I RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF HORACE

1. Horace in the digital age

The internet now provides many prime resources for the study of Horace which make life considerably easier for the student and scholar of the poet, such as reliable and searchable online Latin texts,[1] bibliographies,[2] and prose and verse translations of all kinds,[3] as well as access to a wide range of modern and classic Horatian scholarship via digital versions of older works, Google Books, and journal databases such as JSTOR and Project MUSE (for subscribing institutions),[4] not to mention increasing numbers of monographs available via subscription to publishers' own websites.[5] These resources are growing continually and repay regular monitoring. But most Horatian scholarship is still to be found in printed form: here I give a brief survey of the most useful books for effective orientation in the modern study of Horace.

2. Printed bibliographies

The massive Horatian bibliography for 1936–75 in Kissel 1981 and its supplement for the years 1976–91 in Kissel 1994 are both valuable, as is the survey of Horatian bibliography for the years 1957–87 by Doblhofer (1992); especially useful for recent work is the fully indexed sequel to Kissel 1994, covering the years 1992–2005, in Holzberg 2007 (also available online). Full bibliographical listings (especially of work in Italian) on almost every Horatian subject are to be found in the

[1] E.g. the PHI database, <http://latin.packhum.org>; see also <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/>.

[2] For example, that by Niklas Holzberg (see section 2 below), currently (March 2014) available at <http://www.niklasholzberg.com/Homepage/Bibliographien.html>, and that by Wilfried Stroh, currently at <http://stroh.userweb.mwn.de/bibl/horaz.html>, or McNeill 2009 on *Oxford Bibliographies Online* at <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/>.

[3] E.g. various historical versions on the Perseus Digital Library, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper>, or the modern version by A. S. Kline on his useful *Poetry in Translation* site, <http://www.poetryintranslation.com>.

[4] <http://www.jstor.org/> and <http://muse.jhu.edu/>.

[5] E.g. *Oxford Scholarship Online*, <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/>, where many recent Oxford University Press books and some from other university presses can be found; also <http://www.cambridge.org/online/>, for Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Enciclopedia oraziana (Mariotti 1996–8; see section 4 below). The general online bibliography by McNeill (2009) is more selective as its format requires, but contains useful brief comment on the items listed. Substantial bibliographical listings are also to be found in the three *Companions* to Horace discussed in section 4 below (Harrison 2007a, Davis 2010a, and Günther 2013a).

3. Texts, commentaries, and English translations

Texts

For Horace, as for most other classical authors, the nineteenth century had seen much fundamental work on textual transmission. The text of Keller and Holder (1899, second edition 1925) still gives the most elaborate *apparatus criticus* and most extensive reports of manuscript readings. These were incorporated into the naturally much more selective apparatus of the Oxford Classical Text of E. C. Wickham (1900), with its second edition by H. W. Garrod (1912). F. Vollmer followed Keller and Holder in seeing three groups among the variety of Horatian manuscripts in his Teubner edition (second edition 1912); this was reduced to two by F. Klingner in his third edition (1959). However, because of contamination, such classification can be misleading,[6] and when Klingner posits a third group (Q) which he regards as a conflation of his two main classes (Ξ and Ψ), his procedure has proved vulnerable to criticism;[7] Courtney (2013a) has recently firmly argued that the antiquity of many shared corruptions indicates that there was in effect a single ancient source for our modern transmission of Horace's non-hexameter works.

Many modern editions have consequently preferred to treat manuscripts individually in the *apparatus criticus* even if formally recognizing groupings: see, for example, the Leipzig Teubner of Borzák (1984). Shackleton Bailey's Stuttgart Teubner (1985) presents the evidence clearly by splitting up Klingner's Ξ group into its components but retaining the symbol Ψ for the more homogeneous second group. It is difficult for an editor of Horace to decide when to emend;[8] vulgate

[6] See Brink 1971: 12–27.
[7] See Tarrant 1983.
[8] See Tränkle 1993.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press

readings are usually those of ancient editions and seldom incomprehensible, and Horace's style is often terse and testing. Many modern editors have been too conservative; Shackleton Bailey 1985 is sometimes too bold but is always stimulating.[9] A new Oxford Classical Text is planned by R. J. Tarrant, who will approach the manuscripts individually and eclectically, and who has suggested that what we need is a clearly comprehensible apparatus like that of Shackleton Bailey, but with fuller information on both manuscript readings and conjectures.[10]

Commentaries[11]

The ancient commentaries of pseudo-Acro and Porphyrio, though seldom as valuable as the ancient commentaries on Virgil, have been fully studied in recent years (on Acro see Noske 1969, on Porphyrio see Diederich 1999 and Kalinina 2007); in both cases a new text is a keen *desideratum* (for that of Acro see still Keller 1902, for Porphyrio Holder 1894). In terms of modern commentaries, the nineteenth century left a substantial legacy: particularly notable (and still of use) are the scholarly commentaries on the complete works by Wickham (1874, 1891), Kiessling (1884, 1886, 1889), and Keller and Holder (1899, especially rich in parallels), and the school commentary on the *Odes* by T. E. Page (1886). The twentieth century has built on these foundations, especially in Heinze's revision of Kiessling (last revised 1930, reprinted until 1960). Important too is the commentary on the *Satires* by Lejay (1911), still the fullest on that work.

In 1969 the short but stimulating commentary on the third book of the *Odes* by Gordon Williams appeared, and in the next year the massive commentary on Book 1 of the *Odes* by Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), with Book 2 following in 1978. This highly detailed editing of separate books broke new ground for the *Odes*: it reflected both an approach to ancient poems as individual literary artefacts open to judgement, and also the scholarly concern of Pasquali (1920) and Fraenkel (1957) with the Greek (and other) intertextualities of Horace's poetry in the *Odes*.

[9] See Nisbet 1986; Delz 1988. For a survey of editions up to Shackleton Bailey, see Tränkle 1993.

[10] I paraphrase a lecture by him at Cambridge, 10 January 2013.

[11] Commentaries are dealt with in more detail in the chapters dedicated to individual works below; these paragraphs are intended to give some rapid orientation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The result was a need for a greater length of explanation than was permitted in the standard complete editions. Nisbet and Hubbard's concern with literary genre and category, and their lengthy collections of relevant parallels, following and extending the work of Keller and Holder, revealed how the literary tradition is moulded and reshaped in the *Odes* and set a scholarly standard for all subsequent commentaries on Latin poets, while their forthright literary views have provided stimulating points of departure for literary discussion.

The kind of detail which this depth of exegesis allows is further exemplified by Brink's vast edition of the *Ars poetica* and *Epistles* 2 (1963, 1971, 1982), which explores the language, meanings, and structure of these poems to a degree previously unparalleled in classical scholarship. Similarly scholarly and inclusive are the major commentary on the *Epodes* by Watson (2003), now required reading for detailed study of those poems, and the extensive commentary on *Odes* 4 by Fedeli and Ciccarelli (2008). The substantial running commentaries on the *Satires* and *Epistles* by Fedeli (1994, 1997) are of considerable interest for their literary analyses.

But the shorter commentary has not been neglected either, supplying the need for convenient school and university editions. In Italy there are many such editions: I would select for special mention Labate 1981 on the *Satires* and Cavarzere 1992 on the *Epodes*. In English, Quinn (1980) has produced a lively if uneven commentary on the *Odes* for students, with some interesting reactions to Nisbet and Hubbard; Rudd (1989) has capably summarized and varied Brink on *Epistles* 2 and the *Ars poetica*; and Brown (1993) and Muecke (1993) have produced Aris and Phillips editions of *Satires* 1 and 2 respectively, with parallel translations which are of considerable help in interpretation. Notably helpful are the three volumes of briefer commentary (with facing translation) by West on the first three books of the *Odes* (1995, 1998, 2002), which provide firm and lively interpretations of the key points in each poem. Several recent commentaries have appeared in the Cambridge 'Green and Yellow' series on Horatian books, following Rudd 1989: Mayer's commentary on *Epistles* 1 (1994) and Mankin's commentary on the *Epodes* (1995), the first editions of these poems in English for a generation;[12] Thomas' commentary on *Odes* 4 and the *Carmen saeculare* (2011); Gowers' commentary on *Satires* 1 (2012); and Mayer's on *Odes* 1

[12] Though some credit should be given to Dilke 1954, the commentary on *Epistles* 1 for generations of students.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2012). Further commentaries are in progress in this series by myself on *Odes* 2 and by Freudenburg on *Satires* 2.

More interpretative running commentaries have also been produced; the most important of these is Syndikus 1972–3 (third edition 2001) on the *Odes* – succinct but pointed short essays on each poem which repeatedly identify the central points and problems and judiciously weigh up solutions. Particular strengths are a solid awareness of structure and of literary sources and allusions. Also significant in this genre is Putnam 1986 on *Odes* 4, where the stress is always on the artistically crafted verbal icon and on close reading of imagery and emotional colour, and a further running commentary on the same book by T. Johnson (2004), who argues that Book 4 effectively combines symposiastic and encomiastic elements, and who provides firm historical contextualization, a neat complement to Putnam's approach.

English translations

English translations of classical texts are a flourishing genre, and are increasingly executed as well as annotated or introduced by professional classicists: this is a positive tendency in applying scholarly expertise to public benefit, especially if (as in the case of Horace) the relevant scholars are also fluent writers in English. The major prose translations in print are that of Rudd of the *Odes* and *Epodes* in the Loeb series with parallel Latin text (Rudd 2004), and that of the *Satires* and *Epistles* by Davie in the World's Classics series (Davie 2011): both can be recommended as accurate, clear and elegant; those of *Satires* 1 and 2 by Brown and Muecke (see under 'Commentaries above') are also helpful. The standard verse translations are the World's Classics version of the *Odes* and *Epodes* by West (1997), and the Penguin Classics version of the *Satires* and *Epistles* by Rudd (revised version 1987), both accurate and well expressed. These are the key modern versions; others will be discussed in Chapter VII below, along with the historical tradition and the reception of Horace in general.

4. *Companions* and general accounts

Horace has been a particular beneficiary of the recent tendency in classical publishing to commission multi-contributor *Companions* to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particular authors aimed at providing a synoptic view, with three such volumes now in print from Cambridge (Harrison 2007a), Wiley-Blackwell (Davis 2010a), and Brill (Günther 2013a). Between them these three volumes assemble most of the best-known Horatian scholars and provide a good range of different approaches. The Cambridge companion has shorter and briefer chapters, seeking to cover a wide range of topics and receptions as well as the usual analyses of particular poetic collections. The Wiley-Blackwell volume has less range but allows longer chapters and deeper excavation on certain topics, including substantial work on reception. The Brill volume, for its part, is the longest but pursues a more traditional path, containing detailed readings of Horace's works in a limited number of extensive literary chapters, plus sections on style and transmission. These volumes are the best starting point for anyone who wants to appreciate current directions in Horatian research.

Alongside these handbooks stands the *Enciclopedia oraziana* (Mariotti 1996–8), in three volumes each of about a thousand pages, which contain a plethora of entries in Italian on the poet on every topic from transmission to modern reception, occasionally of uneven quality but with detailed bibliography in almost every case. Its high price means that it can only be consulted in leading libraries, but it provides copious material and gives an excellent idea of the range of research on Horace in Italian (naturally better covered than other scholarly languages) up to the mid-1990s, and forms a suitable monument for the bimillennium of the poet's death in 1992/3.

General books by single authors covering the whole of Horace's output in the last half-century have necessarily laboured under the still considerable shadow of Fraenkel (1957), whose work has been formally marked as epoch-making by Doblhofer 1992. The book begins with the life of Horace and then goes through his works in chronological order, reflecting Fraenkel's general view that Horace's later work marks the heights of his development as a poet, especially in *Odes* 4, regarded by Fraenkel as a triumphant climax. The great strength of the book lies in its close analysis of individual poems, bringing out their sources, structures, and other important elements; perhaps the most outstanding of these is the famous treatment of *Odes* 3.4 as an imitation of Pindar's first *Pythian* ode. Such detailed treatment necessitates selection, but Fraenkel manages to deal with a high proportion of Horace's poems. His omissions are instructive: on the one hand most of the lighter erotic odes, on the other the *Ars poetica* and *Epistles* 2.2. The former are left out since they do not fit

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fraenkel's picture of the dignified and serious poet, the latter because their fluid dating does not allow a neat placing in the development of Horace's career which forms the frame of the book. A central theme of the book is Horace's relationship with Augustus, one of developing admiration and respect according to Fraenkel, who sees *Odes* 4.5 (his favourite Horatian poem) as the final and most exquisite expression of the poet's loyal affection. Though much is dated in the overall approach, the unity of Fraenkel's vision and the quality of his scholarly analysis remain impressive half a century later.

Fraenkel's book seems to have deterred others from large-scale general treatments; since 1957 there have been mainly short books of this kind, such as Grimal 1958 and Perret 1959 (English translation 1964), both of which give capable summaries of Horace's career with some interesting literary judgements, West 1967, La Penna 1969, and Williams 1972. La Penna directly opposes Fraenkel, arguing that the 'real' Horace is the ethical private poet rather than the public bard; West explores in some depth the imagery and thought-sequence of select passages of Horace, offering a model of practical criticism which is sometimes over-ingenious but always intelligent and thought-provoking. Williams, in the forerunner to this volume and following the format of this series, provides a survey of issues and problems in Horace which usefully reacts against a number of Fraenkel's more arguable views.

The biographical model has remained attractive to some after Fraenkel, especially in books intended for a broader audience. Levi 1997 looks back specifically to Fraenkel in its structure, close readings, and presentation of Horace as historical personality (and has some good translations by the author, a noted poet). Hills 2005 and Holzberg 2009 both move through the works of Horace chronologically, but concentrate more on reading the poems as works of literature rather than as expressions of personality and traces of biography: Hills is a lively short treatment for the general reader, but written by a scholar well up with recent developments, while Holzberg shows a particular interest in the unity and development of Horace's work and the structuring of his individual poetry collections. Armstrong 1989 again goes through the works in order, with many lively interpretative comments for the general reader, and some important arguments about Horace's social background, conveniently reprised in Armstrong 2010. Sophisticated and nuanced modifications of the biographical tendency can be found in Lyne 1995, who argues that Horace's public poetry throughout his career combines the required encomium of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press

great with more personal and subversive views, and in Oliensis 1998, who sees Horace's work as concerned primarily with rhetorical self-presentation and 'saving face' amid the pressures of Roman society and the desire for literary fame.

A number of significant volumes collect studies on Horace by single hands. Shackleton Bailey 1982 is a mixed collection of essays, with a stress on interpretative difficulties, appropriate to an editor of Horace; while Büchner's collection of interpretations (1962) contains a number of papers which are strong on technical and linguistic analysis. The collected Horatian papers of Klingner (1953, 1964) treat both transmission and literary interpretation, and show a depth and sympathy of interpretation which influenced both Nisbet and Hubbard and Syndikus. La Penna 1993 gathers an important and influential body of work which presents Horace as an artist struggling to maintain personal independence under political pressure to praise Augustus. Equally significant is the body of work in Schmidt 2002b, with its interest in pronouncedly ethical and highly aesthetic readings of the poems with some good close analysis, in formal structures in Horace's poems and poetry books, and in the considerable reception of Horace in German literature.[13] Woodman 2012 contains a number of literary essays on Horace, especially on his interaction with historiography, while Cairns 2012 collects many articles on the *Odes*.

Further volumes collect studies by different scholars, another recent tendency, often reflecting the proceedings of a conference. An early case (in a significant series) was Costa 1973, containing stimulating pieces by Hubbard and West on the *Odes* and Russell on the *Ars poetica*. The bimillennium of Horace's birth in 1992/3 yielded (apart from the *Enciclopedia oraziana*) some significant collections: Rudd 1993a, Ludwig 1993a, Harrison 1995a (covering a range of Horatian topics), and Martindale and Hopkins 1993 (a key gathering of essays on the reception of Horace – see further in Chapter VII). More recently, Woodman and Feeney 2002 gathers together new pieces by major Horatian scholars across the range of Horace's work, and the two volumes of reprinted papers on Horace in the Oxford Readings in Classical Studies series have brought together some classic pieces with excellent contextualizing introductions (Freudenburg 2009, Lowrie 2009a); other useful similar collections are Santirocco 1994 and Anderson 1999.

[13] For a detailed account see Harrison 2002.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245114000030 Published online by Cambridge University Press