DIGITAL ACCESS TO
SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD
DASH.HARVARD.EDU

HARVARD LIBRARY
Office for Scholarly Communication

Copies and Models in Horace "Odes" 4.1 and 4.2

Citation
Nagy, Gregory. 1994. "Copies and Models in Horace "Odes" 4.1 and 4.2. (updated, online version)." The Classical World 87, no. 5: 415-26.

Permanent link
https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37366705

Terms of Use
This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. Submit a story .

Accessibility

Copies and Models in Horace Odes 4.1 and 4.2

Gregory Nagy

[The printed version of this essay was published over 20 years ago in *Classical World* 87 (1994) 415–426. The online version, as presented here in 2015, replicates almost word for word the content of the original version, indicating the original pagination by way of braces ("{" and "}"). For example, "{415|416}" indicates where p. 415 of the printed version ends and p. 416 begins. In this online version, I add wherever needed my own translations of the quoted Latin and Greek. And I have made a few additional observations, which are all enclosed within double-square brackets ("[[" and "]]"). All these additional observations date from 2015.12.31.]

§1. When Horace imitates Pindar in *Ode* 4.2, beginning with *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari* 'whoever is eager to imitate [*aemulārī*] Pindar' at line 1, he presents his composition not so much as an act of copying within a genre but as a model, even an archetype, in its own right. Key words are *aemulārī* 'to imitate' at line 1 and *imitātus* 'imitating', from *imitārī* 'to imitate', at line 57, towards the very end of the poem.

§2. These two Latin words *aemulārī* and *imitārī*, along with a third, *imāgō*, are conceptually related to the Greek word *mīmēsis*. In an earlier work, I argued that the primary meaning of *mīmēsis* was 're-enactment' in a dramatic sense, and that the secondary meaning of 'imitation'—which is a built-in aspect of re-enactment—became the new primary meaning of this word only after its older dramatic sense became destabilized.[1] Here I will argue that

[1] G. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore 1990) 42–45, 346, 349, 373–375, 381, 387, 411. I draw special attention to the meaning of (Latin) *aemulus* as 'striving to equal, understudy' and of (Latin) *imāgō* as 'death-mask of an ancestor' (p. 349n58). [[Updatings in the posting Nagy 2015.10.15, "*Homo ludens* in the world of ancient Greek verbal art," http://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/homo-ludens-in-the-world-of-ancient-greek-verbal-art/.]]

Horace's own dramatic sense of re-enactment *through poetry* brings to life the older and more traditional idea of *mīmēsis.*

§3. This idea of mimesis, which I write without italics from here on, works on the principle that those who *re-enact* something are not only imitating a model: by re-enacting they also become models in their own right, to be imitated by a series of successors who perpetuate, moving forward in time, the chain of re-enactment. I suggest that Horace has achieved an imaginative repetition of this idea in the poetics of *Ode* 4.2—and of *Ode* 4.1 as well.[2]

§4. I have introduced the word *repetition* in precisely this context in order to evoke a 1843 work of Kierkegaard, entitled *Repetition.* Just as ancient Greek philosophy teaches, it is claimed, "that all knowledge is a recollecting," so also "modern philosophy will teach that all life is a repetition."[3] To quote further: "repetition and recollection are the same movement, except in opposite directions, for what is recollected has been, is repeated backward, whereas genuine repetition is recollected forward."[4]

§5. Mimesis is like Kierkegaard's repetition. When you *re-enact* an archetypal action in drama, you *imitate* those who re-enacted before {415|416} you and who served as your *immediate* models. But the *ultimate* model is still the archetypal figure that you are acting out or re-enacting, who is coextensive with the whole line of imitators who had re-enacted the way in which their ultimate model acted, each imitating each one's predecessor. When it is your turn, your moment to re-enact something in this forward movement of mimesis, you become

---

[2]In forming my views about these two poems, I was helped by two books in particular: M. J. Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (Ithaca 1986) and G. Davis, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1991).

[3]S. Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling. Repetition* (edited and translated, with introduction and notes, by H. V. Hong and E. H. Hong; Princeton 1983) 131. The date, to repeat, of Kierkegaard's *Repetition* is 1843.

[4]Kierkegaard p. 131.

the ultimate model in that very moment. As a working definition, I will equate this moment of mimesis with *the poetic occasion.*

§6. Horace's poetic occasion in *Ode* 4.2 centers on the imitation of Pindar, beginning with *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari* 'whoever is eager to imitate [*aemulārī*] Pindar' at line 1. The poet's strategy is characteristically complex, matching the complexity of his predecessor. It looks at first as if Horace does not want to have Pindar as a model. Whoever seeks to imitate Pindar, the poem starts to say, is like the doomed Icarus who botched his imitation ~~of Daedalus~~: *ceratis ope Daedalea | nititur pinnis* 'he relies on wings crafted by Daedalus and fastened with wax' at lines 2–3. After all, the wings of Icarus, unlike those of his model ~~Daedalus~~, were defective, even bogus. [[In my posting for *Classical Inquiries* 2015.12.31, I explain my reasons for deleting "of Daedalus" and "Daedalus" from the original printed version.]] So we may ask, with Giorgio Pasquali, why Horace should be trying to imitate Pindar precisely at the moment when he advises against imitating Pindar?[5] Gregson Davis offers an answer, and I agree with him that this much is relatively straightforward: "the disavowal [*recūsātiō*] itself," he writes, "*by virtue of its form* [emphasis mine], reveals the speaker's actual competence to undertake precisely what he claims to be incapable of doing."[6] This way, the model who is Pindar becomes the foil for the new model, who is to be Horace. So maybe the wings of this new Icarus are not defective at all. We shall return in the end to this image of the winged poet, but for the moment I draw attention simply to the pride of the artist in achieving an imitation—or, better, let us call it a mimesis in the older sense of the word, in that this particular 'imitation' claims to become a model in its own right.

---

[5]G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico* (Florence 1920) 782.

[6]Davis (n2) 134. The poetics of *recūsātiō* are of course a convention in their own right, which Horace adapts from Hellenistic models and even earlier ones, including those of Pindar; cf. Davis pp. 11, 28–30.

§7. The occasion of a poet, which I have just defined as the moment of mimesis, can become absolutized by his or her composition *when this composition is performed*. A striking example is the epinician moment as dramatized in any given song of Pindar, which comes to life in the context of its performance.[7] Seth Schein has analyzed Pindar's *Pythian* 6 as an illustration of that moment,[8] and he quotes in this context the remarks of Hans-Georg Gadamer, who has this to say about the element of the occasional in the epinician songs of Pindar {416|417}:

> The occasional in such works has acquired so permanent a form that, even without being realised or understood, it is still part of the total meaning. Someone might explain to us the particular historical context, but this would be only secondary for the poem as a whole. He would only be filling out the meaning that exists in the poem itself.[9]

§8. Just as any given composition of Pindar is meant to absolutize the occasion of its performance, so also Horace, in composing an imitation of Pindar, imitates also the absolutization of the occasion. But in this case, following the pattern of Alexandrian poetics, the occasion may not be "real"—to the extent that there need not be a real performance. Still, the occasion is presented by the poet as absolute, and it is indeed "real" on the strength of that presentation. Provided that Horace follows the tradition, that tradition will uphold the absoluteness of the given occasion. In terms of mimesis in the older sense of the word, that is,

---

[7] Nagy (n1) 381.

[8] S. L. Schein, pp. 246–247 of "Unity and Meaning in Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode," *MHTIC*: *Revue d'Anthropologie du Monde Grec Ancien* 2 (1987) 235–247.

[9] H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York 1975) 129.

re-enactment, the occasion of Horace is indeed real. The occasion becomes “unreal” only if mimesis is restricted to its newer sense, that is, mere imitation.

§9. I am arguing that mimesis in the older sense of the word requires that the speaker’s identity merge with that of his *role* as speaker, just as the identities of those who are spoken to and spoken about must merge with their respective roles. If the merger is successful, then the model has not been merely copied, that is, imitated. It has been remodeled, that is, re-enacted. What is remodeled can continue to be a model. What is merely copied cannot become a model. The paradox here is that a model implies no change, whereas whatever is remodeled does indeed imply change. That is to say, an explicit idea of unchangeability through time subsumes an implicit idea of change in the here-and-now of the occasion of performance.

§10. I maintain that the premier metaphor for this paradox of re-enactment is *repetition*. This metaphor is ideally expressed by adverbs meaning ‘again’, such as Greek *dēute* in the fourth and fifth stanzas of Song 1 of Sappho, where Aphrodite is being addressed:

> $|_{1}$ ποικιλόθρον’ ἀθανάτ’Ἀφρόδιτα, $|_{2}$ παῖ Δίος δολόπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε, $|_{3}$ μή μ’ ἄσαισι μηδ’ ὀνίαισι δάμνα, $|_{4}$ πότνια, θῦμον, $|_{5}$ ἀλλὰ τυίδ’ ἔλθ’, αἴ ποτα κἀτέρωτα $|_{6}$ τὰς ἔμας αὔδας ἀίοισα πήλοι $|_{7}$ ἔκλυες, πάτρος δὲ δόμον λίποισα $|_{8}$ χρύσιον ἦλθες $|_{9}$ ἄρμ’ ὐπασδεύξαισα· κάλοι δέ σ’ ἆγον $|_{10}$ ὤκεες στροῦθοι περὶ γᾶς μελαίνας $|_{11}$ πύκνα δίννεντες πτέρ’ ἀπ’ ὠράνωἴθε$|_{12}$ρος διὰ μέσσω· $|_{13}$ αἶψα δ’ ἐξίκοντο· σὺ δ’, ὦ μάκαιρα, $|_{14}$ μειδιαίσαισ’ ἀθανάτωι προσώπωι $|_{15}$ ἤρε’ ὄττι δηὖτε πέπονθα κὤττι $|_{16}$ δηὖτε κάλημμι $|_{17}$ κὤττι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι $|_{18}$ μαινόλαι θύμωι· τίνα δηὖτε πείθω $|_{19}$ βαῖσ’ ἄγην ἐς σὰν φιλότατα; τίς σ’, ὦ $|_{20}$ Ψάπφ’, ἀδικήει; {417|418} $|_{21}$ καὶ γὰρ αἰ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει, $|_{22}$ αἰ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ’, ἀλλὰ δώσει, $|_{23}$ αἰ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει $|_{24}$ κωὐκ ἐθέλοισα. $|_{25}$ ἔλθε

μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλέπαν δὲ λῦϲον |26 ἐκ μερίμναν, ὄϲϲα δέ μοι τέλεϲϲαι |27 θῦμοϲ ἰμέρρει, τέλεϲον, ϲὺ δ' αὔτα |28 ϲύμμαχοϲ ἔϲϲο.

stanza 1||1 'You with pattern-woven flowers, immortal Aphrodite, |2 child of Zeus, weaver of wiles, I implore you, |3 do not devastate with aches and sorrows, |4 Mistress, my heart! stanza 2||5 But come here [*tuide*], if ever at any other time |6 hearing my voice from afar, |7 you heeded me, and leaving the palace of your father, |8 golden, you came, stanza 3||9 having harnessed the chariot; and you were carried along by beautiful |10 swift sparrows over the dark earth |11 swirling with their dense plumage from the sky through the |12 midst of the aether, stanza 4||13 and straightaway they arrived. But you, O holy one, |14 smiling with your immortal looks, |15 kept asking what [*otti*] is it once again *this* time [*dēute*] that has happened to me and for what reason [*k'ōtti*] |16 once again this time [*dēute*] do I invoke you, stanza 5||17 and what [*k'ōtti*] is it that I want more than anything to happen |18 to my frenzied [*mainolās*] heart [*thūmos*]? "Whom am I once again *this* time [*dēute*] to persuade, |19 setting out to bring [*agein*] her to your love?[10] Who is doing you, |20 Sappho, wrong? stanza 6||21 For if she is fleeing now, soon she will be pursuing. |22 If she is not taking gifts, soon she will be giving them. |23 If she does not love, soon she will love |24 even against her will." stanza 7||25 Come to me even

[10] See p. 51 of J. B. Petropoulos, "Sappho the Sorceress—Another Look at fr. 1 (LP)," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 97 (1993) 43–56, who adduces evidence from the diction of magical formulae to support the restoration [[βαῖϲ' ἄγην here at line 19]], first proposed by M. G. Parca ("Sappho 1.18–19," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 46 [1982] 47–50). I agree with Petropoulos that the wording in Sappho 1.18–19 is based on the language of love spells, not on "Homeric allusion," as Parca pp. 49–50 claims. Translation: 'whom am I, once again *this* time, to persuade, setting out to bring her to your love?' [[See also the posting Nagy 2015.11.05, "Once again this time in Song 1 of Sappho," http://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/once-again-this-time-in-song-1-of-sappho/.]]

now, and free me from harsh |$_{26}$ anxieties, and however many things |$_{27}$ my heart [*thūmos*] yearns to get done, *you* do for me. *You* |$_{28}$ become my ally in war.

Song 1 of Sappho = Prayer to Aphrodite

§11. At the beginning [[of this song, in a part not quoted in the printed version, the]] female speaker invokes Aphrodite, the archetype of love, in the form of a prayer (first stanza).[11] The goddess is then represented as flying down from Olympus, but this narration happens not in a third-person diegesis but still in the second person, so that the potential diegesis is subsumed by the syntax of prayer (second, third, and fourth stanzas, lines 5–18). Then, as the goddess arrives all the way from her distant celestial realm, she is quoted by the speaker as speaking directly in the first person to this speaker, who is now suddenly switched into the second person (fifth and sixth stanzas, lines 18–24). Aphrodite's first question is: what is wrong with you *this* time (line 15)? And she is addressing a woman whom she calls Sappho (line 20). So, we learn that the speaker who had started speaking at the beginning of the song was Sappho. But now the speaker Sappho is speaking in the first person of Aphrodite (lines 18–24): she is in effect re-enacting the goddess. Moreover, at the end of Sappho's prayer (lines 25–28), she asks to be the goddess's equal partner, a *summakhos* 'fellow fighter' in the warfare of love. As I have argued elsewhere, the active *telessai* 'to get done, to get someone to experience' as used in place of the expected passive *telesthēn* 'to experience' toward the end of the poem (line 26) suggests that the controlling plan is meant to be in the mind of Sappho, as if she were equivalent to Aphrodite herself.[12]

---

[11] R. M. Travis, "The Descent of the Goddess: Ritual and Difference in Sappho's Prayer to Aphrodite" (A. B. thesis, Harvard University, 1990) has written a perceptive study of the poetics of prayer in *Song* 1 of Sappho.

[12] G. Nagy, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca 1990) 259–260.

§12. The re-enactment of Aphrodite as the archetype of love is made manifest by the adverb *dēute* 'again' (lines 15, 16, 18), which refers to the onset of love in the speaker's heart. It is reinforced by the repetition of this adverb denoting repetition—three times at that (to repeat, lines 15, 16, 18). And there is further reinforcement in the triple repetition of *otti*/*k'ōtti* 'what' (line 15 twice, line 17 once). Yet, in this paradox of repetition, the more you hear 'again' or 'one more time', the more changes you see. It is all an archetypal re-enactment for the archetypal goddess of love, but for the humans who re-enact love it becomes a vast variety of different experiences by different people in different situations. This paradox of repetition brings to mind the words of Kierkegaard: "The dialectic of repetition is easy, for that which is repeated has been—otherwise it could not be {418|419} repeated—but the very fact that it has been makes the repetition into something new."[13]

§13. The variety of erotic situations suggested by *dēute* 'again' and highlighted by the instances of *amor versus* 'reverse love' toward the end of Sappho's song (lines 21 to 24) can also be illustrated by the strikingly plentiful set of examples that we may find in the relatively few surviving fragments of Anacreon (as numbered in Page, D. L., ed. 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford):

> σφαίρηι δηὖτέ με πορφυρῆι | βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἔρως | νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλωι | συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται
>
> Golden-haired Eros throws at me once again *this* time [*dēute*] a purple ball, prompting me to frolic with a young girl who wears multicolored [*poikila*] sandals.
>
> Anacreon *PMG* 13.1–4

---

[13] Kierkegaard (n3) p. 149.

ἀρθεὶς δηὖτ’ ἀπὸ Λευκάδος | πέτρης ἐς πολιὸν κῦμα κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι

Lifting off once again *this* time [*dēute*] from the white rock I dive down into the gray eddies below, intoxicated with eros.

Anacreon *PMG* 31.1–2

μνᾶται δηὖτε φαλακρὸς Ἄλεξις

Bald Alexis is wooing once again *this* time [*dēute*].

Anacreon *PMG* 49b.1

παρὰ δηὖτε Πυθόμανδρον | κατέδυν Ἔρωτα φεύγων.

Once again *this* time [*dēute*] I went down, slinking, to Pythomandros, trying to get away from Eros.

Anacreon *PMG* 55.1–2

μεγάλωι δηὖτέ μ’ Ἔρως ἔκοψεν ὥστε χαλκεὺς | πελέκει, χειμερίηι δ’ ἔλουσεν ἐν χαράδρηι.

Once again *this* time [*dēute*] Eros struck me with a great double-axe [*pelekus*] like a coppersmith [*khalkeus*] and washed me in a wintry torrent. [[For objections to the interpretation of *pelekus* as a smith’s ‘hammer’, see my posting in Classical Inquiries 2015.12.31.]]

Anacreon *PMG* 67.1–2

ἐρέω τε δηὖτε κοὐκ ἐρέω | καὶ μαίνομαι κοὐ μαίνομαι

I passionately love [*erô*] once again *this* time [*dēute*]—and don’t love [*erô*].

Also I am mad—and I’m not mad.

Anacreon *PMG* 83.1–2

§14. Surveying these and other instances of *dēute* in Greek love lyric, Anne Carson remarks about the constituents *dē* 'now' and *aute* 'again': "The particle *dē* marks a lively perception in the present moment: 'Look at that now!' The adverb *aute* peers past the present moment to a pattern of repeated actions stretching behind it: 'Not for the first time!' *Dē* places you in time and emphasizes that placement: *now*. *Aute* intercepts 'now' and binds it into a history of '*thens*'."[14]

§15. I could go on with other illustrations, but the point has already been made. Every time I say to myself, "here I go again," I am repeating the pattern of Aphrodite, but each time it is a different experience for me. No wonder Aphrodite is invoked as *poikilothronos* in the first word of *Song* 1 of Sappho. This epithet, if indeed it is derived from *throna* 'pattern-woven flowers' rather than from *thronos* 'throne', can be translated 'with varieties of pattern-woven flowers'.[15] For those who re-enact her, the goddess of love is as limitlessly varied as the limitless varieties of flowers that are pattern-woven on her exterior. [[In the original printed version, I used the word 'embroidered' where I now use 'pattern-woven'. For background, see 2§§57–147 (especially 2§70) in Nagy, G. 2015. *Masterpieces of Metonymy*. Hellenic Studies Series 72. Washington and Cambridge MA. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_Nagy.Masterpieces_of_Metonymy.2015]]

§16. This metaphor of re-enactment as *repetition*, expressed by Greek adverbs such as *dēute* meaning 'again', is in turn repeated in Horace's use of Latin preverbs and adverbs such as *re-*,

---

[14] A. Carson, *Eros the Bittersweet: An Essay* (Princeton 1986) 118–119.

[15] M. J. Putnam, "*Throna* and Sappho 1.1," *Classical Journal* 56 (1960–61) 79–83, with further bibliography. A decisive passage is *Iliad* 22.441, where *throna poikila* refers to varied flower patterns that are woven into the fabric. On the magical properties of the *throna,* see Petropoulos (n10) 53. [[See also the posting Nagy 2015.11.05, "Once again this time in Song 1 of Sappho," http://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/once-again-this-time-in-song-1-of-sappho/.]]

rursus, *iterum*, and so on, all meaning 'again'. We come now to *Ode* 4.1 of Horace. After a long interruption of warfare in love (line 1), Venus is being addressed once again in prayer—*precor*, *precor* 'I pray, I pray'— as she begins the battle *rursus* 'once again' (line 2). The doubling of *precor*, *precor* 'I pray, I pray' reinforces the repetitiveness already marked by *rursus* 'once again'.

§17. Venus the warrior reminds us of Aphrodite the fellow-warrior invoked by Sappho in the final line of her Song 1. But now the {419|420} Roman poet does not want any part of this warfare: Horace's poem is now the opposite of Sappho's song of invocation, since the poet here prays that the goddess be absent, not present. 'Come here!'—Sappho had prayed to Aphrodite: ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν (line 25). 'Go away from here!'—Horace now prays to Venus: *abī* (line 7). Go instead to the young men whose prayers do indeed invoke you: *quo blandae iuvenum te revocant preces* 'to where the pleasing prayers [*preces*] of young men are re-calling [*re-vocant*] you' (line 8).[16] The *re-* of *revocant preces* reinforces the repetitiveness of their prayers invoking the goddess—the same kind of insistent repetitiveness that we saw in Sappho's *dēute*.[17]

§18. Horace shows that he too had once made such repetitions in his own invocations when he was a young love poet—but supposedly no more, now that he is old: *non sum qualis eram*, he declares: 'I'm not the man I used to be' (4.1.3). Then I was the love slave of the girl Cinara (line 4), and I was the young love poet of *Odes* Books 1–3. But now this is Book 4: I am past fifty years of age (line 6), and I am a love poet no more. Remarkably, Horace's denial of repetition

---

[16]On Paulus Fabius Maximus, the youth toward whom Venus is being redirected by the poem, see T. N. Habinek, "The Marriageability of Maximus: Horace, *Ode* 4.1.13–20," *American Journal of Philology* 107 (1986) 407–416. In this context, Habinek discusses the interplay of genres in *Ode* 4.1, providing a valuable critical overview of previous work on the use and re-use of literary conventions in this complex poem.

[17]We may compare Horace *Ode* 4.13, which begins *audivere, Lyce, di mea vota, di* | *audivere, Lyce* 'the gods have heard, Lycus, my prayers, | they have heard, Lycus'. The repeated sound of *di* reinforces the repeated words of the prayers, *mea vota*, which are in fact *repeated prayers*. This poem mentions Cinara (line 21), as does the poem that we are now considering, *Ode* 4.1 (line 4). More on Cinara presently.

happens precisely at the moment when he is repeating the words of a love poet—just as his denial of imitating Pindar happens precisely at the moment when he replicates and even re-enacts the sum total of Pindar's poetics. At the very moment that Horace says *non sum qualis eram* 'I'm not the man I used to be' at line 3, as if he were no longer the love poet of Books 1–3, he not only repeats the words of a love poet, but that love poet is none other than his old self, back in his old love poems: the expression *dulcium* | *mater saeva Cupidinum* 'savage mother of sweet passionate loves' that follows at lines 4–5 is an imitation, even more, a repetition, of *mater saeva Cupidinum* 'savage mother of passionate loves' at line 1 of *Ode* 1.19.[18] So, Horace is repeating his words of love poetry, repeating himself, repeating his *self*, at the very moment when he prays never again to be a love poet. He is up to his old tricks of poetic reversal. In that same earlier poem *Ode* 1.19, the image of *in me tota ruens Venus* 'Venus, rushing into me with her entire essence' at line 9, so reminiscent of the erotic melt-down in Song 31 of Sappho, happens to occur in the context of an ultimate symbol of poetic reversal, the picture of Parthians shooting *versis … equis* 'with horses turned around' (*Ode* 1.19.11).[19] {420|421}

§19. This virtuoso display of repetitions in Horace *Ode* 4.1 reinforces Michael Putnam's conclusion about this poem: "Looked at, therefore, as an epigone to Sappho's masterpiece,

---

[18]Putnam (n2) 42; cf. Davis (n2) 65–66, who also mentions the echoes from *Ode* 3.26.1–3.

[19]We may compare the image of *amor versus* in Sappho 1.21–24, as noted above. In *Ode* 4.1.35–36, *cur facunda parum decoro* | *inter verba cadit lingua silentio* 'why does my eloquent tongue in less-than-seemly… | —between one word and the next—fail …silence?', the effect of an unconventional elision necessitated by the juxtaposition of *…o* and *i…* in *decoro* | *inter* is used as a symbol for the actual meaning of the two lines. [[In my translation, the wording 'less-than-seemly silence' is interrupted by an ellipsis that I symbolize as "…"): so, 'less-than-seemly…silence'. What interrupts, as marked by the ellipsis, is the wording '—between one word and the next—fail'.]] Cf. Putnam (n2) p. 38. Such use of a sound-effect to match meaning may be compared with the "gagging" effect of the hiatus in the sequence γλῶσσα ἔαγε ('[my] tongue broke down') of Sappho 31.9, where the sound of gagging conveyed by hiatus matches an expression that designates the sensation of gagging. See G. Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge MA 1974) 45. See also Davis p. 255 for Horatian imitations, besides *Ode* 4.1, of Sappho 31 (especially *Ode* 1.13.5–8, *Epodes* 11.8–10, 14.1–8).

Horace’s ode is a prayer for the reritualization of Venus.”[20] Such a reritualization, I would add, reflects Horace’s success in mimesis, and again I mean it in the older sense of the word.

§20. The reritualization in Horace *Ode* 4.1 turns out to be a revitalization. The poet’s denial of interest in love poetry, expressed as *mollibus* | *iam durum imperiis* ‘hard [*durus*] in responding to soft commands’ at lines 6–7, is suggestive. The *imperiis* ‘commands’ in this expression picks up the *regno* ‘régime’ in the earlier expression *bonae* | *sub regno Cinarae* ‘under the régime of good Cinara’ at lines 3–4, which was the actual context for *non sum qualis eram* ‘I’m not the man I used to be’ at line 3. Who, then, is this Cinara, the one who had once made the young love poet Horace become a slave to her régime? And what does it mean that the poet has by now grown ‘hard’ to the ‘soft’ *imperia* ‘commands’ of Venus?

§21. Let us start with Cinara. The schoolbook from which I first studied Horace many years ago taught me that she was a “real” person, “alone among Horace’s loves.”[21] Her name, however, suggests that there is more to it. The *cinara* is a kind of thistle, now known as *Cinara scolymus* in the Linnaean taxonomy. Particularly suggestive of its implications is a passage in Columella 10.235–236 where we learn that ingesting this plant was good for ‘a drinking Bacchus’ but ‘bad for a singing Apollo’: *hispida ponatur cinara, quae dulcis Iaccho* | *potanti veniat nec Phoebo grata canenti* ‘let the bristly *cinara* be planted, which comes across as sweet to Bacchus when he drinks but displeases Phoebus [Apollo] when he sings’. The Greek word from which the Latin *cinara* was borrowed is κινάρα (and variant κυνάρα), which is synonymous with σκόλυμος (*skolumos*). This other Greek word for ‘thistle’ is prominently featured in a

---

[20]Putnam (n2) 40.

[21]C. E. Bennett, *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (Boston 1934; revised by J. C. Rolfe) 367, citing Horace *Epistles* 1.14.33; cf. also 1.7.28.

drinking song of Alcaeus (fr. 347), as also in a Hesiodic passage (*Works and Days* 582–588).[22] Gregson Davies was the first to notice the sympotic connotations of the name Cinara by making the connection with the Alcaic and Hesiodic passages; he links Horace's reference to Cinara in *Ode* 4.1 to the very idea of the symposium—and, by extension, to the idea of sympotic poetry.[23] Going further, Michèle Lowrie notes another detail {421|422} in both these Greek passages: the blossoming of the thistle marks the time in the Dog Days of summer when men are least potent sexually—and women are most desirous and lascivious.[24] She combines this detail with the observations of Pliny *Natural History* 20.262 and 22.86–87, to the effect that the thistle is an aphrodisiac when it is ingested with wine. I agree therefore with Lowrie's conclusion that "the reign of Cinara was erotic as well as sympotic."[25]

§22. Let us return, then, to the passage that I cited from Columella, which says that the *cinara* is good for 'a drinking Bacchus' but 'bad for a singing Apollo'. If Horace was following a régime—let us say a diet—of *cinara*, on the grounds that the thistle is an aphrodisiac when ingested with wine, then the poet's declaration that he is now 'hard' to the 'soft' régime of love may well be yet another example of Horatian affirmation through denial. The poet may say that he has lost interest in Venus, and yet he is now 'hard' to her 'soft' régime. What, then, do

---

[22]I have argued elsewhere that *Works and Days* 582–588, although the date of this text is of course earlier than that of Alcaeus fr. 347, is *derived* from the kind of drinking song tradition that we see attested in the Alcaeus fragment: Nagy (n1) 462–463. I also think that *Iliad* 3.151–152 alludes to the same tradition of drinking songs.

[23]Davis (n2) 68–69.

[24]M. Lowrie, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* [[02.07.02, http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/1991/02.07.02.html]], in her review of Davis (n2). In this connection, I cite three important new works on the poetics, as it were, of the Dog Days: E. Oliensis, "Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*," *Arethusa* 24 (1991) 107–138; R. C. Ceragioli, *Fervidus ille Canis: The Lore and Poetry of the Dog Star in Antiquity* (Harvard Ph.D. dissertation 1992); J. C. B. Petropoulos, *Heat and Lust: Hesiod's Midsummer Festival Scene Revisited* (Lanham MD 1994).

[25]Lowrie (n24). Henry Hoenigswald points out to me that the expression *sub regno Cinarae* 'under the régime of Cinara' in *Ode* 4.1.4 may have astronomical connotations as well.

we make of the *ancien régime* of Cinara? Evidently it is not after all a thing of the past, if indeed the poet is now 'hard' in response to Venus's 'soft' commands.

§23. Here I invoke the important observations of Ellen Oliensis concerning the negative imago of the Horatian female love-partner, the notorious Canidia, especially as she figures in *Epodes* 5 and 17 as well as in *Satire* 1.8.[26] In *Epode* 17, as Oliensis shows, the poet in fact prays to Canidia in what amounts to a sinister mirror image of the prayer to Venus in *Ode* 4.1:

> 'On my knees I pray, … leave off (*parce*) casting spells, and loose, loose the magic wheel (*solve, solve turbinem*) so it may run backward.' [= *Epode* 17.2, 6–7] In both poems, Horace pleads unfitness for love—decorously formulated in the late ode (*non sum qualis eram …* ['I'm not the man I used to be']), but spelled out in ugly detail in the epode (21–22): 'My youth has fled, the modest blush has abandoned my bones in their wrapper of sallow hide …' (*fugit iuventas et verecundus color | reliquit ossa pelle amicta lurida …*). If Venus is 'looking for a suitable liver to scorch' (*si torrere iecur quaeris idoneum* [*Ode* 4.1.]12), Canidia already has Horace on the coals ([*Epode* 17.]30, 33–35): 'O sea and earth, I'm on fire. {422|423} … Are you going to keep up the heat, you workshop of Colchian drugs, until I'm nothing but arid ashes scattered by the injurious winds?'[27]

§24. The mark of Canidia is the Dog Star,[28] and Oliensis observes that in all three of the Horatian poems where Canidia plays a central role, *Epodes* 5 and 17 and *Satire* 1.8, "an

---

[26]Oliensis (n24).

[27]Oliensis p. 120.

[28]Oliensis p. 116n20.

overheated Canidia is viewed through the eyes of an impotent male."[29] The Horatian image of male impotence goes back to a central idea in the ancient Greek drinking song as enacted in Alcaeus fr. 347 and as paraphrased, as it were, in Hesiod *Works and Days* 582–588. That central idea, as formulated by Oliensis, is this: "it is the woman's heat that saps the man's strength."[30]

§25. According to Oliensis, the Horatian image of *impotentia* is two-sided, conveying the "twinned meanings" of "lack of power, or weakness," and "lack of self-control, or violence."[31] From the standpoint of the earlier Greek poetics, however, I would suggest more simply that *impotentia* has a double meaning, one for male and one for female, conveying simultaneously 'impotence' on the part of the male and 'loss of self-control' on the part of the female, as is made explicit in the drinking song about the Dog Days.[32]

§26. The very notion of a female 'loss of self-control' is of course subjective, defined by a male point of view. Negatively portrayed as it is, female sexuality becomes a reflection of male *impotentia*. And here we come to a paradox: as Oliensis observes about Roman love poetry, the very state of being in love is presented by the male poet as a matter of *impotentia*, given that "the traditional opposition of the erotic lifestyle to military heroism sets up an opposition of 'soft' to 'hard', feminine to masculine, disarmed to armored, amorous complaint to aggressive invective."[33] The "solution" perpetuates the paradox: "to regain his potency," the male lover in

---

[29]Oliensis p. 121.

[30]Oliensis p. 121 with n25, following M. Detienne, *The Gardens of Adonis: Spices in Greek Mythology* (translated by J. Lloyd; Hassocks, Sussex 1977) 121–122.

[31]Oliensis p. 121.

[32]At *Epode* 16.53–54, there is a reference to the *aestuosa inpotentia* ('loss of *potentia* in the heat-wave') of the Dog Star. I see both meanings implicit here.

[33]Oliensis p. 125.

Roman love poetics "must either borrow the attributes of the soldier—hence the pervasive motif of the 'soldier-lover', especially in Roman elegy—or else he must assert his masculine independence from his mistress, adopting the tough stance of invective."[34] Such "toughness" or "hardness" requires a rejection of love. As an example of this paradox, Oliensis cites Catullus 8, where the idea of being in love with {423|424} Lesbia is the same thing as being *impotens* (*tu quoque impotens noli* 'you also, powerless, must decide not to be willing': line 9), and where the poet keeps telling himself to 'stay hard' in order to escape his *domina*: *obdura* (line 11), *obdurat* (line 12), *obdura* (line 19).[35]

§27. So also in *Ode* 4.1 of Horace, we see that the poet has now become 'hard' to the 'soft' domination of Venus: *mollibus* | *iam durum imperiis* 'hard [*durus*] in responding to soft commands' (lines 6–7). Moreover, he addresses as 'O you hard one [*durus*]!' that last object of his desire, what we may call that "sweet bird of youth," the one who eludes him endlessly in his sleep as he now reaches the end of his poem: *nocturnis ego somniis* | *iam captum teneo, iam volucrem sequor* | *te per gramina Martii* | *Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubilis* 'in my nighttime dreams, I at one moment catch up with you and hold on to you, while at the next moment you take wing, flying off, and I pursue you as you speed over the grounds of the field of Mars and over the swirling waters, O you hard one [*durus*]!' (lines 37–40).[36]

§28. Who, then, is that winged boy, that last object of the poet's desire? What do we know about him, besides the description *volucris* 'winged, taking wing' at line 38 and *durus* 'hard'

---

[34] Oliensis p. 125.

[35] Oliensis p. 125.

[36] Mary Jaeger has kindly shown me a copy of her article, "Restructuring Rome: The Campus Martius and Horace, *Ode* 1.8," forthcoming in *Arethusa* (1995). [[The article was soon thereafter published in *Arethusa* 28 (1995) 177–191.]] In this work, she makes clear the importance of the Campus Martius as the poetic space that brings to life, as it were, such images as the athletic boy of *Ode* 4.1.37–40.

here at line 40 of *Ode* 4.1? A key is his name, Ligurinus: *sed cur heu, Ligurine, cur | manat rara meas lacrima per genas?* 'but why, I say with regret, O Ligurinus, why is there this tear, so rare, that flows down my cheeks?' (lines 33–34).[37] I am persuaded by the suggestion of Michael Putnam that Ligurinus, the "Ligurian" of line 33, reflects an Italic version of Cycnus the "swan" (Greek κύκνος 'swan').[38] The story of the hero Cycnus and how he changed into a swan is well known to us from Ovid *Metamorphoses* 2.367–380. Also, Cycnus was a lover of that hero with a solar name, Phaethon, as we see from the reportage of Servius on *Aeneid* 10.189: *fuit etiam Ligur, Cycnus nomine, dulcedine cantus ab Apolline donatus, amator Phaethontis* 'there was also a Ligurian by the name of Cycnus who was given the sweetness of song by Apollo and who was a lover of Phaethon'.[39] Putnam goes on to argue that Ligurinus is a self-extension of Venus.[40] I raise the question, further, whether Ligurinus is a self-extension of Horace. Putnam himself says: "Ligurinus is very much the speaker-poet's former self."[41] {424|425}

§29. The swan, as evoked by the name Ligurinus here in *Ode* 4.1 at line 33 and by the word *volucris* 'winged, taking wing' at line 38, is of course none other than the bird of Apollo.[42]

---

[37]In another work, not yet published, Jaeger argues that the adjective *durus* suits both the name Ligurinus and the poetics of the Campus Martius as a setting for a figure called Ligurinus, since Ligurians were proverbially known for their martial and athletic toughness (Diodorus Siculus 39.1–7). I am very grateful to Professor Jaeger for showing me the relevant portions of this important work, in which she adduces striking parallels to the Horatian image of the athletic youth as a training partner or pacesetter, as it were, of the aging poet. She also makes some crucial remarks about the poetics of monumentality in *Ode* 4.1.

[38]Putnam (n2) 44–46. In the work that I mention in the previous note, Jaeger stresses that her interpretation of the implications inherent in the name Ligurinus does not exclude the further implications suggested by Putnam.

[39]Putnam p. 44. I suspect that the theme of being in love with the sun, as made explicit in Sappho fr. 58.25–26, is pertinent (on this theme, and on the relevance of the Phaethon myth, see Nagy [n12] 260–262).

[40]Putnam p. 45.

[41]Putnam p. 45.

[42]Putnam p. 45.

Perhaps the most memorable passage about the swan as Apollo's songbird is Plato, *Phaedo* 84e–85b, where Socrates speaks of his own impending death and compares the swan song, that most beautiful of all the songs that the bird sings in its lifetime, which is to be sung when it prophetically foresees the impending moment of its own death. The swan is also the archetypal poet, precisely because he is the bird of Apollo, and Pindar himself is called 'the swan of Dirce' in *Ode* 4.2 (*Dircaeum ... cycnum*, line 25)—that is, in the very same poem where Pindar becomes the prime object of Horace's imitation and even replication.[43] Even more, as Putnam has noticed, Horace imagines himself as turning into a swan in *Ode* 2.20: *iam iam residunt cruribus asperae | pelles et album mutor in alitem | superne nascunturque leves | per digitos umerosque plumae* 'any moment now, my rough skin is sloughed off, down to my legs, while in my upper half I am transformed into a white winged bird, and a light plumage is growing over my fingers, my shoulders' (lines 9–12).[44] The *vates* 'poet' (line 3)—or swan—is flying through the aether (line 2): this 'winged singer', *canorus | ales* (lines 15–16), is flying over vast stretches of water and land (lines 13–16; at line 16 I note the usage of *campos* for 'land', which may be compared with the *campi* of *per gramina Martii | campi* 'over the grounds of the field of Mars' at *Ode* 4.1.39). Thus the ever-elusive object of the poet's ultimate desire is his own self *as the ultimate poet*, as that archetypal bird of song, the swan of Apollo.

§30. We have seen from the verses of Columella that the *cinara* is bad for the poet's voice, bad for the singing Apollo. But now the poet says: *non sum qualis eram bonae | sub regno Cinarae*

---

[43]As the anonymous referee for this paper points out, there is more to be said about the poetics of repetition as a validator of occasion, especially with reference to the second, political half of *Ode* 4.2, where Augustus is being praised in Pindaric style: "note for example the location of Augustus against the background of eternity in the tenth stanza, and the antepenultimate stanza's repetition of *Io Triumphe* [lines 49 and 50] with the proclamation *non semel dicemus* '*Io Triumphe*—we will say it not just once' [50]."

[44]Cf. Putnam p. 45. Also Davis p. 135.

‘I’m not the man I used to be under the régime of good Cinara’. Suddenly, I am not the man I used to be—when I used to be under the régime of Cinara. I am no longer the love poet who sings at symposia. The regimen of *cinara* is over. The aphrodisiac diet is finished. Bacchus must stop drinking and Apollo can start singing again. So too his bird of song can start to sing. And so too the poet Pindar can now sing, replicated by Horace. The poet replicates the poet who replicates the swan who replicates Apollo.[45] But the song of the swan, bird of Apollo, threatens to become the swan song for Horace. As Putnam remarks, “the call of the swan elicits what is in fact a moving swan song to his {425|426} human and imaginative past.”[46] And the winged boy remains, alas for the poet, *durus* ‘hard’ at the end of *Ode* 4.1. That is much to be regretted by one who is now *durus* to the régime of Venus, as we had heard him say at the beginning of *Ode* 4.1—unless the *durus* man and the *durus* boy can become replicas of each other.[47]

---

[45]On this topic, I have benefited from the advice of Cynthia Damon. She has helped me understand how (1) the privileging of Apollo over Dionysus in *Ode* 4.1 and (2) the ambition to replicate Pindar in *Ode* 4.2 may provide a rationale for Horace’s poetic program in composing Book 4 of the *Odes*, where the earlier Horatian model of sympotic / erotic poetry is shaded over and the distinctly Pindaric model of choral / praise poetry is highlighted. She draws my attention to the choral implications of passages like *Odes* 4.2.45–52, 4.5.36–40, 4.10.6–8, 4.15.25–32.

[46]Putnam p. 46.

[47][[The conference at the University of Pennsylvania to which I refer in this footnote took place at the end of the academic year 1992–1993. This conference is described by Matthew S. Santirocco, “Introduction: Recovering Horace,” in the special issue of *Classical World* Vol. 87, No. 5 (May - Jun., 1994), p. 355.]] The task of writing about the poetry of Horace for the meetings at the University of Pennsylvania was turned into a pleasure by the occasions it gave me to learn about the complexities of this poetry from a variety of congenial scholars who attended those meetings, including Ronnie Ancona, Henry Bender, Joseph Farrell, Henry Hoenigswald, Michèle Lowrie, Sheila Murnaghan, Ellen Oliensis, Lee Pearcy, Ralph Rosen, and especially Matthew Santirocco and Michael Putnam. Thanks to Professor Farrell, I made contact with John McMahon, from whose research on ancient lore about aphrodisiacs I stand to learn a great deal. A later version of my paper was presented at a symposium, organized by Marcel Detienne and Giulia Sissa at the Johns Hopkins University (October 1, 1993), on the topic of Apollo and Dionysus. A still later version was aired at a round-table session of the Civilizations of Ancient Greece and Rome seminar of the Center for Literary and Cultural Studies at Harvard, chaired by Deborah Beck (December 16, 1993). Richard Thomas served as the respondent to my paper, and I am grateful to him for his incisive critique. I am also grateful for the advice given by several scholars attending the session, especially Cynthia Damon, James Halporn, and Mary Jaeger. I have tried to address, however briefly, some of the important

points that they raised.

---

points that they raised.