HORACE
EPODES

EDITED BY

DAVID MANKIN

Associate Professor of Classics, Cornell University

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1. HORACE

The main sources for information on Quintus Horatius Flaccus (H.)[1] are his own works and a short biography transmitted with his text that probably came from the *De uiris illustribus* of Suetonius (time of Trajan).[2] H. was born at the town of Venusia in Calabria close to Apulia on 8 December 65 BC (13.6n.),[3] the son of an ex-slave who had become an auction agent (*S.* 1.6).[4] This father had H. educated at Rome and then Athens as would befit the son of an equestrian or a senator (*S.* 1.6.76–7, *Ep.* 2.1.69–71, 2.41–5).

While H. was at Athens he joined the army of the 'liberator' M. Brutus (Intro. 2), rising to the high rank of *tribunus militum* (4.20n.). He fought in the battle of Philippi (42 BC), and, when his side was defeated, eventually returned to Italy. There he found himself deprived of his father's estate (*Ep.* 2.2.50–1), possibly as a result of its confiscation and assignment to a discharged soldier of the victors.[5]

Later in life H. would claim that he was completely impoverished, and that this is why he took up 'writing verses' (*Ep.* 2.2.51–4). But he could not have been entirely without resources. He was able somehow to purchase a 'living' as a *scriba quaestorius* and, even more significant, he remained an equestrian in status with the possibility, if he had so chosen, of advancing to senatorial rank.[6]

Around this time (early thirties BC) H. became friends with the poets Virgil and Varius, which suggests that he was already writing and showing his works to others. It seems likely that he was concen-

[1] For H.'s full name, cf. *S.* 2.6.37 (Quintus), *C.* 4.6.44, *Ep.* 1.14.5 (Horatius), *Epodes* 15.12, *S.* 2.1.18 (Flaccus), and *ILS* 5050 (commemorating the Secular games of 17 BC) *carmen composuit Q. Hor[at]ius Flaccus*.

[2] Fraenkel (1957) 1–2.

[3] H. mentions the year and month (13.6, *C.* 3.21.1, *Ep.* 1.20.26–7), Suetonius the day (*natus est VI idus Decembris L. Cotta et L. Torquato consulibus*).

[4] Cf. Fraenkel (1957) 4–5. Nothing is known about H.'s mother, but he does mention a nurse named Pullia (*C.* 3.4.10; cf. Fraenkel (1957) 274).

[5] H. does not say this, but it has been inferred from the knowledge of such confiscations that he shows in his Ofellus poem (*S.* 2.2).

[6] Cf. *S.* 1.6 with the interpretation of Armstrong (1986) and (1989) 18–19.

trating on the hexameter poems that would make up his first book of *Satires*,[7] although some would date certain Epodes to this period (Intro. 4). In 39 or 38 BC Virgil and Varius introduced H. to Maecenas, who 'in the ninth month after bade [H.] to be among the number of [his] friends' (*S.* 1.6.61–2).

C. Cilnius Maecenas was an equestrian originally from Arretium in Etruria.[8] It is not known when or why he came to Rome, but he was already a trusted adviser to Octavian by the time of the war against the 'liberators' (Intro. 2), and he would continue in that capacity until the late twenties BC.[9] His talents seem to have been more political than military, and he had a reputation for decadence and effeminacy (1.10, 9.13–14, 14.1nn.),[10] but he was with Octavian at Philippi (*Eleg. Maec.* 43–4) and, accompanied by H., in parts of the war against Sextus Pompeius (Intro. 2) and at Actium (9.3n.).

Maecenas was extremely wealthy, had pretensions as a writer,[11] and was a friend to a number of famous poets. From later antiquity on his relationship with these men has been seen as more or less that of a 'patron' to his 'clients'.[12] But in the case of H., at least, this seems to be a distortion. As he presents it, H.'s friendship with Maecenas is based above all on a mutual regard and affection that is independent of the 'positions' of the two (1.2, 23–4nn.; cf. *S.* 1.6, 9.45–60, 2.6.29–58). Maecenas gave him gifts, as friends do (1.31n., *C.* 2.18.11–13, 3.16.38, *Ep.* 1.7), but there is no evidence that H., himself an *eques* and *scriba* (above), was dependent on these for a livelihood.[13]

[7] The date of publication of *Satires* I is not certain, but it may have been as late as 32 BC (Mankin (1988a) 68).

[8] For Maecenas, cf. N–H on *C.* 1.1.1, *RE* XIV 207–29, Armstrong (1989) 20–4.

[9] It is not clear why Maecenas 'faded from the scene'; cf. *RE* XIV 212–13, Syme (1939) 409.

[10] Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 19.9, 92.35, 101.10–15, 114.4–6, 120.19, *RE* XIV 214.

[11] Poetic fragments in *FPL* pp. 132–4, Courtney (1993) 276–81; cf. 17.67n., N–H on *C.* 2.12.10.

[12] E.g. Porph. on *C.* 4.12.15, Schol. on *C.* 1.1.2, 3.16.38, *S.* 2.6.31, also Suet. *Vit. Horat.*, Juv. 7.94. There are countless modern versions of this; for a critique, cf. Armstrong (1986).

[13] It is often stated that H. owed his 'Sabine farm' (1.31–2n.) to Maecenas, but neither he nor Suetonius says this. It seems to be an inference from *C.* 2.18.12–14 (cf. Porph., Schol. *ad loc.*), which is usually taken to mean 'now

Little is known about the externals of H.'s life after the period that is the focus of the *Epodes*.[14] At some point Octavian (by then 'Augustus') invited him to become his personal secretary or at least a member of his household, but H. declined (Suet.). Octavian also seems to have invited him to compose certain poems, including *Ep.* 2.1 (the 'epistle to Augustus'), the odes concerning Tiberius and Drusus (*C.* 4.4, 14), and the *Carmen saeculare*, which was performed at the Secular games of 17 BC (Suet.).[15] Following that there is silence until the notice of H.'s death, which occurred on 27 November 8 BC, shortly after the death of Maecenas (cf. *C.* 2.17).

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

H.'s early works, *Satires* 1 and the *Epodes* (Intro. 4), belong to a time of great tension (42–32 BC), then great conflict (32–30 BC) among the Romans. For over a century Rome and Italy had been ravaged by strife both external and internal.[16] The Gracchi and their supporters had been murdered in the city (133, 121 BC), there was a huge invasion of German tribes (105–101) followed by more civil disorder (100), then a war with the Italian allies (91–88), and a full-scale civil war, the first in Rome's history (88–81). A relatively peaceful interval (80–50) was nevertheless punctuated by rebellions, conspiracies, and slave revolts (79–71 (Sertorius), 78 (Lepidus), 72–71 (Spartacus), 63 (Catiline)), and, increasingly, civil disorder in the city (58–52). This culminated in yet another civil war, which left Julius Caesar the sole ruler of the state (50–44).

When Caesar was killed by Brutus and the other 'liberators' (44), it appeared at first that the Republic might be restored. But it was not long before factions began to vie for control, one consisting of

that he has given me a Sabine estate, I need ask nothing from my powerful friend' (= Maecenas; cf. 13.6n.). But the passage makes more sense in its context if H. is saying 'Since I have an estate that belongs to me [i.e. makes me independent], I do not have to ask anything from a powerful friend.'

[14] Cf. Putnam (1986) 15–30, Armstrong (1989) 135–6.

[15] The Suetonian *uita* cites evidence (a letter of Augustus) only in regard to *Ep.* 2.1, and some scholars have been justly sceptical about Augustus' involvement with *Odes* 4 (Fraenkel (1957) 364–5, Putnam (1986) 20–3).

[16] For the history of Rome in this period, cf. Syme (1939), Scullard (1982), Brunt (1988).

the 'liberators', another of M. Antonius (Antony) and his followers, and a third of Caesar's heir Octavian and his followers.[17] When Octavian and Antony made common cause as members of the 'second triumvirate'[18] they turned on the others, proscribing and murdering prominent citizens, including Cicero, at Rome, and defeating the armies of the 'liberators' at Mutina (43) and finally at Philippi (42).

After Philippi Octavian and Antony consolidated their power and set about, as they put it, 'restoring the state'. Their only rivals were a few die-hard senators and Sextus Pompeius, the son of Pompey the Great, whose fleet of Romans, ex-slaves, and foreigners was a serious threat to Italian food supplies and shipping. In 41–40 Octavian fought a brutal war against Romans holed up in Perusia and led by Antony's brother. This came close to erupting into another full-scale civil war, but the triumvirs managed to salvage and cement their coalition by in effect dividing the Roman world between them, with Octavian attending to the western, Antony to the eastern empire ('treaty of Brundisium' 40). A personal bond was created by the marriage of Antony to Octavian's sister Octavia.

An accord was also reached with Sextus Pompeius, who received, among other things, control of Sicily ('treaty of Misenum' 39). But when Antony went east to prepare for war against Parthia, Octavian and Sextus soon fell out. Their war began with Octavian capturing Sardinia (38), but he then suffered a series of naval defeats and disasters, including one off Cape Palinurus, at which Maecenas and probably H. were present.[19] It was not until he put M. Vipsanius Agrippa, Maecenas' 'man-of-action' counterpart,[20] in charge and received some assistance from Antony, that he was able to defeat Sextus, first at Mylae (July or August 36), then decisively at Naulochus (3 September 36).[21]

[17] For the name 'Octavian', cf. 1.3n.

[18] The 'triumvirate' also included M. Aemilius Lepidus, but 'this flimsy character' (Syme (1939) 166) was essentially irrelevant even before Octavian forced him to 'retire' shortly after Naulochus.

[19] Cf. *C.* 3.4.28 with the discussion of Wistrand (1958) 16–17.

[20] Agrippa (*C.* 1.6, *S.* 2.3.185, *Ep.* 1.12) is 'conspicuous by his absence' from the *Epodes*; cf. 9.7–8n.

[21] Cf. 9.7–10 with notes.

Antony had come to Italy after Octavian's first setbacks, and they renewed the triumvirate with another treaty (Tarentum, spring of 37).[22] But when Antony returned east it was to Cleopatra, who had become his ally and probably more as early as 42, but with whom he now lived openly, apparently preferring her and their children to Octavia and his legitimate Roman offspring. In 34, after a successful campaign in Armenia, he celebrated some sort of triumph and seems to have promised various territories which might have interested Rome to Cleopatra and her children.

It is not certain whether Antony meant to throw in his lot with Cleopatra and become a kind of eastern 'king' or whether Octavian, wishing to be rid of his last rival, convinced Romans that this was Antony's plan.[23] In any case, relations between west and east deteriorated until 32, when it became clear that war was inevitable (7 intro.). Both sides began their preparations, Antony divorced Octavia, and Octavian declared war on Cleopatra (9.27n.) as if it were a foreign, not a civil conflict. At Actium (9 intro.) Antony and Cleopatra were defeated; they fled back to Alexandria, where they committed suicide, he while Octavian's army advanced on the city (1 August 30), she after it had been captured (8 August).

The 'Alexandrian war' would be the last Roman civil war for nearly a century, but at the time nobody could have known this. People would eventually come to think, or at least hope, that the replacement of the Republic with a 'principate' was one way of guarding against a recurrence of civil strife. This suggests, and the works of some authors make this plain, that many Romans attributed the civil wars above all to the *contentio dignitatis*, the 'competition' among the foremost men of the city to achieve the highest honours in war and peace.[24] For many centuries this competition had remained only that because it was checked partly by fear of external enemies but also, in a more positive way, by the participation of these men in institutions that educated them to subordinate rivalry

[22] H. may have accompanied Maecenas to this 'summit conference' (*S.* 1.5), but cf. E. Gowers, *P.C.P.S.* 39 (1993) 48–66.

[23] Cf. Pelling on Plut. *Ant.* 53–5, 60.1, Huzar (1978) 185–208.

[24] This represents what seems to be H.'s own view of these matters (7.5, 18, 16.1, 2, 3–10nn., N–H on *C.* 2.1, 3.4.65–8) and it is not entirely different from the views of Sallust and Livy in their prefaces. Cf. Jal (1963).

to a sense of what made them fellow citizens and, in Roman terms, *amici*.

With the destruction of Carthage (146 BC) and the increasing 'corruption' of Roman society by wealth there was a decline in both the external and internal restraints on the Romans. Not only were different groups at odds, but within each group rivalries began to verge towards enmity. The Gracchi were killed by fellow senators, their deaths applauded even by some relatives. In the Social War, Romans got used to the idea of killing their former comrades-in-arms. Sulla had been an assistant to Marius, Caesar the father-in-law of Pompey, Octavian the brother-in-law of Antony. Whatever the cause of each civil war, it always came down to men connected by these and by even more intimate bonds of *amicitia* killing each other and thus repeating again and again the 'crime of Romulus' (7.17–20).

3. THE *EPODES* AND EARLY GREEK *IAMBUS*

Five of the seventeen *Epodes* (1, 4, 7, 9, 16) are explicitly concerned with the last stages of the story just recounted (Intro. 2), and it is possible to relate most, if not all, of the others to this theme.[25] It is clear, then, that, as a whole, the Epode book was meant as a 'response' to the crisis of the end of the Republic. But in addition to its 'political' content, there is much that seems to be more purely 'literary', and it has not been clear to most commentators how this aspect of the collection is also relevant to its historical context.[26]

H. draws on a wide range of earlier literature both Greek and Latin,[27] but he leaves no question as to his chief model, the early Greek *iambi* of Hipponax and especially Archilochus (6 intro.).[28] At a

---

[25] Cf. the introductions to the individual Epodes.

[26] The following discussion is based on the editor's doctoral thesis, 'The *Epodes* of Horace and Archilochean iambus' (University of Virginia 1985).

[27] See Index 2 s.v. 'Alcaeus', 'Anacreon', etc.

[28] It has become fashionable to state (not argue) that the *Epodes* were also influenced by the *Iamboi* and perhaps the *Ibis* of Callimachus. But there is no evidence that H. even knew these poems, let alone made them his 'secret' models. Cf. 15.7–9n. and nn. 44 and 61 below.

later time (around 20 BC) he would summarize his achievement (*Ep.* 1.19.23–5):

> Parios ego primus iambos
> ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
> Archilochi, non res et agentia uerba Lycamben.

Most of this is borne out by even a cursory look at H.'s *Iambi.*[29] His metres are Archilochean down to minute details (Intro. 6), while his subject matter (*res*) and the targets of his *uerba* are not the same as those of Archilochus. But it is not entirely clear what he means by *animi*, 'spirit', and many have doubted whether in this respect H. in fact owes as much to the early Greek poet as he claims.[30]

One reason for these doubts is that most Latinists have laboured under what appears to be a mistaken interpretation of the nature of early Greek *iambus*. Until fairly recently, it was assumed that Archilochus and the others 'wrote' primarily from personal experience, and that the main function of their *iambi* was to 'settle scores' with real people who had in some way offended them. H.'s *Epodes*, with their 'stock figures' (below), seem far removed from this. But some new discoveries (cf. 11 intro.) and, especially, a reassessment of the evidence have completely changed the way in which Hellenists, at least, interpret *iambus* and produced a picture of that genre which makes it more evident why H., in the late Republic, would choose to imitate its 'spirit'.[31]

The genre *iambus* 'had its heyday in the seventh and sixth centuries [BC]' (West (1974) 33), and although it probably had many practitioners, those best known to later antiquity were Archilochus of Paros and Thasos (*fl.* mid seventh century), Hipponax of Ephesus (*c.* 540), and Semonides of Amorgos (mid seventh century).[32] It

---

[29] This was H.'s own title for the *Epodes* (Intro. 4). For his claim of 'primacy', see Intro. 6.

[30] E.g. Leo (1900), Fraenkel (1957) 36–41, Fedeli (1978) 124–8.

[31] The account of early Greek *iambus* given here is based on the following: K. J. Dover, 'The poetry of Archilochus', in *Archiloque*, ed. B. Snell (Entr. Hardt 10, Geneva 1964) 181–212, West (1974) 22–39, Nagy (1979) 222–52, M. R. Lefkowitz, *The lives of the Greek poets* (Baltimore 1980), A. P. Burnett, *Three archaic poets* (Cambridge Mass. 1983), Gentili (1988) 107–14, 179–96.

[32] H. does not mention Semonides, but may owe a few touches to him; see Index 2 s.v.

may have originated as a 'cult song' associated with Demeter and Dionysus whose characteristic form was what would later be called 'iambic' metre. But *iambi* could also be composed in other measures, including 'elegy' and the related 'mixed' forms of epodes and *asynarteta* (Intro. 4). The common element, what made *iambus* a distinct genre, was that it was essentially 'blame poetry' which in one way or another and with varying degrees of hostility (below) found fault with behaviour that was seen as somehow inappropriate or dangerous.[33]

The sense of what was inappropriate or dangerous was provided not so much by the individual iambist's sensibilities as by the norms of his society. *Iambus* was composed primarily for an audience drawn from that society, whether the citizens in the assembly, or smaller groups in the predominant social context of archaic Greece, the symposium. In either circumstance, the *iambus* was meant to remind the audience of what might be a threat to the very shared customs, morals, and so on which brought them together and united them as an audience. Whether as fellow citizens or as drinking companions, the members of the audience would consider themselves *philoi* ('friends') and what they shared as *philotēs* ('friendship'), a term which has the same complex range of meaning in Greek as *amicitia* has in Latin (Intro. 2).

The 'affirmation of *philotēs*'[34] through blame could be accomplished in various ways. The poet, speaking more or less in his own person as a member of the group, could attack someone directly, either another member or an 'outsider' (below). Or he could adopt an 'identity' not his own and reveal 'himself' to be guilty of some misconduct by in effect 'saying the worst things about himself'.[35] Or he could tell a story, a 'blame narrative' (5 intro.) combining such 'self-indictments' with accounts of reprehensible acts. There

[33] There are, of course, other types of blame poetry, including 'Old Comedy' (perhaps derived from *iambus*; cf. West (1974) 35–7) and Roman satire and its antecedents (cf. Mankin, *A.J.Ph.* 108 (1987) 405–8).

[34] Nagy (1979) 251.

[35] The phrase comes from an 'attack' on Archilochus by the fifth-century BC sophist Critias (88 B D–K = Aelian, *V.H.* 101.3 = Arch. fr. 295 West); cf. Gentili (1988) 181–2.

were also different 'levels' of blame, ranging from admonition and humorous chiding directed at members of the group to more virulent attacks, usually reserved for 'outsiders'.

It appears that these 'outsiders' tended to be figures who had originally been members of the group but had 'alienated' themselves through the worst forms of misconduct. It also appears that most such figures were not real people, but 'stock characters' with significant names embodying or symbolizing what the iambist and his society found most inimical.[36] A scenario, either known to or repeated for the audience, would explain how such an exemplary (in a bad sense) figure had become an 'outsider' and serve as a warning against such behaviour.

The parallels between all this and H.'s *iambi* are not hard to discover. His audience, where he indicates it, is either his fellow citizens (7, 16) or his friends in the context of a symposium (3, 9, 11, 12, 13). These friends are real people, but his 'enemies', like those in early *iambus*, are mostly 'stock figures' (1.33–4, 2.67, 4.1, 5.15, 25, 29, 41–4, 73, 6.1, 10.2, 11.6, 24, 12.18, 14.16, 15.11nn., App. 2). He speaks in his own person but also poses as an 'Alfius' (2; cf. 4 intro.) and frequently says 'the worst things about himself' (4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17). Most of the poems pretend to be 'direct speech', but there is a 'blame narrative' (5) and a 'dialogue' that suggests that this may also have been a technique of early *iambus* (17 intro.). Within other poems there is considerable use of narration and 'talking characters' (4, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15).

It may also be possible to discover, or at least suggest, why H. chose to re-create early Greek *iambus* at Rome in the late thirties BC. In the midst of a crisis which could be seen as a result of the decline and failure of traditional Roman *amicitia* (Intro. 2), H. turned to a type of poetry whose function had been the affirmation of 'friendship' in its community. It is doubtful whether he believed that his or anyone else's poetry could avert disaster (cf. 16 intro.). But he may have hoped that his *iambi* would somehow 'blame' his friends and fellow citizens into at least asking themselves *quo ruitis?* (7.1).

---

[36] Cf. West (1974) 26–7, Nagy (1979) 243–9. For arguments that Lycambes, at least, may have been a real person, see Gentili (1988) 294–5.

4. THE EPODE BOOK

The idea of the *Epodes* as a response to the historical events of the
late thirties BC depends, of course, on the hypothesis that H. com-
posed them or at least wanted his audience to think that he com-
posed them during this period. This is only a hypothesis, but it seems
to make more sense than any of the other suggestions that have been
made concerning the chronology of the *Epodes*.[37]

There is one certain date in the collection, that of the battle of
Actium (2 September 31 BC), the setting for Epode 9. It has been
argued that this is only a *terminus ante quem* for the 'political poems',
and that other poems could have been written as early as 42 BC,
when H. (by his own account), began 'making verses' (*Ep*. 2.2.49–54;
cf. Intro. 1). The usual criteria for deciding on an 'early' or a 'late'
date for each Epode are its supposed level of 'maturity' and, in the
case of the political poems, its attitude (if this can be determined)
towards Octavian. Thus Epode 10 (a 'mature' H. would not imitate
his model so closely), Epodes 8 and 12 (or use so much obscenity),
and Epode 16 (or express such pessimism with Octavian triumphant)
are considered 'early', while Epode 13 (it resembles certain Odes)
and Epode 1 (it seems to express a 'commitment' to Octavian (but cf.
1.2, 5, 23–4nn.)) are considered 'late'.[38]

Even if the criteria for distinguishing 'early' and late Epodes were
more objective, there would be a basic difficulty with this approach.
Unless their sensibilities were the same as those of H.'s modern
'chronographers', the members of H.'s original audience hearing or
reading the Epode book for the first time would have nothing to go
on except the order in which the poems are arranged. When they
encountered Epodes 1, 4, and 7, for instance, they would see these
poems as anticipating a war which, when they finally read Epode 9,

[37] For surveys of the dating of the *Epodes*, see Carrubba (1969) 15–17,
Setaioli (1981).

[38] This approach, which informs most recent scholarship on the *Epodes* (for
exceptions, see n. 39 below), can be traced to C. Franke, *Fasti Horatiani* (Ber-
lin 1839). The views of earlier commentators, where they can be recovered,
are closer to that presented here (e.g. Bentley (1728) xix–xx).

they might naturally assume to be the Actian war. It would also be natural to take Epodes 13 and 16, coming 'later' in the collection, as referring to a time 'later' than that of Epode 9.[39]

There are other indications that the Epode book invites such a 'linear' or 'sequential' reading.[40] Perhaps the most objective is the metrical sequence (Intro. 6): ten poems in a combination of iambic lines are followed by a poem (11) in which a dactylic element 'intrudes', an entirely dactylic poem (12), a mostly dactylic poem with an iambic element (13), poems containing a balance of dactyls and iambics (14, 15, 16), and finally a poem which returns to pure iambics (17).[41] The first word of the book is *ibis* (1.1), the last is *exitus* (17.81n.). Epode 14 seems to alert the reader to the fact that the book is coming to an end (14 intro.). There are numerous 'cross-references' from poems 'back' to those 'preceding' them (e.g. 2.1–8, 3.4, 5.15, 6.16, 8.11, 10.1, 11.5, 12.23, 13.6, 14.6, 15.7, 16.1–14, 17.1–18nn.).

This is not to say that the movement of the book is entirely 'linear': there is also a kind of 'architecture'[42] by which poems separated from each other in the space (or time?) of the volume nevertheless seem to be paired. They do not form a pattern as neat as those detected in Virgil's Eclogue book and in Propertius' *'monobiblos'* (book 1), and there does not seem to be any 'numerology' such as can be found in those works.[43] But besides Epodes 1 and 17 (above), there are correspondences between 1 and 9, 2 and 16, 3 and 14, 4 and 6, 5 and 17, 7 and 16, 8 and 12. None of these, however, violates the

---

[39] For this interpretation, cf. Schmidt (1977), Kraggerud (1984) 9–20, Porter (1987) 254–9.

[40] For these terms and other 'principles of arrangement' in Latin poetry books, see J. Van Sickle, *The design of Virgil's Bucolics* (Rome 1978), Santirocco (1986), Porter (1987).

[41] Cf. H. Belling, *Studien über die Liederbücher des Horatius* (Berlin 1903) 137, Carrubba (1969) 18–21. It is possible that H. imitated an arrangement of metres in a collection of Archilochus, although there is no way of proving this (Carrubba (1969) 87–103). It is worth noting that H.'s arrangement is quite different from that of Callimachus in his *Iamboi* (above, n. 28).

[42] For this term, see the studies cited in n. 40 above, and, for its application to the Epode book, see Carrubba (1969) 22–86, Schmidt (1977), and H. Dettmer, *Horace: a study in structure* (Hildesheim 1983) 77–109.

[43] Cf. Van Sickle (above, n. 40), B. Otis, *H.S.C.Ph.* 70 (1965) 22–86.

apparent 'chronological sequence', i.e. there is no instance where a reader might think that the events in a poem 'later' in the book are supposed to have occurred 'earlier' than those in the poem with which it seems to be paired.

Although it is clear that H. himself called this collection his *Iambi* (14.7, *C.* 1.16.24, *Ep.* 1.19.23, 2.2.59, cf. *Ars* 79), it has become conventional to call it the 'Epodes', and that practice is continued here. But it should be noted that the title *Epodi* or *Epodon Liber* is not attested before Porphyrio (Intro. 7) and even later *grammatici* (*ThLL* v 2.695–6), and that it is in any case inappropriate, since the last poem of the collection is not, technically, an *epodus* (Intro. 6).[44]

5. LANGUAGE AND STYLE

The language of Archilochus and the other early iambists has been characterized as a 'stylized Ionic', somewhere between and drawing on both the spoken form of that Greek dialect and the elevated 'Kunstsprache' of epic.[45] The *Epodes* can likewise be seen as occupying a kind of 'mid-stage', not only between the colloquial and the poetic, but in terms of H.'s own works, 'between [his] informal hexameter poetry and his lyric poetry'.[46]

H. achieves this 'mid-stage' by combining, in various proportions in various contexts, 'poetic' with 'unpoetic' language.[47] The 'poetic' consists of words, forms, phrases, and constructions which evidence

---

[44] Cf. N. Horsfall, *B.I.C.S.* 28 (1981) 109. For this reason it seems unlikely that there is a connection with *epodai*, (Greek) 'magical spells' (cf. Gowers (1993) 282). Since some ancient books were referred to by their opening words (e.g. *arma uirumque* = the *Aeneid*; cf. Jocelyn on Enn. *trag.* 350, Kenney, *C.R.* 20 (1970) 290), it has been suggested that H. may have intended *ibis* (1.1) as a kind of title and as an 'allusion to Callimachus' invective poem *Ibis*' (Heyworth (1993) 86). But there is no evidence that any of H.'s books were known by an '*incipit*', or that his *Iambi* owe anything to Callimachus (above, n. 28).

[45] A. Scherer, 'Die Sprache des Archilochos', in *Archiloque* (above, n. 31) 89–107, West (1974) 77–111.

[46] Armstrong (1989) 55. For H.'s own placement of the *Epodes* 'between' his other works, cf. *Ep.* 2.2.59–60. The chief studies of the language of the *Epodes* are Blok (1961), Grassman (1966), and Hierche (1974) 93–125.

[47] For these terms, cf. Axelson (1945) and P. Watson (1985).

suggests would have been perceived by the original audience either as appropriate to 'elevated' types of poetry (epic, tragedy) or as 'old-fashioned' ('archaism') or foreign ('Graecism').[48] The 'unpoetic', on the other hand, would be more familiar to that audience either from standard (i.e. Ciceronian, Caesarian) prose ('prosaic') or from the spoken language ('colloquial', 'vulgar').[49]

As if anticipating the advice he would later give the Pisones (*Ars* 47–59), H. also creates his own poetic language with neologisms (Index 2 s.v.) often 'formed on the analogy of Greek' (Brink on *Ars* 53 (*uerba*) *Graeco fonte ... parce detorta*). These include what seem to be new words (1.19, 20, 2.11, 3.18, 5.34, 95, 7.8, 8.20, 11.15, 28, 13.18, 14.14, 16.38, 41, 43, 51, 57, 58, 60), previously attested words used in new senses (1.15, 2.5, 4.12, 17, 5.50, 89, 7.12, 10.7, 9, 11.10, 11, 19, 28, 12.8, 14, 13.5, 14.4, 16.7, 8, 48, 17.33), and Greek-style constructions (1.23–4, 2.19, 20, 64, 3.7, 5.68, 8.16, 9.20, 10.16, 15.1).[50] It would be interesting to know how many of these could be traced to analogies in early Greek *iambus*, and whether the neologisms in the *Odes* in turn reflect Greek lyric models.[51]

Like other Greek and Latin poetry, including early *iambus*, the *Epodes* contain their share of poetic 'figures' such as 'hendiadys' (5.16n.), 'metonymy' (2.29n.), and 'personification' (2.17–18n.).[52] Their

---

[48] The fragmentary state of 'elevated' poetry before H. often makes it necessary to risk anachronism by bringing in texts which might have been influenced by H. or which themselves combine various styles. Another problem specific to the study of iambic and lyric verse is the loss of most early Latin tragedy, an 'elevated' genre which, unlike hexameter epic, was composed in metres that accommodate words containing a 'cretic' sequence ($- \cup -$). There are a number of such words in the *Epodes* (73 occurrences – 61 words), but it is seldom possible to determine their stylistic level (cf. 2.40, 3.6, 13, 18, 5.43, 50, 70, 99, 11.13, 26, 13.4, 14.8, 16.14, 18, 62, 17.14, 49, 75nn.). See Appendix 3.

[49] The evidence for the spoken language is provided by 'lower' genres of verse (comedy, satire, epigram) and prose (letters, novels, inscriptions). The term 'vulgar' is used here of language that would probably not be acceptable to 'polite company' in H.'s day (cf. Adams (1982) 1–2, Richlin (1992) 1–31).

[50] For Greek borrowings that are attested earlier than the *Epodes*, see Index 2 s.v. 'Graecism'.

[51] For the *Odes*, cf. Bo III, Index s.v. *uocabula noua*, and A. Waltz, *Des variations de la langue et de la métrique d'Horace* (Paris 1881).

[52] For such 'figures', cf. LHS II 772–838 and Fantham (1992) 35–41.

stylistic level is also 'raised' by similes, metaphor, and more subtle uses of imagery, and they are 'ornamented' (although rarely, if ever, 'for ornament's sake') with mythological and geographical names and epithets. Finally, H. anticipates the intricacy of the *Odes* with various techniques involving word order, including 'transferred epithet', '*apo koinou* construction', 'zeugma', 'postposition', and 'hyperbaton' (Index 2 s.vv.).

It might be expected that the language and style of the *Epodes* would have been influenced by that of Catullus and the other 'new poets' who were active during H.'s youth.[53] There are suggestions of such an influence (Index 2 s.v. 'Catullus'), but there are also many differences, and even where H. seems to adopt elements that modern scholars consider 'hallmarks' of Neoteric style, he does not 'ape' them (cf. *S.* 1.10.19).[54] In this respect he distinguishes himself not only from those putative 'models' but also from his contemporaries Virgil (of the *Eclogues*) and, it would seem, Gallus (Index 2 s.v.). On the other hand, the *Epodes* do seem to owe a considerable debt, if not in 'philosophy', at least in word choice and some aspects of style, to Lucretius (Index 2), which is not surprising in view of that poet's influence on H.'s other works.[55]

6. METRE

All but one (17) of H.'s *Iambi* are composed in 'epodic' couplets, in which a verse of one metrical structure and length is followed by a

[53] This is the view of, among others, Newman (1967) 270–82 and E. McDermott, 'Greek and Roman elements in Horace's lyric program', *ANRW* II 31.3 (1981) 1644–9. For the 'new poets' or 'Neoterics', cf. Courtney (1993) 198–253.

[54] These 'hallmarks' (cf. Ross (1969) 17–112) include postponed particles (1.12n.), adjectives in *-osus* (3.16n.), diminutives (8.15–16n.), compound adjectives (17.12n.), elided *atque* (2.40n.), and 'the vocabulary of urbane Rome: *delicatus, dicax, elegans, facetiae, ineptiae, lepos, sal, urbanus,* and *uenustus* with their other forms and opposites' (Ross (1969) 105–6), none of which occur in the *Epodes*. Although Catullus' 'polymetrics' and the Neoteric fragments allow some 93 'cretic-containing words' (above, n. 48), they contain only nine that also occur in the *Epodes* (*aestuosus, antea, curiosus, immerens, impudicus, laboriosus, obliuio, otiosus, umbilicus*), and of these only one is not attested in still earlier Latin poetry (*obliuio* (5.70, 14.2, Bib. *Poet.* 3 *FPL*, but cf. Acc. (?) fr. 697 Ribbeck)).

[55] Cf. W. Rehmann, *Lukrez und Horaz* (Freiburg 1969).

verse of a different length and, in some cases, metrical structure. The ancient grammarians called this second verse the *epōdos*, something 'added' (*epi*) to the song (*ōdē*), but with a looseness typical of Greek and Latin literary terminology this word was also used of the two verses together as a couplet and of whole poems consisting of such couplets.[56]

Archilochus was sometimes reckoned the 'inventor' of epodes,[57] and fragments and citations indicate that he used at least nine different combinations.[58] It appears that at some point his poems in these metres were arranged in a separate collection evidently called both *Epōdoi* and *Iamboi*.[59] Since the content of these and other early Greek epodes seems to have been neither more nor less 'iambic' than that of poems composed in stichic metre or (for Archilochus) elegiac couplets, it appears likely that they differed from other forms of *iambus* not in 'genre' but in how they were performed. The *testimonia* concerning Archilochus as a musician and as an 'inventor' of *parakatalogē* ('recitative') suggest that epodes represent a mode of performance somewhere between speech unaccompanied by music and full-scale song.[60]

Although H. draws on all of Archilochus' poetry (Intro. 3), it is possible that his choice of metres and, perhaps, their sequence in his book owe something to the separate collection of Archilochian epodes.[61] All but two of his combinations are attested for Archilochus, and it seems likely that even the 'missing' ones (Systems IV,

[56] LSJ s.v. *epōdos*, *ThLL* v 2.695–6.
[57] Cf. Tarditi (1968) 212–16 ('testimonia de metris Archilochi').
[58] Frr. 168–204 West; cf. Rossi (1976) 223–9.
[59] Cf. the *testimonia* to Arch. frr. 182, 187, 188–92, 200, 201 West, and West (1974) 22. The collection is sometimes thought to be Hellenistic, but there is no sure evidence for this, and it is clear that there were texts of Archilochus in circulation in the Classical period, if not earlier (cf. Tarditi (1968) 'Index auctorum', Pfeiffer (1968) Index s.v. 'Archilochus').
[60] Rossi (1976) 215–16. This is not to say that Archilochus' elegiacs (a kind of epodic combination) were not also accompanied by music; cf. West (1974) 9–10, 13–15, Gentili (1988) 35. For Archilochus and the lyre, see 13.9n.
[61] Carrubba (1969) 87–103, Setaioli (1981) 1688–9. It may be worth noting (cf. above, n. 28) that H. uses none of the combinations attested for the *Iamboi* of Callimachus, that the only verse types they share are the common iambic trimeter (*a*) and dimeter (*b*), and that H. avoids altogether the choliamb (a trimeter with a long at pos. 11), although it is the 'signature' measure of Hipponax as well as Callimachus and was popular with the Neoterics.

vii) would 'turn up' if further evidence were available.[62] His usage, especially in the *asynarteta* (Verse Type *e*), but also in the more common iambic trimeter (Verse Type *a*) seems in some respects distinctly 'Parian'. It appears, moreover, that he recognized the status of epodic verse as somewhere between speech and song or, in terms of his own works, between his hexameter *sermo* and his lyric *carmen*.[63]

At *Ep.* 1.19.23–4 (Intro. 3) H. claims that he 'first displayed Parian *iambi* to Latium'. Since 'iambic' verse had a long earlier history at Rome, this claim has been taken as an exaggeration or even a conscious 'slighting' of such poets as Catullus and Varro.[64] But H. is not talking about metre alone (Intro. 3), and even if he were, his 'iambics' (i.e. trimeters) differ from those of his Latin predecessors (Verse Type *a*), and he does seem to have been the 'first' to 'display' epodic combinations.[65]

This is not to say that H.'s metrical usage is entirely 'Greek'. His prosody (treatment of syllables as 'short' or 'long') is in general the same as that of his Latin precursors and contemporaries,[66] and his

---

[62] Until the discovery of the 'Cologne epode' (Arch. fr. 196a West; cf. Intro. 3) it was thought that H. might have 'invented' the metre of Epode 11 (System 11).

[63] H. pretends, at least, that some epodes would be accompanied by the lyre (13.9, 14.12n.; cf. 17.39n.), and he would later describe Archilochus' *numeri* as *modos et carminis artem* (*Ep.* 1.19.24–7), a phrase that might suggest a musical element (cf. *C.* 1.23.5, 2.1.40 etc., *OLD* s.v. *modus* 8). For his placement of *iambi* 'between' *carmen* and *sermo*, cf. *Ep.* 2.2.59–60 (above, n. 46).

This is not the place to discuss if and how H.'s works were performed, but the prevailing view that they were essentially 'book poetry' runs against the many references in H. to 'singing', his attention in the *Ars* and elsewhere to the needs of an 'aural' audience, the evidence for the public performance of the lyric *Carmen saeculare* (above, n. 1), and Ovid's claim (if his words can be taken at face value) that he heard H. himself playing the lyre (*Tr.* 4.10.49–50).

[64] Cf. Newman (1967) 273.

[65] It seems likely that [Virg.] *Cat.* 13, composed in 'System 1', is later than the *Epodes* (R. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergili Maronis Catalepton* 11 (Assen 1963) 77–92). Epodic combinations have been postulated for Laevius (2, 21 *FPL* cf. Courtney (1993) 121, 135) and Varro (*Men.* 78, 141; cf. Astbury's app. crit.), but the arguments are not very convincing.

[66] See Index 2 s.v. 'prosody'. The *Epodes* also seem to be more 'Latin' than 'Greek' in avoiding unelided monosyllables at verse end (11.21, 17.63 (trim.), 12.23, 15.7, 16.15 (hex.), 12.6, 14, 16, 24 (dact. tetr. cat.), 11.16 (hemiepes) = 2% of the verses), although these are not common in Greek iambic

dactylic hexameter (Verse Type *c*) follows the Ennian, rather than the Homeric (or Archilochian), model. In regard to the 'rules' governing elision and hiatus he also follows Latin practice, although the incidence of elision in the *Epodes* is distinctly lower than in any previous Latin verse, including his own hexameters.[67] He has been criticized for apparently paying little attention to the 'natural gait of Latin talk', i.e. for failing to accommodate the Latin word accent to his metrical structures.[68] But this may be in keeping with the nature of those structures as neither speech nor song (above).

What follows is an account of the different measures (Verse Types) and combinations (Systems) employed by H. in the *Epodes*. In the schemes, the subscript numbers indicate verse position,[69] while the superscript numbers show the ratio of long to short syllables at positions in the iambs where either can occur ('anceps'). The principal break ('caesura') in each verse type is indicated by a single bar, verse end or its image (in the *asynarteta*; cf. Verse Type *e*) by a double bar.[70]

poetry either (Van Raalte (1986) 223). In this respect, as in others (Intro. 5), the *Epodes* fall between the *Odes*, where the incidence is even lower (0.3% in *Odes* 1–3, 1.5% in *Odes* 4 and *Saec.*), and the hexameter poetry, in which it tends to be considerably higher (12% in *Sat.* 1, 8% in *Sat.* 2, 9% in *Ep.* 1, 6% in *Ep.* 2.2 and *Ars*, but 2% in *Ep.* 2.1). Cf. Soubiran (1988) 368–70 (other Latin iambic verse), and J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le monosyllable dans l'hexamètre latin* (Paris 1964) 50–68.

[67] Cf. Soubiran (1966) s.v. 'Horace'. An indication of this is provided by comparing H.'s trimeters, in which there are 55 elisions in 311 verses (= 1.8 per 10 verses) to the trimeters and choliambs of Catullus and Varro, in which there are 131 in 228 verses (= 5.7 per 10).

[68] Gratwick (1993) 41, 58–9. H. himself provides some of the evidence for the existence of an *ictus* ('verse accent') in iambic metre (Brink on *Ars* 253, 274), something recent scholars find difficult to accept (Soubiran (1988), Gratwick (1993) 40–1, 59–60). In the *Epodes* there seems to be no correlation between word accent and any positions in the verse where this *ictus* might be located.

[69] The 'positions' are numbered according to the schemes in Van Raalte (1986).

[70] 'Verse end' or, in some metres, 'period end' (cf. West (1982) 4–6, N–H on *Odes* 1, Intro. 3) can be recognized as a position where usage permits either a short syllable where a long would be expected (*brevis in longo*), as in pos. 12 of the iambic trimeter (Verse Type *a*), or hiatus (lack of elision) between a final vowel, diphthong, or (in Latin) -*m* in one verse and an initial vowel or diphthong in the next. For the 'signs' of verse end in *asynarteta*, cf. Verse Type *e*.

Verse Types

a. Iambic trimeter

$$\overset{1:1}{\underset{1}{\bar{\cup}}}\ \overset{}{\underset{2}{\bar{\cup}\cup}}\ \underset{3}{\cup}\ \overset{}{\underset{4}{\bar{\cup}\cup}}\ \overset{2:1}{\underset{5}{\bar{\cup}}}\ |\ \overset{}{\underset{6}{\bar{\cup}\cup}}\ \underset{7}{\cup}\ |\ \overset{}{\underset{8}{\bar{\cup}\cup}}\ \overset{1:1}{\underset{9}{\bar{\cup}}}\ \underset{10}{-}\ \underset{11}{\cup}\ \underset{12}{\bar{\cup}}\ ||$$

H.'s trimeter resembles both that of the Greeks of all periods and of Latin poets who composed 'Greek-style' iambics[71] in regard to the location of the caesura at either pos. 5 or pos. 7 (cf. 1.19, 6.11nn.). But it may be particularly 'Archilochian' in its frequency of verses having word end (w/e) simultaneously at both caesura positions (5 + 7).[72] Its ratio of long to short syllables in anceps (total 1.3 : 1) is closer to that of early Greek poetry (1.4 : 1 in tragedy), including Archilochus (1.1 : 1), than to those of earlier Latin, in which longs predominate, and of Hellenistic epigram, which is more balanced.[73] Like early Greek, but unlike most Hellenistic and 'Greek-style' Latin, it allows 'resolution' of the long into two shorts at the non-anceps pos. 2 (2.33, 67, 5.15, 85, 91, 10.19, 11.27, 17.6, 12, 78), 4 (1.27, 2.35, 57, 61, 3.17, 5.15, 10.7, 17.42, 63, 74), 6 (2.23, 39, 5.25, 49, 7.1, 17.12, 65), and 8 (17.12, 74).[74] On the other hand, H. shows little regard for 'Porson's Law', the tendency in most Greek trimeters outside of comedy to avoid w/e after long anceps at pos. 9 (1.27, 29, 2.13, 33, 47, 3.9, 13, 4.13, 5.17, 19, 93, 7.1, 13, 8.1, 15, 9.27, 10.7, 21, 11.3, 5, 27, 17.13). It is possible that H. was not aware of this 'law', or

[71] These include Catullus (iambic trimeters and choliambs) and fragments of Varro's *Menippea* (cf. System VII). The 'trimeter', if it is that (cf. *Ars* 250–62), of Republican drama and of Lucilius is almost a different 'species', especially in allowing anceps and resolution at all positions save 11 (Gratwick (1993) 40–62).

[72] In both H. and Arch. 35% of the trimeters have w/e at both pos. 5 and 7. This is a higher frequency than in any other Greek poetry (Van Raalte (1986) 171, 183) and than in Catullus' trimeters (15%) and choliambs (22%) and Varro's trimeters (4%).

[73] In Varro the ratio is 2.3 : 1, in Hellenistic epigram it is 1 : 1. For other Greek poetry, see Van Raalte (1986) 105–11. Greek and Latin choliambs, which in other respects resemble iambic trimeters, provide no basis for comparison, since they have only two anceps positions (1 and 5).

[74] Leo (1900) 17. H. seems to agree with Arch. and other early *iambus* in avoiding 'split resolution' (distribution of the shorts between two words), but cf. 2.33n. and 17.74 (elision). For what appear to be resolutions at anceps positions, cf. 2.35n.

that Archilochus did not observe it as 'strictly' as his fragments suggest, or that whatever its significance for the rhythms of Greek it is not relevant to Latin.[75]

In the trimeters of Epode 16 (System vi) there are no long syllables at anceps positions (but cf. app. crit. at 16.4, 14, 36). Such 'pure trimeters' occur intermittently both in the *Epodes* (1.3, 13, 15, 17, 23, 31, 2.1, 7, 41, 4.3, 5, 9, 17, 5.3, 7, 9, 43, 71, 7.15, 9.21, 10.1, 3, 11, 17.22, 23, 28, 38, 40, 41, 64, 75) and in other iambic verse (e.g. Arch. frr. 48.5, 177.3, 196a.50 West). But H. may owe something to Cat. 4 and 29, the only surviving poems earlier than the *Epodes* composed entirely, or almost entirely (cf. Fordyce on 29.3, 20, 23) in this measure.

b. Iambic dimeter

$$\overset{2:1}{\overline{\cup}}_1 \ \overline{\cup\cup}_2 \ \cup_3 \ \overline{\cup\cup}_4 \ \overset{7:1}{\overline{\cup}}_5 \ -_6 \ \cup_7 \ \overline{\cup}_8 \ \parallel$$

This measure is less common than the trimeter, and the surviving examples in Archilochus (frr. 172–8, 180–1, 193–4, 196, 196a = 27 complete verses) differ from those of H. in having a more regular break at pos. 6 (w/e in 74% of the verses, 47% in H.).[76] They also have more short syllables at pos. 5 than at pos. 1 (the inverse of H.), but their total ratio of long to short (2.8:1) resembles that of H. (3.5:1) in being considerably higher than in both poets' trimeters (Verse Type *a*). There are no resolutions in Arch. and few in H.

[75] For 'Porson's Law', cf. West (1982) 42, Van Raalte (1986) 248–56. It appears that the first Latin poet to 'observe' it is Seneca, who still has 'violations' (F. X. Bill, *Beiträge zur lex porsoniana* (Westphalia 1932) 60–84, Soubiran (1988) 368–70). H. and other Latin poets also ignore 'Knox's Law', avoidance of a trochee-shaped ($-\cup$) word filling pos. 8 and 9 (West (1982) 42), and they tend to have a higher overall incidence of w/e at pos. 9 (30% of H.'s trimeters, 47% of Cat., 30% of Var.) than in non-comic Greek verse (10–20%; cf. Van Raalte (1986) 251). This might be because such w/e usually results in coincidence of word accent with the presumed *ictus* (above, n. 68) at pos. 8 and 10, although if this were the intent, one might expect an even higher incidence. For the corresponding pos. 5 in the dimeter, see Verse Type *b* and n. 77 below.

[76] For other iambic dimeters, cf. Hipp. fr. 118 West (System 1), Call. *Iamb.* 5 (combined with choliambs), Laev. *poet.* 1, 4, 6, 15, 18, 21 (?), 23, 27 *FPL*, and A. M. Dale, *The lyric metres of Greek drama* (Cambridge 1968) 75–7 (occasional 'runs' and cola in tragedy and comedy).