IMAGE IS EVERYTHING: SATIRIC ELEMENTS IN HORACE'S LYRIC PERSONA

by

JOHN A. LASATER

(Under the Direction of Mario Erasmo)

ABSTRACT

The ways in which the poet Horace appears in his *Odes* are multi-faceted and complex. In constructing his poetic personae, Horace alludes to a vast array of literary precedents, both Greek and Latin. One of the very many works to which Horace refers often in the *Odes* is his own previous collection of poetry, the *Satires*, published over ten years before the publication of the *Odes*. This thesis explores the ways in which Horace uses elements of his personae in the *Satires* to shape the personae he presents in his *Odes*.

INDEX WORDS: Horace, Odes – History and criticism, Satires – History and criticism

IMAGE IS EVERYTHING: SATIRIC ELEMENTS IN HORACE'S LYRIC PERSONA

by

JOHN A. LASATER

BA, Samford University, 2002

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2007

IMAGE IS EVERYTHING: SATIRIC ELEMENTS IN HORACE'S LYRIC PERSONA

by

JOHN A. LASATER

Major Professor:	Mario Erasmo
Committee:	Charles Platter Nicholas Rynearson

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As Horace presents the lyric genre to a Roman audience, he engages not only his Greek lyric predecessors, but also his Hellenistic, Archaic Latin and Neoteric precursors in a complex intertextual dialogue in which his poetic persona shifts from that of satirist to that of *vates* to that of *princeps* as he inserts himself among the Greek poets of the lyric canon. The Odes are in a similar dialogue with Horace's own earlier work, bringing the expectations of the personae found in lyric poetry together with the expectations of the personae Horace created for himself in his Satires. Horace uses the personae that he developed in his Satires as a starting point from which to develop his personae in the Odes. This thesis will explore Horace's shifting personae in *Odes* Books 1-3 to consider the effectiveness of infusing his lyric persona with the irony of a satirist to present himself in the roles of *vates* (1.1) and *princeps* (3.30).

By no means are Horace's *Satires* the only source from which he draws to construct the personae he presents in the *Odes*. Horace draws on a vast array of literary precedents to construct his personae, from sources a varied as Homer, Sappho, Callimachus, and Catullus. In many passages, Horace refers to two, three or more different writers or works at once, making the task of trying to trace all of Horace's literary allusions a daunting one, not to mention the difficulty of determining just what constitutes an allusion in the first place. As part of the process of understanding how the *Odes* relate to previous literature, this thesis focuses on the influence of Horace's own *Satires* in the *Odes*. It does not propose that the *Satres* lay exclusive claim to the shaping of Horace's personae in the *Odes*, but instead seeks to understand how the *Satires* appear

in the *Odes* as one way of investigating how Horace presents his personae in his lyric poetry. Many passages which allude to the *Satires* also include references to other works and writers, but this thesis will limit itself to the influence of the *Satires* as much as possible. The *Satires* are only part of the story of Horace's influences, and they are the part of the story this thesis seeks to tell.

But why choose the *Satires*? Where do they come into the discussion of Horace's personae in the *Odes*? The answer may be seen by looking backwards at Horace's career from the perspective of the fourth book of *Odes*. In the fourth book, there is a difference in the persona of the poet from that found in the original three books which is very striking. It seems that the Horace found in the fourth book is a deflated version of the vibrant personality found in the first three books. A question then arises: just how does one define Horace's persona in the first three books, since one must be familiar with the persona established in the earlier poetry in order to know how the persona in the fourth book is different.

In those first three books, Horace, while adapting certain self-portrayals well-known in Greek lyric, such as the shield-thrower character of Archilochos (*Odes* 2.7), his character as the lyric poet is much more than a mere copy of the Greek lyric poets' presentations of themselves. Horace appears in his *Odes* as a character in a way that differs from his Greek predecessors. Being many centuries later, he draws on many more traditions, especially Latin literature and his own previous work, to construct his persona. Because of this, an understanding of Horace's lyric persona only in terms of his Greek and Latin precedents is not enough in itself. Rather than looking only at Horace's literary precursors, a natural place to look is in his own earlier poetry. This takes the reader to satire, the first genre in which Horace published and the genre that made him famous. Scholars often refer to passages of the *Odes* as "satiric," but frequently leave the

statement at that with no deeper explanation.[1] This thesis seeks to examine just how satire, and in particular Horace's own *Satires*, figure into Horace's persona in the *Odes*.

Horace's career as a poet is first documented in his *Satires*, the first book of which was published in 35 BCE and the second book in 30 BCE.[2] In the time between the publication of these two books, Horace also wrote his *Epodes*, published in the same year as his second book of *Satires*. The first three books of *Odes* were published together in 23 BCE, and from internal evidence, it seems clear that he had been working on them throughout his career.[3] The publication of the *Satires* before the *Odes* is what makes it possible to say that Horace accesses elements of the persona from the earlier work in the latter. Satire and lyric are very different, however, and the task of a lyric poet accessing a satiric persona and elements of the satiric genre to contribute to the construction of his persona is indeed daunting.

As a genre, satire is notoriously difficult to define. As Horace writes it, it employs a vast array of stylistic elements from many kinds of writing, including epic, dialogue, drama (both tragic and comic), and even forensic rhetoric. According to Horace, satire's purpose is similar to that of Greek Old Comedy (*Satires* 1.4), that is, to point out the foibles of society and make fun of them. Rather than accomplishing this through the mouths of choruses and characters in comic plots, satire usually speaks through the mouth of the satirist as he relates a story or anecdote, delivers a diatribe on the vices of certain men, or has a conversation with an interlocutor. Horace's satiric style is marked by an economy familiar to the Neoteric school, as influenced by

[1] Kenneth Reckford, *Horace* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969), 55, on *Odes* 2.16, says, for example, "The first four stanzas are half satiric," but makes no further comment on exactly *how* they are. Similarly, R.G.M. Nisbet and Niall Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 3, comment on *Odes* 3.1.9-16, saying the passage is "here described with some satire," with no further explanation. These examples are two among very many.

[2] For general dating information, see Gian Biaggio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*. trans. Joseph B. Solodow. (Baltmore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987, 1984). 292-294.

[3] For more specific dating information on the *Odes*, see Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970). xxvii-xxxviii.

Hellenistic poetry and also by rhetorical flourishes not unlike speech heard in the forum, all this based on a style that is consciously and meticulously designed to sound conversational in vocabulary and tone.

In addition to these stylistic elements, Horace's satire has an ironic sense that calls into question the reader's understanding of many of the things the poet says, such as his fawning praise of Lucilius (*Satires* 1.4), whose verse Horace, immediately after praising it, claims was not nearly as refined as his own. Since elements such as these will be crucial to the Horace one finds in the first three books of *Odes*, it is clear that the unique voice of Horace in the *Odes* is at least in part based upon the earlier voice of Horace in the *Satires*.

While Horace is never a single, predictable personality that can be completely pinned down and defined, there are elements of the faces he puts forth in the *Satires* that appear quite often in the *Odes*. The primary elements that reveal the appearance of Horace's satiric self-presentation in the *Odes* include such things as diatribe, satiric priamel, ironic self-presentation, and a focused attention on his relationship to particular literary predecessors. The programmatic *Odes* 1.1, in its extended priamel, lists different occupations with which the poet will not occupy himself, recalling Horace's satirical diatribes against various vices and types of vicious men. The poem ends with the grand hope that Maecenas (or rather the general reader) will rank him among the great traditional *lyrici vates* of the Greek canon, a hope that he declares fulfilled in *Odes* 3.30, having completely made the transition from satirist to *princeps* of lyric poets. The trajectory from familiar satirist to new *princeps* is apparent when the first three books of *Odes* are taken linearly[4] rather than as a monolithic unit, which means that Horace's arrangement of

[4] Horace does, however, maintain a degree of irony as one way his lyric persona displays continuity with those in the *Satires*. He accomplishes this irony through such techniques as playful self-contradiction, exaggerated loftiness or lowliness of tone, and other means.

his poems expects the reader to begin with 1.1 and end with 3.30, at least in the way the reader perceives his poetic persona shifting from beginning to end.

HORACE'S SATIRIC PERSONA AND ODES 1.1

A discussion of Horace's self-presentation in the *Satires* is a necessary step to understanding his persona in the *Odes*. Understanding how he approaches things such as self-description and generic participation (i.e. how the poet himself is part of the genre he is writing) in the *Satires* is crucial to being able to follow him on his poetic journey in the *Odes*. Horace understands satire as a purely Roman genre, stating at *Satires* 1.10.66 that the genre is "untouched by the Greeks." It is part of Horace's well-known irony that he makes statements such as this that contradict his actual practice, because he actually does use Greek models to execute his poetic task[5] as well as the models of his predecessors in Latin, like Lucilius. He presents several intersecting personae in his satiric poetry, and in that mix of personalities, three primary general pictures arise. The first of these is in the opening three satires, the diatribe satirist, who presents himself as a sort of country preacher, come to town to tell the people living in Rome all about their vices. Ironically, he is far too familiar with those vices to be taken seriously as an outsider.

A similar voice Horace takes on is that of the accomplished poet included in Maecenas' circle. This figure shows up as a man who journeys with Maecenas on important trips and makes fun of fools in small towns. However, the poet's own small-town origins come up a little too often for the reader to ignore. He also presents himself at times as a literary critic who is an expert on writing verse and particularly keen on criticizing Lucilius. He develops an ironic position both below and above Lucilius in terms of skill as a poet. He praises his forbearer and

[5] David Joseph Coffta, *The Influence of Callimachaean Aesthetics On the Satires and Odes of Horace*. (Lewiston; Queenston; Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 2-6 is a succinct and helpful review of scholarship on Horace's debt to Hellenistic models.

claims that he himself is far less of a poet, but at the same time criticizes his predecessor's poetry, demonstrating his own technical superiority as a writer of hexameters. Such ironic contradiction is central to the appearance of the poet throughout the *Satires*.

As a writer of lyric, Horace certainly follows his stated Greek models such as Alcaeus, Sappho, and Pindar, but he also takes into account the personae he has already developed as a satirist. Because of his success in satire, Horace addresses his now-famous persona when presenting himself in lyric. *Odes* 1.1 serves as a model of Horace's overall program of self-definition, opening with its satiric critique of society and ending with the poet as a *vates* inserted among the canonical Greek lyric poets. The poem begins with a satiric catalogue, but then transforms that catalogue into a lyric priamel like that in the opening strophe of Sappho 16. By using satire to introduce lyric, Horace comes to his new poetry with an already-developed persona ready to deploy in his development toward the goal of becoming poetic *princeps*.

AN OLD PERSONA REVIVED IN A NEW GENRE

So, just how does Horace employ his satiric character in the development of his lyric persona in the *Odes* books 1-3? Over the course of the collection, as it is read linearly[6] from beginning to end, Horace transforms from the satirist-become-*vates* in the first poem into the *princeps* of the last. The initial and final poems of each book show the poet at his progressive stages on this trajectory. Horace recalls the *Satires* in different ways in each book; in each one evolving further towards his goal of being a Roman lyric poet whose work is a monument more lasting than bronze. In the first book, he appears to be playing with the new genre, expertly affecting a lower tone as in the *Satires*. In the second book, he takes on the air of a lyric voice

[6] The term I wanted to use here is "diachronic" because of its sense of motion through time, but since it is a technical term in historical linguistics, to use it for this purpose would be misleading and confusing. Instead, I say "linear" because I read the *Odes* as a dynamic collection that moves along a trajectory, rather than being a monolithic structure.

more strongly, now sounding more like a lyric poet, but still writing on subjects that are appropriate to satire. By the third book, the poet has totally adopted his lyric identity and has also begun to take on an identity as a sort of state poet under Augustus, particularly in the famous "Roman Odes" which begin the third book.

The first and last poems in each book strongly mark the transition in character Horace's persona undergoes. *Odes* 1.1 introduces the poet with strong ties to his earlier genre, but elements that look forward to the hope that he can become something new. By *Ode*s 1.38, the poet is still critiquing elements of society as the satirist-lyricist, except that he is critiquing what kind of garland one must wear in a sympotic setting. He still works in the mode of the satirist, even though he is writing in lyric meters about more lyrical topics. The first poem of book 2 is an address to Pollio, the tragedian who is currently writing historical epic. Since Horace is the satirist writing lyric, the reader is unsure whether the poem is actually about Pollio or about Horace. He transforms into the Pindaric swan in Ode 2.20, presenting himself as having completely taken on his new lyric persona. In two of the "Roman Odes," 3.1 and 3.4, Horace re-traces his steps through the satire-heavy poetry of the first book to the increasingly lyric second book to arrive at his goal: his third book in which he fully puts on display his new lyric identity. He finally becomes the *princeps* worthy of bumping his uplifted head on the stars in *Ode*s 3.30.

CHAPTER 2

HORACE'S SATIRIC PERSONA AND ODES 1.1

When a reader well acquainted with Horace's *Satires* first approaches the *Odes*, he finds in them a familiar voice. *Odes* 1.1, the programmatic introduction to Horace's collection of lyric poetry, not only looks forward to the monumental accomplishment of the *Odes* but also looks back to the personae and poetic elements that are distinctive of his first published genre. The first of the *Odes* uses satiric poetic elements and speaks with an ironic voice that recalls Horace the satirist and his earlier self-presentation. Horace's persona in *Odes* 1.1 is consistent in many ways with his persona in the *Satires*, and he exploits his readers' familiarity with him as a satirist in that he recalls and incorporates that voice in his presentation of himself as a lyric poet in the *Odes*. In both collections, the poet is sometimes an outsider whose stance as such legitimizes his statements and sometimes he is an insider who knows how things work even though he is from outside origins. His position as an outsider or an insider in the *Satires* is variously defined vis-à-vis the social (*Satires* 1.5, 1.9) and artistic (*Satires* 1.4, 1.10, 2.1) elite in Rome, Rome's urban population in general (*Satires* 1.1-3, 1.9) Stoic philosophers and rustic outsiders, among others. In *Odes* 1.1, Horace's *ego* voice defines itself against various occupations, each with their own dangers - farmer, merchant, politician, soldier, athlete - and rejects them in favor of his pursuit of inclusion in the canon of Greek lyric poets, an ambition that is itself lofty, if not also dangerous.

In investigating persona as it appears in the *Satires*, this chapter's focus will be on the multi-faceted first person voice as it appears in select satires with a view to examining how that voice is echoed in *Odes* 1.1, the programmatic poem that lays out the Horace's goals and claims

for his collection of *Odes*. Then, it will trace the appearance of those satiric elements in the way the poet presents himself in *Odes* 1.1. Rather than attempting to construct a single consistent picture of the satirist, this approach allows Horace to speak through satiric masks[7] with different nuances at different times, as if each satire is a performance piece being narrated on stage. Approaching his persona in this way also acknowledges the often-cited connection between Satire as a genre and the Roman stage.

Satire is best conceived as fundamentally a performance genre closer in kind to drama than to epic, lyric or other genres, although conventions from any genre are fair game to the satirist.[8] The very use of the word *persona*, the mask an ancient actor wore on stage, to describe the poet's first-person voice belies the connection between drama and satire. The nature of satire's analogous relationship to drama shifts, however. "The satirist may identify himself as a dramatist, a performer, or a spectator of events."[9] He alternately appears as the one ordering the events reenacted before the audience, the one enacting them, and the one merely observing them, himself an audience of society at large. The personae are only masks worn by the same poet, and the poet's actual life is frequently the basis (if not sometimes the entirety) of the multi-faceted and complex personality that comes across as the speaker of the poems.

Horace employs three general (and intersecting) ways of presenting himself in the *Satires*. His persona as an outsider looking in, corresponding to the audience in an analogy with

---

[7] I say mask instead of character because the word "character" implies that each persona is well-defined and absolutely distinct. Instead, they are all poetically re-packaged versions of Horace himself, following Susanna Morton Braund. "Introduction to Roman Satire: The Basics." in *Roman Satirists and their Masks*. (Bristol: Bristol University Press, 1996), ix. See also Ellen Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 1-5 and Randall L.B. McNeill, "The Horaces of Horace" in *Horace: Image, Identity, and Audience*. (Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 1-9.

[8] Braund. "The Masks of Satire" in *Roman Satirists*, 1-5; Kirk Freudenburg. "Horatian Satire and the Conventions of Popular Drama" in *The Walking Muse.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 3-51; William S. Anderson. "Roman Satirists and Literary Criticism" in *Essays in Roman Satire*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 3-10; Catherine Keane. "The Theatrics of Satire" in *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 13-41.

[9] Keane. *Figuring Genre*, 13

drama, appears in the so-called "diatribe Satires" 1.1-3.[10] This diatribe satirist is a specifically characterized version of Horace's voice, made to sound like a rustic preaching to Romans about their vices. Second, his more general satiric persona, which is the poet from humble origins who has risen to membership in the circle of Maecenas, appears in the most satires and is the most well-known satiric voice of Horace. This persona would correspond to an actor in drama, participating in the action before the audience. *Satires* 1.5 (the journey to Brundisium), 1.6 (the autobiography), 1.9 (the pest), 2.2 (a lecture on the simple life), 2.4 (the philosophy of gourmet), 2.6 (the city mouse and the country mouse), and 2.8 (the worst dinner party ever) all feature this persona. Lucilius' influence on the literary critic persona appears in the literary Satires 1.4, 1.10, and 2.1, where Horace sounds more like a poet discussing how it is that one should go about practicing his craft of writing satire. As for the rest of the Satires, the first person is either not present or not intended to be associated with Horace. It is important to note at this point that these personae are not clearly distinct and easily separated personalities. They are ways of speaking that Horace can put on and take off at will, like masks, sometimes adopting one, all or none of them. Separating them serves merely as a way of helping to identify ways in which he approaches his persona in a satiric context.

THE DIATRIBE SATIRIST: SATIRES 1.1-3

The first of Horace's satiric masks that a reader encounters is that of the sermonizing writer of diatribe, as found in the first three satires of book 1. Horace normally builds his personae from himself, and adds certain characteristics to further mold the mask. The sermonizer has a tendency to meander through his diatribe, indicating that he has little or no rhetorical or literary training, and is thus not a participant in the cultural elite of Rome. The examples and

[10] For discussion of how these *Satires* are grouped together and named "diatribes," see Niall Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), 1-35; see also Freudenburg, *Walking Muse*, 8-20.

analogies he gives in these satires are a mix of the rural and the urban, with the rural references indicating that the diatribe satirist is something of a country sage, come to the city to instruct everyone how to behave. He even asks his sophisticated hearers to have compassion for him, dressed as he is like a *rusticus* (1.3.29-32).

The several urban figures he uses, however, contradict this country persona and indicate that the satirist, in fact, does know his way around the city and the upper circles of society, particularly in light of his familiarity with famous people like the professional singer Tigellius (1.2.1-11, 1.3.1-19) and his detailed and intimate knowledge of women from every social stratum, from the very highest to the very lowest (1.2). The sermonizing satirist of the diatribes makes himself at times a participant in the culture he describes and at times a social critic, preaching from outside of the system and offering his version of the way things should be. By doing so, the poet demonstrates his ability to shift theatrical positions at will. The diatribe satirist will also occasionally make a statement that goads the *sapiens*, a jab at Stoic philosophy, for example at *Satires* 1.3.124-142.[11] He often makes philosophical statements, but does so in line with a rustic, uneducated manner. The result is that the diatribe satirist's voice is more in the tradition of an ironic, parodic satire like that of Menippus and Callimachus rather than the philosophical diatribes of Bion, which were humorous in tone but serious in their moralizing.[12]

There is an apparent lack of structure in the speech of the diatribe satirist that encourages a sense that the content is extemporaneous. For example, *Satires* 1.1.1-22 begins with a catalogue of people in different stations of life who are not content with their individual lots and think that others are happy, who in turn think that still others are really happy. None of them, however, would change places if a god gave them the chance. It seems from the beginning that

[11] Rudd. *Satires of Horace*, 9.
[12] Freudenburg. *Walking Muse*, 16-21 has an extended discussion of Greek diatribes and their impact on Horace's satire.

the Satire will be about contentment with one's lot in life. However, the satirist abruptly shifts to the example of the industrious ant, seemingly about to give a lesson on the value of industriousness. Instead, he launches into an attack on the greed that causes people to hoard goods beyond what they need, while the little ant knows when to stop.

His rant goes on to say that the needs of the miser and the one who only acquires what is sufficient are the same. He asks questions like, *quid referat intra | naturae finis viventi, iugera centum an | mille aret?* ("What does it matter to the man living within the bounds of nature that he plow a hundred acres or a thousand?" 1.1.49-51)[13] And on the rant goes, catching the reader off guard with its transitions. The diatribe satires are full of such apparent rambling.[14] The seeming lack of structure characterizes the satirist as one who is definitely not a learned rhetorician. He has none of the rhetorical acumen of a Cicero and his mode of speaking serves to characterize him as an outsider to the rhetorically-educated elite class in Rome as well as lull the reader into a sense of familiarity through his conversational tone. Horace's name for the *Satires* was, after all, *Sermones* ("conversations").

The diatribe satirist gives many hints that he is not only uneducated in rhetoric, but also that he is from the uncorrupted country as opposed being a jaded urbanite. He does this by using rural exempla and illustrations to further his points, such as at *Satires* 1.3.115-6, where he uses the rustic example of stealing a neighbor's cabbages and again, at 1.3.123, where he uses the agricultural example of the *falx*, the pruning hook, as his metaphor for cutting away crimes. However, his simple country façade is undercut by his urban sensibilities. He is one who has

[13] Interestingly, this line recalls that of Achilles at Iliad 9.318-320: ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι, καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι ἐν δὲ ἰῇ τιμῇ κακὸς ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλός. κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὅ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὅ τε πολλὰ ἐοργώς. Taken along with the mock-epic tone of passages such as *Satires* 1.5.51-54 and 1.9.78, one can see that the satirist often becomes an ironic mock-epic hero.

[14] cf. "Structurally, then, these poems (Satires 1.1-3) are alike in having an opening theme of about twenty verses introduced by some striking hyperbole or comic effect, and then illustrated in a series of antithetical pairs. A second, related theme then emerges and receives a much more extended treatment, though here too Horace avoids the appearance of a systematic arrangement by gliding casually from one topic to another." Rudd, *Satires of Horace*, 14.

come from the outside and is now on the inside, and thus he is allowed to comment on the society from either perspective, as either a player on the stage or as a spectator in the audience. However, he also often negates this perception in his references to himself or others, attempting to appear at times as completely an oustider and at times as an insider. This leaves his status ambiguous and displays the contradictory irony which marks satiric personae. He moves rather freely between the two roles.

Of the diatribes, Satire 1.2 illustrates this ironic tension most clearly. It begins with a catalogue of those who mourn Tigellius the singer, whom the satirist faults for his extravagant spending (1.2.1-11). This is followed by a rant on Fufidius' outrageous lending habits (1.2.11-16). These examples establish the satirist as a man who is familiar with the people and practices of the social elite of Rome. A mere bumpkin would not know who these people are, let alone feel comfortable criticizing them. The outsider status from which he derives his ability to satirize is seriously compromised by such demonstrations of urban knowledge, but the sermonizer, undaunted by such setbacks, plunges on. Later in the poem, he is describing how one chooses the woman with whom he wants to carry out a romantic liason, and compares the process with *reges* buying horses (1.2.86-89). He does not include himself in the category of upper-crust people who make purchases of fancy, expensive horses, but he knows all about the pitfalls of adultery with a married woman from his own experience (1.2.127-33, below). Similarly, in Satire 1.3, the satirist again displays intimate knowledge of the singer Tigellius, who, in this poem, is alive and in the habit of never singing when asked but never silent the rest of the time.

The diatribe satirist's ironic ambiguity with regard to being either inside or outside the elite circles of Rome finds its most overt illustration in Satire 1.3.63-66:

> simplicior quis et est, qualem me saepe libenter
> obtulerim tibi, Maecenas, ut forte legentem

aut tacitum inpellat quovis sermone: 'molestus,
communi sensu plane caret' inquimus.

And who is more naïve, as I have often freely shown myself to be with you, Maecenas, than who interrupts you, perhaps either reading or being silent, with any sort of conversation: “Annoying, clearly he lacks common sense,” we say.

So the first-person voice has often demonstrated his lack of *communis sensus* (“common sense”) by interrupting Maecenas involved in an erudite and scholarly pursuits of either reading or thinking. He lacks the learning and social skills common to those around Maecenas, indeed the very activities he interrupts indicate his lack of education and his outsider status. Yet there he is, in the company of Maecenas, one of the most important men in Rome. He also includes himself in the group of people who call such a person ‘*molestus*’ by using the first-person plural *iniquimus* (1.3.66), including himself with Maecenas not only in the situation of the passage, but also in the very words themselves. His participation in the society he criticizes is made clear by the verb and the fact that he is often (*saepe*) in close contact with Maecenas who suffers Horace to bother him.

Another example of his ambiguous stance as both a participant in the society he is satirizing and an outsider of it is in Satire 1.2.127-133. The passage describes what Horace does not fear will happen to him when he is in the heat of the adulterous moment. It demonstrates that Horace is more than willing to stand in the position of the performer, acting out the very vices he is denouncing.

nec vereor, ne, dum futuo, vir rure recurrat,
ianua frangatur, latret canis, undique mango
pulsa domus strepitu resonet, vepallida lecto
desiliat mulier, miseram se conscia clamet,
cruribus haec metuat, doti deprensa, egomet mi.
discincta tunica fugiendum est et pede nudo,
ne nummi pereant aut puga aut denique fama.

> Nor do I fear that, while I am in the act, her husband hurry back from the field, the door bust open, the dog bark, everywhere the house, struck, resound with the great racket; that the woman, deathly pale, leap away from the bed, her accomplice cry out that she is wretched, she fearing for her limbs, the one who was caught for her dowry, and I for myself. I, with toga barely on and bare-foot, must run off, lest my money or my rump or, worst of all, my reputation perish. (1.2.127-33)

He is anything but the outside observer here, a clown telling a story that he "does not fear" will happen. Two elements of the narrative indicate that the satirist may not be exactly forthright with his audience about this event never happening. First, the scene is so vivid, with the dog barking and the *conscia* shouting, that it suggests an actual event. I am not suggesting that this happened to the historical Horace, but that it is meant to sound as if it really happened to the satirist.[15] Second, the satirist follows his character down the street, pulling on his toga as he runs away barefoot trying not to get caught, a detail which also suggests to the audience that some actual event is slyly being portrayed as a fear the speaker does not have. He has stepped into the line of fire of his own satiric attack on adulterers, softening the blow and making himself a participant with his audience rather than purely the preacher from the outside as he sometimes portrays himself.

Finally, the satirist of the diatribes takes philosophical stances at many points. While never seriously presented as a philosophic text, *Satires* 1.3 contains an extended section blasting the Stoic doctrine that all sins are equal.[16] Starting at 1.3.78, he discusses how sins are not all equal, finally quoting the Stoic doctrine at line 96, *paria esse … peccata.…* ("sins…are equal…"). He goes on to make use of the Stoic idea that the philosopher is a master of all things and a king among men by constantly using the word *rex* to make fun of the Stoic "wise man." He

[15] Maria Plaza, *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) 83-84.
[16] Rudd, *Satires of Horace*, 9 discusses this passage, noting how Horace humorizes the Stoic doctrine as "an object of derision" in order to criticize it. On the doctrine's status as indeed Stoic in nature, Rudd, 274 n.2, cites H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 1.53,.10, 3.81.31, 3.150.17, 3.158.35ff., 3.159.1.

has the stoic make the ridiculous claim that all philosophers are excellent cobblers and barbers and singers although they never do any such things. The satirist then excuses the unwittingly dismissed and ridiculed philosopher to fight the vulgar crowds on the way to the cheap public baths with nobody for an attendant except crazy Crispinus.

While the Stoic "king" enjoys his imaginary royalty, the *stultus* satirist says he will go on living happily with friends who are willing to forgive his minor offences. It is typical of the satirist that the Stoic doctrine he chooses to attack is the unequivocal and extreme stance that all sins are equal. Tigellius' major offense is his inconsistency and lack of *aequibilitas*, since *nil fuit umquam | sic impar sibi.* ("never was there anyone so inconsistent as he." 1.3.18-9). Elsewhere, the satirist decries the problem of people avoiding vices with excessive corrective measures by saying *nil medium est* ("there is no moderation" 1.2.28) and declares *est modus in rebus* ("there is balance in things" 1.1.106) to advocate moderation and contentment. Horace's call for the Aristotelian "golden mean" will persist in his lyric persona, although overshadowed by the Epicurean *carpe diem* exhortations.

HORACE AND MAECENAS: THE INSIDE MAN

While in the diatribe *Satires* Horace used status as an outsider observing Roman life to legitimize his claim to authority, elsewhere in the *Satires*, he emphasizes that he is a proud member of Maecenas' circle who can look down on people of lower status and make fun of them. When he presents himself in this light, Horace no longer presents himself as the rustic who wandered into Rome to preach the right way to live, but as an "inside man" who represents the values and social expectations of Maecenas' circle. There is a dichotomy between 'us' and 'them' which the satirist emphasizes. "The 'us' is the elite group around Maecenas, the group which Horace wishes to impress so that he will be included in it. The poem therefore celebrates

the standards of the group."[17] The subtle distinction between this voice and that of the first three satires is that the voice of the diatribes speaks from the outside to the inside and this voice, which appears in the majority of the satires, speaks from the inside as one who used to be outside. In other words, Horace presents himself in the Satires at some times clinging to his outsider origins and at others casting them aside to embrace his acquired legitimacy as a poet under the patronage of Maecenas.

This insider persona shows up as the Horace who cannot escape the pest in *Satires* 1.9 who, despite his position of superiority over his pursuer, cannot get away because he is just too nice. The culinary conversations in Satires 2.4 and 2.8 both require the satirist to be a member of the elite who understands why the philosophy of fine dining or a disastrous dinner party are humorous. This persona not only features the ironic qualities of Horace's literary critic persona, which appears in *Satires* 1.4, 1.10, and 2.1, but also some of the humility of the sermonizer. It is important that there is no clear and distinct line drawn between any of Horace's various satiric voices; they are all based, however closely or loosely, on the actual Horace who writes the poetry. For instance, *Satires* 1.1 begins with an address to Maecenas, demonstrating that acknowledged membership in Maecenas' circle is not something exclusive to Horace's persona as the inside man, but rather something emphasized when Horace is wearing that mask, as are all the characteristics of his personae. This insider persona is the narrator of the "journey to Brundisium" (*Satires* 1.5), which presents a good example of the persona and its most salient characteristics.

The journey is made by Maecenas and Cocceius as a diplomatic mission to reconcile Octavian and Antony, but the historic momentousness of the occasion is nowhere to be found in

[17] Braund, *Roman Satirists and Their Masks*, 23.

the poem.[18] The poet instead focuses on such events as the squabbles of sailors and slaves on a barge (1.5.11-14), a fight between the boatman and an impatient traveler (1.5.17-22), the not-quite-eloquent verbal match between Sarmentus and Messius (1.5.51-70), and other strikingly mundane events. A social climber, the satirist in these poems presents himself as one concerned with such things to the exclusion of events on which a writer of epic or grandiose praise would focus. The episodes between the commoners in the satire all serve to accentuate the difference in social class and behavior that exists between them and the narrator's group. The episodes are executed with comic effect, which lightens the mood of the poem, but only from the perspective of the satirist, whose disdain for those beneath his group is only accentuated by his (and his readers') laughter at them.

In the middle of the poem, however, there is a strange passage in which the satirist points out that the group had arrived at his hometown region. In a passage of ironic self-presentation, Horace, the one making fun of the commoners from his position in an important entourage tells an oddly self-deprecating story:

> incipit ex illo montis Apulia notos
> ostentare mihi, quos torret Atabulus et quos
> nunquam erepsemus, nisi nos vicina Trivici
> villa recepisset lacrimoso non sine fumo,
> udos cum foliis ramos urente camino.
> hic ego mendacem stultissimus usque puellam
> ad mediam noctem exspecto; somnus tamen aufert
> intentum veneri; tum inmundo somnia visu
> nocturnam vestem maculant ventremque supinum.
>
> From there, Apulia begins to show familiar hills to my eyes, which the Atabulus scorches, and over which we never would have crawled if a villa in the area of Trivicum had not taken us in, not without tear-inducing smoke, with the stove burning wet logs with their leaves. Here I, like a fool, stayed up till midnight waiting for a deceitful girl. However, sleep bore me off, intent on love. Then, a dream, dirty to see, came and messed up my pajamas and my stomach, me lying on my back. (77-85)

[18] Oliensis, *Rhetoric of Authority*, 27-8; Rudd, *Satires of Horace*, 54-5; Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses From Lucilius to Juvenal.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 52-3.

Here, Horace nicely juxtaposes the elitism of the inside man with his ironic, self-deprecating manner. He specifically mentions that they are in Apulia, which recalls Horace's own humble origins, which he often mentions. First, the entire group is assailed by the smoke of wet wood, which makes their eyes water. The mundane detail serves to lower the elite travelers from their haughty 'us vs. them' position, showing them squinting and tearing up at the overly smoky fire just as anyone else would. The satirist himself, though, is further lowered in status, first being stood up by a deceitful *puella* and finally being debased by a wet dream.[19] The position of superiority that makes possible all the laughing at sailors and slaves and idiots at dinner is undermined by Horace's inclusion of this story. Thus the persona is infused by the poet with the inherent irony that marks Horace throughout the *Satires* and will appear as a satiric element in the *Odes*.

LUCILIUS AND HORACE'S LITERARY CRITIC PERSONA

Another of Horace's prominent satiric masks is that of the literary critic.[20] This is the persona Horace presents when he discusses his views on poetry and literature, such as in *Satires* 1.4, 1.10, and 2.1, in which the primary subject of discussion is Lucilius, the father of satire and the precedent from which the satirist presents himself as not being able to escape.[21] Horace's perceived need to explain and defend why his satire differs so greatly from those of Lucilius is in part due to his adherence to the aesthetics of Callimachus. At *Satires* 1.10.78-91, he claims that the opinions of Maecenas' group of poets and critics are the only ones that matter to him. Their poetic ideal is a Hellenistic ideal, drawn from the small, clear stream of Callimachus' Hymn to

[19] Oliensis, *Rhetoric of Authority*, 28; Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome*, 54.
[20] Freudenburg, *Walking Muse*, 119-128.
[21] This is of course according to Horace and other ancient writers. Freudenberg, *Satires of Rome*, 3, equates Lucilius' influence on Latin verse satire to Vergil's influence on epic. This may not be a fair estimate, however, since Ennius' satires are simply in too fragmentary a state to make judgments. See also Rudd, *Satires of Horace*, 87-88.

Apollo (*Hymns* 2.105-112) rather than the muddy stream[22] of Lucilius' voluminous output (*Satires* 1.4.11). Horace's muse instead is slender in that he claims to labor over the technical poetics of his satire (1.10.9-10), unlike Lucilius, whom Horace sets up to be rhetorically equivalent to Callimachus' Telchines (*Aetia* 1.1-2, 7-20) in order to have a model of poorly written poetry against which to favorably present his own (*Satires* 1.4.11-18). Additionally, the more Horace can emphaisize the fame and greatness of the Lucilius he exceeds, the better his group of poets and he himself look when he presents his poetry as superior. So there are two primary characteristic elements of Horace's literary critic satirist. First is his need to defend his poetry against his predecessor Lucilius. Second is his participation in a small group of poets who adhere to a Callimachean aesthetic, focusing on the poetic values of the clique (1.10.78-91) rather than their social standing.

Horace's criticisms of Lucilius come in spite of generous praise, comparing his predecessor, in *Satires* 1.4.1-8, to the great poets of Greek Old Comedy, who attacked whoever deserved it with no compunction. With such a beginning, it seems that the satire will take its initial praise for Lucilius' willingness to attack and apply it to Horace. However, the satire takes an abrupt turn. Instead of continuing the discussion of satire as a genre of attack, Horace draws attention to meter and rhythm (1.4.7) and criticizes Lucilius for lacking art in his execution of hexameters. Particularly, Horace mentions the great quantity of verses Lucilius was reputed to write at once (1.4.9-10), and says of himself that he does not pay too much attention to the volume of his output. Ever the Callimachean, Horace values instead slender and highly polished poetry. He declines an invitation to a speed-poetry contest with Crispinus in favor of editing his lines more laboriously (1.4.14-21). He uses the Callimachean metaphor of a muddy stream for

[22] While it is the mud of Lucilius' stream that Horace disapproves of in the *Satires*, it will be the forcefulness of Pindar's stream that Horace will similarly reject in *Odes* 4.2.

Lucilius' verses, a muddy stream from which there is much one would want to remove (1.4.11). The literary critic persona adheres firmly to the Callimachean aesthetic, and uses it to judge Lucilius and the other poets who fall short of that aesthetic ideal. This devotion to a Hellenistic model of highly polished poetry is a central characteristic of the literary critic satirist, who ironically never attempts the one thing for which he praises Lucilius: unbridled political invective.

Despite adhering to his Hellenistic aesthetic and judging Lucilius' verse to be lacking, Horace the literary critic frequently declares his inferiority to Lucilius as a satirist. This contradictory stance between the position he claims and the position he actually takes in his poetry is an important characteristic of the literary critic's persona. The dual stance stems from his poetic superiority versus his inability or unwillingness to engage in real political invective. He exploits the disjunction between the two for ironic effect. Because he spends so much time criticizing Lucilius' poetry, Horace's claims to humility ring hollow, and create an ironic "wink." Satire 2.1 is where Horace most obviously scrapes and bows before Lucilius, saying, *quicquid sum ego, quamvis | infra Lucili censum ingeniumque* … ("Such as I am, however much below Lucilius in rank and talent…" 2.1.74-5). He refers to Lucilius as *nostrum melioris utroque* ("better than either of us" 2.1.29). In the first literary satire, despite his criticisms of Lucilius, Horace goes so far in his (feigned) humility as to remove himself from the number of those he allows to be called poets (1.4.39-40).[23]

The second book of satires was published five years after the first and while composing it Horace likely heard quite a lot from his critics about his treatment of Lucilius in the first book.

[23] He makes claims to humble status elsewhere, as in his autobiographical Satire 1.6, but claims to humble social status rather than poetic lowliness will be treated later.

Between Satires 1.4 and 1.10, he had already made adjustments to his criticism of Lucilius in anticipation of such criticism.

> As Horace no doubt foresaw, these remarks [criticizing Lucilius in Satire 1.4] annoyed the champions of Lucilius. Rallying to the defence of their favourite, they stressed the colour and vigour of his style and affirmed that he had a genial and sophisticated wit. Since Luclius had now been brought to the forefront of the controversy, Horace felt obliged to amplify and, where necessary, modify his earlier statements.[24]

I would add to Rudd's comment here that Horace also adjusts his critical stance between *Satires* 1.10 and *Satires* 2.1, but does so with his ironic wink. The literary critic's statements of humility and subordination to Lucilius are undermined by his continued stance on Lucilius' poetic merits. He does the same to his own claims of humility, as well. He says to Trebatius' suggestion that Horace abandon satire for a while, *cupidum, pater optime, vires | deficiunt* … ("though willing, good father, my powers fail me …" 2.1.12-13) about his inability to write epic in praise of Caesar. However, in direct contradiction to his statement he continues,

> … neque enim quiuis horrentia pilis
> agmina nec fracta pereuntis cuspide Gallos
> aut labentis equo describit uulnera Parthi.
>
> For not just anyone can describe troops in formations bristling with javelins, nor Gauls perishing with a shattered lance, or the wounds of a Parthian slipping from his horse. (13-15)

Such a "three-line slice of the kind of poetry he hasn't the strength to write"[25] is typical of the winking Horatian persona. This ironic wink will appear in the *recusationes* of the Odes and be one of the most distinctive features of Horace's persona, in lyric as well as here in satire.

ODES 1.1 AND ITS SATIRIC ELEMENTS

Despite the different nuances of Horace's satiric personae, they all display an inherent juxtaposition of humble origins and lofty purposes that accomplishes the ironic wink which

[24] Rudd, *Satires of Horace*, 92.
[25] Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome*, 82.

defines them. As the diatribe satirist, Horace observes and attacks from without, claiming to be a humble rustic while at the same time displaying intimate knowledge of the vices of the elite at Rome. As the proud member of Maecenas' circle, he ridicules from within, from a position of belonging and prestige, while telling stories about himself which compromise that position. As the literary critic, he looks down upon the poetic virture of Lucilius, to whom he claims to be inferior. Horace has this cadre of satiric voices at his disposal when he begins his lyric project in the *Odes*.

Neither the poet nor his audience can have forgotten the ways he presented himself in the *Satires* during the time between their publication and 23 B.C.E, when the first three books of *Odes* are published. In the *Satires*, he took on different masks for different poems, often in book 2 even writing not as himself but as some other character in the first-person. However, in the *Odes*, he is one lyric figure from beginning to end. The final poem of the collection suggests this by its use of the singular *monumentum* (3.30.1) to describe the first three books of *Odes*. In *Odes* 1.1, Horace does not explicitly take up his satiric personae again, but echoes them by two primary means. First, Horace's narrative voice in the *Odes*, the way he describes and presents himself, develops from and echoes that in the *Satires*. Second, the *Odes* employ satiric themes and techniques with which Horace's readers are already familiar. That is not to say that Horace is merely re-writing satire with lyric meters in his *Odes*, but that the first-person voice and poetic content he employed in his *Satires* reappears in his lyric corpus.

The most striking parallel between the programmatic first ode and the *Satires* is with that collection's opening poem in both structure and subject matter.[26] Both begin and end with an

[26] H. J. Shey, "The Poet's Progress. Horace, *Odes* I,1" (*Arethusa* IV: 1971), 185-196 discusses the parallels between the two poems.

address to Maecenas.[27] The address in the *Odes* is longer and more grandiloquent and that in the *Satires*, which is swift and serves merely as a way to launch into the subject of the poem. Both introductory poems act as glimpses into the kind of genre Horace is writing, and "are intended to inform Maecenas how he wishes to be regarded as an artist."[28] In *Satires* 1.1, the swiftness of the address to Maecenas sounds like the beginning a conversation, fitting Horace's own title for his *Satires*: the *Sermones*, or "conversations." *Quid fit* ("how come") at *Satires* 1.1.1 presages the lower, more conversational tone Horace intends to use for his satiric poetry,[29] while the grandiloquent language of the address to Maecenas[30] in *Odes* 1.1 signals that an entirely different kind of poetry is underway.

In his new genre, Horace will employ a persona infused with a strong dose of bravado and confidence that his verse is worthy of the greatest lyric poetry ever written (*Quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres…* 1.1.35). He goes so far as to declare his project a success in *Odes* 3.30, before Maecenas has ever had the chance to fulfill Horace's request to include him with the lyric poets. However, the second person addressee of *inseres* does not have to be Maecenas, but could be anyone approaching the *Odes*. Arthur Pomeroy describes it this way:

> From Maecenas, we pass to the general second person (*numquam dimoveas*, 13: 'one/you would never move') and by the end of the ode, the wish expressed by *inseres* is no longer confined to the stated addressee, but can be taken as the ideal second person singular of the future.[31]

The reader of *Odes* 1.1 remembers how Horace in the *Satires* attained social and poetic status from his position within the literary circle of Maecenas. As Horace begins his huge lyric project,

---

[27] This is slightly different than the nature of the address in *Epodes* 1, where throughout the poem, Horace never leaves the first-person to second-person address for a third -person narrative as he does in *Satires* 1.1 and *Odes* 1.1.
[28] Shey, "Poet's Progress," 190.
[29] See Freudenburg, *Walking Muse*, 11, also J.E.G Zetzel, "Horace's *Liber Sermonem*: The Structure of Ambiguity" (*Arethusa* 13 1980), 69.
[30] As noted by Nisbet and Hubbard. *Odes I*, 3-4.
[31] Arthur J. Pomeroy, "A Man at a Spring: Horace, Odes 1.1." (*Ramus* 9: 1980), 35-36.

he emphasizes and exploits that connection, calling on Maecenas to continue to be his *praesidium* ("protection") and his *dulce decus* ("sweet glory").

So in the first two lines, Horace claims, just as he did in the *Satires*, dependence on Maecenas for his standing among poets and peers. In his discussions of Lucilius in the *Satires*, Horace had gone so far as to deny himself the very title of poet (*Satires* 1.4.39-40) in order to present the appearance of humility and deference to the old master of the genre. His position was consistently one of looking up at either Maecenas or Lucilius from below. This is not the case in the *Odes*, especially in light of 2.20 and 3.30 and their declarations of success beyond death. In *Odes* 1.1.1-2, Horace recalls his previous humble stance vis-à-vis Lucilius in his grand address to Maecenas. But at 1.1.29-36, he changes positions, placing himself above all others, including his patron, when he is (hopefully, *quod si*, "but if" 1.1.35) inserted among the canon of Greek lyric poets.

His shifting of positions from below to above begins immediately after his initial address to Maecenas. From 1.1.3 until the end of the poem, there is a consistent upward motion until Horace finally bumps his head on the stars in the final line. Line 3 starts off with the dust (*pulverem*) beneath Olympic chariot wheels. The victor is lifted to the gods (*ad deos* 1.1.6).[32] The successful politician is lifted (*tollere* 1.1.8) to his offices. In line 29, at the same time Horace names himself directly with the pronoun *me*, the scenes of the poem leave the plane of normal human activity and enter the realm of the mythical, with literary prizes mingling Horace with the gods (*dis miscent superis* 1.1.30) and choruses of Nymphs with Satyrs separating him from the people (*me…secernunt populo* 1.1.30-32). Being so separated from the populace, Horace is no longer subject to kings like the ancestors of Maecenas in the opening couplet. Now, it is not the

[32] Olympic victors lifted to gods in a lyric meter immediately bring Pindar to mind, especially *Olympian* 2. However, Horace subtly reverses the direction of the poetry, starting with the dust/mortals and ending with gods, as opposed to Pindar who starts with gods at *Olympian* 2.2 and descends to mortals.

approval of his human patron that Horace needs in order to accomplish his goals but rather the continual inspiration and musical accompaniment of the muses Euterpe and Polyhymnia[33]. In the *Odes,* Horace demonstrates a relationship to Maecenas (and powerful people in general) which closely resembles his poetic position with Lucilius, in which he criticized and demonstrated superiority from a rhetorically ironic position below him.

As Horace wishes to be included among the lyric greats, he justifies his wish by presenting himself as a lyric figure both by describing himself and contrasting himself against other kinds of people, which was the device he used so frequently in the first three *Satires* of book 1. The body of *Odes* 1.1, where he does this contrasting and describing, is divided into four sections. The first (1.1.3-18) is a catalogue of occupations presented in the satiric manner, recalling Horace as the author of the *Satires*. The second section (1.1.19-22) introduces a figure sipping wine who contrasts with the satiric catalogue and re-focuses the poem as a lyric priamel rather than a satire. The third section (1.1.23-28) is another list of occupations, this time executed purely as a lyric priamel. The last section (1.1.29-34) before the final couplet addressed to Maecenas shows Horace as a lyric poet in lyric settings, extolling the kinds of virtues his new collection of poetry aims to embody. Thus the poem stylistically follows Horace's transformation from a poet of satiric verse to one who writes lyric worthy of Sappho, Alcaeus and Pindar.

The members of the opening list of occupations are those whom "it pleases" (*iuvat* 1.1.4) to participate in various occupations. The three occupations are separated neatly in the poetry; the divisions between them all come at line-end: the Athletes take up all of lines 3-6, beginning

[33] According to Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes I*, 282-283, no inference can be drawn on the particular provenance of the muses Euterpe and Polyhymnia in their discussion of Melpomene in *Odes* 1.24, "…the assignment of provinces was still vague…"

with a clear introductory *sunt quos* (there are those whom… 1.1.3),[34] while the politician is introduced with *hunc* in line 7, and the wealthy landowner by *illum* in line 9. The poetry is heavily deictic, pointing to the men it is describing, as in *Satires* 1.2.23 ff. Additionally, at *Satires* 1.4.24, Horace uses *sunt quos* with *iuvat*, just as here in *Odes* 1.1. In *Satires* 1.4, however, it is used to say that Horace's satire does *not* please some people, but the link is certainly there, especially considering the literary nature of Horace's proclamation at the end of *Odes* 1.1 and the defense of his own poetry in *Satires* 1.4 -- in both instances, the *sunt quos* … *iuvat* serves as part of an introductory section of a poem that makes statements about Horace's own poetry. Another parallel with the *Satires* is that the list is divided cleanly, as if it were merely prose re-worked into a lyric meter, as Horace described his writing in *Satires* 1.4.39-42. The reader is lulled into a sense that while the meter of this collection of poetry from Horace is new, the subject matter will remain the same as before.

Indeed, after this early section there comes the passage of *Odes* 1.1 that most closely resembles *Satires* 1.1 in particular and the genre of satire in general. Here, the poet warns the reader never to try and make a farmer into a sailor and declares that a merchant will never settle down, despite the dangers of life at sea because he just cannot stand to be poor (*indocilis pauperiem pati*. 1.1.18). You should never try, he says, to make the farmer plow the sea rather than his fields since the rustic, as Horace had described himself in the *Satires*, is too scared to use the Cyprian beam.[35] Similarly, Horace portrays the *mercator* with great irony, depicting him as simultaneously praising his old town for its *otium* while busy repairing his ships in order to get ready for more *negotium*, despite the fact that his last trip had apparently greatly damaged the

[34] cf. *sunt quibus* from *Satires* 2.1.1

[35] Cyprus was noted for its shipbuilding and its lumber, but more important here are its connections with the worship of Venus. Perhaps Horace is saying that his satiric persona could never conquer the erotic and sympotic genre of lyric as he is without becoming a different kind of poet.

ships. Remember, the satirist had criticized the activities he knew so well. The *mercator* is *indocilis*, in need of education, and satire is the genre in which Horace had so often purported to offer education for such ignorant types in the past. The poetic voice is performing several functions of a satirist here: first, he is observing the behavior of men, second, he is advising his audience as to behavior to avoid (*numquam dimoveas* 1.1.13), and finally, he is decrying a wicked characteristic in one of the men he observes by means of humor, namely the greed and hypocrisy of the merchant.[36]

At this point, the reader has identified the poet as the same Horace he has encountered in the *Satires* and is prepared to hear more of the same from a familiar voice. The expectation is interrupted, however, by the intrusion of a very un-satiric character. Lines 19-22 introduce us this reclining fellow, who seems to be Horace in his new poetic mode[37]:

> Est qui nec veteris pocula Massici
> nec partem solido demere de die
> spernit, nunc viridi membra sub arbuto
> stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae.
>
> There is one who scorns neither cups of old Massic wine nor cutting off part from the workday, at some times stretched out with his limbs under the green arbutus, at other times gently at the head of a sacred stream. (1.1.19-22)

Following a satiric list of occupations of kinds of men, one would expect some discussion or censure of their vices or even advice to the audience on how to avoid the lust for glory of the athlete or the hunger for power of the politician or the greed of the wealthy landowner or the merchant. The reader gets none of these. Instead, Horace confronts his audience with a new kind of person. This person is not defined by his desires or lofty pursuits as the men in the previous

[36] Here, I part ways with many critics, in particular Shey "The Poet's Progress" by positing that the introduction of the reclining figure breaks off the satiric priamel begun in line 3. Shey sees chiastic arrangement in the entire section from lines 3-28, making it a single structural unit. He calls the reclining figure a "wealthy prodigal" and invents a back-story about leaving his shop at mid-day.

[37] For a discussion of the identity of this figure and the many names and identities given him by critics, see Pomeroy, "A Man at a Spring," 45-46.

lines. He simply takes a break from the day and enjoys some wine and a nap under a tree or near a stream. He is the answer to all the busy occupations listed above.

The *est qui* (1.1.19) which introduces him answers the *sunt quos* (1.1.3) that began the catalogue of occupations. He appears at the midpoint of the poem and introduces Horace's new identity as the lyric poet. No longer is he one who points out the foibles of men for those around him. His catalogue, it turns out, has simply stated a list of people whom it pleases (*iuvat*) to do certain things. There is no censure or judgment, only the offer of a better alternative in the one who is willing to cut out part of the day for relaxation. Now, rather than a satiric catalogue, the reader realizes that he has in his hands a lyric priamel not unlike the first stanza of Sappho 16:

> οἰ μὲν ἰππήων στρότον οἰ δὲ πέσδων
> οἰ δὲ νάων φαῖσ' ἐπὶ γᾶν μέλαιναν
> ἔμμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν ὄτ-
> τω τις ἔραται.
>
> Some say that an army of horses , others, one of soldiers,
> others, one of ships, is the most beautiful thing
> on the black earth; but I say it is whatever some-
> body loves

Sappho offers no condemnation of those who prefer armies. She simply states, with ἔγω δὲ, that which she says is the most beautiful thing on the black earth, and Horace follows that precedent by showing himself reclining in the middle of the poem.

The two occupations that follow line 22 are presented in a more lyric manner than their predecessors. Rather than a satiric catalogue, given for the purpose of laughter or instruction, the pair of occupations following the jarring introduction of the reclining man is described in a distinctly lyrical way in order for the poet to define himself and his poetry against them. The first and most superficial difference to note is that the two occupations of soldier and hunter are not separated cleanly by line divisions, but are joined together by enjambment at line 25. This is one

way in which Horace demonstrates that he has made the transition from the satiric catalogue to the lyric priamel. The shift is subtle but significant. Formal elements of the second list, such as enjambment and the use of narrative rather than pointing, gently suggest that the soldier and hunter are in a lyric list rather than a satiric one. Rather than making the members of the list the subjects of the poem, the poet himself is now the subject, while those in his priamel are objects against which he defines himself, his "foils."[38] The soldier and hunter are not pointed out with pronouns as in satire, but described with lyric narrative.

Those in Sappho 16.1-3 who think that various kinds of military resources are the most beautiful thing in the world are not themselves subjects, but ways in which Sappho defines herself and her poetry. She will not go on to tell their stories; they exist in the poem merely as a way for the poet to define herself. By setting herself apart from the people who admire martial goods, she also declares her departure from epic poetry, which celebrates martial values. She will differ from epic in subject matter, because she says love is the most beautiful thing, not anything military, as well as in meter, because the poem itself is in sapphic stanzas rather than dactyllic hexameter. Horace does something similar here, except that his priamel is more complex and serves to re-define his persona from a writer of satire to one who writes lyric-not-epic. In creating a confused and complicated priamel, Horace recalls the sort of parody of the form he had used at places such as *Satires* 2.1.24-29, where he offers a confusing juxtaposition of a drunken Milonius with Castor and Pollux as the foil to his enjoyment of writing satire.[39] Here in *Odes* 1.1, Horace deftly manipulates the form of priamel to both create the comic effect of parody and introduce his lyric persona.

---

[38] The term "foils" as used by William S. Anderson, "Ironic Preambles and Satiric Self-Definition in Horace *Satire* 2.1," (*Pacific Coast Philology* Vol.19, No. 1/2, Nov. 1984): 36, n.1 citing E.L Bundy, *Studia Pindarica I,* (*Univ. of Calif. Publications in Classical Philology* 18, 1962): 4-16 and n.2 citing W.M. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Memnosyne Supplement 74, 1982).

[39] As noted by Anderson, "Ironic Preambles," 37-38.

Just as he had defined his satire against that of Lucilius, Horace will continue to define his poetry against earlier poets. By using the soldier as his exemplum, he follows the lyric convention of declaring that his poetry is not epic, nor will it treat epic themes, but those nearer and more intimate to the poet. His many *recusationes*, such as 1.2, 1.6, 2.1 and others bear this out. Both the soldier and the hunter are described as pursuing careers that have a negative impact on people at home. The soldier loves wars, which are *matribus detestata* (hated by mothers 1.1.24-25). The hunter goes on a hunt for an extended period of time *tenerae coniugis immemor* (forgetful of his tender wife 1.1.26). In the first list, despite the fact that the occupations echoed those given in *Satires* 1.1, there is no value judgment made of them. Just as Sappho's famous priamel eschewed martial glories for the object of her love, the concern of Horace here is to reject these occupations which are the subject of epic poetry in favor of wine (*Massici* 1.1.19), ivy (*hederae* 1.1.29) and the Greek lyre (*barbiton* 1.1.34). The initial satiric priamel was in effect cancelled by the appearance of the reclining man and re-started in order to re-define the poet reflected by that central figure.

At 1.1.29, Horace finally names himself explicitly again after the opening two lines with the pronoun *me*, and gives a sample of the kinds of things he will write about in the collection his reader is now holding. The pronoun in such an emphatic position clearly draws a line that marks what follows as the climax of the priamel material that came before. Even with the division of the priamel into two sets of foils, this emphatic *me* gives the final and best alternative to all the occupations listed. Horace confirms the reader's suspicion that the drinking man in 1.1.19-22 was in fact the poet with his use of *frontium* (1.1.29), recalling *caput* (1.1.22) and *nemus* (1.1.30), recalling *sub arbuto* (1.1.21). So the figure that interrupted and re-directed the priamel turns out to be its climax, after all. Line 30 ties together the rest of the poem, with *dis miscent*

superis recalling the Olympic victor, whom the palm *evehit ad deos* in line 6 and with *gelidum nemus* referring back to the hunter who *manet sub Iove frigido* in line 25. Also, the ivy on Horace's head is that of *doctarum frontium*, by no means *indocilis* as the sailor was in line 18. So Horace's new lyric identity is not only set apart from epic as the old Greek lyric poetry was, but also set apart from his own old satiric poetry, at least in subject matter. The new lyric poet as he appears in line 29 connects both to his own past and that of the poetry he is writing.

The new lyric Horace retains some characteristics of the old satiric personae, though. He is still a poet who values the hellenistic aesthetics of the group of poets he cares about at *Satires* 1.10.78-91. The *hederae* at *Odes* 1.1.29 is that of learned heads, meaning that the poetry will be finely crafted, following Callimachean aesthetic standards. The poetry will also take place in the wooded sanctuary so favored by Callimachus, as indicated by *gelidum nemus* in line 30.[40] With Callimachean poetic standards in mind, then, when Horace says that the *nemus* and the *chori* separate him from the people, he means several things. Not only is he physically out in the country away from the population of Rome, but he is also head and shoulders above them in terms of poetic acumen and talent. By virtue of his poetry, then, he is also above all humanity in general, since the *hederae* have mingled him with the gods and his musical accompaniment will be provided by none other than the muses Euterpe on flute and Polyhymnia on *barbiton*. Later poems like *Odes* 2.20 and 3.30 will recall this claim to semi-divine, immortal status. As Denis Feeney puts it, "The audacity is marvelous."[41]

One element of *Odes* 1.1 connects his new divine associations and his satiric past: the chorus which, along with the cool grove, separates Horace from the populace is one composed of *Nympharum … cum Satyris*. There is a connection between the name of the genre of satire and

[40] "The image is borrowed from Alexandria by the Roman poets." Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes I*, 14.
[41] Denis Feeney, "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," in *Horace 2000: A Celebration*, Niall Rudd, ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993): 41

satyrs, the attendants of Bacchus. Whether the two are actually related etymologically, popular etymology in ancient Rome certainly linked the two from time to time.[42] Naming *Satyri* as those who will sanction his lyric poetic endeavors signals that while this new lyric Horace may be singing a new kind of song in a grove far away from the people he used to satirize, his poetry is still going to be informed by his *satura*e. He demonstrates this by his ironic treatment of the sailor, by his willingness to show an example of satire in lyric at the beginning of the poem at all, and most of all by his ironic stance regarding Maecenas, to whom he claims inferiority as a poet under his patronage but vast superiority as someone whose poetry makes him immortal.

Horace's old satiric self-presentation re-appears not only in the way he relates to Maecenas, but also in the very way in which he claims that he will become immortal. He is writing in Latin and expects to be included in a canon that is exclusively Greek, in a genre that is exclusively Greek. Even the instruments that will accompany his poetry are Greek: the *tibia* accompanies choral lyric like that of Pindar and the *Lesbous barbitos* is for solo performances of poetry like that of Sappho and Alcaeus. The most striking juxtaposition is in line 35, where Horace hopes to be included in the *lyrici vates*. Lyric as a term for genre does two things: first, it names the archaic and classical Greek poets whom Horace hopes to join, and second, it acknowledges his debt to the Hellenistic interpretation and preservation of those poets, using *lyricis*, the term favored by Aristophanes of Byzantium rather than the older *melici*.[43] The noun modified by *lyricis* is *vatibus*, a term for poet as far from Greek in origin as possible. *Vates* were soothsayers, holy men, who long before Horace's time made their proclamations in verse. According to Nisbet and Hubbard, "In early Latin *vates* were given a bad name."[44] The term is

[42] Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome*, 28 n.18 for a discussion of the word *satura* as understood by the scholia of Pseudo-Acro in terms of satyrs and drunkenness.
[43] Feeney, "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," 41-42.
[44] *Odes I*, 15, on *Odes* 1.1.35.

more than a little out of place in reference to the lyric poets of the Greek canon, especially as the grand goal to which Horace aims. Thus the strong ironic element of his satiric persona emerges and not for the last time.

Indeed, throughout *Odes* 1-3, Horace will employ the ironic wink of the satirist to characterize himself as a poet. Such ironic self-characterization recalls his persona in the *Satires* in order both to mark distance from the earlier persona and to relate back to it. Such references to his satiric persona are one way in which Horace sets himself apart from other writers of lyric poetry. In his lyric project he not only wants to be included in the canon of great poets, but also to surpass them. His *Odes* will be informed by those archaic voices but also by the Hellenistic aesthetics of Callimachus. However, the goal of writing poetry informed by Hellenistic standards is nothing new in Rome, considering the success of the neoteric poets and Horace's contemporaries Vergil and Propertius, all of whom adhere to Callimachean aesthetics. Horace seeks to create something truly unique with his Hellenistic Roman Lyric. He admires the Callimachean standard along with the other poets in Maecenas' circle, and he stays true to the conventions of lyric in both meter and subject matter, but he seeks to do all this in Latin and as a Roman, employing poetic elements and persona of his first published genre.

One of the ways he accomplishes this Roman identity is though his use of satiric self-presentation and poetic elements common in his satire, as seen in *Odes* 1.1. He will present himself as one who observes and makes lists of vices worthy of criticism, at times using and at times parodying the technique of the priamel. He will position himself ironically both above and below people of power in his *recusatio* poems. He will adopt a relationship to Pindar not unlike that he had with Lucilius in the *Satires*, lavishing on his poetry fawning praise that actually presupposes Horace's poetic superiority. The lyric and satire he displays in *Odes* 1.1 is part of

his programmatic statement that will find its fulfillment in 2.20 and 3.30, when Horace emerges as a *princeps*, having conquered all poetry, Latin and Greek, a satirical lyric poet who claims unique status in the canon of *lyrici vates*.

CHAPTER 3

HORACE'S SATIRIC PERSONA IN BOOKS 1-3 OF THE *ODES*

Throughout books 1-3 of the *Odes*, Horace frequently refers back to both the *Satires* and to *Odes* 1.1 as a way to track his progress along the trajectory towards the stars (*Odes* 1.1.36). He constructs a single, multi-faceted persona in the *Odes*, which, over the course of the collection, develops into the Roman lyric poet he announces as his goal in *Odes* 1.1. This is a different kind of use of the poetic persona than in the *Satires* (or *Epodes*, for that matter), where Horace's persona appears in different ways in individual poems. In those earlier books, he does not form a unified personality to present throughout the collections, but rather appears in each poem individually, using the personas which that poem particularly requires. This is seen in such examples as the diatribe satirist from the first three *Satires* or the literary critic persona who appears in *Satires* 1.4, 1.10, and 2.1. The single persona of the *Odes*, on the other hand, develops like a character in a story, from beginning to end. In *Odes* 1.1, he announces an intention to become the great lyric poet, and by the time the reader reaches *Odes* 3.30, Horace declares himself to have done exactly that. On the way, he accesses the various personae, or shades thereof, that had appeared in the *Satires* and *Epodes* to provide foils against which to define the new lyric poet as he takes shape.

This chapter focuses on the ways in which the original three books of the *Odes* use elements from the *Satires* to develop the persona of Horace as a lyric poet. It examines representative examples from each book, focusing especially on the first and last poems, since they are positioned at programmatically important places. Just as the first and last poems of the

entire collection show the poet at the beginning and end of his ascent to inclusion within the lyric greats, the first and last poems of each book present him at various stages along the way. From the beginning of the collection, certain elements and attributes of Horace's satiric persona stand out, such as the occupations he uses in the catalogue of *Odes* 1.1.3-18. As the collection progresses, Horace's use of his satiric persona shifts and becomes more and more subtle until it is finally only one small facet of his lyric persona in book 3. Book 2 sees many direct references to themes and situations common in the *Satires*, such as using specifically named people as examples of bad behavior (*Odes* 2.2), presenting himself as a mock epic character (*Odes* 2.7, *Satires* 1.9), ironically contradictory stances (*Odes* 2.11 cf. *Odes* 1.38), among other examples. In book 3, Horace does not access his satiric persona in obvious ways. His use of direct references to the *Satires* virtually disappears, and in instances where a satiric approach would be appropriate, he writes in the manner of Greek lyric rather than satire. The diminishing influence of satire as a genre is part of Horace's progress to his goal in *Odes* 3.30.

BOOK 1, *VATES*: THE SATIRIST WRITES LYRIC

In the first poem in the *Odes*, Horace lays out his goal to be inserted among the *lyrici vates* of the Greek lyric canon. In that programmatic poem, he includes several elements of his satiric persona, such as his relationship to Maecenas, his social superior, as compared to his relationship to Lucilius, his poetic superior. Other references include the use of characters such as the sailor or farmer in lists of discontented or greedy people, referring to their appearance in *Satires* 1.1.1-22. When reading the rest of book 1 with satire in mind, however, there is what seems to be a concerted effort on the part of the poet to prefer lyric themes. Despite his use of lyric themes such as wine and renunciation of martial (and by extension epic poetic) values, he recalls the satirist of his earlier poetry, demonstrating that he is still in the early stages of his

trajectory towards inclusion with the lyric greats. He does this in a number of ways. One way is by presenting characters, particularly himself, in narrative positions that recall particular *Satires* or by making references (both veiled and not-so-veiled) to satire as a genre. At other times he takes rhetorical stances more appropriate to a satirist than a lyric poet. He presents himself as still learning the ropes, so to speak, and limits his overt references to satire in order to establish his lyric identity so that he can proceed down his trajectory towards being the *lyricus vates* he declared as his goal in the first poem.

The first poem is not the end of Horace's introduction to the *Odes*. In the first nine poems of book 1, Horace presents a series of poems, all in different lyric meters, in what may be called a "parade of meters." These "Parade Odes"[45] continue to introduce Horace the lyric poet to his audience. As part of that introduction, they also make reference back to his satiric persona, either directly or through reference to *Odes* 1.1. The Parade Odes at the beginning of book 1 establish both Horace's technical ability with Greek lyric meters and they begin to present his new, unified lyric persona. They present the poet's voice as the same in some ways and different in others when compared to his personae in the *Satires*. Just as the first poem is programmatic, the first group of odes gives a preview of how the poet will appear throughout the collection. They do this by presenting him in a variety of situations. For example, he is in a very lyric setting of love and grottoes in such odes as the "Pyrrha Ode" 1.5. In others, he brings back the ironic "wink" of the satirist, such as when he is the older man comically detaining Thaliarchus and keeping him from following the advice which he had detained Thaliarchus to hear in the "Soracte Ode" 1.9. The remainder of the first book presents the poet in various stages of adaptation to his new lyric

[45] Santirocco, "The Parade Odes: The Poetics of Initiation." in *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*, 14-41, discusses the nomenclature and their status as a group to be taken together.

genre until it ends with Horace in as lyric a setting as possible, discussing proper garland choices for drinkers in *Odes* 1.38.

SEA AND SATIRE IN THE PARADE ODES

The first nine odes of book 1, the Parade Odes, make several important connections between the *Odes* and the *Satires*. As the first series of poems in the collection, they serve as an extension of the introductory element of the programmatic *Odes* 1.1. They do this through the use of recurring images which are connected to themes and situations connected to satire. In *Odes* 1.1.11-18, Horace uses the opposing figures of the farmer and the merchant-sailor as part of his satiric catalogue of occupations. They represent the juxtaposition of two characters expected by a reader familiar with Horace's *Satires*: the content farmer from the countryside, who lives by more or less Epicurean mores prescribed by the diatribe preacher of *Satires* 1.1-3 and the greedy merchant who risks life and limb to add a little more to his wealth. They are connected by the violence and uncertainty of the sea, which represents a separation from contentment that the farmer fears and the merchant craves. Horace recalls this juxtaposition as it appears in *Odes* 1.1 through one of the most striking features of the Parade Odes, which is the recurring image of the violent water that threatens to kill or disturb the natural order.

Water that represents danger is so prevalent in the Parade Odes that not until *Odes* 1.10 is the first ode which does not include such imagery. In these poems, it often connected with disorder of the kind liable to be attacked by a satirist, such as the swimming deer of *Odes* 1.2.11 who come before a critique of how awful the current generation has become (1.2.21-24) or the boats and winds which appear in *Odes* 1.3.10-16 that threaten Vergil's safety and 1.9.9-12 where winds bother the sea just before a piece of Horatian Epicurean advice not to ask what will happen tomorrow. The critiques or pieces of advice, either upcoming or in progress, are often of

people failing to live according to the moderation Horace recommends in both the *Satires* and *Odes*. At *Odes* 1.1.11-14, the reader is begged not to remove the farmer from his land to make him plow the sea as a terrified (*pavidus*, 1.1.14) sailor, and the *Odes* following 1.1 continue this use of violent water in conjunction with satiric exhortations and critiques.

Raging water exerts its force as an image of disorder in *Odes* 1.2. Here, the flood of Pyrrha's age returns and makes deer, *pavidae* (1.2.11) as the farmer was *pavidus* (1.1.14) when made a sailor, to swim; similarly, fish cling to tree-tops and seals climb mountains. They suffer the fate Horace urged his audience in *Odes* 1.1.13 not to foist upon the farmer: that of displacement by violent water. The reason is given in the sixth strophe:

> audiet civis acuisse ferrum
> quo graves Persae melius perirent,
> audiet pugnas vitio parentum
> rara iuventus.
>
> They will hear that a citizen sharpened a sword
> by which the deadly Persians would have better died,
> they will hear of battles, they the youth, thinned out
> by the vice of their parents.

The vice of civil war is sufficient to cause natural upheaval, not to mention the very practical result of a diminished number of citizens. To criticize political events hints at the sort of political invective for which Horace praised Lucilius so highly at *Satires* 1.4.1-8. There is a critical difference, however. Lucilius' political invectives were against individuals:

> 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 …
>
> If anyone was worthy to be described because he was rotten and a thief
> because was an adulterer or a murderer or otherwise
> notorious, they noted him with great freedom.
> Lucilius wholly depends on these …

Such criticism of individuals under a *princeps*, however, could not have been a safe activity, and as a result, just as Horace had done in the *Satires*, he avoids direct critique of living individuals. He opts here for criticism of the civil strife as a whole, but it is enough to further cement the connection between violent water and satiric critique as a part of his poetic persona in his new collection.

At *Odes* 1.3.1, Horace recalls the Cyprian beam with which the farmer should not plow the sea by asking Venus, goddess of Cyprus, to guide Vergil's ship safely to Greece. The sea throughout this poem is the starting point for a series of images of displacement, starting with the gods' purposeful placement of the seas between countries in order to separate them and their people (1.3.21-24). The poem goes on to mention Daedalus and Hercules, who both famously tested man's natural limits, not unlike a farmer daring, beyond his own bounds, to ply the oar in search of wealth. In a critique of such attempts to go beyond human limits he recalls both the social commentary of satire and the "know your limits" message common to Pindaric epinician. In doing so at the very beginning of the *Odes*, he starts to bring together his own satiric persona and the lyric persona he is cultivating.

The first two sentences of *Odes* 1.4 again mention the sea and Venus in close proximity. Language of displacement is altered to language of mere change to accompany the coming of springtime. There is, though, a marked satiric note in lines 13-15, where Horace declares that death comes for the rich and poor alike. This recalls *Satires* 1.1.45-46, where Horace says: *milia frumenti tua triverit area centum, | non tuus hoc capiet venter plus ac meus …* ("Your threshing-floor may have threshed out a hundred thousand [bushels] of grain, your stomach will not take more than mine…"). Rich and poor are equal and this essential equality leads to a call for moderation. Horace's repeated calls in the *Odes* for moderation and adherence to an *aurea*

mediocritas (“golden mean” *Odes* 2.10.5) bring to mind such language as it came from the diatribe preacher of his first book of *Satires*.

The famous “Pyrrha Ode” 1.5 is soaked with satiric sea imagery. The very name of the woman who has left Horace and so many other men all washed up recalls the *saeculum Pyrrhae* of *Odes* 1.2.6 to which the excessive, flooding Tiber was compared. Pyrrha’s unwitting victim in the first line of the poem is *perfusus* (1.5.2) with perfume, as Horace’s *votiva … uvida … vestimenta* (1.5.14-16) were soaked by his immoderate attempts to woo Pyrrha. Her fickleness is described as the sea, which now, five poems into the collection, has a familiar ring of vulnerability to criticism. The poet is speaking from experience about affairs with women, just as he had in *Satires* 1.2.127-133, where he had given a humorously realistic, if ostensibly hypothetical, account of getting caught in the act of adultery with another man’s wife. Throughout the first three satires, he talks about the wickedness of illicit affairs while at the same time ironically displaying such knowledge on the subject as must only come from experience. He also had appeared as a failed lover in *Satires* 1.5, where on the journey to Bruidisium, he was stood up by an unnamed *puella* (*Satires* 1.5.82-85). Comic ineptitude in matters of romance mark Horace’s persona in satire, and he appears in the same role in *Odes* 1.5.

Maritime images in *Odes* 1.6 are subtler in their recalling of satire, but still function generally as they do in the previous odes. Horace connects Agrippa with war both at sea (*navibus*) and on horseback (*equis*), thus connecting Agrippa, and also any poem about him, to Achilles (1.6.6) and Odysseus (1.6.7), heroes of land and sea in their respective Homeric epics. The literary critic of the *Satires* would never write epic, though, clinging as he does to Callimachean poetic aesthetics. He describes his own poetry and poetic talent as *tenues* (1.6.9) and *leves* (1.6.20), which are loaded terms that immediately bring to mind the Callimachean

aesthetics Horace had embraced in his *Satires* and *Epodes*. He sets himself and his poetry against such mammoth subjects of epic poetry as Agrippa, Achilles and Ulysses. In so doing, he sets himself against the poetry of writers like Varius, who he says will celebrate Agrippa instead. As a poet fond of writing about poetry, Horace again declares here that he will remain a poet of the slender muse. This stated devotion to "slender" poetics is another point of continuity between his old persona and his new genre.

Odes 1.7 shares with the *Satires* a satiric take on the lyric priamel[46] which is signalled by the appearance of water in the priamel's climax at 1.7.12-14. The poem opens with a long list of places which Horace will not praise and kinds of poetry he will not write, longer than usual for a priamel. The priamel goes on for eleven lines and delays its climax to the point that it seems one will not come. This delay continues despite the word *me* in line-initial position at 1.7.10, a formulaic indicator of the climactic point of a priamel. In the eventual climax of the priamel, Horace adds two more items to the list of things which do not strike his poetical fancy before finally naming what *does* please him: *domus Albuneae resonantis | et praeceps Anio ac Tiburni lucus et uda | mobilibus pomaria rivis* ("the home of resounding Albunea and the headlong Anio and Tiburnus' grove and the orchards wet with swift streams" 1.7.12-14). This in itself consists of yet another list rather than a satisfactory climax to a priamel. The handling of the priamel here displays the ironic ineptitude with the technique which he had displayed in the *Satires*, particularly in *Satires* 2.1.

A single word near the end of *Odes* 1.8 also highlights its satiric connections through the sea, *marine* at 1.8.13. In *Odes* 1.8, Horace asks Lydia why she rushes to destroy Sybaris, who no longer acts as he used to because of his love for her. The situation has certain resonances with Horace's own as a poet when considering his program as set out in *Odes* 1.1, and his language

[46] Anderson, "Ironic Preambles," 35-42, discusses the satiric take on the priamel in detail.

bears this out. In line 4 are the phrases *patiens pulveris* and *militaris … equitat*, which recall two important images from *Odes* 1.1. The first and most obvious is that of the Olympic athlete who stirred up the dust with his chariot at *Odes* 1.1.3. The second is that of the soldier, who delights in camps and trumpets rather than lyric poetry at *Odes* 1.1.23-25. Sybaris rejects the dust and fighting, as well as many other things, just as Horace had done in *Odes* 1.1, except that Sybaris' choice is not lyric poetry or simple Epicurean delights, but rather Lydia, who *Sybarin … propere*[*t*] *amando perdere …* ("rush[es] to destroy Sybaris with love" *Odes* 1.8.2-3).

Odes 1.8 reads as a critique both on Lydia's actions as a temptress and also on Sybaris as the willing victim. Horace's critique comes as a litany of questions asking why Sybaris no longer takes part in his former activities. A similar litany of questions is to be found at *Satires* 1.2.114-118, which is also largely about women and the dangers they pose to men who may get involved with them. The questions in the satire are part of an exhortation to choosing neither women of too low or too high a station for affairs. In the ode, Horace reverses the address of the questions, instead using them to beg Lydia to stop making poor Sybaris act so immoderately for her sake. Finally, at *Odes* 1.8.13-16, Horace shows Thetis making Achilles dress like a woman, something he decidedly is not, in order to escape war, the very thing which makes Achilles who he is. She is described as *marinae*, of the sea, exploiting the connection Horace has already made between the sea and displacement that is worthy of satiric critique in verse.

Odes 1.9 recalls Horace's satiric persona in that it has both the sermonizer's advice-giving and a characterization of the poet as an inept lover, like in *Satires* 1.5. In this poem, he detains Thaliarchus to tell him about winter and spring as ways to encourage the young man, in the spring of his life, to enjoy the pleasures of life, which he, the poetic voice apparently in the winter of his life, can no longer enjoy. While the two aspects of the poet in *Odes* 1.9, advice-

giver and inept lover, do have resonance with the *Satires*, they also recall other models from which Horace draws to construct his lyric persona. This is especially true when considering such Greek lyric examples as Anacreon's aging inept lover persona in his "Purple Ball" (358) and "Thracian Philly" (417) poems, both of which express the futile desires of older men to be with young women. So *Odes* 1.9 does not only recall Horace's satiric persona, but also connects it to aspects of the lyric precedents he wishes to join in his overarching poetic program.

The ode also recalls *Satires* 1.9 rather strongly in terms of the story it tells. Old man Horace interrupts and detains young, vital Thaliarchus in order to give him advice about what it is he should be doing. Ironically, the advice does not involve listening to an old man rattle off about pretty mountains and the advantages of youth. Horace here presents himself as playing a part similar to that of his uninvited companion so well known from *Satires* 1.9. In the satire, Horace was going about his day when a man *notus mihi nomine tantum* ("known to me by name alone" *Satires* 1.9.3) interrupts him and does not leave his side no matter what measures Horace takes. Horace's poetic voice similarly detains Thaliarchus in *Odes* 1.9, and adds irony to the situation by describing in intimate detail exactly the kind of thing he is keeping his young addressee from doing.

Outside the Parade Odes, also, the image of the ship at sea manifests itself as an image of displacement worthy of satiric critique. For instance, in *Odes* 1.14, Horace addresses a distressed ship which is carried out to sea by *novi fluctus* ("new waves") at 1.14.1-2, and is facing danger *iterum* ("for a second time") at 1.14.10. If the ship is allegorically connected to Horace's poetic endeavors, then the *novi fluctus* would be lyric meters and the *Odes* are indeed the second time Horace has attempted to write in a new genre, having earlier attempted iambic poetry in the *Epodes*. Reading the poem that way, it appears that Horace is a satirist at heart, whether or not he

is out sailing though iambics or lyric poetry instead of plowing the field of the genre in which he belongs like the farmer of the first ode. The last strophe of *Odes* 1.14, however, declares that Horace embraces his new genre and wishes it well on its voyage; the ship of his new poetry, after all, carries his fate with it. He continues here pointing out his transition from satire to lyric and, as is the case so often in book 1 of the *Odes*, he has to remind the reader that he is now someone new, no longer writing the kind of poetry they are accustomed to expecting from him.

THE SATIRIC PERSONA ELSEWHERE IN BOOK 1

There are many places in the first book of the *Odes* where Horace makes a direct reference to his earlier career, or else imitates the *Satires* in some way. In *Odes* 1.12.1-3, Horace imitates Pindar's *Olympian* 2 and anticipates a relationship to his literary predecessor not unlike that he shared with Lucilius in the *Satires*. Horace's literary declarations in the literary *Satires* leave an expectation in an audience familiar with the poet for more literary criticism, but the *Odes* treats Horace's literary predecessors in a markedly different way. By beginning *Odes* 1.12 the way he does, Horace hints that he might be writing a Pindaric ode, and maybe even a discussion of Pindar like those the satirist wrote about Lucilius. Here are the two openings, first Pindar:

> ᾽Αναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι,
> τίνα θεόν, τίν᾽ ἥρωα, τίνα δ᾽ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;
>
> Hymns, lords of the lyre,
> what god, what hero, what man will we celebrate? (*Olympian* 2.1-2)

And then Horace:

> Quem virum aut heroa lyra ver acri
> tibia sumis celebrare, Clio?
> quem deum?

> What man or hero on the lyre or sharp
> pipe do you take up to celebrate, Clio?
> What god? (*Odes* 1.12.1-3)

Horace quotes Pindar's list of celebration options in the opposite order in which the earlier poet had written them, thus leading the reader to expect Horace to write an adaptation of *Olympian* 2, or at least reference it or at least do something intertextual with it. However, after the opening lines of *Odes* 1.12 are the only lines which have any significant resonances with Pindar's second *Olympian Ode*. For Horace's fullest treatment of his relationship with Pindar in the first three books of *Odes*, the reader will have to wait until *Odes* 2.20.[47] *Odes* 1.12 instead goes on loosely to reference Theocritus' panegyric poems on Heiron of Syracuse (*Idyll* 16) and Ptolemy Philadelphus (*Idyll* 17).[48] It does find its way to praise of Augustus, but on Roman terms, without the Pindaric structures of strophe, antistrophe, and epode. The poets whom Horace really wants to imitate in his *Odes* are not mentioned until *Odes* 2.13, when he shows Sappho and Alcaeus singing in the underworld. His relationship with those poets will be discussed below.

There are two specific references to the *Satires* and one general assertion of his new identity in *Odes* 1.34. In this ode, Horace announces his departure from his previous wayward philosophical and religious ways because he saw lightning cross a clear sky with no clouds (1.34.5-8).[49] This specific portent goes against the Epicurean idea of the physical causes of natural phenomena, represented by Lucretius' famous assertion that lightening never comes from a clear sky (*De Rerum Natura* 6.400-401). The Epicureanism of Horace's satiric corpus is anything but pure,[50] but his frequent calls to enjoyment of the country life in both the *Satires* and

[47] However, it is worth mentioning that Horace does take up Pindar in the way he took up Lucilius in *Odes* 4.2, which is beyond the scope of this paper.
[48] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes I*, 142-145.
[49] Some see in this poem a sort of conversion experience, but there is little to no evidence of Horace espousing a single philosophy before the first collection of *Odes* and a different one after them, particularly this poem, according to Niall Rudd, "Horace as a Moralist" in *Horace 2000*, 64-88.
[50] Rudd, *Satires of Horace*, 18-20, 249-253 includes discussions of Horace's use of Epicureanism in the *Satires*.

Epodes have an Epicurean tendency. By declaring that he is abandoning one aspect of his previous philosophy (which he never actually does), he also accents his departure from the genres in which he wrote using that philosophy.

The first direct reference is *insanientis … sapientiae* (1.34.2), which uses the same root word for philosophy used at *Satires* 1.3.124, *sapiens.* In the satire, Horace refers to the wise man, in the ode, to the wisdom itself, but the verbal resonance is clear in the philosophic context. Horace had done this before, announcing a stance in a poem or context that contradicts his declaration. One example is Horace's repeatedly ironic stance with regard to Lucilius in *Satires* 1.4, 1.10, and 2.1, where he claims to be less of a satirist than Lucilius while at the same time criticizing Lucilius' dexterity with hexameter and demonstrating his own technical superiority.

Later in *Odes* 1.34, Horace heightens the irony of his claim by using a philosophical stance with regard to divinity which he had expressed in *Satires* 1.1. For someone who claims he has turned over a new leaf, his words at *Odes* 1.34.12-14 seem like less of a new direction for his poetry when compared to his earlier writing:

> … valet ima summis
> mutare et insignem attenuat deus,
> obscura promens …
>
> … a god is powerful to change the lowliest things into the highest
> and he brings down the illustrius,
> bringing forth the obscure …

The passage with which this resonates from the *Satires* is 1.1.15-19:

> … si quis deus, "en ego," dicat,
> "iam faciam quod voltis: eris tu, qui modo miles,
> mercator; tu, consultus modo, rusticus; hinc vos,
> vos hinc mutatis discedite partibus: eia!
> quid statis?" -- nolint. atqui licet esse beatis.
>
> … if some god were to say, " I'm here!
> Now, I will accomplish what you want: you, who were just a soldier, will be

a merchant; you, just recently a lawyer, a farmer; away from here, you,
and you, away from here, depart with changed parts: Well!
Why are you standing still?" -- they refuse. And it is even allowed for them to be happy.

Here, in the very ode in which Horace announces his conversion to a new outlook and a new way of relating to the gods, he expresses an idea of divinity that restates a concept of the gods which had appeared in his very first collection of poetry. In both instances, the particular god is not named, he is simply *deus*, and what he does is described by the verb *mutare* in the active infinitive in *Odes* 1.34 and in the passive participle in *Satires* 1.1. The passage referenced also includes the soldier, the farmer, and probably also the sailor (under the name *mercator*) who had all appeared in the catalogue and the priamel of *Odes* 1.1, connecting the passage to Horace's acknowledged tension between being a satirist and a lyric poet.

Another good example of reference to Horace's earlier career comes at *Odes* 1.16.22-25. Here, Horace talks about his hot temper as a character flaw of his youth and says that he (and presumably his poetry, too) is different now. The passage is directly about his *Epodes*, but comes in a satiric context:

composce mentem: me quoque pectoris
  temptavit in dulci iuventa
    fervor et celeris iambos
misit furentem: nunc ego mitibus
mutare quaero tristia, dum mihi
  fias recantatis amica
    opprobriis animumque reddas.

Restrain your mind. A temper of the heart also tempted me in sweet youth and drove [me], mad, [to write] swift iambics. Now, I seek to transform the gloomy things into soothing things, provided that you become my friend with taunts taken back and you return your heart. (*Odes* 1.16.22-25)

The iambics he mentions are clearly his *Epodes*, which he called *Iambi*. They are *celeris*, referring both to the swift rashness of words said in anger and to the pace of the iamb-based

meters in which he wrote them.[51] Those swift iambics are also called *tristia* in line 26, and he wishes to transform them into *mitibus,* which are mild, gentle, soothing things. So he declares here that he is replacing both the meter and nature of his earlier poetry with a different kind of poetry, lyric, which is soothing in subject and style when compared to his hot-headed earlier corpus.

However, when the reader re-examines the whole poem to investigate the context in which Horace denounces his hot-headed *iambos* (line 24), he discovers that the motivation of the entire poem is to assuage the anger of a woman he has apparently wronged in his verses. He has offended her with iambic poetry, not unlike Catullus 36, wherein the *cacata carta* (line 1) of Volusius will, through their destruction, fulfill a vow the poet made to a girl. Catullus' girl trouble came about due to his willingness to write *iambos* (line 5), just like Horace's. So Catullus sends Volusius' poetry into flames to fulfill his vow, and Horace recalls this by giving his girl the option of destroying his former poetry *flamma | sive mari liet Hadriano* ("with flame | or if it pleases in the Adriatic Sea"). His renunciation of his previous poetic persona is thus couched in an intertextual framework which is also heavy with mythological examples, like the Greek lyric tradition Horace wants to imitate. So in *Odes* 1.16, Horace uses his Neoteric and Greek lyric predecessors to define his persona as a poet who used to write satire but has since reformed and chosen instead to pursue girls and *mitibus*, his new kind of poetry. Thus his lyric persona is again defined with reference to his satiric corpus.

ODES 1.38: A REENACTMENT OF *ODES* 1.1

The last poem of book 1 presents Horace in one of the most natural settings for a lyric poet: a drinking scene. The poem, with its emphatic proclamation of Callimachean poetic ideals through the metaphor of simple garlands, provides a return to a lyric tone after the rather epic

[51] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes I*, 214.

tone of *Odes* 1.37, the "Cleopatra Ode."[52] *Odes* 1.38, while not a *sphragis* per se, places a sort of seal on the first book of *Odes*, announcing the aesthetics to which Horace holds in writing the poetry which will raise him to the stars.

From the first poem, where he declared his intentions, to the repeated appearances of his satiric persona, either in the voice of the poet or as the object of the poet's denials, the first book of the *Odes* largely deals with defining the poet as a lyric poet rather than any other kind, particularly satiric. In the first poem, Horace presents himself as the reclining figure at the end of the satiric catalogue of occupations. When he culminates the lyric priamel at the end of the poem, he is among the stars, having completed his passage from the Horace so well known from his earlier poetry to the Horace who will emerge by the end of the third book. Here in *Odes* 1.38, he presents himself as the lyric figure which he had given as an alternative to the occupations of the satiric catalogue of the first ode. In a sense, the poem shows him having completed the first leg of his journey, cutting some hours from the solid day and drinking wine while reclining outside.

Odes 1.38 follows the first ode somewhat in structure, moving from a satiric critique to a lyric declaration about poetry. The first strophe sounds exactly like something the satirist might say, expressing his distaste for fancy things like garlands and late-blooming roses:

> Persicos odi, puer, apparatus
> displicent nexae philyra coronae;
> mitte sectari rosa quo locorum
> sera moretur.
>
> I hate Persian paraphernalia, my boy,
> garlands all tied up with linden basting displease;

[52] Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes*, 164-165, discusses the location of *Odes* 1.38 as a poem on simplicity as a metapoetic statement following the epic tendencies of the "Cleopatra Ode." Additionally, Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes I*, 423, discuss the dismissal of this poem by scholars in some time periods, noting that its position at the end of the first book undoubtedly lends it some significance it would not otherwise have.

do not seek after the place where the rose,
late-blooming, lingers.

Such a critique of Persian paraphernalia establishes the poet as one who prefers the simple life of, say, the farmer over things like garlands and flowers. However, he does so like the sermonizer of the *Satires*, who denounced various kinds of adultery while expressing a great degree of seemingly experiential knowledge on the subject. Here, the poet hates the luxuries he knows exactly how to describe. He does not simply describe the garlands as "fancy" or "elaborate." He very specifically describes them as *nexae philyra* ("tied with linden basting"). Additionally, rather than advising against merely having expensive flowers, he shows his knowledge of the value of the last roses of Spring, before they all die in the Italian summer heat.[53] So here, Horace is again the staunch critic of things on which he has expertise, just like in the *Satires*.

There is a degree of humor in the poem, as well, in the form of an ironic surprise. Following his disdain for all things garlanded in the first strophe, Horace surprises the reader with the revelation that instead of hating all garlands, he only hates ones which are too fancy. It is better to wear a garland made of simple myrtle[54]:

Simplici myrto nihil allabores
sedulus curo: neque te ministrum
dedecet myrtus neque me sub arta
vite bibentem.

To simple myrtle, you should take pains to add nothing,
being painstaking with care: neither for you, an attendant,
is myrtle unbecoming, nor for me under the thick-leaved
vine, drinking.

[53] Nisbett and Hubbard, *Odes I*, 425.

[54] Myrtle does not only signify simplicity, however. It carries with it other significances, as well, as defined earlier in the *Odes*. Myrtle is defined in terms of age and sexual attractiveness in the mock paraclausithyron of *Odes* 1.25. In the last strophe of that poem, Horace says that *laeta … pubes hedera virenti | gaudeat pulla magis atque myrto* (… young men delight in joyful green ivy rather than dull myrtle 1.25.17-18). Horace, in his preference for myrtle, identifies himself as past his prime.

Garlands are a metaphor for poetic style in Hellenistic literature, and Horace here transforms what starts in the first strophe as a satiric critique of fanciness in general and turns it into an expression of preference for slender, Callimachean poetry as opposed to more flowery styles. This follows the pattern of *Odes* 1.1, where he began the poem in the manner of a satiric critique and ended it as a statement of poetic intentions. As for the content of that poetic declaration, he reaffirms that he is still a poet who holds to the Hellenistic aesthetic, just as he was in his literary critic *Satires* 1.4, 1.10, and 2.1. His adherence to the Callimachean school of poetic style is well attested already in book 1, and its inclusion here acts to reinforce the poem's significance as a programmatic statement at the end of the book that began as it did, with *Odes* 1.1.

ODES 2.1: POETS OUT OF PLACE

The first and last poems of each book not only state and re-state Horace's program for his poetry in the *Odes*, but they also act to chart his progress along the way. Horace in part enacts the transition of *Odes* 1.1 from a satiric poet to a lyric poet in *Odes* 1.38. In that poem, his voice does not speak from a vague non-location, as it often does in the *Satires*, but rather the poet locates himself emphatically in a sympotic setting, more appropriate to his new lyric persona. He still has satiric tendencies, however, as the first strophe of 1.38 demonstrates. By the end of *Odes* book 1, Horace has yet to present himself as completely taken on his new lyric mantle. Considering this consciousness of just how out of place he is in his new genre, and considering his frequent declarations of generic identity, it only makes sense that the first poem of book 2 is about a poet writing outside of the genre for which he is known.

To a large extent, *Odes* 2.1 is about being out of place. Its first line, *Motum ex Metello consule civicum* ("The civic commotion from the time of Metellus' consulship" 2.1.1) indicates that the poem will be concerned with commotion and disorder, if not civil, then at least of some

other sort. The commotion Horace addresses is poetic rather than political, but Rome's civil wars serve as an apt backdrop. It starts as a historical epic in terms of content, but inappropriately written in Alcaic strophes. Not until *tractas* in line 7 is it clear that the poem is not itself an epic, but an address in the second person.[55] It is not until line 11 that it is apparent that Horace wants Pollio, whose name does not even appear until line 14, to leave off his writing of historical epic and return to writing tragedy. Horace's request is also ironic in that he himself is writing in a genre to which he is not accustomed. One can almost hear in Horace's lines here requests from others for Horace to return to the satiric or iambic Muse just as he is asking Pollio to come back to theater.

Part of Horace's justification for his request that Pollio write tragedy again is that historical epic is dangerous, saying, *et incedis per ignis | suppositos cineri doloso* ("and you march over fires covered over by deceitful ash" 2.1.7).[56] But did Horace himself not already encounter resistance for writing in a dangerous genre, as he says in *Satires* 2.1? In it, he cites his critics, who apparently want to get him into legal trouble for his poetry, saying in lines 1-2, *Sunt quibus in satura videar nimis acer et ultra | legem tendere opus…* ("There are those to whom I seem too harsh in satire and to stretch the work beyond legal bounds" *Satires* 2.1.1-2). While Horace in *Odes* 2.1 warns Pollio about the danger of his new genre, in *Satires* 2.1 he reports the dangers of his old genre, his first book of *Satires*, to which he has returned for a second book. Horace's return in *Satires* 2.1 to the genre that he claims could potentially cause him legal trouble endorses the writing of such dangerous poetry. Also, the fact that his injunction against venturing out into new kinds of poetry comes in Horace's own ambitious attempt at a new genre

[55] So noted by Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 15.
[56] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 15-16, note that the fire is likely "the smouldering remains of a conflagration" rather than domestic coals covered with ash at night to preserve the fire for the morning.

further causes the poem's request to ring hollow and accomplish the ironic "wink" familiar to readers of the *Satires*.

Another element of *Odes* 2.1 which undercuts its own argument and thus recalls Horace's satiric wink is the fact that throughout the poem, there are examples of the kind of poetry he wants Pollio to stop writing. In the very same satire in which he mentions his detractors' opinion that his first book of *Satires* overstepped its legal bounds, he also gives an example of the kind of epic poetry he, as a satirist, will not write. At *Satires* 2.1.13-15, Horace claims that his strength would fail if he were to try to write epic, saying:

> … neque enim quiuis horrentia pilis
> agmina nec fracta pereuntis cuspide Gallos
> aut labentis equo describit vulnera Parthi.
>
> For not just anyone can describe troops in formations bristling
> with javelins, nor Gauls perishing with a shattered lance,
> or the wounds of a Parthian slipping from his horse.

This kind of diversion from the genre at hand is at work in *Odes* 2.1, as well. The reader does not discover that the ode is an address or that it is not itself an epic until line 7, with the full nature of the poem not revealing itself until lines 11 and 14. The first strophe and a half ironically sound like an epic, even after 38 poems of self-definition as a lyric poet in the first book, Horace begins the second with a sort of false start in the wrong genre. Indeed, starting at line 17, even after it is clear that the poem is a call for Pollio to return to tragedy from epic, sound like Horace attempting his own epic lines, much like the passage in *Satires* 2.1. He says to Pollio:

> iam nunc minaci murmure cornuum
> perstringis auris, iam litui strepunt,
> iam fulgor armorum fugaces
> terret equos equitumque vultus
>
> Already, with the threatening rumble of trumpets
> you offend the ears, now the horns resound,

now, the flash of arms terrify the
fleeing horses and the faces of horsemen.

Even though he characterizes the epic elements he gives as being offensive to the ears, he continues from there in much the same way for 16 more lines of what Pollio's poetry makes him see and hear. He seems to get carried away as he reaches line 25, where the second-person address is no longer present and it Horace seems to have begun to write Pollio's epic for him. So much for dissuading people from writing epic.

When taken in the context of Horace's own venture into the genre of lyric, his words to Pollio the tragedian ring hollow, since he is similarly Horace the satirist, writing outside of his expertise. His taunting epic lines in the poem make this especially evident. The effect is similar to Horace's diatribe on sexual dalliances in *Satires* 1.2, in which he rants about the merits and drawbacks of affairs with various kinds of women. Of course, he takes the opportunity in the satire, in lines 23-110, to poke fun at his own frequent exhortations to the "middle way" by comically criticizing those who get involved with married women and common whores as succumbing to extremes, whereas he who visits a modest brothel or gets involved with a mere freedwoman is much better off. He pokes fun at historical and contemporary examples, but also speaks from what sounds like experience about every kind of woman he describes. At lines 127-134, he describes in great detail that which he does not fear will happen to him because of his policies with women, but the level of detail suggests that he is relating his actual experience, and that he does not follow his own good advice. Similarly, Alfius the moneylender in *Epodes* 2 praises the country life, and is about to become a farmer until he realizes that it is the Ides and he has to collect loan payments so that he can lend money out again on the Kalends. Giving advice which one has no intention to follow is yet another element of Horace's lyric persona that has its roots in his earlier winking satiric persona.

BOOK 2: LYRIC VOICE, SATIRIC MESSAGE

Horace uses Sallustius Crispus' name directly in his critique of avarice at *Odes* 2.2.3, recalling the beginnings of *Satires* 1.2 and 3, which both begin with direct references to the singer Tigellius by name, or *Satires* 1.2.23-27, where he discusses Maltinus' lack of style and the personal odor problems of Rufillus and Gargonius. These people are objects of criticism because they do not display the moderation Horace recommends. Crispus likewise is the object of a critique, except that here in the ode, he is also the addressee. In *Odes* 1.9, where Horace addresses Thaliarchus directly, as well as in *Odes* 1.8 with Lydia, he gives advice on love to second-person addressees, re-tracing a topic well covered in the *Satires* (1.2 in particular) but in a lyric setting. Here in *Odes* 2.2, he does the same thing. Instead of speaking to a general audience like a satirist about the person who is the object of his criticism, he instead addresses the object himself. Turning the observational criticism of the satirist into the direct address of the lyric poet is one of the key ways Horace presents himself as the same poet as before, with satiric things to say, but this time in a new genre. The content, which is here criticism of immoderate miserliness, is the same as in satire, but the style is changed to fit the genre of lyric. Thus Horace demonstrates that he, now a lyric poet, has a lyric voice, even when saying satiric things like he used to say.

Odes 2.7 begins in an exaggeratedly elevated tone,[57] with Horace claiming to have frequently entered the most dangerous battles, what Nisbet and Hubbard call "supreme crisis,"[58] with his friend, Pompeius, under Brutus' command. The mock elevation of tone is similar to that of *Odes* 1.22, where Horace as a lyric love poet is comically protected from a ferocious wolf by

[57] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 106, 109 ad loc.
[58] *Odes II*, 109

his song of love. In *Odes* 2.7, it is Horace's sympotic nature that leads to Mercury saving him.[59] Since Horace is destined to be a lyric poet and not a warrior, Mercury, the inventor of the lyre, must save him in order for him to bring lyric poetry to Rome. His behavior as a drinker during wartime with Pompeius at 2.7.6-8 as well as his plans for their reunion at 2.7.17-28 both show him in his sympotic mode. They also display the *Odes'* tendency to end a poem with language of a much higher or lower register than what is found at the poem's beginning. Examples are 1.6, 1.19, 2.4, 3.10, or 3.26 to name a few.[60]

When Horace mentions his military service in the passage *Satires* 1.6.45-52, it comes directly after his admission to lowly origin as the son of a freedman. The motion of his social status is upward from lowly origins, *libertino patre natum* ("born from a freedman father" *Satires* 1.6.45, 46), to the rank of military tribune over a Roman legion, *mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno* ("a Roman legion obeyed me as tribune" 1.6.48). Mention of his military career is offered as part of his *bona fides*, as justification for his inclusion in Maecenas' circle. In *Odes* 2.7, however, his military action is reduced to a single act of cowardice and poetry, connecting him to the Greek lyric tradition, but at the same time offering a piece of humor at his own expense which further defines who he is in his lyric poetry.[61] The reference is ironically twisted to the particular needs of the lyric genre in a way that recalls the irony of Horace the satirist, who often did the same thing, only not in the case of his military past.

Similar false elevations in tone occur in the *Satires*. One instance is the prophecy of Horace's demise at *Satires* 1.9.31-34, in which a Sabine crone predicts his death at the hands of a

[59] Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes*, 196-197 discusses Horace's salvation by Mercury as being connected to his status as a poet and participant in symposia. According to Lowrie, symposium is also the cure for Pompeius' weariness (*longaque fessus militia…* 2.7.18).
[60] H.P. Syndikus, "Some Structures in Horace's *Odes*." in *Homage to Horace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 17-20 is a discussion of Horace's frequent practice of varying the tone of individual *Odes* from beginning to end, following Klingler's research of the same.
[61] Plaza, *The Function of Humour*, 189-195, is a full discussion of the use of self-deprecating humor in Horace's creation of his satiric persona.

garrulus ("chatterbox" 1.9.33), poking fun at the unwelcome companion who follows Horace around the city. There, the illusion of a very serious prophecy of death is broken by the comic unexpectedness of the prophecy's content. Another correspondence with *Odes* 2.7 comes at the end of *Satires* 1.9, where Horace is rescued from his unwelcome companion by Apollo, saying *sic me servavit Apollo* ("thus Apollo saved me" *Satires* 1.9.78). Both the ode and the satire take on an epic tone to describe Horace's escape at the hands of a god. In *Odes* 2.7, the lyric poet is as much the mock epic hero as the satirist was in *Satires* 1.9, except that in the ode, Horace adds the detail that he himself had thrown his shield away and begun to run away, making connections to the well-known *rhipsaspis* motif of Greek lyric poetry.[62] Mock elevation in tone alongside a rescue by a god who is associated with the lyre also link Horace's self-presentation in *Odes* 2.7 and *Satires* 1.9.

Horace in *Odes* 2.7 also seems to contradict major elements of his image as the reclining sympotic figure from *Odes* 1.1.19-22 and 1.38, as he depicts himself drinking with Pompeius both during the war and once Pompeius returns to Italy. Here is how he reclined with Pompeius during the war:

> cum quo morantem saepe diem mero
> fregi coronatus nitentis
> malobathro Syrio capillos.
>
> with whom I often broke the tedious day with unmixed wine
> having been crowned on my glistening
> hair with Syrian perfume. (2.7.6-8)

Instead of shunning eastern luxuries as he had in *Odes* 1.38.1, Horace embraces them with his head anointed by *malobathro Syrio*. At the end of book 1, Horace repudiates the overwrought luxury of Persian paraphernalia in garlands just as he rejects poetry which, like those fancy

[62] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 113 give not only the famous rhipsaspis poem of Archilochos as an example but also examples from fragments of Anacreon and Alcaeus.

eastern garlands, does not conform to Callimachean aesthetics of elegant simplicity. In *Odes* 2.7, he shows himself embracing that very luxury for which he had earlier professed his hatred (*odi* 1.38.1). The perfect tense associated with his memories of military life with Pompeius seem to suggest that his days of such luxurious and soldierly living are over: *redonavit* (2.7.3), *fregi* (2.7.7), *sensi* (2.7.10), *sustulit* (2.7.14), and *tulit* (2.7.16). However, his plans for Pompeius' return are wild and immoderate, pouring perfume from *capax* ("capacious" 2.7.22) shells and planning to *furere* ("go wild" 2.7.28), going squarely against his repeated exhortations to moderation.

Similar passages in which Horace ironically indulges in the very things he advises against are frequent in the *Odes*. One example which parallels 2.7.6-8 is found at 2.11.13-17, where Horace encourages his friend Quinctius to join him in drinking outside under a tree, with their hair covered in Assyrian perfume (2.11.16) and roses (2.11.14). This, of course, flies even more directly in the face of Horace's declarations against Eastern luxuries and roses in particular in *Odes* 1.38 than the similar passage about Horace's youthful days with Pompeius at *Odes* 2.7.6-8. In 2.11.13-17, Horace is winking again, employing the irony of his satiric persona as a way to develop his image in lyric. The irony come in the fact that he is playfully contradicting himself for the purpose of developing his persona. There are other correspondences with the *Satires* in the passage as well, such as the lower and more conversational tone, represented by the *cur non* ("why not?") at 2.11.13. Also, his praise for Lyde, the *devium scortum* ("discreet call-girl"), echoes his stance on what kinds of women are best for love affairs in *Satires* 1.2.23-134.

When Horace lists the fears which Barine causes for mothers, fathers and new wives at *Odes* 2.8.21-24, he recalls *Satires* 1.2.127-134, where he lists the things he does not fear when he is with his mistress. A particular correspondence is *Satires* 1.2.131, *cruribus haec metuat, doti*

deprensa, egomet mi ("this one fears for her limbs; the lady who got caught, for her dowry; and I for myself."). The comic tricolon involving an unfaithful woman is echoed in *Odes* 2.8.21-14:

> te suis matres metuunt iuvencis,
> te senes parci, miseraeque nuper
> virgines nuptae, tua ne retardet
> aura maritos.
>
> Mothers fear you for the sake of their young bulls,
> as well as frugal old men, and poor little recently
> married virgins, lest your scent
> delay their husbands

Again, as with other personal critiques in the *Odes* the 2.8 presents its take on this comic tricolon on unfaithful women from the *Satires* in the second person rather than the third. The lyric poet Horace speaks directly to the objects of his criticism, as opposed to the satirist, who speaks to an unnamed audience about others in the third person who are worthy of criticism. Once again, he levels at someone a critique reminiscent of the *Satires*, but does so in a way that is more appropriate to his lyric voice.

His satiric voice is transferred onto other characters in the ode. Earlier in *Odes* 2.8, Horace describes Venus, Cupid and the Nymphs as laughing at Barine's ability to become ever more beautiful as she leaves a trail of broken hearts and lies in her wake: *ridet hoc, inquam, Venus ipsa, rident | simplices Nymphae, ferus et Cupido …* ("she laughs at this, I say, Venus herself laughs; the guileless Nymphs laugh as well as savage Cupid" 2.8.13-14).[63] Such laughter is a large part of Horace's satiric persona. His reputation for such laughter and smiling in his satires was understood by the later satirist Persius in this way:

> omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
> tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit,
> callidus excusso populum suspendere naso.

[63] Venus actually laughs as the subject of the verb *ridere* exactly once in each of the first three books of *Odes*, at 1.2.33, 2.8.13, and 3.27.67.

> Sly Flaccus touches every vice in his laughing friend
> and having been let in, he plays around his heart,
> clever at hanging the people from his cleared nose. (*Satire* 1.116-118)

That laughing is ever a part of Horace's persona, and he depicts Venus, the Nymphs and Cupid laughing similarly at the ruin Barine makes of those she seduces and leaves. Horace's own words on laughter as part of the satirist's identity and purpose come in the first *Satire*:

> praeterea, ne sic ut qui iocularia ridens
> percurram: quamquam ridentem dicere verum
> quid vetat?
>
> Furthermore, lest I, like some laughing joker,
> pass the subject by: nevertheless, what stops a laughing person
> from speaking the truth? (1.1.23-25)

Venus and her companions, then, take on the role of the satirist in their laughter at the aftermath of Barine. This is a different sort of application of Horace's satiric persona in the *Odes*. Instead of either appropriating some aspect of the satirist for himself or else contrasting his own lyric identity to the satirist, here he presents divine agents as taking over the mantle of satire by laughing as he used to in his *Satires*.[64]

An element of humor similar to that in *Odes* 2.8 is to be found in *Odes* 2.13, in which Horace curses the man who planted a tree which nearly killed him. He accuses the unknown arborist of being capable of the worst imaginable crimes because of the evil which his tree nearly wrought upon poor, innocent (*immerentis*, 2.13.12) Horace. At 2.13.13-20, he notes the fears of the sailor and soldier, representatives of the satiric elements of *Odes* 1.1. This poem is also programmatic (like 1.1) in that it is the first time in the collection in which Horace shows Alcaeus and Sappho, whose meters dominate book 2 of the *Odes*. He sets them in Hades in front

[64] Horace does not often speak of his *Satires* as necessary the way Persius and Juvenal do. The later satirists concieve of their writing as essential to the health of Rome, whereas Horace merely smiles and points out faults, letting his self-deprecating humor pave the way for him, so it is unlikely that Venus' taking over of the satirist's role acts to free Horace from any responsibility he feels he must carry out as a satirist. see Braund, *Satirists and their Masks*, 30-36.

of an audience which absolutely loves Alcaeus' songs of battles and banished tyrants (*pugnas et exactos tyrannos*, 2.13.31). In this, the poem in which Horace first gives a picture of his primary poetic model, Alcaeus,[65] he also brings up his old satiric persona. In so doing, he repeats the trajectory he laid out for himself in *Odes* 1.1, which has been the consistent way in which Horace has conceived his persona throughout the *Odes*. He is dynamic, changing from the satiric poet of his early career to the lyric poet who will appear in *Odes* 3.30; it is what Michèle Lowrie calls, "Horace's unfolding myth of self."[66]

The bold ambition of that "unfolding myth" provides opportunities for Horace to access his satiric persona again in *Odes* 2.16.[67] This ode displays Horace's evolving persona vis-à-vis satire uniquely, not only because of its direct relationship to satire, but also because of its relationship to the programmatic first poems of the first and last books of the collection, *Odes* 1.1 and 3.1. Once again, the sailor appears in a context of discontentment reminiscent of *Satires* 1.1.1-22 and *Odes* 1.1.15-18, as well as throughout the Parade Odes:

> Otium divos rogat in patenti
> prensus Aegaeo, simul atra nubes
> condidit lunam neque certa fulgent
> sidera nautis;
>
> One asks the gods for rest when caught
> on the open Aegean, at the same time a black cloud
> hides the moon and the fixed stars to not shine
> for the sailors (2.16.1-4)

The sailor is consumed with the dangerous business of seafaring, and prays for *otium*. The same is the case in the following lines with the warring Thracian and Mede (2.16.5-6), who together in turn recall the soldiers mentioned in *Satires* 1.1.1-22 and *Odes* 1.1.23-25. Horace urges Grosphus

[65] Matthew Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 89.
[66] Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes*, 201.
[67] Kenneth Reckford, *Horace*, 55, sees the satiric elements of *Odes* 2.16, saying, "The first four stanzas are half satiric."

to be frugal (2.16.13-16) and not to worry about tomorrow (2.16.25-28), unlike the merchant and soldier, but rather simply enjoy each day as it comes. The exhortation is set against the ambitions and non-Epicurean behavior of the greedy merchant and the two warriors.[68] So, here, Horace again uses the satiric images of sailor and soldier as negative examples of behavior in giving his advice.

Horace accesses his satiric persona not only in the negative exempla which gives at the beginning of the poem, but also in the way he positively suggests that Grosphus behave. The laughter which Horace uses to describe the work of the satirist at *Satires* 1.1.23-25 appears in *Odes* 2.16 as a way to carry out the Epicurean task of enjoying the moment: *quod ultra est | oderit curare et amara lento | temperet risu* … ("let him hate to care for what is ahead and let him dilude bitter things with an easy smile" 2.16.25-27). Laughter cuts the bitterness of things much like the cookies the teacher hands out to young pupils at *Satires* 1.1.25 or Lucretius' honey on the doctor's cup of bitter medicine at *De Rerum Natura* 1.936-938.

The last two stanzas of *Odes* 2.16 set out to compare Grosphus' wealth, represented by his vast possessions of cattle, a thoroughbred and fancy clothes (2.16.33-36), to Horace's simpler possessions of a small farm, a thin bit of poetic inspiration and a hatred for the vulgar mob (2.16.37-40). Each of those three attributes of Horace's persona as he presents them in *Odes* 2.16 have a resonance with his grand ambition to be included with the lyric greats. First, his small farm (*parva rura* 2.16.37) represents the slenderness and simplicity not only of his Epicurean philosophical leanings, but also his Callimachean aesthetics.

Secondly, Horace chooses to describe his inspiration as having come from the *Graiae … Camenae* ("Greek Italian-Muses" 2.16.38). Such a term is not only an example of Horace's habit

[68] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 252-256, discuss Epicureanism in this poem, particularly Horace's debt to Lucretius, *DRN* 2.40-55.

for oxymoron,[69] but also alerts readers that his calls for humility and simplicity do not quite square with the grand and ambitious trajectory he set out for himself.[70] In this poem's warnings against ambition, Horace points out his own very high poetic ambitions, winking with the irony of the satirist. Many such ironic terms are used to define his poetic persona in the *Odes*, such as *lyricus vates* (*Odes* 1.1.35) or *age dic Latinum, barbite, carmen* ("come, Greek lyre, sing a Latin song" 1.32.3-4), which juxtapose his Roman identity with the Greek origins of his lyric poetry. This is not to mention his many others, such as *simplex munditiis* ("simple in its refinements" 1.5.5).

Finally, in the last two lines, Horace claims that *Parca* (Fate) has granted him *malignum | spernere vulgus* ("to scorn the spiteful mob" *Odes* 2.16.39-40). In *Odes* 1.1.31-32, (*me*) … *nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori | secernunt populo* ("and light choruses of nymphs with satyrs separate me from the people"). And in *Odes* 3.1.1, Horace writes *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo* ("I hate the uninitiated mob and keep it at bay"). In *Odes* 1.1.31-32, Horace is the direct object of the action of nymphs and satyrs, appearing in the accusative. He does not separate himself from the rabble, but rather the nymphs and satyrs do. In *Odes* 2.16.39-40, Fate grants Horace that he can hate the mob for himself. He still requires the action of an outside agent before he himself can act, appearing in the dative at 2.16.37. Finally, in the first Roman Ode, 3.1.1, Horace separates himself from the vulgar crowd by himself, with no help from anyone. This shift in the means by which he becomes separated from the uninitiated is crucial to understanding how his persona develops from the hopes and wishes of *Odes* 1.1 to the confident

[69] This habit for oxymoron is noted by many commentators, including Steele Commager, *Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. (Norman; London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 101, "Oxymorons and puns, a juxtaposing of dissimilars or an identifying of them, are habitual mechanics of his verse." also, Connor, *Horace's Lyric Poetry*,34, on *Odes* 1.22 and 193, on *Odes* 1.33. also, Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes I*, 240 (1.19), 271 (1.22), 371 (1.33), and *Odes 2*, 23 (2.1), 89 (2.5), 151 (2.9), and many other places.

[70] Rudd, "Horace as a Moralist," 77, cites *Odes* 2.16 as an example of the fact that, "Horace, too, covets fame." He includes other passages, such as *Satires* 1.10.73-77, 1.6.23-24, and *Odes* 1.1.7-8 as further examples.

declaration of *Odes* 3.30.1 *exegi monumentum* ("I have completed a monument…"). The transitional quality of his agency in separating from the crowd in *Odes* 2.16 locates him on the path to *Odes* 3.30 as halfway there.

Following *Odes* 2.16, with its somewhat ironic exhortations to humility, and right before *Odes* 2.18, another ode concerning simplicity and shunning wealth and greed, comes *Odes* 2.17, which is an ode to Maecenas, a man who is in himself a symbol of wealth and connection to power. Two primary elements of this poem display Horace's use of his satiric persona. The first is his relationship with Maecenas. He opens the poem with very familiar tone: *cur me querelis examinas tuis?* ("why do you exasperate me with your complaints?" 2.17.1).[71] It recalls the first line of *Satires* 1.1, *quid fit, Maecenas* … ("Maecenas, how come …?") both in its colloquial nature and the familiarity it expresses between poet and patron. It recalls the closeness Horace claims he and Maecenas share in their mutual separation from the common mob at *Satires* 1.6.17-18: *nos … a volgo longe longeque remotos* ("us … far, far removed from the rabble").

So, Horace projects the image that he and Maecenas share a close relationship from the very first line, even before he begins to exaggerate the dearness of that relationship by means of promises of a shared death (2.17.8-12) and references to mythic monsters and divinities (2.17.13-16). The promise to die together with Maecenas, however, will be broken by the claim he will make only three poems later, *non ego quem vocas, | dilecte Maecenas, obibo* ("I whom you call on, dear Maecenas, shall not die" 2.20.5-6). Here in the *Odes*, Horace presents a relationship with Maecenas which is not unlike that which he had with Lucilius in the *Satires*. His social position below Maecenas, like his poetic one below Lucilius, is contradicted by the way it is

[71] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 274-275, interpret the tone here as reproachful and note that familiarity is a necessary component of that tone. They also note the frequent juxtaposition of the two men in the language of the poem, such as 2.17.2: *mihi te* or 2.17.3: *Maecenas mearum*.

stated and by claims Horace makes elsewhere in the poetry. His attitude is something like ironic reverence, here applied to a social superior rather than to a poetic predecessor.

Another resonance with the *Satires* in *Odes* 2.17 is the way in which Horace describes the thank offerings which he and Maecenas will give to the gods in the final stanza. Horace's perspective on the potential death, which he and Maecenas (did not) share, shifts. At the beginning of the poem, he expresses fear that it (the death) will occur (2.17.1-16), but by the end of the poem, he expresses thanks that it has not (2.17.17-30).[72] Horace reminds Maecenas to offer *victimas* | *aedemque votivam* ('sacrificial animals and a votive temple" 2.17.30-31). The two gifts are grand in scope, with the *victimas* suggesting gifts appropriate to Jupiter and the *aedem*, in the words of Nisbet and Hubbard, "absurdly ostentatious."[73] Horace's gift not only takes half a line less of poetry than Maecenas', it also is a mere lamb, and is a modest gift. The modesty, or smallness, of Horace's gift reflects his Callimachean aesthetic, in that he claims to prefer slender (often *tenuis*) poetry to more ponderous forms, like epic, which are better represented by temples and *victimas* for Jupiter. It also reinforces the irony of his relationship to Maecenas, winking as he praises him and at the same time winking while declaring his own modesty. He will, after all, claim immortality in just the third poem after 2.17 in the collection.

ODES 2.20: SOARING INTO HIS LYRIC IDENTITY

In the last ode of book 2, Horace takes on his lyric identity in the form of bird's wings and launches himself into immortality, thus sending his persona on the final leg of its journey towards the completion of his poetic *monumentum* in *Odes* 3.30. For the second time at the end of a book, Horace reenacts his transformation from one kind of poet into another. The transformation also serves to link Horace with Ennius, who, like Horace, wrote in multiple

[72] Syndikus, "Some Structures," 24, takes a similar view on this ode.
[73] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 287.

genres, including satire and who also presented himself as having undergone a bird-metamorphosis.[74] The adjective *biformis* (2.20.2) bespeaks this status as simultaneously the Horace of his earlier poetry and the Horace of his great lyric accomplishment. More specifically, Horace transforms into a swan,[75] which connects him to Pindar and thus public poetry of the kind he so often rejected earlier in the collection.[76] Several aspects of this transformation go against claims to slenderness and humility which Horace has repeatedly made throughout books 1 and 2. By contradicting his earlier claims to humility and against epic so strongly here, he accomplishes what one might call a grand wink before flying off into the ever-serious and ever-political Roman Odes.[77]

As a specific example of this grand wink, he breaks his promise to die with Maecenas (*Odes* 2.17) at 2.20.6-7, as mentioned above. Such a deliberately subverted relationship to a figure Horace proclaims to revere is similar to his relationship to Lucilius in the *Satires,* where he praised his predecessor as being the greatest and that he did not deserve to be mentioned in the same breath as Lucilius, while all the while demonstrating that he actually deems himself a much better poet in terms of taste and metrical dexterity. Here, instead of being a better poet than Maecenas, Horace will instead be immortal, compared to the mortality Maecenas faces. While this relationship with Maecenas does echo Horace's relationship to Lucilius in the *Satires*, it must be said that perhaps the primary dynamic at work between Horace and Maecenas in the

[74] Mario Erasmo, "Birds of a Feather? Ennius and Horace, *Odes* 2.20." (*Latomus*: 65.2, 2006), 369-377.
[75] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 341-342, explain that the adjective *album* is a common epithet of swans, which connects their white plumage with old men's white hair.
[76] Denis Feeney, "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," 53, suggests that Horace's transformation in *Odes* 2.20 prepares him to take on the task of the state poetry of the Roman Odes, having previously rejected epic or state poetry in such places as *Odes* 1.2, 1.12, and 2.1. He suggests that Horace, while using Alcaeus for his primary model in the first two books, takes on Pindar as his model in the third, which is marked by more public poetry of the sort which Pindar wrote. The connection of the swan with Pindar is made more clear when considering *Odes* 4.2.25-27, where he calls Pindar the *Dircaeum … cycnum*.
[77] For *Odes* 2.20 and its links to the Roman Odes, see Commager, *Odes of Horace*, 313 n.7, also O. Thevenaz, "Le cygne de Venouse: Horace et la métamorphose de l' Ode II,20," (*Latomus*: 61, 2002), 861-888 cit. Erasmo, "Birds of a Feather?" 369 n.1.

Odes is the poet's progression towards greater independence, thus allowing Horace to stand on his own at the end of the collection.[78]

Another satiric element of *Odes* 2.20 which contributes to its grand wink is the sudden, vivid and even comic description of his transformation into a bird at 2.20.9-12. This third stanza, mainly because of its suddenness and, as Eduard Fraenkel puts it, its "crude zoological precision,"[79] has not always been well liked by scholars, Frankel especially.[80] Many, however, see in it humor and the typical Hellenistic motif of metamorphosis put to an interesting use.[81] The vividness recalls two comic narrative details from the first book of *Satires*. The first is *Satires* 1.2.127-134, in which Horace very vividly describes the scene he is confident will never happen to him when he is involved with a certain class of woman. There, the detail is humorous and directs the laughter at the poet, just as in *Odes* 2.20.9-12, where Horace comically calls attention to the suddenness of his transformation with the *iam, iam* which begins the lines. Close-up detail on Horace's legs in particular was also used for humorous effect in the *Satires*, at 1.9.10-11, when Horace had to stop and listen to his unwelcome companion in heat that made sweat run down to his *imos … talos* ("lowest ankles" 1.9.10-11). So, along with echoing the metamorphosis motif of Hellenistic poetry and preparing Horace's persona for its flight into the Roman Odes, the transformation of *Odes* 2.20 also recalls passages of his satiric past, truly reinforcing his status as a *biformis* (2.20.2) poet.

[78] Matthew Santirocco, "The Maecenas Odes," (*TAPA*: Vol. 114, 1984), 242-243. see also Lyne, *Behind the Public Poetry*, 102.
[79] *Horace*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), 301.
[80] W.R. Johnson, "The Boastful Bird of Modesty," (*CJ*: Vol. 61 No. 6, Mar. 1966), 272-273 catalogues particular scholars' distaste for the poem. Also, Connor, *Horace's Lyric Poetry*, 1-6 discusses why different scholars have disliked this poem and its stark imagery.
[81] Nisbet and Hubbard, *Odes II*, 332-337, document examples of the motif from Hellenistic literature. also, on the humor of the passage, see Connor, *Horace's Lyric Poetry*, 1-7.

Finally, as he so often did in the *Satires*, Horace makes certain that his audience has an image of Q. Horatius Flaccus as the speaker of the poem rather than any other subject.[82] He names himself here in manner similar to the way he did at *Satires* 1.6.45-46: *libertino patre natum* ("born from a freedman father"), he describes himself as *pauperum sanguis parentum* ("blood of poor parents" 2.20.5). While the difference between the social connotations of freedman status and mere poverty are significant, naming a humble origin to make his grand achievement seem even greater is one of the ways in which Horace magnified the achievement of being in Maecenas' circle in the *Satires*. It will continue to do the same thing in the *Odes*, appearing in *Odes* 3.30.12: *ex humili potens* ("from humble origins, powerful"). Horace thus brings the satiric elements of his lyric persona with him as he leaves the second book of *Odes* and begins the final book in the collection.

REINTRODUCTION FOR THE FINAL PHASE

Horace introduces a new identity for himself at the very beginning of the third book of *Odes*. He describes himself as *Musarum sacerdos* ("priest of the Muses") at 3.1.3. This identity continues Horace's progression towards self-assertion and his rise to the stars which he began with the very first ode. The first words of book 3, *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo* ("I hate the ininitiated mob and keep it a bay" 3.1.1) finally present Horace as separating himself from the common rabble in the first person and active voice. It is no longer the choruses of nymphs and satyrs who set him apart (1.1.30-32) or Fate who has to give him permission to spurn the crowd (2.16.37-40). He does it himself. He is in a position of power now, as *Musarum sacerdos*, to command silence (*favete linguis*, 3.1.2) and act as Roman priest, which position gives him

[82] Connor, *Horace's Lyric Poetry*, 5, puts it this way, "The third stanza startles us by its insistence that this image does not belong to some world of polite poetic mythology, but represents reality: a plumb and bald little man turns into a swan before our eyes."

religious, political, and social clout.[83] Lyne uses the phrase "religious-political, public-poetical"[84] to describe the societal position Horace carves out for himself with the title.

This lofty image of the poet, however, is somewhat undercut by the violently physical and comically exaggerated metamorphosis he underwent just prior to the beginning of the third book in *Odes* 2.20. But the comic and satiric dimensions he presents earlier in the *Odes* are not all that recall satire in *Odes* 3.1. There is a satiric priamel of men at *Odes* 3.1.9-16. In this and many other respects, this first ode of the last book reenacts much of the first poem of the entire collection, and the satiric list of men and their occupations is part of that.[85] The priamel parallels the priamel at *Satires* 2.1.24-29:

> Quid faciam? saltat Milonius, ut semel icto
> accessit fervor capiti numerusque lucernis
> Castor gaudet equis, ovo prognatus eodem
> pugnis; quot capitum vivunt, totidem studiorum
> milia: me pedibus delectat claudere verba
> Lucili ritu, nostrum melioris utroque.
>
> What should I do? Milonius dances just as soon as
> the heat doubles in his wine-struck head and the lamps, too, are doubled;
> Castor delights in horses, but his twin, born from the same egg,
> in fights; as many heads as there are alive, there are that many thousands
> of pursuits: it delights me to close words in feet
> after the manner of Lucilius, a man better than either of us.

William Anderson points out the strangeness of this priamel in that the first person in the list is unrelated to the following series. [86] Milonius dances ridiculously in his drunken stupor, and he is included in a list of delights with Castor and his horses and Pollux and his boxing. The odd set of three serves as a foil for Horace's declaration of what delights him, namely writing satire. The

[83] Lyne, *Behind the Public Poetry*, 160, discusses the multiple roles of priests in Rome and the significance that holds for Horace in *Odes* 3.1 as *Musarum sacerdos*.
[84] *Behind the Public Poetry*, 160, 184.
[85] Nisbet and Rudd, *Odes III*, 3, describe the list as a list of "various ambitions (here described with some satire)."
[86] Anderson, "Ironic Preambles," 37-38.

priamel which provides examples against which Horace defines himself has been a common element in his poetry to this point, particularly in *Odes* 1.1.

However, *Odes* 3.1 executes the priamel to a different effect than what is expected based on earlier examples of priamel in the *Odes* and *Satires*. Horace does not use the technique to lead to himself and defining his persona, but rather to say that the differences do not matter. In his satiric priamels and those earlier in the *Odes*, Horace used the device to accentuate and participate in difference, but here, he employs it to declare that difference does not matter:

> est ut viro vir latius ordinet
> arbusta sulcis, hic generosior
> descendat in Campum petitor
> moribus hic meliorque fama
>
> contendat, illi turba clientium
> sit maior: aequa lege Necessitas
> sortitur insignis et imos;
> omne capax movet urna nomen.
>
> It is the case that a man lays out his orchards
> in rows wider than (another) man, this man of more noble birth
> goes down to the Campus as a candidate
> this one with character and better reputation
>
> contends, for that one there may be a larger
> crowd of clients: by an equal law does Necessity
> choose by lot the famous and the lowest;
> a capacious name moves every name. (3.1.9-16)

The first man in the list contents with other men by laying out larger orchards, but the next three all display their difference in the way in which they seek office in the Campus Martius. The first foil is unrelated to the others in the priamel, raising the expectation that Horace will, as he does at *Satires* 2.1.24-29 and elsewhere, use the device to describe himself. Instead, he breaks the expectation by taking the priamel in the opposite direction from that in which he is accustomed.

Here, Horace accesses a device he had so often used to define his persona and turns it on its head.

Later in the poem, however, at 3.1.25-28, he repeats the call for moderation which runs throughout the *Satires* and *Odes*. He does so in a way that recalls the catalogues of occupations in *Satires* 1.1.1-22 and *Odes* 1.1.2-18.

> desiderantem quod satis est neque
> tumultuosum sollicitat mare
> nec saevus Arcturi cadentis
> impetus aut orientis Haedi
>
> The one desiring what is enough neither
> the stormy sea bothers
> nor the savage assault of setting
> Arcturus or the rising Kid (3.1.25-28)

The fact that the man desiring (only) what is enough escapes the sea's wrath recalls Horace's persistent use of the greedy merchant-sailor as the paradigm of immoderate desire in the *Satires* and *Odes*. Horace's use of the sea here is also reminiscent of how he used the image in the Parade Odes, as an image connected to what happens to those who fail to follow his advice or are worthy of satiric critique in some other way. Horace strengthens this connection by the satiric trait of giving examples that are opposite of what he is talking about. As Nisbet and Rudd put it, "though Horace professes to be talking of the contented man, he goes on to give two vignettes of the opposite, as so often in the *Satires.*"[87]

Also, two stanzas later, he uses the image of fish displaced, as he did in *Odes* 1.2.9. In *Odes* 3.1.33 *contracta pisces aequora sentiunt* ("the fish sense the sea receding"), the land is encroaching on the sea because of the greed of landowners but in *Odes* 1.2.9 *piscum et in summa genus haesit ulmo* ("the race of fish clings in the highest elm tree"), the sea encroaches on the

[87] *Odes III*, 14.

land. Horace's persona in the third book of *Odes* remains very closely connected to that in the earlier *Odes* and the *Satires*.

He defines himself against his previous poetic pursuits (or anyone else's, for that matter) at 3.1.2-3, when he declares that he sings *carmina non prius* | *audita* ("songs not heard before"). The declaration recalls *Odes* 1.32, in which he calls on the Greek lyre to sing a song in Latin which was first sung by Alcaeus:

> age dic Latinum,
> barbite, carmen,
> Lesbio primum modulate civi,
>
> come, Greek lyre, sing a
> Latin song,
> you, tuned first by a citizen of Lesbos. (1.32.3-5)

In *Odes* 3.1, unlike in 1.32, Horace does not mention any previous models[88] and claims that his song has never been heard before at all.[89] With that claim, he continues his motion towards independence expressed in the first person active verbs *odi* and *arceo* (3.1.1). In stating his independence so emphatically, he shows himself to have already gone beyond being a *biformis vates* (2.20.2-3), and to have taken on fully the image of the *Musarum sacerdos* (3.1.3).

Odes 3.4, with its invocation of Calliope, serves as a second introduction to the third book of *Odes* and presents Horace in much the same light as 3.1, as the *Musarum sacerdos*. Here, calling on a muse to sing and writing about political topics so boldly, Horace fully adopts the political ramifications involved in the title of *sacerdos*.[90] Even more than *Odes* 3.1, *Odes* 3.4, in the words of Michèle Lowrie, "recapitualtes all of the elements from the other personal

[88] Santirocco, *Unity and Design*, 71, notes, on *Odes* 1.32, that "Borges' observation that poets create their own precursors is particularly apt here," since Horace is telling his readers how to trace his literary lineage.
[89] Nisbet and Rudd, *Odes III*, 8, corroborate this claim, saying, "there is nothing like [the Roman Odes] in Alcaeus, and even an early piece like [*Odes*] 1.2 cannot equal the combined authority of the Roman Odes."
[90] Lyne, *Behind the Public Poetry*, 160, 184.

narratives up to this point."[91] The personal narrative which Horace gives in fact lasts for 36 lines before moving on to talk about Augustus via the myth of the gigantomachy, which means that he splits time with the *princeps* fairly equally in the poem. This means that Horace is beginning to equal and even surpass Augustus on his way to the *monumentum* of 3.30. The poem also re-traces Horace's steps through the previous two books of *Odes* in the first section of the last book.

After calling on Calliope to sing a long song on the *tibia*, or reed pipe (3.4.1-2), Horace offers two other options for her to choose how to sing her song: *seu voce nunc mavis acuta*, | *seu fidibus citharaque Phoebi* ("or if you prefer, with the sharp voice,[92] or with strings and the lyre of Phoebus" 3.4.3-4). Giving options to the muse in this way seems a bit arrogantly presumptuous of the poet, saying that he can accomplish any poetic task Calliope may want to sing. However, the variety in possibilities emphasizes that Horace is indeed able to write in whatever lyric mode one might like, as he demonstrated in the Parade Odes at the beginning of book 1. There are such correspondences throughout *Odes* 3.4 to previous odes in books 1 and 2. He mentions Philippi, the subject of *Odes* 2.7, and the tree which nearly killed him from *Odes* 2.13 at 3.4.26-27. Another example is *visam* ("I shall visit" 3.4.35) and its connection to *Odes* 2.20.33 and 35, where Horace visits far off places in his bird form.[93]

However, just like in *Odes* 3.1, Horace goes against the advice he gives throughout the *Odes* up to this point. At 3.4.29, Horace forgets all of his exhortations against braving the dangers of the sea from all his S*atires* and *Odes*, and expresses willingness to become a sailor:

> utcumque mecum vos eritis, libens
> insanientem navita Bosphorum

[91] *Horace's Narrative Odes*, 215.
[92] Nisbet and Rudd, *Odes III*, 58, point out that there is debate as to whether this refers to a cappella singing or to singing alternating with the tibia. They also offer Darnley Naylor's substitution of *si* for *seu* at 3.4.3, giving Calliope only two choices: the tibia or the lyre. In any case, the mention of both still recalls the dexterity of the Parade Odes at the beginning of book 1.
[93] Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes*, 216-217, gives a more complete list of correspondences.

temptabo et urentis harenas
litoris Assyrii viator,

As long as you will be with me, gladly
will I try the crazy Bosphorus
as a sailor and the burning sands
of the Assyrian shore as a traveler (3.4.29-32)

His willingness to go against his old advice springs from the fact that the muses have taken him through the journey of the *Odes*, and now he is willing to break from his past and go wherever they will take him. He no longer wants to reflect his earlier personae in his pursuit of the goal he had set out in *Odes* 1.1: to be included among the greatest lyric poets of the Greek canon. Just like the sailor who abandons all in pursuit of wealth, Horace here is willing to abandon his own advice and previous personae in pursuit of the blessings of the Muses.

BOOK 3: LEAVING SATIRE BEHIND

Finding overt references to the *Satires* or satiric elements of Horace's persona is difficult in book 3 of the *Odes*. When Horace addresses the tortoise shell lyre at 3.11.3, he says

tuque testudo resonare septem
callida nervis,
nec loquax olim neque grata, nunc et
divitum mensis et amica templis

and you, tortoise shell, who resonate cleverly
with seven strings,
once you neither had a voice nor gave pleasure, now
you are friend to both the tables of the wealthy and to temples. (3.11.3-6)

If this is a reference to himself, the bard via the lyre, it takes the position that his previous poetic ventures were voiceless compared to what he is accomplishing, now that he has fully taken on the mantle of the *lyricus vates*, the *sacerdos Musarum*, the great Roman Lyric Poet. Later in *Odes* 3.11, the very satiric word *ridere* appears, but the laughter is not that of the satirist which lightens the force of a lesson taught or an unpleasant truth learned as it was at *Satires* 1.1.24. It is

rather part of Horace's "light-hearted attitude to the myth, [which is] more reminiscent of Callimachus than of early Greek poetry,"[94] or of satire.

Horace also passes up a chance to incorporate his satiric side in *Odes* 3.15. The poem makes fun of an aging woman who used to be socially active. There is an opportunity for Horace to take on the persona of the diatribe satirist and use Chloris' poor behavior as she advances in years as an example of how not to act, just like so many objects of criticism in the *Satires*. Instead, Horace lays on abuse after the manner of Archilochos' poetry against Neobule and his own *Epodes* 8. The iambic and Archilochean character of the *Epodes* is appropriate to use in Greek lyric poetry. The purely Roman origin of satire makes it less acceptable as a model of the Greek-lyric-in-Latin that Horace is writing in this third book. He is not competing with Lucilius, but with the Greek poets, and it is they whom he must take on.

Similarly, in *Odes* 3.16, the topic of money and greed is addressed, but with no reference to greedy merchant-sailors or soldiers, as is the case in the previous odes which use satire as way to critique greed. Here, Horace does not point out contemporary examples of greed to warn of its dangers. He lists mythological examples (3.16.1-16), followed by gnomic statements about the power money has to ruin recipients (3.16.17-20) and personal affirmations of his choice to live in voluntary poverty (3.16.21-28). There is irony in such statements, especially when directly following Maecenas' name at 3.16.20. Horace, of course, has a nice estate in the Sabine hills, supplied by Maecenas, so the mention of the patron who supplies Horace the chance to live richly while claiming to be a pauper constitutes an instance of the satiric wink which characterizes Horace's satiric persona. However, it is the only remotely satiric element in the poem, and it is softened by 3.16.29-38, where Horace proclaims that he does not have the most

[94] Nisbet and Rudd, *Odes III*, 151.

luxurious and profitable of luxuries and lands, and admits that he does avoid any real poverty because of the kindness of the poem's addressee, Maecenas.

However, with the mention of the *purae rivus aquae* ("stream of pure water" 3.16.29), Horace turns *Odes* 3.16 into a statement about poetry rather than money. The phrase refers to the end of Callimachus' hymn to Apollo:

> ᾽Ασσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
> λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ᾽ ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει.
> Δηοῖ δ᾽ οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι Μέλισσαι,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
> πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.
>
> Great is the flow of the Assyrian river, but
> it carries a lot of runoff from the earth and much rubbish in its water.
> And the Melissai do not bring to Demeter from every water,
> but whatever clean and undefiled little stream
> that trickles up from a holy fountain, choicest pinnacle of water. (Hymn 2.108-112)

The stream of pure water signals that this poem is about the Callimachean slenderness to which Horace adheres. He used the same reference to criticize Lucilius' *lutulentus rivus* ("muddy stream" *Satires* 1.4.11), but the reference is so powerfully Callimachean, it cannot be a reference to the passage in the *Satires,* but merely confirmation that Horace still adheres to the same aesthetics as in his earlier career.

The rest of book 3 is similar. Even advice poems, like 3.20, lack the ironic self-presentation, observational critical technique, and diatribe voice of the satires. The observational narrative technique used in *Odes* 3.24.9-24 comes close to satire's Horace's father pointing out vices for little Horace to avoid in *Satires* 1.4.103-128. However, the ode presents the positive examples of the Scythian migrant workers (3.24.9-16) and the good wife (3.24.17-24) to demonstrate how to behave, as opposed to the *Satires*, which point out negative examples, as Horace's father did. Even calls to moderation in wealth, such as *Odes* 3.29.1-16, do not unfold as

satiric critiques, and the voice of the poet does not come across as that of a satiric critic. In the case of *Odes* 3.29, Horace's exhortations to Maecenas to leave behind his wealth and dine instead at a *parvus lar* ("small house" 3.29.14) do not lead to examples of bad dining, as would be the case with satire, but a simple statement that such dining is able to *sollicitam explicuere frontem* ("unfold a troubled forehead" 3.29.16). So it goes for satire in book 3 of the *Odes*, as Horace's persona reaches nearly exclusively to its Greek Lyric and Hellenistic predecessors for inspiration.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

ODES 3.30 AND THE COMPLETION OF THE JOURNEY

From the very beginning of the *Odes,* Horace's lyric persona strives towards the goal which he declares accomplished in *Odes* 3.30.1: *exegi monumentum* ("I have perfected a monument"). It is the culmination of the entire collection and Horace's triumphant declaration that he has indeed finished the grand task which he set for himself. The satiric notes in the final poem are slim and debatable, which is in keeping with how satiric elements appeared in Horace's persona throughout the third book. First are the biographical details in 3.30.11-12, *et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium | regnavit populorum, ex humili potens* (and where Daunus, poor in water, was ruler of a rustic people). Daunus was an ancient ruler in Horace's home region of Apulia,[95] and the reference to the agrarian nature of the people in the region reminds the reader of the rustic self-presentation of the diatribe satirist in *Satires* 1.1-3. The rise from humble origins is a part of Horace's self-presentation from the *Satires* all the way through the first three books of *Odes* and beyond.

The phrase *ex humili potens* ("powerful from humble origin" 3.30.12) accentuates this aspect of his persona. It also echoes the phrase *libertino patre natus* ("born from a freedman father") in *Satires* 1.6.6, 45, and 46. The phrases certainly refer to his social rise, as he notes frequently in the autobiographical in *Satires* 1.6. In it, he tells the story of his early schooling and the sacrifices his father made to get him into the right schools (1.6.71-82), emphasizing the fact that he should not have been able to afford the education he received. Just after saying that he

[95] Nisbet and Rudd, *Odes III,* 374-375.

used to be teased for his status as *libertino patre natus* (1.6.45, 46), Horace asserts that he rose to the level of tribune, with a legion under his command (1.6.47-48). The social dimension of Horace's ascent is certainly part of his satiric persona, and may be the strongest satiric note struck in *Odes* 3.30. However, Horace could rather be referring to his career as a poet with the phrase *ex humili potens*.

Since Horace's project in the *Odes* is not social, but poetic in nature, it would be odd to consider a declaration such as *ex humili potens* to have a purely social dimension. Horace's lowly origin in *Odes* 3.30 lies not only in Apulia, but also in the genre of satire. From the beginning of the *Odes*, Horace negotiates his relationship with satire through various means, including such things as imagery of the sea in the Parade Odes and the use of sailors and soldiers as negative exempla. As the *Odes* progress from beginning to end, Horace's relationship with satire changes, as well. He accesses the genre less and less until in the third book, it is virtually absent. The trajectory Horace takes in the *Odes* runs from his humble beginnings in the lowly genre of satire to the greatest Pindaric heights of his lyric *monumentum*.

FURTHER REASEARCH: BOOK 4 AND THE PROBLEM OF CONTINUITY

Further research on this topic could lead to an investigation on Horace's persona in the fourth book of *Odes* and how it differs from that found in the first three books. No longer is Horace vaunting that he will be counted among the canonical lyric poets of Greece. This is because he had already accomplished everything he claimed that he wanted to accomplish in lyric by the end of his first collection. His lyric corpus was a grand monument, on par with the pyramids, which he had completed (*exegi*), apparently thinking he would never return to the project. However, Augustus commissioned the *Carmen Saeculare* and the fourth book of odes, which opens with a defeated Horace, begging for Venus to go somewhere else and bother

younger men, and closes with pure praise for Augustus - pure, saccharine praise which is notably missing Horace's sly satiric character. There is a precedent for such a work as this fourth book in the final three books of Ennis' *Annales*, which were similarly added on to an already completed work at the behest of a patron, changing the focus of the original work seemingly against the poet's wishes. Horace's persona in the fourth book of odes shares an interesting intertextual relationship with his earlier personae and with personae in its literary precedents.

REFERENCES

Ancona, R. *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994.

Anderson, W.S. *Essays in Roman Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

----. "Ironic Preambles and Satiric Self-Definition in Horace *Satire* 2.1." *Pacific Coast Philology* 19 (1984): 35-42.

----. *Horace*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

----. "*Horatius Liber*, Child and Freedman's Free Son." *Arethusa* 28 (1995): 151-64.

Armstrong, D. *Horace*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

----. "Some Recent Perspectives on Horace." *Phoenix* 51 (1997): 393-405.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's Odes." *Classical Antiquity* 15 (1996): 5-47.

Bing, Peter. "Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*." *TAPA* 123 (1993): 181-198.

Braund, Susanna H. *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. *Exeter Studies in History*. Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1989.

----. *Roman Satirists and their Masks*. Bristol: Bristol University Press, 1996.

Bundy, E.L. "Studia Pindarica I." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 18 (1962): 4-16.

Cairns, Francis. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh: Edingurgh University Press, 1971.

Clay, Diskin. "The Theory of the Literary Persona in Antiquity." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici.* N° 40 (1998): 9-40.

Coffey, Michael. *Roman Satire.* Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1976.

Coffta, David Joseph. *The Influence of Callimachean Aesthetics on the Satires and Odes of Horace*. Lewiston; Queenston; Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.

Collinge, N.E. *The Structure of Horace's Odes.* London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Commager Steele. "The Function of Wine in Horace's Odes." *TAPhA* 1957 LXXXVIII: 68-80.

----. *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. Norman; London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.

Connor, Peter. *Horace's Lyric Poetry: The Force of Humor*. Berwick, Vicroria, Australia: Aureal Publications, 1987.

Conte, G.B. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets,* trans. and ed. C. Segal. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986

----. *Latin literature : A History*. trans. Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Davis, Gregson. *Polyhymnia : The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

DuQuesnay, I.M. le M. "Horace and Maecenas: the Propaganda Value of *Sermones* I." in T. Woodman and D. West, eds., *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Elliott, Robert C. *The Literary Persona*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Erasmo, Mario. *Archaic Latin Verse.* Focus Publishing: Newburyport, MA 2004.

----. "Birds of a Feather? Ennius and Horace, *Ode* 2.20" *Latomus* 65.2 (2006), 369-377.

Fantham, Elaine. *Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Fowler, Don. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Freudenburg, Kirk. "Horace's Satiric Program and the Language of Contemporary Theory in Satires 2.1." *American Journal of Philology* CXI (1990): 187-203.

----. *The Walking Muse.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

----. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Gold, Barbara. "Openings in Horace's *Satires* and *Odes*: Poet, Patron, and Audience." *Yale Classical Studies* 29 (1992): 161-86.

Harrison, S.J., ed. *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Highet, Gilbert. "*Libertino Patre Natus.*" *American Journal of Philology* 94 (1973): 268-81.

----. "Masks and Faces in Satire." *Hermes* 102 (1974): 321-37.

Hutchinson, G.O. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Johnson, W.R. “The Boastful Bird of Modesty.” *Classical Journal* 61.6 (March, 1966): 272-275.

Keane, Catharine. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kiernan, Victor Gordon. *Horace: Poetics and Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Kurke Leslie. *The Traffic in Praise : Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Lewis, C.S., and Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Personal Heresy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Lowrie, Michèle *Horace's Narrative Odes.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. *Horace: Beyond the Public Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Mayer, Roland G. “Persona<l> Problems : The Literary Persona in Antiquity Revisited.” *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici.* N° 50 (2003): 55-80.

Muecke, F. “Horace the Satirist: Form and Method in Satires 1.4.” *Prudentia* 11: 55-68.

McNeill, Randall L.B. *Horace: Image, Identity, and Audience*. Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Miller, Paul Allen “Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of Odes 1-3.” *American Journal of Philology* CXII (1991): 365-388.

Murray, O. “Symposium and Genre in the Poetry of Horace.” *Journal of Roman Studies* LXXV (1985): 39-50.

Nisbet, Robin M.G. and Margaret Hubbard. *A Commentary on Horace's Odes, Book I*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1970.

----. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Nisbet, Robin M.G. and Niall Rudd. *A Commentary on Horace : Odes, Book III.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Oliensis, Ellen. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Plaza, Maria. *The Function of Humor in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying.* London; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Pomeroy, Arthur J. “A Man at a Spring: Horace, Odes 1.1.” *Ramus* 9 (1980): 34-50.

Porter, David H. *Horace’s Poetic Journey: A Reading of Odes 1-3*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 1987.

Powell, Anton, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.

Putnam, M.C.J. *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Race, W.M. "The Classical Priamel From Homer to Boethius." *Memnosyne Supplement* 74 (1982).

Reckford, Kenneth J. *Horace.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969.

Ross, Jr., David O. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Rudd, Niall. *The Satires of Horace*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966.

----. *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge Universiy Press, 1976.

----, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Santirocco, M. S. "Horace's Odes and the Ancient Poetry Book." *Arethusa* XIII (1980): 43-57

----. "The Maecenas Odes." *TAPhA.* 114 (1984): 241-253.

----. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Schenker, David J. "Poetic Voices in Horace's Roman Odes." *Classical Journal* 88 (1993): 147-66.

Shey H. J. "The Poet's Progress. Horace, Odes I,1." *Arethusa* IV (1971): 185-196.

Van Sickle, John. "The Book-roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Book." *Arethusa* XIII (1980): 5-42.

West, David. *Reading Horace*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1967.

Witke, E.C. "Varro and Horace: Carmina 1.9." *Classical Philology* LVIII (1963): 112-115.

Woodman, A.J., and J.G.F. Powell, eds. *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Woodman, T., and Denis Feeney. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Zetzel, J.E.G. "Horace's *Liber Sermonem*: The Structure of Ambiguity." *Arethusa* 13 (1980): 59-77.