

A DUET OF PRAISE: HORACE, VERGIL AND THE SUBJECT OF CANEMUS IN CARM. 4.15.32

By: [Jonathan P. Zarecki](#)

Zarecki, J. P. (2010) "A Duet of Praise: Horace, Vergil and the Subject of *Canemus* in *Carm.* 4.15.32."
Classical Journal 105.3: 245-263.

Made available courtesy of Classical Association of the Middle West and South: <http://www.camws.org/>

*****Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document.*****

Abstract:

The Vergilian references in *Carm.* 4.10-15 suggest that Horace and Vergil, not Horace and a Roman crowd, are the subjects of *canemus* in 4.15.32. Horace has resurrected Vergil through his poetry to help him praise Augustus, because a true encomium of the *princeps* lies outside the capabilities of Horace's lyric persona.

Article:

As the final word in Horace's poetic career, the *canemus* of *Carm.* 4.15.32 has garnered much attention; Putnam, for example, calls this "one of the most moving concluding words in literature,"¹ It is indeed striking that Horace ends his final ode with a plural verb, especially since the odes that end the first three Books are all concerned with the power of the poet, and focus on the poetic *ego*. The final two verses of *Carm.* 4.15 seem to indicate a celebratory scene of mirth and communal singing, and most scholars construe the greater significance of *canemus* as a symbol of Horace's exit, from the poetic stage and his departure into the crowd that will now take over the song in praise of Caesar.² I suggest instead that the subject of *canemus* is not Horace and an indeterminate number of others, but only Horace and Vergil.³

Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui
victas et urbis increpuit lyra,
ne parva Tyrrenum per aequor
vela darem. tua, Caesar, aetas

fruges et agris rettulit uberes 5
et signa nostro restituit Iovi
derepta Parthorum superbis
postibus et vacuum duellis

lanum Quirini clausit et ordinem 10
rectum evaganti frena licentiae
iniecit emovitque culpas
et veteres revocavit artis,

per quas Latinum nomen et Italiae 15
crevere vires, famaue et imperi
porrecta maiestas ad ortus
solis ab Hesperio cubili,

custode rerum Caesare non furor
civilis aut vis exiget otium,
non ira, quae procutit ensis
et miseris inimicat urbis. 20

non qui profundum Danuvium bibunt
edicta rumpent Iulia, non Getae,
non Seres infidique Persae,
non Tanain prope flumen orti;

nosque et profestis lucibus et sacris 25
inter iocosi munera Liberi
cum prole matronisque nostris
rite deos prius apprecati

virtute functos more patrum duces
Lydis remixto carmine tibiis 30
Troiamque et Anchisen et almae
progeniem Veneris canemus.

When I was thinking of singing about
battles and conquered cities, Phoebus
reproached me with his lyre not to set my
little sails over Tyrrhenian waters. Your era, Caesar,

has refreshed the crops and the fertile fields, 5
and restored to our Jupiter the standards
snatched away from the doorposts
of the arrogant Parthians,

closed the doors of the temple of Janus Quirinus,
now free from wars, restrained the licentiousness roaming 10
without proper order, removed our faults,
summoned again the ancient arts

through which the Latin name and the power of Italy
have grown and the reputation and majesty
of the empire was extended from the sun's western bed 15
all the way to its eastern rising.

As long as Caesar is the guardian of our affairs, neither
civil madness nor violence will disturb the peace,
nor will anger, which forges swords and
sets miserable cities at variance with one another. 20

Those who drink the waters of the Danube
will not break the Julian edicts, nor will the Getae,
nor the Seres nor even the perfidious Persians,
nor those born beside the banks of the river Tanais.

And we, both on ordinary days and on festive days, 25
among the gifts of jesting Liber,
first having worshipped the gods according to custom
with our offspring and our matrons,

with a song remixed for Lydian pipes we will sing of our leaders
who have lived up to the heroic valor of their ancestors, 30
and we will sing of Troy and Anchises
and the descendant of nourishing Venus.

To argue for Vergil's presence in the *canemus* of *Carm.* 4.15.32 is not innovative; the clear allusion to the *Aeneid* in the final two lines, *Troiamque et Anchisen et almae / progeniem Veneris*, assures us that he is there.⁴ But most scholars see Vergil's voice as one of a legion joining to sing the glory of Augustus. *Canemus* thus becomes inclusive rather than exclusive. Correspondingly, the addition of Vergil's voice has been seen as merely a demonstration of Horace's poetic power.⁵

Reconciling Vergil's epic voice with Horace's own lyric would be a poetic tour-de-force, especially if done "on Horace's own lyric terms."⁶ Yet if Horace merely intended to recast Vergilian epic as Horatian lyric, he would not have filled the last third of Book 4 with so many Vergilian allusions. The presence of Vergil and his poetry in *Carm.* 4.10-15 indicates that Vergil's voice is necessary for the completion of Horace's poetic undertaking in 4.15. The relationship between Horace and Vergil had been physically broken by Vergil's death, but in Book 4 Horace reconstructs it on both thematic and personal levels. The appearance of Vergil and his song allows Horace to transcend Phoebus' warning and create an Augustan encomium while remaining within the lyric genre.⁷ Horace does not resurrect Vergil merely to be another voice in the communal song. He resurrects him because *Carm.* 4.15 is a song for only the two of them to sing.

Arguing that *canemus* has only Vergil and Horace as its subject allows us to join Fowler's assertion that true Horatian panegyric is impossible with Johnson's claim for lyric's requirement of inclusivity. Horace cannot sing his encomium for Augustus by himself. When the time comes for a full-blown Augustan encomium, he finds the assistance he requires not in the urban mob of Rome but in, his friend and colleague Vergil, who had already provided both the subject and the song. In *Carm.* 4.10-14, Horace brings Vergil's poetry—and their friendship—into sharp focus in order to combine Vergil's song with his own in a final panegyric for Augustus. In 4.10, he begins to interweave Vergil's presence into the final third of Book 4. The theme of reflection—the very backbone of 4.10—is built around the intertextuality of Horace's songs with Vergil's.⁸ The first line of 4.10, *o crudelis adhuc et Veneris muneribus potens*, repeats the title of *Ecl.* 2, *o crudelis Alexi, nihil mea carmina curas*, a parallel noted by commentators since at least Pseudo-Acro's time (4.10.1 Keller).⁹

The presence of the title of *Ecl.* 2 would by itself be enough to recall Vergil, just as the last two lines of *Carm.* 4.15 recall him by their paraphrase of *A.* 1.1. But by repeating the title of Vergil's poem and then producing a new poem rather than a mere adaptation of the earlier work, Horace also recalls the song exchange between Menalcas and Mopsus in *Ecl.* 5.85-7:

Hac te nos fragili donabimus ante cicuta.
haec nos "formosum Corydon ardebat Alexim,"
haec eadem docuit, "cuium pecus? an Meliboei?"

I will give to you this fragile little pipe made of hemlock.
It taught me the song "Corydon burned for beautiful Alexis,"
And this one as well, "Whose flock is this? Is it Meliboeus?"

Menalcas, the older poet, hands over both his reed and his song (*Ecl.* 2) to the younger Mopsus, much as Vergil has in a fashion handed over his songs to Horace. Horace thus offers his reader a hint as to what he will do with the following five odes, particularly 4.14 and 4.15. He will take his lead from Vergil and will produce new songs—in lyric meters on Vergilian subjects. The recasting of Vergil's poetry finds its ultimate expression in *Carm.* 4.15.31-2, as I argue below.

The theme of reflection and remembrance introduced in 4.10 continues in 4.11, the invitation to Phyllis on the occasion of Maecenas' birthday.¹⁰ In this ode, Maecenas makes his only appearance in Book 4. But his final appearance in Horace's odes mirrors his first. As the addressee of *Carm.* 1.1, Maecenas presides, in a manner of speaking, over the entirety of Books 1-3. Though he is not the addressee of 4.1, his appearance in Book 4 is nonetheless emphatic, coming as it does in the exact midpoint of 4.11.¹¹ Maecenas' reintroduction should not be seen as a rescue from forced retirement as a literary patron.¹² Rather, Maecenas signals a return to the subjects of the first three odes of Book 1.¹³ *Carm.* 4.10 has already brought Vergil back to the collection by recalling the *Eclogues*, and Maecenas' presence in Book 4 firmly establishes the resurrected poetic circle.

The poetic exchange with Vergil in *Carm.* 4.10 and the appearance of Maecenas in *Carm.* 4.11 create the expectation that Augustus will be the focus, if not the recipient, of *Carm.* 4.12. Maecenas, Augustus and Vergil received the first three odes of Book 1, and this grouping represents the only instance in Books 1-3 where the three men receive consecutive dedications. But Horace defies this expectation, and the effect is jarring. In place of an address to Augustus, he presents the reader with a morose invitation in 4.12 for Vergil to join him at a spring symposium.¹⁴ Horace, it seems, is not yet ready to dedicate a poem to the *princeps*. Instead, he continues to place Vergil at the center of his poetic program.

The connection between the place of this poem in the cycle of *Carm.* 4.10-15 and its relation to the *canemus* of 4.15.³² assumes that the Vergil mentioned in 4.12 is to be identified with the author of the *Aeneid*. There can be little doubt that this is so.¹⁵ It would be odd for

Horace to create an ode so reminiscent of the poet if he did not intend his audience to make that assumption. And even if he was referring not to *Vergilius poeta* but to *Vergilius mercator*, the Vergilian allusions constitute, as Kirby notes, "an undeniable bond between Horace's poem and the poetry of Vergil."¹⁶ The following poems, especially 4.15, continue to use Vergilian themes, constantly reinforcing the presence of *Vergilius poeta*, or at least his poetry, in this ode.

In *Carm.* 4.12, Vergil is to be guest of honor at the symposium, and his attendance is of the utmost importance. Without Vergil and the gift he will bring (*tua merx*, 4.12.21-2) there will be no party. That he has passed away will provide no barrier; if Vergil himself cannot be present, at least his poetry can. It is the *merx* that will pay for the cups of wine Horace will provide.¹⁷ By addressing the poem to Vergil, Horace has resurrected him, and by making his poetry the necessary contribution for the symposium to take place, he recalls 4.10 and invites his readers to reflect again on Vergil. Once Horace has received this gift from Vergil, he will offer tribute to his fellow poet by recasting Vergilian themes, particularly those found in the *Aeneid*, into lyric verse. To that end, *Carm.* 4.12 provides a thematic introduction to *Carm.* 4.13-15, where themes of the *Aeneid* are given lyric treatment. Finally, in 4.15 Horace combines the familiar Golden Age and martial themes of Vergil's works in a lyric panegyric to Augustus to be shared with his friend.

Following this second ode concerned primarily with Vergil and his poetry, Horace interjects *Carm.* 4.13, a short poem to his former lover Lyce.¹⁸ This ode may seem a sudden departure from the reconstruction of the Maecenaic circle and the reflection on Vergil. But 4.13 continues the Vergilian intertextual allusions begun in 4.10 and made explicit in 4.12, by providing a Horatian interpretation of one of the most important passages in the *Aeneid*: Dido's verbal assault on Aeneas and her subsequent suicide. As in *Carm.* 4.10 and 4.12, Horace envisions Vergil as having handed over his songs for Horace's lyric use. *Carm.* 4.13 combines with 4.14 to form a pair of poems that treat two major themes of the *Aeneid*, lost love and military battles. Though these topics are themselves unremarkable in Augustan poetry, Horace sets up the expectation that *Carm.* 4.13 will also touch on something Vergilian, as *Carm.* 4.10-12 have done.

Two aspects of *Carm.* 4.13, one philological, the other thematic, highlight its place within the Vergilian scheme of *Carm.* 4.10-15. The main theme of the ode is Horace's *Schadenfreude* at Lyce's unkind yet prayed-for aging (4.13.1-6). He gleefully describes the departure of Venus from her life (*quo fugit Venus*, 4.13.7) and warns that even lust-filled young men will laugh at this shell of a woman, described as *dilapsam in cineres facem*, "a fire

fallen into ash" (4.13.28). The harshness of Horace's attack on Lyce mirrors the vitriolic assault of Dido on Aeneas in *Aeneid* 4, albeit with the roles reversed. In *A.* 4.553-705, Dido both pines for and curses her lover; the surreptitious escape in the middle of the night of Aeneas, Venus' son, marks the departure of Venus herself from Dido's life.¹⁹ Spurned by Aeneas, Dido takes her own life, and Vergil describes the departure of her soul as *dilapsus calor atque in ventas vita recessit* (4.705). The line is thematically similar to *Carm.* 4.13.28, *dilapsam in cineres facem*, and the recurrence of *dilapsus* indicates a further connection. The word is uncommon in Vergil and Horace, and appears nowhere else in other poets of the period.²⁰ When read against the background of Vergilian intertextuality in the final poems of Book 4 and the song-exchange indicated in *Carm.* 4.10 and 4.12, the similarity of usage and the paucity of occurrences of the word in other Augustan poets indicate a deliberate connection between *Carm.* 4.13.28 and *A.* 4.705.

The theme of past and present, touched on briefly in *Carm.* 4.10, is central to *Carm.* 4.13.²¹ In the previous two odes, Horace's lyric has proved able to conquer time itself; through Horace, both Phyllis, the nominal dedicatee of 4.11, and Vergil can once again enjoy life and, the songs appropriate to the symposium.²² Lyce, on the other hand, cannot escape the inevitable march of time. She has grown old and will soon be snuffed out like a torch. Horace's lyric, unlike Lyce herself, transcends time through what Putnam describes as "incursions of temporality" that recall the immortalizing power of the poet.²³ The ability of poets to create monuments more lasting than bronze and to eclipse time itself will be central to *Carm.* 4.15. In that ode, Horace (and Vergil) bestow on Augustus the ability to transcend the finality of the past (by restoring the Golden Age, 4.15.4-16) and the uncertainty of the future (through his continued rule, peace will reign eternally, 4.15.17-18). Without coincidence, Horace begins 4.15 with the perfect tense verb *increpuit* and ends it with the future *canemus*.

The penultimate ode in the collection continues to play with Vergilian themes and wording. In the guise of an encomium for Drusus and Tiberius and their military victories, *Carm.* 4.14 exhibits Vergilian influence through numerous recollections of the second half of the *Aeneid*. In addition, 4.14 completes the cycle of addressees from *Carm.* 1.1-3: 4.11 for Maecenas, 4.12 for Vergil, and now 4.14 for Augustus.

The influence of the *Aeneid* is omnipresent in *Carm.* 4.14, not only in style but in content.²⁴ Johnson has documented a number of parallels between the depiction of Tiberius in this ode and the heroes in the *Aeneid* who are under the influence of *furor*, and he notes that "the panegyrist's Tiberius would be right at home among the heroes of the Iliadic *Aeneid*."²⁵ In addition, the list of foreign peoples who will venerate Augustus in *Carm.* 4.14.41-8 recalls the list of people and places Augustus will conquer in *A.* 6.794-800.²⁶ Though Drusus and Tiberius are the victorious generals in *Carm.* 4.14, they are acting under Augustus' authority, and the victories are thus his; all the lands they subjugate will venerate the *princeps*, not his adopted sons (*te venerantur*, 4.14.51-2). Augustus' victories have in fact never ended; for example, Tiberius' triumph over the Rhaeti happened on the same day that Augustus took Alexandria (4.14.34-40). The overwhelming repetition of *tu/ tuus* (ten instances in the last twenty lines of 4.14) reinforces the notion that these new victories are in reality an extension of Augustus' successes.²⁷

Given that Horace has prominently displayed Vergil and his poetry in the preceding four odes, it is unsurprising to find Vergilian influence in *Carm.* 4.14, especially since the ode is presented as an encomium of Augustus and the imperial family. After all, Vergil cast Augustus as the culmination of Rome's evolution in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*. Horace has also composed his Vergilian-themed encomium using a poetic vocabulary and structure that are unusual for him.²⁸ Though the themes of encomium are by no means unique to Horace and Vergil (and we may also see a connection with Prop. 3.4), the manner in which Horace composes them sets them apart from his previous poetic endeavors. Behind the facade of a praise poem for Augustus' sons is a Vergilian subtext in *Carm.* 4.14 that carries forward the Vergilian allusions in the preceding odes. In *Carm.* 4.10, Horace implied that Vergil had handed over his song for Horace's superior piping skills. Again in *Carm.* 4.12, the theme of song-exchange was repeated, as Vergil brought his songs to the symposium and Horace reciprocated by singing on similar themes. In *Carm.* 4.13, Horace gave the theme of love lost—which Vergil had tackled in *Aeneid* 4—his own lyric twist. Here, in *Carm.* 4.14, Horace attempts to sing battles and victories, as Vergil did in the last

six books of the *Aeneid*. The recurrence of Vergilian material has repercussions for the interpretation of *Carm.* 4.15.

The culmination of the Horatian treatment of Vergil's works comes in *Carm.* 4.15. The ode draws from the entirety of the Vergilian corpus to create a duet of praise for Augustus. Horace makes this an unmistakably Vergilian ode in structure and content, with an explicit reference to the Vergilian *recusatio* in the first stanza, Golden Age imagery reminiscent of the *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and even the *Aeneid* in the second through seventh stanzas, and the use of the *Aeneid's* opening lines to conclude Book 4 in the eighth and final stanza.²⁹ Through this abrogation of Vergil's works, Horace sings true panegyric in lyric guise, using the well-worn motifs of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*.

Carm. 4.15 begins with a direct reference to Vergil's *recusatio* in *Ed.* 6.3-5, the first-known occurrence of a motif that became a favorite of the Augustan poets.³⁰ Horace used the *recusatio* frequently before *Carm.* 4.1.5,³¹ but his language parallels Vergil's so closely in no other poem (*Ecl.* 6.3-5 and *Carm.* 4.15.1-4):

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
vellit et admonuit: "pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen."

When I would sing of kings and battles, the Cynthian god
plucked my ear and warned me, "Tityrus, a shepherd
should graze a fat sheep, but sing a slender song."

Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui
victas et urbes increpuit lyra,
ne parva Tyrrenum per aequor
vela darem.

When I was thinking of singing of battles and
conquered cities, Phoebus reproached me with his lyre
not to stretch out my tiny
sails over Tyrrhenian waters.³²

The *recusatio* at the opening of 4.15 imbues the entire ode with a Vergilian context and indicates that Horace is still working within the lyric genre.³³ But we should not see Horace as refashioning lyric to fit epic themes; rather, he is refashioning epic to fit lyric models, as he also did in *Carm.* 4.13 and 4.14. By making Vergil's "fat sheep" suitable for his "tiny sails," Horace emphasizes the inclusive nature of the *recusatio*.³⁴ This inclusivity creates a poem in which Horace supplies the meter and Vergil the subject, a situation foreshadowed in *Carm.* 4.10. The adaptation of Vergil's work allows Horace to demonstrate his poetic power by converting epic into lyric, while simultaneously allowing him to maintain his slender Muse.

Though Horace professes an inability to sing epic and/or encomiastic poetry, *Carm.* 4.15 is arguably an example of both. But Horace couches his praise in the repetition of Vergilian themes, particularly from the *Eclogues*, making the song only partially his own. The poem is perfectly balanced: the first stanza is the Vergilian *recusatio*, the middle six stanzas recall Vergil's Golden Age in the *Eclogues* and the achievements of Augustus in the *Aeneid*, and the final stanza paraphrases the *Aeneid*. We can thus trace the evolution of Augustus' worthiness for a panegyric song. The *recusatio* indicates that he is indeed worthy of the song, although Horace is incapable of singing it. In the list of Augustus' deeds in stanzas 2-7 we almost see Horace's will breaking. Augustus has, after all, ensured peace, prosperity and order in the Roman world; perhaps a lyric poet could make an exception for such a man. Finally, in the last stanza, Horace does not offer his own encomium, but instead takes Vergil's honorary epic and bends its subject matter to the lyre.

In the description of the benefits of Augustus' rule (stanzas 2-4), Horace uses a number of verbs with the *re-* prefix, indicating the return or restoration of previous institutions or times. These verbs (*rettulit*, *restituit* and *revocavit*) point to what Fraenkel terms "a fundamental ideology underlying the regime of Augustus,"³⁵ who took pains to show that his rule was not a revolution but a restoration of the traditional *res publica*.³⁶ Horace's use of *re-* prefix verbs in *Carm.* 4.15 may also direct the reader to the source of his inspiration, or at least to the works he thought proper for the praise of the *princeps*. The imagery in 4.15.5-16 draws from a wide variety of Vergilian treatments, as had several of Horace's earlier works concerned with praising Augustus or Golden Age imagery.³⁷ Caesar's *aetas* has restored the crops and peace and brought back the ancient arts by which Rome grew great (4.155-12). Each boon has a thematic parallel in *Ecl.* 4, and the phrase *fruges et agris rettulit uberes* is reminiscent of the incipit of the *Georgics*.³⁸ Golden Age imagery is common in Augustan poetry and ideology, and by itself requires no comment.³⁹ But as we have seen in the context of *Carm.* 4.10-14 and in the opening of 4.15, Horace has created the expectation of Vergilian intertextuality in 4.15. He has thus likely borrowed from Vergil here rather than from some universal current theme in Roman poetry.

With peace restored and Rome on the threshold of a new Golden Age, Horace presents his reader with the most significant Vergilian echo in the series *Carm.* 4.10-15: *Troiamque et Anchisen et almae / progeniem Veneris canemus* (4.15.31-2). The connection with *A.* 1.1, *arma virumque cano Troiae qui primus ab oris* is generally acknowledged.⁴⁰ The connection in 4.15.31-2 of Aeneas with Augustus, himself *a progenies Veneris* by virtue of his adoption by Julius Caesar, has also been widely noted.⁴¹ As mentioned above, it is no innovation to make a claim for Vergil's voice in the *canemus* of line 32 based on this paraphrase of the *Aeneid*. But the manner and setting of the *Aeneid* reference are of interest.

Horace asserts that *Carm.* 4.15.32 will be *Lydis remixto carmine tibiis*, "a song remixed for Lydian pipes." Coffin identifies this *remixtum carmen* as a sign that Horace has "taken a literary tradition and made it relevant to a contemporary audience."⁴² This "remix" of Vergil's song adapts the *Aeneid* to the generic constraints of Horatian lyric.⁴³ In *Carm.* 4.10, Horace recalled the exchange of songs between the elder wordsmith Menalcas and the younger, more skilled Mopsus. Here that exchange is applied: verses belonging to Vergil are combined in the meter and sympotic setting belonging to the younger poet Horace. Horace thus combines the dialogue created by the song-exchange in *Carm.* 4.10 and 4.12 with the sympotic setting of 4.11, 4.12 and 4.15, adapting Vergil's panegyric epic to fit his slender lyric.

The *remixtum carmen* Horace has created is a mixture of two songs: Vergil's and his own. Harrison has seen in *Carm.* 4.15.31-2 a "guest-host" relationship: the epic "guest" material is fitted modally into the generic framework of the "host" lyric." If we return again to *Carm.* 4.12, we will remember that Horace has not extended an invitation to the symposium to anyone but Vergil. The party will have a single guest entertained by a single host, and the song exchange will take place between them alone. Since the lyric verses of *Carm.* 4.15.32 contain no song but Vergil's *Aeneid*, only two poets are present.

In *Carm.* 4.12.28 Horace reminded Vergil *dulce est desipere in loco*, "it is sweet indeed to go out of one's mind for a moment." The implication is that by drinking numerous cups of *pressus Liber* (4.12.14) Vergil and Horace will succumb to the influence of the god and will be able to *misce stultitiam consiliis brevem*, "mix a little bit of silliness with wit" (4.12.27). In *Carm.* 4.15.26, we learn that the singing will happen *inter iocosi munera Liberi*, "among the gifts of jesting Liber." Liber, of course, causes men to go out of their minds, and *Carm.* 2.19 and 3.25 indicate that he causes Horace to praise Augustus openly and in new ways (3.25.7-8).⁴⁵ Horace would be a poor host indeed if he did not allow his guest to join him in his song, especially after entreating him to do so. Thus in 4.15.31-2, under the influence of Liber, the invitation extended to Vergil in 4.12 finds its ultimate expression in the song about Aeneas and Anchises, a song with but two vocalists: Horace and Vergil.

Though each ode from *Carm.* 4.10 through 4.14 contains references and allusions that create the expectation of Vergil's appearance at the end of *Carm.* 4.15, this expectation alone does not preclude objections to an exclusive reading of *canemus*. There is indeed a movement within 4.15 from the first-person singular (as seen in the *recusatio*) to the first-person plural (in the *nostro Iovi* of line 6 and the *canemus* of the last line), indicating a

shift from the individual to the collegial.⁴⁶ It is also true that Greek lyric, which Horace has adopted for his own use, is by its very nature communal. There must be others to share in the song for lyric to have power, either through singing or listening, and Horace does not hesitate to invite a wide variety of people to join him or to place his song in the mouths of others.⁴⁷ The verb *canere* itself indicates Horace's self-portrait as a poet of public performance, and we should expect multiple voices in the public performance in 4.15.32.⁴⁸ The question is whose voices these are.

On the whole, Horace is careful in the *Carmina* to name those with whom he sings. He uses first-person forms of *canto* and *cano* eight times, four times in the singular (1.10.5, 2.2.10; 3.1.4; 4.2.49) and four times in the plural (1.6.19; 2.9.19; 3.28.9; 4.15.32).⁴⁹ In the case of the singulars, Horace is speaking for himself, or at least as the individual performer of the ode. In the case of the plurals, the subjects are carefully noted, even if Horace means only himself. In 1.6.19 and 3.28.9, he employs the poetic plural,⁵⁰ while at 2.9.19 he enjoins Valgius—and only Valgius—to stop weeping and join him in singing Augustus' praises. It is unlikely that Horace would now, in the final poem of his collection of 103 odes, suddenly employ *canemus* as an unspecified plural in contradiction to his consistent previous use of the word.

One might object that *Carm.* 4.15 ends in a communal setting. The sympotic element in the final stanza is indicated by the phrase *nosque ... more patrum*, which some scholars have taken as evidence of Horace's revival of a lapsed tradition of banquet songs. In that case, *canemus* must have an indeterminate number of subjects.⁵¹ There are two problems with this thesis: there is no firm evidence that such songs existed, and, more important, the presence of a sympotic allusion or setting in 4.15 does not lessen the association with Vergil, and indeed strengthens it.⁵² In 4.12, Horace invited Vergil to a drinking party at which Liber would be present (4.12.14). The god of wine reappears in *Carm.* 4.15, or rather his gifts do (*munera Liberi*, 4.15.26). By reintroducing Liber in 4.15, Horace recalls the symposium of 4.12, the last primarily sympotic poem in Book 4. The recollection of the wine, and with it the metaphor of wine as poetry, is emphatic. Only after the reintroduction of wine/poetry in stanza seven does Horace offer his bold paraphrase of the *Aeneid* (4.1529-32), again recalling his involvement in the gift-exchange of 4.10 and 4.12.

A further objection to the exclusivity of *canemus* might arise from comparison of the final stanzas of *Carm.* 4.5 and 4.15, which form a thematic pair. But the Vergilian overtones of *Carm.* 4.10-15 make it difficult to see the *dicimus* of 4.5 and the *canemus* of 4.15 as indicating similar communal celebrations.⁵³ 4.5, a prayer for Augustus' return to the city after a long absence, ends as follows (4.5.37-40):

"longas o utinam dux bone, feries
praestes Hesperiae!" dicimus integro

sicci mane die, dicimus uvidi
cum sol Oceano subest.

"O blessed leader, furnish long-lasting
peace for Italy!" We say this, parched,
when the day is still whole in the morning; and say it drunk,
when the sun has sunk beneath the ocean.

Du Quesnay and others have identified the style of this poem as Pindaric, following the *klētikōn* motif described by Menander Rhetor.⁵⁴ As Pindaric odes are meant for a chorus, the two occurrences of *dicimus* in 4.5.38-9 identify the singer as a representative of the Roman people and declare that he is joining his voice with theirs during libations and prayers for Augustus. As 4.5 is a public song, *dicimus* makes the poet's voice equal to that of the crowd, though they remain a nameless group. The end of 4.5 does contain a banquet scene similar to that at the end of 4.15, and both odes are panegyrics for Augustus. Both also follow poems of praise for the imperial family, and these parallels might suggest that *canemus* in 4.15 is indicative of Horace's self-inclusion in the nameless group gathered for another celebration of Augustus. But when read against the Vergilian

intertextuality and recollection in 4.10-15, and the exclusivity of the Horatian *canere*, the *dicimus* of 4.5 and the *canemus* of 4.15 cannot indicate the same situation.

In conclusion, Horace takes great care to infuse the last six odes of Book 4 of the *Camilla* with linguistic and thematic parallels to Vergil's poetry. These parallels build on one other and create the expectation that Vergil will appear and help Horace close his final Book. Horace's lyric persona is incapable of singing pure encomium without assistance, and he looks to the encomiastic poetry of Vergil for assistance to eulogize Augustus. Horace first recreates the poetic circle around Maecenas with 4.11 and 4.12 (and to a lesser extent 4.10). Then, through the repetition in 4.10 and 4.12 of the song exchange central to Vergil's fifth *Eclogue*, he crafts two odes (4.13 and 4.14) that treat Vergilian themes with lyric meters. Finally, in 4.15 Horace borrows wholesale from the *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid* to create a lyric panegyric for Augustus. The final verb of 4.15, *canemus*, indicates a joint song. Horace's resurrection of Vergil and his adaptation of Vergil's epic poetry for his own lyric use in the five odes preceding 4.15 culminates in a song that belongs to only two voices: Horace's and Vergil's.⁵⁵

Notes:

¹ Putnam (1986) 290, because "*canemus* is looking as it does to constant futurity in song, to new beginnings, not finality."

² Oliensis (1998) 152-3, for example, views *canemus* as Horace's erasure of himself from the poem and his forfeiture of poetic independence, perhaps due to Augustus' commissioning of Book 4 from the unwilling poet; see Suet, *V.H.* 220-5. On the problems, especially chronological, with Suetonius' assertion, see Fraenkel (1957) 364-5; Du Quesnay (1995) 131-5; Hills (2001) 615-16. Lowrie (1997) 326-52, on the other hand, views the verb as a powerful statement of Horace's presentation and control of the lyric genre, a carefully staged withdrawal of his own voice from the conflict between hymn and narrative, while Fowler (1995) 245-64, commenting on the impossibility of Horatian panegyric of Augustus, believes *canemus* to be much more ironic. Johnson (2004) 201-12 views the final plural as a statement of the inclusivity of lyric: Horace's poem, and his panegyric, will succeed only if the inspired interpretive crowd shares his song and makes it a communal celebration (p. 212). The resulting praise (*Carm.* 4.15) "lacks a definite resolution and therefore requires an interpretive community to actively engage the song and negotiate its meaning through their voices" (p. 201).

³ Citations of Horace are from Shackleton Bailey (1985), while references to Vergil are from Mynors (1969). All translations are my own.

⁴ As Johnson (2004) 213 writes, Vergil "finally comes to the party." Johnson further comments that "the Horatian panegyrist breathes in from his divine source and out main upon—with—from—his own people" (citing *Carm.* 3.30.6-8 for support).

⁵ See n, 2 above.

⁶ Johnson (2004) 213,

⁷ It is, after all, Vergil's Apollo that prevents Horace from singing of battles and conquered cities in *Carm.* 4.15 (Cameron (1995) 471).

⁸ See Johnson (2004) 138-54 for the ode's deep Vergilian tint.

⁹ *Ecl.* 2 is also named by title, *formosum Corydon ardebat Alexim*.

¹⁰ On the Vergilian echoes in both the description of the ivy for Phyllis' hair and its amatory implications (again, Vergilian), see Putnam (1986) 187-8.

¹¹ For further discussion of the emphatic nature of the center of Horatian odes, see Moritz (1968).

¹² Tac. Ann. 3.30 seems to indicate that Maecenas had been forced out of Augustus' inner circle. Syme (1939) 333-43 took Tacitus' comments at face value, and his opinion that Maecenas fell into disfavor with Augustus or was forced into retirement remains influential (Lyne-(1995) 207, e.g., holds to Syme's view). For the opposite view, that the relationship between Maecenas and Augustus remained essentially unchanged after the conspiracy in 23 BCE, see Williams (1990) 261-3; White (1991) 133-8; also Ambrose (1995) 48-9.

¹³ Fraenkel (1957) 416-17 views the entire ode as a tribute to Maecenas. On the return to *Carm.* 1.1-3 and its support for the identity of the Vergil in the following ode as the poet, see Moritz (1969) 191-2. Will (1948) 222 n, 2 also notes a definite connection between *Carm.* 4.11.35-6 and 4.12.19-20 in the metaphor of wine as song.

¹⁴ Much has been made of the report in the *Vita Horatii* that Augustus' request for a poem to celebrate the victory over the Vindelici resulted in the creation of the entirety of Book 4. But scholars generally agree that Suetonius is misleading; for discussion and bibliography, see Hills (2001) 615-16.

¹⁵ Many scholars disagree that this is *Vergilius poeta*, esp. Kiessling, Shorey, Page, Wickham and Griffin. Most recently, Tarrant (2007) 74 "finds it hard to believe" that Horace would refer to the poet as *iuvenum nobilium cliens* or with a *stadium lucri*. Tarrant argues that the allusions in 4.12 are "best understood as playful references to Vergilius' more famous namesake." Fraenkel's (1957) 418 n. 1 is the most impassioned opinion: "A minimum of common human feeling should save us from the sense of humour that turns Horace, the most tactful of poets, into a monster of callousness." But many scholars grant that this Vergil is indeed the poet. Bentley, Bowra, Collange, Porter, Quinn, Kirby and Johnson all accept the identification; for the Vergilian parallels and references, see Bowra (1928); Kirby (1985); for a detailed deconstruction of the arguments for and against a positive identification with the poet, see Johnson (2004) 160-4. Duckworth (1956) 313 cites the fact that the ode mentioning Vergil follows one mentioning Maecenas as further proof that the identification must be with the poet.

¹⁶ Kirby (1985) 36-7. Particularly striking is the reference to Arcadia, named here in line 12 but nowhere else in the *Carmina*:

dicunt in tenero gramine pinguium
custodes ovium carmina fistula
delectante deum cui pecus et nigri
colles Arcadiae placent.

The guardians of the fat sheep, in the soft grass,
sing their songs with the pipe
delighting the god whose flock and the black
hills of Arcadia please.

Especially in Vergil's poetry, Arcadia evokes the pastoral and idyllic world of the simple shepherd and his songs, as at *Ecl.* 4.58-9; 7.4; 10.26.

¹⁷ On the necessity of Vergil's gift for the symposium to take place, see Johnson (2004) 164-6. Porter (1972) 85-6 sees the strong commercial terms and metaphors for gift-giving in *Carm.* 4.12 as indicating the presence of the gift-exchange motif.

¹⁸ Arnaldi (1949-50) 229-33 sees support for the positive identification of Vergil in the previous poem in its location between *Carm.* 4.11, an ode addressed to one of Horace's final loves, and 4.13, addressed to an earlier one.

¹⁹ Dido asks her love *quo ruit* (A. 4.429), just as Horace asks Lyce where her love will go (*quo fugit*, *Carm.* 4.13.7).

²⁰ The other instances *dilapsus* in Vergil, *G.* 3.557 and 4.410, both symbolize the disappearance of the body into nothingness, or at least into nothing useful. *Dilapsus* describes the herds attacked by Tisiphone, whose bodies *turpi dilapsa tabo* (*G.* 3.557), and Proteus, who *in aquas tenues dilapsus*, when Aristaeus attempts to capture him (*C.* 4.410). In *Horace*, both appearances are in a Maecenaic context: *Carm.* 4.13.28, discussed here, and 5. 1.5.73, describing the kitchen fire at the inn in Beneventum where Maecenas and Horace stayed on the way to Brundisium. The word does not appear in Catullus, Propertius or Tibullus, and occurs only six times in Ovid (almost exclusively in the *Metamorphoses*).

²¹ Ancona (1994) 95-7.

²² Johnson (2004) 170-1, who also comments on Horace's movement from transcending time in *Carm.* 4.10-12 to manipulating it for his attack on Lyce.

²³ Putnam (1986) 231 recognizes the coherence of this temporal theme with the preceding two odes, though for reasons different from my own.

²⁴ On the epic style of this poem, see Syndikus (1973) 415-16.

²⁵ Johnson (2004) 190-3. On the similarity of the horse metaphor in *Carm.* 4.14.14- 24 to A. 6.77-80, see also Putnam (1986) 243-4; for the influence of *Ecl.* 1.67-71 on *Carm.* 4.14.26-30, see Putnam (1986) 246. Putnam

(1986) 244 also comments that Horace's depiction of Tiberius indicates that Horace is "learning from his friend [Vergil]."

²⁶ It is perhaps no coincidence that the only occurrence of the proper name Indus in Horace's work is in *Carm.* 4.14.42 (cf. *A.* 6.794). Lowrie (1997) 341 sees a connection to the geographical groupings in the first three books (*Carm.* 2.20.13-20; 3.4.33-6) and their function as coextending Horace's immortality with the boundaries of the empire.

²⁷ As Johnson (2004) 186 notes, "[Tiberius' and Drusus'] recent victories resulted from the greatest of Augustus' past victories working itself out in the present."

²⁸ Putnam (1986) 257-8.

²⁹ For a line-by-line comparison of Vergilian motifs in *Carm.* 4.15, see Setaioli (2006) 172 n. 71, who goes beyond the standard scholarly mentions of the *recusatio* and the final two lines.

³⁰ Griffin (2002) 320-1 acknowledges the *recusatio* as a Vergilian tradition, but sees a stronger connection with Prop. 3.9. Propertius' *recusationes* most likely predate Horace's *Carmina* (though Hor. S. 1.10.31-5 was probably first after Vergil); on the dates of 23 BCE for Prop. 3 and 16 BCE for Prop. 4, see Hutchinson (2006) 2-3. For the possible influence of Propertius on Book 4 of the *Carmina*, as well as the problem of dating the poems, see Johnson (2004) 274 n. 54 with bibliography.

³¹ For a list of Horatian *recusationes*, see Race (1978) 191-3. The standard work on the Augustan *recusatio* remains Wimmel (1960),

³² Putnam (1986) 265 remarks that the reference in *Carm.* 4.15.3 to the *Tyrrhenum aequor* echoes *A.* 1.67 *gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat aequor*.

³³ Not only does the obvious *imitatio* recall Vergil, but the use of the *recusatio* brings to mind the evolution of his poetry. In *Aeneid* 7 Vergil seems to apologize for his abandonment of his "commitment to Callimacheanism" (Thomas (1985) 62-8), yet the *recusatio* in *Ecl.* 6 denounced only a particular type of epic (Cameron (1995) 455). Vergil has already done what Horace is about to do: abandon his professed poetic genre and cross into epic territory, without sounding like a hypocrite. He thus functions in a manner similar to Bacchus in *Carm.* 3.25. To sing explicitly of Augustus and his deeds is something Horace does under the influence of another's agency. In that poem, as Oliensis (1998) 129-30 notes, the intervention of Bacchus relieves both Horace and Augustus "of the responsibility for Horace's 'deviation' into encomium," and enables Horace to "represent himself as the passive vehicle of praise, not its agent"; see also Silk (1969) 196-7,

³⁴ The conflict between exclusion and inclusion forms the basis of Williams' (1990) 270-2 argument that the opening of 4.15 should not be considered a *recusatio*. Davis (1991) 28-33 (without reference to *Carm.* 4.15) states that with "generic disavowal," the speaker "begins with deferral and ends in a synthesis" (p. 30). Lyne (1995) 38 calls 4.15.1-4 a "one-off *coup*" to show that the old version of the *recusatio* motif was no longer necessary in the *Pax Augusta*; so too Voisin (2002) 352 n; 2. Johnson (2004) 204-10 gives a balanced definition, inviting the audience to read the *recusatio* as exclusive, subversive and inclusive at the same time.

³⁵ Fraenkel (1957) 450,

³⁶ According to Augustus; the principate was merely a new incarnation of an old institution, and he was careful to go through the public show of restoring the empire to the Senate and people (D.C. 533).

³⁷ The *Eclogues* in particular provide fertile ground for Horace to seek the Golden Age, and indeed he had already given numerous examples *imitatio* and *aemulatio* of the *Eclogues* in the first book of the *Satires* published in 35 BCE; see especially van Rooy (1973) 71-85, and for particularly Golden Age imagery, pp. 74-9. The same is true of the *Carmen Saeculare*, a hymn celebrating the reestablishment of the *magnus ordo saedorum* prophesied in *Ecl.* 4.5 and itself rife with allusions to *Ecl.* 4, as Barker (1996) 434-46 has shown. There are also a number of parallels with the *Aeneid*, as Harrison (2007) 204-5 points out.

³⁸ For the restoration of the crops, *Ed.* 4.28-30; for the return of peace brought about by the *patriis virtutibus*, *Ecl.* 4.17. In fact, peace has brought back the crops, and thus the two cannot be separated; see Porter (1975) 223. *G.* 1 begins with *quid faciat laetas segetes*, and the phrase *auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem* appears in *G.* 1.27. Moreover, *Carm.* 4.15.19-20, *non ira, quae procudit ensis / et miseras inimicat urbis* alludes to *G.* 1.508-11.

³⁹ On the use of Golden Age imagery in Augustan Rome and by Augustus himself, particularly in his self-presentation as savior, expiator of Rome's prior crimes and indispensable for the continued prosperity of the state, see Rea (2007) 76-84.

⁴⁰ Doblhofer (1966) 105 n. 9 has rightly called the end of *Carm.* 4.15 "eine feine Reverenz, wohl such vor Augustus, mehr aber vor dem verstorben Freunde Vergil." For sources on the connection with A. 1.1, see Minadeo (1982) 121-2; Putnam (1986); Breed (2004). Tarrant (2007) 74 describes the final line of *Carm.* 4.15 as "casting the hero of Vergil's epic in appropriate lyric terms," Noyes (1947) 241, followed by Duckworth (1956) 310, describes the theme of 4.15 as "the vision of Rome as it had been announced by Virgil in the *Aeneid*."

⁴¹ Page (1964) 456 thinks that *progeniem* refers only to Augustus and not to Aeneas; but as La Penna (1969) 475 observes, "e naturale che il poeta richiami al lettore tutta la discendenza, lino ad Augusto."

⁴² Coffta (2001) 117, who sees this as evidence that Horace has not abandoned his lyric models, but is making the statement that lyric is just as grand as epic, and in fact more versatile. So too Harrison (2007) 205, who views *remixto carmine* as a "metapoetical statement of the blending of lyric and epic elements."

⁴³ Harrison (2007) 205, Special thanks are due Timothy Johnson for an advance look at a manuscript on Horace's reconstruction of civil discourse, in which he notes, with particular focus on the relationship between *Epod.* 17 and *Carm.* 1.16 and the relationship between Horace and Canidia, that when Horace uses compounds with the *re-* prefix he seems to invite an exchange or give-and-take in the form of a song, and that his use of *re-* recovers meanings including "hack to, back again, back away from." This exchange/recantation has the power to reconstitute a broken relationship, as the Vergil—Horace friendship had been broken by Vergil's death. Johnson's observations support the idea that Horace is bringing Vergil's song, and thus the poet himself, back into a dialogue.

⁴⁴ Harrison (2007) 206.

⁴⁵ Race (1978) 192, Feeney (1993) 54, and Lyne (1995) 38-9 all *see* a connection between the *CMWrI714S* of *Carm.* 4.15.32 and the *dicam* and *loquar* of *Carm.* 3.25.7 and 3.25.18. Both verses indicate promised song, not actual ones, since the *Pax Augusta* has made singing of *proelia* and conquered cities irrelevant. Indeed, several commentators have declared *Carm.* 4.15 a commentary on the Ara Pacis, dedicated in the year of Book 4's publication: Duckworth (1956) 314-16; Putnam (1986) 327-39; Lyne (1995) 194.

⁴⁶ Henriksen (2002) 324, however, views Horace's switch from the singular to the plural as a move "to allow himself to represent Roman society." In this respect he is not much different from the scholars mentioned in n. 2, above, but he further states that "as shown by the opening stanza. the speaker here is Horace himself,"

⁴⁷ For example, the unnamed *mater pulchra filia pulchrior* of *Carm.* 1.16, Tyndaris in 1.17, the prostitute Lyde in 3.11 and Iullus Antonius (who would be consul in 10 ticE) in 4.2. The collaborator need not be a friend, as Horace's song with the witch Canidia in *Epod.* 17 attests. Even Hannibal, the scourge of Rome, serves as the panegyricist of Rome's greatness in *Carm.* 4.4.

⁴⁸ Markus (2000) 152, who contrasts *canere* to *scribere* in the *Satires*, which serves there as the term for poetic composition; also Lefevre (1993) 143-57 on elements of Horace's poetry that identify him as a public poet. Johnson (2004) 277 n. 64 disavows *canemus* as a poetic plural. The suggestion by Putnam (1986) 290 that *canemus* in *Carm.* 4.15.32 refers to the last line of *Ecl.* 9, where Moeris claims that *carmine tum melius, cum uenerit ipse, canemus*, "we'll sing our songs better when he comes," is particularly attractive. Vergil's *canemus* refers only to Lycidas and Moeris, with no indication that the world will join their song; in the lonely world of the shepherd, two would be a crowd. If Horace intended a direct and recognizable parallel between *Ecl.* 9.67 and *Carm.* 4.15.32, we should expect two voices, not many.

⁴⁹ *dicere* is also used for singing, and appears in the first person nine times in *Carmina* 1-4 (not at all in *Carmina* 2). Of these, only three instances are in the plural (4.2.50, 5.38-9). The rest (1.12.13, 12.25; 3.3.58, 1.6.27, 25.7 and esp. 30.10) are actions of the author himself or are passive (3.16.27, 30.10).

⁵⁰ *Carm.* 3.28.9 could mean that Horace and Lyde will sing one after another, Horace about Neptune and Lyde about Latona and the arrows of Diana. In any event, there can be no doubt that there are only two singers in this ode.

⁵¹ Thus Porter (1975) 224; Johnson (2004) 202-3; Lowrie (2007) 87-8.

⁵² There are only three firm references to these songs, all in Cicero (*Brut.* 75; *Tusc.* 1.2; 4.3; though *Var. De Vita Populi Romani* fr. 84, ap. Non. p. 77 M reports that children sang such songs). Johnson (1994) 65 n. 40 and

(2004) 203, while making a convincing argument for the place of these songs and Horace's reinvention of them in the grand sympotic scheme of *Carmina* 4, admits that the evidence for their existence is tenuous. Putnam (1986) 272 calls this evidence "the nostalgia of later writers that such *carminae* existed"; Zorzetti (1990) 289-307, while not fully accepting the historicity of the sources, sees them as reflections of what the Romans viewed as their poetic traditions (cf. Zorzetti (1991) 311-29); against Zorzetti's uncertainty, see Horsfall (1994.) 50-75. Momigliano (1957) 104-14, on the other hand, accepts the existence of the songs, perhaps even into the 4th century, while Goldberg (2005) 4-5 goes so far as to declare that "their existence has never been questioned." I adhere to the argument of Williams (1960) 6, who believes that it is "unnatural" to detach *more patrum* from *functos duces*, especially since the adverbial phrase is suitable in meaning for attachment to *functos*. Quinn (1980) 326, while mentioning the references in Cicero, believes that *more patrum* should be understood with both *duces functos* and *canemus*. For further examples of syntactical ambiguity of this sort in Horace, see Quinn (1960) 38-40.

⁵³ There are two strong Vergilian parallels in *Carm.* 4.5, both in the eighth stanza. The anaphora of *te* in 4.5.31-2 recalls *G.* 4.465-6, Orpheus' lament for the lost Eurydice (see Putnam (1986) 113), and *codiit quisque diem* of *Carm.* 4.5.29 most likely alludes to *longos ... condere soles* of *Ecl.* 9.51-2 (Du Quesnay (1995) 173-4, 186-7). But in both cases, Horace is making a firm distinction between his lyric and Vergil's bucolics, not recreating Vergilian themes in lyric verse.

⁵⁴ Du Quesnay (1995) 146-60.

⁵⁵ I would like to thank Timothy Johnson, Randall Childree and especially S. Douglas Olson and the anonymous reviewers at CI. Their comments and suggestions improved this paper immensely, and any errors that remain are mine alone.

WORKS CITED

- Ambrose, J.W. 1995. "Ambivalence in Horace, *Odes* 4.11." *NECJ* 23: 47-52. Ancona, R. 1994. *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes*, Durham.
- Arnaldi, F. 1949-50. "L'Ode a Virgilio di Hor. *Carm.* IV, 12." *RAAN* 24-5: 227-33.
- Barker, D. 1996. "The Golden Age is Proclaimed"? The *Carmen Saeculare* and the Renaissance of the Golden Race." *CQ NS* 46: 434-46.
- Bowra, C.M. 1928. "Horace, *Odes* IV.12." *CR* 42: 165-7.
- Breed, B.W. 2004. "Tua, Caesar, Aetas: Horace Ode 4.15 and the Augustan Age." *AJP* 125: 245-53.
- Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton.
- Coffta, D.J. 2001. *The Influences of Callimachus on the Satires and Carmina of Horace*. Lewiston.
- Davis, G. 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of I'oration Discourse*. Berkeley.
- Doblhofer, E. 1966. *Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht*. Heidelberg.
- Du Quesnay, I.M. 1995. "Horace, *Odes* 4.5." In *Homage to Horace*, edited by S.J. Harrison, pp. 128-87. Oxford.
- Duckworth, G.E. 1956. "Anirriae Dimidium Meae: Two Poets of Rome." *TAPA* 87: 281-316.
- Feeney, D. 1993. "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets." In *Horace 200: A Celebration*, edited by N. Rudd, pp. 41-63. Ann Arbor.
- Fowler, D.P. 1995. "Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics." In *Homage to Horace*, edited by S.J. Harrison, pp. 248-66. Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.
- Goldberg, S.M. 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Griffin, J. 2002. "Look your last on lyric: Horace, *Odes* 4.15." In *Classics in Progress*, edited by T.P. Wiseman, pp. 311-32. Oxford.
- Harrison, S.J. 2007. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.
- Henriksen, C. 2002. "The Augustan Domitian: Martial's poetry on the Second Pannonian War and Horace's Fourth Book of *Odes*." *Philologus* 146: 318-38.
- Hills, P.D. 2001. "Ennius, Suetonius and the Genesis of Horace, *Odes* 4." *CQ NS* 51: 613-16.
- Horsfall, N. 1994. "The Prehistory of Latin Poetry: Some Problems of Method." *RFIC* 122: 50-75.
- Hutchinson, G.O., ed. 2006. *Propertius: Elegies Book IV*. Cambridge.
- Johnson, T.S. 1994. "Horace, C. IV.12, Vergilius at the Symposium." *Vergilius* 40: 49-66.
- . 2004. *Sympasation of Praise*. Madison,

- . *Horace's Criticisms: The Reconstruction of Civil Discourse*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Keller, O. 1967. *Pseudoacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustum*. Leipzig.
- Kirby, J.T. 1985, "Vergilian Echoes in Horace *Carm.* 4.12: A Computer Study." *Vergilius* 31: 30-40.
- La Penna, A., ed. 1969. *Q. Orazio Flacco Le Opere. Antologica*. Florence.
- Lefevre, E. 1993. "Waren horazische Gedichte zum 'offentlichen' Vortrag bestsimmt?" In *Beitrage zur miindlichen Kultur der. Romer*, edited by G. Vogt-Spira,, pp. 143-57. T ubingen.
- LoWie,4.1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.
- . 2007. "Horace and Augustus." In *Tie? Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. Harrison, pp. 77-89. Cambridge.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1995. *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven.
- MarkuS, D. 2000. "Performing the Book: The Recital of Epic in First-Century CE Rome." *CA* 19: 138-79,
- Minadeo, R. 1982. *The Golden Plectrum*. Amsterdam.
- Momigliano, A. 1957. "Perizonius, Neibuhr and the Character of Early Roman Tradition." *JRS* 47: 104-14.
- Mortiz, L,A, 1968. "Some 'Central' Thoughts on Horace's Odes." *CQ NS* 18: 116-31,
- .1969. "Horai e's Virgil." *G&R* 16: 174-93,
- Mynors, R.A,B., e. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
- Noyes, A. 1947. *Portraillice*. London.
- Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace ,v;l ihe Rheforic of Authority*. Cambridge.
- Page, T.E., ed. 1964. *Q. Horati Floc, i Garminurn Libri IV. Epodon Libel'*. London,
- Porter, D.H. 1972. "Horace, *Ctirmirra*, IV, 12." *Latomus* 31: 71-87.
- . 1975. "The Recurrent Motifs of Horal e, Carmina IV." *HSCP* 79: 189-228.
- Putnam, M.C.J. 1986. *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Ithaca.
- Quinn, K. 1960. "Syntactical ambiguity in Horace and Vergil." *AUMLA* 14: 36-46.
- , ed. 1980. *Horace: The Odes*. London.
- Race, W.H. 1978. "*Odes* 1,20: An Horatian *Recusatio*." *CSCA* 11: 179-96,
- Rea, J.A. 2007. *Legendary Rome: Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*. London.
- van Rooy, C.A. 1973. "'Imitatio' of Vergil, *Eclogues* in Horace, *Satires*, Book I." *AC* 16: 69-88.
- Setaioli, A. 2006. "Le Virgile d'Horace." *Prometheus* 32: 161-84.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R., ed. 1985. *Horatius Opera*, Stuttgart.
- Silk, E.T. 1969. "Bacchus and the Horatian *recusatio*." *YCS* 21: 195-212, Syme, R. 1939, *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- Syndikus, H.P. 1973. *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden*, Vol. 2. Darmstadt.
- Tarrant, R. 2007. "Horace and Roman literary history." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. Harrison, pp. 63-76. Cambridge.
- Thomas, R.F. 1985. "From *recusatio* to Commitment: The Evolution of the Vergilian Programme." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 61-73.
- Voisin, D. 2002. "Horace, Agrippa et les recusationes." *Latomus* 61: 352-61, White, P. 1991. "Maecenas' Retirement." *CP* 86: 130-8.
- Will, W. 1948. *Horaz und die Augusteische Kultur*. Basel.
- Williams, G. 1990. "Did Maecenas Fall from Favor? Augustan Literary Patronage." In *Between Republic and Empire*, edited by K.A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, pp. 258-307. Berkeley.
- Williams, R.D. 1960. "Horace, *Odes* iv.15.29." *CR NS* 10: 6-7.
- Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom: Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augristerzeit*. Wiesbaden.
- Zorzetti, N. 1990. "[he *Carmina Convivalia*." In *Symptotica*, edited by O. Murray, pp. 289-307. Oxford.
- . 1991. "Poetry and Ancient City: the Case of Rome." *CJ* 86: 311-29.