Classical Quarterly 65.1 253–285 © The Classical Association (2015)
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000597

A DITHYRAMB FOR AUGUSTUS: HORACE, *ODES* 4.2[1]

1. ANTONIUS AND *RECUSATIO*

Odes 4.2 ostensibly looks forward to two public events lying at some indeterminate point in the future, Augustus' return from campaign in Gaul, and a triumph over the Sygambri. The celebrations anticipated for these occasions frame the second half of the ode; but they do not supply its dramatic setting or timing, and the latter is evidently associated with the period following Augustus' departure for Gaul in summer 16 B.C., or at any rate with a time when the Sygambri were felt still to present an armed threat.[2] The dramatic date need not however be identical with the time of writing, and it should not be assumed that *Odes* 4.2 was composed in 16. Indeed, as will be seen (below, Section 6), it is most likely to be the retrospective product of a later period, around the time of Augustus' eventual return in July 13. On this view, the poem does not look forward to future events, but back to the time of Augustus' departure.

The dramatic setting presented in *Odes* 4.2, whatever it was (below, Section 7), brings together the poet and Iullus Antonius. The son of two enemies of Augustus, the triumvir and his third wife Fulvia, Antonius was the husband of Augustus' niece Marcella, an acknowledged favourite of the Princeps, and 'among the most resplendent *nobiles* not yet of consular years'.[3] Born in 43 (the praenomen advertised loyalty to the dead Caesar), he was praetor in 13 at the age of 30, and then consul in 10, a regular progression that suggests tenure of the aedileship in 16, around the likely dramatic date of our poem.[4] As praetor, Antonius stage-managed events around Augustus' fiftieth birthday, following his return to Rome; and if the fourth ode-book was published in 13,

[1] I am grateful to the anonymous referee for helpful comments and bibliographical advice. I am also indebted to a pre-publication reading of Jacqueline Klooster's analysis of Aratean references in Horace's sacrificial *vitulus* (cited below, n. 74).

[2] So I.M. Le M. Du Quesnay, 'Horace, *Odes* 4.5: *Pro Reditu Imperatoris Caesaris Divi Filii Augusti*', in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration* (Oxford, 1995), 128–87, at 132, noting the reference to *vota publica* for Augustus' return (42–3), and comparing Dio 54.19.7; H.P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden*, vol. 2 (Darmstadt, 1973), 296 n. 3. The Sygambrian incursion is dated to 17 by Obsequens 71, the year preferred by R. Syme, 'Some notes on the legions under Augustus', *JRS* 23 (1933), 14–33, at 7 n. 33. All dates cited are B.C., unless otherwise stated.

[3] R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 397–9 (quotation at 396). On young *nobiles* in *Odes* 4, see also S.J. Harrison, 'The praise singer: Horace, Censorinus and *Odes* 4.8', *JRS* 80 (1990), 31–43, at 33–4.

[4] *PIR*^{2} A800. Praenomen: Syme (n. 3), 398. The aedileship is generally assumed for 16: thus, A. Kiessling and R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden* (Berlin, 1930^7), ad loc.; C. Becker, *Das Spätwerk des Horaz* (Göttingen, 1963), 124, 126; S.J. Harrison, 'Horace, Pindar, Iullus Antonius and Augustus: *Odes* 4.2', in Harrison (ed.) (n. 2), 108–27, at 116; cf. O. Seel, '*Maiore poeta plectro*', in W. Eisenhut (ed.), *Antike Lyrik* (Darmstadt, 1970), 143–81, at 166–8; P. Fedeli and I. Ciccarelli, *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina: liber IV* (Florence, 2008), 117 (the citations there imply ancient authority). Cf. R. Thomas, *Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare* (Cambridge, 2011), 105. No discussion in *Orazio: Enciclopedia oraziana*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1996–8) (henceforth *EO*), 1.637 s.v. 'Antonio, Iullo'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

then the prominence within it of *Odes* 4.2 may mark Antonius' spectacular emergence into public life in that year.[5] In addition, as a pupil of the critic Crassicius Pansa and the attested author of an epic *Diomedeia*, Antonius evidently took an active interest in poetry;[6] but in the background, as will be seen, stands a more substantial figure in the history of Roman letters, M. Antonius (cos. 99), great-grandfather of Iullus, participant in Cicero's *de Oratore*, and himself one of the two leading *oratores* of his generation.

Antonius' activity as poet is adduced in the pseudo-Acronian commentary to explain the poetic celebration anticipated in lines 33–44, in these terms: *cantabis nobiscum, tu Antoni, ... meliori opere victorem Caesarem ...* ('you, Antonius, will sing with us of victorious Caesar in a better work'). This interpretation, which has prevailed at least since Late Antiquity, underpins the modern view of the poem as a *recusatio*, similar in essentials to what we find in Horace's 'refusals' to sing of Octavian/Augustus and Agrippa in *Sat.* 2.1.10–20, *Odes* 1.6 and 2.12, and *Ep*. 2.1.250–9.[7] On this reading, Horace responds to a prior suggestion from Antonius that he compose a Pindarizing song in honour of Augustus' anticipated return and triumph;[8] but he declines the request and counter-proposes that Antonius himself should 'sing of Caesar';[9] and his praise of Pindar is revealed as a defensive device to parry an unwelcome commission.

The *recusatio*-reading involves a number of serious difficulties. In the first place, there is no mention of Augustus until the second half of the poem; and his putative triumph (which of course was never sought or granted) is placed at some indeterminate point in the future (*quandoque*), so that it can scarcely be the object of a song-commission representing the settled requirements of state celebration.[10] Again, while a *recusatio* might put forward a classic poet as an ideal exemplar (in *Odes* 1.6, Varius is presented as *alter Homerus*), the Pindar-passage does not fulfil that function

[5] Publication in 13? See most recently Thomas (n. 4), 5–7. R.G.M. Nisbet, 'Horace: life and chronology', in S. Harrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (Cambridge, 2007), 7–21, at 17, suggested that the recovery of standards and closure of the temple of Janus at *Odes* 4.15.6–9 may refer to events in 11 (this would not materially affect the conclusions of this article). Antonius: Dio 54.26.2 (Circus games and a senatorial feast on the Capitol for Augustus' birthday in 13).

[6] Suet. *Gramm.* 18.3 *sed cum edoceret iam multos ac nobiles in his Iullum Antonium triumviri filium* ... Pansa issued a commentary on Cinna's *Zmyrna*. T.P. Wiseman, 'Who was Crassicius Pansa?', *TAPA* 115 (1985), 187–96, at 193, speculates that Antonius' *Diomedeia* was written in Greek. A. Coppola, 'Diomede in età Augustea: appunti su Iullo Antonio', *Hesperia: studi sulla Grecità di Occidente* 1 (1990), 125–38 (otherwise helpful) implausibly conjectures a counter-Aeneas, thus counter-Augustan, treatment.

[7] W. Wimmel, '*Recusatio*-Form und Pindarode', *Philologus* 109 (1965), 83–103; E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 20–1; G. Calboli, 'Zur Pindarode: Horaz und Terenz', *Philologus* 141 (1997), 86–113, at 87–8.

[8] There are traces in the scholia of an alternative view, that Antonius himself aspired to imitate Pindar, and is being warned off: H.J. Botschuyver, *Scholia in Horatium*, vol. 4 (Amsterdam, 1942), 143–4. Compare the Pindarizing Titius of *Epistles* 1.3; and for interplay between *Odes* 4.2 and that poem, compare *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari* (1) with *fidibusne Latinis | Thebanos aptare modos studet* (*Ep.* 1.3.12–13); *laurea donandus Apollinari* (9) with *prima ... hederae victricis praemia* (*Ep.* 1.3.25), each attached to a disjunctive catalogue; *thyma* (29) with *thyma* (*Ep.* 1.3.21); *parvus* (31) with *non tibi parvum | ingenium* (*Ep.* 1.3.21–2); *vitulus ... | ... qui largis iuvenescit herbis | in mea vota* (54–6) with *pascitur in vestrum reditum votiva iuvenca* (*Ep.* 1.3.36). The epistle acts a commentary on the ode: below, Section 4 (c) and n. 146.

[9] So, for example, Kiessling and Heinze (n. 4), ad loc.; Fraenkel (n. 7), 433; I. Troxler-Keller, *Die Dichterlandschaft des Horaz* (Heidelberg, 1964), 151; Syndikus (n. 2), 296–7; Harrison (n. 4), 109–10.

[10] The supposed specificity is taken to be the product of (assumed) Senate preparations for the return: Fraenkel (n. 7), 433. Becker (n. 4), 126 rightly questions such a scenario.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in relation to praise of Augustus.[11] Rather, it constitutes a completed statement about Pindar's incomparable style and status, rounded off by a return in ring composition to Antonius (26). The *recusatio*-reading thus requires us to accept that for more than half the poem, Horace ignores the object of the supposed request, Augustus' return and (putative) triumph, and focusses instead on the desiderated Greek model for its treatment, in what turns out to be the pretext for pushing the main project back to Antonius.

Yet the figurative description (54–60) of the sacrificial *vitulus* implies that a poem of some sort will be forthcoming from Horace, or indeed that it is already doing so through the medium of *Odes* 4.2 itself.[12] No scholarly account has satisfactorily related this metapoetic sacrifice (together with the parade of Callimachean principles in stanzas 7–8 [25–32]) to the commonplace encomium anticipated in stanza 12 (*canam*, 47), to the speaker's identification with the state in stanza 13 (49–52) or to the apparent hyperbole of the poem-outline in stanzas 9–11 (32–44).[13] The focal point for much of the difficulty is line 33, *concines maiore poeta plectro*, where commentators' puzzlement over the apparent concession of the *maius plectrum* by the publicly inscribed poet of the *Carmen Saeculare* (and their uncertainty as to whether Antonius is to compose an epic poem or a Pindarizing ode) is symptomatic of the deep-seated implausibilities that reside within the traditional reading of *Odes* 4.2.[14]

In short, the *recusatio*-reading simply does not hang together, and in my view cannot be satisfactorily defended. In what follows, a new reading of the poem is put forward: Antonius' imagined prior request will be reassessed (Section 2); the central sections (3–5) will deal with dramatic dynamics (including the neglected issue of *personae loquentes*) and generic identity; and the two final sections (6–7) will consider dating and occasion. As the title indicates, it will be argued that the poem is a Roman version of the Greek dithyramb. This will entail a generic approach which has had a mixed scholarly reception over recent years, namely the categorization as 'dithyrambs' of certain Latin poems containing Dionysiac/Bacchic material and celebrating, or anticipating, triumphs.[15] In reopening the matter here, I hope to clarify the sacral, literary and political contexts in which these and other works for Liber/Bacchus were composed, and to show how *Odes* 4.2, read as an Augustan dithyramb, relates and responds to them.

2. *ALTER PINDARUS?*

At the start of the poem, the reader is evidently *in mediis rebus* but has no clear signposts to assist in identifying the situation being presented. The opening stanza is

[11] *Alter Homerus*: G. Davis, '*Quis ... digne scripserit?* The *topos* of *alter Homerus* in Horace *C.* 1.6', *Phoenix* 41 (1987), 292–5; id., *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley, 1991), 38. Cf. *Ep.* 2.1.50 *Ennius ... alter Homerus.*

[12] Syndikus (n. 2), 299 is in my view right to suggest that the ode is self-fulfilling (see below, Section 5 [b]); M.C.J. Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (New York, 1986), 54 n. 10 comments to the same effect.

[13] Hyperbole: Fedeli and Ciccarelli (n. 4), 159; Thomas (n. 4), 116: 'The excessive and Pindaric song …'.

[14] As was seen by Becker (n. 4), 124–34. Calboli (n. 7), 92–5, 106–9 summarizes efforts to define the nature of the *recusatio* and to explain or emend *concines*. Antonius' poem as Pindarizing ode: Fraenkel (n. 7), 437; Thomas (n. 4), 104, 116. As epic: Harrison (n. 4), 115–22; Fedeli and Ciccarelli (n. 4), 156–7; a short survey of the matter at A.D. Di Liddo, '*Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari* (Hor. *Carm.* 4,2)', *Aufidus* 18 (2004), 21–69, at 51 n. 125 (my thanks to Professor Alessandro Schiesaro for sending me this article).

[15] See below, nn. 41, 88, 94, 95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

parainetic in tone, from which we may infer that, notwithstanding his public status, 'Iullus' is addressed either on equal terms or as a younger man. This does not exclude the possibility that 'Horace' is responding to encouragement to emulate Pindar;[16] but how might such encouragement have been framed? The assumption that it involved an Augustan poem-commission is simply a back-reading from *concines maiore poeta plectro* | *Caesarem* (33–4). If, however, Antonius might be supposed to have requested a *carmen* in the Pindaric manner appropriate to the dramatic occasion (whatever it was), then 'Horace' might be fending off an invitation to parade as *alter Pindarus*.[17] There were well-known precedents: Varius, nominated to write about Agrippa, had been puffed by Horace as *alter Homerus* (above, Section 1); and Propertius (4.1.64) had dubbed himself *Callimachus Romanus*. Horace touches on the subject of Pindaric imitation in *Epistles* 1.3, addressed to Iulius Florus (closely related to our poem: above, n. 8); and he goes on to consider poetic nomenclature in the later literary epistle to the same addressee, *Ep*. 2.2.99–101 (two poets engage in a duel of compliments): *discedo Alcaeus puncto illius: ille meo quis?* | *quis nisi Callimachus? si plus apposcere visus,* | *fit Mimnermus et optivo* ***cognomine*** *crescat* ('I come away as Alcaeus on his mark. And he on mine? Who but Callimachus? And if he seems to require still more, Mimnermus he becomes; and let him thrive with his chosen *cognomen*'). The model here is the commander who acquires a new *cognomen* from conquered territory (a topic deployed also in *Odes* 4.8).[18] Poetic nomenclature features more than once in *Odes* 4, as Horace explores his own public status in the period following performance of the *Carmen Saeculare*. The first title to which he lays claim, *Romanae fidicen lyrae* ('player of the Roman lyre'), foregrounds the Roman *lyricus* (4.3.23). Later (4.6.30), in a passage bearing on the term *poeta* at 4.2.33, Horace ascribes to Apollo the gift of his *nomen poetae*, in the formal context of the *Carmen Saeculare*.

Horace's interest in nomenclature is underlined by the framing of the Pindar-section with the two names of his addressee, Iullus (2) and Antonius (26). This adds point to *daturus* | ***nomina*** *ponto* (4.2.3–4): the poet fears to deposit his own (plural, accumulated) names, 'Q. Horatius Flaccus Pindaricus' as it might be, in the sea. The centrality of *nomina*, and their acquisition, to Horace's purposes is accentuated by the anagram *Pindarus* | ***pin****nis* ... ***da****tu****rus***, taken together with the part-acrostic formed by the opening letters of the first four lines, P-I-N-N:[19] for Horace to rival Pindar, and as a corollary to be linked with his name, would be to reach for the skies on *pinnae* made of wax. By the same token, however, it engages the 'nominal' aspirant in the act of 'giving' (*daturus*, 4), a motif that proves to be programmatic for the poem as a whole (*donandus* [9, Pindar], *donat* [20, Pindar], *donavere* [38, gods], *dabunt* [39, gods] and especially ***da****bimus* ... ***tur****a* [51–2, Roman citizens]): 'Pindarus', then, is evidently 'he who will

[16] 'Horace' in inverted commas signifies the poet as character in the poem, as distinct from the historical Horace. *Aemulatio* of Pindar was claimed by Pancrates, presumably in his poetry: ps.-Plut. *De mus*. 1137f ἐζήλου γοῦν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔφη, τὸν Πινδάρειόν τε καὶ Σιμωνίδειον τρόπον ...

[17] Cf. Wimmel (n. 7), 95 (on Antonius); Calboli (n. 7), 107–8 adduces an interesting comparison with Terence as the Roman Menander.

[18] *Odes* 4.8.18–19 (surely genuine: Harrison [n. 3], 39–40), on Scipio Africanus: ... *eius qui domita nomen ab Africa* | *lucratus rediit* ...

[19] Anagram: Di Liddo (n. 14), 23 n. 9 and Fedeli and Ciccarelli (n. 4), 124, citing J. Starobinski. Acrostic: Thomas (n. 4), 104, citing John Henderson; see below, n. 104 for an allusion to the Aratean acrostic λεπτή (initial letters of *Phaen*. 783–7) in the last stanza. And see below, n. 120 for comparable letter-play in Pind. fr. 75 Ma. (dithyramb).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

give'; and perhaps also, in an inspirational context (see below, with Section 5 [b]), 'he who will give wings'.

The nature of Antonius' imagined request may best be approached through the 'dithyrambs' (10) placed first within the catalogue of Pindaric genres. This is the only song-*eidos* (genre) to be specified, and it is further emphasized within a metaphorical identification of Pindar and river (7–12) which itself develops the torrent-simile describing Pindaric style (5–6); moreover, the mountain-torrent has a striking Dionysiac parallel in Euripides' account of bacchants on Cithairon, 'maddened by the god' and leaping through a 'torrent-flowing valley' (*Bacchae* 1093–4), a clear analogue between landscape and mental state. The prominence of *dithyrambi* would be consistent with a prior request from Antonius that specified (or, in the occasional context, implied) the performance of a dithyramb in the Pindaric style. There is support for this reading in some 'dithyrambic' features of the preamble (stanza 1). Thus, bilingual interplay between *nomina* (4) and *nova ... verba* (10–11) deftly connects the accumulated 'poet's nomenclature' (above) with the synthetic, compound, vocabulary deployed by dithyrambists, through Greek ὀνόματα (both 'names' and 'words').[20] As will be seen (below, Section 4 [b]), the '**Pin**darizing' poet's feathered wings (***pin**nis*) are reminiscent of self-reflexive statements by dithyrambic singers (and parodies thereof);[21] and *Daedalea* evokes *poikilia*, a particular characteristic of the dithyramb.[22] The 'Icarian' poet's watery denouement is reminiscent of *katapontismos* ('diving into the depths') as a feature of dithyrambic myth.[23] The hazards of Pindaric emulation are thus given a markedly dithyrambic spin in the preamble, implying that the genre is associated with the dramatic occasion (and that it featured in Antonius' imagined initiative). Propertius (3.17.39–40) had pointed the way in hymning Bacchus: *haec ego non humili referam memoranda coturno*, | *qualis **Pindarico** spiritus **ore** tonat* ('these things will I recount, fit to be memorialized in no humble garb, an inspired breath such as thunders in the mouth of a Pindar'). Here, surely, was a challenge to the Roman lyric poet most obviously associated with Pindar.

The first half of the poem comprises the one-stanza preamble, the five-stanza evocation of Pindar and his poetry (5–24) and then the two-stanza (25–32) comparison of

[20] For σύνθετα (or διπλᾶ) ὀνόματα in the dithyramb, see A.W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford, 1927), 66–7; G. Ieranò, *Il ditirambo di Dioniso: le testimonianze antiche* (Pisa and Rome, 1997), 298; A. Ford, 'The poetics of dithyramb', in B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson (edd.), *Dithyramb in Context* (Oxford, 2013), 313–31.

[21] That 'flight' (etc.) appears in other genres is not an objection: what matters is the distinctive accumulation of references in context: see Ford (n. 20), 316–18. 'Dithyrambic' feathers are combined with 'wax' (*ceratis*), a poetic symbol evoked in Propertius' emulation of Philitas (4.6.3 ***cera** Philiteis certet **Romana** corymbis*; cf. F. Cairns, 'Theocritus' first Idyll: the literary programme', *WS* 17 [1983], 89–113, at 97–9, 101).

[22] Cf. *TLL* 5.4.22–31 s.v. *daedalus*. For 'dithyrambic' application, cf. Pind. fr. 75.5 Ma. (Athens) πανδοίδαλον ... ἀγοράν; Simonides, *FGE* 28.2 δαιδάλεον τρίποδα. For ποικιλία in/of dithyramb, cf. Pratinas 708.10 *PMG*; Eur. *Bacch*. 1056–7; Plato, *Laws* 665c, 812d–e; Philodem. *Pap. Herc*. 994 col. 37.8–11 (πεποικιλμένα of Lasus' songs); Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 238c; ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1141d; *Coll. Alex.* p. 192 no. 22.1 Powell. See Ieranò (n. 20), 207–8, 210–11; J.C. Franklin, '"Songbenders of circular choruses": dithyramb and the "demise of music"', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 213–36, at 216, 225.

[23] *Katapontismos*: S. Lavecchia, 'Becoming like Dionysus: dithyramb and Dionysian initiation', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 59–75, at 63–4, 66–8; Prop. 3.17.25–6 *curvaque Tyrrhenos delphinium corpora nautas* | *in vada pampinea desiluisse rate*. *Vitreo* suggests multi-coloured glass: Calboli (n. 7), 87 n. 3, citing Nisbet and Hubbard on *Odes* 1.17.20; the first syllable *vit-*, established as a 'Dionysiac' sound by Propertius (3.17.7, 15, 19, 23, 41), is echoed in the vari-coloured ***vit**ulus*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

swan (Pindar) and bee ('Horace'). A central panel is thus framed by two apologetic programme-statements addressed to Antonius, thereby offering a complete, three-part, Pindar-poem.[24] Pindar himself is projected as a quasi-divine song-power (analogous to a river-god), and the survey of song-types is structured along hymnic lines, as a disjunctive catalogue in er-stil, but with marked elements of ring composition.[25] The 'hymn' brings the poet-god to life (present tense verbs), and celebrates his continuing efficacy: he creates belief and emotional engagement in the historicity of the 'just' fate of compound mythological monsters (14–16, central stanza);[26] he grants monumental status to agonistic victors (17–20; the fourth stanza [*palma, donat*] recalls the second [*laurea donandus*]); and in immortalizing the heroic dead, he conveys the sobbing emotion of the *flebilis* war-widow (21–5; the fifth stanza [with metrical overruns, below Section 4 (b)] recalls the first). Strikingly, 'Horace' moves into a higher, impersonal, register, quite different from the two framing personal statements, and suggesting something akin to inspiration by his exemplar.[27] Yet, the catalogue is set out along the lines of a scholarly edition, book-*eidos* neatly packaged within Sapphic stanza;[28] thus, the juxtaposition of Pindaric *ingenium* and Horatian *ars* (exemplified in stanzas 2–6 and paraded in the apologetic comparison of swan and bee), owes something to the Library at Alexandria.[29]

Pindar's 'inspirational' impact on 'Horace' has been in operation through the medium of reading and book-roll.[30] Again, in awarding Pindar the crown for supremacy among the *lyrici* (*laurea donandus*, 9), 'Horace' himself has taken on the role of κριτής ('judge', 'critic'), surveying the past masters (a role that will be clarified below, Section 7).

Horace's undoubted admiration for Pindar is not incompatible with wit and humour. To use a term for the literary misrepresentation of contemporary poets, he deploys *deformazione* in attributing to Pindar a dithyrambic style more characteristic of later

[24] Cf. Becker (n. 4), 128.

[25] Hymn: Fraenkel (n. 7), 435: 'the hymn on the power of Pindar's song'. It has much in common with Lucretius' hymn to Epicurus (3.1–30), and, like it, proceeds from an avowedly non-competitive relationship to its model (Lucr. 3.5–6, *non ita certandi cupidus quam ... | quod te imitari aveo*); for Horace's linkage of Lucretian and Pindaric sublimity, see n. 27. K. Quinn, *Horace: The Odes* (London, 1980), 301 observes that *profundo ... ore* (7–8) suggests Pindar as river-god: cf. Stat. *Theb*. 9.420, of Ismenos.

[26] Factual *cecidere* implies historicity. Pindar/Centaurs: Galen, *De usu part*. vol. 3 pp. 169.15–170.7 K. For 'falling' of Dionysus' victims, cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 1112; Ov. *Tr.* 5.3.29.

[27] This touches on *Odes* 4.2 and the 'sublime', explored in relation to physical height and depth, rise and descent, and authorial aspiration, set against ostensible diffidence/failure, by P. Hardie, 'Horace's sublime yearnings: Lucretian ironies', *PLLS* 13 (2008), 119–72, esp. 149–54; Hardie (pp. 150–1) observes a Lucretian antecedent for the Pindar-mountain torrent simile at *DRN* 1.280–9.

[28] Edition: R. Freis, 'The catalogue of Pindaric genres in Horace "Ode" 4.2', *CA* 2 (1983), 27–36; Freis' views on catalogue order are refuted by W.H. Race, 'P.Oxy 2438 and the order of Pindar's works', *RhM* 130 (1987), 407–10. None the less, the allusion to catalogue arrangement by song-*eidos* is clear: Thomas (n. 4), 107 comments that 'the whole passage functions both as catalogue and attenuated description, almost like a miniature of the *Pinakes* of Callimachus'.

[29] For 'Callimachean' winged imagery applied to natural ability and imitation, see D. Steiner, 'Feathers flying: avian poetics in Hesiod, Pindar and Callimachus', *AJPh* 128 (2007), 177–208, esp. 203–5.

[30] Similarly, Lucretius 3.10–13 (in hymn to Epicurus; above, n. 25) *tuisque ex ... **chartis** | floriferis ut apes* [!] *in saltibus omnia libant | omnia nos itidem depascimur aurea dicta*. Cf. Hor. *Ep*. 1.3.16–17; Cic. *De or*. 2.60 (the influence of Antonius' reading on his *oratio*). 'Horace's' emotional engagement (cf. Putnam [n. 12], 54) is inspired by reading; cf. A. Hardie, 'Juvenal, the *Phaedrus*, and the truth about Rome', *CQ* 48 (1998), 234–51, at 246–7. This 'book-roll' reading is consistent with the suggestion that the two-tone *vitulus* alludes to the poem-papyrus: Thomas (n. 4), 120, citing J. Henderson. See below, Section 7 on the background presence of the Palatine Library.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

practitioners.[31] In this connection, we might ponder whether the verbal play between *aureos* (23) and *aura* (25), allied with the prosaic regularity (*tendit ... quotiens*, 26) of Pindar's expeditions to the clouds, hints at the role of 'gold' in transporting the 'Dircaean swan' to the sublime heights.[32] The Athenians paid him well for a dithyramb (fr. 76 Ma.), which however, according to the biographical tradition, also brought a cash fine (compare Horace's *multa*?) by Thebes.[33]

3. DRAMATIC DIALOGUE

With *carmina fingo* (32), the 'Pindar-poem' might be thought to be complete. But of course there is more to come, and matters take a new turn in stanza 9, with the unheralded statement around which the poem as a whole hinges: *concines maiore poeta plectro | Caesarem ...* ('You will join singing for Caesar as a poet with a greater plectrum ... ', 33–4). On this translation, 'Horace' turns from his own profile as a poet (stanza 8; 29–32) to Antonius and proposes that the latter, a poet with a greater *plectrum*, should sing of Caesar. But the absence of *tu* with *concines* deprives this supposed shift of the emphatic marking we should expect.[34] By contrast, an emphatic *ego* (27) marks the comparison of Pindar and 'Horace'; and, again, *meae ... vocis* (45–6) marks a contrast between that speaker and the subject of (the second) *concines* in the preceding stanza (41). The omission of a pronoun marker at line 33 is significant, and it is this anomaly which points to the need for an alternative reading.

The alternative to be considered here is that Antonius enters the poem as *persona loquens* at line 33. Antonius, I will argue, responds to the 'Pindar-hymn' and to its framing stanzas; it is Antonius who addresses 'Horace', and 'Horace' who is the subject of *concines*, so that no rhetorical requirement arises for pronoun-marking. It may be acknowledged that the suggestion of an unmarked (or, rather, a negatively marked) change of speaker in the middle of a Horatian ode is likely to strike some readers as involving greater difficulties than the anomaly it seeks to address. Aside from the dramatic dialogue between Horace and Canidia in *Epodes* 17, and from *Odes* 3.9, where an 'I' figure and 'Lydia' speak in alternate stanzas without explicit marking, there is no generally agreed Horatian instance of such a phenomenon. Yet there is some evidence, particularly in contexts where Horace appears to be working within the conventions of

[31] See Freis (n. 28), 30–31 (n. 7); cf. R. Hamilton, 'The Pindaric dithyramb', *HSCPh* 93 (1990), 211–22, esp. 215–16; Ieranò (n. 20), 214–18. The term *deformazione* is adopted from F. Cairns, *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge, 2006), 105–9.

[32] Wordplay: Verg. *Aen*. 6.204 *discolor unde auri per ramos aura refulsit*. For the rewards of praise-poetry, cf. *Sat*. 2.1.10–12 *aude | Caesaris invicti res dicere, multa laborum | praemia laturus*. For payments to *kykliodidaskaloi*, G. Ieranò, '"One who is fought over by all the tribes": the dithyrambic poet and the city of Athens', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 368–86, at 370, 372, 377, citing Hdt. 1.24.1, Plato, *Hipparch*. 228c (Simonides). For the 'inspiration' of cash, cf. Pers. *Prol*. 12–14.

[33] Cash reward: Isoc. 15.165–6 (Pindar and Athens). Theban fine: ps.-Aeschin. *Ep*. 4.2; other sources at M.J.H. van der Weiden, *The Dithyrambs of Pindar* (Amsterdam, 1991), 207; *RE* 20.1607. Cf. Ar. *Birds* 939 Πινδάρειον ἔπος (poet seeking gifts).

[34] Cf. *Odes* 2.12.9–11, where Horace deflects to Maecenas the suggestion of a panegyric: ***tu****que pedestribus | **dices** historiis proelia **Caesaris**, | Maecenas, **melius***. G. Maurach, *Horaz: Werk und Leben* (Heidelberg, 2001), 404 (drawing different conclusions) comments, 'Und nun, trotz deutlicher Kontrastierung, kein "Du aber", warum nicht?'. E.C. Wickham, *Quinti Horati Flacci Opera Omnia*, vol. 1: *The Odes, Carmen Saeculare, and Epodes* (Oxford, 1896[3]), ad loc. comments, 'We should rather expect an emphatic "tu"'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greek choral lyric, to suggest his active interest in speaker-variation, in addition to his experimentation with the variety of individual singer-*personae* offered by the Greek canon.[35] At all events, few Horatian critics would claim that the subject of dramatic voice in the *Odes* is fully understood as things stand, and 4.2 would appear to offer a welcome opportunity to explore its bearing on a major poem in the late book-collection. The analysis that follows is put forward on the assumption that two conditions will need to be satisfied if speaker-change is to be accepted: it will need to remove the anomalies outlined earlier, and yield something superior to the traditional reading it replaces; and it will need to embrace a new context, both generic and dramatic, in which changes of speaker can be understood to take place. The first requirement will be tackled here, and the second in the treatment of dithyramb and drama in Section 5.

The obvious place to start discussion of the *persona loquens* in 4.2 is at the series of exclamatory cries quoted in stanzas 12 and 13 (45–52). The former contains a play on 'voice' (*meae ... vocis*, 45–6), the owner of which (*canam*, 47) is different from the singer envisaged in (the second) *concines* (41), and will address *laudes* to Augustus. In the latter, the speaker is identified with the 'whole state', which will address the processing Triumphus (see below). The parallel double cries *o sol | pulcher, o laudande* and *io Triumphe ... io Triumphe* are explicitly signalled as such (*canam*, 47; *dicemus*, 50); yet they represent different 'voices', in the first instance Antonius and in the second *omnis civitas*. The anticipation of the phrases to be uttered on Augustus' return focusses attention on the shifting reference of the speaking voice (*vox*) in that context, and it can, I believe, help the reader understand implicit shifts of *persona loquens* on the present dramatic occasion.

We turn now to stanza 9 (33–6):

> concines maiore, poeta, plectro
> Caesarem, quandoque trahet ferocis
> per sacrum clivum merita decorus
> fronde Sygambros…

On the working assumption that the Antonius does indeed enter as *persona loquens* at this juncture, the stanza can be translated as follows: 'To the accompaniment of a greater *plectrum*, poet, will you sing of Caesar such time as he draws the ferocious Sygambri the length of the sacred hill, resplendent in well-merited wreath …'. *Concines* can be given its syntactical (*con-*) connection with *maiore ... plectro* (see below, Section 4 [c], on 'accompaniment'). This leaves *poeta*, punctuated as shown, as a vocative (not as nominative with suppressed *tu*), and vocative *poeta* offers a discreet, but positive, textual signal of a change of addressee and speaker: in addressing 'Horace' by the '*nomen poetae*' which the 'poet' goes on to claim for himself in *Odes* 4.6, Antonius acknowledges his professional status and responds to his concern about *nomina* (Section 2).[36] The thrust of Antonius' intervention at line 33 lies in the prediction

[35] *Odes* 3.9: R.G.M. Nisbet and N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III* (Oxford, 2004), 133–4. On speaker-variation in *Odes* 4, see A. Hardie, 'Horace, the paean and Roman *choreia* (*Odes* 4.6)', *PLLS* 10 (1998), 251–93.

[36] *Odes* 4.6.29–30 *spiritum Phoebus mihi, Phoebus artem | carminis nomenque dedit poetae.* Horace's criteria for *nominis huius honorem* (sc. *poetae*) are set out at *Sat.* 1.4.39–48. For this mode of address among poets, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 5.3.48 *vos quoque, consortes studii, pia turba, poetae* (see below, Section 7 for context). As Thomas (n. 4) notes ad loc., Horace deploys *poeta* only in these two places in the *Odes*, and it is beyond belief that the accolade should first be applied in jest to Antonius. Contrast Prop. 2.26.24 *de nostro surge, poeta, toro*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that 'Horace's' diffidence, and claimed deficiencies *vis-à-vis* Pindar (stanzas 7 and 8), will fall away in the presence of Augustus, and with a Sygambrian triumph as his subject. Antonius is not, however, commissioning a triumph poem, still less reformulating a prior request: he is making an entirely new point that leads on from what 'Horace' has said about Pindar and about himself in the first half of the poem. On the evidence of the higher, 'inspired', register of the Pindar-hymn he has just heard (above, Section 2), Antonius responds to 'Horace's' subjective claim to 'smallness' (*parvus*, 31) by presenting Caesar as a song-subject analogous to Pindar (hence the two laurel wreaths), one that will be equally or more 'inspiring'. In the presence of the victorious *princeps* at Rome, he claims, 'Horace' will indeed be capable of sublimity.

If Antonius does indeed enter the poem in stanza 9 (33–6), at what point does he cease to act as *persona loquens*? In stanza 14 (53–6), the contrast of great and small sacrifices makes it clear that 'Horace' (*me*, 54) addresses Antonius (*te*, 53). A satisfactory speaker-sequence is obtained, I suggest, if Antonius' intervention is understood to include the preceding stanza (49–52), and to conclude at that point. A particular attraction of this speaker-division is that it makes sense of the received text, in particular the respective referents of MS *te* (49) and *te* (53) in successive stanza-openings. The first *te* is addressed by Antonius to 'Triumphus', and the apostrophe echoes *Epodes* 9.21–2, *io Triumphe,* ***tu*** *moraris aureos | currus ...?* The second *te* (53) marks 'Horace's' re-entry into the text, responding to Antonius as previous speaker. This re-entry is further marked by neglected features in the sacrificial sequence opening *dabimusque divis | tura benignis* (51–2): the rejoinder deals with votive sacrifices but is syntactically disengaged from the predicted offering of *tura*; and *decem tauri* represents a repost to Antonius ('not just *tura*, but *tauri* will be required to discharge *your* obligations').[37] The *tura* will be offered to all gods as a component of a state thanksgiving *supplicatio* (below, Section 5), while *decem tauri totidemque vaccae* will evidently be a state sacrifice (perhaps to take place on the Capitoline [*sacrum clivum*, 35]) and are the rejoinder to Antonius' prediction of the song 'Horace' is to sing about the triumphal procession. The wit of this sequence, and of the greater/lesser sacrificial contrast, is sharpened by reference to *tus* (a standard representative of the 'humble offering') as a component of the state offerings.[38] With this bantering compliment to Antonius' status, the poet rounds off the dialogue.

On this reading, quotation marks should be placed before *concines* (33) and after *benignis* (52). Stanzas 9–13 (33–52) present Antonius' response to the 'Pindar-hymn' and its personal frame, while stanzas 14–15 (53–60) present 'Horace's' rejoinder to Antonius. This yields an overall stanza-breakdown as follows: 1 (preamble), 5 ('Pindar-hymn'), 2 (comparison of Pindar and Horace), 5 (Antonius' response), 2 ('Horace's' rejoinder). Parallel to the ring-structure of the 'Pindar-hymn', Antonius' hypothesized response will unfold in ring composition in five distinct parts, each matched to a stanza, thus:

A^1 (stanza 9; 33–6): 'Horace' will sing of Caesar when he leads triumph-procession;
B^1 (stanza 10; 37–40): gods' benevolence, as component of Antonius' *laudes* of Caesar;

[37] For the wordplay, cf. Verg. *G.* 2.139–40 (*turiferis ... tauri*); Prop. 2.19.11–13; Ov. *Tr.* 2.1.75–6 *sed tamen, ut fuso taurorum sanguine centum, | sic capitur minimo turis honore deus*; *Met.* 7.588–95; cf. *Ars am.* 3.393 *visite turicremas vaccae Memphitidos aras.*

[38] For incense at *supplicatio*, cf. e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 35. For incense as 'humble sacrifice', cf. e.g. Men. *Dysc.* 449; *Anth. Pal.* 9.93.4; Ov. *Tr.* 2.1.75–6; Hor. *Odes* 3.23.3, with Nisbet and Rudd's note.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

C (stanza 11; 41–4): 'Horace' will celebrate festivities vowed for Augustus' return;
B^2 (stanza 12; 43–8): *felix* Antonius will sing personal salutation, *laudes* of Caesar;
A^2 (stanza 13; 49–52): *civitas* will salute processing 'Triumphus'; *supplicatio* to gods.

The hyperbole of the prescribed content in stanzas 9–11 (33–44) can thus be attributed, not without humour, to Antonius; and the apparent inconsistency between the avowal of Callimachean principles in stanzas 7 and 8 (25–32) and 'Horace's' supposed identification with the crowd in stanza 13 (49–52) falls away. Especially striking within the proposed dramatic dialogue is the progressive identification of Antonius with the state. Thus, his sacrificial obligations will arise from state responsibilities and may well (with Quinn) be referred to his tenure of the praetorship in 13.[39] Again, there is a good deal of official-sounding language in the passage; and in *si quid loquar audiendum* (45), following the cessation of judicial activity (43–4), we catch the legal tone of the praetor who *ex officio* 'hears' court cases and expects at that juncture himself to say something which 'requires to be heard'; this is Antonius the *orator*, speaking of the encomiastic branch of oratory, as distinct from the forensic (and, in *bona pars*, of *laudatio* as distinct from *vituperatio*).[40] Then, identification with the 'whole city' in salutation of the processing 'Triumphus', *dicemus ... | civitas omnis* (51–2) recalls *Epodes* 16.36, *eamus* ***omnis*** *...* ***civitas***, and suggests that here, as there, we are hearing a magisterial *persona* speaking for the community. In taking his interlocutor back to the era of civil war (the iterated *io Triumphe*, as already noted, echoes *Epodes* 9.21–3), Antonius reminds 'Horace' of his advocacy of escape to a *tempus aureum* (*Epodes* 16.64), renouncing *reditus* to Rome (25–6, 35–6); and in that context, anticipating Augustus' *reditus*, he asserts that there can be no higher blessing, *quamvis redeant in* ***aurum*** *|* ***tempora*** ('even if the times return to gold', 4.2.39–40).

This alternative account of the poem, as I see it, helps to show that if the hypothesis of speaker-change is accepted, solid gains in sense and coherence emerge, and the incongruities outlined earlier (Section 1) fall away. Moreover, a clearer sense of 'personality' emerges, as also a pronounced element of personal humour. There is a further gain in the poem's sacral dynamics: speaker-variation creates a break between Antonius' enthusiastic assumption that return and triumph are assured and 'Horace's' salutary reminder of the requirement for sacrificial offerings. It is the act of vowing the latter that will secure the benign gods' engagement in Augustus' victorious return; thus, divine benevolence, though noted in general terms by Antonius (stanza 10) and assumed as a given by him in the matter of Augustus' return (stanzas 12–13), is 'Horace's' primary focus. The *poeta* suggests that his (metapoetic) *votum* will be efficacious in bringing about the desiderated return (at which point he will of course be *voti compos*, and the *vitulus* will be sacrificed in fulfilment of the vow). The *votum*, its metapoetic status

[39] Quinn (n. 25), 303, on 53–6 (dating the poem to Antonius' praetorship in 13) catches the distinction between Antonius' state offering and Horace's offering.

[40] See Thomas (n. 4) on 41–4 ('the language is formal and redolent of forensic oratory'); 42–3; Fedeli and Ciccarelli (n. 4), 163. *Audiendum*: for *audire* of those 'qui ... audiuntur in iudicio', *TLL* 2.1283–4; *audiendus* is a technical term for parties to an action with a legal right to be 'heard' (many instances in the *Digest*; cf. Tac. *Hist*. 2.10; also Cic. *Mil*. 65). For the general sense, cf. Cic. *De or*. 1.116 (Crassus) *magnum ... est onus ... profiteri, se esse ... unum maximis de rebus magno in conventu hominum audiendum*. Forensic and encomiastic: cf. Cic. *De or*. 2.65 (Antonius). *Laudationes* may be added to *lites* and *deliberationes* as *genera dicendi*. *Bona pars*: cf. Hor. *Sat*. 2.1.82–5. Horace reflects bilingual Greek/Latin etymologies of *orator*, from cursing and praying: cf. R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), s.v. *orator*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and its quasi-sacral function will be considered further in Sections 4 and 5; but the key point lies in 'Horace's' culminating claim, speaking as *poeta*, to be uttering a song-*votum* that will help ensure Augustus' success and return. Speaker-variation (with the distinct *personae* of 'Horace' and Antonius) provides the key to identifying this central, sacral, focus.

4. SOME 'DITHYRAMBIC' FEATURES

It was observed some 40 years ago by Francis Cairns that the prominence given to the Pindaric dithyramb in *Odes* 4.2 reflects a Roman view that poems about triumphs were themselves a form of that genre.[41] Cairns identified *Odes* 4.2 itself as a dithyramb, a conclusion which will be restated here, in different terms and with additional argumentation. In this section, as a basis for the identification, some features of the poem which can be considered (in some sense) 'dithyrambic' are reviewed.

(a) Io Triumphe, io Triumphe

The proposition that poems about triumphs may be identified as Roman dithyrambs was advanced on the combined evidence of cult/cult-song terminology, Dionysiac victory procession as a model for Hellenistic kings, and Dionysus as mythical 'first *triumphator*'. In particular, it reflected the etymological testimony of Terentius Varro, who offers this comment (*Ling.* 6.68): *sic triumphare appellatum, quod cum imperatore milites redeuntes clamitant per urbem in Capitolium eunti 'io triumphe'; id a* θριάμβῳ *ac Graeco Liberi cognomento potest dictum* ('"to triumph" is so called, because soldiers returning with an *imperator* repeatedly shout 'io Triumphe' as he proceeds through the city to the Capitol. This may be derived from *thriambos*, a Greek cult-title of Liber').[42]

In *Odes* 4.2, the dithyramb-stanza links forward to Augustus' triumph-procession through the sound-echo of *dithyrambos* (10) in *Sygambros* (36) and also in the laurel wreath to be worn by both Pindar and Augustus. A more substantial connection is established in the apostrophe to the processing 'Triumphus' (48–9), where the evidence of Varro, cited above, indicates that *te ... dicemus* is to be understood as a salutation of Liber/Dionysus as Thriambos. Here, as noted earlier (Section 2), the iterated *io Triumphe* (49–50) recalls *Epodes* 9.21–3, also in anticipation of a future triumph; and the iteration itself, deftly marked by ***non semel di****cemus* ('not once', 50), alludes to the standard Greek derivation of the first syllable of ***di****thyrambos* from δίς ('twice').[43]

[41] F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972), 95–7 (*Odes* 4.2.5–12 at 96); cf. 168, 187. I. Rutherford, '*Dithyrambos, thriambos, triumphus*: Dionysiac discourse at Rome', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 409–23, at 420–3, appears to support Cairns' views on *Odes* 4.2, with additional material on 'Dionysiac victory celebration', but challenges his wider conclusions: see below, n. 88.

[42] For *dithyrambos* and Dionysus, Ieranò (n. 20), testimonia 2–23; for *thriambos* and *dithyrambos*, ibid., testimonium 2 (Ath. 1.30b, of Lampsacus). For *triumphus*, *thriambos* and *dithyrambos*, see H.S. Versnel, *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph* (Leiden, 1970), 16–55, esp. 21–5; M. Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, MA, 2007), 315–18.

[43] Cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 88–100, 519–27, with Dodds' note on 526. *Etym. Mag.* s.v.; Maltby (n. 40), s.v. *Dithyrambus*; Ford (n. 20), 322–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(b) Metrical Licence and the Rhetorical Period

The supposed metrical licence of the dithyramb is explicit in *numerisque fertur | lege solutis* (11–12) and implicit also in Pindar's 'measureless' onrush (*immensus*, 7). It is also exemplified in the threnody-stanza, where the hypermetric *moresque* (22) and *nigroque* (23) form 'a closing frame that proves the opening claims about Pindaric licence', and also 'instantiate the image of rivers overflowing their banks'.[44] The issue can be illuminated from peripatetic theory on the development of the metrical prose period from dithyramb.[45] Citing Theophrastus, Cicero describes the 'diffusion' (*diffusa*) 'in all rich prose of the *cola* and metre of the fuller and more unrestrained dithyramb'; Cicero sustains the river-image in stating the requirement for rhythm in the rhetorical period, to break up what would otherwise be an unbroken flow of words; and he represents the latter, by analogy, as *amnis praecipitans*.[46] This passage (the only extant Latin instance of *dithyrambus* before *Odes* 4.2) has undoubtedly influenced Horace's Pindaric river-image, the extension of the dithyrambic style to Pindar's work in its entirety, and the encapsulation of the whole in a single, twenty-line (78-word), period, arranged in ring composition over five (un-Pindaric) metrical units.

The metrical licence of the dithyramb evidently served as a positive model for the deployment of metre in prose, and for the evolution of the rhetorical 'period' (περίοδος, *ambitus*).[47] But the dithyramb was separately adduced by Aristotle (*Rh.* 3.9.1, 6), as a negative choric analogue for the 'strung-out', non-periodic, style of speaking (εἰρομένη λέξις), on the basis of Melanippides' abandonment of antistrophic structure.[48] Ironically, the deployment of the dithyrambic chorus had developed in the opposite direction, from processional straight line ('rope-stretched' in Pindar's account in the Second Dithyramb [fr. 70b.1 Ma.]), to κύκλιος χορός.[49] The genre was thus deployed in different ways by peripatetic authorities to illustrate and/or explain both the metrical content of the circular περίοδος and the straightness of its 'strung-out' counterpart. The main interest of these theoretical matters for *Odes* 4.2 lies, I suggest,

[44] Thomas (n. 4), 107. Metrical licence: see the discussion in Freis (n. 28), 30–2, including the hypermetric phenomenon noted by Thomas. Cf. *Odes* 1.37.1 *pede libero,* with A. Hardie, 'Horace *Odes* 1,37 and Pindar *Dithyramb* 2', *PLLS* 1 (1977), 113–40, at 124.

[45] Freis (n. 28), 32; Putnam (n. 12), 53.

[46] Cic. *De or.* 3.185 ... *inde hic licentior et divitior fluxit dithyrambus, cuius membra et pedes, ut ait idem* [*sc.* Theophrastus], *sunt* ***in omni locupleti oratione*** *diffusa*. At 186, *illa sine intervallis loquacitas perennis et profluens*, a feature described as *rudis et impolita*, is to be avoided; and the desiderated rhythm is illustrated by analogy to water: detectable in falling drops, but not *in amni praecipitante* (that is, unbroken *continuitas verborum*; cf. Horace's *verba devolvit* [10]). For comment, including on Theophrastus' *On Style* as source, see W.W. Fortenbaugh, 'Cicero as a reporter of Aristotelian and Theophrastean rhetorical doctrine', *Rhetorica* 23 (2005), 37–64, at 49–52. Derivative appreciation of Theophrastus, rhetorical period and dithyramb, is preserved in two Sapphic stanzas by Rufinus of Antioch (*Gramm. Lat.* 6.567.20–5 Keil; testimonium 192b Ieranò).

[47] For the rhetorical period, its Latin designations (*ambitus*, *circuitus*, *circumscriptio*), and the difference between it and *oratio perpetua*, see H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, trans. M.T. Bliss, A. Jansen and D.E. Orton (Leiden, 1998), 413–16.

[48] For the dithyrambic background, Franklin (n. 22), 226–31. There was a separate rationale for the abandonment of antistrophic composition, in the rise of the solo professional: ps.-Arist. *Prob.* 918b13–30 (testimonium 76 Ieranò); Ieranò (n. 20), 229–30; A.E. Peponi, 'Dithyramb in Greek thought: the problem of choral mimesis', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 353–67, at 362–4.

[49] A. D'Angour, 'How the dithyramb got its shape', *CQ* 47 (1997), 331–51; see below, (c) for *extensum funem* at Juv. 12.5. In a further illustration of the penetration of dithyrambic terms into rhetorical theory, the Pindaric σχοινοτένεια ('rope-stretched') reappears in Hermogenes (second century A.D.), of 'long drawn-out' expression in sub-units of the period (*De inv.* 1.5, 4.3, 4.4).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in tension between conventional dithyrambic circularity and the 'straight line' of the triumphal procession, and in associated contrasts between the style of Horace and Pindar. These are considered next.

(c) Circularity and Procession

A 'central' word in *Odes* 4.2 is *circa* (30), suggesting the poet-bee's circular flight-pattern (confirmed in the related bee-figure at *Ep.* 1.3.21, *quae circumvolitas thyma?* 'what thyme are you flying around?'). This is one of several references to circularity. In the final stanza, the sacrificial *vitulus* is described as *fronte curvatos imitatus ignes | tertium lunae referentis ortum* ('which with its forehead imitates the curving fires of the moon as it brings back its third rising', 57–8).[50] A well-known reference to Moschus' description of Zeus in the form of a bull involves two circular shapes (*Europa* 84–8): the 'circle' (κύκλος) on the bull's forehead, and the comparison of the horns to the κεραῆς ... κύκλα σελήνης ('the crescents of the horned moon'). To these Moschus-circles, Horace adds an allusion to Aratus' description of the κύκλος formed by the moon's horns on the third day (*Phaen*. 796; below, n. 74); and *referentis* offers a further 'circular' dimension, in the recurring lunar 'cycle' (also κύκλος). The figurative status of the *vitulus* as symbol of Horace's poetry implies that this embedded 'circularity' carries metapoetic significance, and in what follows it will be connected with the dithyramb as κύκλιος χορός, the 'circular chorus' with which the genre was virtually synonymous.[51]

Pindaric style, by contrast (in a further piece of *deformazione*), is implied to be straight. The 'dithyrambic' *decurrens amnis* recalls Cicero's analogue of *amnis praecipitans* for *continuatio verborum* (*De or.* 3.186; see above, [b]), that is, the 'strung-out style' that proceeds with simple connectives and without the artistic structure characteristic of the 'circular' περίοδος/*ambitus*.[52] When Horace's image shifts to Pindar as swan, 'straightness' is again visually implicit (26–7): *tendit, Antoni, quotiens in altos | nubium tractus* ('so often, Antonius, as he directs his course to the high expanses of the clouds').[53] We envisage a direct flight to height (*altos*) and extension in space (*nubium tractus*), a reconfiguration of the vertical descent and lateral spread of the Pindaric *amnis* (5–8). Taken together, Horace's Pindar-imagery suggests something akin to the *genus orationis fusum atque tractum* ('the expansive and extended type of literary style'), which Cicero associates with historiography in *De oratore* (2.64: M. Antonius), and which a late rhetorician connects with the 'strung-out', non-periodic, style.[54]

[50] For allusion to *cornua* in *curvatos*, Varro, *Ling.* 7.25 *cornua a curvore dicta, quod pleraque curva*.

[51] Schol. Aeschin. *In Tim.* 10 λέγονται δ' οἱ διθύραμβοι χοροὶ κύκλιοι καὶ χορὸς κύκλιος. *RE* 5.1217–18; B. Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung* (Göttingen, 1992), 24–9; P. Ceccarelli, 'Circular choruses and the dithyramb in the Classical and Hellenistic period: a problem of definition', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 153–70. For the sound/shape-association of Liber's *cornua* and *choroi*: *Odes* 2.19.25 (*choreis*) and 29–30 (*te* [*sc.* Bacchus] *vidit insons Cerberus ... | **cor**nu de**cor**um*; Prop. 3.17.19 *per te et tua **cor**nua vivam* and 21–2 *dicam ... | Indica ... arma fugata **chor**is.* For the association of *chorus* and *corona*, see Maltby (n. 40), s.vv. *chorus*, *corona*.

[52] *Decurro* itself is later drawn into rhetorical terminology in related contexts: *TLL* 5.232.14–23; cf. esp. Quint. *Inst*. 9.4.61 *velut prono decurrentis orationis flumine*.

[53] High-flying swan: [Hes.] *Scut*. 316. For the swan's neck extended in flight, Hom. *Il*. 2.460; Bacchyl. 16.6 (dithyramb); Verg. *Aen*. 7.698–702, with Servius; cf. Isid. *Orig*. 12.7.18.

[54] For echo of *tractus* (noun) in *tractus* (adjective), compare Cic. *De or.* 2.64 (Antonius) *genus orationis fusum atque **tractum**, et cum lenitate quadam aequabili profluens ... persequendum est* with 54

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The interface between poetic style/rhetorical theory and procession lies in the echo of *tractus* (27) in *trahet* (34), over the central hinge of the poem. The verb suggests the long line of Sygambrian captives extending over the length (*per*) of the *clivus Capitolinus*, while *tendit ... in ...* ***tractus*** (26–7), as we saw, suggests straight ascent to the extended space of the clouds.[55] The implication of Antonius' pictorial vision of extended processional ascent is that Horace will be inspired to sing a comparable (*sc.* extended, Pindaric) song, integrated in style with the procession it describes. Antonius for his part, along with the *civitas*, will cry *Io Triumphe*, as the Dionysiac god of the triumph, Triumphus/Thriambos, processes (*dum* ***procedis***, 49).

There is no explicit reference in *Odes* 4.2 to the 'circular chorus' (not an obstacle to identification as a dithyramb, since processional choreography of the triumphal Dionysus at Athens co-existed with the κύκλιος χορός).[56] Within the poem, however, 'stylistic' circularity, in the broadest sense, is exemplified in the ring composition of the 'Pindar-hymn' and of Antonius' intervention. It might also be observed that between the two references to the triumph-procession lies the central prediction that 'Horace' 'will sing together' of the public festivities vowed for Augustus: here, the second *concines* (41) implies collective (choric) singing; and while the (unparalleled) singular *publicum ludum* alludes to the sung content of *publici ludi*, the primary reference is to *ludus* as street 'dance', involving the populace.[57] In addition, the sound-sequence ***urbis*** (41) ... *Forumque | litibus* ***orbum*** (43–4), plus *ortum* (58), may recall the Varronian conception of the 'circular' *urbs*, as derived from *orbis*.[58]

There is a sequel to these reflections of circularity and procession in Juvenal's well-known imitation of Horace's *ex voto* offerings in the twelfth satire, welcoming the *reditus* of 'Catullus': the speaker offers a combination of sacrifices to the Capitoline triad (3–16) and bloodless domestic offerings (83–92). Tarpeian Jupiter will receive a *ferox vitulus* which will cap the lamb for Juno Regina and the sheep for Minerva (5):

(Catulus) *sed ... Coelius ... neque ...* ***tractu*** *orationis leni et aequabili perpolivit illud opus*; and for the adjective, cf. also Cic. *Orat.* 66 (of historiography) *sed in his tracta quaedam et fluens expetitur* [sc. *oratio*]. The association of historiography with the strung-out style is foreshadowed in Aristotle's citation of Herodotus at *Rh.* 3.9.2; cf. esp. Lausberg (n. 47), 413, citing the third-century (?) rhetorician Aquila, *De figuris* 18 (on εἰρομένη λέξις) *ea praecipue historiae et descriptioni convenit, quae* ***tractum et fusum genus*** *eloquendi, non conversum neque circumscriptum desiderat*. For juxtaposition of periodic rotundity (figured as projectile in flight) and *historiae*, in a related context (the female *criticus*), cf. esp. Juv. 6.448–55, with Y. Nadeau, *A Commentary on the Sixth Satire of Juvenal* (Brussels, 2011), 260–2.

[55] Verg. *Aen*. 8.722 (triumph) *incedunt victae longo ordine gentes*. The issue of execution at the *carcer* (not invariable practice) evidently does not arise. At least some leaders made it to the Capitoline temple (Beard [n. 42], 128–39), but there may well be a suggestion of *clementia*: cf. Sen. *De clem*. 1.21.2–3, with Braund's comment ad loc.

[56] G. Hedreen, 'The semantics of processional dithyramb: Pindar's *Second Dithyramb* and archaic Athenian vase-painting', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 171–97, esp. 191–4; cf. Rutherford (n. 41), 418–20, 421, 423, on 'Dionysiac victory celebration'.

[57] *Concines* and *chorus*: *TLL* 4.52 s.v. *concino*, I.A. *ludus*/dance: Verg. *Aen*. 8.717–18 *laetitia* ***ludis****que viae plausuque fremebant; | omnibus in templis matrum chorus* ... (see below, [f], with n. 83, for celebrations by 'the whole city', including Dionysiac street dances). *TLL* 7.1789.48–66 (parallel to Greek *paidia* for *choreia*: cf. Proclus ap. Phot. *Bibl*. 320b [testimonium 1 Ieranò], on the origin of dithyramb ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τοὺς ἀγροὺς παιδιᾶς). *Ludi* and *choreae* are juxtaposed at Tib. 1.7.49 (Messalla's birthday). Singular *publicus ludus*: cf. *TLL* 7.1783.73 (it is not *metri gratia* here).

[58] *Urbs* and *orbis*: Varro, *Ling.* 5.143 *orbis urbis principium* (the etymology present, with explicit circularity, at Verg. *Aen*. 12.671–2, 762–3); for *urbs*, *orbus* and (implicit) *orbis*, cf. Ov. *Am*. 2.14.16–18. For the ideological significance, and identity of city and empire, P. Hardie, *Virgil's* Aeneid*: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), 364–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sed procul extensum petulans quatit hostia funem ('but the butting victim shakes the long-stretched rope'). In context, *quatit* clearly etymologizes the (implicit) preceding 'Pallas' (Minerva with shaken *aegis*), and the *extensus funis* (cf. Pindaric σχοινοτένεια, fr. 70b.1 Ma.) connects with Juno Regina, through allusion to the rope-linked choric procession of virgins to placate the goddess in 207 (Livy 27.37.14); *petulans* is then glossed (6) *frontemque coruscat* ('butts [with] its *frons*'), where the verb picks up a Lucretian sound-play between ***corus**cat* and *chorus*, again in the context of sheep and lambs, and again in contrasting linear progression and circular *ludus*.[59]

(d) Flight, Air and aulos

Flight is a common figure for the activity of poets;[60] but it was especially associated with dithyrambic self-description, as is evident from Aristophanes' depiction (*Birds* 1372–1409) of Cinesias seeking to acquire feathers, to traverse the sky and to obtain new *anabolai* from the clouds. There, the dithyramb is 'feather-driven', and 'airy'.[61] At *Peace* 828–31, Trygaeus reports his celestial encounter with dithyrambists 'winging about, collecting overtures of the aerial breeze-cruising sort' (trans. Henderson, Loeb). Feathers/wings, flight and air duly turn up in dithyrambic poetry: Pratinas becomes a 'swan leading the song that has wings of varied hue' (οἷά τε κύκνον ἄγοντα ποικιλόπτερον μέλος, 708.5 *PMG*). And Telestes applies combined figures from flight/wing and air/wind to the breath of the dithyrambic aulete: 806.4 *PMG* πνεύματος εὔπτερον αὔραν ἀμφιπλέκων καλάμοις ('weaving about the reeds the fair-winged breeze of his breath'); and 805c.1–2 *PMG* (Athena and *aulētikē*) ἃν ... Βρομίῳ παρέδωκε σεμνᾶς | δαίμονος ἀερθὲν πνεῦμ' αἰολοπτέρυγον ('…which the uplifted breath, variegated in wing, of the august deity handed over to Bromios'). Aristophanes supplies a further layer of satire at *Clouds* 331–9, parodying dithyrambists who (figuratively) feed on the clouds, which they turn into poetry (several meteorological examples are quoted), in return for a (literal) banquet of bird-flesh.

This mix of poetry and parody offers useful parallels for Pindaric style as portrayed in *Odes* 4.2. The *imbres* that 'feed' (*aluere*) the Pindar-river (5–6) have Aristophanic counterparts in the (quoted) ὄμβρους … νεφελᾶν (*Clouds*, 338), and in the associated figure of cloud-feeding (*aluere* is itself playfully echoed in ***altos** nubium tractus*, 26–7).[62] The flight/air imagery further illuminates Pindar's elevation to the clouds (25–7): *multa Dircaeum levat aura cycnum | tendit, Antoni, quotiens in altos | nubium tractus* ('much air lifts the Dircaean swan, Antonius, so often as it sets its course for the high stretches of the clouds'). *Nubium* echoes 'dithyrambic' poet-flight and associated clouds, and *Dircaeum*, in addition to its Pindaric reference, surely alludes to Dirce's role in the birth legend of Dionysus.[63] The primary reference in *multa aura* will thus be to air as an inspirational force in the dithyrambic manner, lifting Pindar to the heights, and yielding a contrast with the *nemus* (30) from which 'Horace' as poet-bee claims to derive

[59] Lucr. 2.320 *et satiati agni ludunt blandeque coruscant*, where *ludunt* alludes to proto-choric 'play' (above, n. 57) by the 'sated' (*sc.* satyric) lambs, again in contrast to forward progression, in the case the 'creeping' progression of sheep (318–19).

[60] Steiner (n. 29).

[61] Zimmermann (n. 51), 119–20. On this language, the comic ridicule it attracted, and its grounding in contemporary intellectual currents, see Ford (n. 20), 318–20, 326, 331.

[62] (Paul.) Fest. p. 7 Lindsay *altus ab alendo dictus*. On *Clouds* 338, Ford (n. 20), 317.

[63] Eur. *Bacch*. 519–31; cf. Prop. 3.17.33 *mollia Dircaeae pulsabunt tympana Thebae*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sustenance. In addition, *aura* and *levat* allude to dithyrambic *aulos*-accompaniment, and to the interplay of *aulos*-breath and breeze in fifth century dithyramb (cf. Telestes' πνεύματος ... αὔραν and ἀερθὲν πνεῦμ', cited above). This adds a further dimension to line 33 *concines maiore, poeta, plectro*: spoken by Antonius, *concines* ('you will sing to accompaniment') will pick up the allusion to *aulos*-accompaniment and respond with a capping reference to 'Horace's' anticipated lyre-accompaniment.[64]

(e) The Bull-Calf, the Bee and the River

The work of poets is depicted successively as river in flood, high-flying swan, busy bee and sacrificial *vitulus.* Within this sequence, some obvious verbal echoes, *notas ... ripas* (6), *ripas* (31), *notam* (59), plus a sustained visualization of feeding/nurture (*aluere*, 6; *carpentis*, 29; *relicta matre*, 55–6), should encourage the reader to consider what else might link these diverse figures, and by extension what role, taken together, they play within the poem as a whole. Some less obvious linkages also call for comment: in particular, a 'dithyrambic' relationship can be documented between the vari-coloured *vitulus* and the Matine *apis*, mediated by allusion to the vari-coloured Egyptian bull-calf Apis which embodied Osiris and was identified with the fertilizing Nile in flood.[65]

The bull (and the bull's horns) were closely associated with Dionysus, and (as prize and sacrifice) with the dithyramb.[66] The bull was also common to the worship of Dionysus and Egyptian Osiris; and at Memphis, the bull-divinity Apis was periodically selected as a calf (μόσχος) to be the god's incarnation.[67] Apis' Greek identity was Epaphos (Hdt. 2.153), who appears as Egyptian son of Io in a Bacchylidean dithyramb (19.42); and Apis himself enters Roman poetry in Tibullus' triumph-poem for Messalla (1.7.28).[68] Antonius' father, despite identifying himself with Osiris-Dionysus, had ignored Apis, who proceeded to add lugubrious bellowing to portents of doom for

[64] For *concines* and 'accompaniment', cf. Ath. 617b–c (Pratinas' *Hyporchema*: the poet was angry ...) ἀγανακτεῖν τινας ἐπὶ τῷ τοὺς αὐλητὰς μὴ **συναυλεῖν** τοῖς χοροῖς, καθάπερ πάτριον, ἀλλὰ τοὺς χοροὺς **συνᾴδειν** τοῖς αὐληταῖς. Lyre/pipe-accompaniment is at issue in the anticipated victory celebration in *Epodes* 9 (5–6): *sonante mixtum tibiis carmen lyra | hac Dorium, illis barbarum*; for the mixture of modes (Dorian/Phrygian) in the dithyramb, see L. Battezzato, 'Dithyramb and Greek tragedy', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 100–2, citing Arist. *Pol*. 1342^{b}7–12, *P.Vindob.* 19996a, fr. a I; see also Rutherford (n. 41), 414–15, citing Dion. Hal. *Comp*. 19. With *Dorium* cf. Pratinas' appeal to Dionysus to 'hear my Dorian *choreia*' (708.16 *PMG*, resisting the *aulos*); Telestes 806 *PMG*. Horace's anticipated *carmen* is recalled at *Odes* 4.15.30 *Lydis remixto carmine tibiis* (of music *inter iocosi munera Liberi* [!], 26).

[65] Cf. Stat. *Silv*. 3.2.115–18, where Apis is juxtaposed with the 'Hyblaean nectar', i.e. honey, in which Alexander was preserved.

[66] Lavecchia (n. 23), 67–8, noting (n. 58) Dionysus Dithyrambos as 'bull-horned' at Eur. *Bacch*. 100, with parallel material. Cf. Hor. *Odes* 2.19.29–30; Prop. 3.17.19; Tib. 2.1.3; Ov. *Am*. 3.15.7; *Fast*. 3.789. *LIMC* 3.1.440–1 ('Dionysus tauromorphos').

[67] For the bull, Apis, Osiris and Dionysus, see Plut. *Is. et Osir*. 364f.; R. Merkelbach, *Isis regina–Zeus Sarapis: Die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1995), 71–2. On Apis: *RE* 1.2807–9; A.B. Cook, *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1914), 432–7; Pease on Cic. *Nat*. 1.82; M. Malaise, *Les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des cultes égyptiens en Italie* (Leiden, 1972), 212–14; *LIMC* 2.1.177–82. For selection of Apis as calf (μόσχος), cf. Hdt. 3.28; Aelian, *HA* 11.10; *Anth. Pal.* 7.744.4; Diod. Sic. 1.82.5; Euseb. *Praep. evang*. 2.1.50.

[68] Epaphos: *LIMC* 5.1.663. Cf. Tib. 1.7.15–16 *quantus et aetherio contingens vertice nubes | frigidus intonsos Taurus alat Cilicas*, where *Taurus* (mountain) plays on Osiris/Dionysus as bull, and *contingens* on Apis as Epaphos ('Touched'); and again, 'clouds' and 'feeding' are juxtaposed. See also R. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* (Cambridge, 2006), 54–61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Egyptian regime.[69] On the death of a bull (by drowning at 25 years), a period of ritual mourning accompanied the search for a new calf-god.[70] The chosen animal was identified by black colouring and white markings, on one account a white triangle on its forehead, on another, a white crescent moon on its flank: *varius coloribus Apis*, in Ovid's phrase.[71] The lunar symbolism is supplemented in the iconographical record by the solar disc regularly displayed between the beast's horns.[72]

Tibullus (1.7.27–8) conjoins Osiris and Apis in hymnic address to the Nile, alluding thereby to the identification of both with the river. Apis was in fact regarded, by virtue of his special markings, as guarantor of the fertilizing floods;[73] and it is the association of Apis and river flood (well known to Roman readers), together with the bull-god's distinctive lunar marking, which is of most immediate interest for the *vitulus*. *Notam* (59), together with the calf's lunar horns, recalls Apis' lunar marking. In intertextual dialogue with Aratus, the 'fiery' horns are also a harbinger of storms; and so together with the echo of *notas ... ripas* (6) in *notam* (59), they engage with the 'dithyrambic' meteorology of *imbres* (5) and consequent 'flooding'.[74] The common tauroform iconography of river-gods is also in play, but is brought out only implicitly, later in the ode-book, in *Me**taurum** flumen* (4.38) and in the comparison of Tiberius to the Aufidus (*sic **tauriformis volvitur** Aufidus*, 'as the bull-formed Aufidus rolls down …', 14.25).[75]

Apis also helps connect Pindar's burst *ripae* and Horace's activity around Tiburtine *ripae*, where the fertile landscape attracts Dionysiac colouring in *uvidus* and its association with *uva* ('grape').[76] The calf/bull-god of Nilotic flooding supplies a sacral and

[69] Antony and Osiris-Dionysus: P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (trans. A. Shapiro) (Ann Arbor, 1988), 46–7, 57–8. Antony spurns Apis: Dio 51.16.5; portents: ibid. 17.5. Augustus also declined to visit (Suet. *Aug*. 93; E.M. Orlin, 'Octavian and Egyptian cults: redrawing the boundaries of Romanness', *AJPh* 129 [2008], 231–53, at 234–5). A latter-day 'Apis', the Serbian Col. Dragutin Dimitijevič, directed the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand.

[70] Mourning: cf. Call. *Aetia* fr. 54.16 H. (*SH* 254) (*Victoria Berenices*) εἰδυῖαι φαλιὸν ταῦρον ἰηλεμίσαι, echoed by Tibullus (1.7.27–8): *te* [sc. *Nile*] *canit atque suum pubes miratur Osirim | barbara Memphiten plangere docta bovem*; Hunter (n. 68), 59.

[71] Ov. *Met*. 9.691; cf. Hdt. 3.28.3; Strabo 7.1.31 διάλευκος τὸ μέτωπον καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ μικρὰ τοῦ σώματος, **τἆλλα** [cf. *cetera*] δὲ μέλας; Plin. *HN* 8.184 *insigne ei in dextro latere candicans macula **cornibus lunae crescere incipientis***; *LIMC* 2.1.175 s.v. 'Apis', nos. 12, 15; R.L. Vos, '"Varius coloribus Apis": some remarks on the colours of Apis and other sacred animals', in W. Clarysse, A. Schoors and H. Willem (edd.), *Egyptian Religion: The Last Thousand years. Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur*, vol. 1 (Leuven, 1998), 709–18.

[72] *LIMC* 2.2.175–81; for sun and moon together, nos. 7; 33. Cook (n. 67), 435–6. Cf. Porphyrius ap. Euseb. *Praep. Ev*. 3.13.2 σελήνη δὲ ταῦρον ἀνέθεσαν, ὃν Ἆπιν ἐπονομάζουσιν, μέλανα μὲν καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους, φέροντα δὲ σημεῖα ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, ὅτι καὶ τῆς σελήνης τὸ φῶς ἐξ ἡλίου. ἡλίου δὲ σημεῖον τὸ μέλαν τοῦ σώματος καὶ ὁ ὑπὸ τὴν γλῶτταν κάνθαρος. σελήνης δὲ σύμβολον τό τε διχότομον καὶ ἀμφίκυρτον.

[73] Aelian, *HA* 11.10 καὶ γάρ τοι καὶ τὴν ἄνοδον τὴν τοῦ Νείλου ὑποδηλοῦν σημεῖά φασι. For familiarity at Rome, cf. Lucan 8.477–9 (on the priest Ancorus) *hunc genuit custos Nili crescentis in arva | Memphis vana sacris; illo cultore deorum | lustra suae Phoebes non unus vixerat Apis*; cf. Tib. 1.7.21–2 with 27–8; Stat. *Silv*. 3.2.115–16.

[74] J. Klooster, 'Horace, *Carmen* 4.2.53–60: another look at the *vitulus*', *CQ* 63 (2013), 346–52, identifies an intertextual relationship between *vitulus* (in particular 57–8, *fronte curvatos imitatus ignis | tertium lunae referentis ortum*) and Arat. *Phaen*. 783–7, describing the horns of the moon on its third rising. Aratus' concluding reference (796–8) to the full 'disc' (κύκλος) of the horns and to 'fierier' (πυρώτερα) redness presaging 'a more severe storm', is echoed in *curvatos ... ignis*; cf. also *Phaen*. 802–4.

[75] *LIMC* 4.1.141-4 s.v. 'Fluvii', nos. 1–25, 146–8. Good comments on the linkage in D.H. Porter, 'The recurrent motifs of Horace *Carmina* IV', *HSCPh* 79 (1975), 189–228, at 200; cf. Putnam (n. 12), 257.

[76] Maltby (n. 40), s.v. *uva*; the etymology is present also at *Odes* 4.5.39 *dicimus uvidi*, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conceptual connection between Pindar projected as 'river-god' (above, Section 2), the Pindaric dithyramb, the *apis Matina* and the sacrificial *vitulus*. If it were correct to identify Horace's *Matinus* with Murge, the mountain-plain area lying south-east of the Aufidus, the reference to 'bull-formed Aufidus' (4.14.25) would assume greater significance, for Horace's poetic formation would include that landscape feature of his native district.[77]

The Egyptian identity of Apis involves no incongruity *vis-à-vis* Horace as Matine *apis*. The Horatian calf is 'Italian' by nurture, and by virtue of the etymological presence of *Italia* in *vitulus*.[78] That indigenous dimension, delicately indicated, is not incidental: it is consistent with the Augustan policy of representing Dionysus as the Italian agricultural Bacchus/Liber;[79] and here again, Tibullus 1.7 guarantees that Horace's Roman readership will have appreciated Osiris-Apis' status, identified with the Nile, as divine symbol of Egyptian *felicitas*, its/their identification with the Greek Dionysus, and the significance of its/their 'Italian' repositioning in *Odes* 4.2.[80] For contemporary interest in the Egyptian sacral hinterland, there is good evidence in early-Augustan wall-painting featuring Isis, Io and the Nile, in the House of Livia and the Farnesina (*c.* 20 B.C.).[81]

(f) Omnis civitas

Dionysiac worship was famously inclusive, accessible to all without distinction of rank, age or gender.[82] The advent of Dionysus typically cues a universal response: the 'whole city' (πᾶσα πόλις) is caught up; the 'whole land' (πᾶσα γῆ) dances; city streets become chorus-grounds; and if a Dionysiac occasion intersects with a Theoxenia, 'all the gods' dance too.[83] For the Athenian festivals, the returning Dionysus processes from his outlying sanctuary and becomes 'the god of the *agora*', uniting urban centre with territorial

(of Bacchus) at *Odes* 2.19.18–20 *tu ... uvidus ... coerces ... crines*. For fertile Tibur and Dionysiac colouring, cf. *Odes* 4.3 *Tibur ... fertile*, 2.6.19 *fertili ... Baccho*, and Prop. 4.6.76 *Bacche, soles Phoebo fertilis esse tuo*. For dithyrambic flowers, cf. Bacchyl. 16.5, 34; 19.39–40 (Nile); and for flowers in Pindaric dithyramb, Hamilton (n. 31), 220.

[77] Matine/Murge: *EO* 1.396–7 (Russi); the identification is not certain (cf. Di Liddo [n. 14], 42 n. 90). On the topographical issue, Nisbet and Hubbard on *Odes* 1.28.3; L.C. Watson, *A Commentary on Horace's* Epodes (Oxford, 2003), 505, on *Epodes* 16.28.

[78] Maltby (n. 40), s.v. *Italia* cites numerous Latin and Greek sources for this etymology.

[79] Cairns (n. 31), 367, on Prop. 3.17. Dionysus/*Italia* at *Odes* 1.37.16, A. Hardie (n. 44), 134, citing Soph. *Ant*. 1117–18.

[80] Dionysus/Osiris/Apis: I. Jenkins, 'The masks of Dionysos/Pan – Osiris – Apis', *JDAI* 109 (1994), 273–99; Apis in Italy (mostly post-Augustan), G.J.F. Kater-Sibbes and M.J. Vermaseren, *Apis II: Monuments from outside Egypt* (Leiden, 1975), 9–30. For Augustus' policy towards Egyptian cult in this 'Italian' context, Orlin (n. 69), 248. For Augustan appreciation of allusion to Egyptian sacral matters, Hunter (n. 68), 54–61.

[81] Wall-paintings: D.L. Balch, 'The suffering of Isis/Io and Paul's portrait of Christ crucified (Gal. 3:1): frescoes in Pompeian and Roman houses and in the temple of Isis in Pompeii', *Journal of Religion* 83 (2003), 24–55; M.R.S. Di Mino (ed.), *La Villa della Farnesina in Palazzo Massimo alle Terme* (Milan, 1998), 215.

[82] This paragraph draws on R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford, 1994), 246. The classic statement of Dionysiac universality and the 'entire city' is Plato, *Laws* 665c; cf. Eur. *Bacch*. 208–9.

[83] Eur. *Bacch*. 114–15, 1295; cf. Philodamus' *Paian to Dionysus* (text in W.D. Furley and J.M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns*, vol. 2: *Greek Texts and Commentary* [Tübingen, 2001], 53–7), 19–20. Cf. Plato, *Laws* 637b **πᾶσαν** ἐθεασάμην τὴν **πόλιν** περὶ τὰ Διονύσια μεθύουσαν. Streets/chorus-grounds: Eur. *Bacch*. 86–7; Dem. *Or*. 21.52 (Delphic oracle) μεμνῆσθαι Βάκχοιο, καὶ εὐρυχόρους κατ' ἀγυιὰς | ἱστάναι ὡραίων Βρομίῳ χάριν ἄμμιγα πάντας; Philod. *Paian* 144–7. Theoxenia/gods: Philod. *Paian* 8–9; cf. also Pind. fr. 75.1–2 Ma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

periphery.[84] The Dionysiac dithyramb itself brought together all ten tribes in agonistic festivity and provided an institutional focus for civic cohesion within a diverse populace. The musical and choric god is thus associated with internal and external concord, and with the removal of *stasis*.[85]

Here, then, is a Dionysiac reading of Augustus' return from the frontier leading the tamed *feroces Sygambri*, a return graced by the urban *ludus*, a *forum* free from disputation, and *omnis civitas* shouting *io Triumphe*. As with the Dionysiac victory-shout voiced in unison, all the citizenry combine in salutation of Triumphus/Thriambos, to which Antonius (observing the dissolution of distinctions) will lend his voice.[86] The Greek 'all-city' background is blended with Roman state ritual, and with the engagement of the entire populace, in a thanksgiving *supplicatio ad omnia pulvinaria*, over a period of several days.[87]

5. DITHYRAMB, *VOTUM* AND DRAMA

(a) Criteria

It is uncertain when the association of Dionysus, the dithyramb and the triumph entered Roman poetry, but Horace's treatments of the Actium campaign and Augustus' triple triumph of 29 in *Epodes* 9 and *Odes* 1.37 represent its first identified appearances, followed by Tibullus 1.7 (Messalla).[88] It has also been suggested that two hymns to Bacchus which do not deal with triumphs, Propertius 3.17 and Horace *Odes* 3.25, are dithyrambs; and in addition *Odes* 1.15 was observed by Fraenkel to be modelled on a Bacchylidean dithyramb.[89]

The issue of definition calls for comment.[90] Criteria for categorizing the genre, and for the allocation of classic texts to dithyramb-books, were subject to scholarly dispute

[84] Procession, dithyramb and *agora*: Seaford (n. 82), 240–6; C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (Lanham, 2003), 69–100; see below, Section 5 (d).

[85] For dithyramb, civic cohesion and the removal of *stasis*, see B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson, 'The world of dithyramb', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 1–27, at 11–13; Seaford (n. 82), 246 cites Diod. Sic. 3.64.7 ... πανταχοῦ πανηγύρεις ἄγειν καὶ μουσικοὺς ἀγῶνας συντελεῖν, καὶ τὸ σύνολον συλλύοντα τὰ νείκη τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων ἀντὶ τῶν στάσεων καὶ τῶν πολέμων ὁμόνοιαν καὶ πολλὴν εἰρήνην κατασκευάζειν.

[86] Victory-shout in unison after *agon*: Eur. *Bacch*. 1131 ἦν δὲ πᾶσ' ὁμοῦ βοή (Maenads for Agave); cf. 1154 ἀναβοάσωμεν (chorus of Bacchae for Dionysus); R. Seaford, 'The eleventh ode of Bacchylides: Hera, Artemis and the Absence of Dionysos', *JHS* 108 (1988), 118–36, at 134.

[87] G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich, 1912[2]), 423–6.

[88] A. Hardie (n. 44); C.W. Macleod, 'Horace and his lyric models: a note on Epode 9 and Odes 1.37', *Hermes* 110 (1982), 371–5 (= C. Macleod, *Collected Essays* [Oxford, 1983], 220–4), argued for *Epodes* 9 as an 'Archilochean dithyramb' and as a dramatic counterpart to 1.37 (both dismissed by Rutherford [n. 41], 422); Macleod's identification is not discussed by Watson (n. 77), but see above, n. 64 for further support. On Tibullus 1.7, see F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge, 1979), 171–2.

[89] *Odes* 3.25: implied at D. West, *Horace* Odes *III.* Dulce Periculum (Oxford, 2002), 208. Prop. 3.17: Cairns (n. 41), 97 (modified in Cairns [n. 31], 364); cf. J.F. Miller, 'Propertius' hymn to Bacchus and contemporary poetry', *AJPh* 112 (1991), 77–86, at 79. F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge, 1989), 102 suggests that the Actian triumph at the end of *Aeneid* 8 draws on the 'dithyrambic genre'. *Odes* 1.15: see below, n. 119. None of the poems cited features in Rutherford's treatment of Roman dithyramb (n. 41).

[90] G. D'Alessio, '"The name of the dithyramb": diachronic and diatopic variations', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 113–32; Kowalzig and Wilson (n. 85), 7–13, 24–7; Ieranò (n. 20),

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in antiquity. The term itself was applied to a range of songs, and the mainstream genre was characterized by continuous innovation and change through its long history. Not all dithyramb is Dionysiac (the Bacchylidean corpus, for example), and not all that is Dionysiac (the first *Homeric Hymn*, for example) is dithyramb; and while some dithyrambs had a high narrative content, others were framed as dramatic dialogues, and others again as a mix of narrative and character *mimēsis*.[91] Allegedly disrespectful of conventional generic and musical boundaries (Plato, *Laws* 700d), dithyramb seems to have had a fluid, two-way, interface with tragedy.[92] Again, some distinctive features of the dithyramb (the *kyklios choros* being one) turn up in other song-types. Yet as a general point, it can be assumed that, as (still) performed and as a topic of scholarly enquiry, the dithyramb was sufficiently well known in the Greco-Roman world for the *eidos* and its history to have been accessible to Horace's audience.[93] Galen's polemic against the Neronian physician Thessalus offers a later perspective that is strikingly close in some respects to what we have in *Odes* 4.2 (*De meth. med.* vol. 10 p. 12 K.): ridiculing Thessalus' challenge to the teachings of Hippocrates, Galen depicts him as, in his own estimation, a crowned agonistic victor in the arts, and ponders whether 'some Homer' might hymn the 'Thessaleian victory', or 'some lyricist singing in sublime style, in dithyrambs, in the manner of Pindar – as in the past of Dionysus, so now of Thessalus'.

Odes 1.37 can be categorized as a dithyramb on the basis of its function, the quasi-sacral celebration of victory and triumph, taken together with sustained Dionysiac content and various features characteristic of the genre as represented in surviving examples and ancient criticism: a heroic narrative, structured as a single extended sentence, 5–32; distinct 'tragic' colouring;[94] and the sacral consumption of wine.[95] In addition, the ode has a Pindaric analogue in the Second Dithyramb (Hercules' capture of Cerberus). Similar criteria are here brought to bear on the identification of *Odes* 4.2 as a Roman dithyramb, supplemented by the marked incidence of intertextual linkage within the group of Augustan poems cited above. Some dithyrambic features were considered in Section 4, and a possible Pindaric analogue will be outlined below (d). Here, I consider the poem's addressee, its sacral function and its framing as a dramatic dialogue.

205–32, 321–8; C. Calame, 'The dithyramb, a Dionysiac poetic form: genre rules and cultic contexts', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 332–52.

[91] Plato, *Resp*. 394b–c (testimonium 205 Ieranò); ps.-Plut. *De Mus*. 1134e (testimonium 209 Ieranò); Calame (n. 90), esp. 335–6, 341–5, 346–9; Peponi (n. 48).

[92] Dithyramb/lyric: Peponi (n. 48), 354–6. Tragedy: Battezzato (n. 64).

[93] Rutherford (n. 41), 409–18.

[94] A. Hardie (n. 44), 119–20, 130–2 (for an instance of the influence of tragedy on dithyramb, see now Battezzato [n. 64], 96–9); on the basis of a selective summary, Rutherford (n. 41), 422 finds '[n]one of this … persuasive'.

[95] A. Hardie (n. 44), 122, 123–4, 127–8; Macleod (n. 88), 373 (= 222) n. 10 argued that the dramatic setting of *Odes* 1.37 is 'the moment when news of Cleopatra's death reached Rome'; for the reasons presented in my own article (esp. pp. 120–2, 132), I believe that this is a misreading of the poem's syntactical treatment of the present occasion in relation to the past, as also of its sacral dynamics and its sequence of events (in particular, Octavian's reduction of the enemy forces to helplessness at Actium). 1.37 celebrates the triumph that is anticipated in the dithyrambic *Epodes* 9; but whereas the latter anticipates consumption of Caecuban at a symposium with Maecenas, 1.37 offers a public celebration with sacral-'Dionysiac' consumption of the wine. It is depressing to record the article's absence from the most recent commentary on 1.37 (and the unqualified transmission of orthodoxy).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(b) A votum *for Liber*

The dramatic occasion of *Odes* 4.2 is not clearly defined. Like *Epodes* 9, it anticipates a triumph; but this triumph did not actually take place, and it cannot provide the poem with its occasion, or define its sacral function.[96] A more productive approach is offered by the votive content. Antonius alludes to *publici ludi*, presumably with reference to the games already vowed by decree in 16; and there is a further reference to *vota publica suscepta pro salute et reditu Augusti* attested for that year, in *super* ***impetrato*** | *fortis Augusti* ***reditu*** (42–3).[97] These votive allusions are further developed in 'Horace's' rejoinder, the comparison of sacrificial victims that will discharge (*solvet*, 54) respective *vota* (56) on Augustus' return; and *Odes* 4.2 itself constitutes 'Horace's' *votum* as *poeta*.

When the time comes to discharge these *vota*, Antonius' ten bulls and ten cows will constitute a state sacrifice, perhaps on the Capitoline (*sacrum clivum*, 35) to Jupiter Optimus Maximus. But to which god will Horace sacrifice his *vitulus*/*iuvencus*? The dithyrambic material offers an obvious candidate, in Liber/Bacchus himself. The 'Dionysiac' term *solvet* (54) points in the same direction;[98] but a more intriguing (and far-reaching) item of support is offered by the two lines that conclude the central poem in the ode-book (8.33–4), *ornatus viridi tempora pampino* | *Liber vota bonos ducit ad exitus* ('his temples adorned with green vine, Liber leads our vows to good outcomes'). The first line (33) overtly quotes the end of Horace's hymn to Bacchus (*Odes* 3.25.20 *cingentem viridi tempora pampino*); in doing so, it signals a less obvious allusion in the second (and last) line (34) to the end of our ode (*notam* ***duxit***), and to the *vota* undertaken there; moreover, *bonos ... exitus* is a poetic variation of the state prayer for the *bonus eventus* of the emperor's expeditions, and thus helps fix the back-reference to 4.2.[99]

Odes 4.8 addresses the power of poet and poetry, and it concludes with what I have suggested is a self-reflexive reference to the efficacy of 4.2 as poem-*votum* directed to Liber. The wider theme of the efficacy of *vota* is explored elsewhere in the ode-book, as also in the earlier collection.[100] In 4.2 itself, this same theme, the power of poetry, is integral to the hymnic praises of Pindar (Section 2), and it is carried over into what follows in the central characterization of 'Horace's' sung production as *operosa ... carmina* (31–2).[101] At one level, this signifies 'songs on which much effort has been expended', thus 'highly wrought' in the Callimachean sense. But the range of *operosus* shifts in extant poetic usage at around this time towards the active sense 'expending much effort', hence 'efficacious'.[102] Here, it develops *grata thyma*: thyme offers a reciprocal return

[96] Du Quesnay (n. 2), 132 n. 22.

[97] Du Quesnay (n. 2), 132 n. 23, with bibliography. For *impetrato* Fedeli and Ciccarelli (n. 4), 163 cite *TLL* 7.599.23–4 for the sense 'de quibusvis quae sacrificiis rite peractis vel precationibus a dis tribuuntur'; cf. *CS* 49–51; *Ep*. 2.1.137 (*impetrat ... chorus*).

[98] *Solvet* echoes *lege solutis* (12) and alludes to Dionysus the 'loosener' or 'liberator' (*Lyaeus*), from λύω. Cf. esp. *Epodes* 9.37–8 *curam ... iuvat* | *dulci Lyaeo* ***solvere***; also e.g. Prop. 3.17.5–6 *per te* [Bacchus/wine] *iunguntur, per te* ***solvuntur*** *amantes:* | *tu vitium ex animo* ***dilue****, Bacche, meo*.

[99] Du Quesnay (n. 2), 161 n. 178, and the *vota* of the Trajanic Fratres Arvales cited there. For confirmation of the expeditionary context of *exitus* (and of 'return'), cf. *Odes* 4.14.37–8 *Fortuna ...* | *belli secundos reddidit exitus*; Putnam (n. 12), 260–1.

[100] Efficacious *vota* are made explicit (in the erotic sphere) at *Odes* 4.13.1–2: *audivere, Lyce, di mea vota, di* | *audivere, Lyce: fis anus*; Putnam (n. 12), 221. *Odes* 3.23 treats the efficacy of private and state sacrifices.

[101] Pindaric efficacy: *centum* ***potiore*** *signis* | *munere donat* (19–20).

[102] *TLL* 9.699.33ff. s.v. shows that *operosa* of elaborate workmanship of objects is a recent extension of this late-Ciceronian coinage. See *TLL*, ibid. 53ff. for active *operosus* 'de eis qui (quae) magnam operam impendunt'; and ibid. 75–8 for 'de medicamento ... efficaci' (Cic. *Fin.* 1.72 *artem ... tam*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the *labor* expended upon it; and like Greek *charis*, it also suggests the persuasive impact of the resulting honey-*carmina* on their addressees.[103] The active or efficacious aspect of Horace's *carmina* (hence of 4.2 as *votum*) is thus inseparable from its high level of refinement. The latter is further developed through the intertextual relationship between the *vitulus* and Aratus (*Phaen.* 783–7) observed by Jacqueline Klooster, whereby the calf and its lunar horns are associated with the virtue of λεπτότης; the metapoetic sacrifice to Liber/Dionysus that will fulfil the poem-*votum* will thus share the refinement of the Matine *apis*.[104]

The tension between Pindaric *ingenium* and Callimachean–Horatian *ars* calls for further comment within the Dionysiac context under discussion. Here, the *labor plurimus* on which 'Horace' insists (29–30), in contrast to the effortless elevation of the 'Dircaean swan', offers a good line of approach: for those in the service of Liber/Dionysus, and charged with his superhuman power, *labor* (πόνος) is sharply differentiated from all other divine service, as 'pleasant', 'unwearying' and 'effortless';[105] indeed, a decade or so earlier, 'Horace' himself had celebrated this aspect of the inspirational Bacchus in *Odes* 3.25, juxtaposing the superhuman, Dionysiac, strength of the bacchants with the *dulce periculum* of singing in his service (14–20). On that occasion, as a self-fulfilling promise, he said (19–20) *nil parvum aut humili modo | ... loquar* ('nothing small or in humble style shall I utter'), thus demonstrating that Dionysiac inspiration was by no means alien to his literary *persona*.[106] The apparent conflict between *nil parvum* there and *parvus* at 4.2.31 can best be resolved by reference to the 'Pindar-hymn', where 'Horace's' personality withdraws, and where his poetry, rolling out as a majestic, twenty-line, all-embracing period, does operate in a higher, indeed sublime, register. At one level, this suggests the 'inspiration' of close reading of Pindar (above, Section 2); but it also suggests the active presence of Dionysiac inspiration, such that, in hymning 'dithyrambic' Pindar, 'Horace' does so under the influence of the god who inspired his model and who now, we may infer, enables him to rise towards his own version of the 'sublime', one in which *labor* is combined with the surge of inspired strength.

Yet it is Apollo and not Dionysus whose name is in evidence (*laurea donandus Apollinarii*, 9), and he is referenced again, more discreetly, in the salutation of

... *operosam et perinde tam fructuosam* points the way). For active *operosa*, linked with *carmina*, Ov. *Met.* 14.20–22 *at tu, sive aliquid regni est in carmine, carmen | ore move sacro, sive expugnacior herba est, | utere temptatis* ***operosae*** *viribus herbae*. For 'hard-working' and 'achieving the sought-for effect', cf. Ov. *Fast.* 1.101–2 (Janus to Ovid) *disce ... vates operose dierum | quod petis* (cf. 3.177). M. Pasco-Pranger, '*Vates operosus:* vatic poetics and antiquarianism in Ovid's *Fasti*', *CW* 93 (2000), 275–91, at 275, 278, misses the point, connecting with poetic *labor* alone. For dual sense (as in *operosa carmina*), cf. Ov. *Ars am.* 1.399 *tempora qui solis operosa colentibus arva* (passive if taken with *arva*, active if with *tempora*).

[103] Cf. Verg. *G.* 1.83 *nec nulla interea est inaratae gratia terrae*, with Mynors' note; add Plin. *Pan.* 31.1 *omnibus equidem gentibus fertiles annos gratasque terras precor*. For *charis*/Charites in dithyramb, cf. Pind. fr. 75.2 Ma.; *Ol.* 13.18–19; Bacchyl. 19.6, with H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides 2: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente* (Leiden, 1997), 251; 23.7–8.

[104] Klooster (n. 74), 350 observes interplay with the Aratean acrostic λεπτή (initial letters of lines 783–7), and its relevance for Horace's opening 'Pindar-acrostic' (above, Section 2, with n. 19); Pindar and Aratus are associated 'by acrostic' at start and finish.

[105] Eur. *Bacch.* 66–7, 194, 1053, 1127–8; Ar. *Frogs* 402; cf. Philod. *Paian* (n. 83), 35–6; Apul. *Met.* 11.1, 6. For the extensive evidence for choric play around πόνοι in relation to musical τέχνη in satyric drama, see R.A.S. Seaford, *Cyclops of Euripides* (Oxford, 1984), 34–5. For choric πόνοι in Pindaric dithyramb, fr. 70d.16 Ma.

[106] Troxler-Keller (n. 9), 47–69, esp. 63–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Augustus, *o sol pulcher!* (46–7).[107] Similarly, the god's laurel wreath, *laurea ... donandus*, is echoed in *o laudande!* (47), thereby yielding two 'Apolline' salutations in stanza 12 to match the double-salutation of Triumphus-Thriambus in stanza 13: truly, a μειξιβόαν διθύραμβον ('dithyramb which mixes different shouts')![108] In a Roman setting, of course, *Apollinari* recalls the Ludi Apollinares, which included competitions of dramatic poets (below, Section 6). Horace thus weaves the Apolline emblem of poetic victory/supremacy into association with the dithyrambic celebration of the victorious *triumphator*. This has classical antecedents in the presence of Apolline elements, in combination with the Dionysiac, in some fifth- and fourth-century dithyrambic and paeanic poetry.[109] More immediately, it is the product of the association of the two gods as a feature of Augustan poetry (below, Section 7). Horace's lyre-accompaniment (*maiore … plectro*, 33) may further reflect the intrusion of Apolline interests, since the standard instrumental accompaniment of the dithyramb was the *aulos* (above, Section 4 [d]). This is a more complex issue, since the cithara/lyre was by no means excluded from dithyrambic performance.[110] At all events, as the state lyre player (cf. *Odes* 4.6.35–6), Horace draws the dithyramb into instrumental harmony with his chosen title, *Romanae fidicen lyrae*.[111]

The clearest extant parallel for a votive dithyramb promising certain actions in return for Dionysus' favour is Propertius 3.17. I have not found any obvious classical antecedent, but this may well be an accident of survival, since at least some dithyrambists will have promised bull-sacrifices to the god in the event of agonistic victory. As it happens, one of the earliest dithyrambic records is an inscribed epigram recording an *ex voto* dedication by a victorious poet (though we cannot be certain that the vow was a component of the winning dithyramb);[112] and the discharge of votive obligations might well be envisaged at the Dionysiac *epinikia* celebrations for victory-dithyrambs.[113]

(c) Drama

The dithyramb was closely associated with drama, and several testimonia use the term δρᾶμα of individual examples.[114] Again, dithyramb was closely associated with *mimēsis*

[107] For *sol*, Apollo and Augustus in the context of the Actium triumph, see P. Hardie (n. 58), 355–7; for Apollo *pulcher*, J.F. Miller, *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets* (Cambridge, 2009), 116.

[108] *Laudande* echoes *laurea … donandus*: Maltby (n. 40), s.vv. *laurus*, *laus*, citing Serv. *Ecl.* 8.12 *cur ... triumphantes lauro coronentur, haec ratio est, quondam apud veteres a laude habuit nomen, nam laudum dicebant*. μειξιβόαν διθύραμβον: Aesch. *TrGF* 3.355; Battezzato (n. 64), 95.

[109] On this aspect of Philodamus' *Paian*, see L. Käppel, *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Berlin and New York, 1992), 207–84; on Bacchylides 17, see now D. Fearn, 'Athens and the empire: the contextual flexibility of dithyramb, and its imperialist ramifications', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 133–52, at 146–8.

[110] On this subject, including interplay with Apollo, see now the discussion of T. Power, 'Kyklops *kitharoidos*: dithyramb and nomos in play', in Kowalzig and Wilson (edd.) (n. 20), 237–56, esp. 239–42.

[111] Cf., with Becker ([n. 4], 129 n.11), the echo of stanzas 4–6 at *Ars am.* 83–5 *Musa dedit fidibus divos puerosque decorum | et pugilem victorem et equum certamine primum | et iuvenum curas et* ***libera vina*** *referre*, where the reference is to *skolia*, allied to Liber.

[112] *IG* 1^3.833 bis (testimonium 92 Ieranò); Ieranò (n. 20), 252–5.

[113] Z. Biles, 'Celebrating poetic victory: representations of epinikia in classical Athens', *JHS* 127 (2007), 19–37.

[114] Schol. Ar. *Frogs* 320 (testimonium 45 Ieranò) ἢ κωμικὸς διθυραμβικά, τουτέστι Διονυσιακὰ δράματα ποιῶν. Ibid. 366 Κινησίαν τὸν διθυραμβοποιὸν κωμῳδεῖ, ὃς εἰσήνεγκεν ἐν δράματι τὴν Ἑκάτην. Cf. *Suda* κ 22. On Philoxenus' *Cyclops*, see J.H. Hordern, 'The *Cyclops* of Philoxenus',

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of various kinds, both musical and in the representation of named roles.[115] Herein, I suggest, lies the generic significance of Horace's *imitatus* (57): the *vitulus* 'imitates' lunar phenomena as metapoetic symbol of the mimetic character of the song that it represents.

Two Bacchylidean odes illustrate the dramatic range of some earlier dithyrambic poetry.[116] *Theseus* (18), written for an Athenian festival, presents a question-and-answer dialogue between a proto-ephebic chorus and King Aegeus, supplemented by choric comment.[117] The subject is Theseus, now approaching Athens, his catalogue of heroic actions against mighty brutes, and the god-spurred 'justice' that motivates them. The papyrus carries no indication of speakers, whose identity must be inferred from the text, as must speaker-changes (*sc.* after each fifteen-line strophe); and it is unclear whether 'Aegeus' was sung by a soloist or (more likely) by the chorus alternating between the two speaking parts.[118] In *Io* (19, again for an Athenian festival), the dramatic interplay is between Athenian chorus (not further identified) and Keian poet: a gnomic statement about poetry ('whoever [ὃς] obtains gifts from the Muses, to him are open countless paths') leads to exhortation by chorus to a poet exceptionally favoured by Calliope, to 'weave something new' for Athens; the poet responds (speaking, of course, through the chorus) with a narrative account of Io and Argus which concludes with the latter's death, for which the Muses are one of three possible agents; the (Muse-inspired) poet then reflects in the first person (37), and with obvious humour, on his own 'safest' course of action, quickly takes Io to the Nile and the birth of Epaphus, and finally catalogues the generations down to Dionysus, 'master of crown-bearing choruses' (51).

The hermeneutic value of these Bacchylidean dithyrambs for *Odes* 4.2 lies in part in the lively mix of dramatic exchange and narrative/catalogue (Theseus' deeds [18], the ways Argus may have perished, and Dionysus' ancestors [19]; and in 4.2, the Pindaric genres). The 'drama' in each case involves a protagonist (Aegeus, the Keian poet) and the performing chorus, identifiable in *Theseus* with proto-ephebes, and in *Io* with contemporary representatives of the *polis*. The dramatic content of *Io*, moreover (as in *Odes* 4.2), lies in the response of the poet to civic challenge, in this case the command of a dithyrambic chorus representing Athens to respond to an inspirational Muse-gift (*sc.* 'Calliope', by implication as represented in the 'beautiful voice' of the chorus) with a 'new' (*sc.* dithyramb) for 'blessed Athens'. On the evidence of *Odes* 1.15, we can be confident that Horace was familiar with the Alexandrian edition of

CQ 49 (1999), 445–55, at 452–3; Power (n. 110), 238; also, with different conclusions, D.F. Sutton, 'Dithyramb as Δρᾶμα: Philoxenus of Cythera's "*Cyclops or Galatea*"', *QUCC* 13 (1983), 37–43. Schol. Ar. *Plutus* 290 ... δρᾶμα τὴν Γαλάτειαν ἐποίησεν, ἐν ᾧ εἰσήγαγε τὸν Κύκλωπα ἐρῶντα τῆς Γαλατείας. Zenobius (second cent. A.D.) *Cent.* 5.45 (824 *PMG*) Κύκλωψ γάρ ἐστι δρᾶμα Φιλοξένου τοῦ ποιητοῦ ... The *Suda* notice on Telestes (τ 265), Τελέστης, κωμικός. τούτου δράματά ἐστιν Ἀργὼ καὶ Ἀσκληπιός, refers to dithyrambs: Hordern (cited above), 455. Although all of late date, the testimonia derive from earlier assessment: cf. Pickard-Cambridge (n. 20), 134–5; Sutton (cited above), 38.

[115] Plato, *Resp*. 397a; cf. esp. Ar. *Plut*. 290–91 (parody of Philoxenus' *Cyclops*) τὸν Κύκλωπα μιμούμενος; 302–6 Ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν Κίρκην ... μιμήσομαι πάντας τρόπους; 312 τὸν Λαρτίου μιμούμενοι τῶν ὄρχεων κρεμῶμεν. Zimmermann (n. 51), 127–8; Hordern (n. 98), 453. On the dithyramb, *choros* and *mimēsis*, Peponi (n. 48), esp. 359–67. On dramatic scenes, Power (n. 110), 244–6.

[116] Calame (n. 90), 346–52.

[117] Ephebes: R. Merkelbach, 'Der Theseus des Bakchylides (Gedicht fuer ein attisches Ephebenfest)', *ZPE* 12 (1973), 56–62; Maehler (n. 103), 211–12.

[118] Hordern (n. 114), 452 dates the introduction of soloists to the later fourth century, and notes that 'the evidence for soloists in the classical dithyramb is generally weak'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bacchylides' *Dithyrambs*.[119] While there is little verbal association between *Io* and our poem beyond gnomic ὅς/*quisquis*, the thematic intersection of Io/Epaphos/Nile with Apis in a 'dithyrambic' mini-drama adds to the ode's interest as a possible antecedent; and its transparent humour usefully parallels the playful, even bantering, element in *Odes* 4.2.

(d) A Pindaric Antecedent?

Identification of *Odes* 4.2 as a dithyramb, taken together with illustrative parallels from the Bacchylidean dithyramb-book, supplies a plausible generic context for reading the poem as a dramatic dialogue between Horace and Antonius. Nothing in the extant Pindaric corpus suggests the dramatic framing of *Theseus* or *Io*; yet it would be surprising if Horace had altogether ignored Pindar's dithyramb-book in this Pindarizing poem, and indeed the likelihood is that he has echoed not one classical model but several, perhaps including Simonides as well as Bacchylides and Pindar. Nothing remains of Simonides' vast output of prize dithyrambs, and the Pindaric remnants are too sparse to permit anything other than an indication of possible influences. Fr. 75 Ma. (for Athens) appears to offer the closest comparator. Composed for the City Dionysia, this processional dithyramb was evidently a component of Dionysus' ceremonial return from the Academy to Athens on the occasion of the dramatic festival, and it opens with an address to the (twelve) Olympians at their altar in the *agora*, before proceeding 'from Zeus' to (the paraded statue of) Dionysus.[120] The god's annual return (epiphanic in processional symbolism), the combination of the twelve Olympians with Dionysus as primary addressee, the city-centre detail and the literary festival offer parallel material of obvious interest for *Odes* 4.2, its combination of processing Triumphus/Thriambus and (*supplicatio* to) the *boni divi*, including Jupiter, its Roman topography and its festal references (including the Ludi Apollinares [below, Section 6]). Taken together with the Bacchylidean parallels noted earlier, this may give some sense, however partial and incomplete, of Horace's debt to the classical Athenian dithyrambs of the fifth century.

The classical dithyramb was quintessentially a choric song-type. Thus, the question of 'choric' performance of *Odes* 4.2 itself, real or imagined, necessarily arises. My own view, which is based on Horace's evident interest in Greek choric conventions elsewhere, is that the speaker-changes in performance argued for earlier can best be understood by reference to the mimetic functions of a singing chorus. A contemporary context for this suggestion may perhaps be discernible in the annual observances of the chorus of poets at the Palatine temple of Liber, to be considered in the final section (7). But the general issue of 'choric' odes, closely tied up as it is with Horace's posture as a Pindarizing poet, would require more extensive documentation than can be justified in the present context, and it will not be considered here in any greater depth.[121]

[119] Porph. on Hor. *Odes* 1.15, with reference to Bacchyl. fr. 23 (*Cassandra*); Maehler (n. 103), 268, 270–1; Fraenkel (n. 7), 189–90; cf. R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford, 1970), 188–9.

[120] Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 84), 96–8. Dionysus and the Zeus-led twelve Olympians intersect in the appeal ἴδετε … δεύτερον (8) which includes a playful echo of the opening summons to the twelve gods to join the dithyrambic chorus (δεύτερον/**δεῦτ' ἐν** χο**ρόν**).

[121] Greek choric conventions in *Odes* 4.6 are discussed in A. Hardie (n. 35).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6. THE ODE-BOOK AND THE TIME OF WRITING

My aim in the final two sections is to reach a closer understanding of the poem's time of writing and of the occasion at which it was first performed. The dramatic date appears to be 16, for that is when the *publica vota pro reditu* will have been decreed (above, Section 1). The date of composition is a more complex matter: it might in principle be late 16 or early 15, but there are good grounds for thinking that the poem is the product of a later period, in or around 13. The first pointers in this direction appear in Antonius' intervention, and in phraseology that seems to reflect his appointment as *praetor urbanus* in that year (above, Section 3). The true starting point for discussion, however, lies in the aggregated linkages between *Odes* 4.2 and other poems in *Odes* 4: its closest partners are 4.3, 4.5 and 4.8, and there are meaningful links, offering material assistance in clarifying or confirming points of interpretation, with 4.1, 4.6, 4.14 and 4.15;[122] that amounts to half the total, and while taken in isolation they might be reckoned the product of a process of composition stretching over several years, the cumulative impact is undeniably impressive and would be consistent with composition of our poem as a component of a planned ode-book.[123] For that reason alone, the possibility that 4.2 was written closer to 13 than to 16 merits serious consideration.[124]

The proposition that Horace could compose poetry about near-contemporary events with a dramatic date substantially earlier than the time of writing is not problematic. Recent work on *Epodes* 9 has underlined the need to distinguish its dramatic or fictional chronology from its actual time of composition; and a strong case has been made for putting the date of composition of *Odes* 3.6, set in the uncertain world of the early 20s, in 25 or later.[125] Within *Odes* 4 itself, the dramatic date of the other *reditus* poem, 4.5, clearly precedes news of Augustus' return, but again there appear to be good grounds for thinking that it was written to celebrate that event.[126] From time to time, then, Horace seems to locate the perspective of the *persona loquens* in the period preceding some decisive event that has already taken place, in order to catch the mood of that period, be it uncertainty, hope, despair or bullish exuberance. This kind of dramatic retrojection is effective precisely because it carries the appeal of direct recall for

[122] 4.1 and 4.2: Putnam (n. 12), 54 with n. 10. Here is an indicative list of further linkages, which has no claim to completeness (line numbers in 4.2 given first). Between 4.2 and 4.3: Tiburtine waters, *nemora* (30/11) and fertility (30–31/10), plus *fingere* (32/12); games victors (boxer/horse, 18/4); *triumphator* and laurel *corona* (35–6/6–7). Between 4.2 and 4.4: *cetera fulvus* (60, cf. Antonius' mother Fulvia?)/*fulvae matris* (14); bull-river god/*Me**taurum** flumen* (above, 4 [e]/38); *sol pulcher* (46–7)/*pulcher dies* (39–40). Between 4.2 and 4.5: *reditus* of Augustus (43/3); *vota* (56/13); sun-imagery (46/5–8); *divi boni* (38/1); *uvidus* (30/39). Between 4.2 and 4.6: *poeta* (33)/*nomen poetae* (30). Between 4.2 and 4.8: acquisition of *nomen* (4/18); *munus* (20/12) and *donare* (9, 20/1, 3, 12); poems and statues (19–20/2, 7); *Liber* and *vota* (56/34). Between 4.2 and 4.9: Pindar/*Pindaricae Camenae* (1, 8/6–8); poetic immortality after death (23–4/*passim*). Between 4.2 and 4.14: river-god (Pindar) and Apis/*tauriformis Aufidus* (above, 4 [e]/25, Tiberius); the Sygambri (36/51).

[123] The quest for an over-arching unity within the ode-book is of course not new: Porter (n. 75) supplied some foundations; most important are Putnam (n. 12), 24, 291–306, 307–26, 327–8 and *passim*; and A. Kerckhecker, 'Zur Komposition des vierten Horazischen Odenbuches', *Antike und Abendland* 34 (1988), 124–43 (noted by the referee); cf. also Thomas (n. 4), 7–10, citing H. Dettmer, *Horace: A Study in Structure* (Hildesheim, 1983), 484–523.

[124] Quinn (n. 25), 303; N. Holzberg, *Horaz: Dichter und Werk* (Munich, 2010), 185.

[125] *Epode* 9: Watson (n. 77), 311; E. Kraggerud, *Horaz und Actium: Studien zu den politischen Epoden* (Oslo, 1984) (noted by the referee). *Odes* 3.6: id., 'The sixth Roman Ode of Horace: its date and function', *SO* 70 (1995), 54–67.

[126] Du Quesnay (n. 2).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

readers who had been participants in the events described; and it skilfully extends the range of techniques that Horace had at his disposal for indirect praise of Augustus and the regime. This, I suggest, is what the poet is doing in *Odes* 4.2: from a later perspective, he is recreating the period following Augustus' departure from Rome in 16, the *publica vota pro reditu*, and the sincerely held feelings evoked by that event.[127] Within the generic framework of the dithyramb, Horace fictionalizes a dramatic dialogue between himself and Antonius; and through that medium, he presents afresh some of the issues of public policy that arose around the Gallic expedition.

A further pointer to the poem as the product of 13 is *Apollinari* (9), alluding to the Ludi Apollinares: these were staged annually from 6 to 13 July, and in the year 13, they will have overlapped with the *supplicationes* in Augustus' honour following the assumed date of his return to Rome, 4 July.[128] It is difficult to suppose that such a reference is a matter of coincidence, given the onward connection to *urbis publicum ludum* (41–2). Indeed if Antonius' praetorian post in 13 was as *praetor urbanus*, as seems very likely (above, Section 3), he will have had charge of the Ludi Apollinares, in line with responsibilities laid down when the festival was established in 212;[129] and as presiding magistrate, Antonius will have led the festival *pompa*, processing on the high chariot, thereby yielding a resonance with 'the triumph that never was'.[130] The games cohere with the triumphal and 'dithyrambic' scenario outlined earlier in other significant respects: they were vowed to secure victory over Hannibal, and were dedicated to Apollo *victoriae, non valetudinis ergo* (Livy 25.12.15); they comprised *ludi circenses* (including horse/chariot racing), and *ludi scaenici*, in which winners were awarded the *palma*; and perhaps of greatest immediate relevance, they were observed by the *populus laureatus*, each individual wreathed in laurel.[131] *Odes* 4.2 thus brings together the Roman/Apolline and the Athenian/Dionysiac (as represented, for example, in Pindar, fr. 75 Ma.: above, Section 5 [d]); and in that context, it seems very likely that Horace was aware of Antonius' praetorship in 13 when he wrote the poem, as also of his role in the Ludi Apollinares and the proximity of the latter to the date of Augustus' return.

Of course, there remains the fact that the Sygambrian triumph did not take place. By the time of Augustus' return, the Sygambrian threat was consigned to history; and indeed Augustus' decision not to stage further imperial triumphs will by then have been known to Horace and his audience (Dio 54.24.7–8, under the year 14). The appearance of the phantom triumph is not, however, inconsistent with the separation of the

[127] Cf. Du Quesnay (n. 2), 134–5.

[128] For the near-exclusive application of the adjective to the Ludi, *TLL* 1.248.16–24. For the celebrations, see Du Quesnay (n. 2), 140–1.

[129] The Ludi Apollinares were established following promulgation of two *carmina Marciana* (Livy 25.12): one 'predicted' the defeat at Cannae, with a warning to the 'Trojan-born' not to engage the enemy on the Apulian 'plain of Diomedes' (cf. Antonius' *Diomedeia*?); and the other predicted that the Carthaginians would be driven from Italy if *ludi* were vowed to Apollo. *Praetor urbanus*: Livy 25.12.10 (paraphrasing the *carmina Marciana*) *iis ludis faciendis praeerit praetor is, qui ius ... dabit summum*; F.X. Ryan, 'Die Apollinarspiele zur Zeit der Republik', *Aevum* 80 (2006) 67–104, at 91–6.

[130] Versnel (n. 42), 129–31.

[131] *Victoria*: Ryan (n. 129), 84 with n. 51. Horse/chariot racing: ibid., 88. People wreathed: ibid. *Palma*: Cic. *Att.* 4.15.6. In July 44, Antonius' uncle Gaius took over from Marcus Brutus the responsibilities of *praetor urbanus*, and with them the staging of the Ludi Apollinares (*MRR* 2.319); this was a key event in the tussle between Caesarians and conspirators for the favour of Apollo (A. Gosling, 'Octavian, Brutus and Apollo: a note on opportunist propaganda', *AJPh* 107 [1986], 586–9), and in that sense a precursor for the post-Actium strategy of recovering Liber for Augustus and Italy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dramatic date from the date of composition, for if *Odes* 4.2 does present a dramatic reconstruction of a dialogue that notionally took place in 16, then what we have is not the genuine prospective view of the campaign as recorded by Horace in 16, but something altogether more complex. We should be compelled to read the poem as a reconstruction of the campaign perspective of the year 16 composed from the later standpoint of the year 13.

To appreciate why Horace should represent Antonius as anticipating a triumph in a dramatic reconstruction written when it was known there would be (or had been) no such triumph, we might recall the testimony of Dio (54.20.6) to the effect that the Sygambri retired and sued for peace when they learned that Augustus himself was taking the field. That account foregrounds the personal impact of the *princeps* on a hostile barbarian tribe which had challenged the imperial order; and as such it resonates, from a later century, with a major theme of *Odes* 4.14, Augustus' capacity to resolve tribal challenges through his presence in the field (41–52). That poem's closing reference to the Sygambri represents the theme (51–2): *te caede gaudentes Sygambri | compositis venerantur armis* ('to you the Sygambri whose pleasure is in slaughter pay loving obeisance, their arms laid up'). This culminating hymnic compliment explicitly credits Augustus with effecting, through his presence, the voluntary accommodation of a tribe which was given, by its nature, to the business of slaughter;[132] and of course, the peaceful outcome of a frontier war which at its inception had seemed to require a formidable enemy to be crushed in armed conflict must redound mightily to Augustus' credit as a peacemaker. In Roman contemporary terms, the achievement is more praiseworthy still when considered against the conventional expectation of victory and triumph among authoritative observers at the time of the revolt. For that reason, we need to address the proposition that the two Sygambri-passages, the anticipated triumph (4.2.34–6) and the tribal submission (4.14.51–2) were not after all written in isolation, the product of successive impressions recorded at the time they entered circulation; rather, they constitute the twinned record of the start and conclusion of the campaign from a later perspective, operating together to throw into relief the magnitude of Augustus' achievement as imperial pacifier. Putnam has commented that '[t]he sequence of odes devoted to the emperor is a major *revocatio*, which ... brings Augustus home'.[133] That is consistent with an ode-book composed as a unitary design; and while it cannot prove that 4.2 was written later than its dramatic date, it certainly encourages the view that the poem is part of a larger design for the period leading up to the senatorial decree of the *Ara Pacis Augustae* on 4 July 13.

Antonius himself would not, of course, be in any way diminished by a 'retrospective' reading of *Odes* 4.2. On the contrary, it would have been essential for the purposes of dramatic fiction that the 'forward view from 16' (that is, of a conventional war followed by triumph) should be placed in the mouth of an authoritative public figure, and a loyalist member of the imperial house. Only thus could it serve as an effective 'contemporary' foil for Augustus' actual achievement of a peaceful settlement. In addition, we need to recall the parallel that was being drawn in late 15 between the European campaign culminating in that year and the fall of Alexandria on 1 August 30, fifteen years earlier to the day (*Odes* 4.14.34–6). The shade of Mark Antony, and his identification with

[132] Good comments in Putnam (n. 12), 254–6 on *venerantur*, its evocation of Propertius 3.4 and 3.5, and of Venus as goddess of love/peace.

[133] Putnam (n. 12), 240–1 (on 4.2, 4.5, 4.14); 256–7 (on 4.2 and 4.14).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dionysus-Osiris (and Hercules), hovers in the background; and as a corollary, the regime's consistent efforts to 'reintegrate them [*sc.* Dionysus and Hercules] into the post-Actium consensus' are drawn into the political frame.[134] Antonius' request to Horace to compose a Pindarizing dithyramb (if that is indeed what we are to suppose), something the poet had done once before, in *Odes* 1.37, to celebrate the Actium triumph, would thus act as a tribute to his commitment to erasing his father's imprint on the cult of the two gods. At the same time it would compliment Augustus' capacity for reconciliation, extending even to the son of his greatest internal enemy. Internal reconciliation would thus complement external peacemaking, and that may be the true significance of the exuberant exclamations of joy and loyalty placed in Antonius' mouth as he envisages the happy scene; Augustus, we infer, has left a united capital, and a governing elite very much at one with itself. Moreover, and by way of counterbalance to an infamous father, the engagement with Cicero's *De oratore* (above, Section 4 [c]), and the address to Antonius himself at the critical juncture (26), must evoke the great consular ancestor, and his role in a classic literary dialogue. And there, as again in stanza 12, the poet associates rhetoric and poetry, while complimenting Iullus on his status not as *poeta*, but as *orator*.[135]

It is the extraordinary impact of the *praesens princeps*, the leader in person, on his loyal subjects that underpins Antonius' prediction that an inspired Horace will rise to the occasion when Augustus comes home. The returning emperor is presented as a *deus praesens* modelled on Dionysus in epiphany; and his quasi-divine impact on those who come into his presence reflects the powers of the god himself. Horace had developed this same theme in *Odes* 1.37, where Octavian exercises 'positive' Dionysiac powers over enemy forces infected with an orgiastic travesty of maenadism, thereby reducing them to blind panic and putting them to flight.[136] Dionysus, as Versnel observed, 'is the *victorious god*, whose weapon is not the lance or the sword, but trance and μανία' (original emphasis).[137]

The god's eastern conquests had lain through the advancement of his choruses and his *teletai*, and it is the capacity of the choric god to subdue enemies through the advancement of cult that Horace had celebrated in *Odes* 2.19, *idem | pacis eras mediusque belli* ('but in the same way, you were a mediator of peace and midmost in war', 27–8). Here, to be sure, is a powerful divine model for Augustus' achievement in reducing warlike tribes to peaceful behaviour by his presence alone, as celebrated at the end of *Odes* 4.14; and while we do not meet those powers in their external application in our poem, we do observe their positive domestic impact on *omnis civitas*.

For Augustus' epiphanic and triumphal *reditus* to Rome, a tradition of Greek processional models reaches back to the epiphanic processions of Dionysus' returning image during the Athenian City Dionysia.[138] This processional tradition, itself triumphal in character, later embraced the epiphanic/Dionysiac city-arrivals of Hellenistic rulers, such as that of Demetrius Poliorcetes at Athens (Ath. 535f–536a), and ultimately of Alexander himself. To conclude: the conception of imperial reconciler and peacemaker,

[134] Cairns (n. 31), 366, on Prop. 3.17.

[135] Pindar and rhetoric: with *Pindarus ore*, cf. the etymology *orator ab ore*: Varro, *Ling.* 6.76; Isid. *Orig.* 10.195; and cf. Enn. *Ann.* 304–5 Sk.; Plaut. *Merc.* 176; Cic. *Phil.* 5.20; *Rep.* 3.8.

[136] A. Hardie (n. 44), 127–8; this lies at the heart of *Odes* 1.37's identity as a dithyramb.

[137] Versnel (n. 42), 251.

[138] G. Hedreen, 'The return of Hephaistos, Dionysiac processional ritual and the creation of a visual narrative', *JHS* 124 (2004), 38–64, at 45–50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the Dionysiac dimension sketched here, are likely to have matured in Horace's mind towards the time of Augustus' return. The considerations advanced in this section make it probable that *Odes* 4.2 is the product of the year 13.

7. LIBER AND THE POETS

The matter of dramatic setting, though not explicitly defined in the poem, must nevertheless be addressed in that it bears on the context of Antonius' imagined request to Horace and on the dramatic dialogue that follows. The question, then, is whether a setting can be identified such as to provide a sacral context for a dithyramb that records a poetic *votum* to Liber for Augustus' return, and offers a technical discussion on the subject of poetry together with critical adjudication on the best on the Greek *lyrici*.[139]

One official occasion that would satisfy most, perhaps all, of these criteria, is known from later evidence to have been staged each year at a shrine of Liber/Bacchus on the Palatine.[140] This was a kind of Roman *festum poetarum*, the primary evidence for which lies in Ovid's celebration of the occasion (perhaps an extension of the Liberalia on 17 March; or else the temple *natalis*).[141] This is how Ovid opens his poem (*Tristia* 5.3.1–4):

> illa dies haec est, qua te celebrare poetae,
> si modo non fallunt tempora, Bacche, solent,
> festaque odoratis innectunt tempora sertis,
> et dicunt laudes ad tua vina tuas.

This is that day, on which, if only the date/my temples do[es] not deceive me, Bacchus, poets are accustomed to celebrate you, and weave festal temples with perfumed wreaths, and declaim your praises to the accompaniment of your wine.

The importance of this remarkable testimony lies in the certainty that Ovid is not speaking in figurative terms of poetic *sacra* but is describing a genuine calendar event, an annual gathering of *poetae* at the Palatine temple of Liber. Ovid depicts this company of *poetae* as functioning on collegiate lines, the named members sharing, as *cultores*, in sacral-poetic activities in the vicinity of Liber's statue and altar, and constituting, at least for the purposes of the immediate occasion, the god's *chorus*.[142] This is the context of Ovid's plea to his fellow poets, notwithstanding his exclusion by exile, to preserve his *nomen* within their company.

[139] Poetics: Becker (n. 4), 129, with cross references to the *Ars poetica*. Putnam (n. 12), 51–62, 312.

[140] *LTUR* 1.153 s.v. 'Bacchus (Palatium)' (E. Rodríguez Almeida).

[141] G. Luck, *P. Ovidius Naso: Tristia*, vol. 2 (Heidelberg, 1977), 290 connects the occasion with the Liberalia.

[142] *Collegium*: Luck (n. 141), 290; Ov. *Tr.* 5.3.47 *consortes studii, pia turba, poetae*, with Luck ad loc. *Cultores*: *Tr.* 15 *sacris hederae cultoribus*; 34. *Chorus*: *Tr.* 52 *nostri pars modo Naso chori* (cf. *Odes* 4.3.15; Prop. 4.6.70; Stat. *Silv*. 2.7.23). *Nomina*: *Tr.* 49 *Nasonis nomine dicto*; 58 *inter vos nomen habete meum*; the collegiate 'name' dimension is on display in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* which routinely record the names of members of the *collegium* physically present at each and every meeting. Statue and altar: cf. *Tr.* 33–4 *et potes aspiciens circum tua sacra poetas | 'nescioquis nostri' dicere 'cultor abest'*. For the Greek literary and cultic roots of shared musical activity as member of the god's *chorus*, A. Hardie, 'Sappho, the Muses, and life after death', *ZPE* 154 (2005), 13–32, esp. 14–20, 29–32; id., 'Muses and mysteries', in P. Murray and P. Wilson (edd.), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousikē in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford, 2004), 11–37, at 19–21.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ovid claims to have participated on many occasions (*pars ego saepe fui*, *Tr.* 5.3.6), suggesting an extended period prior to his exile in A.D. 8. In addition, Pausanias (8.46.1, 5) records the location, within a Roman shrine to Bacchus standing 'in the emperor's gardens', of a tusk from the Erymanthian boar; that trophy, Pausanias adds, had been taken by Augustus as booty from Tegea following the defeat of Antony. If this *hieron* is identical with the Palatine temple, its *natalis* will likely be datable to the period after Actium; it will have been closely associated with the defeat of Antony and will have represented Augustus' personal identification with both Dionysus/Liber and Hercules.[143] The temple of Liber would thus take its place alongside the nearby temple of Apollo as part of Octavian's post-Actium sacral strategy, on his private grounds on the Palatine.[144]

The event described by Ovid will most probably have been instituted as part of the same programme and at roughly the same time, in the early 20s. Thus, Propertius' hymn to Bacchus (3.17), the dramatic setting of which is the god's shrine adjacent to the Palatine Magna Mater (*Bacche, tuis ... aris*, 1; *iuxta dea magna Cybebe*, 35–6; *ante fores templi*, 37), might well have been presented in the temple on the annual occasion under discussion.[145] More important, as Propertius well knew (but chose to ignore on this occasion), was the temple of Palatine Apollo. Ovid refers to the proximity of Apollo in his concluding, collegiate, prayer to his fellow *poetae* (*Tr.* 5.3.57–8): *sic igitur dextro faciatis Apolline carmen:* | *quod licet, inter vos nomen habete meum* ('Thus, therefore [*sc.* given Ovid's candid (*candore*, 53, an 'Apolline' term) approbation of contemporary poetry] may you compose songs with Apollo in your favour; as to what is licit [*sc.* not *illicitum* for the '*collegium*'], keep my name among you[rs]'). The burden of Ovid's conditional prayer is that the poets' new work should be acceptable to 'Apollo', i. e. at the library adjoining the Palatine temple;[146] the prayer is appended to the suggestion (53–6) that some form of critical activity, involving individual *iudicia* on the work of fellow poets, formed part of the annual proceedings at the temple of Liber; and the passage as a whole implies some association (figurative or otherwise) between those *iudicia* and admission of books to the library. The *realia* here remain obscure, but I would suggest that Ovid's closure offers a Palatine temple and 'library' context that helps make sense of Horace's 'Apolline' *iudicium* on the 'dithyrambic' Pindar, *laurea donandus Apollinari* (9).[147]

The existence of the Palatine celebration of Liber may account for other early-Augustan poems addressed to the god, or containing a high level of Dionysiac subject matter. An obvious candidate is *Odes* 1.37: this ode (in my view, indebted to Pindar's dithyrambic treatment of a 'Dionysiac' Hercules' capture of Cerberus) again conjoins Dionysus and Hercules. Tibullus 1.7 also enters the frame for consideration,

[143] Thus Rodríguez Almeida (n. 140), with specialist bibliography.

[144] Rodríguez Almeida (n. 140): 'Tutto fa pensare che si tratti di un'opera augustea nel complesso della sua casa palatina.'

[145] Thus, Rodríguez Almeida (n. 140) with the tentative support of Cairns (n. 31), 369.

[146] Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.3.17 *scripta Palatinus quaecumque recepit Apollo*; 2.1.216–17 *si munus Apolline dignum* | *vis complere libris et vatibus addere calcar ...*

[147] The relationship between the Palatine temples of Apollo and Liber works also in the other direction: Propertius' concluding call in at 4.6.71–86 (after celebration of Apollo Palatinus) for a vinous celebration at which poems on recent victories in war are to be performed includes these lines (75–7): *ingenium potis irritet Musa poetis.* | ***Bacche, soles Phoebo fertilis esse tuo.*** | *ille paludosos memoret servire Sygambros* ..., again with reference to the Palatine library; for discussion of the dramatic/topographical scenario here, see G.O. Hutchinson, *Propertius Elegies Book IV* (Cambridge, 2006), 153.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as do Horace's two hymns to Bacchus (2.19 and 3.25).[148] An intriguing feature of these Augustan poems for Liber/Bacchus is the incidence of cross-referencing. Most obvious is Ovid's quotation, in the poem cited at the beginning of this section, of the opening lines of Tibullus 1.7 *hunc cecinere diem Parcae, fatalia nentes | stamina non ulli dissoluenda deo* ('the Parcae sang of this day, weaving the threads of fate which are not to be released by any god'); compare *Tr.* 5.3.256–7 *scilicet hanc legem nentes fatalia Parcae | stamina bis genito bis cecinere tibi* ('of course, the Parcae, weaving the threads of fate, twice sang of this law for you [*sc.* Liber] twice-born'), where Ovid wittily turns the forecast by the Parcae of Messalla's birthday into the Parcae as singers of the 'first dithyramb' for Dionysus' double birth. Some of Horace's back-references to his own work have already been noted. Propertius' 'dithyrambic' echoes in 3.17 of *Odes* 3.25 (Bacchus) have been analysed by John Miller;[149] and *Odes* 4.2 in turn echoes Propertius 3.17.[150] And while these various resonances could perhaps be explained by the fact that contemporary poets were writing about the same god within the same literary milieu, they are certainly consistent with a common sacral focus and performance scenario in the poets' annual celebration of Liber/Bacchus. The matter calls for a fuller treatment of *Tristia* 5.3, its relationship to the corpus of Augustan poetry for Liber/Bacchus, and the interconnections within that same body of work than can be offered here; but the connections outlined above may suffice to show that the temple of Liber, and the annual gathering of poets, offer a plausible dramatic setting for *Odes* 4.2 as a votive dithyramb, as also for the 'dithyrambic' assessment of the Pindaric corpus. Antonius' role in the ode may perhaps be understood as analogous to a collegiate *patronus*, an extension of his emerging profile as poet-impressario that yields, in context, a relationship with Horace not unlike that between P. Papinius Statius and L. Arruntius Stella, in a later era.[151]

The hypothesis of 'fictitious retrojection' outlined earlier (Section 6) leaves open the question of the poem's actual place of performance. Perhaps the most economical proposition is that it was presented in the temple of Liber as part of the celebration of 13 (or 12), and that that celebration itself took the form of a kind of *cena adventicia* in Augustus' honour. There is no direct evidence on the point, but there is perhaps a pointer within Horace's treatment of the *vitulus*: as was noted earlier (Section 5 [b]), the growing calf is promised (*sc.* to Liber) in a *votum pro reditu*. Yet in figurative terms, the calf also represents *Odes* 4.2 itself, and so additionally functions as a metapoetic dithyramb-sacrifice. The deft combination of (literal) *vitulus votivus* with (metapoetic) *vitulus* as poem-sacrifice in effect bridges the space between the dramatic timing and setting (in 16) and the actual timing and setting, in 13 or 12. On this reading, in the personality of poet-devotee within the Palatine cult of Liber, Horace has written a poem-

[148] Kiessling and Heinze (n. 4), 429 suggested that *Odes* 4.8 was performed on this occasion, eliciting an unduly sharp reaction from A. Barchiesi, 'Poetry, praise, and patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*', *ClAnt* 15 (1996), 5–47, at 13 n. 15.

[149] Miller (n. 89), 78–9, observing that 'the hymnic elegy now ending has itself been an attempt to best the lyric poet'.

[150] *Odes* 3.25.17–18 *nil parvum aut humili modo | nil mortale loquar*; Prop. 3.17.39–40 *haec ego non humili referam memoranda coturno, | qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat*; *Odes* 4.2.8 *Pindarus ore*. Prop. 3.17.1 (*nunc*) echoes the opening of *Odes* 1.37 (*nunc*, the only extant parallel at that date); and 39–40 echoes *Odes* 1.37.32 *non humilis mulier triumpho*, with 'tragic' overtones (*coturno*, with reference to the 'tragic' content of the Cleopatra-ode: Hardie [n. 44], 119–20 with n. 23).

[151] Stat. *Silv*. 1.2.258 (to Stella) *multumque pares bacchamur ad aras*; this recollection, again with Dionysiac dissolution of distinctions of rank, follows an invitation to the poets of Rome to 'compete' (*certare*, 248) with ivy crowns (249) to celebrate Stella's wedding.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sacrifice in which the dramatic setting is the same annual occasion, but located three or four years earlier. The *carmen* projected by Antonius is *Odes* 4.2 itself; and Horace's claim to compose 'efficacious songs' (*operosa carmina*) is vindicated by the fact of Augustus' return (and, for all we know, by his presence in the temple of Liber at Horace's performance).

Odes 4.2 offers a glimpse of a community of poets in a sacral setting; and if the linkage with the temple of Palatine Liber proposed here is acceptable, Antonius and Horace are brought together by common commitment to *studia* and by common allegiance to Liber as a god of poetry reclaimed from Antonius' orientalizing father for Italy and the Augustan consensus.

University of Edinburgh ALEX HARDIE
ahardie1@staffmail.ed.ac.uk

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000597 Published online by Cambridge University Press