From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyrightlaw. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material inour collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff.For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information onthe Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.
https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us

---

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026 Classics

2019

Lucretian Lyric: Allusion and Appropriation in Horace's Odes

Curran, Emma Laraine

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

---

http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp010k225d98k

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf

LUCRETIAN LYRIC: ALLUSION AND APPROPRIATION IN HORACE'S *ODES*

Emma Laraine Curran

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY

OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE BY

THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

Adviser: Denis Feeney

September 2019

© Copyright by Emma Laraine Curran, 2019. All rights reserved.

Abstract

This dissertation examines Horace's engagement with Lucretius in his *Odes*. Although commentators have studied Horace's Lucretian allusions in particular poems, and have seen general Epicurean resonances in the *Odes*, I present a sustained treatment of Lucretian language in the collection, elucidating not only Horace's relationship to the Epicurean, but his construction of his lyric voice. Horace's references to Lucretius are implicated in his creation of a distinctive generic identity for the *Odes*, which involves claiming a place among the Greek lyricists while making his poetry an organic part of Roman culture, topography, and politics. A study of Horace's engagement with Lucretius allows insight into the lyric persona; Horace appropriates Lucretian language as he defends his own poetic activity and develops his authoritative, vatic voice. However, the lyricist treats his predecessor with an equal degree of irreverence, forcing Lucretius into confrontation with the political sphere and often turning the philosopher against himself. Lucretian allusion is, I argue, bound up in Horace's assertive lyric voice, but also in his idiosyncratic and paradoxical sublime imagery.

In the first three chapters, I explore Horace's relationship to Lucretius through three major areas: the poet's depiction of his Sabine estate; his characterisation of his relationship with his patron, Maecenas; and his use of sublime language, particularly in the Bacchus odes, 2.19 and 3.25, and the endings of books 2 and 3. I show how Horace's references to Lucretius are integral to the poet's authoritative voice; the poet uses Lucretian pastoral imagery to imbue his property with ethical *ataraxia*, and increasingly places his patron on the side of urban anxieties, while proclaiming his own freedom. The lyricist's assertion of authority involves a surprising confrontation between Lucretian language and the political order. I show, as well, how Horace's inversions and transformations of Lucretius' philosophical language are involved in the

construction of an irreverent and tricky lyric sublimity. The fourth chapter explores *Odes* 4, a much more political work written a decade after the earlier collection, contending that Horace grants space within his Augustan encomium for Lucretian ideas of eroticism, seasonal cycles, and mortality.

Table of Contents

Abstract iii

Acknowledgements vi

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: Lucretian Pastoral in Horace's Sabine Property 25

Chapter 2: Memmius, Maecenas, and the Epicurean *princeps* 88

Chapter 3: Bacchus, Sublimity, and Wild Spaces in Lucretius and Horace 145

Chapter 4: Lucretian Visions of Venus and Spring in *Odes* 4 210

Conclusion 275

Bibliography 282

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to my committee members, Denis Feeney, Yelena Baraz, and Emily Gowers. Their insightful comments and suggestions have not only improved my arguments throughout the dissertation process, but have helped me become a better and more confident writer. I am particularly thankful to them for their support, patience, and compassion in the final stages of this undertaking.

Thank you to the Princeton Classics Department. I owe particular gratitude to Jill Arbeiter and Stephanie Lewandowski for their guidance and kindness over the past five years. I am thankful for the friendship and advice of the Classics graduate students—I am very fortunate to have spent the past six years in your company, and I will miss you all. Particular thanks to Caroline Mann, Amanda Klause, Emily Hulme Kozey, Carolyn Tobin, Brahm Kleinman, Erik Fredericksen, Thomas Wilson, Clem Wood, and the rest of the Chancellor Green lunch team.

I am grateful for the aid of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Love and many thanks to my parents, Carl and Joan, for their support through the many years of long-distance phone calls and cross-country trips. My deepest love and gratitude to Henry, who made this whole process more complicated, more fun, and infinitely more worthwhile, and to Martin, for his love, patience, and willingness to live in New Jersey for many years.

For my father, who handed down his love of poetry

Introduction

Horace's first Roman Ode decries the opulence and avarice of the city, arguing that wealth, warfare, and other civic concerns cannot banish mental burdens (3.1.36–40):

> . . . sed Timor et Minae
> scandunt eodem quo dominus, neque
> decedit aerata triremi et
> post equitem sedet atra Cura.
>
> . . . but Fear and Threats climb to the same place as the master, and dark Care does not leave the bronzed trireme, and it sits behind the rider.[1]

To these worries, Horace opposes his own modest life on his Sabine estate, offering this life as the antithesis, and thus the implied antidote, to urban extravagance: *cur valle permutem Sabina/divitias operosiores?* ('why would I change my Sabine valley for more troublesome wealth?' 3.1.48). The passage, which contrasts a decadent urban existence and Horace's humble Sabine villa, has vivid Lucretian resonances; it recalls the proem of *De Rerum Natura* 2, which similarly juxtaposes civic riches and a pastoral vision of Epicurean *ataraxia*, and describes the *curae* . . . *sequaces* (2.48) that are not frightened away by the din of war.[2] The Lucretian allusions in 3.1 have been well recognised, but their significance has primarily been explained

[1] All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.
[2] See Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 3) for an account of other connections between 3.1 and the *DRN*. Pasquali (1964, 659), Pöschl (1991, 148–63), and West (2002, 10–23), among others, also study the similarities between the passages. I will discuss 3.1 in greater detail in chapter 1, section C (iv), and I will address the Lucretian resonances of *curae* in depth in chapter 2, section B (iii).

within the context of this ode alone. This dissertation seeks to draw together Horace's references to Lucretius in the *Odes*, looking at them not simply as separate moments among the diverse poems of the lyric collection, but as a cohesive whole. The Lucretian resonances in 3.1 are, I will argue, linked to an ongoing exploration of the *DRN* in the *Odes*, a web of allusions that Horace involves in his construction of the Sabine estate, his lyric voice, and his engagement with Rome itself.

As the example of *Odes* 3.1 intimates, the significance of Lucretian ideas and imagery in individual odes is well attested, but the Epicurean's role as a model for the collection in its entirety has been, for the most part, left to one side, or relegated to the realm of aesthetics alone. Perhaps because of the great variety of influences on the *Odes*—particularly their vowed allegiance to Greek lyric models—or because of their fluctuations in subject, tone, and sincerity, Lucretius has been seen as an important model for particular odes or images, but not for the lyric voice as a whole. Enough work has been done on how Horace is *not*, in essence, Lucretian. In this study, I propose that Lucretius is at the heart of the *Odes*, one of Horace's important models for his lyric project, and that the lyricist's interest in the Epicurean goes beyond a strictly philosophical allegiance, and also goes beyond the borrowing of words and imagery. To argue that Lucretian allusion is a cornerstone of Horace's project is not to argue that the *Odes* are a dogmatically philosophical work, or that Horace is a single-minded Epicurean; instead, I contend here that Horace looks to both Lucretius' poetry and his philosophy as he creates his new, Roman lyric. Lucretius plays a vital part in the poet's construction of a distinctive generic identity for his project and a clear, authoritative lyric voice for himself, one that is equally at home in his Sabine retreat and in the political world of Rome itself.

The *Odes* are profoundly varied in form, subject, and tone, and are densely allusive, displaying a fascination with the literary tradition and the poet's many models. Horace directs the reader's gaze toward himself as poet, whose art intertwines ancient and modern, grand and small, lyric *nunc* and the eternal future of Rome. In placing side by side themes and poetic modes that contrast or even conflict, Horace calls attention to his own artistic control over the text, his own distinctive poetic voice. It is my contention that we miss a vital piece of this lyric voice if we neglect Horace's persistent engagement with Lucretius. Gale (2007, 70) writes of the *DRN*: "Homer was sometimes regarded in the ancient world as the source of all the literary genres; Lucretius, conversely, represents himself as subsuming and—in a sense—transcending them all." In his *Odes*, Horace treats Lucretius' epic as this great source for all genres, and yet always puts himself in the foreground: it is Horace himself, the poet seems to claim, who draws the seeming contradictions of his predecessor's work into harmony and forms out of Lucretius' words a new and Roman genre, one that assumes a natural space within the civic order. In Lucretius, Horace finds a source of humility and sublimity, mortality and immortality; although the lyricist defines and redefines his work in myriad ways throughout the collection, he returns again and again to Lucretius as he articulates his lyric project. I contend here that Horace employs his predecessor in order to bolster his own lyric authority and defend his poetic *otium*, looking to Lucretius' claims of artistic glory as much as to his philosophical images of humble, pastoral tranquillity. In so doing, he offers a personal, lyric reading of the *DRN*, one that isolates particular ideas and passages of Lucretius and often turns the Epicurean against himself; Horace both appropriates and subverts Lucretius in his construction of a lyric identity that is authoritative and yet pervasively contradictory.

(A) Horace's Lyric Programme and Models

Horace's lyric project is a capacious one. It is explicitly a revival of archaic Greek lyric; in his opening poem, the poet asks his patron, Maecenas, to set his work into the lyric canon (*quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres/sublimi feriam sidera vertice*, 'but if you insert me among the lyric bards, I will strike the stars with my uplifted head,' 35–6). The *Odes* are in no way a work of translation, however, nor do they stage a straightforward reanimation of an ancient genre. Horace's lyric collection reveals, first of all, a keen awareness of the entire literary tradition—both Greek and Roman—that has intervened between the archaic poets and his own time period. It also shows itself to be deeply rooted in Roman time and space; the *inseres* of 1.1.35, in fact, reveals the great gap between Horace and his archaic predecessors by evoking the Alexandrian canon.[3] The *Odes* continually describe the Italian landscape, both urban and rural, and reveal their relationship to not only contemporary political circumstances, but the new Roman understanding of time itself, as I will discuss just below. Ross (1975, 152) expresses the place of the *Odes* in their contemporary literary milieu:

> The *Odes* of Horace are the distilled essence of Augustan poetry: they reach naturally to the past, both the Greek literary past and the national past of Rome itself; they owe their depth and variety of expression, their power to move the reader either by simplicity or by the Pindaric torrent, to the poetic activity of what may well be the most sudden and fruitful literary maturation any society has experienced; and they are concerned, finally,

[3] The image also suggests the idea of Maecenas shelving Horace's book among the works in the Palatine library. See e.g. Horsfall (1993). Zetzel (1983, 87) adds that "the very phrase 'lyricis vatibus' combines a transliterated Greek term with *vates*, a recently resurrected archaic Roman word for 'poet'," explaining that Horace is "combining classical Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman elements in what is in fact a radical transformation of the lyric forms of early Greece."

with the experience of their own time, transforming it, in turn, through the timely maturity of poetic expression and theory, into a comprehensible vision of past and future. Horace continually varies the metrical form and length of his poems, just as he varies their content. Their tone shifts from sublime to humble, their focus from past to present to future. They reach from the archaic Greek lyricists into the contemporary day, making of an ancient form a genre that speaks of, and to, Horace's own Roman world. These oscillations are essential to Horace's new genre and the space it carves out for itself in the late first century BCE.

Time, in its many forms, is an integral part of how Horace connects his *Odes* to both their archaic roots and his contemporary world. The *Odes* often take up Greek lyric ideas about the relationship between seasonal cycles and symposium; so, for example, in 1.9 an image of winter leads to an invitation to drink, evoking Alcaeus fr. 338, in which wintery weather leads to symposium (κάββαλλε τὸν χείμων', ἐπὶ μὲν τίθεις/πῦρ, ἐν δὲ κέρναις οἶνον ἀφειδέως/μέλιχρον, 'Down with the storm! Stoke up the fire, mix the honeysweet wine unsparingly').[4] On the other hand, Roman time and the civic calendar have a powerful presence in the *Odes*. Of Horace's *innumerabilis/annorum series* (3.30.4–5), for example, Feeney (2009, 229) writes: "Horace is able to conceive of future time as a continuous linked sequence of years. . . . No Greek lyric poet could have thought in terms remotely like this." The sympotic poems often refer to the new calendar and to Roman historical events; most prominent of these is perhaps 3.21, where Horace praises the wine that was bottled in his own birth year, *consule Manlio* (1). There, the symposium is associated with nighttime, but this image of natural time is linked to Roman time and history, as well as to Horace's own life. All of these ways of expressing the movement of

[4] Text and translation are from Campbell (1982). See e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, 116) and Lyne (2005) for the connection. As we will see in the fourth chapter especially, the language of the seasons—particularly insofar as it contrasts with the linearity of the human lifespan—often draws on Lucretius' imagery as well.

time collide and augment one another in the *Odes*, connecting Horace to his lyric predecessors but also revealing his distance from them, as well as the distinct Roman character of his project.[5]

The opening poem of the *Odes* demonstrates the many genres, subjects, and registers at work in Horace's collection. As a priamel, *Odes* 1.1 is able to present in unified form a wide spectrum of human lives and desires, holding together a range of generic threads from political encomium to epic to pastoral.[6] This first ode therefore evinces what Harrison (2007a) has termed "generic enrichment": "the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres" (1). Without departing from the metrical or thematic boundaries of archaic lyric, 1.1 holds within itself strands of many genres; ostensibly denying all other genres in favour of lyric, Horace shows that his project is expansive enough to contain them all. The form of the poem is comparable to *recusatio* (used, for example, in *Odes* 1.6 and 2.1), another of the lyricist's ways of showing the breadth of his work; by a form of *praeteritio*, the poet's refusals bring epic within the modest framework of a lyric poem.[7] This concept of generic enrichment is important to my own arguments about Lucretius' place within the *Odes*. Horace draws upon Lucretius' own varied and rich work to pull into his lyric a range of themes and registers, from philosophical discourse to epic flights, from sublime tones to Callimachean simplicity. The lyricist's relationship with the philosopher-poet involves a complex balance of

[5] In the second chapter, I argue that Horace employs language about time to write his own anniversaries, and thus the *Odes* themselves, onto the civic calendar and public space.
[6] I will discuss this poem in greater depth in chapter 2, section B (i), where I will consider Maecenas' place within this priamel.
[7] Davis (1991, ch. 1) makes a thorough study of *recusatio* in the *Odes*, showing how the form is part of Horace's "efforts to forge a distinct identity by *both* differentiating himself from *and* incorporating crucial facets of a prestigious Greek tradition" (11).

inclusion and refusal; although he harnesses the power of Lucretian ethics and poetic sublimity, he continually reverses and remythologises his predecessor's words.

Horace's relationship to his literary forebears is central to his lyric project; the *Odes* reach back through the literary past, not only of Greece but of Rome, not only of lyric but of every genre. Barchiesi (2000, 169–70) argues that Horace's interactions with his models are thematised in the work: "The lyric genre exists for Horace in close symbiosis with images of authorship." Thus, he writes, "Horace raises the construction and assertion of a lyric personality to the status of a significant recurring theme in his collection, and the problem of how to establish a personal voice that confronts the canonical voices of the Greek masters becomes not only a prerequisite but also a part of his poetic representation." The opening of the *Odes* thematises Horace's negotiation with his lyric models; the so-called "Parade Odes", the first nine poems of the collection, all have different metres and experiment in particularly vivid ways with Horace's lyric predecessors.[8] In these opening odes, the lyricist calls attention to his own poetic voice, which works to establish a place within the lyric canon, while simultaneously situating the *Odes* in their contemporary time and Italian landscape.[9]

Alcaeus plays an especially prominent role in Horace's articulation of his authorial voice; not only does the Greek poet inspire the climax of the Parade Odes at 1.9, but Lyne (2005, 547) argues that the two poems that follow also take their cue from Alcaeus, with 1.9–11 together forming a "signature sequence" that hints at the first three poems of Alcaeus' own collection, as it was organised in the Alexandrian edition.[10] Alcaeus' centrality in the *Odes* has much to do

[8] See especially Lyne (2005). Lowrie (1997, 128) also argues for a second parade at 1.12–18.
[9] So, for example, the deeply Alcaic 1.9 is firmly rooted in Italian topography, from the opening view of Soracte down to the Campus Martius at the end.
[10] Lyne concludes his argument with the suggestion that Horace's surprising choice to include thirty-eight poems in *Odes* 1 may take its cue from Alcaeus' first book of poems.

with Horace's movement between private and political realms.[11] In his invocation to his lyre at 1.32, Horace addresses his instrument (5–9):

> Lesbio primum modulate civi,
> qui ferox bello, tamen inter arma
> sive iactatam religarat udo
> litore navim,
>
> Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
> semper haerentem puerum canebat . . .

> First tuned by the citizen of Lesbos, who was bold in war, but between battles, or when he had tied up his battered ship on the damp shore, sang of Liber and the Muses, and Venus and the boy who always clings to her . . .

Alcaeus holds together *arma* and *Venus*, a legacy he passes on to his Roman descendant. The opening of 1.37 also reveals this Alcaic unity of public and private: *nunc est bibendum* (1), Horace writes in Alcaic stanzas of the fall of Cleopatra, evoking Alcaeus fr. 332 (νῦν χρῆ μεθύσθην καί τινα πὲρ βίαν/πώνην, ἐπειδὴ κάτθανε Μύρσιλος, 'now we must get drunk, and drink with all our might, since Myrsilos is dead').[12] Private symposium celebrates public event, and Alcaeus provides the model for this connection.

[11] Pindar becomes more prominent than Alcaeus in *Odes* 4; see especially Griffin (2002).
[12] See e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.) and Pöschl (1991, 68–116).

Also conspicuous among Horace's poetic inspirations is the neoteric Roman poet Catullus, whose aesthetics—indebted to the Hellenistic period, in particular the work of Callimachus—are influential on the *Odes*. Although he never names Catullus in the *Odes*, Horace often looks to his Roman predecessor as a model for his own Callimachean tendencies; this is true, for example, in *Odes* 2.16, where Horace aligns his *tenuis* poetics (identified with the Callimachean *leptos* style) with his *tenuis* lifestyle and recalls Catullus' vision of poetic *otium*. As well, Catullus' own relationship with the archaic lyricists makes him an important figure in the *Odes*; for example, in the first chapter I consider how *Odes* 1.22 draws upon Catullus 11 and 51, both in Sapphics, and implicitly corrects his Roman forebear's translation of Sappho's words in the latter. Putnam's (2006) study demonstrates the deep debt that the lyricist owes to Catullus; Horace continually alludes to his predecessor, while also setting himself apart and distinguishing his own *Odes*. I argue here that Horace at times looks to Catullus and Lucretius simultaneously, using the latter to give philosophical grounding to what the lyricist presents as the 'slight' poetics of Catullus, and transforming and highlighting the two poets by juxtaposing them.[13]

(B) Lucretius and Epicureanism in the *Odes*

In this study, I propose that Horace's relationship with Lucretius deserves the kind of attention that has been given to his relationship with Alcaeus. The Greek lyricist, as we have just seen, is a model not only for individual moments of the *Odes*, but for the unity that Horace creates between disparate themes and registers. Over the course of four chapters, I contend that Lucretius also plays a major part in Horace's construction of his lyric identity in the *Odes*. Previous scholarship has primarily interpreted Lucretius' influence on the *Odes* as an aesthetic

[13] This is evident in both 1.22 and 2.16. See chapter 1, sections C (i) and (iii).

one, or one that shapes only individual poems within the collection.[14] There have been very few sustained studies of Lucretian elements in Horace's lyric; Weingaertner (1874) and Rehmann (1969) both demonstrated Horace's profound knowledge of Lucretius' work, but they interpreted the Epicurean as a predominantly aesthetic influence, showing how Horace repeatedly recalls Lucretian phrases in his own poetry.[15] Hardie's (2009) study is invaluable to an understanding of Lucretius' place in the *Odes*, but largely leaves to one side the question of Horace's engagement with Epicurean philosophy, as well as Lucretius' influence on the lyricist's construction of his Sabine landscape and his own humble life. Other studies have identified connections between individual odes—for example, 2.16, 2.18, and 3.1—and Lucretius' philosophy, but have not traced the relationship between these philosophical poems, and have not considered how these odes relate to Horace's construction of an authorial voice.[16] Still others have read the *Odes* as predominantly Epicurean, but have separated these claims from any consideration of Lucretian allusion, instead looking in broad ways at Horace's treatment of such topics as time and friendship.[17]

In this dissertation, I argue that we need to look at the Lucretian elements of the *Odes* as connected, part of a sustained encounter with the Epicurean—albeit one that leaves room for

---

[14] For example, West (1998, 114) argues of 2.16—and Horace's approach in general—that its many Lucretian allusions reveal Horace as "not an evangelist but a ruminator," in sharp contrast with Lucretius, the "zealot".

[15] Weingaertner (1874, 45) writes that Horace *lucretianum carmen valde amasse penitusque memoria tenuisse*, while Rehmann (1969, 244) contends (citing Wimmel 1953, 333), "All die vielen Lukrezreminiszenzen bei Horaz lassen den Schluß zu, daß 'überhaupt vielleicht Lukrez der von Horaz am meisten benutzte römische Autor war'." Hardie (2009) references both studies.

[16] Giesecke (2000, ch. 5) examines these three poems in particular, but determines that in the collection, "There are echoes only of Lucretius' diatribe against luxury, of the details of the process of poetic inspiration, and of his praise of Epicurus" (152). Harrison (2013a, 2017) has excellent observations about Lucretian influence on many individual poems, including the Bacchus odes, as well as on the general philosophical orientation of *Odes* 2.

[17] See especially Michel (1992) and Moles (2007).

irony and subversion. Lucretius, I will argue, figures strongly in Horace's poetic voice, particularly insofar as he is part of the lyric vision of the Sabine estate and the humble lifestyle and poetic freedoms located therein. These Lucretian resonances, which defend the lyricist's poetic *otium*, are implicated in the evolution of Horace's lyric voice over the course of the collection; the poet becomes increasingly authoritative, asserting liberty from Maecenas and staking his claim on civic, political space. In Horace's boldest claims of liberation and glory, we find Lucretius as well; in his creation of a distinct, lyric sublimity, the poet mingles homage to Lucretius' own vision of poetic authority and ironic reversal of Lucretian dogma.

Lucretius' powerful presence in the *Odes* is something of a surprise. As we will see in greater detail below, the *DRN* is one of Horace's models in the *Satires*, a more expected connection because of their shared hexameter form, as well as Lucretius' "proto-satiric and self-consciously didactic elements."[18] The didactic poet's connection to the *Odes* is less transparent, particularly in light of Horace's staging of his project as a revival of archaic lyric. In the simplest terms, Horace's abundant allusions to Lucretius are part of how the lyricist draws archaic Greek lyric into Rome. The *Odes* encompass the entire literary tradition; they are a return to archaic lyric, yet they also embrace genres from satire to epic, and all periods of literary genealogy, through the Hellenistic period and into the Roman world. Horace's extensive allusions to Lucretius emphasise the Roman character of the *Odes*; not only was Lucretius himself a prominent Latin poet, but Epicurean philosophy was part of the fabric of Roman life. When we encounter a lyric, sympotic moment expressed in the language of Lucretius, we see a meeting of archaic Greek and Roman worlds, an ancient sentiment sung in the Roman cultural and literary vernacular. Further, as I will suggest below, the continuity of Lucretian influence between the

[18] Gowers (2012, 22).

Satires and the *Odes* is not arbitrary. In returning to the *DRN* as a model for his lyric, Horace connects his *Odes* to his earlier hexameter work—showing a continuity of ethical concerns, landscapes, and certain aspects of his self-presentation as author—but also articulates the novelty of his lyric project and distinctive poetic voice.

More than this, Lucretius is an ideal model for such a transformation of Greek into Latin, ancient into contemporary. He is himself the successor to a Hellenistic philosophical tradition, and effects a certain 'translation' of his own, bringing Epicurus' philosophy into Rome, transforming it in both language and medium by writing a Latin philosophical poem. Moreover, like Horace, he calls attention to his movement from Greek to Latin (*nec me animi fallit Graiorum obscura reperta/difficile inlustrare Latinis versibus esse*, 'I am not unaware of how difficult it is to light up the obscure discoveries of the Greeks with Latin verses,' 1.136–8).[19] For Lucretius, too, the difficulty and novelty of his project are connected to his preeminence as poet.

Finally, Lucretius also calls upon the entire literary genealogy in his creation of an Epicurean poem; his work holds together all genres, from Homer to Callimachus.[20] Cowan (2013, 116) writes: "The *DRN* makes all genres serve its didactic aim, even going so far as to imply that they were already Epicurean, if only they were read aright." As we will see in the third chapter in particular, the philosopher-poet binds together genres and tones in order to further his didactic project; so, for example, his Bacchic imagery looks to both Callimachean and tragic sources, uniting these influences in his vision of his own poetic innovation and preeminence. Fowler (1989) explains that "the *De rerum natura* was an attempt to reach over the

[19] The poets' use of neologisms is bound up with their assertions of novelty in bringing Greek into Latin. Horace's defence of the creation of words at *Ars P.* 46–69 is indicative of his general approach to neologising; see Dufallo (2005). Putnam (1986) shows the increase in neologism in *Odes* 4. For Lucretius' own neologising, see e.g. Dalzell (1996, ch. 3).

[20] Gale (2007, 74) also writes, "the *DRN* is able to present itself as at once critique and culmination of the Graeco-Roman literary canon."

hellenistic mock-didactic poetry in which style and matter were dissonant to the archaic sublime tradition of Empedocles: to reintroduce *ingenium* without losing *ars*."[21] The *DRN* is a fitting model for the *Odes* not only as a work of linguistic and cultural transformation, then, but as a synthesis of literary traditions; in particular, it reveals a way of engaging with the literary past as far back as the archaic poets, while making room for the innovations of the Hellenistic period. It is Lucretius, I will argue here, more than any other poet, who provides Horace with a model of this blending of traditions, this accommodation of Callimacheanism, philosophy, and archaic sublimity.

Lucretian and Epicurean scholarship has become more popular in recent decades, a fact that greatly benefits this investigation. Studies of Lucretius have given greater attention to the interrelationship of poetry and philosophy within the *DRN*, and, as we will see throughout this dissertation, Horace's distinctive reading of Lucretius in the *Odes* emphasises these same moments. Armstrong (1995) builds on earlier interpretations of Lucretius' poetry and connects them to Philodemus' *On Poetics* to argue for a kind of Epicurean theory of poetics: Lucretius' poetry, which involves a poetic cosmos of letters and words, mirrors the physical cosmos. This conception of poetry relates to Philodemus' treatise, which argues for the precision of an artistic work and the impossibility of rearranging it.[22] Asmis' work on Lucretius has also been

[21] See also Schiesaro (2009, 71): "Lucretius is the Roman poet who most effectively problematises the notion that Callimachean elegance should supposedly be decoupled from any sense of profound intellectual engagement."

[22] See also Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995) and Beer (2009). These studies substantiate the claims of many scholars who have fought against the arguments of Patin's (1883) "l'anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce." Patin, among many others, believed that Lucretius' recourse to poetry and metaphor was antithetical to Epicurean teachings. Friedländer (1941) and Snyder (1980) have both brought out how Lucretius creates a poetic cosmos to mirror the real one, and how his puns and rearrangements of letter and word order reveal the activity of atomic structure. Armstrong and Oberhelman's arguments add evidence to these ideas, showing how both Lucretius and Philodemus connect text to meaning. Armstrong (1995, 228) writes that "both are true Epicureans in that they appeal to a concept of surface textuality, and hidden

particularly insightful in identifying the connections between philosophical content and poetic imagery; her 2008 study, for example, shows how Lucretius uses images of treaties, boundaries, and agriculture to describe atomic activity and cosmic structure, redirecting the Roman reverence for these institutions to the realm of cosmic *ratio*. Lucretius' sublime language, too, has been the focus of several recent studies, most prominently Porter's (2016) survey of ancient sublimity; as we will see in the third chapter, Porter argues that Lucretius' work is as important to the history of the sublime as Longinus' later treatise.[23] These studies, among many others, reveal how Lucretius' poetic style and content is intimately linked to his philosophical teachings. It is my contention here that, although Horace's *Odes* are in no way dogmatic statements of Epicurean philosophy, we cannot separate his interest in Lucretius' poetry from his interest in his predecessor's philosophy; I aim to show that Horace's many allusions to the Epicurean engage with Lucretius' philosophy and poetry, and draw upon both in his creation and development of lyric authority. Horace's focus on particular Lucretian passages or motifs—the philosophical *locus amoenus*, Bacchic imagery, and others—reveals a particular reading of the *DRN*; he emphasises moments where Lucretius' imagery and philosophy are inseparable, and where the philosopher-poet demonstrates the great benefits of teaching Epicureanism through poetry rather than prose. The *Odes* thus show a fascination with Lucretius' own poetic authority and persuasive power.

As Armstrong's work on Epicurean poetics highlights, Lucretius was by no means the only Epicurean philosopher active in Rome during the first century BCE. Epicureanism was a living part of Rome, much like Stoicism, and the cultural environment of the first-century poets

---

appropriateness and deeper significances of both meaning and form beneath it, which is the literary analogy of atomist doctrine in physics."

[23] See also Conte (1994) and Most (2012). The third chapter will explore these ideas of sublimity in depth.

points to sustained interactions between poets and Epicurean philosophers.[24] The work of the Epicurean Philodemus has been increasingly brought to light, deciphered, and analysed, leading to a far greater understanding of how significant his impact was on contemporary Rome. In order to keep the present study focused, I here primarily examine the influence of Lucretius himself on Horace's *Odes*. However, the work of Philodemus will come into play briefly, particularly in the second and fourth chapters, where I consider Horace's allusions to the philosopher's epigram to Piso, a poem that invites a possible patron to an Epicurean celebration of the Twentieth, Epicurus' birthday. These allusions—prominent in 1.20, 4.11, and 4.12 in particular—are closely related to Horace's treatment of Lucretian imagery, and help elucidate the Epicureanism associated with the Sabine property. Similarly, I predominantly discuss Horace's use of particular verbal allusions to Lucretius, rather than his more generalised Epicurean language. In the first chapter, I argue that the broadly philosophical language of *Odes* 2, which many have interpreted as vaguely Epicurean, is focused through specific reference to passages of the *DRN*, and is thus tied to Horace's other uses of Lucretian language. I contend throughout that the lyricist's primary interest is in Lucretius himself, who holds together philosophy and poetry, sublime and simple registers.

In making sense of Horace's relationship with Lucretius in the *Odes*, this study will frequently look to the work of Virgil. As a contemporary of Horace, Virgil's impact on the lyricist can be hard to gauge; their mutual influence and personal connection "makes it difficult at times to determine the chronology of shared motifs or language."[25] Horace's *Satires* show his

[24] The evidence is particularly strong for the connections between Virgil and the Epicureans Philodemus and Siro; the Herculaneum papyri of Philodemus' work reveal that Virgil was, along with Quintilius Varus, Varius Rufus, and Plotius Tucca, the addressee of the Epicurean's *On Flattery*. See Gigante's (2004) study of the Philodemean manuscripts.
[25] Tarrant (2007, 72).

desire to set himself apart from his contemporary. The poet claims to have chosen satire as his medium because other Romans have already excelled at the other genres, and *molle atque facetum/Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae* ('the Camenae who rejoice in the country granted Virgil smoothness and elegance,' *Sat*. 1.10.44–5). Virgil's own philosophical approach has long been seen as eclectic; Servius claims at *Aen*. 10.467, for example, that Virgil uses philosophy to suit his needs, as do other poets (*sectis philosophorum poetae pro qualitate negotiorum semper utuntur*).[26] In a similar vein, Farrell (2015) argues that Virgil incorporates both a four-element philosophical theory and Epicurean ideas in the *Georgics*.[27] We will see in the first chapter, as well, that Virgil employs Lucretian allusion in the *Eclogues* in order to claim originality for his own pastoral vision, but also complicates and reverses much of Lucretius' interpretation of the pastoral mode. I argue that Horace, who makes pastoral only one thread of the collection, vies with Virgil's *Eclogues* by grounding his use of the mode more firmly in a Lucretian sense of mental tranquillity and arguing for the primacy of his own landscape. In the final chapter, I discuss the impact of the publication of the *Aeneid* on *Odes* 4. There, I contend that Horace continually juxtaposes imperial sentiments drawn from Virgil's epic with Lucretian ideas of mortality and seasonal change, drawing the two into conflict and then, in the final poem, bringing them together into a kind of harmony.

[26] See also his commentary at *G*. 4.219.

[27] See also Ross (1987). Gale (2000) makes a sustained study—building on Hardie's (1986) treatment of Virgil's remythologisation of Lucretius in the *Aeneid*—of how the *Georgics* treat Lucretius in a deliberately inconsistent way by remythologising Lucretius, bringing the *DRN* into conflict with itself and using Lucretian language in non-Lucretian arguments.

(C) The *Satires*

The *Odes* are by no means Horace's first experiment with Lucretian allusion; the lyric collection is set apart not by the fact that it alludes extensively to Lucretius, but by the way it does so. A brief look at the *Satires* reveals a deep engagement with the philosopher-poet. As I suggested above, the Lucretian references in the *Satires* are in many ways more expected, given Horace's hexameter form and didactic elements, as well as the satiric aspects of Lucretius. Horace's frequent allusions to the Epicurean add aesthetic interest and philosophical background to his *Satires*, but are also part of how he defines his genre and articulates his satiric voice. I will argue that the *Odes*, too, are shaped in important ways by their engagement with Lucretius; the Epicurean is therefore implicated in the distinctions that Horace draws between the genres and poetic voices of his own works. The opening poems of the *Odes* and the *Satires* hint at this. The priamel of *Odes* 1.1 is reminiscent of the *mempsimoiria* that begins *Sat*. 1.1; whereas the former gives an account of various human preferences, the latter describes the discontent of every person with his own profession and lot.[28] Seafaring and warfare figure prominently in both opening poems; at *Sat*. 1.1.4–8 the merchant and soldier envy each other, while at *Odes* 1.1.11–22 the two lives frame that of an otiose pastoral figure.[29] Both evoke the proem of *DRN* 2, where the detached perspective of the Epicurean sage contrasts with the tumultuous cares of those endangered at sea or in war.[30] Horace both connects and distinguishes his satiric and lyric

[28] See e.g. Santirocco (1986, 16–17).
[29] I argue in the first chapter that this indolent man is a symbol of Lucretius' own pastoral imagery, and is thus connected to Horace's own poetic persona. Observing the many connections between *Sat*. 1.1 and *Odes* 1.1, Farrell (2007, 179–81) contrasts the two in terms of their images of the body; the first body we see in the *Satires* is that of the decrepit soldier (4–5), while the first body of the *Odes* is that of the reclining pastoral man.
[30] Freudenburg (2002, 20).

projects through the form and language of their related opening poems; Lucretius plays a role in how Horace stages his two works, and thus also in how he sets them apart.

Sat. 1.1 continues to look to Lucretius as it establishes the language and tone of the collection. Horace makes a claim about the function of satire a little later in the poem, calling upon Lucretius' own famous honeyed-cup analogy (*DRN* 1.943–47), where the philosopher-poet outlines the purpose of poetry by comparing it to the honey that doctors use to convince children to drink wormwood. Horace writes (*Sat*. 1.1.23–7):

> praeterea, ne sic, ut qui iocularia, ridens
> percurram: quamquam ridentem dicere verum
> quid vetat? ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi
> doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima . . .
>
> Further, so that I do not run through everything, laughing as one who tells jokes—although what prevents someone who is laughing from speaking the truth? As coaxing teachers sometimes give pastries to children so that they wish to learn their first letters . . .

Horace alludes to his predecessor's passage in order to explain his own satiric method and, implicitly, his use of poetry; his inclusion of the word *elementa*, a favourite of Lucretius, cements the connection.[31] The satirist's relationship with the Epicurean continues to the end of the poem, where Horace employs the image of the *conviva satur* (119), who is both the man

[31] See especially Armstrong (2015) and Gowers (2012, 22 and ad loc.).

content with life and, the satirist suggests with *satis est* in the next line, the figure of a complete poem. Turpin (1998) argues that Horace here looks to *DRN* 3.938–9 and 959–60, where Lucretius compares the man who lived a happy life to a guest who has dined well.[32] The satirist thus returns to Lucretius repeatedly in his programmatic first poem. Not only does Horace claim the importance of the Epicurean to his project, but he approaches his predecessor in a tongue-in-cheek way; Lucretius seems to offer something of a model for the satiric voice, but the playful way Horace treats him is also a key part of his poetic persona.[33] While the *Satires* are shaped by their relationship to Lucretius, moreover, they reveal a narrator who is continually at odds with himself and can never entirely embody his own principles of philosophy or poetry.[34]

It is difficult to assess the unity and intent of *Satires* 2, but the book is permeated with philosophical language of all kinds. The caricature of the Stoic Damasippus in 2.3 and that of the Epicurean Catius in 2.4 are particularly explicit explorations of popular pseudo-philosophy. Horace does not assent to either philosophy, but instead paints both in light of contemporary stereotypes about them; the Stoic has no measure for degrees of madness, instead seeing all people who do not reach the level of the wise man as equally foolish, while the Epicurean's precepts are entirely culinary. Horace distances himself deliberately from the philosophical ideas of both poems, putting the theories in the voices of other characters and, further, making Stertinius the source of Damasippus' ideas in 2.3 and an unnamed *auctor* (11) the source of

---

[32] There is also an earlier parallel to *DRN* 3.980–83. As in Lucretius, Tantalus becomes a living person, the man afflicted by greed, instead of a mythological underworld figure: *mutato nomine de te/fabula narratur* (69–70).

[33] Satire is in fact present in the *DRN* as well: Gowers (2012) points to Horace's transformation in 1.3 of the lover's delusions in *DRN* 4. There, Horace makes such delusions desirable in the case of friendship, drawing on satirical language in Lucretius himself; Rochette (2001) and Knorr (2004) also analyse this similarity.

[34] Putnam (1995–6, 313) writes that Horace "alerts his reader to the fact that knowledge of both the composition and contents of Lucretian didactic and Virgilian pastoral poetry are crucial for full appreciation of the satiric project on which he is embarking."

Catius' in 2.4. The satirist also displays a fascination with Plato: *nec meus hic sermo est* (2.2.2) echoes Plato's *Symposium*, while *unde et quo Catius?* (2.4.1) recalls the first line of the *Phaedrus*, and Damasippus refers to Horace reading Plato (2.3.11).[35] Epicureanism, then, forms just one part of Horace's exploration and blending of philosophies in this second book.

Horace experiments with philosophy in book 2 in part through the theme of food, which is particularly prominent in 2.4, 2.6, and 2.8.[36] The caricature of the Epicurean in 2.4 suggests that we are in part meant to think of food as obliquely pointing to Epicurean conceptions and misconceptions.[37] Ofellus' lifestyle in 2.2, especially, is clearly modelled on Epicurean precepts; the first line, *quae virtus et quanta, boni, sit vivere parvo*, seems to recall Lucretius' injunctions, such as *vivere parce* (5.1118), and to look ahead to the ideals of the *Odes*. Ofellus' simple dining style, surrounded by friends, is echoed in Horace's own feast with his friends in 2.6, where each dines according to his *libido* (67).[38] Pleasure is central, but *libido* is here a principle of moderation rather than excess. One of the philosophical questions at this dinner party, whether *usus rectumne* (75) leads to friendship, is a particularly Epicurean one, and the philosophical character of this symposium suggests a kind of ideal friendship produced through the *otium* and modesty of country living.[39] The feast of 2.8 is in stark contrast to that of 2.6. There, again, are

---

[35] For a more complete consideration of Platonic resonances in *Satires* 2, see Harrison (2013b), Gowers (1993), Freudenburg (2001, 117), and Classen (1978).

[36] See especially Gowers (1993), Oliensis (1998), and Rudd (1981, 202–23). Gowers discusses thoroughly the etymological implications of food in satire, and the ways in which *Satires* 2 makes literal much of the symbolic language of food that is connected to satire itself in the first book and throughout Horace's corpus.

[37] Horace makes the Epicurean character of 2.4 particularly apparent with the narrator's final statement to Catius: *at mihi cura/non mediocris inest, fontis ut adire remotos/atque haurire queam vitae praecepta beatae* (94–5). These lines recall *DRN* 1.927–8: *iuvat integros accedere fontes atque haurire* (see Muecke 1993 and Classen 1978).

[38] See Muecke (1993, 194). Armstrong (1986) compares 1.6 and 2.6 as well in terms of their presentations of Horace's simple lifestyle (280–1), also giving an account of the popular idea of the 'Epicurean day', as, for example, is found in Cicero's *Ad Fam*. 9.20 and Epictetus 3.24 (277ff.).

[39] Armstrong (2015, 96): "The passage gains a new dimension if we see it as a profession by the speaker of allegiance to the Epicurean theory of what the gods and their friendships are like." We will see in the

hints of philosophy, but these are of a parodic character: *suavis res, si non causas narraret earum et/naturas dominus* (92–3).[40] Throughout *Satires* 2, then, the question of the proper way to live is articulated through the language of food and its connection with friendship, also a vital element of Epicurean philosophy.

The Sabine estate and the related figure of Maecenas play prominent roles in Horace's negotiation with Lucretian ideas and language in the *Satires*.[41] Maecenas is central to the way that Horace moves between simplicity and extravagance: he is source of gifts but also of certain social difficulties in 2.6; Davus accuses Horace of rushing off to Maecenas' dinner parties at a moment's notice in 2.7; and in 2.8 Maecenas is the guest of honour at Nasidienus' ridiculous banquet. As we will see in the first chapter, the *otium* and *modus* of the Sabine property in *Sat*. 2.6 are strongly connected to Lucretian philosophy, particularly Lucretius' employment of pastoral language to illustrate the idea of Epicurean *ataraxia*, an imagistic thread of the *DRN* that I will discuss in detail. Whereas in the *Odes* Horace looks to this same Lucretian pastoral language in his construction of the Sabine estate, and uses this imagery to bolster his own poetic authority, in the *Satires* similar imagery is implicated in Horace's ethical meditations, but also the way he continually undercuts his satiric persona.

(D) Chapter Summaries

The first three chapters of this dissertation examine *Odes* 1–3, while the fourth chapter deals briefly with the *Epistles* before discussing *Odes* 4. The opening chapter investigates the Italian landscape of Horace's Sabine property, which the lyricist repeatedly figures as a space of

---

first chapter, section C, that Horace undermines the sincerity of his Epicurean symposium even within *Sat*. 2.6.

[40] See e.g. Freudenburg (1995, 207 n. 1) and Caston (1997, 243–4).

[41] See chapter 1, section C.

poetic *otium*. I begin with a discussion of pastoral landscapes in the *DRN*; Horace shapes his Sabine estate in significant ways through allusion to Lucretius' pastoral, so we must first look at how the philosopher-poet employs the mode in his own work. Lucretius' pastoral scenes illustrate Epicurean mental *ataraxia*, implicitly correcting the Hellenistic pastoral tradition and arguing for the value of a philosophical poetry that reflects cosmic order and leads the reader to his own tranquillity. First Virgil's *Eclogues*, and then Horace's *Odes*, draw on Lucretius' use of the pastoral mode, not only to provide aesthetic colouring, but to harness the Epicurean's ideas of poetic primacy. Horace, this chapter contends, also weaves Lucretius' ethical vision into his Sabine estate; by imbuing his property with a sense of Epicurean modesty and mental tranquillity, the lyricist presents his own poetic freedom as bound up with philosophical authority, thus defending his own work and claiming Lucretius' primacy as his own. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the political implications of the Sabine villa; in the Roman Odes that begin book 3, the authority that Horace has constructed for himself comes face to face with the state, and proposes itself as a cure for political ills.

In the second chapter, I continue to explore the connection between the public and private sides of Horace's lyric project, considering how the poet uses Lucretian and Epicurean language to articulate his relationship with his patron, Maecenas. After looking briefly at the role of Memmius in the *DRN*, and discussing how Lucretius hints at his own relationship with Rome in his first proem, I turn to the Maecenas odes and examine them sequentially. Horace constructs the figure of Maecenas in the *Odes* in such a way as to claim increasing independence for himself. I contend here that this autonomy begins in 1.20, where the poet uses Philodemus' epigram to Piso in order to establish an identity between Epicurean *philia* and Roman *amicitia*, so placing the two men on equal footing. The poems of *Odes* 2 then locate Maecenas at a

juncture between a Lucretian ethical sensibility and the dangerous decadence of the city, while those of *Odes* 3 increasingly situate the patron on the side of the city. As Horace gradually sets Maecenas against his own Epicurean ethics, however, he simultaneously claims for himself a space in the public sphere, inscribing his own poetry and personal life on urban space and the civic calendar. This second chapter thus argues that Horace's negotiation of his relationship with his patron is in key ways articulated through Lucretian and Epicurean language, and is implicated in the poet's double claim of authority: on both Lucretian ethics and imperial greatness.

The third chapter takes up Horace's grand claims of poetic inspiration and immortality, looking at how these claims also draw upon Lucretian language. The arguments of this chapter build upon those of the first two; the poet constructs his lyric authority in part by evoking Lucretian ethics, and this increasing assertiveness leads into the poet's sublime flights. The lyricist at times appropriates the philosopher-poet's own vatic tones, and at times reverses and subverts Lucretius' language. I first discuss the role of sublimity in the *DRN*, looking at its philosophical power. I focus particularly on Lucretius' Bacchic imagery in the Second Proem of book 1, which resonates through the work. Turning again to the *Odes*, I show how Horace's two Bacchus odes, 2.19 and 3.25, unite the simple and sublime sides of Horace's lyric poetry; this unity of poetic themes and registers, which is related to the *biformis* character of Bacchus himself, owes a good deal to Lucretius' own Bacchic language. The chapter then turns to the sublime, elevated spaces of the *Odes* as a whole, showing how Lucretian language is repeatedly involved in Horace's declarations of inspiration and exemplarity. Throughout, I contend that Horace's use—both sincere and ironic—of Lucretian allusion is involved in his construction of his distinct mode of lyric sublimity, which both exalts and undercuts the bard.

The fourth chapter considers Horace's final book of *Odes*, written a decade after the earlier books. *Odes* 4 is strikingly urban and political in comparison to the previous books; it leaves the Sabine hills behind and moves into the city, coming into closer confrontation with the civic realm and, for the first time, addressing Augustus himself. As the poet becomes more Pindaric and political, he becomes in certain ways less Lucretian, but the Epicurean is still prominent in this final book of lyric. This chapter begins by looking briefly at Horace's *Epistles*, which were composed in between *Odes* 1–3 and 4. I argue that Horace's hexameter letters reveal a deep engagement with Lucretian ideas, looking back to the *Satires* and the *Odes*, and that this allusive structure is part of how he articulates his epistolary project. Turning to *Odes* 4, I examine the figure of Venus and her associated vernal imagery throughout the collection, contending that it is through Horace's use of these images that we can most clearly see his relationship with Lucretius. Venus and spring are associated with the *pax Augusta*—and, relatedly, the vision of Virgil's *Aeneid*—as well as a Lucretian sense of mortality, and these interpretations vie with one another in the book. I assert that imperial and Lucretian views reach a kind of harmony in the final poem, which ends with a communal, civic hymn that draws upon the opening of Lucretius' poem: *Troiamque et Anchisen et almae/progeniem Veneris canemus* ('we will sing of Troy and Anchises and the offspring of nurturing Venus,' 4.15.31–2). This song, which is both Lucretian and civic, grants a space within the communal glorification of the state for the ageing poet, his personal desires and friendships, and Epicurean ideas of natural cycles.

Chapter 1: Lucretian Pastoral in Horace's Sabine Property

We begin our investigation of Lucretius' presence in the *Odes* within Horace's Sabine property. As a space that foregrounds the poet's sacrosanctity, creativity, and primacy, the Sabine landscape is of great importance to Horace's project in the *Odes*. The poet describes his property as a retreat from the city and associates it with moderation in both lifestyle and poetics, so its general Epicurean character has been well recognised. My goal here is not just to show how the estate in the *Odes* is full of Lucretian echoes; I aim to uncover how the landscape participates in a distinctly Lucretian interpretation of the pastoral mode, while Horace engages with Virgil's *Eclogues* and the Alexandrian tradition at the same time. Lucretius' vision of pastoral has an important role in how Horace refashions archaic lyric in a Roman context. Horace's Sabine property and its concomitant pastoral imagery are indebted to Lucretius' pastoral images of *ataraxia* and poetic creation, which Horace draws upon to bolster his own vatic authority and give ethical power to his lyric voice. At the same time, Horace personalises the pastoral mode and restores its mythological denizens, both contradicting Lucretius' Epicurean vision of pastoral and carving out a space for his lyric in relation to the *Eclogues*. Horace appropriates the philosophical and poetic significance of Lucretius' pastoral landscapes, making them his own property through the image of the Sabine estate. In so doing, he defends his own poetic *otium*, justifying the creativity that he associates with his Sabine withdrawal. Lucretian allusion is thus tied to Horace's articulation of his own authorial identity in the *Odes*; by connecting Lucretian ethics with his property and thus his poetic output, Horace increases his lyric authority, an authority that eventually allows him to address Rome itself.

The first section of this chapter will consider the pastoral landscapes of the *DRN*. I will examine the idyllic image in the proem of book 2, where *ataraxia* is illustrated by a scene of

repose in the shade, and go on to explore the connections between this passage and two others: the illusory appearance of nymphs and satyrs in echoing landscapes (4.580–94) and Lucretius' account of the invention of music (particularly 5.1390–99). Through the interconnections between these three passages, I will argue, Lucretius gives poetic form to an Epicurean idea of mental tranquillity, emphasises the importance of intellectual withdrawal from civic concerns, and relates his own poetic philosophy to the foundations of civilisation, thus asserting his own originality. I will next briefly take up the reception of Lucretius' pastoral imagery in Virgil's *Eclogues*, which open with a scene that is equally Theocritean and Lucretian. I will here show that Virgil's pastoral resonates with the language of Lucretius, but the *Eclogues* continually undermine and question the Epicurean poet's pastoral vision; Lucretius' pastoral imagery is implicated in Virgil's complicated relationship to the state and the natural environment.

The remainder of the chapter will concern Horace's reception of this Lucretian pastoral landscape, and will explore how the lyricist relates his work to Virgil's bucolic poetry while also returning directly to Lucretius' work. I will here contend that Horace draws on Lucretius' pastoral language not only to emphasise the harmony between nature and song in his Sabine estate, but to give his poetic project philosophical substance, and to bind together its poetic and philosophical sides. I will first take up *Odes* 1.1, considering how the image of the man drinking by the stream (1.1.19–22) introduces both pastoral imagery and Epicurean *ataraxia* to the lyric realm. *Odes* 1.17, Horace's first description of his Sabine villa, again views the pastoral landscape through the lens of Lucretius, reminding the reader of an Epicurean ideal life and the birth of song out of the natural world. I will therefore argue that Horace engages with the traditional questions of pastoral while relating them to a state of philosophical tranquillity,

defending his own endeavour and giving it a kind of ancient origin story by evoking Lucretius' account of the foundation of civilisation.

After examining these introductory poems, I will discuss *Odes* 1.22, considering how the poet evokes an Epicurean idea of how the human mind can escape its own limitations by accepting the limits of the natural order. Horace, I will argue, relates this paradox to the *termini* of his own Sabine property; the Lucretian authority he claims through pastoral allusion permits a form of liberation not unlike that of Epicurus in the *DRN*. I will then turn to the second book of the *Odes*, where the strong presence of Lucretian imagery gives the philosophical ideas of the book a Lucretian framework. The idea of limits is again central here: the book's most prominent theme is that of moderation in philosophy, lifestyle and poetics. This discussion will culminate with a discussion of *Odes* 2.16 and its engagement with the idea of *otium*: Horace connects his modest life and poetic style to Epicurean *ataraxia*, thus defending his existence as poet through Lucretian echo and confirming the suggestions of the first book.

Finally, I will turn to the third book of the *Odes* and discuss how the Lucretian moderation of the previous book becomes more intensely engaged with the political realm. This discussion will lead into that of the next chapter, where I will take up the figure of the poet's patron, Maecenas, and consider the other odes of book 3 in more depth; there, I will examine how Horace simultaneously claims Epicurean and imperial freedoms for himself. My investigation will focus on *Odes* 3.1 and 3.4, where the poet's private retreat becomes intimately connected to the realm of politics. By offering his Sabine property as the cure for civic ills, Horace moves away from Epicurean withdrawal, revealing the political potency of his own ethical and poetic stance; the lyric poet figures himself repeatedly as a kind of Alcaeus, both sympotic and political, but both his retreat and his civic engagement find expression through

distinctly Roman conceptions of philosophy and politics.[42] Both drawing on and rejecting Lucretius' poetry, Horace appropriates Lucretius' artistic and philosophical authority, while at the same time reworking his predecessor to make him part of a new, Roman lyric that participates in the discourse of empire and power.

(A) Lucretian Pastoral

As we will see in what follows, Horace's Sabine landscape is strongly informed by the pastoral tradition, even as the poet embraces numerous genres and subjects. Virgil's *Eclogues* play an important role in Horace's reception of pastoral, unsurprisingly, but so too does Lucretius' philosophical interpretation of the pastoral mode. We must begin by investigating this mode in Lucretius, considering his various uses of pastoral imagery side by side. The *DRN* is a capacious project; Lucretius makes room within his didactic epic for the pastoral mode, among many others, as we saw in the introduction.[43] Pastoral is a notoriously difficult tradition to define; it is commonly accepted that it originates with Theocritus, but exactly what Theocritus can be seen to invent is controversial, and the *Idylls* have precursors in earlier traditions, looking back to such works as Plato's *Phaedrus* and Hesiod's *Theogony*.[44] Theocritus himself plays with questions of genre and innovation. Payne (2007, 20) argues, for example, that *Id.* 7 "dramatizes the invention of pastoral as the encounter between a version of its creator and a fictional character that inspires it," suggesting that pastoral "precedes its creator." Hubbard (1998, 21) describes the genre as being, at its core, about the genealogy of poetry itself: "The bucolic, more

[42] See Morgan's (2009) study of 3.13 for a clear discussion of how Horace characterises his poetic output as Alcaic in its essential form.
[43] See especially Gale (2007) for an analysis of the many genres at work in Lucretius' project.
[44] See especially Jenkyns (1992) and Hubbard (1998, ch. 1); as well, the introduction to the Brill companion (Fantuzzi and Pananghelis 2006) summarises well the issues at stake and the connections between Theocritean pastoral and previous traditions, and gives relevant bibliography.

than any other poetic type, is about poetic influence and succession: bucolic poetry by its very nature can exist only as part of an interconnected tradition of poets influencing other poets." This is evident in the amoebean song of Theocritus' characters, and also in Theocritus' own relationship to the poetic past. Thus, for example, the description of the *kissubion* in the first *Idyll* (27–61) contends with epic and rustic traditions; a Homeric word used for the simple drinking cup of the Cyclops and Eumaeus becomes an intricate ecphrasis with parallels to the Shield of Achilles.[45] Poetic agonism is central to Lucretius', Virgil's, and Horace's divergent interpretations of the tradition, and the interactions between them, as we will see. Lucretius' own pastoral imagery involves an implicit correction of the tradition, and, further, he claims a kind of primacy for his own poetry using a pastoral vision of the origins of song.

The natural environment is also a central element of the pastoral tradition, especially as it is received by Lucretius and then Virgil and Horace. The connection between human and nature, particularly insofar as it is itself amoebean, proves crucial to an understanding of how Lucretius participates in the tradition. The first *Idyll* opens with an "intertwined parallelism of man and nature."[46] Thyrsis begins, ἀδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἁ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα,/ἁ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι, μελίσδεται, ἀδὺ δὲ καὶ τύ/συρίσδες ('the pine tree, the one by the springs, sings some sweet whispering, goatherd, and you play your pipe sweetly too,' 1.1–2).[47] The idealisation of nature is part of this relationship: "the Theocritean countryside is always peacefully under human control."[48] Connected to this is the relationship between city and country in the pastoral mode.

---

[45] Hubbard (1998, 21).
[46] Gutzwiller (1991, 85). See also Hunter (1999, ad loc.), who observes that "both ψιθύρισμα and μελίσδεται are transferred from the human sphere to that of nature to emphasise the relationship."
[47] Gutzwiller (1991, 84) writes that the two speeches at the beginning of *Id*. 1 are "carefully worked to create the impression that man and nature are almost interchangeable, virtually indistinguishable, in the world vision of these rustics."
[48] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004, 145).

Theocritus moves back and forth between the two in his *Idylls*, and the relationship is foregrounded within the individual poems, even in their form, which holds together 'high' epos with 'low' subjects.[49] Simichidas, in *Id.* 7, read as a figure of the bucolic poet himself, is an urban poet who has become pastoral; the character thus epitomises the interaction between city and country, a relationship that is explored by Lucretius, Virgil, and Horace in turn.[50]

The proem to *DRN* 2 envisions mental tranquillity as a pastoral idyll.[51] Nature demands nothing, Lucretius declares, *nisi utqui/corpore seiunctus dolor absit, mensque fruatur/iucundo sensu cura semota metuque* ('except that pain be absent from the body, and that the mind enjoy pleasurable sensation, with care and fear removed,' 2.17–19). People need simple pleasures, not luxury (2.29–33):

> cum tamen inter se prostrati in gramine molli
> propter aquae rivum sub ramis arboris altae
> non magnis opibus iucunde corpora curant,
> praesertim cum tempestas adridet et anni
> tempora conspergunt viridantis floribus herbas.
>
> Yet when they lie with one another on the soft grass by the stream, under the branches of a tall tree, they refresh their bodies joyfully, with no great labour, especially when the weather smiles and the time of year sprinkles the green grass with flowers.

[49] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004, 141).
[50] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004, ch. 4).
[51] See especially Betensky (1976), Buchheit (1984), Gale (1994b, 147–8), De Lacy (2007), and Giesecke (2007).

The image is as much an illustration of *ataraxia* as of physical pleasure. Lucretius' treatment of the pastoral tradition emphasises this idea. He looks to Theocritus, particularly the repose by the cave of the nymphs in *Id.* 7 (131ff.), for the framework of the passage: the rural setting, the natural bed, the shade, and the water. In clear contrast to the Theocritean landscape, however, Lucretius' image is markedly generic: his tree is simply an *arbor*, his flowers are *flores*, and his people are unnamed.[52] His generalities stress the timelessness of the scene: the pastoral vision of book 2 is attainable, in the form of mental accord with nature, by any dedicated Epicurean mind.[53] As well, like Theocritus, Lucretius interrogates the relationship between city and country in his pastoral imagery; pastoral peace is opposed to the opulence of the city, continuing the imagery of the opening lines, in which the wise man looks down from his *templa serena* (8) at humans struggling for *nobilitas* (7–13). The centrality of the countryside in pastoral thus becomes an Epicurean tenet: *ataraxia*, envisioned as pastoral tranquillity, necessitates separation from the city and politics, but this is primarily a mental, rather than physical, process. The Epicurean *kēpos* gives a model for such a relationship between philosopher and city; Epicurus' Garden, just outside Athens' Dipylon Gate, created a semi-withdrawn community for Epicureans, but remained integrated with the city. The distance from which the wise man gazes on civic strife is a mental detachment, reinforced by a semi-secluded community based on philosophical friendship.[54]

Natura is violent as well as fruitful. The Epicurean wise man must understand this truth, yet there is no hint of it in the pastoral image of book 2, much like the opening lines of the whole

---

[52] Betensky (1976, 46).
[53] Cf. Gillis (1967, 353). Also see Betensky (1976, 54): "Certainly the pastoral scenes in the poem present a natural ideal which people can adopt only metaphorically."
[54] See especially Asmis (2004, 135): "Epicureans form a close community with one another; but they also adapt themselves to the institutions of the larger community."

work, where the poet invokes Venus as a goddess of fertile nature: *te, dea, te fugiunt venti, te nubila caeli/adventumque tuum, tibi suavis daedala tellus/summittit flores* ('the winds flee from you, goddess, the clouds in the sky flee from you and your approach; for you the inventive earth sends forth sweet flowers,' 1.6–8). The goddess is associated with lush, fecund landscapes that hint at a similar *locus amoenus*, and prefigure the strong connection that such natural scenery will have to a conception of philosophical tranquillity.[55] Lucretius begins to suggest the destructive side of nature with his image of Mars lying in Venus' lap (29–43), a nod to Empedocles' dualistic conception of the universe that is quickly dissolved: the *eadem natura* (57), the philosopher explains, destroys that which it produced.[56] In order to be liberated, the Epicurean must understand how the two sides are linked within the cosmic *ratio*. The poet illustrates this liberation at the end of book 3 with an image of how each man tries to flee himself, discontented with anywhere he finds himself.[57] If he could see what was wrong, Lucretius writes, *iam rebus quisque relictis/naturam primum studeat cognoscere rerum* ('with these matters put aside, he would then strive first to learn the nature of things,' 3.1071–2). A crucial lesson of the *natura rerum* is the inexorable, destructive power of nature: *certa quidem finis vitae mortalibus adstat* ('there is indeed a fixed limit of life for mortals,' 1078). True

[55] The connection between the proems of books 1 and 2 is emphasised by the word *suavis*, which Lucretius uses to describe the state of the wise man looking placidly at the troubles of others at 2.1–6. The *locus amoenus* imagery associated with Venus in book 1 is confirmed to be a vision of mental tranquillity by the language of book 2.

[56] See especially Sedley (1998) and Campbell (2015) for the Empedoclean resonances. The peaceful image of fertile Venus in the proem to book 1 becomes gradually redefined: "Venus is not so much eclipsed as redefined, or fragmented. Her attributes are gradually stripped from her, and given instead to the blind forces of inanimate nature" (Gale 1994b, 212). For the introduction of violence in the image of Mars and Venus, see e.g. Giesecke (2007, 131) and Edmunds (2002, 345). See also Thury (1987, 289), who argues that even in the first line, Lucretius' description of Venus as *Aeneadum genetrix* highlights the Roman character of the goddess and the "connection between Romanness and passion and violent action prepares for the association of Venus with war."

[57] A passage that we can see at work in Horace's *Satires* 1.1.

contentment lies in this understanding; the Epicurean who comprehends the natural limits of his own existence in the world is the only one who can possess true tranquillity.[58] It is this perfect accord with the natural order that is the basis for Lucretius' pastoral language, his image of harmony with the natural environment.

As an illustration of *ataraxia*, pastoral imagery is a vision of *libertas*. Asmis (2008, 142) argues: "Lucretius demands that humans must use their unique natural power, reason, to recognise three basic limits: a limit to the power of the gods; a limit to their lifetime; and a limit of pleasure. These limits are enabling conditions rather than constraints, making it possible for humans to live a life of happiness." The sage who has come to this understanding of his own natural condition is the one whose mental tranquillity approximates that of the pastoral figures: "The rural scenes represent a life within boundaries; the fury of war represents a life that lurches far beyond any boundaries" (155). Lucretius uses the pastoral mode to illustrate harmony with *natura*: the idealised scene of physical accord with nature becomes symbolic of an acceptance of one's place and boundaries within the natural order of things.[59] The paradox of Epicurus' flight is closely related to this idea (1.72–7):

> ergo vivida vis animi pervicit, et extra
> processit longe flammantia moenia mundi
> atque omne immensum peragravit mente animoque,
> unde refert nobis victor quid possit oriri,

[58] Thus Betensky (1976, 55) contends: "On this foundation Lucretian pastoral is based. This is nature in its broadest and least specific sense, *natura rerum*, to be understood for its bearing on the place of mortal beings within the natural world."
[59] Newlands (1984, 61) explains that "Lucretius introduced into the Hellenistic concept of the *locus amoenus* an ethical principle."

quid nequeat, finita potestas denique cuique
quanam sit ratione atque alte terminus haerens.

Therefore the vigorous power of his mind was victorious, and he went far beyond the fiery walls of the universe and wandered the whole expanse in his mind and spirit, whence he brought back to us in victory what is able to come into being, what is not, and finally, how each thing's power is limited and its boundary stone set deep.

The master's flight beyond the *moenia mundi* is possible because of his understanding of the *termini* of things; in other words, true Epicurean freedom is found not in the removal of boundaries but in the acceptance of them.[60] The sage must accept both the laws that govern the cosmic *ratio* and his own bounded place within the universe, and only thus attain true *libertas*.

With this in mind, we can turn to the two other prominent instances of pastoral imagery in the work. The pastoral image of *DRN* 2 recurs almost verbatim in the history of civilisation in book 5. Lucretius first explains that early humans learned song from the natural world (5.1379–87):

at liquidas avium voces imitarier ore
ante fuit multo quam levia carmina cantu
concelebrare homines possent aurisque iuvare.
et zephyri, cava per calamorum, sibila primum
agrestis docuere cavas inflare cicutas.

[60] I will look at the sublimity of this passage in greater detail in ch. 3.

inde minutatim dulcis didicere querellas,
tibia quas fundit digitis pulsata canentum,
avia per nemora ac silvas saltusque reperta
per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia.

But men were able to imitate the clear voices of the birds with their mouths far before they could make light songs with their singing and please the ears. And by their whistling through hollow reeds, the zephyrs first taught the rustics to blow into hollow hemlock. Then little by little they learned sweet plaintive songs, which the pipe poured out when it was struck by singers' fingers, the pipe discovered in pathless groves and woods and thickets, in empty pastoral spaces, and daylit *otia*.

These first people learned speech from nature (1028–29), and mimicked nature in their agricultural advances (1361–2). The invention of music follows suit, agreeing with the Epicurean view that language is a natural phenomenon, constrained by the nature of objects and human physiology.[61] This discovery is a source of deep pleasure, which Lucretius expresses by returning to his earlier pastoral language (5.1392–9):

saepe itaque inter se prostrati in gramine molli
propter aquae rivom sub ramis arboris altae
non magnis opibus iucunde corpora habebant,
praesertim cum tempestas ridebat et anni

[61] See Epicurus' *Epistula ad Herodotum* 75–6.

tempora pingebant viridantis floribus herbas.
tum ioca, tum sermo, tum dulces esse cachinni
consuerant; agrestis enim tum musa vigebat.

Thus they often lay with one another on the soft grass by the stream, under the branches of a tall tree, and gave pleasure to their bodies with no great labour, especially when the weather smiled and the time of year painted the green grass with flowers. Then there were jokes, then speech, then sweet laughter; for then the rustic muse was vigorous.

The passage repeats the proem of book 2 but situates the idyll in the distant past: the two passages are connected by the idea of living in accordance with nature.

In contrast to this primitive scene are the foolish believers in satyrs, nymphs, and Pan in the previous book (4.580–9):

haec loca capripedes satyros nymphasque tenere
finitimi fingunt, et faunos esse loquuntur,
quorum noctivago strepitu ludoque iocanti
adfirmant volgo taciturna silentia rumpi,
chordarumque sonos fieri dulcisque querellas,
tibia quas fundit digitis pulsata canentum,
et genus agricolum late sentiscere, quom Pan,
pinea semiferi capitis velamina quassans,
unco saepe labro calamos percurrit hiantis,

fistula silvestrem ne cesset fundere musam.

> The neighbours pretend that goat-footed satyrs and nymphs live in these places, and they say that there are fauns, by whose night-wandering din and joking play they declare the silence is often broken, and from whom the sound of strings and sweet plaintive songs come, which the pipe pours out when it is struck by singers' fingers. And they say that the race of farmers listens, while Pan, shaking the pine covering of his half-beast head, often runs over the open reeds with curved lip, so that the reed-pipes do not cease from pouring forth the woodland muse.

Two forms of song, then, can emerge out of an encounter with the natural world. The one envisioned here is deluded, mythological song that imagines gods where there are only empty echoes; the other, in book 5, is one that accords with the true workings of *natura*. While the former pairs the appearance of nature with false beliefs, the latter makes no claims about the *ratio* that underlies the natural order. Lucretius corrects the view that song is learned from the gods: "Lucretius' rustics think their music imitates that of the gods, when in fact as echoes those very gods are really imitations of man."[62] The passage from book 5, in contrast, shows humans learning music by imitating nature, in an intentional 'echo' of the natural environment.

The account of the foolish men in book 4 is an implicit correction of Hellenistic pastoral; not only does the poet disabuse his reader of the theory that the landscape is inhabited by divinities, but he seems to speak against a pastoral idea of echoing landscapes. Although Theocritus' own landscapes do not echo, Guztwiller (1991, 85) has observed the importance of

[62] Breed (2006, 99). See also Buchheit (1984).

the post-Theocritean *Epitaphios Bionos* ([Moschus] 3) for the idea of nature imitating human song.[63] There, the poet writes: Ἀχὼ δ' ἐν πέτραισιν ὀδύρεται ὅττι σιωπᾷ/κοὐκέτι μιμεῖται τὰ σὰ χείλεα ('among the rocks, Echo laments because she is silent and can no longer imitate your lips,' 30–1). Bion also instructs the birds: ἀδονίδες πᾶσαί τε χελιδόνες, ἅς ποκ' ἔτερπεν,/ἃς λαλέειν ἐδίδασκε ('all the nightingales and swallows, whom you once pleased, whom you taught to sing,' 46–7). In refusing to anthropomorphise and deify nature, Lucretius turns to a more ancient tradition in which song is learned from nature (cf. Alcman, *PMG* 39, where the poet says he rearranged the song of partridges), making this an Epicurean statement by connecting it to the idea of speech as a natural phenomenon, learned from the environment.[64]

The repetition of the pastoral image of *ataraxia* from book 2 in the account of early humans in book 5 also makes an implicit argument about the goal of Lucretius' own poetic endeavours. While the life of the first people is no longer attainable, such harmony with the natural order is not only possible, but made more powerful by Epicurean philosophy. By connecting the passages in books 2, 4, and 5, Lucretius implies the possibility of an ideal poetics that leads readers to their own mental harmony with the natural order. His own poem, Lucretius intimates throughout his work, brings about a return to the primal, pastoral state of humankind, but also improves upon this original song.[65] Not only does it effect such a state of harmony, but it

[63] The idea of echo is naturally foregrounded in a poem that itself echoes Bion's *Epitaphios Adonidos* (Bion 1). Kronenberg (2016, 28–9) describes how pseudo-Moschus' *Epitaphios* shows the identification of poet and shepherd, as Bion "becomes one of his own bucolic creations" (at 28). So, she adds, "Vergil inherited a pastoral genre that had increasingly blurred the lines between poets and shepherds." Rosenmeyer (1969, 150) discusses the absence of echo in Theocritus.

[64] For the ancient roots of this idea, see especially Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004, 144–5).

[65] See Giesecke (1999, 6) for the idea that the parallel between the pastoral scenes in books 2 and 5 shows Lucretius "providing his audience/readers with a means, on a metaphysical or spiritual level, of returning to the blessed springtime of human existence and its primal harmony with nature. It is with the guidance of Epicurus and the attending withdrawal from the misconceived modern-day, urbane value system that this beatific condition, freedom from distress and anxiety, can be recreated."

emerges out of the natural order in its own way; it strives to present the *rerum natura* (1.25), and also reflects the cosmic order in its very structure and shape. Lucretius uses his poem as an incredibly complex and extensive analogical tool; from the *elementa* of words, which are analogous to the atoms that make up all things, to the structure of the books of the poem, Lucretius' work reflects the cosmos.[66] Lucretius' own poetry is one that 'listens to', and imitates, the cosmic *ratio* much like early humans imitated birdsong. While the song of the first people was in harmony with nature, his poetry can echo the cosmos itself, and in so doing can lead its readers to their own state of pastoral *ataraxia*; it has the power to convert, persuade, and heal. Lucretius' claim of poetic superiority fits with the tradition of agonism within the pastoral landscape. His work looks back to the origins of civilisation, but stages itself as a culmination of human progress, a poetics that is only possible after Epicurus' life and teachings.[67]

(B) Virgil's Reception of Lucretius

Before turning to Horace, we should pause to consider the influence of Lucretian pastoral imagery on Virgil's *Eclogues*; the bucolic collection is important both as an influence in its own right on the *Odes* and as a comparandum for them, because both Virgil and Horace look to Lucretius' vision of pastoral. Moreover, they illuminate Lucretius' own pastoral language, because they draw attention to the connections between Lucretius' various pastoral passages and emphasise the relationship between nature and humanity that is integral to the *DRN*, even as Virgil reshapes, and in many ways contradicts, Lucretius' idea of harmony. Horace grapples with the *Eclogues* in the *Odes*; his lyric claims its place in the Roman world in part by distinguishing

[66] See especially Friedländer (1941) and Snyder (1980). Fowler (1995, 9) asserts: "The *ratio* of Lucretius' account maps onto the systematic *ratio* of the universe. It is not simply one story among many, but segments the world according to its natural divisions."
[67] For this idea of human progress, see especially the end of book 5 and 6.1–42.

itself from the *Eclogues*. One of the ways in which Horace accomplishes this is to treat many of the same Lucretian passages as Virgil, but in markedly different ways, incorporating more of Lucretius' philosophical ideas and identifying them with his own property.

The first *Eclogue* opens with multiple allusions, highlighting both Virgil's place in the pastoral tradition and his reworking of it in Roman terms. Meliboeus begins (1–5):

> Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
> silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena;
> nos patriae fines et dulcia linquimus arva.
> nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
> formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas.
>
> Tityrus, lying in the shade of a spreading beech, you practise the woodland Muse on your light oat-pipe; we leave the limits and sweet lands of our country. We flee our country; you, Tityrus, calm in the shade, teach the forest to echo beautiful Amaryllis.

It has been widely recognised that, while these opening lines evoke Theocritus, particularly the first and seventh *Idylls*, they also point in multiple ways to the *DRN*.[68] Virgil's *silvestrem . . . Musam* (2) looks to Lucretius' *agrestis . . . Musa* (5.1385) in the account of the origin of civilisation that we saw above (a phrase Virgil will evoke more explicitly at *E*. 6.8) and, more clearly, the *silvestrem . . . Musam* (4.589) that pours from the *fistula*. The connection to *DRN* 5 allows Virgil to appropriate the implications of Lucretius' origin story: "Thus the beginning of

[68] See especially van Sickle (2000).

the *Eclogues* is figured not only as the start of a collection in the Theocritean mode and as the first appearance of Theocritean poetry at Rome, but in a sense as a scene from the very beginning of music itself."[69] Although Virgil radically changes the character of the harmony between human and the natural world, his own idyll looks to the beginnings of human history. Virgil shows his great debt to both Theocritus and Lucretius in these opening lines, yet his allusion to the latter connects his poetics to the very origins of civilisation, claiming for his *Eclogues* a kind of primacy even as he acknowledges his deep generic debt to the literary genealogy of pastoral. Virgil's Lucretian allusions thus play an important role in his own pastoral claims of primacy and renegotiation of the tradition.

On the other hand, the opening of the *Eclogues* also looks to the deceptive echoes in *DRN* 4, restoring the traditional mythology of the pastoral landscape and thus correcting Lucretius. Van Sickle (2000, 37) points out that "Virgil rehabilitates the demystified mythology, assigning *Tityrus* the music of *Pan*, the pipe's inventor, and opening the way to further mythologizing in *Tityrus*' tie to Rome." The verb *resonare* (5), in conjunction with the *silvestrem* . . . *Musam*, nods to Lucretius' delusive echoes, foregrounding the question of harmony between nature and human life. The woods are personified; far from echoes being misinterpreted as the voices of woodland deities, here the forest is teachable (*doces*, 5), and harmonises with the singer: "echo reverses the relationship between a natural original and man's imitation that first produces music on Lucretius' telling."[70] Virgil's choice of a Lucretian passage about echoes as a reference point is significant, because his allusion is a kind of literary echo. Echoing Lucretius on echoes, Virgil

[69] Breed (2000, 9). See also Hardie (2009, 289), who argues that Tityrus is "retrojected into an idyllic past near the beginning of Lucretius' history of human civilisation."
[70] Breed (2006, 99). See also Breed (2000, 13ff.), Giesecke (1999, 8), and Hardie (2009, 285), who writes: "The Lucretian echoing landscape is peopled only by insentient atoms, while the Virgilian woods have minds that can be taught, so that their echoes are signs of a real presence."

reinterprets and reverses his forebear's pastoral landscapes. As he does so, his echoes take on a life of their own; what Lucretius stripped of pastoral specificity, Virgil replenishes with the vivid particularity of a Theocritean scene. So, for example, Virgil's *sub tegmine fagi* in the first line of the *Eclogues* nods to the Lucretian phrase *sub tegmine caeli* (2.663, cf. 1.988 and 5.1016), but corrects it, giving his pastoral denizens a better form of cover and at the same time filling his scene with particular flora.[71] Virgil returns to a portrayal of echo like that of the *Epitaphios Bionos*, where Bion teaches nature his song, but he does so through Lucretius, reversing his Roman predecessor's account of the origins and proper use of song. Further, Breed (2006, 101) emphasises the ambiguity of Virgil's allusions, explaining that the reader who recognises both Theocritean and Lucretian cues "might equally well aetiologize Virgilian pastoral as Theocritean and Lucretian imitation, as the first music itself, as divinely ordained practice, or as mere rustic simplemindedness." He adds, "The connection of a voice to its personal source and the connection of an alluding text to its model are equally threatened by echo." The difficult nature of echo produces a proliferation of meaning: the harmony with nature suggested in these opening lines is drawn into question by the similarity between Virgil's pastoral figures and the deluded ones of *DRN* 4. In Virgil's opening scene, we can see the two Lucretian aetiologies of song, but Virgil blends and transforms both.

Virgil also seems to appropriate something of Epicurean *ataraxia* even as he eschews much of the philosophical argument of the *DRN*. Tityrus' reply to Meliboeus' opening lines centres on the idea of *otium*: *o Meliboee, deus nobis haec otia fecit* ('Meliboeus, a god made these *otia* for us,' 1.6). The word *otia*, like the allusions of the first lines, reflects Lucretius' description of early humans, in which the pipe is discovered *avia per nemora ac silvas saltusque*

[71] Hubbard (1998, 49).

reperta/per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia ('in pathless groves and woods and thickets, in empty pastoral spaces, and daylit *otia*,' *DRN* 5.1386–87). Virgil's *otia* looks back to this harmonious life, and, while it corrects the nature of this harmony, it evokes a sense of Epicurean *ataraxia.*[72] However, we have already seen tension in Virgil's metamorphosis of the Lucretian echo; here again, there is tension in the bucolic poet's incorporation of Lucretius' language. Not only does the *otium* in question come from a political figure (who is also a god!), but it belongs to only one of the two characters, while the other flees his home. From a Lucretian kernel, Virgil produces a conception of *otium* that draws both its origins and its complications from contemporary politics.

The tension in Virgil's treatment of *otium* is connected to the problematic role of the city in the *Eclogues* as a whole. As we saw above, the relationship between city and country is hinted at in the proem to *DRN* 2; Lucretius' Epicurean pastoral necessitates mental withdrawal from the concerns of the civic realm. In the *Eclogues*, the landscape is from the outset linked irrevocably to civic concerns: the *deus* who permits *otium* at 1.6 is understood to be Caesar. The melancholy of the land confiscations permeates the work from its outset; if there is to be *otium* in the countryside, it can only be accessible for some, the product of a gift and therefore dependent on the city. A similar problem is at work in *Ecl*. 5, where the amoebean lament for Daphnis evokes both Caesar and Epicurus. Menalcas declares that the landscape itself will resound: *ipsi laetitia voces ad sidera iactant/intonsi montes; ipsae iam carmina rupes,/ipsa sonant arbusta: deus, deus ille, Menalca* ('the unshorn mountains themselves joyfully cast voices to the stars; the cliffs themselves now cast songs, the groves themselves sound: a god, that one is a god, Menalcas!'

[72] Giesecke (1999) argues: "It seems . . . that there is much to recommend the possibility of interpreting Virgil's *otium* as *ataraxia*, the Epicurean utopian ideal" (9).

62–4).[73] The image of Daphnis as *deus* recalls Caesar at the opening of *Ecl*. 1, but the line itself also looks to Lucretius' depiction of Epicurus: *deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi* (5.8).[74] This connection is sustained; Gale (2013) and others suggest that Daphnis himself is analogue for both Caesar and Epicurus simultaneously, while Kronenberg (2016) argues that Daphnis represents a peaceful, philosophical *otium* that contrasts with that of Caesar. Unease is the result of either interpretation: either we can see within the single figure of Daphnis the conflict between the apolitical pastoral *ataraxia* of Lucretius and the politically-charged *otium* of Caesar, or there is conflict between Daphnis and Caesar. Lucretian allusions underwrite the vision of *otium* in the *Eclogues*, but also make problematic the possibility of its existence, and, especially, its permanence. Echoes, again, are a source of ambiguity: the mountains, cliffs, and trees *ipsi* resound with Daphnis' praise, just as *colles collibus ipsi/verba repulsantes iterabant docta referri* in Lucretius ('the hills themselves, casting back to the hills, repeated the words that were trained to return,' 4.578–9) and are taken to be the voices of divinities.[75]

By blending Lucretius' two opposed aetiologies of song, and calling the possibility of apolitical *otium* into question, Virgil uses his predecessor to set his pastoral vision in a Roman context. Breed (2000, 10) argues, "It might even be said that in the way Virgil alludes to Lucretius, he creates for himself a Latin predecessor in writing pastoral," but it might be said more aptly that Virgil reads and isolates a pastoral thread that is already strong in Lucretius. He refigures this imagery such that his own pastoral *otium* is both dependent on and drawn into question by the *DRN*. Lucretian echoes suggest that Virgilian pastoral is linked to the origins of civilisation, and they evoke a sense of Epicurean tranquillity. At the same time, however,

[73] For the echoing landscape, cf. *Ecl.* 1.38–9.
[74] See especially Saunders (2008, 26) and Kronenberg (2016).
[75] See Giesecke (1999, 8) for the connection.

Virgil's reworking of Lucretius' pastoral imagery underscores both the impossibility of the Epicurean vision and the grief that permeates his own Roman pastoral world. As we will see, Horace's *Odes* must grapple with Virgil's interpretation of Lucretian pastoral, even as the poet looks directly back to the *DRN* in order to draw upon the Epicurean poet's authority.

(C) Horace and Lucretian Pastoral

It is in the context of this Latin pastoral genealogy that Horace composes his *Odes*. Neither the pastoral mode nor Lucretian imagery is new to Horace at this point in his career. Horace articulates his generic choices in the *Satires* in significant part by means of allusion to Lucretius, as I outlined in the introduction; the first poem concludes with the image of the *conviva satur* (1.1.119), who suggests an Epicurean contentment with life and acts as a symbol of the poem itself, as the *satis est* of the following line intimates.[76] The complete satiric form is in a certain way aligned with the complete Epicurean life, although this is far from an orthodox Epicureanism. As we will see in what follows, in important ways Horace carves out a space for his lyric genre, too, in relation to his predecessor's philosophical epic. The lyricist's Sabine estate, a landscape that Horace associates with his own poetic creativity, contains strong resonances of Lucretius, which link the *Odes* to Lucretius' vision of pastoral *ataraxia*, making the philosopher's image personal to the poet.

The depiction of the villa is not static between Horace's different works; the rural space of music-making and Lucretian *otium* that plays such an important role in the *Odes* is shaped to

[76] See e.g. Roman (2014, 102), who argues that the satire "links ethical and aesthetic restraint, etymologically associating the concept of contentment with the genre of satire (*satura*) itself." See also Putnam (1995–6, 312), who discusses another gustatory comparison as well: the use of cookies to convince students to learn their *elementa* (*Sat*. 1.25–6), which looks to Lucretius' honeyed-cup analogy (and his frequent use of *elementa*). See the introduction, section C, for this comparison.

suit Horace's lyric genre and self-representation.[77] It has long been recognised that Horace's references to his estate cannot be seen as glimpses into some stable reality; the Sabine landscape changes between works, between poems, and even within a single poem.[78] The property is part of how Horace articulates the genre and character of each of his works. It is generally figured as a space of withdrawal, of protection from the busyness and politics of the city. Its portrayal is in part indebted to the traditional Roman exaltation of rural values.[79] It also owes a great deal to Epicureanism, a natural enough association for such a retreat. In the *Odes*, as we will investigate, the property is defined both by moderation and abundance; it accords with the lyric poet's presentation of his modest life and moderate poetics, yet it is also filled with song and characterised by a profusion of genres, like the *Odes* themselves. The landscape has an extensive and complicated relationship to Lucretian imagery. Not only does it evoke the pastoral image of *ataraxia* in *DRN* 2, but, much like the *Eclogues*, it looks to the ideal relationship between nature and song pictured in book 5, as well as the deluded rustics of book 4. Horace appropriates the ethical authority and primacy of his predecessor, while making the pastoral landscape proper to himself and his poetic activity. He thus personalises the universal claims of Lucretius, claiming the philosopher-poet's ideas of mental freedom for himself.

Before we undertake an investigation of the Sabine estate in the *Odes*, we should take stock of the recent emphasis on the political and social implications of such an extra-urban

---

[77] See especially Leach (1993), who writes that we can see in the estate "how a single reality interacting with diverse contexts yields diverse identities, each one a function of the specific text that it generates" (275). See also Spencer (2006).

[78] See Henderson (1999, 118), although his statement that the "mercurial Odes (can) only glance at Horace's land in a run of fragmentary glances," while it emphasises the partiality of Horace's presentation, seems to see something more stable underlying these glances.

[79] See e.g. Ross (1987, 22): "When Horace writes most simply and deeply about human life and mortality, it is not the terms of Greek literary thought that he gives us, but rather the passing seasons and aspects of the Italian landscape, its storms and intervals of quiet, its rites, its trees and animals, all that he knew and loved."

landscape. As we will see, the tensions created by the simultaneous presence of Epicurean and political resonances are central to Horace's engagement with Lucretius. The role of Maecenas in the *Odes* will be the focus of the next chapter, but we need to remember at the outset that the patron is constructed as the source of the Sabine property; his presence can be felt even in those odes in which he is not explicitly mentioned. As well, Spencer (2006) argues that reminders of both Augustan *clementia* and the enduring grief of civil war are embedded in the landscape, in part because of the connections between Horace's property and Virgil's bucolics.[80] To this, Dang (2010, 122) adds that it was in such rural villas that elite Romans negotiated their social relationships and aristocratic position: this is not to say that the villa in the *Odes* is a description of reality, she argues, but it does "refract connections to a historically contingent material world."[81] Even in the ostensible withdrawal of the Sabine retreat, civic concerns loom implicitly. We will see, at the end of this chapter and in the next, how Horace brings his landscape into contact with the city.

The second book of *Satires*, where the rural landscape is central in Horace's poetic self-fashioning, provides an important comparandum for the lyric image of the Sabine landscape. *Sat*. 2.6, in particular, involves an ethical Epicurean sense, with its focus on the idea of *modus*, introduced in the first line: *modus agri non ita magnus*.[82] The landscape is connected to an Epicurean vision of *otium*, one that is located specifically—if ambivalently—in the countryside

[80] In similar fashion, Bowditch (2001, 155) and Dang (2010, 121) connect the *cornucopia* iconography in 1.17 to the *pax Augusta.* Newlands (1984, 56ff.) also discusses this, and observes the emphasis on *pietas*, which links the *locus amoenus* with the "traditional virtue of the Italian farmer."
[81] See also Henderson (1999, 119): "The estate complex of farm/villa installs itself as the social interface between Horace and others."
[82] Newlands (1984, 62) writes, "Here Horace domesticates the details of Lucretius' picture and gives them a practical turn. Instead of Lucretius' meadow he has a field; instead of flowers he has a *hortus*, a kitchen garden; instead of the lofty tree he has a small patch of woods."

rather than the city in *Satires* 2.[83] Horace represents it as a space of philosophical moderation, omitting any reference to the historical circumstances, management, or source of the land.[84] At the same time, the description of the property involves pastoral language; it contains the "standard features of the *locus amoenus* without their usual associations of external *amoenitas*."[85] It may be read as connected to Lucretius' pastoral vision, although the connection is more in the conjunction of rural space and Epicurean ethics than in any particular verbal reference.[86] Further, the property involves an Epicurean vision of friendship, in the form of a dinner party (65–117) in which philosophical conversation is central (70–6). This conversation includes specifically Epicurean themes, particularly the question of whether *usus rectumne* (75) leads to friendship.[87] The poem is satire, however. Even within 2.6, the concluding fable questions the exaltation of the country, since the country mouse recalls the fool of *DRN* 3, who goes searching for another life: "Any good Epicurean of the time should know better, for when Lucretius tells his mouse-free version of the tale at *DRN* 3.1057–70, he argues that racing off to the country to find contentment is a sign of the racer's own internal confusion."[88] Davus' complaint in 2.7, which places the Sabine property at the centre of the inconsistencies and self-

[83] Muecke (1993) compares 2.6 to 1.6, which has a similar image of the unattached, moderate life, but locates this Epicurean ideal in the city rather than the country. See also Bowditch (2001), Newlands (1984), and Armstrong (2016, 202–8), who observes the importance of an Epicurean conception of friendship in the satire.
[84] Newlands (1984, 62–3).
[85] Newlands (1984, 62). Newlands emphasises that, while Horace reinterprets pastoral as a *hortus* (2), he omits any reference to *labor*.
[86] See Muecke (1993). Bowditch (2001, 211f.) argues that the scene also engages with Virgilian bucolic: its *di melius fecere* (4) recalls Virgil's *deus nobis haec otia fecit* (*Ecl*. 1.6), recalling the land confiscations, but at the same time, "the aesthetic connotations of pastoral . . . transform the farm from a place associated with debt, loss, or potential expropriation . . . into a site of interpretive plenty." Horace's ownership of the land is not entirely secure, but it is fruitful.
[87] See Grilli (1993, 56), Muecke (1993, 194), Armstrong (1986, 277–81), and Armstrong (2015, 96). See also Leach (1993, 284–6) and Kiessling and Heinze (1961) for other philosophical resonances.
[88] Freudenburg (2006). See also Leach (1993, 290).

undermining of the satiric voice, continues to undercut the rural enthusiasm of 2.6.[89] The slave criticises his master's Epicurean stance, ridiculing the poet for praising his country life only when his patron has not invited him into the city (28–35). As well, the second book of the *Satires*, so centred on the rural space and its separation from the city, ends with the satirist envying an opulent dinner party. The city is omnipresent even in the country. Epicurean withdrawal and pastoral language figure importantly into Horace's articulation of his satirical persona; his championing of the countryside and undermining of this attitude are important elements of his prickly, hypocritical authorial voice.

Before we begin to consider the *Odes* themselves, we should pause to discuss the cultural value of the term *otium*, a word that reveals a tension between the political realm and a pastoral Epicureanism in the *Eclogues*; as we will see, the word figures prominently in Horace's own negotiation with his Lucretian model. Lucretius does not himself use the term to refer to *ataraxia*, but *otium* does appear to have been used to describe *ataraxia* by Horace's time; in the *De Natura Deorum*, for example, Cicero describes the Epicurean view as making even a god *otio langueat* (1.67). The word also has significant implications for the idea of literary creation in the first century BCE. It is a central part of the anxiety that appears often in Cicero's works, particularly during his forced retirement, as the prologue to the *De Natura Deorum* illustrates. Cicero explains that he took to writing *cum otio langueremus* ('since we were languishing in *otium*,') and so *primum ipsius rei publicae causa philosophiam nostris hominibus explicandam putavi* ('I first thought that I should explain philosophy to our countrymen for the sake of the republic itself,' 1.7). This, he adds, contributes *ad decus et ad laudem civitatis* ('to the honour

[89] Evans (1978, 307) describes the poem as "our most fully developed Horatian satire on satire itself." Dang (2010, 111) writes of the farm and city in *Sat.* 2, "Horace scrambles between his public and private worlds like an itinerant traveler or a storyteller."

and glory of the state'). Cicero thus figures his *otium*, in which he otherwise 'languishes', as a kind of *negotium*. Of the late Republican anxiety about intellectual activity, Baraz (2012, 14) writes, "Intellectual pursuits are felt to be more appropriate when they are limited to the sphere of *otium*, time free from the important business of the state that is expected to occupy most of the time of the elite Roman man." She argues that "both Sallust and Cicero, who can claim no public *negotia* of their own at the time of their writing, are engaged in constructing their intellectual occupation as a new type of *negotium*, functionally similar to the traditional ones, and just as valuable." It is in counterbalance to *negotium*, or figured as a kind of *negotium* itself, that *otium* may be seen as the fitting context for literature, but in the absence of this proper balance *otium* must be justified and reworked to give it value.

Something of a shift in the conception of *otium* and its role in the literature of the late first century seems clear, but should not be oversimplified. Roman (2014, 91) argues for a changing idea of *libertas* in the early principate:

> Literary freedom develops into an inwardly oriented concept; self-regulation and self-sufficiency are emphasized at the expense of the capacity for aggression. An implicit assumption in this new paradigm of literary freedom is the interconnectedness of two distinct yet related meanings of the term *otium*: social stability (*otium*) provides the basis for the writer's peaceful existence of leisure (*otium*).[90]

The role of *otium* among the poets of the principate is related to the anxiety of Sallust and Cicero, but the defence of leisure takes a distinct form for the poets, who cannot claim their own

[90] See also Badian (1985, 344–45): "The shift from that attitude [of denigrating poets as *grassatores*], through client status, to the minor legitimacy shared with other cultural pursuits, is an important phenomenon, and so is the emergence of one or two men of equestrian standing who made poetry their sole pursuit. But the limitations of the phenomenon are as important as its occurrence. Whatever the games poets played on themes like equating love and war, no one seriously thought that it was the duty of the political aristocracy to devote itself to love to the exclusion of war and government."

works as *negotia* in the same way. According to Roman, the cultural shift in the use of *otium* is not reflected by the poets but is in a very real way created by them; "the autonomist rhetoric employed by Roman poets played an important role in fostering this hard-won cultural legitimacy" (345). Roman's view, that these various rhetorical claims do not just reflect a cultural change but are part of the creation of a new form of autonomy, will prove important to my arguments about Horace's *Odes* and his relationship to Lucretius; particularly in *Odes* 2.16—which illustrates and then corrects a false conception of *otium* by recourse to Lucretian language—the poet defends his own *otium*, giving a philosophical underpinning to his lyric collection. Although we will see how the lyricist deals with the word itself in 2.16, the underlying idea of poetic freedom and justification is pervasive in the *Odes*, and is bound up with Horace's treatment of Lucretius throughout the collection.

(i) Introductions: *Odes* 1.1 and 1.17

Like the opening of the first *Eclogue*, the first poem of Horace's *Odes* evokes Lucretius' pastoral imagery. The *Eclogues* begin with a single landscape—although Virgil foregrounds the multiplicity of perspectives and models in his work—while Horace's lyric project demands multiple beginnings; the *Odes* open with many landscapes and many characters. *Odes* 1.1 is a priamel, a form indebted most clearly to Pindar's first *Olympian*, but also to Solon and Sappho.[91] Harrison's (2007a) concept of "generic enrichment", which we considered in the introduction, is valuable here; much as *recusatio* permits the expansion of genre by a form of *praeteritio* in

[91] See especially Barchiesi (2000, 172), who argues that the poem begins as Pindaric priamel, but distances itself from Pindar. Horace will return to Pindar in 3.30 with the crown of Delphic laurel. See also Morgan (2010, 222), who describes how both choral and monodic forms are represented in 1.1 through the *tibiae* of Euterpe and *Lesbous barbitos* of Polyhymnia (1.1.32–4). See also Fraenkel (1957, 230–3), among others. We will see in chapter 2, section B (i) how Maecenas is implicated in the treatment of Pindar here.

which other genres are refused, yet incorporated through their very refusal, Horace's priamel holds together military and political themes, wealthy and humble lives, sublime and simple poetics. Horace sets himself apart from the other figures as lyric bard (the anaphoric *me*, 29 and 30, emphasises this separation), yet his priamel shows that he is able to transform himself into many shapes.[92] The opening poem contains and displays the myriad possibilities of the *Odes*; the lyric form contains all genres.[93]

This virtuosic display of generic possibilities is the context of the pastoral image of 1.1, the figure drinking beside a stream. Just as the Olympian competitor (3–6) and priamel form reveal that the collection is capable of encompassing Pindaric encomium, and the man who delights in being exalted by the *turba Quiritium* draws in political themes (already implicit in the reference to Pindar, whose poetry holds together politics and song), so the Massic-drinking character introduces the pastoral tradition (19–22):

> est qui nec veteris pocula Massici
> nec partem solido demere de die
> spernit, nunc viridi membra sub arbuto
> stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae.

[92] Santirocco (1986, 16–17) observes the similarity to the *mempsimoiria* that opens *Sat*. 1.1, and notes that Horace works the same account of dissatisfaction into his ode at 11–18. He argues that this indicates that "the *Odes* will share the moral aims and interests" of the *Satires*.

[93] The first nine poems of the collection, the "Parade Odes", display this kind of diversity as a whole, as well: all nine are in different metres and experiment with a vast number of lyric possibilities. See especially Santricco 1986 (14–15) and Lyne (2005). Lowrie (1997, 128) also argues for a second parade at 1.12–18.

> There is a man who despises neither cups of old Massic nor wasting part of the whole day, now spreading his limbs under a green strawberry-tree, now by the gentle head of a sacred spring.

The wine-drinker lies between two distinctly negative characters: the *mercator* of 15–18, who cannot *pauperiem pati* and so returns to his livelihood despite his fear of the sea, and the soldier (23–5), who takes pleasure in the *bella . . . matribus/detesta*. This placement emphasises the pleasant nature of the scene, and the busyness and noise of the war scene that follows heightens the contrast.[94] The rustic seems to be a figure of the very *otium* rejected by the merchant that precedes him, who *otium et oppidi/laudat rura sui* ('praises *otium* and the countryside of his own town,' 16–17), yet returns to his ships.[95] The drinker embraces both *otium* and *rus*.

The scene, with its rural scenery and idle occupant, has clear resonances of pastoral. Rest, in the shade of a tree, is a clear generic cue, reminiscent of the opening of the *Eclogues*. The figure of the drinker also looks to Lucretius' vision of mental tranquillity in the proem to book 2. The word *stratus* is of particular importance here; Horace's man, *stratus* beneath the strawberry tree, evokes Lucretius' *prostrati* figures (29).[96] The drinker is under a tree, and also beside water: *ad aquae lene caput sacrae* recalls Lucretius' *propter aquae rivum* (30). Horace nods to Lucretius' image of *ataraxia*, even as he fills out the details of Lucretius' generalised vision: the tree is the *arbutus* (suggesting a departure from Virgil's own shade-tree, the *fagus*) and the wine

[94] Vretska (1971, 329).
[95] Horace's postponement of *spernit* until 21 emphasises the contrast by delaying the man's judgement on wine and leisure.
[96] See e.g. Dunn (1989, 99).

is Massic.[97] Not only does Horace add detail, but he describes the water as *sacrae*; the adjective hints at a transformation of Lucretius, a remythologisation.[98] Moreover, as I suggested in the introduction, the contrast between the struggling sailor, the tribulations of warfare, and the peaceful man is the same juxtaposition found in the proem to *DRN* 2.[99] We saw above that Virgil intertwines Theocritean and Lucretian language in the opening lines of his bucolics, thus reading Lucretius as a Roman pastoral predecessor. Horace does much the same thing here; his image of the man *stratus* in the grass briefly sketches a Lucretian form of pastoral—and therefore an Epicurean idea of mental tranquillity and an aetiology of song—even as he develops his predecessor's image and gives it lyric context.[100] As I have argued above, *otium* is central to Horace's self-definition in the *Odes*; we will see this in greater detail below in *Odes* 2.16. Here, in the first poem of the collection, it is valued positively in connection with an Epicurean ideal.

Moreover, the drinker has intriguing parallels to the poet himself.[101] Within 1.1, the idealised landscape of the drinking figure looks forward to the *gelidum nemus* and implied presence of Bacchus in the poet's revelry (29–32).[102] The *stratus* man also has a central position in the poem, and his solitude, like Horace's, is emphasised (*est qui*).[103] Water, shade, *locus*

---

[97] Already in this opening poem, we can see how Horace makes use of Lucretius' pastoral imagery to articulate genre: whereas in *Satires* 2.6 the imagery was used in a more practical context, as we saw above (see Newlands 1984), the drinker here is at ease and the scene closer to Lucretius' own.
[98] This idea of remythologisation will be particularly important in the third chapter.
[99] Grassi (2005, 207) notes that the isolation of the poet in the later lines (*me doctarum* . . .) is similar to that of Lucretius' sage in an imagined fortress (*DRN* 2.7–13).
[100] Dunn (1989, 98) argues that the drinker represents Epicurean *otium*, but believes that this *otium* still needs justification, contending that the fact that the peasant (11–14) and the *stratus* man both receive positive depictions means that the two are linked: "In the departure from the priamel . . . and in the implied comparison of peasant and poet, Horace suggests that we . . . be willing to see in the poet not only the contentment of an Epicurean but also the dignity and responsibility of a Cincinnatus or a Cato" (108). As we will see, however, Horace places great value on Epicurean *ataraxia* itself.
[101] As Vretska (1971, 329) argues of the identification of the drinker, "nur das Dichten fehlt."
[102] See Dunn (1989, 100). We will take up the Bacchic language of this poem again in chapter 3, comparing it to Bacchic imagery in Lucretius and elsewhere in the *Odes*.
[103] Pomeroy (1980, 43). See also Farrell (2007, 180): "Where the soldier's limbs in the first *Sermo* are broken by constant toil, those of the unnamed tippler in the first Ode are spread out relaxing in the shade.

amoenus, and placement in the poem all suggest that this figure in the priamel is not to be rejected but embraced. The two specific details of the passage contribute to this comparison. The first is the Massic wine, which prefigures the Bacchic inspiration that follows, as well as the *oblivioso Massico* of 2.17.21.[104] In *Odes* 3.21, the wine jar (*nata mecum*, 1) contains Massic; not only is Horace's birthday wine the first to be named in the wine-saturated *Odes*, but it is associated with a poetic landscape. Further, the *arbutus* of 1.1 recurs only at 1.17.5, where the goats seek the strawberry trees.[105] In 1.17, then, the idealised grove and river of the first poem seem to be revealed as features of Horace's own Sabine villa.

The drinker of 1.1 is thus the poet, yet he is also not the poet: it is too reductive to assume such a straightforward identity. This ambivalence is in part a generic question, and in part a philosophical one. The *Odes* are not pastoral poetry, yet they are often pastoral. They are not statements of Epicurean philosophy, yet they are often Epicurean, and specifically Lucretian. Horace's lyric is open and expansive, and the priamel of 1.1 encompasses all genres and themes within lyric metre. The reader is prepared for the collection to embrace a kind of pastoral that is bolstered by Epicurean *otium* without being dogmatically philosophical, one that turns to the traditional themes and deities of both lyric and pastoral without losing sight of the philosophical underpinnings of Lucretius' pastoral vision. Horace draws his archaic priamel form into the Roman world in part through his incorporation of Lucretius' image of mental tranquillity, thus giving this *otium* a place in his *Odes* without suggesting a dogmatic allegiance to Epicureanism.

Each of these passages effectively sets the tone for what follows. The satiric body is one beset by labour, pain, disease, and want, while the lyric body is generally at ease, its needs few and ready to hand."

[104] Putnam (1973, 16). This latter connection emphasises the wine's ability to release the drinker from cares, much like the scene in 1.1.

[105] Putnam (1994, 359) argues of 1.17 that the elements of the scene come together as "a landscape where delectation of body and inspiration of mind complement each other to form the poet's ideal," with the connection between the *arbutus* of 1.1 and 1.17 contributing to the delineation of this landscape.

Odes 1.17 confirms and deepens the connection between poet, pastoral imagery, and Epicurean *otium* that Horace suggests in 1.1, showing the importance of Lucretius to the lyric voice. *Odes* 1.17 explicitly sketches the details of the Sabine estate for the first time, offering a vision of music-making within the countryside and delineating the opposition of *urbs* and *rus* that, as we will investigate in more depth in the final section of this chapter, is central in Horace's articulation of his personal and poetic freedoms. As Horace reveals his Sabine landscape in 1.17, he alludes to Lucretius both to defend his poetic *otium* and to claim authority for his own project, even as he reworks and even contradicts Epicurean dogma.

The opening of 1.17 makes the landscape an image of Horace's own lyric project. It opens: *velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem/mutat Lycaeo Faunus* ('swift Faunus often exchanges Lycaeus for pleasant Lucretilis,' 1–2). The movement of Greek Pan from Arcadian Lykaion into Italy suggests the movement of poetry from the Greek world into Horace's Roman lyric.[106] Pan becomes Faunus, Lycaeus becomes Lucretilis, Tyndaris is invited into the Sabine property, and Homeric themes are uttered by Italian lips.[107] Horace's transformation of Greek into Latin is not merely a matter of nomenclature. As Lycaeus becomes Lucretilis—the assonance of the names showing their connection—the etymological connection of 'Lycaeus' to wolves becomes literal; the Latin Faunus protects Horace's goats from wolves (9), who are not welcome on the Sabine mountain.

The generic plurality of 1.17 emphasises the role the property plays as a symbol of Horatian lyric; it is distinctly Lucretian, as we will see, but the ideal character of a Lucretian

---

[106] See e.g. Toohey (1982, 117).

[107] Putnam (1994, 373) argues that this passage also shows Horace comparing himself to Virgil; Pan appears in the *Eclogues* and, most importantly for this passage, the *Georgics.* Horace's invitation to Faunus recalls Virgil's *ipse, nemus linquens patrium saltusque Lycaei/Pan, ovium custos, tua si tibi Maenala curae,/adsis, o Tegeaee, favens* (*G.* 1.16–8). Horace claims divine support for his own lyric project, identifying the god of Virgil's rustic denizens (*G.* 2.494) with his own property.

pastoral scene is paired with a richness of poetic content. Many interpretations of 1.17 highlight the idea of generic multiplicity; the poem contains resonances of religious hymn, Hellenistic epigram, as well as convivial, pastoral, epic and erotic poetry.[108] Tyndaris, too, is patronymically related to Helen of Troy, in keeping with the song she will sing of Penelope and Circe (19–20), but is at the same time anacreontic (*fide Teia*, 18). Her name also suggests a pastoral character, and her role in the poem hints at Theocritus' Galatea.[109] Bowditch (2001, 157) links the poetic diversity of 1.17 to the opulence of the natural landscape: "Aesthetic abundance here resides in the profusion of genres, as elements of pastoral conform to a lyric *convivium* in which both elegiac rivalry and epic violence are contained." This is archetypal of the "generic enrichment" we considered above in 1.1: within the brief poem and the confines of its Alcaic metre are an eclectic and vivid collection of generic possibilities, each of which expands the boundaries of the lyric project. The *locus amoenus* is the opulent landscape for Horace's own pouring forth of poetry, which is a rich blend of traditions and themes from all parts of literary history.

Just as the pastoral scene in 1.1 evoked Lucretius' vision of *ataraxia*, so too is *Odes* 1.17 Lucretian. The word *Lucretilem* in the poem's opening line, in fact, seems to nudge the reader to think of Lucretius, a suggestion confirmed by the rest of the ode.[110] The poet invites Tyndaris into his idyllic rural estate, offering her a space for song that is free from the violent disturbance of the city: even in its broad outlines, the poem hints at the idea of Epicurean withdrawal from civic concerns. Although the setting of the ode is an idyllic rural retreat that is reminiscent of *Sat.* 2.6, the Sabine landscape of the *Odes* is distinguished from that of the *Satires* by the pervasive

[108] See Dang (2010, 121–4), Bowditch (2001, 157), Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, 215–17), and Fraenkel (1957, 204–9).
[109] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, 216).
[110] See Putnam (1994, 370), who argues that the poem is so imbued with Lucretian imagery that *Lucretilem* is a nod to Lucretius' name.

presence of song.[111] As this difference intimates, the landscape of *Odes* 1.17 is even more indebted to Lucretius' pastoral vision, as it appears not only in the proem to *DRN* 2, but in the twofold account of the origins of poetry in books 4 and 5. Music was missing from the pastoral picture in 1.1; in 1.17, Horace makes song inextricable from the space. Horace's landscape is numinous, and its special protections derive from its musicality; the goats are safe from wolves and snakes *utcumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula/valles et Usticae cubantis/levia personuere saxa* ('whenever, Tyndaris, the valleys and smooth rocks of the slopes of Ustica resound with the sweet reed-pipe,' 1.17.10–12). The poet's song (*musa*, 13) is linked both to his *pietas* (12) and the *cornucopia* imagery that follows (13–15): the *locus amoenus* is matched by an ideal ethical and poetic state.[112] The close identity of landscape and song has strong Virgilian resonances; Meliboeus' statement to Tityrus, *silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena* (*Ecl*. 1.2), seems to be at work in Horace's description of his own *musa*, as does the more general idea of musical sympathy between human and nature. Horace makes clear allusions to the *Eclogues*, as we will see below. However, he also turns directly to the pastoral imagery of the *DRN*—to which much of Virgil's own language alludes—in creating his Sabine space. Horace's direct gaze at the *DRN* reveals his interest in the ethical implications of the landscape; he returns to the philosophical context of Lucretius' pastoral imagery. As we will see, he also looks to Lucretius' aetiologies of song, claiming for himself Lucretius' poetic originality while remythologising the Epicurean landscape.

Like Virgil, Horace draws on Lucretius' passage about the misinterpretation of echoes. As we saw, the forests of the *Eclogues* are teachable, echoing the beloved's name, and the landscape is remythologised with the very deities that Lucretius rejects. The same rehabilitation

[111] Leach (1993, 278–9).
[112] See especially Davis (1991, 199–205).

of divinity is evident in the first line of Horace's ode; Faunus returns to his traditional role after being denied by Lucretius (4.580–9).[113] Horace's *fistula* (10) alludes to the one that Lucretius' deluded rustics use when they pour forth the *silvestrem . . . musam* (4.589). The security of the poet's property derives from precisely what Lucretius denies: the woodland deities and their divine music. Moreover, the Sabine rocks *personuere*, a nod to the echoes that are the source of delusions in Lucretius.[114] As Virgil does, Horace echoes Lucretius' passage about echoes, making more self-conscious the literary process by which he takes up and subverts his predecessor's language. The lyricist simultaneously echoes Virgil's reception of Lucretius; the reverberation of language recalls the genealogy of the image, yet at the same time emphasises Horace's own project, with its correction of Lucretius and outdoing of Virgil. Further accentuating Horace's own primacy is a nod to *Odes* 1.12, where the *iocosa imago* (3–4) of some great name would issue from Helicon, Pindus, or Haemus; the poet hints that his own echoing Sabine landscape fits into this catalogue of archetypal poetic landscapes.[115]

Lucretius' account of the origins of civilisation and the invention of song is also in the background of *Odes* 1.17; the other rustic muse in Lucretius is, of course, the *agrestis musa* of book 5 (1399). Horace's goats are *deviae* as they wander the Sabine *nemus*: they are reminiscent of Lucretius' *tibia*, discovered *avia per nemora* (5.1386).[116] More broadly, Horace's connection

---

[113] Putnam (1994, 370). The presence of Faunus here is also connected to *Odes* 3.18, a prayer to Faunus that asks him to enter the property: *per meos finis et aprica rura* (2). The identification of the deity with the poet's personal property shows Horace subsuming the pastoral mode, identifying it with his lyric voice without making any exclusive generic claim. Also cf. 2.17, where Faunus protects Horace from the falling tree (27–30).

[114] Putnam (1994, 369).

[115] We will also see the *iocosa imago* in 1.20 (6–8), a poem I will discuss in chapter 2, section B (i). I will argue there that echoes in 1.20 suggest the movement of the Sabine landscape into an urban space.

[116] Putnam (1994, 361) suggests a connection to Lucretius' *avia Pieridum . . . loca* (1.926–7) instead. As we will discuss in more detail in the chapter 3, Lucretius makes a clear connection between this Second Proem and his account of civilisation's origins in book 5; the most prominent parallel here seems to be to the latter.

between symposium and musical landscape takes its cue from Lucretius, whose account of the invention of music leads into his account of the first feasts, as we have seen: *tum ioca, tum sermo, tum dulces esse cachinni/consuerant; agrestis enim tum musa vigebat* (5.1397–8).[117] Putnam (1994, 370) argues that the many connections between 1.17 and the *DRN* show that Horace is contending with Lucretius' idea of origins: "Horace takes [Lucretius'] generalized analyses of the emergence of music and uses them as the basis for his own highly particularized lyric meditation on music in a carefully located rural setting." In so doing, I contend, Horace grants authority to his own project, much as Lucretius did with his own; his is a song that looks back to the origins of music itself, exists in perfect harmony with nature, and creates a protected space for *convivium*. Although Horace corrects and transforms Lucretius' vision of this harmony and protection, his detailed allusions to the *DRN* lend the poet and his property philosophical authority, even as Horace underlines his originality and preeminence. *Odes* 1.1 thus evokes Lucretius' pastoral image of *ataraxia*, including the Epicurean's integration of poetry and philosophy within the rural landscape. The ode invites Tyndaris into a space of Epicurean *otium*, yet this *otium* is not the generalised, universally-available *ataraxia* of the *DRN*, but one that is highly individualised and proper to the lyric poet himself, as well as distinctly Roman.[118] Horace underlines the Roman character of the landscape by describing the movement from Greek to Italian—in both physical space and nomenclature, as we have seen—in the first lines, and also by drawing in clear ways on the Latin poetic tradition.

Horace makes his Sabine estate pastoral and philosophical, presenting the property as a golden age space, characterised by its seclusion, protection from danger, and fruitfulness. He

---

[117] Putnam (1994, 370).
[118] See Newlands (1984, 62) for the latter point: "In a sense he has nationalized Lucretius' *locus amoenus*."

elides all but the faintest reference to the economic dealings of the estate or its management. Bowditch (2001, 160) argues that Horace's characterisation of his farm involves an expression of independence from Maecenas: "by so transforming his material *munus* into a locus *a-moenus*, a place that is 'not for profit,' Horace appropriates the libidinal excess of patronal voluntarism and creates an imaginative site of copious connotation."[119] The Lucretian image of *otium* is thus tied to Horace's personal and poetic expression of *libertas*; we will see in more detail in the next chapter how Maecenas is involved in the poet's increasing freedom, and how his characterisation throughout the *Odes* is closely connected to Horace's Lucretian allusions. In tying a vision of Epicurean *otium* to the Sabine estate, and eliding the social and economic implications of such a villa, Horace frames his property as something like Epicurus' Garden: a space imbued with philosophical significance, set apart from the city and yet—as we will see in the next chapter especially—not entirely divided from civic institutions.[120]

In fact, the spectre of the city is suggested at the end of 1.17 in the violence that Horace excludes from his landscape: you do not need to fear *protervum . . . Cyrum* (24–5), the lyricist tells Tyndaris. As Pucci (1975, 275) contends, Horace "performs, at the figurative level, the violence that Cyrus is prevented from enacting."[121] Although the Sabine landscape forbids such disruption, the conclusion of the poem contains it, and urban violence seems to pose a threat to

---

[119] We will see how this transformation is similar to the one Horace performs in the *Epistles* (chapter 4, section A); in his letters, Horace effects this change visibly, referring to the economic activity and labour involved in the estate but transforming the farm into a private space of *otium*.

[120] Giesecke (2007) identifies the Roman villa in general with Epicurus' garden: "By mingling the amenities of the natural world with the benefits of urbanism, the Roman villa became the true successor of Epicurus' Garden. As an urbanized 'country' retreat conducive to reflection on the urban condition and the place of humanity in the universe, the villa became synonymous with *otium*, leisure and 'withdrawal,' although business and politics also had their place within villa grounds" (116). Horace connects his Sabine villa more clearly to the philosophical implications of the Garden.

[121] Oliensis (1998, 124) writes that "the vivid description, which is left to stand as the poem's conclusion, keeps it before our eyes."

the secluded retreat. Putnam (1994, 364) connects this Cyrus to the appearance of the historical Cyrus at 3.29.27, arguing that the latter "may be vicariously present in *C*. 1.17 through his modern namesake." In the penultimate ode, Cyrus' Parthians represent "the larger worries posed for the state by eastern enemies." These urban dangers, both erotic and political, are present in 1.17 despite their exclusion. Horace has transformed his property from a villa with economic implications into a *locus amoenus*, but suggests the menacing presence of the city. These suggestions set the stage for a later confrontation between Sabine *otium* and Rome; as we will see in the final section of this chapter, Horace poses his estate as the cure to civic degradation in the Roman Odes and elsewhere, including 3.29. As the poet develops the Lucretian authority that he begins to construct in 1.17, he gradually builds a vision of a lyric that can overcome the dangers looming in this introductory poem.

The poem's double relationship to the *Eclogues* and the *DRN* should be stressed. In alluding to both authors, Horace reminds his reader of Virgil's own use of Lucretius' pastoral scenes in the opening of the *Eclogues*, where these allusions play a significant role in how Virgil establishes both his genre and his poetic primacy. By reaching back beyond the *Eclogues* to Lucretius' account of the origins of human civilisation, Horace contends with Virgil, using Lucretian language to construct his own landscape, a space that is bound up with his poetic project and lyric voice. As a mode of poetic agonism, pastoral makes an ideal backdrop for Horace's comparison of his own poetics to his predecessors' work, much like Virgil's opening to the *Eclogues*, and indeed Lucretius' own assertions of primacy and authenticity. *Odes* 1.17 performs a scene-setting role in the collection, establishing the poet's Sabine property as a space permeated with song and linking pastoral imagery to his own poetic creativity. Horace's use and transformation of Lucretian imagery in this landscape connects his project to both an ethical

Epicurean stance and a conception of poetry as harmonious with nature, drawn directly from nature. Horace appropriates and subsumes Virgilian pastoral, vying with his predecessor without defining his *Odes* as a pastoral project.[122] His lyric collection makes space for pastoral, identifying the mode with his Sabine property to make it personal, and appropriating the ethical substance and poetic authority of Lucretius. The poet lays claim to a form of Lucretian *libertas* through his transformation of his predecessor's language; his Sabine property offers a vision of *ataraxia*, one that he may extend to others in the form of an invitation into his space.[123] We will see the implications of this in the rest of the chapter; the Epicurean *otium* of the Sabine property underlies many of Horace's expressions of freedom and poetic power.

(ii) *Termini* in 1.22

Horace emphasises the boundaries of his Sabine property in *Odes* 1.17: the villa is figured as a retreat from the city, a place for Tyndaris to sing *in reducta valle* (17); Faunus is pictured entering from outside; and the landscape's security is envisioned in terms of the violence, both natural and urban, that it excludes. The prominence of boundaries accords with Lucretius' pastoral vision; as Asmis (2008) contends, the philosopher's "rural scenes represent a life within boundaries," the life of the sage who needs nothing more than what nature provides. It is in this state of boundedness, Asmis shows, that the Epicurean wise man attains true *libertas*. However, Leach (1993, 297) observes that, "although the boundaries of the Sabine valley are secure in Ode 1.17, in succeeding poems they exist to be challenged or violated." This is the topic that concerns us now: how do these challenges to the Sabine *termini* relate to the Lucretian conception of

[122] Cf. Horace's own statement in the *Satires* that he has chosen the satiric genre to avoid competition with other Roman authors: *molle atque facetum/Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae* (1.10.44–5).
[123] We will see the importance of invitations in greater detail in the next chapter, beginning with *Odes* 1.20, which follows 1.17 and confirms the Lucretian and Epicurean resonances of the Sabine landscape.

boundaries? Recall the paradox of the *DRN*, where true freedom lies in a complete acceptance of limits: it is only through an understanding of how natural things are bound by *termini* that Epicurus is able to achieve his superhuman flight. As we will see, Horace harnesses the power of this Lucretian paradox in his vision of the Sabine landscape in 1.22; the freedom within boundaries pictured in 1.17—which draws on Lucretius' pastoral vision of *ataraxia*, perfect accord with nature—is connected to a freedom that permits the transcendence of limits.

Odes 1.22 describes both the *termini* of the Sabine estate and the edges of the earth. The poem begins with philosophical loftiness: the *integer vitae scelerisque purus* ('the man of unblemished life and pure of crime,' 1.22.1) who is ethically raised above the mundane cares of the world. This man is safe even at the edges of the world: *sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas/sive facturus per inhospitalem/Caucasum* ('whether he makes a journey through burning Syrtes or inhospitable Caucasus,' 5–7). The scope of the poem then contracts, both physically and ethically (9–12):

> namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
> dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra
> terminum curis vagor expeditis,
> fugit inermem.
>
> For in the Sabine woods, while I was singing of my Lalage and wandering carefree beyond my boundary-stone, a wolf fled from me, although I was unarmed.

It is the *termini* of the estate, not of the world, that the narrator traverses. At the same time, the *Lalagen* of line 10 "begins to correct the lofty moralism of the opening stanzas, since he does not claim that it was his spotless character which saved him from the wolf."[124] The narrator is not the philosophical wise man that the opening lines suggest, but instead shares in the trope of the protected lover, kept safe from harm by Venus.[125] The contrast is humorous.[126] The fact that the narrator is protected by love, rather than wisdom, deflates the pseudo-philosophical grandeur of the opening lines, while the over-the-top vistas of inhospitable lands mock the device of the invulnerable lover.[127]

Despite its humour and unexpected turns, there is room within the poem for a more serious message about the skill and protection of the poet. This argument depends on recognising the allusion in the final two lines: *dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo,/dulce loquentem* ('I will love my Lalage sweetly laughing, sweetly speaking,' 23–4). These lines refer to Catullus 51, where the lover sees and hears Lesbia *dulce ridentem* (5). Horace's allusion to Catullus is a 'window reference' that looks through Catullus to his Sapphic model: *dulce loquentem* in the final line of 1.22 revives Sappho's own ἆδυ φωνεί-/σας (31.3–4), which Catullus omits.[128] Horace seemingly

[124] Mayer (2012, ad loc.)
[125] Ibid.
[126] West (1995, 104) argues, for example, "From the beginning Horace is having a dig at the pretensions not only of Stoic philosophers but, at the same time, at extravagant lovers like Catullus and the elegiac poets." Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, 263) explain, "The *integer vitae* is thus revealed as the lover; the poem which began so pompously is shown to be not so earnest after all." Cf. Commager (1962, 135): "Though the Ode claims to be autobiographical, Horace seems tacitly to ally himself with the reader rather than the lover in the poem."
[127] See also Harrison (2007c, 268), who observes that the grand language of the edges of the earth in the first stanzas highlights the mundanity of Horace's own passage across the *terminus* of his land. This simultaneous deflation and elevation is characteristic of Horace's lyric sublimity, which I will study in detail in the third chapter.
[128] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.), Putnam (2006, 34), Mayer (2012, ad loc.), and Barbaud (2008, 90). For the concept of a window reference, see Thomas (1986, 188): "It consists of the very close adaptation of a model, noticeably interrupted in order to allow reference back to the source of that model: the intermediate model thus serves as a sort of window onto the ultimate source, whose version is otherwise not visible. In the process the immediate, or chief, model is in some fashion 'corrected'."

corrects Catullus' own homage to Sappho, and so draws attention to his own activity of allusion and transformation. In choosing to return to Sappho's poem, he also emphasises poetry itself: Lalage speaks sweetly, a phrase that suggests music and hints at the connection between her name and λαλαγεῖν ('to chatter').[129] Horace's final two lines explicitly describe the intensely personal experience of the lover, yet implicitly, by looking back through a neoteric lens at Sappho's lyric, they highlight the activity of poetic inspiration and imitation, so putting the focus on the lyricist, an emphasis that recalls the centrality of poetic creation in 1.17.

The *integer vitae* of the poem's first line has frequently been taken to suggest a Stoic wise man, as West (1995) argues, but this is not the only possible reading of the first stanza. Lefèvre (1977) contends that Horace is here looking to the description of Epicurus in the proem of *DRN* 5. Horace's *purus* figure reflects the *pectus purum* of Epicurus (5.18), while the unarmed lover (1.22.2–4) recalls Epicurus expelling fears with words, *non armis* (*DRN* 5.50). To this, we should add the first description of Epicurus in the *DRN*, where Lucretius depicts the mind that grasps the *termini* of the natural order and thus attains the freedom to transgress these *moenia* (1.72–7). The poet's movement beyond the *terminus* of his estate, coupled with the Lucretian resonances of the *purus*, unarmed man, suggests another connection to the *DRN*. The boundaries of the Sabine property have been figured as a space of poetic protection in 1.17; now, this protection extends beyond these limits. Horace's images of the ends of the earth involve another Catullan reference. Catullus 11, which is also in Sapphic stanzas and concerned with far-flung places, similarly highlights the contrast between grand vistas and the poet's own erotic life. As Putnam (2006, 37) describes, in 1.22 "we leave behind the problematics of eroticism and embrace the imagined realm of a sacrosanct poet fully devoted to the lyre and its authority." We

[129] See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) on line 10. See also Putnam (2006, 35) for Lalage's "seductive world of lyrical words and music."

can expand this idea by recognising the way the poet is made into a kind of Epicurus figure; Horace translates the eroticism of Catullus' poem into a philosophical image, even as he deflates the grandeur of the Lucretian vision—also by alluding to Catullus—and focuses it intently on his own poetic prowess.

While Horace's transgression is certainly humorous, there is good reason to take his allusions to Lucretius seriously, even as we recognise the joke. Just before, in 1.17, Lucretian echoes reinforced the poet's vision of poetic *otium* and protection within the Sabine farm; now, the narrator transgresses the boundaries of this estate as a kind of Epicurus, deflecting danger and fear. In Lucretius, as we have seen, true *libertas* is a product of proper boundedness, a state that he describes using pastoral language. In casting himself an Epicurus figure, Horace seems to claim a similar idea for the Sabine estate and his personal protection as poet. In 1.22, this security follows the poet beyond these boundaries. The allusion is humorous in its grandiosity, but at the same time continues and develops the close relationship between the lyric project and Lucretius' work. The connection between Horace's safety and his poetic endeavour is reinforced by the image of the wolf; in 1.17, as we saw, it was the Italian Faunus—a symbol of Horace's own movement from Greek to Latin—who kept his Sabine goats safe from wolves on Lucretilis, which is itself no longer 'wolfy' Lycaeus. The authority Horace claims for himself in 1.17 leads to his Lucretian expression of freedom in 1.22, which is again linked to his sacrosanct property.

The final lines of 1.22, with their allusion to Catullus and implicit correction of the neoteric's interpretation of Sappho, show Horace gazing back into the archaic lyric past through the great span of literary history. The poet steps across boundaries as an Epicurean sage, deflects danger and fear, and can, in two lines about the beloved, look back through a poetic tradition, even as he invites the audience to laugh at the grandiloquence of his claim. The Sabine estate is a

crucial piece of this poem; Horace takes up the picture of security that he painted so carefully in 1.17, and now extends this safety beyond the boundaries of his land, while keeping the Sabine landscape at the centre of his vision of poetic protection. As in 1.17, where we saw not the generalised scenery of Lucretius' pastoral *ataraxia* but the specific Italian property, in 1.22 the freedom of the philosophical mind is identified with the lyric poet alone. Just as Lucretius figures himself as the successor and renewer of Epicurus, so Horace reaches back across the literary tradition and makes it new; Horace appropriates for his personal lyric the freedom of the Epicurean philosophical mind, while remaining irreverent in his treatment of Lucretius.[130]

(iii) *Mediocritas* and the proem to *DRN* 2 in *Odes* 2

The Lucretian imagery associated with the Sabine estate in the first book of the *Odes* continues into the second and becomes more explicitly philosophical. The second book has, on the whole, a more philosophical tone; it has been called the book of *mediocritas*, because it lauds moderation in life and poetry, and reflects this moderation in its form.[131] The predominant character of this philosophy is Epicurean, many contend: "in general an Epicurean humanity dominates, though without an Epicurean dogmatism."[132] The Epicurean philosophy of book 2 is rooted in the *DRN*, an influence that has not been sufficiently studied. The Sabine property and connected pastoral imagery are central to the book, and again contain clear Lucretian parallels. The core of Horace's Lucretian references in *Odes* 2 is again the proem to *DRN* 2, and the associated

---

[130] In the next chapter, we will take up some of this imagery again, considering how Horace also uses imperial imagery to describe his freedom, thus simultaneously appropriating the power and *libertas* of the empire itself.

[131] "Where Book 1 shows poetic ambition and diversity, Book 2 shows poetic moderation and consistency" (Harrison 2017, 9).

[132] See e.g. Harrison (2017, 10–11), Nisbet and Hubbard (1978, 2), and Moles (2007), who attributes many of the themes of book 2 to a generalised Epicurean *carpe diem* idea, although he does not connect this to specific Lucretian passages.

pastoral visions in books 4 and 5. Not only can we can identify resonances of the pastoral idyll of *DRN* 2.29ff., but we can see the related images of the frightened sailor and the drawn-up battle lines, as well as Lucretius' description of the gilded halls and purple coverings that are not necessary, and are indeed detrimental, for a tranquil life. The alert reader is put in mind of Lucretius' proem continually, and many of the generalised philosophical meditations of *Odes* 2, particularly those about moderation and the inevitability of death, are revealed as distinctly Epicurean and, specifically, Lucretian. The various images of *DRN* 2 come together with particular emphasis in 2.16; there, as we will see, Horace defends a form of *otium* that is simultaneously philosophical and poetic.

Odes 2.3 and 2.11 take up the pastoral imagery of the previous book, similarly looking to Lucretius' vision of *ataraxia* in book 2. The opening of 2.3, with its focus on mental moderation and the inevitability of death (*moriture Delli*, 4), echoes Lucretius in both image and context. The poet instructs Dellius to preserve an *aequam . . . mentem* in both good and difficult circumstances (1–4), because he will die (5–8):

> seu maestus omni tempore vixeris,
> seu te in remoto gramine per dies
> festos reclinatum bearis
> interiore nota Falerni.

> Whether you live in grief all the time, or, reclined in a secluded meadow on holidays, refresh yourself with the stamp of Falernian from the inner part of the cellar.

The scene is closely related to the themes of Greek lyric; like so many of the *Odes*, the sympotic poems of Alcaeus—such as fr. 362, with its dual emphasis on drinking and garlands, or 352, with its connection between summer and symposium—are particularly relevant here. However, Horace draws on these archaic lyric images not directly, but through the lens of the Hellenistic and Roman pastoral tradition that has more recently preceded him. The clearest influence on Horace's scene is, again, Lucretius' pastoral imagery. *In remoto gramine* recalls Lucretius' *in gramine molli* (2.29), and the shade and water of the next lines (9–12) complete the echo, reminding the reader of the wine drinker in 1.1 as well.[133] *Remotus* may also hint at an Epicurean idea of withdrawal.[134] The logic of the image, too, is reminiscent of Lucretius; the same death awaits Dellius whether he reclines in the grass or lives *maestus*, similar to Lucretius' claim that the *gratius interdum neque natura ipsa requirit* ('nature herself does not demand anything more pleasing,' 2.23), whether one lies on a grass bank or lives in a gilded house. The theme is a strongly Epicurean one, and Horace illustrates the idea in a manner that recalls Asmis' argument about the role of pastoral in the *DRN*. Here again, the recognition of one's mortal boundaries offers the possibility of liberation, pictured in pastoral terms: *omnes eodem cogimur* (25), the poet reminds his addressee, and the acknowledgement of this natural *terminus* leads to a life in accordance with the natural world, envisioned in pastoral terms.[135]

[133] Harrison (2017), MacLeod (1979), and Spencer (2006). Newlands (1984, 60–1) shows how the sensuality of the landscape is linked to the fragility of nature, whether human or floral.
[134] Harrison (2017, ad loc.).
[135] The pine and poplar *consociare amant* (10), as well, an image that MacLeod (1979, 27) connects to an Epicurean vision of friendship.

Odes 2.11, which urges Quinctius to put away his political anxieties in favour of sympotic rest, looks back to 2.3.[136] The poet reminds his addressee that the seasons and the moon both change, so: *quid aeternis minorem/consiliis animum fatigas?* ('why do you weary your limited mind with eternal plans?' 11–12). Therefore, he urges (13–16):

> cur non sub alta vel platano vel hac
> pinu iacentes sic temere et rosa
> canos odorati capillos,
> dum licet, Assyriaque nardo
>
> potamus uncti?
>
> Why not drink, while it is permitted, lying under either the high plane tree or this pine, just as we are at random, our grey hair scented with roses and oiled with Assyrian nard?[137]

As in 2.3, the poet offers sympotic repose in the shade by a stream as the antidote to care, and as the best response to the inevitable encroachment of death and age. The shade is provided by the *pinus* again (2.3.9 cf. 2.11.14). Youth, like spring, is ephemeral, and must be enjoyed while it lasts. Just like 2.3, the scene has its roots in archaic lyric, but its emphasis on the present moment

[136] Quinctius is presumably the addressee of *Epist*. 1.16 (see Nisbet and Hubbard 1978), a poem similarly concerned with the Sabine estate.
[137] Using Harrison's (2017) translation for *sic temere*.

and injunction not to fear make it distinctly Epicurean in ethos.[138] Although neither 2.3 nor 2.11 makes explicit reference to the Sabine estate, their imagery is vividly connected to the scenery and pastoral calm of the very first poem of the collection, as well as the Sabine *locus amoenus* in which Horace situates his poetic activity in 1.17. Both 2.3 and 2.11 invite the reader into a familiar space that by this point is identified with the poet's own property and art. The pastoral idyll of *Odes* 2 continues a thread of pastoral imagery in the *Odes* that, beginning with the *stratus* drinker in 1.1, reminds the reader of Lucretius' identification between his pastoral vision of *ataraxia* and the origins of song. Horace's appropriation of the image claims for the lyricist a poetic authority, a kind of unity with the natural world and thus a vatic power in his philosophical teachings, which are connected to Lucretius' didactic voice. Through his pastoral language, which appears continually in the lyric project in connection with the Sabine property, Horace identifies Epicurean ethics with his own song. The imagery of archaic lyric is filtered through the pastoral tradition, which Horace represents as culminating in Lucretius: lyric medium is united with—and given authority by—philosophical substance.

At the same time, the strong presence of pastoral imagery in the *Odes* is, as we have seen, part of a dialogue with Virgil, in keeping with the traditional agonistic connotations of such idyllic landscapes. For example, while the combination of pine and poplar in 2.3 echoes *Ecl*. 7.66, the outdoor symposium recalls that of the farmers at *G*. 2.527–8.[139] A similar sympotic scene features prominently in 2.11 (13–20), in the passage we considered above, and refers to the opening of *Ecl.* 5.[140] Horace looks through Virgil's own Lucretian allusions, referring directly to the *DRN*; his

[138] *Nec trepides*, Harrison (2017, ad loc.) argues, seems to be a literal translation of *ataraxia*. For the references to Anacreon, see Harrison (2017) again and Nisbet and Hubbard (1978), who connect the poem to 396.1–6 *PMG.*
[139] Harrison (2017, ad loc.)
[140] Ibid.

pastoral idyll is filled with detail just as Virgil's (and Theocritus' before him) is, and some of the details even derive directly from Virgil. By using a pastoral idyll to illustrate a Lucretian philosophical tenet, while continually reminding his reader of Virgil's bucolic landscape, Horace makes a claim for his own primacy and the ethical superiority of his project, infusing his advice to his addressees with something of a didactic authority: what the *Eclogues* only hint at with their vision of pastoral *otium*, Horace asserts confidently and identifies with his own Sabine property and thus his own lyric voice.

The association of Sabine landscape, poetry, and Lucretian ethos becomes most explicit in *Odes* 2.16.[141] As we will see, Horace draws on not only the pastoral imagery of *DRN* 2, but the entire proem. The ode opens (2.16.1–8):

> otium divos rogat in patenti
> prensus Aegaeo, simul atra nubes
> condidit lunam neque certa fulgent
> sidera nautis;
>
> otium bello furiosa Thrace,
> otium Medi pharetra decori,
> Grosphe, non gemmis neque purpura ve-
> nale neque auro.

[141] See e.g. Woodman (1974, 125–26), Giesecke (2000, ch. 5).

> *Otium*, a man caught in the open Aegean asks of the gods, as soon as a black cloud hides the moon and the certain stars no longer shine for the sailors. *Otium*, calls Thrace, raging with war, and *otium*—which cannot be bought with jewels, nor purple, nor gold, Grosphus—the Medes with painted quivers demand.

Horace's words recall the opening of *DRN* 2, where it is *suave* to see the man struggling at sea when you are safe on land (2.1–6). Such prayers at sea are also anathema to the Epicurean mindset; Lucretius later writes of the *induperator* of the fleet, *non divom pacem votis adit ac prece quaesit/ventorum pavidus paces animasque secundas?/nequiquam, quoniam violento turbine saepe/correptus nilo fertur minus ad vada leti* ('does he not seek the peace of the gods by vows, and, trembling, ask for peaceful winds and favourable breezes through prayer? He does so in vain, since, seized in a violent whirlwind, he is nonetheless carried to the shoals of death,' *DRN* 5.1229–32).[142] With his Lucretian echoes, Horace points to the idea that true *otium* is a form of Epicurean tranquillity long before he has explicitly described this state of being. The triple *otium* at the beginning of 2.16 can, in fact, be read as an allusion to Lucretius' similar repetition of the word *suave*. Lucretius' *suave* describes the state of mental tranquillity attained by the wise man, and so a form of *ataraxia*, or *otium*, itself.

The image of the dangers of seafaring and warfare in the opening of 2.16 recall the similar pairing of the two in the beginning of *DRN* 2, where Lucretius describes the sweetness of an Epicurean distance from such turmoil. Horace's other Lucretian language in the poem—including his echo of the repeated *suave* of *DRN* 2—and his implicit argument for a kind of mental tranquillity make it clear that he draws this imagery, too, from the opening of Lucretius' book.

---

[142] See Nisbet and Rudd (2004) on 3.29.58–59, which is similarly about prayer at sea but instead shows that Horace himself will not be prone to such fears.

Horace's figures are not, of course, the distant ones of the *DRN*; the lyricist instead brings his reader onto the ship beside the merchant, watching the threatening clouds, and into Thrace and Medes as they rage in war. He makes the sailor and soldier not just remote counterexamples to the wise man, but descriptive figures of men's foolishness, implicating himself and his reader with his first person *iaculamur* (17).[143] If we consider 1.1 again, we can see similar imagery; the indolent man is flanked by the *mercator* and the soldier, whose struggles draw attention to the peace enjoyed by the rustic. There, the soldier is Roman, as the *lituus* (23) indicates, but the language of seafaring and warfare is similar.[144] Finally, we should consider a similar context for the passage in 2.13, where Horace illustrates the tenet that one cannot avoid every danger in life, describing an imperilled sailor and soldier (13–19), then asserting the inevitability of death. His soldier here is both Italian and Parthian: *miles sagittas et celerem fugam/Parthi, catenas Parthus et Italum/robur* ('the soldier [fears] the arrows and swift retreat of the Parthian; the Parthian [fears] the chains and strength of Italy,' 17–18). Horace illustrates in lyric terms Lucretius' Epicurean tenet: war carries an oppressive mental burden, whether the soldier is Roman or Rome's enemy. Although 2.13 is humorous, with much in common with the *Epodes*, Horace hints at the special protections of the poet in the Sabine farm again and, in juxtaposition to the soldier and sailor, briefly touches on the Epicurean lesson that we cannot know the future or hope to avoid death (13–14).[145] The centrality of the *DRN* in 2.16 pulls the earlier snatches of Lucretian imagery together, emphasising the importance of Lucretius' proem to the *Odes* as a whole.

---

[143] Galinsky (1996, 243) and Syndikus (1972, 444).
[144] See Meucci (1989) for an analysis of the *lituus* in Roman warfare.
[145] However, we should keep in mind that the poem also implies a form of poetic immortality: this is, Feeney (2009, 213) describes, "the first intimation that he will not simply die and have a funeral." I will consider Horace's immortal flights in greater detail in the third chapter.

The poet's statement that *otium* cannot be bought is reminiscent of the opulent house that Lucretius says is unnecessary for *ataraxia*: *nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet/nec citharae reboant laqueata auratаque templa* ('the house does not gleam with silver or shine with gold, nor do the golden panels and the rafters resound with the cithara,' 2.27–28).[146] Horace's next stanza emphasises the parallel (9–12):

> non enim gazae neque consularis
> submovet lictor miseros tumultus
> mentis et curas laqueata circum
> tecta volantis.
>
> For neither wealth nor the consul's lictor remove the wretched tumults of the mind and the cares that fly around the panelled ceilings.

Odes 2.18 opens with a reference to this same Lucretian passage: *non ebur neque aureum mea/renidet in domo lacunar* ('neither ivory nor the gilded ceiling shine in my house,' 1–2).[147] Both 2.16 and 2.18 repudiate luxury and teach the benefits of a life of *mediocritas*, and look to the imagery of *DRN* 2 for an illustration of this life: the extended allusion to Lucretius' proem links the poems of *Odes* 2 in philosophy and image.[148] Both also use Horace's own property as a counterexample to the dangers of politics, wealth, and avarice, connecting Lucretius' vision of

[146] See Pöschl (1991, 132–33) and Giesecke (2000, 135–42).
[147] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) also observe in these opening lines an imitation of Bacchylides, while noting that *renidet* draws on Lucretius. There is a hint of a similar image in 2.2, as well, where *nullus argento color est auaris/abdito terris* (1–2). See also Giesecke (2000, ch. 5).
[148] We will see in the next chapter that Horace associates the word *cura* with the proem of *DRN* 2 as well; see section B (iii).

ataraxia more firmly to the lyricist's own Sabine villa. In fact, we will see in the next chapter that Horace asserts his own ethical position even more confidently in 2.18 than in 2.16, augmenting and developing the Epicurean authority he establishes in the earlier poem.[149]

The proem to *DRN* 2 is thus integral to the imagery of Horace's most philosophical book; the vision of pastoral *ataraxia*, the wise man's serenity, the figures of soldier and sailor, and the superfluity of wealth all come together in Horace's picture of ideal *mediocritas*, and their repetition and fragmentation throughout the book gives a certain imagistic continuity to its philosophical principles. What remains to be discussed in more detail is the relationship between poetry and philosophy, most clearly seen in 2.16, where the poet links his creative output to a vision of *ataraxia* and his own Sabine property. We should first observe another prominent allusion in the opening lines of 2.16, this time to the final stanza of Catullus' poem 51, his reworking of Sappho 31 (51.13–16):

> otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est:
> otio exsultas nimiumque gestis:
> otium et reges prius et beatas
> perdidit urbes.

> *Otium*, Catullus, is troublesome to you: you exult and rejoice too much in *otium*. *Otium* has ruined kings and wealthy cities.

[149] Not only does Horace decry luxury in *Odes* 2 just like Lucretius, but he similarly transforms gold into something with philosophical import; his praise of the *auream . . . mediocritatem* (2.10.5) gives a positive value to gold—in opposition to the gilded ceiling of 2.18— reminiscent of Lucretius' own transformation of the metal from the negative opulence of *DRN* 2 into Epicurus' *aurea dicta,/aurea* in the next proem (3.12–13). See Harrison's (2017) commentary on 2.10.5.

Horace's triple *otium* echoes Catullus' own, and the lyricist's Sapphic stanzas emphasise the connection.[150] In Catullus' opus, *otium* is not universally rejected as the stuff of erotic suffering; the triple *otium* in 51 echoes the poetic activity of 50: *hesterno, Licini, die otiosi/multum lusimus in meis tabellis* ('yesterday, Licinius, we played many games on my tablets *otiosi*,' 50.1–2). Catullus and Licinius exchange poetry *otiosi*; *otium* is here the fertile leisure in which friends are free to exchange poems. The poet's use of *otium* at the end of 51 is not a straightforward condemnation, but part of an exploration of the poetic and erotic senses, the dangerous and powerful possibilities, of the term.[151]

Horace's allusion to Catullus brings to mind the idea of poetic *otium*, while his numerous Lucretian allusions remind the reader of Epicurean *ataraxia*; as we have seen, the triple *otium* that begins 2.16 also nods to Lucretius' repetition of the word *suave*. Philosophical and poetic conceptions of *otium* are aligned from the first lines of the poem, in keeping with the strong connection between the internal tranquillity and external humility of the Epicurean life, on the one hand, and Horace's own poetics, on the other. The final strophe, in which Horace illustrates the modesty of his own life in contrast to the *greges centum* (33) of Grosphus, draws a parallel between a life of Epicurean simplicity and a simplicity of poetics (2.16.37–40):

---

[150] Further highlighting this debt to Catullus, Horace makes the choice, rare in his poetry, to divide the word *venale* between lines 7 and 8, a poetic technique adopted from Catullus that in fact looks back to Sappho's own poem and understanding of the metrical form (this is not found in Alcaeus' own sapphics). See Harrison (2017, ad loc.) and Garrison (1998, ad loc.).

[151] In fact, the poetic character of *otium* is adumbrated even within the context of poem 51 alone. In blaming *otium molestum* for his suffering, Catullus blames it for the very content of his poem. The extremely close relationship between Catullus' poem and its Sapphic model makes poem 51 particularly self-conscious about its status as a work of art; *otium* is the source of erotic suffering, but as such it is also the source of the poet's material and of the artistic tradition into which he has placed himself. Finamore (1984, 11–12) contends that the two uses of the term "are inextricably linked and . . . Catullus intended them to be read together."

mihi parva rura et
spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae
Parca non mendax dedit et malignum
spernere vulgus.

A Fate that is not false gave this small estate and the modest breath of the Greek Camena to me, and allowed me to spurn the envious crowd.

The *spiritum tenuem* that Horace attributes to his own poetic style looks back to the life of simplicity in the fourth strophe, the man whose lifestyle is epitomised by the ancestral salt cellar on his *mensa tenui* (14).[152] The fineness of poetry here, the *spiritus tenuis*, suggests the Callimachean *leptos* style, in line with the Catullan references.[153] Moreover, Horace's *parva rura* echo the earlier image of the wise man, who *vivitur parvo bene* (13).[154] With his clear allusions to both Catullus and Lucretius in the opening strophes of 2.16, Horace mingles poetic and philosophical *otium*, evoking the neoteric ideal while grounding it in philosophical seriousness.

Not only does the term *otium* suggest both Epicurean *ataraxia* and Catullan poetry, but it evokes Lucretius' own poetic aetiology yet again. The implicit setting of the poem is again Horace's Sabine property, which the reader understands by now to be a landscape imbued with Lucretian significance and infused with song. The *Parca non mendax* gives the poet both a small piece of land and the slender Muse; lifestyle and poetic mode spring from the same source. The

[152] See e.g. Davis (1991, 205).
[153] Womble (1967, 405–6). See also Davis (1991, 214) and Santirocco (1986, 103).
[154] Santirocco (1986, 101–103) and Lefèvre (2000, 209).

prominence of the word *otium* in 2.16 also looks back to Lucretius' use of the term and Virgil's reception of it. As we saw above, although Lucretius does not use the word to refer to *ataraxia*, the first people learned song on pipes discovered *per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia* (*DRN* 2.1387). It is this same passage that Virgil takes up in the opening of the *Eclogues*, where Tityrus declares, *deus nobis haec otia fecit* (1.6). We have seen that *Odes* 1.17 looks to the various pastoral passages in the *DRN*, connecting the image of *ataraxia* in *DRN* 2 to the misheard echoes of book 4 and the invention of music in book 5. There is a similar connection of ideas in 2.16: Horace draws on both Lucretius' own pastoral vision of the original poetics and his related, philosophical image of mental tranquillity, implicitly asserting the primacy of his own poetry.

Horace's complex use of the word *otium* in 2.16 is part of how he articulates his place in the literary tradition: by connecting his use of the term to the proem of *DRN* 2, Horace is able to reject the erotic dangers of Catullus' poetics—calling to mind the exclusion of violence from the Sabine landscape in 1.17—and claim a philosophical force for his own collection that transcends that of the *Eclogues* and the Catullan corpus. He performs a kind of defence of his own poetics by means of this negotiation, since, as we saw above, the term *otium* has significant implications for the idea of literary creation. I outlined above Roman's (2014) view that the various rhetorical claims of the Augustan poets do not just reflect a cultural change but are part of how the poets create their own new form of autonomy. It is in this context that we might best understand Horace's use of *otium* in 2.16 and his relation to Catullus. The poem does not so much reveal a shift in values that has already taken place as it enacts such a movement: we see the poet in the act of legitimating his creation, much like Cicero and Sallust. By giving his lyric Lucretian weight, Horace lays a foundation for his poetry, drawing together poetic and philosophical *otia* and balancing the 'lightness' of a neoteric poetics. The personal, lyric voice of the *Odes* thus

contains, while transforming for its own use, the ethical and poetic authority of Lucretius' didactic epic. Horace looks to Lucretius' pastoral vision as he binds together philosophical message and poetic creation, but he claims this vision as his own possession by identifying it with his own Sabine property.

(iv) *Odes* 3: the Sabine Landscape in Rome

We will take up *Odes* 3 in greater detail in the following chapter; the Sabine property is increasingly connected to the political realm in the final book of the collection, and the role of Maecenas has much to do with this relationship between public and private. Our discussion there will look at 3.8, 3.16, and 3.29 in particular depth, alongside the Maecenas odes of books 1 and 2, considering how Horace uses Lucretian language and Epicurean ethical ideas to construct and develop his relationship with his patron. There, I will argue that the figure of Maecenas is at the centre of how the lyric poet claims two forms of freedom for himself: one the ethical and vatic authority of a Lucretian pastoral vision, which we have examined here, and the other the authority of empire itself. We should, however, begin to investigate the question of the relationship between the Sabine property and the city here, taking up the role of the Sabine landscape in the Roman Odes. By situating his Lucretian pastoral vision in the context of these political poems, Horace reveals that the Lucretian power he has claimed for himself throughout the *Odes* is one that has power within the political realm, thus making his Lucretian ethical authority inextricable from his public voice. The centrality of Alcaeus to the *Odes* is again important here; the lyric poet is one of Horace's main models, particularly for the interweaving

of private and public voices in the collection.[155] Lucretius, I will argue here, also plays an important part in the intersection of public and private in the Roman Odes.

Odes 3.1 echoes Lucretius repeatedly in its tirade against contemporary opulence. The Lucretian allusions in 3.1 have been extensively catalogued, most thoroughly by Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 3), who state: "When we consider the appropriateness of the ode as an introduction to a political series, we are confronted with an awkward fact: its provenance is predominantly Epicurean . . .".[156] These references should be situated in the context of the rest of the Lucretian resonances of the *Odes*. We should also rethink the idea of these Lucretian allusions as "awkward", considering instead how Horace draws on and reshapes Lucretius to give his own lyric an organic space within the political realm. The general frame of reference for the ode is, yet again, the proem to *DRN* 2. Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 4) list the connections:

> . . . competition for status (10 ff., cf. Lucr. 2. 11 ff.), elaborate banquets (17 ff., cf. 2. 23 ff.), the sound of music (20, cf. 2. 28), the repose of the poor (21 ff., cf. 2. 36 ff.), the shady bank (23 f., cf. 2. 29 ff.), mankind's limited needs (25, cf. 2. 20 f.), anxiety that cannot be shaken off (40, cf. 2. 48), useless purple (42, cf. 2. 35, 52), the concluding *quodsi* (41, cf. 2. 47).[157]

The number of similarities to *DRN* 2 is striking, and the comparison to 2.16 is apt. However, as we have seen over the course of this chapter, the web of allusions to Lucretius (particularly to *DRN* 2) in the *Odes* is incredibly complex; a straightforward alignment of 3.1 and 2.16 misses out on a much greater allusive structure, which has significance for our understanding of

---

[155] See especially Feeney (2009) and Morgan (2009).
[156] See also, among others, Pasquali (1964, 659), Pöschl (1991, 148–63), and West (2002, 10–23).
[157] They add, "The central doctrine obviously comes from Epicurus himself: οὐ λύει τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ταραχὴν οὐδὲ τὴν ἀξιόλογον ἀπογεννᾷ χαρὰν οὔτε πλοῦτος ὑπάρχων ὁ μέγιστος οὔθ' ἡ παρὰ τοὶς πολλοῖς τιμὴ καὶ περίβλεψις οὔτ' ἄλλο τι τῶν παρὰ τὰς ἀδιορίστους αἰτίας (*sent. Vat.* 81 . . .)."

Horace's lyric voice, and the authority he constructs for himself through the image of the Sabine estate by taking ownership of Lucretius.

Horace gives pride of place to his Sabine property again in 3.1, thus connecting the ode to the Lucretian pastoral imagery that runs throughout his lyric collection. At this late point in the *Odes*, the property needs little elaboration; the reader now knows the Sabine landscape to be strongly Lucretian, and an integral part of Horace's self-representation as lyric poet. The Lucretian associations of the Sabine estate are unmistakeable in 3.1 (41–8):

quod si dolentem nec Phrygius lapis
nec purpurarum sidere clarior
    delenit usus nec Falerna
        vitis Achaemeniumque costum,

cur invidendis postibus et novo
sublime ritu moliar atrium?
    cur valle permutem Sabina
        divitias operosiores?

But, if neither Phyrgian stone nor the wearing of purple, brighter than a star, nor the Falernian vine, nor Persian perfume, soothes the one afflicted, why would I strive for a lofty atrium with enviable doors and a modern style? Why would I change my Sabine valley for more troublesome wealth?

The contrast between Sabine valley and opulent, urban lifestyle clearly evokes the similar contrast at *DRN* 2.20–36 between the riches of the city and the pastoral vision of Epicurean *ataraxia*. The poet's property is described only as *valle . . . Sabina* (although the earlier *humilis domos* and *umbrosam . . . ripam* of the farmers, 22–4, hint at same shady banks of the pastoral scene in *DRN* 2), but the reader understands the Sabine property to be the locus for the poet's expression of a *libertas* that is equal parts philosophical and poetic.

A Lucretian ethical stance thus acts as an antidote to political despair in 3.1. The prevalent allusions to *DRN* 2, as well as appearance of the Sabine estate, reveal that the remedy for contemporary degeneracy is an Epicurean philosophy that is inextricable from song, and is the possession of the lyric poet himself; the reference to the Sabine property recalls the Lucretian pastoral imagery, the vision of Epicurean *ataraxia*, that by this point in the *Odes* is indelibly associated with the poet and his property. At the same time, however, we should not forget the lofty voice of the bard in the opening stanza (1–4):

> odi profanum vulgus et arceo;
> favete linguis: carmina non prius
> audita Musarum sacerdos
> virginibus puerisque canto.

> I hate the profane crowd and keep it at a distance: hold your tongues. As priest of the Muses, I sing songs never heard before for maidens and boys.

The opening imagery of the ode is arcane and vatic: the tone of the poem changes dramatically between the poet's claim to be *sacerdos* and his humility in the final lines.[158] Horace's sublime, grand voice in the *Odes* will be the focus of the third chapter of this study, but we should observe briefly here that the poet's self-representation in these opening lines of 3.1 draws on Lucretian imagery as much as the remainder of the poem does; Lucretius' famous "Second Proem" of *DRN* 1 contains the phrase *retroque/volgus abhorret ab hac* ('and the crowd shrinks back from it,' 1.944–5 = 4.19–20), in the context of the poet's glorification of his own project (*laudis spes magna*, 1.923) and claim of novelty (925–7, 944). We have seen how Horace looks to Lucretius' poetic authority as he evokes the philosopher-poet's passage about the pastoral origins of music; in 3.1 we can see that the lyric poet also harnesses the sublimity of Lucretius, while reversing his predecessor's meaning and appropriating his religious tone to speak to the political realm. I will consider Horace's treatment of Lucretian sublimity in much greater depth in the third chapter, where I will discuss how the lyricist both coopts and undermines his predecessor's imagery, implicating Lucretius in the irreverent, tricky sublimity of the *Odes*.

What is implied in the use of the Sabine farm as an antithesis to urban opulence in 3.1 is elaborated and developed in 3.4, a poem that looks to Pindar's first *Pythian* for a model of how song and politics can be united.[159] I will examine this ode in more detail in the third chapter, where I will consider the important role Lucretius plays in the poet's use of lofty imagery, his vision of poetic madness, and his use of Calliope in the poem. Here, we should think briefly about the role that the Sabine estate plays in the ode, particularly in relation to political themes.

---

[158] See e.g. Carey (2016). Nisbet and Rudd specifically contrast the opening two stanzas to the Lucretian language of the rest of the poem.

[159] See especially Fraenkel (1957, 273ff.) and Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 56). In addition, Dang (2010, 123) argues that Horace looks to Alcaeus "to mediate between the public and private spheres, and to celebrate or comment on public events from the private context of the *convivium*."

In 3.4, the property is linked to other rural landscapes: Horace's birthplace in Apulia, most prominently (9–20), but also Praeneste, Tibur, and Baiae (21–4).[160] Unlike in 3.1, where the Sabine property was a model of the proper observance of boundaries and moderation, in 3.4 the poet emphasises how his poetic sacrosanctity protects him beyond boundaries, much as we saw in 1.22: he describes his childhood wanderings *extra limen* in Apulia (10), and declares himself the possession of the Camenae: *vester, Camenae, vester in arduos/tollor Sabinos* ('I am yours, Camena, yours, when I am borne into the lofty Sabine hills,' 21–2).[161] The poet identifies his estate with his childhood home, then widens his gaze to include Tibur and Baiae. As in 1.22, the poet's protection allows him to venture into famously dangerous lands: he begins his list, *utcumque mecum vos eritis, libens/insanientem navita Bosphorum/temptabo* ('as long as you [the Camenae] are with me, I will willingly attempt the raging Bosphorus as a sailor,' 29–31). The stakes are greater and the tone loftier in this poem than in 1.22 where, as we saw above, the poet describes his own divine protection but simultaneously deflates his sincerity by conflating his own humble *termini* and the bounds of the known earth. In 3.4 the poet, under the special protection of his Italian Muses, is granted the freedom not only to travel anywhere but to speak to Caesar himself, through the mediation of the Camenae: *vos*, the poet addresses them, *finire quaerentem labores/Pierio recreatis antro* ('you refresh [Caesar], as he seeks to finish his labours, in the Pierian cave,' 39–40).[162] Dang (2010, 122) emphasises that this poem integrates private and public realms: "The elevation of the poet to a mythical and sacred status authorizes

[160] Cf. Newlands (1984, 67) on the role of Tarentum in *Odes* 2.6: ". . . such is Horace's lack of specificity in dealing with landscape that the value of Tarentum emerges as the same as that of the Sabine farm."
[161] See especially Dang (2010, 122). The textual difficulties of the third stanza make unclear exactly what *limen* is referred to, but the 'out of bounds' character of the scene is clear.
[162] For the mediation of the Muses, see especially Nisbet and Rudd (2004, ad loc.) and Oliensis (1998a, 133–4). See also Harrison (2007e, 245), who argues that 3.4 shows "how the sometimes private poetic landscape can be enlisted for more nationalistic and public poetry."

his participation in the public and ceremonial context." This elevation—which, as I argued above, also looks to the *DRN*—is paired with a Lucretian philosophical seriousness that Horace has appropriated since the beginning of the collection. The ability to speak with authority is bound up with Lucretius' philosophy and didactic authority; thus Horace uses his predecessor even as he exits the Epicurean Garden and addresses the *princeps*.

The poet offers his Sabine villa, and thus a Lucretian vision of pastoral *ataraxia*, as the antidote to the voracious greed of the civic realm. The Lucretian allusions of 3.1 suggest that Epicurean philosophy is the only possible solution to the troubled times, but the poem leaves a gulf between the poet and urban opulence: the poet opens with his statement of isolation (*odi profanum vulgus et arceo*, 3.1.1), and closes with his own distaste for excess, expressed in the first-person singular (*moliar*, 44, and *permutem*, 46). *Odes* 3.4, on the other hand, offers the possibility of mediation between *rus* and *urbs* through the medium of poetry: the poet's Camenae speak to Caesar, and so the bard of the Sabine hills is freed to speak obliquely to the *princeps*. The Sabine landscape itself, so carefully constructed throughout the collection, offers the model for this political integration of the lyric voice. By linking the *libertas* and *otium* of Lucretius' pastoral vision to his Sabine estate, Horace adds philosophical weight to his lyric voice, and claims for himself something of Lucretius' didactic mode. Beyond Horace's Italian *termini* is the Roman empire: the poet's special protection allows him to confront the political sphere, and offer his own landscape and life as an ideal, thus rewriting Lucretian ethics as a medium for political engagement. The lyricist's binding together of private and public thus interprets Lucretius as something of an Alcaic figure, who moves fluidly between the two realms. In the next chapter, we will investigate Horace's confrontation with the state, and see how he also claims for himself the *libertas* of the empire itself.

Chapter 2: Memmius, Maecenas, and the Epicurean *princeps*

The subject of the second chapter follows closely upon that of the first; the previous chapter looked only briefly at the purported source of the Sabine property, the poet's patron, Maecenas. We must consider Maecenas' place in the *Odes* now, a subject that will build on the topics of the previous chapter even as it takes a broader look at the relationship between public and private in the *Odes* as a whole. At the end of the first chapter, I argued that Horace's use of Lucretian pastoral language is involved in his confrontation of the civic realm in the Roman Odes. In this chapter, I will consider the role that Maecenas plays in the poet's construction of a Lucretian ethical authority and his interactions with the state. The lyric poet establishes his patron as a figure of potentiality: Maecenas has made the choice to remain an *eques* rather than pursue senatorial status; Horace's invitations suggest that the patron may enter the Sabine property or stay in the city; and the poet often situates Maecenas at a juncture between Epicurean ethics and civic extravagance. It is in major part through the figure of Maecenas, who is bound up closely with Horace's use of Lucretian and Epicurean language, that the lyricist defines the boundaries of his Sabine space and articulates his increasing ethical command; by continually measuring his patron by Epicurean standards, Horace expresses first his equality to Maecenas and then his growing independence. It is also through Maecenas, who is always implied in the image of the estate, yet always outside it and only invited within, that Horace shows the permeability of his Sabine boundaries. Thus, I will contend in this second chapter, Maecenas has a pivotal role in connecting the private and public sides of Horace's lyric endeavour; the poet implicates his patron in the movement of his lyric into the public view, as well as his own authoritative confrontation of the civic sphere, which is grounded in his personal, private form of Lucretian ethics.

I will begin with a consideration of Lucretius' own addressee, Memmius; there are certain connections between Memmius and Maecenas that will help to elucidate the place of Horace's patron in the *Odes*. I will first take up the philosopher-poet's approach to the political realm, arguing that his addresses to Memmius suggest a certain engagement with politics and subtly hint that Epicureanism can solve civic strife. Lucretius' addresses to Memmius and to a more general *tu* are also integral to his poem's structure; I will consider how these addresses draw readers in and guide them through Lucretius' lessons. Finally, I will briefly discuss how Virgil's own Maecenas in the *Georgics* looks to Lucretius' Memmius in certain ways.

Turning to the *Odes*, I will examine the Maecenas odes sequentially, beginning with 1.1 and 1.20. After establishing a position of somewhat qualified deference in 1.1, the poet uses allusions to Philodemus' epigram to Piso to convey a sense of Epicurean friendship with his patron in 1.20, one that is closely identified with a Roman conception of *amicitia*. I will further show that connections between 1.17 and 1.20 not only remind the reader of the Lucretian implications of the Sabine landscape into which Horace invites his patron, but imply that this landscape has the power to enter and transform the city through the medium of lyric poetry.

In the second book of the *Odes*, Horace addresses three poems to his patron: 2.12, 2.17, and 2.20. Although it is the latter two that involve Maecenas in a complex negotiation with Lucretian imagery, I will briefly consider 2.12, showing how the ode suggests Horace's increasing freedom from his patron, and, through the figure of Licymnia, hints at the movement of lyric into the public realm. Moving to 2.17 and 2.20, I will investigate the contrast between the strongly Lucretian poems at 2.16–18 and the final two poems of the book, looking at how Horace overturns many of his Epicurean sentiments. I will argue that 2.17 offers something of a choice to the patron: he can participate in Lucretian modesty, or indulge in dangerous opulence.

Odes 2.19 and 2.20 seem to reverse the Epicurean philosophy that precedes them, yet Lucretius' words are equally important to these final poems. I will argue here that Horace's use of Lucretian language in his addresses to Maecenas—which is often related to the Lucretian resonances of the Sabine estate—is critical to how he expresses his growing freedom from his patron, as well as his increasing ability to confront Rome itself.

In *Odes* 3, I will first examine the invitation to Maecenas at 3.8, arguing that the poem looks back to 1.20 and reiterates some of the Epicurean resonances of the earlier ode. At the same time, I will contend that, like 1.20, the invitation suggests the movement from private to public: Horace writes his personal anniversary of a near-death experience onto the civic calendar. *Odes* 3.16 again addresses Maecenas as *eques*, and again offers him a certain choice, placing the patron at the juncture between avarice and Epicurean simplicity; I will argue that the poem sets the scene for the final address to Maecenas in 3.29, with its bold claim of independence. This final address is in some ways reminiscent of the Roman Odes; it constructs the lyricist as an Epicurean sage and entreats the patron to leave behind civic cares, although Maecenas does not seem to heed his client's invitation. After declaring his independence from Maecenas, the poet makes himself the image of the state itself, the *princeps* (3.30.14) of Italian lyric, in a poem that incorporates Lucretian imagery much as 2.20 does. The continuity of Lucretian language through the final poems of books 2 and 3, I will contend, reveals the importance of Lucretius to the poetic authority Horace has constructed for himself. This authority is the basis of the lyricist's liberation from his patron; both patron and philosopher-poet are involved in Horace's assertion of a strikingly un-Epicurean, imperial message of poetic immortality.

In the final section, I will return to the question of didactic poetry, and briefly consider the similarities between Horace's Maecenas and Lucretius' Memmius. In certain ways, Horace's

authoritative lyric voice draws on the didactic form of the *DRN*. The lyric poet comes into much closer confrontation with the Roman state than does his philosophical predecessor, but we can see some traces of Lucretius' intimation that Epicureanism may heal the state; Horace reworks his predecessor to place Lucretius much more firmly within political discourse. I will also suggest that Horace's claim of independence from his patron looks to both Lucretius' Memmius and Virgil's Maecenas. Like Lucretius' and Virgil's addressees, the figure of Maecenas in the *Odes* draws the reader into the work, but Horace also draws himself out—into confrontation with the empire—through his relationship with his aristocratic patron.

(A) Lucretius, Memmius, and Politics

The first chapter began by establishing the importance of the pastoral mode in the *DRN*, showing how Lucretius identifies a pastoral landscape with Epicurean *ataraxia*. There, I argued that Lucretius gives a sustained critique of traditional, mythological pastoral poetry, reimagining the mode as a state of mental tranquillity. In the *DRN*, the harmony that pastoral creates between human and environment becomes a philosophical tenet: to achieve true happiness, one must live in accordance with nature. Lucretius takes the pastoral idyll and translates it into philosophical terms, such that accord with nature becomes an inward condition. He connects his own poetry to this vision of pastoral *ataraxia* and to the original invention of song in response to the natural environment; his work, he hints, bears an important resemblance to this Ur-song, yet takes its cue from the entire cosmos, and leads the willing student toward mental, rather than physical, harmony with nature.

This state of *ataraxia* has political implications, as the previous chapter suggested only briefly. As we saw at the end of the chapter, Horace's own reworking of Lucretian pastoral is

part of how the poet enters and seeks to heal urban degeneracy in the Roman Odes; Lucretian allusion is a cornerstone of his assertion of ethical authority in the context of civic upheaval.[163] As we will see, Horace both grounds his own poetic-philosophical voice in his rural retreat and creates tension between this withdrawal and the civic realm. Horace's patron, Maecenas, is a central figure in the poet's exploration of the political; he is figured as the source of the Sabine estate and yet, as figure of great wealth with connections to the *princeps* himself, he potentially undermines the Epicurean retreat. Before we consider Horace's political engagement or his relationship with his patron further, we should pause to think about Lucretius' own approach to Rome and politics; in a certain way, Horace draws on and expands Lucretius' implication that Epicureanism might permit a path for curing the contemporary state according to natural principles. Further, I will argue that the Epicurean's relationship with his own aristocratic patron and addressee, Memmius, influences Horace's portrayal of Maecenas in the *Odes*; both Memmius and Maecenas, as creations of their respective texts, provide literary bridges between poet and state by means of which their authors may confront and transform the city. However, Horace not only engages in a deeper, more sustained way with the civic order, but offers both praise and criticism of its great works; his treatment of political concerns makes frequent reference to Lucretian language and imagery, yet Horace embeds his lyric voice far more deeply within the civic realm, making of his predecessor a political poet.

The contrast between the pastoral imagery and language of urban opulence in the proem of *DRN* 2 suggests an Epicurean withdrawal from the political sphere, particularly with its image of the Epicurean sage set apart in fortified *templa*, looking down on those who *certare ingenio,*

[163] The contrast that Horace draws between civic opulence and his own humble, tranquil life has parallels to the proem of *DRN* 2.

contendere nobilitate ('compete in talent, contend in nobility,' 11).[164] Lucretius' own engagement with politics is notoriously ambivalent, however, as the proem to *DRN* 1 intimates. Venus' role as Julian ancestor is suggested by *Aeneadum genetrix* (1), and she seems to have been the ancestor or protector of Memmius' own household.[165] As Lucretius opens his great didactic epic on the order of the cosmos, then, he also addresses the political order: the Venus who begins book 1—who will gradually be redefined and demythologised as Epicurean *voluptas* and *ataraxia*—is identified in some ways with the state. The suggestion becomes clearer in the poet's prayer for peace (*effice ut interea fera moenera militiai/per maria ac terras omnis sopita quiescant*, 'meanwhile, make the wild works of war become quiet in sleep over the seas and every land,' 29–30) and the famous and evocative image of Mars subdued on Venus' lap (31–40). The passage has clearly Roman implications, as Venus' earlier identification hints.

Not only is Venus connected to Memmius' family, but Lucretius' prayer for peace ends with the claim that the Memmii must necessarily remain involved in politics (1.41–3):

> nam neque nos agere hoc patriai tempore iniquo
> possumus aequo animo nec Memmi clara propago
> talibus in rebus communi desse saluti.

---

[164] This passage has a clear influence on Horace's Roman Odes, as for example with the candidate who competes with his reputation: *moribus hic meliorque fama/contendat* (3.1.12–13). See Mader (1987, 16–17).

[165] Courtney (2001) discusses the numismatic evidence for this association. J. F. Miller (2009) explains, "Venus is . . . deftly shown to reflect his patron's private concerns as well as embodying Epicurean Pleasure, Empedoclean Love, Aphrodite of traditional mythology, and one of Rome's national deities" (4–5). For the controversy over which of the Memmii is addressed in the *DRN*, see especially Schiesaro (2007a), who explains how assumptions about Memmius' identity have led scholars to make particular claims about Lucretius' party politics. Of Lucretius' reference to the health (*salus*, 43) of the state, Schiesaro writes: "The political implications of the term would not be impossible to reconcile with what we know of Memmius' shifting allegiances, but would perhaps be more appropriate if the addressee is not C. Memmius L.f., praetor in 58, but the pro-senatorial C. Memmius C.f., tribune in 54 BC" (54).

> For in this hostile time for our country, we cannot live with untroubled minds, nor can the famous offspring of Memmius neglect the common good in such conditions.

This political engagement contrasts sharply with the image of the gods that follows: *omnis enim per se divom natura necessest/immortali aevo summa cum pace fruatur* ('for the whole nature of the gods must itself enjoy immortal life in the greatest peace,' 44–5). Despite the Epicurean dislike of political involvement, the times demand action, and so, Fish (2011, 87) argues, "the purpose of the poem cannot have been to withdraw Memmius from politics."[166] Fish further contends that, while it is preferable to withdraw, the Epicureans did not counsel a complete rejection of politics; this idea was created more by Cicero and Plutarch than the Epicureans themselves.[167] Although the best scenario is to withdraw, the politician who practises Epicurean philosophy is of great benefit to the state.

The address to Memmius and the prayer for peace thus insinuate that Lucretius' Epicurean teachings may heal the state itself. Schiesaro (2007a, 49) argues that the poem seeks to transform both individual and civic upheaval, doing away with a Ciceronian conception of a political order grounded in natural law: "Deprived of its metaphysical sanction, any constitutional form is nothing more than a purely historical, practical set of arrangements which

---

[166] See also 76.

[167] Fish also cites DL 10.119, which contains only two words on Epicurus' position (οὐδὲ πολιτεύσεται). Fish also finds evidence for his claim in Philodemus' *On the Good King According to Homer*, which likely draws on Epicurus' own *On Kingship* (see especially Dorandi 1982). Of Lucretius, Fish argues that scholarship has tended to focus on the philosopher's negative exempla of politicians (e.g. his Sisyphus allegory in book 3, where Sisyphus' struggle is an image of human political greed: *petere imperium quod inanest nec datur umquam*, 998). This ignores Lucretius' treatment of Memmius and his necessary involvement in the political realm.

must be evaluated on the basis of its ability to foster the attainment of *uoluptas* 'pleasure'."[168] Thus, Schiesaro asserts, Lucretius is nonpartisan, dedicated only to a complete reversal of civic order so as to best achieve *ataraxia*: "The *DRN* shows that a return to nature is the key not just to the happiness of the individual, but also to the salvation of the state" (54). This argument can be augmented with a consideration of how Memmius figures into Lucretius' work; the patron's public, political role, emphasised by Lucretius' reference to him working for the common good, suggests that the aristocratic addressee must bridge the gap between private Epicurean practice and the public weal.

Rejecting any metaphysical basis for human laws, Lucretius employs the language of human politics to describe atomic structure, as we began to see in the previous chapter. Asmis' (2008) contention, that natural boundaries are fundamental to Epicurean freedom, is based on the political language that Lucretius uses to describe the natural order. Lucretius relocates the Roman language of *terminus* and *foedus* to the cosmic structure; the sanctity belonging to boundary-stones and treaties becomes part of the natural order, the fixity of such things as genera and growth. The philosopher thus gives the *foedera naturai* to atoms themselves, taking treaties away from the human realm and placing them at the atomic level.[169] If we read the first proem as making a political statement about how an Epicurean mindset is a necessary prerequisite to a healthy state, we can see how such a political education would require a relearning of the terms of politics, such that true, 'sanctified' law resides at the level of atomic structure, not human law. The first stage in political transformation, Lucretius hints, would have to be within the mind of

[168] Lucretius' analysis of the development of politics in book 5 (1105–60) is particularly clear on this point. The philosopher derides the desire of men to be powerful and famous, saying it is preferable that one *vera vitam ratione gubernet* (1117). He explains the dangers of ambition: *ut satius multo iam sit parere quietum/quam regere imperio res velle et regna tenere* (1129–30).
[169] Schiesaro (2007b). See also Shearin (2015).

the Epicurean politician—represented by Memmius—and the sole aim of the new politics would be a universal state of mental *ataraxia* aligned with the principle of *voluptas*.

Memmius' function as didactic addressee also influences Horace's characterisation of Maecenas in the *Odes*.[170] Volk (2002) has explored the relationship between didactic teacher and student in depth, arguing of the *DRN* that we "have to understand Memmius primarily as an intra-textual character, a 'creation of the poem itself', in other words, as one member of the teacher-student constellation typical of didactic poetry as a genre" (74). Poetic simultaneity, "the illusion that the poem is really only coming into being as it evolves before the readers' eyes" (13), is a central feature of didactic, Volk explains, and continual addresses to a reader call attention to this activity.[171] Lucretius' poem has true didactic intent, she argues, but Memmius himself serves not as a unique addressee but as a feature of the poem that facilitates its lesson. He is sketched vaguely in the *DRN*, with his name appearing only eleven times. The philosopher-poet also addresses a more general *tu*, connected with Memmius but not specified, who draws readers into the argument and involves them in the student-teacher relationship.[172] While Volk's interpretation provides an invaluable perspective on Memmius as didactic addressee, we should not forget the above idea that Memmius' aristocratic identity does, in fact, offer some insight into the function of Lucretius' own philosophy. As we have just seen, Memmius' appearance in

[170] He also has important connections to Empedocles' own use of Pausanias, as Garani (2007) sets out in detail; Empedocles in general is an important model for the *DRN*, especially influential on Lucretius' use of metaphors and emphasis on the importance of sight.

[171] Volk traces a line of didactic poetry that starts with Hesiod and includes such authors as Empedocles, Aratus, Manilius, and Ovid. Cf. Servius' comment on the *Georgics*: *hi libri didascalici sunt, unde necesse est, ut ad aliquem scribantur; nam praeceptum et doctoris et discipuli personam requirit. unde ad Maecenatem scribit [Vergilius], sicut Hesiodus ad Persen, Lucretius ad Memmium* (*Praef. ad Georg*. 129.9–12, qtd Volk 2002, 37).

[172] Lucretius addresses this unspecified *tu* 412 times. See especially Mitsis (1993, 122) and Clay (1983, 212ff.).

the proem to *DRN* 1 not only brings the prayer for peace into the context of the contemporary Roman state, but hints at how the Epicurean poem may seek to transform the political order.

Despite Memmius' apparent connection to the poet as patron, the only place in the poem where this relationship is evident is the first proem; for the remainder of the work, Memmius is more often cast as a student struggling to understand, or even as a child. Particularly vivid is Lucretius' proclamation that he can supply ample, even overwhelming, proof for any subject that Memmius struggles to understand. Lucretius declares, *quod si pigraris paulumve recesseris ab re,/hoc tibi de plano possum promittere, Memmi* ('but if you are reluctant and draw back a little from the matter, I can easily promise you this, Memmius,' 1.410–11), saying that he will pour out so many arguments on the subject that he fears they will both grow old before he has exhausted his evidence (414–15). Volk (2002, 81) argues that "while the recurring addresses in the second-person singular serve to involve [the readers] in the instruction process and make them feel like students themselves, the apparent stupidity of the intra-textual addressee causes them to dissociate themselves from this character and side with the teacher instead." One aspect of this process is Lucretius' recourse to paternalistic language, most famously in the honeyed-cup simile, where he compares his project of feeding the reader the bitter truths of philosophy couched in sweet poetry to a physician tricking a child: *sed veluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes/cum dare conantur, prius oras pocula circum/contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore* ('but as when doctors try to give bitter wormwood to children, they first touch the rims of the cups with the sweet yellow liquid of honey,' 1.936–8 cf. 4.11–13). The reader, in trying to avoid being implicated in Lucretius' analogy, sides instead with the teacher: "we may include ourselves among the adults sadly shaking our heads at the masses of the sick or the unwashed

vulgus."[173] The development and impact of Lucretius' Epicurean argument, then, are bound up in the figure of Memmius and the implied relationship between student and teacher. By avoiding identification with the childlike addressee, the reader is caught up more tightly in Lucretius' Epicurean dogma. This treatment of Memmius, I will argue, influences Horace's own portrayal of Maecenas in the *Odes* and his ongoing meditations on Epicurean philosophy.

Although Lucretius' own political intent and use of addressee could be explored in greater depth, we should turn briefly to Virgil's *Georgics* as a contemporary influence and comparandum for Horace's *Odes*. We can fruitfully compare the role of Maecenas in the *Odes* to his function in the *Georgics*, where Virgil addresses the patron prominently, but exclusively, near the beginning of each of the four poems. The placement of these addresses is significant, and is connected to Lucretius' own addresses to Memmius in the *DRN*. Virgil's Maecenas, Volk (2002) contends, is a "creation of the poem," an integral part of the didactic "illusion of poetic simultaneity" (132). Virgil's careful positioning of Maecenas within the opening exposition for each book in the *Georgics* is significant, Volk argues (136):

> . . . the speaker's conversation with Maecenas is like a self-referential frame drawn around the teaching speech; . . . whenever Vergil's patron is explicitly addressed, it is in the context of a discussion of the poem itself. While the poet is speaking to the farmers, he says to Maecenas: 'Look at what I am doing: I am composing a didactic poem, *Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen*.'

Virgil's characterisation and placement of his patron in the *Georgics* draws attention to the poet's own activity. The temporal movement of the poem, Nelis (2013, 253) argues, "draws the reader closely into the actual process of the poem's unfolding, as she or he becomes inextricably

[173] Mitsis (1993, 127).

involved in the creative process of the poem's ongoing composition." Maecenas, as the addressee, makes the readers acutely aware of this development and implicates them in it through the second person address.

Virgil's characterisation and placement of Maecenas also permit the poet to leave his patron behind in a certain way. This understanding of the relationship between the *DRN* and the *Georgics* will provide insight into Horace's own treatment of Maecenas in the *Odes*; not only do the two poets share a patron, but their works both involve a certain superseding of Maecenas. The *Georgics* are addressed to both patron and farmers, and it is only to the latter that Virgil's agricultural lessons are directed, Volk (2002, 131) observes. Since philosophical topics are well suited to an aristocratic audience, Memmius does not need to give way to another recipient in the *DRN* (although, as we have seen, the unspecified *tu* addresses play a far greater role in the poem than does Memmius himself); "by contrast, in the *Georgics*, Maecenas must again and again step into the background and hand over the stage to the farmers." Horace, the previous chapter argued extensively, gives ethical Epicureanism an important place in his construction of lyric authority, identifying it with his Sabine property and so claiming ownership of it. As we will see, Horace's characterisation of his own patron owes a debt to both Lucretius' Memmius and Virgil's Maecenas, and the poet claims independence from his patron as his collection progresses. This increasing freedom is intimately connected to the lyricist's Lucretian vision of his Sabine villa.

(B) Maecenas and Epicureanism in the *Odes*

(i) *Odes* 1: 1.1 and 1.20

In the previous chapter, we saw that Horace identifies his poetic *libertas* and *otium* with Lucretius' pastoral, appropriating the ethical authority of his predecessor while transforming it

and making it proper to both his own Sabine estate and his lyric mode. We saw briefly, however, that even as the Sabine property is characterised by withdrawal and retreat, it always at least potentially contains civic concerns, even before the poet uses his own property as a corrective to the city's problems in *Odes* 3; the poet omits any reference to the source of his estate in 1.17, but in so doing reminds his reader that it is the gift of the wealthy Maecenas. We saw, as well, that urban violence menaces the landscape of 1.17, contained within the poem even as the lyricist proclaims the safety of his retreat. Moreover, the poet's property contains implicit suggestions of the elite culture associated with such villas—a social framework that Horace perhaps draws attention to by its very elision, as he does with Maecenas' role as patron—as well as the memories of civil war and land confiscation, and suggestions of the *pax Augusta.*[174] The *Satires* make significant use of the tension between rural retreat and urban busyness, connecting this tension to the hypocrisy of the satiric voice.[175] Although the lyric voice of the *Odes* is markedly different from that of the *Satires*, here too Horace makes the friction between rural and urban spaces a central part of the lyric project, with its embrace of many genres and subjects. As we will discover, the figure of Maecenas, who not only underwrites the Sabine property but is the frequent addressee of Horace's injunctions and invitations, offers a link between retreat and empire. Horace suggests the flexibility of the patron's own character, placing Maecenas the *eques* at the juncture between ethical Epicureanism and political grandeur. In addition, Horace depicts his relationship with his patron as evolving over the course of the *Odes*, such that the poet claims increasing independence from Maecenas. As we will see, the development of the lyricist's relationship with his patron is an important part of how Horace claims for himself a

[174] See especially Bowditch (2001, 155, and 211ff.), Dang (2010, 121), and Newlands (1984, 56ff.).
[175] See especially chapter 1, section C (i).

twofold authority that intensifies over the course of the *Odes*: one side the ethical authority of a Lucretian voice, and the other a power that is parallel to the empire itself.

Odes 1 opens with Maecenas, exalting him through his literal position and his royal ancestry: *Maecenas atavis edite regibus/o et praesidium et dulce decus meum* ('Maecenas, sprung from royal ancestors, my protection and my sweet glory,' 1–2). As many have observed, the poem establishes an initial stance of deference to the patron. The effusive praise of the opening lines is matched by the conditional of the concluding two lines: *quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres/sublimi feriam sidera vertice* ('but if you graft me among the lyric bards, I will strike the stars with my uplifted head,' 35–6). Maecenas is responsible for protecting his client and ensuring his success.[176] The deference of this opening will be shattered by the end of the collection; as we will discuss below, the final address to Maecenas is given penultimate place in the *Odes*, disconnecting the patron from the poet's final ascent in 3.30, and the poet in 3.29 represents himself as ethically superior to Maecenas' civic *curae* and wealth.

Even in this opening poem, however, Horace's praise is not absolute, hinting at the eventual separation between the two men in the collection. The grandeur of the patron's Etruscan ancestors is matched by an allusion to the grandest of poets, Pindar. Horace looks particularly to *Ol*. 1, with its similar priamel form. Barchiesi (2000, 171) writes: "This initial allusion would be consonant with Horatian strategies or reduction and self-protection, because after gesturing towards Pindar—the king of the lyric canon for the king of patrons, Maecenas—the collection falls back to Lesbian models, and it distances Pindar as a model too ambitious to handle." If Horace himself is divided from the athletes and politicians of the opening lines, set apart by the

[176] Santirocco (1984, 243) contends, for example, that "his poetic programme is also inseparable from, and indeed accomplished by, the personal dedication." Oliensis (1998a, 106) adds to this that the ode is "underwritten not only by Maecenas, invoked in the poem's opening and closing couplets, but also and primarily by Augustus, who clears a space for the poet's grove within a pacified Italy."

double *me* of lines 29 and 30, and he rejects Pindar in favour of the Lesbian poets, then where in this choice of lives does the patron fall? By shrinking back from Pindaric encomium, Horace displaces Maecenas from his expected position of praise; while Pindar relates Hieron's achievement to his own song, thus lauding both himself and his patron, Horace in a certain way dislodges Maecenas from his place of glory by beginning with Pindar but veering away from this model.[177] Further, the poet undercuts his own glory in the final lines: "the poet will strike the stars with his head, an incongruously literal picture which suggests a nasty headache."[178] If Horace deflates his own Pindaric exaltation, where does this leave his patron? Does the poet's disavowal of such a grand voice also undercut the praise with which the poet began? The question of Maecenas' role is left open, and this establishes a certain potentiality at the heart of the patron's figure in the *Odes*, a flexibility that will allow Horace to use his patron as a symbol of movement between humility and grandeur, private and public.

Maecenas next appears in *Odes* 1.20, the poem that opens the second half of Horace's first book.[179] The patron does not appear in the introduction to the Sabine estate in 1.17; Horace elides any hierarchical suggestions of a patron-client relationship, foregrounding his own freedom and *otium* instead. When he does appear in 1.20 it is as the addressee of an invitation, not explicitly as the wealthy benefactor of the poet. Horace makes a clear connection between his patron and Epicureanism not only with the content of 1.20 itself, but with a strong link between

---

[177] See e.g. Kirkwood (1982, 43–4) for a discussion of how Pindar aligns Hieron's achievement and his own song. Zetzel (1982) argues that there is a kind of *recusatio* here, commenting that the placement of Maecenas in a priamel is similar to Theognis' use of the name Cyrnus as a *sphragis*, and noting the connection between this priamel and the opening of *Sat.* 1.1.

[178] Harrison (2007b, 29). Pomeroy (1980, 36–7) suggests that the addressee is by this point not just Maecenas but a general reader.

[179] Cairns (1992, 85) observes that this poem is meant to stand out in the first book, as the opening to the second half: "As the twentieth ode of a book containing thirty-eight odes it begins the book's second half, and can almost be seen as a second prologue; it is addressed, like the first ode, to Maecenas, and it rededicates the book to Horace's patron, as well as setting the tone for the subsequent odes."

1.17 and the invitation to Maecenas in 1.20. As we saw in the previous chapter, in 1.17 the poet urges Tyndaris to withdraw from the city into an idealised space that evokes Lucretius' pastoral imagery, alluding to both the vision of *ataraxia* in the *DRN* and Lucretius' account of the origin of song. The ode emphasises the permeability of the property: not only does Horace ask Tyndaris into his sequestered space, prefiguring the invitation to Maecenas, but he opens with the image of Faunus, who *mutat* (2) his home, leaving Arcadian Lycaeus for Lucretilis. As we saw in 1.22, moreover, the transgression of boundaries is related to the poet's articulation of his sacrosanctity: the existence of limits, of the bounded property, permits the poet to cross the *terminus* of his estate without leaving behind its *libertas*. By inviting his addressees out of the city and into the Sabine estate, the poet calls attention to the limits of the property, the movement in and out of the landscape, and the distinction between rural and urban spaces, a difference that has implications for the Epicurean resonances of the property. Further, the framework of invitation into the rural landscape hints at an Epicurean sense of the importance of friendship, as well as the interconnection of friendship and *libertas*.[180]

The proximity between *Odes* 1.17 and 1.20 accentuates the powerful Epicurean resonances of Horace's invitation to his patron. The brevity and allusiveness of 1.20 urge the reader to fill in the details. The poet intimates that he is inviting the patron to his Sabine property through his invitation to drink *vile* . . . *Sabinum* (1).[181] With 1.17 still fresh in their minds, readers recall the withdrawn Sabine landscape and its contrast to the city, an image that evoked the juxtaposition of Epicurean *ataraxia* and opulence in the proem to *DRN* 2. The *vile* wine and

[180] See e.g. MacLeod (1979, 27) for a discussion of Epicurean friendship and freedom. Santirocco (1986, 156) observes that the tone of Horace's address to Maecenas is "less formal and more familiar" than 1.1.
[181] Santirocco (1984, 244) argues that the Sabine wine implies Horace's gratitude to his patron for the gift of the farm. See also West (1995, 96). Sabine wine is also present in *Odes* 1.9, which shares certain sympotic elements, and an Epicurean *carpe diem* sentiment, with 1.20 (see Nisbet and Hubbard 1970).

modicis cups give a sense of Epicurean modesty and convey an atmosphere of aesthetic restraint, which is reflected in the simplicity of the poem itself.[182] The ode introduces many of the motifs that Horace associates with his patron throughout the rest of the collection: Maecenas' recovery from illness, his equestrian status, invitations to sympotic friendship, the difference between the patron's status and that of his client, and movement between public and private spaces.[183] The ode also establishes an Epicurean framework for the relationship between Maecenas and Horace, which will prove to be a central element in the Maecenas odes that follow, and will shape the progression of the relationship between patron and client over the course of the collection.

While 1.17 overflowed with Lucretian allusions, *Odes* 1.20 looks primarily to another Epicurean source: Philodemus' invitation to Piso, the Epicurean philosopher's possible patron.[184]

Αὔριον εἰς λιτήν σε καλιάδα, φίλτατε Πεισων,
ἐξ ἐνάτης ἕλκει μουσοφιλὴς ἕταρος,
εἰκάδα δειπνίζων ἐνιαύσιον· εἰ δ᾽ ἀπολείψεις
οὔθατα καὶ Βρομίου χιογενῆ πρόποσιν,
ἀλλ᾽ ἑτάρους ὄψει παναληθέας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπακούσῃ
Φαιήκων γαίης πουλὺ μελιχρότερα·
ἢν δέ ποτε στρέψῃς καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ὄμματα, Πείσων,
ἄξομεν ἐκ λιτῆς εἰκάδα πιοτέρην.

[182] See Dang (2010, 124) for this latter point.
[183] See Santirocco (1986, 157) for the first four items in this list.
[184] *Epigram* 27 Sider = *AP* 11.44. Among many others, see Pavlock (1982), Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), and Gigante (1995, n. 56). There may be hints here as well of Catullus 13, the invitation to Fabullus, which also looks to Philodemus. However, as we will see in the final chapter, allusions to the neoteric's invitation factor much more significantly into *Odes* 4.12, the invitation to Virgil.

> Tomorrow, dearest Piso, your friend, beloved by the Muses, who keeps our annual feast of the twentieth invites you to come after the ninth hour to his simple cottage. If you miss udders and draughts of Chian wine, you will see at least sincere friends and you will hear things far sweeter than the land of the Phaeacians. But if you ever cast your eyes on me, Piso, we shall celebrate the twentieth richly instead of simply.[185]

Horace relates his modest invitation to this model; particularly clear is his emphasis on the simplicity of his own fare, which contrasts with his patron's wealth.[186] His message, too, is similar, although the ode is not as explicit as the epigram; Horace's wine, Italian in a Greek jar, has often been taken to be an image of the poet's own lyric—much as the landscape of Sabine villa is—and thus poetry takes the place of the philosophical discourse that Philodemus promises to Piso in place of a luxurious feast and Homeric song.[187]

Philodemus' epigram, Sider (1995, 47–8) argues, indicates that "Piso and Philodemus will be both *amici*—i.e. patron and poet—and φίλοι, i.e. two members of an Epicurean

---

[185] Translation is from Paton (1918).

[186] See especially Pavlock (1982) and Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, 244).

[187] See e.g. Commager (1962, 326), and Fitzgerald (2013, 135), who writes, "Horace's poetry, the Roman wine in the Greek jar, will last longer than the ephemeral applause that erupted in the theatre." Gigante (1995) gives a thorough explanation of the Twentieth. Horace's specificity with regards to the wine also connects to Philodemus' epigram, although Horace expands his discussion of wine to frame the poem.

If we read 1.20 as linked with 1.17, as their shared Sabine context suggests, we can also see hints of Philodemus in the earlier poem: the poet tells Tyndaris, *dices laborantis in uno/Penelopen vitreamque Circen* (1.17.19–20), and the Homeric content is reminiscent of Piso's vision of conviviality, ἀλλ' ἐπακούσῃ/Φαιήκων γαίης πουλὺ μελιχρότερα (5–6). Gigante (1995, 84) explains that Philodemus here "opposes the truth of philosophy to the falsehood of poetry." In 1.17, Horace reverses this language, much as he reverses Lucretius' image of the echoes misinterpreted as woodland deities: Homeric song, in 1.17, is given pride of place beside Epicurean friendship, symposium, and pastoral *ataraxia*. Horace takes up Epicurean ideas of *philia* and *ataraxia*, yet he draws them into his lyric mode without dogmatic allegiance.

friendship."[188] The Roman tradition of describing the relationship between patron and client as *amicitia* typically involves the grounding of the relationship in shared values.[189] Philodemus' invitation to Piso seems to enact this very cultural tradition; the epigram itself performs the activity of levelling any economic disparity between the two men, offering philosophical friendship in place of sumptuous fare.[190] By modelling his invitation to Maecenas on this epigram, Horace similarly performs his *amicitia* with his patron; his allusions imply that the equal friendship between the two men is one founded on Epicureanism.[191] The poem thus follows the ideas of 1.17; not only does the proximity of the two odes confirm the Epicurean implications of both, but where 1.17 elided the patron's presence from the landscape, 1.20 invites Maecenas into the Sabine space as an equal. Even as he delineates the social difference between the two men, Horace in another way levels this hierarchy through his portrayal of private Lucretian *ataraxia* and then Epicurean convivium.[192]

The topography of the poem also has social and economic implications.[193] Like Philodemus' epigram, *Odes* 1.20 draws attention to the divide between patron and poet even as it suggests Epicurean equality. Horace's poem highlights this difference even more than

---

[188] See also Yona (2018, 50) and Edmunds (1982), who argues that the epigram gives a glimpse into real Roman social life.

[189] See e.g. White (1993, 13ff.). The poem is comparable to Seneca's translation of an Epicurean maxim (*Ep*. 19.10): *ante . . . circumspiciendum est, cum quibus edas et bibas, quam quid edas et bibas. nam sine amico visceratio leonis ac lupi vita est*.

[190] This expression of *amicitia* fits with Philodemus' *On Property Management*, which argues that the best livelihood for the Epicurean wise man is to exchange truthful philosophical discussion in return for patronal support (23.23–6). See Yona (2018, especially 46–7).

[191] Similarly, Harrison (2007b, 28) argues that "Horace's indirect approach to acknowledging the gift of the *Sabinum* not only shows delicacy towards Maecenas but also serves to conceal the crudely material workings of the client/patron relationship."

[192] See e.g. Murray (1985, 40).

[193] Dang (2010, 112–16) writes of *Epist*. 1.14 that, while the letter portrays an Epicurean, egalitarian friendship between the poet in Rome and his Sabine *vilicus*, and illustrates the estate in pastoral terms similar to those of *Odes* 1.17, we must not ignore the social and political elements of both landscape and relationship. I argue that we should take a similar approach to 1.20. See chapter 4, section A, for a brief consideration of the Sabine estate in the *Epistles*, including 1.14.

Philodemus' does; while the philosopher moves from the Chian wine that Piso will miss to the image of friendship and philosophical discourse, Horace concludes with Maecenas' own vintages, making the economic disparity between the two men the poem's conclusion. Moreover, the poet describes not the Sabine valley, but Rome itself, recounting the applause echoing through the city after Maecenas' return (5–8). We will return to this imagery in a moment, but for now we should note that the poem, although apparently an invitation to the Sabine property, pictures only the city; the division between patron and poet—which Horace emphasises increasingly over the course of the *Odes*—is evident despite the vision of Epicurean *philia*.

The ode thus simultaneously implicates the patron in the poet's ethical stance and suggests Maecenas' potential separation from such an Epicurean perspective. Pointedly, Horace here addresses Maecenas as *eques* (5), drawing attention to his patron's decision not to seek senatorial glory.[194] At the same time, however, the patron is not painted in purely Epicurean terms: he may be modest, but Horace also addresses him as *clare*—or perhaps *care*—(5), creating tension with the restraint implied by *eques*.[195] The Tiber is, moreover, described as the patron's *paterni fluminis* (5–6), recalling the first line of the collection, which also lauded Maecenas' royal Etruscan heritage: *Maecenas atavis edite regibus* (1.1.1). The patron is both humble and elite in 1.20, both a philosophical equal of the poet and a symbol of civic concerns. The invitational form, moreover, situates him between private and public spaces. *Odes* 1.20 thus leaves us uncertain: does the invitation to Maecenas level the disparity between patron and

[194] We will see a similar moment at 3.16.20; see the discussion below (iii), as well as Nisbet and Rudd's (2004) commentary on the passage. Cf. Propertius 3.9.1–2, which gives Maecenas a similar set of contrasting attributes and draws on Horace's own portrayal of his patron: *Maecenas, eques Etrusco de sanguine regum,/intra fortunam qui cupis esse tuam*. See Zetzel (1982).

[195] Gigante (1995, n. 58), who cites Heinze, Klingner, and Fraenkel, reads *care* instead of *clare*, but Fitzgerald (2013, 136) argues that the juxtaposition of *clare* and *eques* expresses the tension in the character of Maecenas, a tension that is further worked out by the description of the Tiber, discussed here. Cairns (1992, 96) points out that *care* could allude to Philodemus' φίλτατε (1).

client, making them ideal Epicurean friends, or does Maecenas' fame and wealth undermine the freedoms and egalitarianism of the Epicurean landscape? As we will see, the duality of the patron's character in 1.20 is characteristic of his role throughout the *Odes*, and the poet's various expressions of this problem are part of an evolution that eventually permits him to claim both imperial and Epicurean liberty for himself.

Finally, we should return to the image of the city, and the language Horace uses to illustrate Maecenas' joyful return to society—the details of which, again, are missing from this poem, but will be supplied by 2.17.[196] The description recalls the Sabine landscape of 1.17. The physical landscape echoes the applause for Maecenas, as we saw: *paterni/fluminis ripae simul et iocosa/redderet laudes tibi Vaticani/montis imago* ('the banks of your fathers' river and the playful echo of the Vatican Mount returned your praises,' 5–8). The city echoes applause, as the rural landscape echoed the pipe (1.17.10–12). The ephemerality of the echo is preserved in the poem: "an essential part of the event was its reverberation, its *imago*, and the poem is a continuation of that reverberation."[197] The echo of this poem echoes that of 1.17: now the urban landscape is said to *redderet* the applause, as the Sabine stones *personuere* with the sound of the pipe. Dang (2010, 123) argues that the poem "enacts the poet's program of self-definition and establishes the connections and interactions between the Sabine farm and Rome, which together complete Horace's purview." We can add to this by considering the connection between the echoes: those of 1.17, as we saw, recalled Lucretius' origin story of song itself, imbuing the

[196] Although it is not explicit that 1.20 and 2.17 describe the same occasion, as Mayer (2012, 162) emphasises, it is characteristic of the *Odes* that one poem builds on another, and that series of references to the same idea or object are meant to be read together. See also Santirocco (1986, 157).
[197] Fitzgerald (2013, 137).

estate with a kind of poetic primacy.[198] The echoing echoes of 1.20 rewrite Rome as Sabine space even as the poet invites the patron away from the city. Poetic authority seems to infiltrate the city; if the city makes its presence known in my secluded landscape, Horace seems to claim (reminding us of the looming presence of Cyrus and urban violence in 1.17), so too my poetic authority is present within the city itself, and the city can be redrawn by my pen. Although the lyricist issues an invitation into his Sabine property, then, the poem also suggests that Horace's authority in a certain way extends into the civic realm. The Epicurean invitation, then, comes face to face with Rome itself. This movement seems to be made possible by the figure of Maecenas, who is potentially part of the Sabine landscape but also an outsider, potentially Epicurean but also caught up in urban concerns. The invitation at 1.20 is not Horace's final word on the subject: the suggestion that his own poetic authority may extend from the Sabine estate into the city becomes increasingly potent as the *Odes* progress.

(ii) *Odes* 2: 2.12, 2.17, and 2.20

In the second book of the *Odes*, the poet develops and deepens the ambivalence of Maecenas' character, as well as the Epicurean resonances of the relationship between patron and client. The previous chapter drew attention to the Lucretian imagery—particularly that of the proem to *DRN* 2—that permeates *Odes* 2. There, we saw how Lucretian language comprises an essential component of the poet's expression of his own freedom; by aligning poetic *otium* and Epicurean *ataraxia*, Horace constructs his own authority, claiming the generalised vision of *otium* in Lucretius as his own by associating it with his Sabine property. In doing so, I argued,

[198] As we saw in the previous chapter, the connection between echoing landscape and poetic authority is bolstered by allusions to *Odes* 1.12, where similar echoes occur in traditionally famous poetic landscapes (see Pavlock 1982).

Horace appropriates some aspects of Lucretius' didactic voice. In this section, I will take up *Odes* 2 again, now considering the role of Maecenas in this philosophical book. We saw in chapter 1 that 2.16 and 2.18 are paired through reference to the proem of *DRN* 2. In this section, I will study these two odes again insofar as they frame 2.17, a poem that not only addresses Maecenas, but again refers to the patron's close encounter with death. As we will see, the trio of poems entangles Maecenas in a web of philosophical, Lucretian language, even as it leaves ambiguous what place the patron has in a continuum of perspectives that encompasses both the poet's own self-conscious *paupertas* and the avarice of the rich. *Odes* 2.16–18 then stand in contrast, we will discover, to the Bacchic epiphany of 2.19 and the grand flight of 2.20, where the poet again addresses, and then supersedes, his patron.

The first address to Maecenas in the second book of *Odes* is 2.12, which we should briefly consider before we take up the poems that conclude this middle book. As many have shown, this *recusatio* reveals increasing assertion and independence, emphasised by the fact that Horace defers any address to his patron until after the middle of the book, not even placing the poem at the opening of the second half.[199] The ode charts a familiar form; Horace declares that his own genre is inadequate to a prose account of the *princeps*' achievements.[200] *Nolis* (1), the poet begins, placing the responsibility for his refusal on his patron: you do not wish, Maecenas, for me to force harsh, great military campaigns into my *mollibus modis* (3–4). Oliensis (1997, 163) explains, "Horace's opening gambit is to claim that he knows Maecenas better than Maecenas knows himself." The lyricist offers an alternative: *tuque pedestribus/dices historiis proelia Caesaris,/Maecenas, melius ductaque per vias/regum colla minacium* ('you, Maecenas, will speak better in prose histories of Caesar's battles and of the necks of threatening kings

[199] See especially Santirocco (1984, 245).
[200] Davis (1991, ch. 1) makes a thorough account of *recusatio* in the *Odes*.

dragged through the streets,' 9–11). The suggestion is humorous, especially if we take seriously Suetonius' report of Maecenas' affected prose style (Suet. *Aug*. 86); it is an offer "to make Maecenas's neoteric heart sink."[201] The result is a self-conscious levelling of the relationship between client and patron, which advertises Horace's security in his friendship with his patron.[202] Much as we saw in 1.20, where Horace depicted *amicitia* as an equalising, ideal Epicurean friendship, in 2.12 he employs *recusatio* to efface the social difference between the two men.

All this is not to say that there is anything particularly Epicurean about this ode, except insofar as it develops Horace's ongoing negotiation with public and private spaces, an exploration that is closely related to the poet's use of Epicurean and Lucretian language. As a *recusatio*, the ode allows Horace to introduce public, political themes into his lyric while preserving his distance from such concerns.[203] Maecenas is not the only addressee of the *Odes* to receive a poetic refusal such as this; in fact, a similar refusal opens the second book of odes, a detail that may call attention the fact that the lyricist defers his address to Maecenas until the twelfth ode. The *recusatio* permits Horace to maintain an ostensible claim on private lyric, while incorporating a public, political genre.

The role of Licymnia in the ode warrants brief consideration here. The poet relates that his *Musa* demands he sing of the *dulces dominae . . . Licymniae/cantus* ('sweet singing of mistress Licymnia,' 13–14), and he goes on to describe her dance. He then asks Maecenas if the patron would be willing to take the wealth of Achaemenes, or Phrygia, or the Arabs, instead of Licymnia's hair (21–8). The woman who seems to be the poet's beloved ends the poem as

---

[201] Oliensis (1997, 163). See also Griffin (1984, 195–6), West (1998, 82–3), and Harrison (2017, 147–8).
[202] Lyne (1995, 102–3).
[203] See especially Harrison (2007a, 170–5) and his concept of generic enrichment in the *recusatio* of 1.6.

Maecenas'; Ps.-Acro's ancient commentary identifies Licymnia with Maecenas' wife Terentia, and scholarship is split on whether this identification is justified.[204] Davis' (1975) analysis of the poem, which makes Licymnia a symbol of lyric poetry itself, is elaborated by Sutherland (2005), who argues that Licymnia is a "literary body", beloved by both poet and addressee.[205] The poet constructs Licymnia as desirable, handing her over to Maecenas (and, by extension, the external audience) in the final two stanzas: Maecenas is implicated in the poet's desire. The question of her identity is an intriguing one, but is perhaps most clearly understood as a meaningfully ambiguous moment. Sutherland explains that Licymnia represents literary *materia*, and her changing role in the poem suggests the movement of poetry from private to public: "When he gives Licymnia to Maecenas, Horace's speaker firmly sets his oeuvre in the public sphere" (206). To this, we can add an important detail, one that will have significance for the interpretation of *Odes* 3 in particular: Licymnia is said to have danced at the festival of Diana of the Aventine.[206] The passage has a certain similarity to the movement into urban space in 1.20; Licymnia's dancing is written on both the public calendar, in the form of the annual festival, and public space, the Aventine temple. As an image of poetry itself, Licymnia moves into the public sphere in both time and space, a movement facilitated by the figure of Maecenas—the patron who belongs to both public and private spaces and is characterised by his movement between them. The relocation of Licymnia, and therefore of Horace himself, into civic space occurs through

[204] Pseudo-Acro on Hor. *Serm*. 1.2.64 and Hor. *Carm*. 2.12.13. See especially Evenepoel (2014) and Harrison (2017).
[205] This argument gains even more strength if we agree with the argument of Nauck (1894, 122) that Licynmia's name derives from λιγεῖς ὕμνοι, a phrase then suggested by Horace's description of her *dulces cantus* (13–4).
[206] The poet writes that it is not unsuitable for Licymnia to join such a dance (*nec . . . dedecuit*, 17), variously interpreted as a defence of her inclusion in such a dance as a *hetaira*, or proof of her high status. Harrison (2017, ad loc.) argues that she is figured as being respectable enough to join high born women in the festival. On the other hand, Davis (1975, 75) summarises the evidence for the openness of the festival.

reference to Maecenas, as the poet seems to hand over his beloved to his patron. The subject of the public calendar and space will become increasingly important to the way Horace figures his relationship with his patron, as we will see.

Odes 2.12 begins to shake free of Maecenas, because of its placement within the second book—not first, and not even at the centre—and because of its refusal of the patron's demands. *Odes* 2.17 occurs in the context of this increasing independence, located just a few poems later in the midst of a series of reflections on moderation and mortality. The ode recalls 1.20, not only because it is similarly addressed to Maecenas, but because it too concerns the acclamation of the patron after his recovery from illness; the later poem, in conjunction with the earlier 2.13, seems to fill in detail that was missing from the sparse sketch in 1.20.[207]

Odes 2.17 is, like 2.12, a difficult poem. The poems that flank it are conspicuously Lucretian, as we saw in the previous chapter. Both point clearly, and in similar ways, to Lucretius' description of the gleaming halls of the wealthy in *DRN* 2. The two poems are linked, and 2.18 asserts the ideas of 2.16 even more confidently. The first exhorts the wealthy addressee to Epicurean modesty and tranquillity, and concludes by praising the poet's own humble possessions. *Odes* 2.18 seems to pick up directly from the end of 2.16, with its allusion to *DRN* 2 (*non ebur neque aureum/mea renidet in domo lacunar*, 'neither ivory nor the gilded ceiling shine in my house,' 1–2, cf. Lucretius' *nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet/nec citharae reboant laqueata aurataque templa*, 'the house does not gleam with silver or shine with gold, nor do the golden panels and the rafters resound with the cithara,' 2.27–28). It makes an even more confident personal claim on ethical superiority.[208] The poet exalts his own modest life again, now making more explicit his earlier assertions: *nihil supra/deos lacesso nec potentem amicum/largiora*

[207] As we will see, *Odes* 3.8 will continue exploring the double salvation of the poet and his patron.
[208] See especially Lyne (1995, 120–1) for the condescension implied by Horace's ethical stance here.

flagito,/satis beatus unicis Sabinis ('I do not trouble the gods for more, nor do I entreat my powerful friend for greater things—I am fortunate enough in my unparalleled Sabine land,' 11–14). In 2.16 the poet states that *curae* are present even in the lavish halls that Lucretius describes (*et curas laqueata circum/tecta volantis*, 'the cares that fly around the panelled ceilings,' 11–12); in 2.18, he more clearly argues that he does not have such riches. *Odes* 2.17 is something of an outlier, a surprising interlude between the two relatively faithful Lucretian sentiments of 2.16 and 2.18. The poem does similarly centre on the contrast between wealth and Horace's own *paupertas*: as with 2.16, the poem ends with the opposition between Horace and his addressee, concluding with the *aedem . . . votivam* (31) that Maecenas ought to dedicate and juxtaposing this with Horace's own *humilem . . . agnam* (32).[209] Further, Horace's address to his patron is all about death, in keeping with the philosophical emphasis of *Odes* 2.[210] Death even acts as a kind of leveller, taking both rich patron and client on the same day: *ille dies utramque/ducet ruinam* ('that day will bring ruin for both of us,' 8–9).

Placed at the centre of this trio of poems that grapples with Lucretian images and ethical principles, Maecenas is given a position of potentiality. He can be the modest Epicurean, in keeping with his role in 1.20, where he was both Roman patron and Epicurean friend. On the other hand, it has been observed frequently that the unspecified *tu* of 2.18 seems connected to Maecenas, the addressee of the previous ode.[211] Lyne (1995, 128) argues that Horace's *potentem amicum* (11) is a clear reference to Maecenas, and therefore identifies the addressee with the

---

[209] A contrast that recalls the different wines of 1.20.
[210] Wili (1948) stresses this emphasis on mortality, calling the second book of the *Odes* a *Todesbuch*.
[211] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978, 289), for example, state: "Horace sometimes gives immediacy to his moralizing by contrasting his own simplicity with the luxury of his friends . . . ; editors do not observe that though our poem has no addressee, it seems to some extent to be hinting at Maecenas (the recipient of the previous ode)." See also Santirocco (1984). However, Oliensis (1998b, 89) is sharply critical of Lyne's perspective in her review of his work, writing that "the beneficiary of Maecenas' generosity cannot first thank his patron and then attack him for misusing his wealth."

patron. Harrison (2017, 209) argues convincingly against this identification, saying that the generalised address is diatribic, and found elsewhere in the *Odes*.[212] Even if we do not follow Lyne, there are clear connections between this ode and the preceding one, such that 2.18 clarifies the reflection on wealth and poverty, as well as the idea of death as an equaliser, in 2.17. *Odes* 2.18 lays out in stark, Epicurean terms what 2.17 may have hinted: *aequa tellus/pauperi recluditur/regumque pueris* ('the earth opens impartially to the poor man and the sons of kings,' 32–4). In the later poem, nothing is left of Horace's claim that patron and poet will die on the same day, or his astrological concerns, yet a trace of the earlier poem remains: despite the contrast between the wealth and status of the two men, both will ultimately die. Perhaps we are meant to see some hint of Maecenas' presence in the poem; even if he is not the particular addressee of 2.18, he could potentially become the unnamed *tu*, with the capacity to dangerously push the boundaries of the natural world, transgressions that overturn Epicurean principles. Maecenas' placement in this meditation on wealth seems to offer him a choice: he can remain the underwriter of the *unicis Sabinis* (2.18.14), or he can be the overreaching rich man who attempts to burst the limits of the natural world. By situating the patron at this juncture, Horace offers him the choice between Epicurean simplicity and dangerous opulence.

This is not, however, the ending of the second book of the *Odes*. Two poems remain, and their tone is dramatically different from the other eighteen poems of the book. *Odes* 2.19 and 2.20 set aside the Epicurean humility of the earlier poems, granting the poet first a divine epiphany, then a bizarre metamorphosis into an immortal swan. The two poems are strongly connected; Heyworth (2017) goes as far as to make them the same ode, a sublime Alcaic poem

[212] See especially 3.6.5 and 3.24.4. Harrison (2017) suggests that this is, in fact, a diatribic element borrowed from Lucretius (see, for example, *DRN* 2.45, 66, 3.904, 969, 1025, and 1045).

that leads into a single, lengthy Alcaic Roman ode in book 3.[213] The inspiration Horace draws from Bacchus in 2.19 builds toward the immortal metamorphosis of 2.20.[214] Because the Lucretian themes of moderation, the contrast between wealth and *paupertas*, and the inevitability of death that structure *Odes* 2.16–18 all seem overturned in the final two poems of the book, we might also expect a complete overturning of Lucretian language and ideas. Instead, both 2.19 and 2.20 are similarly saturated with Lucretian imagery.

I will take up *Odes* 2.19 in detail in the next chapter, which will be concerned with Horace's so-called "Bacchic poetics", but a few points are particularly salient here. Although Horace gives his Bacchus a far more traditional character than Lucretius', the words of his predecessor resonate through the poem and remind the reader that Lucretius, too, had a vision of poetic grandeur, a kind of immortality of his own.[215] Lucretius' Bacchic imagery, which is central to the Second Proem of *DRN* 1, as we will see, emerges in a conspicuous way in the remote spaces of 2.19 and the *gravi thyrso* (2.19.8) that recalls Lucretius' own *acri . . . thyrso* (1.922–23).[216] Horace's *turbidum/laetatur* (6–7) evokes the paradoxical mixture of *voluptas* and *horror* in *DRN* 3.28–9, where Lucretius gazes down like a god on the workings of nature, with Epicurus as his guide. This paradox is again reflected in the *dulce periculum* of the second Bacchus ode (3.25.18), which I will discuss more thoroughly in the third chapter.

---

[213] Santirocco (1986, 107) connects them thematically: "Horace attempts to convey the quality of his experience as a poet in 'mythic' terms, by representing it as a vision of Bacchus in C. 2.19 and as a metamorphosis into a bird in C. 2.20."

[214] Among others, see Feeney (2009, 218–19), who argues that the double form of Bacchus in 2.19 sets up the transformation into *biformis vates* in 2.20, and Sutherland (2002), who reads 2.19 as a 'classroom scene' that depicts a lyric teacher, and contends that it prepares the reader for 2.20 by showing the poet's separation from ordinary human experience.

[215] See Harrison (2013a, 373–4) for a consideration of Horace's more traditional imagery.

[216] Hardie (2009, 218). Hardie argues that "the combination of a religious earnestness with hints of scepticism, while typically Horatian in its irony, is intelligible as a comment on Lucretian dealings with places of poetic numinosity." See chapter 3, section B (i).

It is in 2.20 that Horace lays claim to true immortality (21–4):

absint inani funere neniae
luctusque turpes et querimoniae;
    conpesce clamorem ac sepulcri
    mitte supervacuos honores.

Let dirges, ugly mourning, and laments stay away from my empty grave; restrain your cry and put aside the unnecessary rites of the tomb.

The contrast with the earlier poems of book 2 alone is conspicuous; in this final ode, the poet ostentatiously overturns his continual refrain that we are all mortal. More strikingly, even as these final lines of the poem assert the immortality of the poet, they evoke the Epicurean precept that we should not mourn the dead excessively.[217] Hardie (2009, 199) argues that Horace nods not only to an Epicurean theme but to a particular Lucretian moment, the passage of book 3 where Lucretius explains that funeral honours are useless because the corpse cannot sense anything (3.870–93). Bonfante (1992, 40) also looks to *DRN* 3.953–60, *Natura*'s instructions to the man mourning his own death (*aufer abhinc lacrimas, baratre, et compesce querellas*, 'away with your tears, *baratre*[218], and restrain your laments,' 3.955), as a model: "Lucretius's Nature points out that mourning is useless, because death is inevitable: Horace states that no funeral is necessary, since he has in fact avoided death." Horace uses Lucretius' language and imagery

[217] See e.g. Jacobson (1995, 574): "The final stanza . . . plays off two common but contradictory themes, the Epicurean theme that survivors should not mourn the dead man because death is not an evil, and the Ennian theme that survivors should not mourn because the dead poet lives on."
[218] Sedley (1998, 60–61) discusses the problems with this word and its possible meanings.

about the permanence of death to, paradoxically, claim his own immortality.[219] He employs his predecessor's words against themselves, uniting them with Ennius' claim to immortality in his epitaph.[220] Horace's tongue-in-cheek allusions to Lucretius are remarkable, and they contrast directly with the strong claims about the inevitability of death that fill the rest of the second book of *Odes*, particularly 2.16–18. Just before, the poet has used Lucretius' words and ideas to make distinctly Epicurean points; now, in 2.19 and 2.20, he uses them to contradict these same points, turning them against themselves and making even more flagrant the reversal he has effected at the ending of this book of odes.

Even as Lucretius' teachings and words are overturned in this final poem, however, the philosopher-poet's own sublime vision is implicated in the lyricist's flight; Hardie (2009, 199) comments that one source for Horace's metamorphosis into a swan is Epicurus' mental flight in Lucretius (1.72–7), the same flight we saw alluded to in 1.22 in the previous chapter.[221] In the pair of poems at the end of book 2, then, while Horace does remythologise what he receives from his predecessor, and turns certain of Lucretius' words against themselves, his lofty vision of poetic grandeur has much in common with the Epicurean's own sentiment. With this in mind, we might even read the image of the swan in 2.20 as at least partially another allusion to Lucretius, who himself claims to be a swan: *suavidicis potius quam multis versibus edam;/parvus ut est cycni melior canor, ille gruum quam/clamor* ('I will produce [an account of how *simulacra*

[219] West (1998, 144) also observes the connection between Horace's *liquidum aethera* (2.20.2) and Lucretian meteorological descriptions, especially the *liquidissimus aether* of 5.500. Horace's immortal swan flies through the atomistic world of Lucretius.
[220] See Erasmo (2006).
[221] See also Harrison (2017, 236). The image also looks to the early lyricists (the wings that Theognis gives to Cyrnus [237–9], for example), as well as the epitaph of Ennius, which reads, *nemo me lacrumis decoret, nec funera fletu/faxit. cur? volito vivus per ora virum* (*var*. 17–18 Vahlen).

move] in verses that are sweeter than they are numerous, as the short song of the swan is better than the clamour of cranes,' 4.181–3).[222]

Not only does Horace's tone shift conspicuously between 2.16–18 and the final two poems of the book, but this movement is all the more pronounced because of how Maecenas figures into the transition. The patron is again the addressee of the final ode of book 2, but his appearance in the poem is deferred and he is not a subject of the poem.[223] The presence of two Maecenas poems so close together in *Odes* 1–3, which contain only eight odes in total addressed to him, is remarkable in itself. 2.17 is an outlier in a scheme that otherwise puts addresses to Maecenas only roughly at the beginning, middle or end of books.[224] This double address to Maecenas asks the reader to compare the two odes, and situates the patron within two very different sets of poems. The two poems have not often been compared, despite their identical addressee and common interest in the idea of death.[225] 2.20 seems to undo entirely the arguments of 2.17. The poet who just stated that he would die at the same moment as his friend (2.17.8–9) now proclaims his own eternal life as a swan, underlining the contrast between himself and his

---

[222] A passage that is itself strongly Callimachean. Horace looks to Lucretius often in his ongoing dialogue in the *Odes* between Callimacheanism and a grander epic sentiment, a dialogue that the philosopher-poet, too, engages with in the *DRN*. *Odes* 2.20 is often cited as an example of this dialogue: Horace's description of his wings as *non usitata* signals a kind of recherché Callimacheanism, while *nec tenui* opposes Callimacheanism, which is associated with the word *tenuis*. Both grand and Callimachean sentiments are connected to Lucretian language in 2.20. I will explore this idea more in chapter 3.

[223] Sutherland (2002, 145) comments that Horace does not specify his addressee until the seventh line of the poem, and even then does not convey intimacy: "Because the poet's goal is to distance himself from the human community, his relationship with addressee and external audience are compromised as well." See also Jacobson (1995, 574), who observes that Maecenas is caught up in the reflections of the ode not as a figure of great wealth, but as the much more detached recipient of Horace's grand claims of immortality.

[224] Santirocco (1984, 243). This does not, of course, mean that the poems are in these precise positions (for example, the final address to Maecenas is 3.29 rather than 3.30).

[225] Jacobson (1995, 574) perhaps goes the furthest in comparing them, writing of 2.20 that "the comrade who implied that he and Maecenas could not be long separated by death (2.17.1–22) will, after all, abandon his friend." Hornbeck (2014, 155) also observes that Horace seems to break his promise to Maecenas in this ode.

patron: *non ego quem vocas,/dilecte Maecenas,obibo/nec Stygia cohibebor unda* ('I, whom you summon, beloved Maecenas, will not die, nor will I be restrained by the Stygian wave,' 6–8).[226] The presence of Maecenas emphasises the antithesis between the two sets of poems.

On the other hand, even as Horace proclaims his separation from his patron, his newfound independence whereby he will fly off as an immortal swan and leave Maecenas behind, he briefly reminds the reader of the patron-client relationship: *ego quem vocas* (6), Horace says of himself. Harrison (2017, ad loc.) argues, "[Horace] is stressing his humble and dependent social status (whenever Maecenas calls him, he comes)." Although the phrase does recall Maecenas' patronage, the lyricist's response to his patron does not seem to be this straightforward; his movement is not toward Maecenas, but upward, away from earthly, social obligations. In 2.20 the poet soars independently, whereas his flight in 1.1 was conditional upon patronal approval: *quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,/sublimi feriam sidera vertice* (35–6). The distance that Horace creates between himself and his patron also contrasts clearly with Maecenas' earlier place as the very first word of 1.1. In 2.20, the poet reminds the reader of his relationship to his patron, yet he abandons his earlier claims for the most part, and leaves his patron behind when he achieves immortality.

In proclaiming his immortal flight in 2.20, Horace looks to the boundaries of the empire itself as the landscape for his journey; his catalogue (13–20) covers "the known Roman world to its limits in every direction."[227] The image of his expansive flight looks back to the idea of publication we discussed above with reference to 2.12, and forward to the lyricist's alignment of his accomplishments with the empire in 3.30. The language and grand scope of 2.20 also

---

[226] The contrast between this sentiment and much of the preceding book is underlined by the reference to Styx, which appeared in 2.14 as the river that is *enaviganda* by all, *sive reges/sive inopes erimus coloni* (11–12).
[227] Harrison (2017, ad loc.).

anticipates the Roman Odes that follow, with their political themes and similar Alcaic stanzas.[228] In 2.12, we saw the movement of poetry from the poet's private space into the civic realm through the figure of Licymnia, first imagined as the poet's beloved and then as Maecenas'. In the final quarter of *Odes* 2, we can see a similar process. The deeply Lucretian language of 2.16–18 and the earlier poems bolsters the lyricist's poetic authority, as we saw in depth in the previous chapter. This authority then provides the foundation for the mythical, sublime journeys of the final two poems. The continuity of Lucretian language through all five poems hints at the connection between the poet's private, Epicurean voice and the grand flights that illustrate the process of publication and great reach of fame. The paired addresses to Maecenas at 2.17 and 2.20 emphasise the relationship between the two sides of the lyric voice, and also show the poet's increasing independence. As he claims growing autonomy through his engagement with Lucretian ethics—gradually establishing his patron as opposed to this philosophy—his claims of immortal glory also increase. Even as Horace reminds the reader of his continued ties to his patron, however, he also undercuts his sublime flight in certain ways, as we will explore in greater detail in the next chapter; in particular, the avian metamorphosis in 2.19 is illustrated in exaggerated, grotesque terms that unsettle the reader, and Horace's comparison of himself to Icarus (2.20.13) indicates the danger of hubris. As we will see in this chapter and the next, Horace needs to renegotiate his relationship with politics and his patron in *Odes* 3 before arriving at his final articulation of his poetic glory, which retains traces of irony even as it mitigates the hubris of 2.20.

(iii) *Odes* 3: 3.8, 3.16, and 3.29

[228] See again Heyworth (2017).

Maecenas is not named until after the Roman Odes are over; the poet again defers his address to the patron, which is notable, given the clear political connotations of Maecenas' role in the *Odes*. We might expect an invocation of the patron as the poet addresses the civic realm, but he is not named. The delay in Maecenas' appearance displaces him from the grandeur of the Roman Odes; Horace only calls on his patron in 3.8, after apparently retreating from public concerns in the previous erotic poem, and he does not reveal his addressee's identity immediately.[229] As another sympotic invitation, 3.8 draws the reader's mind back to the Philodemean invitation of 1.20. *Odes* 3.8 is connected to the earlier poem not only in its invitational form, but also because the poet celebrates the anniversary of his own close call with death: his escape from the falling tree, which 2.17 paired with the patron's own near-death experience, the illness that was the subject of 1.20.[230] As we saw above, 1.20 introduced this motif of the brush with death, a story that is developed throughout the collection. It is the third address to the patron that concerns these events, but now the poet's escape alone is celebrated. The progression of the addresses to Maecenas thus puts increasing attention on the poet himself; Horace not only delays his address to his patron until after the lofty Roman Odes, but elides Maecenas' own celebration. This development is linked to the ending of book 2 where, as we saw, 2.20 reverses the claim of 2.17 that the two men will die together. The poet's celebration of only his own anniversary in 3.8 evinces Horace's growing liberation from his patron.

Moreover, the reiteration of the near-death experiences in the collection emphasises their recurrence as anniversaries: in 1.20 and 3.8, especially, the events are commemorated as dates on

---

[229] Pavlock (1982, 83) argues of the previous poem, "By its serious reference to the decline of morals and its more ambivalent erotic suggestiveness, *Odes* 3.7 mediates between the public, socially minded Roman Odes and the private love poems which follow (3.9–12)." For the delay in Maecenas' appearance in book 3, see Lyne (1995, 109–10).

[230] Independently, the tree is also the subject of the epodic 2.13, and is proof of the Camenae's love at 3.4.27.

the calendar to be celebrated with sacrifice and symposium. We have seen throughout that the relationship Horace constructs with his patron in the *Odes* has much to do with the connection between public and private in the collection. In 3.8, the patron is at the centre of another juxtaposition of public and private, urban and rural, and, as we will see, the emphasis on these polarities again seems to argue for the poet's claim on both Sabine and civic spheres. Horace opens with an association between personal celebration and civic calendar (1–8):

> Martiis caelebs quid agam Kalendis,
> quid velint flores et acerra turis
> plena miraris positusque carbo in
> caespite vivo,
>
> docte sermones utriusque linguae?
> voveram dulcis epulas et album
> Libero caprum prope funeratus
> arboris ictu.

> Do you wonder what I, a bachelor, am doing on the Kalends of March, what these flowers mean, and the box full of incense, and the charcoal on the fresh turf, you who are educated in the discourses of both languages? I vowed sweet feasts and a white goat to Liber when I had almost been sent to the grave by the blow of a tree.

Maecenas is invited within the poet's private space: *mitte civilis super urbe curas* ('set aside your civic cares about the city,' 17), the poet enjoins, bringing to mind his Sabine property again, with its extraurban, Epicurean connotations.[231] The poem begins by inviting the patron, and by extension the reader, into a private celebration; the apparent withdrawal seems to accord with the personal, erotic tone of the previous poem, the first to follow the Roman Odes.

Maecenas' *curae* suggest those spectres of 2.16 that flutter around the consul's *laqueata tecta* (11–12), undeterred by riches; in fact, Horace frequently associates *curae* with civic concerns, and suggests that they are remedied by an Epicurean perspective. He draws this Epicurean association from Lucretius, who describes the cares of men in the proem to *DRN* 2, the passage Horace continually returns to as he grapples with his predecessor in his *Odes*. Lucretius writes: *re veraque metus hominum curaeque sequaces/nec metuunt sonitus armorum nec fera tela* ('and truly the fears of men and their pursuing cares do not fear the sound of arms nor wild weapons,' 2.48–9). In contrast to this is the state of peace that the philosopher-poet illustrates with pastoral imagery: nature demands nothing, *nisi utqui/corpore seiunctus dolor absit, mensque fruatur/iucundo sensu cura semota metuque* ('except that pain be absent from the body, and that the mind enjoy pleasurable sensation, with care and fear removed,' 2.17–19). The worries of *Odes* 2.16 are similar to the oppressive concerns of the *DRN*; *curae* are undeterred by riches, which Horace describes in terms that evoke the lines in the *DRN* that precede the *curae sequaces*. Moreover, the Sabine estate, associated repeatedly with Lucretian pastoral, offers the remedy for such worries. The ending of 3.1—an ode that is, as we saw in chapter 1, steeped in Lucretian imagery just like 2.16—looks to the same passage of the *DRN*, making even clearer reference to Lucretius' image of pursuing cares: *sed Timor et Minae/scandunt eodem quo*

[231] West (2002, 82) discusses how the details of the first stanza, especially the fresh turf, suggest the Sabine landscape.

dominus, neque/decedit aerata triremi et/post equitem sedet atra Cura ('but Fear and Threats climb to the same place as the master, and dark Care does not leave the bronzed trireme, and it sits behind the rider,' 36–40). Maecenas' political *curae* in *Odes* 3.8, then, bring to mind this same context, suggesting that urban cares are resolved by Epicurean tranquillity and implying that, just like in 2.16 and 3.1, it is Horace's private, Sabine landscape that offers the cure for such worries.

The emphasis on the poet's anniversary in 3.8 is a pointedly Roman gesture; as Feeney (2009, 228) has emphasised, part of the distinct Romanness of Horace's lyric project lies in his ability "to conceive of future time as a continuous linked sequence of years," a result of the new fixity of the Julian calendar. The persistent motif of the two anniversaries, linked as they are by the logic of 2.17, calls attention to the inexorable movement of the Roman calendar through the work. *Odes* 3.8 takes this emphasis on anniversaries further by inscribing the poet's personal celebration on the civic calendar; not only does Horace's own narrow escape recur on the calendar annually, but the personal anniversary is identified with the Matronalia.[232] We could read this poem as revealing the intrusion of the city upon the Epicurean withdrawal of the Sabine landscape: Horace's private anniversary must be celebrated within the constraints of the civic calendar, while the patron represents an interruption to his rural retreat. However, I argue we should instead read the poem as Horace's rewriting of the public calendar; the poet replaces the Matronalia with the celebration of his own salvation, despite the fact that, as *caelebs*, he disrupts the civic insistence on fecundity.[233] Maecenas is invited into the secluded Sabine space and asked to put his civic

[232] The description of the wine jar as 'taught to drink the smoke when Tullus was consul (*consule Tullo*)' (11–12) also connects private celebration to civic order. See Feeney (2009, 229–30) for more about Horace's dating system in the *Odes*.

[233] See Henderson (1999, 140) for the concordance of private and public here: "Horace's privately improvised religious calendar has to square with his concurrent participation in the public civil round of festivals."

concerns aside—Horace urges his patron to eschew not only political *curae*, but the Roman calendar itself, celebrating not the Matronalia but Horace's own salvation from death. The emphasis this interpretation places on the poet and his private anniversary accords with the increasing emphasis Horace places on his own escape from death as he moves between 1.20, 2.17, and 3.8.

The idea that Horace is writing his own anniversary on the civic calendar agrees with what we have seen of the Maecenas odes throughout the chapter. Recall that in 1.20, the poet's invitation to his patron—purportedly asking Maecenas to a modest celebration of the patron's escape from illness—involves Horace's own flight outside the bounds of the Sabine estate, so that the city itself echoes the applause for Maecenas (5–8). In 2.12, Horace's portrayal of Licymnia hints at his own poetry and the fact of its publication; the beloved enters the public sphere by way of the transference of desire between poet and patron, a fact underlined by Licymnia's dancing at the festival of Diana of the Aventine. *Odes* 2.17 and the poems that frame it seem to involve the poet's withdrawal into his Lucretian, Sabine retreat, but these odes lead into the lofty visions of 2.19 and 2.20, in which Horace matches his own poetic glory to the expanse of empire. In 3.8, even as Horace invites Maecenas inside his property and entreats him to set aside public *curae*, he also moves outside his rural seclusion, staking a claim on the empire itself and the institutions of Rome.

Of course, not all of these moments in which Horace moves out of his private property and into Rome are tied to Maecenas odes. These passages seem to come with increasing frequency in *Odes* 3. The Roman Odes, as I argued in the previous chapter, offer the Lucretian space of the Sabine estate as a model for healing civic corruption, and 3.4 hints at how poetry itself may act as a conduit between *rus* and *urbs*. This conduit is made possible, I argued, by the authoritative voice

that Horace constructs for himself throughout, in important part by means of Lucretian allusion and transformation. In book 3, we can see how private and public become increasingly thematised, and increasingly identified.[234] Both Feeney (1998) and Henderson (1999) argue of 3.22, for example, that the ode shows the alignment of private and public celebration; Horace's offering to Diana (*imminens villae tua pinus esto*, 'let the pine that hangs over my villa be yours,' 5) looks to the specific celebration of Diana of the Aventine, the first day of Augustus' triple triumph in 29, and the meeting of Evander and Aeneas. The presence of the city looms large in this third book: "Consular dates, traditional festivals, national and biographical landmarks, thanksgivings and celebrations, jostle themselves alongside lyric discourse of seasonal, life-cycle, erotic bio-rhythms, into the cultural politics of a sense of time as an organized grid through which natural time flows."[235] Horace gives his private anniversaries and lyric, seasonal rhythms a space of their own on the public calendar. As 3.8 intimates, Maecenas plays an important part in the rewriting of civic time; his presence in the ode emphasises the movement between public and private realms. As Horace invites his patron into his secluded space, he simultaneously intimates the movement of his own lyric voice into the civic world.

In what follows, we will see how the final two poems of *Odes* 3 show the poet asserting his own authority over the civic realm, while maintaining and even strengthening his hold on a lyric interpretation of Lucretian authority. It is here important to consider Oliensis' (1998a) argument about Horace's "rhetoric of authority" in the *Odes.* Although epic, not lyric, is traditionally seen as the "natural home of the *triumphator*," the insistence of Horatian lyric on

---

[234] Feeney (1998, 134) argues, "Horace is perhaps more interested than anyone else in the nuanced relationship that exists between the city and the country, and his presentation of urban and rustic ritual therefore reveals a keen interest in the divisions and continuities that may be constructed within these categories."

[235] Henderson (1999, 141–2).

restraint and *fines*, Oliensis contends, makes it ideal for comparison: "Rome's imperial expansion was bound up with the proper regard for boundaries" (107). Thus, she argues, "If Horace can align the boundaries of his odes with the edges of the empire, he can also figure the empire as a Horatian ode writ large" (113). The lyricist continually blurs the lines between his own achievements and those of the empire, as we saw in 2.20, where lyric reaches to the limits of Rome itself. In this discussion of Maecenas' role in the *Odes*, we can begin to see a particular manifestation of this idea. Horace asks his patron within his estate for a celebration of his own salvation—already, as we have seen, asserting his independence by celebrating his own, rather than his patron's, rescue from death—but, as he urges his patron to set aside his *curae* and drink, he simultaneously rewrites the civic calendar so that it lifts the poet himself up. I argued in the previous chapter that Horace grounds his poetic *otium* in a lyric form of Lucretian ethics through the image of the Sabine estate, and that his poetic authority grows as the *Odes* progress. As he increasingly associates Maecenas with political busyness and *curae*, Horace both augments his Epicurean authority and stakes a claim on the public calendar.

The penultimate address to Maecenas offers something of a final choice to the patron. In both placement and content, *Odes* 3.16 echoes the first invitation to the patron at 1.20. Like the earlier poem, 3.16 opens the second half of its book—although in the third book, unlike in the first, this placement also calls attention to the patron's absence from the first poem of the book. The characterisation of Maecenas, too, is reminiscent of the earlier invitation. Horace opens with the story of Danae, translating the myth into an allegory for bribery and the corrupting power of wealth.[236] He moves into a series of negative exempla of the degenerative power of greed, ending with a reference to what is likely the story of Menas, who deserted Sextus Pompeius and

[236] Lyne (1995, 124) observes that this is the first known use of the myth in this kind of allegory.

was given riches and equestrian status by Octavian (15–16).[237] From here, he moves into his address to Maecenas (17–20):

> crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam
> maiorumque fames. iure perhorrui
> late conspicuum tollere verticem,
> Maecenas, equitum decus.
>
> Worry and the hunger for greater things follow growing wealth. I have rightly feared raising my head so that it is visible far and wide, Maecenas, glory of the *equites*.

Addressed as *equitum decus*, the Maecenas of 3.16 recalls the image of the patron as *eques* at 1.20.5. The epithet draws attention again to Maecenas' decision not to claim senatorial status, and pairs the modesty of the patron's choice with that of the poet, who chooses not to lift his head too high. On the other hand, *decus* recalls Maecenas' first appearance in the *Odes* as the poet's *dulce decus meum* (1.1.2), and functions as a form of panegyric.[238] If *decus* at line 22 reminds the reader of the opening of 1.1, the preceding line is surely reminiscent of the ending: Horace's fear, *perhorrui late conspicuum tollere verticum*, feels ironic in comparison to his earlier claim that, with Maecenas' aid, *sublimi feriam sidera vertice* (1.1.36). Even as Horace asserts his preference for his own simple lifestyle in the second half of the poem, the ode reminds us of his competing claims of poetic grandeur, and the tension between Sabine humility and vatic glory in the collection. In 3.16, we can again see Maecenas' part in Horace's articulation of this

[237] See especially Nisbet and Rudd (2004, ad loc.).
[238] Nisbet and Rudd (2004, ad loc.).

tension; the poet situates his patron in between descriptions of exorbitant wealth and humble rural life, but simultaneously reminds his reader of his own claim on poetic greatness as well as Epicurean retreat.

In contrast to the dangers and *curae* of growing wealth is the poet's own life, with its rural setting (29–32):

> purae rivus aquae silvaque iugerum
> paucorum et segetis certa fides meae
> fulgentem imperio fertilis Africae
> fallit sorte beatior.
>
> A stream of clear water, a few acres of groves, and a sure confidence in my crops—these escape the man who gleams in his command of fertile Africa. I am more fortunate.

The passage implicitly describes the Sabine landscape. Its closest parallel is in fact within not the *Odes*, but the *Satires*, where Horace describes it: *modus agri non ita magnus,/hortus ubi et tecto vicinus iugis aquae fons,/et paulum silvae super his foret* ('a measure of land, not too big, where there would be a garden and, near the house, a spring of always-flowing water, and a small grove above these,' 2.6.1–3). The passage also yet again suggests Lucretius' pastoral image of *ataraxia*, which we traced throughout the *Odes* in the previous chapter; following so many references to Epicurean tranquillity beside streams, Horace's *purae rivus aquae* calls to mind Lucretius' peaceful Epicureans (*cum tamen inter se prostrati in gramine molli/propter aquae rivum sub ramis arboris altae/non magnis opibus iucunde corpora curant*, 'yet when they lie

with one another on the soft grass by the stream, under the branches of a tall tree, they refresh their bodies joyfully, with no great labour,' *DRN* 2.29–31). Moreover, the *cura* that follows (*sequitur*) growing wealth (17) strongly evokes Lucretius' *curae . . . sequaces* (*DRN* 2.48), which, as I argued above, also inform 2.16, 3.1, and 3.8. Horace thus offers his Sabine landscape, yet again, as the Epicurean antidote for civic worries, in a gesture that recalls the proem of *DRN* 2, with its connected illustrations of pastoral *ataraxia*, urban opulence, and pursuing cares.

The poet places Maecenas at almost the centre of his poem, in between his deprecation of avarice and his detailed account of his own humble, Sabine lifestyle.[239] Horace seems to implicate his patron in the latter by reminding the reader of both Maecenas' choice to remain an *eques* and his gifts to the poet. However, as we have seen, the lyricist has repeatedly called attention to the great divide between the two men, particularly in terms of their wealth—recall, for example, the contrast even in the first invitation between Horace's own *vile . . . Sabinum* (1.20.1) and the patron's *Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno/. . . uvam* (9–10). Caught in between dire warnings about the dangers of wealth and exaltations of a modest, rural life, Maecenas seems poised to make a choice: can he set aside his *civilis super urbe curas*, as Horace has recently requested (3.8.17)?

The ending of 3.16 includes Horace's clearest reference to his patron's generosity: *importuna tamen pauperies abest/nec, si plura velim, tu dare deneges* ('but troublesome poverty is absent, and, if I wished for more, you would not refuse to give it,' 37–8). Maecenas' sponsorship of the poet's own *purae rivus aquae* and modest life is visible here; Horace's chosen life is dependent on his patron's generosity, and as such the poem contains the suggestion of

[239] Connor (1987, 132) draws particular attention to the disjunction between the two halves of the poem, but argues that this represents a kind of failure.

gratitude.[240] Yet Horace's description of his Sabine landscape, with its Lucretian resonances, reminds the reader again of the Epicurean ethics and *libertas* that the lyricist associates with his property and claims as his own possession. The presence of Maecenas in the background of the poet's description of his property emphasises the patron's mutability; in supporting his client, Maecenas is tied to Horace's simple, Lucretian lifestyle, yet he has the ability to give more, to demand more, to turn away.

Horace's own refusal to ask for more sets the scene for his much bolder separation from Maecenas in 3.29. The poet has what he needs, and this modest position is aligned with his ethical stance—a perspective that has, since the first introduction of the Sabine estate in 1.17, been intimately connected with Lucretian philosophy. The expression of contentment that concludes 3.16 thus establishes a moral position that will, in the following address, set the scene for his complete liberation from his patron. As we will see, however, in the final two poems of *Odes* 3 the poet yet again uses the modesty of his Lucretian position as a stepping stone toward his poetic ascension, an ascension that appears to conflict with the poet's humble Sabine life.

Odes 3.29 is the poet's final address to his patron. We saw that 1.20 sets up a certain set of motifs that are linked to Maecenas throughout the *Odes*, including the disparity between wealth and poverty and the invitation to drink. To Santirocco's (1986) list of these motifs, I added the language and imagery of Epicureanism, expressed especially, but not exclusively, in the form of Lucretian allusion. The last address to Maecenas—which conspicuously takes the penultimate place in the collection, displacing the patron from the final poem—is another invitation, connecting the ode to 1.20 and 3.8 and asking the reader to look back at these earlier poems to consider the progression of Horace's relationship with his patron. Notably, the poem

[240] This gratitude is the focus of West's (2002, 142–53) analysis of the poem.

hints that Maecenas has not accepted the previous invitations; the wine has been ready for the patron *iamdudum* (5), suggesting that the poet is still waiting for Maecenas to arrive.[241] As we will see, the poet's claim of independence in this final address is grounded in a sense of ethical superiority that is identified strongly with Epicureanism. On the other hand, the simplicity of Horace's professed philosophy is the foundation for his dramatic ascent in the final poem of the collection; his warnings to Maecenas against civic *curae* and his intimation that the patron has not heeded his invitations defend the privacy and integrity of the Sabine space, and thus the poet's own authority. This authority then leads into Horace's own elevation in 3.30, where he assumes the role of poetic *princeps*.

In this final appearance in the *Odes*, Maecenas is again caught up in a lyric treatment of Epicureanism. The poem again identifies a lyric emphasis on the present with an Epicurean philosophical perspective (3.29.41–8):

> . . . ille potens sui
> laetusque deget cui licet in diem
> dixisse: 'vixi'. cras vel atra
> nube polum Pater occupato
>
> vel sole puro; non tamen inritum,
> quodcumque retro est, efficiet neque
> diffinget infectumque reddet,
> quod fugiens semel hora vexit.

[241] Santirocco (1984, 250).

> That man has control over himself, and lives happily, who can say every day, 'I have lived.' Tomorrow, let Father Jupiter fill the heavens with a black cloud or the clear sun—he will not make worthless that which is behind us, nor will he transform or undo what fleeting time has brought.[242]

A deeply Epicurean sentiment guides the poem, much as we saw in 2.16–18: "Above all, the moral exhortation . . . at the centre of the poem expounds the attitude to time that lies at the heart of Epicurean ethics: the way to achieve happiness and inner peace is to concentrate on the present."[243] The sentiment is similar to *DRN* 3.957–8: *sed quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis,/imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita* ('but because you always desire what is absent, and you condemn what is present, life has passed for you, imperfect and unpleasant'). The invitation also partakes in the language of lyric symposium; the opening image of the wine, roses, and balsam (1–5) would be at home in any number of the odes in the collection, or in one of Alcaeus' poems, for example.[244] However, as in many of Horace's poems, the lyric insistence on the present moment takes a distinctly Epicurean form; Horace's wise man, who can say *vixi* at the end of each day, also partakes enthusiastically in a lyric symposium.[245] He is thus a figure of the lyricist himself.

---

[242] I am here following Kiessling and Heinze (1930), Nisbet and Rudd (2004), and West (2002), among others, in attributing only the *vixi* to the *potens sui*. This is a much-contested passage, however, with many scholars (e.g. Sutherland [2002] and Lyne [1995]) attributing the entire passage down to v*exit* to the wise man.
[243] Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 346).
[244] West (2002, 253) also comments that *aequus* in this poem (*quod adest memento/componere aequus*, 'remember to deal calmly with what is present,' 32–3) evokes an Epicurean idea of *ataraxia*, "but it corresponds also to a familiar theme of ancient wisdom, expressed for example by Pindar at *Pythian* 3.19–24."
[245] See e.g. Sutherland (2002, 213) for the sympotic elements of the poem.

The disparity between wealth and poverty, as well as city and country, is centred on the figure of Maecenas yet again.[246] After asking his patron to come out of the city, a string of imperatives underlining his urgency (*eripe*, 5, *desere*, 9, *omitte*, 11), Horace explains that his invitation offers the solution to civic cares (13–16):

> plerumque gratae divitibus vices
> mundaeque parvo sub lare pauperum
> cenae sine aulaeis et ostro
> sollicitam explicuere frontem.
>
> Change is often welcome to the rich, and nice meals under the small *Lar* of the poor, without tapestries or purple coverings, relax a worried brow.

The language is reminiscent of the thread of Lucretian imagery that winds through *Odes* 2; we have seen how the poet continually evokes the proem to *DRN* 2, particularly in 2.16 and 2.18, and recalls this passage again in his vision of his estate in 3.16.[247] The dialogue between country and city in 3.29 is related to this. The lyric poet effectively asks his patron to set aside his *curae* again, much like he did in 3.8 (*tu civitatem quis deceat status curas* . . . 'you are worried about what institutions are fitting for the citizens,' 3.29.25–6). The verb brings to mind Maecenas' earlier worries, and the Lucretian resonances of *curae* throughout, hinting again that the solution

[246] See especially Lyne (1995, 113), who says of *divitibus* (13): "*Diues* is the epithet that especially fits Maecenas: simplicity has something to offer that people like him lack and need."
[247] Nisbet and Rudd (2004, ad loc.) observe that *plerumque* suggests Lucretian language.

to such concerns lies in an Epicurean, pastoral tranquillity, which, as we have seen throughout these first two chapters, is connected to Horace's Sabine estate and his poetic voice.

The poet suggests the Sabine landscape more vividly a few lines later. The turmoil of the city and Maecenas' anxieties for the state are reflected by the ferocity of the summer heat, the *dies . . . siccos* (20). Horace suggests a pastoral solution to this discomfort, and his description recalls the atmosphere and details of 1.17 (3.29.21–4):

> iam pastor umbras cum grege languido
> rivumque fessus quaerit et horridi
> dumeta Silvani, caretque
> ripa vagis taciturna ventis.
>
> Now the tired shepherd with his sluggish flock seeks the shade, the stream, and the thickets of shaggy Silvanus, and the silent bank is free from the wandering winds.

The vision of rural withdrawal blends once again with an Epicurean exhortation; here again, the pastoral idyll is linked to *ataraxia*. The general sense of much of 3.29 is Lucretian, as many have observed, and the logic of Horace's *sine aulaeis et ostro* (15) looks to Lucretius' description of the riches that cannot soothe fever (especially Lucretius' *si in picturis ostroque rubenti iacteris*, 'if you lie on embroidered fabrics and blushing purple coverings,' 2.35–6). The poet has built up the association between his property and Lucretian *ataraxia* throughout the *Odes*; the several studies that discuss the Epicureanism of this penultimate poem are hampered by their general tendency to consider the ode in isolation. This is not to say that we should ascribe dogmatic

Epicureanism to Horace himself, as I have stressed repeatedly. Rather, I argue that we need to recognise that *Odes* 3.29 is the continuation, and the culmination, of this important element of the collection, which bolsters the poet's own authoritative voice with the ethical philosophy of Lucretius.

Horace's assertion of independence is confirmed by the final lines of the poem, which envision the poet setting off alone at sea: *tunc me biremis praesidio scaphae/tutum per Aegaeos tumultus/aura feret geminusque Pollux* ('then the breeze and twin Pollux will bear me safely through the Aegean storms with the protection of my two-oared dinghy,' 62–4). Not only is the poet alone, suggesting that his final invitation to Maecenas, too, has not been accepted, but the *praesidium* of his small boat takes over for the *praesidium* of the patron (*o et praesidium et dulce decus meum*, 1.1.2).[248] *Odes* 3.29 thus concludes the poet's negotiation with his patron; the deference of 1.1—which is even there, as we have seen, somewhat qualified—is translated into the independence of 3.29. The penultimate ode is, of course, not a statement of Epicurean dogma; most obviously, the divine protections of the final lines are incompatible with such a philosophical orthodoxy. As with so many of the Lucretian references in the collection, Horace harnesses Epicurean and Lucretian language while drawing it into the lyric world, replete with divinities and special poetic protections. The strongly Epicurean philosophy that permeates 3.29 is the cornerstone for the declaration of self-sufficiency at the conclusion of the ode; Maecenas seems again to have rejected the poet's invitation and embraced his urban *curae*, turning away from the lyricist's Sabine landscape and thus the Lucretian authority that poet has claimed for himself.

[248] Santirocco (1986, 166). See also Putnam (2000, 43): "By the time we reach the conclusion of the penultimate poem, Horace has coopted Maecenas' word for himself."

Odes 3.30, like 2.20, proclaims the immortality of the poet. As with the ending of the previous book, the claims of 3.30 are in tension with the ideas that precede it. Horace's *vixi* of 3.29.43, his image of the man who is content with each day and therefore prepared for whatever comes—even, implicitly, death itself—is superseded by Horace's own *non omnis moriar* in the final poem (3.30.6). Whereas 2.20 addressed Maecenas, but for the most part moved beyond him by rejecting the claims of 2.17 that the two men would die together, the patron is entirely absent from the final poem of the collection. The poet who so recently urged Maecenas to set aside civic concerns, with a broad look at the expanses of the empire (*et Urbi sollicitus times/quid Seres et regnata Cyro/Bactra parent Tanaisque discors*, 'and worried for the city, you fear what Seres, and Bactria, once ruled by Cyrus, and the warring Tanais are plotting,' 26–8), now aligns his own poetic achievement with the institutions of empire (*dum Capitolium/scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex*, 'as long as the Pontifex climbs the Capitoline with a silent virgin,' 8–9).[249] Even more assertively, he makes himself into Caesar, as the *princeps* of lyric: *ex humili potens/princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos/deduxisse modos* ('powerful from humble beginnings, I was the first to have brought Aeolian song to Italian verse,' 12–14). The withdrawal of the previous poem, in which concern for empire threatened Epicurean tranquillity, is now transformed. The juxtaposition of the two poems suggests again that Epicurean ethics are part of the foundation of Horace's authority; a form of Epicurean philosophy leads to the poet's independence in 3.29, and the confidence of his self-sufficient perspective leads from this poem to the grand assertions of 3.30. The movement is similar to the one we saw in 3.8, but on a much larger scale. Whereas Horace there claimed a place for himself on the civic calendar, he now claims a scope for himself that equals the empire itself. Maecenas is again implicated in the

[249] Although geographically he now looks not to the far reaches of the empire but to his own nearby homeland, referencing the Aufidus and Daunus.

poet's movement between his private space and the public realm; Horace sets himself apart from his patron's civic worries in 3.29, but, instead of retreating further into his private landscape, uses his claims of ethical authority to launch himself into claims of immortality and imperial grandeur. Unlike 2.20, where he still addressed Maecenas and referred to their relationship (*ego quem vocas*, 6), in 3.30 he moves entirely beyond his patron.

Even as Horace rejects and transforms the Epicurean sentiments of 3.29, his vision of immortality in the final poem draws on Lucretius' work while simultaneously rejecting its ideas about death. Much like 2.20, the poem's allusions to Lucretius are extensive and ostentatious, calling attention to the dramatic reversal that occurs between 3.29 and 3.30. Horace does not merely hint that he is overturning the previous poem's claims of a modest lifestyle and insistence on mortality—he does so by reference to particular Lucretian passages. Most striking of these is his opening assertion (1–5):

> exegi monumentum aere perennius
> regalique situ pyramidum altius,
> quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
> possit diruere aut innumerabilis
> annorum series et fuga temporum.
>
> I have completed a monument more lasting than bronze, and higher than the royal decay of the pyramids, which neither devouring rain nor the wild north wind can destroy, nor the uncountable series of years and the flight of time.[250]

[250] See especially Harrison (2001) for an account of the Simonidean allusions in this final poem. He argues that the connections to Simonides 531 *PMG*, the dirge to the dead at Thermopylae, show

The passage recalls in particular *DRN* 5.306ff., where Lucretius compares the mortality of monuments with that of humankind: *non monimenta virum dilapsa videmus* ('do we not see that the monuments of men have collapsed?' 5.311).[251] On the other hand, he also hints at Lucretius' theory of the *heuretes*; as evidence of the world's youth, the philosopher argues that people continue to improve in the arts, and could not do so if the world were eternal (330–4). He concludes this section: *natura haec rerum ratioque repertast/nuper, et hanc primus cum primis ipse repertus/nunc ego sum in patrias qui possim vertere voces* ('this nature and philosophy of things has recently been uncovered, and I myself have been discovered, first of all, who can transform this into my own ancestral language,' 335–37). Horace seems to draw upon these lines, too, in his claim to be *princeps* in bringing Greek lyric into Latin (3.30.13).[252] Although it ostensibly demonstrates the mortality of the world, however, Lucretius' boast of primacy cannot help but recall his earlier statements about his great poetic achievements, particularly the Second Proem of book 1 (921–50) and its reiteration at 4.1–25.[253] In arguing for the eternity of his poetry and his own artistic novelty, then, Horace both contradicts Lucretius and coopts something of his predecessor's language of artistic preeminence.

Horace's appropriation of Lucretius is complete; claiming Epicurean ethics as a personal possession is a significant part of how the lyricist builds up his poetic authority through the collection and comes to confront the state itself, and his use of Lucretius in his image of poetic immortality hints at how his assertions of imperial greatness are connected to his claims of

---

Simonides' ἐντάφιον becoming *monumentum*, reminding the reader that *monumentum* can mean 'tomb', and Simonides' εὐρώς becoming *situ*, recalling that *situs* can mean 'rot' or 'decay'.

[251] See Woodman (1974) and Putnam (1973, 3–4).

[252] Putnam (1973, 3–4).

[253] Gale (1994b, 152) points out that just before this passage, Lucretius describes poetry as a repository for the *facta virum* (5.324–29): "poetry is thus able to confer a kind of immortality on names and events."

philosophical humility. Maecenas, as we have seen, figures importantly into Horace's construction of lyric authority; not only does the poet make his liberation from his patron part of his growing assertiveness, but he continually implicates Maecenas in his own movement outside the Sabine estate and into the civic sphere. As we will see in the next chapter, on the other hand, the power that Horace claims for himself in the conclusion of *Odes* 1–3 is not without its own ironies. While in 3.30 the poet tempers the various ironies of 2.20—such as the bizarre details of his metamorphosis and his identification with Icarus—his ambivalent relationship with Lucretius is involved in his ongoing construction of an irreverent, paradoxical lyric sublimity.

(iv) Maecenas, Memmius, and the Didactic Student

We have explored Maecenas' role in the endings of *Odes* 2 and 3: the evolution of the patron-client relationship is a crucial part of how the poet expresses his dual *libertas*, which derives from both withdrawal from the city and identification with Rome itself. The Sabine property, represented as the poet's private property and a space of Epicurean ethics, yet also a constant reminder of patronal beneficence and civic concerns, is connected to both Horace's didactic authority and his imperial ascent. The figure of the patron is pivotal in Horace's articulation of the relationship between public and private, rural and urban, Epicurean and imperial. As we conclude, we should return to the earlier discussion of Memmius' role as didactic student in the *DRN*. Maecenas' multiple transformations throughout the *Odes* bear a resemblance to the role of Memmius in Lucretius, a resemblance that is also connected to Virgil's *Georgics*. I suggested briefly in the first chapter that Horace harnesses something of Lucretius' didactic voice, particularly in the strongly philosophical second book of the *Odes*; in

the relationship the poet constructs with his patron, we can see further evidence of this didactic thread.

The first section of this chapter described Memmius as a creation of his poet-teacher, a figure whose appearances in the poem draw readers in, implicating them in the unfolding of the didactic argument. He is therefore, Volk (2002, 13) argues, a key tool in Lucretius' creation of poetic simultaneity, "the illusion that the poem is really only coming into being as it evolves before the readers' eyes." Addresses to Memmius, or to a generalised *tu*, involve Lucretius' readers in the didactic journey, so that they experience each stage of the argument as a vivid present. This, as Volk contends, influences Virgil's own use of Maecenas in the *Georgics*; the appearance of the patron draws attention to each new stage of the poem, showing the poet's ongoing craftsmanship as the poem seems to unfold in the present moment.

I have argued that Horace's relationship to Maecenas changes over the course of the collection, and that Epicurean and Lucretian imagery is integral to this transformation. There is naturally a superficial similarity between Horace's lyric Maecenas and Lucretius' Memmius, as addressees and aristocratic patrons, but it is worth pausing to think about whether this connection may help us understand Maecenas' role in the *Odes*. As I have contended throughout, in the *Odes* Maecenas is implicated continually in an ongoing negotiation of Epicurean themes. Not only does Horace suggest that the two men share a kind of Epicurean friendship in 1.20, but the repeated invitations to the patron hint at a didactic journey, one that involves a repeated plea to turn aside from urban *curae*. The final invitation at 3.29 expresses frustration at a refused offer, intimating that the patron has rejected Horace's repeated invitations and thus also his attempt at a lyric form of Epicurean didacticism (one that is insistent and continual, even as it is unorthodox and inconsistent). This final address to Maecenas, as the previous section discussed, strengthens

the division between the two, putting the patron firmly on the side of wealth and civic cares while the poet himself seems to remain on the side of ethical Epicureanism. Like Memmius, Maecenas does not appear to heed the lessons of the poet, but his refusal is more complete; Horace's final claim of poetic immortality is connected to his assertion of independence from his patron. Although not conventional didactic poetics, Horace's relationship with his patron hints, occasionally and intriguingly, at the teacher-student relationship of Lucretius and Memmius.

These traces of Lucretius' didactic are, in part, connected to the argument I have been making throughout: that, while transforming Lucretius' language to suit his lyric mode and restoring much of the traditional apparatus of mythology, Horace appropriates Lucretius to reinforce his own poetic authority. A thread of didacticism runs through the *Odes*, and forms part of Horace's assertive lyric voice: the poet casts himself as a teacher, and Maecenas is his primary addressee. Tied to this idea is the fact that Maecenas is, like Memmius, a political figure. We have seen that the Roman Odes of book 3 connect Horace's private, Lucretian space to the world of Rome itself, suggesting a conduit between private and public spaces that offers a form of healing for the civic realm. This is not to say that Horace proposes a diet of strict Epicureanism for his contemporary Romans; instead, by associating his Sabine property with Lucretian *ataraxia*, Horace establishes a new kind of authority for himself that is proper to his own poetry, and incorporates Lucretius' doctrine into a complex admixture of poetic styles. Lucretius himself, as the first section of this chapter described, implies subtly that Epicurean doctrine is an antidote to civil strife. Horace's construction of his own Epicurean authority makes this political engagement central to his reading of Lucretius. He presents his Sabine estate, with its Lucretian resonances, as a corrective model for the corrupt state, and then, with growing assertiveness, claims a place for his own lyric as equal to empire itself. Whereas for Lucretius, an Epicurean

Memmius may be able to aid Rome, Horace gradually transforms his suggestion that Epicureanism may heal the state into a claim that his own lyric is parallel to the empire.

Horace's addresses to his patron in the *Odes* may also bear some relation to Virgil's Maecenas in the *Georgics*. Both poets situate their patron carefully within their poetry books. Virgil's placement of Maecenas in the opening exposition of each book calls attention to the unfolding of his poetic project, as we saw earlier; he addresses the patron even as he describes his poem and its development. Similarly, Horace links Maecenas closely to the evolution of his own lyric project; the placement of the patron shows the poet's growing independence, which is mirrored in the way he manipulates Lucretian and Epicurean language to articulate his own increasing authority. Moreover, as we saw in the first section, the patron disappears from the *Georgics* in a certain way: "Maecenas must again and again step into the background and hand over the stage to the farmers."[254] This 'fading out' of the patron is perhaps reflected in Horace's own treatment of Maecenas; the lyricist himself, however, takes the stage when his patron disappears. The disappearance of Maecenas from the *Odes*—patronal *praesidium* replaced by the poet's own one-person boat—leads to the imperial authority of the lyricist himself, an authority that derives in major part from the poet's construction and appropriation of an Epicurean voice.

[254] Volk (2002, 131).

Chapter 3: Bacchus, Sublimity, and Wild Spaces in Lucretius and Horace

In the previous chapter, I began to discuss Horace's grand flights at the end of *Odes* 2 and 3; there, I argued that the lofty claims of 2.20 and 3.30 are connected to the poet's assertions of a personalised, lyric form of Epicurean authority, and that a continuity of Lucretian language helps to bind together the lyricist's modest Sabine lifestyle and his sublime poetic heights. Horace's declarations of lyric glory, we saw with reference to the arguments of Oliensis (1998a), reflect the greatness of the empire itself, such that the poet figures himself as another *princeps* (13) in the final poem of his collection. The present chapter takes up the sublime language of the *Odes* in more depth, focusing on Horace's two Bacchic epiphanies in 2.19 and 3.25 and examining in greater detail their relationship to the *DRN*. The contrast between sublime and humble is central to Horace's lyric genre, which contains myriad tones and draws on centuries of poetic tradition. This contrast is important to Lucretius' work as well; as a work of Epicurean poetry, his project must encompass both the grandeur of the Epicurean cosmic vision and the humility of the Epicurean life. My aim in this second chapter is to investigate the sublime imagery that runs through Horace's collection, considering how the lyricist's most elevated moments look to Lucretius' own. In what follows, I will argue that Horace draws on Lucretius' grandest moments in order to connect more deeply the simple and sublime sides of his own lyric project; the lyricist makes use of passages in the *DRN* that themselves derive power from a unity of poetic registers and traditions. Of course, there is a certain irony in Horace's employment of Lucretius, because on the elevated side of the lyric project lies the empire itself; as we saw in the previous chapter, Horace identifies a subtle idea of political engagement in Lucretius and magnifies it, such that the lyricist both addresses the public sphere and mirrors himself after it, claiming its authority for himself. I will also explore the distinct, paradoxical character of Horace's lyric sublimity. The

presence of Lucretius in Horace's most elevated passages—particularly evident in the role that Lucretius' vision of Bacchus plays in the imagery of the *Odes*—is involved in Horace's construction of his shape-shifting, often ironic, grand lyric moments. The lyricist's irreverent approach to his predecessor's ideas and language is integral to his sometimes-unsettling visions of his own poetic glory, which undercut themselves even as they boast of his vatic authority.

As in the previous two chapters, the first section will again concern Lucretius' own work. After a brief explanation of the sublime and its relationship to literary style, I will turn to the role of sublimity in the *DRN*. I will show here that Lucretius' sublime language serves an aesthetic purpose, clothing Epicurean dogma in appealing language, but at the same time it is instrumental in revealing unseeable realms—the minuscule atoms and infinite void—and so leads the student to the vast and troubling truths of Epicureanism. I will then consider a specific aspect of Lucretian sublimity: the philosopher-poet's use of Bacchic imagery in the so-called Second Proem of book 1, and the resonances of this language in the rest of the work. The connections between these various Bacchic moments allow us to see more clearly how Lucretius' philosophical poetry uses sublime imagery to bring about sublime understanding. Moreover, these moments are instrumental in holding together different genres and tones in Lucretius' text.

Keeping in mind this understanding of sublimity in Lucretius, I will turn to Horace's own Bacchic imagery, considering in particular how the two extended Bacchus odes, 2.19 and 3.25, are connected to Lucretius' text in both their landscape and their structure. These two odes are key junctures of the *Odes*, moments where Horace self-consciously emphasises and transforms his poetic project. Schiesaro (2009) and Oliensis (1998a) have shown how the figure of Bacchus is central to Horace's multifaceted poetics and the modulations of the poet's voice. In Horace's Bacchus odes, I will argue, we can see traces of Lucretius' own "Bacchic poetics". As Horace

unites humble and grand moments in his *Odes*, he nods to the very imagery with which Lucretius creates his own harmony of disparate themes, registers, and poetic traditions. I will also return here to the final poems of books 2 and 3, as well as taking up the political language in the Roman Odes and 3.24, arguing that the insistent thread of Lucretian language in the endings of both books is part of how Horace connects simple and sublime, *tenuis* and *grande*, in his work. His allusions to Lucretius simultaneously pay homage to and undercut the Epicurean. This complex treatment of Lucretius is, I will contend, important to Horace's construction of a tongue-in-cheek strain of lyric sublimity that blends solemnity and absurdity.

After examining the two Bacchus odes in detail, I will widen my gaze to look at the Bacchic, elevated spaces in the *Odes* as a whole, arguing that Lucretius appears vividly in the landscapes that Horace associates with his own poetic inspiration and exemplarity. We saw in the first chapter that 1.22 reveals the poet crossing boundaries while retaining his poetic sacrosanctity; I argued there that Horace's journey in 1.22 mirrors the flight of Epicurus in the *DRN*, and that this is tied to the Lucretian resonances of the Sabine estate. Here, I will consider these boundary-crossing moments in greater depth, focusing on 1.1, 1.9, and 3.4, and investigating how the Lucretian, Bacchic nature of Horace's landscapes connects domestic and wild spaces in the *Odes*. These sublime landscapes draw attention to the most self-conscious junctures of Horace's poetry, but simultaneously underscore the ironic reversals of Lucretian imagery, and thus the way the lyricist continually undermines his own sublimity.

(A) Sublimity and Bacchus in the *De Rerum Natura*

Sublimity is notoriously difficult to define, and our grasp of how classical antiquity understood the concept is limited by the fact that only one ancient treatise on sublimity exists:

Longinus' *Peri Hypsous*, usually dated to the 1st century CE.[255] Longinus is not, however, the only ancient author to reveal an interest in the sublime; in fact, he opens his treatise by saying he has already considered a work περὶ ὕψους by Caecilius of Caleacte (1.1), and he discusses a long tradition of sublime moments in his predecessors. There has been a growing interest in Lucretius' view of the sublime recently, and a growing understanding of the connections between Longinus and Lucretius. A brief look at the similarities between the two authors should help clarify the sense of the sublime that we will be exploring here. It is clear that both authors draw on a long tradition of ancient works; Porter (2016, 457) explains that they share "a fascination with conceptual extremes and limits that is also found in earlier traditions of poetry and philosophy."[256]

Although Longinus' text is grounded in a Stoic view, and insists on a providential cosmos, both Longinus and Lucretius locate sublimity within the mind, and not in the natural phenomena themselves: "Above all, the sublime is never a fixed entity. This is in part because sublimity is a moving target that varies with the capacity of a subject to apprehend it or not, but also because the sublime lives in relations rather than in objects."[257] Longinus writes (35.3–4):

---

[255] The name Longinus became associated with the text because of the 10th-century Byzantine manuscript that is its primary source; the codex attributes the work to a Dionysius Longinus, while its table of contents attributes it to either Dionysius *or* Longinus. See especially Porter (2016, ch. 1) for an account of Longinus' identity and the manuscript tradition. Most (2012) discusses the influence of the text, explaining that the translation by Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux, published 1674, made the work popular. See also Doran (2017, ch. 1).

[256] This common interest even seems to extend to their specific sources; Porter (2016) suggests that the two philosophers share some common scientific or paradoxographical source, from which they derive similar sublime accounts of the universe, Ocean, Nile and Etna (*DRN* 6.608–737 cf. Longinus 35.2). This similarity suggests a connection between Lucretius' and Longinus' understandings of sublimity, but also indicates a broader ancient interest in the concept of sublimity, a tradition on which both philosophers draw in their respective works.

[257] Porter (2016, 55).

> διόπερ τῇ θεωρίᾳ καὶ διανοίᾳ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπιβολῆς οὐδ᾽ ὁ σύμπας κόσμος ἀρκεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τοῦ περιέχοντος πολλάκις ὅρους ἐκβαίνουσιν αἱ ἐπίνοιαι. καὶ εἴ τις περιβλέψαιτο ἐν κύκλῳ τὸν βίον, ὅσῳ πλέον ἔχει τὸ περιττὸν ἐν πᾶσι καὶ μέγα καὶ καλόν, ταχέως εἴσεται πρὸς ἃ γεγόναμεν.
>
> Thus the whole universe is not enough to satisfy the speculative intelligence of human thought; our ideas often pass beyond the limits that confine us. Look at life from all sides and see how in all things the extraordinary, the great, the beautiful stand supreme, and you will soon realise what we were born for.[258]

In both authors, too, sublimity is a kind of disruption within the mind. In his discussion of the sublime in oratory, Longinus describes ὕψος as having the power of a thunderbolt: τά τε πράγματα δίκην σκηπτοῦ πάντα διεφόρησεν (1.4).[259] We will see that a similar admixture of fear and elation is characteristic of Lucretius' own sublimity, as well as Horace's reception of this sublimity; Lucretius describes his view of the Epicurean cosmos as mingled *divina voluptas* and *horror* (3.28–9). Moreover, both Lucretius and Longinus see the sublime moment as involving divine elevation, despite their radically different views on divinity itself. Most (2012, 245) summarises Longinus' position: "To feel and understand the sublime is not quite to become a god, for no mortal can, but it is to approach the gods' own plan for us as close as any human possibly can, if only for a moment." The gods have no plan for humans in the Epicurean cosmos, of course, but Lucretius' vision of sublimity has striking parallels to Longinus'; the pleasure he takes in seeing the cosmos uncovered by Epicurean doctrine is *divina*, and, as we will see in

[258] Translation is from Fyfe and Russell (1999).
[259] See Porter (2007, 168).

greater depth below, Epicurean wisdom consists in occupying *templa serena* (8), detached from human busyness and cares, an image reflects the remove of the gods themselves.[260]

Longinus' treatise looks at how literature and cosmological phenomena can produce sublimity. His text is structured primarily around the literary techniques that convey a sense of sublimity, but "it can locate sublimity in a particle of grammar or in a glimpse of the cosmos in order or in disarray, in thoughts about the divine or in expansions of the self."[261] Lucretius' text, while not a treatise on sublimity, evinces a similar understanding of how literary style is connected to sublime thought. His work vacillates between the logic of *nec mirum* and an elevated style which, as we will see below, shows how literary grandeur can lift the reader's mind toward an encounter with the sublime: "sublimity advertises the enormity of the Epicurean revelation, unprecedented in scope and reach; it raises often mundane topics into complex poetry where *hypsos* joins forces with Callimachean sophistication and Dionysiac enthusiasm."[262] Atomism, Porter (2016) argues in detail, is a philosophy particularly well suited to the sublime; the unimaginably great void and unimaginably tiny atoms both baffle the mind, and the two scales thus collide with one another. Lucretius' atomistic perspective, which eliminates the notion of any divine, providential governance of the world, was deeply influential on the thinkers of the Enlightenment, especially the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, whose understanding of sublimity emphasises the point that this elevation takes place within the mind of the observer, and not within nature itself. Kant's philosophy, Porter (2007, 180) contends, has clear parallels to Lucretius: "one has to suspect a certain awareness on Kant's part that he is working in a

[260] See especially 3.18–24 and 1.44–9 for the remove of the gods.
[261] Porter (2016, 7).
[262] Schiesaro (2014, 87).

Lucretian, or at the very least atomistic, tradition."[263] The Kantian sublime is, much like his ancient predecessors', a mingling of *Verwunderung* and *Schreck*, and has the power to seize the mind violently, recalling Lucretius on the edge of the void in the proem to *DRN* 3.[264]

In what follows, we will consider those places in which Lucretius illustrates the awed state of the human mind as it confronts Epicurean truths, and see how the sublimity of these moments connects to the philosopher-poet's own elevated style as he discusses his poetic achievements. These sublime passages, I will argue, lift the reader's mind to better grasp the truths of the atomistic cosmos. Sublimity is integral to how Lucretius binds together not only the macro- and micro-levels of his cosmic understanding, but the simple humility of the Epicurean life and the lofty, awe-inspiring encounters with the cosmic *ratio*, as well as his prosaic descriptions of atomic order and his exalted flights of poetic glory. In the second section of this chapter, I will contend that Horace draws on Lucretius' sublime moments as he harmonises the diverse themes and registers of his own lyric—yet he also moves his predecessor more deeply within the political sphere, and implicates him in the often-paradoxical, ironic sublimity of his own lyric.

(i) The Logic of Lucretian Sublimity

Sublimity and wonder are ambivalent concepts in Lucretius' poem. The reader must be drawn toward firm Epicurean belief by means of wonder, yet must not be thrown off course by this amazement. Lucretius links the dangers of wonder to his criticism of *religio* (5.82–86):

---

[263] This argument draws on Kant's declaration in his earlier work, the *Universal Natural History*, that Epicurus has come to life again, and his statement that he is following in the line of the atomists (Ak. 1:212, 226, qtd. Porter 2007, 180).
[264] *CJ* § 29; Ak. 269 (qtd. Porter 2007, 181).

nam bene qui didicere deos securum agere aevom,
si tamen interea mirantur qua ratione
quaeque geri possint, praesertim rebus in illis
quae supera caput aetheriis cernuntur in oris,
rursus in antiquas referuntur religiones.

For those who have learned well that the gods lead a life free from care, if they nevertheless marvel at how things can happen—especially the things they see above their heads in those ethereal regions—they are borne back again to their ancient superstitions.[265]

It is wonder (*mirantur*) that steers the Lucretian fool off course, driving him to *religio*, which is anathema to the true, atomistic *ratio* of the cosmos. However, wonder also serves a vital purpose in the *DRN*; Lucretius uses sublime imagery to lead the student from lofty image to lofty understanding. It is this didactic technique that Lucretius employs at the end of his second book, where he teaches his reader difficult truths about the cosmos: our earth is not unique, and will eventually be destroyed. Despite the sublimity of the heavens, he explains, the human mind has become bored with them, and no longer finds them marvellous (2.1030–36):

principio caeli clarum purumque colorem,
quaeque in se cohibet, palantia sidera passim,
lunamque et solis praeclara luce nitorem—

[265] Also cf. *DRN* 6.50–65.

omnia quae nunc si primum mortalibus essent,
ex improviso si sint obiecta repente,
quid magis his rebus poterat mirabile dici
aut minus ante quod auderent fore credere gentes?
nil, ut opinor: ita haec species miranda fuisset.
quam tibi iam nemo, fessus satiate videndi,
suspicere in caeli dignatur lucida templa!

In the first place, the clear, bright colour of the sky, and whatever it holds: the stars that wander here and there, the moon, and the brightness of the sun with its brilliant light—if all these things now appeared to mortals for the first time, if they were brought before them suddenly and unexpectedly, what could be said to be more wonderful than these things, or what could people have believed less possible to exist beforehand? Nothing, I think: this sight would have been so wonderful. Think how no one, tired of too much seeing, thinks it worth looking into the clear circuit of the heavens!

Lucretius reports that the sky is *miranda*, but he also compels his readers to see it, shaking the fatigue from their eyes with his description of the sky and its *clarum purumque colorem*. As Lucretius refreshes their sight, he also redirects their thinking: he writes next, *principio nobis in cunctas undique partis/et latere ex utroque supra subterque per omne/nulla est finis* (‘in the first place, in all directions and on every side of us, above and below, through the whole universe, there is no end,’ 1048–50). The *principio* of 1038 repeats that of 1030: Lucretius leads the reader from an image of the heavens to an understanding of their infinity, with sublimity of sight

becoming sublimity of understanding.[266] He uses the verb *miror*, as with the men who *mirantur* at 5.83: the heavens are *miranda* (2.1034), echoing the *mirabile* of 1032, but here, unlike 5.83, the word is positive and even salutary. In these two passages, we can see the two opposed outcomes of a single moment of wonder: the mind can veer away from Epicurean tenets and grasp at the ancient *religio* about the gods, or it can be firmly and clearly directed back to Epicurean principles by means of this very wonder, in the context of properly philosophical poetry.[267] The intervention of Epicurus and his teachings in human history, Lucretius implies, has made possible a desirable form of wonder, one that leads to true understanding. The idea is connected to the one we explored in the first chapter: proper philosophical poetry, which exists in harmony with nature, is only attainable after the advent of Epicureanism.

Lucretius' language of *nec mirum*, a fundamental part of his logic and didactic method, is connected to the ambivalent character of wonder in his poem. A particularly clear example of this deflation of wonder appears in the explanation of thunder in book 6. The whole world seems to shake: *tonitru concussa videntur/omnia saepe gravi tremere et divolsa repente/maxima dissilluisse capacis moenia mundi* ('struck by heavy thunder, all things often seem to tremble, and it seems that the great walls of the wide universe, suddenly torn to pieces, have leapt apart,' 6.122–3). Yet Lucretius intervenes to instruct the reader not to wonder: *nec mirum, cum plena animae vesicula parva/saepe ita dat magnum sonitum displosa repente* ('it is no wonder, since a tiny little bladder of air often makes a great sound when it is suddenly burst,' 130–31). Lucretius' *displosa repente* in the second passage echoes *divolsa repente* in the first, bursting the grandeur

[266] Fowler (1995) gives a thorough account of how Lucretius uses particular words to segment the poem and draw connections between different passages, and shows how these map onto the articulation of the universe itself.
[267] On the idea of *persuasio* in the *DRN*, Clay (2003, 184) writes: "As Lucretius presents it, suasion possesses an ambiguous power: it can lead to crime or it can lead to philosophy."

of the moment just like the bladder of air.[268] The poet's sublime language catches the reader up in the moment of wonder, where the decision must be made between Epicurean *ratio* and ancient superstition. Lucretius' language of *nec mirum* then propels the student to the Epicurean truth.

On the other hand, the language of wonder may describe rightly the mind's encounter with the necessity that structures the natural order: Lucretius relocates sublimity within the mental activity of the philosopher. The exaltation of the mind finds its most complete expression in the proem to book 3, where Lucretius, led by his master's *ratio* (14), comes face to face with the void: *diffugiunt animi terrores, moenia mundi/discedunt, totum video per inane geri res* ('the terrors of the mind flee, the walls of the universe separate, I see things happening through the whole void,' 16–17). This reflects Epicurus' own mental journey: *extra/processit longe flammantia moenia mundi* ('he advanced far beyond the fiery walls of the universe,' 1.72–73). The imagery of both passages is comparable to the above image of the world shaking with thunder, where the *moenia mundi* seem to fly apart, but the language is here applied to the mind's grasp of the infinite cosmos, rather than the visible phenomena themselves. As I described above, Lucretius locates true sublimity in the mind, rather than the external world. Conte (1994, 24–25) explains:

> The sublimity of the idea of infinity exalts the reader's mind and enables him to accept Epicurus's difficult doctrine: the mind leaves the world's restrictions behind so as to wander without limits, and this liberation repeats the gesture of emancipation with which reason, freed by Epicurean wisdom, is rescued from fears and false beliefs.

Because it can use a great range of evocative and sublime images, properly philosophical poetry—only possible after the life and teachings of Epicurus, who enabled a salutary form of

[268] Kenney (2007, 101) writes: "It is all a matter of scale. Illusion is dispelled by a douche of logical cold water expressed in homely language in a homely image."

sublimity rather than a deluded return to *religio*—is particularly adept at this activity of liberating the mind, setting the reader free to approach infinity. Lucretius' comparison of his own poetry to the honey that sweetens wormwood (1.936–49 = 4.11–24) suggests that poetry's value lies in its inherent pleasure, which urges the reader to philosophical enlightenment by making pleasant the journey of the mind. A consideration of sublime imagery in the text reveals that the power of poetry is greater than the explicit message of this analogy: because it can draw the mind from the grandeur of visible phenomena and literary tone toward a sublime comprehension of the cosmic *ratio*, poetry is the best possible medium for the encounter of the mind with the true nature of the cosmos.[269]

There are, then, two connected ways in which wonder and sublimity are permitted, or even necessary, in Lucretius' philosophy: the first is in the poetry itself, which lifts the mind and causes it to desire the philosophical truth, and the other, most true form, is in the philosophical understanding, the power of the mind that can pierce through the appearances of things. The first permits and is transformed into the second, so that the reader draws back from the world to perceive it from a distance, as Lucretius illustrates in the proem to *DRN* 2. It is *suave*, Lucretius writes, to look at another struggling on the sea when you are on the shore, *suave* to see a battle in which you are not embroiled: *sed nil dulcius est bene quam munita tenere/edita doctrina sapientum templa serena* ('but nothing is sweeter than to inhabit lofty, serene sanctuaries, fortified well by the teachings of the wise,' 2.7–8). It is *suave*—or, we might gloss, it is the state of *ataraxia*, the mental state of the wise man—to view things at a distance.[270] This proem illustrates the two connected aspects of Lucretian sublimity: it gives us an image of the vastness

[269] As we will see below, the analogy itself connects honey to Dionysian inspiration, and so has greater significance than this superficial meaning.
[270] "This is the life of the gods, who themselves, from their distant abodes in the spaces between the universes, are indeed far removed from our world and its troubles" (De Lacy 2007, 149).

of the world, an image that appeals to the mind and draws it into philosophy, yet it also gives us an image of the sublimity produced when the mind comprehends this vastness.

(ii) Lucretius' "Bacchic Poetics"

Bacchus plays a central role in the poetry of the first century BCE. As an ambivalent god of uneasy tensions and unions, he frequently figures in poetic accounts of civil wars and their difficult resolutions. He is implicated in the triumph of Caesar over Antony; the latter's identification with Dionysus in Egypt is overcome in Augustus' appropriation of this deity as the Roman Bacchus, or Liber.[271] The god's traditional role as a source of poetic inspiration becomes blended with his political implications, such that his appearance in poetry is linked to questions about the stability of the post-bellum world and the place of poetry within this new order. The figure of Bacchus looms particularly large in Virgil's *Georgics*, where his dual nature is central to the ambivalent character of the second book. Gale (2000, 44–45) writes, "This duality has troubling implications for the poet's role in society and the nature of poetic inspiration. Is poetry to be seen as a force allied with the order and control ideally exerted by the farmer and politician, or as an irrational product of *furor*, the frenzy of poetic inspiration?"[272] The political and poetic questions that are associated with the god make his presence in Horace's *Odes* a topic of particular interest, and multiple studies have examined how Horace's treatment of Bacchic imagery similarly brings to the forefront the complexities of a society born out of civil war, and the difficult position of a poet whose allegiances have shifted.[273]

---

[271] See especially Harrison (2013), Harrison (2017), Mac Góráin (2014), and Batinski (1991).
[272] Mac Góráin (2014) similarly foregrounds the way in which Bacchus' presence in the poem brings up important questions about the possibility of reintegration, explaining that Bacchus "unites and cuts across religion, agriculture, politics and poetics" (2).
[273] See especially Schiesaro (2009), Batinski (1991), and Silk (1969), who argues for a gradual Augustan reconciliation over the course of the *Odes.*

What has been studied less is Lucretius' own Bacchic imagery, and the philosopher-poet's influence on later portrayals of Bacchus, particularly that of the *Odes*. Although the god does not appear as a fully-formed mythological figure in the *DRN*, his imagery has a central role in Lucretius' Second Proem, which we considered in the first chapter with reference to Horace's pastoral language (1.921–34):

> nunc age quod super est cognosce et clarius audi.
> nec me animi fallit quam sint obscura; sed acri
> percussit thyrso laudis spes magna meum cor,
> et simul incussit suavem mi in pectus amorem
> Musarum, quo nunc instinctus mente vigenti
> avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante
> trita solo, iuvat integros accedere fontis
> atque haurire, iuvatque novos decerpere flores
> insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam
> unde prius nulli velarint tempora Musae:
> primum quod magnis doceo de rebus et artis
> religionum animum nodis exsolvere pergo,
> deinde quod obscura de re tam lucida pango
> carmina, musaeo contingens cuncta lepore.
>
> Now come, learn what remains and hear more clearly. It is not unknown to me how obscure these things are, but a great hope of glory strikes my heart with its violent

> thyrsus, and at the same time casts the sweet love of the Muses into my breast, impelled by which I now travel through the untracked places of the Pierides in my lively mind, places never trodden by any foot. It delights me to approach pure fountains and drink, it delights me to pluck fresh flowers and to seek a distinguished garland for my head from a place where the Muses have never before wreathed anyone's temples—first, because I teach great things and undertake to release the mind from the knots of superstition, and then because I compose such clear songs about an obscure subject, touching everything with the charm of the Muses.

Using elevated language, the passage catches the reader up in a numinous landscape and epiphanic atmosphere. It is an image of Bacchic frenzy without the god himself: the poet is struck with the *acri . . . thyrso* of Bacchus within the kind of out-of-bounds space that is characteristic of the divinity.[274] As we will discover, the hints of Bacchic epiphany in the Second Proem are integral both to the poet's joining together of different registers and poetic traditions in his work and to the way he leads his reader toward atomistic philosophy. Bacchic imagery connects the poet's vision of his own innovation to the flights of Epicurus throughout the work, as well as to the mind's experience of the Epicurean *ratio*. We can trace a kind of "Bacchic poetics" through Lucretius' text, and see how the sublimity of the poetry is connected to sublimity of thought, such that the elevation of one leads to the elevation of the other. Lucretius' use of Bacchic imagery proves deeply influential on Horace's own union of poetic traditions in the *Odes* and, relatedly, on his elevation of his own poetics into a sublime register.

[274] Lucretius' linking of Bacchic frenzy and the Muses is a traditional one; cf. Plato, *Ion* 533e ff., which will be treated below.

The landscape and Bacchic resonances of the Second Proem weave together traditionally-opposed poetics. Bacchus lies on the side of anti-Callimachean, inspired poetry, often associated with the [275]concept of *ingenium*. On the other hand, the pathless grove in which the god's almost-epiphany occurs is reminiscent of the landscape of Callimachus, where *ars* is traditionally dominant. The particular combination of trackless places and untouched fountains can be traced back to *Epigr.* 28.[276] Gale (2007, 74) argues:

> Lucretius implies that his own poem transcends the very distinction between Callimachean and anti-Callimachean poetics suggested by the conflicting images of Dionysiac inspiration and the draught of pure water from an unsullied spring. The *DRN*, with a wonderfully hubristic self-assertiveness, represents itself as the culmination not just of one poetic tradition but of all poetic traditions.

Not only does Lucretius merge the two traditions by depicting the blow of the thyrsus leading to the untouched land of the Muses, but he could be seen to supplant the Callimachean Apollo with Dionysus: whereas Apollo in the *Aetia* prologue instructs Callimachus to take κελεύθους/ἀτρίπτο]υς ('untrodden paths,' 27–28), here Lucretius encounters Bacchus, or at least the imagery of the god, in *avia* space.[277] Lucretius thus joins together the boundary-transgressing nature of the god and the untouched landscapes of Callimachus: it is characteristically Dionysian to lead the initiate beyond boundaries, yet the landscape to which he leads the poet recalls that of

---

[275] This idea looks to Schiesaro's (2009) argument about the importance of "Bacchic poetics" to the *Odes*.
[276] Kenney (1970) is the seminal discussion of this. See also Brown (1982) and Fowler (1989) for the relationship between Lucretius and Callimachus.
[277] Text of Callimachus is Pfeiffer (1949). Lucretius' use of the adjective *avius* is pointed here; it is a word he frequently uses to describe the errors of the non-Epicurean mind. Here, he converts the term into an image of his own primacy, a choice that is parallel to his use of the word *miror* as a term to describe salutary wonder instead of dangerous ignorance. See, for example, his description of the person who thinks atoms can stop moving: *si cessare putas rerum primordia posse/cessandoque novos rerum progignere motus,/avius a vera longe ratione vagaris* (2.80–2). Again, journeys into the sublime are made possible by Epicurus' teachings.

Callimachus. Gale contends that "the *DRN* is able to present itself as at once critique and culmination of the Graeco-Roman literary canon" (74). It is only through recourse to the totality of the poetic tradition that Lucretius can encompass the vast and difficult teachings of Epicurus, the Second Proem seems to claim: the landscape is *nullius ante/trita solo* (926–27), but of course it also contains the footprints of poets from all traditions. Lucretius presents himself as an innovator—not only in transforming Epicurean philosophy into Latin poetry, but in uniting traditionally-opposed poetics and harnessing their combined power for his new project. He is able to reach into the sublimity of archaic and classical poetry without rejecting Hellenistic poetics. The ambivalent character of Dionysus is important to Lucretius' programme here; the contrast between the two poetic traditions is obliterated in the Dionysian epiphany.[278]

Bacchic imagery does not disappear after these lines; Lucretius' description of the Bacchic landscape and his poetic innovation is the prelude to his meditation on the purpose of his poetic philosophy, where he compares his poetry to the honey that physicians use to trick children into drinking wormwood, and explains (1.943–47):

> sic ego nunc, quoniam haec ratio plerumque videtur
> tristior esse quibus non est tractata, retroque
> volgus abhorret ab hac, volui tibi suaviloquenti
> carmine Pierio rationem exponere nostram
> et quasi musaeo dulci contingere melle.

[278] Fowler (2002) explains that we can see the poet assuming both passive and active roles; in describing the blow of thyrsus, Lucretius figures himself as a Bacchant, and so places himself in a feminine, passive role. Fowler writes: "While the inspired poet therefore may be male in his force and vehemence, his lost control inevitably places him in the position of the female" (149). Just as Callimachean and Bacchic inspiration are both at play here, so too are active and passive poetic roles, a point that will be important in our discussion of *Odes* 3.25, section B (ii).

> Thus, since this account often seems to be rather disagreeable to those by whom it is not practised, and the crowd shrinks back from it, I have now resolved to relate our account to you in the song of the sweet-speaking Pierides, and to touch it as if with the Muses' sweet honey.

Bacchus does not vanish from the poem as Lucretius embarks upon this analogy. When the poet is struck by the *acri . . . thyrso*, it is honey that pours out: we might think of the honey-dripping thyrsoi of the bacchantes in Euripides' *Bacchae*.[279] Moreover, Lucretius looks to Plato for his expression of the connection between the Muses, Bacchic inspiration, and the honey of poetry. In the *Ion*, Socrates explains that lyric poets ὥσπερ αἱ βάκχαι ἀρύονται ἐκ τῶν ποταμῶν μέλι καὶ γάλα κατεχόμεναι ('are possessed just like bacchants gathering honey and milk from rivers'), and that ἀπὸ κρηνῶν μελιρρύτων ἐκ Μουσῶν κήπων τινῶν καὶ ναπῶν δρεπόμενοι τὰ μέλη ἡμῖν φέρουσιν ὥσπερ αἱ μέλιτται, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτω πετόμενοι ('they bear honey to us that they have culled from the honey-flowing streams in certain gardens and groves of the Muses, just like bees, and they fly like them,' 534a–b).[280] Lucretius' honey is not bland sweetness, then, but pours out of ecstatic inspiration. What is more, the mixture of pain and pleasure that results from *absinthia taetra* ('bitter wormwood,' 936) touched with *mellis dulci flavoque liquore* ('the sweet, yellow liquid of honey,' 937) has strongly Bacchic connotations. It looks to the lines just before, where the *acer* thyrsus strikes the *cor* with love: violence and sweetness mix inseparably in the Dionysian experience, and this paradoxical thrill causes the poet to pour forth his bittersweet

[279] ἐκ δὲ κισσίνων/θύρσων γλυκεῖαι μέλιτος ἔσταζον ῥοαί, 710–11.
[280] Grilli (1970, 97) writes: "Lucrezio ha colto lo spunto del famoso passo platonico e lo ha fuso con altre tradizioni puramente letterarie." Also see Gale (1994b, 48–49) for a discussion of the similarities between Lucretius' and Plato's visions of *mythos*.

solution. Gale (2007) observes that Lucretius collapses the distinction between pleasure and utility in the passage, much as he did with the opposition between water and wine, or *ars* and *ingenium*, in the Bacchic lines that preceded it. To this observation we can add that the two parts of the Second Proem, the moment of inspiration and its product, are linked by their Dionysian imagery. We saw above that Lucretius' poetics have greater power than the honeyed-cup simile seems to suggest. With the Bacchic resonances of the entire Second Proem in mind, we can see that the simile itself surpasses its superficial meaning. Lucretius' honey is a sweetness poured forth from the mingled pleasure and horror of an Epicurean form of Bacchic epiphany. At the same time, Lucretius' comparison of his activity to that of a doctor hints at the idea of poetry as an *ars*; again, *ars* and *ingenium* blend in the philosopher-poet's vision of his project.

The influence of Callimacheanism also continues as Lucretius moves into his honeyed-cup analogy. Lucretius' image of the *volgus*, which *abhorret* (1.945) from the Epicurean *ratio*, suggests the idea of poetic initiation, in keeping with the suggestions of the Bacchic mysteries in the preceding lines.[281] The truth of Lucretius' claim has been questioned by commentators for its seeming exaggeration of the unpopularity of Epicurean philosophy.[282] The suitability of the claim to its context, rather than its literal truth, seems to be the point; the poet has undergone a kind of Bacchic initiation in which the god himself is removed, and now attempts a kind of reverse ritual, wherein the *volgus* withdraws by its own volition rather than being forbidden, and the poet aims to draw them in. Moreover, Lucretius' words echo and reverse the Callimachean

---

[281] See Nisbet and Rudd (2004, ad loc.) for a discussion of the initiation theme at *Odes* 3.1.1 (*odi profanum vulgus et arceo*), which we will consider briefly below; Lucretius' words seem to reverse traditional images of religious ritual and initiation.

[282] See e.g. Brown (1984, ad loc.), who observes that Cicero represents the opposite extreme at *Tusc*. 4.6–7, where he says Epicurean ideas *Italiam totam occupaverunt* after Amafinius' writings, particularly among the common people. Cf. Ovid *Met*. 4.416–17: *tum vero totis Bacchi memorabile Thebis/numen erat*.

use of the language of the mysteries as a metaphor for the arcane literary project, exemplified by his injunction, σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια ('I loathe all common things,' *Epigr*. 28.4). We saw above that this epigram is suggested in the grouping of trackless paths and fountain in Lucretius' preceding claim for poetic primacy; it is logical that the same epigram finds its way into the Epicurean's claim about the *volgus*. Again, though, Lucretius reverses the sense, such that he invites the *volgus* into his rites rather than shunning them. Readers enter into a kind of Bacchic initiation whereby they are elevated into an encounter with the infinite atoms and void, and this initiation employs the language of mystery religion while aiming not to forbid but to invite the *volgus*.

We saw above that Lucretius uses elevated language to lift the student's mind toward Epicurean truth. The same principle holds true with the Second Proem. The passage is not merely ornamental, and is not a digression from the main philosophical arguments of the chapter; instead, the elevation of the passage and its description of the activity of poetry itself are meant to persuade the reader to assent to the difficult truths that follow. Just after Lucretius' lofty image of the untouched landscape and honey-sweet poetry, he makes a bold claim for the infinity of the universe: *nunc extra summam quoniam nil esse fatendum,/non habet extremum, caret ergo fine modoque* ('now since it must be said that there is nothing beyond the sum of things, it has no outermost point, and therefore it lacks boundary and measure,' 1.963–4).[283] The journey of the mind into the limitless cosmos repeats the journey of the poet through *avia Pieridum loca*, and the connection reveals the way poetry acts to illuminate the difficult truths of the cosmos. Gale (2013, 7) describes the movement from the Second Proem to the teachings that follow as an "imagistic transition," but the power of the passage goes beyond this; its ecstatic vision of

[283] See e.g. Fratantuono (2015, 59) and Gale (2013, 7). See Fowler (2002, 175), for a discussion of 2.92 (*sine fine modoquest*) and comparison to 1.964.

Bacchic frenzy actually draws readers out of their accustomed perspective and so prepares their minds for a sublime encounter with difficult cosmic truths.

The Second Proem is not an isolated moment in the *DRN*; the Dionysian elements in Lucretius' statement of poetic inspiration are connected to earlier passages, and resonate forward into the rest of the work, connecting the Second Proem to Epicurus' great discovery of the *natura rerum*, such that Epicurus can be read as akin to Dionysus throughout the work. The parallels have important implications for the activity of the sublime in the *DRN*; Epicurus' near-divinity and grand flights recall the Dionysian thrill of the Second Proem, helping to reveal how sublime poetry leads to sublime thought. The Second Proem looks back to Lucretius' first portrayal of Epicurus in book 1: not only are the two passages linked by a general picture of bursting past boundaries, but Lucretius uses the verb *peragro* for the travels of both (1.74 cf. 1.926).[284] Moreover, the *acri . . . thyrso* (1.922–23) of the Second Proem reflects the *acrem . . . virtutem* (1.69–70) of Epicurus, and both the poet and his master are characterised by mental energy (*vivida vis animi*, 1.72, cf. *mente vigenti*, 1.925).[285] Lucretius' statement of his own poetic primacy in the Second Proem reworks the language of Epicurus' earlier mental flight, and the echoes of the earlier passage hint that Epicurus is almost himself the god who appears in oblique form in the untracked grove to inspire the poet.

The proem to book 3 also has intriguing parallels to the Second Proem. Hints of the savage thrill of Dionysian initiation appear again here in the context of a discussion of Epicurus' preeminence. The parallels between the description of Epicurus (1.62–79) and the Second Proem seem to come to fruition here, in Lucretius' second extended glorification of Epicurus. The language is lofty and hymnic, with its apostrophe, repeated *te*, and creation of anticipation, in

[284] Segal (1989, 204).
[285] The placement of *acri* at the end of the line accentuates the similarity to the earlier *acrem*.

keeping with the almost-divine status of Epicurus in Lucretius' text.[286] Epicurus is here named *pater* (9): the epithet recalls Liber Pater, a suggestion strengthened by its pairing with *rerum inventor* in the same line.[287] The suggestion of divinity continues with his words, which are *aurea, perpetua semper dignissima vita* ('golden, most worthy of eternal life,' 13), and his *divina mente* (15). His students come to his words like bees: *floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant* ('as bees taste everything in flowery meadows,' 11), a line that is clearly reminiscent of Lucretius' own honeyed-cup simile.[288] We are meant to envision Lucretius himself as a bee, producing the honey of his poetry to draw in and convince his reader, but we should also remember the original connection between honey and Bacchic frenzy. The passage again looks to Plato's *Ion*, where poets are both bacchants and bees: the Platonic echo clearly connects the proem of book 3 to the Dionysian imagery of the Second Proem. Lucretius is bacchant and bee, inspired by his forebear's words to produce both the honey and wormwood of philosophy.

Bacchic imagery continues through the proem of book 3 with Lucretius' pleasure and horror in the face of the void, furthering the idea of Epicurean inspiration as a kind of Dionysian experience. Lucretius gazes at the workings of nature and the infinite void (3.28–30):

> his ibi me rebus quaedam divina voluptas
> percipit atque horror, quod sic natura tua vi
> tam manifesta patens ex omni parte retecta est.

[286] See Kenney (2014) for discussion of hymnic elements. Duban (1982) connects the passage to the first proem and suggests that Epicurus represents a counterpart to Venus.
[287] The importance of invention to the figure of Bacchus is stressed in the proem to book 5, considered just below.
[288] Lenaghan (1967, 239–40), and Segal (1989, 201).

> Then from these things a certain divine pleasure and horror seizes me, because nature is thus exposed so clearly by your power, and uncovered on every side.

Lucretius' own experience of Epicurus' teachings recalls the mixture of harshness and pleasure in the Second Proem, the combination of *acer* thyrsus and *amor* as well as the mingling of wormwood and honey, all of which evoke the traditional imagery of Dionysus. The connection between Lucretius' epiphany and his master's teachings is emphasised by the repeated *divina* (15, 28). Again, we can see how Lucretius' articulation of his poetic project far surpasses the superficial meaning of the honeyed-cup simile; to be certain, poetry is honey, but it is honey poured from ecstatic inspiration, rather than empty sweetness. The moment of inspiration in the Second Proem resonates in both the master's sublime achievement and the disciple's meeting with the void. Clay's (2007, 24) argument about Lucretius walking in his master's *vestigia* (3.4) furthers the point: he contends that Lucretius' *avia Pieridum* (1.926) is equal to the Epicurean ἄπειρον. So, he says, "The deliberate parallelism drawn by Lucretius between himself and Epicurus leads to an explanation of how it is that Lucretius can portray himself as *following* in Epicurus' footsteps and at the same time striking out through a trackless region to the sources of his inspiration." Lucretius' space of inspiration is the Epicurean infinite: the moment of ecstatic Bacchic inspiration is identified with the shudder at the void. As disciple, Lucretius is made ecstatic by the *voluptas* and *horror* of the mind's meeting with the infinite, and as teacher, he is inspired to pour forth the *voluptas* and *horror* of his own poetry to lead his own student to a sublime experience of Epicurean truth.

The proem to book 4 repeats in major part the Second Proem of book 1, and so, although the honey is here removed from its epiphanic context, we can recall again how Bacchic frenzy

leads to the pouring forth of poetic honey. Gale (1994a) defends this passage as authentic.[289] She points out that, much like the Second Proem itself, the proem to book 4 is linked to the content that follows; in particular, the honeyed-cup simile finds echoes in Lucretius' discussion of sweetness and bitterness (615–72)—which includes reference to honey (678–80)—and the wild spaces of the proem look forward to the landscape of the false pastoral divinities at 580–94. The proem also looks back to the language of book 3, recalling the image of Epicurus' students as bees; the proximity and similar position of the two proems emphasises the connection between Lucretius, his philosophical forebear, and the Bacchic language of the poem. As well, the religious resonances of the passage suggest a certain sense of ritual; the repetition of the lines hints at the renewal of Lucretius' paradoxical initiation as he opens the second half of his poem.

The suggestion of a Bacchic Epicurus appears again in the proem to book 5 with the exaltation of Epicurus over Ceres and Liber. The philosopher's gift is greater than those of the so-called gods, Lucretius argues, for life could have gone on without grain or wine, *at bene non poterat sine puro pectore vivi* ('but it is not possible to live well without a pure mind,' 18). The comparison hinges on the fact that all three figures are inventors: Epicurus discovered his *ratio*, as Ceres is said to have (*fertur*, 14) discovered grain, and Liber wine.[290] Lucretius puts the idea of invention at the centre of his glorification of Epicurus again, just as he did in the proem to book 3, where Epicurus was both *pater* and *rerum inventor* (3.9). *Deus ille fuit, deus* (5.8), Lucretius claims of his master: the divinity most strongly evoked is, again, Bacchus.

---

[289] She shows that ancient authors seem to have been aware of both passages, noting especially Virgil, *G.* 3.289–93.

[290] Harrison (1990) connects this passage to Tiresias' speech at Euripides' *Bacchae*, 274–80, where the same two gods are paired in a discussion of the *protos heuretes*. Lucretius' *fertur*, he argues, nods to Euripides' influence.

Finally, the wild space of the Second Proem recurs, and is connected both to Bacchus and to song. People imagine that a similar landscape is home to satyrs and nymphs because of the echoes that the hills throw back: *cetera de genere hoc monstra ac portenta loquuntur,/ne loca deserta ab divis quoque forte putentur/sola tenere* ('they speak of other wonders and signs of this kind, so that they may not be thought to live in lonely places, deserted even by the gods,' 4.590–92). The contrast between this passage and the Second Proem recalls the earlier discussion of the role of sublimity in Lucretius' logic: the poet derides false belief in nymphs and satyrs, but retains these Bacchic resonances as the space of mental inspiration. Sublimity is located in the mind of the poet—in both his encounter with the cosmic *ratio* and his moment of poetic inspiration—rather than the physical space of the empty grove. In the next book, the scene of the creation of music among the first people recalls the echoes and false creatures of book 4: humans learn the *querellae* from the tibia, which was discovered *avia per nemora ac silvas saltusque reperta,/per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia* ('discovered in pathless groves and woods and thickets, in empty pastoral spaces, and daylit *otia*,' 5.1386–87). The *avia* groves in which music is inspired also recall Lucretius' own *avia* landscape. The continuity of space allows us a deeper glimpse into Lucretius' poetic project: wonder at the physical world can be translated into false *religio* or music, and the best poetry will harness this wonder, not only escaping superstition but actively working against it. As we saw in chapter 1, the true poet will not turn to nymphs and satyrs when he hears the echoes of the empty groves, but will ground his song in the teachings of Epicurus, who supersedes Bacchus.

(B) Horace's Bacchus Odes

Keeping in mind the sublime, Bacchic moments of the *DRN*, we can turn to the *Odes*. In the previous chapter, I argued that Maecenas plays a major role in the connections between private and public, domestic and political, in Horace's lyric. The poet stages his own liberation from his patron over the course of the *Odes*; Horace's increasing independence from Maecenas involves a strong assertion of Epicurean authority, which is bolstered by Lucretian language and ideas in the context of the lyricist's Sabine estate. This independence is then expressed in the grand flights that conclude books 2 and 3, where Horace leaves his patron behind and stakes a claim on empire itself, even figuring himself as *princeps* in the final ode. In what follows, I will investigate several instances of sublimity in the *Odes*, paying particular attention to the lyricist's two extended encounters with Bacchus, 2.19 and 3.25. Both odes use elevated language and imagery, and both are illustrations of poetic inspiration, self-conscious reflections on their own sublimity and the way the lyric voice moves into higher registers. Their remote and mystical landscapes, which frame and inform the poet's meeting with the god, strongly recall those of the *DRN*, particularly those that are themselves part of Lucretius' own Bacchic poetics.

It is my contention that the Lucretian resonances of the two odes do not simply pay aesthetic homage to Horace's predecessor, or merely act as ironic gestures, as some have argued, but have a crucial role in the poet's expression of his project and the modulations that take place within it. As we have just seen, Lucretius' landscapes are deeply imbued with poetic significance, and the Bacchic imagery of his work is important to his own poetic project. The two Bacchus odes are climactic moments in Horace's own treatment of sublime imagery, and their remote and difficult landscapes resonate through the collection. The Lucretian echoes in these two sublime odes, I argue, serve a similar purpose to the role they play in the *DRN* itself,

yet the purpose is metamorphosed to serve Horace's particular lyric ends. They lift the reader toward an encounter not with Epicurean cosmic truth but with the poet himself. What is more, the odes play an important role in binding together the registers and themes of Horace's project; the *biformis* poetry of Bacchus is part of the link between the sober humility of the predominantly Epicurean poems and Horace's grand flights of poetic glory. Finally, allusions to Lucretius are implicated in Horace's contradictory lyric sublimity; in undercutting, reversing, and politicising Lucretius, Horace reinforces the polyvalent and paradoxical character of his lyric poetry.

Before turning to 2.19 and 3.25, we should look briefly at the Bacchic language of *Odes* 1.37, the celebration of Cleopatra's fall. The poem's engagement with civil war is indicated by not only its subject but its opening allusion: as we saw in the introduction, *nunc est bibendum* (1) looks to Alcaeus fr. 332, the lyricist's celebration of Myrsilos' fall.[291] As he often does in the *Odes*, Horace makes Alcaeus a central part of his lyric voice, using an Alcaic form of sympotic revelry to connect private and public activity. As many scholars have observed, the poem makes the victory over Cleopatra ambivalent; Davis (1991, 233ff.) traces the language of inebriation in the ode, for example, showing how Cleopatra—unnamed through the entire poem—is *ebria* with her *fortuna* (11–12), but becomes sober in the battle, and finally commits suicide by *deliberata morte* (29). Lowrie (1997, 154) contends that the queen's position at the end is ambiguous, blending Roman fortitude in the face of death with a 'barbaric' method of suicide. The transformation of Cleopatra is Dionsyian, Feldherr (2010) argues; like the queen, the god is not named, but traces of him are present "on the levels of wordplay, literary form, and myth" (227). The phrases *pede libero* (1), *deliberata morte* (29), and *Liburnis* (30) suggest the name Liber,

[291] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.): "The educated reader, who knows the Greek original, will understand that the tyrant is dead."

and dithyrambic elements hint that we should think of the god.[292] Cleopatra's *voltu sereno* (26) "gives her for an instant the characteristic Dionysiac smile, and the Bacchantic aspects of her death transform the drunkenness, which initially appears in the poem only as an index of hubristic overreaching, to the mark of those whose apparent madness is really a form of Dionysiac enlightenment."[293] The poem makes ambiguous the victory of civil war; Dionysus' polyvalent figure makes it difficult to characterise Cleopatra and her death, and the ambivalence calls to mind the associations between Antony, Caesar, and Dionysus or Bacchus. Moreover, the ode unites private celebration and public events; the presence of wine and Bacchus hold together the poet's personal symposium and the political victory, in keeping with the opening Alcaic allusion. The ambivalence of Dionysian elements here, as well as the bridge that the ode creates between private and public, resonate strongly in the Bacchus odes that follow in the next two books.

(i) *Odes* 2.19

As we saw briefly in the previous chapter, *Odes* 2.19 is saturated with Lucretian imagery, despite its mythological, epiphanic subject; the same is no less true of 3.25, as we will see. I argued there that the poems preceding 2.19 establish a strong sense of Epicurean ethical authority; Horace vividly recalls Lucretius in 2.16 and 2.18, thus claiming a Lucretian form of authority for his property and lyric voice. *Odes* 2.16 is perhaps the most explicit statement of Lucretian ethics in the *Odes.* There, the philosophy is united with not only Horace's Sabine landscape but his poetic style; as we saw earlier, *tenuis*—which is linked to both lifestyle (*in*

[292] Hardie (1976, 132–3) also argues that the concluding *triumpho* (32) is a Latinised *thriambos*, setting the ode in the context of hymns to Dionysus.
[293] Feldherr (2010, 228). See also Hardie (1976, 131). Cf. Euripides, *Bacchae*, 431 and 1021. See Foley (1980) for a discussion of Dionysus' smiling mask in the tragedy.

mensa tenui, 14) and poetic inspiration (*spiritum . . . tenuem*, 38)—suggests a connection between Epicurean simplicity and Callimachean poetics. The language of the final two poems of the book is an ostentatious departure from the simplicity of the previous poems. Lucretius, I will argue here, is an important influence on Horace's portrayal of Bacchus, and the lyricist's echoes are part of how he draws together the registers of his collection as he prepares to move into his immortal flight in 2.20 and the Roman Odes that follow.[294] The discussion will therefore show the connection between the Lucretian ethical vision of Horace's Sabine property, which I discussed in the first chapter, and the sublime language of the *Odes*.

Much of *Odes* 2.19 looks to Euripides' *Bacchae*: the ruined buildings and miracles of the fourth and fifth stanzas are particularly reminiscent of the tragedy.[295] However, Horace's numinous space and divine epiphany also make clear nods to Lucretius' famous illustration of his own poetic primacy. *Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus/vidi docentem* ('I saw Bacchus teaching songs on the distant cliffs,' 1–2), Horace writes, and declares (9–12):

> fas pervicacis est mihi Thyiadas
> vinique fontem lactis et uberes
> cantare rivos atque truncis
> lapsa cavis iterare mella

> It is permitted for me to sing of the wilful bacchants, and the spring of wine, and the rich streams of milk, and to speak again of the honey flowing from hollow trunks.

[294] As we saw in the previous chapter, the Alcaic stanzas of 2.19–3.6 hold together the ending of book 2 and the Roman Odes (see Heyworth 2017).
[295] See especially Harrison (2017, 222) and Davis (1991, 107–14).

The scene recalls Lucretius' Second Proem, the philosopher-poet's announcement of his poetic primacy. Although he has a great tradition of poetic epiphanies in untrodden landscapes at his disposal, Horace turns again to Lucretius in specific and significant ways in his own divine experience.[296] Horace places the god back at the centre of the landscape where Lucretius left only hints of Bacchic initiation, but the space itself remains strikingly Lucretian.[297] Harrison (2013a and 2017) and Hardie (2009, 218–19) make particularly thorough account of the resemblances. Horace's *gravi thyrso* (2.19.8) nods to Lucretius' own *acri . . . thyrso* (1.922–23), and this allusion suggests that the lyricist's *turbidum laetatur* (6) similarly looks to Lucretius' simultaneous *divina voluptas* and *horror* in his encounter with the void (*DRN* 3.28–29). The remote cliffs reflect the echoey landscape of the *DRN* that Lucretius blames for false beliefs in satyrs and nymphs (4.590–92), as well as the empty spaces of the Epicurean's Second Proem (*loca nullius ante/trita solo*, 1.926–7 = 4.1–2). Because of these similarities, Harrison (2013a, 374) argues that in Horace's *fontem* (10) and *rivos* (11), we should see "Lucretius' untouched streams of inspiration . . . transformed into the magical streams of wine and milk from the miracle-working of Dionysus in Euripides' *Bacchae*." Within the *carmen*, the wild, violent divinity of Euripides' *Bacchae* appears in the demythologised, yet also untamed, untracked, and

[296] In light of the strong allusive structure of the ode, the word *iterare* may point to the reiteration of earlier poets, including Euripides and Lucretius. Harrison (2017, ad loc.) writes that the word "wittily suggests repetition of an established literary topic as well as of the god's traditional story."

[297] Horace's reestablishment of Bacchus in the landscape is highlighted by his placement of *Bacchum* as the first word of the ode. See Harrison (2013a, 374): "Here we find Horace picking on a rare moment of traditional poetic inspiration in Lucretius and expanding the mythological hints it contains: the thyrsus of Dionysus, an element of concealed myth in Lucretius, is echoed in a Horatian poem which gives a substantial account of that god's career, while the poetic symbol of the garland and the metaphor of the stream [of] poetic inspiration are appropriated and supplemented in a much more traditional form. Once again Horace takes on Lucretian material and renders it more conventional for his Roman reader."

numinous terrain of Lucretius. Both the physical space and the experience of the epiphany recall Lucretius, even as Horace restores the god himself to Lucretius' empty landscape.

Given the centrality of Lucretian imagery to *Odes* 2.19, it is surprising that Lucretius does not figure more strongly in the several studies that argue that the ode is self-conscious in its depiction of the poetic process. Emphasising the *credite* (2) of the opening stanza, Davis (1991, 109) asserts that the poem illustrates the elevation of the poetic voice: "By acceding to the speaker's pitch for credence, we legitimate not so much the genuineness of the vision itself as the quality of its product—a *carmen* that exhibits the hallmarks of the grand style."[298] Schiesaro (2009) goes the furthest in accounting for the presence of Lucretius in the ode; in Horace's combination of Bacchic imagery and the transcendent flight of 2.20 we can see traces of Parmenidean and Pythagorean philosophical imagery, he contends, and Horace's blending of philosophy and Callimachean innovation has a precedent in Lucretius. He explains that "Lucretius is the Roman poet who most effectively problematises the notion that Callimachean elegance should supposedly be decoupled from any sense of profound intellectual engagement" (71). I argue that we should consider the extensive Lucretian resonances of the landscape and divine epiphany in connection with these ideas of poetic and philosophical inheritance. Horace's remote landscape recalls Lucretian images of untouched space, yet this very act of allusion reveals that the landscape has indeed been touched: as we enter the Bacchic wilderness with the poet, we come face to face with Lucretius himself. The employment of poetic predecessors' words to illustrate one's own poetic primacy is nothing new, of course; as we saw, Lucretius himself can be seen to do much the same thing in the Second Proem, in fact, with the

[298] Similarly, Schiesaro (2009, 72) argues that, together with 2.20, the first Bacchus ode lifts the register of the collection in preparation for the Roman Odes of book 3.

Callimachean echoes of his own untouched space.[299] The tradition of allusivity at such moments makes it all the more important to take account of Horace's own references to the *DRN*. Why does Horace choose to write Lucretius into the landscape of 2.19, when his predecessor eschewed the divinity that the lyric poet restores to his epiphany? And why, after the strongly Epicurean 2.16 and 2.18, does the poet pay homage to Lucretius' imagery while undercutting his philosophical message?

A further echo of Lucretius suggests that we might almost see the philosopher-poet himself in the landscape of 2.19. The image of Horace's Bacchus as *docentem* has been interpreted primarily as a nod to the lyric poet himself teaching *carmina* to the chorus.[300] Given the extensive allusions to Lucretius in the ode, however, we can fruitfully add another level of interpretation to the passage. The Muses have set me apart, Lucretius declares, *primum quod magnis doceo de rebus* ('first, because I teach great things,' 1.931). We have already discovered the tracks of Lucretius on Horace's remote cliffs—there is perhaps also a trace of Lucretius himself in the vision of Bacchus teaching his followers.[301] This allusion exemplifies perfectly Horace's treatment of Lucretius: in a poem where he pays homage to his predecessor, yet reinstates a fully mythological deity and repeoples the landscape with nymphs and satyrs, the

---

[299] Lucretius further problematises his own depiction of entering untouched space with his later image of following in Epicurus' *vestigia* (3.4). See Kenney (1970). Dionysus is particularly well suited to such interplays between novelty and imitation; as a god who is both old and young, he holds together the two sides of this poetic conundrum. See e.g. Segal (1982, ch. 1).

[300] E.g. Harrison (2017, 225). Cf. *Odes* 4.6.43–44. Also see Pöschl (1973, 214).

[301] Hardie (2009, 219) comes close to suggesting this, saying that the importance of teaching in both *docentem* (2) and *discentis* (3) "perhaps hints at the models in the didactic *DRN*." We can take this suggestion further, however, in light of the many parallels between 2.19 and *DRN* 1.921ff, and see it as a particular nod to 1.931. The verb *doceo* was also a "generic signal" at *Sat*. 1.5.101 (*namque deos didici securum agere aevum*) (Hardie 2009, 219 n. 139).

Horace's emphasis on sight in his opening lines (*vidi*, 2) might hint at the primacy of sensory experience in Epicurean philosophy—according with his call to belief (*credite*, 2)—while also portraying the mythological deity.

poet hints that Lucretius himself is metamorphosed into Bacchus, who is a chorus-master and thus, in a way, the lyric poet himself. In the *DRN*, as we saw, Lucretius intimates throughout that Epicurus acts as a kind of Bacchus, whose initiation takes the form of a sublime experience of the infinite atoms and void. Horace's encounter with the god does something similar with Lucretius, although the lyric poet treats his predecessor with far less reverence than Lucretius treats his philosophical master: Lucretius is part of Horace's ecstatic moment of inspiration, a kind of Bacchus himself, who inspires but is transcended in the creation of a new poetics.

We must, therefore, reconsider the literary self-consciousness of the poem in light of these extensive allusions. Once we see the major parallels between the landscapes and epiphanic experiences of 2.19 and the *DRN*, we can see other echoes throughout the ode, which help clarify the role that Lucretius plays in Horace's self-conscious literary presentation. *Odes* 2.19 mirrors Lucretius' Bacchic passage in its introductory imperatives: *credite, posteri* (2), Horace demands, while his forebear instructs, *age, cognosce*, and *audi* (1.921). 'Commit to what follows,' both poets insist of their readers, inviting them to enter the sublime spaces they have created. Recall what we have seen of Lucretius' use of sublimity in the *DRN*: the philosopher-poet lifts his student's mind with his sublime imagery so that it can experience the true cosmic *ratio* and thus attain its own mental sublimity. Horace uses a parallel structure of imperative followed by numinous sublimity to lift his readers and impel them to follow him. The poet calls on his readers to assent to his vision, and this assent carries them along with him as he moves into an elevated subject and tone.[302] Far from lifting us into a philosophical encounter with the infinity of the universe, however, Horace draws the reader along as he himself soars into the heavens and defies death in 2.20, then launches into the elevated, complex Roman Odes. The difference

[302] Davis (1991, 109).

between his imperatives and those of Lucretius underscores this distinction between poetic glorification and philosophical teaching; Horace's *credite* is plural, and addressed to *posteri*, while Lucretius' didactic imperatives are singular, addressed to the individual Epicurean student. Drawing his readers with him, the lyricist thus ascends from the Lucretian humility of his earlier poems toward his immortal flight and the political odes that follow.

Not only does Horace's sublime imagery mirror Lucretius' in the way that it draws in the reader, but the nature of the poetry that emerges from his Bacchic epiphany has a distinctly Lucretian character. The final stanzas of 2.19 reveal the double nature of the god, *idem pacis . . . mediusque belli* ('the same, not only a mediator of peace but midmost in the fight,' 26–27), which links the ode to the *biformis* nature of the poet himself at 2.20.2.[303] Feeney (2009, 218–19) observes that both god and poet are *biformis* at this juncture of the odes where Horace moves from humble to grand, suggesting that the poet himself is *idem* in peace and war. The connection is an Alcaic one, in accordance with Horace's own illustration of the archaic poet in the earlier 1.32; it emphasises Horace's own Alcaic persona in the *Odes.* The moment recalls the blending of Dionysian and Alcaic language in 1.37, the Cleopatra ode. The idea of the double-natured poet and god is also at work in Horace's *turbidum laetatur*, which evokes the Lucretian idea of the joyful terror of Bacchic initiation. As we have seen, Lucretius' description of the Bacchic landscape and his own poetic innovation is the prelude to his meditation on the purpose of his poetic philosophy, and the admixture of bitter *ratio* and sweet *carmen* there is the product of Bacchic inspiration. The ecstatic epiphany, which is linked to the mind's experience of Epicurus' teachings, is responsible for the pouring forth of a new kind of philosophical poetry, one that uses both honey and wormwood to persuade and heal the student. Horace's own ecstatic

[303] Translation borrows from Nisbet and Hubbard (1978).

experience is similarly the inspiration for a new, *biformis* poetry. In addition, as I have already suggested, Horace's ode ties together the humble Lucretian ethics of the earlier poems and the sublime odes that follow; it is *biformis* as well in the way it lifts the reader from one register to another, its Lucretian echoes aiding in this movement.

Another important aspect of this *biformis* poetry is its mixture of Callimachean and non-Callimachean poetics. As we saw above, Schiesaro's (2009) treatment of Horace's "Bacchic Poetics" argues that Horace looks to Lucretius' Second Proem for the coupling of weighty material and Callimachean poetry. This pairing is essential to Horace's self-depiction as *biformis* bard, he argues (72):

> Taken together, *Odes* 2.19 and 2.20 represent not so much the conclusion of Book 2 as the prelude to a novel form of poetry, the so-called 'Roman odes' of the first part of Book 3, where Horace does indeed turn into a *vates*. The end of Book 2 establishes a bold connection between Bacchic inspiration, Orphic-Pythagorean imagery, Pindaric loftiness and Callimachean originality.

Odes 2.20 opens with the poet's Callimachean (*non usitata*) and anti-Callimachean (*nec tenui*) wing, *biformis* in poetics as in physical form. Lucretius is an important precedent for bringing together Callimachean poetics and weightier intellectual topics, and, notably, he too associates this union with Bacchic imagery. Not only is Horace's poetry *biformis* in its ability to move effortlessly from lyric, sympotic themes to grand military imagery, but it is *biformis*, and indeed multiform, in its mingling of traditions and tones. Recall again the emphasis that 2.16 placed on a *tenuis* poetics that was aligned with a *tenuis* modest life; these Callimachean threads join with sublime grandeur in the final two odes, and the *biformis* Bacchus is part of the unity Horace creates between his disparate tones, and the movement between them.

Given Horace's many reversals of Lucretius in 2.19, we need to take into account Hardie's (2009) argument that "the combination of a religious earnestness with hints of scepticism, while typically Horatian in its irony, is intelligible as a comment on Lucretian dealings with places of poetic numinosity" (218). According to Hardie's interpretation, the allusions to Lucretius are both aesthetic and—especially because of Horace's reversal of Lucretius' passage about false beliefs in nymphs and satyrs—a comment on the fictionality of the scene. He argues that "recollection of Lucretius' scornful incredulity of rustic superstition ironizes Horace's call to posterity to lend credence" (219), further remarking that Horace's own disavowal of Bacchic followers at *Epist*. 1.19.3–4 lends support to this notion.[304] While this interpretation is valuable in its reading of Horace's approach to the literal truth of the epiphany, and accentuates the ambivalence of his dealings with truth and fictionality in the poem, it does not engage with the poetic and philosophical project that is articulated in the passages of the *DRN* to which Horace alludes. As we have seen, when we examine what Lucretius himself is doing in these passages, we can begin to uncover how Horace is drawing upon the vatic power of his predecessor, in particular the way that Lucretius makes use of sublime imagery to guide his reader and the way he holds together the Callimachean and non-Callimachean. Thus Horace is indeed 'ironizing', as Hardie contends, yet he is also making use of the strength of Lucretius' poetry, with its ability to seduce and lift up its reader, and to hold together opposing poetics in one seamless whole.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the irreverent approach that Horace takes toward his predecessor's work in 2.19 and 2.20 is equally vital to his project. Horace's grand flights in

[304] See also Harrison (2017, 22–23): "H.'s rhetorical urging that his vision was a true one at 3–4 reverses this claim in echoing its vocabulary, but his ironic presentation of the supposed epiphany suggests no great difference from his fellow Epicurean poet."

the *Odes* are never purely sublime; the ending of 1.1 (*quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres/sublimi feriam sidera vertice*, 'but if you insert me among the lyric bards, I will strike the stars with my uplifted head,' 35–6) introduces the admixture of seriousness and sublimity that permeates the collection.[305] Much the same can be said of the final two poems of *Odes* 2. The closing image of Cerberus in 2.19 seems to deflate the grandeur of the rest of the poem: *leniter atterens/caudam et recedentis trilingui/ore pedes tetigitque crura* ('gently rubbing with his tail, he touched your feet and legs with his three-tongued mouth as you walked away,' 29–30). The poem ends on a minute detail instead of glorious heights, and the image of the dog's tongues leaves the reader curious about the mechanics of the activity.[306] A similar emphasis on physical detail follows in 2.20, where the poet describes his avian metamorphosis in grotesque detail, even as he nods to lofty poetic precedents, such as the flight of Cyrnus in Theognis (237ff.) and Ennius' epitaph.[307] Moreover, in this final ode the poet undercuts his own grand flight by comparing himself to Icarus (*iam Daedaleo notior Icaro*, 13). Even as Horace lays claim to the bounds of the Roman Empire, he reminds us of the dangers of hubris.[308] Hornbeck (2014, 160) argues that, along with the harsh details of the metamorphosis, the very inclusion of Icarus effects the self-defeat Horace describes: "Instead of soaring triumphantly over the Roman Empire, the speaker tumbles into a sea of negative reactions to his imagery and tone. By over-stating his success, he compromises it." Horace's lyric sublimity, then, is never simple; it blends elevated and grotesque language,

---

[305] See again Harrison (2007b, 29): "The poet will strike the stars with his head, an incongruously literal picture which suggests a nasty headache."
[306] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978, ad loc.) emphasise the point: "Cerberus must be rubbing his tail against Bacchus, though this action is more characteristic of a cat than a dog."
[307] See especially Harrison (2017, 237–8) and Feeney (2009, 219–20), who compares the transformation to that of the horses in Plato's *Phaedrus* (251a–c). Hornbeck (2014, 158) writes: "Whether the metamorphosis of poet into swan strikes the reader as funny or simply jarring, this sudden and vivid literalization of metaphor distances the reader from the speaker."
[308] The passage recalls his criticism of Daedalus in 1.3 (*expertus vacuum Daedalus aera/pennis non homini datis*, 34–5).

lofty and mundane imagery. The final two poems of book 2 elevate the collection toward the Roman Odes that begin the third book, yet this ascent is complex and at times ironic.

Horace's approach to Lucretius in these final poems is thus bound up in the contradictory nature of lyric sublimity. The lyricist, as we have seen, restores Bacchus to his traditional mythological form in 2.19, giving back his nymphs and satyrs, along with his streams of honey, milk, and wine. The ostentatious reversal of Lucretius' passages is worth comparing to the many ways in which the poet overturns Lucretian ideas in the final poem of the collection. In the previous chapter, I drew attention to passages in 2.20 where the poet takes up Lucretian arguments about the finality of death and the uselessness of mourning, and, inverting their meaning, appropriates their language to argue for his own immortality.[309] Both 2.19 and 2.20 allude to Lucretius with deep ambivalence, reversing much of his doctrine while drawing extensively on his sublime imagery of poetic preeminence. This mingling of irreverence and homage is, I argue, an important part of the particular kind of lyric sublime that Horace constructs in his *Odes*. Lucretian allusions are part of how Horace bridges the divide between the earlier poems and the grand ending of the book, as I have argued; not only do they provide a continuity of imagery, but Horace harnesses Lucretius' own *biformis* Bacchic language in unifying his own poetry. However, these allusions also emphasise the irreverent, complex nature of Horace's sublimity. Just as his references to Cerberus' tripartite tongue, the growth of feathers out of rough bird skin, and the fall of Icarus all clash with the sublime moment, Horace's reversals of Lucretian language are jarring, and contribute to the discordant character of his sublimity. Moreover—as we saw in the previous chapters, and will see in greater detail in the discussion of 3.25 that follows—by using Lucretian language in his ascent toward the Roman

[309] See chapter 2, section B (ii).

Odes, Horace appropriates Lucretius for his own, politically-engaged lyric project. As we will see, these political implications become even more important in *Odes* 3.25.

(ii) *Odes* 3.25

The second Bacchus ode, 3.25, clearly recalls 2.19. The poet asks, *quo me, Bacche, rapis tui/plenum?* ('where are you dragging me, Bacchus, full of you?' 1–2), looking back to his earlier *pleno . . . Bacchi pectore* (2.19.6).[310] The phrase *velox mente nova* ('swift with a new mind,' 3), too, is reminiscent of the earlier *recenti mens trepidat metu* ('my mind trembles with fresh fear,' 2.19.5). The identity of the god, the form of the ecstatic state, the distant landscape, and the newness of the subject matter are all shared between the two odes.[311] What is more, the landscapes and ecstatic epiphanies of both involve a strongly Lucretian image of sublimity. *Odes* 3.25 looks again to the untouched, *avia* landscape of the Second Proem: *mihi devio/rupis et vacuum nemus/mirari libet* ('it delights me, as I wander in deserted places, to wonder at the cliffs and empty grove,' 12–14).[312] Horace's mixture of terror and pleasure in 3.25, his *dulce periculum* (18), echoes his earlier *turbidum laetatur* (2.19.6), and both phrases recall the proem of *DRN* 3, Lucretius' pleasurable, sublime terror in the face of the void. Horace's *vacuum* (12) is also linked to this void; Hardie (2009, 220) associates the word with Lucretius' *inane* at 3.27, but the term *vacuus* also appears throughout the *DRN* to describe the void.[313] The poet of *Odes* 3.25 comes to the remote grove and Bacchic revelry as the Epicurean comes to the void, and his

[310] See Nisbet and Rudd (2004).
[311] See especially Davis (1991).
[312] Following Muretus' reading of *rupis*, which Nisbet and Rudd (2004) accept.
[313] See especially Porter (2003) for a discussion of the term *vacuus*, focusing on book 6.

delightful shiver of horror is a moment of Lucretian sublimity. Horace again harnesses the power of the Lucretian sublime as he elevates his own language, even as he remythologises the philosopher-poet's Bacchic imagery. *Odes* 3.25 uses the Bacchic vision to enter into an even closer encounter with the political realm; the lyricist weaves Lucretian language into his un-Lucretian confrontation of civic themes, yet, as we will see, he ultimately suggests that the primary object of his attention is not the actual *princeps* but his own poetic persona. This use of Lucretian sublimity to help focus the reader's gaze on the lyric poet has much in common with *Odes* 2.19.

Horace's union with the god involves another echo of the proem to *DRN* 3; the poet writes that it is a sweet danger to *sequi deum/cingentem viridi tempora pampino* ('to follow the god, temples wreathed with green vines,' 19–20), mirroring Lucretius following Epicurus (*te sequor*, 3.3). The participle in the final line, *cingentem* (20), is ambiguous; the vines could encircle the head of the god or his follower, as Hardie (2009, 221) observes:

> The point is perhaps that the worshipper of Dionysus identifies with his god to the point where such discriminations no longer operate. Successfully to follow Lucretius following Epicurus will lead the reader of the *De Rerum Natura* to a state of *ataraxia* identical to that enjoyed by the gods. Contemplation by Lucretius of the sublime revelations of his master leads the poet to his own sublime effusion.

According to Hardie's reading, then, the poet of 3.25 employs Lucretian echoes in order to illustrate how he will become one with Bacchus, united with him as the true Epicurean sage is united with the philosophical master, and thus the freedom of the divine life. This Epicurean 'apotheosis' is what Lucretius presents as the source of his sublime language, and thus, if we take Hardie's line of argument a little further, Horace takes up this Lucretian moment as he

himself turns to sublimity. In this second Bacchus ode, Horace again reads the proem of *DRN* 3 together with the Second Proem of book 1 as intertwined instances of Lucretius' Bacchic imagery. His reading of Lucretius lends credence to the idea that these passages are connected in important ways within the *DRN*. Horace's allusion accords with what we saw above of Lucretius' Bacchic poetics; Lucretius describes Epicurus in Bacchic terms, and Horace restores the traditional deity in place of the philosopher-poet, remythologising his predecessor's image even as he takes up its sublimity. It also suggests something similar to the *docentem* of 2.19.2; the poem intimates a certain philosophical epiphany as it describes a mythological one, hinting at something close to an identity between Bacchus and Epicurus/Lucretius. Within this mythological ode, we can see traces of Lucretius' vision of Epicurean freedom. This idea agrees with what we have seen in the preceding chapters of Horace's *otium* and *libertas*; the freedom associated with the Sabine property, I argued earlier, is intimately connected to Lucretius' idea of the *libertas* conferred by an Epicurean life. As with 2.19, we can trace a line between the freedom of the Sabine estate—a sense of poetic authority bolstered by Epicurean simplicity and tranquillity—and the sublime freedom of 3.25.

As with *Odes* 2.19, we should consider how the Lucretian resonances of the ode relate to the self-conscious literary activity Horace is performing in 3.25. The ode makes a bold claim to encomium (3–8):

. . . quibus
antris egregii Caesaris audiar
aeternum meditans decus
stellis inserere et consilio Iovis?

dicam insigne recens adhuc

indictum ore alio.

In what caverns will I be heard, practising how to graft the eternal glory of excellent Caesar among the stars and council of Jove? I will speak of a distinguished and fresh subject, until now spoken by no other mouth.

The poet's entrance into this *insigne*, *recens* subject reflects his *mente nova* (3) and the empty, untracked landscape, *vacuum nemus* (13). As in 2.19, Horace pairs Bacchic epiphany with a grander, sublime style; in the poet's initiation, as he is filled with the god, the audience is drawn upward with him into this elevated language.[314] However, whereas 2.19 looks forward to 2.20 and the Roman Odes that follow, 3.25 seems to enact the very performance it promises: "the line between announcement and performance is virtually obliterated" (112).[315] 'I will sing,' Horace declares, but the promise does not lead into loftier odes; the following poem is brief, declaring the end of Horace's erotic ventures. There, Horace employs the elegiac topos of the *exclusus amator*, and undercuts both lofty hymnic language (*o quae beatam diva tenes Cyprum*, 'o goddess who guards rich Cyprus,' 9) and his declaration that he is finished with love, praying that Venus strike Chloe with her whip (11–12).[316] The contrast between the two poems draws attention to the fact that the grand claim of 3.25 must be simultaneous with the poem itself, not a

[314] Davis (1991, 111) says that the ode is the "same elaborate vindication of a grander mode of composition" as 2.19.
[315] Davis (1991, 112). In light of the Lucretian echoes in the landscape and description of new subject matter, *insigne* (7) might also be read as an allusion to Lucretius' *insignem . . . coronam* (1.929).
[316] See e.g. West (2002, 214–19) and Syndikus (1972, 215–19), who describes the many reversals that occur within the poem.

statement of what is to come, and also to the fact that the lyric project as a whole is one of unexpected couplings of subject and tone.

Moreover, Horace not only makes his statement of future encomium simultaneous with the declaration, but leaves what Oliensis (1998a, 130) terms a "sublime blank" even within 3.25 itself. Although the lyricist declares his subject to be political encomium, he averts his gaze from the *princeps* immediately after his proclamation (8–14):

> . . . non secus in iugis
> exsomnis stupet Euhias
> Hebrum prospiciens et nive candidam
> Thracen et pede barbaro
> lustratam Rhodopen, ac mihi devio
> rupis et vacuum nemus
> mirari libet.
>
> Just as the sleepless Maenad on the mountain ridge is astonished, looking at Hebrus and Thrace, white with snow, and Rhodope, wandered by barbarian feet, so it delights me, as I wander in deserted places, to wonder at the cliffs and empty grove.

The poet's eyes turn not to Caesar, as the reader expects, but to a Maenad who looks out at the snowy mountains. Nor is the Maenad even placed in parallel to the *princeps*—instead, the passage ends with a comparison to the lyricist himself, similarly wondering at the wild landscape. Oliensis (130) continues: "The mountaintop displaces the starry *consilium*, and

Horace—himself destined for stardom, as he ventures to hope elsewhere . . . —deposes Caesar." Even in the lines that precede the image of the Maenad, the poet's language hints that the poem will ultimately focus on his own poetic power; his *inserere* (6) is reminiscent of his use of the verb in 1.1, where he asks Maecenas to inscribe him in the lyric canon (*quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,/sublimi feriam sidera vertice*, 'but if you insert me among the lyric bards, I will strike the stars with my uplifted head,' 35–6). The elevated language of the poem lifts toward another statement of the poet's future song: *nil parvum aut humili modo,/nil mortale loquar* ('I will sing of nothing small or in a humble style, nothing mortal,' 17–18). As we will see in what follows, by focusing the reader's attention on the poet himself, the ode prepares for the final statement of poetic glory in 3.30 where the poet is *princeps*, with his fame projected to mirror that of the empire. As in Lucretius, wonder elevates both poet and his reader. But again, Horace focuses the reader on himself: sublime language does not lead to sober cosmic *ratio*, but to an image of the inspired bard. Moreover, in harnessing Lucretius' apotheotic language—as we saw in Hardie's (2009) argument, above—Horace compares himself not only to the god but to Caesar.

Even as he centres the poem on the greatness of the song he will sing, however, Horace emphasises not his poetic power but his passivity, in keeping with the opening language of the ode (*rapis*, 1; *plenum*, 2; *agor*, 2). The figure of the Maenad is a particularly vivid image of this submissiveness; as Fowler (2002, 151) describes, "even as an inspired poet Horace figures himself as feminized by the process of inspiration." In part, this imagery permits the poet to rise up to the political realm, Oliensis (1998a, 129–30) argues: "In the rhetorical economy of this ode, Bacchus steps in between the poet and the emperor, relieving them both of the responsibility for Horace's 'deviation' into encomium, and enabling Horace to represent himself as the passive

vehicle of praise, not its agent."[317] On the other hand, as we have just seen, the very image that seems to cast the poet in a passive role is simultaneously the one that lifts him into parallel with Caesar. In an ode that makes multiple allusions to Lucretius, and looks back to the Lucretian 2.19 as well, the ambiguity of this position recalls the Epicurean's own mixture of passivity and activity in his Second Proem, where he is a Maenad but also an exalted teacher. Lucretius himself is not only Maenad and inspired poet, but student and teacher; the balance between active and passive roles in the Second Proem is related to the way he represents himself as striking into new territory, but also following in his master's footsteps.

Yet again, then, Horace brings the *biformis* nature of his poetry to the forefront in this self-conscious illustration of poetic, Bacchic inspiration, and yet again, we can see Lucretius' influence as the lyricist calls attention to his polyvalent poetics. As Batinski (1991) shows, Horace places Bacchus into a Callimachean moment, much as he does in 2.19: "Bacchus, who had swept Horace off to these isolated places, has encroached on Apollo's domain" (373). Not only the god, but the poet's new public, political theme questions the Callimachean mode implied by the fresh subject and remote landscape of the poem; the project in question is not a slender Callimachean theme but the *aeternum . . . decus* of Caesar (5). The poem itself is slight, and its emphasis on novelty strikes a Callimachean note, but its topic is heavy. Schiesaro (2009, 64) contends that we cannot place Bacchus firmly on the side of political, weighty poetry here: "it would be rash to assume that such a powerful and limitless energy can also be tapped into without dangers and risks." Bacchus is again a symbol for Horace's lyric project itself, which is characterised by its wide-reaching embrace of contradictions in both theme and register.[318]

---

[317] See also Schiesaro (2009) for the tensions of this poem.

[318] The final image of the poem emphasises the idea: the green *pampinus* encircles the forehead of either god or poet, the image of entwining embrace reflected in the root of the word for vine, 'to swell'. Lewis and Short relate that its root is pamp- or pap- [cf. *papula* and *pōpulus*].

Even if, as I have argued, the ode performs the very elevation that it foretells, the type of politically-centred sublimity it enacts is not isolated to this poem. In fact, Lowrie (1997, 319), while agreeing that the ode performs the elevation it anticipates, argues that its political language also refers back to the Roman Odes: "Rather than pointing outside the collection to a never-to-be-fulfilled future, the claim to praise functions both as a self-enacting utterance within the poem . . . , and tells us retrospectively (one aspect of) what Horace was doing in the Roman Odes." It is notable that these Roman Odes—framed, in a way, by the two Bacchus odes—open with yet another reference to Lucretius, one that similarly overturns the philosopher-poet's words, as we saw in the first chapter: *odi profanum vulgus et arceo*, Horace begins (3.1.1), suggesting Lucretius' *volgus abhorret ab hac* (1.945). The deeply Lucretian content of the poem shows that this opening line, too, looks to the Epicurean, drawing on Lucretius' use of ritual language, but Horace re-imbues the image with religious meaning, making himself into the priest of the Muses.[319] The passage thus continues Horace's remythologisation of his predecessor, and does so with reference to the Second Proem yet again; the lyricist again looks to the Lucretian sublime as he elevates his own poetry. Horace thus emphasises his transformation of his philosophical predecessor, showing how he speaks Lucretian ethical truth to Rome, but does so with an authority that is both mythological and Epicurean, and draws Lucretius fully within the political sphere.

The idea that 3.25 looks back to the Roman Odes is emphasised by a verbal connection between 3.25 and 3.4; in his earlier poem, Horace tells the Camenae, *finire quaerentem labores/Pierio recreatis antro* ('you refresh [Caesar], as he seeks to finish his labours, in the Pierian cave,' 39–40). The *antris* of 3.25.4 echoes this earlier cave, because it, too, provides the

[319] See especially Woodman (1984, 85–6).

space for an encounter with Caesar, now a more direct meeting between the poet's song and the *princeps*. Whereas the movement of 2.19 and 2.20 was upward, culminating in a sublime flight that was undercut by the appearance of Icarus, the movement of 3.25 is inward, into *nemora*, *specus*, and *antra*. As we will see presently, the final poem of the collection is a more tempered proclamation of glory than 2.20 is; Horace's confrontation of the political realm in book 3 leads to his alignment of his own achievement with that of the empire, and this seems to permit a more stable—although still in certain ways ironic—sublime authority.

A similar connection can be made between the Bacchus ode and the preceding 3.24, which is linked to 3.25 by their shared asclepiads. *Odes* 3.24 has clear similarities to the Roman Odes; it criticises Roman avarice and degenerate morality, and gives advice to the man who wants to be called *pater urbium* (27).[320] Its declaration about the powerlessness of wealth (*non animum metu,/non mortis laqueis expedies caput*, 'you will not set your mind free from fear, nor your head from the noose of death,' 7–8) strongly evokes Lucretian language (e.g. *haec vulnera vitae/non minimam partem mortis formidine aluntur*, 'these wounds of life [i.e. greed and desire for distinction] are fed in no small part by the fear of death,' 3.63–4). The civic confrontation of 3.24 and its incorporation of Epicurean ideas create a strong echo of the Roman Odes. The connections between the Roman Odes, 3.24, and 3.25 all suggest that the sublimity of the Bacchus ode is closely related to the civic engagement of the book as a whole, and recall the way that political discourse is bound up with Lucretian imagery throughout. As Horace appropriates the sublime imagery of Lucretius in his Bacchic epiphany, then, he not only transforms Lucretius' words to pull them into his mythological mode, but yet again enlists his predecessor as he brings his lyric into direct contact with the political realm.

---

[320] See especially Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 270–3) for an account of the connections between 3.24 and the Roman Odes.

Even as *Odes* 3.25 seems to be the culmination of the elevated Roman language of book 3, it also looks forward to the final poem of the book, recalling the way that 2.19 points toward 2.20. *Odes* 3.30 rehearses much of the political imagery of the book, as the discussion in the previous chapter showed, and it again employs Lucretian language to make its grand claims. The parallel between poet and Caesar that Horace intimates in 3.25 is particularly revealing; the same parallel is central to 3.30, where the lyricist makes his fame (described as *recens*, 8, like the encomiastic song of 3.25.7) equal to the eternity of the empire (7–9), describes himself as *princeps* of Latin lyric (13), and suggests the language of triumph (*deduxisse*, 14). *Odes* 3.25 prefigures this final moment of the collection, and at the same time ties together the moments of deep political engagement that pervade this third lyric book.

Lucretian language, then, is implicated in the elevation of the poet's voice into civic discourse; in 3.25, Horace forces this language to work for un-Lucretian ends even as he makes use of its sublime power. Somewhat surprisingly, Hardie (2009, 222) argues that this ode is the "exception to the rule that Horace ironizes moments of Lucretian inspiration and sublimity."[321] He contends, as we saw above, that Horace here draws upon the Epicurean concept of becoming like the gods through the contemplation of cosmic truths. The distinction he makes between the two Bacchus odes, arguing that the first alludes to Lucretius ironically while the second follows the sublime logic of the *DRN*, is surprisingly stark. To be sure, the first ode uses Lucretius against himself in setting the epiphany of Bacchus in the *loca sola* where Lucretius says foolish people imagine fauns and satyrs. As Hardie argues, the allusion brings up questions of credibility, highlighting the fictionality of the scene. However, *Odes* 3.25 just as brazenly restores a divinity to Lucretius' demythologised landscape, and equally uses the language of the

[321] Williams (1968, 68–69) also argues that Horace is more sincere in 3.25, and attempts to convey his actual experience of the moment of inspiration.

Lucretian encounter with the Epicurean *ratio* to illustrate Horace's personal encounter with a god of poetry, appropriating Lucretius' use of sublimity to focus the reader's attention not on a philosophical truth but on his own poetic voice and his modulation of his lyric project. Moreover, the ode turns the imagery of the *sedes quietae* of the gods (*DRN* 3.18) on its head by describing a snowy landscape instead of lands untouched by snow. Most pointedly, the moment of Lucretian inspiration is used to engage with the political order, joining encomium and self-glorification while blurring the line between them.

To be sure, there is a difference between the ending of book 3 and that of book 2; not only does Horace omit such clear moments of reversal as the reference to Icarus in 2.20, but he replaces the grand claim of immortality in the earlier poem with the more restrained claim that he will not *wholly* die (*non omnis moriar*, 6), and that it is his fame that will continue, and increase, as long as the great empire itself. On the other hand, as we saw in the previous chapter, the final poem of the collection again recalls Lucretian arguments about the finality of life and the ephemerality of human endeavour, turning them against themselves in the poet's vision of himself as equal to *princeps* and empire. The ironic treatment of Lucretius in *Odes* 3.30 is connected to that of 3.25, and is comparable to the appropriation of Lucretian language in 2.19 and 2.20 as well. The continuity of Lucretian allusion between the final two poems of book 3, as I argued in the previous chapter, connects the Epicurean authority of 3.29—centred on the ethical philosophy of the Sabine estate—to the poetic glory of 3.30, creating a continuity of language that helps tie together the two disparate registers of Horace's lyric.[322] On the other hand, much as I argued of 2.19 and 2.20 in the previous section, Horace's treatment of his philosophical predecessor in the final ode is part of how he constructs his particular mode of ironic, irreverent

[322] We saw a related idea in the previous chapter, where I argued that Maecenas is implicated in the Epicurean language at the endings of both books.

sublimity in his lyric collection. Even as the ethical assertions of the penultimate ode give a foundation for the authoritative, independent claims of 3.30, the reversals of Lucretius in the final poem point to the contradictions inherent to Horace's sublime.

(iii) Bacchic and Wild Landscapes in the *Odes*

Horace's Bacchic and sublime imagery, much like Lucretius', spills over from his two extended Bacchic epiphanies in 2.19 and 3.25 into the rest of his collection; the visions of remote landscapes and distant journeys in those poems can be traced throughout the collection. A thread of sublime, supernatural landscape imagery runs through the *Odes*, and is bound up with Horace's ideas of poetry and inspiration. The figure of Bacchus is important to these poetic landscapes, Batinski (1991) and Schiesaro (2009) contend; the god plays a major role in Horace's merging of poetic traditions within the *Odes*. What has been left out of these analyses, for the most part, is the influence of Lucretius on Horace's articulation of these landscapes and, by extension, on his complex poetics and idiosyncratic sublimity. Roman, Hellenistic and archaic influences come together to shape the fantastic landscapes and journeys of the *Odes*, and Lucretius' sublime and Bacchic language is integral to many of these moments where Horace is clearly and self-consciously merging traditions to create his own distinctive lyric. The Bacchus odes and the related imagery of distant journeys and landscapes are central to Horace's expression of his poetics, and the poet frequently incorporates Lucretius as he articulates the innovative, multifaceted character of his own project.

Images of a distant landscape and a voyage beyond limits appear in the very first ode of the collection, and their position underlines their importance to Horace's project (1.1.29–36):

me doctarum hederae praemia frontium
dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori
secernunt populo, si neque tibias
Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.
quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

The ivy, reward of learned brows, sets me among the celestial gods, the icy grove and the swift bands of nymphs and satyrs divide me from the common people, if Euterpe does not keep back her tibias, and Polyhymnia does not refuse to hold out her Lesbian lyre. But if you insert me among the lyric bards, I will strike the stars with head uplifted.

The poet is set apart from the *populus* in an isolated grove that resounds with Bacchic imagery, and his separation from the ordinary world is emphasised by his anticipated flight to the stars in the final line. The ode itself is an intricate web of influences. As we saw in the previous chapter, the opening situates the poet in the archaic tradition of priamel, particularly alluding to Pindar's first *Olympian*.[323] Yet the poem is also Aeolic (*Lesboum* . . . *barbiton*, 33), Roman, and at the same time Hellenistic; in this introduction to his lyric collection, Horace calls attention to the way he weaves together disparate threads. Batinski (1991) argues that the Bacchic imagery at the end of the poem is instrumental to this activity of weaving; Horace's *gelidum nemus* (30), she

[323] See especially Barchiesi (2000).

claims, encompasses both Hellenistic and archaic poetry, as a remote grove that is both Callimachus' untouched space (*secernunt populo*, 32, emphasises the connection) and a reference to an older tradition of Bacchic revelry.[324] Much as we saw above with *Odes* 2.19 and 3.25, Horace displaces Apollo from his accustomed place in Callimachus' untracked landscape, and "the mingling of Hellenistic with archaic Greek elements colors Bacchus' initial appearance in the collection of odes."[325] The Bacchic imagery of 1.1 is then balanced, Batinski continues, by the Apolline *lauro* with which the poet asks Melpomene to encircle his head in the final poem (3.30.16).[326] An appearance of Apollo in the wild grove of 1.1 would suggest a more uniform allegiance to an Alexandrian aesthetic, and so Horace places Bacchus at the centre of this landscape instead; the god thus reconciles Bacchus and Apollo, *ingenium* and *ars*, archaic and Hellenistic.

It is not only Bacchus who holds these sides together, but the landscape of his revelry, which is both Callimachean and archaic, the refinement of centuries of poetic tradition but at the same time untamed and untouched. This Bacchic landscape, with its intricate poetic implications, thus prefigures the two remote spaces of the later Bacchus odes. The later odes expand and explore the landscape of 1.1, reminding the reader of the myriad influences and tones of this programmatic space, as well as the exceptionality of the poet placed within it. The importance of Lucretius to the Bacchus odes suggests that the philosopher-poet's presence may be felt in the end of first poem, as well; just as Lucretius situates his statement of poetic inspiration in a wild

---

[324] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.) note the Callimachean resonances of the separation from the *populus*.
[325] Batinski (1991, 370).
[326] Putnam (1973) contends that Bacchus yields to Apollo, rather than the two gods balancing one another. However, his argument does not fully account for how Horace moves between the two gods, and the presence of Apollo in 3.4 in particular. It also does not account for the importance of ivy and similar vegetation throughout; for example, at 1.18.1, 1.25.17 (as a symbol of youth) and 1.36.20 (as an erotic image), as well as the *pampinus* at 3.25.20.

landscape that resonates with Bacchic energy, so Horace's *gelidum nemus* (1.1.30) contains traces of the god, but not yet the god himself in full form. Recall that, in the first chapter, we also saw Lucretian language in the image of the *stratus* drinker of 1.1, the man lying beside the stream (1.1.19–22). In his first ode, then, Horace hints at two different Lucretian images; the first is a vision of Epicurean *ataraxia* and the modest lifestyle that plays such a large role in the lyricist's construction of his Sabine estate, while the second looks to Lucretius' sublime language. Even within *Odes* 1.1, we can see how the two contrasting, yet related, images will play equal roles in the lyric programme that follows.

Sublime landscapes and journeys into the unknown appear continually in the *Odes*, and can be read in connection with the grove at the end of 1.1 and the two Bacchus odes, where the sense of Bacchic frenzy in 1.1 is fully realised as the epiphany of the god himself. Troxler-Keller (1964) gives the seminal account of this type of landscape in the *Odes*; she describes the *Dichterlandschaft*, which finds its most complete form in the empty grove, a place which the poet may enter, although ordinary mortals may not.[327] The landscape participates in some ways in real, Italian space, she argues, but exists primarily in a fantastic realm of spiritual being and divine inspiration. These spaces thus reveal Horace taking possession of the tradition of both Alexandrian and archaic untamed spaces, translating them to suit the Italian landscape yet never making them completely comfortable in this realistic setting. A connected theory is Lowrie's (1997) conception of the "Out of Bounds", a dangerous wilderness that is an integral part of the poetic journey. She writes of 2.19: "Bacchus here and at *C*. 3.25 inspires Horace's own forays Out of Bounds, into the *genus grande*" (209). The space and the movement into it are sublime: the poet describes a realm beyond ordinary human experience and the crossing of boundaries

[327] See also Schmidt (1977).

into it. As Lowrie argues, this transgression of mental and physical limits is the expression of poetic inspiration and elevation of style. As we saw above, the transcending of physical boundaries is one and the same as the transcending of poetic limitations; in his descriptions of sublime spaces, Horace links disparate traditions and enacts the elevation of his own lyric voice.

The wild landscapes of the Bacchus odes are not isolated, therefore. The *Odes* repeatedly describe distant groves and far-off mountain peaks, sublime landscapes that contrast with the familiar and comfortable spaces of the poet's rural estate and sympotic leisure, yet are also connected to these domestic spaces. We can see the importance of these spaces to the *Odes* as a whole, and their poetic implications, by taking up just a few examples. The image of the *gelidum nemus* in the first ode reaches its fullest expression in the snowy mountains of 3.25, where the poet compares his own wonder (*vacuum nemus/mirari libet*, 13–14) to that of a Bacchant, astonished at Hebrus *et nive candidam/Thracen* (10–11). The description of Thrace there looks back to the earlier image of Soracte, where Horace places *stet nive candidam* (1.9.1) in a similar position at the end of the line.[328] Indeed, we could think of the icy landscape of 1.9 as a nod to the ending of 1.1. Santirocco (1986, 41) explains that this poem, the Alcaic finale of the "Parade Odes" that begin book 1, resolves "the dialectic between lyric and epic" that occurs in these first nine odes. He contends that 1.7 and 1.8 perform the activity of "domesticating epic material in the service of *convivia* and *erotica* respectively," while 1.9 holds both lyric themes together. We can see in 1.9, as well, the unity of sublime and small that is characteristic of Horace's project; the lyricist moves from the grand heights of Soracte all the way down into the *angulus* and a *digito male pertinaci* (23) in the final stanza. As we have seen, Bacchus in the *Odes* acts as a unifier of ideas and of poetic traditions. The sublime mountains and groves that are characteristic

[328] Nisbet and Rudd (2004).

of the god's revelry are implicated in this activity. The beginning of 1.9 nods to the Bacchic landscape of 1.1, and anticipates the remote spaces of 2.19 and 3.25; Soracte is another glimpse into the sublime poetic landscape that helps establish Horace's lyric programme, with its binding together of disparate models and tones, and its simultaneous contrast between and union of domestic and sublime landscapes.

The poetic landscapes of 1.12 also participate in sublime imagery and look to the traditional spaces of poetic inspiration. The poet asks what hero, man or god he should exalt, and where this subject may be found: *aut in umbrosis Heliconis oris/aut super Pindo gelidove in Haemo* ('either in the shady slopes of Helicon or on top of Pindus, or on icy Haemus,' 5–6). The specific setting of Pindus and the catalogue of possible spaces for song allude to Virgil's tenth *Eclogue* and ultimately to Thyrsis' song in Theocritus' *Idyll* 1, and so the passage is another example of poetic models woven together: archaic and Hellenistic landscapes are placed side by side, drawn into the *Odes* through the Roman voice of Virgil.[329] This union of traditions, moreover, follows a clear debt to Pindar in the first stanza.[330] Not only are these traditional spaces of poetic inspiration related to the distant landscapes of the Bacchus odes, *Odes* 1.1, and other remote spaces in the collection, but Bacchus himself appears in the poem, apostrophised as Liber alongside Phoebus (21–24) as a possible recipient of the poet's song. As Feeney (1998, 112) observes, the choice of Bacchus is significant because of Dionysus' transgressive nature: "In placing here a god whose status as a true Olympian was problematic, Horace shows that the Greek categories are not as tight as they might have appeared." Augustus, Feeney argues,

[329] See Ross (1975, 137–8) for Horace's allusions.
[330] For the allusions to Pindar, see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) and Ross (1975). Feeney (1998, 111) writes: "In Horace's Rome, the categories of god, hero, man are not what they were in Pindar's Greece; as the poem moves to its climactic evocation of Augustus as the one who straddles all three categories at once, it reveals the porosity of the divisions constructed by the Greek and Roman traditions."

ultimately holds together the three categories of hero, man and god in the ode. We can see Horace doing much the same with categories of poetics: genres and periods are shown to be mutable and porous. Remote and sublime landscapes are again the space of elevated poetry, and they are again spaces where Horace draws attention to his activity as poet, his joining together of voices and traditions in his new lyric. We should remember, as well, that the echoing mountains of 1.12 resonate in the echoing rocks of the Sabine estate in 1.17, which are themselves recalled in the urban landscape of 1.20. Sublime spaces of poetic inspiration are not isolated in the collection, as I have argued throughout this chapter. Bacchic landscapes, and the ambiguous figure of the god himself, are involved in Horace's binding together of domestic and sublime visions within his *Odes.* Lucretius has an important role to play in the continuity of imagery between these landscapes, as well as the connection between them, particularly the idea that the security of the Sabine property provides a foundation for Horace's grand poetic flights.

The movement in the Soracte ode between sublime and small is also suggested by *Odes* 1.22, which we examined in the first chapter. I argued there that Horace looks to Lucretius' flight of Epicurus in order to express his poetic sacrosanctity, while connecting this sublimity to his own Sabine property and its stable *termini*. The poem thus draws on images of both the life of *ataraxia* and the sublime experience of the Epicurean mind, much as 1.9 looks at the grand vista of Soracte but then contracts into the *angulus*, and 1.1 implicates the poet in both Epicurean tranquillity and Bacchic sublimity. *Odes* 1.22 thus closely relates the two landscapes; the security of domestic *termini* permits sublime flights, not only because these *termini* are physical boundaries that can be transgressed, but because they evoke the Lucretian idea that an understanding of natural limits enables a sublime experience with the cosmic *ratio*, like the exaltation of Epicurus. Moreover, the poem again evinces the irreverent sublimity that is

characteristic of the *Odes*; Horace here draws on a Lucretian vision of *termini* and the *libertas* these limits create, but simultaneously produces a humorous juxtaposition of philosophers and lovers, glorious journeys and woodland strolls.

A somewhat different example of Horace's interaction with the Lucretian sublime, one that is important to the poet's construction of lyric sublimity, occurs at *Odes* 1.34; we should step away from Horace's landscapes briefly to consider another sublime moment that draws extensively on Lucretian language. In 1.34, the lyricist's apparent recantation of Epicureanism seems to reinstate divinity to the image of lightning that Lucretius demythologised (1–8):

parcus deorum cultor et infrequens
insanientis dum sapientiae
    consultus erro, nunc retrorsum
        vela dare atque iterare cursus

cogor relectos: namque Diespiter,
igni corusco nubila dividens
    plerumque, per purum tonantis
        egit equos volucremque currum.

I used to err, a sparing and infrequent worshipper of the gods, learned in mad wisdom, but now I am compelled to sail back and retrace my path, for Diespiter, who often splits the clouds with flickering fire, led his thundering horses and flying chariot through a clear sky.

Commentators as far back as Porphyrio have read this poem as an image of conversion away from Epicureanism; not only does the narrator describe his previous disinterest in the gods, but the image of the thunderbolt alludes to the *DRN*. As we saw in the first section, Lucretius demythologises thunder, using the language of *nec mirum* to deflate its apparent grandeur. Moreover, a thunderbolt in a clear sky is an *adynaton* for Lucretius, who asks believers incredulous questions about the behaviour of their purported gods: *denique cur numquam caelo iacit undique puro*/*Iuppiter in terras fulmen sonitusque profundit?* ('finally, why does Jupiter never cast a lightning bolt onto the earth or produce thunder from a completely clear sky?' 6.400–401).[331] Horace responds as Lucretius' interlocutor here, proclaiming that in fact *Diespiter* has done exactly that, thus implying that the lyricist has no choice but to recant his Epicurean principles.

Horace would therefore seem to reverse Lucretius' *nec mirum* logic in 1.34, turning to a more traditional understanding of the gods and their interventions in the natural world. However, Horace's treatment of his predecessor is more complicated than this. The lyricist presents himself as the archetypal Lucretian fool, who, as we saw in the earlier discussion, goes against his philosophical ideals and professes belief in the gods as soon as he encounters inexplicable celestial events (*DRN* 5.82–86). Horace casts himself as that fool who is borne back *in antiquas . . . religiones* by a wonderful event, and so undermines the sincerity of his own conversion by aligning himself with Lucretius' object of ridicule.[332] The *plerumque* of the poem's seventh line is also noteworthy. As West (1995, 163) remarks: "Horace's point collapses if lightning *usually*

[331] See also 6.99 and 6.246–8.
[332] See Fredricksmeyer (1976). Also note that Horace employs the word *erro* for his foolishness, a word associated with the fool in Lucretius, as at *DRN* 2.9–10: *dispicere unde queas alios passimque videre errare atque viam palantis quaerere vitae*. See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.).

comes from a clouded sky. It is valid only if lightning *always* comes in a clouded sky."[333] With *plerumque*, Horace removes the absolutism of Lucretius' words: if Diespiter ordinarily sends lightning from a cloudy sky, but not always, Horace in fact allows room for the very event he says is so shocking as to convert him away from his beliefs.

Odes 1.34 is an important moment in Horace's construction of his idiosyncratic, tongue-in-cheek sublimity. The ode apparently turns away from Lucretius toward the traditional gods and their sublime power, but the lyricist uses Lucretius' own language to question the transformation. The ostensible conversion disintegrates upon closer inspection: Lucretius is made to speak against himself through the implicit argument that if thunderbolts *cannot* appear in a clear sky, then the narrator is *not* a fool if he is turned away from his philosophical views in the face of this very event—yet Horace undercuts both Lucretius and his own 'conversion' by adding a *plerumque*, a modification of Lucretius' originally absolute stance. Moreover, the narrator's self-depiction as an Epicurean fool undermines a serious interpretation of the conversion. As well, the movement of the ode away from Epicureanism is unclear; the poet describes the power behind the unexpected thunderbolt first as *Diespiter* (5), then as *deus* (13), and finally as *fortuna* (15). The supposed convert finds himself faced with a many-headed divinity, whose appearance as *fortuna* even reminds the reader of the Epicurean understanding that the future is unpredictable and often brings misery.[334] Lucretius is, therefore, again bound up

[333] West also observes that this word is rare in poetry, belonging instead to colloquial speech, but that Lucretius uses it frequently, including three times in his several discussions of thunder and lightning. If *plerumque* echoes Lucretius' own language, Horace uses a tone borrowed from his predecessor to further undercut his own conversion.

[334] The connection between Fortuna and an Epicurean perspective is evident in *Odes* 3.29, where, although she is personified (*Fortuna saevo laeta negotio*, 49), Fortuna is connected to the idea of an Epicurean acceptance of whatever life brings. As well, the connection between 1.34 and 1.35 in terms of the appearance of Fortuna is striking, and adds even more possible identities for the divinity of 1.34; Barber (2012) argues for the unity of the two poems and reviews their multiple connections, citing other

closely with Horace's articulation of his lyric sublimity; as in 2.20 and 3.30, the lyricist turns the Epicurean against himself, and the reader who recognises the Lucretian allusions is more keenly aware of the ridiculous character of the sublime image. The undercutting of Lucretius is even more pointed in this ode, because its ostensible subject is a conversion away from Epicureanism.

Odes 3.4 is a particularly important point of comparison with the Bacchus odes, because it not only features remote and sublime landscapes, but does so in the context of a self-conscious meditation on the poet's own special nature and preeminence. As one of the Roman Odes, moreover, it participates in the extended elevation of the lyric voice that Horace initiates in 2.19. Its remote landscape connects the sublime content of the poems that end book 2 and those that begin book 3. The space of 3.4 looks back to 2.19 in a general way, as a remote landscape that is the setting for poetic creation. The poet writes of the *fabulosae . . . palumbes* ('fabled wood-pigeons,' 3.4.9–14) who covered him with leaves when he was a child, *extra limen* (10) in Apulia.[335] He pairs the Italian landscape of Vultur with the generalised ideal landscape of the previous stanza: *audire et videor pios/errare per lucos, amoenae/quos et aquae subeunt et aurae* ('I seem to hear [Calliope] and to wander through sacred groves, which pleasant streams and breezes enter,' 6–8). The ode is deeply Pindaric, indebted in particular to the first *Pythian* where harmonious music is coupled with harmonious politics, but "Horace gives the idea an entirely Roman context, employing the Muses to associate his own poetry with the Augustan settlement."[336] The elevation of the poetic voice in 2.19 carries through to this poem, as the out-of-bounds landscape suggests; the inspired lyricist of 2.19 now confronts the Roman state.

---

scholars who have contended that the two are a single ode. Among these are Heyworth (1995) and Griffiths (2002).

[335] There are textual problems in this stanza that make the identity of this *limen* unclear, but some form of boundary transgression is evident.

[336] Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 56). Also see Fraenkel (1957, 276–85), who describes how the overall shape of the ode looks to Pindar.

The resonances of 2.19 in *Odes* 3.4 suggest that Lucretius may again be present; we are certainly brought back to the earlier landscape in a general way because of the remoteness of the space and its association with poetic inspiration, but there are a few moments that stand out as particularly Lucretian. The first of these is the invocation of the Muse. The presence of Calliope in this poem has been variously explained, with Ross (1975) asserting that Horace's choice of Muse nods to *Ecl.* 4.57, and so to an Alexandrian inspiration, as transmitted through Gallus and Virgil. Horace then changes direction, Ross contends, turning to the stories of the ancient Greek poets with his description of his childhood. In contrast, Commager (1962) attributes Horace's choice of Muse to Hesiod's assertion that Calliope is the προφερεστάτη of all the Muses (*Theog*. 79).[337] Given the strong echoes of 2.19 in this poem, it is surprising that the possibility of Lucretian influence has been passed over. Calliope is the only Muse whom Lucretius invokes in the *DRN*, modelling his reference on Empedocles, fr. 131.[338] She appears in the proem to *DRN* 6, where Lucretius describes her—using a translingual pun that identifies her name with the adjective *callidus*—as *callida Musa . . ./requies hominum divomque voluptas* ('intelligent Muse, . . . rest for humans and pleasure for the gods,' 93–4). Here, in Horace's ode, the poet similarly invokes her as an inspirer of restorative poetry. The poet addresses the Camenae, saying of Caesar, *finire quaerentem labores/Pierio recreatis antro* ('seeking to end his labours, you refresh him in the Pierian cave,' 39–40) and adding that they give him *lene consilium* (41).[339] Horace's particular choice of Calliope, along with his emphasis on rest and recreation, strongly recalls Lucretius' own Muse.

---

[337] See also Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 57); they note that Hesiod says that she accompanies kings, which makes her suited to the political aspects of Horace's poem. Calliope is also the πρεσβυτάτη of the Muses in the *Phaedrus* (259d), cf. chapter 1, section A.

[338] See Gale (1994b, 68–70) and Sedley (1998, 22).

[339] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) note that *recreatis* recalls Lucretius' description of Calliope as *requies hominum*, but do not connect Horace's choice of Muse to his predecessor's.

With this connection between Horace's Calliope and that of Lucretius in mind, the poet's description of the Camenae is worth reexamining. The Camenae, the poet declares, are *almae*: *vos lene consilium et datis et dato/gaudetis almae* ('nurturing goddesses, you give him gentle advice and rejoice in having given it,' 41–42). The word looks to the opening of the *DRN*: *Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas,/alma Venus* ('Ancestor of the children of Aeneas, pleasure for humans and gods, nurturing Venus,' 1–2).[340] Calliope in *DRN* 6 is, Gale (1994b, 153–54) shows, the double of Venus in book 1; the description of Calliope as *requies hominum divomque voluptas* (94) strongly echoes the opening line of the text, and thus both goddesses hold together poetry, philosophy and pleasure. They are both, Gale contends, images of Epicurean *ataraxia*, as Calliope's association with *requies* hints. As *almae* goddesses, with Calliope as their leader, Horace's Camenae look to Lucretius for their model. They are not only purveyors of pleasure, but of worthwhile, restorative recreation. The description has parallels with the *otium* of 2.16, which we examined in detail in the previous chapter; just as the word there linked philosophical *ataraxia* and poetic pleasure, here the recreation the goddesses offer goes beyond aesthetic pleasure. Horace draws on Lucretius as he defends his own poetic project against claims of triviality by supporting it with an Epicurean sense of mental tranquillity. The importance placed upon poetry and its association with a kind of life-giving restoration is strongly Lucretian, and emphasises Horace's own reading of his philosophical predecessor, which calls attention to those moments of Lucretius that most clearly emphasise how poetry is the best possible vehicle for philosophical teachings.

At the same time, of course, Horace departs from his predecessor even as he echoes him; poetry here serves a distinctly political purpose, refreshing Caesar after war. As we saw in the

[340] The adjective *almus* will play a central role in the next chapter; it appears multiple times in *Odes* 4, most strikingly in the final hymn to Venus in 4.15.

first chapter, the political engagement of lyric in 3.4 is part of a thread running through the Roman Odes that connects Horace's particular mode of lyric Epicureanism to the civic sphere.[341] I argued in the second chapter that the lyricist draws out what is only a faint suggestion in Lucretius: the idea that Epicureanism has the potential to heal civic upheaval. At the end of the first chapter, I contended that Horace links the special protections of his Sabine property to a grand flight beyond these boundaries in 3.4, much like he does in *Odes* 1.22. He describes himself as the possession of the Camenae: *vester, Camenae, vester in arduos/tollor Sabinos, seu mihi frigidum Praeneste seu Tibur supinum/seu liquidae placuere Baiae* ('I am yours, Camenae, yours, when I am borne into the lofty Sabine hills, whether cool Praeneste, or sloped Tibur, or clear Baiae pleases me,' 21–2).[342] It is this belonging that keeps him safe from the bears and vipers in Apulia (17–18), much as he remains safe from the wolf in 1.22. The strong implications of Epicurean *ataraxia* and simplicity that are associated with the Sabine property throughout come into play in this ode again, therefore, but now protect him not only as he wanders outside of his *termini*, but even as he comes into contact with the political world. His Camenae seem to bring Epicurean tranquillity to the *princeps* himself, exaggerating or even contradicting their Lucretian model. Horace's reinterpretation of Lucretius appropriates Epicureanism for his lyric voice, while radically politicising the Epicurean's message; Horatian lyric makes use of both Lucretian thought and imagery as it establishes itself as an integral part of the civic realm.

We can thus see the presence of Lucretius again in the landscape and figures of 3.4. The scene of the opening is both the distant landscape of 2.19 and not; it is the source of poetic inspiration and a place where the poet is set apart, yet it is Phoebus, and not Bacchus, who

[341] See chapter 1, section B (iv).
[342] Newlands (1984, 67) argues of 2.6 that "the value of Tarentum emerges as the same as that of the Sabine farm," a point that could be made of this poem as well.

appears in the landscape. It is Apollo, moreover, who appears most prominently in the Gigantomachy of the later stanzas (60–64), just as Bacchus did in 2.19 (21–24). Both Phoebus and Bacchus are at home in the distant landscapes that recur throughout the *Odes*; although this ode focuses on the former, both physical space and mythological context recall 2.19, and so remind us of Bacchus even as we read of Phoebus. The poem is situated in the Alexandrian tradition and its Roman reception because of the presence of Apollo and Calliope, yet we are also made to think of Bacchus, and, as we have seen, Lucretius' poetic, Epicurean Calliope. As Miller (2009) argues, the ode proclaims a Callimachean allegiance with its invocation of Apollo and Calliope and its connection to the final lines of 3.3, where the poet asks the Muse to find a subject more fitting for his *modis* . . . *parvis* (72). On the other hand, the ode is deeply Pindaric, and is, moreover, the longest in the collection. What is more, the ode anticipates 3.25 with its singing of Caesar; as I argued above, the elevated claim of 3.25, although it looks to the future, in certain ways also encompasses the political odes that begin book 3. Apollo and Bacchus come together in Horace's poetics, which are grand and humble, simultaneously lyric, choral, Alexandrian, and Roman. Lucretius' voice plays an important role in this complex unity of Horace's poetry; just as he is involved in the movement between Sabine and civic realms, Lucretius is also implicated in the self-conscious junctures of register and poetic style.

Horace's grand journeys and sublime landscapes, which first appear in the landscape at the end of 1.1, come to two climaxes in his Bacchus odes, 2.19 and 3.25, where we can see the great attention with which Horace reads Lucretius' own "Bacchic poetics": the thread of imagery that unites Epicurus' lofty mental journeys, Lucretius' grand poetics, and the sublime encounter of the mind with the infinite atoms and void. In the transformative hands of Horace, this imagery becomes the landscape of his own poetic journeys, his modulation of his project to grander

themes, and his union of poetic traditions. The landscape of the poet's inspiration is a space where influences, genres, and tones collide and intersect. This sublime space, which slides in and out of focus through the collection, beginning with the conclusion of *Odes* 1.1, reverberates with Lucretian language: its physical space and the transgression of boundaries that accompanies it echo not only Lucretius' most explicit statement of poetics in the Second Proem, but his images of Epicurus' achievements and the mind's encounter with Epicurean philosophy, which themselves look to the Bacchic imagery of the Second Proem. As we have seen, the Second Proem is a locus not only for poetic inspiration but for poetic union; the landscape is both Callimachean and not, with the god of wine drawing the poet to untouched springs and thus revealing that the *DRN* is the confluence of wine- and water-drinking traditions. In the *Odes*, these wild landscapes and sublime journeys again become the setting for poetic modulation and unification, yet they become distinctly Horatian as the lyricist translates them into his poetic project. At the same time as the lyricist pays homage to Lucretius' sublime, Bacchic imagery, he draws his predecessor deeply within his contemporary political world. His ironic reversals of the philosopher-poet, moreover, are bound up in the distinct character of Horace's lyric sublimity, which can at the same moment exalt the poet to the sky and awkwardly knock his head against the stars.

Chapter 4: Lucretian Visions of Venus and Spring in *Odes* 4

To complete this investigation of Lucretius' presence in Horace's lyric work, we must take stock of the fourth and final book of the *Odes*, written a decade after the completion of the earlier three books, with the first book of the *Epistles* and *Carmen Saeculare* intervening between the two lyric works. This final chapter will first treat *Epistles* 1 briefly before it turns to *Odes* 4, keeping the *Carmen Saeculare* in view as it traces the Lucretian and Epicurean themes of Horace's last lyric collection. *Odes* 4 is markedly different from the previous lyric books; it is widely recognised as more assertively political than *Odes* 1–3, more engaged with Augustus himself, and more willing to pursue a Pindaric form of encomium. Famously, the collection begins with the individual voice of the poet, but ends with communal, civic song: *Troiamque et Anchisen et almae/progeniem Veneris canemus* ('we will sing of Troy and Anchises and the offspring of nurturing Venus,' 4.15.31–2). Political themes are nothing new to Horace's lyric, of course; we saw in the earlier chapters that the previous odes repeatedly take on civic subjects, particularly in the poems of book 3. I argued in the first two chapters that a Lucretian ethical sensibility, appropriated for the poet's own Sabine property and lyric voice, is a vital element of how Horace constructs his own poetic *otium* and gives himself the power to speak to civic concerns. Maecenas is implicated in this Lucretian vision of the Sabine estate; as Horace increasingly asserts his own ethical and political authority, he claims his own freedom, setting his patron on the side of civic *curae*. In *Odes* 4, however, both property and patron fade away as the city comes into sharper focus. Moreover, the poet himself is changed by time. Horace represents these final lyric moments as bound up with his own end: his own senescence and preoccupation with the finitude of human life. The near-disappearance of Maecenas and the Sabine estate suggests that book 4 turns away from Lucretius, and this holds true in certain ways.

However, Lucretian and Epicurean language and imagery still permeate these poems, and Horace's final lyric project is again shaped in part by its relationship to Lucretius. This relationship takes place most vividly, I will show, through the figure of Venus and the associated imagery of spring; the metamorphosis of this imagery through the collection, from erotic poet of 4.1 to civic bard of 4.15, is closely connected to the language of the *DRN*. The communal voice of 4.15, I will argue, honours a Roman, civic goddess, but by means of a series of encounters between Augustan, Virgilian, and Lucretian language throughout the book, the final lines also make room for the ageing poet, the ephemerality of human endeavours, and the relentless cycles of nature.

Because of the distinctive character of *Odes* 4, and because I will be returning to many of the same images and themes as the earlier chapters, the structure and approach of this fourth chapter will be somewhat different. The chapter will begin not with a discussion of Lucretius, but with a brief consideration of Horace's epistolary collection; these hexameter letters self-consciously mark a break with the poet's earlier lyric work, yet they return to many of the subjects of *Odes*, and once again incorporate distinctly Epicurean ideas and images. Following the work of Bowditch (2001) and others, I will argue that the poet's Sabine property in the *Epistles* is characterised by an Epicurean *otium*, one that derives power from its opposition to mercantile, economic concerns. I will further contend that the contrast Horace draws between his epistolary and lyric collections reveals the self-conscious way the poet manipulates Lucretian and Epicurean language to distinguish his generic concerns, looking back to his earlier works while also setting his *Epistles* apart.

The remainder of the chapter will concern *Odes* 4. I will trace the figure of Venus and vernal imagery through the book as a whole, beginning with the erotic, personal goddess of 4.1. I

will argue that her character in the first poem contains resonances of the demythologised Venus of Lucretius' fourth book, where she represents sexual desire. The connections between dreams and eroticism in *Odes* 4.1, I contend, take their cue in part from Lucretius' own account of sexuality. The poem thus poses the figure of Venus as a something of a problem to be solved in the rest of the book—a problem for which, I will argue, the work offers no easy solution.

I will then turn to three poems that are intimately connected: 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7. All three contain references to Venus or spring, presenting different glimpses of the goddess and her concomitant imagery. In the first, Augustus is the *instar veris* (4.5.6), a title that resonates in the vision of the *pax Augusta* in the final poem of the collection. In 4.6, Venus is the goddess of Virgil, ancestor of the Roman people, while in 4.7 spring is illustrated with markedly Lucretian language. The juxtaposition of 4.6 and 4.7 calls attention to the contradictions between the two perspectives, I will argue; Virgil's account of Roman greatness is questioned by the subsequent view that no human can escape the encroachment of time. This trio of poems thus establishes a tension in the work, rather than suggesting a linear, encomiastic movement toward the final ode.

The next section will primarily concern 4.11 and 4.12, which are similarly connected within *Odes* 4. The two odes are both invitations, and both experiment with the model of Philodemus' invitation to Piso, as well as recalling the Lucretian associations of the invitations in *Odes* 1–3. The first of these poems celebrates but does not address Maecenas, and blatantly inverts Lucretian imagery, while the second invites Virgil to a Philodemean symposium, but is permeated with the knowledge of Virgil's death. The lyricist's playfulness with Lucretian and Epicurean language in both poems is part of how he shows his movement into the city and away from his rural retreat, I will argue. At the same time, however, Epicurean ethical philosophy remains important to the pair of poems. I will contend here that, whereas the lyricist of *Odes* 1–3

claimed Epicurean authority for his own Sabine property and poetic voice, he seems now to move away from this personal appropriation, while maintaining the strong Epicurean implications of sympotic community, friendship, and the impermanence of human life.

After a brief consideration of 4.10 and 4.13, in which we will see the continuation of the erotic themes introduced in 4.1, I will turn to the final poem of the collection, Horace's vision of the *pax Augusta*, in which his voice seems to merge with that of the city in the communal song to *alma* Venus. The epithet and Roman associations of the goddess recall the opening of *DRN* 1, as many scholars have observed. Keeping in mind the many perspectives on Venus and spring that Horace offers to his reader throughout *Odes* 4, I will assert that Horace here effects a kind of accord between Virgilian and Lucretian Venuses, one that allows him to preserve the vernal, erotic, and even violent connotations of the Epicurean's Venus, even as he glorifies the Roman state.

(A) *Epistles* 1

Horace's first book of *Epistles* precedes *Odes* 4, and warrants consideration as we work to understand how the lyric voice transforms between *Odes* 1–3 and the final book.[343] Not only do the *Epistles* intervene between the two lyric collections, but the epistolary poet repeatedly draws attention to the divide between his current project and the lyric that preceded it. As we trace the changes in Horace's lyric treatment of Lucretius between *Odes* 1–3 and book 4, then, we should keep these hexameter letters in mind. As with both the *Satires* and *Odes* 1–3, the poet of the *Epistles* marks out the parameters of his new project in certain ways by recourse to

[343] Of course, as Thomas (2011, 5–7) observes, this is not to say that Horace stopped writing lyric; however, the differences between *Odes* 4 and Horace's earlier lyric are notable, and the time gap between the collections is not only a fact of publication, but a theme of the later book.

Epicurean and Lucretian language, something he will repeat in the final book of the *Odes*; this allusive structure thus looks back to Horace's earlier works while also distinguishing his new programme. The *Epistles* have a notably philosophical bent, and many have taken them to be distinctly Epicurean, even as they explore diverse philosophical ideas. This is not the place for a complete analysis of Epicurean and Lucretian moments in the *Epistles*; the question is too vast and deserves more extensive treatment. I will here confine myself to two aspects of Horace's epistolary collection that are particularly steeped in Epicureanism, and seem to have the most bearing on the approach to Lucretius that we can observe in *Odes* 4: first, the role of sympotic moments and invitations, with particular reference to 1.4 and 1.5; and second, the Sabine property and, relatedly, the figure of Maecenas.

Epicureanism is part of the philosophical ethos of the *Epistles*, but it also has generic implications; as letters, the collection not only thematises a vision of Epicurean withdrawal, but reflects this retreat in their form. The *Epistles* are constructed around a complicated series of dichotomies, which are tied up in the very genre of the collection:

> The letters enact a compromise between Horace's presence and absence, and in being sent they open up a path between two ways of life, neither of which fully holds his allegiance. It is the persona's profound ambivalence toward public and private, engagement and withdrawal, independence and obligation that this book addresses.[344]

The work is represented as letters, and not poetry, a fact that permits an emphasis on these contradictions; the epistles move from the country into the city, from the poet to addressees of varying status, and, through their publication, from private to public space.[345] The ambivalence

[344] McCarter (2015, 3).
[345] See especially Mayer (1986, 70) for the contrast between the *Epistles*, staged as non-poetry, and the *Satires*.

of Horace's position frames the work, which begins with Horace's comparison of himself to the old gladiator who *latet abditus agro,/ne populum extrema totiens exoret harena* ('lurks concealed in the country, so that he does not have to implore the crowd at the end of the match,' 1.1.4–5), but ends with the personified *Epistles* themselves, *liber* (1.20.1), yearning for publication (4–5).[346] The split between private and public roles is represented as a divide between the writer and his work, an image that is underlined by the idea of letters themselves moving away from their author and toward the addressees, and then, as a collection, moving into the public sphere in 1.20.[347]

It would be unfair to deny the *Epistles* their eclecticism; the poet himself declares in the first letter, *nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri,/quo me cumque rapit tempestas, deferor hospes* ('I am not bound to swear allegiance to any master—wherever the storm seizes me, there I am carried off as a guest,' 14–15).[348] As evidence of this, Horace describes his tendency to move between the *civilibus undis* and allegiance to Aristippus' Cyrenaicism: *nunc in Aristippi furtim praecepta relabor* ('now I secretly slip back to the precepts of Aristippus,' 18). Many have read Epicureanism as an important element of the *Epistles*, but in no way a defining one, simply one philosophy among many in the collection. Much like I have argued of the *Satires* and the *Odes*, however, this perspective can restrict how we understand the place of Epicureanism in Horace's works. We do not need to read the *Epistles* as statements of Epicurean doctrine, but we

---

[346] Following Mayer (1994) for the translation of *extrema harena*.

[347] Mayer (1994) writes: "The poem artfully discloses a final inconsistency of the poet's. All along he claims to want only the approval of a few and to compose with their opinion in view. Yet publication belies this attitude and no one can deny that he secretly wants the widest possible renown. To demonstrate this, H. throws the blame upon the book itself . . ." (274).

[348] MacLeod (1976, 22) draws attention to the image of the poet seized by a storm, noting the contrast between this image and the Epicurean vision of γαλήνη or Stoic εὔροια: "So if Horace is still writing, his activity at the same time embodies a poetic ideal and reflects his awkward moral position: he reaches out towards philosophy, but his feet are planted in his own weakness."

also do not need to see Epicureanism as merely another element in the self-proclaimed eclecticism of the collection. As I will outline briefly in what follows, Horace's representation of his own privacy and withdrawal, as well as his emphasis on friendship, is informed by Epicurean and Lucretian language, and thus the philosophical school is a vital piece of how the poet represents his poetic programme and even his genre, looking back to the *Satires* and *Odes* as he distinguishes his new work.

I argued in the first three chapters that Lucretius is the primary Epicurean model for *Odes* 1–3, and that much of Horace's more generalised Epicureanism in the collection is focused through specific Lucretian references. Philodemus also makes certain key appearances, most notably in the invitation to Maecenas at 1.20, which identifies Philodemus' invitation to Piso with the Lucretian resonances of Horace's Sabine property. In the *Epistles*, on the other hand, not only does the tone of Horace's Epicureanism change, but his Epicurean models seem to have shifted. The previous chapter concerned the sublime, Bacchic spaces of *Odes* 1–3, and observed how these vistas are opposed to Horace's domestic, Sabine spaces, yet are equally informed by Lucretian imagery. The *Epistles*, on the other hand, predominantly—although not exclusively—locate themselves in private, domestic landscapes. Ferri (1993) elucidates this change in scope, contending that Horace here takes up the ambitious and cosmic project of Lucretius and transfers it to the narrow space of the *angulus*, going beyond Lucretius to the letters of Epicurus.[349] While drawing on Lucretius in many ways, particularly the image of a philosophical path with an endpoint of calm repose, Ferri argues, Horace reacts against the heroic and epic interpretation of

[349] Armstrong (2003) also argues powerfully for the importance of Epicurus' own letters to Horace's epistolary project, noting that these letters made a clear impact on later authors, including Philodemus and Cicero. See also Heinze (1919, 305–7), Morrison (2007), and Fowler (2008).

Epicurus in the *DRN*.[350] Instead of Lucretius' Epicurus, soaring through the cosmos, we see a pre-Lucretian Epicurus, who speaks to his student individually through letters.[351]

(i) *Epistles* 1.4 and 1.5

The most conspicuous instance of Epicurean language in the *Epistles* is the poet's playful comparison of himself to an Epicurean pig at the end of the fourth letter, to Albius, where he describes himself as an *Epicuri de grege porcum* ('a pig from Epicurus' herd,' 15–16). The lines lead neatly into the following poem, the invitation to Torquatus, which is permeated with Epicurean ideas. McCarter (2015, ch. 4) observes that, while both letters urge moderation on their addressees, they are inversions of each other in their approach; while 1.4 calls Albius out of philosophical inwardness, 1.5 asks Torquatus to set aside his civic *negotium*. They are both strongly informed by Epicureanism, but take different approaches to the philosophy: in the former, the poet names himself part of the Epicurean herd, while in the latter, he draws on Philodemus' invitation to Piso in order to urge his addressee to Epicurean *otium*.

Epist. 1.5 is a "transgenre exercise in expanding Philodemus' famous 'invitation to a simple Epicurean dinner' addressed to Piso into the genre of satiric hexameter."[352] It is useful to return to Philodemus' epigram here, which will also be pivotal in the discussion of 4.11 and 4.12 below:

---

[350] "Con le Epistole, anche Orazio ritorna a Epicuro. E di Epicuro, anche, riprende appunto la forma epistolare, per farne la forma del proprio discorso educativo, della propria esortazione protrettica" (86).
[351] Bowditch (2001, ch. 4) discusses the relationship between the *Epistles* and Epicurean practice of memorisation: this is particularly revealed through Horace's comparisons of philosophical sayings to liquid and the student to the vessel.
[352] Armstrong (2003, 283). See also Sider's (1997) commentary on 27, and Tait (1941).

Αὔριον εἰς λιτήν σε καλιάδα, φίλτατε Πεισων,
ἐξ ἐνάτης ἕλκει μουσοφιλὴς ἕταρος,
εἰκάδα δειπνίζων ἐνιαύσιον· εἰ δ᾽ ἀπολείψεις
οὔθατα καὶ Βρομίου χιογενῆ πρόποσιν,
ἀλλ᾽ ἑτάρους ὄψει παναληθέας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπακούσῃ
Φαιήκων γαίης πουλὺ μελιχρότερα·
ἢν δέ ποτε στρέψῃς καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ὄμματα, Πείσων,
ἄξομεν ἐκ λιτῆς εἰκάδα πιοτέρην.

Tomorrow, dearest Piso, your friend, beloved by the Muses, who keeps our annual feast of the twentieth invites you to come after the ninth hour to his simple cottage. If you miss udders and draughts of Chian wine, you will see at least sincere friends and you will hear things far sweeter than the land of the Phaeacians. But if you ever cast your eyes on me, Piso, we shall celebrate the twentieth richly instead of simply.[353]

The epistle follows the Philodemean prototype closely, with its emphasis on the simplicity of the scene (*nec modica cenare times holus omne patella*, 'you do not refuse to dine on only herbs from a modest dish,' 2) and its injunction against acquisitiveness (*mitte levis spes et certamina divitiarum*, 'set aside trifling hope and struggles for wealth,' 8). It depicts a kind of Epicurean friendship, with emphasis placed on discourse rather than riches (*impune licebit/aestivam sermone benigno tendere noctem*, 'we may extend the summer night in friendly discourse with

[353] Translation is from Paton (1918).

impunity,' 11). Moreover, the occasion of the invitation is Augustus' birthday (9), recalling Philodemus' celebration of the Twentieth, Epicurus' own birthday. The modesty of the scene and encouragement to put aside city affairs is also reminiscent of the Philodemean invitation to Maecenas at *Odes* 1.20, as well as the increasingly impatient invitations that follow, which end with the lyricist urging his patron to forget the city and his piles of wealth in 3.29.[354]

The identity of the addressee cements the connection between the letter and Epicurean philosophy. As Nisbet (1959) has argued, Horace identifies the Torquatus of 1.5 as one of the Manlii Torquati through allusions to both the fabled severity of his ancestors and—through the provenance of the offered wine—the victorious battle of the first Torquatus.[355] Eidinow (1995) and Feeney (2010) develop this argument, showing how Horace places Epicureanism at the centre of the poem by reminding the reader of the Cicero's *De Finibus*, where L. Manlius Torquatus is the spokesperson for Epicureanism. Eidinow argues that his purpose is to "urge Torquatus to relax into a (quasi-Epicurean) pursuit of his own pleasure, with Horace as his companion" (194).[356] The letter thus plays with the Philodemean invitation, an assumed understanding of the family traditions of the Manlii Torquati, and the Ciceronian version of Torquatus.

The playfulness of the poem is emphasised by its proximity to *Epist*. 1.4, addressed to an Albius who is often identified with the poet Tibullus, the addressee of *Odes* 1.33. He is here *nostrorum sermonum candide iudex* ('frank judge of our *sermones*,' 1.4.1), an address that calls

---

[354] *fastidiosam desere copiam et/molem propinquam nubibus arduis;/omitte mirare beatae/fumum et opes strepitumque Romae* (3.29.9–12).
[355] Horace's *imperium fer* (6) seems to refer to the legendarily harsh *imperia Manliana*, while the wine (*vina bibes iterum Tauro diffusa palustris/inter Minturnas Sinuessanumque Petrinum*, 4–5) alludes to the battle against the Latins in 340 at Trifanum.
[356] For example, Horace's second line (*nec modica cenare times holus omne patella*) looks to *De Fin.* 2.77.22 (*atqui reperiemus asotos primum ita non religiosos ut edint de patella*).

to mind an Epicurean emphasis on frank speaking that will be mirrored by the poet's own treatment of his friend.[357] Albius is in the country at Pedum, and the poet reminds him of his youth, suggesting that he should engage more deeply with society, because *di tibi formam,/di tibi divitias dederunt artemque fruendi* ('the gods gave you beauty, the gods gave you wealth, and the art of enjoying,' 6–7). The message is ultimately much the same as 1.5; both letters urge their addressees to enjoy the moment through sympotic friendship (*omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum*, 'believe that each day that has dawned is the last,' 1.4.13). The letter ends with the poet's humorous description of himself: *me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute vises,/cum ridere voles, Epicuri de grege porcum* ('you will see me, when you want to laugh, fat and shining, with my hide well cared for, a pig from Epicurus' herd,' 15–16). The passage calls attention to the importance of bodily pleasure, both in Albius' laughter and the implications of porcine physicality.[358] The approach to Epicureanism at the end of the epistle is playful, hinting at charges of hedonism, yet it also draws attention to the Epicurean content of the rest of the poem. The ending of 1.4 thus sets the scene for the experimentation of the following epistle. In fact, this final line of 1.4 is another likely reference to the *De Finibus*, which describes Epicurus' followers as *amicorum greges*.[359] There is true benefit, the poet suggests, in belonging to the Epicurean *grex*, but this does not preclude humour—in fact, it requires it.

Both individually and together, the two epistles reveal a deep connection to Epicurean ideas, but take a lighthearted approach to their treatment of the philosophy. Their humour is heightened through a series of references to, and inversions of, Cicero's criticisms of Epicurean

---

[357] See Armstrong (2003), who argues further that Philodemus' *On Frank Speaking* has a large presence in *Epistles* and helps to explain Horace's approach to his addressees throughout.
[358] See Putnam (1972, 87) for a discussion of bodily and mental pleasures in these final lines.
[359] *At vero Epicurus una in domo, et ea quidem angusta, quam magnos quantaque amoris conspiratione consentientes tenuit amicorum greges!* (*De Fin.* 1.65).

philosophy. Horace experiments with various guises of Epicureanism, testing out different approaches and degrees of sincerity, and playing with the relationship between Epicureanism, withdrawal, and the affairs of the city. Armstrong (2003) argues that it is often Epicureanism, in the *Epistles*, that emerges as the *modus*, set in between hedonism and Stoicism. In these paired letters, this argument seems to hold true; the convivial friendship offered by the poet is the solution to both extreme retreat from society and overeager participation in societal *negotium*. As we will see below, this pair of letters plays an important role in *Odes* 4; Horace alludes to the two epistles in the invitations at 4.11 and 4.12, which similarly experiment with the Philodemean model of invitation, but both undermine the Epicurean form in revealing ways.[360]

(ii) The Sabine Estate and Maecenas

Horace places his patron and the Sabine property at the centre of *Epistles* 1 in a way that is reminiscent of their importance in *Odes* 1–3, and indeed looks back to the earlier collection. As with the lyric poems, Horace transforms his relationship with both Maecenas and the Sabine landscape over the course of the work; both patron and property—along with their concomitant Epicurean resonances—are deeply contingent upon the particular project and the poet's generic programme. The book stages another liberation from the patron, one that is effected in major part through the image of the Sabine farm; as Freudenburg (2002, 125) argues, "the performed agonies of this book have to do with coming to terms with Maecenas' offer, chafing at its too narrow limits, and redefining it to suit the poet's own terms." As it did in *Odes* 1–3, Epicureanism plays a significant role in the achievement of *libertas.* The poet of the *Epistles*

[360] As we will see briefly, his address to Torquatus in 4.7 is also notable; the ode, I will argue, draws the addressee into another Epicurean moment, and Torquatus' presence underlines the Epicurean content of the poem. See Thomas (2011, 182–3) for a comparison.

constructs his own freedom in ways that resonate with Epicurean ideals, yet the very language that participates in Epicureanism also permits his participation in elite society; the poet's eventual freedom is not complete, but dependent on his patron and elite connections in a much stronger way than in the *Odes*.

The *Epistles* open with refusal; while praising Maecenas (*prima dicte mihi, summa dicende Camena*, 'you who are sung of by my first Camena, and should be sung by my last,' 1.1.1), the poet rejects his patron's desire to *iterum antiquo me includere ludo* ('confine me again in my old school,' 3), implicitly referring to the *ludus* of lyric poetry. The image of the *ludus* continues with Horace's comparison of himself to an old gladiator, Veianus, who has set aside his weapons and seceded to the countryside.[361] The refusal of 1.1, Traina (1998) argues, initiates a *recusatio* that permeates the entire book of letters. The next address to Maecenas, 1.7, is a clear continuation of the first poem. Maecenas has asked the poet to return to the city, Horace writes, but he is still absent, and intends to continue his stay in the country. The poet's retreat is only implicitly a Sabine one, but the tale of Philippus and Mena at the end of the letter seems to confirm the identification; Mena, the client of Philippus, *arvum caelumque Sabinum/non cessat laudare* ('does not stop praising the Sabine land and air,' 77–8), and his patron gives him a loan to buy a Sabine farm. McCarter (2015, ch. 5) argues that the tale offers an alternate story of Horace's own relationship with Maecenas; Mena's anxiety over his farm and ultimate ruin exemplify the breakdown of a proper relationship between patron and client. In Horace's refusal to reenter the city, we see a path of *libertas* in between subservience and refusal, McCarter continues: "It is the Sabine farm itself that symbolizes this third path or mean, for it is simultaneously the seat of his rustic freedom and, in being made possible by Maecenas's

[361] See especially Moles (2002) for a discussion of the *ludus*.

generosity, a token of Horace's dependence on his powerful friend" (125).[362] In this vision of the property as a locus of freedom, we can see the reappearance of Epicurean *otium*, similar to that of *Odes* 2.16: *nec/otia divitiis Arabum liberrima muto* ('nor would I exchange my very free *otia* for the wealth of the Arabs,' 35–6). *Otium* is here, much like in the *Odes*, figured as a space of *libertas* and artistic production.

Epist. 1.14 develops the divide between the *Odes* and the *Epistles* that Horace establishes in the opening letter, where he represents his lyric output as the *ludus* from which he has retired (1–6). The letter, addressed to the *vilicus* of Horace's estate, asserts the value of the Sabine property against the bailiff's own love of the city: *rure ego viventem, tu dicis in urbe beatum* ('I say that he who lives in the country is happy, you say he who lives in the city,' 10). The poet vaunts the superiority of his own preference; I am consistent in my desire for the country, he tells his addressee, deriding the *invisa negotia* ('hateful business,' 17) of Rome. He depicts his current perspective as a recent one, however, contrasting the pleasures of the country with what are clearly intended to describe his earlier lyric endeavours (32–6):

> quem tenues decuere togae nitidique capilli,
> quem scis immunem Cinarae placuisse rapaci,
> quem bibulum liquidi media de luce Falerni,
> cena brevis iuvat et prope rivum somnus in herba;
> nec lusisse pudet, sed non incidere ludum.

[362] See also Bowditch (2001, 163), who argues that the Maecenas poems "aesthetically refashion the patronal relationship into one of a more egalitarian friendship" (163).

> He whom fine togas and anointed hair suited, who, as you know, pleased greedy Cinara though he was without gifts, who freely drank clear Falernian in the middle of the day—a simple meal pleases him, and sleep in the grass by the stream. It is not shameful to have played, but it is shameful not to stop playing.

The life of pleasure is meant to recall the lyric of *Odes* 1–3; the language of *ludus* (36) is reminiscent of the gladiator of *Epist*. 1.1.[363] However, the epistle makes surprising use of Lucretian imagery in its description of the contrast between the *Epistles* and the *Odes*. The rustic nap, *prope rivum somnus in herba* (35), nods to the pastoral *ataraxia* of *DRN* 2.29ff., the passage that, I have argued, strongly influences the pastoral language associated with the Sabine property in *Odes* 1–3.[364] The language of *DRN* 2 is a vital part of the Sabine property in the earlier lyric project. In *Odes* 2, especially, Horace looks to Lucretius' proem repeatedly, underlining the *ataraxia* that belongs to him as owner of the villa; for example, he encourages Dellius to lie *in remoto gramine* (2.3.6) instead of worrying about death. Although Horace places himself and his epistolary project on the side of Epicurean *ataraxia* in this letter, the reader of his corpus will remember that this thread of ethical Epicureanism was strong in the *Odes* as well. In other words, what the poet appropriated for his own property in the *Odes*, he reappropriates for the same landscape in the *Epistles*, but under the appearance of novelty. The use of Epicureanism in the *Epistles* is pointed; the poet takes up the philosophy not just for himself, but for his new genre.

---

[363] The reference to Cinara (33) accords with the opening of *Odes* 4, where the poet laments his renewal of lyric with the statement *non sum qualis eram bonae/sub regno Cinarae* ('I am not as I was under the reign of good Cinara,' 3–4); in both poems, Cinara seems meant to evoke—and exaggerate—the eroticism of *Odes* 1–3. See Kiessling and Heinze (1930) and Thomas (2011) on 4.1.3–4. Cinara also appears *Epist*. 1.7.28 and *Odes* 4.13.21–2.

[364] See e.g. Bowditch (2001, 231).

The economic aspects of the Sabine estate are much more evident in the *Epistles* than in the *Odes*, where this side of the farm was mostly invisible. In the letters, questions of labour and profit occur repeatedly, but the poet transforms these elements and subsumes them within the project of the *Epistles*. Horace's letter to his *vilicus* provides a clear example of this transformation. The fact of the addressee's position as chief slave of the estate, the reference to Horace's tenants (2–3), and the description of the bailiff's labour (26–30) all stress the functionality of the property. Yet Horace's own enjoyment of the estate involves Epicurean tranquillity, sleep beside the stream. The two sides are connected; the slave's work to prevent the meadow from flooding (*multa mole docendus aprico parcere prato*, '[the stream] must be taught to spare the sunny meadow by great toil,' 29–30) leads logically to the owner's enjoyment of the same *rivus* a few lines later (35). Bowditch (2001, 235) contends, "The speaker's own economy of *otium* is thus embedded in the conditions of material production—slave and tenant labor—that govern the actual farm." She argues powerfully for the connection between Horace's use of Epicureanism in the *Epistles* and his participation in aristocratic power structures. By converting the economic associations of the farm into a vision of personal *ataraxia*, the poet actually inscribes himself into elite *otium*: "by showing his Epicurean disregard for material wealth, he displays his aristocratic sensitivity to the *amoenitas*, or charm, of elite property."[365] A similar elision of economics occurs in the sixteenth letter, addressed to Quinctius. The poem begins with Quinctius' hypothetical questions about the farm's output: *ne perconteris, fundus meus, . . ./arvo pascat erum an bacis opulentet olivae* ('lest you ask, whether my estate feeds its master with its land, or makes him rich with the fruits of the olive,' 1–2). Horace replies to these inquiries with effusive praise of the pleasures, rather than the exports, of his property. The Sabine landscape

[365] Bowditch (2001, 246).

becomes a kind of golden age ideal; even the production of acorns suggests a golden age primitivism.[366] At the same time, the importance of patronage to this transformation is hinted at in Horace's claim upon elite culture.

The final few poems of the book suggest Horace's independence, while also indicating his reliance on elite patronage. *Epist.* 1.17 and 1.18 both deal with questions of patronage, building toward the final address to Maecenas in 1.19. The former, addressed to Scaeva, advises his addressee not to speak of his own needs in front of his patron (*coram rege suo de paupertate tacentes plus poscente ferent*, 'those who are quiet about their own need in the presence of their patron will get more than the one who begs,' 43–4); the letter suggests how the client must intentionally construct his relationship with his patron, an idea that the following epistle develops. *Epist.* 1.18 makes a detailed study of the relationship between patron and client, urging Lollius to be judicious in his interactions with his patron and not to be critical, pry, or assert his own interests in contrast with those of his *amicus*. But among all these lessons, Lollius must also determine *quid minuat curas, quid te tibi reddat amicum* ('what diminishes cares, what returns you to yourself as a friend,' 101). The line looks back to the opening of 1.14, where Horace addresses his bailiff, *vilice . . . mihi me reddentis agelli* ('bailiff of the small estate that returns me to myself,' 1). Bowditch remarks that this parallel "suggests that for Horace, it is the farm as an image within the letters—the 'study' of the estate and its incorporation into his philosophical excursions—that restores the poet and compensates for any symbolic losses associated with the debts of patronage" (232).[367] The burdens of patronage, which 1.18 sets out in detail, are

[366] E.g. Newlands (1984, 64). McCarter (2015, 147) argues that "the landscape over which Horace holds sway is therefore a poetic one, removed from the realities of farming life." See also Thomas (1981). Also cf. *Epist.* 1.12, which opens, *fructibus Agrippae Siculis, quos colligis, Icci,/si recte frueris, non est ut copia maior/ab Iove donari possit tibi* (1–3), and concludes, *aurea fruges/Italiae pleno defudi Copia cornu* (28–9). The letter effects a transformation into golden age plenty, eliding the complaints of Iccius.
[367] See also Oliensis (1998a, 176).

overcome through a restoration of *libertas* within the estate, and this restoration returns the client to himself as *amicus*. Yet at the same time, the importance of this patronage as a foundation for the poet's freedom is transparent.

It is in the context of this ongoing meditation on patron-client relationships that Horace argues for his exclusivity in 1.19: *non ego ventosae plebis suffragia venor* ('I do not hunt for the votes of the inconstant crowd,' 37). Like *Odes* 3.29, the epistle displaces Maecenas from his expected position by giving him penultimate place in the collection. Taken together, 1.17–19 illustrate the poet's contingent independence; his patronage permits him his engagement with the close circles of the elite (as the aristocratic *otium* of the Sabine estate illustrates), yet he sets the terms of this relationship himself.[368] The implied middle ground that Horace finds in his relationship with Maecenas is reflected in his approach to his earlier work, which again involves a reworking of Lucretian language. Describing his *Epodes* and *Odes*, he writes: *libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps* ('I was the first to place free footsteps in the void,' 1.19.21). The passage looks to *DRN* 3.3–4, where Lucretius professes to follow Epicurus (*te sequor, o Graiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc/ficta pedum pono pressis vestigia signis*, 'I follow you, glory of the Greek people, and now I place firm footprints in your marks').[369] The connection to Lucretius is cemented by the word *vacuum*, which recalls the Epicurean void, much as it did in *Odes* 3.25.[370] At the same time, Horace alludes to his own *Odes*, where he is *princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos/deduxisse modos* ('the first to have brought Aeolian song to Italian verse,' 3.30.13–14). The poet's claim of originality, then, not only draws upon the work of another, but specifically refers to a passage about imitation: "by seeing this passage inside the claim, we spy Horace

[368] See especially MacLeod (1976) for the relationship between philosophical discipline and the negotiation of patronage.
[369] See especially Freudenburg (2002, 136).
[370] See Porter (2003) for a discussion of this term in the *DRN*.

stepping in Lucretius' tracks, and right at the point where Lucretius pushed Callimachus aside to claim that he was not leading, but following straight in the tracks of his conquering hero, Epicurus."[371] The allusion has two effects. First, the epistolary writer appropriates a kind of Lucretian sublimity for the *Odes*, while claiming for his *Epistles* a more secluded perspective, Ferri's (1993) Epicurean *angulus*. Staging this retrospective of his poetic career at the end of the *Epistles*, Horace contrasts the sublimity and complexity of his earlier lyric work with his current epistolary project, which is posed as a straightforward letter-writing endeavour.[372] Even as he distinguishes his *Epistles*, however, his ongoing use of Lucretian language makes a strong connection to his earlier collections. Secondly, the passage qualifies Horace's exceptionality: McCarter (2015, 226) compares it to Horace's earlier descriptions of his lyric poetry, arguing that "whereas in 1.1 his past poetry rendered Horace a servile gladiator dependent upon the whims of the crowd, it is here reconfigured as embodying the best kind of imitation and independence." Even as Horace uses Lucretian language to illustrate the sublimity of his earlier lyric, he also uses it to reveal this balance of innovation and imitation, the *modus* that defines his epistolary work.

Odes 4, as we will see in what follows, takes up Epicureanism in yet another way. Strikingly, however, Maecenas and the Sabine property, two cornerstones in Horace's meditations on the philosophy in all of his earlier works, fade out of view in the final book of *Odes* as the lyricist comes into closer confrontation with the political realm. An overview of the

---

[371] Freudenburg (2002, 136). There may also be resonances of the Second Proem here: *avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante/trita solo* (926–7). The question of imitation and novelty is of course a frequent concern of the *DRN*, as well, and the contrast between the Second Proem and 3.3–4 points to the complexity of this relationship.

[372] As we have seen, the distinction is a construction of the *Epistles*; his letters are of course poetry, while the *Odes* repeatedly engage with the pastoral *ataraxia* of the *DRN*. Fowler (2008, sections 2–3) discusses the nature of the *Epistles* as letters.

Epicureanism in the *Epistles* will serve us well in this next section; not only does the poet frequently allude to his epistolary project as he resumes his lyric voice, but he also finds a new approach, or multiple new approaches, to Epicureanism, overturning much of the philosophy of the *Epistles* as he looks more insistently toward Rome itself in the *Carmen Saeculare* and then the final book of *Odes*. We have seen that Horace renegotiates his relationship to Epicureanism in each new work, particularly through the figure of the patron and the symbol of the Sabine estate. We must trace this same relationship in *Odes* 4; the nearly complete absence of Maecenas and the Sabine property in this final lyric book is a strong clue that the poet is demarcating the work as something novel and different.

(B) Lucretius, Virgil, and Empire in *Odes* 4

Venus takes centre stage in *Odes* 4, with a role much more prominent, and problematic, than the one she played in the first three books of the *Odes*. She is the first addressee of the book (*intermissa, Venus, diu/rursus bella moves?* 'do you again make wars, Venus, that were long ago set aside?' 4.1.1), and part of the song that Horace declares he will sing, in community with others, at the end of the final poem (*Troiamque et Anchisen et almae/progeniem Veneris canemus*, 'we will sing of Troy and Anchises and the offspring of nurturing Venus,' 4.15.31–2). As the second word and the penultimate of the collection, she frames Horace's new lyric project. She is also, we will see in what follows, in certain ways Lucretian; the communal prayer at the end of 4.15, in particular, has been linked to Lucretius' Venus in the proem to *DRN* 1 and the philosopher-poet's prayer for peace (29–43).[373] In 4.1, on the other hand, Venus appears in a form much like the one she takes in *DRN* 4, where she is a destructive force of sexuality. In

[373] See also Putnam (1986) and Ancona (2010).

between these two poems, the goddess takes on a wide range of representations, from erotic desire, to vernal fecundity, to Augustan imagery. Feeney (1998, 102–3) writes: "The book takes us from private hymns in honour of a marble love goddess to public Horatian lyric in honour of a civic and imperial goddess whose persona is apprehended through the *Aeneid*, and through the *Aeneid*'s appropriation of Lucretius." It is through the figure of Venus and images of spring most of all, I will argue here, that Horace articulates his relationship to Lucretius in his final book of lyric poetry and sets the work apart from his earlier *Odes*.

The prominence of Venus in *Odes* 4 is remarkable in its contrast with Horace's earlier lyric books. In *Odes* 1–3, Mercury takes pride of place; most notably, the poet credits Mercury for saving his life at Philippi in 2.7, and describes himself as a *Mercurialis vir* at 2.17.29–30. Mercury is also an important figure in book 1, connected to Caesar in 1.2 and hymned in 1.10. Miller (1991) argues that Horace's relationship with Mercury in *Odes* 1–3 involves the simultaneous rejection of and attachment to the political world; the god is associated with both *princeps* and poet. Horace's use of Mercury to navigate the tension between political and private might valuably be compared to Lucretius' portrayal of Venus as *Aeneadum genetrix* (1.1) and bringer of *pax* to the Roman people (1.31), but also his own *socia* (1.24) and poetic inspiration. In *Odes* 4, Venus seems to take the place of Mercury. Not only is her role in the book programmatic, but we can even see a hint of a verbal connection between the two divinities. Mercury in books 1–3 was the *almae/filius Maiae* (1.2.42–3), and was related to the *almae* Muses of 3.4.42. Now, as in Lucretius, it is Venus who will be *alma* at the book's close (4.15.31) and, as we will see, the adjective appears in a variety of contexts through the work, describing both imperial glory and a Lucretian vision of the cyclical seasons. The centrality of Venus to *Odes* 4 is compelling; as we will see, she appears in a wide range of guises, from the intensely

private figure of 4.1 to the public goddess of 4.15. This metamorphosis does not, however, occur in a linear manner, and Venus' final appearance seems to contain all her previous roles.

Venus and spring imagery will be the focus of what follows. As we saw in the first three chapters, Horace uses Lucretian resonances throughout his earlier lyric collection to bolster his own poetic authority and give himself power to speak to the political realm—and ultimately, and paradoxically, to suggest his own equality to the empire itself. In the fourth book, Horace calls attention to his own inexorable ageing, while simultaneously lauding the strength of Rome. Venus, with her connections to both Lucretian imagery and the mythology of the state itself, figures importantly into Horace's articulation of the contrast between himself and the empire. *Odes* 4 stages a series of confrontations between seasonal change and human fragility, on the one hand, and the promise of eternity, on the other: both the immortality offered by poetry and the greatness of empire. Lucretian and Epicurean language, found most often in images of Venus and spring, or connected to these images, forms a key piece of Horace's reconciliation of the various polarities of his text. Through the poet's ongoing negotiation with Lucretian language, he makes possible an accommodation, within the civic, communal hymn of the final poem, of his own ageing body, erotic desire, the pain of grief, and the lyric cycle of the seasons.

(i) *Odes* 4.1

Odes 4 begins by foregrounding the time that has elapsed since Horace's earlier lyric collection. The first poem declares both its renewal of lyric themes and the agedness of the poet,

self-consciously staging its own late place within Horace's corpus.[374] In its resumption of lyric, it reminds the reader of the opening of *Epist*. 1.1, where the epistolary poet refused his *antiquus ludus* (1.1.3) with similar reference to the passing of time (*non eadem est aetas, non mens*, 1.1.4, cf. *Odes* 4.1.3, below).[375] Beginning his new lyric project, Horace writes (4.1.1–8):

> intermissa, Venus, diu
> rursus bella moves? parce precor, precor.
> non sum qualis eram bonae
> sub regno Cinarae. desine, dulcium
> mater saeva Cupidinum,
> circa lustra decem flectere mollibus
> iam durum imperiis: abi
> quo blandae iuvenum te revocant preces.
>
> Do you again make wars, Venus, that were long ago set aside? Spare me, I pray, I pray. I am not as I was in the reign of good Cinara. Harsh mother of sweet Cupids, stop bending me, now around fifty and hardened to your soft orders. Go away to where the flattering prayers of young men call you.

The poem, many have observed, looks to Sappho fr. 1, the Greek lyricist's own invocation of Aphrodite; there are a number of connections between the two poems, including the identity of the goddess and the military language. Because fr. 1 is the first poem in the Alexandrian editions

[374] See Harrison (2010) on Horace's poetic career.
[375] Freudenburg (2002, 127).

of Sappho, Horace's reference is ostentatious and programmatic.[376] I argue that *DRN* 4 is also lurking in the background of *Odes* 4.1; the intertext underlines the problematic character of Venus in this opening poem by making thematic the essentially unfulfillable nature of *eros*. If Horace here hints at the Lucretian vision of Venus as demythologised sexual desire, the poem creates an even clearer counterbalance to the communal, Roman Venus of 4.15, who is the fulfilment of prayer and desire and reflects the mythological Venus of *DRN* 1.

The Venus of 4.1 poses a problem, both within the poem and within the overall structure of *Odes* 4. Apart from *Sat.* 2.1, *Odes* 4.1 is the only opening poem in Horace's works to be addressed to someone other than Maecenas.[377] Where we might expect an invocation of one of Horace's Italian Camenae, instead we are faced with Venus, and even the invocation itself is reversed: *parce* (2), the poet writes, *abi* (7), to Sappho's ἀλλὰ τυίδ' ἔλθ' (5).[378] Venus' presence in this first poem seems symbolic of Horace's resumption of his lyric voice, yet the goddess was by no means the main addressee of the earlier *Odes*; her importance here implies that erotic lyric was predominant in the previous collections, but this is not evident.[379] *Odes* 4.1 certainly looks back to *Odes* 1–3, recalling especially 1.19 with its quotation of its opening line (*mater saeva cupidinum*, 1.19.1 = 4.1.5), but it makes central a figure, and a theme, that was only one element of the earlier poems. Why, then, does Venus play such a prominent—and complicated—role in the final book of lyric poems?

---

[376] See especially Feeney (1998, 101), Barchiesi (2000, 172–3), and Hunter (2007)00.
[377] Thomas (2011, 88). He does not count *Sat*. 2.1, as a continuation of *Sat*. 1.
[378] "The poet oscillates between Sapphic impersonation and a sense of absence and surrogate" (Barchiesi 2000, 173). See also Hunter (2007).
[379] Kiessling and Heinze (1930, 286) consider the identity of the goddess and erotic subject: "Da für den Sänger der *convivia et proelia virginum* Dichten und Lieben eins ist, begründet das Wiederaufleben der erotischen Stimmung zugleich die Wiederaufnahme der Lyrik."

The final lines of the collection will echo Lucretius as they anticipate the hymning of a civic Venus: *Troiamque et Anchisen et almae/progeniem Veneris canemus* (4.15.31–2). At that juncture, the audience inevitably remembers the goddess' first appearance in the poem, aware of the opposition between the personal, erotic goddess of 4.1 and the communal divine ancestor of 4.15. Even as we see Sappho fr. 1 as the primary intertext for the first poem of *Odes* 4, we may see hints of Lucretius as well. The presence of Venus might itself intimate this connection; given the prominence of Lucretian imagery throughout Horace's oeuvre, there seems to be a faint parallel between 4.1 and the opening of the *DRN*. Of course, Lucretius explicitly requests the goddess' presence (*te sociam studeo scribendis versibus esse*, 'I desire you to be my partner in writing these verses,' 1.24), in contrast to Horace's admonition, but there is certainly something programmatic about Horace's address to Venus, which couples the resumption of lyric with longing for Ligurinus. The connections between *Odes* 4.1 and Sappho fr. 1 and those between 4.1 and *DRN* 1 are not entirely discrete, since Lucretius, too, is thought to have looked to Sappho's poem in his own first proem.[380] Sappho and Lucretius may be simultaneous and connected models for the opening lines of *Odes* 4.1.

There are again traces of Lucretius in the final lines of *Odes* 4.1, and these resonances help to clarify the Lucretian language at the end of 4.15, as well as the poet's exploration of Venus through the rest of *Odes* 4. The conclusion of the poem reveals the failure of the poet's prohibition of Venus. The poet declares himself finished with *eros*, yet laments (33–40):

sed cur heu, Ligurine, cur
manat rara meas lacrima per genas?

[380] "Lucretius here creatively reads Sappho's request to Venus as functioning rather like Callimachus' request to the Graces at the conclusion of the first *aition* of the *Aitia*" (Hunter 2007, 220–1).

cur facunda parum decoro
inter verba cadit lingua silentio?
nocturnis ego somniis
iam captum teneo, iam volucrem sequor
te per gramina Martii
Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubilis.

But why, alas, Ligurinus, why does an occasional tear drip down my cheeks? Why does my eloquent tongue falter between words in unbecoming silence? Now, harsh one, I hold you captive in my dreams at night, now I follow you as you fly through the grass of the Campus Martius, I follow you through rolling waters.

The first four lines of the passage are another Sapphic cue, this time one seen through the intervening lens of Catullus; Horace nods to the physical symptoms of *eros* in Sappho fr. 31, and thus also Catullus' poem 51.[381] The final four lines have not been explained as fully, although Thomas (2011) observes that they are comparable to Dido's frenzied dreams after Aeneas' decision to leave (*agit ipse furentem/in somnis ferus Aeneas, semperque relinqui/sola sibi . . . videtur* 'in her dreams, wild Aeneas himself follows her as she rages, and she always seems to be left alone,' *Aen*. 4.465–6), and to the simile comparing Turnus' incapacity in his fight against Aeneas to dreams, in which strength and language fail.[382]

[381] See e.g. Putnam (1986, 41). Catullus writes: *nam simul te,/Lesbia, aspexi, nihil est super mi/[vocis in ore]/lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus/flamma demanat, sonitu suopte/tintinant aures, gemina teguntur/lumina nocte* (51.9–12).

[382] *Aen*. 12.908–14 (especially *non lingua valet, non corpore notae/sufficiunt vires nec vox aut verba sequuntur*, 911–12, which itself recalls Catullus 51 and Sappho 31). It is worth noting, too, that the figure of Ligurinus himself has been compared to Virgil's digression about Cycnus and his Ligurian ancestry

To these Virgilian parallels, I argue that we should add a Lucretian one. *DRN* 4 analyses the origin of dreams, and the end of this account forms a bridge into the concluding investigation of sexuality; young men, Lucretius recounts, often dream of beautiful bodies and *vestem . . . cruentent* (1036). Horace reveals his awareness of this passage in the *Satires*; 1.5 describes the poet's sexual frustration and own wet dream in terms that recall Lucretius' (82–5).[383] The dream is an important image in Lucretius' fourth book; not only do sexual dreams provide the link to the philosopher's analysis of sexuality, but the dream itself becomes a metaphor for the inherent frustration of erotic desire (1097–1102):

> ut bibere in somnis sitiens quom quaerit, et umor
> non datur, ardorem qui membris stinguere possit,
> sed laticum simulacra petit frustraque laborat
> in medioque sitit torrenti flumine potans,
> sic in amore Venus simulacris ludit amantis.

> As when a thirsty person seeks to drink in his dreams, and no water is given that can put out the burning in his limbs, but he seeks the image of fluid, and works in vain, and thirsts while he drinks in the middle of a rushing stream—so in love Venus deceives lovers with images.

(*Aen*. 10.185–93); the description of Ligurinus as *volucer* (38) is linked to Cycnus' metamorphosis into a swan, a passage that itself evokes Horace's own *Odes* 2.20. See especially McCallum (2015).

[383] Reckford (1999).

Horace's Ligurinus appears to him in dreams *per aquas . . . volubiles* (40); the picture of the *volucer* (38) youth is echoed in the *volubilis* water, and the image is reminiscent of Lucretius' comparison of the lover to Tantalus, trying to clutch at his beloved as after water in a dream. The language also recalls Lucretius' earlier description of how dreams cause the mind to believe itself somewhere else: *conclusoque loco caelum mare flumina montis/mutare et campos pedibus transire videmur* ('we seem to exchange a confined space for the sky, sea, rivers, and mountains, and to cross fields by foot,' 458–9). Horace's beloved is in his dreams, but the hints of Lucretian language also reminds us that, for the Epicurean, the erotic condition is like a dream, in which full satisfaction is impossible and reason is precluded by the absence of real sense imagery.[384]

The Lucretian echoes are troubling, because they introduce to lyric eroticism the bleak sexuality of *DRN* 4, where the lover's position is envisioned as an impediment to philosophical *ataraxia*, and erotic activity is closer to dream than reality. The Lucretian resonances of the final lines of 4.1 hint at the figure of Venus in *DRN* 4, where the goddess is reduced to sexual impulse.[385] While the Venus of 4.1 is not Lucretius' radically demythologised deity, the Lucretian resonances help to point out the problematic character of the poet's goddess: true fulfilment is impossible in an erotic encounter, Lucretius argues. Horace's words, which lament the impossibility of either forgetting or consummating his erotic desire, intimate also that even consummation is insufficient. Instead of Lucretius' idea that the mind is better turned to philosophy, with sexual desire given only a minor role in the wise man's life, *Odes* 4 suggests that a different Venus is required, if true satisfaction is to be found in her worship.

---

[384] See Smith (2005) for a consideration of *somnia* in Lucretius.

[385] See Gale (1994b, ch. 6) for an account of how the Venus of Lucretius' first proem "is not so much eclipsed as redefined, or fragmented. Her attributes are gradually stripped from her, and given instead to the blind forces of inanimate nature" (212)

Venus, as the poet represents her in 4.1, cannot be worshipped properly. The middle third of the poem emphasises the point. Horace presents Paulus Maximus as his surrogate, saying the younger man is able to set up a statue of the goddess and worship her with choruses, but the poet hints at the insufficiency of this alternative. Putnam (1986, 40) contends that the poem is a "prayer for the reritualization of Venus," explaining, "From a goddess who socializes with aging mortals and demeans them along with herself, she is asked to regain a fitting status and station elsewhere, intimate with her proper worshipers in the formal semblance of a marble replica." But, if we move further into *Odes* 4, the poet himself rejects statuary as inadequate to memorialisation, saying, *gaudes carminibus; carmina possumus/donare et pretium dicere muneri* ('you delight in songs; we can give songs, and explain what they are worth,' 4.8.11–12). Horace adds that poetry achieves more than *incisa notis marmora publicis* ('marble statues carved with public lettering,' 13).[386] Civic statuary is insufficient, but so too is personal erotic poetry—*Odes* 4 demands a new articulation of the goddess.[387] This demand will take shape over the course of the collection, as the poet tests various incarnations of the goddess. The presence of the Venus of *DRN* 4 in the first poem of the book hints that the collection will move backwards in Lucretius' poem, beginning with the purely physical sexual urges of the fourth book and ending with the densely mythological, Roman goddess of Lucretius' opening lines. On the other hand, as we will see, the movement of the book is not so simple; the Venus of *Odes* 4 metamorphoses continually, and the Lucretian echoes throughout the book hint that the final incarnation of the goddess in 4.15 encompasses the eroticism of the opening and the political

[386] Feeney (1998, 102).
[387] While erotic and political inspiration are intermingled in the ode and made two aspects of the same thing, beginning with the resumption of love poetry as *bella*, the poem poses this as a problem. Delignon (2016, 273) argues for the intermingling of the two: "La lyrique érotique, loin de s'opposer à la lyrique politique, la rend ici possible. »

stability of the ending, while also permitting a space for seasonal cyclicity, human fragility, and mourning. Horace does return to the opening of Lucretius' *DRN*, then, but draws upon all the implications of the poet's presentation of Venus, granting room in his final lines for the Epicurean's cosmic understanding.

(ii) *Odes* 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7

If we are to reject the erotic Venus of 4.1, the process is not a simple one. Horace's lyric project is not one of definition, but of exploration; as Feeney (1998, 103) argues, Venus has many guises in the fourth book of *Odes*, and there is power in "the interaction between the various ways of figuring her divinity."[388] There is, however, a distinct shift from the Venus of the first poem to that of the last, from the lyric eroticism of 4.1 to the communal prayer of 4.15. In between these two poems, the poet explores the goddess' identity and iconography, testing out every possible facet of her divinity. An important part of this negotiation is Horace's relationship to the publication of Virgil's *Aeneid*, a monumental cultural event that intervenes between the first and final collections of *Odes*. Horace must grapple with the *Aeneid*, just as he deals with the rest of the literary tradition from Homer to his present, Roman era. Virgil's epic, however, poses an even greater challenge than do the archaic lyricists or earlier Roman poets. Horace hints at the difficulty in 4.12, the invitation to Virgil, which calls attention to Virgil's death and looming presence in *Odes* 4.[389] What is the relationship between Horace's lyric and his contemporary's epic? And what, if anything, does Virgil's role in *Odes* 4 have to do with Lucretius? I will argue

[388] Barchiesi (1996, 5) similarly argues of the work as a whole that Horace's purpose in writing lyric is "trying out different roles and fluctuating among separate and competing ideologies."
[389] See below, section iii. Armstrong (2015, 95) calls the poem "a touching invitation to Vergil to come to an Epicurean supper before death comes for him, the point being that Vergil is now (13 B.C.) several years dead, and his *Aeneid* a classic echoed—along with Lucretius—in nearly every poem of the fourth book."

here that Horace's treatment of Venus and spring imagery is connected to his relationship with both of these epic Roman predecessors, as well as the state itself. In grappling with both, side by side, he stages the coming-to-be of his own Roman project, one that encompasses the divine genealogy of Virgil's Rome, but also an Epicurean insistence on the finality of life, and the endless but often brutal cycle of the natural world.

It is in 4.7 that Lucretian imagery comes most vividly to the foreground, but the juxtaposition of this ode and the two that precede it is remarkable, and calls into question both political and Lucretian elements. *Odes* 4.5 is a prayer for Augustus' return. It addresses the *princeps* as *divis orte bonis, optime Romulae/custos gentis* ('born from the worthy gods, greatest guardian of Romulus' people,' 1), and entreats him (5–8):

> lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae:
> instar veris enim vultus ubi tuus
> adfulsit populo, gratior it dies
> et soles melius nitent.
>
> Good leader, return the light to your country: for when your face, the image of spring, gleams on the people, the day is more pleasing, and the suns shine better.

The *princeps* is the *instar veris* (6), an image that is confirmed and developed with the golden age language that follows (*tutus bos etenim rura perambulat,/nutrit rura Ceres almaque Faustitas*, 'since the ox rambles through the country, Ceres and nurturing Faustitas nourish the country,' 17–18, and *nullis polluitur casta domus stupris*, 'the pure house is stained by no

violation,' 21). Augustus' return is associated with perpetual spring, fecundity, and golden age peace, in accordance with Augustan mythology.[390] The adjective *alma* (17), in fact, reverberates in the final *alma* Venus (4.15.31), an idea we will take up below. The poem not only addresses Augustus, but reinforces his mythology; Du Quesnay (1995) argues that, in accordance with an increasing interest in Augustus' divinity, Horace here makes an extended allusion to Ennius' account of the apotheosis of Romulus, moving from a sense of longing for the absent leader to his deification. The vision of Augustus as *instar veris*, then, is tightly linked to the iconography of the *princeps* and his purported divinity.[391]

The next poem follows 4.5 closely; its opening *dive* even echoes the initial *divis* of 4.5.[392] *Odes* 4.6 is similarly steeped in the mythology of the Roman state, relating the story of Apollo's destruction of Achilles and subsequent support of Aeneas and Rome. The civic role of the ode is reinforced by a set of related allusions. It takes up Pindar's sixth *Paean*, transforming Pindar's story of Apollo working against Zeus into a tale of Phoebus, Venus, and Jupiter agreeing to support Aeneas and bring about the foundation of Rome.[393] As well, the joint address to Phoebus and Diana (31–4), the god's championing of Troy, and the salvation of Aeneas all link the ode to Horace's own *Carmen Saeculare*, a connection that the final lines confirm with their address to a maiden who participated in the hymn (41–4):

> nupta iam dices 'ego dis amicum,
> saeculo festas referente luces,

[390] See e.g. Dyer (1965).
[391] We might even see a hint of this in the previous poem, which is closely related to 4.5 (see especially Du Quesnay 1995); there, spring (*verni*, 7) winds teach the eagle that stands for Drusus.
[392] Miller (2009, 288). See Du Quesnay (1995) for a detailed analysis of the connections between the two poems.
[393] See, among others, Syndikus (1973, 347–8), Barchiesi (1996, 8–9), and especially Hardie (1998).

reddidi carmen, docilis modorum

vatis Horati.'

Now a married woman, you will say, 'When the age brought back the festival days, I, skilled in the measures of Horace the bard, delivered the song that was pleasing to the gods.'

The centrality of the *CS* to the ode reinforces the Pindaric theme of poetry celebrating the state. The *CS* was itself named a paean, a fact that binds together the Pindaric allusions and those to the *CS*; like both, Horace's ode addresses both Apollo and Diana, and focuses on the wellbeing of the people.[394] The ode performs a function within the state, glorifying both Rome and the poet himself, who is the recipient of Phoebus' gifts just as Rome is: *spiritum Phoebus mihi, Phoebus artem/carminis nomenque dedit poetae* ('Phoebus gave me my inspiration, Phoebus gave me the art of song and the name of poet,' 29–30).

The tale of Phoebus and Venus' appeal to Jupiter also alludes to Virgil's account of Jupiter's vow to Venus in *Aeneid* 1, as Feeney (1998, 103) has observed: as an "agent of divine and imperial history", the goddess is here "not *saeua*, 'savage', as in the first ode, but *grata* (21)—pleasing to Jupiter and in his favour." Venus plays a small but significant role in this deeply political poem; the erotic deity of the first ode becomes a civic figure, reminding us of her role in the *Aeneid* and aligning her with the very inception of the Roman state. The metamorphosis seems to have occurred not only in this poem, but in the one before, where Augustus is figured as the spring itself; her translation into civic goddess is bound up with the

[394] Hardie (1998, 261).

imagery of the *pax Augusta*. Given the strong political resonances of Venus' role here, we might assume a relatively smooth transition from the *saeva* goddess of 4.1 into the *grata* deity of 4.6 and then the *alma* Venus of 4.15, from a reluctant resumption of erotic lyric into poetry used in service of, and homage to, the state.

Odes 4.7, however, questions this progression and offers an alternative vision. Like 4.5, the ode does not name Venus, but its spring imagery makes it central to our understanding of how Horace treats the goddess and her iconography in this book, and how he grapples with both Virgilian and Lucretian models. Although Thomas (2011, 176) and others argue that this ode opens a third triad of poems within *Odes* 4, and its break from the previous two poems is clear, it is equally important to read it in connection with these odes; its language and allusive content contrast in revealing ways with the mythology of the state and leader established previously. By proposing a different view of seasonal change—and, implicitly, of Venus—4.7 introduces a set of associations for this imagery that is strongly Lucretian and offers an alternative to the political mythology of the previous odes.

The poem begins with Lucretius: *diffugere nives* ('the snows have fled,' 1) echoes Lucretian language.[395] Not only is the first word of the poem a Lucretian one, but the illustration of the seasons following one another in rapid, violent succession owes much to the philosopher-poet's own language at 5.737ff., which begins: *it Ver et Venus, et Veneris praenuntius ante/pennatus graditur* ('Spring and Venus come, and the winged harbinger of Venus goes ahead,' 737–8).[396] The connection between the Lucretian passage and 4.7 is confirmed by the

[395] Thomas (2011, ad loc.), who says that the verb is one of Lucretius' favourites. See e.g. 1.761–2 (*ut tempestate coacta/fulmina diffugere*); 1.1102–3 (*ne . . . moenia mundi/diffugiant*); and 3.16 (*diffugiunt animi terrores*).

[396] See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.). Perhaps the violence of Horace's scene (e.g. *ver proterit aestas/interitura simul/pomifer Autumnus fruges effuderit*, 9–11) reworks the military language associated with Venus in 4.1.

importance of this same passage to *Odes* 1.4, the lyric model for 4.7. In the later ode, the parallel is deepened; whereas in 1.4 the moon only hung over the scene (*imminente Luna*, 1.4.5), in 4.7 the moon's cycles are themselves part of the meditation on the cyclic passage of natural time (*damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae*, 'yet the swift moons repair the celestial losses,' 13). This image confirms the Lucretian connection; the Epicurean describes both the moon's changes and the cycle of the seasons as examples of order in the natural world (*ordine cum videas tam certo multa creari*, 'since you see that many things are created in such a fixed order,' 736). Horace's comparison of the two cycles vividly evokes the Lucretian scene and builds on his earlier lyric picture of spring. As always, of course, Horace weaves Lucretius together with his lyric antecedents; in this poem Simonides is particularly evident, particularly in the connection between human life and the seasons.[397] In Horace's hands, Lucretius becomes lyric, his language and imagery transformed into lyric meditations on time and human life.

Following his vision of seasonal succession, Horace moves to the human realm, where an individual has no hope of immortality: *nos ubi decedimus/quo pater Aeneas, quo Tullus dives et Ancus,/pulvis et umbra sumus* ('when we have descended where father Aeneas, where wealthy Tulus and Ancus are, we are dust and shadow,' 14–16).[398] The language of heirs accentuates the contrast to the realm of nature: *cuncta manus avidas fugient heredis, amico/quae dederis animo* ('all things that you have given to your own spirit will escape the greedy hands of your heir,' 19–20).[399] The absence of children emphasises the distinction between the seasons and the moon, on the one hand, and humankind on the other; while one might argue for rebirth through succeeding

[397] See Thomas (2011, 175–6), Barchiesi (1996), and Cataudella (1927–8).
[398] Thomas (2011) prefers *pius* to *pater* at 15.
[399] The language of *heres* recalls the references to heirs in *Odes* 2, where a lack of offspring was repeatedly involved in meditations on the brevity of human life. See especially 2.3.20 and 2.14.25.

generations, Horace underlines his own, and his addressee Torquatus', lack of natural heirs.[400] The idea is, in a general way, Lucretian; we have seen repeatedly how Horace's meditations on the inevitability of death tend to recall Lucretian ideas, given the great importance of the Epicurean to his lyric work. The passage alludes to a particular Lucretian passage, as well: a discussion in book 3 of how even great men die, *hoc etiam tibi tute interdum dicere possis:/lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancu' reliquit,/qui melior multis quam tu fuit, improbe, rebus* ('this also you can sometimes say to yourself: even good Ancus left behind the light with his eyes, he who was better than you, dishonest man, in many ways,' 3.1024–5).[401] The Lucretian passage itself quotes Ennius: *postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit* (*Ann.* 149).[402] Horace implicates the *Aeneid* in his layered allusion, adding Aeneas to the Lucretian vision of the finality of death as he calls attention to his engagement with the Latin epic tradition; the lines allude to not only Lucretius, but Virgil and Ennius, thus staging a clear confrontation with the lyricist's poetic predecessors, and showing his departure from Virgil's epic vision.[403] What is more, the appearance of Torquatus here highlights the Epicureanism of the poem; as in *Epist*. 1.5, the relationship between the addressee and the Epicurean character in Cicero's *De Finibus* underlines the philosophical resonances of the ode.

---

[400] Torquatus' specific identity emphasises this point; see Feeney (2010, 221) for more on Torquatus as the last of his line.
[401] Putnam (1986, 138).
[402] Tarrant (2007, 74) notes that half of Horace's metre consists of dactylic hexameter, which stresses the relationship to epic literary history.
[403] This creates an intriguing contrast with *Odes* 4.4, which engages with both Ennian and Virgilian versions of Venus: "In his ode, Horace shows how inspirational Ennius can still be, but this is an Ennius reworked, reimagined and modernised in the light of what Virgil has achieved, and in light of what Virgil has done to Ennius. One senses Horace's excitement at the way that the new epic has revivified the Roman epic tradition, making Ennius' view of the Roman past newly rewarding to think with" (Feeney 2016, 305). By contrast, 4.7 favours a Lucretian vision of epic themes.

The pairing of a reflection on seasonal cycles and a meditation on the ephemerality of human life feels similar to the lyric voice of *Odes* 1–3, and the poem stands out in a collection that is more concerned with political panegyric, on the one hand, and the implications of ageing on *eros*, on the other; the connection to 1.4 is not coincidental. The ode is particularly striking in its contrast to the preceding poem. As we have seen, in 4.6 Horace looks to the *Aeneid*, transforming the erotic Venus of 4.1 into the ancestor of the Roman people and suggesting his own alignment with the *Aeneid*'s vision of Roman history. The appeal of Venus in *Odes* 4.6 recalls her plea to Jupiter in *Aen*. 1; there Venus similarly pleads with her father to save Aeneas, and he promises that she will see Roman walls built (*Aen.* 1.258–9), just as in 4.6. Jupiter adds, *sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli/magnanimum Aenean* ('you will carry great-spirited Aeneas uplifted to the heaven's stars,' 259–60), specifying the upward movement of Aeneas' deification. In *Odes* 4.7, on the other hand, Aeneas descends: *nos ubi decidimus* (14), Horace writes, just like Aeneas, Tullus, and Ancus. For a moment, the reader might believe that the reference is to Aeneas' *katabasis* in *Aen*. 6, but the point is clear when we reach Tullus and Ancus: "The line is a pointed questioning of the myth of Julian and Augustan divinity, an effective refutation of Jupiter's promise to Venus at Virg. *Aen.* 1.259–60."[404] Jupiter's promise to Venus in the *Aeneid*, then, forms a bridge between *Odes* 4.6 and 4.7, but while the former poem affirms the vow, the latter rejects it.

Venus herself does not appear in 4.7, but the poem strongly hints at her presence. The connection between the ode and 1.4 recalls her position as leader of the spring chorus there; in the earlier poem, Cytherean Venus danced with the Nymphs and Graces.[405] Moreover, she is partner to spring in the lines of Lucretius that Horace references here (*it Ver et Venus*, *DRN*

[404] Thomas (2011, ad loc.). Also see Putnam (1986, 138).
[405] Fedeli and Ciccarelli (2008, ad loc.) observe her absence.

5.737), and is traditionally associated with vernal imagery, most vividly in Lucretius' own opening proem. Now she is not named, but her presence is suggested. Horace's word choice in his description of spring brings the goddess to mind, as well: the day is described as *almus* (7), the same adjective that describes Venus at *DRN* 1.2, which Horace will allude to in the penultimate line of *Odes* 4.15.[406] The poem offers yet another perspective on Venus, another fragment of her complex character in *Odes* 4. On the other hand, the reminder of 1.4 and the word *almus* make her absence conspicuous; why does Horace refuse to name the goddess herself in this spring ode? The empty space where Venus is expected seems to pose a problem that demands some sort of resolution within the book. One reading of this might suggest the complete detachment of Venus from her role as nature goddess and her Lucretian identity, preparing for the final conception of her as the goddess of eternal Rome in 4.15. However, as we saw above, Augustus in 4.5 is *instar veris* (6), and brings about a golden age peace that *alma . . . Faustitas* (18) supports. The Augustan Venus of 4.15 must encompass both spring imagery and the goddess' role as ancestor of Rome. In uniting these sides of her identity, as we will see, Horace's final image of Venus looks back to both of these earlier poems, holding together an imperial vision of the goddess and a Lucretian idea of the relentless cycle of the seasons and the fragility of human life.

Set just after the Virgilian Venus of 4.6, the Lucretian vision of 4.7 poses something of a paradox for the lyric collection. We could read the Lucretian language of 4.7 as a subversive undercutting of the imperial language in 4.6, but I argue that this is too simple a reading of *Odes* 4, and denies both the powerful political encomium of the book and what we have already seen of the great complexity of Venus' role in the collection. If the final lines of the work encompass

[406] Ancona (1994, 55).

both Virgil and Lucretius, accommodating both, this juncture of 4.6 and 4.7 is important to understanding what is at stake.

Questions of time are central to the distinction between 4.7 and the odes that precede it. In 4.6, not only does Horace allude to and corroborate Jupiter's speech to Venus in the *Aeneid*, thus implicitly affirming the eternity of both Aeneas and Rome, but he mirrors this with an assertion of his own longevity; as we have seen, the poem ends with Horace the composer of the *Carmen Saeculare*, his fame moving down through generations. In 4.7, time is again of great importance, but the scale and focus of attention have shifted. Now the poet writes of the relentless, cyclical motion of the seasons and the moon, and contrasts this with the transience of human life, which does not permit any individual person to be reborn. As we have seen, Horace makes extensive reference to Lucretius in his crafting of the poem, even as he also weaves Lucretian imagery together with lyric—particularly Simonidean—models. A Virgilian sense of the grand order of the Roman state, and its eternal future, thus butts up against a Lucretian, and lyric, sense of the natural order of time and the seasons, and the inevitability of death.

As we saw in the second chapter, in *Odes* 1–3 time is a distinctly Roman theme; the poet reveals the centrality of the calendar to his contemporary world, and, on multiple occasions, suggests that his own private anniversaries supersede those of the civic calendar. In *Odes* 4, the subject is again a distinctly Roman one. By setting 4.6 and 4.7 side by side, Horace puts himself into dialogue with the *Aeneid*. By vividly evoking Lucretian imagery in 4.7, he casts himself further back into the Roman literary tradition, proposing another perspective on the state and time itself. The lyric medium enables this juxtaposition of sentiments; within this capacious mode, the two conflicting perspectives can coexist. Horace is able to accord with the *Aeneid*'s way of grasping the Roman world, but also challenge the monumentality of the epic by recourse

to Lucretius' cosmic understanding, a philosophical perspective that is, ultimately, identified with the poet's perspective on his own ageing body. He can be a great writer of Rome, whose work is tied up with the achievement of empire itself, and also a man who acutely feels his own senescence. He can write powerfully of the need to enjoy the present moment, while still feeling the heaviness of his own mortality.

(iii) *Odes* 4.11 and 4.12

Horace places two invitation poems side by side at 4.11 and 4.12, drawing attention to their form and urging the reader to consider them together. The poet's experimentation with Philodemean and Lucretian language in the two poems reveals how his approach to Epicureanism has changed since *Odes* 1–3 and the *Epistles*, and continues an ongoing dialogue between Epicurean and Virgilian ideas. Both 4.11 and 4.12 play with Philodemus' invitation to Piso (27 Sider), an important reference for several of Horace's earlier poems as well, quoted in its entirety above (section A). Like *Epist.* 1.5, *Odes* 4.11 centres on a birthday, recalling the celebration of Epicurus' own in Philodemus, as well as the commemoration of Maecenas' return to civic life in 1.20. Wine is the poet's opening gambit again, as in 1.20, although the circumstances have changed. The focus is now on opulence rather than simplicity; seemingly reversing Piso's idea that friendship will be the basis for a richer (πιοτέρην, 8) celebration, Horace's focus here is on his material goods, emphasised by his opening *est* (1–12):

> est mihi nonum superantis annum
> plenus Albani cadus; est in horto,
> Phylli, nectendis apium coronis;

est hederae vis

multa, qua crinis religata fulges;
ridet argento domus; ara castis
vincta verbenis avet immolato
spargier agno.

There is a cask full of Alban wine that has passed its ninth year; there is parsley in my garden for weaving garlands, Phyllis; there is a great abundance of ivy, with which you gleam when it binds your hair; the house smiles with silver; the altar, surrounded with holy foliage, longs to be sprinkled with a sacrificed lamb.

The abundance of the scene, with its glittering *domus* and crowds of slaves (*huc et illuc/cursitant mixtae pueris puellae*, 'slave girls mingled with boys rush about here and there,' 9–10), contrasts clearly with the Epicurean humility of Philodemus' epigram, as well as Horace's earlier invitations.

Intervening between the two odes of book 4 and their models in the earlier lyric collection is *Epist.* 1.5, Horace's invitation to Torquatus. We saw above how the epistle engages with both Philodemus' invitation and Cicero's portrayal of Epicureanism in the *De Finibus*, while also looking back to *Odes* 1.20 and the Epicurean resonances of Horace's various invitations to Maecenas in *Odes* 1–3. In its exhortation that Torquatus turn back to a family tradition of Epicureanism, and its overturning of Cicero's attitude toward the philosophical school, the epistle asserts itself as a playful Epicurean invitation, one that prioritizes friendship

and moderation. In reading the paired invitations in *Odes* 4, we should keep *Epist.* 1.5 in mind; the importance of invitations to both *Odes* 1–3 and the *Epistles* suggests that these poems may give us insight into Horace's changed relationship to Epicureanism in his final collection.[407] It suits the poet *Epicuri de grege* (*Epist*. 1.4.16) to speak like Philodemus in *Epist*. 1.5, much as the Philodemean resonances in *Odes* 1.20 reflect the Lucretian overtones of the lyric Sabine estate. In *Odes* 1–3, the poet's Lucretian property is part of his construction of lyric authority; a certain Lucretianism, appropriated as a personal possession, reinforces the poet's ability to confront the city. In *Odes* 4, however, the poet leaves behind the private space of the Sabine property, and at the same time almost entirely abandons the figure of Maecenas, who is closely connected with the Sabine landscape in *Odes* 1–3. In his renegotiation of his Epicurean models in 4.11 and 4.12, Horace increasingly departs from the privacy and intimacy of his earlier invitations, reflecting the political character of *Odes* 4 and preparing for the civic hymn in the final poem. On the other hand, the pair of poems evoke a strong sense of loss and the passing of time, which will ultimately have to be reconciled with the communal *pax Augusta*.

One line of 4.11 stands out as particularly un-Epicurean: *ridet argento domus* (4.11.6), the poet writes of his home, revealing his movement into an urban and more opulent space. In the first two chapters, we examined the Lucretian language of Horace's Sabine estate; in *Odes* 2.16 and 2.18, in particular, Horace looks to the account of unnecessary luxuries in the opening of *DRN* 2 (*nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet/nec citharae reboant laqueata auratаque templa*, 'the house does not gleam with silver or shine with gold, nor do the golden panels and the rafters resound with the cithara,' 2.27–28). While 2.16 nods to Lucretius' panels (*curas*

[407] The *Satires*, as we have seen repeatedly, also involve Epicurean suggestions of feasting, friendship, and invitation, and provide another view of how Horace manipulates Epicurean and Lucretian language according to his programmatic intent.

laqueata circum/tecta volantis, 'the cares that fly around the panelled ceilings,' 11–12), 2.18 decries luxury with reference to the previous line in Lucretius (*non ebur neque aureum mea/renidet in domo lacunar*, 'neither ivory nor the gilded ceiling shine in my house,' 1–2). As I argued extensively in the first chapter, these allusions to Lucretius are part of how Horace establishes his Sabine property as a Lucretian space, one that bolsters his poetic freedom by reinforcing it with Epicurean authority.

Horace's *ridet argento domus* inverts Lucretius' *nec domus argento fulget* in clear ways.[408] The lyricist's consecutive placement of *fulges* (5) and *ridet* (6) draws attention to the Lucretian allusion. Horace's metaphorical use of *rideo* seems also to look to Lucretian precedent.[409] The most famous example of this is the ocean in Lucretius' first proem: *tibi rident aequora ponti/placatumque nitet diffuso lumine caelum* ('the waters of the sea smile for you, and the peaceful sky shines with light poured forth,' 1.8–9). Similarly, the *aether* smiles in 3.22, in a line that evokes the first proem: *semperque innubilis aether/integit, et large diffuso lumine ridet* ('the cloudless aether always protects [the divine *sedes*], and smiles with its light poured forth abundantly,' 3.22–3).[410] The verb does not always have positive connotations. When Lucretius denounces the foolish luxuries that erotic desire inspires, he uses *rideo* to convey opulence: wealth, he writes, turns into Babylonian perfumes, *et pulchra in pedibus Sicyonia rident* ('and beautiful Sicyonian slippers smile on the feet,' 4.1125). Lucretius' use of the word aligns with his Epicurean teachings on the proper function of pleasure; the wise man takes pleasure in what

---

[408] There are also archaic models for Horace's line. Hutchinson (2018) connects the phrase to Alcaeus fr. 140.1, where the poet describes halls laden with the apparatus of war: μαρμαίρει δὲ μέγας δόμος χάλκωι. Also of note is *Theog*. 40: γελᾷ δέ τε δώματα πατρὸς.

[409] Fedeli and Ciccarelli (2008, ad loc.) note the similarity to Lucretius' various metaphorical uses. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) note some of these parallels in their discussion of 2.6.13–14: *ille terrarum mihi praeter omnes angulus ridet*. There is surely a Lucretian allusion there, as well; the ode describes Tibur in a way strongly evocative of the Sabine property.

[410] Cf. 5.1395, *cum tempestas ridebat*, which also refers to harmony with nature.

is necessary and according to nature, not in decadent hedonism. Horace's *ridet argento domus* (4.11.6) brings to mind the strong Lucretian resonances of the poet's earlier lyric invitations. In his use of *rideo* to personify the house, evocative of Lucretian use, the lyricist underlines the contrast to his earlier representation of his home.

I have said that 4.11 refers to Maecenas, and so calls to mind the invitation poems of *Odes* 1–3, but the ode is conspicuous in how obliquely it deals with the patron. The opening image of nine-year-old wine has been taken as a reference to the publication of *Odes* 1–3, reminding the audience to think of this new invitation in the context of the earlier collection, and perhaps also to remember the importance of Maecenas to those previous poems.[411] *Odes* 4.11 sets Maecenas' birthday in the spring, specifically the month of Venus (12–20):

> ut tamen noris quibus advoceris
> gaudiis, Idus tibi sunt agendae,
> qui dies mensem Veneris marinae
> findit Aprilem,
>
> iure sollemnis mihi sanctiorque
> paene natili proprio, quod ex hac
> luce Maecenas meus affluentis
> ordinat annos.

[411] See Bernays (1996, 42) for the latter point. Thomas (2011) and others mention the connection to 1–3.

> So that you may know, however, what joys you are invited to, you must celebrate the Ides that divide April, the month of seaborn Venus, a day that is rightly festive for me, almost more sacred to me than my own birthday, because from this day my Maecenas numbers his flowing years.

There is a pronounced difference between this effusive declaration of love, in which the poet declares Maecenas' birthday even more important to him than his own, and the minor role that Maecenas actually plays in the ode. Maecenas is a prominent figure in *Odes* 1–3; Horace addresses eight poems to his patron, including three invitations to what the poet implicitly identifies as own Sabine property. *Odes* 4.11, on the other hand, is addressed to Phyllis instead of Maecenas. The contrast to the invitation poems of *Odes* 1–3 is stark; this later poem does not even confirm that the patron is invited to the feast.[412] The poet's ostentatious retreat from the Lucretian stance of his earlier invitations mirrors his movement away from the Sabine property and into an urban space. The transformation is also bound up with the relative disappearance of Maecenas. In emphasising his patron's absence, Horace draws attention to the fact that he is no longer using Maecenas as something of a measuring stick for his own Epicureanism; whereas in the earlier collection the lyricist claimed for himself a Lucretian authority that was closely connected to his Sabine property, and increasingly placed Maecenas on the side of urban *curae*, Horace now moves within the city and—in certain ways—away from his old Epicureanism.

Finally, Maecenas' birthday is on the Ides of April, the *mensem Veneris marinae* (14); the poem shows another face of Venus.[413] Of her presence in the poem, Putnam (1986, 191) writes:

---

[412] Thomas (2011, 216).

[413] Fedeli and Ciccarelli (2008, ad loc.) also observe that the goddess "serve a introdurre il tema dell'amore e contribuisce a saldare la prima con la seconda parte del carme." It is striking that she performs a structural role in this ode, much as she does in the book as a whole.

"Two births, then, are to be celebrated, of which one signals seasonal change and hints at love-making, the other honors a patron possessed by the speaker though remote from his poem's action." Every reference to Venus within the collection contains the goddess' many visages. This nod to the goddess in the context of joyful celebration contains also a vestige of the springtime of 4.7, the Lucretian onslaught of seasons contrasted with the finality of human existence. These suggestions are confirmed in the final stanzas of 4.11, where Horace contrasts his own age (*meorum/finis amorum—/non enim posthac alia calebo/femina*, 'end of my loves—for after this I will not grow warm for any other woman,' 31–4) with Phyllis' youth.[414] The final two lines of the poem may also hint at Lucretius: *minuentur atrae/carmine curae* ('dark cares will diminish by song,' 35–6). As we saw in the second chapter, the word *cura* in *Odes* 1–3 has strongly Epicurean resonances. The *curae* of 2.16, which flutter around the *laqueata* ceilings of the rich man (11–12) and board ships (21–2, also cf. *oderit curare*, 26) recall Lucretius' *re veraque metus hominum curaeque sequaces/nec metuunt sonitus armorum nec fera tela* ('and truly the fears of men and their pursuing cares do not fear the sound of arms nor wild weapons,' 2.48–9).[415] The same dark cares appear at the end of 3.1 (*sed Timor et Minae/scandunt eodem quo dominus, neque/decedit aerata triremi et/post equitem sedet atra Cura*, 'but Fear and Threats climb to the same place as the master, and dark Care does not leave the bronzed trireme, and sits behind the rider,' 36–40), strongly evoking 2.16 and the proem to *DRN* 2. These worries are also suggested in the *civilis* . . . *curas* that the poet asks Maecenas to put aside (3.8.17) and the cares that follow

[414] In particular, the poet figures his addressee as the epitome of youthful beauty, with her love for the *iuvenis* Telephus, and the contrast between her hair bound with ivy (*est hederae vis/multa, qua crinis religata fulges*, 4–5) and Ligurinus' projected hair loss in the previous poem (4.10.3–4).
[415] See chapter 2, section B (iii), as well as chapter 1, section C (iii).

wealth in 3.16: *crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam* ('care follows growing wealth,' 17–18).[416] Horace's allusions to Lucretius intimate an Epicurean solution to these tenacious urban cares.

Where, then, does the poem leave us? Horace's invitation self-consciously eschews the Epicurean modesty that was so tightly bound to his characterisation of the Sabine estate in *Odes* 1–3, and by rejecting any direct address to his patron, he sets aside the role of Epicurean authority that he granted himself in the earlier collection. On the other hand, there are traces of Horace's earlier Epicurean authority; here, in the context of an invitation that refers to Maecenas, song retains its power to lift black cares. Even in glittering halls, it can reduce this grief. References to Venus and spring remind us of the relentless movement of time, but the *carmen* provides a cure to this fear. The following poem asks the reader to take 4.11 and 4.12 together; in the latter, I will argue, the poet develops the suggestions of 4.11, and offers a space for Virgilian poetry within his meditations on the ephemerality of life.

Odes 4.12 approaches the invitational form in another way, drawing on other sources and suggesting a different attitude toward Epicureanism. The poem's opening is imbued with Virgilian imagery, and its dense allusiveness argues powerfully that the ode's Vergilius is the poet Virgil, dead since 19 BCE.[417] The fact that it is an invitation asks us to compare it to the preceding poem, and also, yet again, to Philodemus' invitation to Piso. After his opening meditation on the seasons—which we will consider in more depth below—the poet announces (14–28):

---

[416] Similarly, in 3.29 the poet writes to his patron, *tu civitatem quis deceat status/curas* (25–6).

[417] There has been a great deal of debate over this question, but I follow Thomas (2011) and the many others who take the addressee of the poem to be Virgil the poet; the profuse allusions to Virgil's early works in the opening stanzas of the ode seem to be incontrovertible evidence, and it would be strange for Horace to address a poem to some other Virgil at this point in his oeuvre, after two odes directed to the poet in *Odes* 1. For summaries of the critical positions, see Thomas (2011, 226–7) and Clay (2002, 130–1), as well as Porter (1972) and Belmont (1980).

sed pressum Calibus ducere Liberum
si gestis, iuvenum nobilium cliens,
    nardo vina merebere.

nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum,
qui nunc Sulpiciis accubat horreis,
spes donare novas largus amaraque
    curarum eluere efficax.

ad quae si properas gaudia, cum tua
velox merce veni: non ego te meis
immunem meditor tingere poculis,
    plena dives ut in domo.

verum pone moras et studium lucri,
nigrorumque memor, dum licet, ignium
misce stultitiam consiliis brevem:
    dulce est desipere in loco.

But if you are eager to drink wine pressed at Cales, client of the young nobles, you will earn wine with nard. A small jar of nard will draw out a vessel, which now reclines in Sulpicius' warehouses, generous in giving new hope, and effective at washing away the

> bitterness of cares. If you are eager for such joys, come swiftly with your commodity: I do not plan to soak you with my cups without charge, at if I were a wealthy man in a full house. But put aside delay and the pursuit of money, mindful of the black fires, and while you can, blend foolishness with wisdom: it is sweet to be foolish at the right moment.

The invitation is reminiscent of those to Maecenas in *Odes* 1–3; the exhortation not to delay, and to put aside concerns about wealth, evoke the spectre of the patron and the impatience of the lyricist at the end of *Odes* 3. These suggestions of Maecenas draw attention again to the nearly complete absence of the wealthy patron in this final book.

On the other hand, there is clear humour here, crafted in part through allusion to Catullus 13, the invitation to Fabullus. There, the neoteric tells his friend that he will dine well at the poet's house—if he brings his own meal, *non sine candida puella/et vino et sale et omnibus cachinnis* ('not without a beautiful girl, and wine, and salt, and all kinds of loud laughter,' 4–5). If all the trappings of a banquet are supplied by Fabullus, Catullus tells him: *unguentum dabo, quod meae puellae/donarunt Veneres Cupidinesque,/quod tu cum olfacies, deos rogabis,/totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum* ('I will give the unguent that Venuses and Cupids gave to my girl, and when you smell it, you will ask the gods to make you all nose, Fabullus,' 11–15). Catullus' poem appears to be itself a riff on Philodemus' epigram; there are a striking number of parallels, and the neoteric poem seems to exaggerate Philodemus' simplicity in his request that Fabullus bring the whole dinner, and replace Epicurean conversation with erotic poetry.[418] Both 4.11 and 4.12 remind the reader of Philodemus' invitation, and thus of Horace's earlier invitations to his patron, yet the liberties Horace takes with the form in both draw attention to his experimentation.

[418] See Dettmer (1989) for an especially detailed analysis of the two poems, as well as Marcovich (1982). There are many parallels in the language and structure of the two poems.

The Epicurean invitation in *Odes* 1–3 plays a central role in the poet's construction of his own poetic and philosophical authority; in the final collection, on the other hand, it is the locus for poetic playfulness, but also contains Epicurean themes.

The homage the ode pays to Virgil is evident in the opening image of spring, which recalls the language of 4.7, as well as the interplay between Lucretian and Virgilian references in 4.7 and those that precede it. The ode begins (1–8):

iam veris comites, quae mare temperant,
impellunt animae lintea Thraciae;
iam nec prata rigent nec fluvii strepunt
    hiberna nive turgidi.

nidum ponit Ityn flebiliter gemens
infelix avis et Cecropiae domus
aeternum opprobrium, quod male barbaras
    regum est ulta libidines.

dicunt in tenero gramine pinguium
custodes ovium carmina fistula
delectantque deum cui pecus et nigri
    colles Arcadiae placent.

adduxere sitim tempora, Vergili.

> Now the Thracian winds, companions of spring that calm the sea, push forward the sails; now the meadows are not frozen, and the streams do not roar, swollen with the winter snow. Groaning tearfully for Itys, the unfortunate bird builds her nest, the eternal disgrace of Cecrops' house, because she avenged herself on the uncivilised lust of kings. The shepherds of fat sheep sing songs on the pipe, and delight the god whom the flocks and black hills of Arcadia please. The season has brought on thirst, Virgil.

From the first moment of the poem, the reader is reminded of the onrush of seasons in 4.7; the repeated *iam*, in the context of spring, recalls the first line of the earlier ode.[419] Horace here alludes to Virgilian images of spring, and two of his allusions are particularly telling. One important intertext is a passage from the autogenesis of bees at *G*. 4.305–8 (*hoc geritur Zephyris primum impellentibus undas,/ante novis rubeant quam prata coloribus, ante/garrula quam tignis nidum suspendat hirundo*, 'this [the slaughter of the bullock] is done when the zephyrs are first pushing at the waves, before the meadows grow red with fresh colour, before the chattering swallow hangs her nest from the beams'). Another is the story of Philomela, Procne, and Itys, told at both *G*. 4.15 and *Ecl*. 6.78–81. As he describes the activity of nature in the spring, Horace draws upon Virgilian moments that delineate the contrast between human and natural cycles: the doomed story of Orpheus and Eurydice is the aetiology for the rebirth of bees out of the carcass of a bullock, and grief over a lost child leads to avian metamorphosis—and therefore

[419] The lines also suggest Catullus 46, which begins, *iam ver egelidos refert tepores*. See especially Putnam (1986, 203). It is also worth noting that the opening of 4.12 moves us quickly from spring to summer, ending with the summer thirst of line 8 (see Clay 2002). The movement recalls the onslaught of seasons in 4.7 and Lucretius.

participation in the natural cycles. The two myths are woven into the fabric of an ode that is richly allusive in other ways to both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*.

Of the first lines, Porter (1973, 58) explains that the recollections of 4.7 work "to suffuse the description of spring in 4.12 with the sense of sorrow and loss with which spring was so strongly associated in 4.7." The melancholy of the opening lines of the ode confirms the arguments of those who contend that the addressee is Virgil, and the poem is carefully positioned within *Odes* 4: it is steeped in the awareness of Virgil's death, "an attempt to evoke the old sense of camaraderie and humor that had prevailed between Horace and Virgil, an effort whose outward gaiety is colored, however, by the present knowledge that those times are now lost for Horace."[420] The poem balances the joy of friendship and the grief of loss, and does so with reference both to Horace's earlier spring poem, 4.7, and Virgil's own early poetry, both of which address the contrast between natural and human lifespans.

It is notable that Horace alludes here to the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Despite the great importance of the *Aeneid* to *Odes* 4 as a whole, this poem confines itself to the earlier works—with the exception of Horace's nod to his own earlier prayer for Virgil's safety at *Odes* 1.3. The opening image of calm seas and winds recalls the fear of storms in 1.3; moreover, Clay (2002) observes that warm west winds can only come from Thrace when one is on the coast of Asia Minor, suggesting an epic orientation for the first lines. While 1.3 concerns Virgil's departure for Greece, then, Horace here invites his friend back to Italy. The allusions to the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* align with this movement away from the epic perspective. *Odes* 4.12 presents not the glorification of an eternal state but the transitory nature of human life, and the pervasive sadness

[420] Porter (1972, 84). A number of scholars argue that instead, the poem was written during Virgil's lifetime, and spliced into the lyric project at a later date. See e.g. Belmont (1980), who says of Horace, "that he would be able to write a new poem, much less a light one, to a living Vergil after Vergil's death is impossible" (14).

of this condition. This is not to deny the *Aeneid* itself such a perspective on mortal life; rather, it is to say that Horace's own references to the epic in *Odes* 4 concentrate on the glory of nation-building and the divine protection of Rome.[421] *Odes* 4.12 heals something of the conflict between 4.6 and 4.7; Virgil's own words speak much the same sentiment as the Lucretian image of spring's passing.

Both 4.11 and 4.12 stress the importance of friendship—which, in the context of the Philodemean invitations, evokes an Epicurean sense of companionship—yet, in different ways, the friendships they describe belong the past. The two poems are farewells of a sort.[422] In 4.11, as we have seen, Maecenas' absence is conspicuous. In earlier odes, the poet draws attention to the patron's absence by addressing invitations to him, but here Maecenas is not even the addressee; the brevity of the patron's appearance accentuates the fact that he is missing, not only from this poem but from the collection as a whole. In 4.12, Virgil's absence is even more glaring; the incontrovertible fact of his death underlies the poem and gives pathos to the lyricist's request for Virgil's company. Both 4.11 and 4.12 suggest Epicurean friendship, then, but this image of philosophical companionship is bound up with an abiding sense of melancholy and grief.

On the other hand, as we have seen, neither 4.11 nor 4.12 takes a straightforward approach to the model of Epicurean invitation. By pairing the two odes—drawing attention to their invitational form and his own creative liberty with his models—Horace expresses in 4.12 both neoteric irreverence and an Epicurean sense of friendship, as well as the fragility of human

[421] We will see this especially in the final poem, where Horace elides the *ira* and *furor* of Virgil's vision (see section iv below).
[422] Belmont (1980).

existence. Like so many of the sympotic odes, the poem conveys something of the lyric *carpe diem* motif, yet the message is paradoxical:

> It presents a bitter-sweet evocation of Horace's dead friend, and it describes an impossible dream—acknowledged to be folly—inviting Virgil from beyond the grave to join Horace for a brief renewal of their old intimacy. It thus playfully inverts the sympotic topos of 'eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die'.[423]

The impossibility of the situation, combined with the reversals of Lucretius in the preceding poem, suggests a certain breakdown of the Epicurean power of *Odes* 1–3; the lyric symposium, envisioned in terms of Epicurean simplicity, can no longer heal the grief of loss and ageing. Phyllis in the previous poem is the *finis amorum* (4.11.32), Maecenas is mentioned for the last time, and 4.12 is the final invitation, reminding us of the end of sympotic joys and the realisation of the inevitable conclusion that 'tomorrow we die'.

However, not only does a kind of Epicurean friendship remain at the core of Horace's sympotic lyric in these two poems, but in 4.12, like the poem before, symposium provides the solution to *curae*. Wine here washes away the *amara . . ./curarum* (19–20), evoking the traditional association between song and wine and so nodding to the activity of poetry in the previous poem (*minuentur atrae/carmine curae*, 4.11.35–6). Virgil's nard, too, mirrors Catullus' *unguentum*, which is widely interpreted as a symbol of poetry itself; the allusion hints that Virgil brings his own song to the feast, a fitting suggestion given the wide range of Virgilian allusions in the poem.[424] Together, then, 4.11 and 4.12 create an atmosphere of Epicurean, sympotic song exchange; Horace's own odes find parallel in the songs of Phyllis and Virgil, convivial music that alleviates heavy *curae*. With echoes of Virgil's early poetry and mournful reminders of his

[423] Clay (2002, 131).
[424] See e.g. Pavlock (1982, 94).

death, Horace carves out a space for a reconciliation with Virgil, his own grief and preoccupation with ageing, and a meditation on the relentlessness of natural cycles. It is this pair of invitational poems, as much as the frequent allusions to the *Aeneid*'s imperial pride, that we should keep in mind as we move toward the final lines of the collection, the hymn to *alma* Venus who holds together Lucretius and Virgil.

Before we leave 4.11 and 4.12 completely, we should briefly consider the poems that frame them; 4.10 and 4.13 take up ageing and mortality again, but under a very different guise. The poems present another incarnation of Venus, one that seems to return to the erotic divinity of 4.1, rather than pushing the collection forward to the civic function and unity of the hymn in 4.15. As with the poems they frame, 4.10 and 4.13 have clear parallels to one another, and their strong connection demonstrates how the figure of Venus changes throughout the collection, without progressing in a linear way from the first poem to the last.[425] Both odes consider the effect of ageing on erotic desire, the first looking ahead to the day when Ligurinus' beauty will fade, and the second rejoicing in Lyce's wrinkles and white hair. Both use the word 'Venus' to describe the height of erotic appeal. *Odes* 4.10 opens with an address to Ligurinus, *o crudelis adhuc et Veneris muneribus potens* ('you, who are still cruel, and powerful with the gifts of Venus,' 1). The poet predicts the breakdown of these *munera*, the moment when Ligurinus will ask, *quae mens est hodie, cur eadem non puero fuit* ('why was this feeling, which I have today, not the same when I was a boy?' 7). The identity of the addressee recalls *Odes* 4.1, of course, but so too does Ligurinus' question, which evokes the lyric poet's own lament, *non sum qualis eram bonae/sub regno Cinarae* ('I am not as I was under the reign of good Cinara,' 4.1.3–4).[426] The

[425] Thomas (2011, 238) notes that this extends to verbal parallels: both use dendrological metaphors for ageing (4.10.4–5 cf. 4.13.9–10), the word *color* (4.10.4 cf. 4.13.17), and *genae* (4.10.8 cf. 4.13.8).
[426] Asztalos' (2008) reading of the poem takes this connection further, arguing that the poem is really Horace's address to himself.

parallel seems to continue the Sapphic allusion of 4.1; for Sappho's image of the beloved suffering the same anguish of love as she does, Horace substitutes a scene of his beloved suffering the same effects of age that he laments in 4.1.

In 4.13, Lyce has already suffered these effects: *audivere, Lyce, di mea vota, di/audivere, Lyce: fis anus* ('the gods heard my prayers, Lyce, the gods heard, Lyce: you are becoming an old woman,' 1–2). Lyce's attempts to rouse Cupid with her song fail (5–6), and Venus leaves her: *quo fugit Venus, heu, quove color?* ('where is Venus fleeing, alas, and where your complexion?' 17). The image of Venus fleeing aligns neatly with the description of Ligurinus as *potens* in the goddess' gifts. The poem is harsh in its rejection of the ageing Lyce; its abuse is epodic.[427] It follows the bittersweet reflections on death and friendship in 4.12, and, while its focus on ageing continues the theme of mortality, its approach is a near-inversion of the ode to Virgil. The erotic, epodic moment looks back to 4.1, but with even greater brutality and blatant physicality; the Venus of the first poem has returned, only to flee again. As Feeney (1998, 103) puts it, "Where Venus is running to is the last line of the last poem of the book"; the goddess' next, and final, appearance will be at the end of 4.15. Her flight will involve a dramatic metamorphosis into a goddess who is hymned by the state; she abandons the once-beloved mistress, apparently leaving the realm of eroticism to enter the civic sphere. However, her appearances in 4.10 and 4.13 show the relentlessness of the erotic Venus. Not only does she reappear after the poet's attempt to banish her in 4.1, but, by placing her in related poems before and after 4.11 and 4.12, Horace emphasises her persistence and the non-linear character of her transformation throughout *Odes* 4. When Venus flees to the communal hymn of 4.15, she is certainly transformed, but she carries with her the manifold guises she has assumed throughout the collection; all of the complicated

[427] See Thomas (2011, 238). By contrast, Esler (1989) and Catlow (1976) both argue that Horace displays some empathy toward the addressee.

and messy facets of the deity—and the vernal language that accompanies her—are contained by Venus' final appearance in the collection.

(iv) The Hymn to Venus: *Odes* 4.15

The communal song to Venus in *Odes* 4.15 offers a reply to Lucretius' opening invocation of the goddess, and reminds the reader of Venus' many, varied appearances in the book. The lyricist praises the peace that Augustus has brought about, and his description of the *pax Augusta* recalls the golden age language of 4.5: *tua, Caesar, aetas/fruges et agris rettulit uberes* ('your age, Caesar, has brought back rich fruits to the fields,' 4–5), he writes, and declares that *custode rerum Caesare non furor/civilis aut vis exiget otium* ('with Caesar as the guardian of affairs, neither civil madness nor violence will drive out *otium*,' 17–18). He concludes (29–32):

> virtute functos more patrum duces
> Lydis remixto carmine tibiis
> Troiamque et Anchisen et almae
> progeniem Veneris canemus.
>
> In song mingled with Lydian flutes, we will sing of leaders who fulfilled their *virtus* by the custom of our ancestors, and of Troy, and Anchises, the offspring of nurturing Venus.[428]

[428] See Thomas (2011, ad loc.) for a discussion of *more patrum*, which some take with *canemus* ('we will sing in the manner of our ancestors').

These final lines encompass the great breadth of the last book of *Odes*, uniting its pervasive political encomium with the frequent and pointed references to Virgil's *Aeneid* and its grand vision of Rome. The civic function of the hymn is underlined by its connection to Horace's own *Carmen Saeculare*, which names Augustus the *clarus Anchisae Venerisque sanguis* (50). In describing *alma* Venus, the ancestor of the Roman people, the conclusion of 4.15 also recalls the opening of the *DRN*, which calls upon *Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas,/alma Venus* ('ancestor of the children of Aeneas, pleasure for humans and gods, nurturing Venus,' 1–2). We saw in the first chapter that the image of fecund spring associated with Venus in this first proem anticipates Lucretius' pastoral vision of *ataraxia* in *DRN* 2. Lucretius' opening is a thus a vision of peace, a point emphasised by the poet's prayer that Venus pour peace upon Mars and thus upon the Roman people (38–40). Horace's final words in *Odes* 4 look to these initial lines of Lucretius, drawing out and magnifying Venus' role as both historical ancestor of the Roman people and bestower of civic *otium*. I will argue here that Horace's incorporation of Lucretius in his conclusion does suggest an accord between political peace and Epicurean *ataraxia*; this is prefigured by the appearance of the word *otium*, which has strong Lucretian resonances, as we saw especially in 2.16. However, I will contend that Horace's final lines also ask the reader to remember all the various guises of Venus and vernal language throughout *Odes* 4. If we keep the goddess' changing visage in mind as we read this final ode, I argue, the *alma* Venus of 4.15 not only evokes an image of civic *pax* and Epicurean *ataraxia*, but acts as a reminder of the natural cycle and the fragility of human life, all the things that would seem to be overwhelmed by the grand sweep of empire.

The movement from the Venus of *Odes* 4.1—the second word of the collection—to the Venus of 4.15—the penultimate word—is a striking metamorphosis. Both deity and poetics are

transformed as the collection moves from the erotic, personal goddess of the opening to the peaceful, civic goddess of the ending. Of the framing of *Odes* 4 with Venus, Putnam (1986, 296) writes: "Horace, by this explicit balance, plots a poetic course from a serio-comic au revoir to the goddess of love to final acknowledgment of the fostering presence of a divinity who is both the mythical source of the Julian *gens* and a vital symbol for the peace that bears the name of its most notable scion." I argued above that the Venus of the first poem also contains resonances of the *DRN*, as a destructive sexual force whom Horace connects to Lucretius' understanding of dreams and their relationship, both literal and metaphorical, to erotic desire. Therefore, as I suggested earlier, *Odes* 4 does in a certain sense move backward through Lucretius' work, reinstating Venus as the ancestor of the Roman people and the symbol of spring and peace. This interpretation gives primacy to a Lucretian idea of peace at the end of *Odes* 4, and this is no doubt a crucial aspect of Horace's incorporation of Lucretian imagery in this final moment. We saw in the second chapter that Lucretius' opening proem adumbrates the importance of Epicurean *ataraxia* to the Roman state, not only through its image of Mars placated in Venus' lap, but through the role of Memmius, whose proper Epicurean education, the philosopher intimates, is linked to the pacification of the state itself. There is, then, in these final lines of *Odes* 4, the suggestion that the *otium* of the Roman state is in part an Epicurean one. The idea would accord with the earlier collection of *Odes*, where, as we saw in the previous chapters, Horace augments the political authority of his own lyric voice by recourse to Lucretian imagery.

Of course, if Horace hints that the *pax Augusta* of 4.15 involves something of a Lucretian sense of peace, he is clear that this is part of a Virgilian conception of Roman greatness. The ode is replete with allusions to the *Aeneid*, which give epic context and content to Horace's poem, despite its Callimachean opening (*Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui/victas et urbis increpuit*

lyra,/ne parva Tyrrhenum per aequor/vela darem, 'Phoebus rebuked me when I wanted to speak of battles and conquered cities with my lyre, so that I would not sail on the Etruscan sea,' 1–4).[429] Horace constructs his vision of Augustan peace, from its image of fecundity to the language of Rome's expansive domain, out of references to the *Aeneid*.[430] However, the lyricist attributes credit to Augustus where Virgil looks at the present obliquely; Horace primarily alludes to passages where Virgil intentionally distances himself from his message, namely prophecies, the parade of heroes in *Aen*. 6, and the ecphrasis of Aeneas' shield in *Aen*. 8. The return of Crassus' standards, for example, looks to the shield: Horace's *Parthorum superbis/postibus* (7–8) quotes Virgil's own *superbis/postibus*, the doorposts that hold the *dona . . . populorum* at *Aen*. 8.721–2. As well, Horace does not present his poem as another *Aeneid*, but as a lyric successor, one that comes after the struggle of the epic's hero:

> The *furor*, *vis*, and *ira*, for instance, which in lines 17–20 Horace represents as safely eliminated under Augustus' custodianship, are the very forces that occupy Aeneas at the epic's end, even though Jupiter had earlier predicted a day when chains would restrain "unholy rage," *Furor impius* (*Aen*. 1.294–96).[431]

On the other hand, despite his apparent resolution of the human struggles of Virgil's epic, Horace does not eliminate such ambiguities and difficulties from his own poem; I will argue

---

[429] See Harrison (2007a) for a discussion of this contrast between lyric and epic: "The incorporation of material from Vergil's epic, declined as a generic model at the poem's beginning, thus adds epic elements while accommodating them to Horatian lyric texture" (205). Horace's refusal of the Etruscan sea implicitly rejects the *Aeneid* itself, which opens with the Trojans on this sea. See Thomas (2011, ad loc.) for a defence of taking *lyra* this way instead of with *increpuit*.

[430] Horace's *fruges et agris rettulit uberes*, 5, recalls Virgil's *divitis uber agri*, *Aen*. 7.262. The passage about Rome's domain, describing how Caesar's *aetas* has brought back the ancient arts, *per quas Latinum nomen et Italae crevere vires, famaque et imperi/porrecta maiestas ad ortus/solis ab Hesperio cubili* (13–16), looks to *Aen*. 6.851–3, 1.278–9, 1.286–8, and 6.777–84. See Putnam (1986, 264–306) for a detailed breakdown of Horace's various allusions to the *Aeneid*, as well as Breed (2004). Thomas (2011, ad loc.) also notes that 4.15.4–16 are "about as far from the lyric register as H. could get."

[431] Breed (2004, 251).

below that ambiguities like those of Virgil's epic are still very much present within Horace's ode; the poet's own grief and mortality is contained within the vision of the *pax Augusta* and communal hymn.

Despite the metamorphosis of Venus from goddess of love in 4.1 into civic protector in 4.15, an interpretation of this movement as linear misses the myriad faces of Venus in *Odes* 4. Putnam (1986, 298) describes the change as a sublimation of personal desire:

> The change from the book's beginning to its conclusion, as private becomes public and personal trials yield to public, historical occasions, defines a sublimation of the individual's amatory cravings, ever a victim of time's flow, into the larger, more constant love of Rome and the communal rituals of song which betoken her eternity.

I hope to have shown in the preceding discussion how many guises the goddess assumes in the collection, both as a divine figure and as vernal imagery; there is no clear line moving from the Venus of 4.1 to that of 4.15. As we saw above, the two erotic, epodic poems that frame the invitation poems, 4.10, and 4.13, reveal the inconsistency of the goddess within the collection, and the non-linear development of her character; Venus is at one moment a symbol of Augustan peace, at another an image of bountiful spring, and at still another an erotic, spiteful deity. Nor is Horace's approach to Virgil a straightforward one. The lyricist balances homage to his friend's work with gentle subversion—as we saw in the trio of poems at 4.5–7—and a turn away from Virgil's epic toward his earlier work, as we saw in the paired 4.11 and 4.12. An epic Virgilian perspective cannot be said to assume complete dominance in the final poem, unless we ignore the manifold and mutating appearances of Virgil, Venus, and Lucretius within the collection.

The word *alma* is central to this interpretation. Recall that the adjective played a role in the discussion of 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7; *Faustitas*, symbol of the *pax Augusta* in 4.5, is said to be *alma*

(18), while time steals away the *almum/. . . diem*, an image of spring's abundance, at 4.7.7–8. The former example accords with a line in the previous poem, as well; there, another *dies*, this time the one that saw the defeat of Hasdrubal at the Metaurus, *primus alma risit adorea* ('first smiled with nurturing glory,' 4.4.40–1).[432] *Almus*, the descriptor of peace arising out of military accomplishment in both 4.4 and 4.5, becomes in 4.7 the word for spring's sweet—and ephemeral—bounty. I have argued throughout that Horace grants equal space to a Virgilian vision of the *pax Augusta* and a Lucretian, lyric insistence on the temporary character of human life and the continuous cycle of the natural world, a view that stresses the importance of friendship and sympotic pleasure in the face of such knowledge. *Odes* 4.15, with its *alma* Venus, recollects both sides of Horace's lyric voice; instead of the personal becoming sublimated into the public over the course of *Odes* 4, I argue, the final lines hint at a harmony between personal and civic, an accord between all of the goddess' many aspects.[433]

What role does the lyric poet himself play in the conclusion of the book? Interpretations of this final moment of *Odes* 4 diverge. Oliensis' (1998a) argument represents one extreme of the spectrum. She contends that Horace is absent from the communal song of the conclusion, observing that the image of men singing *cum prole matronisque nostris* (27) would seem to shut out the bachelor poet of the *Odes*: "As the last frontier of Horace's last collection, the emperor usurps the place of the poet, and the empire overwhelms the poem" (153). In contrast to this interpretation is that of Putnam (1986), who, as we have seen, argues that the poet's isolation of 4.1 is remedied in the final lines of the collection, which draw Horace within the community while granting primacy and a kind of immortality to his art; Putnam contends that the

[432] See Thomas (2011, ad loc.) for a discussion of *adorea*, a rare and problematic word. I here reproduce Thomas' own translation.
[433] We can also connect this idea to the *almae* Camenae of 3.4.42; there, too, as I argued in the first chapter, the goddesses are Lucretian, but also conduits to the political realm.

individual's sublimation into the state "seems to assure the poet-speaker a continuity in art which nature's linear inexorability patently denies" (298). How are we meant to understand the communal voice that concludes 4.15? The personal, erotic Venus of 4.1 is certainly transformed into a communal, civic goddess in 4.15—does this represent the erasure of the poet, or his joyful participation in the Roman corporate voice, and indeed his own preeminence in political song?

The Lucretian resonances of the conclusion can help elucidate this question, if we understand that these allusions are connected to an ongoing negotiation with Lucretius' images and ideas in *Odes* 4. Horace not only echoes the first proem of the *DRN* in his final lines, but places this allusion in something of a sympotic context; the lyricist describes those who will sing, *nosque et profestis lucibus et sacris/inter iocosi munera Liberi/cum prole matronisque nostris* ('we, on working days and holidays, among the gifts of jesting Liber, with our offspring and our wives,' 25–7). On the one hand, we can see the endurance of the lyric speaker in the projected future of his poetry, the final *canemus*, which recollects the ending of 4.6, with its vision of the maiden singer of the *CS* telling her story in the future. This suggestion of poetic immortality is reinforced by the reference to *Liber* (26), whose other appearances in the book are also linked to poetic symposium.[434] On the other hand, the sympotic image reminds the reader of the lyricist's mortality and his frequent meditations on the changing of the seasons and fragility of human life; not only does the symposium recall the *carpe diem* motif in a general way, but the very omission of the bachelor Horace from the group of men with wives and children recalls the poem to Torquatus (*cunta manus avidas fugient heredis*, 4.7.19). Moreover, the language of fecundity and agricultural bounty (5) looks back to the golden age imagery of 4.5, but does so through the lens

[434] In 4.8, which lauds the power of poetry to preserve human achievement, the god *vota bonos ducit ad exitus* (34), linked to the Muse refusing to let the great man die (28–9). In 4.12, the poet asks Virgil to trade nard for wine, a passage that, as we saw above, recalls Catullus 13 with its image of poetic exchange.

of 4.7 and 4.12, especially, in which spring "is heavy with the melancholy awareness of the swift passing of man's one spring but which is also filled with profound joy over the perpetual spring that poetry alone can grant."[435] At this point in *Odes* 4, the language of agricultural fertility contains these resonances of grief, reminders of human mortality. Within this scene of community symposium, then, is the reminder that life is finite, and, without offspring, there is not even the possibility of participation in natural rebirth—even as the passage simultaneously makes a claim for poetry's power to endure. Horace answers Lucretius' prayer for peace, then, but he is not content with a hollow, imagistic allusion to the philosopher-poet's opening; he draws upon the complex implications of Lucretius' Epicurean vision, which have been present in his new lyric collection from its very beginning.

I have argued throughout this chapter that, in his final lyric collection, Horace moves away from much of the Epicureanism of his earlier books as he moves closer to the city and political sphere. However, in a paradoxical way the *alma* Venus of the final lines presents perhaps the most Lucretian moment of all. As the poet binds together a sense of Lucretian *otium* and the greatness of the Roman state, he simultaneously proclaims his own poetic immortality and retains the lyric identity he has explored throughout the collection, that of the ageing, vulnerable poet for whom springtime signals the ephemerality of his own life. This perspective, by which the poet can participate in grand, imperial heights but also in the natural rhythms of the cosmos, is in a way more harmonious with an Epicurean perspective than the grand flights of 2.20 or 3.30. Song will answer Lucretius' prayer for *otium*, and it will also immortalise the Roman state. But the only way of arriving at this particular song is through the integration of Lucretius, Virgil, the neoterics, and the archaic lyricists. Horace draws his models together in his

[435] Porter (1987, 118). This heaviness and melancholy is also present in 4.11, where we saw the fading of Maecenas and the emphasis on Phyllis as the *finis amorum*.

final project, which places lyric at the heart of the Roman world, integrating it into the political realm while insisting on the importance of both natural cycles and the human poet, who must contend with the inevitable fact of mortality.

Conclusion

These four chapters have followed Lucretian resonances through the *Odes*, and have argued for the great importance of the philosopher-poet to Horace's lyric programme. Horace's extensive references to Lucretius have been an understudied element of the *Odes.* I have argued here that these allusions are not only more prevalent than has previously been recognised, but are interconnected, and are bound up in Horace's construction of his own lyric identity and poetic authority. As we conclude, we should take stock of Horace's approach to his philosophical predecessor, considering again how his treatment of Lucretius is simultaneously aesthetic and philosophical, and outlining the Epicurean's involvement in Horace's creation of his own lyric voice. In what follows, I will look at the arguments of each chapter again, emphasising the connections between them and tracing how Lucretius' work is influential at each stage as the lyricist develops and intensifies his poetic authority.

As I suggested in the introduction, the prominence of Lucretius in the *Odes* is somewhat unexpected; the hexameter, didactic *DRN* has a more natural connection to the *Satires* and *Epistles*. In fact, the continuity of Lucretian allusions between the three works in part explains the philosopher-poet's presence in the *Odes*; even in the opening poems of the *Odes* and the *Satires*, as we saw, Horace emphasises the connections, but also the distinctions, between his collections by recourse to Lucretian references. I further contended there that Horace's deep debt to Lucretius in his lyric collection is partly related to his project of making an ancient genre Roman. Not only do allusions to Lucretius help situate the *Odes* in the Roman literary tradition and contemporary philosophical world, but Lucretius himself thematises his own poetic primacy in drawing a Greek work into the Roman world and accommodating it to the Latin language. This idea of primacy and innovation is central to Horace's interpretation of the Epicurean; the

lyricist gives us a selective reading of the *DRN* in the *Odes*, one that emphasises passages—among them the pastoral landscape that represents Epicurean *ataraxia*, and the language of Bacchic inspiration in the Second Proem and beyond—where philosophy and poetry most clearly work together, and where Lucretius stresses his own novel creation of a poetic Epicureanism. Lucretius' innovative approach involves a union of genres and tones, one that draws on the entire literary tradition for its didactic goals, reaching back into the archaic and classical worlds without losing sight of Hellenistic aesthetics. Horace reads these moments in his predecessor as almost proto–Horatian lyric: capable of holding together traditions and registers, able to convey vividly the importance of the present moment and the fleeting nature of human life, but at the same time deeply integrated with the political sphere.

The first chapter traced Horace's engagement with Lucretius' interpretation of the pastoral mode, and argued that the lyricist is interested in both Lucretius' poetic language and the philosophy that grounds it. Lucretius uses pastoral imagery to illustrate an Epicurean precept: that a wise Epicurean will live in mental harmony with *natura*. The vision of *DRN* 2.29ff., where Lucretius pictures mental tranquillity as pastoral repose by a stream, is linked to the Epicurean's account of the origins of poetry in book 5. The connection hints that Lucretius' own poetry returns to an original state of accord with the natural world, while also possessing the power to turn students toward their own harmony with nature, their own Epicurean *ataraxia*. Lucretius' version of the pastoral mode informs the Sabine landscape of the *Odes*, wending its way through the collection from the first poem all the way to the penultimate one, the final address to Maecenas in 3.29. The imagery carries its philosophical implications into the *Odes*; the language of Lucretius' pastoral vision is aesthetically pleasing, to be sure, but brings with it philosophical significance, which gives Horace's own image of poetic *otium* an Epicurean context. This

philosophical influence is particularly concentrated in *Odes* 2.16, where the 'lightness' of a Catullan poetic *otium* seems to be rooted in Lucretian *ataraxia*. Horace's own Sabine property, which he constructs as the locus of his poetic output and creativity, is thus also associated with ethical freedom and philosophical authority. In claiming Epicurean *otium* for his own property, Horace makes Lucretius' universal argument about mental tranquillity into a personal declaration of poetic authority; his philosophically-informed *otium* belongs to his own Sabine landscape, not to the properly trained mind of any Epicurean student.

The second chapter continued to explore the implications of the first; by centring the idea of Lucretian mental tranquillity within the Sabine landscape, Horace claims for his own property the freedom of such an ethical standpoint, and he uses this freedom to increasingly assert his own independence from his patron, Maecenas. The idea is related to the arguments of Bowditch (2001) and others, who have contended that the aesthetic abundance of Horace's depictions of the Sabine estate conceal the economic complications of such a property, and thus also hide the patron's role. The Lucretian allusions help to paint the villa as a space of freedom, and thus help to establish Horace's independence, both personal and poetic. The *Odes* move from a deferential approach to Maecenas in 1.1 to complete liberation from the patron by the end of 3.29. Lucretian and Epicurean language is central to this movement; Horace increasingly alienates his patron from the Epicurean authority he has claimed for himself, situating Maecenas on the side of civic opulence against the *otium* and modesty of the Sabine estate.

This second chapter, along with the ending of the first, revealed that Horace's idiosyncratic reading of his philosophical predecessor makes Lucretius into a political poet. The Roman Odes of book 3 propose the lyricist's own Sabine life as the antidote to urban degradation and decadence, an idea that takes its cue from Lucretius—particularly his juxtaposition of

pastoral peace and superfluous urban wealth in the proem to *DRN* 2—but moves Epicureanism much more firmly into the civic realm, even suggesting the ability of lyric to speak to the *princeps* in 3.4. In the second chapter, I argued that Maecenas plays an important role in the civic engagement of the *Odes*, and that this connection between addressee and politics looks in part to Lucretius' didactic poem, particularly the Epicurean's portrayal of Memmius. While Lucretius states in his first proem that Memmius is responsible for the public weal (1.41–3), only adumbrating the possibility of Epicureanism as a cure for civic ills, Horace makes Lucretius into something of a Roman Alcaeus, who both fights for the state and indulges in symposia. Horace's Lucretianism, then, is intensely personal and political; in offering himself and his property as a model for civic healing, the lyricist continues his appropriation and transformation of Lucretian philosophy and imagery. Moreover, as he presents himself as a foil for the state, Horace establishes himself as something of a mirror for the civic realm; the poet increasingly makes his private life and his own poetry alternatives to civic space and the public calendar, a suggestion that culminates in his assumption of the role of *princeps* in 3.30.

Horace thus harnesses and transforms Lucretian philosophy as he bases his own authority in the Sabine estate and gradually builds up this power and freedom. In the third chapter, the final one concerning *Odes* 1–3, I looked at most sublime, lofty moments of the collection—the odes that Horace presents as the climaxes of his increasing freedom and poetic strength. I have said that the lyricist grounds his poetic project in a Lucretian sense of *otium*, giving philosophical weight to neoteric 'flightiness', for example, but of course, this 'flightiness' is equally part of the lyric project. Just as Horace connects his ethical modesty and tranquillity to the *DRN*, he also alludes to Lucretius in his grandest, most sublime passages. In fact, Lucretius is also involved in the movement between the two registers; I traced a thread of Bacchic poetics through the *DRN*,

and showed how Horace's own Bacchus odes draw upon not only the imagery of Lucretius, but his unity of simple and sublime poetics. This harmony of poetic registers is both aesthetic and philosophical; Bacchic *biformis* poetics hold together the disparate elements of both the *DRN* and the *Odes*, while also lifting the readers' minds and guiding them.

As Horace makes this ascent, however, he reverses Lucretius as much as he pays homage to him. The sublime visions of poetic glory in *Odes* 1–3 are pervasively ironic and self-undermining, even as they exalt the lyricist. Why does Horace allude to Lucretius only to overturn him? Why, for example, does he repeatedly allude to Lucretius' claims about the inevitability of death in 2.20 and 3.30, while inverting these arguments to make them assert his own immortality? I have argued that these subversions are implicated in the lyricist's construction of his peculiar, paradoxical form of sublimity; by taking up Lucretian tenets and overturning them, Horace startles the reader, undercutting his own sublime flights and seeming to reverse the very precepts on which he constructed his own authority. Not only does the lyricist remythologise his predecessor, then—drawing him within the lyric way of doing things by connecting him to an Alcaic, sympotic perspective and a mythological landscape—but, in his most sublime moments, he also sets Lucretius against Lucretius, taking an ironic and irreverent approach that is characteristic of his poetic voice. The Epicurean is therefore involved at every stage of Horace's construction of a lyric identity, but, in order to become part of the sublime flights of poetic immortality, he must be turned against himself. In the end, then, Lucretius is fully integrated with Horace's lyric voice, but this is only possible if he is inverted and transformed.

The fourth chapter dealt with Horace's very different approach to his philosophical predecessor in *Odes* 4, revealing how Horace's allusions to Lucretius bring Epicurean ideas

about natural cycles and human mortality into his Pindaric, political final work. *Odes* 4 moves further into the civic sphere, engaging more deeply with politics and even addressing Augustus himself, while Maecenas largely disappears from the lyric purview. The subjects that Horace most closely connects to Lucretian language in the first three books of the *Odes*, then, are missing from the fourth. The image of lyric authority that Horace constructs in this final book is unlike that of *Odes* 1–3. While the lyricist assumes a grander, more political voice, he is also in many ways more deferential in his exaltation of the *pax Augusta* and the achievements of empire; many have taken the final, communal hymn to Venus and the legends of Rome (*Troiamque et Anchisen et almae/progeniem Veneris canemus*, 'we will sing of Troy and Anchises and the offspring of nurturing Venus,' 4.15.31–2) as a sign of the poet's obsequiousness. In the final chapter, I examined the appearance of the goddess Venus and her vernal imagery in *Odes* 4, arguing that Horace identifies the divinity and spring with both a Lucretian understanding of the cosmic order and an Augustan, Virgilian idea of Roman imperial greatness. The final poem of the collection, which encompasses Lucretius' *alma* Venus, Virgil's account of Roman history, and the *pax Augusta*, permits the coexistence of these perspectives. In his last book of *Odes*, therefore, Horace involves Lucretius not in the construction of a lyric authority with which he can rival the state, as in the earlier books, but in a subtler accommodation of natural rhythms, his own ageing body, and his erotic desires within the realm of political encomium.

In every chapter, we have seen how Horace looks to Lucretius as a source of philosophical power as well as poetic beauty, and how he treats his predecessor with equal parts respect and irreverence. Lucretius' influence on Horace is far more extensive than has been previously suggested, and is not purely aesthetic, but is a unified and evolving part of the

lyricist's voice in the *Odes*. Horace alludes to the Epicurean as he defends his poetic *otium* and establishes his artistic and personal freedoms, connecting his Sabine estate to a modest Epicurean stance, and he draws on his predecessor as he envisions lyric inspiration, ascent, and sublimity. Lucretian allusion helps to situate the *Odes* in a Roman context, certainly, but Horace also views Lucretius through a lyric, and Horatian, lens. Horace offers his reader a radically metamorphosed Lucretius, one who speaks directly to the city, sings of dancing woodland deities, and proclaims both the necessity of death and the immortality of the poet.

Bibliography

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

———. 2010. "Female Figures in Horace's *Odes*." In *A Companion to Horace*, edited by G. Davis, 174–92. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Armstrong, D. 1986. "*Horatius Eques et Scriba: Satires* 1.6 and 2.7." *TAPhA* 116: 255–88.

———. 1995. "The Impossibility of Metathesis: Philodemus and Lucretius on Form and Content in Poetry." In Obbink, *Philodemus and Poetry*, 210–32.

———. 2003. "Horace's *Epistles* 1 and Philodemus." In Armstrong, *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*, 267–98.

———. 2015. "Horace's Epicurean Voice in the *Satires*." In Garani and Konstan, *The Philosophizing Muse*, 91–127.

———. 2016. "Utility and Affection in Epicurean Friendship: Philodemus *On the Gods* 3, *On Property Management*, and Horace *Sermones* 2.6." In *Hope, Joy, and Affection in the Classical World*, edited by R. R. Caston and R. A. Kaster, 182–208. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Armstrong, D., J. Fish, P. A. Johnston, and M. B. Skinner, eds. 2004. *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Armstrong, D., and S. Oberhelman. 1995. "Satire as Poetry and the Impossibility of Metathesis in Horace's *Satires*." In Obbink, *Philodemus and Poetry*, 233–54.

Asmis, E. 1992. "An Epicurean Survey of Poetic Theories (Philodemus *On Poems* 5, cols. 26–36)." *CQ* 42: 395–415.

———. 2004. "Epicurean Economics." In *Philodemus and the New Testament World*, edited by J. T. Fitzgerald, D. D. Obbink, and G. S. Holland. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2008. "Lucretius' New World Order: Making a Pact with Nature." *CQ* 58: 141–57.

Asztalos, M. 2008. "The Poet's Mirror. Horace *Carmen* 4.10." *HSCP* 104: 289–302.

Badian, E. 1985. "*Nobiles amici*: Art and Literature in an Aristocratic Society." Review of B. K. Gold (1982). *CPh* 80: 341–57.

Baraz, Y. 2012. *Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Barbaud, T. 2008. "Catulle versus Horace? Revolte et sagesse poétiques." *REL* 86: 80–96.

Barber, D. 2012. "Address and the Continuity of Horace, *Odes* 1.34–35." *Hermes* 140: 505–13.

Barchiesi, A. 1996. "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*." *ClAnt* 15: 5–47.

———. 2000. "Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition." In *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, edited by M. Depew and D. Obbink, 167–82. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Batinski, E. 1991. "Horace's Rehabilitation of Bacchus." *CW* 84: 361–78.

Beer, B. 2009. *Lukrez und Philodem. Poetische Argumentation und poetologischer Diskurs.* Basel: Schwabe.

Belmont, D. E. 1980. "The Vergilius of Horace, *Ode* 4.12." *TAPhA* 110: 1–20.

Bernays, L. 1996. "Zur Interpretation der Horaz-Ode 4.11." *Prometheus* 22: 35–42.

Betensky, A. 1976. "A Lucretian Version of Pastoral." *Ramus* 5: 45–58.

Bonfante, L. 1992. "The Poet and the Swan: Horace *Odes* II.20." *PP* 47: 25–45.

Bowditch, P. 2001. *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Breed, B. W. 2000. “Imitations of Originality: Theocritus and Lucretius at the Start of the *Eclogues*.” *Vergilius* 46: 3–20.
———. 2004. “*Tua, Caesar, aetas*: Horace *Ode* 4.15 and the Augustan Age.” *AJPh* 125: 245–53.
———. 2006. *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing Virgil’s* Eclogues. London: Duckworth.
Brown, P. M. 1984. *Lucretius,* De rerum natura *I.* London: Bristol Classical Press.
Brown, R. D. 1982. “Lucretius and Callimachus.” *ICS* 7: 77–97.
Buchheit, V. 1984. “Lucrez über den Ursprung von Musik und Dichtung.” *RhM* 127: 141–58.
Cairns, F. 1992. “The Power of Implication: Horace’s Invitation to Maecenas (*Odes* 1.20).” In *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, edited by T. Woodman and J. Powell, 84–109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Campbell, D. A. 1982. *Greek Lyric: Sappho, Alcaeus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Campbell, G. 2015. “Lucretius, Empedocles and Cleanthes.” In Garani and Konstan, *The Philosophizing Muse*, 26–60.
Carey, C. 2016. “Negotiating the Public Voice.” In Delignon, Le Meur, and Thévenaz, *La poésie lyrique*, 177–92.
Caston, R. R. 1997. “The Fall of the Curtain (Horace *S*. 2.8).” *TAPhA* 127: 233–56.
Cataudella, Q. 1927–8. “L’elegia di Semonide e l’ode di Orazio IV 7.” *Bollettino di filologia classica* 34: 229–32.
Catlow, L. W. 1976. “Horace, *Odes* 1.25 and 4.13: A Reinterpretation.” *Latomus* 85: 813–21.
Classen, C. J. 1978. “Horace—a Cook?” *CQ* 28: 333–48.
Clay, D. 1983. *Lucretius and Epicurus*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
———. 2003. “Lucretius’ Honeyed Muse: The History and Meaning of a Simile.” In *Le jardin romain: Épicurisme et poésie à Rome, Mélanges offerts à Mayotte Bollack*, edited by A. Monet, 183–96. Villeneuve d’Ascq: Presses de l’Université Charles-de-Gaulle–Lille 3.
———. 2007. “The Sources of Lucretius’ Inspiration.” In Gillespie and Hardie, *Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, 18–47.
Clay, J. S. 2002. “Sweet Folly: Horace, *Odes* 4.12 and the Evocation of Virgil.” In *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, edited by M. Paschalis. Rethymnon: University of Crete, Department of Philology.
Commager, S. 1962. *The* Odes *of Horace: A Critical Study*. University of Oklahoma.
Connor, P. 1987. *Horace’s Lyric Poetry: The Force of Humour*. Berwick, Victoria: Aureal Publications.
Conte, G. B. 1994. “Instructions for a Sublime Reader: Form of the Text and Form of the Addressee in Lucretius’s *De rerum natura*.” In *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny’s Encyclopedia*, translated by G. Most, 1–34. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
Courtney, E. 2001. “The Proem of Lucretius.” *MH* 58: 201–11.
Cowan, R. 2013. “Fear and Loathing in Lucretius: Latent Tragedy and Anti-Allusion in *DRN* 3.” In Papanghelis, *Generic Interfaces*, 113–33.
Cucchiarelli, A. 2015. *L’esperienza delle cose (*Epistole*, Libro I)*. Venice: Marsilio.
Dalzell, A. 1996. *The Criticism of Didactic Poetry: Essays on Lucretius, Virgil, and Ovid*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dang, K. 2010. “Rome and the Sabine ‘Farm’: Aestheticism, Topography, and the Landscape of Production.” *Phoenix* 64: 102–27.
Davis, G. 1975. “The Persona of Licymnia: A Revaluation of Horace, *Carm*. 2.12.” *Philologus* 119: 70–83.
———. 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
De Lacy, P. 2007. “Distant Views: The Imagery of Lucretius 2.” In *Oxford Readings in Lucretius*, edited by M. R. Gale, 146–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press. First published 1964 in *CJ* 60: 49–55.
Delignon, B. 2016. “Lyrique érotique et lyrique politique dans l’*Ode* 4.1 d’Horace.” In Delignon, Le Meur, and Thévenaz, *La poésie lyrique*, 263–73.
Delignon, B., N. Le Meur, and O. Thévenaz, eds. 2016. *La poésie lyrique dans la cité antique: les* Odes *d’Horace au miroir de la lyrique grecque archaïque.* Paris: Diffusion Librairie de Boccard.
Dettmer, H. 1989. “Catullus 13: A Nose is a Nose is a Nose.” *SyllClass* 1: 75–85.
Doran, R. 2017. *The Theory of the Sublime from Longinus to Kant*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dorandi, T. 1982. *Filodemo, Il buon re secondo Omero*. Naples: Bibliopolis.
Duban, J. M. 1982. “Venus, Epicurus and *naturae species ratioque*.” *AJPh* 103: 165–77.
Dufallo, B. 2005. “Words Born and Made: Horace’s Defense of Neologisms and the Cultural Poetics of Latin.” *Arethusa* 38: 89–101.
Dunn, F. M. 1989. “Horace’s Sacred Spring (*Ode* 1.1).” *Latomus* 48: 97–109.
Du Quesnay, I. M. le M. 1995. “Horace, *Odes* 4.5: *Pro reditu imperatoris Caesaris divi filii Augusti*.” In Harrison, *Homage to Horace*, 128–87.
Dyer, R. R. 1965. “*Diffugere nives*: Horace and the Augustan Spring.” *G&R* 12: 79–84.
Edmunds, L. 1982. “The Latin Invitation-Poem: What Is It? Where Did It Come From?” *AJPh* 103: 184–8.
———. 2002. “Mars as Hellenistic Lover: Lucretius, *De rerum natura* 1.29–40 and Its Subtexts.” *IJCT* 8: 343–58.
Eidinow, J. S. C. 1995. “Horace’s Epistle to Torquatus (*Ep*. 1.5).” *CQ* 45: 191–9.
Erasmo, M. 2006. “Birds of a Feather? Ennius and Horace, *Odes* 2.20.” *Latomus* 65: 369–77.
Esler, C. C. 1989. “Horace’s Old Girls: Evolution of a Topos.” In *Old Age in Latin Literature*, edited by T. M. Faulkner, 172–82. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
Evans, H. B. 1978. “Horace, *Satires* 2.7: Saturnalia and Satire.” *CJ* 73: 307–12.
Evenepoel, W. 2014. “Horace, *Carm*. 2, 12, 13: *Domina . . . Licymnia*.” *Hermes* 142: 494–8.
Fantuzzi, M., and R. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fantuzzi, M., and T. Papanghelis. 2006. *Brill’s Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden: Brill.
Farrell, J. 2007. “Horace’s Body, Horace’s Books.” In Heyworth, *Classical Constructions*, 174–93.
———. 2015. “Philosophy in Vergil.” In Garani and Konstan, *The Philosophizing Muse*, 61–90.
Farrell, J., and D. Nelis, eds. 2013. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fedeli, P., and I. Ciccarelli. 2008. *Q. Horati Flacci, Carmina Liber IV*. Firenze: Felice le Monnier.

Feeney, D. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 2009. "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets." In Lowrie, *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes, 202–31. First published in Rudd, *Horace 2000*, 41–63.
———. 2010. "Fathers and Sons: The Manlii Torquati and Family Continuity in Catullus and Horace." In *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*, edited by C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C. Pelling, 205–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2016. "Horace and the Literature of the Past: Lyric, Epic, and History in *Odes* 4." In Delignon, Le Meur, and Thévenaz, *La poésie lyrique*, 295–312.
Feldherr, A. 2010. "'Dionysian Poetics' and the Memory of Civil War in Horace's Cleopatra Ode." In *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars*, edited by B. Breed, C. Damon, and A. Rossi, 223–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ferri, R. 1993. *Dispiaceri di un epicureo: uno studio sulla poetica oraziana delle* Epistole *(con un capitolo su Persio)*. Pisa: Giardini.
Finamore, J. F. 1984. "Catullus 50 and 51: Friendship, Love, and *Otium*." *CW* 78: 11–19.
Fish, J. 2011. "Not All Politicians Are Sisyphus: What Roman Epicureans Were Taught About Politics." In *Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition*, edited by J. Fish and K. R. Sanders, 72–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fitzgerald, W. 2013. *How to Read a Latin Poem If You Can't Read Latin Yet.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Foley, H. 1980. "The Masque of Dionysus." *TAPhA* 110: 107–33.
Fowler, D. 1989. Review of Thomas 1988. *G&R* 36: 235–6.
———. 1995. "From Epos to Cosmos: Lucretius, Ovid, and the Poetics of Segmentation." In *Ethics and Rhetoric: Essays for Donald Russell on His 75th Birthday*, edited by D. C. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling, 3–18. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2002. "Masculinity Under Threat? The Poetics and Politics of Inspiration in Latin Poetry." In *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, edited by E. Spentzou and D. Fowler, 141–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2008. "Lectures on Horace's *Epistles*." *PCPhS* 54: 90–114.
Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fratantuono, L. 2015. *A Reading of Lucretius'* De rerum natura. New York: Lexington Books.
Fredricksmeyer, E. A. 1976. "Horace *C.* 1.34: The Conversion." *TAPhA* 106: 155–76.
Freudenburg, K. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
———. 1995. "Canidia at the Feast of Nasidienus (Hor. *S.* 2.8.95)." *TAPhA* 125: 207–19.
———. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2002. "*Solus sapiens liber est*: Recommissioning Lyric in *Epistles* 1." In Woodman and Feeney, *Traditions and Contexts*, 124–40.
———. 2006. "Playing at Lyric's Boundaries: Dreaming Forward in Book Two of Horace's *Sermones*." *Dictynna* 3: 135–72.
Friedländer, P. 1941. "Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in Lucretius." *AJPh* 62: 16–34.

Fyfe, W. H., ed. and transl. 1995. "Longinus: *On the Sublime*." Revised by D. Russell. In *Aristotle XIII.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gale, M. 1994a. "Lucretius 4.1–25 and the Proems of the *De rerum natura*." *CCJ* 40: 1–17.
———. 1994b. *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The* Georgics*, Lucretius, and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2007. "Lucretius and Previous Poetic Traditions." In Gillespie and Hardie, *Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, 59–75.
———. 2013. "Virgil's Caesar: Intertextuality and Ideology." In Farrell and Nelis, *Augustan Poetry*, 278–96.
Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Garani, M. 2007. *Empedocles Redivivus: Poetry and Analogy in Lucretius*. New York: Routledge.
Garani, M., and D. Constan, eds. 2015. *The Philosophizing Muse: The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Garrison, D. H. 1998. *Horace:* Epodes *and* Odes. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
Giesecke, A. L. 1999. "Lucretius and Virgil's Pastoral Dream." *Utopian Studies* 10: 1–15.
———. 2000. *Atoms, Ataraxy, and Allusion: Cross-Generic Imitation of the* De Rerum Natura *in Early Augustan Poetry*. New York: Olms.
———. 2007. *The Epic City: Urbanism, Utopia, and the Garden in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies.
Gigante, M. 1995. *Philodemus in Italy: The Books from Herculaneum*. Translated by D. Obbink. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
———. 2004. "Vergil in the Shadow of Vesuvius." In Armstrong, *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*, 85–100.
Gillespie, S., and P. Hardie, eds. 2011. *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gillis, D. T. 1967. "Pastoral Poetry in Lucretius." *Latomus* 26: 339–62.
Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2012. *Horace*: Satires*, Book 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2016. "Under the Influence: Maecenas and Bacchus in *Georgics* 2." In *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational*, edited by P. Hardie, 134–54. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Grassi, V. 2005. "Influssi lucreziani nel I libro delle *Odi* di Orazio." *Vichiana* 5: 206–28.
Griffin, J. 1984. "Augustus and the Poets: *Caesar qui cogere posset*." In *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, edited by F. Millar and E. Segal, 189–218. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 2002. "Look Your Last on Lyric: Horace, *Odes* 4.15." In *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*, edited by T. P. Wiseman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Griffiths, A. 2002. "The *Odes*: Just Where Do You Draw the Line?" In Woodman and Feeney, *Traditions and Contexts*, 65–79.
Grilli, A. 1993. "Orazio: La filosofia e le filosofie." In *Atti del Convegno di Venosa,* 47–57.
Gutzwiller, K. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
Hardie, A. 1976. "Horace *Odes* 1.37 and Pindar Dithyramb 2." *PLLS* 1: 113–40.

———. 1998. “Horace, the Paean and Roman *Choreia* (*Odes* 4.6).” *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10: 251–93.
Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil’s Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 2007. “Lucretius and Later Latin Literature in Antiquity.” In Gillespie and Hardie, *Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, 111–27.
———. 2009. *Lucretian Receptions: History, the Sublime, Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2016. “Reflections of Lucretius in Late Antique and Early Modern Biblical and Scientific Poetry: Providence and the Sublime.” In *Lucretius and Modernity: Epicurean Encounters Across Time and Disciplines*, edited by J. Lezra and L. Blake. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Harrison, S. 1986. “Philosophical Imagery in Horace, *Odes* 3.5.” *CQ* 36: 502–507.
———. 1990. “Lucretius, Euripides and the Philosophers: *De rerum natura* 5.13–21.” *CQ* 40: 195–98.
———. 2001. “Simonides and Horace.” In *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, edited by D. Boedeker and D. Sider, 260–71. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2007a. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2007b. “Horatian Self-Representations.” In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 22–35.
———. 2007c. “Style and Poetic Texture.” In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 262–74.
———, ed. 2007d. *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2007e. “Town and Country.” In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 235–47.
———. 2010. “There and Back Again: Horace’s Poetic Career.” In *Classical Literary Careers and Their Reception*, edited by P. Hardie and H. Moore, 39–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2013a. “Didactic and Lyric in Horace *Odes* 2: Lucretius and Vergil.” In Papanghelis, *Generic Interfaces*, 367–84.
———. 2013b. “Author and Speaker(s) in Horace’s *Satires* 2.” In *The Author’s Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, edited by J. Hill and A. Marmodoro, 152–71. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2017. *Horace:* Odes*, Book II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Heinze, R. 1919. “Horazens Buch der Briefe.” *Neue Jahrbücher* 43: 305–15.
———. 2009. “The Horatian Ode.” In Lowrie, *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes, 11–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press. First published 1923 as “Die Horazische Ode.” *Neue Jahrbücher* 51: 153–68.
Henderson, J. 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Heyworth, S. J. 1995. “Dividing Poems.” In *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve, 117–48. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto medioevo.
———, ed. 2007. *Classical Constructions: Papers in Memory of Don Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2017. “Segmentation and Interpretation in *Odes* 2.” *Dictynna* 14.

Heyworth, S. J., and J. H. W. Morwood. 2011. *A Commentary on Propertius, Book 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Horsfall, N. 1993. "Empty Shelves on the Palatine." *G&R* 40: 58–67.
Houghton, L. B. T. 2007. "Horace, 'Odes' I,10: A Very Literary Hymn." *Latomus* 66: 636–41.
Hubbard, M. 1973. "The *Odes*." In *Horace*, edited by C. D. N. Costa, 1–28. Boston: Routledge and Kegan.
Hubbard, T. 1998. *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Hunter, R. L. 1985. "Horace on Friendship and Free Speech." *Hermes* 113: 486–90.
———. 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection:* Idylls *1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2007. "Sappho and Latin Poetry." In *I papiri di Saffo e Alceo: atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 8–9 giugno 2006*, edited by G. Bastianini and A. Casanova. Florence: Istituto papirologico G. Vitelli, 213–25.
Hutchinson, G. O. 2018. "What is a Setting?" In *Textual Events: Performance and Lyric in Early Greece*, edited by F. Budelmann and T. Phillips. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jacobson, H. 1995. "Horace's Voladictory: *Carm*. 2.20." *CQ* 45: 573–4.
Jenkyns, R. 1992. *The Legacy of Rome: A New Appraisal.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kenney, E. J. 1970. "*Doctus Lucretius*." *Mnemosyne* 23: 366–92.
———. 2007. "Lucretius Texture: Style, Metre and Rhetoric in the *De rerum natura*." In Gillespie and Hardie, *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, 92–110.
———. 2014. *Lucretius:* De rerum natura*, Book III.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kiessling, A. G., and R. Heinze. 1914. *Horaz: Briefe.* 4th ed. Berlin: Weidmann.
———. 1930. *Horaz: Oden und Epoden*. 7th ed. Berlin: Weidmann.
———. 1961. *Horaz: Satiren*. 8th ed. Berlin: Weidmann.
Kirkwood, G. M. 1982. *Selections from Pindar*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
Knorr, O. 2004. *Verborgene Kunst: Argumentationsstruktur und Buchaufbau in den Satiren des Horaz.* Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.
Kronenberg, L. 2016. "Epicurean Pastoral: Daphnis as an Allegory for Lucretius in Vergil's *Eclogues*." *Vergilius* 62: 25–56.
Leach, E. W. 1993. "Horace's Sabine Topography in Lyric and Hexameter Verse." *AJP* 114: 271–302.
Lee, M. O. 1970. "Everything is Full of Gods: A Discussion of Horace's Imagery." *Arion* 9: 246–63.
Lefèvre, E. 1977. "Epikur und der Wolf im Sabinerwald. Gedanken zu Horaz Carm. I,22." *GIF* 29: 156–171.
———. 1993. *Horaz: Dichter im augusteischen Rom*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
Lehoux, D., A. D. Morrison, and A. Sharrock, eds. 2013. *Lucretius: Poetry, Philosophy, Science.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lenaghan, L. 1967. "Lucretius 1.921–50." *TAPhA* 98: 221–51.
Lowrie, M. 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 2009. "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace *C.* 1.12–18." In Lowrie, *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes, 337–55.
———, ed. 2009. *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1995. *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. Yale: Yale University Press.
———. 2005. "Horace *Odes* Book 1 and the Alexandrian Edition of Alcaeus." *CQ* 55: 542–58.
Mac Góráin, F. 2013. "Virgil's Bacchus and the Roman Republic." In Farrell and Nelis, *Augustan Poetry*, 124–45.
———. 2014. "The Mixed Blessings of Bacchus in Virgil's *Georgics*." *Dictynna* 11: 2–14.
MacLeod, C. W. 1976. "The Poetry of Ethics: Horace, *Epistles* 1." *JRS* 69: 16–27.
———. 1979. "Ethics and Poetry in Horace's 'Odes' (1.20; 2.3)." *G&R* 26: 21–31.
Mader, G. 1987. "Poetry and Politics in Horace's First Roman Ode: A Reconsideration." *AClass* 30: 11–30.
———. 2002. "That St(r)ain Again: Blood, Water, and Generic Allusion in Horace's Bandusia Ode." *AJPh* 123: 51–9.
Marcovich, M. 1982. "Catullus 13 and Philodemus 23." *QUCC* 11: 131–8.
Mayer, R. 1986. "Horace's *Epistles* I and Philosophy." *AJPh* 107: 55–73.
———. 1994. *Horace:* Epistles *I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2012. *Horace:* Odes *I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McCallum, S. L. 2015. "*Heu Ligurine*: Echoes of Vergil in Horace *Odes* 4.1." *Vergilius* 61: 29–42.
McCarter, S. 2015. *Horace Between Freedom and Slavery: The First Book of* Epistles. University of Wisconsin Press.
Meucci, R. "Roman Military Instruments and the Lituus." *The Galpin Society Journal* 42: 85–97.
Michel, A. 1992. "Poétique et sagesse dans les Odes d'Horace." *REL* 70: 126–137.
Miller, J. F. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Miller, P. A. 1991. "Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of *Odes* 1–3." *AJPh* 112: 365–88.
Minadeo, R. 1975–6. "Vergil in Horace's *Odes* 4.12." *CJ* 71: 161–4.
Mitsis, P. 1993. "Committing Philosophy on the Reader: Didactic Coercion and Reader Autonomy in *De Rerum Natura*." *MD* 31: 111–28.
Moles, J. 2002. "Poetry, Philosophy, Politics and Play: *Epistles* 1." In Woodman and Feeney, *Traditions and Contexts*, 141–57.
———. 2007. "Philosophy and Ethics." In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 165–80.
Morgan, L. 2009. "The One and Only *Fons Bandusiae*." *CQ* 59: 132–41.
———. 2010. *Musa pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Morrison, A. D. 2007. "Didacticism and Epistolarity in Horace's *Epistles* 1." In *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, edited by R. Morello and A. D. Morrison, 108–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Most, G. W. 2012. "The Sublime, Today?" In *Dynamic Reading: Studies in the Reception of Epicureanism*, edited by B. Holmes and W. H. Shearin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Muecke, F. 1993. *Horace, Satires II.* Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
Murray, O. 1985. "Symposium and Genre in the Poetry of Horace." *JRS* 75: 39–50.
Nauck, C. W. 1894. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden*. 14th ed. Leipzig: Teubner.
Nelis, D. P. 2013. "Past, Present, and Future in Virgil's *Georgics*." In Farrell and Nelis, *Augustan Poetry*, 244–62.
Newlands, C. E. 1984. *The Transformation of the* Locus Amoenus *in Roman Poetry*. PhD diss., Berkeley.
Nisbet, R. G. M. 1959. "Notes on Horace, *Epistles* 1." *CQ* 9: 73–6.

Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes*, Book I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes*, Book II.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nisbet, R. G. M., and N. Rudd. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes*, Book III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Obbink, D., ed. 1995. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Oliensis, E. 1997. "The Erotics of *Amicitia*: Readings in Tibullus, Propertius, and Horace." In *Roman Sexualities*, edited by J. Hallett and M. Skinner, 151–71. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
———. 1998a. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1998b. Review of R. O. A. M. Lyne (1995). *CP* 93: 86–9.
Papanghelis, T. D., S. J. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis, eds. *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Tranformations*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Pasquali, G. 1964. *Orazio lirico: studi*. Florence: Felice le Monnier.
Patin, M. 1883. "Du poëme *De la Nature*: L'anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce." In *Études sur la poésie latine*, 117–37. 3rd ed. Paris: Hachette.
Paton, W. R. 1918. *The Greek Anthology, Books X–XII*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Pavlock, B. 1982. "Horace's Invitation Poems to Maecenas: Gifts to a Patron." *Ramus* 11: 79–98.
Payne, M. 2007. *Theocritus and the Invention of the Unreal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pfeiffer, R., ed. 1949. *Callimachus*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Pomeroy, A. J. 1980. "A Man at a Spring: Horace, Odes 1.1." *Ramus* 9: 34–50.
Porter, D. H. 1972. "Horace, *Carmina*, IV, 12." *Latomus* 31: 71–87.
———. 1973. "The Motif of Spring in Horace, *Carmina* 3.7 and 4.12." *CB* 49: 57–61.
———. 1987. "From Separation to Song: Horace, *Carmina* IV." *ICS* 12: 97–119.
Porter, J. I. 2003. "Lucretius and the Poetics of Void." In *Le jardin romain: Épicurisme et poésie à Rome. Mélanges offerts à Mayotte Bollack*, edited by A. Monet, 197–226. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses de l'Université Charles-de-Gaulle-Lille III.
———. 2007. "Lucretius and the Sublime." In Gillespie and Hardie, *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, 167–84.
———. 2016. *The Sublime in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pöschl, V. 1973. "Die Dionysosode des Horaz (c. 2,19)." *Hermes* 101: 208–30.
———. 1991. *Horazische Lyrik: Interpretationen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Pucci, P. 1975. "Horace's Banquet in *Odes* 1.17." *TAPhA* 105: 259–81.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1972. "Horace and Tibullus." *CPh* 67: 81–8.
———. 1973. "Horace *C*. 3.30: The Lyricist as Hero." *Ramus* 2: 1–19.
———. 1986. *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
———. 1994. "Structure and Design in Horace 'Odes' 1.17." CW 87: 357–75.
———. 1995–6. "Pastoral Satire." Review of K. Freudenburg (1993). *Arion* 3: 303–16.
———. 2006. *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Reckford, K. J. 1999. "Only a Wet Dream? Hope and Skepticism in Horace, *Satire* 1.5." *AJPh* 120: 525–54.

Rehmann, W. 1969. *Die Beziehungen zwischen Lukrez und Horaz*. PhD diss., Albert Ludwigs Universität.
Rochette, B. 2001. "Horace, lecteur du livre V de Lucrèce (*Satires* I, 3, 99–112)." *Latomus* 60: 16–20.
Roman, L. 2014. *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Rosenmeyer, T. G. 1969. *The Green Cabinet: Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Ross, D. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1987. *Virgil's Elements: Physics and Poetry in the* Georgics. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Rudd, N. 1981. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———, ed. 1993. *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium*. London: Duckworth.
Santirocco, M. 1984. "The Maecenas Odes." *TAPhA* 114: 241–53.
———. 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Saunders, T. 2008. *Bucolic Ecology: Virgil's* Eclogues *and the Environmental Literary Tradition*. New York: Bloomsbury.
Schiesaro, A. 2007a. "Lucretius and Roman Politics and History." In Gillespie and Hardie, *Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, 41–58.
———. 2007b. "Praxis, Rhetoric, and the Law in Lucretius." In Heyworth, *Classical Constructions*, 63–90.
———. 2009. "Horace's Bacchic Poetics." In *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and His Readers*, edited by L. B. T. Houghton and M. Wyke, 61–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2014. "*Materiam superbat opus*: Lucretius Metamorphosed." *JRS* 104: 73–104.
Schmidt, E. 1977. "Das horazische Sabinum als Dichterlandschaft." *A&A* 23: 97–112.
Schrijvers, P. J. 1970. *Horror ac divina voluptas: études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
Sedley, D. 1998. *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Segal, C. 1982. *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides'* Bacchae. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
———. 1989. "Poetic Immortality and the Fear of Death: The Second Proem of the *De rerum natura*." *HSPh* 92: 193–212.
Shearin, W. H. 2015. *The Language of Atoms: Performativity and Politics in Lucretius' De rerum natura.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Sider, D. 1997. *The Epigrams of Philodemus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Silk, E. T. 1969. "Bacchus and the Horatian *Recusatio*." *YCS* 21: 193–212.
Smith, W. S. 2005. "'The Cold Cares of Venus': Lucretius and Anti-Marriage Literature." In *Satiric Advice on Women and Marriage from Plautus to Chaucer*, edited by W. S. Smith, 71–91. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Snyder, J. M. 1980. *Puns and Poetry in Lucretius'* De Rerum Natura. Amsterdam: Grüner.

Spencer, D. 2006. “Horace’s Garden Thoughts: Rural Retreats and the Urban Imagination.” In *City, Countryside and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*, edited by R. M. Rosen and I. Sluiter, 239–74. Leiden: Brill.
Sutherland, E. 2002. *Horace’s Well-Trained Reader: Toward a Methodology of Audience Participation in the* Odes. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 136. New York: Peter Lang.
———. 2005. “Literary Women in Horace’s *Odes* 2.11 and 2.12.” In *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, edited by W. W. Batstone and G. Tissol. New York: Peter Lang.
Syndikus, H. P. 1972. *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden*. Vol. 1. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
———. 1973. *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden*. Vol. 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Tait, J. I. M. 1941. *Philodemus’ Influence on the Latin Poets*. PhD diss., Bryn Mawr College.
Tarrant, R. 2007. “Horace and Roman Literary History.” In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 63–76.
Thomas, K. M. 1981. “Horace’s *Epistularum liber primus*: A Structured Whole?” *CB* 67: 49–53.
Thomas, R. 1986. “Virgil’s *Georgics* and the Art of Reference.” *HSPh* 90: 171–98.
———. 1988. *Vergil:* Georgics. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2011. *Horace:* Odes *Book IV and* Carmen Saeculare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thury, E. M. 1987. “Lucretius’ Poem as a Simulacrum of the *rerum natura*.” *AJPh* 108: 270–94.
Toohey, P. G. 1982. “The Structure and Function of Horace, *Odes* 1.17.” *ICS* 7: 110–24.
Traina, A. 1998. “L’ultimo amore: lettura dell’*Ode* 4,11 di Orazio.” *Aufidus* 34: 7–18.
Troxler-Keller, I. 1964. *Die Dichterlandschaft des Horaz*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
Turpin, W. 1998. “The Epicurean Parasite: Horace, Satires 1.1–3.” *Ramus* 27: 127–40.
Van Sickle, J. B. 2000. “Virgil vs. Cicero, Lucretius, Theocritus, Plato, and Homer: Two Programmatic Plots in the First Bucolic.” *Vergilius* 46: 21–58.
———. 2004. “Virgil *Bucolics* 1.1–2 and the Interpretive Tradition: A Latin (Roman) Program for a Greek Genre.” *CPh* 99: 336–53.
Volk, K. 2002. *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Vretska, K. 1971. “Horatius, *carm* I.1.” *Hermes* 99: 323–35.
Weingaertner, A. 1874. *De Horatio Lucretii Imitatore*. PhD diss., Halle.
West, D. A. 1995. *Horace* Odes *I: Carpe Diem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 1998. *Horace* Odes *II: Vatis Amici*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 2002. *Horace* Odes *III: Dulce Periculum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
White, P. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
———. 2007. “Friendship, Patronage and Horatian Sociopoetics.” In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 195–206.
Wili, W. 1948. *Horaz und die Augusteische Kulture*. Basel.
Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 1980. *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Wimmel, W. 1953. “Über das Verhältnis der 4. Ekloge zur 16. Epode.” *Hermes* 81: 317–44.

Womble, H. 1967. “Horace, *Carmina*, II, 16.” *AJPh* 88 (4): 385–409.
Woodman, T. 1974. “*Exegi monumentum*: Horace, *Odes* 3.30.” In *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, edited by T. Woodman and D. West, 115–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1984. “Horace’s First Roman Ode.” In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, edited by T. J. Woodman and D. West, 83–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2002. “*Biformis vates*: The *Odes*, Catullus and Greek Lyric.” In Woodman and Feeney, *Traditions and Contexts*, 53–64.
Woodman, T., and D. Feeney, eds. 2002. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Yona, S. 2018. *Epicurean Ethics in Horace: The Psychology of Satire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Zanker, A. T. 2010. “Late Horatian Lyric and the Virgilian Golden Age.” *AJPh* 131: 495–516.
Zetzel, J. E. G. 1982. “The Poetics of Patronage in the Late First Century B.C.” In *Artistic and Literary Patronage in Ancient Rome*, edited by B. K. Gold, 87–102. Austin: University of Texas Press.
———. 1983. “Re-Creating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past.” *Critical Inquiry* 10: 83–105.
Zumwalt, N. K. 1974. “Horace *C*. 1.34: Poetic Change and Political Equivocation.” *TAPhA* 104: 435–67.