




RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Two Unnarrated Stories in Horace's Roman Odes (Carm. 3.2.1–12 and 3.6.21–32): Echoes of Vergil's Unfinished *Aeneid* and a Lowlife Epigram

Shirley Werner 

Duke University, USA

Email: [shirley.werner@duke.edu](mailto:shirley.werner@duke.edu)

(Received 30 July 2022; revised 19 December 2022; accepted 4 January 2023)

### Abstract

Within the rhetorical frameworks of exhortation and illustrative exemplum, Horace's second and sixth Roman Odes offer compressed, contrasting images of a young person's education and transformation, presenting these as stories about a *puer* and a *virgo*, respectively, in a lyric mode that does not narrate. In the first of these stories (Carm. 3.2.1–12), Horace slyly usurps characters from Vergil's unfinished *Aeneid*, alluding to some of its distinctive narrative techniques, but also draws on the similes and plot structure of its Iliadic model. The second of Horace's stories (Carm. 3.6.21–32) plays off his first, as he converts the *adulta virgo* who figures in Carm. 3.2 into her antitype. This story has as its intertext an obscene Hellenistic epigram by Automedon. Horace makes both intertextual and metatextual use of his models, while his indirect references, through Homer, to Vergil's intended design for his emerging *Aeneid* may be considered under the new heading of extratextual.

**Keywords:** Horace; Vergil; intertextuality; metatextuality; extratextuality; Greek epigram; Automedon; narrative technique

'[T]he vast majority of Horace's *Odes* contain little trace of narration'.<sup>1</sup> Yet, as Lowrie demonstrates, Horace can present 'stories' without actually narrating,

---

<sup>1</sup> Lowrie (1997) 30. 'The most important criterion for formal narrative is the perfect tense, especially in the third person' (1997: 30 n. 25). Lowrie establishes a restricted definition of 'narrative' as 'the discourse recounting a story': 'In narrative, the speaking voice steps backwards in time from the discourse of the moment. A divide separates the time of speech from the time of the events' (31). Lowrie (1997: 30 n. 25) lists all the odes that, in her judgment, engage in narration or come

or telling, them. This article examines two such instances in the Roman Odes (*Carm.* 3.1–6). In each case, the story is embedded in a larger rhetorical structure that is not narrative; and in each case the picture that emerges is elaborated and embellished over three stanzas and acquires a status of its own as a story that captures the imagination.

The first of these stories, at *Carm.* 3.2.1–12, presents the transformation of a boy from *puer* to warrior. This story unfolds within the rhetorical frame of an exhortation, which leads to the gnomic declaration – an echo of Tyrtaeus – that ‘it is sweet and seemly to die for one’s country’ (*dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*, 3.2.13).<sup>2</sup> The second, contrasting story, at *Carm.* 3.6.21–32, details the transformation of a *virgo* from a young girl to a jaded wife who is pimped openly by her husband. The story is developed as an exemplum to give emotional colour to the preceding claim that generations fertile in debauchery have defiled marriage and the family (3.6.17–20). This general claim plays a causal role within a more intricate argument of causes and consequences in the ode.<sup>3</sup>

Although the rhetorical structures – exhortation versus exemplary illustration – in which these two stories are presented can be seen therefore to differ in their aims, the stories themselves offer comparably compressed accounts of a bewilderingly rapid transformation from youth to maturity. In neither case do we see the entire life of the young person; we are given only glimpses of her or his education on the verge of adulthood, and the final result. Yet a larger life history is implied in both stories.

In the first part of this article, I present the stories. In the second part, I analyse aspects of each story’s intertextual resonances, arguing that in *Carm.* 3.2 Horace draws on Homeric similes and alludes to Homeric and Vergilian narrative and stylistic techniques to construct his own miniature epic; the characters in his battle scene are sketched impressionistically from the characters who play prominent roles in the second half of Vergil’s unfinished *Aeneid*. In the sixth Roman Ode, with allusion to an obscene epigram by Automedon, Horace converts his Horatian mini-*Aeneid* into its opposite by replacing the story of the *puer*’s development with the startlingly contrasting story of a *virgo*’s development and downfall. His allusion to the sleazy epigram arguably reproduces a textual corruption that has been detected and which – along with a second, previously undetected corruption – is still preserved in the epigram that has come down to us. In conclusion, I speculate that Horace’s peculiar reproduction of the textual error serves as a metatextual comment on the uncurated quality of the source text itself and, by extension, on its depraved moral content. The contrast with Vergil’s carefully protected

---

close to it. To prevent confusion, I use ‘narrator’, ‘narrates’, ‘narration’, and related words in Lowrie’s sense. When I refer to the lyric poet’s voice, I use the circumlocution ‘voice of the poet’ and avoid the commonly used (and, in other contexts, unobjectionable) term ‘narrator’, since the voice of the lyric poet is rarely ‘narrating’ in Lowrie’s sense.

<sup>2</sup> Tyrt. fr. 10.1–2. I follow Rudd (2004) for Horace’s text, but I capitalise the personified abstractions; translations are mine.

<sup>3</sup> These causes require separate treatment and will not be discussed here. For the most recent detailed analyses, see Lowrie (2018); Werner (forthcoming).

and curated text and lofty morality could not be stronger. Horace's skilful variation and reconfiguration of his own material in the two Roman Odes highlights his lyric virtuosity and links these sections of two very different odes, 3.2 and 3.6, stylistically as a study in contrasts.

Before I embark on my detailed discussion, two preliminary observations must be made. First, I do not mean to suggest that the Vergilian colouring I attempt to tease out in the first three stanzas of the second Roman Ode is the only, or even the most prominent, intertextual resonance to be felt in this poem. Echoes of Tyrtaeus and other Greek archaic poets and of Simonides and Pindar have long been noted.<sup>4</sup> In the ode as a whole, it is possible to discern a shift of focus from Greek military elegy to hymnic lyric. I have previously argued that the rhetorical mode characteristic of the martial poetry of Tyrtaeus and Callinus – in which exhortations to bravery on the battlefield alternate regularly with gnomic declarations reinforcing those exhortations – gives way after the first four stanzas to a Pindaric-Simonidean mode, in which the relationships between gnome and theme are varied and more elusive or harder to define.<sup>5</sup> I concluded that 'the juxtaposition of the worlds of military elegy and hymnic lyric motivates Horace's ode, and the movement from one to the other constitutes a question'.<sup>6</sup> Within this larger rhetorical dynamic, the Vergilian colouring may be felt as a minor theme that gives depth to this questioning without undermining or supplanting the main themes.

My second preliminary remark is offered in defence of my admittedly unconventional approach to the relationship between Horace's *Odes* and Vergil's *Aeneid*. The bold claim that Horace was acquainted with the basic structure, and in some cases even with the text, of Vergil's unfinished *Aeneid* will, on chronological grounds, be greeted by many with an understandable skepticism. Suetonius famously informs us that in 19 BC Vergil, on his deathbed, insisted in vain that the *Aeneid* be brought to him to be burnt when he recognised that he would not live long enough to give it its finishing touches, a labour he had anticipated would take three more years. Moreover, Suetonius reports, it was only in 23 BC – the year Horace's first three books of *Odes* were published – that Augustus himself was at last privileged to hear Vergil read aloud Books 2, 4, and 6 of the *Aeneid*, although he had long been pleading with and even demanding that Vergil let him see a 'first draft of the poem, or any portion of it that he was willing to share'.<sup>7</sup> My claim, based on a careful consideration of the texts themselves, that Horace had specific knowledge of some passages of the *Aeneid* and of its larger plan is therefore bound to be controversial. Yet I believe that this claim can be reconciled with the anecdotes and evidence preserved by Suetonius. Against the skepticism engendered by chronological considerations, I would posit that the

<sup>4</sup> In this century, by Woodman (2022); Nisbet and Rudd (2004); West (2002).

<sup>5</sup> Werner (1998); cf. the remarks in Syndikus (1973) 27–32, which tend in this direction.

<sup>6</sup> Werner (1998) 282.

<sup>7</sup> As preserved in Donatus' abridgement of Suetonius' *Life*: Donat. *Vit. Verg.* 31 (on pressure from Augustus, with quotation from a letter to Vergil: 'uel prima carminis ὑπογραφή uel quodlibet κῶλον mitteretur'); 35 (on the intended three years' of revision), 39 (on Vergil's deathbed requests). Text, Brugnoli and Stok (1997).

particular ways in which Horace engages with the unfinished *Aeneid* operate on several distinct but interacting levels, which may be defined as intertextual, metatextual, and – to introduce a new term – extratextual. I hope to show that these different forms of engagement with Vergil are ultimately implicated, albeit indirectly, with themes that are recognisable elsewhere in Horace's poetry and in the Roman Odes themselves: namely, Horace's withdrawal from the common crowd and his confidence in the lasting value of his poetry, with the expectation of readers far into the future.

## I. The Stories

### *The Second Roman Ode*

Angustam amice Pauperiem pati  
 robustus acri militia puer  
     condiscat et Parthos feroces  
         vexet eques metuendus hasta  
 vitamque sub divo et trepidis agat  
 in rebus. illum ex moenibus hosticis  
     matrona bellantis tyranni  
         prospiciens et adulta virgo  
 suspiret, eheu, ne rudis agminum  
 sponsus lacessat regius asperum  
     tactu leonem, quem cruenta  
         per medias rapit Ira caedis.

Hor. *Carm.* 3.2.1–12

To put up with straitened Poverty as a friend – a boy must learn to do this, a boy made tough through strict military training; and let him harass the fierce Parthians as a horseman to be feared for his javelin; and let him lead his life under the open sky in dangerous circumstances. Looking out on him from the enemy's battlements, let the wife of the warring monarch and the girl, grown up, sigh, Ah! lest the princely betrothed, not yet trained in the line of battle, provoke the lion, savage when touched, which bloody Rage is sweeping through the very heart of the slaughter.

The second Roman Ode opens with a personification that – if it does not slip by the reader unnoticed<sup>8</sup> – is startling: an image of straitened Poverty treated as if she were a friend. This personification provides a link to the memorable

<sup>8</sup> As far as I can discover the personification has not been recognised since antiquity. Bentley (1713: 146) felt that the adverb *amice* was excessive: 'cur enim adeo *amice*? satis profecto est, si *patur*' ('Why, indeed, in a friendly manner? Certainly, it's enough if he *endures*'), and he preferred Pseudo-Acro's interpretation *hanc oden ad amicos generaliter scribit* ('This ode [Horace] addresses to his friends in general'), thus reading *amici*. Shackleton Bailey (1985) obelises; cf. Holmes (1995) for further discussion.

personifications of the first Roman Ode, where Fear (*Timor*) and Forebodings (*Minae*, 3.1.37) climb as high as the owner does when he ascends to the uppermost prospect from his lofty seaside mansion, built up to jut into the water; and where dark Care (*atra Cura*, 40) is a constant companion on the rich man's yacht and – in a haunting image – is always sitting behind the horseman as he rides. The stylistic echo of these personifications in the figure of Poverty encapsulates the ethical concern with the folly of greed and the burdens of wealth with which the previous ode concluded. For the (re)reader of the *Odes*, the personification also echoes, or is echoed by, the more striking personification of Poverty developed in *Carm.* 3.29, a poem that presents itself as an invitation to Maecenas to put aside his political cares and the distractions of wealth and, like Horace, to cultivate an attitude of equanimity. In this prominently placed ode, the second-to-last of the collection, Horace dwells for two stanzas (3.29.49–56) on the cruel capriciousness of Fortuna. If Fortuna flaps her wings and abandons Horace, 'I pay back what she has granted me, wrap myself up in my virtue [as if it were a cloak],<sup>9</sup> and go courting honest Poverty, who has no dowry' (*resigno quae dedit et mea | virtute me involvo probamque | Pauperiem sine dote quaero*, 54–6). The (re)reader's perception of the structural balance between the second and penultimate odes of Horace's third book confirms, in hindsight, the philosophical implications of the first verse of *Carm.* 3.2 that I attempt to tease out here.

This verse thus bears a philosophical burden that may seem disproportionately heavy in an ode where such ethical concerns – an embrace of the simple life and the cultivation of tranquillity in the face of unpredictability and adversity – play no further role.<sup>10</sup> The abandonment of these concerns signals the rapidity of the transformation that the boy must undergo. From the image of straitened Poverty we move quickly: in the second verse we learn that the boy (*puer*) who emerges as the subject has been 'made tough through strict military training' (*robustus acri militia*). In both grammar and sense, the finite verb in the third verse, *condiscat*, looks back to the boy's ethical education (*angustam amice Pauperiem pati*), but his progression from philosophy to boot camp is so rapid that these successive stages of his young life are sandwiched together before the verb. The movement from his philosophical higher education (*condiscat*) to his participation in a foreign military campaign (*et Parthos feroces ...*) takes place in a single line (3).<sup>11</sup> This third verse is grammatically completed by *vexet eques metuendus hasta* (4), and with the restatement of the subject (from *puer* to *eques*) a subtle shifting of identity begins in a development that culminates with *leonem* (11). The boy's transformation may be

<sup>9</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 361: '[A] rough cloak or τριβων was the badge of the Stoic-Cynic preacher ... and his one protection against the elements'.

<sup>10</sup> Kiessling (1890: 217) observes that '*amice pauperiem pati* is not the theme of this poem, because no further reference will be made to this *patientia* but serves only to provide a link to the end of the previous ode' (my translation from the German).

<sup>11</sup> It is worth rereading Horace's account at *Epist.* 2.2.41–52 of his own abrupt transition from his youthful philosophical studies in Athens to the battlefield of Philippi alongside Fraenkel's imaginative reflections on Roman higher education in Athens during that critical period, Fraenkel (1957) 7–11. Cicero's son was also studying philosophy in Athens at the time.

seen in three stages: from a human *puer*, he becomes an *equus*, a person whose function is defined in relation to an animal; finally, he becomes an animal himself (*leonem*). In a parallel movement, from subject (*puer, equus*) to object (*illum, 6; leonem*), he loses his agency as well as his humanity. His encounter with a second personification signals closure; we have reached the end of his story. The boy who was enjoined to make a friend of Poverty is ultimately seen as the victim of bloody Rage (*cruenta ... Ira, 11–12*), who hurtles him (*raptit, 12*) through the carnage of battle.

### The Sixth Roman Ode

motus doceri gaudet Ionicos  
 matura virgo et fingitur artibus  
     iam nunc et incestos amores  
         de tenero meditatur ungui;  
 mox iuniores quaerit adulteros  
 inter mariti vina, neque eligit  
     cui donet impermissa raptim  
         gaudia luminibus remotis,  
 sed iussa coram non sine conscio  
 surgit marito, seu vocat institor  
     seu navis Hispanae magister,  
         dedecorum pretiosus emptor.

Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.21–32

A girl, (now) grown up, is delighted to be taught Ionian dance moves; even now she's moulded in (those) arts, and from earliest infancy she obsessively plots illicit love affairs. Soon she's looking for younger adulterers in between her husband's quaffs, and she doesn't (bother any longer to) choose one to whom she'll give forbidden pleasures, in a rush, when the lamps have been taken away; but, propositioned in the presence of everyone, and with her husband's connivance, she gets up (from her dinner couch), whether it's a travelling salesman who has put in his order (for sex), or a Spanish sea captain, a big-spending buyer of sleazy degradations.

The three stanzas of this exemplum (stanzas 6–8 in the ode) sketch the progression of a life from girlhood to maturity. In this barely narrated story, we find only two indicators of time: *iam nunc* (23, in stanza 6), of her earliest education in seduction, and *mox* (26, in stanza 7), of the depravity that is to come. This gesture towards narration is undercut by Horace's use of present-tense verbs throughout the description, a stylistic feature that communicates the rapidity of the young woman's degeneration, as if the course of her life is rushing by in a single moment. Yet, while 'now' and 'soon' seem to point to two phases of decline within this eternal (and universalising) present, in

Horace's terse description there are implied a number of stages. Distinct phases of her life as a girl (*virgo*) are tumbled together and conflated in stanza 6. The adjective *matura* (22), indicating that the young woman is ready for marriage, is placed in a verbal context that refers to a period of childhood when she is still being taught lessons (*doceri*, 21) and her unformed character is still being shaped (*figitur*, 22). In the second half of the stanza the discrepancy between her activities and her stated age is even more pronounced: *de tenero ... ungui* (24) means 'from earliest infancy', but the girl cannot possibly have been scheming to have adulterous affairs since she was a baby, and in her preoccupation with her sex life she seems now to have lost her virginity.<sup>12</sup>

In stanzas 7 and 8, a sequence of disparate events is compressed into the impression of a single dinner scene that conveys the wider contours of the story of her marriage. While *matura virgo* (22) remains the grammatical subject, *mox* (25) points to a time when the woman, now a wife, seeks 'younger adulterous lovers' as her husband slugs down another drink (*inter mariti vina*, 26). What older person is being compared to these younger men (*iuniores*, 25)? Most obviously, her husband; but the comparison could as well imply a string of earlier lovers. The negative formulation *neque eligit cui donet impermissa ... gaudia* (26–8), in telling us what she does not now do, may reveal what she used to do in the past, in singling out a man at dinner with whom she would sneak in some quick sex after the lamps were taken away. This choosing is contrasted, however, with her present submissiveness. In this final stage of her degradation, she is openly summoned from the dinner couch, her husband fully complicit, to have sex with any lowly salesman who happens to be passing by, or with any rich sea captain who is willing to pay a high price (*pretiosus emptor*, 32) for such degradation (*dedecorum*).

## 2. Intertextual Resonances

### *The Second Roman Ode*

Cedite, Romani scriptores, cedite, Grai!  
nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.

Prop. 2.34.65–6

Make way, you Roman writers! Make way, you Greeks! Something greater than the *Iliad* is coming to birth.<sup>13</sup>

The most fascinating intertext in the story presented in the second Roman Ode may not (yet) even have been a complete text. In the years when *Carm.* 1–3 were being composed and at the time of their publication in 23 BC, Vergil's *Aeneid* was at least four years away from its publication, shortly after

<sup>12</sup> In my discussion of intertextuality, below, I address the controversy over the meaning of *de tenero ... ungui*.

<sup>13</sup> Text, Goold (1990).

Vergil's death, in 19 BC. Commentators have been loath to consider the possibility of the *Aeneid's* influence on the Roman Odes in anything other than the most sweeping terms mainly for this reason.<sup>14</sup> When we consider that traditional approaches to intertextuality try first to determine the direction of textual influence and then to interpret how the source is imitated, complicated, 'corrected', or otherwise received, this caution is understandable in light of the uncertainty regarding the poems' respective chronologies. And yet in the case of an epic whose composition extended over the course of (perhaps) eleven or twelve years, an epic which – as Propertius testified in 26 or 25 BC – was famously taking shape, even if it had not yet been released to the world, a more fluid approach is needed.<sup>15</sup> It is not necessary to suppose that Vergil had yet finalised in verse the later books of the *Aeneid*, which told of the war in Latium, in order to admit the possibility that Horace may nevertheless have been acquainted with the contours of its emerging plot and, perhaps, some textual details. Nor is it necessary for Horace to have had a meticulous knowledge of these later books for him to have acquired an understanding of Vergil's strategies of characterisation, his engagement with Homer, and other distinctive features of his narrative style. These techniques were already on display even in the first book of the *Aeneid*. From this perspective it is not a question of defining the direction of influence from Vergil to Horace or from Horace to Vergil; it is enough to posit Horace's response to elements of the larger story of Aeneas that was taking shape in Vergil's epic and to demonstrate the mutual influence on Vergil and Horace of Homeric material that is relevant to that larger story. There is an element of poetic playfulness in Horace's double engagement with Homer and Vergil: by alluding to a Roman epic that, according to Suetonius' account, had not yet been made public through reading, even in a limited way, within Augustus' inner circle,<sup>16</sup> Horace slyly usurps Vergil's partly told story and makes it his own. His artful appropriation is a tribute to the *Aeneid* which, precisely because no

<sup>14</sup> Harrison (2014) 622: 'There is at least some chance that the presentation of Juno in *Odes* 3.3 and her ban there on the recreation of Troy indicates knowledge of Juno's reconciliation in *A.* 12'. Most commentaries cautiously refrain even from going this far, although the parallel is sometimes noted (cf. Kiessling-Heinze [1930] 270, citing *Aen.* 12.827–8). Much of the reluctance to find traces of the *Aeneid* in the Roman Odes arises from assumptions concerning the date of composition of the Roman Odes, which is often thought to be early based on Horace's use of the name Augustus (an honorific bestowed in 27 BC) in *Carm.* 3.3 and 3.5 and his reference in *Carm.* 3.6 to the unfulfilled need to repair Rome's decayed temples (restored by Octavian in 28 BC). The case for an early date is not watertight. In a forthcoming study I argue that the sixth Roman Ode situates itself anachronistically in the period of the war against Antony and Cleopatra but that it, and the other Roman Odes, could have been composed at any time up to the publication of *Carm.* 1–3.

<sup>15</sup> Prop. 2.34 was written not long after the death of Cornelius Gallus in 26 BC (*modo ... mortuus*, Prop. 2.34.91–2; for the date, Cass. Dio 53.23).

<sup>16</sup> If we accept both the evident allusions by Propertius and Horace to *Aen.* 7 (made before 25 and 23 BC, respectively) and Suetonius' report (31–3) that Augustus himself was made to wait until 23 for a recitation of Books 2, 4, and 6 only (cf. above, n. 7), we must necessarily conclude that the poets shared more privileged access to the unfinished *Aeneid* than did Augustus. On elite Roman imperial reading culture and on the creative interactions that took place between authors and a restricted circle of fellow writers and trusted critics, see Johnson 2010.



announcement is made and no names are named, presents itself, perhaps deliberately, as the opposite of Propertius' heraldic prediction.

Horace took upon himself the daunting challenge of encapsulating an epic narrative within a tightly woven, small-scale, and nonnarrative lyric mode. He met this challenge by alluding to epic narratives without narrating and by evoking characters, situations, or images in passages that occupy critical positions in the larger-scale structures of the *Aeneid* and *Iliad*. With the ode's transition to a scene set on the walls of a city (*illum ex moenibus hosticis*, 6), the outline of a landscape populated by characters comes into view, setting the stage for a narrative of a traditional type-scene in epic and tragedy in which the inhabitants of a besieged city look out from the ramparts over a battlefield. This cast of nameless but individually delineated characters springs into life when they are recognised as actors in the world of the *Aeneid*. Rather than narrating a background history, however, or, alternatively, a sequence of events, as these might be presented in Vergil's epic, Horace offers a static tableau in which the actions of the characters are only impressionistically represented. The imagery of Horace's scene summarises Vergil's 'Iliadic' *Aeneid* (Books 7–12) with bookending clues that point both to its highly marked proem, in which these characters enter the narrative, and to its dramatic conclusion with Turnus' death.

After Aeneas' departure from the underworld at the beginning of Book 7, Neptune's favouring winds blow his ships to the shores of Italy and they enter the waters of the Tiber. Here Vergil pauses his narrative and, invoking the Muse, makes a programmatic declaration that is positioned at the very turning point from the Odyssean to the Iliadic half of his narrative: 'A grander sequence of events is emerging for me; I embark upon a grander work' (*maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo; | maius opus moveo*, *Aen.* 7.44–5). Propertius' *nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade* seems to echo Vergil's wording, taken by many to be a clear signal that Propertius – even if not Augustus – had at least some privileged knowledge of Vergil's text and a positive sign that Vergil was working on the composition of *Aeneid* 7 in the years when Propertius' second book of elegies and Horace's *Odes* were being written.<sup>17</sup> Horace's own allusion to

<sup>17</sup> Although many are willing to regard Propertius' proclamation as an allusion to Vergil's programmatic statement (Horsfall [2000] 75 is agnostic: 'possibly ... but not demonstrably'), some object to the possibility of Propertian allusion to the later books of the *Aeneid* on chronological grounds. These objections are often tied to discomfort with the anomalies that can be observed between Propertius' account of the *Aeneid*'s focus and subject matter and the events that are actually narrated in the *Aeneid*: for Tränkle (1971), Propertius' prediction of its content is based on expectations of an annalistic treatment in the *Aeneid* similar to the chronologically comprehensive epics of Naevius and Ennius; Heslin (2018) 220 sees the relationship between Propertius and Vergil as competitive, and makes the unorthodox proposal that Vergil's *maior ... nascitur ordo | maius opus moveo* is a response to Propertius' (implied) 'critique' at 2.34.66 of the *Aeneid* 'as a work of insane ambition'; finally, the suggestion has variously been made that Propertius' mention of Actium alludes not to Vergil's description of the battle on Aeneas' shield in Book 8 but to the poem on Actium Vergil seems to promise in *G.* 3. Others account for the anomalies between Propertius' elegy and Vergil's *Aeneid* with explanations that do not require assuming Propertius' ignorance of the *Aeneid*'s larger structure: O'Rourke (2011) sees a deliberate misrepresentation of Vergil,

Vergil's 'Iliadic' proem looks not to the claim itself but to the narrative that follows, in which Vergil introduces the characters and motivating forces that will drive the events of the war soon to engulf Italy. Latinus, king of Latium, had one living child:

sola domum et tantas servabat filia sedes  
iam matura viro, iam plenis nubilis annis.  
multi illam magno e Latio totaque petebant  
Ausonia; petit ante alios pulcherrimus omnis  
Turnus, avis atavisque potens, quem regia coniunx  
adiungi generum miro properabat amore;  
sed variis portenta deum terroribus obstant.

Verg. *Aen.* 7.52–8

Only a daughter dwelt at home holding that palatial seat, a daughter now ripe for a husband, now marriageable in years. Many had been wooing her from wide Latium and from all over Ausonia; the most beautiful, beyond all others, who woos her is Turnus, powerful in his ancestral lineage, whom the royal wife had been hastening – with a passion to inspire wonder – to have united with her as son-in-law; but terrifying omens from the gods are standing variously in her way.<sup>18</sup>

Horace's characters – the king at war; the watchful queen; their daughter, ripe for marriage (*adulta virgo*, 3.2.8; cf. *iam matura viro*, *Aen.* 7.53); and the betrothed prince on the battlefield – comprise the same cast as the characters introduced by Vergil in his 'Iliadic' proem, but their attributes, situations, and attitudes point to the very end of the *Aeneid* rather than to the beginning of Vergil's 'Iliad'.<sup>19</sup> The war foretold in Vergil's proem is already raging in Horace's ode, and Horace's briefly sketched image of women watching fearfully from the battlements conveys a situation analogous to, although also strongly contrasting with, Vergil's action-packed narrative of the panic and confusion that break out within and outside the city as Aeneas approaches, as Latinus withdraws in despair and self-reproach, as women and children line the walls, and as Turnus arms himself eagerly for the final fatal encounter with Aeneas (*Aen.* 11.468–97). The transformation of Horace's 'Aeneas' into a figure who has

---

prompted by Propertius' sense of the 'anxiety of influence'; Stahl (1985) 350–2 n. 19 argues that Propertius mischaracterises the *Aeneid* because he sees it as 'being written for one purpose: to please the man whose final step to unrestrained power ... was his victory at Actium' and finds that purpose repugnant. Of these various proposals, the suggestion that Vergil's striking announcement in the highly marked introduction to his 'Iliadic' *Aeneid* might allude to Propertius' rather diffuse review of Vergil's (and others') poetry, rather than the other way around, strikes me as the least compelling.

<sup>18</sup> Text, Mynors (1969). My translation takes liberties with the tenses in an attempt to bring out Vergil's emphasis on the historical background that sets the stage for the present and future events.

<sup>19</sup> Although Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 25 opine that 'tyrannus implies an Eastern despot', Vergil refers to Latinus as *Laurentis ... tyranni* at *Aen.* 7.266.

lost his humanity (*leonem*) and is carried away by rage (*quem cruenta | per medias rapit Ira caedes*) parallels Aeneas' shocking devolution away from *pietas* – forgetful of Anchises' admonition to spare the conquered – as he himself is 'inflamed by fury, terrible in his rage' (*furiis accensus et ira | terribilis*, *Aen.* 12.946–7) when he plunges his sword into Turnus' heart in his final act in the *Aeneid*. Although Vergil's Turnus is conspicuous for his *violentia*, Horace makes the transformation of his Horatian 'Aeneas' more pointed through contrast by simplifying and reversing the Vergilian characterisation of Turnus. He presents his Horatian 'Turnus' as the betrothed rather than as the rejected suitor and portrays him as unwarlike and vulnerable in the face of the lion's savagery. Horace's characters, then, do not in all respects duplicate Vergil's. The adjustments facilitate lyric compression – Horace resists showing character development as it would be presented in stages in an epic plot – and they illustrate one of the ways in which Horace takes over Vergil's developing story to tell it in his own way.

Horace employs a number of stylistic strategies to avoid narration. Of the three nameless characters introduced in two dense lines – the wife (*matrona*, 7) of a king (*tyranni*, 7) and a young woman of an age suitable for marriage (*adulta virgo*, 8) – the queen and king barely act. Their involvement in the scene is conveyed through present participles. The *matrona* is stationed on the battlements, looking out (*prospiciens*, 8), while the king's location and movements are not specified. We are not told whether he is on the battlefield, on the ramparts, or somewhere inside the city; we know only that he is a king at war (*bellantis tyranni*, 7), an attribute that conveys his ongoing state or condition rather than his actions and that gestures towards Latinus' inability to take effective action in the *Aeneid*. The *matrona* lacks her own finite verb: in the zeugma *matrona ... et adulta virgo | suspiret* (7–9), the singular verb *suspiret* must do grammatical duty for both subjects, although in sense – according to the usual Latin construction in prose – the verb belongs only to one of these subjects (*virgo*).<sup>20</sup> Moreover, the landscape in which these characters are fixed remains embedded in the grammatical framework of the injunction. 'Let her sigh' oddly culminates the string of earlier injunctions ('let him learn', 3; 'let him harass', 4; 'let him lead [his life]', 5), revealing the emotions of a character without becoming the narrative of an actual event: Horace does not say 'she sighed' or 'she will sigh' but rather 'let her sigh'. While *eheu* verges on narration by delivering the sound of the sigh, the words that follow cannot be taken as a direct quotation of speech in any 'realistic', or even in any epic, world. Nor do these words, which describe the betrothed and the lion, give a literal rendition of the character's fears, as Heinze recognised: 'What follows is of course not direct speech, but neither does it directly reproduce the women's fearful thoughts; rather, it converts them into the poet's own conception: only he can contrast the two warriors in this way'.<sup>21</sup> If we

<sup>20</sup> Kühner and Stegmann (1997: 565–6 [§241.9]) offer multiple examples from Cicero, Sallust, Tacitus, and other prose writers. In poetry, although the figure is common ('u. poet. oft'), Kühner and Stegmann find only two unambiguous examples.

<sup>21</sup> Kiessling and Heinze (1930) 258 (my translation from the German original); Heinze's more subtle formulation of Kiessling (1890) 217, 'mit Seufzen befürchten'.

rephrase Heinze's remarks in narratological terms, we can recognise a distinction between the poet who speaks and the character who sees,<sup>22</sup> that is, between the voice of the poet, who structures his discourse with the use of zeugma (*matrona ... et ... virgo suspiret*, 7–9), transferred epithet (*cruenta ... Ira*, 11–2), metaphor (*leonem*, 11), and other poetic figures and the feelings, judgments, and perceptions of a character or characters within the story. The discourse is the poet's, but the words describing the betrothed and the lion focalise the emotions of the characters and contribute to their characterisation.<sup>23</sup> Horace's deployment of this stylistic device constitutes something of a paradox: the focalisation allows him to avoid narrating even while he adopts, from Homer and Vergil, a distinctive narrative technique. The zeugma *matrona ... et ... virgo suspiret* works along with the focalisation to provide further characterisation. Although logic and the rules of prose insist that *suspiret* properly applies only to *virgo*, the verb stands in as a substitute for whatever else the *matrona ... prospiciens* is doing. Some of its emotional colouring inevitably infects her.<sup>24</sup> The figures and techniques Horace uses to structure his discourse are therefore not merely ornamental. They say more than they seem to. Each encodes a narrative or exemplifies a narrative technique that alludes to Vergil's unfinished epic.

Three of these figures – a metaphor, a transferred epithet, and a striking personification – are particularly ingenious in that they achieve their Vergilian resonance not through adaptation of the characters, images, or plot structures that would later be encountered by readers of the *Aeneid*, but through reference to narrative contexts in *Homer* that have far-reaching significance for the *Aeneid*. To encapsulate this broader Vergilian narrative, Horace colours his allusions to Homer with Vergilian overtones and interpretive implications. Horace's lion metaphor draws on the lion similes that describe enemies of Aeneas in two extended and roughly parallel episodes in the *Iliad* in which Aeneas narrowly escapes death; while his personification of bloody Rage refigures a stylised personification depicted on Achilles' shield. Horace's allusion to a work of art in Homer must also, however, be understood as a gesture towards the *Aeneid*, where the descriptions of works of art – such as the images of the Trojan War on display in Juno's temple in Carthage, the reliefs carved by Daedalus on the doors of the temple of Apollo in Cumae, and the images on the shield of Aeneas wrought by Vulcan – raise questions

<sup>22</sup> Fowler (1990) 42, referencing Genette (1980) 189–211 as the originator of the term 'focalisation'.

<sup>23</sup> De Jong (1987) 118–22, on Homer's *Iliad*, terms this overlap between the poet who speaks and the character who sees 'embedded focalization'; when the focalisation is 'not marked by a verb of perceiving, thinking/feeling or speaking', she terms it 'implicit embedded focalization' (118). Fowler (1990) 42–3, on Vergil's *Aeneid*, uses the term 'deviant focalisation' for the latter technique because 'there is a sense in which these instances ... "break the rules"' in that 'there are no explicit signals in the text' that the point of view is not that of the poet. Horace's *suspiret* marks the focalisation as embedded, but not implicit or deviant.

<sup>24</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 26 (with examples): '*suspiret* describes a lover's sigh, whether of anxiety or longing'. It is difficult to translate or even construe Horace's Latin without including the queen as a subject.

of interpretation and interpretability both for the characters within the narrative and for the reader.

From a Vergilian perspective, Aeneas' encounter with Achilles at *Il.* 20.75–352 bears a special significance. In this long episode, one of several that interrupt the narrative of Achilles' *aristeia* (which began with his arming in Book 19 and will end with the death of Hector in Book 22), Achilles taunts Aeneas, who responds with an account of his divine ancestry. The genealogy 'recapitulates the history of Troy and its close associations with the gods at a time when the city's doom is rapidly approaching'.<sup>25</sup> This confrontation between the heroes thus provides an excuse for the narrative to dwell on the mythological foundation that serves as the background against which the epic events unfold. For Vergil, one passage in particular within the Homeric narrative of the clash could have been read tendentiously as a 'prediction' of his own epic narrative. At *Il.* 20.300–8 Poseidon, seeing that Aeneas is about to be killed by Achilles, reminds the other Olympians that Aeneas is not fated to die; rather, 'it is his destiny to escape, so that the race of Dardanus not perish without seed, blotted out. ... But as it is, mighty Aeneas will rule among the Trojans, as will the children of his children who are born afterwards'.

The centrality of Aeneas and the forward-looking emphasis on his fated destiny in this Homeric passage makes Horace's allusion to one of its finer details – a simile (*Il.* 20.164–73) – also, indirectly, an allusion to the *Aeneid* as a whole. Warriors are frequently compared to lions in the similes of the *Iliad*, and in several of the more developed of these similes a predacious lion is described defending itself against shepherds, bands of men, or dogs. In only two of these similes (*Il.* 5.136–42 and 20.164–73), however, is a lion roused to greater ferocity after having been wounded – as he threatens to be in Horace's metaphor, where the warrior-lion is provoked, through contact (*tactu*, 11) with a harassing weapon, into a violent rampage.<sup>26</sup> A reader's suspicion that this detail of imagery in Homer may point, for Horace, specifically to the *Aeneid* increases with the recognition that the earlier Homeric simile of the wounded, enraged lion also occurs in a narrative context (*Il.* 5.111–362, 431–53, 512–8, 561–75) in which Aeneas plays a critical role. Although neither of these unique similes duplicates, or even echoes, the other in its vocabulary or formulae, in many ways the broader context of the earlier narrative prefigures and prepares for the later one, which may perhaps be regarded as a kind of doublet: in both narratives, the simile characterises an enemy (Diomedes in Book 5; Achilles in Book 20) whom Aeneas confronts; in both, the gods intervene to save Aeneas by spiriting him away from the battlefield (Aphrodite, followed by Apollo, in Book 5; Poseidon, in consultation with Hera and other gods, in Book 20). Horace's allusion, through his imitation of Homer's similes, to Vergil's *Aeneid* may therefore be said to be extratextual. The reader's awareness of this double extratextual reference directs our attention away from the differences between the verbal formulae and particulars of each Homeric encounter (Aeneas against Diomedes; Aeneas against Achilles) and toward the overarching

<sup>25</sup> Edwards (1991) 286.

<sup>26</sup> On the unwounded predacious lion in Homer, *Il.* 11.548–55 ≈ 17.657–64; 12.299–306.

structure of the plot of Vergil's 'Iliadic' *Aeneid* (Aeneas against Turnus) and to the details that are relevant to that plot or that are repeated or shared in the Homeric similes: the motif of the wounded lion roused to greater fury and the application of each simile to an enemy of Aeneas. While Vergil drew on these very similes from Homer to characterise Turnus' *violentia* at *Aen.* 12.4–8 and to foreshadow his death, Horace's application of the wounded lion similes to his 'Aeneas' rather than to his rival, the *sponsus*, accomplishes for the ode the same unsettling reversal that Vergil achieves through plot development.<sup>27</sup> This lyric inversion foreshadows, so to speak, or more precisely substitutes for the epic narrative of the increasing *furor* that finally overpowers and consumes Vergil's Aeneas.

Horace's artistry in transforming Vergil's epic narrative into a lyric discourse that is not narrated is further demonstrated in the Homeric allusion encapsulated in Horace's *cruenta ... Ira* (11–2). The wounded lion in Homer's simile of Achilles is said to be 'borne straight ahead by rage' (ἰθὺς φέρεται μένει, *Il.* 20.172). Horace picks up on this detail but takes it one step further in his personification of *Ira*, whom he characterises as 'bloody' with the addition of a transferred epithet that more properly applies to the carnage (*caedes*, 12) than it does, in a literal sense, to rage. In the Homeric simile, by contrast, the rage is not modified by an adjective, and it is figurative rather than personified: in the *Iliad*, personified abstractions interact with humans only in exceptional circumstances, only when undetected by humans, and only when sent by Zeus.<sup>28</sup> Yet the image of a bloody personification seizing and hurtling men through carnage is, in fact, Homeric, even though it does not occur in the narrative of an actual battle. This ghastly abstraction is represented in a figurative and, in Homer's terms, nonrealistic battle scene wrought by Hephaistos on the shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.535–40). Here, Ἐρις (Strife), Κυδοιμός (Tumult), and ὀλοή Κήρ (deadly Fate) were shown fighting among men as if they themselves were mortal (ὠμίλευν δ' ὥς τε ζωοὶ βροτοὶ ἢ δ' ἐμάχοντο, 'and they joined in battle and fought like living men', 539), one holding a man who had just been wounded, another an unwounded man, while the third, deadly Fate, dragged a corpse 'by his feet through the press of battle' (κατὰ μόθον, 537; cf. *per medias ... caedes*, *Carm.* 3.2.12), and she 'wore around her shoulders a garment crimsoned with men's blood' (εἶμα δ' ἔχ' ἄμφ' ὄμοισι δαφροινεὸν αἷματι φωτῶν, 538; cf. *cruenta ... Ira*, *Carm.* 3.2.11–2).

Horace's allusion to Homer's ekphrasis of Achilles' shield does not necessarily constitute an allusion to Vergil's ekphrasis of Aeneas' shield at *Aen.* 8.608–731, a passage that, after all, may not yet have been composed. The relevance to the *Aeneid* of Horace's Homeric allusion is simultaneously more diffuse and more pointed. Unlike the moments in the *Aeneid*'s grander

<sup>27</sup> For an analysis of and further bibliography on Vergil's simile, see Tarrant (2012) 85–6.

<sup>28</sup> At *Il.* 11.1–12 Strife (Ἐρις), holding a πολέμοιο τέρας ('omen of war') in her hands, is sent by Zeus to rouse the Achaeans' battle spirit. She stands on Odysseus' ship and screams; at 11.73–4 she watches the battle and rejoices, 'for she alone of the gods was present with those who were fighting'. At *Il.* 16.454, Hera advises grief-stricken Zeus to send 'Death and gentle Sleep' (Θάνατόν τε καὶ νήδυμον Ἵπνον) to carry the corpse of Sarpedon back to his homeland.

narrative that are relevant to Horace's scene on the walls – the introduction of Vergil's Italian characters in *Aen.* 7 and Aeneas' final act of *furor* in *Aen.* 12 – Horace's allusion to Achilles' shield points not so much to the plot or structure of the *Aeneid* as it does to Vergilian questions concerning interpretation and interpretability. Within a narrative context, the ekphrasis of a work of art is, almost inevitably, bound up with the reception of that art by an interpreting character who views it. A foundation for this stylistic technique of characterisation was already laid by Homer, who differentiates the reactions of the Myrmidons and of Achilles to Achilles' armour depending on their respective abilities even to look at and to understand what they see. The Myrmidons – ordinary mortals – are overcome by trembling (τρόμος, 14) and shrink back in fear (ἔτρεσαν) at the very sound of the clashing armour as Thetis places it before Achilles; not one of them dares to look directly (ἄντην εἰσιδέειν, *Il.* 19.15) at the divinely wrought handiwork, which Homer presents as beyond their ability to comprehend. Achilles' eyes, by contrast, respond in kind by flashing with their own inner fire, which is compared to a sign, signal, or omen (like lightning, a fiery beacon, or a meteor: ὡς εἰ σέλας ἐξεφάνθη, 19.17) when he sees the armour. He, son of an immortal, has the ability not only to satisfy his heart by gazing at the armour at length (ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ἦσι τετάρπετο δαίδαλα λεύσσω, 19) but also to recognise and acknowledge the artefacts as the work of a god.

Vergil's Aeneas is both like and unlike Achilles in his reaction to Vulcan's armour in Vergil's description of the shield. He is like Achilles in that he is able to gaze at length upon what he sees and to rejoice in it (*Aen.* 8.617–25). But Vergil problematises Aeneas' interpretation in that the images themselves bear a meaning that he cannot comprehend, as they refer to Rome's (to Aeneas, unknown and unknowable) future. This problematisation introduces an additional layer of complexity by drawing the reader into the text to complete, or complicate, the act of interpretation. The reader knows the Roman history that Aeneas does not know and can bring to bear on the artefact described in the text knowledge or a perspective that the interpreting character within the text lacks. A particularly eloquent development in the *Aeneid* of an ekphrasis that signals this analogous relationship between the interpreting character and the reader occurs in the first book.<sup>29</sup> Aeneas' tearful declaration to Achates that the images of the Trojan War displayed in the temple of Juno in Carthage are motivated by a noble sense of humanity is at odds with the narrator's stark description of events whose representation in the temple offers

<sup>29</sup> O'Hara (1990) demonstrates that the *Aeneid* persistently signals to the reader the existence of this analogous relationship, and O'Hara (1993) 99–114, at 112, further shows that the *Aeneid*'s 'relentlessly ambiguous' narrative problematises the act of interpretation both for its characters and for its readers. If characters live 'in a world where it is difficult to know the truth, then the reader has entered a world where it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to know the correct interpretation'. O'Hara (1993) draws on wider scholarship concerning the interpreting character in modern and ancient novels and quotes Schor (1980) 170: 'via the interpretant the author is trying to tell the interpreter something about interpretation and the interpreter would do well to listen and take note'.

an account that is, if anything, bleaker even than the reality Aeneas himself remembers when he later describes the fall of Troy to Dido.<sup>30</sup>

Horace's intertextual allusion to a Homeric work of art may therefore be understood as yet another extratextual allusion to Vergil's *Aeneid* and, further, to the problems of interpretation and interpretability embodied in that text. The ode's lion metaphor reverses the larger Homeric narrative by applying the imagery to Horace's 'Aeneas' figure rather than to his enemy. The problem raised here is one of interpretation: what does it mean for the enraged lion to be Aeneas rather than Aeneas' enemy? Horace's allusion to a Homeric work of art, in turn, raises the Vergilian question of interpretability. But the ode, unlike the epic, offers the reader neither a narrative nor an interpreting character. Its allusion to an epic ekphrasis serves as a signal that the work of interpretation must be done by the reader. How is the reader to understand Horace's own problematisation of *dulce et decorum* in this ode?

### The Sixth Roman Ode

In its intertextual echoing, the contrasting story of the *virgo* in the sixth Roman Ode takes us from the sublime (Homer and Vergil) to the seamy (Automedon) in the form of an allusion to an obscene epigram, *Anth. Pal.* 5.129, whose text was probably already corrupt in Horace's own time.<sup>31</sup> In fact, as it has come down to us this short epigram arguably contains two textual corruptions. A literal translation exposes the difficulties of the received text.

Τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ὄρχηστρίδα, τὴν κακοτέχνους  
 σχήμασιν ἐξ ἀπαλῶν κινυμένην ὀνόχων,  
 αἰνέω, οὐχ ὅτι πάντα παθαίνεται οὐδ' ὅτι βάλλει  
 τὰς ἀπαλὰς ἀπαλῶς ὥδε καὶ ὥδε χέρας,  
 ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τριβακον περὶ πάσσαλον ὀρχήσασθαι  
 οἶδε καὶ οὐ φεύγει γηραλέας ῥυτίδας.  
 γλωττίζει, κνίζει, περιλαμβάνει· ἦν δ' ἐπιρίψη  
 τὸ σκέλος, ἐξ ἄδου τὴν κορύνην ἀνάγει.

*Anth. Pal.* 5.129

The dancing girl from Asia, who moves with lascivious poses from her earliest infancy (?), I praise not because she shows passion in her every gesture or because she tenderly positions her tender hands this way and that, but because she knows how to dance around my worn-out

<sup>30</sup> Compare the ransoming of Hector's body, which, as Werner (2002) 65 observes, 'is represented as a heartless financial transaction' in the images (*Aen.* 1.484), with Aeneas' account of Priam's dying words concerning Achilles' humanity in releasing Hector's body at *Aen.* 2.540–3. On what the temple scene reveals about the character of Aeneas, see Werner (2002) 64–8.

<sup>31</sup> Automedon is considered a contemporary of Horace on the basis of his reference to the rhetorician Nicetes (fl. 31 BC) at *Anth. Pal.* 10.23. That *Anth. Pal.* 5.129 seems already to have been circulating in a corrupted form is, I argue, a sign for Horace that it belongs to a lower and more debased class of poetry.



peg and doesn't run away from an old man's wrinkles. She tongues, she tickles, she hugs; when she throws her leg upon (...?), she can bring my club back from the dead.

The meaning of ἐπιρίψη (7), 'cast at, throw (something) upon',<sup>32</sup> is problematic both grammatically – one would expect an indirect object with this compound verb – and as a description of what the dancer is doing with her (?) leg. Her previous actions in this verse (tonguing, tickling or teasing, and hugging) are all exercised on the old man's body. After these intimate details of foreplay, it is not easy to see how the mere kicking up of her leg could serve as the climactic gesture that brings the old man's club back from the dead. An effective remedy for the text's, and the old man's, problem is found if we emend ἐπιρίψη to ἐπιρίπτω and translate 'when she rubs my thigh ...'.<sup>33</sup> Another epigram by Automedon provides details that clarify the sexual significance of this act. In *Anth. Pal.* 11.29.3–4 Automedon worries about impotence: αὐτή γὰρ λαχάνου σαθρωτέρη ἢ πρὶν ἀκαμπῆς ζῶσα νεκρὰ μηρῶν πᾶσα δέδυκεν ἔσω ('this thing of mine – more flaccid than a [wilted] vegetable – which used to be rigid when it was alive, has sunk entirely into my thighs, a corpse'). In 5.126 he faces a similar problem. Although his worn-out peg has presumably retreated into his thighs, when the dancer rubs his leg (σκέλος) she can bring it back – not as a peg, but as a club, no less! – from the realm of the dead. The physical stimulation of *his* σκέλος, rather than the performance of a sexy dance move in which she kicks up *her* σκέλος, will overcome his impotence.<sup>34</sup>

With this emendation Automedon's epigram falls neatly into two thematic halves. The last four lines describe the dancer's sexual manipulations of the old man's body, while the first four lines concern her dancing moves. Within this context the phrase ἐξ ἀπαλῶν ... ὀνύχων sits as awkwardly as Horace's *de tenero ... ungui* (*Carm.* 3.6.24) sits within the ode, and for a similar reason: in both Greek and Latin the idiom 'from (the time of her) tender fingernails' has the troublesome meaning 'from (her) earliest infancy'.<sup>35</sup> While Horace exploited

<sup>32</sup> *LSJ* s.v. ἐπιρίπτω.

<sup>33</sup> The emendation suggested here is not part of any modern edition or critical apparatus. It was anticipated by Brunck (1785), who printed ἐπιρίψη, but without offering any explication or textual justification. Dübner (1864) cited Brunck's text but did not accept it, interpreting 'if she rubs her leg (against mine)' as the intended meaning. If ἐπιρίψη is posited as the original reading, corruption through the loss of *tau* would also account for the single *rho* in ἐπιρίψη at *Anth. Pal.* 5.129 (an inattentive copyist might have been influenced by a memory of such phrases as τὸ σκέλος ρίψοντες, of dancers 'kicking up (their) legs,' *Ar. Pax* 332). *LSJ* s.v. ἐπιρίπτω, concentrating on earlier texts, cites only this epigram for the orthographic variant ἐπιρίπτω. A search through the *TLG* database shows that this orthography is not uncommon, but it only begins to appear in the New Testament and in texts dating from the second century AD and later.

<sup>34</sup> The parallelism between *Anth. Pal.* 11.26 and 5.126 was noted by Höschle (2006), who comments on death as a metaphor for impotence. She does not consider emendation of the transmitted text at 5.129.7, however, and translates 'when she kicks up her leg' (592).

<sup>35</sup> Cameron (1965) convincingly discusses the evidence. With the adjective: Prop. 1.20.39, *tenero pueriliter ungui*; *Paroemiogr.* 2.407.51a, ἐξ ἀπαλῶν ὀνύχων ἀντὶ τοῦ νηπιόθεν. Without the adjective, the idiomatic meaning 'deeply, to the core of one's being' is intended: Plaut. *Stich.* 761,

this peculiar idiom for poetic effect by compressing the various phases of his *virgo's* life into a tight jumble of scenes in order to create the impression of her very rapid development and downfall, the thematic structure of Automedon's epigram admits no such poetic justification. The phrase ἐξ ἀπαλῶν κινυμένην ὀνύχων is as nonsensical within the epigram ('moving ... from her earliest infancy') as it is gratuitous, since the old man is otherwise engrossed wholly in his own pleasure and betrays no actual curiosity about the dancer herself except as a talented sexual entertainer. For these reasons, Nisbet's tentative emendation to ἐξ ἄκρων κινυμένην ὀνύχων ('quivering from the tips of her fingernails') is persuasive: 'perhaps at an early stage ἄκρων was corrupted to ἀπαλῶν under the influence of ἀπαλὰς ἀπαλῶς below'.<sup>36</sup>

Why did Horace choose to imitate the very phrase that, both in the pointlessness of its content and in its difficulty to construe, contributes the least to the epigram's overall argument and thematic structure? The most economical answer would be that the conspicuous interpretive difficulty introduced with the corruption is a memorable textual feature in an otherwise rather unremarkable, if clever, epigram. Horace's echoing of the difficult text unmistakably signals his allusion to it. This explanation may well tell the whole story without the need for further elaboration, but the possibility that Horace himself might have suspected textual corruption is worth exploring. We have seen that two probable corruptions – both easily detectable and simply fixed – have crept into the text, one of which at least is ancient. The question asked above might now be reformulated to consider why Horace would choose to allude to a transparently corrupt text. I am tempted to propose that in making the allusion to a flawed or inferior reading, Horace is commenting on the poor quality of the physical text itself and, by implication, on the common circulation of that text, with its lewd content, to an uncritical and coarse public. In the form in which Automedon's closely contemporary epigram was circulating in Horace's time, the physical artefact presented to readers was anything but a *lepidum novum libellum* (Catull. 1.1) – a curated, polished edition; rather, the epigram seems to have been preserved as a carelessly copied product that might be compared, in modern terms, to a badly edited, throwaway paperback published for consumption by an idle, indiscriminating audience seeking raunchy entertainment.

Horace's implicit condemnation of the epigram's content is signalled both by the parallels that link the ode closely to its epigrammatic source and by the reversals that distinguish it from that source. Both Automedon and Horace refer either to the dancer's, or to the dance's, Eastern origin (τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ὄρχηστρίδα, 1; *motus ... Ionicos*, 21); to the arts the dancer employs, or which shape her (κακοτέχνους σχήμασιν, 1–2; *figitur artibus*, 22); and to the age of her lover(s) (γηραλέας ῥυτίδας, 6; *iuniores adulteros*, 25); in all these cases the parallelism also serves to some degree as a contrast.

*perpruriscamus usque ex unguiculis*; Plut. *Mor. Lib. educ.* 5.1, ἔνδοθεν καὶ τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον ἐξ ὀνύχων; *Anth. Pal.* 5.14.4, τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξ ὀνύχων ἀνάγει.

<sup>36</sup> Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 107, comparing Lucian *Trag.* 17, *χειρῶν ἀπ' ἄκρων*: 'it seems pointless to apply the adjective to nails and hands with different implications'.

But while Automedon makes abundant use of words relating to dancing in the first part of the epigram and, in its second part, of words relating to sex and parts of the body, Horace refers to dancing only with the words *motus ... Ionicos*; to the act of sex only with *gaudia donare*; and to the body only indirectly, with the idiom of the fingernail. These parallels and contrasts were noted by Colaclidès and McDonald, who also observed that, ‘as if to counterbalance his reserve in the use of such terms’, Horace ‘has put Automedon at a distance in another sense, in relying largely on an intellectual, moral, and social vocabulary’, with reference also to cognitive processes and choice (*doceri*, 21; *meditatur*, 24; *eligit*, 26; *conscio*, 29); while Automedon refers only to the dancer’s knowledge (οἶδε, 6) of how to rouse the old man.<sup>37</sup>

### 3. Conclusion

My analysis has attempted to illuminate two aspects of Horace’s lyric discourse in the Roman Odes through a consideration of two parallel, yet contrasting, figures, a *puer* and a *virgo*. The aim has been, first, to unpack the ways in which the stories of each figure’s progression from youth to maturity are presented in a compressed – some might say almost tortured – lyric discourse that eschews narration; the second aim has been to expose their poetic genealogies. In the second Roman Ode, the exhortations to inure a *puer* to military discipline break down unexpectedly with the injunction *suspiret* in the culminating image of a landscape peopled by characters from Vergil’s *Aeneid*. In miniaturising Vergil’s epic narrative, Horace also adapted or encoded stylistic techniques that are well documented in Vergil, including characterisation through allusion to Homer. The subtlety of Horace’s own Iliadic allusions, in which he displays his nuanced understanding both of the minute details of imagery in the *Iliad* and of the ways in which any given simile or image fits within the broad strokes of Homer’s Aeneas plot(s), shows Horace to have been as careful a reader of Homer as was Vergil.

In the sixth Roman Ode, Horace constructs a second unnarrated story that plays off his first. The *adulta virgo* of *Carm.* 3.2, a character inspired by Vergil’s Lavinia, gave rise to the contrasting figure of the *matura virgo* in 3.6, but here Horace’s allusion is not to Vergil’s Lavinia but to his own lyric *virgo*. The girls’ situations in life are starkly opposed: the *adulta virgo* is under the protection of a royal mother and father (*matrona bellantis tyranni*, 3.2.8) and anticipates a suitable marriage (*sponsus ... regius*, 10); while the *matura virgo* is under the tutelage, not of parents, but of unspecified people who school her in the arts of sexual enticement while her character is still being formed (*doceri ... gaudet*, 3.6.21; *figitur*, 22). Her intentions are directed not towards honourable marriage but towards plotting adulterous love affairs (*incestos amores ... meditatur*, 23–4). Horace’s *matura virgo* is the antitype of his *adulta virgo*, but her passage through the various stages of life, which are piled on top of and interlaced

<sup>37</sup> Colaclidès and McDonald (1974) 382–4, quotation at 383 (my translation from the French original). I slightly revise their interpretation of the parallels and contrasts in keeping with my view of the epigram’s structure.

with each other at the very level of syntax, is analogous to that of the *puer*. Inserted into Horace's sketch of the *virgo*'s downfall are a number of details derived from a frivolously obscene epigram by Automedon, including – puzzlingly – Horace's duplication of a probable textual error. Horace's reproduction of this senseless but easily corrected corruption, which may very well be deliberate, arguably has a metatextual function. The corruption reveals the low quality of an uncurated and (by implication) popularly circulating source text by an undistinguished author, whose sloppy production implicitly reflects its low moral content. This textual carelessness and the epigram's disreputable morality stand in sharp contrast to Vergil's polished and curated text of the *Aeneid*, with its serious ethical concerns.

The metatextual relationship between the corrupted text and corrupted morals touches on a Callimachean topos given rather delicate expression in *Epigr.* 30: the implied equivalence between a commonly circulating poem and a sexually desirable but promiscuous boy.<sup>38</sup> An amusing variation on this topos would be developed more extensively by Horace in the closing epistle of his collection of hexameter letters (*Epist.* 1.20), in which he anxiously addresses his personified book as a slave who is (overly) eager to be put up for sale and go out in the world, but whose release to the public means that he will be well-thumbed by vulgar hands and opens him to the danger of being debased and soon forgotten once his novelty and youthful sexual allure have worn off. Within the context of the Roman Odes, the underlying contrast between vulgar circulation and avoidance of the common crowd picks up on the programmatic declaration – itself a probable echo of Callim. *Epigr.* 30 – that opens the cycle at the very beginning of the third book: *odi profanum vulgus* ('I shun the profane crowd', *Carm.* 3.1.1). Horace's insistence on banishment of the common crowd before he utters his *carmina non prius audita* ('songs not heard before', 3.1.2–3) and his anxiety concerning the epistles' cheapening, corruption, and even, perhaps, the jadedness or eventual oblivion that may come with publication are two sides of the same coin. Stewardship and protection of the text and a resolve to share it only when it is ready to be presented to the world are evident also in Vergil's refusal to accede prematurely to Augustus' demand to see part of the *Aeneid* and in Vergil's deathbed wish that any writings he would not have published himself be burnt.

These motives may also account for Horace's underplaying – one might almost say his disguising – of his allusions to the *Aeneid*. Would Horace's readers in 23 BC have recognised his inexplicit gestures towards the *Aeneid*? I am tempted to propose that at the time of the Roman Odes' publication Horace had in mind two contemporary classes of readers. One was the larger public, who might or might not grasp that the epic colouring of the second Roman Ode pointed to the much-anticipated, but as yet unpublished and still unknown, *Aeneid*.<sup>39</sup> The other was a carefully selected and exclusive audience,

<sup>38</sup> I thank Bob Cowan for drawing this further thematic connection to my attention. On the motif in Martial, cf. Williams (2002); Cowan (2014).

<sup>39</sup> Propertius' heralding of the *Aeneid* shows public awareness that Vergil's composition of an epic to rival the *Iliad* was underway; Suetonius' remark that the *Eclogues*, Vergil's earliest body

including Vergil (and quite possibly Propertius), consisting of an inner circle of those in the know. To these contemporary audiences we must, however, add Horace's proudly anticipated and ever-growing audience of future readers. These readers will have read the *Aeneid* and, in Horace's own words, would be reading his *Odes* 'as long as the Pontifex climbs the Capitol with the silent [Vestal] Virgin' (*dum Capitolium scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex*, *Carm.* 3.30.8–9).

An anecdote preserved in Donatus' abridgement of Suetonius' *Life of Vergil* (23–5) reports that Vergil first composed a draft of the *Aeneid* in prose and then proceeded to turn it into verse in no particular order, propping up the unfinished sections with very slight wording, 'like scaffolding, Vergil would jokingly say, to hold up the structure until the solid columns arrived' (*quos per iocum pro tibicinibus interponi aiebat ad sustinendum opus, donec solidae columnae advenirent*). This anecdote is consistent with the conclusions that can be drawn from an analysis of the ways in which Horace constructs his tribute to the unfinished *Aeneid*, an engagement that I have described as metatextual, intertextual, and extratextual. The anecdote would account both for the slight traces of Vergil's wording in Horace's text but also for why Horace does not show – or, perhaps, was not yet permitted by Vergil to reveal – a more detailed familiarity with the text of the 'Iliadic' *Aeneid* as we know it, even while he demonstrates his awareness of its larger structure. It can plausibly be argued that Horace alludes directly to the 'Iliadic' half of the *Aeneid* with two bookending intertextual references to *Aen.* 7.53 and 12.946–7. But he shows his deeper acquaintance with Vergil's unique narrative style, techniques of characterisation, and problematisation of interpretation and interpretability – features that can be observed already in the first book of the *Aeneid* – not through further direct imitation or adaptation of the text of the later books of the *Aeneid*, but through reference to narrative contexts in Homer that had, or would come to have, significance for the *Aeneid*. I have proposed the term 'extratextual' for this type of allusion, through Homer, to Vergil's intended design for his 'Iliadic' *Aeneid*.

**Acknowledgements.** I am grateful to my anonymous readers for their incisive criticism and to Bob Cowan for his further valuable observations, all of which served to strengthen my argument. Its weaknesses are my responsibility.

## Bibliography

- Bentley, R. (1713), *Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richardi Bentleyi*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Amsterdam.
- Brugnoli, G. and Stok, F. (1997), *Vitae Vergilianae antiquae*. Rome.
- Brunck, R. F. P. (1785), *Analecta veterum poetarum Graecorum. Editio quarto volumine aucta*. Vol. 2. Strasbourg.
- Cameron, A. (1965), 'Tener unguis', *CQ* 15, 80–3.
- Colaclidès, P. and McDonald, M. (1974), 'Horace et Automédon', *Latomus* 33, 382–4.
- Cowan, R. (2014), 'Fingering Cestos: Martial's Catullus' Callimachus', in A. Augoustakis (ed.), *Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past*. Leiden, 345–71.

---

of work, were so popular that they were frequently sung on stage vividly demonstrates Vergil's immediate and extraordinary fame (Donat. *Vit. Verg.* 26).

- De Jong, I. J. F. (1987), *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam.
- Dübner, J. F. (1864), *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina, cum Planudeis et appendica nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*. Vol. 1. Paris.
- Edwards, M. W. (1991), *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 5: Books 17–20. Cambridge.
- Fowler, D. (1990), 'Deviant Focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *PCPhS* 36, 42–63.
- Fraenkel, E. (1957), *Horace*. Oxford.
- Genette, G. (1980), *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. J. E. Lewin. Ithaca.
- Goold, G. P. (1990), *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, MA.
- Harrison, S. (2014), 'Horace', in R. F. Thomas et al. (eds.), *The Virgil Encyclopedia*. Chichester, 622–3.
- Heslin, P. A. (2018), *Propertius, Greek Myth, and Virgil: Rivalry, Allegory, and Polemic*. Oxford.
- Holmes, N. (1995), 'Horace, *Carm.* 3, 2, 1: *angustam famicet pauperiem pati*', *Hermes* 123, 505.
- Horsfall, N. (2000), *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Höschele, R. (2006), 'Dirty Dancing: A Note on Automedon AP 5.129', *Mnemosyne* 59, 592–4.
- Johnson, W. A. (2010), *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. Oxford.
- Kiessling, A. (1890), *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Berlin.
- Kiessling, A. and Heinze, R. (1930), *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden*. 7<sup>th</sup> edn. Berlin.
- Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. (1997), *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Teil 2: Satzlehre*. Vol. 2. Hannover. Reprint of 5<sup>th</sup> edn. from 1975, with the corrections of A. Thierfelder.
- Lowrie, M. (1997), *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.
- Lowrie, M. (2018), 'Figures of Discord and the Roman Addressee in Horace, *Odes* 3.6', in S. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis, and T. D. Papanghelis (eds.), *Intratextuality and Latin Literature*. Berlin, 211–25.
- Mynors, R. A. B. (1969), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Rudd, N. (2004), *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*. Oxford.
- O'Hara, J. J. (1990), *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton.
- O'Hara, J. J. (1993), 'Dido as "Interpreting Character" at *Aeneid* 4.56–66', *Arethusa* 26, 99–114.
- O'Rourke, D. (2011), 'The Representation and Misrepresentation of Virgilian Poetry in Propertius 2.34', *AJPh* 132, 457–97.
- Rudd, N. (2004), *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. Cambridge, MA.
- Schor, N. (1980), 'Fiction as Interpretation/Interpretation as Fiction', in S. R. Suleiman and I. Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Princeton, 165–82.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1985), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Stuttgart.
- Stahl, H.-P. (1985), *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'; Individual and State under Augustus*. Berkeley.
- Syndikus, H. P. (1973), *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden*. Bd. 2: *Drittes und viertes Buch*. Darmstadt.
- Tarrant, R. (2012), *Virgil: Aeneid, Book XII*. Cambridge.
- Tränkle, H. (1971), 'Properz über Virgils Aeneis', *MH* 28, 60–3.
- Werner, S. (1998), 'Reading through Distance: Horace, *Ode* 3.2 and the Rhetoric Imposed by the Reader', *CML* 18, 271–92.
- Werner, S. (2002), "'Frigid Indifference" or "Soaked Through and Through with Feeling"? Portrayal of Character in the *Aeneid*', in W. S. Anderson and L. N. Quartarone (eds.), *Approaches to Teaching Vergil's Aeneid*. New York, 60–8.
- Werner, S. (forthcoming), 'Horace-as-Alcaeus (*Odes* 3.6) Impersonates Horace-as-Archilochus (*Epodes* 7 and 16): Persona and Poetic Autobiography in Horace', *AJPh* 144.
- West, D. (2002), *Horace Odes III: Dulce periculum*. Oxford.
- Williams, C. A. (2002), 'Sit nequior omnibus libellis: Text, Poet, and Reader in the Epigrams of Martial', *Philologus* 146, 150–71.
- Woodman, A. J. (2022), *Horace: Odes, Book III*. Cambridge.

---

**Cite this article:** Werner S (2023). Two Unnarrated Stories in Horace's Roman Odes (*Carm.* 3.2.1–12 and 3.6.21–32): Echoes of Vergil's Unfinished *Aeneid* and a Lowlife Epigram. *Antichthon* 57, 80–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ann.2023.7>