INTRODUCTION

1. LYRIC IMPULSE AND LYRIC CHALLENGE

These lines of Horace’s first and programmatic ode suggest to us at least one reason why he tackled the challenge of composing lyric poems in Latin. His earliest success had been in the native Roman genre of satire. The subject matter of satire was everyday life, and its characteristic tone was critical. The writer of satire – he might not even regard himself as a poet (cf. S. 1.4.39–42) – had therefore to keep his feet on the ground. The lyric poet on the other hand escaped the world of everyday (secernunt populo), he removed himself to a cool grove, far away from the heat of the town, where he joined the dance with nimble Nymphs and Satyrs. Nymphs and Satyrs of course only exist in an imagination nurtured on literary tradition (doctus), not in the satirist’s real world. The imagination of the lyric poet, who now dons the persona of the uates (cf. 31.2), is inspired by Muses (Euterpe and Polyhymnia); the satirist needed no such assistance, nor was he doctus, in the way that a lyric poet was. Lyric is thus presented in these lines as something both liberating and demanding.

The liberating power of lyric was generated above all by its diversity as a genre. To a Roman reader and poet the Greek tradition of lyric song was presented as a ‘canon’ of nine poets, whose range of themes and tones answered human experience far more fully than the restricted scope of Roman satire. On transforming himself into a lyric uates, Horace could deal with more varied issues and situations, which all had different and appropriate tones of voice for him to develop. This variety was part and parcel of the tradition of lyric composition which he appropriated from Greece. Greek lyric was polymorphous, thanks to the service of song in occasions public (praise, lament, prayer) and private (love and friendship, the symposium). The lyric tradition thus kept Horace linked to a realistic world in which men and women fall in love, enjoy a drink together...

---

1 Here and in the commentary poems within the first book are referred to by their number, and where needed line number.

2 For the so-called canon of lyric poets see Pfeiffer 1968: 182–3. For a handy overview of Horace’s exploitation of the canonical singers see G. Burzacchini, art. ‘melica’ in E0 1 68–76.
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(Carm. 20), need consoling for the loss of loved ones (Carm. 24), pray to the gods (Carm. 21, 30, and 31), or are moved either to celebrate congenial divinities in hymns (Carm. 10, 21) or to secure the favour of a potentially dangerous one (Carm. 35). Such situations are common, but lyric treatment invited greater refinement than the satires; in the satires, for instance, men have dinner together, in the lyrics they meet for symposia (Carm. 20 and 27). Fantasy too is liberated and refined by the lyric: in the fourth ode, Horace envisages a springtime in which Venus dances beneath the moon with her retinue of Nymphs and Graces, engaging figures who had not appeared in Latin poetry before Horace. Satire could not rise above a farting Priapus (S. 1.8.46–7).

Even where satire shared themes with lyric, such as the charms of the countryside or sex, the lyric treatment will appeal more to the imagination or fancy. This is achieved for instance by the introduction of the religious or divine element, which was excluded from the realistic genres of satire or invective.

Horace does not hesitate to claim that his country estate is under the direct protection of Faunus, a figure who would have no place in an account of the farm in the satires. Moreover, the girl he welcomes into this protected landscape, Tyndaris, is a musician, whereas in satire Horace’s girlfriends of choice are hardly so congenial and attractive (cf. S. 1.2.123–4 and 5.82–5). Love could be explored in lyric more sympathetically and more variously (albeit idiosyncratically).

But the appropriation of lyric, if it was to prove relevant, presented the poet with particular challenges: Horace had to remodel the Alcaean tradition for Roman conditions. These conditions were fundamentally different from those of the smaller, simpler, and poorer world of the Greek. Horace’s world was altogether grander. His readers were masters of a vast territorial empire, and one of his addressees, Iccius, is off to conquer Arabia (poem 29). The Romans’ private life was altogether more luxurious, and so it is impossible to imagine Alcaeus listing anything comparable to the grands crus which we find in poem 20. Contemporary political conditions at Rome were far more momentous than anything Alcaeus had been involved in. Granted he had been active in the political life of his own community (cf. Lesbio ciui 32.5), his historical activity looks like little more than turf-wars when compared to the recent civil conflicts of the Romans. Thus Horace

3 Murray 1993 is fundamental on Horace’s adroit adaptation of symposiastic song to Roman social practices.
4 N–H 1970: 20 observe with reference to the extravagance of the second ode that Horace ‘allows himself a licence in an ode that would have been impossible in a prosaic epistle’.
7 This issue is discussed in more detail by N–H 1970: xii: ‘the differences between the two poets are in fact more illuminating than the resemblances’ and Hubbard 1973: 9–15; similarly, Wilkinson 1968: 11 speaks of the ‘small amount of spirit’ Horace derived from his models.
had to overhaul the lyric tradition comprehensively so that it could adequately accommodate Roman experience, or more specifically Horatian experience. For instance, by the time he started writing the odes Horace’s engagement in civic life had settled firmly into the private sphere. To be sure, in the epodes he had tackled contemporary civic concerns, but his tone had had to suit the genre: it had to be critical, as in epodes 7 and 16, where he addressed his fellow Romans as criminals, *scelesti* (7.1), and was unrelievedly pessimistic. Lyric provided a different platform for Horace’s engagement with the events of the day. For instance, Alcaeus composed a song to be sung at a symposium on the occasion of the death of his personal political enemy, the tyrant Myrsilus. Horace, acknowledging by means of a motto or quotation in the opening line of *Carm.* 37 a debt to this model, reconfigured his own celebrations after the defeat of Cleopatra as religious and national. Incidentally, he can praise her vanquisher, Octavian, but without tipping over into propaganda: Cleopatra’s husband, the outlawed Marcus Antonius, is nowhere mentioned. More generally, Horace again combines the civic note with the religious in *Carm.* 21, following perhaps in the footsteps of Anacreon, *GL II* 348, who had described Artemis’ attachment to the city of Magnesia. But concern for the collapsing state (ruentis imperi rebus 2.25–6) demanded a more specific remedy, through the help of a saviour, and here the poetry of civic concern embraces panegyric, a matter we may now turn to.

Sometime during the second century the Roman aristocracy began to cultivate literary men as heralds of their own renown, adopting a long-standing Greek cultural practice. Ennius (not at first a Roman citizen) was an early exponent of the panegyric of successful generals in epic (see Cicero, *Pro Archia* 22). Greek poets too provided what was wanted, as we see in the figure of Archias. Cicero makes it plain in defending that poet (*Pro Archia* 19–21) that he was much in demand for his laudatory epics (none of which has survived). Praise presented the Roman citizen however with something of a challenge. A Greek or other non-citizen could be expected to attach himself to a high-ranking member of the dominant power, but a freeborn Roman had to watch his step more carefully when praising a superior; it could seem overtly self-serving. Lyric tradition opened up several honourable paths to tread. As White 1993: 82–3 demonstrated, occasional verse cast flashes of publicity onto the individuals whose activities could be brought into the field of lyric discourse. He offers as an example *Carm.* 36, in which Horace celebrates on behalf of a superior friend, Lamia, the return to Rome of Numida. Nothing is said about Numida, and very little about Lamia, so the poem focuses upon the return as an occasion for a party, with incense, sacrifice, music, drink and crowns and girls: all central to the lyric tradition. Occasional verse enabled a poet to praise decently without loss of his own self-respect. A specific occasion also allowed praise by indirection, as we see in *Carm.* 31: the dedication of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine in October of 28 is heralded at the outset, 8

8 Here and in the commentary dates are ‘before Christ’, unless otherwise indicated.
and that obliquely praises the temple’s dedicator, Octavian; but the poem (unlike Propertius 2.31, which celebrates the same occasion) veers off into a personal prayer for well-being. The public occasion is thus restricted to its impact on the private world of the poet, but the public figure is implicitly acknowledged.

The Greek lyric tradition had heavily invested in praise, which had taken its grandest form in choral song. Appropriation of that more solemn voice (minus of course the song and the dance) allowed Horace to develop a poetry in praise of national figures. He took up that challenge in the twelfth ode (and, again by indirection, in the sixth). The manner of the choral lyric of Pindar, however, was something which at this stage he was reluctant to attempt (cf. Epist. 1.3.12–13), though he would make amends in his final book of odes.

Horace owes a great deal to the varied tradition of early Greek song, but his own lyric voice has characteristics which are much less prominent, perhaps even non-existent, in his models. One such characteristic is moralizing and the giving of advice. Very little of this is found in Alcaeus; in one poem, GL i 38A, he recommends drinking while he and his companion are young, because death will put a stop to it. Such melancholy advice is rare in him, but common in Horace, whose eye is often on the right use of time and on its passage (Carm. 4, 9, 11, 16, 23, 25). The now aged Sappho also comes close to such a sentiment in her advice to young girls to dance, but her focus on time’s passage is less sharp. Anacreon once advises moderation in drinking, GL ii 356B, a song that provides the germ of Carm. 27, but Horace advises moderation in many other situations (Carm. 18, 31, 33, 38). The admonitory or paraenetic tone of the lyrics is the reverse of the critical voice of the satires. In short, one way or another, Horace’s persona is invariably that of the moralist. Throughout his works there is a steadiness and integrity of his observation of the workings of human nature, and from his work generally we derive the hope that life makes sense.

Other individual traits of the poet’s persona are irony and humour, neither prominent features of early Greek lyric. David West has long emphasized Horace’s humour (though sometimes he goes further than some can follow him, e.g. in his account in 1995: 167 of the ‘largely humorous’ Carm. 34). Humour is prominent in Carm. 22, which starts so seriously but soon descends to puns and oxymora; its successor, Carm. 23, is tenderly humorous. For a poem which

---

9 Not his most attractive feature according to Hubbard 1973: 7–9.
10 Fraenkel 1957: 178 noted that the advice given by Alcaeus was, so far as we can tell, different in character from Horace’s.
11 Barchiesi 2009: 325 provides a crisp résumé of how Horace exploits time; more generally cf. F. Citti, art. ‘tempo’ in EO ii 645b–653a.
12 West 2005 offers a completion of GL i 38.11–22, now to be seen as a complete poem.
13 As Syndikus 2001: 6 puts it, song for Horace represents the spirit of a well-ordered life, in which disharmonies are resolved.
14 For Alcaeus’ lack of humour see MacLachlan 1997: 154.
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is rightly seen as one of Horace’s most original experiments, Carm. 27, ‘one of the cleverest that Horace ever wrote’ (N–H 1970: 311), he devised a technique of dramatic presentation unprecedented either in early Greek lyric or even in Hellenistic poems which narrate an ongoing series of events. What makes the poem is its ironical exaggerations and its bantering tone, a tone adopted too in Carm. 29, to Iccius, whose dreams of military glory are comically overdrawn and ironically deflated.

Summing up, with Feeney 1993: 43, we may say that ‘the relationship which Horace establishes between himself and Greek lyric . . . develops his own vision of what being a lyric poet means in the place and time in which he found himself’. Horace would seem to have chosen to exploit ‘civic’ themes precisely because of their absence in Catullus.16

2. TECHNICAL CHALLENGES OF LYRIC

The challenge to the imagination was not all that Horace had to contend with by any means. He had also to naturalize the principal metres of Greek monodic song and to devise appropriate registers of language, a matter for which he had very little guidance since, as he claimed, he was the first to transplant lyric from Greece to Rome.17

A. Metre

In spite of Horace’s claim to have naturalized Greek lyric metres, earlier Roman poets had experimented with the adaptation of some lyric verse lengths. In the early first century, for example, the bizarre Laevius had composed with an eye on Anacreon and Sappho, but it is significant that his lyrics were not reckoned to have conformed to the ‘lyric stamp’ in accordance with the ‘rule of the Greeks’. Nonetheless he acclimatized the hendecasyllable (a line of eleven syllables), which was to become the lyric verse of choice for Catullus. Catullus experimented with other metres, some of which Horace too adopted, for instance the so-called glyconic, pherecratean, and greater asclepiad; twice he used the sapphic in its

15 See Martin 2002.
16 It is worth noting that Horace did not celebrate weddings, arguably because Catullus had done that so well before him. Perhaps for the same reason he did not express his own grief at the death of a friend or family member.
17 Rossi 2009: 376–7 not only supports this claim, but demonstrates the degree to which even Horace’s ‘Greek colleagues’ had lost the feel for lyric.
18 For his work see Courtney 2003: 118–20, and the appreciation by Barchiesi 2009: 320–1.
stanzaic form. And that brings us to a capital difference between Horace and his predecessors: Laevius presumably, and Catullus manifestly, did not establish the four-line stanza as the cornerstone of lyric composition. Most of their lyrics were composed in continuous lines of the same metre (κοσμαλτίστοιοι). Horace composed in this way too (the first ode, for example, repeats exactly the same verse length in thirty-six lines), but he broke decisively with the Roman lyric tradition and reverted to the stanzaic structure found above all in Alcaeus and Sappho.

Horace also imposed greater regularity on the metrical patterns of the individual lines which make up his lyric stanzas. His Aecolian models, Sappho and Alcaeus, had composed lyric to be sung, and so their metrical patterns still showed considerable flexibility. Whilst it would be rash to exclude categorically the possibility that Horace intended his poems to be sung, it is clear that their publication in book form presupposes reading rather than singing. The reading voice expresses metrical patterns better if they are more regular, and regularity is what Horace imposed upon the Aecolian verse lengths. For instance, he decided that the first two syllables, the so-called ‘base’ of asclepiads, glyconics and pherecrateans, should invariably be spondaic. Catullus before him had been as liberal as the Greek lyric poets in admitting short syllables to the base, which could thus be either an iamb or a trochee (though he does show a preference for the spondee). Catullus had written two poems in the sapphic stanza, and like Sappho he had allowed the fourth syllable of the long lines to be either long or short, nor had he felt any need for a regularly recurrent place in the line where a word should end. Horace however made it a rule that the fourth syllable should be long and that a word should end after the fifth syllable (or just occasionally after the sixth). He seems to have had no predecessor in the use of the alcaic stanza, but here too he imposed upon himself the sort of restrictions

20 Catullus could of course compose in stanzas or strophes whenever he wanted, as can be seen in the hymn, Carm. 34, and the wedding song, Carm. 61, in which four glyconics are followed by a pheorcratean, a structure found in Anacreon. But generally he preferred not to do so. It is also significant that the lyric poems of Callimachus were composed in continuous lines of the same verse length.


22 For the issue of singing the odes see G. Milanese, art. ‘Musica’ in EO n 921–5, Lyons 2006 and Rossi 2009. The Carmen sacrae was surely at least chanted.

23 The point is stressed by Rossi 2009: 369: ‘reading valorizes all the more the virtuosity of the caesurae (however monotonous)’.

24 In fact, regularization started well before Horace, as West 1992: 148 notes for the treatment of the ‘base’ even by Sappho and Alcaeus. The tightening-up process continued when these metrical schemes were adopted by later Greek poets (not that there were many successors). Horace builds on a tradition of growing strictness. We see a similar movement in the stricter Roman adaptation of the dactylic hexameter, and in the restriction of the last word in the elegiac pentameter to two syllables.


26 For this tightening up see Raven 1965: 144 and N–H 1970: xlii.
already noted, but not found in his Greek model: Alcaeus treated the fifth syllable of the first three lines as anceps, but Horace made it invariably long, and he insisted that a word generally end after the fifth syllable in the first two lines. These adjustments give Horace’s alcaic stanzas a much more weighty effect than that of the original, especially in the third line. The regular position in the lines of word-endings also helped to produce clearly defined blocks of words, which facilitated their artful placement, a feature which again is appreciated more by reading than by singing. It will be discussed more fully below.

We may now look in more detail at the metrical schemes of the odes in the first book. We begin with those constructed out of the asclepiad and its briefer partners, the glyconic and the pherecratean. The asclepiad consists of the ‘base’ (two long syllables) followed by two choriambics, rounded off by two more syllables (one short, one anceps); there is always word-end (marked thus: | ) after the first choriamb. The scheme is represented thus:

\[ \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \times \]

An extra choriamb can be added to produce the so-called ‘greater’ asclepiad, thus:

\[ \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \times \]

A choriamb is removed from the asclepiad to produce the glyconic, thus:

\[ \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \mid \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \times \]

And finally to produce the pherecratean, the penultimate short syllable is removed from the glyconic, thus:

\[ \text{\textendash\textendash\textendash} \times \]

Metrical schemes based on the asclepiadic lines have been numbered from first to fifth, but without consistency. Here the numbers assigned by Klingner, and adopted by N–H and West, are followed. The numbers of the poems composed in these systems are given in brackets.

First asclepiad: a series of asclepiad lines written κατά στίχον. (1)
Second asclepiad: three asclepiads followed by a glyconic. (6, 15, 24, 33)
Third asclepiad: two asclepiads followed by a pherecratean and a glyconic. (5, 14, 21, 23)

\[ ^{27} \text{For these see Raven 1965: 145–7, and the fuller analysis in N–H 1970: xli–xliv.} \]
\[ ^{28} \text{See Page 1895: xxvii with n., and Wilkinson 1966: 110–11; West 1995: 128 helpfully illustrates the effect of the difference of weight between the third and fourth lines in } \text{Carm. 27, and N–H 1970: xli–xliv illustrate the favoured patterns of word length in the third line.} \]
\[ ^{29} \text{Important discussion of details of Horace’s treatment of these metres will be found in N–H 1970: xxxvii–xlv and by M. Rosellini, art. ‘metri lirici’ in } \text{EO } \text{ii912–19.} \]
Fourth asclepiad: a glyconic and an asclepiad form distichs (it is not necessarily
the case that the distichs should be doubled to form stanzas). (3, 13, 19, 36)
Fifth asclepiad: a series of ‘greater’ asclepiad lines written κατά στίχον.

The alcaic stanza is composed of four lines. The first two have eleven
syllables (hendecasyllables), with word-end normally after the fifth; the third has
nine syllables (enneasyllable) and the fourth ten (decasyllable). The scheme is
represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The sapphic stanza is also composed of four lines. The first three have eleven
syllables (hendecasyllables), with word-end normally after the fifth; the fourth
line has five syllables, and is called the adonius. The scheme is represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

One poem, the eighth, is composed in a related metre, called the ‘greater’
sapphic. This consists of distichs, the first line of which is an aristophaneus, and
the second a Sapphic hendecasyllable to which a further choriamb has been added.
The scheme is represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Finally three poems in the first book are composed in what metricians call
‘epodic’ metres. The metre of the fourth ode consists of distichs, a greater
archilochian followed by an iambic trimeter catalectic (i.e., one syllable in the
final metron has been suppressed). The greater archilochian is composed of two
metrically different cola, a dactylic tetrameter and an ithyphallic; resolutions
may be found in the first three dactyls, and there must be word-end after the
fourth one. The iambic trimeter has a normal caesura after the fifth syllable. The
metrical scheme is represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\times & \times & \times \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

39 Strictly speaking the original alcaic and sapphic stanzas consisted of three lines; the
four-line layout is owed to Alexandrian editorial practice (Rossi 2009: 375, n.64).
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The metre of the seventh and twenty-eighth odes is the same: a dactylic hexameter is followed by a dactylic tetrameter, and the scheme is represented thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\odot \odot & \odot \odot \odot \odot \times \\
\odot \odot & \odot \odot \odot \odot \times
\end{align*}
\]

B. Linguistic register and style

A further, more complex task which Horace faced in his creation of Latin lyric was forging a lyric style, or rather styles. Looking back to his Greek models, we find in Anacreon a refined elegance that is the polar opposite of the sublime intricacies of Pindar; Alcaeus, Horace’s chief model, might be said on the other hand to have no clear style at all. Yet all were in the ‘canon’, and all might be laid under contribution for the development of Latin lyric (cf. for Anacreon Carm. 29, and for Pindar Carm. 12). So unlike his Greek models, who could stick to a fairly uniform and individual manner of their own devising, Horace had to become something of a chameleon, adopting different styles for different lyric situations. His success was duly recognized by Quintilian, a teacher of rhetoric in the late first-century AD, when he said (Institutio oratoria 10.1.96) that Horace was ‘occasionally elevated’ (insurgit aliquando), and that he was ‘full of agreeable charm’ (plenus est iucunditatis et gratiae).

If once again we glance briefly at his Latin predecessors, we will have a better idea of how he faced up to the challenge of producing his varied lyric styles. Laevius, if the excerpts from his lyrics that are all we have to go on are not eccentric, was addicted to unusual word-forms, especially compound words, but he also used urbane colloquialisms, like bellus (20), and diminutives. These linguistic features are still prominent in Catullus’ styles too, though with a difference. Catullus furthermore allowed a colloquial word-form, mi for mihi, in one of his sapphic odes (51.1.7). Horace set his face against all such things. Compound words, for instance, are few and formed in more restricted ways; diminutives are severely limited; and word-forms that were more at home in

31 See the careful account of F. Muecke, art. ‘Lo stile lirico oraziano’ in EO n 777–83. N–H 1970 xxii offer a paragraph on the issue.


33 See the résumé in Courtney 2003: 118.

34 Simpson 1879: 182–5 provides a handy list of ‘familiar’ expressions and at 185–6 a list of diminutives. Ross 1969: 19–22 discusses Catullus’ compound adjectives, and at 159 he notes their difference from Laevius’; at 110–11 he discusses bellus in the poet’s urbane style, and at 158–9 the diminutives (where again he notes their difference from Laevius’). Jocelyn 1999 however further refines upon Ross’s distinctions, and insists that Catullus’ ‘lyric’ styles are highly artificial, and do not reflect the ordinary conversation of the élite as much as is sometimes supposed.
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the spoken language are generally banned from the patently 'textual' poems. In short, the style is in general further removed than that of his predecessors from the spoken language, and given greater formality. It needs however to be added that some features of his diction are not fairly described as 'prosaic'. Words like condicio or delecto, for instance, are more properly described as 'neutral', since they were available for use in a wide range of genres, even the most elevated (tragedy, history). Perhaps what needs to be borne in mind is that an ode is generally speaking framed as an address by the persona of the poet to an individual within his own society; much of the language normally used by the élite in familiar conversation ought to be entirely at home in lyric.35

In contradistinction to the restrictions placed upon the sorts of words that might be allowed into lyric, the door was opened to a range of words and syntagms which marked the poems off from even the most formal Latin prose. Such features as archaism (the revival of old words), coinage, metaphor, poetical diction (the use of a lexicon peculiar to poetry), and grecism (both lexical in the borrowing of Greek words, and syntactical in the creation of Latin constructions based upon a Greek model) all contributed to the literariness of the style.36 It should be borne in mind however that many of these devices are something more than ornaments. The aim of a special poetic syntax for instance was to produce a dense and economical style, often by dispensing with words or constructions, normal in prose, that clog the expression, e.g., prepositions or subordinate clauses. Especially prominent is the extended use made of the infinitive and of the genitive case with adjectives (again, a glance at the Index will establish this point). A peculiar virtue of the 'figure' grecism is that the lexicon was as a rule standard Latin, but the resulting construction was novel, as we see at 15.18 celerem sequi 'swift to pursue/in pursuit'.

C. Word order and placement

More artificial than the language of lyric is the placement of the words in the sentence and in the stanza. Wilkinson 1966: 218–19 noted that Catullus had only just begun to show the way to more elaborate word placement in his own stanzaic lyrics (the hymn to Diana, 34, and the first epithalamium, 61). It was left to Horace to exploit the possibilities of artistic arrangement to the fullest, and there are numerous studies of his achievement, among which Naylor 1922 must take pride of place.37 Three factors were to be taken into account by the poet: metrical exigency must have played some part in the position a word might

35 It is worth remembering that even in epic everyday words, like same, or word-forms, like mi, will be found in the speeches of the characters.
36 The Index should be consulted for these features.