

University of Mary Washington

Eagle Scholar

Student Research Submissions

Spring 4-23-2014

Blame as Consolation: Rehabilitating the Iambic in Horace's Post-Action Symposia

Emma C. Oestreicher

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.umw.edu/student_research



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Oestreicher, Emma C., "Blame as Consolation: Rehabilitating the Iambic in Horace's Post-Action Symposia" (2014). *Student Research Submissions*. 109.

https://scholar.umw.edu/student_research/109

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by Eagle Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Research Submissions by an authorized administrator of Eagle Scholar. For more information, please contact archives@umw.edu.

**BLAME AS CONSOLATION: REHABILITATING THE IAMBIC IN HORACE'S
POST-ACTIAN SYMPOSIA**

An honors paper submitted to the Department of Classics, Philosophy, and Religion
of the University of Mary Washington
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Departmental Honors

Emma C. Oestreicher

April 2014

By signing your name below, you affirm that this work is the complete and final version of your paper submitted in partial fulfillment of a degree from the University of Mary Washington. You affirm the University of Mary Washington honor pledge: "I hereby declare upon my word of honor that I have neither given nor received unauthorized help on this work."

Emma Oestreicher
(digital signature)

05/01/15

BLAME AS CONSOLATION: REHABILITATING THE
IAMBIC IN HORACE'S POST-ACTIAN SYMPOSIA

A THESIS BY

EMMA C. OESTREICHER

SUBMITTED ON APRIL 23RD, 2014

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEPARTMENTAL HONORS IN CLASSICS

Liane Houghtalin

Angela Pitts

Joseph Romero

Table of Contents

Cover Page.....	1
Table of Contents.....	2
Biography.....	3
Abstract.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Overview of Scholarship.....	7
Arguments.....	11
Conclusion.....	35
Endnotes.....	36
Bibliography.....	39

Biography

Emma Oestreicher was born on April 8th 1993, in Fairfax, Virginia. She began her studies in Latin at age 8, and continued her education in the Classics at the University of Mary Washington (Class of 2015). She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and she is also a double major in Italian Studies with a focus on literature.

Abstract

Throughout his literary career, Horace is very careful in addressing political subjects within his poetry, especially the divisive subject of the Roman civil war, a conflict that was still painfully fresh in the national memory. One of the earliest instances in which the Roman civil war is directly addressed occurs in *Epode 9*, a sympotic poem addressed to Maecenas sometime during or immediately after the Battle of Actium. This poem appears in a body of work which is loosely modeled after the Greek iambic tradition, a poetic genre which is generally characterized as “blame poetry.” However, the mythical origins of the genre suggest that the original function of the genre was not blame, but consolation. In *Epode 9*, Horace presents an iambic poem which combines the blame and consolation functions associated with the iambic genre. There are only two other poems in the Horatian corpus which address civil war in a sympotic setting, namely *Ode 1.37* and *Ode 2.7*. While they appear in a work set apart from the *Epodes*, both of these odes seem to contain certain stylistic and structural restatements of *Epode 9*, suggesting that Horace may have had this epode in mind when he was writing these later odes. The purpose of this paper is to assess the evolution of Horace’s response to the Roman civil war across these three pieces of political symposia by comparing the functions of lyric and iambic, and analyzing the sympotic setting that enhances the goal of consolation in each poem.

Pledge:

Introduction

Horace is a poet of many personae; the symposiast, the iambist, the counselor, the satirist, the philosopher, and the *vates*, to name a few. While these many personae may attest to his wide range of poetic creativity, Horace doesn't always appear to achieve complete security by hiding behind them. Whatever persona he is adopting, Horace is consistently cautious in addressing the civil war throughout his poetry. His first direct approach of this topic comes in *Epode 9*, a perplexing sympotic poem that does not appear to strictly adhere to the traditional "blame" function associated with the iambic genre. In fact, the poem appears to incorporate the consolatory function associated with the mythical origins of the genre. Such a blending of the mythical and conventional associations of the iambic genre serve to create a tempered response to the socio-political tensions surrounding the immediate aftermath of the Battle of Actium. Moreover, there are two other sympotic poems, *Odes 1.37* and *2.7*, which also respond to the aftermath of Actium, and which also appear to carry subtle elements of iambic. The sympotic setting not only serves to unite the consolatory function of these three post-Actium poems, but also to combine his lyric and iambic voices and address personal and public anxieties regarding a post-Actian world.

In both the *Epodes* and *Odes*, Horace demonstrates his concern in reaffirming social bonds during a time of massive socio-political instability, but the general manner in which he goes about reaffirming these bonds is different in each body of work. Written during the final turbulent years of the Roman civil war, the *Epodes* as a whole are primarily focused on bringing attention to the social divisions (or that

which threatens established bonds) present in various levels of Roman society. Emulating the iambic tradition, these poems cast varying degrees of blame on a variety of characters: between friends (*Epod. 1*); patron and client (*Epod. 1, 3*); noble and slave/freedman (*Epod. 4*); etc. Each instance of social division brings more and more persons into the cycle of blame, and these social divisions become so pervasive that the distinctions between the threat and the threatened are blurred (*Epod. 6*), and subsequently all social bonds break down (*Epod. 7*). Although he brings attention to these divisions, Horace proves to be just as helpless as any other Roman when it comes to creating a real resolution to the conflict at hand (*Epod. 16*). At this point in the war, the only way Horace can attempt to unite his audience of fellow Romans is by “blaming” them into adopting and sharing in his anxieties concerning the war at present. Written after the war, the *Odes* are comparably more reflective in nature than the *Epodes*. Although violent passions are not entirely absent in the *Odes*, Horace generally tries to move away from the extreme emotion that characterizes much of the poetry in his previous body of work in favor of a calm and cheerful enjoyment of the present moment. As he does in the *Epodes*, Horace attempts to unite his audience by persuading them to adopt his outlook, but his outlook and poetic approach has become much more tempered. Instead of blaming his audience into sharing his anxieties concerning the war at present, Horace persuades (if not gently chides) his audience to abandon their anxieties (if only for a short while) so that they may all be united in the present moment.

First, I shall outline how Horace’s approach of the subject of politics and civil war evolves within his poetry, taking into account the historical and biographical

contexts surrounding each collection of poetry (and in a few cases, individual poems). Next, I will examine the functions of the iambic genre in its mythical origins and how the genre came to be characterized as “blame poetry.” I will then focus on the *Epodes* as an important turning point in Horace’s career as a politically conscious poet and examine his motives in modeling the *Epodes* after the meters and subjects of the iambic tradition. I will then study how the symposium (the common setting of *Epod.* 9 and *Carm.* 1.37 and 2.7) serves as the common element between the iambic and lyric genres. Finally, I will analyze *Epod.* 9, illustrating how the symposium described within the poem links to *Carm.* 1.37 and 2.7, and assess how Horace shifts his approach in responding to the anxieties of civil war and subsequently to the anxieties of a post-Actian society.

Overview of Scholarship

Earlier commentators had distinguished Horace’s *Epodes* from early Greek *iambus* because they believed that Greek iambists (especially Archilochus) wrote from personal experience. This assumption was derived from the fact that Archilochus appeared to address *iambi* to people who had personally offended him, while Horace’s *Epodes* not only vary in subject matter and address, but also contain a wide range of poetic devices not seen in Archilochian *iambi*. Some scholars such as Eduard Fraenkel attempt to account for this diversity by asserting that Horace’s *Epodes* may owe less to the *iambi* of Archilochus and more to Hellenistic models such as the *iambi* of Callimachus, whose aim was to cross genres by incorporating other types of poetry. Moreover, he states that Horace’s emulation of the iambic

tradition was limited to the general “outline” of the *iambus*, and thus he was able to integrate a wider range of poetic devices.¹

While such analyses certainly provide very useful perspectives of Horace’s eclectic poetic style, they have a tendency to focus too much on the “lykambic” Archilochian prototype as the foundation for the iambic genre and overlook the greater social contexts of both the Greek *iambi* and Horace’s *Epodes*. Laurie O’Higgins examines the mythical origins of the iambic genre in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*. Despite the hymn’s status within the conservative epic tradition, O’Higgins suggests that the use of mockery within the hymn is markedly different than the kind of mockery seen in the epic tradition. Mockery in the epic tradition is characterized by highly negative “laughter of exclusion”, often aimed at the unexpected and “shameful” exposure of folly, age, ugliness, failure, or death.² On the other hand, the jesting of the serving girl Iambe in the *Hymn to Demeter* is marked as positive and within an inclusive social context: her jests not only console Demeter, but also consolidates the “carnival of women” which includes the mortal Eleusinian royal women and their servants, as well the goddess. Such a community replicates the common bond among women achieved during the ritual joking/blaming (*aischrologia*) practiced by women in their worship of Demeter.³ Such a practice was also seen in the cult of Dionysus. ⁴O’Higgins then speculates that the positive nature of the cultic “Iambic” tradition preserved in the hymn shifted dramatically in the seventh and sixth centuries as a result of a turbulent socio-political climate, in which there was division between those who supported “rule by the *demos*” and those who supported “rule by the *élite*.”⁵ Such chaos echoed the strife seen in the

kingdoms and oligarchies of Homeric Greece, and thus “blame poetry” returned to the negative, isolationist mockery seen in the Homeric epics.

Although the poetic act of “casting blame” became more associated with isolation and less with camaraderie, the act of isolating could still (paradoxically) embody the process of affirming social bonds. David Mankin analyses the social contexts and functions of Greek *iambus* in such a way as to include Horace’s *Epodes* into the generic realm of “blame poetry.” Mankin claims that the *iambus* ultimately served to reaffirm the common values of a community or group of people by casting blame upon those who threaten those values, and thus isolate the threat from the group.⁶ In focusing on the unifying function of Greek *iambus*, Mankin asserts that Horace (much like Archilochus) adapted the iambic genre in order to generate a poetic response to the socio-political chaos caused by civil strife. Interestingly, he also notes the relationship between *iambus* and symposium: because the *iambus* was typically addressed to members of a community to reaffirm common bonds, including the social bonds of *philotēs* (“friendship”, a word with a wide range of meaning comparable to that of Roman *amicitia*), social gatherings such as the civic assembly or the symposium served as ideal settings (real or imaginary) for the performance of *iambus*.⁷

Horace’s iambic criticism in the *Epodes* fundamentally aims at social reconstruction by highlighting the breakdowns in the Roman social structure as a result of civil strife. *Epodes* 1, 7, 9, and 16 deal with the topic of civil war, and demonstrate Horace as a patriotic Roman who detests fraternal strife. But, both R.O.A.M Lyne and V.G. Kiernan note that because of the uncertainty of the times,

Horace is careful not to vilify any specific political figure for causing civil strife, as a majority of the epodes are characterized by invectives against non-specific Roman characters (or the general Roman populace).⁸ It is not until *Epod. 9*, in which Octavian is about to triumph at the Battle of Actium, that Horace delivers a more direct political invective.

Most scholarship on *Epod. 9* focuses on historical problems of date and setting. Although the fixation on historical content in the scholarship of *Epode 9* is frustrating, the interpretations of date and setting nonetheless play a significant role in the analyzing Horace's response to civil war. Interestingly, much of these analyses of the historicity of *Epod. 9* hinge on the sympotic setting at the end of the poem:

*Capaciores adfer huc, puer, Scyphos
et Chia vina aut Lesbia
vel quod fluentem nauseam coerceat
metire nobis Caecubum.*

Bring here more spacious goblets, boy,
And the Chian or Lesbian wine
Or that which may repress flowing sea sickness
To distribute for us the Caecuban wine.

(*Epod.9.33-36*)

Franz Bücheler interpreted "nauseam" as implying real seasickness, thus testifying Horace's presence on Maecenas' ship at Actium⁹. Contrary to Büchler's historical approach, later scholars such as Eduard Fraenkel took into account Horace's poetic technique and the conventions of Greek poetry (including *iambi*), and understood the sympotic scene to be a fictional one.¹⁰ In a similar vein, Mankin also comments on the stylistic conventions of the poem, as a poem of Archilochus (frag. 4. 6-9) also suggests a nautical symposium, presumably in wartime.¹¹¹² Robert Gurval notes that the shifts of mood and action throughout the poem may suggest Horace's political ambivalence, opening enthusiastically with a call for drinking but ending with sickness and anxiety over an uncertain future.¹³

Arguments

Horace's personal involvement in the Roman civil war began in 44 B.C.E while studying at the Academy in Athens, where Brutus recruited him and other idealistic and impressionable young men to join the Republican cause. Despite his status as a freedman's son, he achieved the rank of *tribunus militum*, a senior office usually given to men born into the higher senatorial and equestrian classes. Horace fought at the Battle of Philippi two years later, where he witnessed the humiliating rout of the Republican forces at the hands of Octavian and Mark Antony. Although Octavian granted early amnesty to Horace and other members of the Republican party, Horace returned to Italy to find his property confiscated for the settlement of army veterans. He then solicited and won the patronage of Maecenas, a close friend and advisor of Octavian, the very man whose army Horace had fought against at the battle of Philippi in 42 B.C.E. Acutely aware of this embarrassment, Horace was very careful in making public political statements in his poetry (especially concerning the civil war) throughout his literary career.

Written between 42 and 32 B.C.E., Horace's *Satires* largely appear to focus on "image-management," actively distancing himself from political matters. For example, and in makes only a passing reference to one significant political event in which Maecenas is meeting with Octavian at Tarentum to negotiate with Anthony:

*huc venturus erat Maecenas optimus atque
Cocceius, missi magnis de rebus uterque
legati, aversos soliti componere amicos.*

(Sat.1.5, 27-29)

Also, in *Sat.* 2.6 he dismisses the nosy pestering from his friends concerning his status with the political in-crowd:

*quicumque obuius est, me consulit: 'o bone—nam te
scire, deos quoniam propius contingis oportet—,
numquid de Dacis audisti?' 'nil equidem.' 'ut tu
semper eris derisor.' 'at omnes di exagitent me,
si quicquam.' 'quid? militibus promissa Triquetra
praedia Caesar an est Itala tellure daturus?'
iurantem me scire nihil mirantur ut unum
scilicet egregii mortalem altique silenti.*

(*Sat.* 2.6. 51-58)

In the *Epodes*, Horace's political anxieties become much more prominent, but he focuses more on the social consequences of war, and even then only a handful of his poems directly concern the war itself (*Epod.* 1, 7, 9, 16). After the Battle of Actium, however, Horace's political anxiety largely disappears in his next body of work, the *Odes*. Any poems that refer to the civil war are limited to celebration and reflection (*Carm.* 1.37, 2.7) and the support of the new imperial regime (*Carm.* 1.2; The Roman Odes). *Carm.* 2.1 hints at anxieties of new threats of civil war, but Horace refrains from expressing himself further:

*Quis non Latino sanguine pinguior
campus sepulcris impia proelia
testatur auditumque Medis
Hesperiae sonitum ruinae?*

*Qui gurges aut quae flumina lugubris
ignara belli? Quod mare Dauniae
non decolorauere caedes?
Quae caret ora cruore nostro?*

*Sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis
Caeae retractes munera Neniae,
mecum Dionaeo sub antro
quaere modos leuiore plectro.*

(*Carm.* 2.1.29-40)

The subject of civil war largely disappears in the philosophical reflections of the *Epistles*, with only passing mentions of Actium (*Epist.* 1.18, 61: “partitur lintres exercitus, Actia pugna...”) and Horace’s participation in the Battle of Philippi (*Epist.* 2.2.49: “Unde simul primum me dimisere Philippi...”).

The *Epodes* in particular are a key turning point in Horace’s evolution as a politically conscious poet. Published at the end of the 30s, this collection contains seventeen poems of various lengths, styles, and subjects, but they are loosely modeled after the “blame poetry” of the Greek *iambus*. But before turning to the *Epodes*, we must examine the evolution of the iambic tradition in order to understand Horace’s motives in emulating the genre.

As mentioned above, the Greek *iambus* was developed in the archaic period in Greece, and possibly originated as a cult song associated with the Greek gods Demeter and Dionysus. It is said that *iambus* is named after the mythological figure Iambe (also known as Baubo, a minor cult goddess), a character who appears in a brief episode in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*. While the disguised Demeter was resting in the House of Celeus in Eleusis, Iambe’s mocking jokes (most likely sexual in nature) cheered the mourning goddess. The mythical “iambic” tradition employs “blame” as a mode of consolation, and the cults of Demeter and Dionysus adopted this prototype as a means of reaffirming bonds not only between fellow worshippers, but also between the unequal groups of mortals (like Iambe, the serving girl) and immortals (Demeter).

Iambus as a literary and social phenomenon developed in turbulent socio-political climate of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.E., with its most well known

practitioners (or “iambists”) including Archilochus of Paros and Thasos, Simonides of Amorgos, and Hipponax of Ephesus. Archilochus is largely considered to be the forefather of *iambus* as a literary genre. Much of his poetry appears to be concerned with personal affairs and contemporary public events, and one of his more political poems (Frag. 114) gives a perspective of the sociopolitical tensions that characterized the period.¹⁴ While his poetry displays a variety of tones, meters and subjects, Archilochus is most notoriously remembered for his harsh iambic poems, most especially those concerning his quarrel with Lycambes and his two daughters.¹⁵ Indeed, his invectives were said to be so abusive that they compelled Lycambes and his daughters to commit suicide.¹⁶ Although Horace prides himself as having been the first poet to introduce the iambic “matter and meter” of Archilochus to the Roman literary sphere, he claims that his own “iambi” (*Epodes*) are not in the abusive “lykambic” vein (*Epist.* 1.19.23-26). As we will see, Horace will contribute to the further evolution of the iambic genre.

Semonides of Amorgos was a contemporary of Archilochus, and his poetry included pessimistic moralizing (frag. 1-4) and obscene narratives (frag. 13-14, 16-18), as well as a denigrating “catalog of women” (frag. 7), much in the manner of Hesiod.¹⁷ The latest of the three iambists, Hipponax was an important innovator of the genre, as he invented the *scazon* (or *choliamb*: “limping iamb”) and experimented in epic parody (frag. 128-129). Like Archilochus, he employs language derived from everyday speech and delivers a few scathing invectives against his personal enemies.¹⁸ However, his verses were much admired for their burlesque wit, especially during the Hellenistic period, and in turn influenced the *iambi* of

Callimachus. Callimachus' *Iambi*, a collection of thirteen poems, are written in a variety of meters, dialects, and lengths. They do contain typical personal invectives (*Iambi* 1-5), but they also address a wide range of subjects which were not typically seen in the iambic tradition established by his archaic predecessors: a celebration of birth (*Iambi* 12), an epinician (*Iambi* 8), an epigram for Phidias' statue of Zeus at Olympia (*Iambi* 6), and *aitia* (*Iambi* 7-11). The poems which frame the work (*Iambi* 1,13) are literary polemics, the first satirizing the quarrelling of literary scholars, and the last is a defense against those who think that Callimachus (or any author) should confine himself to a single genre.¹⁹ While such a critique from fellow scholars probably aims at Callimachus' entire body of work, it is possible that the critique was aimed at the *Iambi*, since Callimachus had blended literary conventions from other genres into the iambic tradition. As we will see, Horace will do a little blending of his own, combining the conventions of lyric symposia and iambic "blame."

Given the great expansion of the genre from its mythical origins, it has proven very difficult to create a straightforward definition of *iambus*. Since *iambi* were composed in a variety of meters, meter alone cannot strictly classify the genre. Because of this, scholars will generally define *iambus* by its basic content. Thus, *iambus* is loosely defined as "blame poetry", in which with varying degrees of hostility the iambist addresses behaviors that his society or peer group (but not necessarily the iambist himself) deems inappropriate, dangerous, or subversive.²⁰ Because its subject largely depends on the values of the society in which it was composed, an iambus is typically addressed to an audience (real or imaginary; individual or general) from that same society, and serves to highlight persons or

behaviors that may threaten those values which bring them together as an audience. In other words, the *iambus* reaffirms social accord by condemning that which incites social discord. Because the *iambus* was typically addressed to members of a community to reaffirm common bonds, social gatherings served as ideal settings for the performance of *iambus*. Such settings included civic assembly and symposium.

The Greek symposium was inclusive by nature, as all guests were treated as equals. It not only presented an occasion for pleasurable recreation (drinking, music, conversation, sexual activity, and general displays of drunken buffoonery) but also for more serious occupations such as a ritualized hymning the gods, presentation of libations, and philosophical dialogue.²¹ The performance of poetry also reflected the inclusive nature of the symposium, as its subject matter ranged from politics, love, wine, current events, bawdy tales, and philosophical reflection.²² In uniting the public and private realms, the Greek symposium (and its poetry) presented a microcosm of the human experience. In comparison, the Roman convivium was more exclusive in nature, as guests were often arranged hieratically, and the poetry performed was traditionally limited to subjects of praise, typically of past leaders or a current patron.²³ Greek sympotic motifs in poetry were frowned upon as un-Roman only became fashionable with the rise of the elegiac poets in Horace's time.²⁴ If he had written within the exclusive traditions of Roman convivial poetry Horace's subject matter would have been limited to praise. However, by adopting the inclusive aspects of Greek symposium into his poetry, Horace would not only be able to write about a variety of human experiences, but also to expand his poetic functions, especially the function of consolation. Indeed, Gregson Davis

posits that the Roman convivium is the “supreme mode of consolation”, since it permits an occasion to reflect upon and alleviate the hardships of war through wine and poetic discourse.²⁵ Oswyn Murray suggests that by rhetorically incorporating the inclusive elements of Greek symposium into his *Odes*, he would, theoretically, be able to discuss subjects of state with as much authority as his superiors (such as Maecenas or Augustus).²⁶ At the same time, because of the convivium’s private setting, Horace would also be able to comment (either with praise or blame) on political affairs while avoiding a direct political statement.

As early as Homer, Greek poets celebrated the pleasures of wine and symposium within their poetry, and sympotic themes were especially a favorite topic among the Greek lyric poets. The “drinking song” often exhorts one or more other drinking fellows to relieve their cares and remain in the present by partaking in the consumption of wine.²⁷ The idea of remaining in the present moment may be reinforced by the presence of some sort of philosophical/mythical allusion or natural observation within the poem, but this is not necessarily present. Alcaeus provides an excellent example of this paradigm:

*Drink and get drunk with me, Melanippus.
Why do you suppose that when you have crossed
Eddying Acheron you will see the sun’s pure light again?
Come on, do not set your heart on great exploits:
Why, king Sisyphus, son of Aeolus, supposed that he,
Cleverest of men, was victorious over death:
But despite his cunning he crossed the eddying Acheron twice
At fate’s command, and king Zeus, son of Cronos,
Ordnained great toil for him under the black earth.
Come on, do nor hope for such exploits. Now, if ever,
While we are still young, we should take whatever enjoyment
of these things God may chance to give us.*

(Alcaeus, frag. 38a)²⁸

Although some of these poems appear to encourage excessively “drowning one’s sorrows” with wine, many poems caution the need for practicing “due measure”, censuring the symposiast for his inappropriate behavior.²⁹ In Horace’s sympotic poetry, the symposium aids the achievement of “meanness” in that the symposiast returns his cares to the present moment (the mean between the past and the future), and that the symposiast curbs his indulgences to what is appropriate to the occasion: if the occasion calls for it, “drowning” may still be acceptable.³⁰ This concern for measured behavior also appears in *iambi*:

*You drank unmixed wine in great quantities,
But did not pay your share...
You did not come invited as a friend:
Your belly misled your wits and brain
Into shamelessness...*

(Archilochus, frag. 124b)³¹

Of course, Archilochus is regarded as a poet of both the lyric and the iambic traditions, and the symposium is a subject that is common to both genres. Both traditions employ the sympotic setting (whether as a real performance setting or an imaginary setting within the poem) as an occasion for social unity and moral counsel. Both traditions condemn inappropriate behaviors, but they have different ways of reinforcing social unity. On the one hand, the lyric tradition reinforces social unity in that it seeks to rehabilitate the inappropriate behaviors or mindsets of the subject so that he may participate in the group, such as in the Alcaeus fragment above. On the other hand, the iambic tradition reinforces social unity by attacking the subject that threatens that unity, and thus alienates the threat from the group.

Given the defensive nature of the iambic genre, it is not difficult to see why Horace would choose to emulate the iambic tradition in his *Epodes*. As *iambus* aims

to affirm the social bonds within a community by attacking any threat to those bonds (as previously asserted by Mankin), Horace drew inspiration from the iambic tradition as an anxious response to the breakdown of social and political bonds during the final stages of the Roman Civil War. Most of the poems address unknown persons (generally classified as “stock characters”) who appear to be socially acquainted with the poet (or his persona within the poem), including friends, lovers, enemies, and general citizenry. Only five of these poems refer to (or directly address) one or more real political figures engaged in the Roman civil war, namely Maecenas (*Epod.* 1.4, 3.20, 9.4, 14.5), Octavian (*Epod.* 1.3, 9.2,18), Sextus Pompeius (*Epod.* 4.17-20, 9.7-8), Marcus Antonius, and Cleopatra (*Epod.* 4.17-20, 9.11-20, 27-32). All of these political figures converge in *Epod.* 9, a sympotic poem set during the highest point of tension in the Roman civil war, the Battle of Actium.

While *Epod.* 9 is not the first sympotic poem in Horace’s *Epodes*, it is the first example of a political theme placed within a sympotic context in his entire collection of poetry. The poem is a response to *Epod.* 1, where Horace addresses Maecenas upon his leaving for Brundisium, the embarking point of the Roman forces setting out for Actium. Although the presence of Horace (and even Maecenas, for that matter) at the Battle of Actium has not been fully determined, the dramatic form and setting of this poem would have the reader believe that Horace observed the battle on board Maecenas’ ship.

Horace is exuberant in demonstrating his patriotic pride in praising the victorious and vilifying the vanquished, but at the same time the dramatic shifts in mood in this poem suggest that the outcome of the Battle of Actium is still uncertain.

But win or lose, Horace and his fellow Romans will have to endure the consequences of this decisive battle.

The epode begins with Horace addressing his patron and friend, Maecenas, in a fashion reminiscent of lyrical invitations to dine:

*Quando repositum Caecubum ad festas dapas
victore laetus Caesare
tecum sub alta---sic Iovi gratum---domo,
beate Maecenas, bibam
sonante mixtum tibiis carmen lyra,
hac Dorium, illis barbarum?*

When shall I drink Caecuban reserved for festive
banquets overjoyed with Caesar's victory
with you —thus is Jove's pleasure—
under your lofty home, blessed Maecenas,
with the lyre sounding a song mixed with flutes,
that (song) Dorian, these ones foreign?

(*Epod.* 9.1-6)

Horace's question to Maecenas expresses joy and anticipates a future convivium in honor of Octavian's victory at Actium. He indirectly establishes the conditions necessary for this future convivium, namely the presentation of Caecuban wine³², the happiness of both Horace and Maecenas in the latter's residence, the presence of music, and most importantly, the victory of Octavian. However, this question posed by the poet is not fully answered until *Carm.* 1.37. The exclamation "for the pleasure of Jove" in the third line is echoed in line 17 of the sympotic *Carm.* 2.7, suggesting that the god's approval of the festivities is more likely a customary appeal to the gods during a symposium: "Therefore deliver the feast owed to Jove, and lay down your side tired by a long military service under my laurel, and do not spare the wine jugs intended for you" (*Carm.* 2.7.17-20). The particular appeal to Jove in line 3 is appropriate, as the god presided over Roman victory celebrations (as *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus*). This exclamation of divine endorsement also relieves any hint of negative consequences caused by the tense

social obligations of the past.³³ The references to Dorian and Phrygian songs have largely been dismissed as poetic embellishment, but these opposing modes may suggest something more. The Dorian mode was associated with warfare, while the Phrygian mode was associated with ecstatic revelry. While both modes might be appropriate for a festive occasion celebrating a military victory, their placement at the beginning of the poem could both anticipate and correspond to the poem's shifts in subject/setting (convivium, battle, convivium) and tone (the lightness of sympotic lyric followed by the belligerence of iambic).³⁴ As such, this reference could serve as a subtle hint to Horace's anxieties and uncertainties surrounding the immediate aftermath of Actium, but this anxiety will not be altogether obvious until the end of the poem.

While the lighthearted tone of the first six lines of the poem lends to the idea of a convivial invitation poem, the next section of the poem shifts to the expected accusatory strains that traditionally characterize the iambic genre. Horace parallels this anticipated victory celebration of Actium with the celebration of another great naval victory at Naulochus (almost exactly five years prior to Actium), where Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa (under Octavian) defeated Sextus Pompeius and eliminated the last of the major opposition to the Second Triumvirate. Lines 7-10 mark the shift from a convivial focus to a martial one, summarizing the battle at Naulochus and presenting the first invective of the poem:

*ut nuper, actus cum freto Neptunius
dux fugit ustis navibus
minatus Vrbi vincla, quae detraxerat
servis amicus perfidis.*

as not so long ago the Neptunian leader,
driven from the sea, fled with his ships burned,
having threatened chains to the city, which he had
removed as a friend faithless slaves

(*Epod.* 9.7-10)

“Neptunius dux” is clearly a sarcastic reference to Sextus Pompeius’ assumption of the title “son of Neptune” after his early naval victories. But “having been driven from the sea” upon his defeat and retreat from Naulochus, Sextus Pompeius’ title is now a bitterly ironic joke that the iambist may take full advantage of. In any case, Horace clearly presents him as a threat to Roman society, along with the great number of runaway slaves who joined his cause during the Sicilian Revolt. But some scholars believe that this scathing reference to a prior naval battle serves more as political propaganda than poetic allusion: Horace may have wanted to downplay the fratricidal element of both the Battle of Naulochus and the Battle of Actium by representing the first as a war against slaves and the second as a war against foreigners.³⁵ Moreover, it would not be difficult to imagine how “blame” poetry could be adapted as kind of straw man technique to divert attention away from undesirable truth of Octavian’s contribution to civil bloodshed by characterizing his enemies as “un-Roman,” and thus easier to blame. While later works of imperial propaganda support this idea of a literary “cover-up”, such an assertion assumes that Horace’s iambic attack against Rome’s enemies is evidence of his wholehearted allegiance to Octavian, and it also assumes the ignorance of the Roman people. The assertion of political propaganda on Horace’s part is challenged by the return to the Battle of Actium in line 11, where the identity of the subject of Horace’s second invective is not as definitively identified as the identity of the “Neptunian leader” in the previous section:

*Romanus eheu---posteri negabitis---
 emancipatus feminae
 fert vallum et arma miles et spadonibus
 servire rugosis potest
 interque signa turpe militaria
 sol adspicit conopium.
 ad hunc frementis verterunt bis mille equos
 Galli canentes Caesarem
 hostiliumque navium portu latent
 puppes sinistrorsum citae.*

Alas, a Roman soldier—you will deny it, posterity—
 Enslaved to a woman
 Bears stakes and arms and he is able
 To serve wrinkled eunuchs,
 And among the military standards
 The sun beholds her foul canopy.
 At this two thousand Gallatians turned away
 Their snorting horses, chanting Caesar,
 And the sterns of the hostile ships
 Mustered to the left lie hidden in port.

(*Epod.* 9.11-20)

While the “Roman soldier” in question is almost certainly a reference to Mark Antony, the fact that Horace chooses to identify him as “Romanus...miles” opens the possibility of a twofold attack: “Romanus...miles” can refer to the singular military leader, Mark Antony (himself already enslaved to Cleopatra), as well as his Roman forces as a collective. Horace laments the Romans’ complicity (under Antony) with a foreign enemy, and his ominous prediction of posterity’s denial of this treachery further emphasizes the tragic recognition of the role of his fellow countrymen in this supposedly “foreign” campaign. The phrase “emancipatus feminae” in line 12 recalls the “servis perfidis” in line 10: Like Sextus Pompeius, Mark Antony also appears to be leading an army of slaves. Moreover, Horace gravely insults the masculine “virtus” of Mark Antony and his army by characterizing them as not only enslaved to a foreign woman, but also to her *eunuchs*. Even the Galatians are apparently so disgusted with this behavior that they change sides and transfer their allegiance to Octavian!

The invocation to the personified god of Triumph in the next several lines would have the reader believe that the battle is already won. But if the battle were

indeed won, what would be the cause for an apparent delay in the festivities?

Horace assumes the persona of the average Roman, anxiously speculating possible

whereabouts of the defeated (but alive) Antony:

<i>Io Triumphe, tu moraris aureos currus et intactas boves?</i>		Hail, Triumph! Do you delay the golden Chariots and the untried bulls?
<i>Io Triumphe, nec Iugurthino parem bello reportasti ducem</i>		Hail, Triumph! You returned a leader equal [to Caesar] Neither from the Iurguthine War
<i>neque Africanum, cui super Karthaginem</i> 25		nor that of Africanus, whose <i>virtus</i>
<i>virtus Sepulcrum condidit.</i>		Raised him a monument over Carthage.
<i>terra marique victus hostis Punico</i>		Conquered by land and sea our enemy
<i>lugubre mutavit sagum.</i>		Has changed his Punic (purple) cloak for mourning.
<i>aut ille centum nobilem Cretam urbibus</i>		That man either seeks Crete famous for her hundred cities,
<i>ventis iturus non suis</i> 30		Ready to sail with winds not his own,
<i>exercitatus aut petit Syrtis noto</i>		Or the Syrtes harassed by the south wind,
<i>aut fertur incerto mari.</i>		Or else he is borne by the uncertain sea.

(*Epod.* 9.21-32)

This impatience for the delayed triumphal procession (and his private convivium, with Maecenas) implies that absolute victory isn't certain: The enemies of Octavian have surrendered and fled to an unknown place, but they have not been captured for triumphal procession. Although Rome's foreign enemies may no longer be an immediate threat, the only enemies left still capable of bloodshed (and of being captured for a triumphal procession) are fellow Romans.

With this tragic thought in mind, Horace ends his poem with a second convivium:

<i>Capaciores adfer huc, puer, Scyphos et Chia vina aut Lesbia vel quod fluentem nauseam coerceat metire nobis Caecubum.</i>		Bring here more spacious goblets, boy And the Chian or Lesbian wine or that which may repress flowing seasickness to distribute for us the Caecuban wine.
<i>curam metumque Caesaris rerum iuvat dulci Lyaeo solvere.</i>		It assists to loosen care and anxiety for Caesar's affairs With sweet Bacchus.

(*Epod.* 9.33-38)

Unlike the anticipated convivium described at the onset of the poem, this second convivium exists in the present moment. However, this present convivium is not characterized by joyful celebration, but by nausea, anxiety, and the excessive consumption of multiple kinds of wine. Recalling the first ten lines of the poem, only one of the necessary conditions for celebration have been met by the time this second convivium is described: the presence of Caecuban wine (line 36). “*Fluentam nauseam*” is commonly thought to refer to real sea-sickness (and thus attest Horace’s presence at Actium), but it could just as easily be taken as an upset stomach caused by a combination of severe anxiety and profuse drinking. Perhaps “*fluentam*” could be interpreted as a general state of flux, thus referring to Horace’s (and the general Roman public’s) exhaustion *ad nauseam* of the many sea battles (including both Naulochus and Actium) fought over the course of this drawn out civil war, and the fear of new conflict.

Horace frames his iambic attack against the enemies of Octavian with two lyric symposia: the first anticipates the pleasures of convivium and the reunion of two friends privately celebrating a public victory, while the second seeks to relieve anxieties of the future. The iambic attacks that separate the two sympotic scenes reflect Horace’s lingering anxiety that a joyful reunion with Maecenas may not yet be possible. As lines 27-32 suggest, the threat to social unity (Antony, along with Cleopatra) has been expelled, but not entirely eliminated. Moreover, being aware of this uncertainty, Horace may have employed elements of lyrical symposia to temper his iambic attack against Octavian’s enemies. In any case, the cause for this final convivium is not a victory celebration, but a lyrical consolation, a theme that will

continue into Horace's *Odes*, most notably the Cleopatra Ode (*Carm. 1.37*), and the Ode to Pompeius' homecoming (*Carm. 2.7*).

In his *Odes*, Horace turns away from the iambic model to console and counsel a post-Actian society, and to reflect upon the war itself. Observing the lighter lyric traditions of his Greek predecessors, many of these reflections occur in conjunction with sympotic motifs. However, Horace rarely makes such reflections strictly within the context of the Roman Civil War, let alone within a sympotic setting. As such, *Carm. 1.37* and *2.7* are two exceptional instances that include moral reflections of the Civil War within a sympotic setting.

Scholars tend to agree that the most datable of the two odes is *Carm. 1.37*, a sympotic poem celebrating the victory at Actium, and may have been the earliest composed poem in Horace's entire collection of *Odes*. Although not as definitively dated, *Carm. 2.7* may have also been composed not very long after the Battle of Actium, as soon after the battle Octavian granted amnesty to those who had opposed him in battle (including Horace's friend Pompeius, to whom the poem is addressed).

Carm. 1.37 is a response to *Epod. 9* in that it marks a private convivial celebration of the death of Cleopatra, having committed suicide to avoid the humiliation of surrender upon her defeat at Actium and the capture of Alexandria. It is also a continuation of *Epod. 9* in that it resumes the work of alleviating fears of war, while still calling attention to the divisions of the past. The poem details the moral transformation of Cleopatra from a "drunken" queen to a noble spirit who

takes her own life to avoid the humiliation of surrender. Like *Epod. 9*, this poem opens with a convivial scene³⁶:

*Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero
Pulsanda tellus, nunc Saliaribus
Ornare pulvinar deorum
Tempus erat dapibus, sodales*

Now there must be drinking, now with a free foot
the earth must be beaten, now would have been/was
the time to adorn the couch of the gods
with Salian feasts, drinking fellows.

(*Carm. 1.37.1-4*)

The convivium expressed by Horace comes at a timely occasion (“nunc”), and finally answers the question posed in *Epod. 9*. The “sodales” are not only permitted but also commanded (“nunc est bibendum...pulsanda”) to partake in a full-blown carousal. The declaration of a Salian feast further indicates extravagance. It becomes apparent in the second and third stanzas (lines 5-12) that there is once again not one, but two convivia being described:

*Antehac nefas depromere Caecubam
Cellis avitis, dum Capitolio
Regina dementis ruinas
Fumus et imperio parabat*

Before this, (it would have been/was) a wrong
to pull down Caecuban wine from ancestral cellars,
while for the Capitoline the queen was preparing
mad ruins and a funeral for the empire,

*Contaminato cum grege turpium
Morbo virorum, quidlibet impotens
Sperare fortunaque dulci
Ebria...*

with the polluted herd of men
foul with sickness, powerless to hope for
whatever it pleases, and with sweet fortune
drunk...

(*Carm. 1.37.5-12*)

Although both convivia conjure images of excess, the present convivium described at the onset of the poem is timely (“nunc est bibendum”) and positive, but this past convivium is characterized as untimely (“Antehac nefas...”) and perverted. It clearly recalls the final convivium of *Epode 9*, where Horace himself had already pulled down the Caecuban wine and excessively indulged himself in it, thus implicating himself here among the symposiasts guilty of such untimely “nefas.” But retuning to the poem, the hostess of this second convivium is a mad queen drunk

with fortune. The phrase “*fortuna dulci ebria*” also gives a moral tinge to Cleopatra’s drunkenness, as it echoes the *spes longa* that Horace advises in *Carm.* 1.11.

Interpreted with “*nefas*”, the phrase alludes to the idea that Cleopatra’s ambition is founded under false premises.

Lines 13-16 purposefully echo Horace’s attack on Antony and his troops in *Epod.* 9 (lines 11-14), as the participants of the convivium are described as polluted (“*contaminato cum grege turpium morbo virorum*”). While the word “*contaminato*” refers to the “polluted” bodies of Cleopatra’s eunuchs³⁷, the word could also refer to the perverted (or “emasculated”) virtue of Cleopatra’s followers, namely, the disgracefully “effeminized” Romans that were “enslaved” to a foreign enemy in *Epod.* 9. In characterizing Cleopatra’s convivium as untimely and her symposiasts as corrupted in mind and body, Horace portrays Cleopatra and her followers as morally misguided. In an iambic fashion, Cleopatra, her eunuchs, and Antony’s troops are all identified as threats to the Roman value of *virtus*.

Despite this jab, Horace is no longer primarily concerned with vilifying his enemy, as he was in *Epod.* 9, but rehabilitating his enemy: he transforms the behavior of his enemy in such a way that she is no longer a threat, and even possesses certain admirable virtues. Lines 13-16 mark the beginnings of Cleopatra’s moral transformation, with Octavian inspiring the initial spark:

...*Sed minuit furorem*

*vix sospes navis ab ignibus,
mentemque lymphantam Mareotico
redigit in veros timores
Caesar...*

...But scarcely one ship

safe from the flames diminished (her) fury
and Caesar drove back (her) mind
frenzied with Mareotic wine
to true fears...

(*Epod.* 9.13-16)

This blending of martial and convivial imagery praises Octavian, the keeper of Roman virtue, not only as a warrior pursuing his enemy, but also as the key rehabilitator of the frenzied leader of the perverted convivium. As the tides of battle turn in Octavian's favor, Cleopatra is forced to confront the fearful reality of her inevitable death ("veros timores")³⁸, and her conduct further transforms in lines 21-32:

*...Quae generosius
perire quaerens nec muliebriter
expavit ense nec latentis
classe cita reparavit oras;*

But she more nobly seeking to perish
Neither like a woman dreaded the sword
Nor to hidden shores
Recovered with her swift fleet

*ausa et iactentem visere regiam
vulto sereno, fortis et asperas
tractare serpents, ut atrum
corpore combiberet venenum,*

And having dared to behold her kingdom falling
With a serene expression, and courageous enough
To handle the harsh serpents, so that
She may drink the black poison into her body.

*deliberate morte ferocior;
saevis Liburnis scilicet invidens
private deduci superbo
non humilis mulier triumpho*

More ferocious with death having been decided;
Certainly begrudging to the savage Liburnian galleys
To be led away as a private citizen
Not a lowly woman in a proud triumph.

(Carm. 1.37.21-32)

The replacement of feminine traits with masculine traits ("Nec muliebriter... non humilis mulier") also indicates Cleopatra's submission to Roman *virtus*. Having been morally rehabilitated, Cleopatra takes a final drink of "venenum" (a symbolic substitute for wine, as implied by "combiberet") and achieves the ideal goal of the convivium: a release from earthly affairs.

As the convivial setting blurs the lines between private and public realms, Cleopatra's private triumph through a sympotic gesture serves to indirectly praise Octavian's public triumph, and Horace uses the former to elevate the latter. Also bearing in mind Horace's role as a moral poet, this ode could serve as cautionary

tale as to the consequences of inappropriate excess. Echoing the sentiments of the Epicureans in his “Carpe Diem” poems, the life and death of Cleopatra also reminds the symposiast (and the reader) to moderate his passions to what is appropriate for the occasion.

This poem relates to *Epod.* 9 not only in subject matter, but also to some of the basic elements of the iambic tradition. The poet identifies and briefly vilifies those that threaten the community and its values (Cleopatra et. al.), and he reminds his audience of how the common value which is responsible for reuniting the “sodales” (*virtus* personified by Octavian) was once under threat. Of course, this poem is obviously not meant to be taken as an iambus, since the primary function of this poem is consolation, not blame. However, Horace’s paraphrased iambic attack against Cleopatra and her allies serves not only to make her moral rehabilitation all the more impressive, but also to enhance Octavian’s role as a moral rehabilitator, and thus attest his capabilities as the leader of a new age of Roman history. Horace has restored hope within the present moment, and he implicitly reassures his audience that the future, too, looks brighter.

Having rehabilitated the enemies of *Epod.* 9 in *Carm.* 1.37, Horace is free to turn his focus to rehabilitating his personal relationships in *Carm.* 2.7 by celebrating the homecoming of his friend Pompeius. Horace and Pompeius had shared the pleasures of wine and the perils of war while campaigning with the Republican army of Brutus. When Octavian routed the Republicans at Philippi, the two friends were separated: Horace was “swept away by Mercury” and became a poet in Octavian’s circle, while Pompeius was swept further into the war and continued to

fight on the side of the Republicans. It is entirely possible that Pompeius is returning from the Battle of Actium, as line 16 may suggest the narrow channel (“fretis”) which separated the two promontories where Octavian and Antony set their camps. Furthermore, lines 4-5 suggest that he was among the Republicans whom Octavian had granted amnesty not long after the battle had ended. Horace celebrates the return of his friend by recounting their experience of union, separation, and reunion:

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

*Pompei, meorum prime sodalium, 5
cum quo morantem saepe diem mero
fregi, coronatus nitentis
malobathro Syrio capillos?*

*Tecum Philippos et celerem fugam 10
sensi relicta non bene parmula,
cum fracta virtus et minaces
turpe solum tetigere mento.*

*Sed me per hostis Mercurius celer
denso paventem sustulit aere; 15
te rursus in bellum resorbens
unda fretis tulit aestuosus.*

*Ergo obligatam redde Iovi dapem,
longaque fessum militia latus
depone sub lauru mea nec 20
parce cadis tibi destinatis.*

*Oblivioso levia Massico
ciboria exple, funde capacibus
unguenta de conchis. Quis udo
deproperare apio coronas 25*

Oh having been led down with me often
Into extreme circumstance
With Brutus as leader of the military
Who returned you as a Quirite

To your native gods and Italian sky,
Pompeius, first of my companions,
With whom I often broke the tarrying day with unmixed wine
Having been crowned with respect to the hairs
glistening with Syrian oil?

With you I experienced Philippi and the swift flight
With the little shield having been abandoned not well,
When virtue was broken and the menacing ones
Touched the foul earth with the chin;

But me frightened swift Mercury carried up
Through the enemy in a dense mist,
The wave swallowing you back again into war
Carried you on seething straits.

Therefore deliver the feast owed to Jove
And lay down your side tired by a long military service
Under my laurel, and do not
Spare the wine jugs intended for you.

Fill up the smooth wine cups with forgetful Massic,
Pour the perfume from the spacious shell.
Who cares to hastily make the crowns
With wet celery or myrtle?

*curatve myrto? Quem Venus arbitrum
dicet bibendi? Non ego sanius
bacchabor Edonis; recepto
dulce mihi furere est amico.*

Who will Venus declare as arbiter of the drinking?
I will not rave more sanely than the Thracians:
With my friend having been received
It is sweet for me to rage.

(*Carm.* 2.7)

The overall structure of the ode harkens back to themes of opposition and the fracturing of social bonds in the *Epodes*. In this case, social division and union are demonstrated via the opposition between bellum and convivium. Moreover, the structure directly imitates that of *Epode* 9: the images of battle are framed by two convivia, with the first being set in the past, and the second being set in the present. The first two stanzas are dedicated to the union of the two friends, in which they share the pleasures of convivium and the perils of war. The fourth stanza details their separation in the midst of the battle at Philippi, and the final three stanzas call for another convivium to celebrate their reunion. Unlike *Epode* 9, there is less emphasis on the battle and more emphasis on the convivia which surround it: 20 out of 28 lines are devoted to convivial in *Ode* 2.7, while only 12 out of 38 lines are devoted to convivia in *Epode* 9. This emphasis on convivia reinforces the fact that Horace is more concerned with his present reunion rather than the threats that caused their separation. As we shall see, however, this neither stops him from despairing this separation nor from casting blame altogether.

The use of polyptoton also contributes to the opposition between the private convivium with the very public catastrophe at Philippi. “Me...sustulit...te...tulit” (lines 13-16) emphasizes the abrupt separation of Horace and Pompeius, and thus contrasts the divisive nature of war to the unifying nature of convivium. “Coronatus” (line 7) and “coronas” (line 4) both appear in convivial contexts, but “coronatus”

appears in a luxurious convivium (suggested by *malobathro Syrio*) that took place before Philippi, a period in which Horace sympathized with the Republican cause. Having experienced the humiliation of the Republican defeat, the return to the simple and traditional “coronas” (with myrtle and/or celery) in the post-Philippi convivium suggests that Horace is gently reproaching himself for his failure to moderate his misguided passion for the Republican cause: Upon the reflection of the humiliating experience at Philippi, the initial convivium seems to have been tainted by misguided Republican ideals. Indeed, the polyptotonic expression of “Fregi” (line 3) and “fracta” (line 7) is particularly critical of Republican morality. “Fregi” is presented in the context of a lively convivium, a welcomed break to daily affairs, while “fracta” is a violent breakdown of Republican valor.

The manner in which Horace expresses the moral breakdown of the Republican army in *Carm.*2.7.12-13 strongly suggests a kind of iambic attack against Brutus. Porphyrio believes that “cum fracta virtus” not only refers to the strength and valor of the Republican army, but also Brutus’ Stoic *virtus*.³⁹ Nesbit and Hubbard also note the abrupt paradox, as one does not expect virtue to break.⁴⁰ Indeed, in declaring that Octavian’s forces broke the virtue of Brutus and the Republicans, Horace questions if the Republicans ever possessed true virtue.⁴¹

Having fought among the soldiers of questionable virtue, Horace’s own conduct is also called into question. Because he admits to fleeing the battlefield in line 10, Horace’s own conduct during the war is also called into question. However, this admission may be more literary than autobiographical, as the Greek poets Archilochus, Alcaeus, and (perhaps) Anacreon also confessed to have abandoned

their shields.⁴² Davis proposes that Horace makes this allusion to undermine the warrior ethos of achieving glory in death (a sentiment he may have once shared in his Republican days) in favor of returning to the life-affirming attitudes of lyric poetry and the convivium of the final stanzas.⁴³ The lyrical transformation of the Homeric allusion in the subsequent stanza (lines 13-14) supports this idea, as Mercury, the savior of lyric poets, bears Horace upward (“sustulit”). This Mercury could also double as a laudatory reference to Octavian (now Augustus)⁴⁴, and this merciful rescue could also symbolize Horace’s political (and moral) rehabilitation. Just as Venus bore Paris away from war to return him to amorous activities, so Mercury (and indirectly, Augustus) bore Horace away from war to return him to lyric activities. The poem ends on an Epicurean note: Horace invites his friend to join him in abandoning the politics of the past by drinking forgetful Massic (line 21) so that they may conduct a joyful convivium not founded on the false premises of Republican politics, but on a friendship in the present. The image of the laurel (line 19) symbolizes the poetic triumph of the war-weary symposiasts⁴⁵.

The structure of *Carm. 2.7* is immediately comparable to *Epod. 9* in that a battle is framed by two convivia. Also, like *Carm. 1.37*, this poem also contains some of the basic elements of the iambic tradition. The poet once again identifies and briefly vilifies those that once threatened social bonds, namely the bond between Horace and Pompeius. Furthermore, he reminds Pompeius of how the common value that reunites them was once under threat. Here, the common value is not *virtus*, but the sense of brotherhood facilitated by convivium.

Conclusions

Epod. 9, *Carm. 1.37*, and *Carm. 2.7* are all sympotic poems centered on the Roman Civil War, and possess elements from both the iambic tradition and the lyrical tradition. The incorporation of reflections of war into a sympotic setting permits Horace not only to criticize instances of moral failure within the public and private spheres, but also to reflect upon instances of moral triumph and a return to reason. The symposia that Horace presents within the iambic context of *Epod. 9* are characterized by his anxiety for the future. Horace incorporates iambic elements into the lighter lyrical symposia of *Carm. 1.37* and *Carm. 2.7* so that he may address and rehabilitate the anxieties present of *Epod. 9*. Such a blending of iambic and lyric elements only attests to the complexity of Horace's poetic style, and perhaps he saw the blending of such genres as a symbolic gesture of reunion in an age fraught with socio-political division.

Endnotes

¹ Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 32-36.

² Laurie O'Higgins, *Women and Humor in Classical Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 45

³ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 62.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁶ David Mankin, *Horace: Epodes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 8.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ R.O.A.M Lyne, *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 25. ; V.G. Kiernan, *Horace: Poetics and Politics* (New York: St. Martin's: 1999), 51-54

⁹ F. Bücheler, "Coniectanea," in *Index scholarum quae summis auspiciis regis augustissimi Guilelmi Imperatoris Germaniae*, ed. F. Bücheler (Bonn, 1878), 3-26

¹⁰ Fraenkel, *Horace*, 74.

¹¹ Mankin, *Horace: Epodes*, 159

¹² See translation of frag. 4 by Campbell: "Come on, go up and down the benches of the swift ship with your jug and remove the covers from the hollow casks: draw off the red wine right down to the lees: for not even we shall stay sober on this watch." David A. Campbell, *The Golden Lyre: The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 34.

¹³ Robert Gurval, "Posterī Negabitīs: Horace and Actium", in *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 140-141.

¹⁴ O'Higgins, *Women and Humor*, 63.

¹⁵ See Archilochus frag. 196a (known as the "Cologne Epode")

¹⁶ However, this legend may have arisen from a misunderstanding of the word *krypsantes* ("hanging their heads"), which Archilochus used to describe the family's humiliation. See C.A Trypanis, *Greek Poetry: from Homer to Seferis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 768.

¹⁷ P.E. Easterling and E.J Kenney, eds. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature Vol. 1: Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1985), 156-158.

¹⁸ Hipponax was supposedly insulted by two sculptors, Bupalus and Athenis of Chios, who sculpted caricatures of the iambist's ugly features. They, too, supposedly hanged themselves. *Ibid.*, 159.

¹⁹

²⁰ Mankin, *Horace: Epodes*, 8.

²¹ Timothy S. Johnson, "Symptotic Horace," in *A Symposium of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in Odes IV* (Madison, WI.: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), 12.

²² Jenny Strauss Clay, "Horace and Lesbian Lyric." in *A Companion to Horace*, ed. Gregson Davis (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 130.

²³ *Ibid.*, 129.

²⁴ Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 11.2; a reference to Cato's lost *Carmen de Moribus*

-
- ²⁵ Gregson Davis, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford, 1991), 149.
- ²⁶ Oswyn Murray, "Symposium and Genre in the Poetry of Horace", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 75, (1985), 49-5
- ²⁷ Campbell, *The Golden Lyre*, 31-34.
- ²⁸ Trans by Campbell.
- ²⁹ Campbell, *The Golden Lyre*, 36-38.
- ³⁰ Davis, *Polyhymnia*, 167-172.
- ³¹ Trans. by Campbell.
- ³² Caecuban is a highly prized wine usually reserved for special occasions (Pliny, NH. 14.8.61). A victory for Octavian would certainly merit a celebration with Caecuban wine. For a study on named wines and their appearances in the Horatian corpus, see Anne Lill, "Wine and a Trial of Character in Horace's Poems." *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol.11, No.1, (2000): 35-47.
- ³³ See Horace *Epod.* 1.
- ³⁴ Gurval, "Posteris Negabitur", 144.
- ³⁵ Francis Cairns, "Horace, *Epode* 9: Some New Interpretations." *Illinois Classical Studies* 8 no. 1 (1983): 83; L. Watson, "Epode 9, or the Art of Falsehood." In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. M. Whitby et. al. (Bristol and Oak Park, IL., 1987), 120-121.
- ³⁶ This ode takes its opening phrase from Alcaeus frag. 332, a sympotic poem celebrating the death of the tyrant Myrsilus.
- ³⁷ A. Holder and O. Keller, *Scholia antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum*, vol. 1: *Porphyrio*. (Leipzig 1894), 50: Cleopatra satellites et cubicularios habebat, quors morbo turpes dixit, quia fere hic effeminata sunt.
- ³⁸ Gregson Davis, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 237.
- ³⁹ A. Holder and O. Keller, *Scholia* vol. 1 (*Porphyrio*), 63
- ⁴⁰ Nisbet and Hubbard, *Commentary: Odes, Book II*, 114.
- ⁴¹ There is an intriguing comparison to be made between the invectives against Antony, Cleopatra, and Brutus. In *Epode* 9, Horace criticizes Antony for enslaving Roman *virtus* to a foreign woman and her eunuchs ("emancipatus feminae"), thus "emasculating" his *virtus*. In Ode 1.37, Horace characterizes Cleopatra as a demented drunkard, but she is rehabilitated in her submission to Roman *virtus* via Octavian, and her feminine traits are transformed ("nec muliebriter..."). In *Ode* 2.7, Horace characterizes Brutus as a Roman whose *virtus*, with all of its masculine connotations, has been broken, or "unmanned" ("cum fracta virtus...") Both Antony and Brutus are effectively emasculated for selling/breaking whatever *virtus* they had claimed to possess, while Cleopatra is implicitly endowed with masculine traits ("nec muliebriter...") when she submits herself to Roman *virtus*. In his *Epodes*, Horace's most severe invective occurs in *Epode* 7, a poem that disparages the Roman people, past and present, for perpetuating fratricidal bloodshed. This comparison suggests that Horace's iambic attacks are primarily reserved for Romans who slaughter fellow Romans.
- ⁴² Nisbet and Hubbard, *Commentary: Odes, Book II*, 112-114.
- ⁴³ Davis, *Polyhymnia*, 92.

⁴⁴ Horace, *Ode 1.2*, 41-44

⁴⁵ John L Moles, "Politics, Philosophy, and Friendship in Horace "Odes" 2,7".
Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica , New Series, Vol. 25, No. 1 (1987): 69.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Horace. *Epistles: Book I*. Edited by Roland Mayer. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Horace. *Epistles: Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*. Edited by Niall Rudd. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Horace. *Epodes*. Edited by David Mankin. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Horace. *Epodes and Odes: A New Annotated Latin Edition*. Edited by Daniel H. Garrison. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.
- Horace. *Satires Book I*. Edited by Emily Gowers. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Porphyrio. *Scholia antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum. Vol. 1*. Edited by Alfred Holder and Otto Keller. Leipzig, 1894.

Secondary Sources

- Bücheler, F. "Coniectanea," in *Index scholarum quae summis auspiciis regis augustissimi Guilelmi Imperatoris Germaniae*, ed. F. Bücheler (Bonn, 1878), 3-26
- Cairns, Francis. "Horace, *Epode* 9: Some New Interpretations." *Illinois Classical Studies* 8 no. 1 (1983): 80-93.
- Campbell, David A. *The Golden Lyre: The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets*. London: Duckworth, 1983.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. "Horace and Lesbian Lyric." In *A Companion to Horace*, edited by Gregson Davis, 128-146. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Davis, Gregson. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991.
- Easterling, P.E, and Kenney, E.J., eds. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature Vol. 1: Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1985.

-
- Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Gurval, Robert. "Posteri Negabitur: Horace and Actium." In *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*, 137-165. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Johnson, Timothy S. *Horace's Iambic Criticism: Casting Blame (iambikê poiêsis)*. Mnemoyne supplements. Monographs on Greek and Latin Language and Literature 334. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Johnson, Timothy S. "Symptotic Horace." In *A Symposium of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in Odes IV*, 3-26. Madison, WI.: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004
- Kiernan, V.G. *Horace: Poetics and Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Mankin, David. "The Epodes: Genre, Themes, and Arrangement." In *A Companion to Horace*, edited by Gregson Davis, 93-104. Chichester/Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Moles, John L. "Politics, Philosophy, and Friendship in Horace "Odes" 2,7". *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, Vol. 25, No. 1 (1987): 59-72.
- Nisbet, R.G.M., and Margaret Hubbard. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Nisbet, R.G.M., and Margaret Hubbard. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- O'Higgins, Laurie. *Women and Humor in Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Trypanis, C.A. *Greek Poetry: from Homer to Seferis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Watson, L. "Epode 9, or the Art of Falsehood." In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. M. Whitby et. al., 119-129. Bristol and Oak Park, IL., 1987.