent use of the same word in the *DRN* to describe the basic elements of the universe (cf. 4.941 *elementaque prima*) and especially of the well-known comparison of the constituent parts of the universe and the letters as part of writing at 1. 823–29.¹⁸ Thus the ethical programme of the *Satires* presents a generically modified version of the *DRN*: Lucretius with laughter, both injecting humour into Lucretian reminiscence and injecting Lucretian moral fervour into Horatian ironic ethical advice.

This generic transposition of Lucretian material is also seen at the very end of *Satire* 1.1 (117–21), a ring-compositional echo which stresses the importance of Lucretius for Horace's satiric stance:

inde fit, ut raro, qui se vixisse beatum
 dicat et exacto contentus tempore vita
 cedat *uti conviva satur*, reperire queamus.
 iam satis est. ne me Crispini scrinia lippi
 concipilasse putes, verbum non *amplius addam*.

¹⁸ On this see most recently Schiesaro (1994).

hence it arises that we can rarely find a man who claims that he has lived a happy existence and who, content with his span of time, leaves his life like a full dinner-guest. That's enough now. In case you think that I have rifled the desk of blear-eyed Crispinus, I will not add another word.

A resemblance has long been noted with Lucretius 3.938–43, another well-known passage:¹⁹

cur non *ut plenus vitae conviva* recedis
 aequo animoque capis securam, stulte, quietem?
 sin ea quae fructus cumque es periere profusa
 vitaeque in offensost, cur *amplius addere* quaeris,
 rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne,
 non potius vitae finem facis atque laboris?

Why do you not withdraw like a dinner-guest full with life, and enjoy with equanimity, you fool, a rest which is free from care? and if those things which you have enjoyed have been poured away and are perished, and your life is an annoyance, why do you seek to add more, which will perish again to no good end and pass away wholly without pleasure, why do you not rather make an end of your life and your tribulation?

Here the diatribic voice of Nature, the speaker of this lively criticism of the man who has lived too long, is an appropriate object of imitation in Horatian satire, so strongly influenced by the same diatribic tradition of Bion which supplies the image of the full dinner-guest.²⁰ But once again the missionary fervour of the Lucretian original is defused in the humour of the Horatian imitation: where the voice of Nature itself seeks to convert the errant,²¹ the voice of the Horatian satirist ironically points out that no one can be found to live up to the noble image of departing from life once one has had one's fill. Once again, we have verbal wit to mark the generic transposition: the moral futility of adding to one's life once one has had enough of the benefits of existence (the Lucretian *cur amplius addere quaeris?*) is replaced by the literary error of adding to one's poem

¹⁹ See Freudenburg (2001: 33–4), developing a different argument from the intertextuality.

²⁰ On diatribe in Lucretius 3 see Wallach (1976); for the image of the dinner-guest cf. Bion fr.68 Kindstrand.

²¹ Freudenburg (2001: 34) indeed sees this citation as the characteristic voice of the *DRN* emerging in Horace's poem.

when one has said enough (the Horatian *verbum non amplius addam*); thus the Horatian poem closes at the point where the Lucretian personification claimed that life should cease.²² The play between the two passages is thus essentially an intertextual joke, though the stress on not exceeding appropriate limits is common to both passages,²³ and the Horatian attack on the Stoic Crispinus would be in tune with Lucretian Epicurean values.

A few further key Lucretian passages can be seen in the first book of *Satires*, all again transmuted for their new satiric context. In 1.3.38–40 allusion is made to the well-known tendency of lovers to ignore the beloved's physical faults or even to turn them into enhancements:

illuc praevertamur, amatorem quod amicae
turpia decipiunt caecum vitia, aut etiam ipsa haec
delectant, veluti Balbinum polypus Hagnae.

Let us turn to this point, that the shameful defects of his girlfriend pass by the lover, or that these very faults even please him, as Balbinus is pleased by the polyp of Hagna.

This clearly recalls Lucretius 4.1150–6, where the poet suggests that the reader makes his own problems in this respect:

nisi tute tibi obvius obstes
et praetermittas animi vitia omnia primum
aut quae corpori' sunt eius, quam praepetis ac vis.
nam faciunt homines plerumque cupidine caeci
et tribuunt ea quae non sunt his commoda vere.
multimodis igitur pravas turpisque videmus
esse in deliciis summoque in honore vigere.

[you would escape] if it were not for the fact that you stand to block your own path, and pass over first of all every fault of mind and body of the person you seek and yearn for. For men act largely blinded by desire, and attribute to these beloveds advantages which they do not truly possess. And so we see many women who are misshapen and ugly in different ways who are the delights of men and flourish in their highest regard.

²² Thus invoking the closural function of death: cf. Roberts *et al.* (1997: 304).

²³ So too Freudenburg (2001: 33–4).

Once again the more elevated Lucretian material is recalled but lowered and redirected for a satiric context: the unspecific physical defects in Lucretius are concretely and unedifyingly exemplified in the Horatian nasal polyp, and Lucretian generalizations about men and their loves are aggressively specified by the naming of Balbinus and Hagna.²⁴ Lucretian moralizing provides the ammunition for Horatian satiric attack, once more unsurprisingly from a passage of *DRN* firmly influenced by the tradition of diatribe which is basic to Horatian satire.²⁵

Likewise, another key section of the *DRN*, the description of primitive man in book 5, is firmly echoed in *Sat.* 1.3.99–112:

cum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
 mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter
 unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus atque ita porro
 pugnabant armīs, quae post fabricaverat usus,
 donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
 nominaque invenere; dehinc absistere bello,
 oppida coeperunt munire et ponere leges,
 ne quis fur esset neu latro neu quis adulter.
 nam fuit ante Helenam cunnus taeterrima belli
 causa, sed ignotis perierunt mortibus illi,
 quos venerem incertam rapiētis more ferarum
 viribus editior caedebat ut in grege taurus.
 iura inventa metu iniusti fateare necesse est,
 tempora si fastosque velis evolvere mundi.

when animals crawled forth on the earliest earth, a mute and shameful herd, they began to fight for acorns and shelter first with nails and fists, then with clubs and so on to fighting with arms, which experiment had fashioned for them at a later stage, until they discovered verbs and nouns, with which to mark their expressions and feelings; then they began to cease from war, fortify towns, and establish laws, so that no one should be a thief or robber or adulterer. For a cunt was a most wretched cause of death before Helen; but those who were killed off by one superior in strength, like a bull in herd, perished in unrecorded deaths as they sought to seize their uncertain pleasure in the manner of beasts. You must admit that rights were invented through fear of injustice, if you wish to unroll the times and dates of the world's history.

²⁴ Du Quesnay (1984: 54) suggests that the naming of Balbinus here attacks a contemporary adherent of S. Pompeius.

²⁵ On the literary background to the Lucretian passage see fully Brown (1987: 280–3).

The evocation here in radically summarized form of Lucretius' account of early man in book 5 is very strong, both thematically and linguistically; three of the fourteen Horatian lines end with exactly replicated Lucretian line-end formulas, two from book 5 (*Sat.* 1.3.99 *animalia terris* = DRN 5.797 *animalia terris*, 1.3.108 *more ferarum* = DRN 5.932 *more ferarum*, *Sat.* 1.3.111 *fateare necessest* = DRN 1.399 (and ten other places) *fateare necessest*), while the key points of the Lucretian argument (primitive violent competition, followed by the civilizing invention of language and the social contract of law) are also reproduced. Further individual linguistic parallels may be noted.²⁶ Once again, these Lucretian details are moulded to the satiric context: the thief, robber, and adulterer of 1.3.106 look to the lower interests of *sermo* (none of these figures occurs in Lucretius, but all recur as targets of the *Satires*),²⁷ the whole passage is angled to the topic in hand (that of adultery), and, most obviously, the anatomically basic *cunnus* of 1.3.107 introduces an obscenity²⁸ which brings the potentially lofty anthropological narrative immediately down to the satirical level. Once again the satiric context is enriched by didactic material, but that material is suitably modified for its new location. This is not so much parody as a shift of generic framework.

3. KINDS OF HEXAMETER VERSE: ON NOT WRITING EPIC IN SATIRES 1

Latin hexameter satire had from the beginning been conscious of a close (if generally parodic) relationship to traditional heroic or historical epic, and Lucilius engaged in such extensive parodies of Ennius as the so-called *Deorum Concilium* in which the gods met in

²⁶ 1.3.100 *glandem atque cubilia* ~ 5.1416–17 *sic odium coepit glandis, sic illa relicta strata cubilia sunt herbis et frondibus aucta*, 1.3.101 *unguibus et pugnibus* ~ 5.1283 *arma antiqua manus ungues dentesque fuerunt*, 1.3.105 *oppida coeperunt munire et ponere leges* ~ 5.1448 *moenia leges*. Only a few of these parallels are picked up by the most extensive Horatian commentator, Lejay (1911: 89–91); see also the Lucretian commentary of Campbell (2003: 218, 231).

²⁷ Adulterer: *Sat.* 1.2. *fur*: *Sat.* 1.8.39. *latro*: 1.4.69.

²⁸ For the linguistic facts see Adams (1982: 80–1).

council to decide the fate of Lupus (fr.5–46 W.) and in attacks on the supposedly pretentious diction and themes of epic (e.g. fr.413 W.).²⁹ Both these elements are taken up in *Satires* 1, which is aware of Lucilian interest in Ennius (1.4.60–2, 1.10.54) and is similarly concerned to preserve generic distance from epic while benefiting from the appropriation of epic textures. The most sustained dialogue with the epic mode in *Satires* 1 occurs in *Satires* 1.5.³⁰ The so-called ‘Journey to Brundisium’ famously reworks a similar southward expedition from Rome narrated in the third book of Lucilius’ *Satires*, the so-called ‘Journey to Sicily’, preserved for us in a number of fragments (fr.94–148 W.). Both poems involved ferry-crossings, inns, and catalogues of places; Lucilius’ travellers witness a gladiatorial battle at Capua (109–17 W.), echoed in the comic Horatian dispute (1.5.51–70) between the low-lives Sarmentus and Cicirrus in the same geographical area.³¹ But there is little sign in the remains of the Lucilian original of any specifically epic texture; Horace, on the other hand, produces in his poem an epicizing texture which has more than a taste of the *Odyssey*.³²

As Emily Gowers has noted, ‘the shadow of Odyssean *nostos* is one we live with throughout this satire as a matter of course’;³³ the journey out to Brundisium clearly echoes and inverts the journey home of Odysseus to Ithaca, and Horace is in a sense returning to his native country, travelling through the familiar mountain landscape of Apulia (1.5.77–8) and passing not far from his home town of Venusia. In particular, the speaker’s first-person narrative of his own journey recalls and reworks Odysseus’ narrative of his travels to Alcinous in *Odyssey* 9–12, often by inversion and contrast,³⁴ as might be expected in the modification of an epic original for a satiric

²⁹ On Lucilius and epic see Christes (2001).

³⁰ It may not be accidental that the numerically balancing 2.5 contains the most extensive epic parody in *Sat.*2. For recent treatments of 1.5 (with bibl.) see Gowers (1993*b*); Freudenburg (2001: 51–8); Cucchiarelli (2001: 15–55, especially his link with Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (25–33), another comic element in the poem which helps to differentiate it from epic); and Schlegel (2005: 59–76).

³¹ Note esp. how one of the combatants in each case is physically deformed: *Sat.*1.5.60–1, Lucilius fr. 109–10 W.

³² On this colour in the poem see briefly Sallmann (1974: 202–6); Gowers (1993*b*: 55–6, 59), to which I add considerably here.

³³ Gowers (1993*b*: 55–6).

³⁴ Cf. Sallmann (1974: 202–3).

context. Like Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, Horace sets off from a great city, Rome, the historical successor of Odysseus' Troy, and as Gowers notes³⁵ the personification at the poem's opening of the first and less prominent destination after the great city recalls the opening stage of Odysseus' narrative to Alcinous.—1.5.1–2 *egressum magna me accepit Aricia Roma / hospitio modico*, 'after my departure from great Rome, Aricia received me with modest accommodation', matches *Odyssey* 9.39–40 *Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεσεν, / Ἴσμάρω*, 'the wind, carrying me from Troy brought me to the Cicones, to Ismarus'. We may note that the hospitality received by Horace contrasts with Odysseus' famously aggressive reaction to his first stop (*Odyssey* 9.40 *ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὤλεσα δ' αὐτούς*, 'then I sacked the city and destroyed the people').

As the travellers embark at Forum Appii on the barges which cross the Pomptine marsh, perhaps a reflection of the marine travel of the *Odyssey* in a journey which is otherwise on land, nightfall is described with an elaborate formula which clearly belongs to the epic tradition³⁶ (9–10): *iam nox inducere terris / umbras et caelo diffundere signa parabat*, 'now night prepared to draw shadows over the earth and to spread constellations over the sky'. The voyage on the barge, on which Horace is accompanied only by the rhetor Heliodorus, is thus a sort of two-man epic night-expedition, a version of *Iliad* 10, with the figure of Odysseus (this time in his Iliadic role) again in the background, and as dawn approaches another epic-type time-formula is deployed (20 *iamque dies aderat*).³⁷ As they land at Feronia that town is apostrophized in epic manner (24 *ora manusque tua lavimus, Feronia, lymphā*, 'we washed our faces and hands on your shore, Feronia'),³⁸ a type of ornament which like other similar details suggests that the list of locations in the poem's travelogue parallels the elaborated enumerations of places to be found in epic catalogues.³⁹

³⁵ Gowers (1993b: 56 n. 43).

³⁶ See Fraenkel (1957: 111) and esp. Pease (1935: 434–6).

³⁷ Cf. *Aen.* 2.132 *iamque dies nefanda aderat*, and the Homeric formula *ὄφρα μὲν ἦως ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ* (*Iliad* 8.66, 11.84, *Odyssey* 9.56).

³⁸ Cf. e.g. *Aen.* 10.200 *tibi, Mantua* with Harrison (1991: 124).

³⁹ Similar in tone is the elaborate description of Anxur (25), the periphrasis for Formiae at 37, *Mamurrarum... urbe*, which recalls the Homeric formula *Τρώων πόλιν* (4x *Iliad*, 2x *Odyssey*), and 97 'walls of Bari rich in fish', recalling *Iliad* 4.378 *ἱερά... τείχρα Θήβης*.

The main narrative incident of the poem, the battle of wits at Cocceius' house between two low-life characters, is introduced in mock-epic mode (51–6):

nunc mihi paucis
 Sarmenti scurrae pugnam Messique Cicirri,
 Musa, velim memores et quo patre natus uterque
 contulerit litis. Messi clarum genus Osci;
 Sarmenti domina exstat: ab his maioribus orti
 ad pugnam venere.

Now, Muse, I would like you to relate in brief the battle of verbal contention between the parasite Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrius, and what the parcentage was of each participant in the struggle. The Oscan Messius' ancestry was distinguished, while Sarmentus had a mistress alive; this was the lineage from which they sprang as they came to battle.

The invocation to the Muse with a request to relate a particular episode in the war and the concern with the ancestry of the combatants before a particular duel both derive from the *Iliad*.⁴⁰ But both these elements are lowered by their context: the battle is to be a low slanging-match as *litis* confirms,⁴¹ and the two combatants are no Homeric aristocrats but a provincial Oscan⁴² and a humble (if talented) freedman. Their lowly status and Sarmentus' description as a *scurra* (parasite) surely also recall the famous parasitic battle of the *Odyssey*, between the beggar Irus and the disguised Odysseus in *Odyssey* 18, which involves a considerable amount of repartee as well as blows; this Odyssean connection is underlined by Sarmentus' insulting comparison of Messius to the Cyclops (18.63). Like the fight of Odysseus and Irus, this verbal combat is a comic spectacle for the non-participants; the amusement of Horace and his friends (1.5.57 *ridemus*, 'we laugh') echoes that of the suitors after watching the Odyssean beggar-fight (18.111 ἡδὺν γελῶντες, 'laughing sweetly'), and in both cases the fight is enjoyable dinner-time entertainment.

⁴⁰ Invocation of Muses for particular battle-episode: *Iliad* 11.218, 14.508, 16.112. Concern with ancestry of individual combatants: *Iliad* 6.144–51, 20.203, 21.153.

⁴¹ *Contulerit* suggests joining battle, *litis conferre* being a metaphorical surprise for *manus conferre*, 'join hand to hand combat' (e.g. *Aeneid* 9.44, 10.876, 11.283) or *certamina conferre* (e.g. Lucretius 4.843, *Aeneid* 10.147).

⁴² Oscans were proverbially uncultured: cf. e.g. Courtney (1980: 185).

Similar epic textures are incorporated into the lower world of Horace's satire in the last stages of the journey, for example in the kitchen fire in the inn at 73–4:

nam vaga per veterem dilapsa flamma culinam
Volcano summum properabat lambere tectum.

For a wandering flame, spreading through the ancient kitchen, threatened to lick the height of the cool with fire.

The metonym 'Vulcan' for 'fire' goes back to Ennius (*Ann.* 487 Sk.), *lambere* of flame to Lucretius (5.396). Odyssean echoes persist, too: when Horace sees smoke rising from a villa near his home territory, this surely recalls Odysseus' yearning to see the smoke of his own land (*Od.* 1.58), and Horace's complete failure to get anywhere with the girl he finds at his stopping-place contrasts amusingly with Odysseus' apparent tendency to find a complaisant girl in every port.

This sustained appropriation of the epic mode in comically degraded terms in 1.5 is matched in other poems in *Satires* 1. Overtly parodic is *Sat.* 1.2.68–72, where the epic motif of the god or hero's internal address to his own heart⁴³ is neatly reversed in the picture of an adulterer abruptly addressed by the demands of his penis:

huic si muttonis verbis mala tanta videnti
diceret haec animus 'quid vis tibi? numquid ego a te
magno prognatum depono consule cunnum
velatumque stola, mea cum conferbuit ira?'
quid responderet? 'magno patre nata puella est.'

What if his heart were to say to him through the words of his dick, as he saw such evils, 'What are you after? Do I demand from you a cunt descended from a great consul and veiled with a gown, when my rage is up?', what would he reply—'the girl is born of a great father'?

Animus here echoes the Homeric *θυμὸς* in internal debate scenes, and the lofty language of 1.2.70 *magno prognatum depono consule cunnum*⁴⁴ stresses the epic origin of this scene.

⁴³ See Skutsch on Ennius, *Ann.* 203 with Homeric parallels; the address to the heart is a convention for an 'aside', and the heart never replies.

⁴⁴ On the lofty tone of *prognatus*, cf. Fordyce on Catullus 64.1; this lexical impression of grandeur (naturally helped by *magno* and deflated only by the final twist of *cunnum*) is enhanced by the internal rhyme and elaborate abcab word-order. On the obscene register of *cunnum* cf. n. 28 above.

The most sustained epic references outside 1.5 in fact come in 1.7, where the verbal battle between Rupilius Rex and Persius reported from the Philippi campaign is presented like that of Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus in 1.5 as a humorous and ironic parallel to Homeric warfare (1.7.9–19):

postquam nihil inter utrumque
convenit (hoc etenim sunt omnes iure molesti,
quo fortes, quibus adversum bellum incidit: inter
Hectora Priamiden, animosum atque inter Achillem
ira fuit capitalis, ut ultima divideret mors,
non aliam ob causam, nisi quod virtus in utroque
summa fuit: duo si discordia vexet inertis
aut si disparibus bellum incidat, ut Diomedi
cum Lycio Glaucos, discedat pigrior, ultro
muneribus missis) Bruto praetore tenente
ditem Asiam, Rupili et Persi par pugnat . . .

And when there was no agreement between the two (for all difficult people who engage in hostile battle have this right, as brave warriors do: there was deadly rage between Hector the son of Priam and spirited Achilles, so great that only the end of death could separate them, for no other reason except that both had the highest courage; if discord were to trouble two cowards, or if battle were to break out between unequal parties, as between Diomedes and Lycian Glaucus, the more sluggish warrior departs, having given gifts of his own accord), when Brutus as praetor held the riches of Asia, the gladiatorial pair of Rupilius and Persius engaged . . .

The verbal clash between the two characters is overtly compared to that between Hector and Achilles as a head-on confrontation (11–15), and contrasted with that of Diomedes and Glaucus (16–17); the epic episode is satirically rewritten as the avoiding of an unequal battle by bribery, rather than as the heroic recognition of kinship and nobly unrealistic exchange of arms we find in Homer (*Iliad* 6.224–31). As in 1.5, such epic parallels are employed for satirical amusement, but there is a difference between that dinner-time battle of the parasites and this ill-tempered lawsuit; 1.5, set in relatively peaceful times, ironizes the less dignified and relatively inconsequential battle of *Odyssey* 18, while 1.7 provides ironic parallels from the tougher world of the *Iliad* with its real battlefields, appropriate for a story from Horace's real

military service with Brutus in the Philippi campaign. This tone is set in the initial introduction of the two antagonists, two distinctly non-heroic characters who belong firmly to the lower and more realistic world of satire, and whose story is the common talk of the barber-shops (1.7.3). Rupilius Rex, though Roman and praetor for 43, is described by a mock-heroic periphrasis⁴⁵ as *proscripti Regis Rupili pus atque venenum*, ‘that pus and poison the outlawed Rupilius Rex’ (1.7.1), while Persius, though a rich local landowner at Clazomenae (1.7.5), is categorized as *hybrida*, ‘half-breed’ (1.7.2) and as vindictive and vituperative (1.7.6–8).

The mock-Homeric nature of their quarrel is brought out by a number of parodic linguistic and thematic echoes of the *Iliad*,⁴⁶ appropriating the epic mode for a satirical generic framework. The first group is in the long commentary parenthesis of 1.7.10–18, cited above: 1.7.11 *adversum bellum* translates *Iliad* 4.281 δῆϊον . . . πόλεμον, 1.7.12 *Hectora Priamiden* echoes 13.316 Ἑκτορα Πριαμίδην, in similar first position, 1.7.12 *animosum . . . Achillem* recalls the prominence of Achilles’ θυμός, ‘spirit’, for example, 1.192, 9.496, 22.312, 24.119, and 1.7.13 *ultima . . . mors* picks up the phrase τέλος θανάτοιο. These are reinforced by later details: Persius is reported as comparing Rupilius to the dog-star, *invisum agricolis sidus*, ‘a star hated by farmers’ (1.7.26), a simile which Homer uses in more extensive form for Achilles (*Iliad* 22.26–32), and is then himself compared by the poet-narrator to a river in winter flood (1.7.27 *flumen ut hibernum*), a favourite Iliadic simile for warriors in full flow on the battlefield.⁴⁷ The appropriation of this high epic discourse for the low slanging-match of this legal quarrel, whose content is clearly not sufficiently interesting to relate, both exploits the amusing mismatch between form and content and shows how the epic mode can enrich satiric literary texture. The minor incident chiefly narrated for its concluding pun on the name *Rex* (1.7.34–5) is thus fleshed out with significant and entertaining literary detail.

⁴⁵ For this epic form of expression (cf. e.g. *Od.* 2.409 ἱερὴ ἴς Τηλεμάχοιο) see Lejay (1911: 43).

⁴⁶ Most of these parallels were collected long ago by Weich (1910: 17–19), but are not sufficiently noted in modern scholarship.

⁴⁷ *Iliad* 4.452–6, 5.87–94, 11.493–7. Horace’s *flumen . . . hibernum* clearly recalls the Homeric term χεῖμαρρος, ‘winter stream’, found in all three similes.

In *Sat.*1.10.36–40 we find a catalogue of current poetic activity in the Rome of the mid-30s BC:

turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque
diffindit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo,
quae neque in aede sonent certantia iudice Tarpa
nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatri.
arguta meretrice potes Davoque Chremeta
eludente senem comis garrere libellos
unus vivorum, Fundani, Pollio regum
facta canit pede ter percusso; forte epos acer
ut nemo Varius ducit, molle atque facetum
Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae.

While turgid Alpinus murders Memnon and splits the ‘muddy head of the Rhine’, I sport with verse which is not such as to resound in competition under Tarpa’s adjudication or to return time and again to be seen at the theatres. You, Fundanius, can best of all the living rattle off your scripts of gentle humour with the clever tart and Davus tricking old Chremes; Pollio sings of the deeds of kings with three-foot rhythm; fierce Varius leads out the mighty epic like no one else, and smoothness and wit has been granted to Vergil by the Muses who rejoice in the countryside.

Here, though brief favourable notice is given to Pollio as a tragedian (41–2), Varius as an epic poet (43–4), and Vergil in the compliment to the recently issued *Eclogues* (44–5), the main attention is focused on two genres which are more directly relevant to the themes and texture of Horatian satire. The work of the comic dramatist Fundanius is highlighted for its proximity to the low world and humorous approach of satire: in Horace’s second book of *Satires*, indeed, sequential satires will actually be narrated by a Davus who matches Fundanius’ typically named slave here (2.7) and by Fundanius himself, who reports to the satirist on Nasidienus’ dinner (2.8). The work of the epic writer ‘Alpinus’, clearly identical with the Furius briefly parodied again at 2.5.40–1,⁴⁸ is attacked (like Lucilius’ work earlier in the same poem) for its non-Callimachean qualities. These include both its hackneyed themes (Memnon, from the un-Callimachean epic cycle;⁴⁹ note *iugulat*, clearly implying

⁴⁸ On the vexed issue of whether Horace’s Furius is to be identified with Furius Antias or Furius Bibaculus see Courtney (1993: 197–200).

⁴⁹ Callimachus, *Ep.*28.1.

stylistic as well as thematic ‘murder’),⁵⁰ and its comically pretentious diction in the epic mode: *Rheni luteum caput*, ‘the muddy head of the Rhine’, is clearly a literal quotation offered for derision from Furius’ poem on Julius Caesar’s Gallic campaigns,⁵¹ while *diffindit . . . caput*, ‘splits apart the head’,⁵² seems to refer primarily to describing the multiple outlets of the Rhine estuary as it meets the North Sea, noted by Caesar himself,⁵³ but also like *iugulat* suggests that the theme has been ‘killed off’ by Furius’ treatment.⁵⁴ In this list of literary genres Horatian satire is thus concerned to stress its thematic proximity (despite formal differences) to comedy (cf. 1.4.1–5) and its thematic differences (despite formal proximity) from epic; but both genres are appropriated in modal form for satiric purposes and enrich the literary texture of Horace’s book of *sermones* through echoes of other contemporary poetic practitioners.

4. OTHER POETIC TRADITIONS: GENERIC VARIETY IN SATIRES 1

As noted above, much of the generic variety in *Satires* 1 can be seen to reflect generic variety in Lucilius, though the increased range and self-consciousness of this in the Horatian context suggests that Lucilian satire is being upgraded in order to compete with the latest poetry (i.e. the *Eclogue* book) in the conscious display of literary variety and texture on post-Hellenistic literary principles of generic complexity. In addition to the elements of generic complexity already

⁵⁰ This may be the first such metaphorical use for ‘doing a subject to death’ by poor literary treatment—cf. Courtney (1993: 197).

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 197–8.

⁵² I here adopt the reading *diffindit* with Shackleton Bailey for its coherence with *iugulat*, rather than the more colourless *diffingit* or *defingit* printed by other modern editors.

⁵³ Caesar, *Gall.*4.10.5 *multisque capitibus in Oceanum influit*, no doubt the inspiration for Furius’ *caput*; the passage is clearly a particularly lively form of common *poeta creator* trope, by which a writer is said to perform actions described in his work (cf. Lieberg, 1975), reanimating the metaphor of *diffindit*.

⁵⁴ For *diffindere* of splitting the head in a fatal blow in epic battle cf. *Aeneid* 9.588–9 *media aduersi liquefacto tempora plumbo / diffindit*.

considered, the use of animal fable (1.1.33–8, 1.6.22; cf. also 2.3.186, 2.3.314–20, and most famously 2.6.79–117) can be traced back to Lucilius and even to the *Saturae* of Ennius,⁵⁵ and the similarly ‘sub-literary’ mime (cf. 1.2.38 ff., 127 ff.) looks to another Lucilian favourite (290 ff., 1083 ff. W.), while the well-known adaptations of New Comedy (1.2.19–22: Terence’s *Heautontimoroumenos*, including translation of title at 22 *se . . . cruciaverit*; 1.2.31–5: close to Plautus, *Curc.* 33–8; 1.4.105–6: reworking Terence, *Adelphoe* 413–20), reflect a source frequently mined by Lucilius (793–803, 937–48 W.).

But *Satires* 1 adds some significant post-Lucilian literary traditions to the already diverse repertoire. Amongst these is Hellenistic epigram, especially erotic epigram, a form which will be of vital importance for Horace’s *Odes* (see Chapter 6 below). Romantic erotic epigram comes in for particular use in *Sat.* 1.2, the attack on adultery. At 1.2.92 the ecstasy of the lover, *o crus, o brachia* (‘what a calf, what arms!’), plainly echoes the opening of Philodemus *AP* 5.132 (= 12 Sider; later also famously imitated by Ovid, *Am.* 1.5.19–23) *ᾠ ποδός, ᾠ κνήμης*, ‘what a foot, what a thigh!’⁵⁶ Once again the material is adapted to its new satirical context, the ecstatic quotation being followed in its Horatian reuse by a debunking realistic analysis which follows the satiric argument that the lover always exaggerates his beloved’s charms (1.2.92–3):

‘o crus, o brachia!’ verum
depugis, nasuta, brevi latere ac pede longo est.

‘What a calf, what arms’. But she’s got no bottom, too much nose, a short torso and big feet.

The epigrams of Philodemus, whom Horace seems to have known personally, are also likely to be under contribution for the theme of 1.2.119 *nam parabilem amo venerem facilemque*, ‘for I like a love that is easily obtainable and complaisant’.⁵⁷ More certain is the epigrammatic echo at 1.2.105–6:

⁵⁵ For the evidence see Courtney (1993: 14–16).

⁵⁶ Cf. Lejay (1911: 53).

⁵⁷ Cf. Sider (1997: 230). On Horace and Philodemus see most recently Armstrong (2004), with bibl.

‘leporem venator ut alta
 in nive sectatur, positum sic tangere nolit’,
 cantat, et apponit ‘meus est amor huic similis: nam
 transvolat in medio posita et fugientia captat.’
 hiscine versiculis speras tibi posse dolores
 atque aestus curasque gravis e pectore pelli?

‘Though the hunter pursues the hare in the deep snow, he would not touch it if it were simply laid out before him’, he sings, and adds ‘my love is just the same: for it flies past what is generally available and seeks after what flees’. Is it by verses such as these that you hope that your pain and seething and heavy cares can be driven from your breast?

As commentators note,⁵⁸ this plainly reworks Callimachus *Ep.* 31 Pf.:

‘Ωγρευτής, Ἐπίκυδες, ἐν οὐρεσι πάντα λαγῶν
 διψᾷ καὶ πάσης ἵχνια δορκαλίδος
 στίβῃ καὶ νιφετῷ κεκρημένος· ἦν δέ τις εἶπη
 “τῆ, τόδε βέβληται θηρίον”, οὐκ ἔλαβεν
 χούμους ἔρωσ τοιόσδε· τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα διώκειν
 οἶδε, τὰ δ’ ἐν μέσσω κείμενα παρπέταται.

The hunter, Epikydes, tracks every hare in the mountains and the spoor of every fawn, suffering frost and snow; but if someone were to say, ‘look, here is a wounded beast’, he would not take it. My love is like this; it knows how to pursue that which flees, but flies past what is generally available.

Here the romantic claims of Callimachus’ epigram are put in the mouth of the foolish adulterer rather than the first-person poet: the shift of genre to satire thus makes these erotic sentiments useless and inappropriate. Once more we are dealing with generic enrichment (erotic epigram enters satire in modal form), and with generic shift rather than parody: the solutions of Greek erotic epigram are not the solutions of the Roman reality of the satiric world.

Another literary genre which enters satire in Horace is hexameter oracular verse. We have already seen how this distinct poetic kind is influential in Vergil’s fourth *Eclogue*,⁵⁹ and we shall see later how it emerges in the *Epodes* too.⁶⁰ At *Sat.* 1.4.81–5 the satirist issues a warning against false friends:

⁵⁸ Lejay (1911: 54; Brown (1993: 111).

⁵⁹ See Ch 2, p. 38 above.

⁶⁰ See Ch. 4, p. 132 below.

absentem qui rodit amicum,
 qui non defendit alio culpante, solutos
 qui captat risus hominum famamque dicacis,
 fingere qui non visa potest, commissa tacere
 qui nequit: hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto.

He who gnaws at the reputation of an absent friend, who does not defend him when another attacks, he who seeks the relaxed laughter of men and the fame of a wit, he who can imagine what he has not seen, and cannot keep silent what he has been entrusted with—he is on the dark side, beware of him, Roman.

The description of an individual by periphrasis rather than name belongs to oracular discourse, as does the final command, recalling the beginning of a Delphic oracle supposedly given to the Romans during their wars with Alba Longa (Livy 5.16.9): *Romane, aquam Albanam cave lacu contineri*, ‘man of Rome, make sure that the water of Alba is contained in the lake’;⁶¹ that oracle, whether genuine or not, seems to be a version of a Greek hexameter response. This, like most Delphic oracles, seems to have been imagined as being in hexameter verse,⁶² and this injects a high rhetorical tone appropriate to satiric *indignatio* by echoing a more elevated form of hexameter writing. More substantial is the invented ‘Sabelline’ oracle at 1.9.29–34 by which the poet tries to shake off his unwanted and talkative companion:

namque instat fatum mihi triste, Sabella
 quod puero cecinit divina mota anus urna:
 ‘hunc neque dira venena nec hosticus auferet ensis
 nec laterum dolor aut tussis nec tarda podagra:
 garrulus hunc quando consumet cumque: loquaces,
 si sapiat, vitet, simul atque adoleverit aetas.’

For a grim fate threatens me, since an aged Sabine woman prophesied to me as a boy, shaking her divine urn: ‘This man will not be carried away by terrible poison or by an enemy’s sword, nor by pleurisy or a cough or slow-acting gout: a talkative man will kill him some day, whenever that will be: let him avoid those who talk too much, as soon as he is grown.’

⁶¹ Cited by Lejay (1911: 125). For the oracular tone of *Romane* see conveniently Austin (1977: 263).

⁶² On oracular hexameters as an epic subgenre see Ch 2, p. 38 above.

This comic prediction, which may draw ironically on some oracular-type hexameters in praise of Zeno the Stoic,⁶³ clearly employs all the standard devices of oracular predictions about death: the use of the demonstrative pronoun for the object of the prophecy,⁶⁴ the specification of the mode of death with rejection of alternatives, and the warning to avoid potentially fatal situations can all be closely paralleled in oracular discourse.⁶⁵ Matching the accuracy of the language of the pseudo-oracle is the pseudo-authoritative description of its source, an old woman with the urn common for drawing lots, whose designation as *Sabella* ('Sabine') clearly recalls by its sound the prophetic *Sibylla* ('Sibyl'), usually to be found in the same metrical position at the end of a Latin hexameter.⁶⁶ Italy had a number of Sibyls,⁶⁷ and here Horace has invented his own local model for the Sabine country. The solemn language of oracular discourse is here clearly parodically reworked for the purposes of satiric amusement, and once again the satiric genre is enriched by incorporating literary textures which belong recognizably to other poetic kinds.⁶⁸

Perhaps surprisingly, the key literary movement of the generation before Horace, that of the neoteric poets, is largely conspicuous by its absence in specific detail in *Satires* 1, though as we have seen the Callimacheanizing criticisms of Lucilius in *Sat.*1.4 and 1.10 clearly share an aesthetic stance with Catullus.⁶⁹ The attack in *Sat.*1.10 on the 'monkey', usually identified with the *cantor* Demetrius,⁷⁰ who is obsessed with Calvus and Catullus, perhaps blames the monotonous programme of a particular performer more than the poets mentioned,⁷¹ though in the context there is certainly some suggestion that these 'new' poets lack the masculine vigour of Old Comedy, once again raised as a Greek model for Horatian satire (*Sat.* 1.10.16–19):

⁶³ Cf. Brown (1993: 178).

⁶⁴ Cf. *Orac.Sib.* 11.223 (Alexander) βάρβαρος ἐξολέσει τοῦτον φόνος ἀμφὶ τραπέζαις.

⁶⁵ Fraenkel (1957: 117–18).

⁶⁶ Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.735, 6.98, 538, 666; Tibullus 2.5.15; Ovid *Met.*14.154; Silius *Pun.*13.621.

⁶⁷ See Parke (1992).

⁶⁸ NB a further example at *Sat.*2.5.62–9—see Muecke (1993: 188).

⁶⁹ On Horace and the neoterics see Tarrant (forthcoming).

⁷⁰ e.g. Brown (1993: 185). ⁷¹ Cf. Zetzel (2002: 49–50).

illi, scripta quibus comoedia prisca viris est,
 hoc stabant, hoc sunt imitandi; quos neque pulcher
 Hermogenes umquam legit neque simius iste
 nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.

Those heroes by whom Old Comedy was written, stood fast by this [i.e. humorous attack], and in this are to be imitated; these pretty Hermogenes has never read, nor that monkey trained to recite nothing except Calvus and Catullus.

Apart from this allusion, there seems to be very little interaction with extant neoteric poetry in the *Satires*, a contrast with the clear use of Catullus in the *Odes*.⁷²

This apparent lack of interaction with Catullus may perhaps be modified by a final analysis of *Satires* 1.8, the most generically experimental of all the poems of the book, in which the statue of Priapus speaks and narrates the disreputable activities of the witch Canidia and her comic routing by his farting.⁷³ As Fraenkel has noted, this poem begins from ‘those dedicatory epigrams in which the dedicated object, addressing a passer-by, gives a brief account of its history’,⁷⁴ and as Rudd has pointed out, there is a particular link with the Priapus-watchman epigrams collected in the *Planudean Anthology*,⁷⁵ some at least Hellenistic, in which Priapus-statues speak and give an account of their function in guarding gardens (*Anth.Plan.* 236–42, 260–1).⁷⁶ What we seem to have here is a blending of these two epigram types in a single poem in a different genre; a similar use of two types of sepulchral epigram is to be found in *Odes* 1.28.⁷⁷ The poem opens with seven lines which could be almost a self-contained epigram itself:

Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum,
 cum faber, incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum,
 maluit esse deum. deus inde ego, furum aviumque

⁷² e.g. in *Odes* 1.22, which at 5–8 echoes Catullus 11.2–9, and at 23 recalls Catullus 51.5.

⁷³ For a recent treatment of this poem see Schlegel (2005: 90–107) (largely with different interests).

⁷⁴ Fraenkel (1957: 121).

⁷⁵ Rudd (1966: 68).

⁷⁶ Book 16 of the *Anthologia Palatina*: for the relevant poems see the table in Parker (1988: 3).

⁷⁷ See Ch 6, p. 177 below.

maxima formido; nam fures dextra coerces
 obscaenoque ruber porrectus ab inguine palus, 5
 ast inportunas volucres in vertice harundo
 terret fixa vetatque novis considerare in hortis.

Once I was the trunk of a fig-tree, a useless piece of wood, until a craftsman, unsure whether to make a stool or a Priapus, opted for me to be a god. Consequently, I am a god, the greatest fear of thieves and birds: for thieves are constrained by my right hand and the red stake projecting from my unspeakable groin, while the reed fixed on my head terrifies the troublesome birds and prevents them from settling on this new garden.

We may compare an epigram of uncertain date in the Planudean Anthology which likewise combines the Priapus-watchman motif with that of the speaking artefact which describes its own manufacture (*Anth.Pl.* 86 = *AP* 16.86):

Τοῦμπρασῆ φύλακος μακρὰν ἀποτῆλε φύλαξαι.
 τοῖος, ὁκοῖον ὄρας, ὦ παρ' ἔμ' ἐρχόμενε,
 σύκνικος, οὐ ῥίνῃ πεπονημένος οὐδ' ἀπὸ μίλτου,
 ἀλλ' ἀπὸ ποιμενικῆς αὐτομαθοῦς ξοῖδος.
 ἀχρεΐως γέλασόν με, τὰ δ' Εὐκλείους πεφύλαξο
 σίνεσθαι, μὴ καὶ σαρδάνιον γελάσης.

Beware from very far off of the watchman in the vegetable garden. I am such as you see, you who pass by me, made of fig-wood, not worked with a file or ruled from the red ochre line, but the product of a self-taught herdsman's knife. You can laugh foolishly at me, but take care not to harm the property of Eucles, or you may laugh on the other side of your face.

There are signs in other poetic genres that such Priapic epigrams could be incorporated or redirected to new poetic effect. The ithyphallic speaking statue of Hermes in Callimachus *Iambus* 9, where a speaker asks whether Hermes' erection is due to his (the speaker's) beloved boy, has some affinities with such speaking statues of Priapus, which are sometimes presented in dialogue with the poet as in Callimachus' poem (*AP* 16.240 and 241). A dialogue of the lover-poet with a statue of Priapus is appropriately used for the pederastic Tibullus 1.4, again very likely under the influence of both Callimachus and the Priapean epigrammatic tradition.⁷⁸ But the existence of

⁷⁸ See Murgatroyd (1980: 129–30).

Latin *Priapea* in non-elegiac metres also show that there was something of a non-epigram tradition of poetry about Priapus, quite possibly before Horace.⁷⁹ Fr.1 of Catullus indicates that Priapean poetry was a feature of Catullus' output; it is in the so-called 'priapean' metre⁸⁰ (glyconic plus pherecratean, the units which make up the stanzas of Catullus 61) which may have particularly marked such poems (though it is not in fact found in the extant Latin *Priapea*, which are likely to be later in date than Catullus):⁸¹

Hunc lucum tibi dedico consecroque, Priape,
 qua domus tua Lampsaci est quaque . . . Priape.
 nam te praecipue in suis urbibus colit ora
 Hellespontia, ceteris ostriosior oris.

This grove I dedicate and consecrate to you, Priapus, at Lampsacus, the place where your home is and where you [?live], Priapus. For the shore of the Hellespont worships you above all in its cities, richer in oysters than other shores.

Likewise, the three *Priapea* (one elegiac, one iambic, one priapean in metre) collected in the *Appendix Vergiliana* and the (possibly consequent) inclusion of *Priapea* in the lists of Vergil's works in the ancient biographies of Donatus and Servius do not in themselves confirm the existence of Vergilian *Priapea*, but they do suggest that such works could be seen as something of a separate literary kind. Here, then, a poem in the *Satires* may be picking up a Priapean literary tradition not just from Hellenistic epigram but also from Catullan *Priapea*; and even if Vergil did not write *Priapea* the three 'Vergilian' *Priapea* may be Augustan in date and thus provide further evidence for contemporary interest.⁸²

The central section of *Sat.* 1.8 shows how Priapus' own metamorphosis from rough tree-trunk to divine image is matched by the metamorphosis of his Esquiline location from common burial ground

⁷⁹ Schlegel (2005: 91) agrees.

⁸⁰ West (1982: 96, 152).

⁸¹ This collection presents about one-third of its poems in the elegiac couplets of epigram, half in the hendecasyllable of Catullus, and the rest in choliambics. Its poems have been variously dated from the 1 cent. BC to the early 2 cent. AD (see Parker, 1988: 36–7).

⁸² Cf. Erucius, *AP* 16.242, a possibly contemporary Priapic epigram (cf. Parker, 1988: 8).

and haunt of witches to a delightful park, clearly a compliment to the establishment of Maecenas' famous Esquiline *horti* (8–22). This is then followed by a comic narrative episode in which the witches Canidia and Sagana are chased from the Esquiline by Priapus' farting (23–50). Here we are in the low-life iambic world of *Epodes* 5 (where the same pair of witches reappear engaged in human sacrifice), and 17 (where Canidia is again attacked by the poet, though on that occasion she seems to win). This is clearly an allusion to work which is already under way, just as some of the later poems in the *Epodes* themselves look forward to the *Odes* in their treatment and subject-matter, as we will see below;⁸³ generic enrichment here combines with proleptic allusion to the poet's next work, as at the beginning of Vergil *Georgic* 3 (see Chapter 4). This necromantic narrative itself contains satiric reworkings of a famous epic scene, for the way in which the two witches go about revivifying their corpses clearly alludes to the famous necromantic episode of *Odyssey* 11, a Homeric book which will also serve as the basis of the parodic dialogue between Odysseus and Tiresias in *Satires* 2.5. This is evident already at *Sat.*1.8.26–9:

scalpere terram
 unguibus et pullam divellere mordicus agnam
 coeperunt; cruor in fossam confusus, ut inde
 manis elicerent animas responsa daturas.

They began to scrape the earth with their nails and to tear up a black lamb with their teeth; its blood was poured into the ditch, so that by that means they could conjure up the ghosts to give them responses.

The details here all provide appropriate low-life and comic versions in this satiric context of the details of Odysseus' necromantic preparations at *Odyssey* 11.23–55, where a trench of blood is similarly made ready.⁸⁴ There the hero digs a trench with his sword (11.24–5); here the two witches scrabble undignifiedly to dig with their nails. The Horatian victim is a black lamb, the Homeric offering a black ram (11.32–3); both are suitably chthonic in colour, but the satiric

⁸³ See Ch. 4, p. 119 below.

⁸⁴ As noted briefly by Brown (1993: 172). On the traditional elements of necromantic sacrifice here see the allusions in Ogden (2001: 163–90), though he treats *Sat.* 1.8 as a straight report rather than a comic fiction.

sacrifice is modified ‘downwards’ in both age and gender. The witches tear the lamb apart with their teeth; even if only severing the throat is concerned here, this is a bizarre and comically impractical version of Odysseus’ clean sword-cut (11.35).

This epic mode recurs in the brief account of the ghostly conversations held by the witches, something of a comic compression of the extended talks of Odysseus (*Od.* 11. 50–224)—cf. 1.8.40–1:

singula quid memorem, quo pacto alterna loquentes
umbrae cum Sagana resonarent triste et acutum.

Why should I relate the details of how the ghosts spoke in turn with Sagana and sounded sad and shrill.

Here Priapus casts himself comically as an epic narrator: he declines to give us details in a formula which Ennius had employed (*Ann.* 314 *sed quid ego haec memoro*, with Skutsch’s note) and which Vergil will later use to cut short long lists (*Aeneid* 6.123,601, 8.483), and the use of *quo pacto* introducing indirect speech is also an epicism going back to Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum* (fr.20.1–2 Blänsdorf *blande et docte percontat, Aenea quo pacto / Troiam urbem liquerit*, ‘he tells with charm and learning how Aeneas left the city of Troy’). The details of alternate speech and the shrill speech of the ghosts are also Homeric; at the end of his encounter with his mother in *Odyssey* 11 (225) Odysseus says *νῶϊ μὲν ὡς ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβόμεθ*, ‘and so we two exchanged words with each other’, and the shrill voices of ghosts, though not a feature of *Odyssey* 11, are found in the epiphany of the ghost of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23.101 and in the brief visit to the underworld in *Odyssey* 24.5–9.

Priapus’ climactic fart and the exit in disarray of the two witches, with which the poem ends, ensure that this epic material is suitably modified for its new context. This sudden end of the Horatian necromancy arguably reflects the equally sudden end of its Homeric counterpart. Odysseus in *Odyssey* 11 is eventually driven from the underworld in fear at the clamouring ghosts and the possibility of a monster appearing (11.632–5); the fear which similarly expels Canidia and Sagana from their quasi-underworld is generated by Priapus’ monstrous flatulence. Here as in the other detailed echoes a recognizably epic motif is incorporated into a lower satiric context and

enriches the low-life Horatian narrative with its literary texture, but is fittingly transformed for its new framework.

5. CONCLUSION: GENERIC ENRICHMENT AND POETIC ASCENT

Priapus' Homericizing flatulence is an effective emblem of the kind of generic enrichment which emerges in the first book of *Satires*. In this first book of Horatian *sermo* the rough and ready Lucilian tradition of satire is honed under the influence of Callimachean aesthetics and the recent polished *Eclogue* book of Horace's friend and professional colleague Vergil into a literary form of complex form and ambition. The subject-matter of *Satires* 1 is still recognizably Lucilian, with several dramatic scenarios closely echoing those of Horace's satiric predecessor (e.g. 1.5 and 1.9);⁸⁵ but the book also takes up and extensively develops another aspect of Lucilius' work, common to the 'mixed dish' of satire in general, its free discussions of and parodic allusions to other literary genres. This leads to a consistently allusive literary texture which enriches the 'humble' tradition of *sermo* through sustained and well-managed contact with 'higher' kinds of poetry, while accommodating those genres in modal form to its own lower satiric parameters. This creative tension mirrors what we have seen in Vergil's *Eclogue* book, and will emerge in similar form in another Horatian genre seeking to ascend from rough early beginnings under Callimachean influence—the iambus of Archilochus as presented in Horace's *Epodes*.

⁸⁵ See the references cited in n. 6 above.

On Not Being Archilochus: Horace's *Epodes*

1. IAMBIC VARIATIONS: GENERIC DIVERSITY IN THE *EPODE* BOOK

The generic diversity of Horace's *Epode* book (published c.30 BC¹) has often been remarked. Most frequently, the comparison is made with the *Iambi* of Callimachus, with its evident generic variety, where (for example) themes from epigram and lyric epinician are found in iambic form (*Iambi* 7, 8, and 9), and at least one poem (*Iambus* 13) is explicitly devoted to the issue of multiple poetic genres.² Callimachean aesthetics are important for *Satires* 1 (see Chapter 3 above), and the *Epode* book too is strongly influenced by the broad interpretation of the iambic genre in Callimachus' *Iambi*. This topic has been well explored recently by other scholars;³ in this analysis I want to look closely at the mechanics by which the tradition of Archilochean iambus, seen necessarily through the prism of its Callimachean counterpart, is enriched in the *Epodes* through interaction with contemporary Roman genres. Unlike *Satires* 1, with its resumption of a genre deemed to be wholly Roman, the *Epode* book may be compared with the *Eclogue* book (an important influence here⁴) in its variation and expansion of an existing Greek literary genre in the light of subsequent and contemporary poetic developments.

¹ On the dating of the collection see Watson (2003: 1–4).

² On generic variety in Callimachus' *Iambi* see esp. Kerkhecker (1999: 201–4, 288–90) and Acosta-Hughes (2002).

³ Cf. e.g. Barchiesi (1994a, 1994b); Cavarzere (1992); Heyworth (1993); Watson (1995).

⁴ See below, pp. 117–19 and 132–4.

The *Epode* book as a whole does not explicitly announce its generic relationship with archaic Greek iambic poetry until *Epode* 6, where the poet-speaker compares himself with the iambists Archilochus and Hipponax by naming their most famous victims (6.13–14): *qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener / aut acer hostis Bupalo*, 'just like the son-in-law spurned by faithless Lycambes or enemy who was fierce against Bupalus'. This is the only explicit mention of Hipponax in the whole of Horace; and though Hipponax may be a significant model in the *Epodes*, if indeed he is the author of the famous Strasbourg epode which forms the model for *Epode* 10,⁵ it is Archilochus who is chosen as the key archaic model for Horace's collection.

Though the name of Archilochus is not mentioned until *Epode* 6 in the passage just quoted, the Archilochean colouring of the collection is well established by that stage; the particular epodic metrical system used throughout *Epodes* 1–10 is strongly Archilochean,⁶ and the title of the collection, probably *Epodi* rather than *Iambi*,⁷ is likely to pick up the Archilochean title *Epodoi*, the collection of iambic poems in epodic metres which contained some of Archilochus' most famous verse—the fables of the vixen and the eagle (fr.171–81 W.) and the fox and the ape (fr.185–7 W.) as well as the splendid Cologne Epode (fr.196a W.). Above all, as many scholars have noted, *Epistles* 1.19.23–5 makes Archilochus the explicit model: *Parios ego primus iambus / ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, 'I was the first to show off the iambics of Paros to Latium, following the metre and spirit of Archilochus, not his subject-matter or his words which harried Lycambes'. Archilochus, then, is the prime Greek archaic model for the iambic *Epodes*, just as Alcaeus is proclaimed as the prime Greek archaic model for the lyric *Odes*.⁸ This adoption of Archilochus rather than Hipponax may well be a reaction to Callimachus' *Iambi*, where Hipponax is

⁵ Modern editors assign the epode, preserved without indication of authorship but in the same papyrus as Hipponax fr.116, to Hipponax (fr.115 West, fr. 194 Degani). For the case for Archilochus see e.g. Fraenkel (1957: 31 n. 2); for a doxography of the issue see Degani (1991: 168).

⁶ Cf. conveniently Mankin (1995: 21).

⁷ Cavarzere (1992: 9–16); Horace elsewhere refers to these poems as *iambi* (cf. Mankin, 1995: 12), but this is a generic indicator rather than a title (cf. *satira(e)* for *sermones* at *Sat.* 2.1.1, 2.6.17).

⁸ Cf. e.g. Fraenkel (1957: 154–78).

proclaimed as the poet's explicit model in the first poem (fr.191 Pf.); the Horatian collection in this respect at least seeks to be different from its Callimachean predecessor. Archilochus' status as the best of the canonical three iambists selected in the Hellenistic period (Archilochus, Hipponax, Semonides) may also have been some motivation.⁹

It is important to note that the Archilochean influence in the *Epodes* is not restricted to his *Epodoi*. In what follows I will consider the whole iambic output of Archilochus (trimeter and tetrameter as well as epodic) as a potential source for Horatian imitation, and even occasionally the non-iambic remains of his elegiac fragments. The incorporation of these non-iambic elements from Archilochus not only gives the reader a fuller picture of the earlier poet, but also points to an important aspect of Horatian poetics. The *Epode* book makes use of non-iambic modes in general (especially, as we shall see, of Roman love-elegy), to enrich by generic variety a collection which yet remains fundamentally iambic in theme and tone.

2. EPODE 1: A ROMAN ARCHILOCHUS?

The first *Epode*, though it does not mention Archilochus (a contrast with Callimachus' *Iambus* 1, where the poet speaks as Hipponax—fr. 191 Pf.), at once sets the speaker in a situation of Archilochean character:

Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium
 amice, propugnacula,
 paratus omne Caesaris periculum
 subire, Maecenas, tui.

You will go, my friend, in Liburnian galleys amongst the lofty ships' bulwarks, prepared to undergo every peril of Caesar at your own.

Here we have an address to a particular friend who is about to take to sea and causes concern to the poet for his safety. Although we have no exact parallels for this in Archilochus, we do have a trimeter

⁹ Cf. Pfeiffer (1968: 204); Quintilian 10.1.59.

fragment (24 W.1–2) in which the speaker welcomes back a friend who has crossed the great sea with a small ship:

νηῖ σὺν σ[μ]ικρῆι μέγαν
πόντον περήσ]ας ἦλθες ἐκ Γορτυνίης

in a small ship you crossed
a mighty sea, and made it back from Gortyn. (Tr. West, 1994)

The detail of the ship's size in Archilochus might be picked up in the specific detail of *Liburnis inter alta navium*, the Liburnian galley being small and light:¹⁰ the theme of the small ship is retained, but here contrasted with larger ships rather than the vastness of the ocean. The theme of fears and laments for seafaring friends is a common one in Archilochus: fr. 105 W. (in tetrameters) addresses an individual friend with fears about a storm at sea:¹¹

Γλαῦχ', ὄρα· βαθὺς γὰρ ἤδη κύμασιν ταρασσεται
πόντος, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄκρα Γυρ<έω>ν ὄρθον ἵσταται νέφος,
σῆμα χειμῶνος, κιχάνει δ' ἐξ ἀελπίτης φόβος.

Glaucus, see, the waves are rising and the deep sea is disturbed;
all about the heights of Gyrae stands a towering mass of cloud—
that's a sign of storm. I fall a prey to unexpected fear. (Tr. West, 1994)

The ancient citer of the fragment (Heraclitus, *Alleg.Hom.* 5.2) tells us that the storm in this passage stands metaphorically for the onset of war. This would make its context similar to that of *Epode* 1, in which Maecenas is presented as sailing to join the Actium campaign; and it may be that the poem represented Archilochus' similar fears for his friend, comparing the dangers of war to those of the open sea. However far we wish to press the details, it is clear that this opening section of *Epode* 1 places the reader in the Archilochean world of close male friends, seafaring, war, and their dangers—a strong generic indicator that this collection is going to follow the Archilochean model.

But as Callimachus in his *Iambi* does not simply replicate the themes and stance of Hipponax, so Horace in his *Epodes* is not simply another Archilochus. See lines 5–10 which follow:

¹⁰ Watson (2003: 59).

¹¹ This concern is not restricted to his iambic poetry: fr.13 W.3–4, an elegiac passage, laments the fate of good men who have fallen victim to shipwreck.

quid nos, quibus te vita sit superstite
 iucunda, si contra, gravis?
 utrumne iussi persequemur otium,
 non dulce, ni tecum simul,
 an hunc laborem mente laturi decet
 qua ferre non mollis viros?

What of me, whose life is sweet while you survive, heavy if not? Shall I pursue peace as ordered, a peace which has no pleasure without you there too, or shall I endure this labour with the kind of mind with which men who are not soft ought to bear it?

Here the profession of friendship is Archilochean enough, but the idea of orders to pursue quiet and peaceful pursuits does not fit Archilochus the proud and independent warrior-poet, who famously proclaims himself in an elegiac fragment as servant of Ares and of the Muses (fr.1 W.). The question beginning with *hunc* suggests the rejection of this soft alternative (implied in *mollis*) and the return to Archilochean toughness and warlike action: *laborem* reminds us not just of the labour of the soldier's life, but also of a hexameter dictum attributed to Archilochus (fr.17 W.), *πάντα πόνος τεύχει θνητοῖς μελέτη τε βροτεΐη*, 'everything comes to men from work and human effort' (tr. West, 1994). *Labor*, as we shall see, can also refer metapoetically to the labour of composing this collection of poems,¹² but here with *non mollis viros* the reference is clearly to the hardships of sailing and campaigning in war, as memorably chronicled by Archilochus himself, who apart from the fragments about shipwreck already mentioned, composed tetrameter accounts of land battles (fr.93, 98 W.).

The promise to accompany Maecenas which follows gives a list of distant and unpleasant places to which the speaker might accompany his friend (11–14):

feremus, et te vel per Alpium iuga
 inhospitalem et Caucasum
 vel Occidentis usque ad ultimum sinum
 forti sequemur pectore.

I shall endure it, and follow you with stout heart even through the passes of the Alps or the hostile Caucasus, or even to the last bay of the West.

¹² See below p. 110.

This plainly echoes Catullus 11.1–14:

Furi et Aureli, comites Catulli,
 sive in extremos penetrabit Indos,
 litus ut longe resonante Eoa
 tunditur unda,
 sive in Hyrcanos Arabasve molles,
 seu Sacas sagittiferosve Parthos,
 sive quae septemgeminus colorat
 aequora Nilus,
 sive trans altas gradietur Alpes,
 Caesaris visens monumenta magni,
 Gallicum Rhenum, horribiles vitro ulti-
 mosque Britannos,
 omnia haec, quaecumque feret voluntas
 caelitum, temptare simul parati:

Furius and Aurelius, companions of Catullus, whether he will reach the far-distant Indians, where the shore is pounded by the far-resounding Eastern wave, or the Hyrcani and effeminate Arabs, the Sacae or the arrow-bearing Parthians, or whether he will march over the lofty Alps, to see the monuments of great Caesar, the Gallic Rhine, or the Britons fearsome in woad and on the edge of the world, you who are prepared to face all these dangers with him, whatever the will of the gods may bring.

The use in both passages of the themes of travel to the ends of the earth (*ad ultimum sinum* ~ *ultimosque Britannos*) and the climbing of the Alps make it clear that the Catullan passage is echoed here.¹³ Already, then, we find an echo of an undoubtedly lyric poem (echoed again by Horace in the *Odes*¹⁴) in the opening of this iambic collection, an early sign of generic complexity and enrichment. The personal context of Catullus' poem is modified here, though its compliment to Julius Caesar's Gallic victories is perhaps picked up in the Horatian setting of the campaigns of Caesar's heir. Catullus' friends are enlisted to help in his erotic troubles, whereas Horace enlists himself to help Maecenas and Caesar in the battle for Rome, with Archilochean machismo, rejecting the suggestion of effeminacy in *otium* and *non mollis viros*.

¹³ See also Watson (2003: 65).

¹⁴ At *Odes* 1.22.5–9.

But as soon as this Archilochean promise has been uttered, the poet-speaker counters with an admission of his own non-Archilochean character (15–18):

roges, tuum labore quid iuven meo,
 imbellis ac firmus parum?
 comes minore sum futurus in metu,
 qui maior absentis habet;

You may ask what help I can give to your labour by my own, unwarlike and infirm as I am? As your comrade I will be in a lesser state of fear, since a greater fear grips those who are absent.

The speaker now makes clear the difference of his contribution to the war effort from that of Maecenas: the *labor* of Maecenas is to be involved in the military campaign, while the *labor* of Horace will be in his poetic work as well as his accompanying friendship.¹⁵ The suggestion of weakness is here important: Horace's poetry in the *Epodes*, like Horace himself, is thus presented as lacking the force and vigour of Archilochus; indeed, the poet draws attention several times in the book to his powerlessness and impotence, whether literal or metaphorical.¹⁶ Horace and his *Epodes* are *imbellis*, 'unwarlike', unlike the martial poetry of Archilochus, servant of Ares and of the Muses. His role (and that of his poetry) is to be a loyal companion to Maecenas, and his motivation for going is not so much fighting at his side as knowing how he is faring.

This role is graphically illustrated in the simile which follows (19–22):

ut adsidens implumibus pullis avis
 serpentium allapsus timet
 magis relictis, non, ut adsit, auxili
 latura plus praesentibus.

Just like the mother bird, guarding her featherless chicks, fears the sliding attacks of serpents more when she has left them behind—not that she could bring any greater help to them if they were present and she with them.

¹⁵ For *labor* of poetic labour see *TLL* 7.2.794.80 ff.; for Horace's likely presence at Actium see Watson (2003: 3 n. 28).

¹⁶ See esp. Watson (1995).

The mother bird fearing for her chicks is traditional material, as commentators note, referring to Homer and others; but there may also be an Archilochean allusion here.¹⁷ Recorded for the *Epodes*, the Archilochean collection which gave that of Horace its title, and in the same metre as *Epode* 1, is a poem which recounted the destruction of a nest of chicks—those of the eagle, destroyed through the prayer of a vixen whose own cub had been killed by the eagle (fr.172–81 W.).¹⁸ This animal story, set in an attack on Lycambes, was clearly meant to illustrate the capacity of humans to offend each other and exact terrible revenge; it may be that the Horatian poem is inverting this story, turning it into an example of the capacity of humans to show friendship and protection towards one another. Horace the anxious mother bird may be a 'softened' version of Lycambes the rapacious eagle, just as Horace's *Epodes* are here presented as a 'softening' of the violence of Archilochus.

From these softer thoughts lines 22–30 return to the Archilochean promise of military service:

libenter hoc et omne militabitur
bellum in tuae spem gratiae,
non ut iuvenis illigata pluribus
aratra nitantur mea,
pecusve Calabris ante sidus fervidum
Lucana mutet pascuis
neque ut superne villa candens Tusculi
Circaea tangat moenia.

Gladly I will serve this war and every war in the hope of your favour, not so that my ploughs may be bound to and rest on a greater number of oxen, or so that my herds may change Lucanian pastures for Calabrian before the burning star rises, or so that my bright villa shining high up at Tusculum may touch the walls of Circe.

Like Archilochus, the speaker will in the end be a servant of Ares as well as of the Muses, though the introduction of *gratia*, the pleasing of a superior, provides a non-Archilochean hierarchical perspective

¹⁷ As agreed by Barchiesi (2001*b*: 155).

¹⁸ In Archilochus' version the chicks are destroyed not through snakes, the subject of the bird's fears in Horace's, but through a firebrand brought by the father eagle himself—fr.179–81 W.

which defines Horace's subordinate role: just as Maecenas will go on campaign to support his greater *amicus* Caesar, so Horace will do the same for his greater *amicus* Maecenas. This subordination reflects contemporary Roman social structures, transforming the Archilochean ideal of equality amongst a group of friends of the same aristocratic status. Just as Horace's iambic poetry and stance has not the force and power of that of Archilochus, so his social status is less independent and powerful.

The simile which follows rejects great wealth in the form of a typical collection of markers of luxurious riches—vast arable holdings, transhumance on an enormous scale, and grandiose building, all found elsewhere in Horace in similar moralizing contexts.¹⁹ This rejection of wealth recalls a famous iambic poem of Archilochus on which the second *Epode*, immediately following these lines, was clearly modelled (see section 3 below)—the trimeters in which Charon the carpenter rejects the wealth of Gyges (fr.19 W.):

“οὐ μοι τὰ Γύγ<εω> τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει,
οὐδ' εἰλέ πώ με ζῆλος, οὐδ' ἀγαίομαι
θ<εώ>ν ἔργα, μεγάλης δ' οὐκ ἔρ<έω> τυραννίδος·
ἀπόπροθεν γάρ ἐστιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἑμῶν.”

Gyges and all his gold don't interest me.
I've never been prey to envy, I don't marvel
At heavenly things, or yearn for great dominion.
That's all beyond the sights of such as me. (Tr. West, 1994)

By putting similar words in the mouth of the poet himself Horace reverses the original Archilochean trick, which he repeats in *Epode* 2 (see below). In both Archilochus and *Epode* 2 these views seem at first to be those of the speaker, until the reader is corrected by the poem's closure, revealing in each case that it is an exaggerated, caricatured character who speaks, whereas in *Epode* 1 the sentiments are restored to the 'authentic' voice of the first-person poetic speaker.

In this rejection of large-scale wealth and consumption we may also (as often in Horace, as Mette has argued²⁰) sense a symbolic rejection of large-scale poetry. The many bulls, coverage of territory,

¹⁹ Vast arable holdings: *Epode* 4.13, *Sat.* 1.1.51; transhumance on enormous scale: *Ep.* 2.2.127–9; grandiose building: *Odes* 3.1.33–46.

²⁰ Mette (1961).

and grand buildings listed here could all be metapoetical symbols,²¹ and in the context of an opening and programmatic poem that seems particularly likely. This fits the context well; the speaker promises the waging of a war, which would normally refer to epic in poetical terms, but here defines his poetry more narrowly, and in generic terms more humbly—no great ambitions, no wish to touch the walls of Circe. Here Circe too seems to be metapoetical; the speaker is about to go on a journey with Maecenas, but that journey will be no *Odyssey*, it will not approach Circe. Support for this view comes from the beginning of *Aeneid* 7, where the detail that Aeneas and his men sail around Circe at Circeii suggests that the second half of the poem in some sense symbolizes a greater avoidance in the second half of the poem than the first of themes from the *Odyssey*.²² The suggestion perhaps is that the more feeble Horace will not reach the quasi-epic heights of Archilochus; though Archilochus was not an epic poet, many of his scenarios, especially his tetrameter battle-poetry (91, 93, 94, 96, 98, 101 W.) aspire to military heights which Horace's *Epodes* do not seek.

After these grander visions and their rejection, the ending of the poem brings us back to earth (31–4):

satis superque me benignitas tua
ditavit: haud paravero,
quod aut avarus ut Chremes terra premam,
discinctus aut perdam nepos.

Your kindness has enriched me enough and more than enough; I shall not try to acquire riches to bury in the earth like the miserly Chremes, or to lose like a foolish spendthrift.

The poet's modest sufficiency in the Sabine estate, implied by *benignitas tua* here, provides a closure which matches his modest poetical ambitions, just as it does in the first Roman Ode, another context where the poet retreats from similar symbols of grandeur and wealth (*Odes* 3.1.45–8):

²¹ Bulls: *Odes* 4.2.53–60 with Harrison (1995*b*: 125–6); territory: *Odes* 2.16.37 *parva rura*, perhaps metapoetic; buildings: *Odes* 3.30.1.

²² Kyriakidis (1998: 116–17). I would not wish to deny that the second half of the *Aeneid* has continuing Odyssean colour, as argued e.g. by Cairns (1989: 177–214), only that it is less overtly Odyssean than the first.

cur invidendis postibus et novo
 sublime ritu moliar atrium?
 cur valle permutem Sabina
 divitias operosiores?

Why should I construct a lofty hall in the new fashion with doors which bring envy? Why should I exchange my Sabine valley for riches that bring greater burdens?

In the final lines of *Epode* 1 the difference of cultural context from the world of Archilochus is stressed once again; this world of patron, gift, and gratitude is far from the rumbustious egalitarianism of the Archilochean *philotes*.

Thus Horace's poetic debt to Archilochus, as displayed in the opening poem of a collection which owes its title, metres, and much of its contents to that poet, is both more extensive and more complex than scholars have believed. The Horatian poem puts its speaker in a typical Archilochean situation with a friend and a sea-voyage in the context of war, but immediately modifies that Archilochean pose: this poetic speaker does not have the vigour and martial aspirations of Archilochus, and he works within a different sociocultural framework, where the equality of a circle of aristocratic friends is replaced by the more uneven relationship of patronage and subordination. A further key difference from Archilochus, as we shall see, is the way in which the *Epode* book looks to and interacts with a variety of poetic traditions not available for Archilochean iambus.

3. NOT THE *GEORGICS* OR *ECLOGUES*: IAMBIC RUSTICITY IN *EPODE* 2

The second *Epode* famously undermines its initial 66-line panegyric to country life, apparently in the voice of the poet-speaker, with a surprise closure which reveals an unexpected different speaker with an apparently hypocritical attitude. The closure itself recalls the Archilochean trimeters (already cited above) in which Charon the carpenter rejects the wealth of Gyges (fr.19 W.).²³ Compare 2.67–70:

²³ Cf. e.g. Fraenkel (1957: 59–61).

haec ubi locutus faenerator Alfius,
 iam iam futurus rusticus,
 omnem redegit idibus pecuniam,
 quaerit kalendis ponere.

When the money-lender Alfius had spoken these words, he the permanently future country-dweller, he collected all his money back on the Ides and sought to put it out again on the Kalends.

Horace's money-lender Alfius, with his significant name ('Mr Growth'),²⁴ is clearly an appropriate Roman version of Archilochus' carpenter, belonging to a similarly lowly profession. Both mouthpieces are used by the poet to good comic effect; Charon makes his case because he has no choice, rejecting wealth and power as a habitually poor man who has no chance to achieve such things, while Alfius famously fails to live up to his idealized praise of country life. Both, then, are making fun of elevated and idealistic discourse by placing it in a comic framework.

Scholars have long linked this reaction to praise of the countryside with Vergil's *Georgics*, published soon after the *Epodes*²⁵ and surely already known at least in part to Horace, like Vergil operating by the late 30s in the poetic circle of Maecenas.²⁶ The relationship between the two texts is sometimes seen as one of criticism, with Horatian realism undermining Vergilian idealism as in the countering of the optimism of *Eclogue* 4 with the pessimism of *Epode* 16 (see section 5 below); there may indeed be some edge here, but I want to focus on the issue of generic shift. The praise of country life which is the key element in the *Georgics* is here modified, even undermined, for the lower and more humorous iambic context by the ironic closure. This leads to strong generic enrichment here: the rustic encomia of the *Georgics*, especially that at the end of the second *Georgic* (2.458–540) can be echoed apparently sincerely in the speech of Alfius,²⁷ but the end of the epode finally confirms the generic shift into iambus by ironizing this 'guest' material. The opening of the poem is a good example of this effect (2.1–8):

²⁴ From Greek *alphlanein*, 'earn, gain'—cf. Watson (2003: 123).

²⁵ Probably early in 29 BC—see Ch. 4, below.

²⁶ Cf. Watson (2003: 2–4 and 75–7).

²⁷ See the full list of parallels, *ibid.* 87–124.

'Beatus ille qui procul negotiis,
 ut prisca gens mortalium,
 paterna rura bubus exercet suis
 solutus omni faenore
 neque excitatur classico miles truci
 neque horret iratum mare
 forumque vitat et superba civium
 potentiorum limina . . .'⁷

'Happy he who far from business, like the ancient race of mortals, works his ancestral estate with his own oxen freed of all debt interest, and is not aroused as a soldier by the fierce trumpet and does not shudder at the sea's rage, and avoids the forum and the proud thresholds of greater citizens.'

This opening with its *makarismos*-form (1–4) clearly picks up the famous blessedness of the farmer as expressed in *Georgic* 2.458–60:

O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint,
 agricolas! quibus ipsa procul discordibus armis
 fundit humo facilem uictum iustissima tellus.

How excessively fortunate farmers would be if they knew their own advantages! For them, far from the discord of battle, the bountiful earth itself pours forth an easy living from the soil.

Likewise, the praise of the farmer's freedom from the demands of civic life (5–8) echoes some later lines in the same section (*Georgics* 2.500–4):

quos rami fructus, quos ipsa uolentia rura
 sponte tulere sua, carpsit, nec ferrea iura
 insanumque forum aut populi tabularia uidit.
 sollicitant alii remis freta caeca, ruuntque
 in ferrum, penetrant aulas et limina regum . . .

He harvests the fruits of the branch, which the country itself with good will produces of its own accord, nor does he see the iron laws, the madness of the forum or the accounting-houses of the people. Others worry the unpredictable seas with oars, and run into the sword, or visit the halls and thresholds of great men . . .

The iambic version of the didactic material suggests one or two ironic details: the absence of commercial cares, the freedom from loan-interest (*faenore*) and unencumbered ownership of land and oxen is naturally a particular interest of the busy money-lender

(*faenerator*) Alfius. But in general this material is directly appropriated, creating a lofty didactic atmosphere which is then effectively undermined by the surprise satiric ending.

Less emphasized than the echoes of the *Georgics* in *Epode 2* are those of the *Eclogues*. But lines 23–8 inevitably evoke the mode of Vergilian pastoral:

libet iacere modo sub antiqua ilice,
 modo in tenaci gramine:
 labuntur altis interim ripis aquae,
 queruntur in silvis aves
 frondesque lymphis obstrepunt manantibus,
 somnos quod invitet levis.

Now it is pleasing to lie under an aged holm-oak, now in the clinging grass; meanwhile the waters glide by within deep banks, and the birds moan in the woods, and the branches compete in noise with the flowing streams, so as to invite light slumbers.

Here, though there are echoes of Lucretius' description of the paradisiacal state of early man (another generic shift from didactic),²⁸ the *locus amoenus* of the *Eclogue* book is clearly at issue: there similarly we find herdsmen/poets relaxing in the shade of a pastoral tree (cf. *Ecl.* 7.1 *forte sub arguta consederat ilice Daphnis*), surrounded by grassy pasture (cf. *Ecl.* 5.46 *in gramine*, 5.26, 10.29, 42), by running water with its delightful sound (cf. *Ecl.* 5.47, 8.87, 10.42). Most of these elements, plus those of birdsong and soporific atmosphere, are found together in the programmatic description of the pastoral environment at *Eclogues* 1.51–8, surely under contribution here:

fortunate senex, hic inter flumina nota
 et fontis sacros frigus captabis opacum;
 hinc tibi, quae semper, vicino ab limite saepes
 Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti
 saepe levi somnum suadebit inire susurro;
 hinc alta sub rupe canet frondator ad auras,
 nec tamen interea raucae, tua cura, palumbes
 nec gemere aëria cessabit turtur ab ulmo.

Fortunate old man, here amongst the streams you know so well and the sacred springs you will enjoy the shady coolness; from this side, as always,

²⁸ Watson (2003: 101).

the hedge on the nearby boundary, browsed by the bees for the willow-flower, will often urge the oncome of sleep with its light murmuring; from that side the pruner will sing his song to the breezes under the high rock, and meanwhile the hoarse doves, your special care, will not cease to murmur, nor the turtle-dove from its lofty elm.

Vergil's pastoral landscape is thus appropriated practically entire for Alfius' rustic idyll, only to be deflated by the final element of iambic realism.

Another element of Vergilian pastoral here is the following hunting-scene of 29–38:

at cum tonantis annus hibernus Iovis
 imbris nivisque conparat,
 aut trudit acris hinc et hinc multa cane
 apros in obstantis plagas
 aut amite levi rara tendit retia
 turdis edacibus dolos
 pavidumque leporem et advenam laqueo gruem
 iucunda captat praemia.
 quis non malarum quas amor curas habet
 haec inter obliviscitur?

But when the winter season gathers the showers and snow of a thundery sky, he drives fierce boars here and there with a pack of dogs, on to the nets which block their path, or stretches out fine nets on a smooth pole, traps for hungry thrushes, and takes with a noose the trembling hare and migrating crane, a pleasurable booty. Amid all this who can not forget the grievous cares which love causes?

This erotic element has been seen as surprising here,²⁹ but once again we find an incorporation of a theme from the *Eclogues*, with some iambic irony. In *Eclogue* 10 one of the cures for love first envisaged and then rejected by Gallus is hunting (55–61):³⁰

Interea mixtis lustrabo Maenala Nymphis,
 aut acris uenabor apros; non me ulla uetabunt
 frigora Parthenios canibus circumdare saltus.
 Iam mihi per rupes uideor lucosque sonantis
 ire; libet Partho torquere Cydonia cornu

²⁹ Watson 106–7.

³⁰ This parallel is noted briefly by Cavarzere (1992: 131).

spicula; tamquam haec sit nostri medicina furoris,
aut deus ille malis hominum mitescere discat!

Meanwhile I will pass over Maenalus in company with the nymphs, or hunt fierce boars; no cold weather will prevent me surrounding the glades of Parthenius with hounds. Now already I seem to myself to be travelling through the rocks and the resounding groves; I can fire Cretan arrows with Parthian bow—as if this were a cure for my madness, or as if the god were able to learn mildness towards human suffering!

The parallel details (fierce boars, cold weather, pack of hounds) are all conventional in literary hunting-scenes, but an allusion is guaranteed by the ironic reversal of Gallus' rejection in Alfius' reverie, which cannot conceive of hunting being an ineffective cure for love (37–8), precisely the claim that Gallus makes in 60–1. Here iambic irony, evoking the darker Vergilian original, suggests that the rosy vision of the putative rustic may be overoptimistic. Once again in *Epode 2* the iambic genre is successfully enriched with pastoral as well as didactic elements in modal form.

4. POINTS OF DEPARTURE? *EPODES* 11, 13, 14, 15

Epode 11 specifically announces a change of thematic direction in the *Epode* book as well as a change of metre, being the first to vary the pattern of iambic trimeter plus dimeter. This theme of generic variation and uncertainty is found with some emphasis in the final section of the *Epode* book (11–17) which this statement introduces; as in the second half of the *Eclogue* book,³¹ these poems are strongly conscious of other genres and of the need to 'move on' from the overt generic model (here traditional Archilochean iambus) as the collection nears its close. The thematic modification is openly stated at 11.1–4:

Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuvat
scribere versiculos amore percussus gravi,
amore, qui me praeter omnis expetit
mollibus in pueris aut in puellis urere.

³¹ Ch. 2, p. 44 above.

Pettius, it gives me no pleasure to write light verses as before, struck as I am with a deep love, a love which seeks me out before all others to burn for soft boys or girls.

Here the poet-speaker claims that the advent of love has changed the kind of verse which he writes in his books, i.e. that love will now be a theme: *versiculos* would seem to allude as in its Catullan usage³² to playful, scabrous, iambic poetry, now supposedly put aside for the more 'serious' topic of unrequited love.

As has long been realized, these lines in fact represent a remodeling of Archilochus fr.215, preserved as a single iambic trimeter: *καί μ' οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλ<έω>ν μέλει*, 'I feel no interest / In iambs or amusements' (tr. West, 1994). Like the elegiac fragment fr.11 W., the poem from which this line derives seems to have dealt with the poet's reaction to the drowning of his brother-in-law; it claims, paradoxically in iambs, that the poet's distress allows him no recreation in iambic poetry or other distractions.³³ This meta-poetical comment seems to be taken up by the Horatian poem; but where the Archilochean context suggests that the poet cannot enjoy his normal activities, writing poetry and other types of pleasure, owing to a major tragic event, the Horatian poem provides a lighter and more sophisticated scenario. The poet is turned away from iambus, just as in Archilochus, not by a family tragedy but by the far less serious act of falling in love, a love which is more literary than literal. Archilochean mourning becomes Horatian metagenic musing.

The mention of love as a theme provides the starting-point for an extensive and well-documented generic interaction with love-elegy in the poem, which provides many of its themes: the suffering lover, the subject of talk in the city, his sighs, the rich rival, the *exclusus amator*, the role of friends in trying to release the lover from an affair—all these may be paralleled from Propertius and other elegists, and no doubt reflect pre-Propertian love-elegy in the works of Gallus. These have been well discussed by recent treatments and need no elaboration here.³⁴ The incorporation of these extensive love-elegiac

³² Cf. Catullus 16.3, 8, 50.4, Heyworth (2001).

³³ The parallel of this Archilochean motif with Catullus 68.19–26 is striking.

³⁴ Conveniently gathered by Watson (2003: 358–63).

elements into the *Epode* book constitutes a major element of generic enrichment, reacting as often to other influential kinds of contemporary poetry in modal form.

Epode 13 again points strongly to generic interaction as a means of varying the Archilochean model. This short poem is strikingly non-iambic, and only the metre and general symposiastic theme have any claims to be Archilochean:³⁵

Horrida tempestas caelum contraxit et imbres
 nivesque deducunt Iovem; nunc mare, nunc siluae
 Threicio Aquilone sonant. rapiamus, amici,
 occasionem de die dumque virent genua
 et decet, obducta solvatur fronte senectus.
 tu vina Torquato move consule pressa meo.
 cetera mitte loqui: deus haec fortasse benigna
 reducet in sedem vice. nunc et Achaemenio
 perfundi nardo iuvat et fide Cyllenea
 levare diris pectora Sollicitudinibus,
 nobilis ut grandi cecinit Centaurus alumno:
 'invicte, mortalis dea nate puer Thetide,
 te manet Assaraci tellus, quam frigida parvi
 findunt Scamandri flumina lubricus et Simois,
 unde tibi reditum certo subtegmine Parcae
 rupere, nec mater domum caerulea te revehet.
 illic omne malum vino cantuque levato,
 deformis aegrimoniae dulcibus adloquiiis.'

A fearful storm has shrunk the sky and the rains and snow-showers bring Jupiter down: now the sea, now the woods resound with Thracian Aquilo. Let us take the opportunity the day offers, my friends, and while our knees are strong and it is fitting, let old age be smoothed from the frowning forehead. You there, bring out wine made when my own Torquatus was consul; leave aside all other speech—the god may well bring all this back to its proper place by a kindly turn of events. Now it is our pleasure to be soaked with Persian nard and relieve our hearts of terrible worries through the Arcadian lyre, just as the Centaur sang to his mighty nursling: 'Unconquered one, mortal boy born from the goddess Thetis, the land of Assaracus lies in store for you, split by the streams of Scamander and the flowing Simois, from where the Fates have denied your return in their sure weft by breaking your thread, and your sea-green mother will not bring you home

³⁵ Metre: Arch. fr.195 W. Symposium: Arch. fr.4 W. 120 W. 124 W.

again. So make light of every evil with wine and song, the sweet consolers of ugly sorrow.

The genre here incorporated into iambus in this poem is lyric, and multiple elements parallel Horace's own *Odes*, a number of which were no doubt written by the time of this poem's publication; though the relevant *Odes* are published later, it is important to see the lyric elements in *Epode* 13 as 'guest' elements in modal form.³⁶ These have been noted in general terms by scholars,³⁷ but a more specific examination shows the extensive and detailed nature of the generic enrichment here.

The epode begins with a bad weather report by the poet-speaker as a stimulus for a symposium, and an injunction to leave the weather and the future in general to the gods and enjoy present pleasures. These exact elements comprise the scenario of *Odes* 1.9 (1–18):

Vides ut alta stet niue candidum
 Soracte nec iam sustineant onus
 siluae laborantes geluque
 flumina constiterint acuto?
 Dissolue frigus ligna super foco
 large reponens atque benignius
 deprome quadrimum Sabina,
 o Thaliarche, merum diota.
 Permite diuis cetera, qui simul
 strauere uentos aequore feruido
 deproeliantis, nec cupressi
 nec ueteres agitantur orni.
 Quid sit futurum cras, fuge quaerere, et
 quem fors dierum cumque dabit, lucro
 adpone nec dulcis amores
 sperne, puer, neque tu choreas,
 donec uirenti canities abest
 morosa.

Do you see how white Soracte stands in its deep snow, and how the woods are in trouble and can no longer bear their burden, and how the streams have stopped still with sharp frost? Melt the cold, laying logs lavishly on the

³⁶ It is also important not to see e.g. *Odes* 1.7 as evoking iambic elements in its parallels with *Epode* 13, since *Epode* 13 is (as argued here) so uniambic.

³⁷ e.g. Fraenkel (1957: 66); Mankin (1995: 214).

fire, and pour out with greater generosity the four-year-old unmixed wine from its two-handled Sabine jar, Thaliarchus. Leave all the rest to the gods, who can all at once lay low the winds which war on the seething sea, so that the cypresses and old mountain-ash trees cease to shake. Do not enquire as to what will be tomorrow, and mark as profit whatever day fortune gives you, and do not reject sweet love or dancing, my boy, while your green youth is free of sad white hair.

The second half of the poem, too, with its evocation of a mythological illustration from the Trojan cycle for the symposium as alleviation for sorrow, involving a speech which ends with the poem, also closely matches the second half of a famous Horatian *Ode*, 1.7, in the same epodic metre (1.7.11–22):³⁸

Teucer Salamina patremque
 cum fugeret, tamen uda Lyaeo
 tempora populea fertur uinxisse corona,
 sic tristis affatus amicos:
 ‘Quo nos cumque feret melior fortuna parente,
 ibimus, o socii comitesque.
 Nil desperandum Teucro duce et auspice Teucro:
 certus enim promisit Apollo
 ambiguam tellure noua Salamina futuram.
 O fortes peioraque passi
 mecum saepe uiri, nunc uino pellite curas;
 cras ingens iterabimus aequor.’

When Teucer was fleeing Salamis and his father, he is yet said to have bound his temples, wet with wine, with a garland of poplar, and to have addressed his sad friends in this way: ‘Wherever fortune, kinder than my father, will take us, we will go, comrades and companions. There is no cause for despair under Teucer’s leadership and Teucer’s auspices; for Apollo has promised in sure prophecy that there will be a second Salamis in a new land. You brave men who have often suffered worse than this with me, now drive away your cares with wine; tomorrow we shall venture again on the mighty ocean.’³⁹

Another literary genre is also operative in modal form in *Epode* 13, though it has not been emphasized. The closing speech of Chiron to

³⁸ This poem seems to recall *Epode* 13 in the specific detail of divine prophetic certitude: cf. *Odes* 1.7.18 *certus promisit Apollo* with *Epod.* 13.15 *certo subtegmine Parcae*.

³⁹ This poem is itself appropriated as a lyric element in Vergil’s *Aeneid*: see Ch. 7 below.

Achilles foretells his future fighting and death in Troy, citing the Parcae or Fates, and this alludes specifically to the prophetic song of the Parcae in Catullus 64 (323–81); we may compare especially 64.357–60:

testis erit magnis uirtutibus unda Scamandri,
 quae passim rapido diffunditur Hellesponto,
 cuius iter caesis angustans corporum aceruis
 alta tepefaciet permixta flumina caede.
 currite ducentes subtegmina, currite, fusi.

The waters of the Scamander will be a witness to his great qualities as it flows down in all directions to the swift Hellespont; its path will be narrowed by heaps of slaughtered bodies, and will make its deep streams warm with the mixture of blood. Run as you draw on the weft, run, spindles.

The naming of the Scamander in the prophecy and the detail of the weft (*subtegmen*) of the fatal weaving of the Parcae guarantee the intertextual echo, which is also of course intergeneric: here we find appropriation of themes and details from a prime example of the most important hexameter genre of the previous poetic generation, the epyllion, natural perhaps in an epyllion metre of which the first line is a hexameter. We also find again an interest in the form of hexameter oracular poetry, already taken up by Horace in *Satires* 1 and perhaps underlying the song of the Fates in Catullus: the form of Chiron's speech, with its particular address, its statement of the place where Achilles will go, and the prediction of his death (here supplying what is notably missing in Catullus 64), strongly echoes the form of oracular responses.⁴⁰

The combination of lyric themes, narrative shape, and even metrical form in the iambic *Epode* 13 shows how the *Epode* book is turning towards the *Odes* in Horace's poetic output, and how the Archilochean framework is loosening in this final section. The scale of generic appropriation and enrichment is apparently so extensive as to exclude almost any recognizably iambic element. But this feature itself reflects the way in which Callimachus' *Iambi* in the intervening Hellenistic period had broadened out the iambic genre from the narrower tradition of Archilochus and Hipponax. *Epodes* 11–17 in particular clearly owe a good deal to the generic experimentation evident in the Callimachean collection (see p. 104 above).

⁴⁰ See Watson (2003: 432–6).

Epodes 14 and 15 effectively continue this intergeneric pattern. *Epode* 14⁴¹ begins by once again thematizing the poet's impotence and inertia, and goes on to suggest very much as in *Epode* 11 that it is love and love-poetry which prevent the collection from continuing in the true forceful Archilochean vein (1–12):

Mollis inertia cur tantam diffuderit imis
 oblivionem sensibus,
 pocula Lethaeos ut si ducentia somnos
 arente fauce traxerim,
 candide Maecenas, occidis saepe rogando:
 deus, deus nam me vetat
 inceptos, olim promissum carmen, iambos
 ad umbilicum adducere.
 non aliter Samio dicunt arsisse Bathyllo
 Anacreonta Teium,
 qui persaepe cava testudine flevit amorem
 non elaboratum ad pedem.

You are the death of me, honest Maecenas, asking me so often why soft inaction has spread such forgetfulness over my inmost senses, as if I had drunk cups which bring the sleep of Lethe with a dry mouth: for it is a god, a god which prevents me from bringing to a close these iambs I have begun, a poem promised long ago. Just so they say Anacreon of Teos burned for Samian Bathyllus, he who so often bewailed his love on the hollow tortoise-shell to a metre of no great elaboration.

The intervening god of line 6 is presumably Amor, but as in Ovid, *Amores* 1.1 Amor's intervention is more metapoetical (or rather metagenetic) than psychological (note the failure to identify the beloved),⁴² following a long tradition of generically diverting gods, most recently instantiated in Vergil's sixth *Eclogue*.⁴³ The erotic thoughts interrupting the Horatian *Epode* book surely represent the

⁴¹ For a recent useful analysis see Watson (2001), which makes an interesting argument for the metagenetic nature of *Epode* 14 as inherited from Callimachus' *Iambus* 14, assuming that the *Iambi* had seventeen not thirteen poems (for the latter position see Kerkhecker, 1999: 271–82).

⁴² But note this might be a teasing reference to Maecenas' own *libertus* Bathyllus, sharing the name of Anacreon's beloved referred to here—see Watson (2003: 449).

⁴³ See Ch. 2, p. 44 above. On the Callimachean aspect of the poem see Watson (2001).

simultaneous composition of the *Odes* in which erotic poems are so significant; here as in *Epode* 13 iambus (cf. 7 *iambus*) is diverted towards lyric, the erotic lyric especially associated with Anacreon (see further below) which will be a significant strand in Horace's own lyric collection of *Odes*.

As in *Epode* 11, the Horatian collection seems to be turning the literal love of Archilochus into literary love. The opening of *Epode* 14 seems to pick up several passages on the strong mental and physical effects of love from Archilochus' homonymous *Epodes*, as follows.⁴⁴ Fr. 191 W.:

τοῖος γὰρ φιλότητος ἔρωσ ὑπὸ καρδίην ἔλυσθεις
πολλὴν κατ' ἀχλὺν ὀμμάτων ἔχεεν,
κλέψας ἐκ στήθ<έω>ν ἀπαλὰς φρένας

Such was the lust for sex that, worming in
under my heart, quite blinded me
and robbed me of my young wits. (Tr. West, 1994)

Fr.193 W. (taken from a different poem, as the metre, the same as that of *Epode* 14, shows):⁴⁵

δύστηνος ἔγκειμαι πόθῳ,
ἄψυχος, χαλεπήμισι θεῶν ὀδύνησιω ἔκητι
πεπαρμένος δι' ὀστέων.

I am in the throes of desire, miserable and lifeless, pierced through my bones with grievous pangs thanks to the gods. (Tr. Gerber, 1999)

Fr 196 W. ἀλλά μ' ὁ λυσιμελῆς ὤταιρε δάμναται πόθος, 'No, my dear friend, / I'm overcome by crippling desire' (tr. West, 1994), where the address to a friend clearly parallels the Horatian address to Maecenas. The use of Archilochean material to frame the poet's statements about an ability to write Archilochean iambus is especially witty here.

Though the erotic symptoms of *Epode* 14 thus clearly draw on Archilochean iambus (and perhaps also on Callimachean epigram⁴⁶), Horace's metaliterary rewriting again adds to the idea of literally

⁴⁴ These passages adduced by Mankin (1995: 227–8).

⁴⁵ Note that this fragment is in the same metre as *Epode* 14. For the theme of overwhelming desire cf. also Archilochus fr.196 W.

⁴⁶ The theme of observing the erotic distress of a fellow-symposiast plainly echoes Callimachus, *Ep.* 43 Pf., though this is not a passage cited by commentators.

falling in love that of metagenetically falling in love, i.e. the intervention in the iambic genre of more specifically erotic forms of poetry. *Non elaboratum ad pedem*, 'to a metre of no great elaboration' (12), clearly points in this direction. The reference is likely to be to the simple metre of the 'anacreontic' (iambic dimeter catalectic) used stichically by Anacreon for whole poems and named after him in antiquity (*PMG* 428 and 429)⁴⁷ and which would present an unfavourable contrast with the more varied and tighter 'stanzaic' structures of Horace's own *Odes*. Once more, as Horace's *Epode* book comes to its end, the impending genre of lyric impedes or diverts the production of Archilochean iambus.

The opening of *Epode* 15, with its allusions to lover's oaths and moonlight meetings, once again has an air of generic departure from iambus, since it unmistakably invokes the topics of love-elegy and of the love-poetry of Catullus⁴⁸ (15.1–10):

Nox erat et caelo fulgebat Luna sereno
inter minora sidera,
cum tu, magnorum numen laesura deorum,
in verba iurabas mea,
artius atque hedera procera adstringitur ilex
lentis adhaerens bracchiis;
dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion
turbaret hibernum mare
intonsosque agitaret Apollinis aura capillos,
fore hunc amorem mutuum.

It was night, and the moon shone in the clear sky amid the lesser stars, when you, soon to injure the majesty of the great gods, began to swear your oath to me, clinging to my arms loath to let you go more tightly than a tall holm-oak is gripped by ivy, claiming that as long as the wolf was the enemy of sheep and Orion, hostile to sailors, disturbed the ocean in winter, as long as the breeze ruffled the unshorn hair of Apollo, so long would this mutual love of ours remain.

The furtive nocturnal meeting of lovers presided over by stars is a feature of Catullus (7.7–8) and of love-elegy (Prop. 3.16.15), as is the unreliability of the female lover's oath (Catullus 70.3–4, Prop.

⁴⁷ For a full discussion see Watson (2003: 447–9).

⁴⁸ See Watson (2003: 458–78, esp. 461–4).

2.28.7–8); the image of the clinging ivy for the lover's long-lasting embrace derives from a Catullan epithalamium (61.33–5), though it has a longer history,⁴⁹ while the citing of an *adynaton* (physical impossibility) as a rhetorical guarantee for a lover's assertions of fidelity is Propertian (1.15.29–30);⁵⁰ *amorem mutuuum* ('mutual love') recalls the Acme and Septimius of Catullus (45.20 *mutuis animis amant amantur*, 'they love and are loved with mutual hearts') as well as love-elegy (Tib. 1.2.65, 1.6.76), while the conjunction *fore hunc amorem* recalls Catullus 109.1–2 *iucundum, mea vita, mihi proponis amorem / hunc nostrum inter nos perpetuumque fore*, 'my life, you propose to me that this love of ours will be pleasant between us and last forever'.

There seems little of iambic colour amongst this welter of erotic clichés, but the key element of the broken oath plainly recalls the apparent breaking of an oath by which Lycambes' daughter Neobule (perhaps echoed in the similar Horatian name Neaera) was denied to Archilochus in marriage.⁵¹ This iambic scenario emerges strongly in the second half of the poem (11–24):

o dolitura mea multum virtute Neaera!
 nam siquid in Flacco viri est,
 non feret adsiduas potiori te dare noctes
 et quaeret iratus parem
 nec semel offensi cedet constantia formae,
 si certus intrarit dolor.
 et tu, quicumque es felicior atque meo nunc
 superbus incedis malo,
 sis pecore et multa dives tellure licebit
 tibi que Pactolus fluat
 nec te Pythagorae fallant arcana renati
 formaque vincas Nirea,
 heu heu, translatos alio maerebis amores,
 ast ego vicissim risero.

O Neaera, how much will you suffer from my forcefulness! For if there is any manhood in Flaccus, he will not endure your giving continuous nights to a

⁴⁹ Beginning at Euripides, *Hec.* 398—cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 406).

⁵⁰ Again with a longer history—cf. Fedeli (1980: 355–6).

⁵¹ Cf. Watson (2003: 459). On the 'plot' of the relations between Archilochus, Lycambes, and Neobule see Carey (1986).

preferred rival and will seek an adversary in his anger, and his firmness once he is offended will never surrender to your beauty, once real pain has intervened. And you, whoever you are, who are more fortunate than I and who walk proudly because of my suffering, though you may be rich in flocks and in great tracts of land, and aware of the secrets of reborn Pythagoras, and superior to Nireus in beauty, alas, you will lament for your beloved consigned to another—and I in turn will laugh.

The strong threat to the faithless girl is firmly iambic: Neaera will suffer from Horace's coming poetic attack for transferring her affections to another, just as her alliterative parallel Neobule was the target of violent invective from the rejected Archilochus in his own *Epodes* (fr.188, 196a 24–34). The pun on Horace's name (*si quid in Flacco viri est*, evoking *flaccus*, 'floppy')⁵² implies that he will not be up to Archilochean standards of firmness, in invective style or phallic performance, a quasi-literal display of the theme of impotence so central to the Horatian *Epodes*.⁵³ This suggestion of incapacity in *Flacci* contrasts notably with Archilochus' commonly displayed phallic potency, for example, in the Cologne Epode (fr.196a W.). The sentimentality of Roman love-poetry found in the poem's opening is here countered by the vigorous spirit of attack central to the iambic genre; though there are further elements from Roman love-poetry in these lines (the power of the girl's beauty, the potential riches of the successful rival and his happiness at the expense of the poet-lover, and the inevitability of his own rejection in turn),⁵⁴ the final laughter at the victim is thoroughly Archilochean (cf. e.g. fr.172.4 W.).

Thus in *Epode* 15 we find quite a different metageneric effect from that of *Epode* 14, a literary texture which first colludes with and then 'corrects' the generic 'deviation' of the preceding poem by beginning with 'guest' elements in modal form but returning by the end to recognizably 'host' material. In *Epode* 14 the mode of erotic lyric had virtually taken over the poem, turning it into a proto-*Ode*; in this following poem, the first section appears to continue the excursion

⁵² Cf. Watson (2003: 472).

⁵³ Cf. Watson (1995).

⁵⁴ Power of girl's beauty, similarly conjoined with unreliability of promises: Prop. 2.5.8. Rich rival: Prop. 1.8, 2.16. Rival's happiness at poet-lover's rejection: Prop. 2.16.28, 2.25.21. Rival's rejection in turn anticipated: Prop.2.25.22, Horace *Odes* 1.5.5–12.

into other genres, but in the final section the iambic tradition of Archilochus is firmly reasserted through the theme of erotic offence and consequent virulent poetic attack.

5. *EPODE* 16: ELEGY, ORACLE, AND PASTORAL

Epode 16 begins with a gloomy assessment of Rome's political situation and an equally negative prediction about its future (16.1–14):

Altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas,
 suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit:
 quam neque finitimi valuerunt perdere Marsi
 minacis aut Etrusca Porsenae manus,
 aemula nec virtus Capuae nec Spartacus acer
 novisque rebus infidelis Allobrox
 nec fera caerulea domuit Germania pube
 parentibusque abominatus Hannibal,
 inopia perdemus devoti sanguinis aetas
 ferisque rursus occupabitur solum:
 barbarus heu cineres insistet victor et Urbem
 eques sonante verberabit ungula,
 quaeque carent ventis et solibus ossa Quirini,
 (nefas videre) dissipabit insolens.

A second age is now being worn away by civil wars, and Rome is collapsing from its own strength; the city which its neighbour Marsi were not able to destroy, or the Etruscan force of menacing Porsenna, which was not subdued by the rival strength of Capua or fierce Spartacus or the Allobroges, disloyal in times of revolt, or by blue Germany with its fierce fighting men, or by Hannibal hated of parents, we will destroy ourselves, an impious age of cursed blood, and its site will once again be occupied by wild beasts: a barbarian victor, alas, will stand on its ashes and horsemen will beat the City with resounding hoof, and will contemptuously scatter the bones of Quirinus, now protected from wind and sun—a dreadful sight to see.

The metrical form of this epode (hexameter plus iambic trimeter) gives perhaps some indication of generic affinity. This combination is not found in extant archaic Greek iambus apart from in the pseudo-Homeric *Margites*, where the iambic line clearly serves to mark the

poem as parody of epic. This pair of lines beginning with a hexameter is close to the elegiac couplet, and it has long been noted that this poem shows the concern with advice to one's fellow-citizens which is a major theme in archaic elegy,⁵⁵ most notably in the work of Solon and Tyrtaeus but even in the few extant elegiac fragments of Archilochus himself (though civic themes can also occur in his iambs, fr.109 W.): fr.14 W. concerns the need not to arouse the censure of the *demos*. As commentators note, there are particular links with Solon fr.4.1–8 W., a similar claim that the city-state is being destroyed by the vices of its own people:

ἡμετέρη δὲ πόλις κατὰ μὲν Διὸς οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται
 αἶσαν καὶ μακάρων θ<εῶ>ν φρένας ἀθανάτων·
 τοίη γὰρ μεγάλθυμος ἐπίσκοπος ὀβριμοπάτρη
 Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη χεῖρας ὑπερθεν ἔχει·
 αὐτοὶ δὲ φθείρειν μεγάλην πόλιν ἀφραδίησιν
 ἄστοι βούλονται χρήμασι πειθόμενοι,
 δήμου θ' ἡγεμόνων ἄδικος νόος, οἷσιν ἐτοῖμον
 ὕβριος ἐκ μεγάλης ἄλγεα πολλὰ παθεῖν·
 οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον οὐδὲ παρούσας
 εὐφροσύνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.

Our state will never fall by Zeus' ordinance
 or the immortal blessed gods' intent:
 such a stout-hearted guardian, she of the mighty sire,
 Pallas Athene, holds her hand above:
 but by their foolishness the citizens themselves
 seek to destroy its pride, from avarice,
 with the unprincipled mob-leaders, who are set
 to suffer badly for their great misdeeds.
 They know not how to prosper modestly, enjoy
 In festive peace the happiness they have. (Tr. West, 1994)

The great city of Rome follows the great city of Athens in self-destruction.

But more important than this connection with bouletic elegy is the link with the prophetic hexameter, a genre which we have already seen as contributing to the literary texture of *Epode* 13 as it also did to the first book of *Satires*.⁵⁶ The prophetic elements in *Epode* 16 cannot

⁵⁵ Fraenkel (1957: 48).

⁵⁶ See pp. 124 and 95–7 above.

be considered without giving an account of its relation to Vergil's fourth *Eclogue*, where similar generic interaction with hexameter prophecy takes place.⁵⁷ Scholars largely agree that the Horatian poem's pessimism, published c.30 BC, is a response to the earlier optimism of Vergil's poem, published c.38 BC;⁵⁸ the ironies of history in fact ensured that neither Vergil's optimism nor Horace's pessimism, both rational in the likely circumstances of composition (the Peace of Brundisium of 41 for Vergil, the opening of the young Caesar's war against Sextus Pompey of 38 for Horace), were justified by the time their respective poetry-books were issued. From the perspective of generic interaction and enrichment, the crucial factor is that the Horatian poem adopts the same strategy as the Vergilian one, that is, the inclusion of Sibylline-type hexameter prophecy in modal form within another poetic genre. Scholars have rightly noted that two lines in Horace's poem echo the language of Sibylline oracles.⁵⁹ First, the bilingual pun on the name of Rome in line 2, *suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit* (where *vires* alludes to Greek *ῥώμη*, 'strength', pointed to by *Roma*), matches the use of a similar pun on a Greek noun with an opposite sense in the similar foretelling of Rome's downfall in two of the Sibylline oracles, *Or.Sib.* 8.165 (cf. similarly 3.363–4) *ἔσται καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη*, 'Rome will be a ruin'. Second, the prophecy of Rome's being returned to a beast-infested ruin in line 10, *ferisque rursus occupabitur solum*, matches a similar prophecy about Rome at *Or.Sib.* 8.37–41:

ἤξει σοί ποτ' ἄνωθεν ἴση, ὑψαύχενε Ῥώμη,
 οὐράνιος πληγὴ καὶ κάμψεις ἀχένα πρώτη
 κάξεδαφισθήσῃ καὶ πῦρ σε ὄλην δαπανήσει
 κεκλιμένην ἐδάφισσιν ἐοῖς, καὶ πλοῦτος ὀλεῖται
 καὶ σὰ θέμειλα λύκοι καὶ ἀλώπεκες οἰκήσουσιν.

There will come to you in time a similar heavenly blow from on high, haughty Rome, and you will be the first to bow the neck, and you will be left desolate, and fire will consume you whole as you lie recumbent on your foundations, and your wealth will vanish, and your ruins will be lived in by wolves and foxes.

These echoes of oracular language in *Epode* 16 are, as has long been noted, matched by echoes of Vergil's adaptation of similar material in

⁵⁷ See Ch. 2 above, p. 38.

⁵⁸ For a cautious statement of the arguments see Watson (2003: 486–8).

⁵⁹ See Watson (2003: 489, 495).

Eclogue 4.⁶⁰ The beginnings of the two poems are clearly related in vocabulary and enclosing word-order⁶¹ (*Ecl.* 4.1 *ultima* *Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas*, 'the last age of the Cumaean prophecy has arrived' ~ *Epod.* 16.1 *altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas*, 'A second age is now being worn away by civil wars'); the Vergilian claim that a new era is here is countered by the Horatian statement that this new era is merely a second age of civil wars.⁶² But it is not merely the Sibylline elements of Vergil's poem which are echoed. In the description of the paradisiacal Isles of the Blest, to which Horace's poem famously proposes escape, the pastoral element is very strong (41–55):

nos manet Oceanus circum vagus: arva beata
petamus, arva divites et insulas,
reddit ubi cererem tellus inarata quotannis
et inputata floret usque vinea,
germinat et numquam fallentis termes olivae
suamque pulla ficus ornat arborem,
mella cava manant ex ilice, montibus altis
levis crepante lymphæ desilit pede.
illic iniussæ veniunt ad mulctra capellæ
refertque tenta grex amicus ubera
nec vespertinus circumgemit ursus ovile
nec intumescit alta viperis humus;
pluraque felices mirabimur, ut neque largis
aquosus Eurus arva radat imbribus,
pinguia nec siccis urantur semina glaebis,
utrumque rege temperante caelitem.

The wandering Ocean awaits us all about: let us make for the blessed fields, the fields and the rich islands, where the unploughed earth returns corn each year and the unpruned vineyard flourishes, and the bud of the olive tree that never fails germinates and the dark fig decorates its own tree, honey flows from the hollow holm-oak, the light spring leaps down with echoing foot from the high mountains. There the she-goats come unbidden to milking and the kindly herd brings its straining udders home, and the bear does not roar about the sheepfold in the evening, nor does the deep ground swell with vipers. In our fortunate location we will wonder at many things—how the squally south wind does not rake the fields with generous showers, or how

⁶⁰ See Ch. 2 above, p. 38.

⁶¹ Implied but not stated by Watson (2003: 488).

⁶² *Ibid.*, for the historical reference.

the lush seeds are not scorched in dry soil, since the king of heaven moderates both these.

The *arva beata*, ‘blessed fields’, of this poem (41) bear a considerable resemblance to the *dulcia arva*, ‘sweet fields’, of the *Eclogues* (1.3). As scholars have noted, the miraculously self-managing agriculture, a typical feature of utopian Golden Age environments,⁶³ is specifically cast in the pastoral mode, imitating the equally pastoral Golden Age miracles in *Eclogue* 4.18–45: the uncultivated but productive earth (16.43 *reddit ubi cererem tellus inarata quotannis* ~ *Ecl.* 4.39 *omnia feret omnia tellus*), the unpruned but productive vineyard (16.44 *et inputata floret usque vinea* ~ *Ecl.* 4.40 *non rastos patietur humus, non vinea falcem*; cf. also 4.29), the honey flowing from trees (16.47 *mella cava manant ex ilice* ~ *Ecl.* 4.47 *durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella*),⁶⁴ the self-herding she-goats (16.19–50 *illic iniussae veniunt ad mulctra capellae / refertque tenta grex amicus ubera* ~ *Ecl.* 4.21 *ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae*), the lack of predators for flocks (16.51 *nec vespertinus circumgemit ursus ovile* ~ *Ecl.* 4.22 *ubera nec magnos metuent armenta leones*) and the lack of snakes (16.52 *neque inutmescit alta viperis humus* ~ *Ecl.* 4.24 *occidet et serpens*). This series of echoes reworks the pastoral/oracular material of the Vergilian poem into a new Horatian iambic context: as at the opening of the poem, Vergil’s previous political optimism is here echoed but inverted, since for the Horatian version the miraculous Golden Age is not about to happen but is an impossible scenario located in the mythical ‘blessed fields’ which provides a purely rhetorical escape from present evils (16.63–6). It is notable that this penultimate poem of the *Epode* book thus matches its second poem by a neat ring-composition in adapting and undermining idealistic material from Vergil’s poetry,⁶⁵ thus both accommodating these ‘guest’ elements to the ‘host’ iambic genre and enriching that genre by such an incorporation of diverse literary modes.

⁶³ Watson (2003: 515).

⁶⁴ The holm-oak in Horace’s version of this topos is itself typically pastoral—cf. *Ecl.* 7.1 *forte sub arguta considerat ilice Daphnis*, echoed in *Epode* 2.23—see p. 115 above.

⁶⁵ See pp. 114–19 above.

6. CONCLUSION

As noted at the end of the last chapter, the *Epode* book matches the first book of *Satires* as a sophisticated Horatian development, under the influence of Callimachus and the early poetry of Vergil, of a genre which might naturally be perceived as relatively 'low' and crude. This idea of elevating and extending the subject-matter of Archilochean matches Horace's own judgement of the *Epodes* a decade or more later in *Epistles* 1.19.23–5, already cited at the beginning of this chapter: *Parios ego primus iambus / ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, 'I was the first to show off the iambs of Paros to Latium, following the metre and spirit of Archilochus, not his subject-matter or his words which harried Lycambes'. The often crude violence of Archilochean invective is not entirely absent from Horace's collection (*Epodes* 8 and 12 would be good examples, following Archilochus' sexually explicit attacks on the daughters of Lycambes in his own *Epodes*⁶⁶), but it is balanced and modified by a post-Callimachean concern with generic diversity and the development of complex literary texture, enriching the iambic genre through consistent contact with other contemporary poetic forms in modal form while remaining perceptibly Archilochean in character.

⁶⁶ e.g. fr.188 W., fr.196a.24–35 W.

Intra-Epic Debate: Vergil's *Georgics*

1. THE *GEORGICS*: TRANSITIONAL DIDACTIC?

The *Georgics* was probably published some time in the first half of 29 BC, as its allusions to Caesar's post-Actium campaigns of 30–29 BC and its vague and unspecific anticipation of his triumphant return to Rome in August 29 BC suggest.¹ Given its middle position in the chronological sequence of Vergil's three major works, the *Georgics* is commonly regarded as the transitional poem of ascent in Vergilian poetics from the *Eclogues* of 38/37 BC (Chapter 2) to the posthumous *Aeneid* of after 19 BC (Chapter 7), an ascent which takes place within the subgenres of epic in antiquity.² In ancient hexameter epos, Theocritean pastoral, Hesiodic didactic, and Homeric military and mythological epic can all be classed as among its subgenres and perceived as an ascending hierarchy;³ there are also other hexameter forms such as the epyllion and even mock-epic which can be given an appropriate place within that same hierarchy. This chapter looks at the scenes of intrageneric debate in the *Georgics*, and the ways in which the poem thematizes its own self-location within the overall epic genre by reference to other epic traditions.

The epic model most immediately emphasized in the *Georgics* is that of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the key founding text of the didactic subgenre.⁴ The poem opens with an implicit statement of that

¹ Thomas (1988*b*: 36).

² Thomas (1988*a*: 1–3); Theodorakopoulos (1997); Farrell (2002).

³ The ancient evidence is laid out by Koster (1970).

⁴ On the sources of the *Georgics* in the epic tradition Farrell (1991) is essential reading.

dependence (*Georg.* 1.1–2), *quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram / vertere*, ‘what makes the crops lush, at what season to turn the earth’. This formulation suggests the dual subjects of growing crops (*Works*) and agricultural almanac (*Days*), and in effect (as ancient commentators noted) reproduces precisely the double topic of Hesiod’s poem.⁵ Hesiod is more specifically indicated in a single passage, at the conclusion of the well-known encomium of Italy in book 2 (2.176 *Ascraeum cano Itala per oppida carmen*, ‘I sing a song of Ascra through the towns of Italy’), a passage which will be more closely considered in section 2 below. Another crucial intertext in didactic epic is the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius, already seen in earlier chapters as the subject of poetic interest in the *Eclogues* and Horace’s *Satires*, and recent scholarship has done much to stress the natural importance of Lucretius’ recent poem in the same subgenre (published in the 50s BC) for the *Georgics*.⁶ Of Hellenistic didactic epic, Aratus’ *Phaenomena*, an astronomical poem of Hesiodic cast, is also influential on the *Georgics* in its uniting of technical information with an underlying Stoic theology, the religious dimension which is excluded from the Epicurean *De Rerum Natura* but is an important element in Vergil’s poem.⁷

Against this firm background in didactic epic, the *Georgics* stages major intrageneric debates which become increasingly dominant, and which also incorporate elements from outside the epic tradition. In the *Laudes Italiae* of book 2, the poem defines itself against traditional epic; in the proem to book 3, there are anticipations of martial epic and back-allusions to other epic intertexts; and in the account of the bees in book 4 the interplay of questions of literary form and political commitment is brilliantly explored through the prism of the Homeric, mock-epic, and epyllion traditions. Thus the texture and plot of the didactic poem is effectively redirected in its last stage by metagenic debate.

⁵ Cf. Farrell (1991: 134) and Ch. 1 above, p. 31.

⁶ Cf. Farrell (1991: 169–207) and esp. Gale (2000).

⁷ On Vergil and Aratus see Farrell (1991: 157–62); on the reinsertion of religion see Gale (2000).

2. LAUDES ITALIAE (GEORGICS 2.136–76):
A CAESARIAN HESIOD?

Recent writing on the *laudes Italiae* has been much concerned with its ideological aspect: does this celebrated setpiece constitute unalloyed praise of Italy and its products, ‘rising to a glory in which past, present and future are fused’,⁸ or is its detail ‘hardly laudatory’ with misrepresenting ‘distortions of reality’?⁹ This issue is naturally closely related to the interpretation of the *Georgics* as a whole, where there is a similar debate as to whether the poem expresses ultimate triumph over adversity for both agriculture and state, or allows too much stress on negative aspects for a positive view finally to emerge.¹⁰ Here I will seek to argue that the *laudes Italiae* passage is both metaliterary, referring to the *Georgics* themselves, and metagenetic, negotiating the space for the *Georgics* within the broader context of the epic tradition. I will also argue as a corollary that this episode is much more firmly rooted than scholars have thought in the anti-Oriental and pro-Italian propaganda of the period surrounding the battle of Actium.¹¹

As Richard Thomas has stressed,¹² it is important not to take the *laudes Italiae* out of context. The passage occurs as the conclusion of a discussion of the suitability of different regions for growing different plants which begins at 2.109 (*nec vero terrae ferre omnes omnia possunt*, ‘and indeed not all lands can yield all products’). In the section which leads up to the *laudes* (109–35), various picturesque and exotic locations are mentioned as suitable for various trees. It is notable that these locations are largely drawn from the East (115 *Eoasque domos Arabum*, 116 and 122 *India*, 117 *Sabaeis*, 121 *Seres*), though the Geloni of 115 represent the Scythian north and the

⁸ Mynors (1990: 119); for another recent positive view see Jenkyns (1998: 352–71).

⁹ Thomas (1988a: 180). For a recent attempt at a middle way see Nappa (2005: 78–85).

¹⁰ For a useful recent overview of the argument see Hardie (1998: 28–52).

¹¹ Nappa (2005: 81–5) has recently emphasized the contemporary political context of the *laudes Italiae*, but reads the passage in the context of war against S. Pompeius in the 30s rather than post-Actium.

¹² Thomas (1988a: 179–80).

Ethiopian of 120 the African south; the Mediterranean west, the location of Italy, is notably lacking here, and this clearly prepares for the *laudes* themselves at 136. The climax of this pre-*laudes* section is plainly the detailed account of the *felix malum* of the citron-tree (126–35), with its quasi-magical medicinal properties; here too the East is in evidence, with the tree's description ringed by references to its location in Media (126 *Media fert*, 134–5 *Medi / fovent*).¹³

Media is here carefully chosen; it is only in this passage and one other that Vergil ever uses *Media* or *Medus*, and that other passage is plainly politically significant.¹⁴ In Latin poetry of the 20s BC and later *Media* and *Medi*, terms technically applicable to the lost empire of the Medians who had been defeated by Cyrus the Great at the founding of the Achaemenid Persian empire (Herodotus 1.130.2–3), usually refer to the contemporary Parthians, Rome's greatest foreign enemy, against whom campaigns were often noised until the settlement of 20 BC and whose relative quietude thereafter was proclaimed as military success.¹⁵ Parthia's position as Rome's imperial Eastern rival was particularly evident in the years immediately following Actium, the chronological context of the *Georgics*, with the possibility of further expansion and settlement in the East following the defeat of Antony. The propagandistic noises made about the young Caesar campaigning at the Euphrates at the end of the *Georgics* (*Georg.* 4.560–1) express appropriate Roman ambition for anti-Parthian aggression at this period, aggression which the young Caesar in fact sensibly and characteristically avoided.¹⁶

¹³ These details are derived (like much of the *Georgics*' plant-lore) from Theophrastus (*HP* 4.4.2); on Theophrastus as a source for the *Georgics* see conveniently Thomas (1988a: 10–11).

¹⁴ The other passage at *Georg.* 4.211 *Medus Hydaspes* clearly shows similar contemporary connections given the presence of Egypt and Parthia in the same context and the topic of the absolute nature of Eastern kingship—cf. Thomas (1988b: 185).

¹⁵ Cf. Seager (1980); for the passages cf. Horace *Odes* 1.2.51–2 *neu sinas Medos equitare inultis / te duce, Caesar*, 1.29.4–5 *horribilique Medo / nectis catenas*, 2.9.21–2 *Medumque flumen gentibus additum / victis minores volvere vertices*, 3.3.43–4 *triumphatisque possit / Roma ferox dare iura Medis*, 4.14.41–3 *te Cantaber non ante domabilis / Medusque et Indus, te profugus Scythes / miratur*, *Carmen Saeculare* 53–4 *manus potentis / Medus Albanasque timet securis*, Propertius 3.9.25 *Medorum pugnacis ire per hastas*, 3.12.11 *neve tua Medae laetentur caede sagittae*. Compare the one-off use of the similarly antiquarian 'Persae' for 'Parthian' at Horace *Odes* 3.5.3–4 in an analogous context (*adiectis Britannis / imperio gravibusque Persis*).

¹⁶ Gruen (1996: 158–60).

Given this political context, the fact that the Medes and their marvellous citron-tree are the first item specifically said at the beginning of the *laudes Italiae* (136) to be outclassed by Italian flora and fauna suggests a clear analogy between botanical and political rivalry from a contemporary Roman point of view. The most extraordinary plant of Parthia can provide no real rival to the plant and animal life of Italy, just as the military might of Parthia is ultimately no match for that of Rome. This idea of political superiority expressed metaphorically through superiority in nature becomes one of the key ideas of the *laudes Italiae*. The Medes, a convenient transition from the previous section, begin another list of rival Eastern locations (136–9):

sed neque Medorum silvae, ditissima terra,
nec pulcher Ganges atque auro turbidus Hermus
laudibus Italiae certent, non Bactra neque Indi
totaque turiferis Panchaia pinguis harenis.

But let not the woods of the Medes, the richest of lands, nor the fair Ganges, nor the Hermus, murky with gold, vie with the praises of Italy, no, not Bactra or the Indians, or the whole of Panchaia rich with its incense-bearing sands.

The collection of place-names gives a generally Oriental atmosphere, as commentators note, but the conjunction of Medes, Ganges, Hermus, Bactra, and Indians specifically recall the campaigns of Alexander the Great, who had conquered Media's successor Persia, received the surrender of the fabulously wealthy Sardis, located in the Hermus valley,¹⁷ incorporated Bactria into the Greek world, and supposedly reached the Ganges in his penetration of India.¹⁸ There is a fabulous element here too, shown in Panchaia, supposed location of the magic island of Euhemerus, but the evocation of Alexander has a realistic contemporary resonance. The young Caesar and Antony clearly encouraged in the 30s the comparison with the world-conqueror Alexander so passionately sought in the previous

¹⁷ Alluded to in *in auro*; hence the surprising use of Hermus for the usual gold-flowing Pactolus, noted by commentators here.

¹⁸ On the career of Alexander cf. e.g. Lane Fox (1973); on his supposed reaching of the Ganges cf. Lucan 3.229–39 with Hunink (1992: 123–4).

generation by Pompey and Julius Caesar,¹⁹ and implicit and explicit comparison with Alexander is a theme that emerges strongly in encomiastic Augustan poetry.²⁰ One element of this comparison is later used by Horace in his epistle to Augustus, where he argues that the Roman poets like Varius and Vergil who praise Augustus far exceed their Greek counterparts such as Choerilus of Iasus who lauded Alexander (*Ep.* 2.1.232–50). *Georgics* 2.136–9, cited above, I would argue, make the same point: the poetic praises of territories associated with Alexander in Choerilus and other poets of Alexander-epics are inferior to the praises of Italy and Caesar/Augustus in the *Georgics* itself.

This metaliterary point can be supported by some of the detail in these lines. The Ganges and the Hermus are both Eastern rivers, the latter ‘murky with gold’. This presents an obvious link with the allusion to the muddy Eastern river Euphrates in one of the more famous metapoetical passages of Callimachus, also (as has been noted²¹) used by Horace at *Satires* 1.4.8–13, published a few years earlier—the lines from near the end of the *Hymn to Apollo* (*Hymn* 2.107–12):

τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὧδέ τ' ἔειπεν·
 “Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
 λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.
 Διοὶ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
 ἀλλ' ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράντος ἀνέρπει
 πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.”

Apollo kicked Envy with his foot and spoke as follows: ‘Great is the stream of the Assyrian river, but it drags along many off-scourings of the land and much rubbish on its waters. The water which the bees carry to Demeter is not from every source, but is whatever comes pure and uncontaminated from the holy spring, a small trickle, the very best.’

The Ganges, fine though it is, and the Hermus, with all its golden attractions, are in metapoetical terms simply exotic forms of the Callimachean muddy Euphrates; Vergil's Callimachean *Georgics* are

¹⁹ See e.g. Michel (1967); Spencer (2002).

²⁰ See Spencer (2002: 165–204); for a strong example at *Aeneid* 6.788–807 see Austin (1977: 242–3).

²¹ See Ch. 3, p. 78 above.

smaller and more exquisite than these larger forms of poetry, and therefore more effective in praising their dedicatee Caesar/Augustus.

This metaliterary connection is maintained in the lines which follow (140–8):

haec loca non tauri spirantes naribus ignem
 inuertere satis immanis dentibus hydri,
 nec galeis densisque uirum seges horruit hastis;
 sed grauidae fruges et Bacchi Massicus umor
 impleuere; tenent oleae armentaue laeta.
 hinc bellator equus campo sese arduus infert,
 hinc albi, Clitumne, greges et maxima taurus
 uictima, saepe tuo perfusi flumine sacro,
 Romanos ad templa deum duxere triumphos.

These regions were not ploughed by bulls breathing fire from their nostrils for the sowing of the teeth of the monstrous dragon, nor did the crop there bristle with shields or the dense-packed spears of warriors; but heavy ears of corn and the Massic juice of Bacchus have filled them up, and they are occupied by olive-trees and happy herds. From here the war-horse carries itself loftily across the plain, from here, Clitumnus, the flocks and the bull, the largest victim, often washed in your sacred waters, have drawn the triumphs of Romans to the temples of the gods.

As commentators note, lines 140–2 refer to the mythological ploughing and planting by Jason in the Argonaut story (cf. Apollonius Rhodius 3.1278–1407, Valerius Flaccus 7.559–643). This can be taken as more than simple praise of Italian agriculture as free from mythological horrors. The demonstrative *haec loca* can refer to the current passage and thence to the poem itself; at *Epistles* 2.1.223 Horace uses the term *loca* of purple passages particularly favoured by the poet in recitation, *cum loca iam recitata revolvimus irrevocati*, ‘when without being asked we wind the scroll back to passages already recited’, and this use of *locus* for parts of literary works is a common one.²² This passage thus claims that this poem will not contain the bizarre heroic ploughings of the Argonautic saga but real Italian agriculture. The rejection of this literary material is highly topical for the period of the *Georgics*, since it was probably in the late 30s BC that Varro Atacinus produced his celebrated (cf. e.g. Ovid,

²² *TLL* 7.2.1592, 40 ff.

Amores 1.15.21–2) but lost translation of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, entitled *Argonautae*, a poem which Vergil himself may have cited directly elsewhere in the *Georgics* and in the *Aeneid*.²³ The rejection of Jason's mythological ploughing in favour of Italian agriculture is also a rejection of traditional mythological epic for the *Georgics*. This poem is to be something different, and will cover the agricultural didactic topics enumerated in lines 143–8. As we shall see, this pattern of rejection of other topics in a search for generic self-definition is played out again at the beginning of *Georgics* 3 (see section 3 below).

This metapoetical reading is supported by Mynors's observation that the following lines 143–8 give 'the subject-matter of Books 1–3 in order': this is in effect a partial *mise en abyme*, an embedded and miniaturized summary of most of the *Georgics*,²⁴ and though the bees of book 4 are omitted, the mentions of the corn of book 1, the wine and olives of book 2 and the stock animals of book 3 look backward and forward with verbal echoes to the poem's treatments of these topics. More importantly, the *mise en abyme* culminates in the mention of a Roman triumph in describing the bulls traditionally used in the ceremony. This looks forward to the indirect allusion to Caesar's expected triumph at the beginning of *Georgics* 3 (3.32–3; see section 3 below), but also matches the poem's ending. There the poet contemplates the military conquests of Caesar/Augustus with another hint at a forthcoming triumph; this material is once more presented in conjunction with a miniature summary of the poem's main topics, not quite in order this time (4.559–62), and balanced with the poet's own career summary:

Haec super arborum cultu pecorumque canebam
 et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
 fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentes
 per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.
 Illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
 Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
 carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,
 Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

²³ On this version and Vergil's use of it see Nelis (2001: 3) and Hollis (2003).

²⁴ On *mise en abyme* see Dällenbach (1989). There is a third occasion in the poem on which this trope is used, at *Georgics* 4.326–8, which we will return to in s. 4.

This was my song on the care of fields [book 1], flocks [book 3], and trees [book 2], while great Caesar thunders at the Euphrates in war, and grants laws as victor to willing peoples, and tries his way to Olympus. At that time sweet Naples nourished me, Vergil, as I flourished in the pursuits of ignoble leisure, I who played with the songs of herdsmen and bold in youth sang of you, Tityrus, under the shade of the spreading beech.

This idea that the *laudes Italiae* mirrors the content and shape of the *Georgics* is also supported by its own climax, which like that of the *Georgics* as a whole presents a combination of encomium of Caesar/Augustus and poetic self-reflection (170–6, see discussion below). The relationship of poetry and politics suggested here will be discussed in section 4(iii) below.

The list of Italy's advantages which follows thus becomes both a list of the attractions of the *Georgics* itself and a statement of difference from other contemporary or fashionable forms of epic (2.149–54):

hic uer adsiduum atque alienis mensibus aestas:
bis grauidae pecudes, bis pomis utilis arbor.
at rabidae tigres absunt et saeua leonum
semina, nec miseros fallunt aconita legentis,
nec rapit immensos orbis per humum neque tanto
squameus in spiram tractu se colligit anguis.

Here spring is incessant, and summer in months not its own; the herds are twice yearly with young, the tree is twice productive of apples. But raging tigers and the savage seeds of lions are absent, nor do aconites take in their unfortunate gatherers, nor does the scaly snake drag its measureless rings along the ground or gather itself into a coil in such great length.

As Richard Thomas has noted,²⁵ the mention of spring here anticipates its description later in this same book (2.319–45); thus *hic* (149) means 'in this work' as well as 'in this country', repeating the trope of *haec loca* (140); the Golden Age of post-Actium peace is the key historical subtext of the *laudes Italiae* (cf. 2.171–2, above).²⁶ The removal of noxious creatures from the landscape is a topic of Golden Age descriptions, but here the list of non-present monsters, as might be expected after the exclusion of Argonautic monstrous

²⁵ Thomas (1988a: 184).

²⁶ For the topic of the Golden Age in the *Georgics* see Perkill (1989: 90–138).

husbandry in 2.140–2, also has additional metageneric significance in setting out the parts of the epic tradition which the Italian didactic epic of the *Georgics* is not to follow. Lions and tigers (151) are animals from martial epic. Lions are a frequent *comparandum* for fierce heroes in Homeric similes, followed by Vergil himself in the *Aeneid*; with tigers, they also belong to the Eastern conquests of Alexander, where the Graeco-Roman world had first encountered tigers and Asiatic lions (cf. Curtius 9.8.2), species which no doubt featured in the lost epics of the Alexander-poets.²⁷ Just as the *Georgics* is not to be a mythological epic in the manner of the Argonaut poems, so it is not to be a Homeric or Alexander-type account of *reges et proelia*.

Aconite and snakes, by contrast (152–4), look to another aspect of Hellenistic epic, to the hexameter didactic catalogue poems of Nicander, whose influence on the *Georgics* is too often forgotten.²⁸ Aconite is the first and most fully treated poison in Nicander's *Alexipharmaka*, 'Antidotes' (12–73), his poem on plant-poisons and their cures, while snakes take up almost all the space allocated to venomous creatures and the antidotes to their bites in the pendant poem *Theriaca*, 'Nasty Creatures' (115–482). Indeed, the notorious inconsistency between the absence of snakes here and their presence in the Italian landscape elsewhere is best accounted for as both an encomiastic hyperbole²⁹ and as an allusion to the *Theriaka*: this poem of Vergil's is not to be a mere technical paraphrase like Nicander's. Once again, as with the Argonaut material, there may be an allusion to a contemporary Latin translation as well as its Greek model. The poet Aemilius Macer (d. 16 BC) wrote loose versions of both the *Alexipharmaka* and the *Theriaka*, at least the latter of which was known by the

²⁷ See further Clausen (1994: 161–2).

²⁸ See Harrison (2004a) for the suggestion that the digression on gardens and the Old Man of Corycus at *Georg.* 4.115–48 is an allusion to Nicander's horticultural *Georgika*, which surely gave Vergil the title of his poem, as perhaps implied by Quintilian 10.1.56.

²⁹ Similarly hyperbolic is a splendid imitation from William Harrison's *The Description of England* (1577), 3.4 'Of Savage Beasts and Vermins': 'It is none of the least blessings wherewith God hath endued this island that it is void of noisome beasts, such as lions, bears, tigers, pards, wolves and suchlike, by means whereof our countrymen may travel in safety and our herds and flocks remain for the most part abroad in the fields without any herdsman or keeper.'

twenties or early teens BC when Macer read it as an old man to the young Ovid (*Tristia* 4.10.41–4), and there is every chance that these translations were available by the 30s BC and referred to here.³⁰ Just as the *Georgics* elsewhere seems to acknowledge but shy away from the horticultural content of Nicander's lost *Georgika* which gave the poem its name, so here Nicander's dense and dry catalogue-poems, though used as sources for technical details,³¹ are rejected as a general poetic model for Vergil.

In 155–64 the quality of the built environment and waters of Italy are stressed:

adde tot egregias urbes operumque laborem,
 tot congesta manu praeeruptis oppida saxis
 fluminaque antiquos subter labentia muros.
 an mare quod supra memorem, quodque adluit infra?
 ane lacus tantos? te, Lari maxime, teque,
 fluctibus et fremitu adsurgens Benace marino?
 an memorem portus Lucrinoque addita claustra
 atque indignatum magnis stridoribus aequor,
 Iulia qua ponto longe sonat unda refuso
 Tyrrhenusque fretis immittitur aestus Auernis?

Add to this so many outstanding cities and the labour of building, so many towns piled by hand on sheer rocks, and the rivers flowing below their ancient walls. Or should I mention the sea that washes the land to the east, or that to the west, or the great lakes—you, mighty Larius, and you, Benacus, surging with waves and a roar like that of the sea? Or should I mention the harbours and the barriers added to the Lucrine lake, and the sea indignant with its great murmurings at the point where the Julian waters resound far and wide with their waves flowing back and the tide from the Etruscan sea is sent into the channels of Avernus?

After the symbolic rejection of other epic topics in 149–54, this is the key subject-matter of the *Georgics*, the physical environment of Italy, the material with which the poem is to create its new generic space as a didactic epic of Italian landscape. The hill-towns of Italy described here (156 *oppida*) are the same towns through which the *Georgics* will resound its Hesiodic note (176 *Romana per oppida*); they also suggest

³⁰ On Macer's career see Courtney (1993: 292–3).

³¹ See Harrison (2004a: 110).

that Italy can match in its own ancient towns the traditional cities of Greek epic (e.g. Troy or Thebes). The landscape naturally begins with the poet's own Cisalpine homeland; Mantua, here figured under its neighbouring waters,³² will emerge more fully later in the poem (2.198, 3.12). In 161–4 we can see the collusion of poetics and politics: the poetic achievement of the *Georgics* is to encompass and contain the landscape poetically from a Caesarian point of view, just as Agrippa's feats of engineering in 37–36 BC had mastered the landscape for Caesar in a more practical sense, creating the channels and lagoons of the Portus Iulius for the use of Caesar's fleet (then engaged against Sextus Pompeius) between Lake Avernus and the Lucrine Lake in Campania.

The climax of the *laudes* again reflects both the poetic content of the *Georgics* itself and its collusion with politics (165–76):

haec eadem argenti riuos aerisque metalla
ostendit uenis atque auro plurima fluxit.
haec genus acre uirum, Marsos pubemque Sabellam
adsuetumque malo Ligurem Volcosque uerutos
extulit, haec Decios Marios magnosque Camillos,
Scipiadas duos bello et te, maxime Caesar,
qui nunc extremis Asiae iam uictor in oris
imbellem auertis Romanis arcibus Indum.
salue, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
magna uirum: tibi res antiquae laudis et artem
ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis,
Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.

This land can show streams of silver and mines of bronze in its veins and has flowed rich in gold. This land has borne a fierce race of men, the Marsi, the Sabine host, the Ligurian inured to suffering and the Volsci armed with javelins, and the Decii, the Marii and great men such as Camillus, the Scipios tough in war and you, greatest of Caesars, who now already victorious on the farthest shores of Asia diverts the unwarlike Indian from the citadels of Rome. Hail, great mother of crops, land of Saturn, great mother of men: it is for you that I embark on these matters of ancient renown and my art, daring to open up the holy springs, and that I sing the song of Ascra through the towns of Rome.

³² For Benacus and Mantua cf. *Aeneid* 10.205.

The richness of Italy in precious metals has been taken as a disquieting element here, given the traditional association of gold and silver with moral corruption,³³ but is better seen as part of the Golden Age imagery: the landscape yields treasure as easily as it produces the agricultural products listed at 2.143–50. Given the explicit mention of Hesiod which follows at 2.176, it is hard not to see an allusion to Hesiod's myth of the Four Ages (*WD* 106–201), imitated by Aratus (*Phaen.* 114–36), where the decline of the human race from the Golden Age is famously measured through comparison with metals of declining value (silver, bronze, and (in Hesiod) finally iron for the poet's own time). The Vergilian triad of gold, silver, and bronze follows the version of Aratus rather than the tetrad of Hesiod, and appears to be a conscious rejection of the use of metals for a pessimistic rhetoric of decline in his didactic predecessors; the *Georgics* does not present a symbolic descending sequence as an index of human decadence, but rather shows all three metals freely available at once in a period of paradisiacal plenty. This inversion of a famous didactic topic demonstrates the novelty of the *Georgics* as a didactic epic of nationalistic optimism.

This productivity in metals moves in 167–70 to a productivity in men, a topic of the praise of places,³⁴ working through the peoples of Italian history to the climax of the 'greatest of Caesars'.³⁵ As already noted, this capping of the *laudes Italiae* with the dominant and victorious military leader Caesar, balanced against the poet's own creative activity, closely matches the climax of the whole *Georgics* at 4.559–65. Overall, it is the close connection in the *Georgics* between its account of the Italian countryside and its activities, its moral drive towards good citizenship, and its lauding of the preserving political activity of Augustus, which make it a more appropriate poem for its own times than a mythological epic such as the retelling of the Argonaut story by Varro Atacinus or modern versions of the encomiastic epics on the conquests of Alexander, suggested again here by the (hopeful) reference to the defeat of India, an achievement of Alexander here presented as emulated by Caesar.³⁶ The superiority

³³ See Thomas (1988a: 187–8).

³⁴ Menander Rhetor 1.353.5 ff.

³⁵ Here the young Caesar is clearly represented as greater than Julius Caesar, with *maxime* also stressing that he is greater than Pompeius *Magnus* and Alexander too.

³⁶ On the purely diplomatic contacts between Augustus and India see André (1986).

of Italian landscape and fertility to that of the East mirrors the superiority of Caesar's Roman forces to his Eastern opponents,³⁷ but also as at the beginning mirrors the implied superiority of Vergil's Hesiodic didactic epic over Alexander-type epics as a mode of praising Caesar. As 4.176 emphasizes with its reference to Hesiod's birthplace, the physical features of Italy and its agricultural landscape under the tutelage of the victorious Caesar are a sufficiently epic topic in the didactic tradition of Hesiod. Moving beyond the mythological plots of the Argonautic tradition, beyond the dry verse handbooks of Nicander, beyond the frigid panegyrics of the Alexander-poets, the *Georgics* has thus carved out its own place in the epic tradition, combining Hesiodic didactic with the contemporary need for Caesarian encomium.

3. THE PROEM TO *GEORGICS* 3 (3.1–48): THE SEARCH FOR EPIC SPACE

The proem to *Georgics* 3 again raises the issue of the poem's generic status by looking both to past poems of others and to the poet's own future plans.³⁸ 3.1–9, like the *laudes Italiae*, look to locate the *Georgics* within literary tradition:

Te quoque, magna Pales, et te memorande canemus
 pastor ab Amphryso, uos, siluae amnesque Lycaei.
 cetera, quae uacuas tenuissent carmine mentes,
 omnia iam uulgata: quis aut Eurysthea durum
 aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras?
 cui non dictus Hylas puer et Latonia Delos
 Hippodameque umeroque Pelops insignis eburno,
 acer equis? temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim
 tollere humo uictorque uirum uolitare per ora.

You too, great Pales, and you, memorable herdsman from the Amphrysus, we will sing, and you, woods and rivers of Pan. All other topics, which would have occupied idle minds with poetry, are already well known: who does not

³⁷ There is at least implicit 'Orientalism' here—cf. Said (1978).

³⁸ For recent stimulating discussions with good bibl. see Kraggerud (1998) and Nelis (2004).

know of Eurystheus' cruelty, or the altars of unpraised Busiris? Who has not told of the boy Hylas, of Leto's Delos, of Hippodamia and Pelops famed for his ivory shoulder, driving fiercely with his horses? I must try a route to raise me too from the ground and fly victoriously on the lips of men.

Though commentators have looked to non-epic allusions here, especially to Pindar and Callimachus, the lament that contemporary literary space is overoccupied in fact derives from the epic tradition, from Choerilus of Samos, author of a late fifth-century *Persica* which was probably closely related to Herodotus' account of the Persian Wars.³⁹ Only a few fragments are preserved of this poem (*SH* 314–23, Colace 1–9), but they include a prefatory passage which is generally placed at or near the poem's opening⁴⁰ (*SH* 317, Colace 1):

ἄ μάκαρ, ὅστις ἔην κείνον χρόνον ἴδρις ἀοιδῆς,
 Μουσάων θεράπων, ὅτ' ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμών·
 νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται, ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχλαι,
 ὕστατοι ὥστε δρόμον καταλειπόμεθ', οὐδέ πη ἔστι
 πάντη παπταίνοντα νεοζυγὲς ἄρμα πελάσσαι.

Blessed is he who at that time had knowledge of song, a servant of the Muses, when the meadow was still unmown; now when all has been parcelled out, and the arts have come to their end, we are left like the last competitors in a race, and even by peering in every direction it is impossible to bring our new-harnessed chariot near.

This passage (perhaps the first expression in Graeco-Roman literature of the 'anxiety of influence'⁴¹) clearly underlies *Georgics* 3.1–9, though this seems to have remained unnoticed by Vergilian scholars;⁴² the complaint *νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται*, 'now when all has been parcelled out' is directly echoed by *omnia iam vulgata*, and the chariot-image of Choerilus is picked up in the Vergilian *temptanda via est* (3.8) as well as in the picture of the poet as charioteer at 3.17–18. This echo of one fifth-century epic is matched by that of another through the names of Eurystheus and Busiris, which (as has

³⁹ For Choerilus see the edn. of Colace (1979) and Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983: fr.314–32).

⁴⁰ Aristotle cites part of it in his discussion of epideictic proemia (*Rhet.* 3.14.2).

⁴¹ Bloom (1973).

⁴² The brief notice of the parallel at Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983: 148) seems not to have been taken up.

been noted) point to the story of Heracles. Both Heracles' labours under Eurystheus' direction and his killing of Busiris, often presented as amongst the labours, seem to have been narrated in perhaps the most famous of the Heracles epics, the *Heracleia* of Panyassis of Halicarnassus,⁴³ a relative of Herodotus, a poet well enough known at Rome to be included in the selective list of epic writers to be read by the aspirant orator according to Quintilian (10.1.54). Though Parthenius also wrote a *Heracles* of which virtually nothing is known,⁴⁴ and the killing of Busiris by Heracles was the topic of a satyr-play of Euripides (fr.313–15 Nauck)⁴⁵ and part of the story of Busiris (probably without mention of Heracles) was narrated in part in the *Aetia* of Callimachus,⁴⁶ and *inlaudati* must in some sense allude to the famous rhetorical praise of Busiris in Isocrates' extant *Busiris*,⁴⁷ the epic reference to Panyassis seems the most attractive intertext here: as in the *laudes Italiae*, this proem is concerned with finding space for the *Georgics* within traditional epic poetry.

The allusions in lines 6–7 also (I would argue) look primarily to hexameter poetry and to the self-location of the *Georgics* within the epic tradition, though other literary traditions are not excluded, and intra-epic positioning is here combined with the kind of interactive appropriation of other genres familiar from other chapters in this book. The Hylas story featured most famously in literature as a subplot of Apollonius' *Argonautica* (1.1207–39), no doubt echoed in the recent Latin version by Varro Atacinus to which I have suggested allusion in the *laudes Italiae* (see section 2 above); it also occurred in a hexameter epyllion by Theocritus (*Id.* 13) and in Nicander's hexameter metamorphosis poem *Heteroeumena* (fr.48 Schneider), and was soon to be the subject of Propertius 1.20. The story of Leto's connection with Delos is most famously narrated in the hexameter *Hymn* 4 of Callimachus, and may also have been a

⁴³ Matthews (1974: 126–7 and index, 153, s.v. 'Herakles, servitude under Eurystheus'); Livingstone (2001: 78–9).

⁴⁴ Lightfoot (1999: 160–4).

⁴⁵ For a reconstruction of the plot see Livingstone (2001: 80–1).

⁴⁶ Fr.42–4 Pf., clearly picked up at Ovid, *Ars* 1.647–52 (see Hollis, 1977: 135); for the likely omission of Heracles see Pfeiffer on Callimachus fr.44 Pf., Livingstone (2001: 82).

⁴⁷ For Isocrates' *Busiris*, an ironic praise of the villainous king, cf. Livingstone (2001), who at p. 83 n. 224 rightly suggests an allusion to Isocrates here.

topic of Parthenius' lost elegiac *Delos* (fr.10–12 Lightfoot). The story of Pelops' chariot-race to win Hippodamia is featured on the cloak of Jason in Apollonius' *Argonautica* (1.752–8), but had long been established as prime epic material through its inclusion in the *μεγάλαι Ἡοῖαι* of Hesiod (fr.259 M/W). In other genres, the famous narration of the race in Pindar's first *Olympian* as the *aition* of the Olympic chariot-race is specifically echoed in the phrase *umeroque Pelops insignis eburno* (3.7, cf. *Ol.* 1.27, ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον ὄμιον κεκαδμένον), the race was the key event of the lost Oenomaus play of Sophocles (fr.471–7 Radt), and a mention of the race in a speech of Thyestes is one of the few fragments preserved from Ennius' *Thyestes* (fr.291–2 Jocelyn). This generic inclusivity is figured in *cui non dictus*, which suggests that the topics listed here are hackneyed both within the epic field and in the broader field of poetry as a whole.

These lines also retain a strong chronological progression. Beginning with Choerilus and Panyassis from the fifth century, we move through Apollonius and Callimachus in the Hellenistic period into the earliest literature of Rome. Lines 8–9 famously pick up the lines cited from Ennius' supposed self-epitaph by Cicero (*Tusc.* 1.34 = *Varia* 17–18 Vahlen):⁴⁸

nemo me lacrimis decoret, nec funera fletu
faxit. cur? voluto vivus per ora virum.

Let no one honour me with tears, or stage my funeral with weeping. Why? I live on by flying over the lips of men.

The argument is that the new Italian didactic epic of the *Georgics* will move beyond the traditional material of mythological epic of the classical and Hellenistic periods to bring a glory to its poet which will match that of Ennius himself, who brought immortality to Scipio Africanus Maior (in his non-hexameter *Scipio*) and to Fulvius Nobilior (in his hexameter *Annales*) as Vergil hopes to bring glory to the similar great man Caesar/Augustus. The nationalistic and encomiastic epic of the *Georgics* is to be a match for the achievement of Ennius in these fields.

⁴⁸ For the echo cf. e.g. Gale (2000: 14).

In lines 10–39 the poet famously looks forward to a future poem on the glory of Caesar:

primus ego in patriam mecum, modo uita supersit,
 Aonio rediens deducam uertice Musas;
 primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
 et uiridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
 propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
 Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas.
 in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit:
 illi uictor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro
 centum quadriiugos agitabo ad flumina currus.
 cuncta mihi Alpheum linquens lucosque Molochi
 cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caestu.
 ipse caput tonsae foliis ornatus oliuae
 dona feram. iam nunc sollemnis ducere pompas
 ad delubra iuuat caesosque uidere iuuenos,
 uel scaena ut uersis discedat frontibus utque
 purpurea intexti tollant aulaea Britanni.
 in foribus pugnam ex auro solidoque elephanto
 Gangaridum faciam uictorisque arma Quirini,
 atque hic undantem bello magnumque fluentem
 Nilum ac nauali surgentis aere columnas.
 addam urbes Asiae domitas pulsumque Niphaten
 fidentemque fuga Parthum uersisque sagittis;
 et duo rapta manu diuerso ex hoste tropaea
 bisque triumphatas utroque ab litore gentis.
 stabunt et Parii lapides, spirantia signa,
 Assaraci proles demissaeque ab Ioue gentis
 nomina, Trosque parens et Troiae Cynthus auctor.
 Inuidia infelix Furias amnemque seuerum
 Cocyti metuet tortosque Ixionis anguis
 immanemque rotam et non exsuperabile saxum.

I, if only length of life allows, shall be the first to return and bring back with me to my homeland the Muses from the top of the Aonian mountain; I shall be the first to bring Idumean palms of victory to you, Mantua, and to place a marble temple in the green plain near the water, where the mighty Mincius wanders with his slow bends and fringes his banks with soft reed. Caesar will be in the middle for me and occupy the temple; for his honour I, victorious and far-seen in Tyrian purple, will drive a hundred four-horse chariots to the

river. All Greece for me will leave the river Alpheus and the groves of Molorchus and hold contests in running and with the raw boxing-glove. I myself, my head decked with the leaves of the shorn olive, will bring him gifts. Now already it is my joy to lead the ritual processions to the shrines and see the slaughter of steers, or how the stage draws back when the flats are turned and how their woven Britons raise the purple curtains. I will depict on the doors a battle in gold and solid ivory, the war of the sons of Ganges and victorious Quirinus, and here the Nile billowing with war and in magnificent flow, and columns rising in bronze from the ships. I shall add the defeated cities of Asia and the Niphates driven back and the Parthian, trusting in flight and in his arrows fired as he flees, and two trophies taken by the same hand from the most diverse of enemies, and a double triumph over two peoples from opposite shores. There will rise too stones of Parian marble, breathing statues, the issue of Assaracus and the names of a race sprung from Jupiter, our ancestor Tros and Cynthian Apollo, founder of Troy. Unhappy Envy will fear the Furies and the grim river of Cocytus and the twisted snakes of Ixion, the monstrous wheel and the rock that cannot be overcome.

Though much of the language and imagery here is drawn from the Pindaric tradition of epinician and its later incorporation into Callimachean court-poetry,⁴⁹ there seems little doubt that this envisaged poem is to be a military epic on the deeds of Caesar/Augustus (cf. especially 3.46–7, cited below). There seems little doubt too that these lines are written in anticipation of the return and triple triumph of Caesar on 13–15 August 29 BC; the fact that they contain no allusion to the triple triumph but emphatically stress the double nature of Caesar's victory (cf. 32 *duo*, 33 *bis*) confirm that the celebration is expected but that its precise details are as yet unknown to the poet,⁵⁰ and the allusions to Eastern campaigns with their evocations of Alexander (26–31)⁵¹ match very well the other allusions in the *Georgics* to the post-Actium campaigns of 30–29 BC as currently taking place under Caesar's command in the East (2.170–2, 4.560–2).⁵² There is also some suggestion here that the *Georgics* itself foreshadows this poem: the promise that Caesar will be in the middle

⁴⁹ On the Callimachean elements see conveniently Thomas (1988*b*: 37); on the Pindaric elements see Wilkinson (1970).

⁵⁰ Though the allusion to theatre at 3.24 *scaena* may allude to Varius' *Thyestes*, likely to have been performed at the triumph—for the evidence see Hollis (1996: 29).

⁵¹ On Augustus and Alexander see p. 140 above.

⁵² See also Harrison (2005*b*) for a suggestion that the temple described here evokes Augustus' own Mausoleum as a symbol of triumph in the post-Actian period.

of this future encomium is in a sense already met by this praise of Caesar at this central point of the *Georgics*, the 'proem in the middle',⁵³ and the detailed promise of encomium in some sense already executes what it suggests for the future.

How far the poem anticipated in these lines can be realistically mapped on to the future *Aeneid* has been a matter of great scholarly debate, to which little will be added here.⁵⁴ While it is true that the *Aeneid* too has its main representation of Augustus not far from its centre at the end of book 6 (6.791–807), celebrates in book 8 the post-Actium triumph adumbrated in 3.21–33, deals with the issue of the Trojan ancestry of Rome (3.34–6), and has a depiction of the underworld which contains the chthonic elements mentioned at 3.37–9, the promise of a poem centring on the achievements of the great man himself seems to look to a putative *Augusteid* rather than the *Aeneid* we have. Here the panegyric type of epic probably written by such contemporary poets as Varius⁵⁵ seems to be at issue: such a poem is promised but not executed in the *Georgics*, despite the latter's encomiastic elements.

This distinction is clearly made in lines 40–8:

interea Dryadum siluas saltusque sequamur
 intactos, tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa:
 te sine nil altum mens incohat. en age segnis
 rumpe moras; uocat ingenti clamore Cithaeron
 Taygetique canes domitrixque Epidaurus equorum,
 et uox adsensu nemorum ingeminata remugit.
 mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas
 Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos,
 Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.

Meanwhile let us follow the woods of the Dryads and the untouched glades, your difficult request, Maecenas: without you my mind can begin no high enterprise. Come, burst through sluggish delays; Cithaeron calls with its mighty clamour, and the dogs of Taygetus and Epidaurus trainer of horses, and the cry bellows back doubled by the accompaniment of the groves. Yet in

⁵³ Conte (1992).

⁵⁴ See most recently Kraggerud (1998) and Nelis (2004).

⁵⁵ On Varius' likely Augustan epic see (cautiously) Courtney (1993: 275), Hollis (1996: 28). See Ch 6, below for a possible Horatian allusion to this work in *Odes* 1.6 (it ought to be the *forte epos* of Varius mentioned at *Sat.* 1.10.43).

due course I will gird myself to tell of the burning battles of Caesar and carry his name in fame through as many years as Caesar is distant from his origin in Tithonus.

The return to the woods and groves recalls the arboricultural topics of book 2, but also symbolizes the general topic of landscape which the *Georgics* shares with the *Eclogues*; the ‘untouched groves’ also emphasize the originality of Vergil’s poem, suggesting an answer to the similar image from vegetation in Choerilus’ nostalgic view of the literary past, ὄτ’ ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμῶν, ‘when the meadow was still unmown’, though it also picks up Callimachean and Lucretian language;⁵⁶ the Italian landscape and its activities provide sufficient space for novelty in the epic tradition, despite the despair of Choerilus found some four centuries before. Here as elsewhere in the *Georgics* we find a strong sense of impending literary ascent, with the promised military epic looming large. This even leads to distortion in the lines which present the book’s subject: the topic of hunting emphasized here is in fact relatively unimportant in *Georgics* 3, receiving only a short passage on hunting-dogs (3.404–13). It seems to be stressed as an appropriate preparation for martial epic poetry, just as hunting could be stressed as practice for war (Xenophon, *Cyn.* 12.1). This thematic drive upwards within epic is continued in book 4, as we shall shortly see.

4. GEORGICS 4: THE POETICS OF INTRA-EPIC ASCENT

(i) Bees and Mock-Epic

The dedication of the whole of the last book of the *Georgics* to bees comes as a famous surprise within the poem’s didactic subject-matter. Though honey was an important natural product and the only real sweetener available in the Graeco-Roman world, to spend a quarter of a work on the whole of agriculture on the topic of bees has seemed disproportionate, especially by comparison with Varro’s contemporary

⁵⁶ For the details see Thomas (1988*b*: 47–9); Mynors (1990: 186–8).

De Re Rustica (6 per cent on bees, but also put in last position). Interpreters of *Georgics* 4 have therefore tended to suggest symbolic and allegorical meanings behind the dedication of the whole book to bees, whether political (encouraged by the continuous anthropomorphism which compares bees to Romans) or literary (spurred on by the dense literary texture and the traditional association between bees and poetry). This interpretation largely follows the latter path while not ignoring the former, tracing the connection of the bees, the institution of *bougonia* by which they are restored, and the narrative about Aristaeus their restorer with various types of hexameter poetry and their interaction and relative hierarchy. In particular, I will seek to argue that (like the proem to *Georgics* 3) *Georgics* 4 is strongly concerned with the transition and ascent from Hesiodic agricultural didactic epic to Homeric military and political epic.

The opening of the book sets a significant tone (4.1–7):

Protinus aerii mellis caelestia dona
 exsequar: hanc etiam, Maecenas, adspice partem.
 admiranda tibi levium spectacula rerum
 magnanimosque duces totiusque ordine gentis
 mores et studia et populos et proelia dicam.
 in tenui labor; at tenuis non gloria, si quem
 numina laeva sinunt auditque vocatus Apollo.

Forthwith I shall proceed to the celestial gifts of heavenly honey: look on this part, too, Maecenas. I shall tell of sights involving small things which will cause you wonder, of great-hearted leaders and the character of a whole race in due order and their pursuits and their peoples and battles. My labour is on slight material; but the glory is not slight, if a man is allowed by inauspicious powers and Apollo hears him when called.

The treatment of the bees is to be anthropomorphic, unsurprising since the similarity of bee communities to those of humans had been noted by Aristotle and Varro. But the anthropomorphism here takes on a specifically mock-epic aspect: this announcement of the military battles of the bees, as Mynors notes, recalls the material of the hexameter *Battle of Frogs and Mice* (*Batrachomomachia*), in which the warring amphibians and rodents are described like Homeric heroes (cf. *Batr.* 4 δῆρην ἀπειρεσίην, πολεμόκλονον ἔργον Ἄρης, ‘a limitless strife, the work of Ares full of the din of war’). Though

there is some chance that the *Battle of Frogs and Mice* is itself post-Augustan, the existence of a fragmentary *Battle of the Weasel and Mice* in similar para-Homeric style on a papyrus of the second or first century AD shows that such mock-epic was well established in Hellenistic literary tradition.⁵⁷ This link with mock-epic is naturally relevant to the theme of epic ascent, since mock literary battles are a preparation for serious literary battles, and the *Battle of Frogs and Mice* could be cited (along with the post-Vergilian *Culex*, the mock-epic tale of a heroic gnat) as a justificatory parallel for lighter hexameter verse leading to higher epic by Statius in his prefatory epistle to the first book of *Silvae*:

sed et Culicem legimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus, nec quisquam est inlustrium poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissiore praeluserit

but we give recognition to both the *Culex* and the *Battle of Frogs*, and there is no famous poet who has not made some sport before his great works in a more relaxed style.⁵⁸

Georgics 4 is (amongst other things) to be the Vergilian equivalent of the *Battle of Frogs and Mice* in the Homeric poetic career as constructed in Rome, the mock-epic prelude to Vergil's *Iliad*.

The way in which the project of describing the bees is characterized also has a para-epic tone. Scholars have noted the ethnographical elements here too (especially in lines 4–5), but have not noted the echoes of Odysseus, the primal literary ethnographer of the *Odyssey*.⁵⁹ *Od.* 1.3 πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω, 'he saw the cities of many men and got to know their way of thinking', is picked up in the Vergilian *totiusque... gentis / mores et studia et populos... dicam* (compare the Latin paraphrase of the same line at Horace *Ep.* 1.2.19–20 *multorum providus urbis / et mores hominum inspexit*, 'he inspected with his foresight the cities and characters of many men'). The poet of *Georgics* 4 promises to be an Odysseus on a smaller, Callimachean scale (6 *in tenui labor*, using two key

⁵⁷ For the Homeric parodies and their dates see conveniently West (2003a: 229–37), and on the tradition of epic parody in Greek poetry see also Olson and Sens (1999: 5–12).

⁵⁸ For a similar view of the *Culex* as propaedeutic for the *Aeneid* cf. Martial 8.55.19–20.

⁵⁹ Hartog (2001).

Callimachean terms), and it is thus not surprising that an episode from the *Odyssey* provides the outer framework for the concluding Aristaeus episode (see below). The comparison between the didactic poet and Odysseus here suggests that Homeric epic is ultimately in his sights.

Apart from the civil wars of the bees, narrated in strongly anthropomorphic terms which recall the recent civil wars of Rome as well as the *Battle of Frogs and Mice* (4.67–94; cf. also 4.197–218), the tone of mock-epic emerges again most strongly in the famous simile which describes the bees working in the hive (4.170–8):

ac veluti lentis Cyclopes fulmina massis
 cum properant, alii taurinis follibus auras
 accipiunt redduntque, alii stridentia tingunt
 aera lacu; gemit impositis incudibus Aetna;
 illi inter sese magna vi brachia tollunt
 in numerum versantque tenaci forcipe ferrum:
 non aliter, si parva licet componere magnis,
 Cecropias innatus apes amor urget habendi,
 munere quamque suo.

And just as when the Cyclopes haste to make thunderbolts from malleable ore, with some drawing in and expelling the air with bellows of bull-hide, others dipping the screaming bronze in water, and Aetna groans under the burden of their anvils, and they raise their arms in unison with each other with mighty force and turn the iron with hard-gripping tongs—just so, if small things may be compared to great, the innate desire for possession drives on the Cecropian bees, each in its own function.

Though this simile has been most often linked to the description of the workshop of the Cyclopes in Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* (*H.* 3.46–86), it also has affinities with mainline epic tradition (note that the same material is reused almost verbatim in the epic narrative of *Aeneid* 8.449–53); it owes something to a simile in the *Odyssey* describing the blinding of the Cyclops Polyphemus (9.391–2), as well as to the Hesiodic (and non-Homeric) characterization of the Cyclopes as smiths rather than pastoralists (*Theog.* 139).⁶⁰ But the arch 'if small things may be compared to great' enunciates the key literary link here, the humorous mock-epic tradition: the tiny bees

⁶⁰ For the fullest account of the models see Biotti (1994: 157–61).

are compared to the massive Cyclopes just as the mice of the *Battle of Frogs and Mice* are programmatically compared to the giants of the Gigantomachy in their capacity as warriors (*Batr.* 7 γηγενέων ἀνδρῶν μιμούμενοι ἔργα Γιγάντων, ‘imitating the deeds of the giants, men born of the Earth’). Just as this simile anticipates a passage of epic narrative in the *Aeneid*, so it looks forward to intra-generic ascent within hexameter epos from Hesiodic didactic to Homeric martial epic via ‘Homeric’ mock-epic.

This ascent from didactic through mock-epic to martial epic is an intra-generic hierarchy which would be recognizable for a contemporary Roman reader, already aware of the rising literary career in the figures of writers like Ennius.⁶¹ Though Martial (8.55.19–20) seems to suggest that the *Culex* (which like Statius he wrongly believed to be genuinely Vergilian) is a preparation for both the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, this is arguably because the *Culex* explicitly presents itself as a very youthful work from Vergil’s earliest poetic career. But the poem also expresses the future ambitions of its poet for greater things in a way which seems to anticipate the *Aeneid* in particular (*Culex* 8–10):

Posterius graviore sono tibi Musa loquetur
Nostra, dabunt cum securos mihi tempora fructus,
Ut tibi digna tuo poliantur carmina sensu.

later our Muse will speak to you with heavier sound, when the seasons give me their fruits free from care, so that songs worthy of your sensibilities may be polished up.

Graviore sono suggests martial epic, as Statius and Martial clearly took it. Didactic epic provides neither Homeric manner nor Homeric material; mock-epic provides one but not the other, and can be seen as a prelude to supplying both.

(ii) Epic, Epyllion, and Aetiology

‘Homeric’ mock-epic is not the only stage in the ascent from Hesiodic to full Homeric epic to be marked in *Georgics* 4. In the long account of *bougonia* (regeneration of bees through the slaughter of a

⁶¹ See Farrell (2002).

bullock) which forms the climax of the didactic information of the poem (4.281–558), scholars have long acknowledged that the outer frame of the material on Aristaeus, his encounter with his mother Cyrene, and his discovery of the technique of *bougonia* is derived from Homeric epic (see below), while the inner Orpheus narrative (4.453–527) owes much to the short hexameter narrative poem or epyllion, a modern but convenient name for this distinct ancient literary form.⁶² This is very unlikely to be the only major use of this important subgenre (of which only Catullus 64 and the post-Ovidian *Ciris* survive as Latin exemplars) in the *Georgics*; the narrative (without proper names) of Hero and Leander at 3.258–63 is very likely to derive from a Hellenistic epyllion which is the source both of the much later Musaeus' *Hero and Leander* and of Ovid *Heroides* 18 and 19.⁶³ In *Georgics* 4 scholars have rightly pointed to the many links with Catullus 64,⁶⁴ and here too there is a good chance of a lost Hellenistic original, which has been speculatively reconstructed.

This last major section of the poem, then, presents something of a tension between an epic framework and its enclosed epyllion, between two parts of the ancient epic tradition, a tension which itself unfolds against the background of a poem which belongs formally to a third part, Hesiodic didactic. The mythological stories of both Aristaeus and Orpheus present a kind of narrative which differs markedly from the rest of the *Georgics*, though the inclusion of such mythological narrative passages is a Hesiodic feature: the similarly aetiological story of Pandora is found in both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. The aetiological thrust is also hard to disassociate from Callimachean elegy: the story of *bougonia* in 4.281–558 is in many ways an epic adaptation of the kind of Callimachean aetiological narratives which composed the *Aetia*, and there are a number of textual signals of this piece of generic incorporation. First of all, the poet introduces the narrative with a preface which suggests a Callimachean origin for the story (4.285–94):

altius omnem
expediam prima repetens ab origine famam.
nam qua Pellaei gens fortunata Canopi

⁶² On the epyllion form in Latin see Perutelli (1979).

⁶³ See Kenney (1998). ⁶⁴ See Crabbe (1977).

accolit effuso stagnantem flumine Nilum
 et circum pictis vehitur sua rura phaelis,
 quaque pharetratae vicinia Persidis urget,
 et viridem Aegyptum nigra fecundat harena,
 et diversa ruens septem discurrit in ora
 usque coloratis amnis devexus ab Indis,
 omnis in hac certam regio iacit arte salutem.

I shall set out all the tradition, going deeper and deriving it from its earliest source. For where the fortunate people of Macedonian Canopus lives by the Nile as it pools by spreading its stream and travels around its fields in painted boats, and where the river, carried all the way from the dark Indians presses close to the archers of Persia and fertilizes green Egypt with its black sand, and flowing in different directions splits into its seven mouths, the whole land places its safety in this technique.

Fama as often in Vergil suggests a literary source,⁶⁵ and *origine* (picking up Greek *aition*⁶⁶) suggests the particular source of the *Aetia*. This is consistent with the origin here of *bougonia* in Egypt, the location of Callimachus' literary career at Alexandria. This topographical allusion is reinforced by a possible play on *Cyrene mater* (4.321): Cyrene is indeed the mother of Aristaeus in mythology (cf. e.g. Ap.Rh. 2.502–29), but Cyrene is also famously (Pindar, *Pyth.* 3) the homonymous founder of Libyan Cyrene, Callimachus' birthplace and metaphorical mother. Aristaeus' application to his mother Cyrene for help thus figures the poet's likely use of Callimachus here. In the extant fragments of Callimachus knowledge is shown of *bougonia*: bees are described as *βουγένεις*, 'generated from oxen' at fr.383.4 Pf., and Pfeiffer (on fr.471) plausibly suggested that Callimachus narrated the story of Aristaeus in a lost passage which was also used by Apollonius. This material from aetiological elegy would add a further strand to the Homeric, Hesiodic, and neoteric texture here.

The Homeric texture of the frame-narrative of the story of Orpheus (4.315–452), in which Aristaeus, seeking a solution to the problem of regenerating his bees, applies first to his mother Cyrene and then (on her instructions) to the sea-god Proteus, needs little argument here, having been well treated in recent scholarship.⁶⁷ The meeting of the hero with his nymph mother and her sisters reworks

⁶⁵ For the technique see Horsfall (1990).

⁶⁶ See Biotti (1994: 235).

⁶⁷ See esp. Morgan (1999), following Farrell (1991: 238–74).

the encounter of Achilles with Thetis and the Nereids in *Iliad* 18, while his encounter with Proteus looks back to Menelaus' account of his own meeting with the same divinity in *Odyssey* 4. The symbolic and metaliterary nature of these encounters is highly significant: the didactic epic of the *Georgics* is here thematizing its own encounter with and aspiration towards 'full' Homeric epic, and a recent argument that Proteus in particular represents the Ocean-like figure of Homer, the origin of all poetic waters, has a strong attraction in this context.⁶⁸ The figure of Aristaeus is crucial here, as it is he who moves from symbolizing the farmer-hero of the *Georgics* to reworking Homeric heroes (Achilles and Menelaus) in a way which will form a key technique of the *Aeneid*, and which thereby marks an intra-generic ascent towards the *Aeneid*'s literary form of martial epic. That Aristaeus represents the mythical, heroic instantiation of the poem's farmer is made clear in his complaint to Cyrene at 4.326–32:

En etiam hunc ipsum vitae mortalis honorem,
 quem mihi vix frugum et pecudum custodia sollers
 omnia temptanti extuderat, te matre relinquo.
 quin age et ipsa manu felices erue silvas,
 fer stabulis inimicum ignem atque interfice messes,
 ure sata et validam in vites molire bipennem,
 tanta meae si te ceperunt taedia laudis.

Look, though you are my mother, I am even abandoning this very honourable form of mortal life, which my skilled guardianship of crops and herds had fashioned for me with such difficulty as I tried every stratagem. Come then, and with your own hand uproot my fertile forests, carry hostile fire to the folds and kill off my crops, burn what I have sown and wield a mighty axe against my vines, if you have now become so tired of the idea of my winning renown.

Here, as has been well noted, the mention of crops, trees, and herds looks back to the subject-matter of books 1, 2, and 3, with verbal echoes of the relevant parts of the poem:⁶⁹ like a climactic Platonic fictional narrative such as the Myth of Er in the *Republic*,⁷⁰ Aristaeus' problem

⁶⁸ Morgan (1999).

⁶⁹ See Thomas (1988b: 205), following Conte (1986: 130–40); for a similar miniaturization of the topics of the poem see p. 143 above.

⁷⁰ On the function of that passage see e.g. Rutherford (1995: 215). For the link between *Georgics* 4 and Platonic myth see Conte (2002: 69–70).

plays out on the mythical level the problem of the individual faced with events beyond his control, both for the Italian farmer whose enterprise does not flourish despite his best efforts owing to natural calamity, and the Roman citizen whose good intentions of civic teamwork and unity are overtaken by the eruption of the national calamity of civil war. It also plays out the problem of the Roman poet for whom an Italian didactic epic is no longer sufficient for either poetic ambition or political affiliation: as stressed in the proem to *Georgics* 3 (see section 3 above), military epic connected with contemporary events is the natural next stage on both fronts, and the appropriation of Homeric discourse in the frame of the Aristaeus episode is the next step in literary terms, just as Aristaeus symbolizes both the poet's ambitions for Caesarian encomium and the figure of Caesar/Augustus himself, as we shall shortly see.

(iii) Poetics, Politics, and Panegyric

The inserted epyllion in the *bougonia* episode, narrated by Proteus, famously explains that Aristaeus can regenerate his bees only after he atones for the death of Eurydice and the consequent end of Orpheus (4.453–527). That the achievements of Aristaeus, with his violent but successful technique of regenerating the bee-state, explicitly compared with Rome, resembles the contemporary achievements of Caesar/Augustus in recreating the Roman state after the violent civil wars, has been several times suggested by scholars.⁷¹ The parallels between the two figures can be taken further: both have a divine parent, and both can hope for apotheosis as a result of their labours on earth.⁷² The conclusion on the metaliterary level could even be that the ultimate victory of Aristaeus, whose narrative is framed in such strongly Homeric terms, looks forward to the future triumph of both martial epic and Augustan politics, combined in the form and content of the *Aeneid*, a development already anticipated (as we have seen) at the beginning of *Georgics* 3; the ultimate defeat of Orpheus, on the other hand, would represent the demise of a past literary form

⁷¹ See the material collected by Hardie (1998: 48 n. 88), and the nuanced version of this argument in Morgan (1999).

⁷² For full allegory see Nadeau (1984); Lee (1996).

and of another way of viewing the world in post-Actium Rome, though it may be going too far to compare him to Antony, who arguably sealed his own fate by an uxoriousness towards Cleopatra comparable to that of Orpheus towards Eurydice.⁷³ Given that the Orpheus section of the Aristaeus episode is strongly neoteric in flavour, it is tempting to assume that Orpheus represents the neoteric poetry with which the *Eclogues* is suffused and which the Vergilian poetic and ideological career has now transcended. It would have been especially tempting to take Orpheus as symbolizing Gallus,⁷⁴ a poet who did perish tragically under pressure from Caesar/Augustus, and who seems certainly to have written some hexameter works of a neoteric cast as well as the love-poetry echoed in *Eclogue* 10,⁷⁵ were it not for severe problems of chronology. All the extant evidence suggests that Gallus' disgrace and suicide cannot be earlier than 27 BC and is usually dated to 26,⁷⁶ and the *Georgics* (I have argued) emerges soon before the celebration of the triple triumph of Augustus in August 29 BC.⁷⁷

One way of interpreting the metaliterary significance of Aristaeus and Orpheus is to view them as representing different parts of Vergil's own poetic career. Orpheus, given the strongly neoteric style of his story and its concerns with poetry and passion as the highest values, looks back to the topics and atmosphere of the *Eclogues* and to the neoteric generation from which that poetry-book draws its colour; some of the themes of his story reappear in the *Aeneid*, but are there reprocessed for an epic and nationalistic context. To take one example, Orpheus' descent to the underworld is famously replayed in *Aeneid* 6, with considerable verbal parallels;⁷⁸ but the context of the katabasis is ideologically transformed, with successful nationalistic

⁷³ Nadeau (1984). ⁷⁴ As argued e.g. by Haarhoff (1960).

⁷⁵ See Ch. 2 above, p. 56.

⁷⁶ Dio 53.23.4–7 dates the downfall to 26; Syme (1986: 32) argues for 27 (with further bibliography).

⁷⁷ The ingenious solution, most recently argued by Jacobson (1984), of viewing the Aristaeus material as a later addition inserted in memory of Gallus I find ultimately unconvincing, as with the old story of the excision of the *laudes Galli* in book 4 (on which see the literature gathered by Hardie (1998: 45)).

⁷⁸ For some close parallels see Setaioli (1969) and (1970: 53–82), though he argues that the *Aeneid* passage antedates that in the *Georgics*, supporting a post-Gallus rewriting of *Georgics* 4—see previous note.

and pious enterprise replacing failed and sentimental self-indulgence. It is not Orpheus but Aristaeus, with his Homeric framing and the emphasis on labour, divine favour, and the achievement of goals even at the expense of innocent parties, who looks forward to the Aeneas of the *Aeneid*, another hero who achieves the recreation of a defunct state through heroic obedience to the gods and the support of a divine mother.⁷⁹

This poetic parallel (crucially) has political consequences. The honouring of the tough and active achiever as against the passionate and leisured poet looks firmly to the contemporary contrast which is articulated in the closing lines of the *Georgics*, already cited in section 2 above (4.559–66):

Haec super arborum cultu pecorumque canebam
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentes
per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.
Illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

This was my song on the care of fields, flocks and trees, while great Caesar thunders at the Euphrates in war, and grants laws as victor to willing peoples, and tries his way to Olympus. At that time sweet Naples nourished me, Vergil, as I flourished in the pursuits of ignoble leisure, I who played with the songs of herdsmen and bold in youth sang of you, Tityrus, under the shade of the spreading beech.

Here the effect of citing the first line of the *Eclogues* at the end of the *Georgics* seems to be that of ending a phase in the Vergilian poetic career,⁸⁰ and in the teleological transition of the *Georgics* towards military epic which this chapter has sketched, the target of poetic ascent and the theme of a full ‘Homeric’ epic is strongly present in the mighty military achievements of Caesar/Augustus.

It could be suggested that the juxtaposition of poet and war-leader creates a conscious distancing effect: as in love-elegy, the poet may

⁷⁹ For specific anticipations of the *Aeneid* in the Aristaeus story see Nadeau (1984: 59–72).

⁸⁰ For a different view see Theodorakopoulos (1997: 161); on the Vergilian poetic career see again Farrell (2002).

have adopted a life of quietistic *otium* which contrasts rather than colludes with the nationalism of war and politics. Commentators have suggested at least some ambiguity here, if not a standoffishness. But the explicit use of the Callimachean metapoetical discourse which has been so central to both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* points decidedly the other way: set within the context of the *Georgics*' drive to martial epic, the poet's inadequacy is a spur for the future and not a statement of incapacity. The greatness of Caesar by the Euphrates recalls the 'great stream' of the Euphrates at the end of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*,⁸¹ symbolic of epic, and the thundering of the great man not only suggests his future apotheosis by evoking an attribute of Jupiter but also looks to the literary 'thundering' of epic, rejected by Callimachus in a passage plainly echoed here,⁸² *Aetia* fr.1.20 Pf. βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ Διός, 'it is not my part to thunder, but that of Zeus.' Epic thundering will follow to match the thunderbolts of Caesar/Augustus.

As Richard Thomas put it, though in an article which made no mention of this ending of *Georgics* 4, we have moved 'from *recusatio* to commitment'.⁸³ The Callimachean rejection of large-scale epic, backed by the programmatic opening of *Eclogue* 6 in the first Vergilian poetry-book, is now inverted at the end of his second major work; the youthful boldness and play of the *Eclogues* and the poet's current poetics of 'ignoble leisure' are to be discarded, and a line is to be drawn under the poet's early work. In effect, the poet has completed a double ascent. He has moved through the hierarchy of hexameter genres from 'frivolous' pastoral through Hesiodic didactic and mock-Homerism to the brink of momentous martial epic to match the martial deeds of Caesar/Augustus. The picture of Caesar/Augustus heading for greatness and immortality through military victory suggests that the poet can head there too through military and nationalistic epic once he has relinquished the baggage of his previous poetic career and its non-epic and non-nationalistic profile. As the proem to *Georgics* 3 so forcefully argued, poetic triumph can match military triumph through the centrality of encomium of the great man.

⁸¹ Cf. Thomas and Scodel (1984); Jenkyns (1993).

⁸² Thomas (1988b: 240).

⁸³ Thomas (1985).

Lyric Flexibility: Literary Form in Horace's *Odes*

1. THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE LYRIC FRAMEWORK

The *Odes* of Horace, of which books 1–3 were published together in about 23 BC, with book 4 emerging a decade later in about 13,¹ stake a firm claim to belong to the ancient genre of lyric poetry, through all three categories of generic indicators proposed in Chapter 1—formal repertoire, thematic repertoire, and metageneric signals. Formally, their use of Greek archaic lyric metres, many of which may appear in the *Odes* for the first time in Latin, is ostentatious and striking;² thematically, their use of archaic lyric patterns and other conventions is frequent and consistent; and metagenERICALLY, their allusions to archaic lyric poets as models and to lyric (pseudo-)performance point strongly to an identity as lyric poetry in terms of Alexandrian generic classification.³ However, the category ‘lyric’ in antiquity is not commensurate with the category of the same name in modern European literatures, as Richard Heinze pointed out long ago,⁴ and the assumption that this was so vitiated much nineteenth-century work on Horace. Modern scholars are aware that the lyric genre in

¹ For the most recent discussion see Hutchinson (2002), who suggests separate earlier publication of books 1, 2, and 3 and then of the three together in 23 (certainly not impossible).

² Note especially the celebrated use of nine consecutive different metres (matching the traditional canonical number of Greek lyric poets) in the ‘Parade Odes’ of *Odes* 1.1–9.

³ See most helpfully Feeney (1993).

⁴ Heinze (1923).

antiquity provided a literary category which was both broader and more flexible than its modern counterpart. W. R. Johnson has also rightly pointed to an 'absence of ancient lyric theory',⁵ other than the use of standard lyric metres and of basic literary conventions, though as we have seen in Chapter 1 prescriptions for many other genres are equally vague. This theoretical vacuum left the Roman lyric collection very considerable room for manoeuvre, and we will see that the *Odes* exploit this to the full.

This flexibility of lyric form is a historical development in antiquity, and here there is a conceptual gap as well as chronological distance between archaic Greek lyric poetry and its Roman counterpart in Horace's *Odes*. Lyric poems in the archaic Greek period were linked to and performed in particular religious and social contexts, such as hymns at festivals and public gatherings and sympotic poetry at private gatherings, but became detached from their original function and context over time as the institutions of Greek society changed. By the Hellenistic period, when the poems of the lyric poets were gathered by scholars into collections, the different categories of lyric were purely literary rather than reflecting any social function of poetry, although they were maintained in the classification of different lyric books, such as the extant books of Pindaric epinicians. In the Roman period, the collection of Catullus, whether or not the extant collection is in a form assembled by the poet himself, shows that different kinds of lyric, such as love-poetry, epithalamia, and hymns, could be juxtaposed in the output of the same poet, and the *Odes* follow in this tradition. But flexibility of form means more than the capacity to combine different kinds of lyric in the same collection.

The relative absence of prescribed content in ancient lyric is crucial in another way for an appreciation of the literary form of Horace's *Odes*, since it allows for particularly wide generic appropriation and enrichment. These encounters with non-lyric literary traditions provide a vital infusion of new material into lyric, and firmly establish the genre at Rome where there is little previous evidence of its importance, apart from the excursions of Catullus. Here once again the influence of Callimachus is important both for similarities and for differences: the lyric poems of Callimachus, preserved for us in

⁵ Johnson (1982: 76–95) and Färber (1936).

fr.226–9 Pf., include a symposiatic lyric (fr.227) and a lyric description of the apotheosis of Arsinoe II (fr.228), both themes which will find parallels in Horace's *Odes*,⁶ and show that lyric formed part of Callimachean generic diversity and could be included in learned Hellenistic book-poetry. Conversely, Callimachus' apparent use of repetitive stichic metres shows that the Horatian collection returns metrically to the archaic rather than the Hellenistic period in its use of stanzaic form.⁷ The Horatian Callimacheanism which I have identified in the *Satires* and *Epodes* continues in the *Odes*, but largely in the matter of aesthetics rather than literary form, in the general preference for tight and polished literary structure.

In what follows I will trace some representative examples of generic interaction in the *Odes*, showing how 'guest' modes are skilfully incorporated into the 'host' genre to produce an enriched and extended lyric tradition.⁸

2. EPIC AND LYRIC: *ODES* 1.6

The opening of this poem to Augustus' trusted chief general, prominently placed in the programmatic introductory sequence of the 'parade odes', is cast as a form of the complimentary *recusatio* or generic disavowal found so convenient by poets in the Augustan period (1–12):⁹

Scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
uictor, Maeonii carminis alite,
quam rem cumque ferox nauibus aut equis
miles te duce gesserit.

⁶ For Augustan apotheosis in the *Odes* cf. 1.2, 1.12, and 3.4.

⁷ The only line preserved of fr.226 is a Phalaecian hendecasyllable (cf. Catullus); fr.227 uses a stichic iambic dimeter and ithyphallic line, fr.228 a stichic Archebulean line, fr.229 a stichic choriambic pentameter. Fr.226 may have come from an epodic poem, but there is no sign here of the complex stanzas of archaic lyric revived in Horace's *Odes*.

⁸ In what follows I owe most to Nisbet and Hubbard (1970); Davis (1991); Lowrie (1997).

⁹ On the *recusatio* see esp. Wimmel (1960: 187–92 and 271–5), Davis (1991: 11–77), and Ch. 1, s. 5, above.

nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec grauem
 Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii,
 nec cursus duplicis per mare Vlixei
 nec saeuam Pelopis domum
 conamur, tenues grandia, dum pudor
 inbellisque lyrae Musa potens uetat
 laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
 culpa deterere ingeni.

You will be written up as a mighty hero and victor over your enemies by Varius, the winged one of Homeric song, telling of all the deeds our fierce soldiery have accomplished under your leadership, whether on horseback or in ships. But I, Agrippa, do not attempt to speak of this or of the bile of Achilles who knew not how to yield, nor of the traversing of the sea by double-dealing Odysseus, nor of the vicious house of Pelops, too large for my slenderness, as long as my sense of shame and the powerful Muse of my unwarlike lyre forbids me to wear away at the praises of great Caesar and of yourself through my faulty lack of talent.

Here a notional epic on Agrippa is declined by Horace and passed on to Varius, claimed to be much better at this type of writing; but this poem and its possible form play a more than fleeting role in the ode. As commentators have noted, the ode is saturated with Homeric allusion, but Homeric allusion of a somewhat ironic and refracted kind:¹⁰ the obdurate Achilles and duplicitous Odysseus here, clearly deriving from critically moralizing treatments of Homer,¹¹ imply that Horace would not treat these figures with sufficient deference and dignity. This view is continued in the penultimate stanza (13–16), which ironically doubts that any poet can match Homeric epic:

quis Martem tunica tectum adamantina
 digne scripserit aut pulvere Troico
 nigrum Merionen aut ope Palladia
 Tydiden superis parem?

Who could write worthily of Mars, protected by his tunic of adamant, or Meriones, black with the dust of Troy, or Diomedes, equal to the gods through the power of Pallas Athene?

¹⁰ See esp. Ahern (1986).

¹¹ Further used in the more overtly ethical context of *Epistles* 1.2.6–22.

These pictures (all taken from the fifth book of the *Iliad*, though with some distortion¹²) of the extravagantly protected Mars who is none the less wounded, the filthy Meriones, and Diomedes whose deeds are accomplished through the aid of a female goddess hardly present the highest ideal of martial courage, and suggest that Horatian lyric form is not adequate for the dignity of epic material.

The Homeric details of this stanza strongly suggest allusion of an ironic kind to Varius' Homericizing verse (cf. 2 *Maeonii carminis alite*). The question of *quis* suggests 'who could write properly [i.e. in epic] about these grand topics I am debunking as too solemn for lyric?', with the strong emphasis on *digne*, suggesting literary appropriateness and generic decorum;¹³ the answer implied is 'Varius'.¹⁴ Varius is likely to have been the author of a poem in praise of Caesar/Augustus to which another passage of Horace may make allusion,¹⁵ and in this poem line 11 *laudes egregii Caesaris* may refer to the poem's likely title of *Laudes Caesaris*, while line 1 *fortis* may recall Varius' reputation at *Satires* 1.10.43 as a writer of *forte epos*, quite possibly already an allusion to his poem on Caesar. An allusion to Varius' encomium of the *princeps* here makes good sense of line 11: *laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas* becomes pointed if the putative *Laudes Caesaris* is in question here. If Agrippa is being honoured through a reference to Varius' poem in which he played a subordinate part,¹⁶ the suggestion may be being made that Varius, having honoured Agrippa by inclusion in his poem on Caesar, should go further and devote a whole poem to Caesar's deputy. It is even possible that the kind of detailed Homeric allusion to *Iliad* 5 found in lines 13–16 may have played a part in Varius' poem. It is not inconceivable that Agrippa may have been compared in it to a specific Homeric hero such as Diomedes; Diomedes would be an appropriate analogue for the historical role of Agrippa as a tough fighter who can be a reliable subordinate,¹⁷ but all must be speculation here.

¹² On the un-Homeric elements here cf. Ahern (1986).

¹³ On *dignus* of literary decorum cf. Brink (1971: 247).

¹⁴ This is controversial: see the discussion in Ahern (1986: 311–12).

¹⁵ On this likely poem see Ch. 5 n. 55 above.

¹⁶ Compare Propertius 2.1.25–6, where Propertius suggests that his addressee Maecenas will be a secondary object of encomium in a poem on Caesar.

¹⁷ See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 80).

The key point here from the perspective of generic enrichment is that the Homeric parody of lines 13–16 and its likely allusion to Varius' epic writing allows incorporation of the epic mode, albeit briefly and ironically, within the literary texture of Horace's lyric collection. The Callimachean world of the *Odes* can accept epic only in a suitably modified form.¹⁸ The last stanza (17–20) follows this with a further incorporation from another genre as part of Horace's anti-epic self-positioning here (17–20):

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

I sing at leisure of symposia, of the battles of fierce girls, their nails cut to fight young men, or of my own burnings, no more frivolous than normal.

Convivia suggests the characteristic activity of youth, but also symposiastic poetry, characteristic of Alcaean lyric in Horace's view. Compare *Odes* 1.32.9–10:

Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
Semper haerentem puerum canebat

He (Alcaeus) used to sing of Bacchus and the Muses, and Venus and the boy who always clings to her.

The Horatian claim to have his own epic wars in the battles of love, inverting in many details the Homeric account of war in the preceding stanzas,¹⁹ again points to love as a characteristic feature of Alcaean lyric, but the idea of love as war (*militia amoris*) is a characteristic trope of another genre of contemporary Roman importance, love-elegy.²⁰ The detailed contrast between the poet as the leisured participant and observer of erotic battles and the real action of military conquest is a particular form of this trope, which is a distinguishing mark of elegiac discourse and seems likely to go back to Gallus.²¹ The key passage is Propertius 3.5.1–2, which opens a poem in which

¹⁸ On Callimacheanism in 1.6 see Ahern (1986: 313–14).

¹⁹ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 88–90).

²⁰ See Murgatroyd (1975) for a convenient treatment.

²¹ See Hinds (1983).

the lover's erotic battles are similarly contrasted with real military campaigning:

Pacis Amor deus est, pacem veneramur amantes:
stant mihi cum domina proelia dura mea.

Love is a god of peace, and peace is worshipped by us lovers; I have constant tough battles with my mistress.

The expressed poetic preference for the *militia amoris* over real *militia*, a convention so strongly associated with Roman love-elegy, thus points to the presence of a further genre within this Horatian lyric poem: the metageneric argument seems to be that Horatian lyric is more like love-elegy than encomiastic epic. In this poem epic material is given a larger space than it need have occupied; the poet could have dismissed it quickly, and concentrated on his own more 'frivolous' material. Instead of this, epic elements are given an extended satirical treatment in the central three stanzas and then transformed into the world of symposiastic lyric and even love-elegy in the last stanza; battles can be appropriate for Horatian lyric if defused and treated in a suitably frivolous, erotic, and ironic way.

3. ELEGIAC AND LYRIC LOVE: *ODES* 1.33

Odes 1.33 (like *Epistles* 1.4) is addressed to an elegiac poet Albius, who is surely Albius Tibullus.²² Here we can see a direct confrontation between Horatian lyric and the important contemporary genre of love-elegy; this leads not just to generic disavowal, the statement of difference between the two genres,²³ but also to the enriching incorporation of elegiac themes and conventions into Horace's lyric collection.²⁴ The poem's first stanza encapsulates some of the central themes of the love-elegy of Tibullus and Propertius—the 'sweet' but cruel *puella* with the appropriately sugary name 'Glycera', the endless

²² Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 368) make a conclusive case.

²³ Davis (1991: 39–43).

²⁴ It is also possible that Horace is recognizing Tibullus' own tendencies towards generic enrichment: cf. the material gathered in Maltby (2003: 55–66).

lamentation of the suffering lover-poet, his complaints about the greater success of rivals (1–4):²⁵

Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor
inmitis Glycerae neu miserabilis
decantes elegos, cur tibi iunior
laesa praeniteat fide.

Albius, do not grieve excessively, thinking of your harsh Glycera, and do not sing to the end your elegies full of lamentation, saying why a younger man is more attractive and fidelity is broken.

Elegy is seen here as the poetics of excess—excessive emotion and lamentation, alluding to the traditional origin of elegy in lament for the dead²⁶—to be contrasted with the more moderate and balanced approach to erotic passion (and life in general) which is characteristic of Horatian lyric.²⁷ There is also some literary criticism of a more concrete kind: in this elegantly compressed poem of epigrammatic length the lyric poet rebukes the elegist for going on too long in his songs (*decantes*),²⁸ perhaps a hint at the length of the poems in the recently published Tibullus 1.²⁹ In the two central stanzas the poem lays out the irrational ways of love, against which elegy so pointlessly protests (5–12):

insignem tenui fronte Lycorida
Cyri torret amor, Cyrus in asperam
declinat Pholoen: sed prius Apulis
iungentur capreae lupis
quam turpi Pholoe peccet adultero.
Sic uisum Veneri, cui placet imparis
formas atque animos sub iuga aenea
saeuo mittere cum ioco.

Passion for Cyrus consumes Lycoris, outstanding for her small forehead, Cyrus inclines to tough Pholoe; but she-goats will mate with Apulian wolves

²⁵ For all these details see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 371–2).

²⁶ See Horace, *Ars Poetica* 75 with Brink (1971: 165–6). For lamentation as an original function of archaic Greek elegy cf. Alexiou (2002: 104–6); West (1974: 4–5).

²⁷ See esp. Lyne (1980: 201–38).

²⁸ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 371).

²⁹ On the date of Tibullus 1, about 26 BC, see Murgatroyd (1980: 11–12). The ten poems of Tibullus 1 contain 810 lines, an average length of 81 lines, more than twice the average length of the twenty or so poems in the 690 lines of Propertius 1.

before Pholoe will err for a shameful adulterer. This is the decision of Venus, whose pleasure is to put ill-matched bodies and minds under the brazen yoke, in her cruel joking.

The poem's advocacy of a realistic, even fatalistic approach, implying that lovers (even elegiac lovers³⁰) must simply endure the passions the gods send them rather than indulging in elegiac complaint, is reinforced by the last stanza (13–16):

ipsum me melior cum peteret Venus,
grata detinuit compede Myrtale
libertina, fretis acrior Hadriae
curuantis Calabros sinus.

When I myself was the object of a better love, Myrtale kept me prisoner with her sweet fetters, a freedwoman, fiercer than the waters of the Adriatic which curve out the bays of Calabria.

Here elegiac themes are once more incorporated, this time not with openly satirical comment but cleverly undermined by literal application. The irrational metaphorical servitude to love (*servitium amoris*) so famously proclaimed by the elegists³¹ is here wittily applied to erotic servitude to a bad-tempered freedwoman who has herself been a slave in the literal sense.³² The lyric acceptance of the lowly, bad-tempered Myrtale is a realistic, debunking reaction to the angst-ridden elegiac protest against the poor behaviour of the idealized *puellae* of elegy with which the poem began, and this realistic acceptance of a partner who is bad-tempered is a feature of Horatian love-lyric elsewhere.³³ Again the lyric emphasis is on measured and philosophical acceptance of one's erotic lot as it is, rather than on the grand passions and endless complaints of elegiac discourse; the tropes of Tibullan elegy are incorporated into Horatian erotic lyric and enrich its literary texture, but are modified in turn to fit its more measured and ironic ideology.

³⁰ This is surely the point of using the name Lycoris, celebrated as Gallus' pseudonym for his mistress Volumnia Cytheris in his elegies—cf. Gallus fr.2.1 Courtney; on the echo see further Davis (1991: 39–41).

³¹ Cf. Lyne (1979); Murgatroyd (1981).

³² I disagree here with Davis (1991: 42–3), who reads the last stanza as referring to previous Horatian behaviour as a conventional elegiac lover, an immature period now past.

³³ e.g. *Odes* 3.9.22–4.

4. EPIGRAMMATIC TRACES: *ODES* 1.28, 2.13, 2.5

The influence of Greek epigram on Horace's *Odes* has long been recognized, though it is perhaps underestimated in modern scholarship.³⁴ The brevity, elegance, and compression of the epigram form, as well as its considerable range of topics, provided an attractive resource for Horatian remodelling of the stylistically ampler tradition of Greek archaic lyric on Callimachean aesthetic principles. The sample considerations of links with epigram which follow highlight an important source of generic interaction in Horace's *Odes* which is a crucial determinant of their literary form.

The metre of *Odes* 1.28, hexameters alternating with dactylic tetrameters in the epodic pattern known as the First Archilochian, is as near as possible to the elegiac couplet (the normal form for sepulchral epigram in antiquity) while still retaining a lyric metre.³⁵ This metrical affinity is reinforced by the overall frame of the poem, which begins, again in the best tradition of sepulchral epigram, by addressing a famous dead person.³⁶ This address is contained in three couplets which would themselves make a detachable elegiac epitaph,³⁷ especially as this section of the poem is rounded off with the paradoxical epigrammatic conceit of the spatial constraint in the grave of the indefatigable mapper of the world (1–6),³⁸ one of many topics from sepulchral epigram in the poem:³⁹

Te maris et terrae numeroque carentis harenae
 mensorem cohibent, Archyta,
 pulueris exigui prope litus parua Matinum
 munera nec quicquam tibi prodest

³⁴ It is mentioned but downplayed by Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: p. xiv), but the main body of their commentary recognizes many epigrammatic models; see their index s.v. 'epigrams', p. 437.

³⁵ For some recent brief observations on the epigrammatic affinities of this poem see now Thomas (2004).

³⁶ Cf. e.g. *AP* 7.8 (Orpheus), 7.12 (Erinna), 7.21, 7.36 (Sophocles), 7.27, 7.29, 7.31 (Anacreon).

³⁷ For six-line sepulchral epigrams on famous people cf. *AP* 7.5, 7.12, 7.21, 7.23, 7.29, etc.

³⁸ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 322).

³⁹ Conveniently summarized by Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 318).

aeris temptasse domos animoque rotundum
percurrisset polum morituro.

You, the measurer of the sea, the land, and of sands without number, Archytas, are contained by the small gift of a little dust by the Matine shore, and your attempt to traverse the dwellings of heaven and the round firmament with your mortal mind gives you no profit.

This is not the only point at which the poem appears to be a series of epigrams sutured together in lyric in both formal and thematic terms. The fifth stanza too seems strongly closural (17–20):

dant alios Furiae torvo spectacula Marti;
exitio est avidum mare nautis;
mixta senum ac iuvenum densentur funera; nullum
saeva caput Proserpina fugit.

Others are presented by the Furies as a spectacle to grim Mars; the greedy sea is the death of sailors; the deaths of old and young man are packed together; savage Proserpina leaves no head untouched.

The idea in 19–20 that death takes all commonly appears at the end of sepulchral epigrams,⁴⁰ and the poem has by now reached the length of the longest sepulchral epigram to be found in the seventh book of the *Greek Anthology*, the twenty lines dedicated by Meleager to his fellow poet Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 7.428). The poem really ought to be complete.

This makes all the more striking the famous shock felt by readers at the beginning of the sixth stanza.⁴¹ The speaker of the poem, who up to now has looked like a traditional sepulchral epigrammatist addressing the dead person, turns out to be dead himself, thereby echoing the other main situation of address to be found in sepulchral epigram where the dead person speaks from the tomb to the anonymous passer-by, especially common as here in the case of a drowned person (21–5):⁴²

⁴⁰ Cf. *AP* 7.335.6, 342.2, 452.2, 477.3–4, 545.4, 732.4.

⁴¹ It seems uncoincidental that this crucial and dramatic turn happens in the central stanzas of the poem, where it achieves most effect. For central turns in Horace's *Odes* see Harrison (2004*b*), with which some material from the next two pages is shared.

⁴² Cf. *AP* 7.264–8, 7.273, 7.278–9, Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 319).

me quoque devexi rapidus comes Orionis
 Illyricis Notus obruit undis
 at tu, nauta, vagae ne parce malignus harenae
 ossibus et capiti inhumato
 particulam dare...

I too was overwhelmed by the south wind, the swift companion of the setting of Orion, in the waves of Illyria; but you, sailor, do not be ungenerous in refraining from giving my bones and unburied head a particle of shifting sand.

The combined deployment of epigrammatic topics and forms makes this an extraordinary lyric poem with several dramatic false closures, and allows some insight into the ways in which generic interaction with epigram aided the Horatian project of the modernizing and transformation of archaic Greek lyric for a post-Hellenistic Roman readership.

Similar effects are achieved in *Odes* 2.13. There in the first five stanzas the poet addresses the fatal tree which nearly killed him, and appears to round off with the appropriate moral that man cannot guard against sudden death (1–20):

Ille et nefasto te posuit die,
 quicumque primum, et sacrilega manu
 produxit, arbos, in nepotum
 perniciem opprobriumque pagi;
 illum et parentis crediderim sui
 fregisse ceruicem et penetralia
 sparsisse nocturno cruore
 hospitis, ille uenena Colcha
 et quidquid usquam concipitur nefas
 tractauit, agro qui statuit meo
 te, triste lignum, te, caducum
 in domini caput inmerentis.
 quid quisque uitet, nunquam homini satis
 cautum est in horas: nauita Bosphorum
 Poenus perhorrescit neque ultra
 caeca timet aliunde fata,
 miles sagittas et celerem fugam
 Parthi, catenas Parthus et Italum
 robur; sed inprouisa leti
 uis rapuit rapietque gentis.

He, whoever it was, who first planted you, did so on an unlucky day and cultivated you with a sacrilegious hand, as a source of destruction for his grandchildren and as a disgrace for the village; him I would believe to have broken his father's neck and to have splashed his inner rooms with the night-time blood of a guest, he made use of Colchian poisons and all possible wickednesses, he who set you up, terrible trunk, to fall on the head of your undeserving owner. No man takes sufficient care from hour to hour of what each should avoid; the Phoenician sailor shudders at the Bosphorus but does not fear further fatal dangers from any other source, while the Roman soldier fears the arrows and the swift flight of the Parthian, the Parthian chains, and the strength of Italy, but the unforeseen force of death has overtaken and will overtake all peoples.

These opening stanzas look back to two types of Greek epigram: the dedicatory epigram written to mark an escape from the fall of a potentially lethal object⁴³ and (once again) the sepulchral epigram, to which (as in 1.28) the apparently concluding moralizing about the universal and sudden rapacity of death plainly looks back.⁴⁴ Poetic closure seems accomplished at line 20, especially with the generalizing force of *gentis*;⁴⁵ once more we seem to have a complete epigram in the formal frame of lyric at the maximum length of twenty lines. But the poem closes with an equally long second half, the poet's famous account of the underworld and the ghosts of Sappho and Alcaeus (2.13.21–40):

quam paene furuae regna Proserpinae
 et iudicantem uidimus Aeacum
 sedesque discriptas piorum et
 Aeoliis fidibus querentem
 Sappho puellis de popularibus
 et te sonantem plenius aureo,
 Alcaeae, plectro dura nauis,
 dura fugae mala, dura belli.
 utrumque sacro digna silentio
 mirantur umbrae dicere, sed magis
 pugnans et exactos tyrannos
 densum umeris bibit aure uolgus.

⁴³ As Nisbet and Hubbard (1978: 202) point out, citing Bianor, *AP* 9.259.

⁴⁴ See the references cited in n. 40 above. This connection is not noted by commentators.

⁴⁵ On clausal generalization in classical texts see Fowler (2000: 265–7).

quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens
 demittit atras belua centiceps
 auris et intorti capillis
 Eumenidum recreantur angues?
 quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens
 dulci laborum decipitur sono
 nec curat Orion leones
 aut timidos agitare lyncas.

How nearly I saw the kingdom of dusky Persephone and Aeacus making his judgments and the ordered seats of the blest, and Sappho, lamenting the girls of her people on the Aeolian lyre, and you, Alcaeus, making a fuller sound with golden plectrum about the harsh sufferings of sailing, exile and war. The shades marvel at the poetry of both, worthy of holy silence, but the ears of the masses, standing shoulder to shoulder, drink in more greedily themes of battles and the expulsion of tyrants. No wonder, when the hundred-headed beast is astonished at these songs and lets down its ears, and the snakes wound in the hair of the Furies are refreshed. Even Prometheus and the father of Pelops are distracted by the sweet sound of poetic labour, and Orion has no inclination to hunt lions or the timid lynxes.

The presence of the two principal figures of Lesbian lyric poetry is a strong generic signal: Aeolian lyric is here firmly represented by a traditional trope through its *auctores* or originating figures,⁴⁶ and even the supposed preference of the masses for the 'virile' poetry of Alcaeus over the 'sentimentality' of Sappho may reflect the preference of the *Odes* as a whole for the former over the latter.⁴⁷ But this lyric colouring overlays an epic mode: the theme of katabasis is not alien to archaic Greek lyric,⁴⁸ but it is fundamentally associated with epic, going back to *Odyssey* 11, from which some of the infernal furniture here is drawn.⁴⁹ Indeed, the remainder of the underworld details derive from a recent deployment of the motif in didactic epic, the katabasis of Orpheus in *Georgics* 4.⁵⁰ It is interesting to note that

⁴⁶ See Ch. 1, above.

⁴⁷ Cf. 1.32.1–12 and Feeney (1993); for a recent interesting argument for the greater importance of Sappho for the *Odes* see Woodman (2002).

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. Bacchylides 5, Pindar, *Ol.* 2, fr.133 Snell.

⁴⁹ The final pictures of Tantalus and of Orion engaged in hunting derive from *Odyssey* 11 (582 ff., 572 ff.).

⁵⁰ *Georgics* 4.482–3 clearly supply Horace with the Cerberus and the Furies—so Nisbet and Hubbard (1978: 204, 218).

Horace does not present himself as descending to the underworld like an epic protagonist but merely imagines its contents, thus further distancing himself from the epic theme. The population of his underworld also consists not of epic heroes and heroines but of lyric poets and their audiences; this is a lyricized underworld which incorporates recognizably epic elements within an overarching lyric framework, adding this further element of generic interaction in the poem's second half to its epigrammatic opening scenario.

A similar example of lyric interaction with epigram occurs in *Odes* 2.5. Here in six Alcaic stanzas the poet addresses himself on the topic of a girl not yet ready for love. The first three stanzas seem a complete unit, in which the poet urges himself to wait until the girl is ripe (1–12):

Nondum subacta ferre iugum valet
 cervice, nondum munia comparis
 aequare nec tauri ruentis
 in venerem tolerare pondus.
 circum virentis est animus tuae
 campos iuvencae, nunc fluviis gravem
 solantis aestum, nunc in udo
 ludere cum vitulis salicto
 praegestientis. tolle cupidinem
 immitis uvae: iam tibi lividos
 distinguet Autumnus racemos
 purpureo varius colore.

She is not ready yet to bear the yoke with tamed neck, not yet ready to match the efforts of a harness-fellow or endure the weight of a bull as he rushes in for love. The mind of your heifer flies around the green plains, now relieving the grievous heat in rivers, now yearning to play in the damp willow-grove with the calves. Cease your longing for the unripe grape; soon Autumn will give the bunches dark markings, bringing change with purple colour.

As scholars have noted, this is clearly related to an epigram of Philodemus, probably known personally to Horace, addressed to Lysidike, too young for love now but soon to dazzle her lovers (*AP* 5.124 = 16 Sider⁵¹):

⁵¹ I cite the text and translation of Sider (1997: 119–20).

Οὐπω σοι καλύκων γυμνὸν θέρος, οὐδὲ μελαίνει
 βότρυς ὁ παρθενίους πρωτοβολῶν χάριτας.
 ἀλλ' ἤδη θαὰ τόξα νέοι θήγουσιν Ἔρωτες,
 Λυσιδίκη, καὶ πῦρ τύφεται ἐγκρύφιον.
 φεύγωμεν, δυσέρωτες, ἕως βέλος οὐκ ἐπὶ νευρῆ·
 μάντις ἐγὼ μεγάλης αὐτίκα πυρκαϊῆς.

Not yet bare of its cover is your summer growth, not yet do you have a dark grape cluster to shoot forth the first rays of a young girl's charms, but already the young Erotes are whetting their swift arrows, Lysidike, and a secret fire smoulders within. Let's flee, unfortunate lovers, while the arrow is off the string. I am a prophet of a great and imminent blaze.

By the end of its first half, already of longish epigram size (twelve lines), Horace's poem has dealt with the matter of Philodemus' six-line poem, and clearly makes specific use of its terms referring to time: the anaphoric 'not yet', which the two poems so notably share, (*nondum/οὐπω*) is resolved in the notion that time will soon (*iam/αὐτίκα*) unleash the grape-like sexual maturity of the girl. There is a strong feeling for the reader that an end has been attained, especially since reference to time and its effects is a standard device of poetic closure.⁵² But the lyric poem then carries on with the new idea, drawn from Sappho, that in time the position will reverse and the now reluctant Lalage will be the pursuer (13–24):⁵³

iam te sequetur; currit enim ferox
 aetas et illi quos tibi dempserit
 adponet annos; iam proterua
 fronte petet Lalage maritum,
 dilecta, quantum non Pholoe fugax,
 non Chloris albo sic umero nitens
 ut pura nocturno renidet
 luna mari Cnidiusue Gyges,
 quem si puellarum insereres choro,
 mire sagacis falleret hospites
 discrimen obscurum solutis
 crinibus ambiguoque uoltu.

⁵² See Smith (1968: 117–31).

⁵³ On the Sapphic connection (with fr.1.21 L/P) see Nisbet and Hubbard (1978: 86).

Soon she will follow you: for time rushes fiercely on, and will give to her the years it takes from you; soon Lalage will seek a mate with wanton brow, more loved than fleeing Pholoe or Chloris, shining with her white shoulder like the clear moon over the sea at night, or Gyges from Cnidos; if you put him in a group of girls, the difficulty of distinguishing him from them would wonderfully defeat even skilful strangers, him with his loose hair and genderless face.

Here the epigrammatic colour of the poem's first half is redirected and appropriated for lyric by the use of a key lyric model in its second half. But (as in 2.13) generic interaction is not over. The poem's last stanza clearly refers to the epic story of the concealment of the young Achilles on Scyros amongst the girl attendants of Deidamia and the unmasking of his female disguise by the stratagems of Odysseus, sent to bring him to Troy (hence *sagacis . . . hospites*). This episode, known to us from Statius' *Achilleid*, was almost certainly part of the epic repertoire in the archaic and Hellenistic period. The use of this myth to describe the attractions of an epicene boy adapts this heroic material for the pederastic world of erotic lyric, but once again this is an instance of generic interaction and enrichment. Just as the first half of the poem harnesses Greek epigram to a lyric context, so the final stanza incorporates an epic theme into the rich and flexible texture of the *Odes*.

5. ETHICS, EPIC, AND PROPHECY: *ODES* 3.3

The lofty Roman *Odes* (*Odes* 3.1–6) use various forms of generic interaction to achieve an impressive tone of dignity and elevation. *Odes* 3.3 opens with the striking image of the imperturbable sage who resists riots, tyranny, and cosmic destruction (1–8):

Iustum et tenacem propositi uirum
 non ciuium ardor praua iubentium,
 non uultus instantis tyranni
 mente quatit solida neque Auster,
 dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,
 nec fulminantis magna manus Iouis:

si fractus inlabatur orbis,
inpauidum ferient ruinae.

The man who is just and tenacious of purpose is not shaken in his firm mind by the burning passion of his fellow-citizens who order evil, or by the features of a threatening tyrant or the South Wind, the raging ringleader of the turbulent Adriatic, or by the mighty hand of thundering Jupiter: if the world shatters and collapses, the remains will strike him as he shows no fear.

This figure clearly represents the Stoic *sapiens*, with more than a glance at the younger Cato, as in the similar opening of *Odes* 1.22.⁵⁴ Here we are in the realms of popularly conceived moral philosophy, long ago identified as one of the non-poetic literary traditions commonly combining with lyric in the *Odes*.⁵⁵ The choice of evidently philosophical motifs and metaphors is a common way of achieving thematic elevation in the Roman Odes.⁵⁶

After this philosophical opening, the poem switches in the third stanza to ruler-panegyric (9–12):

Hac arte Pollux et uagus Hercules
enisus arces attigit igneas,
quos inter Augustus recumbens
purpureo bibet ore nectar.

By this skill did Pollux and wide-travelling Hercules strive to reach the fiery citadels; Augustus, reclining between them, will drink nectar with crimson mouth.

Though the praise of rulers is by no means alien to lyric given its importance to Pindar in poems imitated elsewhere by Horace in the *Odes*,⁵⁷ this passage indubitably draws⁵⁸ on Theocritus' panegyric of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, where Ptolemy I Soter sits down with a similar pairing of Hercules and Alexander (Theocritus 17.16–25):

τῆνον καὶ μακάρεσσι πατὴρ ὁμότιμον ἔθηκεν
ἀθανάτοις, καὶ οἱ χρύσεος θρόνος ἐν Διὸς οἴκῳ

⁵⁴ Cf. Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 36).

⁵⁵ Kroll (1924: 210–11); Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: p. xiv).

⁵⁶ For some specific examples in *Odes* 3.5 see Harrison (1986).

⁵⁷ e.g. 1.2 and 1.12.

⁵⁸ Noted only briefly by Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 42), and not noted as an imitation by Hunter (2003), though he does note (118) the other Horatian imitation of this Theocritean passage at *Odes* 4.8.29–30.

δέδμηται· παρὰ δ' αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρος φίλα εἰδῶς
 ἐδριάει, Πέρσαισι βαρὺς θεὸς αἰολομίτρας.
 ἀντία δ' Ἡρακλῆος ἔδρα κενταυροφόνοιο
 ἴδρυνται στερεοῖο τετυγμένα ἐξ ἀδάμαντος·
 ἔνθα σὺν ἄλλοισιν θαλίας ἔχει Οὐρανίδησι,
 χαίρων νίωνῶν περιώσιον νίωνοῖσιν,
 ὅττι σφεων Κρονίδης μελέων ἐξείλετο γῆρας,
 ἀθάνατοι δὲ καλεῦνται εἰὶ νέποδες γεγαῶτες.

The father made him [i.e. Ptolemy] of equal honour with the blessed immortals, and a golden throne has been set for him in the house of Zeus; and beside him Alexander sits in friendship, the god of the multi-coloured diadem, the bane of the Persians; opposite is set the seat of Hercules, slayer of centaurs, made out of tough adamant: there with the other Olympians he celebrates feasts, rejoicing greatly in the sons of his sons, and that Zeus has removed old age from their limbs, and that those who are born his descendants are called gods.

The god-king Ptolemy, dead at the time of writing, can be displayed as unashamedly deified; the Horatian version praises the living ruler and not his dead father (avoiding the tricky topic of Julius Caesar⁵⁹) and consequently adapts the original to suit Roman cultural sensitivities on the issue of imperial deification during the ruler's lifetime:⁶⁰ Augustus' participation in Olympian feasting is carefully set in the future (*bibet*),⁶¹ and analogies are carefully chosen (as elsewhere in poetic encomia of Augustus as quasi-divine) with men who became gods posthumously.⁶² Theocritus' grand hexameter hymnic encomium (however one defines it generically⁶³) is incorporated into Horace's lyric framework, thus enriching and elevating the poem so as to deal fittingly with the politically crucial and sensitive topic of ruler-cult.

The link of the admission of Romulus to this company (15–18) then allows Horace to present us with the great speech of Juno, which occupies almost all the remainder of the poem (18–68), in which

⁵⁹ For anxiety about Julius Caesar in Augustan poetry see White (1988).

⁶⁰ Beard *et al.* (1998: 206).

⁶¹ The future *bibet* is clearly better than the variant present *bibit*—see Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 42).

⁶² Cf. *Ibid.* 41.

⁶³ For the issue see in detail Hunter (2003: 8–24).

she urges the destruction of Troy and all it stands for. Whether or not this is connected with a contemporary debate about the possible eastwards relocation of the capital of the Roman empire,⁶⁴ stylistic elevation is achieved for this speech by the incorporation of material from the highest Roman epic. Denis Feeney has convincingly reasserted that this speech echoes a lost scene of divine debate on the issue of Romulus' apotheosis in Ennius' *Annales*, in which Juno, as in Horace, must have explicitly accepted Romulus' ultimate reception into the divine company of Olympus,⁶⁵ and the fiery character which Juno displays is consistent with her presentation in the divine discussions of the *Iliad* and *Aeneid*. Epic themes and stiles certainly abound in Juno's speech in Horace's ode. 3.3.46–7 *qua medius liquor / secemit Europen ab Afro* echoes Ennius, *Ann.* 302 Skutsch *European Libyamque rapax ubi dividit undo*, while *refringit* (28) is an Ennian verb (*Ann.* 226 Skutsch) occurring only here in the text of Horace, and *pugnaces Achivos* (27) suggests Homeric formulas for the Achaeans such as *μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί* (*Iliad* 1.123) and *μένεα πνείοντες Ἀχαιοὶ* (*Iliad* 3.8), while *Hectoreis opibus* (28) recalls a Homeric use of adjective for genitive (cf. *Iliad* 2.416 *Ἐκτόρεον... χιτώνα*, 24.579 *Ἐκτορέης κεφαλῆς*). This incorporation of detailed epic diction, as well as of a recognizably epic scenario, plainly lends additional generic dignity to Horace's lyric texture.⁶⁶

This high-flown diction continues in the second half of Juno's speech (37–68), where she promises a great future for Rome. Here (not unexpectedly) we find the incorporation of the discourse of hexameter prophecy as a further strategy of generic elevation (3.3.40–2):

dum Priami Paradisque busto
insultet armentum et catulos ferae
celent inultae...

as long as cattle leap on the tomb of Priam and Paris, and mother-beasts hide their whelps there unpunished.

⁶⁴ For the issue see Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 36–8).

⁶⁵ Feeney (1991: 125–6).

⁶⁶ On the epic details see further Lowrie (1997: 248), part of her argument for a pattern of consistent epic allusion in *Odes* 3.3–3.5 (245).

This apocalyptic image of the ruined city inhabited only by wild beasts is taken directly from the tradition of the Sibylline oracles, already used by Horace in *Epode* 16 in the context of civil war (16.2), *ferisque rursus occupabitur solum*, ‘and the site will be reoccupied by wild beasts’, matching the similar prophecy about Rome at *Or.Sib.* 8. 41 *καὶ σὰ θέμειλα λύκοι καὶ ἀλώπεκες οἰκήσουσιν*, ‘and your ruins will be lived in by wolves and foxes’.⁶⁷ The fate feared for Rome at the height of the civil wars is now demanded for sinful Troy by Juno, in both cases drawn from a recognizable literary tradition outside the generic framework of the poem in question.

In a form of closural self-consciousness found in some other *Odes*,⁶⁸ the final stanza of this ode makes a metageneric comment to the effect that this poem is becoming generically deviant (3.3.69–72):

non hoc iocosae conveniet lyrae:
quo, Musa, tendis? desine pervicax
referre sermones deorum et
magna modis tenuare parvis.

This will not fit my playful lyre: where are you off to, Muse? Cease your stubborn report of the speeches of gods and reducing great things to your small measures.

The epic elevation and serious tone achieved in this poem is thus explicitly marked as inappropriate for Horatian lyric poetry: ‘playful lyre’ suggests that these themes are too grand for the current generic context, and the Muse is rebuked for her supposed stubbornness in retailing material which is traditionally epic, the contents of divine councils (‘the speeches of gods’). The final two words stress the Callimachean aesthetic of the *Odes* which disallows epic ambition: *tenuare* (recalling the Callimachean keyword *tenuis*) and *parvis* point to the smaller and more polished poems championed by Callimachus against larger and cruder literary forms.⁶⁹ The poem’s excursion into epic themes is finally restrained within the bounds of lyric, through an explicit reassertion of its fundamental generic framework, a technique reminiscent of the end of Vergil’s sixth and tenth *Eclogues*.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ See p. 132 above.

⁶⁸ See Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 52–3).

⁶⁹ Cf. *Aetia* fr.1, discussed p. 45 above.

⁷⁰ See Ch. 2 above.

6. TRAGEDY, ELEGY, AND EPYLLION:
ODES 3.11 AND 3.27

The excursions into more elevated literary territory in the Roman Odes⁷¹ are matched by equally rich interactions with other genres in some of the more ambitious odes later in the third book.⁷² In this section I will consider *Odes* 3.11 and 3.27, both of which accommodate narrative mythological sections drawn from other, 'higher' genres to the framework of Horatian erotic lyric. This is a metageneric exploration of the 'narrative seduction' which Michèle Lowrie has convincingly seen in these poems.⁷³

Odes 3.11 begins in its first six stanzas⁷⁴ with a hymn to Mercury and the lyre in classic lyric style, echoing the hymn to Mercury and the lyre in *Odes* 1.10 which in turn recalls an Alcaean lyric hymn; but in 3.11 the hymn has an erotic function, invoking the lyre to tell the poet how to persuade the young and recalcitrant Lyde to engage in love,⁷⁵ picking up the theme of the young girl who claims not to be ready for love which is common in Horatian erotic lyric.⁷⁶ This hymn concludes with praise of the lyre for its capacity to bring the underworld to a halt, briefly recalling the epic katabasis theme treated more amply in 2.13 (see Section 3 above). The scenery of the underworld includes the traditional punishment of the Danaïds (carrying water in a leaking vessel), and it is this element which provides a surprise transition to the poem's second half⁷⁷ (25–32):

audiat Lyde scelus atque notas
uirginum poenas et inane lymphae
dolium fundo pereuntis imo
seraque fata,

⁷¹ In addition to s. 5 above see the important analyses by Lowrie (1997: 224–65).

⁷² For this general development, *ibid.* 266.

⁷³ For the link between the two, *ibid.* 277.

⁷⁴ I concur with many editors in believing the fifth stanza (17–20) to be an interpolation.

⁷⁵ On the erotic plot here *ibid.* 286. She sees this plot as strongly elegiac, but there seems little apart from the last stanza which points to elegy.

⁷⁶ Cf. 2.5 (4 above) and 1.25 for this theme.

⁷⁷ On the false closure here cf. Harrison (2004*b*: 92–3).

quae manent culpas etiam sub Orco.
 impiae (nam quid potuere maius?)
 impiae sponsos potuere duro
 perdere ferro.

Let Lyde hear of the crime and the well-known punishment of the virgins, and the jar empty of water which runs out from the bottom, and the ultimate fates which await crimes even in the underworld. Those impious ones (for what could they have done that was worse), those impious ones dared to kill their bridegrooms with cruel iron.

This turn to the Danaid myth, popular in contemporary Augustan iconography and poetry,⁷⁸ then introduces a mythological narrative which tells the story of the virtuous Hypermestra, the one Danaid who spared her husband in the massacre of the infamous wedding-night. In the erotic plot of the poem, Hypermestra's choice for virtuous love over virginal crime clearly speaks persuasively to Lyde, who is also being urged to opt for love, but generically this material is drawn from Greek tragedy.

The Danaid trilogy of Aeschylus, of which the *Suppliants*, generally thought to be the first play, survives, was clearly centred around the wedding-night killing of the sons of Aegyptus and the sparing of Lynceus by Hypermestra contrary to her father's orders, presumably for the sake of love, a motivation which is already specified in the summary of the Danaid story in the *Prometheus Vincitus*.⁷⁹ Though reconstructions vary and evidence is scarce, the fatal wedding-night was probably the climax of the *Egyptians*, the middle play of the trilogy;⁸⁰ the rights and wrongs of the massacre and of Hypermestra's disobedience to her father's murderous orders are likely to have been the subject of the third play *Danaids*. Though an earlier epic *Danaids* is also known, there is only one relatively uninformative fragment,⁸¹ and it is reasonable to assume that the content of the Danaid story as told by Horace here and by Ovid in *Heroides* 14 derives from the Aeschylean trilogy as the most celebrated and extensive literary presentation of this mythological material.

⁷⁸ See Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 150–1).

⁷⁹ Cf. [Aeschylus] *PV* 853–69, likely to be closely related to the Aeschylean trilogy.

⁸⁰ For the fullest discussion see still Garvie (1969: 163–233).

⁸¹ For this and the exiguous *testimonia* see West (2003: 266–9).

This interaction with tragedy is supported by Horace's version of the Hypermestra/Lynceus story in this poem (33–52):

una de multis face nuptiali
 digna periurum fuit in parentem
 splendide mendax et in omne uirgo
 nobilis aeuom,
 'surge', quae dixit iuueni marito,
 'surge, ne longus tibi somnus, unde
 non times, detur; socerum et scelestas
 falle sorores,
 quae uelut nactae uitulos leaenae
 singulos eheu lacerant. ego illis
 mollior nec te feriam neque intra
 claustra tenebo.
 me pater saeuus oneret catenis,
 quod uiro clemens misero peperci,
 me uel extremos Numidarum in agros
 classe releget.
 i, pedes quo te rapiunt et aurae,
 dum fauet nox et Venus, i secundo
 omine et nostri memorem sepulcro
 scalpe querelam.'

One alone of many was worthy of the nuptial torch, a glorious liar to her perjured parent, a maiden noble for all time, she who said to her young husband 'Get up, get up, in case you are given a sleep which is all too long from a hand you do not fear; evade your father-in-law and my wicked sisters, who (alas) are each mauling their partners like lionesses who have caught calves. I am softer than they, and I will not strike you nor hold you within my door-bolts. Let my father load me with vicious chains for mercifully sparing my poor husband, or banish me with his fleet to the distant territory of the Numidians. Go where your feet and the breezes take you, while night and Venus favour you, go with favourable omen and engrave a lament in my memory on my tomb'.

This urgent speech addressed by Hypermestra to Lynceus suggests a dramatic context in general terms; but the simile used by Hypermestra of her murderous royal sisters as lionesses tearing calves in this family killing has a particular tragic analogue. It recalls the ecstatically murderous royal sisters of Euripides' *Bacchae*, who rip

up calves with their hands (*Bacchae* 737–9) and then hunt down and murder their male relative Pentheus who is compared to a bullock once he has been torn apart (1185). In the *Bacchae* it is the victim Pentheus who is famously compared to a lion (1196, 1278), but the characterization of the female murderer of her male relatives as a wild lioness is another standard image from tragedy, used of Clytemnestra (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1258, Euripides, *Electra* 473, 1163; cf. Lycophron, *Alexandra* 1107) and Medea (Euripides, *Medea* 1358, 1407).⁸² Thus the tragic origin of the Danaid story is here noted through imagery which recalls parallel tragic situations and perhaps even the lost trilogy of Aeschylus itself.⁸³

The accommodation of this disturbing tragic material to the lighter context of erotic lyric is achieved by several means in this poem. First, the ode concentrates on the positive and life-affirming attitude of Hypermestra to love and her new husband rather than the murderous and negative attitude of her sisters; this plainly has a place in the erotic plot of the poem, advocating love to the recalcitrant Lyde. Second, Hypermestra herself makes statements which soften the impact of the massacre: when she claims to be ‘softer’ than her sisters (42–3 *ego illis / mollior*), this has some metagenetic content,⁸⁴ suggesting that this lyric poem, concentrating on the sympathetic character of Hypermestra, presents an appropriately softer aspect of the terrible Danaid myth, more usually a trigger for tragic thoughts of early death and cruel killing;⁸⁵ she is softer than the hard, tragic iron used by her murderous sisters earlier in the poem (31–2 *impiae sponsos potuere duro / perdere ferro*). Finally, Hypermestra’s closing words evoke a further genre which moves away from the world of tragedy and towards that of real Roman domesticity. The *querela* which Lynceus is urged to inscribe on her grave surely looks not to love-elegy (not noted for its devoted and self-sacrificing women)⁸⁶

⁸² I disagree here with the analysis of some of these tragic links by Lowrie (1997: 278).

⁸³ I know of no treatment of the Danaid theme in Roman drama, though it is not unlikely that there was one.

⁸⁴ Though I do not agree with Lowrie (1997: 288) that *mollior* looks to elegy here.

⁸⁵ See Harrison (1998).

⁸⁶ As suggested by Lowrie (1997: 288). Of course *querela* can refer to the complaints made by the volatile *puella* in love-elegy (e.g. Propertius 1.6.11) or to the complaints of the poet-lover himself at her bad behaviour (e.g. Propertius 1.16.13), but neither of these ideas seems relevant here where neither partner behaves badly.

but to sepulchral epigram, for it is one of the standard terms expressing the grief of the bereaved in verse tomb-inscriptions from Rome: compare *CIL* 6.10105 (*CLE* 838; deceased son speaks to mother) *desine iam mater lacrimas renovare querellas*, *CIL* 25063 (*CLE* 1549) *quas ego, quas genitor pro te dabo nate querellas*, or *CIL* 29642 (*CLE* 1292; parents address daughter) *tu segura iaces, nobis reliquisti querelas*.

As Gordon Williams has noted, we are surely to think in particular of inscriptions in which husbands honour the virtues of their dead wives;⁸⁷ he aptly adduces the so-called *Laudatio Turiae* (*CIL* 6.1527), the long prose inscription in which a husband memorializes his wife who saved him from death during the proscriptions of 43–42 BC,⁸⁸ and a number of briefer verse inscriptions similarly honour the qualities of deceased wives and partners.⁸⁹ Thus the legendary crimes of tragedy are accommodated not only to the gentler generic context of Horatian persuasive erotic lyric, but also to the specific cultural context of Augustan Rome. The poem's final stress on self-sacrificing married love, though it is set in the context of erotic persuasion in a casually erotic context which is evidently non-conjugal, reflects the Augustan emphasis on marriage and its moral value promoted in the Roman Odes earlier in the same Horatian book.⁹⁰

Odes 3.27 has been seen as one of the most difficult of Horace's *Odes* for literary interpreters.⁹¹ This difficulty is connected with the generic complexity of its form. For its first six stanzas the poem appears to mark the departure abroad of 'Galatea'; though it is not

⁸⁷ It seems odd, therefore, that he interprets the tomb of line 51 as that of Lynceus and not Hypermetra. I agree with Lowrie (1997: 288 n. 60, who gives a history of the controversy) and Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 164) that it should be Hypermetra's tomb; she expects severe punishment from her father and it is natural for her to think of her own death, rather than that of Lynceus whose life she has just saved.

⁸⁸ See conveniently Horsfall (1983).

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. *CIL* 6.12652 (*CLE* 995), 6.13528 (*CLE* 1559), 6.14404 (*CLE* 1038) or 6.30102 (*CLE* 1508). These four inscriptions are usefully edited as numbers 180, 188, 181, and 186 respectively in Courtney (1995). Horace's fictional epitaph was appropriated in a Roman tourist graffito on the Pyramids in the 2nd cent. AD. See Courtney (1995: 88); Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 164).

⁹⁰ Comparable is the underlying stress on marital fidelity in the depiction of Asterie in *Odes* 3.7: cf. Cairns (1995).

⁹¹ For the best discussion of all the problems and a history of interpretations see now Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 317–20).

easy to excavate the (plainly erotic) plot-line from Horace's indirect hints,⁹² it seems that Galatea is going abroad with a rival, and that the poet addresses her with a mixture of objections to her journey, good wishes for her future, and implicit warning through a mythological story of the dangers of crossing the sea with a lover. The theme of a beloved girl crossing the sea with a rival, and the mixture of concern and objection on the lover-poet's part, are both elements which belong recognizably to the *propemptikon* of contemporary love-elegy (cf. Propertius 1.8, Ovid, *Am.* 2.11),⁹³ and this generic link is confirmed by the fact that Horace's Galatea, for whose safety he here expresses concern, is given the same name as one of the sea-goddesses called upon in such elegies to protect the beloved in her travels (Prop. 1.8.18, Ov. *Am.* 2.11.34).⁹⁴ This opening, in which generic interaction with a poetic situation of love-elegy is clear, is then followed by the lengthy myth of Europa which dominates the poem until its close (25–76). Though it is neatly attached as an *exemplum* of a similar overseas journey by a vulnerable young woman, this narrative covers wholly different generic territory; the monologue of Europa which absorbs most of its length (34–66) recalls the tradition of the epyllion, in particular the monologue of the abandoned Ariadne in Catullus 64 (132–201),⁹⁵ and given that the mythical character chosen here is Europa, there are obvious close parallels to be drawn between this narrative passage and the narrative hexameter poem *Europa* by Moschus, one of the few extant Hellenistic epyllia.⁹⁶

Compared to that of Moschus, Horace's narrative is notably more sharp and humorous, tempering the tone of the original to suit the generic character of Horatian lyric. Though the Hellenistic epyllion form as seen in *Europa* has considerable wit and sophistication, Moschus there presents a romantic version of love: a princess is kidnapped by a god who turns out to be a bull in disguise, they have an exchange of speeches while travelling over the sea, they land

⁹² Lowrie (1997: 302–8).

⁹³ On the *propemptikon* see Cairns (1972), esp. 9–12, 115–19.

⁹⁴ Cf. *ibid.* 190.

⁹⁵ Cf. Nisbet and Rudd (2004: 320).

⁹⁶ On the parallels with Moschus see *ibid.* 319.

and return to their proper shapes, and he marries her, with no previous rape. The poem then ends in the voice of the narrator, celebrating the wedding and Europa's great descendants. Horace, on the other hand, provides a version which is more realistic and cynical as well as bizarre. First, Europa's speech takes place not in mid-ocean but immediately after landing, a more natural location, and it is a monologue of self-rebuke rather than a conversation with a metamorphosed Zeus. Second, her speech is full of sexual guilt, a realistic touch, since she seems to have been raped before reaching Crete, a contrast with Moschus; but her words are presented with considerable humour and artificiality. Much is made of her strange passion for the bull,⁹⁷ and the whole elaborate presentation of her speech, with rhetorical questions, exclamations, and quotation from absent characters suggests the world of clever declamation rather than serious and realistic psychology.

Though Europa's long and emotional monologue is likely to be drawn from the tradition of the *epyllion*, there are clearly elements in it which derive from another literary tradition. The ending of the speech, where Europa imagines her father's rebuke for her lost virginity, has distinctly tragic colouring (57–66):

vilis Europe, pater urget absens:
quid mori cessas? Potes hac ab orno
pendulum zona bene te secuta
laedere collum.
Siue te rupes et acuta leto
saxa delectant, age te procellae
crede ueloci, nisi erile maui
carpere pensum
regius sanguis dominaeque tradi
barbarae paelex.

Europa, you low girl (so urges my absent father), why do you hesitate to die? You can break your neck by hanging it from this mountain-ash, with the girdle that has conveniently followed you, or if your pleasure is the cliff and rocks sharp with death, come, consign yourself to the swift storm-wind, unless you prefer to card an owner's wool and to be handed over though of royal blood to a foreign mistress to be a concubine.

⁹⁷ Recalling that of her future daughter-in-law Pasiphae in Vergil *Eclogue* 6: cf. Ch. 2 above.

As has long been noted, these lines are rich in colouring from Greek tragedy.⁹⁸ Europa's fear of her father's opinion echoes the similar fears of Euripides' *Medea* (*Medea* 166, 483), and the quotation of the reproach of another which is then turned into self-reproach by the speaker is a common feature of tragic rhetoric (Sophocles, *Ajax* 500–4, 1008–16; Euripides, *Alcestis* 954–5, *Phoenissae* 500–3). Further, the debate (53–8) about which mode of suicide to choose (*Selbstmordwege*) recalls a notable feature of Euripidean tragedy (*Heracles* 1148–52, *Orestes* 1035–6, *Helen* 299–302, *Andromache* 841–50, and especially *Troades* 1012–15);⁹⁹ but the normal context of tragic despair in which this motif occurs is appropriately lightened in its Horatian lyric context. It is very soon made clear by Venus that Europa's position is far from desperate, and the hyperbolic melodrama of the speech which Europa imagines for her father (especially the suggestion that violent suicide might be a pleasure, *delectant*) surely adds an element of black comedy here which effectively undermines any tragic effect.

Another passage with Greek tragic colour is Horace's most substantial alteration to Moschus, the ending, in which Venus intervenes to cut short Europa's lengthy lament (66–76):

aderat querenti
perfidum ridens Venus et remisso
filius arcu.
mox, ubi lusit satis: 'Abstineto'
dixit 'irarum calidaeque rixae,
cum tibi inuisus laceranda reddet
cornua taurus.
uxor inuicti Iouis esse nescis.
mitte singultus, bene ferre magnam
disce fortunam; tua sectus orbis
nomina ducet'.

Venus, with her treacherous laugh, was there as she lamented, and her son too, with his bow unstrung. Then, when she had sported enough, she said 'Cease from anger and the heat of brawling, for the bull you hate will yield you his horns to tear. You are, though you know it not, the wife of Jupiter the

⁹⁸ For full details and bibliography see Harrison (1988).

⁹⁹ See the collection of material by Fraenkel (1932).

unconquered. Put away your sobbing, and learn to bear your great good fortune well: a region of the world will take on your name.'

Venus' epiphanic consolation to the distraught heroine, offering divine marriage and future fame, is a scenario which clearly appeared in a Greek mythological narrative of the story of Ariadne of uncertain date and character summarized by the V-scholia on *Odyssey* 11.322: 'and when Ariadne lamented [i.e. her abandonment by Theseus], Aphrodite appeared and exhorted her to be of good courage, for she would be the wife of Dionysus and become famous'.¹⁰⁰ This narrative pattern looks literary rather than merely mythographical, and may even derive from Hesiod, who is very likely to have included Ariadne in his *Catalogue of Women*,¹⁰¹ or indeed from a lost Hellenistic epyllion. But the concluding appearance of Venus in Horace as *dea ex machina* with a consolatory or complimentary *aition* (here the naming of a continent) is a classic pattern of closure in Euripidean tragedies, as Barrett has stated: 'at the end of all his tragedies save Tr.[oades] . . . Eur.[ipides] gives a similar prophecy of 5th-cent. Cult or nomenclature or the like; on the lips of the "deus ex machina" if there is one, on other lips if there is none'.¹⁰²

But as with the elements of tragic rhetoric in Europa's monologue, this tragic material is once again well accommodated to its lighter lyric context. The omniscient and amused perspective of Venus and her ironic and detached control of the affairs of love represents her usual role in Horatian erotic lyric,¹⁰³ and Venus' suggestion that Europa's misfortune is only in her own lively imagination and that her future fame is more than adequate compensation is clearly a comic transformation of the usual aetiological consolations of *dei ex machina* for real or near disaster (e.g. *Hippolytus* 1423–30, *Ion* 1553–1605, *Orestes* 1625–65). As with the end of 3.3 (see section 5 above), the generic interaction with higher literary traditions built up in the body of the poem is defused at the end: the incorporation of elements from tragedy and epyllion enriches and expands the literary repertoire of Horatian lyric, but the ending ensures that this more elevated material is successfully accommodated to a 'lower' lyric context.

¹⁰⁰ κατολοφυρομένης δὲ τῆς Ἀριάδνης ἢ Ἀφροδίτῃ ἐπιφανείσα θαρρεῖν αὐτῇ παραινεῖ· Διονύσου γὰρ ἔσεσθαι γυναῖκα καὶ εὐκλεῆ γενέσθαι.

¹⁰¹ West (1985: 84).

¹⁰² Barrett (1964: 412).

¹⁰³ Cf. e.g. *Odes* 1.19, 1.30, 1.33, 4.1.

7. LYRIC AND EPIC: *ODES* 4.2 AND 4.15

The concern of Horace's fourth book of *Odes* with encomium and the perpetuation of great deeds is one of its most notable features. It is clearly related to the prominence of the *princeps*, his family, and their achievements in this last lyric book, published after the period of the *Carmen Saeculare* in which Horace had in some sense been enlisted as official encomiast of Rome, and reacting (as we shall see) in some degree to Vergil's praise of Rome and Augustus in the *Aeneid*.¹⁰⁴

Odes 4.2¹⁰⁵ begins with a claim that those who attempt to imitate Pindar are doomed to ignominious failure (1–28):

Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,
 lulle, ceratis ope Daedalea
 nititur pennis vitreo daturus
 nomina ponto.
 monte decurrens uelut amnis, imbres
 quem super notas aluere ripas,
 feruet immensusque ruit profundo
 Pindarus ore,
 laurea donandus Apollinari,
 seu per audacis noua dithyrambos
 uerba deuoluit numerisque fertur
 lege solutis,
 seu deos regesque canit, deorum
 sanguinem, per quos cecidere iusta
 morte Centauri, cecidit tremendae
 flamma Chimaerae,
 siue quos Elea domum reducit
 palma caelestis pugilemue equumue
 dicit et centum potiore signis
 munere donat,
 flebili sponsae iuuenemue raptum

¹⁰⁴ For recent work on *Odes* 4 see esp. Putnam (1986) and Johnson (2004). I look forward to commentaries from Philip Hills (for OUP) and Richard Thomas (for CUP) on this book.

¹⁰⁵ For a fuller treatment of 4.2 see Harrison (1995*b*).

plorat et uiris animumque moresque
 aureos educit in astra nigroque
 inuidet Orco.
 multa Dircaeum leuat aura cycnum,
 tendit, Antoni, quotiens in altos
 nubium tractus; ego apis Matinae
 more modoque
 grata carpentis thyma per laborem
 plurimum circa nemus uuidique
 Tiburis ripas operosa paruus
 carmina fingo.

Whoever seeks to rival Pindar, Iullus, relies but on wings waxed by Daedalus' skill, and is destined only to give a name to the glassy sea. Like a river thundering down from the mountain, fed by rain to overflow its usual banks, Pindar seethes and rushes unmeasured with his deep sound, worthy of the gift of Apollo's bay, whether he sends new words rolling down in daring dithyrambs and flows on with metres free from constraint, or whether he sings of gods and kings, the blood-line of gods, by whose hand the Centaurs fell in their justified death, and the fire of the terrible Chimera, or speaks of those brought home by the heavenly palm of Elis as boxer or horseman and presents them with a gift preferable to a hundred statues, or laments the young man taken from his weeping spouse and raises his manly strength, spirit and character to the stars and grudges him to dark Death. A mass of breeze lifts the swan of Dirce, Antonius, whenever he heads for the lofty tracts of the clouds; I, in the way and manner of the bee of Matinus which gathers the pleasant thyme through its labour about many a grove and the banks of the damp Tiber, mould my laborious songs in small size.

The memorable characterization of Pindar's style, later famously appropriated by Quintilian,¹⁰⁶ is followed by a catalogue of his various types of lyric poetry, appropriately full of long-recognized Pindaric echoes: dithyrambs (10–12), hymns (13–16), epinicians (17–20) and laments, *θρῆνοι*, (21–4) are discernible in the list (note the neat distribution of one stanza for each type).¹⁰⁷ This list is then followed by a disavowal on Horace's part, making an intra-generic distinction: the high style and great topics of Pindar are not for him.

¹⁰⁶ Quintilian 10.1.61.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Freis (1983) on the Pindaric genres echoed here.

This is something of a paradox, since Pindar, traditionally the greatest of the Greek lyric poets into whose company Horace had sought acceptance in his very first ode, had naturally been an important model for several major poems in the first three books of *Odes*, and is even more important in the victory odes of *Odes* 4 itself (4.4 and 4.14). It is all the more paradoxical as the image which Horace uses for his own, modest, non-Pindaric poetic activity is itself a famous Pindaric image for the activity of the poet (Pindar, *Pythians* 10.53–4) *ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων / ἐπ’ ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλον ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον*, ‘for the bloom of my songs of praise flits from one theme to another, like a bee’.¹⁰⁸

Gregson Davis has argued that Horace’s disavowal of Pindaric themes here ‘reveals the speaker’s actual competence to undertake precisely what he claims to be incapable of doing’, and that the main purpose of this duplicity is ‘to set Pindar up as a generic foil for the poet of the *Odes*’.¹⁰⁹ This contrast with Pindar is plausible for this particular poem, as we shall see, but does not confront the issue that Horace Pindarizes heavily in the other praise-odes of book 4,¹¹⁰ nor the fact that the catalogue of Pindaric lyric topics in 4.2 itself suggests that these Pindaric topics are already present in Horatian lyric.¹¹¹ The astrophic mythological narratives of dithyramb (4.2.10–12) may seem to have little to do with Horace’s *Odes*, but the quasi-orgiastic Horatian invocations of Bacchus in *Odes* 2.19 and 3.25 are likely to owe something to the presentation of Dionysus in the dithyrambic tradition.¹¹² Hymns, praising gods and men, and epinician odes, celebrating the return to their communities of athletic victors (4.2.13–20), both find echoes in the Pindarizing odes which celebrate triumphant returns of Augustus from campaigning (as in 4.2 itself, see below, and 3.14) and in those which praise the *princeps* more generally (e.g. 1.12 and 4.5). Even the laments for the dead intended to console the living can be detected in 1.27, the ode to Vergil which laments the death of a mutual friend Quintilius.¹¹³ Thus the Pindaric

¹⁰⁸ Davis (1991: 136). ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 134.

¹¹⁰ See Fraenkel (1957: 426–40) and (on Pindar in 4.8) Harrison (1990: 34–5).

¹¹¹ See Harrison (1995b: 111–13). ¹¹² Nisbet and Hubbard (1978: 314).

¹¹³ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 280).

subgenres of lyric selected for mention here, in a list which is far from exhaustive,¹¹⁴ find an echo in Horace's own lyric output.

This ironic Horatian disavowal is clearly connected in the rhetoric of *Odes* 4.2 with the literary capacity of its prestigious addressee, Iullus Antonius, son of Mark Antony, stepson of Octavia and (then) a favourite of Augustus himself.¹¹⁵ Iullus, the poem claims, will rise to the topic of Augustus' expected return in triumph from Germany after the campaigns of 16 BC,¹¹⁶ now revealed for the first time as the occasion for Horace's self-analysis as a non-Pindar (33–44):

concines maiore poeta plectro
 Caesarem, quandoque trahet ferocis
 per sacrum cliuum merita decorus
 fronde Sygambros;
 quo nihil maius meliusue terris
 fata donauere bonique diui
 nec dabunt, quamuis redeant in aurum
 tempora priscum.
 concines laetosque dies et urbis
 publicum ludum super impetrato
 fortis Augusti reditu forumque
 litibus orbum.

You will sing of Caesar as poet with a greater plectrum, when he drags the fierce Sygambri up the sacred slope, ornamented with the well-deserved branch; nothing greater or better than Caesar has been given by destiny and the gods to this earth, nor will be given, though the times return to the golden age of old. You will sing of days of joy, and of the public show in the city on the occasion of the granting of the return of mighty Augustus, and of the forum bereft of lawsuits.

As I have argued more fully elsewhere,¹¹⁷ *maiore plectro* refers to epic here; Iullus Antonius is reported as the author of a twelve-book epic *Diomedea* (Ps-Acro on 4.2.33), and the suggestion that the phrase invites him to compose Pindaric lyric is surely excluded by the opening claim of this poem that anyone attempting to soar to

¹¹⁴ See Freis (1983).

¹¹⁵ For a summary of Iullus' career cf. Syme (1986: 398–401), Harrison (1995*b*: 116).

¹¹⁶ For the date issue see Harrison (1995*b*: 116).

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* 118–22, with previous bibl.

Pindaric heights will crash like Icarus, after which such an invitation to a young noble and favourite of Augustus would hardly be taken as a compliment.¹¹⁸ Horace steps back from praising Augustus in Pindaric style (of which his *Odes* so far indicate that he is in fact thoroughly capable) to leave centre stage to the supposed poetic ambitions of the young Iullus to celebrate Augustus in the suitably lofty style of epic.

Epic themes duly emerge in the three stanzas just cited which give a programme for Iullus' epic poem. First, the picture of captured tribes parading at Augustus' triumph (33–6) surely recalls the recently published image at Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.714–28 of the triple triumph of 29 BC, in which a mass of conquered peoples, including Germans, are vividly presented. Second, the lines which celebrate the existence of Augustus as the providential gift of gods to Rome (37–40) echoes a theme specifically identified as belonging to the poetical praise of Augustus by Horace himself at *Epistles* 1.16.25–9, in a passage which is likely to echo Varius' putative epic on Augustus:¹¹⁹

si quis bella tibi terra pugnata marique
dicat et his verbis vacuas permulceat auris,
'tene magis saluum populus velit an populum tu
servet in ambiguo qui consulit et tibi et urbi
Iuppiter', Augusti laudes agnoscere possis.

If someone were to speak to you of 'wars fought by land and sea' and soothe your empty ears by the following words 'As to whether the people wishes more your safety or you for theirs, let Jupiter, who looks out for both you and the city, keep it undecided', you could recognize the praise of Augustus.

Finally, the encomiastic picture of the return of the Golden Age as an index of Rome's greatness conferred by the rule of Augustus echoes an element which is famously emphasized in the *Aeneid*, appearing both in Jupiter's prophecy of Rome under Augustus (1.291–6) and Anchises' foretelling of the great man (6.791–805). Thus epic elements are here incorporated into Horace's lyric texture through the imagined programme of Iullus' putative epic encomium of Augustus;

¹¹⁸ Wilamowitz (1913: 319) actually believed that Horace is warning Iullus not to attempt Pindaric poetry here.

¹¹⁹ See s. 2, above.

the praise of Augustus which Horace supposedly disavows thus nevertheless appears in his poem, a standard part of the *recusatio* or generic disavowal.

The poem's conclusion presents two imagined sacrificial offerings by Iullus and Horace, previously vowed to celebrate the safe return of Augustus (53–60):

te decem tauri totidemque vaccae,
me tener solvet vitulus, relictā
matre qui largis iuvenescit herbis
in mea vota,
fronte curvatos imitatus ignis
tertium lunae referentis ortum,
qua notam duxit, niveus videri,
cetera fulvus.

You will pay your debt by ten bulls and the same number of cows, I by a tender calf, growing up to fulfil my vow in lush pastures after leaving his mother, resembling on his forehead the curved fires of the moon as it rises for the third time, snow-white where he shows a blaze, otherwise tawny.

As Gregson Davis has argued, the contrast between Iullus' epic praise and the more slender contribution of Horatian lyric is symbolically articulated in the contrast between their two sacrificial offerings.¹²⁰ Iullus' sacrifice is epic in species, size, and gender distribution, recalling the twelve bulls sacrificed to Poseidon at *Odyssey* 13.181–7 and the four bulls and four heifers sacrificed to the Nymphs at *Georgics* 4.538–40; it is even epic in expression, with *totidem* recalling the description of the epicized *suovetaurilia*¹²¹ at *Aeneid* 5.96–7 *caedit binas de more bidentis / totque sues, totidemque nigrantis terga iuven-cos*. Horace's sacrifice is modest but tasteful, the 'small sacrifice' which is a traditional metaphor for the small but well-wrought poetical work since Callimachus;¹²² his choice of the calf may even pick up an apparently metapoetical 'small sacrifice' in Vergil's *Eclogues*.¹²³ Thus in this ending we find the assertion of Horatian lyric

¹²⁰ Davis (1991: 142).

¹²¹ Cf. Williams (1960: 63).

¹²² See the material gathered at Cairns (1979: 21).

¹²³ Cf. *Ecl.* 3.85–7 (cited by Davis, 1991: 142), where a calf sacrifice seems to represent the modest genre of pastoral, a bull a larger genre (cf. Clausen, 1994: 112).

as small and Callimachean as against the grander lyric of Pindar, as well as a symbolic repetition of the inclusion of the epic mode in this lyric poem and the consequent enrichment of its literary texture. This conclusion is also self-reflexive, for it is hard to see the beautifully marked sacrificial animal carefully nurtured by the poet himself as anything other than a *mise en abyme* or symbolic summary¹²⁴ of this well-crafted poem.

Odes 4.15, the final ode of Horace's second and final lyric collection,¹²⁵ begins with a similar self-defining contrast between lyric and epic, a reprise of the familiar Callimachean *recusatio*-pattern of the redirective intervention of Apollo from the *Aetia* already reprocessed by Vergil and Propertius¹²⁶ (4.15.1–4):

Phoebus uolentem proelia me loqui
uictas et urbes increpuit lyra,
ne parua Tyrrhenum per aequor
uela darem.

Apollo, as I intended to speak of battles and conquered cities, rebuked me with his lyre, telling me not to direct my small sails over the Etruscan sea.

Here epic subject-matter is immediately disavowed, perhaps with an allusion to a recent exponent: the 'Etruscan sea', with the common use of *aequor* to represent the ocean of Homeric epic,¹²⁷ perhaps suggests the *Aeneid* of Horace's friend Vergil, whose Etruscan origins are implicitly celebrated in the epic's Etruscan catalogue.¹²⁸ The poem then goes on to proclaim at length (4–24) the achievements of the *pax Augusta*, describing the victories of peace in terms which recall the lyric encomium of the *Carmen Saeculare*, but which also echo elements in the *Aeneid*, as Michael Putnam has demonstrated:¹²⁹ the display of trophies on temple doors (6–8; cf. *Aeneid* 8.721–2), the

¹²⁴ Cf. Dällenbach (1989).

¹²⁵ For recent treatments see Putnam (1986: 262–306); Lowrie (1997: 443–9); Griffin (2002); Johnson (2004: 198–213).

¹²⁶ Vergil, *Eclogue* 6.1–5 (see Ch. 2, above), Propertius 3.3.15–24, 4.1.71–150.

¹²⁷ Wimmel (1960: 227–33); Morgan (1999: 32–40, 46–9).

¹²⁸ See conveniently Harrison (1991: 124, on *Aeneid* 10.200). Putnam (1986: 265) notes that *Tyrrhenum* . . . *aequor* picks up the same phrase at *Aeneid* 1.67 *gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat aequor*.

¹²⁹ Putnam (1986: 274–6).

closing of the temple of Janus (8–9; cf. *Aeneid* 1.293–4), and the naming of a list of tribes subdued (21–4; cf. *Aeneid* 8.722–8).

This incorporation of material from Vergil's epic, declined as a generic model at the poem's beginning, thus adds epic elements while accommodating them to Horatian lyric texture. This incorporation resurfaces more explicitly at the poem's end (25–32):

nosque et profestis lucibus et sacris
inter iocosi munera Liberi
 cum prole matronisque nostris
 rite deos prius adprecati,

uirtute functos more patrum duces
Lydis remixto carmine tibiis
Troiamque et Anchisen et almae
progeniem Veneris canemus.

And we, on work days and festivals, amid the gifts of playful Bacchus, with our children and wives, having first made due prayer to the gods, will sing of leaders who have done the job of courage in the manner of our ancestors, with our song mixed with Lydian pipes, Troy, and Anchises, and the progeny of gentle Venus.

The picture of Romans relaxing with their families puts the poet into the community for which he acts as speaker, but also establishes the kind of symposiastic context in which many of Horace's *Odes* are set, and suggests the idea of lyric performance. Accordingly, when the poem's last stanza talks of future singing of Troy, Anchises, Aeneas and his descendants, the key players in the plot of the *Aeneid*,¹³⁰ it is difficult not to see this as a retrospective programmatic statement of the poem's general procedure as already followed. The poem has successfully incorporated epic material into a lyric framework, and though *canemus*, a verb highly appropriate to lyric song, appears in the future tense and as the last word of the poem, it can be referred to the present performance, a Pindaric usage.¹³¹ This is emblemized by the allusion to 'song mixed with Lydian pipes', a metapoetical statement of the blending of lyric and epic elements. The *tibia* is non-epic and an instrument of Horatian lyric (cf. *Odes* 3.4.1), but 'Lydian',

¹³⁰ Note how *progenies* carefully allows for the future views of the descendants of Venus in the prophetic scenes of the *Aeneid*, esp. of course Augustus himself.

¹³¹ Cf. e.g. Pindar *Ol.* 11.14 with Bundy (1962: 21).

though it suggests the soft and erotic Lydian musical mode suitable for lyric (Plato, *Rep.* 2.398e),¹³² also looks back to the poem's initial allusion in *Tyrrhenum...aequor* to the Etruscan ethnicity of Vergil, who in the *Aeneid* had lost few opportunities of alluding to the supposed Lydian origin of the Etruscans, even referring to the Etruscans straightforwardly as *Lydi* (9.11).¹³³ Epic material thus enters lyric song in this poem, but that 'guest' material is carefully accommodated in modal form to the 'host' generic framework. Here, as in the other examples in this chapter, the inherently flexible texture of Horace's *Odes* is enriched by diverse generic elements which expand and extend its literary repertoire within an overall lyric framework.

¹³² See Lowrie (1997: 348 n. 9 and 281).

¹³³ *Aeneid* 2.781, 7.43, 8.479–80, 9.11, 10.155; modern scholars are generally sceptical on the supposed Lydian origin of the Etruscans—see Briquel (1991); Barker and Rasmussen (1998).

Epic Inclusivity: Vergil's *Aeneid*

1. INTRODUCTION: THE *AENEID* AS GENERIC CONFLUENCE

Vergil's *Aeneid* is in many ways the ultimate example of generic enrichment in Augustan poetry, and fittingly forms the climax of this book. Scholars have consistently noted what Philip Hardie has termed the *Aeneid*'s 'generic polyphony',¹ the way in which this epic poem includes and displays a remarkable range of material from non-epic poetic genres. This systematic 'deviation' from its 'core' epic genre is paradoxically a key marker of the poem's identity as an epic in the Homeric tradition. As Hardie has also noted, the *Aeneid* in its polyphonic texture reflects the tradition of Homer as received in Hellenistic scholarship, the Homer who is the source of all other poetic traditions.² But of course for the *Aeneid* this position must be inverted: the centuries of literary history between Homer and Vergil mean that the Vergilian epic needs to be viewed as the repository and not the source of other literary traditions, and the effect of including these genres in the *Aeneid* thus becomes a kind of completion of the generic circle begun with Homer, an implied return to universal literary origins in Homeric epic. This is both a homage and a claim to match Homer in generic richness: Homeric epic is the perceived source of multiple literary streams, Vergilian epic their self-proclaimed confluence.

This unprecedented scale of generic enrichment in the *Aeneid* had fundamental consequences both for the poem itself and for the epic

¹ Hardie (1998: 57).

² Cf. Hardie (1986: 22–5).

genre. From early on, the poem has been characterized as a classic for its remarkable literary and human scope; equally, after the *Aeneid*, the epic form could never be the same again, and the search for generic diversity in (e.g.) Ovid's *Metamorphoses* bears firm witness to the effect that the extensive generic enrichment of epic in the *Aeneid* had on subsequent examples of the genre.

As Hardie has pointed out, the use of other genres provides interesting and alternative perspectives on the *Aeneid*'s epic plot and values, a generic version of the 'further voices' of Lyne's important analysis of the poem.³ Such alternative generic voices need not, however, be consistently subversive of the epic action or ideology; often, as we shall see, 'guest' generic material is carefully accommodated to the demands of the 'host' genre, and is appropriated to enhance rather than to oppose traditional epic plot and values.

This chapter seeks to show in a selection of brief studies something of how a range of other poetic genres is used in the *Aeneid* to expand and enrich the epic tradition. It is intended to be thought-provoking rather than exhaustive; so much has already been said, and a complete treatment would require several volumes.

2. TRAGEDY AND ELEGY: TWO QUEENS (*AENEID* 4.1–5, 12.54–9)

The perception by Dante's Virgil of the *Aeneid* as 'l'alta mia tragedia' (*Inferno* 20.113) has been widely shared since: to cite Philip Hardie, 'the influence of tragedy on the *Aeneid* is pervasive, and arguably the single most important factor in Virgil's successful revitalization of the genre of epic'.⁴ It is a commonplace of modern critical work on the *Aeneid* since Heinze that the epic has a vital tragic colouring drawn specifically from the work of the Attic dramatists; more recently, the possible channelling of this colouring through intermediate but lost Latin works has rightly been emphasized,⁵ since a Latin poem is likely to have used these non-extant works as well as the extant Greek

³ Lyne (1987).

⁴ Hardie (1998: 62).

⁵ See Hardie (1997) and Galinsky (2003) for recent surveys.

classics. Rather than simply rehearsing the many examples of tragic themes and episodes in the *Aeneid*, in this section I should like to point to two examples where tragic elements are combined with elements of another more contemporary genre, that of love-elegy.

The extensive literature on the tragic colouring of *Aeneid* 4⁶ has said relatively little about the evident use of tragedy in its opening scene. As summarily noted long ago but since largely ignored,⁷ the opening of the book in a conversation between Dido and her sister/confidante Anna (4.1–53) clearly recalls the opening of Sophocles' *Antigone* where Antigone and her sister/confidante Ismene are found in dialogue (*Antigone* 1–99); such a dialogue opening is strongly Sophoclean, since the extant plays of Aeschylus and Euripides tend to begin with an explanatory prologue rather than an interactive scene. Even in purely formal terms, the two scenes are clearly parallel: apart from their shared initial position, the pair of speeches given by Dido (4.9–29, twenty-one lines against a relationship with Aeneas) and Anna (4.31–53, twenty-three lines for the relationship) correspond in both debating spirit and approximate length to the pair of speeches given by Antigone (21–38, eighteen lines against obeying Creon's decree) and Ismene (49–68, twenty lines for obeying it), though in the Sophoclean drama the two speeches are separated by a rapid stichomythic exchange (39–48) rather than following sequentially as they do in the Vergilian epic.

These parallels are more than casual: in both cases the conversation between the two sisters, the stronger protagonist and the weaker confidante, leads to a tragic decision and a consequent series of events which leads to the protagonist's suicide: Dido's resolve to follow her passion for Aeneas and Antigone's determination to bury her outlaw brother. Antigone is a suitable parallel for Dido in a number of ways: her forceful personality, her inevitable linking as royal princess of the political and personal in the decision she has to make about family loyalty, her being forced by events to give up normal 'female' hopes of marriage and children, and her eventual suicide all firmly link the

⁶ Collected e.g. by Suerbaum (1980: 148–51); Harrison (1990: 13 n. 75); Hardie (1998: 62); Fernandelli (2002).

⁷ Cf. De Witt (1907: 287), who says merely that 'The sister of the heroine is a stock character of tragedy. One will recall Ismene in Sophocles' *Antigone*'. This remark is noted at Pease (1935: 10 n. 61) but subsequently ignored.

two characters. It is interesting that the Vergilian scene in some ways inverts the Sophoclean opening: from the beginning of the play it is clear that Antigone is resolved to go through with her drastic course of action and merely wants her sister to assist, while in the epic scene Dido is genuinely in doubt and raises important considerations which her sister then counteracts, showing that Anna is a more persuasive character than her model Ismene, partly perhaps because Anna has features of other tragic confidantes who for the best reasons urge their protagonists to disastrous courses of action (for example, the nurse in Euripides' *Hippolytus*).

Thus, just as for the first tranche of Dido's tragedy in book 1, where tragic scene-setting for the Dido story has been plausibly detected both in the description of Carthage as a *scaena* (1.164) and in Venus' wearing of the *coturni*, tragic as well as hunting footwear (1.337),⁸ this second tranche is marked as deriving from the Greek tragic tradition by specific details, here allusions to the opening of a famous Sophoclean play. This is matched by the closure of book 4, where as many have noted Juno appears as a *dea ex machina* to ease the passage of Dido to the underworld, a final divine intervention typical of Euripidean tragedy and which here closely parallels Euripides' *Hippolytus*: like Artemis' entry at the end of that play, Juno's intervention here is too little too late for a goddess supposedly attached to the fortunes of her protégée. *Aeneid* 4, then, opens and closes with specific recall of the openings and closures of well-known Greek tragedies, implying that this is a particularly tragic section of the poem, and incorporating the emotional force of Greek tragic drama into an epic context.

But tragedy is not the only non-epic genre brought into play in this opening section of the book. The opening lines of the book, preceding the dialogue between Dido and Anna, present images which would have a specific contemporary literary resonance for Vergil's original readers (4.1–5):

At regina graui iamdudum saucia cura
uulnus alit uenis et caeco carpitur igni.
multa uiri uirtus animo multusque recursat
gentis honos; haerent infixi pectore uultus
uerbaque nec placidam membris dat cura quietem.

⁸ Cf. Harrison (1972–3).

But the queen, long since stricken with deep love, nourishes the wound in her veins and is consumed by an unseen fire. Many a time the hero's courage came back to her mind, many a time the distinction of his family; his features stuck fast, fixed in her heart, and his words, and her love allows no peaceful sleep to her limbs.

The imagery of wounds and fire deployed here at the beginning of the book is strongly programmatic: as is well known, these images are not only repeated extensively in the course of the book, but also become literal in the sword-suicide of Dido on her pyre.⁹ A third programmatic element is generic: these images are especially associated with the contemporary genre of love-elegy, where original readers might most easily find the literary discourse of love. The metaphors of love as wound and as consuming fire both go back a long way in ancient literature,¹⁰ but are common in the language of love-elegy:¹¹ for *vulnus* of love cf. Propertius 2.12.12, 2.22.7, 2.25.46, Ovid, *Am.* 1.2.29, for *saucius* Tibullus 2.5.109, Ovid, *Am.* 2.1.7, and for erotic *ignis* Propertius 1.9.17, 3.6.39, 3.17.9, Ovid, *Am.* 1.2.9, 2.19.15. Especially elegiac is the use of *cura(e)* (used twice in these few lines) for the anxiety of love (Propertius 1.5.10, 1.10.17, 2.18.21, 3.17.4), and the climactic picture of the lover's consequent sleeplessness (Propertius 1.1.33, 1.11.5, 2.7.11, Tibullus 1.2.76, 2.4.11, Ovid, *Am.* 1.2.1). This complex of images strongly suggests that the story of Dido will also be elegiac in tone.

But once again there is an element of inversion in the appropriation of an elegiac plot into Vergil's epic framework. In elegy it is almost always the tormented male lover who describes himself as feeling the symptoms of love and suffering rejection and abandonment; in the *Aeneid* it is Dido who is depicted as enduring this range of emotions, while Aeneas steadfastly keeps his (genuine) feelings under control (cf. e.g. 4.331–2, 393–6, 437–49) and suffers insomnia only in the manner of a good leader.¹² The epic context of the *Aeneid* readjusts the

⁹ Cf. e.g. Lyne (1987: 121); Keith (2000: 113).

¹⁰ See e.g. the material collected by Brown (1987: 191) on Lucr. 4.1048 (wounds) and 268 on 4.1138 (fire).

¹¹ The examples which follow are largely culled from Pichon (1902), but I have cited the passages given the rarity of this still useful index of elegiac language. On elegiac sleeplessness see McKeown (1989: 34), for *cura* McKeown (1998: 207).

¹² Cf. 10.217 with Harrison (1991: 131).

unconventional gender-characterization of elegy, whose male lovers were often seen as soft and effeminate; Aeneas remains hard and uncompromising, while Dido portrays the more conventionally 'feminine' emotions. Apollonius' Medea had provided an epic point of reference for the plot of the attractive and powerful princess who falls in love with the hero, thus introducing the narration of romantic passion into the epic tradition; but the contemporary resonance with and remoulding of the angst-ridden male lover of elegy in Vergil's characterization of Dido points to the role of epic in reinforcing traditional gender stereotypes.¹³

The appropriation of tragedy and elegy in the description of Dido in book 4 is neatly balanced by the same generic combination in the characterization of both Turnus and Amata in books 7–12. Whether or not Turnus counts as a tragic hero by traditional Aristotelian standards has been the subject of fierce scholarly controversy, but he clearly has at least some elements of that figure.¹⁴ It seems clear from *Aeneid* 10.501–5 that Turnus makes an error through ignorance in putting on the sword-belt of Pallas, which meets a crucial Aristotelian criterion for the tragic hero, and that in his fall from royal status and lack of moral perfection he conforms in other ways to the Aristotelian category. Likewise, Amata, Turnus' potential mother-in-law, has convincingly been seen as a tragic queen for the poem's second half,¹⁵ matching the first-half Dido in irrational and dangerous passion, opposition to the hero, and dramatic suicide.

But the relationship between these two figures seems to be closer than that of future in-laws, and here once again tragedy and elegy are appropriated together into the epic framework. As Lyne has pointed out,¹⁶ Amata's speaking name has already been used to characterize her indirectly as an elegiac love-object at 7.343 *tacitumque obsedit limen Amatae*, where *Amatae* suggests *amatae* ('beloved') and the classic elegiac idea of the *exclusus amator* and that of the *puella* inside the house is invoked. That erotic characterization is in fact continued in 12.54–9, where Amata pleads with Turnus not to go out to fight with the Trojans:

¹³ On this aspect of Roman epic see esp. Keith (2000).

¹⁴ For a convenient bibliography see Hardie (1998: 63 n. 46).

¹⁵ Zarker (1969). ¹⁶ Lyne (1987: 13–17).

At regina noua pugnae conterrita sorte
 flebat et ardentem generum moritura tenebat: 55
 'Turne, per has ego te lacrimas, per si quis Amatae
 tangit honos animum: spes tu nunc una, senectae
 tu requies miserae, decus imperiumque Latini
 te penes, in te omnis domus inclinata recumbit.'

But the queen, terrified by the new turn of fortune in the battle, was weeping and embraced her fervent son-in-law, as if dying: 'Turnus, I beseech you, by these tears of mine, by any esteem for Amata which may affect your heart—you are my only hope, you are the rest for my wretched old age; in your hands is the glory and rule of Latinus, on you our whole house leans and depends.'

Here she is in one sense playing the maternal epic role of Hecuba, who makes a similar plea to Hector at the parallel point in the *Iliad* (22.76–89), but once again the semantic power of her name suggests an erotic and elegiac connection: not only does *per si quis Amatae / tangit honos animum*, as Lyne argues, recall the claims of passionate love urged by Dido in 4.305–19, where she too tries to prevent a departing hero from taking his leave, but the repeated pun *Amatae/amatae* suggests that elegy is once again in play here; so too (as Lyne notes) does her promise a little later on to die with Turnus (62–3; cf. e.g. Propertius 2.20.15–18). As in the presentation of Dido in book 4, the sufferings and pleas of the male elegiac lover are transferred in the context of epic to the female lover, re-establishing traditional gender hierarchy.

Amata's playing of various Greek tragic roles was already established in book 7: her ecstatic Maenadic departure to the woods and mountains (7.385–91) clearly parallels her with the Agave of Euripides' *Bacchae*.¹⁷ In book 12 this tragic element is combined with her elegiac love for Turnus to produce what Lyne has called a Phaedra complex: her quasi-incestuous passion, marked with the terminology of love-elegy, is rounded off like Phaedra's with self-hanging at *Aeneid* 12.601–3.¹⁸ Thus elegiac passion and tragic self-destruction are inextricably linked for Amata as for Dido, whose suicide in

¹⁷ See conveniently Horsfall (1999: 257). Pacuvius' *Pentheus* may also be important here, as it seems to be in the Pentheus simile of *Aeneid* 4.469–70, which gives details not in Euripides: cf. the detailed and learned investigation of Fernandelli (2002).

¹⁸ Lyne (1987: 16–18).

book 4 famously echoes that of Sophocles' Ajax,¹⁹ and the generic blend which opens the main part of one queen's story at the beginning of *Aeneid* 4 closes the story of another in *Aeneid* 12.

3. A SYMPOSIUM—BETWEEN LYRIC AND EPIC (*AENEID* 1.195–209)

Lyric poetry has been relatively little discussed in the analysis of other genres included in the *Aeneid*.²⁰ Yet the author of the *Aeneid* was a contemporary and friend of Horace (cf. *Satires* 1.4 and 1.5, *Odes* 1.3), and *Odes* 1–3 were published a few years before the *Aeneid*, at least on their usual dating of 23 BC.²¹ At *Aeneid* 1.195–209 Aeneas, having landed in Carthage, supplies his men with wine and encourages them with a speech after the near-disaster of the storm:

vina bonus quae deinde cadis onerarat Acestes litore Trinacrio dederatque abeuntibus heros dividit, et dictis maerentia pectora mulcet: 'o socii—neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum— o passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem. vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis	195 200
accestis scopulos, vos et Cyclopiam saxa experti: revocate animos, maestumque timorem mittite: forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit. per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum tendimus in Latium; sedes ubi fata quietas	 205
ostendunt; illic fas regna resurgere Troiae. durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis. taliam voce refert, curisque ingentibus aeger spem voltu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem.	

The hero shared out the wine which good Acestes had loaded into casks on the shore of Sicily and given to them as they left, and soothed their sorrowing hearts with these words: 'My comrades, for we are not inexperienced in sufferings before now, you who have suffered worse, the god will bring an

¹⁹ Clausen (2002: 101–6).

²⁰ For an exception (not wholly convincing) see Cairns (1989: 151–76).

²¹ For the latest discussion see Hutchinson (2002).

end to this too. You have confronted the rage of Scylla and the rocks that roar within, you have endured the Cyclops' rocks: call back your courage, and leave aside wretched sorrow. Perhaps some day it will be our joy to recall even this. Through different chances of fortune, through so many dangers of events we are heading for Latium, where destiny shows us a peaceful home: there it is right for the kingdom of Troy to rise again. Endure, and preserve yourself for favourable fortunes.' This he spoke aloud, and though distressed with many concerns he feigned hope in his features, and pressed his sorrow deep down in his heart.

It has long been recognized that these lines have some relationship with Horace, *Odes* 1.7, where the poem's mythological example supporting the idea that wine helps alleviate cares is Teucer, half-brother of the greater Ajax, forced by his father to leave his native Salamis after returning from Troy without Ajax (1.7.21–32):

Teucer Salamina patremque
cum fugeret, tamen uda Lyaeo
tempora populea fertur uinxisse corona,
sic tristis affatus amicos:
'quo nos cumque feret melior fortuna parente, 25
ibimus, o socii comitesque.
nil desperandum Teucro duce et auspice Teucro:
certus enim promisit Apollo
ambiguam tellure noua Salamina futuram.
o fortes peioraque passi
mecum saepe uiri, nunc uino pellite curas; 30
cras ingens iterabimus aequor.'

Teucer, when he was in flight from Salamis and his father, nevertheless (they say) bound his brows wet with wine with a garland of poplar and spoke to his sad friends as follows: 'Wherever chance, kinder than my father, may bear us, we will go, my comrades and companions. There is no cause to lose hope with Teucer as your leader and prophet. For firm was the promise of Apollo that there would be a competing Salamis in a new land. You mighty heroes, who have often suffered worse with me, now dispel your cares with wine: tomorrow we will pass again over the mighty ocean.'

Nisbet and Hubbard's commentary on the Horatian passage remarks pithily: 'This may be one of the rare places where Horace has influenced Virgil', echoed by Austin on the Vergilian lines.²² These

²² Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 107); Austin (1971: 82).

brief hints may be amplified with a metageneric emphasis. The lyric story of Teucer, probably drawn in turn by Horace from the tradition of tragedy,²³ is reprocessed in Vergil (who alludes to it later in the same book of the poem²⁴) to characterize the epic hero Aeneas. The thematic parallels are multiple and clear. Both heroes are exiles from their native land after family losses in the Trojan War (though Teucer was of course on the winning side); both engage in sympotic activity and consolatory rhetoric in order to encourage their men, disheartened by the rage of a powerful figure (Telamon, who has exiled Teucer and his men from Salamis, and Juno, who has buffeted Aeneas and his men with a mighty storm); and both follow the predictions of Apollo in seeking a new homeland abroad (cf. *Aeneid* 3.84–101), a new homeland which is intended to replicate the old one in name (cf. *Aeneid* 3.85–6).

Specific verbal echoes are fewer. The most striking has often been noticed, the encouraging suggestion in apostrophe that the hero's companions have suffered worse with him in the past (1.199 *o passi graviora* (followed by allusions to their previous dangers), 1.7.29–30 *o fortes peioraque passi / saepe mecum viri*). But the whole sympotic scenario from Horace's ode clearly suffuses the Vergilian passage: though there are several parallel instances from the *Odyssey* where Odysseus' men are encouraged to eat and drink, none is used in this way by the hero to encourage his men when in despair,²⁵ the key feature of the Horatian ode which the Vergilian lines recall. The epic account removes one lyric feature and adds one of its own, both appropriate to a more dignified and darker genre: the simple injunction to dispel cares through drink, invoking an idea fundamental to the Horatian sympotic ode (cf. *Odes* 1.18.1–4, 2.11.13–18, 3.8.13–24, 3.21.13–20, 4.12.17–20), is omitted in the more dignified epic context. The men do drink, as 1.214–15 makes clear, but their commander does not openly urge them to; the elaborate Homericizing eating-scene which follows (1.210–15) makes it clear that food is the priority in

²³ From Pacuvius' well-known *Teucer*: see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 93, 105).

²⁴ 1.619–22.

²⁵ Cf. *Od.* 10.460, 12.23 (Circe encourages them to eat and drink), 12.293 (Odysseus accedes unwillingly to the suggestion of his discontented men that they should eat and drink).

the form of the traditional epic diet of meat and little else, unlike in the lyric symposium, where food is virtually never mentioned. The epic text also adds the authorial comment that the commander did not feel as optimistic as his words suggested (1.208–9); such an analysis might also be appropriate to Teucer in his similar situation, and could be seen as an epic comment on Horace's lyric story, in which only the speech and not the inner thoughts of Teucer are reported, in the Pindaric mode. The suppression of Aeneas' personal feelings in the interest of the collective project is of course a theme of the *Aeneid* elsewhere (cf. e.g. 4.331–2). Thus recognizably lyric material from the *Odes* is accommodated to the *Aeneid*'s epic framework.

4. EPIGRAMMATIC EPISODES: EPITAPHS AND ARTEFACTS

The inclusion of elements from sepulchral epigram in the obituaries of the *Aeneid* has been the subject of recent study;²⁶ such inclusion seems to be a Vergilian innovation within the traditional epic genre, since Homeric obituaries probably precede any recognizable tradition of literary epigram, Apollonius of Rhodes does not draw on the flourishing tradition of epigram in the Hellenistic period, and only Lucretius seems to make previous use of epigrams within a Latin hexameter poem.²⁷ As we saw in Chapters 3 and 6, Horace does use epigrammatic elements in the *Satires* and *Odes*, incorporating them into the different frameworks of *sermo* and lyric. The incorporation of such elements into epic is important for the history of the genre, since (as so often) Ovid's *Metamorphoses* picks up on and expands this Vergilian innovation.²⁸ Here I shall analyse two passages from this perspective, one from the sepulchral tradition, another from that of the 'speaking artefact' epigram.

²⁶ See e.g. Barchiesi (1979); Kyriakidis (1998: 50–3, 78–82); Horsfall (1999: pp. xix, xxi); Thomas (2004); Dinter (2005).

²⁷ Kenney (1970: 371–3) importantly notes the use of Antipater of Sidon, *AP* 7.713 at *Lucr.* 4.180–2 (=909–11).

²⁸ See Hardie (2002: 81–97).

(a) **Literary Remains: Traces of Catullus 101 in *Aeneid* 6**

Catullus 101 is perhaps the best known sepulchral epigram in Latin:

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora uectus
 aduenio has miseras, frater, ad inferias,
 ut te postremo donarem munere mortis
 et mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem.
 quandoquidem fortuna mihi tete abstulit ipsum.
 heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi,
 nunc tamen interea haec, prisco quae more parentum
 tradita sunt tristi munere ad inferias,
 accipe fraterno multum manantia fletu,
 atque in perpetuum, frater, aue atque uale.

Borne through many peoples and many seas, I come, brother, for these wretched funeral offerings to you, to present you with the last gift due to death and to address your voiceless ashes, all in vain. Seeing that fate has taken you yourself from me, alas, poor brother, sadly snatched from me, nevertheless now for the time being receive these gifts, handed down by the ancient practice of our ancestors for funeral offerings in a sad duty; receive them dripping with a brother's tears, and hail and farewell, brother, for ever.

It is unsurprising that this poem, by a poet of the previous generation crucial for Vergil's poetic development, is echoed in the *Aeneid*. That it is alluded to repeatedly in *Aeneid* 6²⁹ is even less surprising when we remember that Catullus 101 refers to a distant journey undertaken to pay funeral honours to a dead family member, for *Aeneid* 6 narrates Aeneas' demanding journey to the underworld, undertaken primarily to meet again the shade of his father Anchises (5.731–7, 6.108–9, 6.670–1), and reports his dutiful attendance to the funeral rites of his former trumpeter Misenus (6.162–235). We recall too that Catullus' journey moves from Italy to the Troad, while that of Aeneas marks the last stage of his voyage from the Troad to Italy.

The first allusions to Catullus 101 in *Aeneid* 6 come at 6.212–24, in the course of the elaborate description of Misenus' funeral:

²⁹ Most of the parallels discussed here have been simply noted by Austin (1977) without further comment; on 6.692 and Catullus 101.1 see also Conte (1986: 33–4), Hardie (1998: 58).

Nec minus interea Misenum in litore Teucrici
 flebant et *cineri ingrato suprema ferebant*.
 principio pinguem taedis et robore secto
 ingentem struxere pyram, cui frondibus atris 215
 intexunt latera et feralis ante cupressos
 constituunt, decorantque super fulgentibus armis.
 pars calidos latices et aena undantia flammis
 expediunt, corpusque lauant frigentis et unguunt.
 fit gemitus. tum membra toro defleta reponunt 220
 purpureasque super uestis, uelamina nota,
 coniciunt. pars ingenti subiere feretro,
triste ministerium, et subiectam *more parentum*
 auersi tenuere facem.

Meanwhile the Trojans were lamenting Misenus no less keenly, and were bringing the last gifts to his ashes that could give no thanks. First of all they built a mighty pyre, rich in pine torches and oak logs, and covered its sides with dark foliage, and set up funeral cypresses in front of it, and ornament it on top with gleaming weapons. Some make ready hot water and cauldrons bubbling over the flame, and wash and anoint the body of the cold corpse; then they lay out his lamented limbs on a couch and throw over it purple garments, well known coverings. Others put their shoulders under a mighty bier, a sad duty, and turning away held the torch to the pyre according to ancestral custom.

The echoes are clear: *cineri ingrato* (6.213) picks up the idea of *mutam... cinerem* (101.4),³⁰ with the same notion of inert ashes which cannot acknowledge the service rendered, while *suprema ferebant* (6.213) with its reference to the last gifts to the dead clearly picks up 101.3 *postremo... munere mortis*. *Triste ministerium* (6.223) recalls *tristi munere* (101.8), both referring to the 'sad duty' of honouring the dead in a funeral ceremony, and *more parentum* provides a literal echo of 101.7. More generally, the Vergilian emphasis on gifts (6.225) and the last words spoken to the unhearing corpse (6.231—after the end of the quotation above—*dixitque novissima*

³⁰ Note the change of gender (*cinis* can be feminine in Republican writers, but settles down as masculine by the Augustan period, apart from archaizing revival of the feminine by Apuleius and others: cf. *TLL* 3.1070.2–12). Vergil's *ingrato* may pick up another Catullan sepulchral elegy, that for Quintilia addressed to Calvus (96), treating the same idea of whether the dead can be conscious of services from the living—cf. Catullus 96.1–2 *si quicquam mutis gratum acceptumve sepulcris / accidere a nostro, Calve, dolore potest*.

verba) remind the reader of similar features in Catullus (101.3 *donarem*, 101.4 *nequiquam alloquerer*).

The immediately following lines in the Vergilian narrative, though they do not recall the Catullan epitaph, seem to continue themes from sepulchral epigram more generally (6.232–5):

at pius Aeneas ingenti mole sepulcrum
imponit suaque arma uiro remumque tubamque
monte sub aereo, qui nunc Misenus ab illo
dicitur aeternumque tenet per saecula nomen.

But dutiful Aeneas laid a tomb of vast mass on top, and the man's equipment, his oar and his trumpet, beneath the airy height which is now called Misenus after him and retains his name for ever through the centuries.

As commentators note, the use of the oar as marker for the tomb recalls the Homeric model of the interment of Elpenor (*Odyssey* 12.15), and that of the Apollonian Idmon (*Argonautica* 2.841–4),³¹ but the placing of a dead person's professional equipment on their tomb is also a topic of sepulchral epigram: cf. *AP* 7.394 (Antipater of Thessalonica, first century BC/first century AD: a millstone marks a miller's tomb), 7.445 (Perses of Thebes, fourth century BC: axes mark the tomb of brother woodcutters) and 7.505 ('Sappho', probably Hellenistic:³² a fish-trap and an oar mark the tomb of a fisherman). The final aetiology of the toponym (6.234–5) is Callimachean in tone,³³ but the idea of fame bestowed on a dead person by their burial is once again a topic of sepulchral epigram.³⁴

The second general context where the Catullan epigram and its sepulchral tradition is invoked is when Aeneas sees his former comrades who had been drowned in the storm of book 1 (6.333–6):

cernit ibi maestos et *mortis honore* carentis
Leucaspim et Lyciae ductorem classis Oronten,
quos simul a Troia uentosa *per aequora uectos* 335
obruit Auster, aqua inuoluens nauemque uirosque.

There he saw, sad and lacking the honour of the dead, Leucaspis, and Orontes, leader of the Lycian fleet, whom the south wind overwhelmed

³¹ Cf. Nelis (2001: 243).

³² See Page (1981: 185).

³³ See Austin (1977: 107).

³⁴ See the extensive material collected by Lattimore (1942: 240–6).

together as they were carried away from Troy through the ocean, wrapping both ship and crew in water.

Here 6.335 *per aequora vectos* clearly looks back to 101.1 *per aequora vectus*, and *mortis honore* recalls 101.3 *munere mortis*. These verbal links are assisted by thematic connections: the context is once again that of untimely death of young men, and a Trojan journey is involved (in this case away from Troy, again a neat westward inversion of Catullus' eastward voyage). As at 6.232–6, the Catullan material is augmented with topics from sepulchral epigram more generally: the unburied dead who perish at sea (and are provided with cenotaphs) are a major category of epitaphic subject in the *Greek Anthology* (cf. e.g. AP 7.271–5, 285, 395), and even the relative clause which describes their end in detail (*quos simul...*) recalls similar syntax in those epigrams describing the circumstances of death—cf. AP 7.389.3 (Apollonides, on the deaths of four brothers) *οὓς Ἀίδαο συνήριθμον ἤρπασεν ἡμαρ*, 'whom the same number of death-days snatched away', 7.395.1–2 [Argentarius] *Οὗτος ὁ Καλλαισχροῦ κενεὸς τάφος, ὃν βαθὺν χεῦμα / ἔσφηλεν Λιβυκῶν ἔνδρο μέοντα πόρων*, 'this is the cenotaph of Kallaischros, whom the deep tide brought low as he ran through the Libyan straits'. Once again the funeral tone adds to the atmosphere of the underworld, and suggests Aeneas' unexpressed mourning for his lost comrades.

The third allusion to the Catullan epigram occurs when Aeneas finally meets Anchises in the Elysian Fields and is greeted ecstatically by him (6.687–94):

'uenisti tandem, tuaque exspectata parenti
 uicit iter durum pietas? datur ora tueri,
 nate, tua et notas audire et reddere uoces?
 sic equidem ducebam animo rebarque futurum 690
 tempora dinumerans, nec me mea cura fefellit.
 quas ego te terras et quanta per aequora uectum
 accipio! quantis iactatum, nate, periclis!
 quam metui ne quid Libyae tibi regna nocerent!'

'So have you come at last, and has your dutifulness that your father so expected overcome the difficult journey? Is it really granted me to look on your face, my son, and to hear and respond to the voice I know so well? This is what I went through in my mind and thought would happen as

I calculated the time, and my efforts were not in vain. What lands and great oceans have you crossed for me to receive you! What fears I had that the kingdoms of Africa might do you harm!

Aeneid 6.692 (like 6.335, above) recalls 101.1, echoing not just the line-ending but also the combination of two elements through which the journey has been made; *terras* replaces *gentes* but preserves the same universalizing dichotomy between land and sea. Again (as at 6.333–6, above) there is a neat inversion of the original: the lines addressed by the traveller Catullus to the tomb of his dead brother are here addressed by the dead Anchises to his voyaging son. But the pathos of the original is carefully maintained: just as the ‘meeting’ of Catullus and his beloved dead brother cannot be a substantial human encounter, so the meeting of Aeneas and his beloved dead father cannot be physical, since he can see and listen to his father’s ghost but not embrace him as if he were still alive (cf. 6.700–3).

This ‘distribution’ of a single model in several episodes is a technique which has been recognized as a Vergilian strategy of allusion.³⁵ But its impact is consistent: in each context the recalling of Catullus 101 adds to the gloomy atmosphere of *Aeneid* 6 as an enriching allusion to a specifically funereal genre, and this famous poem of loyalty to the dead provides broader literary support for Aeneas’ crucial epic characterization as *pius* towards his comrades and his father.

(b) From Tree to Nymph: Epigrammatic Autobiography at *Aeneid* 10.228–35

At *Aeneid* 10.228–35 the sea-nymph Cymodocea appears suddenly to Aeneas in the middle of the night as he sails back from Etruria to Latium, and gives an account of herself:

tum sic ignarum adloquitur: ‘uigilasne, deum gens,
Aenea? uigila et uelis immitte rudentis.
nos sumus, Idaeae sacro de uertice pinus, 230
nunc pelagi nympheae, classis tua. perfidus ut nos

³⁵ Cf. e.g. the use of the Lucretian figure of Iphigeneia in the *Aeneid*, Hardie (1984), or Vergil’s use of Catullus 66 (Wills, 1996: 74).

praecipitis ferro Rutulus flammaque premebat,
 rupimus inuitae tua uincula teque per aequor
 quaerimus. hanc genetrix faciem miserata refecit
 et dedit esse deas aeuumque agitare sub undis.

235

Then she addressed the unsuspecting Aeneas as follows: 'Are you awake, son of the gods, Aeneas? Wake up, and slacken the brails on the sails. It is we, pines of Ida from its lofty summit, now nymphs of the ocean—your fleet. When the treacherous Rutulian was pressing us headlong with sword and flame, we broke your moorings, all unwilling, and have sought you over the sea. This appearance that you see The Mother refashioned in her pity, and granted that we should be goddesses and live our life beneath the waves.'

The sea-nymph's unsolicited autobiography plainly echoes the words of speaking artefacts in epigrams, where inanimate items strikingly explain their origins. Closest perhaps to this individual instance is *AP* 9.131,³⁶ where a ship is imagined as speaking:

Οὔρεσιν ἐν δολιχοῖς βλωθρῆν πίτυν ὑέτιός με
 πρόρριζον γαίης ξεκύλισε Νότος·
 ἔνθεν ναῦς γενόμην, ἀνέμοις πάλιν ὄφρα μάχωμαι.
 ἄνθρωποι τόλμης οὐ ποτε φειδόμενοι.

In the high mountains the rainy south wind sent me, the strong pine, rolling out of the ground, roots and all; then I became a ship, so as to fight once more with the winds. O men, never sparing in daring.

Like Cymodocea, the ship gives an account of its metamorphosis, in this case from tree to ship, only the first stage in Cymodocea's story. In Chapter 3 (see p. 98 above) we encountered such statements by speaking statues of Priapus, which also occur in epigram form in the Greek Anthology (*AP* 16.86), and such speaking images can be found in other genres of Hellenistic and Augustan poetry.³⁷ These epigrams where the image of a god speaks have obvious links with the divine Cymodocea here, but other epigrams with different types of speakers also provide parallels. For example, at *AP* 6.113 (Simmias of Rhodes, early third century BC) a bow speaks:

³⁶ As briefly noted at Harrison (1991: 135).

³⁷ Cf. Callimachus, *Iambus* 9, Horace *Sat.* 1.8, Tibullus 1.4 (see Ch. 3 above); perhaps also Catullus 4, if Griffith (1983) is right to interpret the *phaselus* as a wooden model of a ship.

Πρόσθε μὲν ἀγραύλοιο δασύτριχος ἰξάλου αἰγὸς
δοῖον ὄπλον χλωροῖς ἐστεφόμεν πετάλοις·
νῦν δέ με Νικομάχῳ κεραοξόος ἤρμουσε τέκτων,
ἐτανύσας ἔλικος καρτερὰ νεῦρα βοός.

Before as the twin weapon of a shaggy wild ibex I was crowned with green leaves; but now a horn-working craftsman has worked me for Nicomachus, stretching across the strong sinew of an ox with crooked horns.

At AP 9.162 (anonymous, probably Hellenistic)³⁸ a pen speaks:

Ἥμην ἀχρεῖον κάλαμος φυτόν· ἐκ γὰρ ἐμείο
οὐ σύκ', οὐ μῆλον φύεται, οὐ σταφυλή·
ἀλλὰ μ' ἀνήρ ἐμύησ' Ἑλικωνίδα λεπτὰ τορήσας
χείλεα καὶ στεινὸν ῥοῦν ὀχρευσάμενος.
ἐκ δὲ τοῦ εὖτε πίοιμι μέλαν ποτόν, ἔνθεος οἶα
πᾶν ἔπος ἀφθέγκτω τῶδε λαλῶ στόματι.

I was the useless shoot of a reed, for from me sprang no figs, or apples, or grapes; but a man initiated me into Helicon by shaping my lips and hollowing out a narrow channel. Since then when I drink the dark fluid, like one inspired I speak every kind of word with this voiceless mouth of mine.

In each case the autobiography has three key features: it is spoken in the voice of the artefact in the first person, the artefact lists its two states of existence (raw material and finished object), and the transition from one state to the other is marked by a temporal term or a pair of temporal terms (cf. 9.131.3 *ἔνθεν*, 'then', 6.113.1–3 *Πρόσθε μὲν . . . νῦν δέ*, 'before . . . now', 9.162.5 *ἐκ δὲ τοῦ*, 'from that time'). All three features are to be found in Cymodocea's account of herself in the lines 230–1 (note 231 *nunc*). Indeed, Cymodocea's statement enhances and varies the traditional framework: she reveals not only her original raw material (*Idaeae de sacro vertice pinus*³⁹) and her final state of sea-nymph (*pelagi nympphae*), but also her intermediate state of ship (*classis tua*). Hers has been a double metamorphosis.

This scene with the nymphs provides light relief between the portentous catalogue of the Etruscans (10.163–214) and the dramatic

³⁸ Page (1981: 368).

³⁹ With a clear reference to Catullus 64.1 *Peliaco quondam prognatae vertice pinus*, evoking another context where sea-nymphs appear to heroes: cf. Harrison (1991: 131, 133, 135).

battle when the Trojans land in Latium (10.249 ff.), and the insertion into the scene of an allusion to a 'frivolous' literary kind such as the epigram of the speaking artefact clearly adds to this atmosphere. But once again the 'guest' material is carefully accommodated to its 'host' genre. The speaker is not merely an artefact but a divine personage: Cymodocea's metamorphosis (as already noted) is not just from raw material to object, but goes further in granting her immortality as a sea-nymph, under the protection of Cybele, the Great Mother. This adds an element of epic miraculousness and sublimity,⁴⁰ as well as providing an indication of the gods' support for Aeneas' forthcoming fight to establish the future Roman state.⁴¹

5. THE POET ASCENDING: EPIC AND OTHER HEXAMETER FORMS

In Chapters 2 and 5 we saw how the idea of upward poetic ascent through the 'lower' hexameter forms was thematized in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. In this final section I would like to invert this and consider how the *Aeneid* incorporates and manipulates some 'lower' hexameter genres, especially by looking back to those in which the poem's author had already worked.

(a) A Hymnic Encounter: *Aeneid* 1.314–418 and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*

At *Aeneid* 1.314–418, having just landed near Carthage, Aeneas meets and converses with his mother Venus, who is disguised as a young and attractive huntress. This episode plainly owes much to the encounter of Odysseus with Nausicaa in the *Odyssey* (6.149 ff.), and the links with that episode have been noted since antiquity and

⁴⁰ Cf. e.g. the miraculous vocality of Achilles' horse Xanthus at the end of *Iliad* 19.404–24, similarly prophetic of the outcome of the impending battle to which the hero is en route.

⁴¹ On the scene see also Fantham (1990); O'Hara (1990: 40–3); on Cybele's role in the *Aeneid* see Wiseman (1984).

closely investigated.⁴² But another model for the episode has been relatively neglected, even though it was noted by an influential work of Vergilian criticism of the nineteenth century.⁴³ Venus' meeting with her son also recalls the narrative of her meeting with Anchises in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, the episode in which Aeneas was conceived.

In that poem Zeus inspires Aphrodite/Venus with a passion for the good-looking mortal Anchises, so that she will not feel herself superior to the other gods, whom she has forced to love-affairs with mortals. The encounter between the two takes place in the wilds of Mount Ida, in the cattle-byre where Anchises is herding cows. Venus, alluringly dressed but disguised as a mortal girl, at once attracts Anchises' erotic interest (*HHA* 84–91):

Ἀγχίσης δ' ὀρώων ἐφράζετο θαύμαινέν τε
 εἶδός τε μέγεθος καὶ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα.
 πέπλον μὲν γὰρ ἔεστο φαινότερον πυρὸς ἀυγῆς,
 εἶχε δ' ἐπιγναμπτὰς ἔλικας κάλυκας τε φαινιάς,
 ὄρμοι δ' ἀμφ' ἀπαλῆ δειρήνῃ περικαλλέες ἦσαν
 καλοὶ χρύσειοι παμπούκιλοι· ὡς δὲ σελήνη
 στήθεσιν ἀμφ' ἀπαλοῖσιν ἐλάμπετο, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι.
 Ἀγχίσην δ' ἔρος εἶλεν...

Anchises gazed and took stock of her, wondering at her appearance, her stature, and her shining garments: for she wore a dress brighter than firelight, and she had twisted bracelets and shining ear buds. Round her tender neck there were beautiful necklaces of gold, most elaborate, and about her tender breasts it shone like the moon, a wonder to behold. Anchises was seized by desire... (Tr. West, 2003*b*)

This provides clear links with (but also instructive differences from) the description of Venus at *Aeneid* 1.314–20:

Cui mater media sese tulit obvia silva,
 virginis os habitumque gerens, et virginis arma
 Spartanæ, vel qualis equos Threissa fatigat
 Harpalyce, volucremque fuga praevertitur Hebrum.

⁴² Cf. Macrobius, *Sat.*5.2.13, Austin (1971: 118); Knauer (1964: 158–61).

⁴³ Sainte-Beuve (1891: 245–58 (originally published 1857)). The parallel is merely noted and not developed by Austin (1971: 123, 125); Wlosok (1967: 75 n. 1 and 84 n. 47) regards the link as improbable.

Namque umeris de more habilem suspenderit arcum
 venatrix, dederatque comam diffundere ventis,
 nuda genu, nodoque sinus collecta fluentis.

He was met by his mother in the middle of a wood, with the features and dress of a young girl, and the equipment of a young girl of Sparta, or like Thracian Harpalyce as she tires out her horses, and overtakes the flying Hebrus in her course. For she was a huntress and had hung her handy bow from her shoulders in the usual way, and had given her hair to float on the wind, her knee bare, her flowing garment bound at the front with a knot.

In both cases the encounter takes place in a rustic environment; the erotic nature and effect of Venus' dress is stressed in the hymn, but in the epic the reader is left to infer that the elaborate description of her appearance is seen from Aeneas' point of view, and indeed (following the hymnic passage) that his view of his disguised mother might be in fact as erotic as Anchises' of his disguised future sexual partner. Though Venus' hunting dress in Vergil resembles (ironically) that of her virginal divine opposite Diana,⁴⁴ the combination of untied hair and hitched-up skirt are surely erotically alluring; Venus is the goddess of sex, and here perhaps her erotic aspect gets the better of her maternal role (she could after all have appeared in a less erotic guise). She dresses at least partly to look sexually attractive to her son.⁴⁵

In the hymn Anchises immediately addresses the disguised Aphrodite as a goddess (*HHA* 92–9):

*Χαίρε ἄνασσ', ἢ τις μακάρων τάδε δώμαθ' ἰκάνεις,
 Ἄρτεμις ἢ Λητώ ἢ χρυσέη Ἀφροδίτη
 ἢ Θέμις ἠγενῆς ἢ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
 ἢ πού τις Χαρίτων δεῦρ' ἦλυθες, αἶ τε θεοῖσι
 πᾶσιν ἑταιρίζουσι καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται,
 ἢ τις νυμφῶν αἶ τ' ἄλσεα καλὰ νέμονται,
 [ἢ νυμφῶν αἶ καλὸν ὄρος τόδε ναιετάουσι]
 καὶ πηγὰς ποταμῶν καὶ πίσσα ποιήεντα.*

Hail, Lady, whichever of the blessed ones you are that arrive at this dwelling, Artemis or Leto or golden Aphrodite, high-born Themis or steely-eyed

⁴⁴ This cleverly picks up Odysseus' comparison of Nausicaa to Artemis on their first meeting in the main model scene from the *Odyssey* (6.151).

⁴⁵ This nuance was observed by the Victorian novelist Thackeray: see Harrison (2000). On the sexual allure of Venus in this scene see also Reckford (1995).

Athena; or perhaps you are one of the Graces come here, who are companions to all the gods and are called immortal: or one of the nymphs who haunt the fair groves [or of the nymphs who dwell on this fair mountain] and the waters of rivers and the grassy meads. (Tr. West, 2003*b*)

In the epic it is Venus who addresses Aeneas with a fictitious question about her hunting-companions (just as the Aphrodite of the hymn invents a long story about her supposed mortal identity, *HHA* 108–42), and it is in reply to this that Aeneas suggests she is a goddess (1.327–9):

O quam te memorem, virgo? namque haud tibi voltus
mortalis, nec vox hominem sonat: O, dea certe—
an Phoebi soror? an nympharum sanguinis una?—

Ah, as of what form should I speak of you, maiden? For your face is not mortal, nor does your voice sound human. Oh, a goddess indeed—are you Apollo's sister, or one of the blood of the nymphs?

As scholars have noted, the comparison with Artemis is found in both the *Odyssey* and the *HHA* and could come from either; but the suggestion that she is one of the Nymphs plainly derives from the hymn (*HHA* 98, above).

Vergil's epic scene thus uses the hymn as source as well as the *Odyssey*, and this in turn imports an erotic frisson into the scene: once one recognizes that one of the literary models for the encounter of Aeneas and Venus is the encounter of Venus and Anchises at which Aeneas himself was conceived, this allows a broader view of Venus in this scene of *Aeneid* 1 which is thoroughly consistent with her characterization elsewhere in the epic, as a deity who has sex as well as parenthood as a concern. Her swift vanishing act at the end of the scene (1.402–5) without formally revealing her identity (as Aeneas complains, 1.407–10) shows that she does not provide her son with the emotional support a mother should, and may be interestingly compared with her equally rapid disappearance in the *HHA* after the end of her post-coital harangue of Anchises (*HHA* 291). Sainte-Beuve concluded that Vergil used the erotic narrative of the hymn in order to show that it had been tastefully transformed for its dignified epic appearance;⁴⁶ but I would rather argue that the echoes

⁴⁶ Sainte-Beuve (1891: 258–9).

of Venus' less dignified role from the markedly lower subgenre of Homeric hymn contribute to a dubious assessment of her character consistent with other parts of the epic.⁴⁷ In either case, the epic narrative appropriates hymnic material for its own purposes, with some consciousness of generic ascent from a shorter and less dignified hexameter form.

(b) A Pastoral Presence: the Return of the Cyclops
(Aeneid 3.641–61)

At *Aeneid* 3.641–44 the marooned Achaemenides, former companion of Odysseus, gives a vivid account to the Trojans (arrived on Sicily) of the blind Polyphemos and his fellow Cyclopes:

nam qualis quantusque cauo Polyphemos in antro
lanigeras claudit pecudes atque *ubera pressat*,
centum alii curua haec habitant ad litora uulgo
infandi Cyclopes et *altis montibus errant*.

For there are a hundred more of the same nature and size as Polyphemos, as he shuts his woolly sheep in his hollow cave and squeezes their udders, monstrous Cyclopes who live in common by these curving shores and wander in the lofty mountains.

Scholars who have studied the appearance of Polyphemos in the *Aeneid* have pointed to important connections with the *Odyssey* and with the Theocritean Polyphemos of *Idyll* 11, and to possible links with Euripidean satyr-play,⁴⁸ but the allusions to Vergilian pastoral have not been stressed. The emphasized phrases plainly look back to the *Eclogues*: *ubera pressat* (3.642) recalls *pressabimus ubera palmis* (again of milking sheep) at *Ecl.* 3.99, while *altis montibus errant* (3.644) picks up the words of the Vergilian Corydon in *Eclogue* 2, who owes so much to the Theocritean Polyphemos of *Idyll* 11⁴⁹—cf.

⁴⁷ For the negative characterization of Venus in the *Aeneid* cf. (e.g.) Feeney (1991: 183); Lyne (1987: 248)—reacting against the more positive Wlosok (1967).

⁴⁸ Glenn (1972) stresses the influence of the *Odyssey* and wants to play down Hellenistic connections; Quinn (1972: 133) emphasizes the connection with Theocritus; on the potential link with satyr-play see Floratos (1959).

⁴⁹ See Du Quesnay (1979).

*Ecl.*2.21 *mille meae Siculis errant in montibus agnae.*⁵⁰ In the *Aeneid*, however, the wandering over the mountains is that of the herdsmen, not that of the animals: the wretched, bestial, wandering life of the Cyclopes reflects that of their sheep. This dark description and its evocation of the very different world of the *Eclogues* emphasizes the generic gap between the more realistic herdsman's existence as depicted in the tougher world of Vergil's epic (following the *Odyssey* here in pointing to the poor lifestyle of the Cyclopes), and the idealized view presented in his pastoral poetry.

A similar contrast is available when we recall that this is not the first appearance of Polyphemus in the Vergilian corpus. In a song quoted by the shepherd Moeris in *Eclogue* 9 we find a version of a section of the Cyclops' wooing-song to Galatea from *Idyll* 11.42–9, and although the Cyclops is not named, the close use of the Theocritean passage and the address to Galatea guarantee that he is imagined as the speaker (9.39–43):

'huc ades, o Galatea: quis est nam ludus in undis?
 hic uer purpureum, uarios hic flumina circum 40
 fundit humus flores; hic candida populus antro
 imminet et lentae texunt umbracula uites.
 huc ades; insani feriant sine litora fluctus'

Come here, Galatea—for what sport can lie in the waves? Here is the crimson spring, here the ground pours forth flowers of different colours around the streams; here the white poplar leans over my cave, and pliant vines weave shade. Come here, and leave the raging billows to strike the shore.

This Polyphemus of the *Eclogues* points to the abundance of the pastoral landscape in general as an inducement for the sea-nymph Galatea to leave the waves for the land, following his Theocritean original, who is similarly concerned to advertise the conveniences of his cave and its associated lush garden (*Id.* 11.42–9). This idyllic pastoral existence seems far from that of the Cyclopes of the *Aeneid*; though the Polyphemus of *Aeneid* 3 still lives in a cave (3.641), there is no emphasis in the epic context on pastoral abundance,

⁵⁰ Note however that the idea of wandering is Vergilian (the Theocritean Polyphemus says only that he herds a thousand cattle, 11.34 βοτὰ χίλια βόσκω).

indeed the opposite,⁵¹ and the traces of the *Eclogues* seem to stress that his life and that of his fellow Cyclopes has returned to the brutish existence description found in Homer.

This can be seen again when Polyphemus himself finally appears (3.655–61):

Vix ea fatus erat summo cum monte uidemus	655
ipsum inter pecudes uasta se mole mouentem	
pastorem Polyphemum et litora nota petentem,	
monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.	
trunca manum pinus regit et uestigia firmat;	
lanigerae comitantur oues; ea sola uoluptas	660
solamenque mali.	

Hardly had he said this when we saw on the mountain's top the shepherd Polyphemus himself, moving with his mighty mass and seeking the shores he knew so well, a dreadful monster, ugly, huge, bereft of light. The trunk of a pine guided his hand and supported his steps; his woolly sheep accompanied him, his sole pleasure and consolation in his suffering.

Here the transformation of the pastoral Polyphemus of the *Eclogues* is complete, and stressed by textual details. Not least of these is the identification of him as *pastorem* and *litora nota petentem*: the *litora* are the shores from which he had thrown rocks at Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, but they are also the shores from which he had tried to seduce Galatea (cf. *Ecl.* 9.43 *litora*) in his role as pastoral shepherd, and they are well-known (*nota*) not only because the blind Cyclops has regularly felt his way there, but also because they are the scenario for his famous pastoral love-song to Galatea. The detail of his pine staff also has pastoral implications: the whole tree-trunk points to the giant's size, but its identity points to the *Eclogues*, where the pine-tree is a key feature of the pastoral landscape (*Ecl.* 1.38, 7.24, 8.22). The Cyclops bears the traces of his previous Vergilian and Theocritean existence; what we see in Vergil's epic is a sad, truncated version of the happier Polyphemus of pastoral, and the *malum* that he suffers is the tragic and permanent harm of blindness, not the comic and temporary pain of unrequited and impossible love for a sea-nymph.

⁵¹ The impression of a harsh landscape is emphasized by the wretched life of Achaemenides himself, living off berries and grass and hiding in deserted places from the Cyclopes (3.645–50).

(c) Didactic Diverted: Ghosts and Bees (*Aeneid* 10.636–42, 1.430–8, 6.706–9, 12.587–92)

The use of Lucretius in the *Aeneid* has been extensively investigated,⁵² but relatively little has been said of how the ‘higher’ genre of heroic epic in the *Aeneid* overtly positions itself by reference to and incorporation of its ‘lower’ relative of didactic epic in the form of the *De Rerum Natura*,⁵³ which must have been the most striking and ambitious hexameter poem in Latin of its time; compare its impact on Horace’s *Satires*, traced in Chapter 3 above. Perhaps the most famous passage of sustained Lucretian allusion in the *Aeneid* is the speech of Anchises at 6.724–51, in which constant verbal allusion to the style of Lucretius is employed to give an exposition of a theory of reincarnation which Lucretius would have strongly opposed: as Austin puts it, ‘the manner is constantly and pointedly Lucretian; the matter would have excited Lucretius’ disdain’.⁵⁴ Philip Hardie has suggestively pointed out that the passage matches the Ennian-type list of Roman heroes which follows in strongly recalling a famous Roman hexameter predecessor:⁵⁵ one might add that the two are thus presented in conventional ascending order, the lower philosophical didactic as a propaedeutic for the higher military epic. Thus the Epicurean didactic epic of nature is appropriated into the very non-Epicurean military epic, and doubly manipulated for its new context: it is set as a ‘warm-up’ for the real epic climax of the book in the Show of Heroes, and anti-Lucretian ideas are systematically presented in Lucretian language to show both respect for Lucretian style and opposition to his ideas.

A further example from book 10 of the poem shows similar attitudes to the *De Rerum Natura*, denying its content while using its form, and putting it in a position subordinate to Homeric-style epic.⁵⁶ At 10.636–42 Juno, following Homeric precedent, makes an

⁵² Hardie (1986: 157–240).

⁵³ Hardie (1998: 54 n. 4) has some brief suggestive remarks.

⁵⁴ Austin (1977: 211).

⁵⁵ Hardie (1998: 54).

⁵⁶ The bare outlines of this argument already appear at Harrison (1991: 227–8).

image of Turnus from cloud in order to deceive Aeneas and rescue Turnus temporarily from the danger of a duel with him:

tum dea nube caua tenuem sine uiribus umbram
 in faciem Aeneae (uisu mirabile monstrum)
 Dardaniis ornat telis, clipeumque iubasque
 diuini adsimulat capitis, dat inania uerba,
 dat sine mente sonum gressusque effingit euntis,
 morte obita qualis fama est uolitare figuras
 aut quae sopitos deludunt somnia sensus.

Then the goddess made an insubstantial, strengthless phantom of hollow cloud in the shape of Aeneas, a wonder marvellous to behold, and decked it out with Trojan weapons; she counterfeited the shield and crests of the godlike hero, gave it empty words and mindless utterance, and fashioned for it the step of a walking man, just like the shades which are said to flit about after death, or the dreams that delude the slumbering senses.

A number of linguistic items in this passage pick up Lucretius 4.29–41, where it is argued that the supposed ghostly visions seen in sleep are simply forms of the emanations that come from all bodies and cause them to be perceived:

nunc agere incipiam tibi, quod vehementer ad has res
 attinet, esse ea quae rerum simulacra vocamus,
 quod speciem ac formam similem gerit eius imago,
 cuius cumque cluet de corpore fusa vagari;
 quae quasi membranae summo de corpore rerum
 dereptae *volitant* ultroque citroque per auras,
 atque eadem nobis vigilantibus obuia mentes
 terrificant atque in somnis, cum saepe *figuras*
 contuimur miras simulacraque luce carentum,
 quae nos horrifice languentis saepe sopore
 excierunt ne forte animas Acherunte reamur
 effugere aut umbras inter vivos *volitare*
 neve aliquid nostri post mortem posse relinquere,
 cum corpus simul atque animi natura perempta
 in sua discessum dederint primordia quaeque.
 dico igitur rerum effigias *tenuisque figuras*
 mittier ab rebus summo de cortice eorum;
 id licet hinc quamvis hebeti cognoscere corde.

You shall now see me begin to deal with what is of high importance for this subject, and to show that there exist what we call images of things; which, like films drawn from the outermost surface of things, flit about hither and thither through the air: it is these same that, encountering us in wakeful hours, terrify our minds, as also in sleep, when we often behold wonderful shapes and images of the dead, which have often aroused in us horror while we lay languid in sleep: lest by chance we should think that spirits escape from Acheron or ghosts flit about amongst the living, or that anything of us can be left after death, when body and mind both taken off together have dissolved abroad, each into its own first-beginnings. I say, therefore, that semblances and thin shapes of things are thrown off from their outer surface. This can be recognized by the dullest brain from what follows. (Tr. Smith, 1975)

The Vergilian passage describing the manufacture of a ghost thus picks up and inverts a key Lucretian passage where the existence of such magic spectres is specifically denied; the arch allusion *qualis fama est*, often indicating a known source for Vergilian material,⁵⁷ confirms this here. The phrase *visu mirabile* (10.637) also specifically inverts Lucretian attitudes to the marvellous: the *De Rerum Natura* consistently argues that what appears to be *mirabile* normally has a common-sense explanation, and that irrational wonder is a destructive force which should be resisted in the interests of mental peace (cf. e.g. 2.308 *illud in his rebus non est mirabile*, ‘this is not marvellous in these matters’, and similar phrases involving *mirabile* at 2.1028, 1035, 4.256, 898, 5.666, 1056), whereas here the reader is presented with a straightforward miracle involving epic divine machinery. *Aeneid* 10.641 even begins and ends with formulas from Lucretian passages.⁵⁸ In particular, as Lyne has noted,⁵⁹ the phrase *morte obita* at line-beginning must recall the same phrase in the same position in the prominent and programmatic rejection of the reality of ghosts at *DRN* 1.135—compare 131–5:

et quae res nobis vigilantibus obvia mentes
terrificet morbo adfectis somnoque sepultis,
cernere uti videamur eos audireque coram,
morte obita quorum tellus amplectitur ossa.

⁵⁷ Cf. Horsfall (1990).

⁵⁸ Noted since Macrobius, *Sat.* 6.1.48. For the conjunction *volitare figuras* see Lucretius 2.380 *volitare figura* (also at line-end).

⁵⁹ Lyne (1989: 110).

[We must examine] what thing it is that meeting us when awake terrifies our minds whilst we are labouring under disease, or buried in sleep, so that we seem to see and to hear in very presence those who have encountered death, whose bones rest in earth's embrace. (Tr. Smith, 1975)

Lyne canvasses the possibility that this passage helps to 'remythologise' Lucretius, as often in Vergil, a feature noted by other scholars too.⁶⁰ This can be put in generic terms: the scepticism inherent in Lucretian philosophical didactic is rare in the traditional epic environment where divine interventions and ghostly figures are standard features,⁶¹ and the reuse of passages where such scepticism is expressed is both an appropriation of 'guest' generic material and a redirection of it towards more conventional purposes of the 'host' genre.

Didactic predecessors appropriated for the *Aeneid* include of course Vergil's own previous work. In particular, the reuse of material from the exposition of the *Georgics* in the similes of the *Aeneid* has been studied in detail,⁶² but once again the issue can be taken further in terms of the relationship between the two genres. The *Aeneid* contains three bee-similes where material is taken from the famous account of apiculture in *Georgics* 4, and in each case we can see a pointed appropriation to epic purposes of didactic elements. The first is at 1.430–8, where Aeneas watches the building of Carthage by its Tyrian colonists:

qualis apes aestate nova per florea rura
 exercet sub sole labor, cum gentis adultos
 educunt fetus, aut cum liquentia mella
 stipant et dulci distendunt nectare cellas,
 aut onera accipiunt venientum, aut agmine facto
 ignavum fucos pecus a praesepibus arcent:
 fervet opus, redolentque thymo fragrantia mella.
 'O fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt!'
 Aeneas ait, et fastigia suspicit urbis.

⁶⁰ Ibid.; see also Hardie (1986: 91, 178) and Gale (2000), *passim*.

⁶¹ Another example is the 'atheistic' question of Nisus at 9.184–5: 'dine hunc ardorem mentibus addunt, / Euryale, an sua cuique deus fit dira cupido?'—see Hardie (1994: 109).

⁶² Briggs (1980).

Just as hard work exercises the bees under the sun at the beginning of summer through the flowery countryside, when they bring out the full-grown issue of their race, or when they cram in liquid honey and distort the cells of the honeycomb with sweet nectar, or take on the loads of arrivals, or, forming a column, bar the drones, that lazy gang, from the hives: the work seethes away, and the honey is scented fragrantly with thyme. 'O fortunate people, whose walls are already rising!', said Aeneas, and gazed up at the roof-gables of the city.

As commentators have long noted,⁶³ these lines include substantial repetitions from the description of the community of the bees in *Georgics* 4.162–9:

aliae spem gentis adultos
educunt fetus, aliae purissima *mella*
stipant et liquido distendunt nectare cellas.
Sunt quibus ad portas cecidit custodia sorti, 165
inque vicem speculantur aquas et nubila caeli
aut onera accipiunt venientum aut agmine facto
ignavum fucos pecus a praesepibus arcent.
Fervet opus, redolentque thymo fragrantia mella.

Some bring out their full-grown issue, the hope of their race, others cram in purest honey and distort the cells of the honeycomb with sweet nectar; there are those to whom guard-duty at the gates has fallen as their lot, and in turn they look out for showers and clouds in the sky, or take on the loads of arrivals, or, forming a column, bar the drones, that lazy gang, from the hives. The work seethes away, and the honey is scented fragrantly with thyme.

The contrast between the two contexts is striking. Not only is the didactic material placed in a simile, suggesting as in the use of agricultural material in Homeric similes the contrast between the world of the epic and the world of bees;⁶⁴ it is also transferred from describing the proto-Roman bee-state (cf. *G.* 4.201 *parvosque Quirites*, 'miniature Roman citizens')⁶⁵ to describing the founding of Rome's greatest enemy, Carthage, a change foregrounded by Aeneas' wistful words at 1.437 (*O fortunati...*) which point to his own as yet

⁶³ See esp. Briggs (1980: 71–3).

⁶⁴ On the content of Homeric similes see conveniently Edwards (1987: 102–10), with bibl.

⁶⁵ On the bee-state as a miniature Rome see Griffin (1979/1985).

unfulfilled mission to found proto-Rome in Italy. Here the 'guest' didactic material provides a broader perspective, but also bolsters the epic teleology of the *Aeneid* and its Italian destiny: despite the temptation it offers to stay and help Dido found her city (graphically expressed at *Aeneid* 4.259–67, where Mercury finds Aeneas assisting in the building work), the material from the *Georgics* here seems simultaneously to reinforce Aeneas' determination to get on with his ktistic mission. Didactic material is enlisted to buttress Aeneas' epic *pietas*.

Similar points can be made about the second bee-simile in the *Aeneid*, describing the souls flitting about the river Lethe (6.706–9):

hunc circum innumerae gentes populique uolabant:
ac ueluti in pratis ubi apes aestate serena
floribus insidunt uariis et candida circum
lilia funduntur, strepit omnis murmure campus.

Around this river numberless tribes and peoples were flying: and just as in the meadows, when the bees under clear summer skies settle on flowers of different hue and pour around the white lilies, the whole plain buzzed with the noise.

Though this simile has epic ancestors in both Homer and Apollonius, it clearly draws for its details on the bees of *Georgics* 4.⁶⁶ As often in Vergil, the content of the simile is transfused into its context:⁶⁷ *gentes populique volabant* suggests the description of the bees as an anthropomorphic community at *G.* 4.4–5:

magnanimosque duces totiusque ordine gentis
mores et studia et populos et proelia dicam.

I shall tell of great-hearted leaders and the character of a whole race in due order and their pursuits and their peoples and battles.

In the *Aeneid* the comparison is reversed (humans are compared to bees), but the anthropomorphic and Roman character is maintained, for (as Anchises explains at 6.713–18) it is these very souls which will

⁶⁶ For *volare* of bees cf. *G.* 4.16, 103, 226; for *pratium* as an apian location cf. *G.* 4.271, 306, for flowers *G.* 4.109, and for summer swarming in a clear sky cf. *G.* 4.59 *per aestatem liquidam*.

⁶⁷ See West (1969/1990).

form the future Roman people which will be described in the impending 'Show of Heroes'. Once again material from the *Georgics* reinforces the epic nationalism of the *Aeneid*.

At *Aeneid* 12.587–92 we find the third and final bee-simile:

inclusas ut cum latebroso in pumice pastor
 uestigauit apes fumoque impleuit amaro;
 illae intus trepidae rerum per cerea castra
 discurrunt magnisque acuunt stridoribus iras;
 uoluitur ater odor tectis, tum murmure caeco
 intus saxa sonant, uacuas it fumus ad auras.

As when a herdsman has tracked down bees to their hideout concealed in a hollow rock, and has filled it with bitter smoke: the bees within, panicking for their property, flit about through their waxy camp and sharpen their anger with mighty buzzing; the dark pungence rolls through the chambers, then the rocks resound within with unseen buzzing, and the smoke rises to the empty air.

Here the comparandum is the Latins who have retreated into their city and are being 'smoked out' by Aeneas. The simile draws on the epic tradition, following a similarly military comparison in Apollonius (2.130–6),⁶⁸ but the elements of swarming in hollow rocks, smoking out and the great anger of the bees are also found in the bees of the *Georgics*, and verbal parallels indicate that both texts are laid under contribution here.⁶⁹ Once again we find a reflection of the bees/Romans identity set up in *Georgics* 4. At first it seems incongruous: in *Aeneid* 12 it is the Latins, Aeneas' temporary enemies, who are compared to bees, not the proto-Roman Trojans. But this brings out well the moral complexity of the war in Italy: in one sense it is a civil war, with the two elements which will soon combine to form the Roman race fighting against each other (as noted at *Aeneid* 12.503–4). The allusion to the *Georgics* clearly supports this, as the struggles between different groups of bees described at 4.67–94 have unmistakable overtones of recent Roman civil strife.⁷⁰ The

⁶⁸ See the full comparison in Briggs (1980: 79).

⁶⁹ Ibid. 78, and note further 12.587 *latebroso in pumice* ~ G.4.42 *latebris*, 4.44 *pumicibusque cavis*; 12.588 *fumoque implevit amaro* ~ G.4.230 *fumosque manu praetende sequacis*; 12.590 *magnisque acuunt stridoribus iras* ~ G.4.236 *illis ira modum supra est*.

⁷⁰ Cf. e.g. Hardie (1998: 38); Nadeau (1984).

didactic material of the *Georgics* is thus enlisted in the service of the *Aeneid's* complex description of Aeneas' campaign in Italy: the Latins are both enemies and future contributors to the Roman race, and thus attract a comparison which in *Georgics* 4 has strong Roman and civil war colouring.

6. CONCLUSION: GENERIC ENRICHMENT AND CLASSIC COMPLEXITY

The passages examined in section 5 point to the self-consciousness of the *Aeneid* as the highest stage in a Vergilian ascent through the hexameter genres from pastoral to epic. Vergil's martial epic looks back to 'lower', 'guest' hexameter forms in order to emphasize its own higher status as the 'host' form. It includes and appropriates them for its own purposes, thus reinforcing its self-presentation as the supreme example of all hexameter traditions. This is merely a special form of its general strategy of generic enrichment; as we saw in sections 2–4, much the same happens with material from non-hexameter genres. The *Aeneid*, following the Hellenistic analysis of Homer as the source of all poetry, presents itself as the confluence of a wide range of poetic genres.

But not all types of poetic genre are consistently appropriated in the *Aeneid*. It is hard to find traces of iambic, satiric, or comic poetry;⁷¹ given the elevated and emotionally intense ethos the *Aeneid* inherits from the Homeric tradition,⁷² the genres pursued above are largely those with emotional colour and literary dignity. But the variety of the poetic genres appropriated even within these limits is striking, not to mention prose genres, excluded from our consideration here.

The overall effect of this generic enrichment on the reception and even monumentalization of the poem has been a strong one. In 'What is a Classic?', T. S. Eliot proclaimed the *Aeneid* as 'the classic

⁷¹ For a likely echo of Aristophanes see *Aeneid* 6.392 with Austin (1977: 145).

⁷² See e.g. Conte (2002).

of all Europe' because of its perceived 'maturity' and 'comprehensiveness' in dealing with universal religious, political, and ethical themes.⁷³ The generic comprehensiveness I have tried to outline in this chapter matches this on the level of literary texture, and constitutes an equally powerful explanation for the endurance of the *Aeneid* over two millennia as an object of study and reading. The diversity of literary forms appropriated into Vergil's epic through generic enrichment ensures a complex and subtle poetic texture, which leads not only to the poem's own extraordinary afterlife but also to substantial evolution within its genre. After the intergeneric pyrotechnics of the *Aeneid*, Roman epic was both inspired and challenged by its example;⁷⁴ as for all the Vergilian and Horatian literary forms investigated in this book, generic enrichment, stimulated by contact with other poetic kinds in the lively literary interaction of the Augustan period, ensured that each genre underwent an expansion and diversification, and entailed that it was never the same again.

⁷³ For the essay see Eliot (1957: 53–71); see modern discussions in Martindale (1997: 3–12); Ziolkowski (1993: 119–34).

⁷⁴ Cf. e.g. Hardie (1993).

Bibliography

- Accorinti, D., and Chuvin, P., eds. (2003), *Des Géants Dionysos: Mélanges offerts à F.Vian* (Alessandria).
- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002), *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- , Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M., eds. (2004), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (Washington, DC).
- Adams, J. N. (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London).
- Ahern, C. F. (1986), 'Horace's Rewriting of Homer in *Carmen* 1.6', *CPh* 86: 301–14.
- Alexiou, M. (2002), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, 2nd edn. (Lanham, Md.).
- Alpers, P. (1996), *What is Pastoral?* (Chicago, 1996).
- André, J. (1986), *L'Inde vue de Rome* (Paris).
- Armstrong, D. (2004), 'Horace's *Epistles* 1 and Philodemus', in Armstrong *et al.*, 2004: 267–98.
- , Fish, J., Johnston, P. A., and Skinner, M. B., eds. (2004), *Vergil, Philodemus and the Augustans* (Austin, Tex.).
- Austin, R. G. (1971), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford).
- (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford).
- Axelson, B. (1945), *Unpoetischer Wörter* (Lund).
- Bagordo, A. (2001), 'Lucilius und Kallimachos', in Manuwald, 2001: 24–36.
- Barchiesi, A. (1979), 'Due "epigrammi" virgiliani (*Aen.*V.870 sg.; VII.1–4)', *Maia*, 31: 3–11.
- (1994a), 'Alcune difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico: Giambo ed elegia nell'epodo XI', in R. Cortés Tovar and J. C. Fernández Corte (eds.) *Bimilenario de Horacio* (Salamanca), 127–38.
- (1994b), 'Ultima difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico: L'epodo XVII', in *Atti del convegno di Venosa* (Venosa), 205–20.
- (2001a), 'The Crossing', in Harrison, 2001a: 142–63.
- (2001b), 'Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian', in Cavarzere *et al.*, 2001: 141–64.
- Barker, G., and Rasmussen, T. (1998), *The Etruscans* (Oxford).
- Barrett, W. S. (1964), *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford).
- Barsby, J. (1978), *Ovid* (Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics, 12; Oxford).

- Beard, M., North, J., and Price, S. (1998), *Religions of Rome, i. A History* (Cambridge).
- Biotti, A. (1994), *Virgilio: Georgiche Libro IV* (Bologna).
- Bloom, H. (1973), *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York).
- Bowman, A. K., Champlin, E., and Lintott, A., eds. (1996), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd edn., x. *The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.–A.D. 69* (Cambridge).
- Bramble, J. C. (1970), 'Structure and Ambiguity in Catullus LXIV', *PCPS*, NS 16: 22–41.
- Braund, D., and Gill, C., eds. (2003), *Myth; History and Culture in Republican Rome* (Exeter).
- Braund, S. M. (1992), *Roman Verse Satire* (Oxford).
- (1996), *Juvenal: Satires Book I* (Cambridge).
- Briggs, W. W. (1980), *Narrative and Simile from the Georgics in the Aeneid* (Leiden).
- Brink, C. O. (1971), *Horace on Poetry II: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge).
- Briquel, D. (1991), *L'Origine lydienne des Étrusques* (Paris).
- Brown, E. L. (1963), *Numeri Vergiliani: Studies in Eclogues and Georgics* (Brussels).
- Brown, P. Michael, *Horace: Satires I* (Warminster, 1993).
- Brown, R. D. (1987), *Lucretius on Love and Sex* (Leiden).
- Brunetière, F. (1890), *L'Évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature* (Paris).
- Bundy, E. L. (1962), *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- Cairns, F. (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).
- (1979), *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge).
- (1983), 'Propertius 1,4 and 1,5 and the "Gallus" of the Monobiblos', *PLLS* 4: 61–103.
- (1989), *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge).
- (1995), 'Horace, *Odes* 3.7: Elegy, Lyric, Myth, Learning, and Interpretation', in Harrison, 1995a: 65–99.
- Cameron, Alan (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton).
- Campbell, D. (1988), *Greek Lyric II* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Campbell, G. (2003), *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution* (Oxford).
- Carey, C. (1986), 'Archilochus and Lykambes', *CQ* 36: 60–7.
- Cavarzere, A. (1992), *Orazio: Il libro degli Epodi* (Venice).
- Aloni, A., and Barchiesi, A., eds. (2001) *Iambic Ideas* (Lanham, Md.).
- Chaudhuri, S. (1989), *Renaissance Pastoral and its English Developments* (Oxford).
- Christenson, D. (2000), *Plautus: Amphitruo* (Cambridge).

- Christes, J. (2001), 'Lucilius und das Epos', in Manuwald, 2001: 51–62.
- Clausen, W. V. (1994), *Virgil: Eclogues* (Oxford).
- (2002), *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology* (Munich and Leipzig).
- Cohen, R. (1987), 'Do Postmodern Genres Exist?', *Genre* 20: 241–58.
- Coleman, R. G. (1979), *Virgil: Eclogues* (Cambridge).
- Colie, R. L. (1973), *The Resources of Kind: Genre Theory in the Renaissance* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- Conte, G. B. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation* (Ithaca, NY).
- (1992), 'Proems in the Middle', in Dunn and Cole, 1992: 147–59.
- (1994), *Genres and Readers* (Baltimore).
- (2002), *Virgilio: L'epica del sentimento* (Turin).
- Copley, F. O. (1956), *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry* (Madison).
- Cordier, A. (1939), *Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans L'Énéide* (Paris).
- Courtney, E. (1980), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London).
- (1993), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford).
- (1995), *Musa Lapidaria: A Selection of Latin Verse Inscriptions* (Atlanta, Ga.).
- Crabbe, A. M. (1977), 'Ignoscenda quidem... Catullus 64 and the Fourth Georgic', *CQ* 27: 342–51.
- Croce, B. (1922), *Aesthetic* (London).
- Cucchiarelli, A. (2001), *La satira e il poeta: Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones* (Pisa).
- Culler, J. (1975), *Structuralist Poetics* (London).
- Dällenbach, L. (1989), *The Mirror in the Text* (London).
- Davis, G. (1991), *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley).
- De Brohun, J. B. (2003), *Roman Propertius and the Invention of Elegy* (Ann Arbor).
- Degani, E. (1991), *Hipponax: Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- Depew, M., and Obbink, D., eds. (2000), *Matrices of Genre* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Derrida, J. (1979), 'La Loi du genre/The Law of Genre', *Glyph*, 7: 176–232; English version in Derrida (1992).
- (1992), *Acts of Literature* (London).
- De Witt, N. W. (1907), 'The Dido Episode as Tragedy', *CJ* 2: 283–8.
- Dinter, M. (2005), 'Epic and Epigram: Minor Heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *CQ* 55: 153–69.
- Du Quesnay, I. M. Le M. (1979), 'From Polyphemus to Corydon: Virgil, *Eclogue* 2 and the *Idylls* of Theocritus', in Woodman and West, 1979: 35–70.
- (1984), 'Horace and Maecenas: The Propaganda Value of *Sermones* I', in Woodman and West, 1984: 19–59.

- Duff, D., ed. (2000), *Modern Genre Theory* (London).
- Dunn, F. M., and Cole, T., eds. (1992), *Beginnings in Classical Literature* (Yale Classical Studies, 29; Cambridge).
- Edwards, C. (2005), 'Epistolography', in Harrison, 2005a: 270–84.
- Edwards, M. W. (1987), *Homer: Poet of the Iliad* (Baltimore).
- Eliot, T. S. (1957), *On Poetry and Poets* (London).
- Färber, H. (1936), *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (Munich).
- Fantham, E. (1990), 'Nymphas... e navibus esse: Decorum and Poetic Fiction in *Aeneid* 9.77–122 and 10.215–259', *CPh* 85: 102–19.
- Fantuzzi, M. (1980), 'La contaminazione dei generi letterari nella letteratura greco ellenistica: rifiuto del sistema o evoluzione di un sistema', *Lingua e stile* 15: 433–50.
- and Hunter, R. L. (2004), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Farrell, J. (1991), *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (New York and Oxford).
- (2002), 'Greek Lives and Roman Careers in the Classical Vita Tradition', in F. de Armas and P. Cheney (eds.), *Literary and Artistic Careers from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Toronto), 25–46.
- (2003), 'Classical Genre in Theory and Practice', *New Literary History*, 34: 383–408.
- (2004), 'Ovid's Virgilian Career', *MD* 52: 41–56.
- Fedeli, P. (1980), *Sesto Propertio: Il primo libro delle Elegie* (Florence).
- Feeney, D. (1991), *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford).
- (1993), 'Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets', in Rudd, 1993: 41–63.
- Fernandelli, M. (2002), 'Come sulle scene', *Quaderni del Dipartimento di filologia A. Rostagni*, ns 1: 141–211.
- Ferri, R. (forthcoming), 'Horace's *Epistles*', in Harrison (forthcoming).
- Finkelberg, M., and Stroumsa, G. G. (2003), *Homer, The Bible and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (Leiden).
- Fish, S. (1980), *Is there a Text in This Class?* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Fiske, G. C. (1920), *Lucilius and Horace* (Madison).
- Floratos, C. S. (1959), *Zur Darstellung Polyphems in der Aeneis* (Athens).
- Fontenrose, J. (1978), *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- Fowler, A. (1982), *Kinds of Literature* (Oxford).
- Fowler, D. P. (2000), 'The Didactic Plot', in Depew and Obbink, 2000: 205–20.
- Fraenkel, E. (1932), 'Selbstmordwege', *Philologus*, 87: 470–3 (reprinted in Fraenkel (1964), ii. 465–7).
- (1957), *Horace* (Oxford).
- (1964), *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, 2 vols. (Rome).
- Francesc, P. (1999), 'Parthenius *Grammaticus*', *Mnemosyne*, 52: 63–71.

- Freis, R. (1983), 'The Catalogue of Pindaric Genres in Horace *Odes* 4.2', *CA* 2: 27–36.
- Freudenburg, K. (1993), *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton).
- (2001), *Satires of Rome* (Cambridge).
- Gale, M. R. (2000), *Virgil on the Nature of Things* (Cambridge).
- ed. (2004), *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry* (Swansea).
- (2005), 'Didactic Epic', in Harrison, 2005a: 101–15.
- Galinsky, K. (1996), *Augustan Culture* (Princeton).
- (2003), 'Greek and Roman Drama and the *Aeneid*', in Braund and Gill, 2003: 275–94.
- Gall, D. (1999), *Zur Technik von Anspielung und Zitat in der römischen Dichtung: Vergil, Gallus und die Ciris* (Munich).
- Garvie, A. F. (1969), *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy* (Cambridge).
- Genette, G. (1980), *Narrative Discourse* (Ithaca, NY).
- (1992), *The Architext: An Introduction* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- Gibson, R. K. (2003), *Ovid: Ars Amatoria 3* (Cambridge).
- Gowers, E. (1993a), *The Loaded Table* (Oxford).
- (1993b), 'Horace *Satires* 1.5: An Inconsequential Journey', *PCPS* 39: 48–66.
- Griffin, J. (1979), 'The Fourth *Georgic*, Virgil and Rome', *G&R* 26: 61–80 (reprinted in Griffin, 1985: 163–82).
- (1985), *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London).
- (2002), 'Look your Last on Lyric: Horace *Odes* 4.15', in Wiseman 2002: 311–32.
- Griffith, J. G. (1983), 'Catullus Poem 4: A Neglected Interpretation Revived', *Phoenix* 37: 123–8.
- Gruen, E. (1996), 'Expansion of the Empire', in Bowman *et al.*, 1996: 147–97.
- (1998), 'Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle', in M. D. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford), 15–36.
- Gutzwiller, K. (1996), 'The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry-Books', in Harder *et al.*, 1996: 119–48.
- Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C., eds. (1996), *Theocritus* (Hellenistica Groningana, 2; Groningen).
- , —, and — eds. (1998), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Hellenistica Groningana, 3; Groningen).
- Hardie, P. (1984), 'The Sacrifice of Iphigeneia: An Example of Distribution of a Lucretian Theme in Virgil', *CQ* 34: 406–12.
- (1986), *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford).
- (1993), *The Epic Successors of Virgil* (Cambridge).
- (1994), *Virgil: Aeneid Book IX* (Cambridge).

- Hardie, P. (1997), 'Virgil and Tragedy', in Martindale, 1997: 312–26.
- (1998), *Virgil* (Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics, 28; Oxford).
- ed. (2002), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge).
- Harrison, E. L. (1972–3), 'Why did Venus Wear Boots? Some Reflections on *Aeneid* 1.314 ff', *PVS* 12: 10–25.
- Harrison, S. J. (1986), 'Philosophical Imagery in Horace *Odes* 3.5', *CQ* 36: 502–7.
- (1988), 'A Tragic Europa? Horace *Odes* 3.27', *Hermes* 116: 427–34.
- (1990), 'The Praise Singer: Horace, Censorinus and *Odes* 4.8', *JRS* 80: 31–43.
- ed. (1990), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
- (1991), *Vergil: Aeneid 10* (Oxford).
- ed. (1995a), *Homage to Horace* (Oxford).
- (1995b), 'Horace, Pindar, Iullus Antonius and Augustus: *Odes* 4.2', in Harrison, 1995a: 108–27.
- (1998), 'The Sword-Belt of Pallas (*Aeneid* X.495–506): Symbolism and Ideology', in Stahl, 1998: 223–42.
- (2000), 'Sons, Mothers and Lovers in Thackeray and Virgil', *Notes and Queries* 245 (NS 47): 329–32.
- ed. (2001a), *Texts, Ideas and the Classics: Literary Theory and Classical Scholarship* (Oxford).
- (2001b), 'Picturing the Future: The Proleptic Ekphrasis from Homer to Vergil', in Harrison, 2001a: 70–92.
- (2002), 'Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist', in Hardie, 2002: 79–94.
- (2004a), 'Virgil's *Corycius Senex* and Nicander's *Georgica: Georgics* 4.116–48', in Gale, 2004: 109–23.
- (2004b), 'Lyric Middles: The Turn at the Centre in Horace's *Odes*', in Kyriakidis and De Martino, 2004: 81–102.
- (2004c), 'Altering Attis: Ethnicity, Gender and Genre in Catullus 63', *Mnemosyne*, 57 (2004), 520–33.
- ed. (2005a), *A Companion to Latin Literature* (Oxford).
- (2005b), 'Vergil and the *Mausoleum Augusti: Georgics* 3.12–18', *Acta Classica*, 48: 185–8.
- ed. (forthcoming), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (Cambridge).
- Hartog, F. (2001), *Memories of Odysseus* (Edinburgh).
- Heinze, R. (1926), 'Die Horazische Ode', *NJb* 51: 153–68 (reprinted in Heinze, 1972: 172–89).
- (1972), *Vom Geist der Römertums*, 4th edn. (Darmstadt).
- Herescu, N., ed. (1958), *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide* (Paris).

- Herrmann, L. (1930), *Les masques et les visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile* (Brussels).
- Heyworth, S. J. (1993), 'Horace's *Ibis*: On the Titles, Unity and Contents of the Epodes', *PLLS* 7: 85–96.
- (2001), 'Catullian Iambics, Catullian *Iambi*?' in Cavarzere *et al.*, 2001: 117–40.
- Hinds, S. E. (1983), 'Carmina digna: Gallus P.Qasr Ibrim 6–7 Metamorphosed', *PLLS* 4: 1–25.
- (1992), 'Arma in Ovid's *Fasti*', *Arethusa*, 25: 81–153.
- (1998), *Allusion and Intertextuality* (Cambridge).
- Hirsch, E. D. (1967), *On Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, Conn., and London).
- Hollis, A. S. (1977), *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 1* (Oxford).
- (1992), 'Hellenistic Colouring in Vergil's *Aeneid*', *HSCP* 94: 269–85.
- (1996), 'Virgil's Friend Varius Rufus', *PVS* 22: 19–33.
- (2003), 'The *Argonautae* of Varro Atacinus', in Accorinti and Chuvin, 2003: 331–41.
- Horsfall, N. M. (1981a), 'Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History', *BICS* 28: 103–14.
- (1981b), 'Virgil and the Conquest of Chaos', *Antichthon*, 15: 141–50 (reprinted in Harrison, 1990: 466–77).
- (1983), 'Some Problems in the Laudatio Turiae', *BICS* 30: 85–98.
- (1990), 'Virgil and the Illusory Footnote', *PLLS* 6: 49–63.
- (1999), *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary* (Leiden).
- Hosius, C. (1915), *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica* (Berlin).
- Hubbard, M. (1975), 'The Capture of Silenus', *PCPS* 21: 53–62.
- Hubbard, T. K. (1998), *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton* (Ann Arbor).
- Hunink, V. (1992), *Lucanus, Bellum Civile III* (Amsterdam).
- Hunter, R. L. (1999), *Theocritus: A Selection* (Cambridge).
- (2003), *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2001), 'The Date of *De rerum natura*', *CQ* 51: 150–62.
- (2002), 'The Publication and Individuality of Horace's *Odes*, Books 1–3', *CQ* 52: 517–37.
- (2006), 'The Metamorphosis of Metamorphosis: P.Oxy.4711 and Ovid', *ZPE* 155: 71–84.
- Janko, R. (2000), *Philodemus On Poems: Book 1* (Oxford).
- Jauss, H. R. (1982), *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception* (Minneapolis).
- Jenkyns, R. H. A. (1989), 'Virgil and Arcadia', *JRS* 79: 26–39.
- (1993), 'Virgil and the Euphrates', *AJPh* 114: 115–21.

- Jenkyns, R. H. A. (1998), *Virgil's Experience* (Oxford).
- Johnson, T. (2004), *A Symposium of Praise* (Madison).
- Johnson, W. R. (1982), *The Idea of Lyric* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- Kannicht, R. (2004), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta 5.1: Euripides* (Göttingen).
- Keane, C. (2006), *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire* (Oxford).
- Kaster, R. A. (1995), *Suetonius De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* (Oxford).
- Keith, A. M. (2000), *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic* (Cambridge).
- Kennedy, D. (1987), 'Arcades ambo: Virgil, Gallus and Arcadia', *Hermathena*, 143: 47–59.
- Kenney, E. J. (1958), 'Nequitiae poeta', in Herescu, 1958: 201–9.
- (1970), 'Doctus Lucretius', *Mnemosyne*, 23: 366–92.
- (1998), 'The Metamorphosis of Hero', in Knox and Foss, 1998: 55–71.
- Kerkhecker, A. (1999), *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford).
- Knauer, G. (1964), *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen).
- Knox, P. E. (1986), *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge).
- (1990), 'In Pursuit of Daphne', *TAPA* 120: 183–202.
- and Foss, C., eds. (1998), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honour of Wendell Clausen* (Leipzig).
- Koster, S. (1970), *Antike Epostheorien* (Wiesbaden).
- (2001), 'Lucilius und die Literaturkritik', in Manuwald, 2001: 121–31.
- Kraggerud, E. (1998), 'Vergil Announcing the *Aeneid*. On *Georg.* 3.1–48', in Stahl, 1998: 1–20.
- Kroll, W. (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart).
- Kyriakidis, S. (1998), *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the Aeneid: The Frame of Book 6* (Bari).
- and De Martino, F., eds. (2004), *Middles in Latin Poetry* (Bari).
- Lane Fox, R. (1973), *Alexander the Great* (London).
- Lattimore, R. (1942), *Themes in Greek and Roman Epitaphs* (Urbana, Ill.).
- Lee, M. O. (1996), *Virgil as Orpheus: A Study of the Georgics* (Albany, NY).
- Lejay, P. (1911), *Œuvres d'Horace: Les Satires* (Paris).
- Levene, D. S., and Nelis, D. P., eds. (2002), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography* (Leiden).
- Lieberg, G. (1982), *Poeta Creator* (Amsterdam).
- Lightfoot, J. L. (1999), *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford).
- Lipka, M. (2001), *Language in Vergil's Eclogues* (Berlin and New York).
- Livingstone, N. (2001), *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris* (Leiden).
- Lowrie, M. (1997), *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1978a), *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge).
- (1978b), 'The Neoteric Poets', *CQ NS* 28: 167–87.

- (1979), 'Servitium Amoris', *CQ* NS 29: 117–30.
- (1980), *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford).
- (1987), *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
- (1989), *Words and the Poet* (Oxford).
- (1995), *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (New Haven, Conn.).
- McGill, S. (2005), *Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity* (Oxford).
- McKeown, J. C. (1987), *Ovid: Amores. Vol. I* (Liverpool).
- (1989), *Ovid: Amores. Vol. II* (Leeds).
- (1998), *Ovid: Amores. Vol. III* (Leeds).
- Maltby, R. (2002), *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- Mankin, D. (1995), *Horace: Epodes* (Cambridge).
- Manuwald, G., ed. (2001), *Der Satyriker Lucilius und seine Zeit* (Zetemata, 110; Munich).
- Martindale, C., ed. (1997), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge).
- Matthews, V. J. (1974), *Panyassis of Halikarnassos: Text and Commentary* (Leiden).
- Michel, D. (1967), *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und M. Antonius* (Brussels).
- Morgan, L. G. (1999), *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's 'Georgics'* (Cambridge).
- Mette, H. J., 'Genus tenue und mensa tenuis bei Horaz', *MH* 18: 136–9.
- Muecke, F. (1993), *Horace: Satires II* (Warminster).
- Murgatroyd, P. (1975), 'Militia Amoris and the Roman Elegists', *Latomus*, 34: 59–79.
- (1980), *Tibullus I* (Pietermaritzburg; repr. Bristol, 1991).
- (1981), 'Servitium Amoris and the Roman Elegists', *Latomus*, 40: 589–606.
- Mynors, R. A. B. (1990), *Virgil: Georgics* (Oxford).
- Nadeau, Y. (1984), 'The Lover and the Statesman: A Study in Apiculture (Virgil, *Georgics* 4.281–558)', in Woodman and West, 1984: 59–82.
- Nappa, C. (2005), *Reading After Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian and Rome* (Ann Arbor).
- Nauta, R. R. (1990), 'Gattungsgeschichte als Rezeptionsgeschichte am Beispiel der Entstehung der Bukolik', *AuA* 36: 116–37.
- Nelis, D. (2001), *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Leeds).
- (2004), 'From Didactic to Epic: *Georgics* 2.458–3.48', in Gale, 2004: 73–108.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1995), *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford).
- and Hubbard, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace's Odes Book I* (Oxford).

- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1978), *A Commentary on Horace's Odes Book 2* (Oxford).
- and Rudd, N. (2004), *A Commentary on Horace's Odes Book 3* (Oxford).
- Ogden, D. (2001), *Greek and Roman Necromancy* (Princeton).
- Ogilvie, R. M. (1978), *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford).
- O'Hara, J. (1990), *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid* (Princeton).
- Olson, S. D., and Sens, A. (1999), *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE* (Atlanta, Ga.).
- Page, D. L. (1936), 'The Elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*', in *Greek Poetry and Life: Festschrift G. Murray* (Oxford), 206–30.
- (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge).
- Parke, H. W. (1992), *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity* (London).
- and Wormell, D. E. W. (1956), *The Delphic Oracle*, 2 vols. (Oxford).
- Parker, W. H. (1988), *Priapea: Poems for a Phallic God* (London).
- Parsons, P. J. (1977), 'Callimachus: Victoria Berenices', *ZPE* 25: 1–50.
- Pease, A. S. (1935), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Pelling, C. B. R. (1988), *Plutarch: Life of Antony* (Cambridge).
- (1996), 'The Triumviral Period', in Bowman *et al.*, 1996: 1–69.
- Perkell, C. G. (1989), *The Poet's Truth: A Study of the Poet in Virgil's Georgics* (Berkeley, Calif.).
- (1996), 'The "Dying Gallus" and the Design of Eclogue 10', *CPh* 91: 128–40.
- Perutelli, A. (1979), *La narrazione commentata: Studi sull'epillio latino* (Pisa).
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *A History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford).
- Pichon, R. (1902), *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores* (Paris).
- Posch, S. (1969), *Beobachtungen zur Theokritnachwirkung bei Vergil* (Innsbruck).
- Prtagostini, R., ed. (2000), *La letteratura ellenistica: Problemi e prospettive di ricerca* (Rome).
- Puelma Piwonka, M. (1949) *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (Frankfurt).
- Putnam, M. C. J. (1986), *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (Ithaca, NY).
- Reckford, K. J. (1995), 'Recognizing Venus. I, Aeneas Meets his Mother', *Arion*, 3: 1–42.

- Reinhardt, U., and Sallmann, K., eds. (1974), *Musa Iocosa* (Hildesheim).
- Roberts, D. H., Dunn, F. M., and Fowler, D., eds. (1997), *Classical Closure* (Princeton).
- Rosenmeyer, T. G. (1985), 'Ancient Literary Genres: A Mirage?', *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 34: 74–84.
- Ross, D. O. (1975), *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Rossi, A. (2004), *Contexts of War: Manipulations of Genre in Virgilian Battle Narrative* (Ann Arbor).
- Rossi, L. E. (1971), 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche', *BICS* 18: 69–94.
- (2000), 'La letteratura alessandrina e il rinnovamento dei generi letterari della tradizione', in Pretagostini, 2000: 149–62.
- Rudd, N. (1966), *The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge).
- (1976), 'Architecture: Theories about Virgil's *Eclogues*', in *Lines of Enquiry* (Cambridge), 119–44.
- ed. (1993), *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium* (London).
- (1996), 'Virgil's Contribution to Pastoral', *PVS* 22: 53–77 (reprinted in Rudd, 2005: 1–24).
- (2005), *The Common Spring: Essays on Latin and English Poetry* (Bristol).
- Russell, D. A., and Winterbottom, M. (1972), *Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford).
- Rutherford, R. B. (1995), *The Art of Plato* (London).
- Said, E. W. (1978), *Orientalism* (London).
- Sainte-Beuve, C.-A. (1891), *Essai sur Virgile* (Paris).
- Sallmann, K. (1974), 'Die seltsame Reise nach Brindisium: Aufbau und Deutung der Horazsatire 1,5', in Reinhardt and Sallmann, 1974: 179–206.
- Schiesaro, A. (1994), 'The Palingenesis of *De Rerum Natura*', *PCPS* 40: 81–107.
- Mitsis, P., and Clay, J. S., eds. (1993), *Mega Nepios: Il destinatario nell'epos didascalico/The Addressee in Didactic Epic [= MD 31]* (Pisa).
- Schlegel, C. M. (2005), *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace Satires Book I* (Madison).
- Scodel, R. S., and Thomas, R. F. (1984), 'Virgil and the Euphrates', *AJPh* 105: 339.
- Scodel, R. (1987), 'Horace, Lucilius and Callimachean Polemic' *HSCP* 91: 199–215.
- Seager, R. (1980), 'Neu sinas Medos equitare inultus: Horace, the Parthians and Augustan Foreign Policy', *Athenaeum*, 58: 103–18.
- Sider, D. (1997), *The Epigrams of Philodemus* (Oxford).
- Skutsch, F. (1901), *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig).

- Skutsch, O. (1985), *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford).
- Smith, M. F. (1975), *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Smith, B. H. (1968), *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End* (Chicago).
- Spencer, D. (2002), *The Roman Alexander* (Exeter).
- Stahl, H.-P., ed. (1998), *Virgil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context* (London).
- Steinmetz, P. (1964), 'Gattungen und Epochen der griechischen Literature in der Sicht Quintilians', *Hermes* 92: 454–66.
- Stewart, Z. (1959), 'The Song of Silenus', *HSCP* 64: 179–205.
- Strelka, J. P. (1978), *Theories of Literary Genre* (Yearbook of Comparative Criticism, 8; University Park, Penn.).
- Suerbaum, W. (1980), 'Hundert Jahre Vergil-Forschung', *ANRW* II.31.1: 3–358.
- Syme, R. (1986), *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford).
- Tarrant, R. J. (1978), 'The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue', *HSCP* 82: 187–99.
- (forthcoming), 'Horace and Roman Literary History', in Harrison (forthcoming).
- Theodorakopoulos, E. (1997), 'The Book of Virgil', in Martindale, 1997: 155–66.
- Thomas, R. F. (1985), 'From Recusatio to Commitment: The Evolution of the Virgilian Program', *PLLS* 5: 61–73 (reprinted in Thomas, 1999: 101–13).
- (1988a), *Virgil: Georgics I–II* (Cambridge).
- (1988b), *Virgil: Georgics III–IV* (Cambridge).
- (1999), *Reading Virgil and his Texts* (Ann Arbor).
- (2004), "'Drowned in the Tide": The *Nauagika* and Some "Problems" in Augustan Poetry', in Acosta-Hughes *et al.*, 2004: 259–75.
- Todorov, T. (1990), *Genres in Discourse* (Cambridge).
- Toohy, P. (1996), *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry* (London).
- Trapp, M. B. (2003), *Greek and Latin Letters* (Cambridge).
- Van Sickle, J. (1978), *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics* (Rome).
- Vardi, A. (2003), 'Canons of Literary Texts at Rome', in Finkelberg and Stroumsa 2003: 131–52.
- Volk, K. (2002), *The Poetics of Latin Didactic* (Oxford).
- Wallach, B. P. (1976), *Lucretius and the Diatribe Against the Fear of Death* (Leiden).
- Watson, L. C. (1995), 'Horace's *Epodes*: The Impotence of Iambos?', in Harrison, 1995a: 188–202.
- (2001), 'Epode 14: Horace's *Carmen Inconditum*', in Cavarzere *et al.*, 2001: 187–204.

- (2003), *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford).
- Webster, T. B. L. (1970), *Sophocles: Philoctetes* (Cambridge).
- Weich, W. (1910), *De Horatii in Saturis Sermone Ludibundo* (Jena).
- Wellek, R., and Warren, A. (1963), *Theory of Literature* (Harmondsworth).
- West, D. (1969), 'Multiple-Correspondence Similes in the *Aeneid*', *JRS* 59: 40–9 (reprinted in Harrison, 1990: 429–44).
- West, M. L. (1974), *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin).
- (1982), *Greek Metre* (Oxford).
- (1985), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford).
- (1994), *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford).
- (2003a), *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (2003b), *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha: Lives of Homer* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- White, P. (1988), 'Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome', *Phoenix* 42: 334–56.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1966), 'Virgil and the Evictions', *Hermes* 94: 320–4.
- (1970), 'Pindar and the Proem to the Third Georgic', in *Wimmel*, 1970: 286–90.
- Williams, G. W. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford).
- Williams, R. D. (1960), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus* (Oxford).
- Wills, J. (1996), *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford).
- Wimmel, W. (1960), *Kallimachos in Rome* (Wiesbaden).
- ed. (1970), *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur: Festschrift K. Büchner* (Wiesbaden).
- Wiseman, T. P. (1984), 'Cybele, Virgil and Augustus', in *Woodman and West*, 1984: 117–28.
- ed. (2002), *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford).
- Winterbottom, M. W. (1976), 'Virgil and the Confiscations', *G&R* 23: 55–9.
- Wlosok, A. (1967), *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils Aeneis* (Heidelberg).
- Woodman, T. (2002), 'Biformis Vates: The Odes, Catullus and Greek Lyric', in *Woodman and Feeney*, 2002: 53–64.
- and Feeney, D., eds. (2002) *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge).
- and West, D., eds. (1979), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge).
- and — eds. (1984), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge).
- Zarker, J. W. (1969), 'Amata: Vergil's Other Tragic Queen', *Vergilius*, 15: 2–24.
- Zetzel, J. E. G. (1980a), 'Recreating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past', *Critical Inquiry*, 10: 83–105.

- Zetzel, J. E. G. (1980*b*), 'Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity', *Arethusa* 13: 59–77.
- (2002), 'Dreaming of Quirinus: Horace's *Satires* and the Development of Augustan Poetry', in Woodman and Feeney, 2002: 38–52.
- Ziolkowski, T. (1993), *Virgil and the Moderns* (Princeton).

Index Locorum

Major treatments are marked in bold.

ACCIUS

Didascalica fr.VIII Dangel 3

ANON.

*Anth.Plan.*86 (*AP* 16.86) 99

AP 9.131 223

AP 9.162 224

ARATUS

Phaenomena 114–26 148

ARCHILOCHUS

fr. 1 West 108

fr.17 West 108

fr.19 West 112, 114

fr.24 West 107

fr.93, 98 West 108

fr.105 West 107

fr.172–81 West 111

fr.191–6 West 126

fr.215 West 120

ARISTOTLE

Poetics

1448a–1462a 3, 8

1459b 7

CALLIMACHUS

Aetia

fr.1.20 Pfeiffer 167

fr.1.21–4 Pfeiffer 45–6

Epigram 31 Pfeiffer 95

Hymn to Apollo 107–12 78,
141, 167

CALVUS

fr.9 Courtney 52, 53

CATULLUS

11.1–8 109

64.326–7 39

64.357–60 124

101 218–22

fr.1 Mynors 100

CHOERILUS

fr.1 Colace (*Suppl.Hell.*317) 150

DANTE

Inferno 20.113 208

DONATUS

Vita Vergili 136–7 31–2

ENNIUS

Varia 17–18 Vahlen 152

GALLUS

fr.4.1–2 Blänsdorf 61–2

HESIOD

Theogony 22–34 46

Works and Days 106–21 148

HOMER

Odyssey

9.39–40 87

11.23–55 101–2

18.111 88

- [HOMER]
Batrachomyomachia 7 160
Hymn to Aphrodite 226–8
- HORACE
Ars Poetica
 19 7
 73–98 4–6
Epistles
 1.16.25–9 202
 1.19.23–4 9, 105, 135
 2.2.58–60 9
Epodes
 1 106–14
 2 114–19
 6.11–14 29, 105
 11 119–21
 13 121–4
 14 125–7
 15 127–30
 16 130–4
Odes
 1.1.35 31
 1.6 170–4
 1.7.21–32 215–17
 1.7.11–22 123
 1.9.1–18 122–3
 1.28 177–9
 1.32.3–12 29–30, 173
 1.33 174–6
 2.5 182–4
 2.13 179–82
 3.1.45–8 113–14
 3.3 184–8
 3.11 189–93
 3.27 193–7
 4.2 198–204
 4.15 204–6
Satires
 1.1.24–6 80
 1.1.117–21 81–2
 1.2.92–3 94
- 1.2.105–6 94–5
 1.3.38–40 83
 1.3.99–112 84–5
 1.4.1–7 77
 1.4.8–13 78
 1.4.81–5 95–6
 1.5 86–9
 1.7.9–19 90–1
 1.8 98–103
 1.9.29–34 96–7
 1.10.31–5 76
 1.10.36–40 92–3
- LUCILIUS
 fr.1196–1208 Warmington 78
 fr. 94–148 Warmington 86
- LUCRETIVS
 1.131–5 234–5
 1.936–47 (= 4.11–22) 80–1
 3.938–43 82
 4.29–41 233–4
 4.1150–6 83–4
- MELEAGER
AP 5.180.1–4 68
- MOSCHUS
Europa 37–62 72
- [MOSCHUS]
Epitaphion Bionis 77 60
- Oracula Sibyllina*
 8.37–41 132, 188
 8.165 132
- OVID
Amores 1.1.1–4 7
Ex Ponto 3.3.31–2 73
Metamorphoses 1.632 53
Remedia Amoris 371–88 8

PARTHENIUS	1.314–418 225–9
<i>Erotica Pathemata</i>	1.430–8 235–7
1 48–9, 69	3.641–61 229–31
11.4 57	4.1–5 209–12
fr. 33 Lightfoot 57	6.212–34 218–20
	6.333–6 220–1
PHILODEMUS	6.687–94 221–2
<i>Ep.</i> 16 Sider (= <i>AP</i> 5.124) 182–3	6.706–9 237
	6.724–51 232
PINDAR	10.228–35 222–5
<i>Pythians</i> 10.53–4 200	10.636–42 232–5
	12.54–9 212–13
PLATO	12.587–92 238–9
<i>Republic</i> 3.394 b-c 2	<i>Eclogues</i>
	1.1–2 30
PROPERTIUS	1.9–10 50
3.5.1–2 173–4	1.51–8 117–18
	2.21 50, 230
QUINTILIAN	3.99 229
10.2.22 8	4 36–44, 132–4
	4.1–3 28, 32
SIMMIAS	6 44–59
<i>AP</i> 6.113 223–4	6.1–2 28, 32
	6.3–5 76
SOLON	7.1 53
fr.4.1–18 West 131	8.7–8 44
	9.39–43 230
SOPHOCLES	10 59–74
<i>Antigone</i> 1–99 209–10	10.51 28
	10.55–61 118–19
THEOCRITUS	10.62–3 32
<i>Idylls</i>	10.77 59
1.1, 1.20 30	<i>Georgics</i>
1.117 60	1.1–2 31, 137
3.40–2 54	2.109–35 138
17.16–25 185–6	2.136–76 [<i>laudes Italiae</i>] 138–49
	2.173–6 28, 137
VERGIL	2.458–60 116
<i>Aeneid</i>	2.500–4 116
1.1 31	3.1–48 149–56
1.195–209 214–17	4 156–67

4.4–5	237	4.559–66	9, 143–4, 166–7
4.162–9	236–7	[VERGIL]	
4.285–94	161–2	<i>Culex</i>	8–10 160
4.326–32	163–4		

General Index

- addressee, and genre 25
aequor = ocean of epic 204
Aemilius Macer 145–6
aetiology 161
Agrippa, M. 147
Alexander the Great 140–1, 145,
148, 154
Antonius, Iullus 201–2
Antonius, M. 41, 165
Aratus, and Vergil 137
Arcadia, and bucolic song 65
Archilochus, and Horace 105–14
actor (originator of genre) 6, 28–30
Augustus/Imperator Caesar Divi
Filius 41, 164–5
- Barchiesi, A. 13
Batrachomomachia [*Battle of Frogs
and Mice*] 26, 157–60
bougonia (regeneration of
bees) 160–2
Brunetière, J. 13
- Callimachus:
and Horace 95, 104, 126, 170
and Vergil 45–6, 141, 161–2, 167
- Catullus:
and Horace 109, 124, 128
and Vergil 218–20
- closure, poetic 178, 180, 197
Cohen, R. 13
Comedy, New, and Horace 94
Comedy, Old, and Horace 77, 97–8
Conte, G. B. 17, 60
Croce, B. 12, 13
- crossing of genres (*Kreuzung*) 6
Culler, J. 12
- Davis, G. 200, 203
decorum (τὸ πρεπόν) 3, 5
Derrida, J. 11
diaeresis, bucolic 31
- elegy, as lamentation 175
Eliot, T. S. 239
Ennius, and Horace 187
epic, ancient subgenres of 136
epigram, dedicatory:
and Horace 98
and Vergil 222–5
epigram, erotic:
and Horace 94–5, 126, 182–4
epigram, Priapean:
and Horace 98–100
epigram, sepulchral:
and Horace 177–9, 193
and Vergil 217–22
epyllion 53, 161, 194
Euphorion 56, 58–9, 69
Euripides, *Bacchae*:
and Horace 191–2
- fable, animal 94
Feeney, D. C. 187
Formalists, Russian 13
Fowler, A. 10, 13–14, 16
- Gallus, and Horace 173
Gallus, and Vergil 54–6, 60–74,
165

- generic 'crossing' 6
 generic 'enrichment' 1–2
 generic hierarchy 8
 generic 'polyphony' 207
 generic theory, Graeco-Roman 2–10
 Golden Age 202
 'guest' genre 16
- Hardie, P. R. 207–8, 232
 Hubbard, M. 215
 Hinds, S. E. 16
 Hirsch, E. D. 12
 Homer:
 and Horace 86–91, 101–2, 187
 and Vergil 158–9
- Horace:
 and Archilochus 105–114
 and Callimachus 95, 104, 126, 170
 and Catullus 109, 124, 128
 and Comedy, New 94
 and Comedy, Old 77, 97–8
 and Ennius 187
 and epigram 94–5, 98–100, 126, 177, 182–4, 193
 and Euripides 191–2
 and Gallus 173
 and Homer 86–91, 101–2, 187
 and love-elegy 174–6
 and Lucilius 79, 86
 and Lucretius 79–85
 and Moschus 184–5
 and neoterics 97
 and Pindar 199–200
 and prophetic hexameter
 verse 95–7, 124, 131–4, 187–8
 and Theocritus 185–6
 and tragedy 190–7
 and Vergil 115, 132–4, 181, 204–6, 214–7
- horizon of expectation 14
 'host' genre 16
 Hylas, in literature 151
- interpretive community 15
 Isocrates, *Busiris* 151
- Jauss, H-R. 14, 16
 Johnson, W. R. 169
 Julius Caesar (C.Iulius Caesar) 186
- katabasis*, literary theme of 181, 189
 Kennedy, D. F. 61, 67
 Knox, P. E. 46
- labor* (poetic labour) 110
Laudatio Turiae 193
 length/structure of work, and
 genre 24–5
 Lightfoot, J. L. 56
 Linus 55
locus = passage in text 142
 love-elegy, and Horace 174–6
 love-elegy, and Vergil 210–13
 Lowrie, M. 189
 Lucilius, and Horace 79, 86
 Lucretius, and Horace 79–85
 Lucretius, and Vergil 137, 232–5
Lydus = Etruscan 206
 Lyne, R. O. A. M. 208, 212, 234–5
 lyric, category of in
 antiquity 168–70
 lyric, in epic 214–17
- Maecenas, and Horace 107–12
 marriage, Augustan views on 193
materies (poetic subject-matter) 7
 metonyms, symbolic 31–3
 metre, and genre 23
 Mette, H. J. 112
militia amoris (love as war) 173

- mise en abyme* (symbolic summary) 143, 204
 mock-epic, tradition of 157–60
 mode (in genre-theory) 16
 model readers 14
 Moschus, and Horace 194–5
 Mynors, R. A. B. 143

 narrative voice, and genre 25
 narrativity, and genre 27
 Nauta, R. R. 14
 neoteric poets, Horace and 97
 New Criticism 12
 Nicander, and Vergil 145
 Nisbet, R. G. M. 215

 Octavia (*Augusti soror*) 41
 openings, programmatic 31–2

 Panyassis 151
 Parthenius, and Vergil 47–59, 69
 Parthia, and Rome 139–40
 Pasiphae 52–3
 pastoral, and the *Aeneid* 229–31
 Philodemus 3
 Pindar, and Horace 199–200
 Plato, and Vergil 163
 Polyphemus, in literature 229
praeteritio, rhetorical 21, 74
 Priapean literary tradition 98–103
propemptikon (farewell poem) 194
 prophecy, ambiguity of 42
 prophecy, as hexameter verse genre 38–9, 95–7, 124, 131–4, 187–8
 prophecy, Sybilline 38, 132

 reader-response theory 14
recusatio (generic disavowal) 7, 21, 170, 203
 register, linguistic, and genre 24
 repertoire, generic 21–7
 repertoire, readerly 14
 Rossi, L. E. 19

 Sainte-Beuve, C. A. de 228
 Scribonia (*Augusti uxor*) 41
Servitium amoris (slavery to love) 176
 Servius 47, 60, 67, 69
 Signals, metageneric 27–33
 Silenus, song of 46–59
silvae = pastoral 36, 70
 Siro 47
 Skutsch, F. 47

tenuis = metapoetically slender 72
 theme of work, and genre 26
 Theocritus, and Horace 185–6
 Theocritus, and Vergil 34–7
 Theocritus, panegyric in 43, 185
 Thomas, R. F. 138, 144, 167
 title, and genre 22–3
 tone, and genre 26–7
 Todorov, T. 10
 tragedy, Greek, and Horace 190–7
 tragedy, Greek/Roman, and Vergil 208–14

 Varius Rufus 155, 172
 Varro Atacinus 142–3
 Vergil:
 and Aratus 137
 and Callimachus 45–6, 141, 161–2, 167
 and Catullus 218–20
 and epigram 217–25
 and Gallus 54–6, 60–74, 165
 and Homer 158–9
 and Horace 115, 132–4, 181, 204–6, 214–17
 and love-elegy 210–13

- Vergil: (*cont.*)
and Lucretius 137, 232–5
and Nicander 145
and Parthenius 47–59, 69
and Plato 163
and prophetic hexameter
 verse 38–9
- and Theocritus 34–7
and tragedy 208–14
- Warren, A. 11
Wellek, R. 11
- Zetzel, J. E. G. 20, 75