

Letteratura Latina Magistrale I B / II

a.a. 2021/2022

Le odi di Orazio e la loro presenza nella poesia contemporanea

Prof. Francesco Ursini

DISPENSE

Contenuto:

Orazio, *Odi* (ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey), da portare in latino con lettura metrica:

- libro I: odi 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 22, 25, 33, 34, 37;
- libro II: odi 3, 7, 10, 14, 16;
- libro III: odi 1, 13, 21, 30;
- libro IV: odi 7, 11.

Saggi critici:

- A. Griffiths, *The Odes. Just where do you draw the line?*;
- R. G. M. Nisbet, *A wine-jar for Messalla: Carmina 3.21*;
- A. La Penna, *Orazio, Carducci e l'unità della poesia carducciana*;
- A. La Penna, *Carducci e Pascoli tra Roma repubblicana e Roma imperiale*.

Q. HORATIVS FLACCVS

OPERA

EDIDIT

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

EDITIO STEREOTYPA
EDITIONIS QVARTAE (MMI)



BEROLINI ET NOVI EBORACI
WALTER DE GRUYTER MMVIII

SIGLA

A = Parisinus lat. 7900 A

a = Ambrosianus 0 136 sup.

B = Bernensis 363

C/E = Monacensis 14685

K = cod. S. Eugendi (St Claude) 2

R = Vaticanus Reg. lat. 1703

δ = Harleianus 2725

z = Vossianus lat. Q. 21

d = Harleianus 2688

π = Parisinus lat. 10310

λ = Parisinus lat. 7972

l = Leidensis B. P. L. lat. 28

φ = Parisinus lat. 7974

ψ = Parisinus lat. 7971

Ψ = Vide praef. p. IV

V = Blandini(an)us vetustissimus, nunc deperditus

g = Gothanus duc. B 61, raro citatus

ς = codd. deteriores

P = Porphyrionis cod. Vaticanus 3314 (interpretatio)

P^l = Eiusdem lemma, interpretatione vel absente vel
dissidente

οχ = scholia ‘Ps.-Acrontea.’

Comm. Cruq. = Commentator Cruquianus

(B) = lectio a Bentleio in commentario defensa

Brink^a = C.O. Brink, ‘Horatian notes’, *PCPhS* N. S. 15 (1969), 1–6

Brink^b = Idem, ‘Horatian notes II’, *ibid.* N. S. 17 (1971), 17–29 (ideo raro a me nominatim citatae quod plerasque in N.–H. (vide infra) secundo volumine ad locos singulos notatas invenias)

Brink^c = Idem, ‘Horatian notes III’, *ibid.* N. S. 28 (1982), 30–56

N.–H. = R.G.M. Nisbet et M.H. Hubbard, *A commentary on Horace Odes I and II* (Oxonii, 1970 et 1978)

* Asteriscis lectiones notavi de quibus in libello nostro *Profile of Horace* (Londinii et Cantabrigiae Mass. 1982) disputatum est. vide etiam quae in *HSCP* 89 (1985) prolatus sum.

CARMINUM LIBER PRIMUS

1

Maecenas, atavis edite regibus,
o et praesidum et dulce decus meum:
sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum
collegisse iuvat, metaque fervidis
evitata rotis palmaque nobilis 5
terrarum dominos evehit ad deos;
hunc, si mobilium turba Quiritium
certat tergeminis tollere honoribus;
illum, si proprio condidit horreo
quidquid de Libycis verritur areis; 10
gaudentem patrios findere sarculo
agros Attalicis condicionibus
numquam demoveas, ut trabe Cypria
Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare;
luctantem Icariis fluctibus Africum 15
mercator metuens otium et oppidi
laudat rura sui, mox reficit rates
quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati;
est qui nec veteris pocula Massici

A(a)BERλΙΨ

1. 3 Olympico Heinze 6 evehit (P) : -here Bentley
13 demoveas BR : dim- cett. Vox Donat. Ter. Ad. 230 17 tuta
Acidalius (B)

nec partem solido demere de die
 spernit, nunc viridi membra sub arbuto
 stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae;
 multos castra iuvant et lituo tubae
 permixtus sonitus bellaque matribus
 detestata; manet sub Iove frigido
 venator tenerae coniugis immemor,
 seu visa est catulis cerva fidelibus
 seu rupit teretes Marsus aper plagas.

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

2

Iam satis terris nivis atque dirae
 grandinis misit Pater et rubente
 dextera sacras iaculatus arces
 terruit urbem,

A(a) BERΛΙΨ

25 detestanda Σ sch. Stat. Th. 3, 377 32–36 *text. recept.*,
quem pro corrupto habeo, tamen reliqui. melius, opinor, sic: secer-
 nunt populo. si ... nec Polyhymnia / Lesbois (*ego: cf. 1, 26, 11*) :
 -oum *etiam P*) refugit tendere barbiton / chordis (*Bergk*), me lyricis
 vatibus inserens (*idem*) / ... vertice 35 inseris Ψ

5

terruit gentis, grave ne rediret
 saeculum Pyrrhae nova monstra questae,
 omne cum Proteus pecus egit altos
 visere montis,

10

piscium et summa genus haesit ulmo,
 nota quae sedes fuerat columbis,
 et superiecto pavidae natarunt
 aequore dammae.

15

vidimus flavum Tiberim retortis
 litore Etrusco violenter undis
 ire deiectum monumenta regis
 templaque Vestae,

20

Iliae dum se nimium querenti
 iactat ultorem, vagus et sinistra
 labitur ripa Iove non probante u-
 xorius amnis.

25

audiet civis acuisse ferrum
 quo graves Persae melius perirent,
 audiet pugnas vitio parentum
 rara iuventus.

quem vocet divum populus ruentis
 imperi rebus? prece qua fatigent
 virgines sanctae minus audientem
 carmina Vestam?

A (a) BERλΙΨ

2. 10 columbis (*Victorin. GL 6, 157*)] pal- π corr. P (B)
 19 non (P)] *anne* num (= fortasse)? 21 acuisse ferrum (P)]
 rapuisse f- *Jeep* : iacuisse ferro Bergk

cui dabit partis scelus expiandi
 Iuppiter? tandem venias precamur
 nube cendentis umeros amictus,
 augur Apollo;

30

sive tu mavis, Erycina ridens,
 quam Iocus circum volat et Cupido;
 sive neglectum genus et nepotes
 respicis auctor,

35

heu nimis longo satiate ludo,
 quem iuvat clamor galeaeque leves
 acer et Marsi peditis cruentum
 vultus in hostem;

40

sive mutata iuvenem figura
 ales in terris imitaris almae
 filius Maiae, patiens vocari
 Caesaris ultor:

serus in caelum redeas diuque
 laetus intersis populo Quirini,
 neve te nostris vitiis iniquum
 ocior aura

45

tollat; hic magnos potius triumphos,
 hic ames dici pater atque princeps,
 neu sinas Medos equitare inultos
 te duce, Caesar.

50

A(a)BERΛΙΨ

39 Marsi *Faber* (B) : mauri *codd.* P Maurum peditis cruenti
 Wodrig

5

Quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa
perfusus liquidis urget odoribus
grato, Pyrrha, sub antro?
cui flavam religas comam,

A(a) BERλΙΨ

4. 8 versat Wade (*cf. Sen. Phaedr. 191*)] visit AΕRλΙ Sacerd.
GL 6, 544 : urit Ψ : urget Scaliger officinam Sacerd. 19 Ly-
cidan *vel sim.* a R (B)] -am cett.

5

simplex munditiis? heu, quotiens fidem
 mutatosque deos flebit! ut aspera
 nigris aequora ventis
 emirabitur insolens,

10

qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,
 qui semper vacuam, semper amabilem
 sperat, nescius aurae
 fallacis! miseri, quibus

15

intemptata nites! me tabula sacer
 votiva paries indicat uvida
 suspendisse potenti
 vestimenta maris deo.

A (a) BERλΙΨ

5. 6 ut *coni*. Cunningham : et codd. 8 ut mirabitur *coni*.
Bentley : heu m- *vir doctus ap. Cunningham* 16 *deo (P)*] *deae Zielinski*

6. 2 alite (*P^l*) -ti *Passerat* 3 qua Σ (*B*) (*v. Brink^a*)] *quam codd. P*

9

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum
 Soracte, nec iam sustineant onus
 silvae laborantes, geluque
 flumina constiterint acuto?

A(a) BERλΙΨ

8. 2 te deos oro φψλ 1 P^l *Caes. Bass. GL 6, 270, 5 Fortunat.*
ibid. 300, 20 : hoc d- oro δπ : hoc d- vere cett. οχ Caes. Bass. l.c. v.
14 Fortunat. l.c. v. 27 (dea) Victorin. GL 6, 87 (cf. 166.1) Diomed.
GL 1, 508.520 properas π (variant test.) 4 deserit Withof:
oderit codd. P 6 equitat δπ (B) : -tet cett. οχ 7 temperat δ
(B) : -ret cett.

9. 4 *de interrog. v. N.-H.*

dissolve frigus ligna super foco
large reponens atque benignius
deprime quadrum Sabina,
o Thaliarche, merum diota.

5

permitte divis cetera, qui simul
stravere ventos aequore fervido
deproeliantis, nec cupressi
nec veteres agitantur orni.

10

quid sit futurum cras fuge quaerere et
quem Fors dierum cumque dabit lucro
appone, nec dulcis amores
sperne puer neque tu choreas,

15

donec virenti canities abest
morosa. nunc et Campus et areae
lenesque sub noctem susurri
composita repetantur hora,

20

nunc et latentis proditor intimo
gratus puellae risus ab angulo
pignusque direptum lacertis
aut digito male pertinaci.

10

Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis,
qui feros cultus hominum recentum
voce formasti catus et decorae
more palaestrae,

A (a) BERΛΙΨ

23 direptum δπλοχ

te canam, magni Iovis et deorum
nuntium curvaeque lyrae parentem,
callidum quidquid placuit iocoso
condere furto.

5

te, boves olim nisi reddidisses
per dolum amotas, puerum minaci
voce dum terret, viduus pharetra
risit Apollo.

10

quin et Atridas duce te superbos
Ilio dives Priamus relicto
Thessalosque ignis et iniqua Troiae
castra gefellit.

15

tu pias laetis animas reponis
sedibus virgaque levem coerces
aurea turbam, superis deorum
gratus et imis.

20

11

Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi
finem di dederint, Leuconoe, nec Babylonios
temptaris numeros. ut melius, quidquid erit, pati,
seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam,
quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare
Tyrrhenum! sapias, vina lique et spatio brevi
spem longam reseces. dum loquimur, fugerit invida
aetas. carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero.

5

A(a)BERλΙΨ

10. 15 Troiae (*P^l*) *improbat Campbell. num circa?*

22

Integer vitae scelerisque purus
 non eget Mauris iaculis neque arcu
 nec venenatis gravida sagittis,
 Fusce, pharetra,

sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas
 sive facturus per inhospitalem
 Caucasum vel quae loca fabulosus
 lambit Hydaspes.

5

A(a) BERλΙΨ

21. 5 comam a BEφψ V οχ(B) 6 gelidi ... Algidi L. Müller,
coll 4, 4, 58 8 viridi Crago L. Müller Gragi (*P^l*)] Cr- *edd.*
olim 12 (h)umerum (*P*)] -ros Peerlkamp 13 hic (*pr.*) (*οχ*)]
 hinc B : haec *Duhamel* (*B*) 14 et *om.* *Scaliger* in *om.* ABER

22. 2 neque B Ψ : nec A E R

namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra
terminum curis vagor expeditis,
fugit inermem;

quale portentum neque militaris
Daunias latis alit aesculetis
nec Iubae tellus generat, leonum
arida nutrix.

pone me pigris ubi nulla campis
arbor aestiva recreatur aura,
quod latus mundi nebulae malusque
Iuppiter urget;

pone sub curru nimium propinqui
solis in terra domibus negata:
dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo,
dulce loquentem.

10

15

20

A (a) BERλΙΨ

11 expeditis (V P) -tus Σ (B), *fort. recte* 14 Daunias (P^l)] -ia
 $\pi\lambda P$: -ia in *edd. vett.*

23. 1 vitas Σ *Comm. Cruq.* : -at *codd. P metrici*

25

Parcius iunctas quatiunt fenestras
 iactibus crebris iuvenes protervi,
 nec tibi somnos adimunt amatque
 ianua limen,

quae prius multum facilis movebat
 cardines. audis minus et minus iam
 ‘me tuo longas pereunte noctes,
 Lydia, dormis?’

in vicem moechos anus arrogantis
 flebis in solo levis angiportu,
 Thracio bacchante magis sub inter-
 lunia vento,

cum tibi flagrans amor et libido,
 quae solet matres furiare equorum,
 saeviet circa iecur ulcerosum,
 non sine questu

5

10

15

A(a) BERλΙΨ

25. 2 iactibus (V P (?) οχι)] ic-·Σ 5 multis *Burman* (sed mul-
 tum *adverbium amat poeta*) 7 long. pereunte nocte *P^l* : -gam ...
 -tem *Bentley*

laeta quod pubes hedera virenti
 gaudeat pulla magis atque myrto,
 aridas frondes hiemis sodali
 dedicet Euro.

20

A(a) BERλ1Ψ

17 virenti (*P^l*)] -te Ψ 20 Euro *ed. Ald. 1501* : hebro *codd. P*

26. 3–4 quid ... meditetur *Cornelissen* : quis ... metuatur
codd. : quid *vel* quae ... meditetur *vel* minitetur *Palmer* 5 quid]
 quod *L. Müller* 9 piplea (*P^l οχ*)] -ei *P(?) (B (Pimp-))* 10 pos-
 sunt *οχ lemm. (B)*

33

Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor
 immitis Glycerae, neu miserabilis
 decantes elegos, cur tibi iunior
 laesa praeniteat fide.

insignem tenui fronte Lycorida
 Cyri torret amor, Cyrus in asperam
 declinat Pholoen; sed prius Apulis
 iungentur capreae lupis

quam turpi Pholoe peccet adultero.
 sic visum Veneri, cui placet imparis
 formas atque animos sub iuga aenea
 saevo mittere cum ioco.

5

10

A (a) BERλΙΨ

15 medicumque *Lachmann* : mihi c- *codd.* P (mihi rite salve c-
P^l) οχ : mihi Cynthie *Onians*, *PCPhS* 178 (1941–5), 27

33. ad (Albium) Tibullum *codd.* *inscr. praeter aE itemque*
 οχ 1–34, 16 *om. B* 10 Veneri (*P*)] *num Cypriae vel Paphiae*
 (*cf. 13*)?

ipsum me, melior cum peteret Venus,
grata detinuit compede Myrtale
libertina, fretis acrior Hadriae
curvantis Calabros sinus.

15

34

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

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

5

quo bruta tellus et vaga flumina,
quo Styx et invisi horrida Taenari
sedes Atlanteusque finis
concutitur. valet ima summis

10

mutare et insignem attenuat deus,
obscura promens. hinc apicem rapax
Fortuna cum stridore acuto
sustulit, hic posuisse gaudet.

15

A(a) BERΛΙΨ

15–16 *virgulam post Myrtale (non post libertina) ponere volunt*
N.–H.

34. 5 relectos N. Heinsius (B) : relic- codd. Eutych. GL 5,
481 13 insignem (P)] -ne Bentley : -nia Cunningham

37

Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero
 pulsanda tellus, nunc Saliaribus
 ornare pulvinar deorum
 tempus erat dapibus, sodales.

A(a) BERΛΙΨ

36. 11 neu] nec RΨ P^l 12 neu] ne^u A : nec RΨ P^l
 13–14 *vix sana haec; v. N.–H. post 16 transp. Peerlkamp*
 13 neu (P^l)] nec A pr. Ψ 14 *anne Bassam?* 15 ne^u A; nec
 R 17 *damalin Ψ : -im cett. (de R n. l.)*

37. 3 ornare (P^l οχι)] ornasse *Usener*

5

antehac nefas depromere Caecubum
 cellis avitis, dum Capitolio
 regina †dementis† ruinas
 funus et imperio parabat

contaminato cum grege turpium,
 morbo virorum, quidlibet impotens
 sperare fortunaque dulci
 ebria. sed minuit furorem

vix una sospes navis ab ignibus
 mentemque lymphatam Mareotico
 rededit in veros timores
 Caesar ab Italia volantem

remis adurgens, accipiter velut
 mollis columbas aut leporem citus
 venator in campis nivalis

15

Haemoniae, daret ut catenis

fatale monstrum; quae generosius
 perire quaerens nec muliebriter
 expavitensem nec latentis
 classe cita reparavit oras,

ausa et iacentem visere regiam
 vultu sereno, fortis et asperas
 tractare serpentis, ut atrum
 corpore combiberet venenum,

20

25

20

25

A (a) BERΛΙΨ

7 dementis (οχ)] -ter *Palmer* : demens et *Campbell* : *fort.* de-
 mens, heu (*vel vae vel iam*) 9 *distinxi* (*cf. Brink^b, p. 17 et Iuv.*
 4.3 solaque libidine fortes/deliciae) 18 *citus*] canis *Wyngarden* : catus *Palmer* 24 *reparavit** (*P^l P(?)*)] penetr- *Bentley*
 25 iacentem (οχ)] τα- Σ (B) : vacantem *Campbell* 28 pectore Σ

deliberata morte ferocior,
saevis Liburnis scilicet invidens 30
privata deduci superbo
non humilis mulier triumpho.

A (a) BERλΙΨ

30 parvis *Campbell*

38. 6 cura (*imper.*) *Bentley*

Aequam memento rebus in arduis
 servare mentem non secus ut bonis
 ab insolenti temperatam
 laetitia, moriture Delli,

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

qua pinus ingens albaque populus
 umbram hospitalem consociare amant
 ramis et obliquo laborat
 lymphha fugax trepidare rivo.

huc vina et unguenta et nimium brevis
 flores amoena ferre iube rosae,
 dum res et aetas et sororum
 fila trium patiuntur atra.

cedes coemptis saltibus et domo
 villaque flavus quam Tiberis lavit,
 cedes, et exstructis in altum
 divitiis potietur heres.

divesne prisco natus ab Inacho
 nil interest an pauper et infima
 de gente sub divo moreris,
 victima nil miserantis Orci.

5

10

15

20

A(a)BERΛΙΨ

3. 2 ut *Housman* : in *codd.* : ac Σ (B) 9 qua Σ (B) : quo
codd. 11 et *Fea* : quid ABRΛΨV *cum litura P^l* : quo aE1
 14 amoenos *Cunningham* 18 lavit (*Eutych. GL 5, 484*)] lavat
 AB 21 prisco et *Cunningham* 23 divo (P^l)] dio A B λ οχ

omnes eodem cogimur, omnium
versatur urna serius ocios
sors exitura et nos in aeternum
exsiliū impositura cumbae.

25

A(a)BERλΙΨ

4. 18 dilectam (V)] del- aER 19 lucrum *vel -ra Palmer,*
metri causa

O saepe mecum tempus in ultimum
 deducte Bruto militiae duce,
 quis te redonavit Quiritem
 dis patriis Italoque caelo,

Pompei, meorum prime sodalium?
 cum quo morantem saepe diem mero
 fregi coronatus nitentis
 malobathro Syrio capillos.

tecum Philippos et celerem fugam
 sensi relicta non bene parmula,
 cum fracta virtus et minaces
 turpe solum tetigere mento.

sed me per hostis Mercurius celer
 denso paventem sustulit aere;
 te rursus in bellum resorbens
 unda fretis tulit aestuosis.

ergo obligatam redde Iovi dapem
 longaque fessum militia latus
 depone sub lauru mea, nec
 parce cadis tibi destinatis.

5

10

15

20

A(a) BERλΙΨ

7. 5 pompei B *inscr.* R P *ad 15* : -pi A B E λ οχ : -pili R Ψ 1

oblivioso levia Massico
 ciboria exple, funde capacibus
 unguenta de conchis. quis udo
 deproperare apio coronas

curatve myrto? quem Venus arbitrum
 dicet bibendi? non ego sanius
 bacchabor Edonis. recepto
 dulce mihi furere est amico.

25

A (a) BERλΙΨ

8. 1 perierati B R P^l (*cf. Diomed. codd. AM GL 1, 524*) : peiecett. $\sigma\chi$ barin(a)e ($P^l \sigma\chi$) (B)] va- A B var. E P $\sigma\chi$ 3 albo Usener (*cf. 3, 27, 18 sq.*) : uno *codd.* : unco Horkel

10

Rectius vives, Licini, neque altum
 semper urgendo neque, dum procellas
 cautus horrescis, nimium premendo
 litus iniquum.

auream quisquis mediocritatem
 diligit, tutus caret obsoleti
 sordibus tecti, caret invidenda
 sobrius aula.

saevius ventis agitatur ingens
 pinus et celsae graviore casu
 decidunt turres feriuntque summos
 fulgura montis.

5

10

A (a) BERΛΙΨ

10. 6 diligit tutus, caret Bentley 9 saevius *ed. Rothomag.*
1701, coni. Burman sen., legisse vid. Fronto 209 N et Isid. Syn. 2,
89 : saepius codd. P^l

sperat infestis, metuit secundis
 alteram sortem bene praeparatum
 pectus. informis hiemes reducit
 Iuppiter, idem

15

summovet. non, si male nunc, et olim
 sic erit. quondam cithara tacentem
 suscitat Musam neque semper arcum
 tendit Apollo.

20

rebus angustis animosus atque
 fortis appare; sapienter idem
 contrahes vento nimium secundo
 turgida vela.

A(a) BERλΙΨ

18 cithar(a)e Ψ

11. 2 quinti a E Ψλιοχ : -te B (*cf. P*) : quincti A R

14

Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume,
 labuntur anni, nec pietas moram
 rugis et instanti senectae
 afferet indomitaeque morti,

non si trecenis quotquot eunt dies, 5
 amice, places illacrimabilem
 Plutona tauris, qui ter amplum
 Geryonen Tityonque tristi

compescit unda, scilicet omnibus
 quicumque terrae munere vescimur 10
 enaviganda, sive reges
 sive inopes erimus coloni.

5

10

A(a) BERλ1Ψ (= zπφψ)

32 (h)umeris (P) *vix sanum*] avida *coni*. Bentley : alacri (*et ore*)
 Campbell 38 laborem A B Ψ P^l(B) : -rum E λ1V ωχ

14. 1 eheu (*test. nonnulla*)] heuheu *test. alia* : heu P^l 5 tre-
 cenis z π λ : tric- *cett.* V 8 geryonem A E λ1z ψ ωχ

frustra cruento Marte carebimus
 fractisque rauci fluctibus Hadriae,
 frustra per autumnos nocentem
 corporibus metuemus Austrum:

15

visendus ater flumine languido
 Cocytoperrans et Danai genus
 infame damnatusque longi
 Sisyphus Aeolides laboris.

20

linquenda tellus et domus et placens
 uxor, neque harum quas colis arborum
 te praeter invisas cupressos
 ulla brevem dominum sequetur.

absumet heres Caecuba dignior
 servata centum clavibus et mero
 tinget pavimentum superbo,
 pontificum potiore cenis.

25

A(a) BERλ1Ψ (= zπφψ)

27 superbo (V P)] -bum ζ Lambinus : -bus ζ Barth : -bis
Lynford

15. 7 fort. sparget; v. Brink^c, p. 33

16

Otium divos rogat in patenti
 prensus Aegaeo, simul atra nubes
 condidit lunam neque certa fulgent
 sidera nautis,

otium bello furiosa Thrace,
 otium Medi pharetra decori,
 Grophe, non gemmis neque purpura ve-
 nale neque auro.

non enim gazae neque consularis
 summovet lictor miseros tumultus
 mentis et curas laqueata circum
 tecta volantis.

5

10

A(a) BERλΙΨ (= zπφψ)

13 probatus *coni.* N.-H. : priva- codd. *P^l* 20 *hinc usque ad*
19,4 def.1

vivitur parvo bene, cui paternum
splendet in mensa tenui salinum
nec levis somnos timor aut cupido
sordidus aufert.

15

quid brevi fortis iaculamur aevo
multa? quid terras alio calentis
sole mutamus? patriae quis exsul
se quoque fugit?

20

scandit aeratas vitiosa navis
Cura nec turmas equitum relinquit,
ocior cervis et agente nimbos
ocior Euro.

laetus in praesens animus quod ultra est
oderit curare et amara lento
temperet risu. nihil est ab omni
parte beatum.

25

abstulit clarum cita mors Achillem,
longa Tithonum minuit senectus,
et mihi forsan, tibi quod negarit,
porriget hora.

30

te greges centum Siculaeque circum
mugiunt vaccae, tibi tollit hinnitum
apta quadrigis equa, te bis Afro
murice tintcae

35

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

40

A(a) BERλΙΨ (= zπφψ)

16. 20 *redit δ* 21–24 (P) *del. Prien* 26 *lento (P^l)*] *leni Bentley* 31 *forset vel fors et R (?) Ψ (cf. ad 1, 28, 31)*

CARMINUM LIBER TERTIUS

1

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

regum timendorum in proprios greges,
reges in ipsos imperium est Iovis,
clari Giganteo triumpho
cuncta supercilio moventis.

est ut viro vir latius ordinet
arbusta sulcis, hic generosior
descendat in Campum petitor,
moribus hic meliorque fama

contendat, illi turba clientium
sit maior: aequa lege Necessitas
sortitur insignis et imos;
omne capax movet urna nomen.

destrictus ensis cui super impia
cervice pendet, non Siculae dapes
dulcem elaborabunt saporem,
non avium citharaeque cantus

5

10

15

20

A(a) BERΛΙΨ

1. 20 avium] fidium Cornelissen

somnum reducent: somnus agrestium
 lenis virorum non humilis domos
 fastidit umbrosamque ripam,
 non Zephyris agitata tempe.

desiderantem quod satis est neque
 tumultuosum sollicitat mare
 nec saevus Arcturi cadentis
 impetus aut orientis Haedi,

non verberatae grandine vineae
 fundusque mendax, arbore nunc aquas
 culpante, nunc torrentia agros
 sidera, nunc hiemes iniquas.

contracta pisces aequora sentiunt
 iactis in altum molibus; huc frequens
 caementa demittit redemptor.
 tum famuli dominusque terrae

fastidiosus, sed Timor et Minae
 scandunt eodem quo dominus; neque
 decedit aerata triremi et
 post equitem sedet atra Cura.

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

25

30

35

40

A (a) BERΛΙΨ

36 tum famuli* *scripsi*, *distinctione nova* : cum famulis *codd.*
 39 et δ (?) π : *om. cett. P^l* 40 postque *coni. Bentley* 42 Si-
 done *Nisbet*, *LCM 5* (1980), 151 *sq.* : *sidere codd. (P)* 44 que
 (*P^l*) ve *Bentley*

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

45

A(a) BERΛΙΨ

2. 1 amice (V *P^l metrici*)] -ci *codd. inscr.* οχ (B) : *anne et aequē*
(*sc. acri militia aequē et condiscat pauperiem pati et Parthos vexet;*
cf. TLL 1, 1043, 21)? 16 ve AB (B) : *que cett.* 17-3, 72 *deest*
B 18 *interminatis Wade*

13

O fons Bandusiae, splendidior vitro,
 dulci digne mero non sine floribus,

cras donaberis haedo,

cui frons turgida cornibus

primis et Venerem et proelia destinat,
 frustra: nam gelidos inficiet tibi

rubro sanguine rivos

lascivi suboles gregis.

te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae

nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile

fessis vomere tauris

praebes et pecori vago.

5

10

A (a) BERλΙΨ

12. 11 et *om.* A B λ 1 δ arto R Ψ λ 1 V (B) : alto A B E

fies nobilium tu quoque fontium,
 me dicente cavis impositam ilicem
 saxis, unde loquaces
 lymphae desiliunt tuae.

15

A(a)BERλ1Ψ

13. 16 lymphae ($P^l\sigma\chi$)] ny- *vel sim.* Ψ P
14. 6 iustis ($P^l\sigma\chi$)] cas- Bentley sacris ABλ1πφ var. (B) :
 divis ERδφψπ var. λ var. P : votis Palmer 7 cari RΨP^l
 11 non virum Bentley : iam v- codd. σχ : coniugi Delz, MH 30
 (1973), 53 sq. expertes Cunningham, Delz male inominatis
 Bentley : male n- ABRλ1ΨP^lσχ : male o- EVP(?) : ab ino- Delz
 (cf. Liv. 25.25.6) 14 exiget B : -git π Prisc. GL 3, 189 : eximet
 cett. (de R n.l.)

21

O nata mecum consule Manlio,
 seu tu querelas sive geris iocos
 seu rixam et insanos amores
 seu facilem, pia testa, somnum,
 quocumque lectum nomine Massicum
 servas, moveri digna bono die,
 descende, Corvino iubente
 promere languidiora vina.

5

A(a)BERΛΙΨ

20. 8 maior (*P^l*)] mollis *coni*. L. Müller (*malim* cedat; cf. *Epist. 1, 16, 59*) illa Peerlkamp : illi *codd.* (*de R n.l.*) *P^lοχ*
 15 *nireus R* : *ner-* *cett. P* (*et Νηρεύς citato Il. 2, 673; cf. Epod. 15, 22*)

21. 5 nomine (*σχ*)] num- BR. *solemnis precationis formula*
facete usurpatur. lectum *enim pro adiectivo habendum nunc puto*

non ille, quamquam Socratis madet
sermonibus, te negleget horridus. 10
narratur et prisci Catonis
saepe mero caluisse virtus.

tu lene tormentum ingenio admoves
plerumque duro; tu sapientium
curas et arcanum iocoso 15
consilium retegis Lyaeo;

tu spem reducis mentibus anxiis
virisque et addis cornua pauperi
post te neque iratos trementi
regum apices neque militum arma; 20

te Liber et, si laeta aderit, Venus
segnesque nodum solvere Gratiae
vivaeque producent lucernae,
dum rediens fugat astra Phoebus.

A(a) BERλΙΨ

10 negleget *vel sim. a E λ Ψ : -git A B l P (de R n. l.)*
uisse (*cf. Maximian. 1, 49*)] inc- *Victorin. GL 6, 159 (B)*

12 cal-

30

Exegi monumentum aere perennius
 regalique situ pyramidum altius,
 quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
 possit diruere aut innumerabilis

annorum series et fuga temporum. 5
 non omnis moriar multaque pars mei
 vitabit Libitinam. usque ego postera
 crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium

scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex.
 dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus
 et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium
 regnavit populorum, ex humili potens 10

princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos
 deduxisse modos. sume superbiam
 quaesitam meritis et mihi Delphica
 lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam. 15

A (a) BERλΙΨ

60 syriae δ P^l 62 tunc (P)] tum Ψ 64 ferat Σ (B) : feret
codd.

30. 7 vitavit A B

Diffugere nives, redeunt iam gramina campis
arboribusque comae;
mutat terra vices et decrescentia ripas
flumina praetereunt.

Gratia cum Nymphis geminisque sororibus audet
ducere nuda choros.
immortalia ne speres, monet annus et alnum
quae rapit hora diem.

frigora mitescunt Zephyris, ver proterit aestas
interitura, simul
pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit; et mox
bruma recurrit iners.

5

10

damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae:
 nos ubi decidimus
 quo pius Aeneas, quo Tullus dives et Ancus,
 pulvis et umbra sumus.

15

quis scit an adiciant hodiernae crastina summae
 tempora di superi?
 cuncta manus avidas fugient heredis, amico
 quae dederis animo.

20

cum semel occideris et de te splendida Minos
 fecerit arbitria,
 non, Torquate, genus, non te facundia, non te
 restituet pietas.

infernis neque enim tenebris Diana pudicum
 liberat Hippolytum,
 nec Lethaea valet Theseus abrumpere caro
 vincula Pirithoo.

25

A (a) BCRλΙΨ

7. 15 *pius (P^l)*] pater δπV tullus dives (P^l)] d- t- *vel sim.*
 Ψ 17–20 *a nonnullis sine causa suspecti* 17 *summae (P)*] vi-
 tiae δπV 19 *avidi coni.* Bentley 21 *def.* C *splendide**
Hartmann 28 *pirithoo Rλ corr. π corr. φψ P : per-* cett. (*va-*
riant οχ)

8. *carmen damnat Lehrs* 1 *crassaque Campbell*

11

Est mihi nonum superantis annum
 plenus Albani cadus, est in horto,
 Phylli, nectendis apium coronis,
 est hederae vis

multa, qua crinis religata fulges;
 ridet argento domus; ara castis
 vincta verbenis avet immolato
 spargier agno.

5

A (a) BRλ1Ψ

52 perire R Ψ V : -ibit A B λ1

10. 2 pluma (P)] bruma (*quod adulescentiae vel virili aetati male convenit*) Bentley : ruga Markland : poena Withof : plaga Ladowski : multa Housman 5 ligurine Σ (B) : -num codd. 6 in speculo (*cf. ωχ*) (B)] sp- R Ψ

cuncta festinat manus, huc et illuc
cursitant mixtae pueris puellae;
sordidum flammae trepidant rotantes
vertice fumum.

10

ut tamen noris quibus advoceris
gaudiis, Idus tibi sunt agendae,
qui dies mensem Veneris marinae
findit Aprilem,

15

iure sollemnis mihi sanctiorque
paene natali proprio, quod ex hac
luce Maecenas meus affluentis
ordinat annos.

20

Telephum, quem tu petis, occupavit
non tuae sortis iuvenem puella
dives et lasciva tenetque grata
compede vinctum.

terret ambustus Phaethon avaras
spes et exemplum grave praebet ales
Pegasus terrenum equitem gravatus
Bellerophonten,

25

semper ut te digna sequare et ultra
quam licet sperare nefas putando
disparem vites. age iam, meorum
finis amorum

30

(non enim posthac alia calebo
femina), condisce modos amanda
voce quos reddas; minuentur atrae
carmine curae.

35

A (a) BRλlΨ

11. 11–12, 21 *deest R* 11 trepidant (*P^l* (-diant) *οχ*)] crepitant *coni*. Bentley 24 vinctum (*P*)] vic- A B λ l π *pr.* 28 Bellerophonten Bentley (*cf. Housman, Cl. pap. 829*)] -tem *codd.*

CONSPECTUS METRORUM¹

SYSTEMATA CARMINUM

I (Asclepiadeum primum)

— — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑

versus Asclepiadeus *κατὰ στίχον*

C. 1, 1; 3, 30; 4, 8.

II (Asclepiadeum alterum)

— — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
— — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
— — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
— — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑

tres Asclepiadeos excipit Glyconeus

C. 1, 6. 15. 24. 33; 2, 12; 3, 10. 16; 4, 5. 12.

III (Asclepiadeum tertium)

— — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
— — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
— — — ∪ ∪ — —
— — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑

duos Asclepiadeos secuntur Pherecrateus et Glyconeus, hi

synhaphia iuncti praeter: 1. 23, 3. 7

C. 1, 5. 14. 21. 23; 3, 7. 13; 4, 13.

1 Haec post Klingnerium ex editione Vollmeriana depropmsimus.

IV (Asclepiadeum quartum)

— — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
 — — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
 — — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑
 — — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑

Glyconeum bis sequitur Asclepiadeus

C. 1, 3. 13. 19. 36; 3, 9. 15. 19. 24. 25. 28; 4, 1. 3

disticha non iunguntur synhaphia, tamen ausus est poeta
synaloephe: 4, 1, 35 decoro | inter.

V (Asclepiadeum quintum)

— — — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — || — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∑

versus Asclepiadeus maior *κατὰ στίχον*

C. 1, 11. 18; 4, 10.

VI (Sapphicum)

— ∪ — — — || ∪ ∪ — ∪ — □
 — ∪ — — — || ∪ ∪ — ∪ — □
 — ∪ — — — || ∪ ∪ — ∪ — □
 — ∪ ∪ — □

tres versus Sapphicos sequitur Adonius

synhaphiam fere affectavit poeta: non hiatur ante Adonium
nisi in -m: 1, 2, 47; 22, 15; in longam syllabam: 1, 12, 7.
31; inter Sapphicos semper in longam syllabam: 1, 2, 6.
41; 12, 6. 25; 25, 18; 30, 6; 2, 2, 6; 4, 6; 3, 11, 29. 50;
nusquam in quarto libro neque in carmine saeculari. syn-
aloephe iunguntur Sapphici: 2, 2, 18; 16, 34; 4, 2, 22;
synaloephe ante Adonium: 4, 2, 23; C. s. 47; idem voca-
bulum pergit in Adonium: 1, 2, 19 u-xorius; 25, 11 inter-
lunia; 2, 16, 7 ve-nale; 3, 27, 59. nota praep. ‘in’ in fine
tertii Sapphici: 3, 8, 3; 4, 6, 11

C. 1, 2. 10. 12. 20. 22. 25. 30. 32. 38; 2, 2. 4. 6. 8. 10. 16;
3, 8. 11. 14. 18. 20. 22. 27; 4, 2. 6. 11; C. s.

VII (Sapphicum maius)

- U U - U - -
 - U - - - | U U - || - U U - U - -
 - U U - U - O
 - U - - - | U U - || - U U - U - O

Aristophanium sequitur Sapphicus maior q. d.

hiatus solum post v. 1, 8, 3

C. 1, 8.

VIII (Alcaicum)

U - U - - || - U U - U U
 U - U - - || - U U - U U
 U - U - - - U - O
 - U U - U U - U - O

duos Alcaicos hendecasyllabos sequitur enneasyllabus, claudit decasyllabus.

nota: 3, 4, 41 consiljum; 3, 6, 6 principjum

caesura deest 1, 37, 14; 4, 14, 17

synhaphiae non operam dedit poeta, tamen inter tertium et quartum versum admisit synaloepham: 2, 3, 27; 3, 29, 35; [cf. 3, 26, 7 coni. Bentlei]. neque creber hiatus (1, 9, 7 ante o exclamationem; 1, 9, 14; 17, 6. 13. 25; 31, 5; 35, 9. 38; 37, 11; 2, 9, 3; 13, 7. 11. 21. 26; 14, 3; 19, 31; 3, 2, 17; 5, 10. 11. 46; 4, 15, 10)

C. 1, 9. 16. 17. 26. 27. 29. 31. 34. 35. 37; 2, 1. 3. 5. 7. 9. 11. 13. 14. 15. 17. 19. 20; 3, 1–6. 17. 21. 23. 26. 29; 4, 4. 9. 14. 15.

IX (Archilochium primum)

- U U - U U - || U U - U U - U U - U
 - U U - U U - U U - O
 - U U - U U - || U U - U U - U U - U
 - U U - U U - U U - O

hexameter cum tetrametro dactylico catalecto.

hiatus post hexametrum: 1, 7, 25. 29; 28, 17. 23

C. 1, 7. 28; cf. Epo. 12.

X (Archilochium alterum)

_ U U _ U U _ || U U _ U U _ U U _ U
 _ U U _ U U U
 _ U U _ U U _ || U U _ U U _ U U _ U
 _ U U _ U U U

hexametrum bis sequitur hemiepes.

disticha synhaphia iuncta

C. 4, 7.

XI (Archilochium tertium)

_ _ _ | _ U U || _ U _ U _ -
 - - U - U || _ U _ U _ -
 _ _ _ | _ U U || _ U _ U _ -
 - - U - U || _ U _ U _ -

Archilochius et trimetrum iambicum catalecticum.

trimetri syllaba prima longa praeter: 1, 4, 2

strophae synhaphia iunctae; hiatus in longa: 1, 4, 9

C. 1, 4.

XII (Hipponacteum)

- U - U - U U
 U - U - o || _ U - U - o
 - U - U - U U
 U - U - U || _ U - U - U

dimetrum trochaicum catalecticum cum trimetro iambico cata-
lecto.

in trimetro soluta arsis secunda: 2, 18, 34 pueris

trimetri prima syllaba brevis praeter: 2, 18, 6 et 34

disticha non iuncta synhaphia; hiatus post dimetrum: 2, 18, 5

C. 2, 18.

XIII ionicum

quattuor decametra synhaphia continua

C. 3, 12.

EPODI

I

□ _ ∘ _ □ || _ ∘ _ □ _ ∘ ∘
 □ _ ∘ _ ∘ _ ∘ ∘

trimetrum iambicum cum dimetro.

synhaphia nulla

Epo. 1–10.

II

□ _ ∘ _ □ || _ ∘ _ □ _ ∘ □
 _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ ∘ || □ _ ∘ _ □ _ ∘ ∘

trimetrum iambicum cum elegiambo.

Epo. 11.

III

_ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ _
 _ ∘ ∘ _ □ □ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘

hexameter cum tetrametro dactylico catalecto.

disticha synthaphia iuncta

Epo. 12.

IV

_ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ □
 □ _ ∘ _ □ _ ∘ ∘ || _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _

hexametrum sequitur iambelegus.

Epo. 13.

V

_ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ □
 ∘ _ ∘ _ ∘ _ ∘ _

hexametrum sequitur dimetrum iambicum.

Epo. 14. 15.

VI

_ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ ∘ ∘ _ □
 ∘ _ ∘ _ ∘ || _ ∘ _ ∘ _ ∘ _

hexametrum sequitur senarius purus.

Epo. 16.

VII

□ _ ∘ _ □ || _ ∘ _ □ _ ∘ _

trimetra iambica *κατὰ στίχον**Epo. 17.*

Traditions and contexts in the poetry of Horace

EDITED BY

TONY WOODMAN
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

&

DENIS FEENEY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

5 THE ODES

Just where do you draw the line?

How did ancient readers of poetry books, working their way through Callimachus or Cercidas or Catullus, know when they had reached the end of a poem? Scribal conventions offered some visual aid: the conclusion of a long lyric poem might be marked by a big wiggly *koronis* in the left margin, while shorter epigrams were separated by the more economical *paragraphos*, the same ‘dash-mark’ which was used to indicate change of speaker in dramatic texts. If the book were an anthology like the *Garland of Meleager*, a new name would mark both change of authorship and change of poem. Yet such *external* graphic signals were subject to the hazards of careless transcription, and might be omitted or misplaced; errors would propagate themselves throughout subsequent copies.¹

Internal evidence offered surer clues to the reader. Just as play-scripts, lacking stage-directions, were designed to be self-sufficient (‘But who is this I see approaching? – surely not Tiresias again?’), so poets deployed a regular set of termination-routines, of which ring-composition is perhaps the most familiar.² Writers drew on a common stock of cues, and could rely on their readers to pick them up.³ A fan of Pindar or Propertius would soon develop an instinct for their favoured pointers. And even if the reader of a text unequipped with *sigla* failed to spot an ending as it passed, an immediately following strongly marked *opening-formula*, combined with a sharp change of subject, ought to have corrected the error in most cases. But here too verbal cues were ambiguous. Catullus uses *quare* with an imperative to mark closure in poems 1, 6, 21 and 69 (and it signals stanza-end at 62.17); not so at 12.10 or 39.9.⁴

A reader capable of crashing heedlessly through both external and internal signals would at least, surely, be brought up short by a change of *metre*. Even in a series of dactylo-epitrite poems, in which the conclusion of a triad constitutes a necessary but not sufficient condition for poem-end, the appearance of a new rhythmic combination of the double-short and single-short elements signals the start of a different poem. And when scazons turn into hendecasyllables, it is clearly time to stop and make a new beginning. If, that is, we are lucky enough to be dealing with a

book of mixed metres. If not, one need only look at the state of the text of Theognis or Propertius to see how editors confronted with an unreliably partitioned stream of elegiacs have agonised over the problem of poem-division.⁵

Horace's *Odes* provide the perfect laboratory in which to carry out an investigation of these issues. The text is in pretty good shape. There is a strong tradition of commentary going back to antiquity (and we shall see that the third-century scholar Porphyrio's views are of particular interest). Finally, Horace's desire to seek *variatio* of all kinds means that there is a regular change of metre between poems; so the area of uncertainty is strictly limited. Only in a few cases do blocks occur where editors traditionally recognise *different poems* although the metre continues unchanged. These are: 1.16 and 17; 1.26 and 27; 1.34 and 35 (all contiguous alcaics); 2.13–15 and 19–20 (again, alcaics); 3.1–6 (the great series of 'Roman Odes', alcaics); 3.24 and 25 (asclepiads); and 4.14 and 15 (alcaics). What I shall be doing here is to examine the three alcaic pairs in Book 1, and the Roman Odes, to see whether there is a case to be made for altering the conventional presentation; and I shall conclude that we should renumber the first book, and seriously rethink the internal divisions of the Roman Ode cycle.⁶

BOOK I

Each of the first three books, which were published as a trinity, adopts a different metrical strategy for its opening. The third starts with *minimum* variation – 84 stanzas of alcaics. The second alternates Horace's favourite workhorses, alcaics and sapphics, up to and including the eleventh poem.⁷ The first presents *maximum* variation: the famous 'parade odes', nine in a row before repetition occurs. The poet is demonstrating the range of his technique, showcasing his talent. And the variation on display here is surely the principle employed throughout the book. There are no other examples of contiguous poems in the same metre, except the three alcaic pairs already mentioned. What if these pairs were in fact intended to stand as single poems? Would that not make the principle of variety stand out even more impressively?

Before we examine these alcaic siblings, let us cautiously test the possible relevance of another consideration: what we may dub the 'five and dime' principle of book construction during the early Augustan period, within which Horace's first books of *Odes* fall. Just as Proteus, when he took a roll-call of his seals in Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, 'fived' them (πεμπάσσεται, 412), so Horace's contemporaries seem to have followed the same practice, making up their books in multiples of fives and tens.⁸ Here are the figures: Virgil, ten *Eclogues*; Tibullus, ten elegies in Book 1;

Ovid, *Amores* (2nd edition)⁹ Book 1, 15; Book 2, 20; Book 3, 15.¹⁰ The intentions of Propertius are by now almost impossible to excavate, poem-boundaries having been first ignored by the MS tradition, and subsequently obscured, often hopelessly, by omissions, transpositions, and corruptions. But Skutsch argued plausibly for 25 poems in Book 3 and 20 (after a fashion) in Book 1.¹¹

When we turn to Horace, we find ten poems in *Satires* 1, and twenty poems in *Epistles* 1.¹² The odes present us with the following breakdown: fifteen in Book 4, thirty in Book 3, twenty in Book 2... and 'die merkwürdige Zahl'¹³ thirty-eight in Book 1.

Eduard Fraenkel declared, *more suo*, 'Book 2 twenty [poems], Book 3 thirty; in the case of Book 1 there was an overflow.'¹⁴ I am not disposed to accept 'overflow' as a legitimate critical term. There must be at least a *prima facie* case that this first book, too, conformed to the contemporary fashion for fiving. Being of a cautious disposition, I discount the possibility that it might once have consisted of (say) 45 or 50 poems, with seven or twelve poems lost, or 30 or 25 poems, with eight or thirteen supposititious interlopers by unknown hands. I will even concede that 40 is a total which we can rule out, for the transmission of Horace (unlike that of Catullus) is excellent, and there is no reason to suspect even lost lines or stanzas, let alone entire poems swallowed up without trace.¹⁵ That leaves as a provisional working target the number 35; and to achieve it we would need, somehow, to reduce the book's total by three.

Robert Graves' headmaster rapped him over the knuckles in his school report for 'preferring some authors to others'; and I too am fonder of some of Horace's lyrics than others. However lukewarm my admiration for his less successful efforts, though, there can be no question but that everything in the book bears the stamp of the master. If we are to bring the total down to 35, it must be by combining poems, running them together, not deleting them. And the most obvious way to combine six poems into three is to amalgamate the adjacent alcaics, 16 and 17, 26 and 27, 34 and 35. Which is where we came in. If we could find it in our conscience to regard these neighbours as constituting a unity, and knock down their party wall, we should confer (it seems to me) a double benefit on Horace, restoring both perfect metrical *variatio* to the book and slimming it down to a desirable figure, the vital statistic of 35. Will it work?

POEMS 16 AND 17

Horace announces in 1.16 that he has previously abused this anonymous 'lovely mother's still more lovely daughter', has suffered for it by losing her love and friendship, and now pleads for forgiveness. He promises that he will now write *mitia* instead of *tristia*, nice poems to efface the

memory of the nasty ones. In itself it seems a perfectly satisfactory, self-sufficient poem, mention of the satiric iambics marking beginning and end by ring-composition. So why should 17 have anything to do with it?

This girl-friend addressed in 1.17, unlike her immediate predecessor, has a name: Tyndaris, daughter of Tyndareus, *Helen*; and that Horace is indeed hinting at Helen is perhaps suggested by the songs that the girl will sing under the midsummer shade – *dices laborantis in uno | Penelopen uitreamque Circen*. When the disguised Iris went to deliver a message to Helen in the third book of the *Iliad*,

she came on Helen in the chamber; she was weaving a great web,
a red folding robe, and working into it the numerous struggles
of Trojans, breakers of horses, and bronze-armoured Achaians,
struggles that they endured for her sake at the hands of the war god.

(3.125–8, tr. R. Lattimore)

Homer's Helen is peculiarly self-aware of her tragic place in history, and it is wholly appropriate that Horace, following this lead, should represent her in another act of artistic contemplation, this time conjuring up not the Iliadic theme of Paris and Menelaus competing for her own body, but the complementary Homeric tug-of-war between Circe and Penelope for the love of Odysseus.

Helen is definitely in Horace's mind, then, and meant to be recalled to ours, even if the poet later elusively (and typically) blurs the image by shifting at the end to a different picture, that of the unwanted attentions of the Hellenistic gigolo Cyrus. And Helen is the key to the link between the two poems. The name Helen is quite compatible, to put it no more strongly, with the periphrastic description of 16's dedicatee: the still more lovely daughter's lovely mother will be Leda, who was after all beautiful enough to catch Zeus's eye.¹⁶ So both of Helen's human parents have been alluded to, Leda as well as Tyndareus. But there is more. Poem 16 is a palinode, and is so described in the MSS. The archetypal palinode of antiquity was that of Stesichorus, who, tradition had it, insulted the reputation of Helen in his poetry, was blinded, and only recovered his sight when he produced his recantation:

οὐκ ἔστ’ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος,
οὐδ’ ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσελμοῖς
οὐδ’ ἵκε πέργαμα Τροίας

It is not true, that tale;
you never went upon the well-benched ships,
nor came to Troy's walled town.

(PMG fr. 192)

Now we can see the picture. The last stanza of 16 promises praise poetry, ἔπαινος, to compensate for the earlier iambic slander (ψόγος) and it promises it *nunc* (25). Poem 17 is the immediate fulfilment of that promise, simultaneously and ambiguously a hymn which summons Helen-as-goddess, in Sapphic vein, to the place of worship, and an erotic invitation which lures Tyndaris-as-contemporary-lover to the *locus amoenus*. Horace is making amends as he said he would.

I am not the first person to make this connection. Scholars had already grasped the point in antiquity, and Richard Heinze finally accepted it in his third revision (1930) of Kiessling's commentary: 'Porphyrio hat die Ode als Ankündigung der folgenden ... gefaßt. ... Diese Kombination wird alt sein und richtig.'¹⁷ This change of mind drove Fraenkel, who describes it as an 'astounding volte-face',¹⁸ to a fit of temper. Pages 207–9 of his Horace book are devoted to a lengthy diatribe against the position espoused by Porphyrio and Heinze, on the grounds that it is held to violate Buttmann's principle that data drawn from outside the poem in question must be deemed irrelevant to its interpretation. Since 1.16 and 1.17 are different poems, says Fraenkel, they cannot be used to throw light on each other. This is a magnificently brazen circular argument, since the point at issue here is precisely where the boundaries of these adjacent alcaics are to be drawn. Such is the vehemence of Fraenkel's tirade that it drives him to say, of the dedicatee of 1.16, 'Horace appears to be very anxious not to lift the veil of anonymity that shrouds the lady in question'; a statement which itself surely violates Buttmann's rule, implying an independent and autonomous biographical reality behind the poetry.

I add one further point: poem 15 immediately preceding is a poem about Paris eloping with Helen, in which Nereus is made to utter a grim prophecy of the fate which the Trojan prince is drawing down on himself. Rather than acquiesce in a sequence which moves from Paris (15) to an echo of a palinode to Helen (16) and on to a love-poem whose addressee just happens to be called 'daughter of Tyndaris' (17), it is surely neater to think of a responding pair of poems, a nasty one about Paris followed and balanced by a nice one to a Helen-persona; just as Propertius included a matching pair of Homeric poems in his fourth book.¹⁹ Propertius 4.7 sees Cynthia returning to haunt the poet in his sleep, echoing the accusations that Patroclus made to Achilles in Book 23 of the *Iliad*; 4.8 is the comic Odyssean pendant, with a Propertius–Penelope found dallying at home with rival lovers by a Cynthia–Odysseus who returns unexpectedly to reclaim her matriarchal rights.²⁰

To sum up, 16 is the overture to the performance of 17; and while they represent distinct parts, they jointly constitute a unity and should be thought of as together forming a single poem. Since this is the pattern which I shall argue applies also in the other two cases we shall be

examining, it would be as well to pause for a while to establish whether such a bipartite structure – ‘preface + performance’ – is attested elsewhere in ancient poetry.

The answer seems to be a qualified ‘yes’. I do not know of any examples in the area where I should most like to find it, in the lyrics of Alcaeus or Anacreon, on whose poetic strategies Horace is building; but there are plenty of general models. The shorter Homeric Hymns are, explicitly, προοίμια composed to introduce epic recitations. The four dactylic hexameters of Alcman’s fr. 26 have been mooted as a ‘solo hexameter prelude to a choral song’.²¹ Pindar speaks at *Nem.* 4.9–11 as if the preceding eight lines of the ode have constituted a ὑμνου προκώμιον, a ‘prelude to the hymn’. From the Hellenistic period onwards the conceit of the ‘covering letter’ becomes a regular form. Thus Theocritus 11.1–18 comprise an introduction addressed to Nicias (cf. too 13); and Catullus 65 is a preface to Hortalus, enclosing 66. More generally, one may think of the five-line preamble by the goatherd of Theocritus 3, which acts as introduction to the Amaryllis song itself. Still later, Mesomedes’ *Hymn to the Sun* (Heitsch no. 2) has a six-line prologue invoking a holy silence before the hymn itself, equipped in two of the MSS with musical notation, gets under way.²²

In Horace’s own *œuvre*, 3.11 conforms to this general scheme. An initial hymnic invocation to Mercury and the lyre requests them to tell a cautionary tale to his recalcitrant girlfriend (25–6 *audiat Lyde scelus atque notas | uirginum poenas*), which then accordingly follows. Admittedly there is not in that poem a clear stanza boundary between packaging and contents, as I shall argue for the three poems in Book 1; nor is the poet himself speaking in two successive, and distinct, registers. But the *aporia* presented in the first three stanzas of 1.12, *Quem uirum*, etc., ‘What man, what hero, what god?’ is clearly *preliminary* to its own resolution, and the poem’s consequent picking up of a clear direction. And if we look at 1.24 – the memorial poem for his friend Quintilius – we not only find the kind of tonal shift I have in mind, but can also perhaps dissolve an apparent problem on the way.

Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus
tam cari capit? praecipe lugubris
cantus, Melpomene, cui liquidam pater
uocem cum cithara dedit.

ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor
urget; cui Pudor, et Iustitiae soror
incorrupta Fides, nudaque Veritas
quando ullum inueniet parem?

multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,
 nulli flebilius quam tibi, Vergili;
 tu frustra pius, heu, non ita creditum
 poscis Quintilium deos.

quid si Threicio blandius Orpheo
 auditam moderere arboribus fidem?
 num uanae redeat sanguis imagini
 quam uirga semel horrida,
 non lenis precibus fata recludere,
 nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi?
 durum! – sed leuius fit patientia
 quidquid corrigeret nefas.

1–8 *tetrasticha inter se mutat* Campbell, coll. Serm. 2.5.101 sq.

Shackleton Bailey (1985a), whose apparatus I reproduce, thought Campbell's citation of the parallel in the *Satires* worthy of mention because that poem too refers, in its first line, to the news of a friend's death: *ergo nunc Dama sodalis | nusquam est? unde mihi tam fortē tamque fidelem?* If the other passage is a valid model, it looks as though *Ergo* ought to stand at the very beginning of the poem. And it is true that many other Latin poems, especially poems on death, do lead off with just that word: for example, Propertius 3.7 and 3.23; Ovid, *Amores* 2.7 and *Tristia* 3.2.²³

Campbell was right – but also wrong. *Ergo* is indeed the first word of Horace's poem; but no transposition is required. The first stanza is *prefatory*. It represents Horace casting around for inspiration, appealing to the Muse for the right words in which to express his grief in the poem proper, which then follows. He does this again in the first stanza of *Carm.* 3.4,²⁴ where it is Calliope's turn to be asked for help; also, if I am right, in the next two cases I want to consider in Book 1.

POEMS 26 AND 27

The short, very short, 1.26 is the excited (note the emphatic anaphora) announcement of an intention to write poetry in a new strain – ‘an ode | in the Alcaic mode’, as Michie (1964) correctly interprets *Lesbio | plectro*. Commager, after Wilkinson, notes that the appeal to the Muse to ‘weave a garland for my friend Lamia’, properly decoded, means ‘inspire a poem for Lamia’.²⁵ Where then is the poem? Apparently, say the commentators, ‘26’ itself. The medium is the message. It is a ‘performative utterance’, the very thing which it promises: a perfect example of δύουσία, being of one substance with itself.

Poems of this ‘recursive’ nature do of course exist, and in the *Odes*.²⁶ But three measly stanzas hardly justify all this trumpeting. If I were Lamia, I should have responded: ‘The wrapping-paper’s pretty. The book jacket is indeed delightful. I like the blurb, too. But (to change the metaphor) – where’s the beef?’²⁷

The beef is the following poem: ‘27’ is the poem which ‘26’ heralds.

What links can we see between that and the prospectus that Horace sent to Lamia in 26?²⁸ First, to start as we did in the previous case simply at the level of compatibility, note that 27 depicts Horace at a drinking party; that chimes very well with the straightforward meaning of *necete meo Lamiae coronam* at 26.8, for the provision of garlands for the guests at the symposium was one of the necessary preparations. Horace invites his friend to a party in 26, and sings a song for him at the party in 27.

Secondly, 27 is a version of a poem by Anacreon, as Porphyrio tells us²⁹ and as we know from fragments of the original (fr. 356 *PMG*). If Horace is here presenting Lamia with his newly turned version of a Greek poem, this matches Catullus’ present of 66, his translation of Callimachus’ *Lock of Berenice*, to Hortalus, the addressee (as we saw) of 65, the covering note. Now we come to the interesting point. Anacreon’s poem was composed, not surprisingly, in anacreontics. Horace has transposed it into his favourite alcaic stanza. And that is exactly what the ‘please find enclosed’ note to Lamia told him to expect. *hunc fidibus nouis, | hunc Lesbio sacrare plectro*: ‘Muse, produce something for Lamia in a new, Lesbian, metre, the metre of Alcaeus’ – not the ‘Tean’ metre in which Anacreon originally composed it.

Finally, what of Lamia himself? He reappears as a *bon vivant* and party-goer in 1.36. We may assume that he was a friend who shared Horace’s sophisticated sense of humour. His *nomen* must inevitably have led to a certain amount of banter among his friends, for it is identical with that of the voracious Greek bogey-woman Λάμια.³⁰ Now Nisbet-Hubbard observe, rightly, that in 1.27 ‘Chimaera’ not only refers to a man-eating myth-monstress but is also attested as a Greek hetaera-name; when we note that exactly the same is true of Λάμια – Demetrius Poliorcetes had a mistress of that name³¹ – it should be clear that it is Aelius Lamia’s own name which at least facilitates, and may indeed have suggested, the reference to Charybdis and Chimaera as predatory females in ‘27’. Yet another reason to draw the two poems together as a complementary pair or (as I am arguing here) two parts of the same poem.

This is the point at which I must declare that, just as I found myself to have been at least partly anticipated on the question of 16 and 17 by Porphyrio and Richard Heinze, so too Ross Kilpatrick came to some of the same conclusions that I have reached about this poem, by a rather

different route, twenty-five years ago.³² I quote: ‘*Carm.* 1.26 and 27 are in essence two components of one metrical recapitulation. The former’s function in the collection is to introduce the spectacular 1.27, and dedicate it . . . to Aelius Lamia.’ What makes the case worth restating here, nevertheless, is that Kilpatrick offered only a weak version of the thesis which I am here presenting in its strong form: he still talked about separate poems, the first serving as an introduction to the second.³³ My aim is more strictly focused: to assert that, at least in Book 1, there is no such animal as adjacent poems in the same metre.

POEMS 34 AND 35

Here, at least, there is no dispute that we are dealing with a symbiotic pair.³⁴ Fraenkel handles these two together, but in topsy-turvy fashion, just as he had done in the case of 16 and 17: the latter first (251–3), then the former (253–7). I am not going to dispute his assertion that 34 ‘serves as a preparation for the prayer to Fortuna that follows it’ (253). This is true as far as it goes, which is not far enough. From my perspective, ‘34’ is the preface to ‘35’, and what the MSS offer as two poems in the same metre is in fact a single poem, a meditation on the unpredictability and mutability of life which leads into a direct address to the responsible goddess. I will draw attention only to what seems to me the inelegant repetition of *ima summis | mutare* (34.12–13) in the first stanza of 35. But that is a problem, if it is a problem, whether you take the poems as separate but successive, as ‘prayer prepared for’ (Fraenkel’s formulation), or as two parts of the same piece.³⁵

I hope this survey of the three pairs of alcaic odes in Book 1 may have established that in each case there are intimate links between the two members. The individual analyses would not, perhaps, quite constitute absolute proof that the pairs should be designated single poems. It is the overall picture, together with the considerations of metrical variety and book total, that prove decisive. I recommend that future editors of Horace should renumber the book, holding firm against the feeble cries of those who may protest at the ensuing confusion.³⁶

BOOK 3

When we turn to the third book, we find that it opens with a block of 84 stanzas, 336 verses, all in the same metre.³⁷ The third-century scholar Porphyrio regarded this long stream of alcaics as constituting a single

poem;³⁸ so, even if he had in front of him a text equipped with *paragraphoi* or other markers of sub-division, he did not think them worth noting. The possibility thus exists that here too the boundaries between the poems we know as 3.1–6, now so familiar, may have been illegitimately introduced at some early stage in the transmissional process, perhaps in order to make the sprawling mass more digestible. At the very least, we are entitled to enquire whether the divisions offered by the MSS³⁹ look convincing.

There seem to me to only two points between 3.1.1 and 3.6.48 at which one can state with confidence that the flow of Horace's expression stops and makes a fresh start: 3.5.56 | 3.6.1 and 3.3.68 | 3.4.5.

First, 3.5.56 | 3.6.1. The marvellous picture of Regulus striding off to face torture and death in Carthage, as stoically calm as if he were departing for his country cottage after a hard week in the city, falls into the closural category of 'quasi-photographic images' which I mentioned (see n. 3). When we move on to the stanza beginning *Delicta maiorum immeritus lues, | Romane, . . .*, it is surely clear that we have crossed a strong boundary – whatever we call it. 3.6 is a separable unit, a coda to the long sequence which began at the start of the book.

Secondly, 3.3.68 | 3.4.5. Juno's long speech ends; and 'hanging speeches' are another favourite terminating device (see n. 3). There then follow two stanzas, in the first of which the poet remonstrates with himself for engaging in out-of-area activities, only to renew an appeal for inspiration in the one which follows:

non hoc iocosae conueniet lyrae:
quo, Musa, tendis? desine peruvicax
referre sermones deorum et
magna modis tenuare paruis.

descende caelo et dic age tibia
regina longum Calliope melos,
seu uoce nunc mauis acuta,
seu fidibus citharaue Phoebi.

Then the inspiration arrives:

auditis, an me ludit amabilis
insania? audire et uideor pios
errare per lucos, amoenae
quos et aquae subeunt et aurae.

and Horace begins the personal reminiscences which lead him on to the subject of Augustus as an earthly Jupiter, and back once more into a high, Pindaric style.

Here then, if anywhere in 3.1–3.5, the great cycle comes to a halt, then rolls forward again. But it is not at all obvious that there is anything which could be called a clear poem-boundary. Editors divide ‘3.3’ from ‘3.4’; and, since we are committed to the conventions of modern typography, we must do *something*. Come back, *paragraphos*, all is forgiven. We should put one at the end of Juno’s speech; and two more to mark off the strong pauses after the two stanzas to the unnamed Muse, and Calliope, respectively.⁴⁰ In the same way, the very first stanza of the whole cycle should be separated from what follows. It is a ‘striking up’, a priestly introit, a prelude to all that follows.

What of the other traditional divisions? That the opening sequence of the cycle should be brought to an end with

cur ualle permutem Sabina
diuitias operosiores?

may seem unsurprising. At *Carm. 2.12* we find not only another question-ending⁴¹ but a question-ending which asks, as here, ‘would you prefer to *permutare* *x* for *y*?’ It will no doubt have been this strong parallel that caused the ancient editors of our text to mark a poem-division here. But the Epicurean message, though we have heard it many times before, seems in this context to strike a false note. This is not just another of Horace’s personal musings but the opening salvo of the ‘Roman Odes’. It is surely odd that the first poem in a cycle whose avowed aim is to proclaim a moral crusade to the Roman public should end on such a meanly selfish note.

While the first poem appears to end by recommending *pauperies* as the solution to Horace’s own life-style problems, the second appears to open by prescribing the same medicine to the budding young soldier. This could be no more than an example of what we may call the ‘leapfrogging’ device used elsewhere in the cycle, by which a thematic idea emerging towards the end of one poem (or ‘section’) is used as the springboard for the next.⁴² On the other hand, it could be an indication that Horace’s personal frugality is not a concluding motif but a merely transitional one; in which case the objections outlined above melt away.⁴³ The poet’s personal concerns are seen in this perspective as a preparatory idea leading up to a much more important, public issue: for the *puer*-destined-to-be-soldier in 3.2.2 can be recognised as one of the *pueri* who Horace declared in 3.1.4 were targeted as his audience.

I do not, therefore, think that a strong break should be marked after 3.1.48. Indeed, if we were to seek a point at which we could say that the opening themes of the cycle seemed to have reached a natural conclusion, it would be rather at the end of the second poem, whose last stanzas recapitulate material from the exordium in the familiar ring-compositional

pattern. Jupiter opened the poem proper (3.1, second stanza), and recurs at the end (3.2, last stanza). The priestly persona in which Horace robed himself at the outset comes once more to the fore in 3.2.26ff. (*uetabo, qui Cereris sacrum | uulgarit arcanae*, etc.);⁴⁴ and the silence which the priest enjoined in 3.1.2 is picked up at 3.2.25–6 in the Simonidean *est et fideli tuta silentio | merces*. The vote-seeking politician of 3.1.10ff. is alluded to at 3.2.17–18 (*Virtus repulsae nescia sordidae*, etc.), and the *profanum uulcus* of 3.1.1 rears its head again at 3.2.23. All these features tie the end of ‘2’ back to the beginning of ‘1’ and make it a more plausible candidate than 3.1.48 for a first resting-point on the long journey through the cycle. And it is also appropriate, to continue the metaphor, that we should have covered a fair amount of ground before our first pause; better a determined hike of twenty stanzas than two short strolls of twelve and eight.

Not a ‘poem-end’, perhaps, at 3.2.32, but a place for a *paragraphos* or for extra space; a minor way-station *en route* to the end of Juno’s great speech in heaven.

If, as I have tried to show and as Collinge observed,⁴⁵ there is no strong break between the image of the omnipotent Jupiter at the outset and the point at which Juno reaches her peroration,⁴⁶ then we may expect ‘3.4’ and ‘3.5’ to form a balancing counterweight between the two central stanzas directed at the Muse and the coda, ‘3.6’.⁴⁷ How convincing is the firm boundary offered by editions at 3.4.80?

Once more I take as my starting-point what seems to me to be a peculiar and unsatisfying ending. The final stanzas of 3.4 describe the eternal punishment suffered by rebels against Jupiter’s authority: the Giants are crushed under mountains, the vulture rips at Tityus’ liver, and finally

amatorem trecentae
Pirithoum cohibent catenae.

It is easy enough to see why a late Roman editor casting around for a way to articulate the alcaics into more manageable units should decide to snip the sequence at this point, for *Carm. 4.7* also concludes with the punishment of Pirithous.⁴⁸ There the conclusion seems to me natural and moving; here, the impression left is one of unfinished business. Certainly the *oddity* of the Pirithous ending was recognised by Fraenkel, for in the very act of lauding ‘this concluding diminuendo’ he used the phrase (the tell-tale phrase) ‘by the happiest inspiration’ – acknowledging that this was by no means an off-the-peg ending, nor (we may reasonably add) one which the reader could be relied upon to pick up.⁴⁹

Caelo tonantem (which follows on the heels of Pirithous) is such a famous ‘opening’ that I realise the difficulty of re-visualising it as a mere

transitional stanza. Yet the hurried progress from Jupiter, via Augustus, to the remnants of Crassus' army all in the space of five lines is so precipitate, and so unlike the normally grandiose and expansive openings of Horace's big Pindaric efforts, that it hardly assures us that we have just crossed a watershed between discrete poems. If I were asked to mark a pause-point in this second block, it would not be here but earlier. At line 42 of '3.4' Horace introduces the theme of Jupiter's crushing of cosmic rebellion: the fate of the Titans, the Aloadae and (in greater detail) the Giants is adduced to show the hopelessness of resisting Olympian rule. The stanza 65–8 seems to offer a *gnōmē*, a point-to-ponder, to conclude this idea:

uis consili expers mole ruit sua;
uum temperatam di quoque prouehunt
in maius; idem odere uiris
omne nefas animo mouentis.

We now expect a new development of thought. But instead we find a further exemplification of the *gnōmē*:

testis mearum centimanus Gyas
sententiarum, notus et integrae
temptator Orion Diana
uirginea domitus sagitta, etc.

... as if we had not already heard enough about the dangers of challenging the powers-that-be. It is as if one were to say: 'Standing up against Stalin was a dangerous business. Look what happened to Bukharin. That proves how risky the attempt was. After all, look what happened to Trotsky.' True, in moralising on the fate of monsters Horace is here following Pindar's sequence of thought at *Pythians* 8.12–18, which moves from *exemplum* to *gnōmē* and then again from *gnōmē* to *exemplum*; but that does not necessarily mean that he must be tied to Pindar's 'archaic' articulation. In fact, if we are to mark a pause anywhere in this 'second block' (and perhaps we shouldn't be doing any such thing), 3.4.64 | 65 seems a much better place to rest and restart than the 3.4 | 3.5 boundary.

Consider first the putative resumption at 3.4.65, *uis consili expers mole ruit sua*. The powerful Pindaric *gnōmē* is now backed up by evidence to launch it on its way – like 3.3 *Iustum et tenacem*, or 1.22 *Integer uitae*.⁵⁰ The hundred-handed Gyas, the rapist Orion and the other criminals now form a legitimate set of *exempla*, no longer the tedious reprise of a point already made; though the start of this section, with its emphasis on the need for *consilium*, does pick up the theme of its predecessor, 'leapfrogging' onwards in a way which is characteristic of the Roman Odes

throughout.⁵¹ And the idea behind the transition to ‘3.5’ is: ‘Jupiter’s punishment of rebels against his own command explains our respect for his rule in heaven. Augustus’ forthcoming treatment of the surly Britons and Persians will justify his earthly dominion in the same way.’

If 3.4.65 is a candidate for a new beginning, we now need to look backwards and ask whether 3.4.64 displays any of the hallowed stigmata of closure. The preceding stanza celebrates Apollo as victor in the Gigantomachy, the god

qui rore puro Castaliae lauit
crinis solutos, qui Lyciae tenet
dumeta natalemque siluam,
Delius et Patareus Apollo.

Like the following Regulus poem, it ends its section on a note of glorious tranquillity, the commanding but relaxed image of Apollo effortlessly quelling the unruly opponents of the heavenly family. Pindar’s First Nemean provides a model: there too Herakles’ life of struggle, wrapped up as here with the Gigantomachy, concludes with a picture of the hero enjoying eternal bliss.⁵² The final words, a recital of the god’s name and cult-titles, possess a semi-magical incantatory power all of their own: compare the last line of Catullus 4: *gemelle Castor et gemelle Castoris*. More significantly, the domination of the section’s conclusion by Apollo the warrior links back to the theme of poetry which has been the central concern of the ode since its restart at 3.4.Iff.: Calliope had been invited to appear with Phoebus’ *cithara*, if she so wished, at the end of the introductory stanza. As often, Apollo is seen by the Augustans as simultaneously the victor of Actium and the poetic *Mousagetes, Citharoedus*.⁵³ Similarly, the *dumeta natalisque silua* at the close recalls the *pii luci* through which Horace wandered at the beginning. Like the first section of the first block (‘3.1’ + ‘3.2’), then, this part also seems to be structured by ring-composition.⁵⁴

To sum up, and come clean: as in Book 1, where I tried to make the case that new poems should only be recognised where we encounter a change of metre, so here I follow Porphyrio in seeing the ‘Roman Odes’ as a single great canto.⁵⁵ The book is thus reduced from 30 to 25 poems, but still fits the ‘five and dime’ criterion laid down in the discussion of Book 1. This monster mega-poem – *carmina non prius | audita* indeed – does however contain, inevitably, a certain amount of internal articulation. I have talked of two great blocks of poetry. They are preceded by the invocatory stanza; separated by the two stanzas to his muse which first express doubt in his project and then celebrate its renewal; and concluded by the ‘coda’,

conventionally known as 3.6. It is the architecture of the main blocks which is so difficult to analyse. I am unhappy with the traditional break-points (those between ‘3.1’ and ‘3.2’; and ‘3.4’ and ‘3.5’), and have proposed alternatives for consideration. But Horace really is attempting to build some quite new kind of structure here, in which themes spring up and fade away only to vault back into the foreground; there are several other points at which one has the sense of a re-launch, a fresh impulse, like the anaphoric stanzas on *virtus* at 3.2.17ff. All the same, one can perhaps discern the outlines of the big pattern Horace was after:

- introit (3.1.1–4)
- *first block*, in two movements: the first dominated by Jupiter, and structured by ring-composition (3.1.5 – end of 3.2); the second dominated by Juno, launched by a *gnōmē* and culminating in a speech on Rome and Troy (3.3.1–68);
- two stanzas on doubt and renewed confidence (3.3.69–3.4.4);
- *second block*, also in two movements: the first dominated by Apollo, and structured by ring-composition (3.4.5–64); the second dominated by a human hero, Regulus, launched by a *gnōmē* and culminating in a speech on Rome and Carthage (3.4.65 – end of 3.5);
- pessimistic *envoi* (3.6).

The general picture that emerges is one of a complex poetic structure which, once brought to a conclusion, is then repeated after a pause, with a shift down towards more recent historical events; the coda considers prospects for the future. And if this sounds like a pseudo-triadic structure, what could be more appropriate for Horace’s Pindaric ambitions?

6 A WINE-JAR FOR MESSALLA
Carmina 3.21

O nata mecum consule Manlio,
seu tu querelas siue geris iocos,
 seu rixam et insanos amores,
 seu facilem, pia testa, somnum,
quocumque laetum¹ nomine Massicum
seruas, moueri digna bono die,
 descende, Coruino iubente
 promere languidiora uina.

non ille, quamquam Socratis madet
sermonibus, te negleget horridus:
 narratur et prisci Catonis
 saepe mero caluisse uirtus.

tu lene tormentum ingenio admoues
plerumque duro; tu sapientium
 curas et arcanum iocos
 consilium retegis Lyaeo;

tu spem reducis mentibus anxiis,
uirisque et addis cornua pauperi,
 post te neque iratos trementi
 regum apices neque militum arma;

te Liber et si laeta aderit Venus,
segnesque nodum soluere Gratiae,
 uiuaeque producent lucernae,
 dum rediens fugat astra Phoebus.

(1) *O born with me in Manlius' consulship, whether thou bearest wrangles or merriment, or brawls and insane love-making, or easy sleep, kindly² jar, (5) in whatever description the Massic rejoices that thou preservest – inasmuch as thou art worthy to be brought out on an auspicious day,*

descend, for Corvinus bids produce a languorous wine. (9) He, though steeped in Socratic dialogues, will not uncouthly despise thee: they say that even old Cato's virtue often grew hot with unmixed wine. (13) Thou dost apply gentle torture to a talent that is generally stiff; thou dost reveal wise men's preoccupations and confidential plans by the aid of the merry Liberator; (17) thou restorest hope to troubled minds and bestowest strength and horns on the poor man, who after thee quakes neither at the raging diadems of kings nor soldiers' weapons. (21) Bacchus and Venus, if she is glad to come, and Graces that are slow to loose their belts, and undimmed lamps will progress with thee, till returning Phoebus routs the stars.

Horace did not usually write for *nobiles*,³ but the Hymn to the Wine-Jar is a conspicuous exception. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus was the most accomplished aristocrat in Augustan Rome, and the subject of this chapter will be the relation of the poem to its recipient. His very name commemorated the history, real or invented, of the Republic. The patrician Valerii claimed descent from P. Valerius Poplicola, who was supposed to have been one of the first consuls in 509 BC. The cognomen 'Messalla' was acquired by an ancestor (*coss.* 263) who rescued Messana from the Carthaginians at the beginning of the First Punic War. The agnomen 'Corvinus', the name that Horace uses here, went back to M. Valerius Maximus Corvus (sometimes himself called 'Corvinus'), six times consul, and a dominating figure in the Samnite Wars in the second half of the fourth century. We shall meet him again later in this chapter.

Messalla Corvinus was himself an experienced soldier.⁴ In 42 BC he served under Cassius at Philippi (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.4), but transferred to Brutus on the right wing (Plut. *Brut.* 40.6), who needed his help more: he must have recalled the deeds of his legendary ancestor who joined a Brutus at the expulsion of the kings (cf. Livy 1.59.2). After the suicide of his leaders he declined the command of the Republican remnants, but with an aristocrat's realism negotiated the surrender to Antony on Thasos (App. *B Civ.* 4.17.136); as a member of Brutus' staff (cf. *Sat.* 1.7) Horace may have been near him in these events, as previously in 45 as a student at Athens (cf. Cic. *Att.* 12.32.3). With characteristic flexibility Messalla joined Octavian at some stage, and fought for him against Sextus Pompeius and in the Bellum Illyricum; in 31, the year of his consulship, he held a command at Actium (App. *B Civ.* 4.6.38). He then served in Syria and Gaul, and in 27 BC celebrated a triumph for the conquest of Aquitania: Tibullus might well call him *magna intonsis gloria uictor auis* (2.1.34, a contrast with Messalla's own sophistication), and Virgil must have had him in mind when he wrote of an Italian warrior *haud expers Valerus uirtutis auitae* (*Aen.* 10.752). He was appointed Prefect of the City

in 26 BC, perhaps about the time of Horace's ode, but with a show of independence resigned after a few days.⁵ When somebody is as grand as Messalla, the trappings of office add nothing to happiness.

Messalla was an important person in Latin literature as well as in war and politics. As a young man in 43 BC he was already commended by Cicero for his eloquence (*Ad Brut.* 23 [= 1.15].1); and he became one of the most eminent orators of the day, distinguished for suavity and charm, though compared with Pollio lacking in force. He translated Greek speeches into Latin, and competed even with the *Phryne* of Hyperides (Quint. *Inst.* 10.5.2 *difficillima Romanis subtilitate*). He wrote an invective against Valerius Laevinus (Plin. *HN* 35.8), whose *imagines* he would not admit among his own.⁶ As a grande of literature he showed the same hauteur towards minor versifiers like Furius Bibaculus and Valerius Cato, whom he called a *litterator* or school-teacher (Suet. *Gram.* 4.2).

On the other hand Messalla gave encouragement to favoured poets, including Horace himself: see *Sat.* 1.10.84–6 *ambitione relegata*,⁷ *te dicere possum, | Pollio, te, Messalla, tuo cum fratre, | simulque | uos, Bibule et Serui.* It is significant that in this group of important *amici* Servius Sulpicius and Bibulus seem to have been related to our Messalla: the former (the son of the great jurist) married his sister Valeria,⁸ and Bibulus was perhaps brother of his wife (below, p. 86). Messalla encouraged other poets who will all appear later in this chapter: there was the mild and elegant Tibullus (qualities that must have appealed), who wrote a famous poem in honour of Messalla's birthday and his Aquitanian triumph (1.7); Sulpicia, Rome's only woman poet worthy of the name, daughter of the Servius mentioned above, and so Messalla's niece; Cornutus, who under the pseudonym of Cerinthus may have been Sulpicia's lover (she was probably also his anonymous bride at Tibullus 2.2); C. Valgius Rufus (*cos.* 12 BC), who is teased by Horace for his sentimental elegies (*Carm.* 2.9). There were also three anonymous poems addressed to Messalla, the tedious *Panegyricus Messallae* (= Tib. 4.1), the more interesting *Catalepton* 9 in the *Appendix Vergiliana*, and the *Ciris*, that post-neoteric 'epyllion', where the addressee is surely our Messalla. As well as encouraging others, Messalla wrote poetry himself; what sort of poetry will emerge at the end of this chapter.

Messalla does not himself appear till line 7 of the ode. In the meantime Horace teases the reader with frivolous misdirections: first he seems to be addressing an old love, born like himself in 65 BC (1 *O nata mecum consule Manlio*); then it appears that the addressee is really a wine-jar (4 *pia testa*); as another element he uses liturgical language,¹⁰ as if the wine-jar were a deity. But once it transpires that Messalla is the true recipient, the date of Horace's wine may seem particularly appropriate. According to Jerome's *Chronicle* (154 Helm) Messalla was born in 59 BC by our reckoning; but in that case he would have been only seventeen

when he rallied the Republicans after Philippi, which was too precocious even for this *fulgentissimus iuuenis* (as Velleius 2.71.1 calls him). He became consul in 31 BC, which somebody of his ancestry is likely to have done at the earliest permitted age, when he was about thirty-two or thirty-three; so it is now generally assumed that he was born in 64¹¹ (*Caesare et Figulo coss.*), which was confused with 59 (*Caesare et Bibulo coss.*). I suggest that even at the cost of losing this explanation we might push his birth back to 65, the consulship of Manlius; in that case the wine-jar is an exact contemporary not just of Horace but of Messalla himself. Coevals might feel a particular bond of sympathy, and *mecum*¹² could evoke memories of shared experiences at Athens and Philippi; but Horace is too tactful to boast directly of an association with the great man.

A date like *consule Manlio* exemplifies the Roman organisation of chronology (Greek poetry had nothing similar), but it also has resonances that are not easy to recover fully:¹³ Manlius Torquatus was presumably the grandfather of Horace's friend in *Epistles* 1.5 (a poem with affinities to our own), and the Valerii had an old association with the Manlii (as will emerge below). An interest in birth-dates and birthdays was also typically Roman, and is particularly noticeable in the circle of Messalla: Tibullus 1.7 is a genethliacon for Messalla, 2.2 for Cornutus, 3.11 (anonymous) for Cerinthus, 3.12 for Sulpicia, while in 3.14 and 3.15 Sulpicia writes about Messalla's invitation for her own birthday. Indeed the 'auspicious day' of line 6 of the ode might be the birthday of Messalla himself (as Denis Feeney suggests). In the case of Maecenas such concern for the calendar suggests astrological interests (Hor. *Carm.* 1.20, 2.17, 3.8); with Messalla one thinks rather of an old-fashioned ritualist who took the Genius Natalis seriously.

The imitations of hymnal style in the first two stanzas are also appropriate to Messalla; he seems to have had a precise understanding of the flavour of words, and the elder Seneca describes him as *Latini . . . sermonis obseruator diligentissimus* (*Controv.* 2.4.8). But beyond that the sacral language suits a family at the heart of the religious establishment; for the Romans had no professional priests, but trusted *res diuinae* to public men of suitable antecedents and temperament. Corvinus himself was made an augur, though there was no vacancy, when still under thirty (Dio 49.16.1), and later was admitted as one of the Arval Brethren,¹⁴ which is why Tibullus wrote on the Ambarvalia in his honour (2.1). His son Messalinus was installed when very young as one of the *quindecimuiiri sacris faciundis*;¹⁵ Cornutus, who may have married his niece, was also an Arval Brother;¹⁶ Messalla 'Niger' (*cos.* 61), who was probably Corvinus' father,¹⁷ was a pontifex;¹⁸ Messalla Rufus (*cos.* 53), who was probably his father's cousin, wrote an authoritative book on the auspices, which he was well qualified to do as an augur for fifty-five years (Macrobius *Sat.* 1.9.14).

Potitus Valerius Messalla, who was perhaps Corvinus' brother rather than his second cousin (n. 8), was another *quindecimuir sacris faciundis*,¹⁹ when suffect consul in 29 he performed the sacrifices on Octavian's return from the East,²⁰ which is reflected by Virgil at *Aeneid* 8.281 *iamque sacerdotes primusque Potitus ibant*. The original Valerius Corvus, from whom the name 'Corvinus' was derived, was said to have been so called because a raven settled on his helmet during a battle (Livy 7.26.2–5; *RE* 7A.2414–15); he was portrayed thus in the statue that Augustus was to erect in his forum (Gell. 9.11.10). The story surely originated because the raven was a bird of augury;²¹ Corvus seems to have been an expert augur.

We may now ask if there is a particular reason why Messalla should be offered Massic wine (5), bearing in mind how often Horace's wines have a power of association. The Mons Massicus runs inland from Sinuessa at the north-western edge of the *ager Falernus*, the important wine-growing district of Campania to the north of the Volturnus; the area was taken over by Rome in 340 BC²² at the end of the Latin War that came between the First and Second Samnite Wars. Accounts of the campaign are inconsistent and unreliable: Diodorus records a Roman victory at Suessa (16.90.2), which controlled the gap between the Mons Massicus and the dominating Monte Roccamontfina to the north; other sources mention a stream called the Veseris,²³ which is unlikely to have been far away. The battle was familiar to everybody because of two exemplary stories: T. Manlius Torquatus, the Roman general, executed his son for disobeying orders, and the elder P. Decius Mus 'devoted' himself to save the army. In the same year Livy describes another victory of Torquatus (unless it is a duplication) at Trifanum, which was situated 'between Sinuessa and Minturnae' (8.11.11); so when Horace offers a Torquatus wine from precisely the same area (*Epist. 1.5.5 inter Minturnas Sinuessanumque Petrinum*), he is certainly alluding to this battle.²⁴ As Sinuessian wine was a kind of Massic,²⁵ it seems that a similar point is being made in our passage. Corvus was regarded by Livy as the greatest general of the period (8.16.4 *maximum ea tempestate imperatorem*), he was perhaps present at the battle of the Veseris (below, p. 91), and he may have been given credit for Rome's conquests by the historian Valerius Antias, who notoriously exaggerated the achievements of the Valerii.²⁶

Other points may be considered summarily. Perhaps Horace calls the great man 'Corvinus' (a name not normally used in Augustan poetry) not just to distinguish him from other Messallae, but to recall the deeds of his famous ancestor; similarly in the *Satires* 'Corvinus' is used to emphasise the glories of Roman history and the Latin language.²⁷ When the Massic wine-jar is called *pia* (line 4), even if the epithet in its context primarily means 'kindly' (n. 2), it might in retrospect hint that the jar honours the family²⁸ that fought for its own countryside. And if we are right that

Corvinus was born in 65 BC, the consulship of Manlius Torquatus, the first line would recall the fruitful association of the first Corvus and the first Torquatus, who derived their names from parallel legends,²⁹ and between them annexed the Mons Massicus.

When Horace says *Coruino iubente* (7), commentators disagree about whether Messalla is the host or the guest. It has been argued that in real life somebody as important as Messalla would not readily visit Horace; but social distinctions were played down to some extent even in the Roman symposium,³⁰ and the Valerii seem to have prided themselves on *civilitas* (up to a point).³¹ Horace was more active in the world of affairs than he pretends, and his talent for eulogy made his friendship worth having: Messalla was not his *patronus* in the Roman sense of the term, and he wished to distinguish himself from the clients who as Cicero puts it ‘cannot invite us to their houses’.³² At least for the purposes of the ode Horace is directing the arrangements and specifying the wine, just as in the parallel poem to Torquatus (*Epist. 1.5*); he could not do this in Messalla’s house. When he says *Coruino iubente*, the verb is less imperious than ‘orders’, and should be translated ‘bids’ or ‘asks’.

In line 8 the wine is described as *languidiora*, ‘on the languid side’.³³ The vocabulary of taste is imprecise and the metaphors of connoisseurs are opaque, but the adjective seems to imply that the wine has become bland and mellow from its repose of forty years (cf. 3.16.34–5 *nec Laestrygonia Bacchus in amphora | languescit*). That suits the easy charm of Messalla himself, whom Quintilian describes as ‘underplaying his strength’ (*Inst. 10.1.118 uiribus minor*); Horace would not have represented the vigorous and austere Pollio as asking for such a drink. Some moderns might wish to suggest that *languidiora uina* is a metaphor for the poem (as at 1.26.8 *necte meo Lamiae coronam* there is no garland other than the ode). That would go too far (for the wine has a significance in its own right); but it is true that Horace is adopting a relaxed style to suit the manner of the recipient.

In 9–10 *ille* and *te* (isolated before the break in the line) are both emphatic; if an allusion to the fourth-century campaign is accepted, Horace is saying ‘a *Corvinus* at any rate will not despise *Massic* wine’. *Socratici sermones* are the Socratic dialogues of Xenophon and Plato, whose style and content must both have appealed to the Ciceronian Messalla. *madet*, ‘is steeped’, suits Attic charm³⁴ as well as drink, but here there is an element of paradox: a philosophical treatise was expected to be dry. *horridus* by contrast suggests dryness; it suits the unkemptness of Socrates but not Messalla, who was famous for the *nitor*³⁵ of his personal and literary style.

In line 11 with mock-seriousness Horace produces an *exemplum* from Roman history: *narratur* appeals to tradition without implying that the story is false. ‘Old Cato’ whose *uirtus* grew hot with wine points at first

sight to the censor of 184 BC: he is described as *priscus* by Horace himself (*Epist.* 2.2.117 *priscis memorata Catonibus*), and Plutarch tells us that his original cognomen was ‘Priscus’ rather than ‘Cato’ (*Cat. Mai.* 1.2). Though he drank water when on campaign (*ibid.* 1.7), Cicero pictures him enjoying convivial occasions in the country.³⁶ In view of his exaggerated reputation for ruggedness, there is humour in choosing him as a model for the urbane Messalla.

Proper names in Latin *exempla* are sometimes ambiguous,³⁷ though caution is needed in assessing the expectations of the original readership. Here there seems to be a hint of the younger Cato; though he had died only twenty years before, *priscus* could be used in its sense of ‘old-fashioned’, and *narratur* might imply that he was already a legendary figure (as at 1.12.35–6). His heavy drinking is attested much more explicitly than the Censor’s, and seems to have figured in Julius Caesar’s *Anticato*;³⁸ Plutarch tells us that ‘as time went on, he grew particularly fond of drinking, so that he often continued over his cups till dawn’³⁹ (just as Messalla is invited to do at the end of Horace’s ode). See also Seneca, *Dial.* 9.17.4 *et Cato uino laxabat animum curis publicis fatigatum*; some think that he is talking about the Censor, but there are repeated references to the younger Cato in this essay, notably just below at 9.17.9 *Catoni ebrietas obiecta est*. On this interpretation *uirtus* would have a philosophical implication, which suits *Socratis sermonibus*; for the younger Cato had Stoic ideals,⁴⁰ whereas the Censor professed to think Socrates a babbler.⁴¹

There might be a further reason for connecting our passage with the Younger Cato. Without using Horace’s ode Syme suggested that Messalla’s wife, apparently a Calpurnia, might be the daughter⁴² of M. Calpurnius Bibulus (*cos.* 59) and the sister of L. Bibulus, Messalla’s close associate;⁴³ when acquaintanceship with suitable women is restricted, men have often married the sisters of their friends. So when M. Bibulus remarried Cato’s daughter Porcia about 58 BC, the young Calpurnia could have looked on her stepmother’s father⁴⁴ as a *domesticus auctor* (to use a Ciceronian phrase). In that case Horace is gently hinting to Messalla that there was authority for drinking among his own connections.

In the last three stanzas Horace lists the virtues and capacities of the wine-jar, and his ‘aretalogy’ continues the language of liturgy to suit the religiosity of Messalla. Here there is probably a reference to a lost dialogue by Maecenas called the *Symposium*, which included among its characters Virgil, Horace, and a Messalla. A fragment shows Messalla discoursing on the virtues of wine (*Serv. Dan. Aen.* 8.310): *idem umor ministrat faciles oculos, pulchriora reddit omnia, et dulcis iuuentae reducit bona* (‘the same liquid provides indulgent eyes, makes everything lovelier, and brings back the blessings of sweet youth’). The natural assumption is that

this is Messalla Corvinus, and that he was celebrated in both the dialogue and the ode as a connoisseur of wine: for the same reason Tibullus commemorates Messalla's birthday by introducing Osiris in the unfamiliar guise of a wine-god (1.7.35–45). By alluding to this *Symposium* Horace is able to flatter Messalla without making Maecenas think that he has transferred his allegiance.

However Cichorius followed by Syme thought that the character in the *Symposium* was not Corvinus at all, but his red-haired relative, the elderly Messalla 'Rufus' (*cos. 53*).⁴⁵ He argued that the same man was given the title-role in Varro's *logistoricus* 'Messalla de ualeutidine', where he might have praised wine as conducive to health. It might be relevant that Potitus Messalla, who is often regarded as the son of Rufus (n. 8), owed his recovery from illness to a Lucanian wine called 'Lagarinum' (Plin. *HN* 14.69): could this information have come from a remark attributed to his father in Maecenas' *Symposium*? Yet Potitus may in fact have been the brother of Corvinus (n. 8); in any case the detail about the Lagarinum could derive from Potitus himself (Plin. *HN* 1.19 cites his treatise on horticulture). Potitus was perhaps a connoisseur like Corvinus, as he seems to have given his name to one of the fine Mamertine wines of Messana: see Plin. *HN* 14.66 (close to the passage about Lagarinum) *ex iis [sc. Mamertinis] †Potulana [Potitiana Detlefsen], ab auctore dicta illo cognomine, proxima Italiae laudantur praecipue*. As has been mentioned above, the first Messalla (*cos. 263*) derived his cognomen from Messana; perhaps Mamertine wine had a sentimental attraction for the family, like the Massic in Horace's ode.

Cichorius argued that Messalla's phrase about the blessings of youth shows that the speaker is an old man, which suits Rufus but not Corvinus. But even the middle-aged may envy the young, and Horace himself, the coeval of Corvinus, mentions 'sweet youth' as something now past (1.16.23). Cichorius also maintained that Corvinus had no connection with Maecenas,⁴⁶ but a poem by Sulpicia points the other way (Tib. 3.14 = 4.8):

Inuisus natalis adest, qui rure molesto
et sine Cerintho tristis agendum erit.
dulcius Vrbe quid est? an uilla sit apta puellae
atque Arretino frigidus amnis agro?
iam, nimium Messalla mei studiose, quiescas;
non tempestiuae saepe, propinque, uiae . . .

Sulpicia is being invited by her kind uncle Messalla to spend her birthday at his country-house, when she would much rather be with Cerinthus in Rome. The interesting thing for our purpose is that Messalla's estate is

at Arezzo in Etruria, the ancestral home of Maecenas; so Maecenas had every excuse for bringing him into his *Symposium*. Cichorius added that there was no reason to associate Virgil with Corvinus, but a link will be suggested at the end of this paper.

To turn to details, when Horace talks of wine's 'bland torture' (13 *lene tormentum*), commentators compare Bacchylides' oxymoron about its 'sweet compulsion' (fr. 20 B 6 γλυκεῖ ἀνάγκα), but the Latin is more specific: just as torture was used in legal proceedings to make witnesses talk, so wine makes inhibited talents fluent and men of affairs indiscreet. This formulation springs less from lyric poetry than from prose writings about the symposium (as notably in the first two books of Plato's *Laws*); thus Plutarch says 'some people have an inventive nature that as long as they are sober remains unadventurous and stiff, but when they start drinking they let off exhalations like incense from the heat'.⁴⁷ Bentley thought that Horace might be hinting at his own purported lack of fluency (cf. *Sat.* 1.4.17–18), but 'wise men's preoccupations and confidential plans' are much more applicable to Messalla; Horace claimed to know no state secrets (*Sat.* 2.6.50–8), and he would not make jokes about his own lack of discretion (cf. *Epist.* 1.18.38 *commissumque teges et uino tortus et ira*). *duro . . . ingenio* may seem tactless when applied to the great orator, but for similar teasing by Horace see the eulogy of wine addressed to the eloquent Torquatus: *fecundi calices quem non fecere disertum?* (*Epist.* 1.5.19). Messalla affected an agreeable diffidence about his own abilities;⁴⁸ so perhaps we have a paraphrase here of something that he is represented as saying in Maecenas' *Symposium*. On the other hand the commonplaces in the fifth stanza seem humorously inappropriate to the character of Messalla, who was not afraid of Eastern kings.

In the last stanza Horace describes the thiasos or escort of the divine wine-jar, a feature common in kletic hymns (cf. 1.30.5–8). First comes Bacchus under his old Latin name of 'Liber', which like the Greek 'Lyaeus' above (16) suggests the liberating power of wine; his presence is particularly appropriate in view of Messalla's standing as a connoisseur (cf. Tib. 1.7.39–42). Venus is mentioned next, not Cupido, for the homosexuality of the Greek symposium would not have suited the impeccable Messalla (contrast *Carm.* 1.4.19 to Sestius). The drinking goes on till dawn as in the *Symposium* of Plato, perhaps also of Maecenas; Phoebus as the morning sun balances the lamps and the stars, but he is also a god to balance Bacchus and Venus, and perhaps one with a particular relevance to Messalla (see below).

Something more must be said about the Graces (22) and their relation to Messalla. When Horace says that they are *segnes nodum soluere*, 'slow to loose the knot', most commentators think that *nodus* refers to the

characteristic circle of three, familiar from Botticelli's *Primavera* and Canova's less beautiful sculpture, a grouping that has been traced back to the art and literature of the ancient world.⁴⁹ Seneca explained that the Graces held hands because good deeds are indissolubly linked (*Ben.* 1.3.4), and Servius in repeating this explanation actually cites our passage (on *Aen.* 1.720); but such allegorical interpretations are too far-fetched. *nodus* here naturally refers to a belt, as at Martial 9.101.5 *peltatam Scythico discinxit Amazona nodo*. The Graces, when they wore clothes at all, did not normally tie their belts, and Horace invites them to come to Glycera's house *solutis zonis* (1.30.5–6). But in our passage they are untypically strait-laced: at a symposium for Messalla *insani amores* would be inappropriate.

The Graces particularly suit Messalla because of the charm of his writings, not only in prose (as is well attested) but also in verse. The author of *Catalepton* 9 mentions one of them among the deities who have helped Messalla with his poetry: *ea quae tecum finixerunt carmina diui | Cynthius et Musae, Bacchus et Aglaie* (59–60). The nature of this poetry is clarified earlier in the same poem (13–20):

pauca tua in nostras uenerunt carmina chartas,
carmina cum lingua tum sale Cecropio,
carmina quae Phrygium, saeclis accepta futuris,
carmina quae Pylium uincere digna senem.
molliter hic uiridi patulae sub tegmine quercus
Moeris pastores et Meliboeus erant,
dulcia iactantes alterno carmina uersu
qualia Trinacriae doctus amat iuuensis.

Few are your songs that have found a place in my pages, Cecropian [i.e. Attic] both in language and in savour, songs that finding acceptance with future generations, deserve to outdo the old man from Phrygia [i.e. Priam] and from Pylos [i.e. Nestor]. Here at their ease under the green shelter of a spreading oak were the shepherds Moeris and Meliboeus, bandying sweet songs in alternating verses, such as the accomplished young man of Sicily loves.

In other words Messalla wrote elegant pastoral poetry in the manner of Theocritus, all about shepherds under a tree, just like Tityrus in Virgil's first eclogue. But unlike Virgil, Messalla wrote his verses in Greek, and apparently Attic (14 *Cecropio*) rather than Doric, which made them an oddity for pastoral poems.

Nestor is mentioned at *Catalepton* 9.16 primarily because of his longevity:⁵⁰ he was said by Homer to have seen three generations of men

(*Iliad* 1.250–2), which is expanded by Roman writers to three centuries. But Homer also says in the same context that Nestor was ‘the clear-toned orator of the Pylians, from whose tongue flowed a voice sweeter than honey’.⁵¹ The mellifluousness of Nestor is mentioned repeatedly in Latin: that is why the *Panegyricus Messallae* (45–51) uses him as an analogy for the speeches of its hero. A fragment of Valgius uses the same analogy for a poet called ‘Codrus’ (fr. 2.1–4 Courtney):

Codrusque ille canit quali tu uoce canebas
atque solet numeros dicere, Cinna, tuos,
dulcior ut numquam Pylio profluxerit ore
Nestoris aut docto pectore Demodoci.

So when the author of the *Catalepton* piece associates Messalla’s poetry with Nestor, he is surely thinking of their mellifluousness as well as their long life.

The Codrus of Valgius must be a real person as he is compared with the real and influential Cinna. He also appears in Virgil’s seventh eclogue (21–6):

CORYDON	Nymphae noster amor Libethrides, aut mihi carmen quale meo Codro concedite (proxima Phoebi uersibus ille facit) . . .
THYRSIS	Pastores, hedera crescentem ornate poetam, Arcades, inuidia rumpantur ut ilia Codro . . .

It is sometimes said that Codrus in the *Elegies* is fictitious and that Valgius has wrongly assumed that he was real. But Valgius could not have made such a mistake, for he was a contemporary of Virgil and Horace: Horace’s ode to him (2.9) must have been written before 23, and the *Panegyricus Messallae* suggests him as an alternative panegyrist (177–80):

non ego sum satis ad tantae praeconia laudis,
ipse mihi non si praescribat carmina Phoebus.
est tibi qui possit magnis se accingere rebus
Valgius: aeterno propior non alter Homero.

Clearly Valgius belonged to Messalla’s own circle.

All this goes to show that the Codrus so admired by Valgius is none other than Messalla himself, as suggested by Rostagni in a neglected article.⁵² When Virgil’s Corydon hopes to compose songs like those of Codrus, that suits Messalla’s Greek pastoral poems mentioned at *Catalepton* 9.17–20 (above, p. 89). When Valgius compares Codrus with Nestor, that suits the comparison of Messalla with Nestor at *Panegyricus*

45–51 and *Catalepton* 9.16; when he compares Codrus with Cinna, it should be noted that the *Ciris*, a poem dedicated to Messalla, shows clear signs of Cinna's influence.⁵³ Valgius regards the voice of Codrus as sweet, and the same adjective is applied at *Catalepton* 9.19 to the poems of Messalla; similarly the Delia of Tibullus is to pick for Messalla 'sweet apples from choice trees' (1.5.31–2 *cui dulcia poma | Delia selectis detrahat arboribus*), and Tacitus says of his prose style *Cicerone mitior Coruinus et dulcior (Dial. 18.2)*. We may also note repeated references to Phoebus, which suggests that Messalla claimed a relationship with the god:⁵⁴ Virgil's Corydon says that Codrus makes songs next to those of Phoebus (*Ecl. 7.22–3*); the *Catalepton* poem says that the Cynthian god (i.e. Apollo) helped Messalla with his poetry (9.60); the panegyrist says that he could not sing adequately of Messalla even if Phoebus told him what to say (178, cited p. 90); and as for Horace's ode, the emphatic last word is *Phoebus*.

Codrus was the name of a legendary king of Athens, who is associated in Greek proverbs with antiquity, noble birth, and simple-mindedness.⁵⁵ It seems a suitable pseudonym for the patrician Messalla with his old-fashioned tastes and his curious penchant for writing bucolic poetry in Attic Greek; his translation of the *Phryne* of Hyperides shows his fondness for Attic purism. Messalla is associated elsewhere with legendary kings of Athens: the poem in the *Catalepton* talks of his 'Cecropian savour' (9.14 *sale Cecropio*); the invocation to him in the *Ciris* mentions the 'Cecropian' garden of Epicurus (3); and when Tibullus celebrates his birthday he says *liba et Mopsopio dulcia melle feram* (1.7.54), an allusion to Mopsopus, another king of old Athens, as well as to the mellifluousness appropriate to Messalla. Rostagni missed the parallel in Tibullus, but included a more speculative point: Codrus sacrificed himself for his city,⁵⁶ and when Messalla joined Brutus and Cassius, his friends may have seen a resemblance to the legendary king. However that may be, there is surely significance in *Catalepton* 9.49 where Messalla is said *saepe etiam densos immittere corpus in hostes*; even if he was called 'Codrus' in the first instance because of his poetry, the line could allude to the king's act of self-sacrifice. Messalla had a special interest in such ritual acts: when the elder Decius Mus immolated himself at the battle of the Veseris, an exemplary instance of *deuotio*, the pontifex who was said to have pronounced the sacred formula was a M. Valerius, very possibly Corvus himself.⁵⁷

It may be argued against Rostagni's identification that Codrus in the *Eclogues* was a bad poet; but when Thyrsis hopes that Codrus may burst with envy (7.25–6, cited p. 90), the remark diminishes not Codrus but Thyrsis, who loses the singing-match. In the fifth eclogue a shepherd invites Mopsus to sing if he has any praises of Alcon or abuse of Codrus

(5.11 *iurgia Codri*); but at the most that shows that some poets of the period made fun of Messalla's old-fashioned Greek bucolics. It is true that 'Codrus' has become a type-name for a bad poet at Juvenal 1.2 *uxeratus totiens rauci Theseide Codri*,⁵⁸ but by that time the man's identity could have been forgotten. Virgil's own more favourable view of Codrus emerges from the eulogy by the victorious Corydon (*Ecl.* 7.21–3); indeed if Messalla wrote his bucolics when a student at Athens in 45, Virgil is likely to have imitated his charm as well as his subject-matter. All this goes to confirm against Cichorius that the Messalla who discourses on wine with Virgil and Horace in the *Symposium* of Maecenas is none other than the recipient of Horace's 'Ode to the wine-jar'.

Messalla attained great eminence in war and politics, but Horace's poem says nothing about his achievements, not even his recent conquest of Aquitania. The reason may partly be political discretion: Horace was closer to the centre than Tibullus, and might be wary of building up a man who was never in the inner imperial circle. But it was a matter also of literary tact: a sensible poet might be deterred by the blatant flattery of the *Panegyricus Messallae*, a recent and exemplary demonstration of how not to praise famous men. An interesting analogy to Horace's approach may be found in the last of his major poems: when Piso the Pontifex returned from Thrace about 10 BC, having reduced the Bessi and won *ornamenta triumphalia*, Horace said not a word about his victories but greeted him with a distinguished and inconsequential literary essay, the so-called *Ars poetica*.⁵⁹ Similarly in the 'Ode to the wine-jar' nothing is said about Messalla's deeds in peace and war: instead we get a parody of liturgical language to suit the religious proclivities of the family, humorous references to wine to suit the connoisseur, a mention of Massic to suit the conquests of his ancestor, a joke about Socratic dialogues to suit the Attic purist with philosophical tastes, discreet banter about Cato to suit a family relationship, reminiscences of the *Symposium* of Maecenas to flatter two important *amici* simultaneously, references to the Graces to suggest the great man's charm and propriety, and to Phoebus to suggest his interest in poetry and augury, above all an urbane and agreeable manner that evokes the aristocratic distinction and languid elegance of Messalla himself (contrast *Carm.* 2.1, the energetic and realistic ode to Pollio). In Horace's poems the style reflects not just the author but sometimes also the recipient.

Antonio La Penna

Orazio e l'ideologia del principato



Giulio Einaudi editore

cordo della donna (115 sgg.), è forse uno spunto lirico proveniente da una delle più belle elegie di Properzio (I 19, 5 sg.):

Non adeo leviter nostris puer haesit ocellis
Ut meus oblio pulvis amore vacet.

Il quadro di Nice che nell'aureo cocchio passa sulla via accanto alla tomba del poeta (121 sgg.), somiglia forse non per caso a quello di Mecenate che nel suo lussuoso cocchio britannico passa sulla via accanto al sepolcro di Properzio e ne compiange la sorte infelice (II 1, 73 sgg.); anche l'umile tomba suburbana del Parini mi ricorda quella di Cinzia « murmur ad extremae nuper humata viae »; ma quest'ultima rassomiglianza può essere casuale ed insignificante.

Queste brevi chiose, se non indicano cose già note, potrebbero essere utili per un commento; ma più m'importa indicare uno dei sensi in cui la poesia augustea ha agito sul Parini, insinuando nella sua poesia un profumo di mondanità brillante e civettuola, che facilmente si confondeva con quello dei salotti settecenteschi (la ricerca, naturalmente, andrebbe estesa ad alcuni passi del *Giorno*). Io non credo che tra il poeta civile e il poeta affascinato dalla grazia di questa o quella dama vi sia uno *hiatus*; e l'ode *Alla Musa*, dove il senso profondo della missione poetica e la grazia dei salotti sono così ben fusi¹, sta lì a dimostrarlo. Si tratta di due aspetti diversi e non stridenti: per capirne la compresenza bisogna tener conto, oltre che della accentuata serenità contemplativa degli ultimi anni, oltre che dell'influsso del rococò e del neoclassico, della varietà di suggestioni che permetteva la poesia augustea.

4. Orazio, Carducci e l'unità della poesia carducciana.

Richiamando in uno di questi saggi² un'ode barbara del Carducci dove Alceo è rievocato attraverso una visione oraziana³ (e la visione si carica, ancora più che di decorazione neoclassica, di una vaporosa voluttà

¹ La strofe sesta, dove si esalta il ritiro del poeta nella campagna, a contatto con la natura, è sotto l'influsso di ORAZIO, *Carm.* I 1, 30 sgg.: « me gelidum nemus Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori Secernunt populo », ma si veda quale significato morale nuovo dà il Parini al contatto sano con la natura, lontano dal « faticoso ozio dei grandi » (cfr. ORAZIO, *Epist.* I 11, 18 « strenua inertia ») e dal clamore cittadino.

² Cfr. sopra, p. 129.

³ Non trovo l'accostamento ad Orazio, che pure s'impone (e lo vedremo meglio tra poco), nel recente commento di M. Valgimigli alle *Odi barbare* (Bologna 1959, p. 197).

romantica, quasi baudelairiana, come sentí il Croce), ho parlato di un piú vivo impegno civile del Carducci. Vorrei riprendere qui il discorso, perché le vicende della critica sul Carducci presentano un'analogia interessante con quelle della critica oraziana: anche nel Carducci, dopo gli entusiasmi della fine dell'Ottocento, la critica è venuta avvertendo sempre piú, quando non si è staccata da lui con disprezzo piú o meno aperto, uno *hiatus* tra il vate e il poeta, tra la lirica civile appassionata, spesso eloquente e veemente, e la lirica sommessamente autobiografica, tra la maestosa retorica epico-storica ed una poesia intima, piú seria, che talvolta raggiunge una sua essenziale nudità, un vigore sicuro; e proprio nella lirica intima ha scoperto la poesia del Carducci che meglio resiste al tempo¹.

La spinta alla poesia civile viene, è inutile dirlo, dal movimento risorgimentale, ma in Carducci fa blocco con la tradizione classicistica ed ha come astri di orientamento Alceo e Orazio. Di là, e precisamente per una via sulla quale incontriamo Niccolini e Giordani, proviene l'ispirazione giacobina², mentre da superficiali contatti con ideologie piú recenti provengono spunti populisti ed anarchici che si avvertono in *Levia gravia* e nei *Giambi ed epodi*. Ma la tradizione neoclassicistica influisce anche sull'altra forza componente della poesia carducciana, quella che si rivelerà la piú autentica, cioè sullo slancio vitalistico, sul sentimento della pienezza vitale immediata e sana, colorita a volte di sfumature paniche: ciò resta vero anche se il neoclassicismo rappresenta per altro verso, con il suo attaccamento allo stile aulico e con il suo puzzo di accademia, una remora alla piena esplicazione espressiva e letteraria di quel sentimento: non si può negare che tra neoclassicismo, « paganesimo » e slancio vitalistico c'è una connessione, una unità organica, ricca di fermenti e carica, purtroppo, di molte scorie.

Molto prima che nella *Fantasia* di *Odi barbare* il richiamo ad Alceo per comporre in armonia la Musa civile e la Musa erotica e conviviale si presenta nell'*Invocazione alla lira* che apre il secondo libro di *Juvenilia* e che è un adattamento di Orazio, *Carm. I 32*:

Canora amica, o le falangi astate
Ferocemente confortasse in guerra,

¹ Piú decisamente e felicemente di tutti si è messo su questa via W. BINNI, *Carducci e altri saggi*, Torino 1960 (i saggi carducciani, dei quali interessano qui i primi due, risalgono al 1957). Molto piú di uno spunto c'era già in LUIGI RUSSO, *Carducci senza retorica*, Bari 1958, pp. 272 sgg., 279 sgg. (il saggio a cui mi riferisco risale al 1954).

² Un accenno sopra, p. 178; cfr. S. Timpanaro jr ivi citato in nota.

O riposasse ne la franca terra,
Al lesbio vate

Tu gli dicevi e Cipride ed Amore
E giovin sempre di Semèle il figlio
E 'l crin di Lico e de l'arcato ciglio
L'ampio fulgore¹.
Or io ti scoto. A me sorride il puro
Genio di Flacco...

Senonché questa cornice unitaria anche in Carducci, come in Orazio, resta fittizia o resta solo un proposito. Il sentimento carducciano dello slancio vitale, molto più accentuatamente che in Orazio, è implicato in una dialettica elementare che lo fa trapassare nel suo opposto, in un sentimento dell'annullarsi della vita, della desolazione, che arriva fino all'ossessione della morte: l'assenza di vita è talvolta la liberazione del poeta stanco e tormentato, ma per lo più conserva un desiderio strugente, una nostalgia disperata della vita, che ne fanno una sofferenza perenne. Da questa dialettica elementare è nata la poesia più profonda e più riuscita, la lirica più pregnante e più essenziale del Carducci. Le *Rimembranze di scuola* sono la lirica in cui la dialettica è più chiara, perché più rapido è il trapasso e perché più esasperati sono i termini dell'opposizione:

E li accigliati monti
Ed i colli sereni e le ondeggianti
Mèssi tra i boschi ed i vigneti bionde,
E fin l'orrida macchia ed il roveto
E la palude livida, pareano
Godere eterna gioventù nel sole.
Quando, come non so, quasi dal fonte
D'essa la vita rampollommi in cuore
Il pensier de la morte, e con la morte
L'informe niente; e d'un sol tratto, quello
Infinito sentir di tutto al nulla
Sentire io comparando, e me veggendo
Corporalmente ne la negra terra
Freddo, immobile, muto, e fuor gli augelli
Cantare allegri e gli alberi stormire
E trascorrere i fiumi ed i viventi
Ricrearsi nel sol caldo irrigati
De la divina luce, io tutto e pieno

¹ Rievocazione analoga di Alceo, anche se di tono ben diverso, in *Per il LXXVII anniversario della proclamazione della Repubblica francese (Giambi ed epodi II 17)*: «Vino e ferro voglio, come a' begli anni | Alceo chiedea nel cantico immortal: | Il ferro per uccidere i tiranni, | Il vin per festeggiare il funeral ».

L'intendimento de la morte accolsi
E sbigottii veracemente.

Altro capolavoro nato da questo elementare contrasto è, come si sa, *Pianto antico*; e non sto ad illustrare, ché non rientra nei miei compiti, altre liriche dove la medesima ispirazione si manifesta più o meno chiaramente e felicemente: *Notte d'inverno*, *Autunno romantico*, *Ballata dolorosa*, *Davanti una cattedrale*, *Brindisi funebre*, *Fuori alla Certosa di Bologna*, *Ruit hora*, *Alla stazione in una matina d'autunno*, *Mors*, *Egle*, *Presso l'urna di Percy Bysshe Shelley*, *Nevicata*, *Nel chiostro del Santo*, *Elegia del Monte Spluga*; ed altre liriche e passi si dovrebbero richiamare, dove il contrasto non è in primo piano, ma pure s'insinua: per es., anche in *San Martino* alla gioiosa alacrità di vita che spirano i tini ribollenti, l'odore aspro dei vini, lo scoppiettare dello spiedo, si oppone la malinconia acuta degli stormi di uccelli neri migranti tra le nubi rossastre del vespro. È innegabile, anche se è rischioso forzare l'affermazione, che inconsciamente il Carducci si accosta a quella dialettica di vitalismo e nihilismo da cui sono nate tanta parte della letteratura europea dalla seconda metà dell'Ottocento in poi e, già prima, alcune manifestazioni romantiche. Comunque le condizioni culturali per quella dialettica Carducci le trovava già in una certa alleanza, di origine settecentesca, tra classicismo e materialismo: ed esse sono la fedeltà alla terra, il rifiuto di aperture verso divinità trascendenti (il « paganesimo » del Carducci), la mancanza di una complessa dialettica storica, come quella idealistica, in cui venisse inglobata la natura e giustificata la morte: vita e morte per Carducci restano press'a poco ciò che erano in *Diffugere nives* di Orazio o nell'apertura dei *Sepolcri* del Foscolo o in Leopardi (le *Rimembranze di scuola* non sono lontane da alcuni toni di Foscolo e Leopardi). In particolare liriche come *Ruit hora* rendono evidenti le radici che legano il nucleo lirico del contrasto fra slancio vitale e annullamento con la tradizione classicistica e specialmente oraziana: lo slancio verso la vita si fa più intenso e impetuoso appunto perché la vita è precaria, senza garanzia per il domani, sempre sull'orlo dell'annullamento:

Vedi con che desio quei colli tendono
le braccia al sole occiduo:
cresce l'ombra e li fascia: ei par che chiedano
il bacio ultimo, o Lidia.

Il peso negativo del classicismo qui si avverte, oltre che nello stile terribilmente aulico (ma dove questo non si sente nel Carducci, se si esclu-

de *Pianto antico*? Anche in *Nevicata* lo stile aulico stride, e lo stridore è accresciuto da quel ritmo artificioso del pentametro!), nello sfondo idillico, arcadico¹:

O desiata verde solitudine
lungi al rumor degli uomini!

Riserve del genere, e piú forti, s'impongono per l'ode *Su Monte Mario*; ma essa, se non è tra le piú felici, è tra le piú indicative del gusto e della concezione carducciana della vita; comunque anch'essa indica quelle radici di cui dicevo e in piú come sul ceppo classicistico vengono ad innestarsi i deboli rami positivistici².

Il senso della pienezza vitale o l'aspirazione ad essa, avvolti o no nell'ombra della morte, alimentano molti dei motivi piú tenaci e piú noti del Carducci: la nostalgia della giovinezza; la rievocazione della Maremma natia, piena di forza severa pur nella desolazione delle sue « vedove piagge », dei suoi colli « arsicci e foschi », delle sue « maligne crete » interrotte da raro bosco; il canto festoso per la vitalità prorompente a primavera, e specialmente nel maggio; la polemica contro i languori e gli sdilinquimenti romantici; ecc. Non sempre la vita è slancio: talvolta è fecondità tranquilla o sonnolenta, ma pur sempre robusta: come quella della terra assomigliata a un'incinta nel *Canto di Marzo* o quella dell'« acqua lenta Ove l'anguilla maturando sta » (*Rime nuove* V 74). Ma dal senso della pienezza vitale si alimenta soprattutto il mito dell'antichità greca e latina, età sana, forte, incorrotta: il canto per Omero è canto di primavera (*Rime nuove* I 6):

E sempre a te co'l sole e la feconda
Primavera io ritorno ad a' tuoi canti,
Veglio divin le cui tempia stellanti
Lume d'eterna gioventú circonda.

¹ Un'aura di Arcadia malinconica avvolge completamente il desiderio di morte, che in seguito troverà espressioni cosí intense e corpose, nel sonetto giovanile fiesolano (*Juvenilia* I 15), un rifacimento di Orazio, *Carm.* II 6.

² Mettere in rilievo la suggestione oraziana che pervade quest'ode sarebbe superfluo; tuttavia vorrei notare un riecheggiamento di Orazio sfuggito nel recente commento di Valgimigli (p. 253). I versi 13-20 riecheggiano la delicatissima ode con cui Orazio chiude il primo libro. È vero che Orazio consiglia « Mitte sectari rosa quo locorum | Sera moretur », mentre il Carducci chiede « il soave | fior de la rosa che fugace il verno | consola e muore », ma tutto il movimento dei due passi (Orazio: lascia le corone di tiglio e le rose rare d'inverno; io mi contento del mirto; Carducci: lascia l'alloro maestoso; io desidero la rosa invernale) è analogo. Nel poeta moderno la rosa è divenuta simbolo del motivo centrale della poesia: è la vita che, pur effimera, resiste alla desolazione.

Di là proviene la polemica anticristiana, attenuata dal deismo e spiritualismo dell'ultimo periodo¹. Il medesimo centro genera anche certi vizi, aggravati dagli eredi, come l'estetismo (malattia molto frequente del vitalismo) o il vagheggiamento delle origini ariane (che estetismo, razzismo, nazionalismo fossero in germe, e più che in germe, nel Carducci è vano negare).

E la storia e la lotta politica? Poesia epico-storica e poesia civile che legame hanno con questo centro? La contrapposizione di paganesimo e cristianesimo, che implica l'interpretazione del cristianesimo come rinuncia alla gioia, esaurimento dello slancio vitale, decadenza, può essere sentita come il riflesso del senso della pienezza vitale nella visione della storia. Il medesimo riflesso si può sentire in certi quadri dell'età comunale: il caso più chiaro e più felice è *Il comune rustico*, dove è meravigliosa la fusione in un solo colore severo e semplice di uomini e paesaggio:

E le rosse giovenile di su 'l prato
Vedean passare il piccolo senato,
Brillando sugli abeti il mezzodì.

La chitarronata dell'inno *A Satana* è a suo modo un tentativo, per quanto poeticamente infelice, di far sprizzare da una fonte unica, di collocare entro uno sviluppo unico la forza vitale, le rivolte anticlericali, l'illuminismo ed il materialismo moderno, l'audacia del progresso scientifico. La gioia della natura e la gioiosa e feconda fatica umana cerca di fondere *Il canto dell'amore* (che il pessimo gusto della conclusione non dovrebbe indurre a condannare in blocco): anzi è questo il caso in cui meglio sembra vinto il vuoto della morte (« Tutto trapassa e nulla può morir ») e in cui più entusiastica è la fiducia nella storia. Un caso, che non vorrei tralasciare, di felice fusione tra il senso della forza vitale, l'ispirazione storica e le speranze del poeta civile è il sonetto *San Giorgio di Donatello*: il novembre fiorentino non offusca la rievocazione della giovinezza del poeta né la « Forza di gioventú lieta da' marmi Fiorente » e questi motivi sono come raccolti e rafforzati nella visione del popolo vincente di eroi che passerà domani davanti alla statua.

Ma più in là non saprei andare: questi casi restano pur sempre sparsi, eccezionali: per lo più tra il nucleo vitalistico-pessimistico da una

¹ Invece hanno scarso peso in senso contrario alcune poesie religiose degli *Juvenilia*, puri esercizi letterari: giustissima la polemica del Russo (*op. cit.*, pp. 211 sgg.) contro superficiali interpretazioni cattoliche. Per la poesia *Alla B. Diana Giuntini* (*Juvenilia* II 33) noto che una delle fonti dell'esercizio retorico (precisamente nelle strofe settima e ottava, dove si descrive il riposo dalle fatiche dei campi) è ORAZIO, *Carm.* III 18, cioè un'ode pagana per Fauno.

parte e dall'altra le invettive civili, i carmi solenni del vate della terza Italia, le rievocazioni epico-storiche resta uno *hiatus* e, come per Orazio¹, non si tratta solo della mancanza di elaborate connessioni logiche, ma di una frattura ch'è nel modo di sentire e incide sempre più sui risultati poetici. Dopo i *Giambi ed epodi* il nucleo vitalistico-pessimistico va chiarrendosi e rinsaldandosi, ma la frattura diviene sempre più netta: alla fine in *Rime e ritmi* il meglio della poesia carducciana si trova, com'è noto, in alcune brevi liriche ispirate da paesaggi (*Mezzogiorno alpino*, *L'ostessa di Gaby*) o dalla malinconia della vecchiaia e della morte imminente (*Nel chiostro del Santo*, *Ad Annie*, *Presso una certosa*). La vicenda richiama in qualche misura quella di Orazio: nel quarto libro delle *Odi* lo scarto fra la poesia civile, specialmente le odi pindariche, e la poesia della gioia fugace e della morte, specialmente *Diffugere nives*, è aumentato rispetto all'epoca anteriore. Se *Il canto dell'amore* si ispirava ad una continuità di forza tra natura e storia e all'immortalità della storia operosa, nell'ode *Su Monte Mario* la storia umana di « perenne gloria e dolore » nasce dalla natura ed è distrutta dalla natura, è una manifestazione, lunga solo rispetto alla nostra vita, del movimento cieco della natura: qui la tradizione materialistica ed i nuovi influssi positivistici quasi sommergono la storia². E qui ancora tra vitalismo e interesse per la storia rimane una specie di raccordo: in seguito il problema non sembra neppure porsi: sulla poesia intima di *Rime e ritmi* potrebbe iscriversi come motto un verso dell'ode barbara *Su l'Adda*: « Addio, storia degli uomini ». Non era facile passare organicamente dal nucleo vitalistico ad un approfondimento appassionato dei problemi della storia umana come quelli di libertà, giustizia, progresso, decadenza, ecc., o anche a miti artificialiosi come quello della Nemesi storica³. In fondo il rifiuto della storia

¹ Alla fine del *Congedo* di *Levia gravia* c'è una *recusatio* che ricalca probabilmente quella con cui Orazio chiude l'ode ad Asinio Pollione (*Carm. II 1*) o quella con cui chiude la terza ode romana: « L'umana libertà già move l'armi: | Risorgi, o musa, e trombe siano i carmi. | Canzon mia, che dicesti? | Troppo è gran vanto a sì debili tempi: | Torniam ne l'ombra a disperar per sempre ». Coscienza della sua vera vocazione? Probabilmente solo il riecheggiamento retorico di un luogo comune oraziano.

² Non so se a quest'ode *Su Monte Mario* sia stata accostata la poesia *Solvet saeculum* con la quale LECONTE DE LISLE chiude i suoi *Poèmes barbares* e dove si descrive l'annullarsi della furiosa storia umana col dissolvimento della terra, urtata « contre quelque univers immobile en sa force ». Tra le due poesie non c'è nessun rapporto di dipendenza; ma è curioso che due classicheggianti e romantici rievicatori della storia umana ne cantino il dissolvimento nelle cieche forze della natura. Il nuovo materialismo si fa sentire in tutti e due. Dal Carducci si sarà ispirato il Pascoli alla fine dell'ode *La porta santa* (in *Odi e inni*).

³ Per l'origine oraziana di questo motivo cfr. sopra, p. 103, n. 2. Nel commento del Valimigli a *Miramar* (*op. cit.*, pp. 166 sg.) nessun richiamo dell'ode oraziana.

a cui portò la nuova ondata romantica dalla seconda metà dell'Ottocento in poi, era una conseguenza più logica della *Weltanschauung* vitalistico-pessimistica¹.

5. Carducci e Pascoli tra Roma repubblicana e Roma imperiale.

Che cosa significasse Roma per il Carducci giovane, particolarmente per il Carducci dei *Giambi ed epodi*, è risaputo: era la Roma repubblicana della rivoluzione francese, della tradizione giacobina, delle correnti politicamente più avanzate del classicismo italiano alla fine del Settecento e nella prima metà dell'Ottocento², dei mazziniani: la Roma antitirannica e anticesarea. Forse mai simbolo ideologico ha contenuto insieme tanto valore positivo attuale e tanta falsità d'interpretazione storica: la Roma repubblicana era stata in realtà uno stato oligarchico, dominato da cricche aristocratiche; ma chi si meraviglierà di un tale errore, se persino nel Novecento studiosi anche illustri hanno posto sugli altari la libertà politica di Roma repubblicana o hanno dissertato di democrazia in Roma? Piuttosto è da vedere se l'errore sia stato sempre del tutto inconsapevole, se nel vagheggiamento di Roma repubblicana non emergesse a volte un limite antidemocratico: il cesarismo serviva a dittatori e sovrani, ma l'anticesarismo poteva essere anche di certi moderati o reazionari. Comunque nel primo Carducci il vagheggiamento di Roma repubblicana convisse con ispirazioni di democrazia avanzata e persino di populismo (qualche venatura populistica si può trovare persino nel Carducci di *Rime e ritmi*: penso, per es., all'esaltazione della sanità plebea nel terzo dei sonetti su Goldoni; ma tali venature sono tutt'altro che estranee al nazionalismo). Tutti i luoghi più o meno comuni del classicismo politico tornano nel Carducci dagli *Juvenilia* ai *Giambi ed epodi*: particolarmente carica ne è la canzone

¹ Per questa breve ricerca e per le due successive devo sottolineare il loro carattere di semplice assaggio: per esaurire il problema molto resta da indagare nelle prosse e nella biografia del Carducci, molto nelle sue vicende etico-politiche, nella storia della cultura del secondo Ottocento, nella storia politica e sociale dell'Italia postrisorgimentale. Da queste poche pagine si può ricavare, credo, che tra il vitalismo del Carducci, là dove si accentuano le sue sfumature paniche o vaporosamente mistiche, e la poesia cosmica del Pascoli, con il suo dissolvimento della storia umana, non c'è un abisso.

² Su questo punto cfr. P. TREVES, *L'idea di Roma e la cultura italiana del secolo xix*, Milano-Napoli 1962, pp. 3 sgg., 36 sgg. Purtroppo questo libro è tanto dotto quanto disordinato e confuso.

A. G. B. Niccolini (*Juvenilia* IV 66), dove domina l'Atene antitirannica; Atene è accanto a Roma in *Juvenilia* III 51:

Vissuto io fossi a sterminar tiranni
Con voi, Roma ed Atene;

il Brindisi (*Juvenilia* II 29) si chiude rievocando Catone, Bruto, Cassio, il primo e il terzo intrepidi bevitori, oltre che combattenti contro i tiranni; a Garibaldi combattente sulle mura di Roma plaudono le ombre dei Curzi e dei Deci (*Juvenilia* VI 86: qui e altrove l'enfasi è ad un passo dal ridicolo); e non c'è bisogno di ricordare, nei *Giambi*, i sonetti anticesarei. Un significato ora più ora meno affine ha il richiamo piuttosto insistente di Alceo¹. Nella canzone *Alla morte di Giuseppe Mazzini* (*Giambi ed epodi* III 24) Gracco sta fra Camillo e Dante, mentre un significato più proprio Gracco ha nella canzone *Per il quinto anniversario della battaglia di Mentana* (*ibid.* II 26):

... i cavalier d'industria,
che a la città di Gracco,
Trasser le pance nitide
E l'inclita viltà...

Il mito di Roma è uno di quei fili pericolosi che legano aspetti ideologici deteriori del nostro Risorgimento a degenerazioni ideologiche future, come i miti germanici del romanticismo tedesco stanno a capo di una catena (molto più terribile) alla cui coda stanno nazismo e razzismo: già l'insistenza sulla continuità da Roma alla terza Italia faceva perdere il senso delle proporzioni storiche, dei problemi reali dell'oggi, e alimentava suggestioni destinate a diventare rovinose. Già in una canzone degli *Juvenilia* (II 26 *Canto di primavera*) il risveglio d'Italia dovrebbe riportare gli antichi trionfi e l'antico orgoglio:

Oh quando fia che d'armi
E monte e piano fremano
A' rai del sol, e i carmi
Del trionfo ridestino
Co' suon del prisco orgoglio
I numi addormentati in Campidoglio?
Te allor, cinti la chioma
De l'arbuscel di Venere,
Canterem, madre Roma;

¹ Oltre i passi citati prima (pp. 236 sg.) cfr. *Juvenilia* IV 68 (che ricalca ORAZIO, *Carm.* I 31); *Levia gravia* II 18, ultima strofa.

Te del cui santo nascere
 Il lieto april s'onora,
 Te de la nostra gente arcana Flora.

Cattiva letteratura, è vero; ma letteratura che ha inquinato la stessa vita civile del nostro paese.

Non si può e non si deve negare che le venature, per cosí dire, giacobine si scorgono nel mito carducciano di Roma anche dopo la poesia giambica. Si sa bene che la missione assegnata alla terza Italia è una missione illuministica, il trionfo « su l'età nera, su l'età barbara »¹; e tuttavia proprio nella medesima ode *Nell'annuale della fondazione di Roma* l'invenzione contro Mommsen è indice della spinta mistificatoria del mito, del rifiuto a guardare storicamente nel passato romano. L'ode *A Giuseppe Garibaldi*, che è una brutta apoteosi romana, classicistica dell'eroe popolare², conserva un soffio del vecchio odio anticesareo. Ma non c'è dubbio che nello stesso periodo si fa sensibile il fascino della Roma conquistatrice e dominatrice maestosa. L'ode *Dinanzi alle Terme di Caracalla*, composta quasi negli stessi giorni dell'ode *Nell'annuale della fondazione di Roma* (aprile 1877), vuol circondare la dea Roma, maestosamente distesa sui suoi sette colli, di religioso orrore³; se si ritiene che questo significhi poco, si legga l'ode *Roma*, molto vicina nel tempo all'ode per Garibaldi (ottobre 1880): qui l'immagine dell'urbe si presenta come « nave immensa lanciata vèr' l'imperio del mondo ». L'impressione che suscita que-

¹ Analogamente, ma più precisamente, questa missione era stata definita alla fine della canzone *Per la proclamazione del Regno d'Italia* (*Levia gravia II* 16).

² L'assunzione di Garibaldi nel concilio dei numi indigeni, immagine ripresa nel discorso per la sua morte (cfr. il commento citato del VALGIMIGLI, p. 137), ricalca l'apoteosi del Mazzini in *Giambi ed epodi II* 24: « Passato era dei secoli | Nel dí trasfigurante, | A i mondi onde riguardano | Camillo e Gracco e Dante... » Ma il passo dell'ode, nel discorso fra Dante e Virgilio e specialmente con la battuta di Livio, lascia scorgere meglio donde Carducci abbia tratto il primo spunto: si tratta di PROPERZIO IV 6, 59 sg.: qui Cesare divinizzato guarda dall'astro idalico il figlio Ottaviano che vince ad Azio e commenta compiaciuto: « Sum deus, est nostri sanguinis ista fides ».

³ Per la rievocazione del paesaggio di Roma arcaica, in cui il quirite veleggia a sera tra il Campidoglio e l'Aventino, si cita OVIDIO, *Fast. VI* 401 sgg. (cfr. VALGIMIGLI, commento cit., p. 28); lo spunto potrebbe provenire anche da Tibullo II 5, 33 sg.: « At qua Velabri regio patet, ire solebat | Exiguus pulsa per vada linter aqua », o da PROPERZIO IV 2, 5 sg. (che del resto sembra presupporre Tibullo): « Hac quondam Tiberinus iter faciebat, et aiunt | Remorum auditos per vada pulsa sonos ». Inoltre bisogna presupporre o commenti a questi passi o qualche guida archeologica. Comunque il colore della scena è nettamente carducciano e intonato mirabilmente colla severità religiosa dell'ode (il che non vuol dire che il risultato poetico dell'ode mi convinca del tutto). Ovvio dovrebbe essere a proposito dei vv. 3-4 il richiamo dell'apertura di ORAZIO, *Carm. I* 9; ma anche qui la trasfigurazione è completa e completamente riuscita.

st'ode è accresciuta da quella, di pochi mesi anteriore, che rievoca Alessandro, il giovane eroe conquistatore: i suoi compagni nel loro peana cantano fra l'altro:

Lisippo in bronzo ed in colori Apelle
ti traggerà eterno; ti solleverà Atene,
chete de' torvi demagoghi l'ire,
al Partenone.

È vero, Carducci non canta in nome proprio; eppure non posso fare a meno di pensare da un lato all'Atene dei tirannicidi cantata un tempo, dall'altro alle tirate, che poi verranno, contro demagoghi e partiti. E viene in mente ancora la visione del popolo di eroi vincenti che sfilerà davanti al San Giorgio di Donatello (il sonetto è del 1886).

Tuttavia il fascino della Roma dominatrice ha tentato, non conquistato veramente il Carducci; e nella tentazione ha una sua parte l'estetismo: questo è, mi pare, il giudizio che la cautela impone. L'involuzione ideologica innegabile del Carducci, come non lo ha portato fino al cesarismo¹, così non lo ha portato, malgrado l'amicizia e la devozione per il Crispi, fino al sogno di guerre di conquista: l'ode *Alla Vittoria* del 1877 è ispirata dall'irredentismo, *Bicocca di San Giacomo* del 1891 canta un'Italia forte per la difesa dei suoi confini, non un'Italia conquistatrice; e si noti che anche l'ode *Alle fonti del Clitunno* celebra, in un tratto ispirato da un'ode pindarica di Orazio (IV 4, 37 sgg.), non una vittoria di Roma conquistatrice, ma una vittoria di Roma, anzi dell'Italia romana che si difende dalla minaccia di Annibale. L'ode *La guerra*, dello stesso anno di *Bicocca di San Giacomo*, non è una meditazione profonda né una lirica felice per le rievocazioni storiche; e può dispiacere che l'insania della guerra sia trovata « sublime » oltre che « fatale »; tuttavia l'invocazione della Pace dalle candide ali è sincera e chiara².

La tentazione doveva rivelarsi molto più pericolosa per il Pascoli. Eppure il Pascoli era partito da atteggiamenti che difficilmente avrebbero lasciato prevedere una tentazione del genere. Quel socialismo fatto soprattutto di sentimenti umanitari, di pietà e di solidarietà con gli umili e quindi pronto ad associarsi con un vago cristianesimo lo portava ad una

¹ Cfr. P. ALATRI, *Carducci giacobino*, Palermo 1953, pp. 99 sgg. (e la conferma di L. RUSSO, *op. cit.*, p. 399). Questo punto resta fermo, anche se quasi sempre giusto è il giudizio più severo e rigoroso che di Carducci politico dà W. BINNI (*op. cit.*, pp. 74 sgg., specialmente pp. 84 sgg.). L'involuzione è molto più netta, per così dire, nella politica interna che nella politica estera: insomma l'avversione alla spinta democratica e al socialismo non arriva in lui fino all'imperialismo.

² L'ultima strofa presuppone probabilmente l'epodo 7 di Orazio.

netta condanna del dominio e dell'oppressione di Roma; nello stesso senso portava la spinta proveniente dalla tradizione manzoniana e neoguelfa¹. Ogni lettore del Pascoli latino ricorda i *Gladiatores* (1892) e ancora più la conclusione agghiacciante di *Iugurtha* (1896): il carnefice, dopo aver strozzato il prigioniero, commenta: « Durus eras... sed durior, Hercule, Roma est ». La Roma augustea, quanto è grande, tanto è corrotta (*Ultima linea* 116 sgg.). La maestà di Roma nella seconda parte del poema conviviale *La buona novella* è una maestà disumana, bestiale: « Roma dormiva, ebba di sangue ». L'*Alexandros* è in una certa misura l'antitesi dell'ode carducciana su Alessandro: dopo la rievocazione del giovane, apollineo conquistatore il sentimento della vanità della conquista, la quale non riesce mai ad estinguere la sete di nuove terre:

... era miglior pensiero
ristare, non guardare oltre, sognare.

Si aggiunga che la poetica del fanciullino, implicitamente anticarducciana, tendeva a portare lontano dalla poesia civile e profetica: per quella poetica tutto il senso dell'*Eneide* è « in quel cinguettio mattutino di rondini o passeri, che sveglia Evandro nella sua capanna, là dove avevano da sorgere i palazzi imperiali di Roma », non nelle narrazioni di guerra e battaglie². Sono note, però, l'incoerenza e la debolezza del Pascoli. Né in *Lyra* né in *Epos* v'è una chiara condanna della poesia civile, anche se traspare la preferenza per la poesia idilliaca umile e autobiografica³; né la poetica del fanciullino impedì al Pascoli di diventare a sua volta il vate della terza Italia⁴.

È chiaro, però, che la ragione più importante del nuovo mito di Roma trionfale non sta nella debolezza del Pascoli: sta in tutta una corruzione politica e ideologica dell'Italia postrisorgimentale, a sua volta conseguenza di cause più profonde; si deve solo dire che senza la sua debolezza il Pascoli avrebbe resistito meglio. Inoltre bisogna tener conto che il nazionalismo italiano, soprattutto dibattendo la questione degli emigranti, accolse esigenze populistiche che il Pascoli poteva facilmente credere pro-

¹ Cfr. P. TREVES, *op. cit.*, pp. 72 sgg.; sul Pascoli pp. 294 sgg. Ma dal farraginoso libro del Treves non emergono prove filologiche chiare del contatto tra il Pascoli e l'interpretazione neoguelfa della storia di Roma.

² *Prose*, I, Milano 1946, p. 31.

³ Per es., nella prefazione a *Lyra* (*Prose*, I, p. 740) il Pascoli elegantemente dice che nelle odi romane l'anima di Orazio è trasfigurata, ma che veramente riflessa noi possiamo coglierla solo nelle odi simposiache e amorose.

⁴ Sul Carducci poeta di Roma visto da PASCOLI cfr. *Prose*, I, pp. 471 sg.

prie; il nazionalismo e poi ancora meglio il fascismo si presentarono da un lato come l'antitesi del socialismo, dall'altro, abbastanza abilmente, come un più vero socialismo: il discorso *La grande proletaria si è mossa* non è solo un discorso nazionalista con inflessioni pascoliane, ma esprime anche un certo aspetto del nazionalismo, che poneva nel suo programma, soprattutto con Corradini, il riscatto della nazione proletaria e la sua adeguazione alla lotta imperialistica. Nell'*Inno secolare a Mazzini*, che è del 1905, la repubblica romana del 1849 è, naturalmente, la rinascita della Roma del senato e dei comizi¹; qui, quanto a ideologia, non si esce dall'ambito carducciano. Ma alcuni anni dopo, nel 1910, nei *Poemi del Risorgimento* Mazzini conclude così uno dei discorsi profetici che tiene ai suoi fedeli²:

E cominciò d'allora la nuova Era
che rivedrà nell'avvenir profondo,
con terra e cielo nella sua bandiera

Roma al timone, placida, del mondo.

Nell'*Inno a Roma* del 1911 si possono trovare, è vero, passi che ricordano l'antico Pascoli cantore del lavoro pacifico, il Pascoli georgico, virgiliano; ma si legga questa rievocazione enfatica del « passo di Roma »³:

Divina,
così, con passo, sempre ugual, di gloria
andava Roma verso il grande imperio.
E monti e valli e fiumi e selve al passo
fremeant sonanti sotto il piè di Roma,
della Immortale sempre più lontana.
E mille passi delle sue legioni
fulgureggianti di metallo al sole
ella chiudeva in uno dei suoi passi.

Siamo già nel periodo della guerra libica. Sull'adesione del Pascoli non c'è bisogno di aggiungere molte parole, dopo ciò che ho detto del legame col problema dell'emigrazione, evidente nel famigerato discorso. Fa sorridere la menzogna, anche se candida, che la guerra serva solo ad imporre la pace « ai popoli che non usano se non la forza »⁴: vecchia menzogna romana. Dove il pericolo della nuova mitologia si avverte più grave, è là

¹ *Poesie*, I, Milano 1958⁹, p. 872.

² *Poesie*, II, Milano 1958⁹, p. 1300.

³ *Poesie*, II, p. 1328. Si notino anche le traduzioni dell'inno a Roma della poetessa greca Melinno (p. 1673) e dell'elogio di Roma contenuto nel poemetto di Rutilio Namaziano (pp. 1674 sg.).

⁴ *Prose*, I, p. 559.

dove l'occupazione della Libia è vista come il ritorno, dopo tanti secoli, delle legioni romane¹.

Inutile ricordare tutta la mitologia artificiosa con la quale il Pascoli tende ad accentuare il senso della continuità romana. Anche quando cantava il contrasto fra la Roma ebbra di sangue e la Roma nascosta dove spuntava il cristianesimo, la continuità tra la Roma pagana e la Roma cristiana non mancava; ma la continuità lì si fissava fra espressioni particolarmente nobili della cultura pagana, estranee alla corrotta *res publica*, come certa poesia di Virgilio o di Orazio, e il cristianesimo: interpretazione storica banale e non del tutto vera, ma tuttavia meno falsa e meno pericolosa del mito di una destinazione eterna di Roma alla potenza e alla conquista.

¹ *Prose*, I, p. 560.