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PREFACE.

This edition of Horace's Odes and Epodes was undertaken at the request of the Syndics of the Pitt Press.

In the text, at a few notorious passages, I have admitted conjectures which give a good sense with very little alteration of the letters. The spelling is, for obvious reasons, adapted in the main to that of Lewis and Short's lexicon. In regard to final -es and -is in acc. plur. of the 3rd declension I have almost always followed the indications given in Keller's Epilegomena.

In preparing the notes, I have used Orelli's edition (as revised in 1885 by Hirschfelder) freely for illustrative quotations. It is the common quarry. Besides this, I have referred very often to the editions of A. Kiessling (1884) and Dean Wickham (1874), less frequently to those of Mr Page (1886), C. W. Nauck (1880) and H. Schütz (1874). The dates given are the dates of my copies.

I am greatly indebted to my friend Dr Postgate, of Trinity College, for many corrections and suggestions.

J. G.

Nottingham,
October, 1895.
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INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Life of Horace.

Our knowledge of the life of Horace is derived chiefly from his own works, which teem with allusions to his past history and present occupations. A few minor details are supplied either by the scholiasts or by a brief biography of the poet which is found in some MSS. and which may be attributed with certainty to Suetonius (C. Suetonius Tranquillus, flor. A.D. 150).

Quintus Horatius Flaccus\(^1\) was born on the 8th of December\(^2\) B.C. 65\(^3\) at Venusia, an ancient military colony situated near Mt. Voltur and the river Aufidus, on the confines of Apulia and Lucania\(^4\).

Horace's father was a freedman, possibly a Greek by birth\(^5\).

---

1 For the full name cf. Sat. ii. 6. 37, Carm. iv. 6. 44, Epod. 15. 12.
2 For the month cf. Epist. i. 20. 27. The day is supplied by Suetonius.
3 Horace names the year by the consul L. Manlius Torquatus, Carm. iii. 21. 1 (nata mecum consule Manlio) and Epod. 13. 6.
4 For Mt. Voltur, see Carm. iii. 4. 10. For the rest, Carm. iv. 9. 1 (longe sonantem natus ad Aufidum), Sat. ii. 1. 34, 35 (Lucanus an Appulas anceps iam Venusinum arat finam sub utrumque colonum), and Sat. i. 6. 73 (where the Venusian boys are said to be magnis et centurionibus orti).
5 Sat. i. 6. 6 (me libertino patre natum). The foundation for the suggestion that the father was a Greek is merely (1) that he had been a

G. H.
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By profession, he was a tax-collector or debt-collector, and perhaps also a dealer in salt-fish (salsamentarius), if Suetonius may be trusted. From small beginnings, he seems to have acquired some fortune, sufficient, at any rate, to warrant him in removing from Venusia to Rome, and devoting himself to his son’s education. To his father’s fond and judicious care of him, during his school days, Horace more than once bears eloquent testimony.

At Rome, Horace was put to an expensive school, kept by a crusty old grammarian, L. Orbilius Pupillus, nicknamed ‘the flogger.’ Here he studied, among other things, the early Latin poets (such as Livius Andronicus) and the Iliad of Homer.

From school Horace proceeded (about the age of 19) without doubt) to the university of Athens, where he attended the lectures of the Academy. The course would include geometry, logic, moral philosophy and probably also rhetoric or literary criticism. In after years, Horace no longer adhered to the slave and must have been a foreigner, and (2) that Horace at an early age was sufficiently fluent in Greek to write Greek verses (Sat. i. 10. 31—35). It is not known how the father acquired the name of Horatius. According to usage, Flaccus (‘flap-eared’) would have been his slave-name and Horatius the name of his former master. (See Dict. of Ant. 3rd ed. s. v. Nomen.) The colony of Venusia was enrolled in the tribus Horatia, and the father may have been a slave in the service of the town.

1 Sat. i. 6. 86 (ut fuit ipse, caeator).
2 Sat. i. 6. 71 (monro paufer agello).
3 Sat. i. 6. 71—96, esp. 81, 82 (ipse mihi custos incorruptissimus omnes | circum doctores aderat).
4 Besides Sat. 1. 6, see also Sat. 1. 4. 105 sqq.
5 Sat. 1. 6. 75—80.
6 Epist. 11. 1. 69—71 (non equidem insector deinde carmina Livi | esse rer, memini quae flagosum mihi parvo | Orbilium dictae).
7 Epist. 11. 2. 41, 42 (Romae nutriti mihi contigit atque doceri | tertius Grai quantum nocuisseit Achilles).
8 Epist. 11. 2. 44. 45 (adieciere bonae paullo plus artis Athenaei, | scilicet ut vellem curvo dionisce rectum | atque inter silvas Academi quaeere verum).
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xi

Academic opinions in moral philosophy, but professed himself a free thinker inclined to Epicureanism.1

During his stay at Athens, Horace made the acquaintance of many young Romans of noble birth,2 by whom apparently he was introduced, in September B.C. 44, to M. Junius Brutus, the Liberator. Brutus, at this time, was passing through Athens on his way to the province of Macedonia which had been assigned to him (as praetor) by Julius Caesar before his murder. (Cassius meanwhile was proceeding to his province, Syria.) As governor of Macedonia, Brutus was collecting an army, partly to oppose C. Antonius, who claimed the province as nominee of the senate, and partly to combat some turbulent tribes of Thracians, who were harassing the borders. In this army, Horace received the appointment of military tribune. He marched with the troops through Macedonia and Thrace, crossed the Hellespont, saw a good deal of Asia Minor5 and returned with the combined forces of Brutus and Cassius to the field of Philippi (Nov. B.C. 42). In the first battle at this place, Brutus was victorious; in the second (twenty days later) he was defeated, and Horace fled,3 never to bear arms again.

1 Epist. 1. 1. 14 (nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri), and Epist. 1. 4. 16 (Epicuri de gregi porcum). Cf. also Carm. 1. 34. 1—5.
2 Some of them are named in Sat. 1. 10. 81—87.
3 Plutarch, Brutus, 24.
4 Sat. 1. 6. 48 (quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno). The statement here is doubtless an exaggeration, for there should have been six tribunes to the legion.
5 It is clear that Horace was at Clazomenae and saw the trial described in Sat. 1. 7. The rest of his campaigning, before Philippi, is mere matter of inference. He speaks of Thrace in winter (e.g. Carm. 1. 37. 10) and of the Hellespont (Epist. 1. 3. 4) as if he had seen them, and he addresses a friend (Carm. 11. 7. 1, 2) as 'O supe tecum tempus in ultimum | deduce Bruto militiae duces.'
6 Carm. 11. 7. 9, 10 (insum Philippus et celerem fugam | sensi, relata non bene parum). Cf. also Carm. 111. 4. 26. In Epod. 1. 16 (written ten years later than Philippi) he describes himself as imbellis | ae firmus parum.
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Soon after the battle, Horace appears to have obtained a pardon from Octavianus and leave to return to Rome. He seems to have travelled nearly all the way by sea and suffered shipwreck, or came near it, at Mons Palinurus on the Lucanian coast. His father was by this time dead, and when he reached Rome, he found himself penniless. It is said that he managed to procure a situation as clerk in some department of the public treasury and that he held this office for about four years (B.C. 41—37). Horace himself says that poverty drove him to making verses, but it is unlikely that he found poetry a source of income. More probably he had introductions to some conservative (i.e. republican) coteries, and used his literary talents to make himself welcome, in spite of his poverty. No other society would have received with favour, at that time, such denunciations of civil war as Epodes 7 and 16, two of Horace's earliest pieces.

The compositions of Horace at this period were undoubtedly either satires in the manner of Lucilius (died B.C. 103), or iambic epodes, mostly satirical, in the manner of Archilochus of Paros (flor. B.C. 700). Through these, probably, he obtained the acquaintance of L. Varius and Vergil, who became his fast friends and introduced him to Maecenas. Some nine months

1 Carm. ii. 4, 12 and 17.
2 Epist. ii. 3. 49—52. (unde simul primum me dimisere Philippo, | decisis humilium pennis inopemque paterni | et laris et fundi puerpertas impulit audax | ut versus facerem.)
3 The authorities are Suetonius, who says scriptum quaestorium comparavit, and the scholiasts to Sat. ii. 6. 36.
4 Epist. i. 19. 26—15 (Farios ego primus iambos | ostendi Latino). The oldest of the published works is Sat. i. 7, which seems to have been written in B.C. 43 or early in 42. Epode 16 seems to have been written on hearing the news of the capture of Perusia, B.C. 40. Sat. i. 2 and 4 were written before Horace became intimate with Maecenas. Epode 7 is assigned to B.C. 36.
5 Sat. i. 6. 54, 55 (optimus olim | Vergilius, post hunc Varius dixit, | quem esse).
INTRODUCTION.

afterwards (B.C. 38) Maecenas invited him to join his circle, and Horace's fortune was made.

C. Cilinius Maecenas was now and for long afterwards the right-hand man of Octavianus in all civil affairs. He was very rich, very fond of literary society, and very generous to literary men. His patronage relieved Horace from poverty and from anxiety about his social position, while it provided the necessary stimulus to a poet who was naturally both lazy and fastidious. The subsequent life of Horace has only a few prominent incidents. In the autumn of B.C. 38 he was one of a large party who accompanied Maecenas to Brundisium. In B.C. 35 he published the first book of the Satires. Soon afterwards Maecenas gratified his dearest wish by presenting him with the small estate in the Sabine district, to which so many loving allusions are made in Horace's works. It seems to have been his habit, at least in later years, to spend the summer and autumn here, the winter at Baiae or Velia or some other seaside resort, and only the spring at Rome. It is likely that Horace was present as a spectator at the battle of Actium in B.C. 31. In B.C. 30 he published the second book of the Satires and, about the same time, the Epodes. About B.C. 23 he published the first three books of the Odes together.

It is obvious, in these works, that the political opinions of Horace had undergone a great change since he fought for the republic at Philippi. By B.C. 31 he had learnt to exult in the

---

3 Ibidem, 61, 63 (revocas nono post mense iubesque | esse in amicorum numero). The year is fixed by Sat. ii. 6. 40, 41, where Horace says that it is nearly eight years since Maecenas me coepit habere suorum | in numero. This satire was written at the end of B.C. 31.

5 The journey is described in Sat. i. 5.

8 The fullest description is in Epist. i. 16. The estate lay in the valley of the Digenia, north of Tibur.

6 Epist. 1. 16. 15, 16. (hae laterae duales, etiam, si credis, amoraeae, | incoluem tibi me praestant Septembribus horis.)

7 Epist. 1. 7. 1—12.

8 Epod. 1 and 9.
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victory at Actium and to hail Caesar as the saviour of society. But there is no sign, even as late as B.C. 20, when the first book of Epistles was published, that Horace was intimate with the emperor. Augustus was perhaps too busy, and too often absent from Rome, to cultivate the poet’s acquaintance. But the intimacy, whenever it began, was of great importance to Horace. He yielded to Augustus what he had refused to Maecenas, and resumed the writing of lyric poetry, which he had meant to abandon. Thus in B.C. 17 he wrote the Carmen Saeculare by command, and about B.C. 14 the odes Carm. IV. 4 and 14, which formed the nucleus of the fourth book. Suetonius, who tells us this, tells us also that Epist. II. 1 was written at the express request of Augustus, who wished his name to be connected with a composition of this class.

The Fourth Book of the Odes was published about B.C. 14, the Second Book of the Epistles about B.C. 12. It is observable that in these works the name of Maecenas is no longer prominent. The first Satire of the first book, the first Epode, the first Ode, the first Epistle had all been addressed to him in

---

1 Epod. 9. Carm. I. 2 and 37.
2 He was absent from Rome B.C. 31 to 29 and 27 to 24; was very ill in 23, and was absent again B.C. 22–19 (October).
3 Epist. I. 9 shows that Horace had some acquaintance with Tiberius before B.C. 20, and perhaps Epist. II. 13 shows as much acquaintance with Augustus.
4 Epist. I. 1.
5 Suetonius says, “scripta quidem eius (Augustus) usque adeo probavit manusque perpetuo opinatus est, ut non modo saeculare carmen componendum inuixerit, sed et Vindelicam victoriam Tiberii Drusisque privignorum suorum, eumque coegerit propter hoc tribus carminum libris ex longo intervallo quarto adde: post sermones vero quosdam lectos nulam sui mentionem habitant ita sit questus ‘irasce me tibi scito, quod non in plerisque eiusmodi scriptis mecum potissimum loquaris. An veres ne apud posceros infame tibi sit, quod videaris familiaris nobis esse’? Expressisse eclogam ad se cuius iniitum est: ‘Cum to sustineas,’ etc.”
6 The date of the Ars Poetica is very uncertain.
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grateful homage for his kindness, but there is no allusion to him in the later publications save an affectionate record of his birthday in *Carm. IV. 11.* It is known, from Tacitus (*Ann. Ill. 30*), that after B.C. 20 there was a coolness between Mæcenas and Augustus. It is clear, too, from Suetonius, that Augustus made efforts to detach Horace from Mæcenas, first by offering him a secretariaship, which was declined, and afterwards by encouraging him to familiarity and giving him handsome presents. One may imagine, therefore, that Horace was in an awkward and unhappy position. He was not easy with Augustus but dared not offend him, and perhaps his compliance with the emperor’s commands roused some jealousy in Mæcenas. But the estrangement, if there was one, between the poet and his patron did not endure. On his deathbed, Mæcenas wrote to Augustus ‘Horati Flacci, ut mei, memor esto.’ He died early in B.C. 8, and Horace followed him to the grave in the same year, on November 27th.

Horace describes himself, in B.C. 20, as ‘short, prematurely grey, fond of the sunshine, quick-tempered but easily appeased.’ Some account of his daily habits in Rome and in the country

1 Augustus had an intrigue with Mæcenas’ wife, Terentia, but Tacitus does not mention this.

2 The following extracts from Suetonius’ life of Horace will suffice: ‘Augustus epistularum quoque officiorum obtulit, ut hoc ad Mæcenatem scripto significaret: ‘ante ipse sufficiabat scribens epistulis amicorum, nunc occupassimus et infirmus Horatium nostrum a te cupio abluere. Veniet ergo ab ista parasitica mensa ad hanc regiam, et nos in epistulis scribendis adiuvarit.’ Ac ne recusanti quidem aut succensus quidquam aut amicitiam suam ingerere desili. Exstant epistulae e quibus argumenti gratia pausa subieci: ‘sume tibi aliquid iuris apud me, tanquam si convictor mihi fueris; recte enim et non temere feceris quoniam id usus mihi tecum esse volui, si per valetudinem tuam fieri possit.’ Praeterea saepè...homuncionem lepidissimum adderat unaque et altera liberalitate locupletavit.’ Horace had, in his later years, a house at Tibur, which was still shown in Suetonius’ time. This is supposed to have been presented to him by Augustus.

3 *Epist. I. 20. 24, 25* (*corporis exigui, praecanum, solibus aptum, | irasci celerem, tamen ut placabilis esset*).
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is given in Sat. 1. 6 and 11. 6. He suffered from dyspepsia and gout or rheumatism, which caused fits of despondency (Epist. 1. 7 and 8). Even without this information about his health, we might easily infer from his poems that he was not a man of a hearty and energetic temperament.

Of the other Augustan poets in whom we are most interested, Horace certainly knew and loved and admired Vergil by far the best (see esp. C. I. 3). He was perhaps familiar with Tibullus (see C. I. 33 and Epist. 1. 4), though Tibullus belonged to the literary circle of Messalla, not to that of Maecenas. He must have known and frequently met Propertius, who was another of Maecenas' prodigé, but for some reason there was no love lost between the two men. Neither mentions the other, but, if Propertius was not the poet whose impertinence is described in Sat. 1. 9, it is pretty clear that he was the poet whose vanity is criticised in Epist. 11. 2. 87 sqq. (See Postgate, Select Elegies of Prop. p. xxxii.) Ovid, who was a friend of Propertius, once actually rebukes Horace (A. A. 11. 271) and omits him from the list of entertaining poets (A. A. 111. 329—340), though he pays him a tardy compliment after his death (Trist. IV. 10. 49).

§ 2. Chronology of the Odes.

It is generally believed, though it is hardly certain, that the first three books of the Odes were published together. Suetonius (supra p. xiv n.) says only that Augustus required Horace to add a fourth book long after the previous three had been published. But internal evidence is strongly in favour of the received opinion. Thus (1) the first ode of the series (1. 1) is addressed to Maecenas, the last but one (111. 29) is also addressed to Maecenas, and the last (111. 30) is a sort of envoi, the poet congratulating himself upon his own achievement. The first book of the Epistles is constructed on just this plan. The first letter and the last but one are addressed to Maecenas, the last is a humorous farewell, committing the book to the
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world. (2) No ode in the first three Books points clearly to a later date than B.C. 24. On the other hand, there are odes in all three Books which refer to this and earlier dates. Thus III. 14 relates to the return of Augustus from Spain: I. 24 to the death of Quintilius: and I. 29 to the expedition of Aelius Gallus into Arabia. All these events happened in B.C. 24. II. 4 was written near the end of Horace's fortieth year, i.e. B.C. 25. I. 31, II. 15 and III. 6 seem all to refer to the restoration of temples which occupied Augustus in B.C. 28. It is obvious that these odes could have been published together. (3) The first Book cannot have been published before B.C. 24, for it refers, as we have just seen, to events of that year. If the second and third Books were written (in part) and published later, why does Horace, about B.C. 20 (see Epist. I. 1. 1—10), speak as if he had long given up the practice of writing lyrics and could not resume it?

If, then, we assume that the first three Books were published together, they must have been published late in B.C. 24 or early in B.C. 23. This date is inferred from the fact that Marcellus, the nephew and adopted son of Augustus, is referred to as the hope of the Caesarian house in Carm. I. 12. 45—48; and Licinius Murena, brother-in-law of Maecenas, is addressed in Carm. II. 10 and referred to as living in III. 19. Marcellus died in the autumn of B.C. 23, and Murena was executed for conspiracy in B.C. 22. It is not likely that Horace published these references to them after their deaths.

The only other dates proposed are B.C. 19 and B.C. 22. The former date is suggested because I. 3 is supposed to refer to the voyage which Vergil took, to Greece, early in B.C. 19; and other odes, especially II. 9, are thought to refer to the expedition into Armenia of B.C. 20. The date of II. 9, however, seems to be fixed to the end of B.C. 25, or the beginning of 24, by the allusion to tropaea Augusti Caesaris, a grand monument so called, voted by the Senate in B.C. 25. (See the concluding note on II. 9.) As to I. 3, it is likely that this ode does not refer to Vergil's last voyage to Greece, for it says nothing about Vergil's ill-health.
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The date B.C. 22 was proposed by the late Prof. Sellar because, in Epist. I. 13, Horace, who was sending his odes to Augustus, directs the messenger (one Vinnius Asina) to push on over hills, rivers and bogs, as if Augustus were far away at the time. Prof. Sellar guessed that Augustus was in Sicily or Asia, whither he went in B.C. 22. It is just as likely, however, that Augustus was at Gabii, undergoing the cold-water treatment which cured him of a grave illness in B.C. 23.

(b) The Fourth Book. The fourth book of the Odes was beyond question written some years after the first three. The opening ode itself, the language of Epist. I. 1. 1—10, and the express evidence of Suetonius (see p. xiv and n.) show that, after the publication of the first three Books, Horace had meant to abandon lyric composition, and only resumed it with reluctance. In the first ode, Horace describes himself as near 50 years of age. Odes 4 and 14 cannot have been written before the winter of B.C. 15, for they celebrate the grand campaign of that year in which Drusus conquered the Vindelici, Tiberius the Rhaeti. Ode 5 must have been written about the same time, for it complains of the long absence of Augustus, who had gone to Gaul in B.C. 16. Ode 2, perhaps, is a little later, for it was written when Augustus seemed likely to return to Rome soon. As a matter of fact, Augustus returned in July B.C. 13. It seems probable therefore that the book was published in B.C. 14 or early in 13. (On the metrical peculiarities of Book IV. see infra pp. xxvii, xxix and the first note to C. IV.)


The Odes of Horace are avowedly imitations of Greek models: but there were Greek models of two quite different kinds, and Horace sometimes imitated them both at the same time. On the one hand, there were public odes, such as Pindar (B.C. 480) wrote—dithyrambs, paeans, songs of victory and dirges—solemn and elaborate compositions, intended to be sung by a trained chorus who danced or marched while they sang. On the other hand, there were lyrics such as Alcaeus or
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Sappho or Anacreon wrote—songs intended to be sung by one person in a private circle.1

The lyrics of Horace (though they were meant to be read or recited, not sung) belong entirely in form, and usually in substance, to the latter class. His metres are all borrowed from the Greek song-writers, and his Muse, as he often says, was inclined to be sportive (iucosa) rather than solemn.2 Even in the Carmen Saeculare and in Carm. iv. 6, which were written for public performance by a chorus, he did not attempt the grand Pindaric elaboration which, he confesses indeed (Carm. iv. 2. 25—32), was beyond him. Yet several of the longer and graver odes (see especially III. 3, 4, 5, 11, 27, iv. 4), though still written in song-metres, are quite Pindaric in the treatment of the theme. In III. 3, for instance, the opening truism, the illustrations from many myths, the elaborate invention of Juno’s compact and the brief sententious close are all clear imitations of Pindar.3 The Pindaric tendency, here

---

1 Ars Poet. 83—85. MUSA DEBIT FIDIBUS DIVOS PIAQUE DEORUM | ET PUGIEM VICTOREM ET EQUUM CERTAINE PRIMUM | ET INVENIUM CURAS ET LIBERA VINA REFERRE. Of these lines the first two refer to chorale odes, and the third to songs. Lyric poetry intended for a chorus is sometimes called melic.

2 See Carm. i. 6: ii. 1. 37 and 12. 1—5, 12—16: iii. 3. 69: iv. 2 and 15.

3 The extant odes of Pindar are all ‘epinikia,’ i.e. celebrations of the victories of certain persons in the great athletic contests of Greece. The following summary of the First Olympian Ode will sufficiently show Pindar’s manner of treating a theme:

1—15. Water is the best drink: gold the choicest metal: so are the Olympic games the noblest games.

15—38. Let us sing the praises of Hiero, the victor, who won glory at Olympia, the home of Pelops.

38—55. Song can give currency to falsehoods, but we must not speak evil of deities.

56—85. Poseidon, of his great love, carried off Pelops. The tale that Pelops was killed and eaten is a base invention.

86—150. Because of the misdeeds of his father Tantalus, Pelops...
xx
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conspicuously seen, to wander into mythology may be noticed too in many of the shorter pieces (e.g. *Carm. I. 7, 18: II. 4, 13: III. 17: IV. 6*). It should be remembered, however, that, in an ode of Pindar, composed for a religious and patriotic festival, a fine local myth, showing forth ‘the glories of our birth and state;’ was especially appropriate; and that moralizing too was, in Pindar’s day, as much expected of the poet as fine images and musical rhythms. He was the popular philosopher, the seer who could discern the tendencies of men’s actions and could pronounce upon them with due blame or praise.

Horace derived, then, from his Greek models a certain discursiveness in his treatment of a theme. He took from them also an extreme ‘abruptness’ of manner, such that it is often difficult to follow the train of his thoughts (see, for instance, I. 7 or II. 2 or III. 4 or IV. 9). This abruptness is due partly to the brevity of his diction and partly to a literary convention. As the poet Gray wrote to his friend Mason, ‘extreme conciseness of expression, yet pure, perspicuous and musical, is one of the great beauties of lyric poetry.’ And the reason is obvious. In short lines, with a marked rhythmical beat, almost every word becomes emphatic and must deserve to be emphatic. This conciseness necessarily leads to abruptness of thought, for the conjunctions and brief explanatory phrases which, in a freer style of composition, serve to mark the connexion of ideas, are excluded from lyrics by their unemphatic character. It is a convention also, between poets and their audience, that lyrics, however elaborate, should profess to be written on the inspiration of the moment, and should therefore seem to be hurried, unpremeditated, unmethocical. They are spoilt if they become argumentative.

In real inspiration Horace was probably deficient. Certainly was sent back to earth and, by help of Poseidon, he won Hippodamia to wife in a chariot-race at Olympia.

150—160. From that time forth the glory of the Olympian races has shone abroad.

161—184. I sing the victor, Hiero, wisest and greatest of kings. Win again, Hiero, and be thou first among kings, I among poets.
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his poems are not, to use Wordsworth's phrase, 'the spontaneous overflow of powerful feeling.' He himself describes them as laborious (opera carmina C. iv. 2. 31). But they are sincere, that is to say, they are the genuine expression of his thoughts and sentiments; and if they do not reveal to us a man of profound insight or ardent passions or lofty imagination, they show at least sympathy, affection, humour, a generous admiration of great men and noble deeds, and a sturdy pride in his vocation. And a man with these qualities, if his vocation happens to be literature, has always been sure of a lasting success. The tact which results from his sympathy and humour appears in his style as well as in his matter, and his writings have the charm which is recognized as 'companionable.' In our own country, Addison and Lamb, in France, Montaigne and Mme. de Sévigné, are conspicuous examples of the Horatian temperament and of its enduring popularity. And Horace had the advantage of writing in verse and of using a language which gave the utmost assistance to his special literary talent. 'The best words in the best places' is a definition of poetry that Coleridge was fond of repeating. It might serve for a description of Horace's writing. He was gifted by nature with a fine ear and an infinite capacity for taking pains, and he had had a scholarly education. He borrowed, from Greek, metres of peculiar swing, and he had, in his native Latin, a store of sonorous andpregnant words, a terse and lucid grammar, and the liberty to arrange his words to the best advantage. With these resources, he has produced an incomparable series of brilliant phrases ('jewels five words long' Tennyson calls them) which are at once easy to remember and impossible to translate.¹

¹ It is idle to quote instances where almost every line is an instance, but one might choose simplex munditiae or insaniens sapientia or splendidus mundior as examples of Horace's untranslateable brevity: dulce et decorum est pro patria mori or nihil est ab omni parte beatum as examples of finished commonplace: non indicoro pulvere sordidos or intiminatoris fulget honoribus or impavidum serient ruinas as specimens of sonority, and qui fragilem truci commissit pelago ratem as an instance of the artful arrangement of contrasted words.
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To a writer with this faculty, it matters little that his ideas are scanty and commonplace. His readers have the less trouble in understanding him and agreeing with him, and can surrender themselves to the charm of his diction. It is because we all find in Horace ‘what oft was thought but ne’er so well express’d’ that he has been used, for so many ages, as the indispensable model of literary excellence.


Horace’s Latin is a good deal affected by the conciseness which, as we have just said (p. xx) was demanded by the perpetually recurring emphases of lyric poetry. For the sake of brevity he often used expressions which may be called ‘short cuts,’ intended to avoid unemphatic prepositions and conjunctions, and to bring important words closer together. The most striking instances of this practice are his use of the genitive case and of the infinitive mood. His freedom in the use of these constructions was undoubtedly imitated from the Greek, though it is not always possible to produce a Greek parallel for every Horatian instance.

1. The following are examples, in the Odes, of unusual genitives: diva potens Cyprī (I. 3. 1), agrestium regnavit populum (III. 30. 11), desine querelārum (II. 9. 17, 18), absti-neto irarum (III. 27. 69, 70), integer vitæ sèlerisque furus (I. 22. 1), patriae exul (II. 16. 19), prosperam frugum (IV. 6. 39), fertilis frugum (Carm. Sāec. 29), fercula culpae (III. 6. 17), piauper aquae (III. 30. 11), dīves artium (IV. 8. 5), docilis modorum (IV. 6. 43), probably also notus animi paternī (II. 2. 6, though these words need not be construed together)

2. The infinitive mood is often used by Horace, as it is often used in Greek, where in prose a final or a consecutive

---

1 The Greek constructions imitated are such as βασιλέως Πόλω, λήγειν αδοκί, ἀγώνι αματο, φυγᾶς Ἀργος, πλάσθεις χρυσ, μαθητικος μουσίκη, θαυμάζει τυ α τοῦ νου.
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clause (with ut and the subj.) would be required. Some of the instances in Horace (e.g. certat tollere in I. 1. 6, or gaudest possuisse I. 34. 16, or tendentes impostuisse III. 4. 52) can be paralleled in prose, but the following are extremely bold:
pecus egit visere (I. 2. 8), conturata rumere and furor reperire (I. 15. 7 and 27), te persequer frangere (I. 23. 10), tradam ventis portare (I. 26. 3), laborar trepidare (II. 3. 11), urges summo more (II. 18. 21), dedit spernere (II. 16. 39), impulerit maturare nascem (III. 7. 14—16), me expetit urere (Epod. 11. 5).

The infinitive is similarly used with adjectives to suggest a purpose or consequence, or to limit the aspect of the epithet: as indolcis pati (I. 1. 18), callidus condere (I. 10. 7), blandus ducere I. 12. 11, 12), praesens tollere and dolosus ferre (I. 35. 2 and 28), leviora tolli (II. 4. 11), pertinax ludere (III. 29. 53), efficax elure (IV. 12. 20), veraece cecinisse (Carm. Saec. 25), lubricus aspic (I. 19. 8), niveus videri (IV. 2. 59), nefas viderere (Epod. 16. 14), nobilis superare (I. 12. 26), and dolens vinci (IV. 4. 62).

It is obvious that, in many of these instances, a gerund with or without a preposition might have been used. Horace, however, regards the infinitive (in the Greek way) as an indeclinable noun.

These constructions, though found in other Latin poets, are specially characteristic of Horace; but, besides these, he has many other and more common devices to procure that perpetual quaintness which, as Aristotel said, is essential to poetical diction.

3. With adjectives, he is partial to a kind of hypallage

1 The Greek constructions imitated are such as ἄνὴρ χαλεπὸς συγγίνεται, παρίσσω ἐμαυνῶ τῷ λατρῇ τέλειον, βάιμα ἱκανόν, λευκὸς δράκαιναι.

2 In the instances above cited, grammarians would call some of the infinitives prolate or complementary, others epegeitical or explanatory. The difference between the two kinds is briefly this: the prolate infin. is necessary to limit the meaning of the preceding verb or adjective, while the epegeitical infin. is merely illustrative of the meaning. E.g. celer irascat means ‘quick to anger,’ not ‘quick at everything, anger included,’ whereas blandus ducere quercus does mean ‘persuasive to everything, oaks included.’
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(i.e. ‘inversion of relations’), whereby an epithet is transferred from the producer to the thing produced or vice versa.

Of the first case, iracunda fulmina (1. 3. 40), dementes ruinas (I. 37. 7), iratos apices (III. 21. 19), inviido latu (IV. 5. 9), are good enough examples. Instances of the second case are more interesting, because here the meaning of the adjective is somewhat affected. Thus nigri venti (I. 5. 7) means, in effect, ‘blackening winds,’ and albus (I. 7. 15) or candidus (III. 7. 1), applied to a wind, means ‘clearing,’ ‘brightening.’ Similar examples are palma nobilis (I. 1. 5), decorae palaestrae (I. 10. 4), insigni Camena (I. 12. 39), inaequalis procellae (II. 9. 3), informes hiemis (II. 10. 5).

Horace is somewhat free in his use of adjectives in -bilis or -ilis. Thus flexibilis (I. 24. 9), amabilis (II. 9. 13), docilis (III. 11. 1 and IV. 6. 43), are equivalent to desflutus, amatus, doctus. On the other hand, passive participles, such as irrigatus (I. 13. 18), indomitus (II. 14. 2), intamatus (III. 2. 18), often supply the place of an adjective in -bilis.

4. The neuter sing. of an adjective is sometimes used as an adverb: as dulce ridentem (I. 22. 23), lucidum fulgentes (II. 12. 14), perfidum ridens (III. 27. 67), turbidum laetatur (II. 19. 6).

5. A few words not used elsewhere (ἀμαξαὶ λαργαῦνα) occur in the Odes. Such are inaudax (III. 20. 3), esulitus (III. 11. 10), immetitus (III. 24. 12), Faustitas (IV. 5. 18), immemori (Epod. 5. 34).

6. The dative case is many times used for in with accus. after a verb of sending: e.g. terris misit (I. 2. 1), mites lucis (I. 12. 60), compulerit gregi (I. 24. 18), suelo tuliris (III. 23. 1), and a similar use may be suspected elsewhere (e.g. C. II. 7. 16, IV. 1. 7).

7. Of strange ablative Cecropio cothurno in II. 1. 12 and coniuge barbarae in III. 5. 5 are conspicuous instances. Abl. of the agent without ab occurs perhaps in I. 6. 1 (where see note).

8. Certain oddities in the arrangement of words may also be noticed.

(a) An epithet, really qualifying two words, is often put with the second only. E.g. in I. 2. 1 nivis atque dirae grandi-nis: 5. 5 fidem mutatosque deos: also I. 31. 16 : 34. 8 : II. 8. 3 : 19. 24 : III. 2. 16 : II. 39 : IV. 14. 4.
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(b) Similarly, a verb, which belongs to both parts of a compound sentence, is often inserted in the second part with -que or -ve: e.g. I. 30. 6 Gratiae propterque nymphae: II. 7. 24 opio curatve myrio. Also II. 17. 16: 19. 28. 31: III. 4. 12: Carm. Sac. 22.

(c) Sentences in which a word may be constructed with either of two other words—the so-called construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ or ‘in common’—are frequent. A striking instance is in II. 18. 37 hic levere functum | pauperem laboribus | vocatus atque non vocatus audit. Here laboribus is appropriate to levere and to functum: and levere is appropriate to vocatus and to audit. So in II. 11. 11 consiliis may be constructed with minorem and fatigas: and in III. 8. 19 sibi with infestus or dissidet.

That the Romans found something inimitable in Horace's style is evident from the rarity and badness of the attempts to imitate him. The few pieces of sapphics and alcaics in Statius and Ausonius are almost doggerel.

§ 5. Metres of the Odes.

The first eleven odes of the 1st Book comprise examples of nearly all the metres used by Horace in the Odes. The only novelties introduced in later books are the Hipponactian stanza of II. 18, the Archilochian of IV. 7 and the Ionic of III. 12.

Metro, in Latin and Greek, is the arrangement of long and short syllables in a line of poetry. Rhythm is the arrangement of stresses (ictus) or loud syllables. In other words, metre is the mode of constructing a line; rhythm is the mode of reading or singing it.¹

For purposes of metre, all long syllables are alike, and all short syllables are alike; but for purposes of rhythm (as in music) long syllables may be of different lengths, and short syllables may be of different lengths.

¹ In English metre and rhythm are identical, for with us a syllable which has stress is long, and a syllable which has no stress is short.

G. H.
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In Horace's Odes, we know the metres, but we do not know the rhythms. In other words we do not know how Horace himself would have read and scanned his lines. For instance, the First Ode of the First Book consists of lines of this metre: 

---0  ---0  ---0  ---0  ---0. But the lines may be scanned and read in several different ways: thus

1. Maće | nās atā | vīs | ēdīte | rēgī | būs.
3. Maće | nās atā | vīs | ēdīte | rēgibus.
4. Maćeenas at | avīs edī | te rēgibus.

Of these methods, the first represents the original Greek rhythm: the second, the scanion which was adopted by grammarians nearly contemporary with Horace: the third, a possible scanion which occurs naturally to an English reader: the fourth is an old-fashioned method which is seldom mentioned now, but which has some merits.

That Horace usually employed the second method, is rendered probable by such lines as

\textit{exegi monumentum aere perennius} (III. 30. 1)

or \textit{perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor} (I. 3. 36):

still more by such a line as

\textit{dum flagrantia detorquet ad oscula} (II. 12. 25).

These instances suggest that there was not such a pause on the sixth syllable as is required by the first method or the third.

But it would seem that, in this matter of 'pause,' Horace was not likely to be consistent. Witness his treatment of \textit{synapheia}.

\textit{Synapheia} is the 'connexion' of line with line, so that (among other effects) a syllable liable to elision may not conclude a line if the next line begins with a vowel. Horace, as a rule, follows the Greek lyrist in maintaining synapheia, and several times elides a concluding syllable before a vowel at the beginning of the next line, or divides a word between two lines. See, for elision, II. 2. 11: 3. 27: 16. 34: III. 29. 35: IV. 1. 35: 2. 22 and 23: \textit{Carm. Sacc.} 47: and, for division, I. 2. 19: 25. 11: II. 16. 7. But in I. 2. 41 and 47: I. 8. 3: I. 12. 6 and 7, and many
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other places, synapheia is ignored and hiatus permitted. Hiatus, of course, implies a slight pause, while synapheia implies that there was no pause between two lines.

For reasons such as these, it is impossible to put forward an authoritative scansion to Horace's lines. In the metrical schemes here subjoined no scansion will be suggested, but the original (i.e. the Greek) rhythm will be given in musical notation according to the theories of Dr J. H. H. Schmidt. It will be seen that Dr Schmidt divides a line into bars of equal length, i.e. occupying the same time in delivery.

In the metrical schemes, a comma marks the caesura or diaeresis, i.e. the point which must coincide with the end of a word.

It remains to be added that all the odes of Horace seem to be divisible into stanzas of four lines. The only exceptions are IV. 8, which there are many reasons for rejecting in whole or in part: and III. 12, which consists of four periods of ten feet each. The metres were undoubtedly borrowed by Horace from the Greek lyricists, especially Alcaeus, but he has introduced many small alterations, such as the use of long syllables where the Greeks allowed shorts, and the regular use of caesura where the Greeks had none.

I. The Alcaic stanza is used in 37 odes, viz.:
   1. 9. 16. 17. 26. 27. 29. 31. 34. 35. 37.
   II. 1. 3. 5. 7. 9. 11. 13. 14. 15. 17. 19. 20.
   III. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 17. 21. 23. 26. 29.

1 Rhythmic and Metric of the Classical Languages, translated by Dr J. W. White.

2 Technically, caesura is the division of a foot between two words, so that part of the foot belongs to one word, the remainder to another. Diaeresis, on the other hand, is the division of feet from one another so that one foot ends with a word, while the next begins a new word. Thus, in the bucolic hexameter, there is caesura in the third foot and diaeresis between the fourth and fifth: as

Nos patri | ae | fi | nes et | dulcia | linquimus | arva.

c2
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The metrical scheme is:
1. \( \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \) (eleven syllables).
2. \( \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \) (nine syllables).
3. \( \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \) (ten syllables).

The first two lines begin with a short syllable only 18 times (out of 634 examples)\(^1\).

The diaeresis (which was not used by the Greeks) after the fifth syllable is neglected in I. 16. 21: 37. 5: 37. 14: II. 17. 21: IV. 14. 17. Elision occurs at the diaeresis in III. I. 5: 4. 49. The fifth syllable is short in III. 5. 17: and possibly III. 23. 18.

In the third line, the first syllable is short only 10 times in 317 examples. The fifth syllable is, in Horace, always long, though in Alcaeus it appears to have been always short. A most important rule in the construction of this line is that it shall not end with two dissyllabic words. Such an ending occurs only 8 times, viz. I. 16. 4: 26. 7: 29. 11: II. 1. 11: 13. 27: 14. 11: 19. 7: 19. 11: and in 5 of these eight instances, the first dissyllable is repeated at the beginning of the next line (e.g. II. 13. 27 \textit{dura navis} | \textit{dura fugae mala}).

In the fourth line, there is usually caesura after the fourth syllable, but the main rule is that the line shall not begin with two trisyllabic words (e.g. \textit{tristia tempora}).

Syncope of the third and fourth lines occurs in II. 3. 27: III. 29. 35, but is conspicuously neglected in I. 16. 27: 17. 13: II. 13. 7: Yet, on the whole, syncope is usually respected. 'An Alcaic line does not often end with a short vowel, even when the next line begins with a consonant.' (Ramsay, \textit{Latin Prosody}, p. 212.)

The original rhythm, according to Dr Schmidt, was:

1. \(
\begin{align*}
1, 2. & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad |
\end{align*}
\)

2. \(
\begin{align*}
3. & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad |
\end{align*}
\)

3. \(
\begin{align*}
4. & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad | & \quad |
\end{align*}
\)

\(^1\) In the IVth Book, the opening syllable is always long.
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This rhythm is trochaic, with an anacrusis (or ‘striking-up’ syllable) at the beginning of lines 1, 2, 3.

2. The Sapphic stanza is used in 25 odes, viz.:
   I. 10. 12. 20. 22. 25. 30. 32. 38.
   II. 2. 4. 6. 8. 10. 16.
   III. 8. 11. 14. 18. 20. 22. 27.
   IV. 2. 6. 11 and Carmen Saeculare.

The stanza seems to have been invented by Alcaeus, though it is named after Sappho. The metrical scheme is:

1, 2, 3. −○−○−○, ○○−○−○ (eleven syllables).
   4. −○−○−○ (five syllables).

The longer line is called the lesser Sapphic: the shorter the Adonius.

In the longer line Horace always has the fourth syllable long, whereas Sappho (and Catullus) often had it short.

Horace has also introduced a caesura, which was not used by Sappho. This caesura, in the first three Books, generally occurs after the 4th syllable, and only occasionally after the 6th (e.g. 1. 10. 1, 6, 18), but in the fourth Book and Carm. Saec. it is very frequently placed after the 6th syllable (in fact, 39 times in only four compositions).

Synapheia is obviously respected between the 2nd and 3rd lines in II. 2. 18: 16. 34: IV. 2. 22; where final syllables are elided: and between the 3rd and 4th lines in I. 2. 19: 25. 11: II. 16. 7: IV. 2. 23: Carm. Saec. 47, where either a word is divided (as in the first three passages) or a syllable elided (as in the last two).

Yet hiatus between the lines frequently occurs, as in I. 2. 41 and 47: 12. 6 and 7 etc.

The original rhythm, according to Dr Schmidt, was trochaic and may be represented thus:

1, 2, 3. ❁❚❚ | ❁❚❚ | ❁❚❚ | ❁❚❚ | ❁❚❚ | ❁❚❚
   4. ❁❚❚ | ❁❚❚
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3. A stanza called the Greater Sapphic is used in I. 8. It consists of couplets of the following form:

1, 3. \(-\odot-\odot-\underline{\odot}\).
2, 4. \(-\odot-\underline{\odot}, \odot-\odot-\underline{\odot}-\underline{\odot}\).

It will be seen that the first line is longer by two syllables than the Adonius, and the second line is longer by four \((-\odot-\underline{\odot})\) than the lesser Sapphic.

The original rhythm is said to be:

1, 3. \(\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|\downarrow\downarrow|\downarrow\downarrow\).
2, 4. \(\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\).

4. The metres called Asclepiad are founded on the following lines:

(a) \(-\odot-\odot-\underline{\odot}, -\odot-\underline{\odot}-\underline{\odot}\) ('lesser Asclepiad').
(b) \(-\odot-\odot-\underline{\odot}, -\odot-\underline{\odot}-\odot-\underline{\odot}\) ('greater Asclepiad').
(c) \(-\odot-\odot-\odot\) ('Glyconic').
(d) \(-\odot-\odot-\underline{\odot}\) ('Pherecratic').

In the Lesser Asclepiad, the caesura is neglected in II. 12. 25 and IV. 8. 17. A short syllable is lengthened at the caesura in I. 13. 6: III. 16. 26.

In the Greater Asclepiad there are two caesuras, but the second is neglected in I. 18. 16.

In the Glyconic, the second syllable is perhaps short in I. 15. 24 and 36.

These lines are combined by Horace into four-line stanzas of different kinds thus:

(A) The First Asclepiad stanza employs (a) alone. See I. 1, III. 30, IV. 8.
(B) The Second Asclepiad has (b) alone. See I. 11 and 18: IV. 10.
(C) The Third Asclepiad has couplets of (a) and (c). See I. 3. 13. 19. 36. III. 9. 15. 19. 24. 25. 28. IV. 1. 3.
(D) The Fourth Asclepiad has (a) thrice repeated, followed by (c). See I. 6. 15. 24. 33. II. 12. III. 10. 16. IV. 5. 12.
(E) The Fifth Asclepiad has (a) twice repeated, then (d), then (c). See I. 5. 14. 21. 23. III. 7. 13. IV. 13.