

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 10 (1964)

Artikel: Archilochus and Horace
Autor: Wistrand, Erik
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660623>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 17.02.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

VII

ERIK WISTRAND

Archilochus and Horace

ARCHILOCHUS AND HORACE

IT is no easy task to describe the relation between Archilochus and Horace. The main difficulty is that we know too little of Archilochus. It is true that we possess quite a number of fragments of his poetry and that much valuable work has been done to supplement them, but there remains the deplorable fact that we are not sure to possess even one complete poem. What the extant fragments — together with the testimonies of ancient writers, who knew his poetry more completely than we do — can give us is only a very general idea of Archilochus' poetical art. The lack of exact and detailed knowledge makes it rather hazardous to try to assess what particular ideas and locutions Horace owed to the old Parian poet whom he himself acclaims as his predecessor and model. What can be said safely on that account has already been said, in essence, by Friedrich Leo in his well-known paper *De Horatio et Archilocho*¹, which is a model of perspicacious judgment and succinct presentation.

The best opportunity by far for a comparison of the two poets is provided by the well-known Strassburg papyrus fragment² beginning κύμασι πλαζόμενος and generally ascribed to Archilochus, (Fr. 79 a D.), which has a striking similarity to Horace's Tenth Epode *Mala soluta navis exit alite*. Leo finds here an instance of Horace's acknowledged aspiration to write poetry after the example of Archilochus. There is the likeness of the fundamental theme: imprecations on an enemy about to start on a sea voyage and gloating in

¹ *Ad praemiorum ... renuntiationem*, Göttingen 1900. Reprinted in *Ausgew. kleine Schr.* 2 (Roma 1960), p. 139 ff. ² First edited by R. REITZENSTEIN, *Sitz. Berlin* 1899, p. 857 ff.

the anticipation of his sufferings when shipwrecked. The real life and true pathos of Archilochus is enfeebled in Horace's treatment of the theme but he compensates for it by the consummate artistry of his composition.

For the other epodes we have no proof or indication of an equally close dependence on an Archilochian model. Generally they are too Roman in character for such a surmise to seem probable. Only the personal invectives Epode VI *Quid immerentes hospites vexas canis* and Epode XII *Quid tibi vis mulier nigris dignissima barris* might possibly be regarded as formed on the pattern of a song of the poet who wrote ἐν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα, τὸν κακῶς με δρῶντα δεινοῖς ἀντα-μείβεσθαι κακοῖς (Fr. 66D.).

Anyhow the Horatian invectives are not very successful in reproducing the Archilochian spirit, Horace being a man abounding in *ἥθος* but lacking in *πάθος*, as Leo puts it. The true Archilochian spirit is revived rather in the purely Roman Epodes XVI *Altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas*, VII *Quo, quo scelesti ruitis*, and IX *Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes*. For here we find passionate and sincere expressions of civic concern and indignation at the political evils of the time, which Leo compares with fragments of Archilochus such as ὡς Πανελλήνων ὁῖζυς ἐς Θάσον συνέδραμεν (Fr. 54D.) and Θάσον δὲ τὴν τρὶς οἰζυρὴν πόλιν (Fr. 129 Bgk.) and, one might add: ὡς λιπερνῆτες πολῖται, τάμα δὴ συνίετε / δόματ' (Fr. 52D.). Then, there may exist, sporadically, particulars in Horace's poetry that may be traced back to Archilochus, like the special technique of Epode II *Beatus ille qui procul negotiis*, where the usurer Alfius seems to have his prototype in the carpenter Charon in Archilochus. But the most important thing that Horace took over from Archilochus is surely the metre, the epodic couplet. So Leo's analysis can on the whole be said to bear out Horace's own description of his relation to Archilochus: *Epist. I, 19, 24 f. numeros animosque secutus Archi-*

lochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben. About the primacy of *numeros* there can be no question; we may doubt whether he came so near the *animi*, the force and passion of Archilochus, as he hoped and whether there may not be more of the *res* than he professes and we can recognize.

Leo's conclusions and views were accepted by Heinze and incorporated in Kiessling-Heinze's well-known commentary on Horace.

Leo's work is also acknowledged by Ed. Fraenkel as basic for his own treatment of the question of Archilochus' influence on Horace's poetry¹. But Fraenkel goes into the matter more fully, considering the problem in its wider aspects. Especially instructive and valuable is his clarification of the profound difference between old Greek poetry, which was part of real life and served important practical purposes, and classical Roman poetry, which was a purely literary art, founded on imitation of recognized models. Fraenkel has made some very acute and illuminating remarks on the peculiarity of the situation and problems confronting a Latin poet, who wanted to conquer a new domain for Latin literature and win fame for himself by imitating and emulating, in his writings, an unexploited Greek model.

I have nothing to add to the description of Horace's relationship to his great predecessor that has been outlined by Leo and Fraenkel as a result of the comparison made between the preserved fragments of Archilochus and Horace's writings. But I should like to point out that the incompleteness of the picture we can form for ourselves of Archilochus' poetry enhances the importance of what Horace himself has to say to us about his indebtedness to Archilochus and, generally, about the question why and how he was inspired to write verses. It may be worth while to subject the relevant passages to a new examination.

¹ Ed. FRAENKEL, *Horace*, Oxford 1957, p. 29.

The first passage I want to discuss is found in Horace's Epistles II, 2, written probably in 20 or 19 B.C.¹ This is a letter to Florus, who had complained of Horace's failure to send him a poem as he had promised. Horace excuses himself by adducing a number of reasons; the first and principal one is the following outline of his literary autobiography, vv. 41-54:

*Romae nutriri mihi contigit atque doceri,
iratus Grais quantum nocuisset Achilles.
adieceré bonae paulo plus artis Athenae,
scilicet ut possem curvo dignoscere rectum
atque inter silvas Academi quaerere verum.
dura sed emovere loco me tempora grato,
civilisque rudem belli tulit aestus in arma,
Caesaris Augusti non responsura lacertis.
unde simul primum me dimisere Philippi
decisis humilem pinnis inopemque paterni
et laris et fundi paupertas impulit audax,
ut versus facerem. sed quod non desit habentem
quae poterunt umquam satis expurgare cicutae,
ni melius dormire putem quam scribere versus?*

From this passage we learn that the force that made Horace a Poet was the humiliation and poverty that civil war had brought upon him after a peaceful childhood and youth spent in studies. So much is clear. But it is not so clear by what particular kind of psychological reaction this was brought about and what exactly Horace means by calling poverty *audax*. The usual explanation of *paupertas impulit audax* is that Horace, ruined, was compelled by necessity to sharpen his wits and try a new expedient to earn his living. I quote Heinze's commentary on the passage: «Gewiss will Horaz nicht im Ernst gesagt haben, dass seine Muse ledig-

¹ See C. BECKER, *Das Spätwerk des Horaz* (1963), p. 61.

lich nach Brot gegangen sei: aber dass der Druck der äusseren Lage nicht wenig dazu beigetragen hat, seine produktiven Kräfte anzuspannen und auf bestimmte Ziele zu konzentrieren, dessen mag er sich allerdings bewusst gewesen sein». To illustrate and support this explanation parallels are quoted: Pseudo-Theokritus 21,1 'Α πενία, Διόφαντε, μόνα τὰς τέχνας ἐγείρει. αὕτα τῷ μόχθῳ διδάσκαλος «only need arouses the arts; it is the teacher of labour»; Plaut. *Stich.* 178 *paupertas... omnis artis perdocet* «poverty teaches all arts and practices»¹. Thus the belief is confirmed that Horace represents his decision to write poetry as a case of «necessity is the mother of invention».

A similar opinion is reflected in Wilkinson's account of Horace's situation². The emphasis is, however, on the financial calculations of the poet to be. «His father was apparently dead, his inheritance was confiscated, and he was left at the age of twenty-three with the sole advantage of his own wits and the best education the world could provide. In the hope of collecting pence or patronage he now took to writing verse.»

Fraenkel seems to be polemizing against these words of Wilkinson when he writes in his book on Horace, p. 14, commenting on the text in question: «Finally it could not occur to any of Horace's contemporaries to take his words as indicating that after Philippi he had hoped to make a living out of the work of his pen. Such a hope would have been absurd. And as for the chance of finding a wealthy patron who might support him that was, at best, a very remote one». But if *paupertas impulit audax ut versus facerem* must not be taken to signify that Horace set out to write verse in the hope of collecting pence and patronage, what does it

¹ Cp. Diod. I, 8, 9 πάντων τὴν χρείαν αὐτὴν διδάσκαλον γενέσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις «In all things it was necessity itself that became man's teacher». ² *Horace and his Lyric Poetry*, p. 8.

mean? Fraenkel answers in a rather roundabout way, and I am not sure I get his precise meaning. He begins by warning his readers of Horace's elusiveness and propensity to irony and understatement. He proceeds to say: « In the present instance he does not want his readers to infer from his words that it was solely *paupertas audax* that impelled him to write his early poems. But he does mean to say that, had it not been for the ruin of his former expectations and the loss of his property, he would not have been a 'professional' poet although, like many educated Romans, he might have written some verse in his spare time ». Fraenkel's interpretation did not convince Wilkinson, who in his review of Fraenkel's book in *The Classical Review* 9 (1959) p. 36 objects: « But is this a positive enough explanation of *impulit*? In retrospect at least he must have thought that he had stood to gain. Was the chance of finding a wealthy patron really so remote? Within four years he had found Maecenas ».

I have been rather circumstantial in quoting Heinze, Wilkinson and Fraenkel in order to show what some of our best modern authorities on Horace think of our passage, and also to demonstrate that it is not so easy to establish the exact implication of the seemingly simple phrase *paupertas impulit audax ut versus facerem*.

The interpretations I have been discussing presume that in *paupertas audax* the adjective *audax* is to be taken in a positive sense: 'bold', 'enterprising'. There are, however, reasons to suppose that it ought to be understood in its more usual derogatory sense of 'audacious', 'reckless'. In a recent, most illuminating study¹ Wirszubski has shown that *audax* — apart from being a general abusive term meaning 'shameless', 'reckless', 'inscrupulous' — is especially

¹ *Audaces. A Study in Political Phraseology.* By Ch. WIRSZUBSKI, in *JRS* 51 (1961), p. 12 ff.

used with a political connotation, to describe those who are so reckless as to have the audacity to attack and endanger the established social order. The *audaces* are often also called *mali*, *improbi*, *perditi*, *furiosi*. They are the opposite of the *boni*. The *boni*, the loyal, conservative citizens, are likely to be well-to-do people who stand to lose in a revolution. To us it may seem shocking that the adoption of political opinion, although regarded as a choice between good and evil — between *boni* and *mali* — was nevertheless considered to be directly dependent on people's financial status; that wealthy people could be depended on to be 'good', whereas poor people were likely to be 'bad'. But to realistic Romans this was common sense. Cicero is not at all embarrassed at addressing his political friends and supporters as *viri boni et locupletes*. Correspondingly, there occur in our texts not seldom allusions to the view that poor people, and particularly those impoverished after having enjoyed prosperity, will tend to be discontented, troublesome, and seditious. Wirszubski adduces such instances as Cic. *Pro Sestio* 85 *hominum cum egestate tum audacia perditorum*; Sall. *Catil.* XVII, 2 *quibus maxima necessitudo et plurimum audaciae inerat*; *ibid.* XVIII, 4 *Cn. Piso, adulescens nobilis, summae audaciae, egens, factiosus, quem ad perturbandam rem publicam inopia atque mali mores stimulabant*; Tac. *Ann.* XIV, 57 *Sullam inopem, unde praecipuam audaciam*.

This is the background, I think, against which Horace's expression *paupertas... audax* should be seen. The idea that Horace wants to convey to his readers is that his impoverishment made him desperate, and so he was driven to enter upon a reckless and reprehensible activity — the writing of verses. Heinze is certainly right in explaining that after the high-sounding *paupertas impulit audax* the expectation of the reader is so much heightened that the following *ut versus facerem* will have the comic effect of an anticlimax, an $\delta\pi\rho\sigma\delta\omega\eta\tau\omega$. But certainly it was not a heroic deed — « eine

Heldentat», as Heinze says — that Roman listeners expected to hear about but some act of criminal temerity.

To the interpretation now proposed I anticipate an objection: that *audax* in its derogatory sense is all right with *necessitas*, *inopia*, and *egestas* but does not go so well with *paupertas* (*pauperies*) because this word does not mean 'destination', 'indigence' but rather 'a modest competence' — or even if, this state is regarded as an ideal one — 'frugality', 'the simple and hardy life'. So e.g. in Hor. *Carm.* I, 12, 41... *incomptis Curium capillis utilem bello tulit et Camillum saeva paupertas* ('stern poverty') *et avitus apto cum lare fundus*, or *Carm.* III, 2, 1 *angustam amice pauperiem pati robustus acri militia puer condiscat*, or *Carm.* III, 29, 56 *probamque pauperiem sine dote quaero*, or Tib. I 1, 5 *me mea paupertas vitae traducat inertis*.

In reply to such an objection let me say that in the actual passage the preceding *inopemque paterni et laris et fundi* makes it quite clear that *paupertas* here is used as a synonym for *inopia*; and that this is by no means the only passage where Horace employs *paupertas* with the connotation that poverty is a bad thing that may have an evil influence on a man's character. Compare *Carm.* III, 16, 37 *importuna tamen pauperies abest*, where *importuna* has very much the same sense as *audax*; III, 24, 42 ff. *Magnum pauperies opprobrium iubet quidvis et facere et pati virtutisque viam deserit arduae*.

The best argument for my view that the sense of the text under discussion is: « Poverty made me so reckless as to stop at nothing: so I wrote verses » — not: « Poverty made me inventive and enterprising in finding my subsistence: so I became a Poet » — is provided by an examination of the context. Before directly answering Florus' complaint — v. 24 f. *quereris super hoc etiam quod expectata diu non mittam carmina mendax* — Horace tells a story about a Roman soldier, who was robbed of all his savings while sleeping, and then in his wild rage performed deeds of reckless valour,

which brought him not only honour but also a pecuniary reward sufficiently large to recover his losses¹. Shortly afterwards, however, when the supposed hero was asked by his general to undertake a particularly difficult and dangerous task, he refused saying: « Let somebody else go who lost his money-belt ! » The soldier's desperate mood after losing his money is depicted in vivid colours, v. 28 ff. *post hoc vehemens lupus, et sibi et hosti iratus pariter, iejunis dentibus acer, praesidium regale loco deiecit...* Now it is obvious that this story is intended as a kind of parable to explain Horace's own experiences and conduct. In the soldier as well as in Horace loss of property led to reckless acts. The soldier's fierce assault on the enemy garrison was not a planned effort to regain his money but rather an explosion of the wild fury and hatred he felt towards the whole world. So, we must conclude, Horace took to writing poetry not with a view to making a career but to give vent to the bitterness and aggressiveness with which his misfortunes had filled his spirit.

Having thus established the purport of what Horace tells his readers about the motive that made him write poetry, there arises the question how seriously we are to take his

¹ *Epist. II, 2, 26-40:*

*Luculli miles collecta viatica multis
aerumnis, lassus dum noctu sterit, ad assem
perdiderat: post hoc vehemens lupus, et sibi et hosti
iratus pariter, iejunis dentibus acer,
praesidium regale loco deiecit, ut aiunt,
summe munito et multarum divite rerum.
clarus ob id factum, donis ornatur honestis,
accipit et bis dena super sestertia nummum.
forte sub hoc tempus castellum evertere praetor
nescio quod cupiens, bortari coepit eundem
verbis, quae timido quoque possent addere mentem:
« I bone, quo virtus tua te vocat, i pede fausto,
grandia latus meritorum praemia. — Quid stas ? »
Post haec ille catus, quantumvis rusticus, « Ibit,
ibit eo, quo vis, qui zonam perdidit » inquit.*

words. Obviously he is talking in a joking, self-ironical tone. But it does not follow that what he says cannot be substantially true. There is no doubt that Horace lost his property in consequence of his participation in a civil war; it is natural for a man to become embittered and rebellious after such experience; his earliest poems certainly show anger and aggressiveness. So why not believe him when he connects these facts and explains them in a perfectly natural way?

To be sure we are not bound to believe that this is all there is to it. Indeed, Horace himself in the verses immediately following our passage, Hor. *Epist. II*, 2, 55 ff:

*singula de nobis anni praedantur euntes;
eripuere iocos, Venerem, convivia, ludum;
tendunt extorquere poemata: quid faciam vis?*

hints that youthful passion was the force that inspired his poetry, so that it is only natural that, at his present age, he should have to abandon verse-writing like other juvenile occupations; and looking back at the iambics he had written as a hot-blooded young man Horace expresses a similar thought in *Carm. I*, 16, 22 ff.:

*compesce mentem! me quoque pectoris
temptavit in dulci iuventa
fervor et in celeres iambos

misit furentem: nunc ego mitibus
mutare quaero tristia...*

We have seen that in Horace's own view his poetry derives from the rebellious bitterness of impoverishment and the passionate temper of youth. Accordingly he adduces his present independence of means and maturity of age as good reasons for giving up the troublous activity of verse-making. This grouping of concepts — youthful passion and rebellious poverty *versus* the discretion of mature age

and the conservatism of a property-owner — is very Roman. Matius for instance in his famous letter to Cicero (*Ad fam.* 11, 28, 4-5) is thinking in these categories when he argues to prove that he has nothing to do with revolutionary Caesarians: being rich, it was in his interest that law and order should prevail, being old, he was proof against errors he had not committed even in his youth when they would have been pardonable. Indeed, the whole voting system in the Roman centuriate assembly was designed to safeguard the state against the rebellious impulses of youth and poverty by granting overwhelming weight to the votes of the rich and the old¹.

Horace's description, in *Epist.* II, 2, of his motives for writing poetry is formed by traditional conceptions of the sober Roman mind. He also dissociates himself from what he says by speaking in a jocular tone and with apologetic irony. Yet what he really tells us is that his lyric poetry was created by a mood of youthful passion and the aggressive bitterness of a disillusioned victim of civil war. I think we may say that Horace in this mood was close to the spirit of Archilochus.

Before leaving *Epist.* II, 2 there is one question I should like to discuss. When Horace alleges that it was the recklessness of poverty that caused him to begin writing poetry, is he thinking of all his lyrical poetry — the hexameter causeries not being under discussion — or is he referring only to his aggressive Iambi? To find the answer to this we shall have to make a little détour. Horace points to a fundamental

¹ In this connexion I should like to refer to KLINGNER's sensitive and perceptive study of Horace, *Carm.* III, 14 *Herculis ritu* (in *Römische Geisteswelt*, p. 377 ff.). In this poem Horace reminds himself that in his youth his attitude to love had been passionate and reckless, and by no means so gentle and placid as at the actual time, and at the same time he is implicitly and discreetly reminding his readers that his political attitude had not always been marked by the warm loyalty to Augustus which he expresses in the first part of the ode. But mellowed by age and wisdom and happy in the security of Augustus' blessed regime he can afford to recall with an indulgent little smile how rashly he had acted *calidus iuventa consule Plano*, i. e. in the year of Philippi.

change in his life when he declares that it was *paupertas audax* that once had made him write verse, and that he would be mad not to prefer a restful life now that he was assured of his bread and butter. Thus we are lead to inquire: when did this change in Horace's financial and spiritual position occur? The possibility that he should be referring to the time when Maecenas took care of him, giving him the Sabine farm, seems excluded. That event had happened a long time ago and had been followed by rich literary productivity, and that change of his situation could not be pleaded as an excuse for not writing a poem for Florus now. Horace must have been thinking of that alteration of his life that had been brought about shortly before. After the publication of his three books of *Carmina* (in 23 B.C.) he had passed through a sort of crisis both in his relation to his patron Maecenas and in his attitude to the writing of poetry. In a letter to Maecenas (*Epist. I, 7*) he had asked to be released from the duty of personal attendance, and offered to give back all the gifts he had received from him. Maecenas was magnanimous enough to set Horace free without withdrawing his bounty or his benevolence. About the same time Horace had decided to abandon poetry and devote himself entirely to the pursuit of wisdom, as he proclaims in another letter to Maecenas (*Epist. I, 1*), adducing, in part, the same reasons as in his reply to Florus: first of all the passing of youth and temper: *Epist. I, 1, 2 ff.:*

*spectatum satis et donatum iam rude quaeris,
Maecenas, iterum antiquo me includere ludo?
non eademst aetas, non mens.*

It is clear that Horace in his epistles about 20 B.C. looks back at a completed period of his life, the period of lyrical poetry, the *antiquus ludus*, which he had once entered driven by the passions of poverty and youth. In retrospect it seemed to him that the hot-tempered indignation of his youth — the

Archilochian spirit, as we may call it — had not only prompted his aggressive iambics but was at the root of all his poetry. This is certainly a most remarkable generalization, seeing how many of his poems, both among the Iambics and the Odes, are written in a different mood and with other sources of inspiration.

In the passage of *Epist.* II, 2 which we have been discussing, the name of Archilochus is not mentioned, although we can hardly help thinking of him, when we hear about poetry inspired by the bold recklessness of poverty and youth. But in another passage written a year or so earlier — in 20 B.C.¹, where he discusses his poetic achievement, not with a view to explaining his personal motives for writing but in order to clarify his relation to literary models, he is the more emphatic in stressing his indebtedness to Archilochus. In *Epist.* I, 19, 19 ff.² Horace prides himself on his originality, while he harshly criticizes those poetasters who imitate him slavishly. His originality consists in the fact that he was the first Roman to write in the manner of Archilochus, adopting his metrical forms and his spirit but not his subject-

¹ See C. BECKER, *op. cit.*, p. 50 ff.

² *o imitatores, servom pecus, ut mihi saepe bilem,
saepe iocum vestri mouere tumultus !
libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps,
non aliena meo pressi pede. qui sibi fidet,
dux reget examen. Parios ego primus iambos
ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben.
ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes,
quod timui mutare modos et carminis artem :
temperat Archilochi musam pede mascula Sappho,
temperat Alcaeus, sed rebus et ordine dispar,
nec sacerum quaerit, quem versibus obliniat atris
nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit.
hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus
volgavi fidicen. iuvat inmemorata ferentem
ingenuis oculisque legi manibusque teneri.*

matter, his persecution of individual victims. The fact that he retains the metres and the technique of Archilochus should not lessen him in anybody's eyes. In this he had followed the best precedents. For it is with the aid of the metres of Archilochus that mannish Sappho moulds the harmony of her muse, and so does Alcaeus, even if his subject-matter and principles of composition are different, and he shuns personal attacks. This poet, then (i.e. Archilochus), whom no other tongue had celebrated before, he, the Roman lyrist, first made known to the people. It is, indeed, a great satisfaction for him to see that he gains wide popularity among the higher class of readers, when he brings poetry of an unknown kind.

The résumé given here means that I have taken up my position in the old controversy about the interpretation of a couple of crucial passages in the epistle. The divergence of opinion concerns the sense of *temperat* in verse 28 and whether in the same verse the genitive *Archilochi* is to be taken with *musam* or with *pede*, in which case *musam* is the muse of Sappho, and it concerns the reference of *hunc* in verse 32: is it Archilochus or Alcaeus?

The first passage was explained by Bentley thus: « *Ne mireris, inquit, aut queraris, quod numeros Archilochi non mutaverim; scias et Sapphonem et Alcaeum (quos poetas!) musam suam illius pede temperare; scias utrumque Archilocheos numeros suis Lyricis immiscere. Quos igitur illi tantopere probabant, egone ut fastidirem et repudiarem?* » Bentley's explanation is still the common one. But it was attacked vigorously by Fraenkel in his great book on Horace. Fraenkel first stresses the difficulty of the word-order supposed by Bentley, for which he asserts that there is no parallel in all the satires and epistles of Horace. This argument is perhaps not so conclusive as it may seem. For Horace may have chosen an unusual word-order to obtain a special effect. He may have wanted to lay stress on *Archilochi* by separating it from *pede* (*traiectio*): « It is in fact on Archilochus' metre that Sappho

models her verses». Then Fraenkel criticizes Bentley's interpretation of *temperare* as (*im*)*iscere*, and asserts that the only meaning likely to be found in Horace with the construction *temperare aliquid aliqua re* is that of the English 'to moderate', 'to soften', as in *Carm.* II, 26 *amara lento temperet risu*; *Carm.* IV, 19, 6 *quis aquam temperet ignibus?* Against this assertion a protest must be entered. There is no justification for restricting the verb *temperare*, in Horace, to the construction with an accusative of the external object affected by the action of the verb ('affiziertes Objekt') and denying to it the construction with an accusative of the result produced ('effiziertes Objekt')? The latter construction is found in classical prose, e.g. Cic. *De rep.* I, 45, 69 *id (genus rei publicae), quod erit aequatum et temperatum*¹ *ex tribus optimis rerum publicarum modis* «that kind of government that is formed by a balanced and moderate combination of the three best kinds of government»; Cic. *Tusc.* I, 1, 2 ...*rem vero publicam nostri maiores certe melioribus temperaverunt et institutis et legibus*; Liv. I, 18, 4 *suopte igitur ingenio temperatum animum (Numae) virtutibus fuisse opinor*. The same construction and sense of the verb, namely «to produce something in such a way that the ingredient parts are rightly proportioned», is also evidenced in Horace, *Ep.* XVII, 80 *desiderique temperare pocula*, and, especially, *Carm.* IV, 3, 18 ff.:

*O testudinis aureae
dulcem quae strepitum, Pieri, temperas.*

With this we can compare Prop. II, 34, 79 f.:

*tale facis carmen, docta testudine quale
Cynthius impositis temperat articulis.*

The last two parallels seem to me very important; it seems improbable that *temperare musam* should be separated from

¹ Cp. *ibid.* I, 29, 45 *quartum quoddam genus reipublicae maxime probandum esse sentio, quod est ex his, quae prima dixi, moderatum et permixtum tribus.*

temperare testudinis dulcem strepitum and *temperare carmen*. So it must be her own song that Sappho 'temperates'. In point of fact, no instance has been adduced, where *temperare* carries the notion 'to soften a literary model'. Even if the accusative is not perhaps exactly that of the result produced, the reference is still to an author's fashioning of his own compositions. So in Cic. *Or.* 57, 196 (*oratio*) *sit... permixta et temperata numeris* (compare *ibid.* 58, 197 *hi (pedes) sunt inter se miscendi et temperandi*). I cannot see much difference between *temperare orationem numeris* and *temperare musam pede*.

The same is true, so far as my knowledge goes, of the synonym *moderari*: Hor. *Carm.* I, 24, 13 f.:

*si Threicio blandius Orpheo
auditam moderere arboribus fidem;*

Cic. *Tusc.* V, 36, 104 *tibicines iique qui fidibus utuntur suo, non multitudinis arbitrio cantus numerosque moderantur*. Stat. *Theb.* 8, 222 *moderata sonum vario spiramine buxus*; Stat. *Silv.* 3, 3, 174 *qualia nec Siculae moderantur carmine rupes*; Claud. 17, 317 *innumeris voces segetis moderatus aenae*. It seems to me that if we compare *Sappho temperat musam* with the type of expression instanced above, we must recognize the similarity and, accordingly, interpret «Sappho moulds her poetry with the aid of the metrical form of Archilochus». If we put it thus: «Sappho retains the metre of Archilochus as an element of her art», we see still more clearly how well the verse fits into Horace's line of argument. It corresponds exactly to *timui mutare modos* in the preceding verse and provides the required contrast to *rebus et ordine dispar* in the following verse. Fraenkel's translation «Sappho moderates (softens, tones down, and the like) by her metre the poetry of Archilochus» is certainly more difficult to fit into Horace's train of reasoning. He does not convince me when he intimates that this a more elegant way of conveying the idea required

by the context: « Sappho did not alter the form of Archilochus ».

The assertion that the poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus is based on the metres of Archilochus may seem strange, but it has its explanation in a metrical theory then current, according to which the Lesbian metres were composed of elements found already in the verses of Archilochus¹. So far all is well. But now we come to what seems to me a great difficulty. We have seen that Horace defends the course he has taken in imitating Archilochus by citing the examples of Sappho and Alcaeus; like these he has retained Archilochus' metrical form but avoided his subjects, his personal invectives. Now according to common opinion among Horatian scholars Horace is here referring only to his epodes mentioned in the preceding sentence; it is to defend the metre of his iambics that he refers to the stanza poetry of the Lesbian poets. I do not find this explanation very satisfactory. Horace's epodes and the stanza poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus are not really parallel cases, bearing the same relation to Archilochus. Or are we to assume that Horace made this seemingly inappropriate comparison, because he thought that his epodes and the lyrical songs of Sappho and Alcaeus were very much the same kind of poetry, being all Archilochian more or less? But if we are willing to accept that, then it would be better to follow up the idea by assuming that Horace drew no distinction here between his own epodes and odes but compared the bulk of his poetry to that of Sappho and Alcaeus. Such a comparison would be more reasonable. But it must be allowed that this interpretation, too, involves a difficulty. For when Horace starts to discuss his imitation of Archilochus by saying: « I was the first to show Latium what Parian iambi were like »², he refers

¹ I refer to FRAENKEL's lucid exposition of this matter, *op. cit.*, p. 346 f.

² *Epist. I, 19, 23 ff. Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio, numeors animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben.*

expressly only to his pioneer work, the *Iambi*, but our interpretation implies that in the following text he was thinking of the rest of his poetical production as well. This may, however, be a lesser difficulty than the alternative one. Let us recall that in *Epist.* II, 2 Horace — according to the interpretation I have already proposed — mentions only the poems written to give vent to the passions of poverty and youth, while he is in reality contrasting the past period of his poetical productivity as a whole to his actual, quite different state of mind and interests.

I have assumed that in both passages discussed Horace's thought passed over from the Epodes to the rest of his lyrical poetry, as by an association from the start to the run, from the root to the tree. This gives me occasion to devote some attention to the question whether the Epodes and the Odes could be regarded as forming together an organic unity, or should be considered to be two distinct kinds of poetry, separated by a clear-cut line of demarcation.

To support the latter view there is, of course, the difference of metre, since the Epodes, except the last one, have the characteristic epodic couplet, which has given them their name, whereas the Odes are divided into stanzas, all of them, if we believe in *lex Meinekiana*, or any way a great majority. There is also the well-known fact that in the odes themselves Horace emphasizes the Lesbian character of this poetry as if to mark the contrast to the Parian *Iambi*. Compare *Carm.* I, 1, 33 f. *nec Polyhymnia/Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton*; I, 26, 10 ff. *hunc fidibus novis, / hunc Lesbio sacrare plectro/ teque tuasque decet sorores*; I, 32, 3 ff. *dic Latinum, / barbite, carmen, / Lesbio primum modulate civi*; III, 30, 13 f. *princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos/deduxisse modos*; IV, 3, 10 ff. *quae Tibur aquae fertile praefluunt/et spissae nemorum comae / fingent Aeolio carmine nobilem*. No doubt there is a difference in general character between the *Carmina* and the *Iambi*, and it is natural that Horace when engaged in writing odes should

be desirous to emphasize that these form a kind of poetry of their own.

But we must not disregard the connecting elements which are important enough to make it impossible to draw a boundary-line between the two groups of poems. The most distinctive feature of the Epodes is the metre, the epodic couplet, characteristic of all of them except the last one (XVII), which is in pure *senarii*. Among the Odes the Lesbian stanzas dominate, to be sure, but it is a remarkable fact that the type of metres found in the Epodes is by no means excluded from the Odes. The *Alcmanium* of *Ep. XII Quid tibi vis mulier nigris dignissima barris?* / *Munera quid mihi quidve tabellas?* is also found in two Odes: I, 7 *Laudabunt alii claram Rhodon aut Mitylenen* and I, 28 *Te maris et terrae numeroque carentis arenae/mensorem cohibent, Archyta*. Other metres of epodic type, though not employed in the Epodes of Horace, are the *Archilochium primum* of *Carm. IV*, 7 *Diffugere nives redeunt iam gramina campis/arboribusque comae* and the *Archilochium quartum* of *Carm. I*, 4 *Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni trahuntque siccas machinae carinas*. Likewise the *Hipponacteum* of *Carm. II*, 18 *Non ebur neque aureum / mea renidet in domo lacunar*. And if we turn our attention from form to subject-matter we can observe that some of the epodes have given up the aggressive quality peculiar to the old iambics; we meet with themes and moods we are accustomed to find in other literary genres such as elegy, epigram, lyrics. In fact, in his Epodes Horace had already gone — and now I am quoting Fraenkel (*op. cit. p. 65*) — « a long way towards composing lyrics proper, *carmina* ». This statement applies to the introductory Epode *Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium, / amice, propugnacula*, where he protests his devotion to Maecenas, and to several love poems and above all to the fine *Ep. XIII Horrida tempestas caelum contraxit, et imbres / nivesque deducunt Iovem; nunc mare nunc siluae*, which — to quote Fraenkel again — « contains a great deal of what we

like best in Horace's odes and seems, indeed, to be one of them». Another observation relevant to the present argument is that in some cases a very close relationship is found between individual epodes and individual odes, which develop the same theme or situation in a similar spirit. So pairs and groups of closely related poems are formed right across the dividing line between the Epodes and Odes. Thus the *Ep.* VII and XVI with their characteristic mood of indignant and sorrowful patriotism have a counterpart in *Carm.* III, 24 *Intactis opulentior / thesauris Arabum et divitis Indiae.* Even the most striking feature of these Epodes — the poet's representing himself as personally confronting and addressing a group of citizens¹ — is found again in *Carm.* III, 24, 45 ff. *vel nos in Capitolium / quo clamor vocat et turba faventium / vel nos in mare proximum / gemmas et lapides aurum et inutile, / summi materiem mali, / mittamus, scelerum si bene paenitet.* The Actium Epode (*Ep.* IX) *Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes* and the Ode on Alexandria's fall (*Carm.* I, 37) *Nunc est bibendum* link together². *Ep.* XIII has great similarity and deep-reaching correspondance to *Carm.* I, 7 *Laudabunt alii claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen*³. *Ep.* VIII *Rogare longo putidam te saeculo* and XII *Quid tibi vis, mulier, nigris dignissima barris* and *Carm.* I, 25 *Parcius iunctas quatunt fenestras*, III, 15 *Uxor pauperis Ibyci* and IV, 13 *Audivere Lyce di mea vota* are closely connected by their common character, invective against amorous old women. More examples of near affinity between Epodes and Odes could be adduced, but I think those mentioned are the most striking.

It is clear that for Horace Epodes and Odes were not fundamentally different kinds of poetry. Some epodes have a coarse and aggressive tone that is avoided in the Odes, and

¹ Well explained by FRAENKEL, *Horace*, p. 40 ff., 56. ² See E. WISTRAND, *Horace's Ninth Epode and its Historical Background*, Göteborg 1958, p. 26 n. 1; 52. ³ See E. WISTRAND, *Horace's Ninth Epode*, p. 21.

some Odes give expression to lofty moral and religious ideas that would be out of place in the Epodes, but there is no clear-cut boundary-line between the two categories; on the contrary there is a great deal of common ground. I think the circumstances of the case will hardly allow of any explanation other than that as Horace's experience widened and his genius unfolded, the new literary form, by a kind of natural development, grew out of the older one.

Let us now go back to *Epist. I, 19*. In the light of what has been ascertained about the interrelation of Epodes and Odes, I hope it will seem plausible to take line 27 *quod timui mutare modos et carminis artem* as containing a reference to Horace's whole poetical production without distinction between iambics and lyrics proper: even his stanza poetry Horace conceives to be based on the metrical art of Archilochus.

This conclusion may be of some help when we proceed to deal with the disputed interpretation of line 32 f. *hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus volgavi fidicen*, where *hunc* since Bentley has been explained as referring to Alcaeus; before Bentley everybody thought that the reference was to Archilochus. Bentley's arguments were two. The first was that the word *fidicen* can be used only of a writer of lyrical poetry and that the predecessor and model of Horace must necessarily be another lyrical poet. That argument will not give us much trouble if we accept the view that Horace claims to be a follower of Archilochus also in his stanza poetry. Bentley's second argument consists in the assertion that if *hunc* refers to Archilochus Horace would be guilty of a pointless repetition of what had already been said in line 23 f.: *Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio*, whereas we might expect some mention of the fact, stressed by Horace himself elsewhere, that his odes were inspired by the Lesbians. In reply to this let me point out that, according to our interpretation, line 32 is no mere repetition; it resumes and amplifies

Horace's acknowledgement of indebtedness to Archilochus by affirming that his *lyrical poetry* — *fidicen!* — was modelled on the art of Archilochus. In the earlier passage there had only been mentioned the imitation of *Parios ... iambos*. Finally, there is an objection to Bentley's explanation which I think deserves to be stressed: Bentley ascribes to Horace a remarkably inconsistent train of thought. He assumes that Horace, having entered upon a discussion of his imitation of Archilochus and having defended it by a reference to Sappho and Alcaeus doing the same thing, then unexpectedly, by a loose association, lapsed into the statement that he was the first Roman poet to imitate Alcaeus¹.

Let me now try to sum up what Horace, according to the interpretation of his words given in the foregoing, tells us about his relationship to Archilochus. He states that it was the recklessness and bitterness caused by personal experience of civil war, and the passionate temper of youth, that drove him to write poetry. No doubt it was this state of mind that made him choose Archilochus — and Lucilius — as his literary models. It was not the other way round. It was not his choice of model that determined the temper of his early writings.

Later, when he turned to the composition of the Odes, he resorted, principally, to the Lesbian poets for a recognized literary form to lean on. But that did not mean that he had given up being a follower of Archilochus. For Alcaeus and Sappho, too, had taken over the art of metrical composition of which Archilochus was the inventor.

It is true that Archilochus throughout antiquity is mostly remembered only as the iambist, the reviler and blasphemer. But it was not quite forgotten that he was much more, a great and many-sided poet. He is constantly coupled with Homer as a father of poetry. A well-known epigram, ascribed to

¹ Cp. R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, *Class. Rev.* 49 (1935), p. 127 ff.

Theocritus¹, praises him not only for his famous iambics but also for his melodious lyric songs². Above all Archilochus is honoured by the ancient metricalians and acclaimed as the great originator in music and metrics, the creator of the verse forms of both lyrical and dramatic poetry. As an example I quote Marius Victorinus' eulogy³: *Archilochum..., quem parentem artis musicae iuxta multiformem metrorum seriem diversamque progeniem omnis aetas canit.*

Against this background it is, I think, understandable that Horace, looking back, in *Epist.* I, 19, at his poetical achievements, does not feel a need to make express and separate mention of his Odes. They were intimately bound up with the Epodes and, like these, they owed their existence to Archilochus, if more indirectly. When Horace contemplated, in retrospect, his poetical career, he saw that the decisive moment was when he first succeeded in giving poetical expression to the storm of feelings and thoughts that filled his breast. He had been able to do this because he was inspired by the force and fire of Archilochus' poetry and availed himself of the poetical forms created by him — *numeros animosque secutus Archilochi*. Archilochus opened the source of the rich and varied flow of Horace's lyric poetry.

¹ [Theoc.] *Epigr.* 21 = *Anthol. Pal.* VII, 664. (TREU, p. 128.)

Αρχίλοχον καὶ στᾶθι καὶ εἰσιδε τὸν πάλαι ποιητάν,
τὸν τῶν ἴαμβων, οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος
διῆλθε κήπι νύκτα καὶ ποτ' ἀῶ.
ἢ ῥά νιν αἱ Μοῖσαι καὶ δὲ Δάλιος ἡγάπευν Ἀπόλλων,
ώς ἐμμελής τ' ἔγεντο κήπιδέξιος
ἔπει τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ' ἀείδειν.

² That it is a simplification to class Archilochus just as an iambist, was an observation made in Horace's own literary circle. Philodemus pointed out that « some of Sappho's poetry has an iambic character, and some of Archilochus' poetry has not ». Cf. Philodem. *De poem.* 2, *Fr.* 29 (p. 252 Hausrath = TREU, p. 138):

οἱ γάρ ἴαμβοποιοὶ τραγικὰ ποιοῦσιν καὶ οἱ τραγῳδοποιοὶ πάλιν ἴαμβικά,
καὶ Σαπφώ τινα ἴαμβικῶς ποιεῖ, καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος οὐκ ἴαμβικῶς, ὥστε
φύσει μὲν οὐ δητέον ἴαμβοποιὸν ἢ ἄλλο τι ποιοῦντα γένος ἀλλὰ νόμῳ.

³ KEIL, *Gramm. Lat.* 6, 141, 10.

DISCUSSION

M. Scherer: Ein paar Worte zur Bedeutung von *temperare*, bloss von der Etymologie her gesehen. Es gehört natürlich zu *tempus* und muss eine recht alte Ableitung sein, weil der Mittelsilbenvokal die regelrechte Entwicklung zu *e* zeigt (gegenüber späterem *temporis* nach Nom.-Akk. **tempos*). Die gedankliche Beziehung zum Grundwort wäre etwa aufzufassen wie bei *finis*: *finire* « zu Ende bringen, zum Ziel bringen » und vor allem bei *locus*: *locare* « an den (richtigen) Ort bringen » sowie **modos* ntr. (vgl. umbr. *meṛs*): *moderare* « ins (rechte) Mass bringen ». Darnach ist *temperare* zunächst: « der richtigen Zeit, der richtigen Gelegenheit anpassen », und daraus ergibt sich leicht: « in die richtige Ordnung bringen », wie es den Belegstellen, die Herr Wistrand beigebracht hat, entspricht.

M. Page: Is there really any irony at all in *paupertas impulit audax*? There is none in the immediately preceding lines; and the fact is true as stated. I see no reason to interpret this particular phrase as ironical.

M. Wistrand: I am very glad that Mr. Page accepts what I consider the main point of my interpretation of *paupertas impulit audax*, namely that *audax* is used here with a connotation taken over from political language. Then Mr. Page says that he fails to see any note of irony in the phrase. I readily admit that the phrase itself has nothing that makes it necessary to take it ironically. But I think — with Heinze — that there is a contrast with the unexpected sentence that follows — *ut versus facerem* — that may have a comic effect, and that the self-mocking tone of the whole context — note for instance *decisis humilem pennis* in the preceding line! — may give a colouring to the phrase *paupertas impulit audax* too.

M. Bühler: Zwei Punkte scheinen mir die Ansicht von Herrn Wistrand zu stützen, dass den Worten *paupertas impulit audax* auch ein ironischer Ton eignet. Einmal die sich daran anschliessenden Verse: Horaz kann doch unmöglich im Ernst meinen, dass er,

wenn er genug Geld hätte, lieber schlafen als dichten wollte. Sodann kehrt das Thema «Armut ist die Mutter der Dichtung» im choliambischen Einleitungsgedicht des Persius — vermutlich im Anschluss an unsere Horazstelle — wieder, und dort ist der Sinn eindeutig ironisch.

M. Page: In speaking of the points of contact between Horace and Archilochus, Mr. Wistrand mentioned the experience of civil war; but the model for this was really Alcaeus, not Archilochus. I see no close contact except in respect of *numeros animosque*, the metres and spirit of the Epodes only. It was not *paupertas* which inspired Archilochus to compose, nor had he much if anything to do with *bellum civile*. Nor do I understand why Horace should wish to say, what is plainly false, that his debt to Sappho and Alcaeus is indirectly owed to Archilochus. Mere arm-chair theorists might class Archilochus and the Lesbians together in a loose and general way as lyrical poets, but nobody knew better than Horace that the metres of the Lesbians owe practically nothing to Archilochus, and that it is wholly the former, in no sense the latter, whom Horace is imitating in his stanza lyrics.

Incidentally, why does Horace explicitly deny that his subject-matter included *agentia verba Lycamben*, and again (as if the matter were of great importance) insist that Alcaeus also refrained from attacking a Lycambes and Neobule? Both Alcaeus and Horace are just as savage in their invective as Archilochus was; the fact that a father-in-law and fiancée were not included among their numerous victims seems quite unimportant, certainly not worth mentioning twice.

M. Wistrand: Mr. Page said that my interpretation of *Epist. I, 19* has the effect of making Horace say strange and unexpected things about Archilochus and Alcaeus. I shall not contradict him. I can only suggest that Horace is reflecting badly informed contemporary opinion, not telling historical truth. That applies to his views on metrics, too. But I agree that on this matter Horace was a connoisseur and one cannot help thinking that he ought to have known better.

M. Page: The fact remains that Archilochus has no « stanza-poetry »; Horace, the greatest of all connaisseurs of Lesbian metres, knows perfectly well that these owe nothing to Archilochus.

M. Wistrand: When Mr. Page finds it difficult to believe that Horace, after his explicit reference to the epodes in *Epist. I, 19, 23-25*, should suddenly be talking in the next lines of the whole of his lyric poetry, including both epodes and odes, he puts his finger on the weakest point of my interpretation. Indeed, I am not very happy about it. I have in fact been driven to accepting this explanation because I found the alternative interpretation even less satisfactory. Or are we to believe that Horace defends his retention, in the epodes, of Archilochus' metres with a reference to the precedent of the Lesbian stanza-poetry?

M. Treu: Aus der strengeren Anwendung der äolischen Vermasse bei Horaz schloss Heinze, dass er das aus einem metrischen Handbuch gelernt haben muss. Steht das fest — und das tut es — so steht es uns frei, in diesem Metriker einen Vertreter der Derivationstheorie anzunehmen.

M. Snell: Die Verse von Archilochos' Epoden und die der lesbischen Dichter konnten dadurch verwandt scheinen, dass sie die einzigen ausserhalb der Chorlyrik waren, die nicht $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\mu\acute{e}t\acute{r}o\upsilon$ gebaut waren und die man mit Hilfe einer Derivations-Theorie erklären konnte (zu Recht, wie ich glaube, bei Archilochos, zu Unrecht bei Sappho und Alkaios). Ausserdem kommen einzelne Archilochische Vermasse auch in der äolischen Lyrik vor (Encomiologicus).

M. Pouilloux: Je ne suis pas aussi sûr que M. Page que les similitudes avec Archiloque évoquées par M. Wistrand pour expliquer la situation d'Horace ne puissent être prises en considération.

Pour la guerre civile, tout d'abord: nous l'avons vu (cf. supra pp. 17 sq., 31), il n'est pas historiquement inconcevable que certains poèmes d'Archiloque concernent des guerres intestines entre Thasiens. Même si nous ne pouvons pas encore en faire la preuve, il semble que, à partir de Critias au moins, la tradition antique ait interprété le vers $\kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{e}i\omega\tau\alpha\Theta\alpha\sigma\acute{e}i\omega\eta$, où $\tau\alpha\Theta\alpha\gamma\eta\acute{e}t\acute{r}o\eta\kappa\alpha\acute{e}$

comme le souvenir de conflits intérieurs, plutôt que comme le signe de défaites extérieures.

De même pour la pauvreté. Certes, historiquement, et nous l'avons vu amplement ces jours derniers, rien ne prouve qu'Archiloque ait été un gueux, un bâtard, un mercenaire, chassé de Paros par la misère. Tout au contraire tend à prouver qu'il appartenait à la classe dirigeante. Mais c'est un fait que l'Antiquité, après Critias, l'a considéré comme tel et qu'Horace avait toutes les raisons de suivre cette tradition.

M. Page: Horace must have known that his model was really Alcaeus, not Archilochus, not only for metre but also for subject-matter. The man who describes himself as writing about *bellum civile, iocos, Venerem, convivia, ludum*, is giving a description which fits Alcaeus infinitely better than Archilochus.

M. Dover: I should like to reinforce the suggestion made by M. Pouilloux. In modern times much has been built on θαλάσσιος βίος and συκοτραγίδαι and on the strength of Γλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνήρ it has even been suggested that Archilochus was compelled to take service as a mercenary soldier. Such a picture of Archilochus may well be very old.

Now, on the question of Horace's view of the history of Greek poetry: it is not only metrical theory, in the strict sense, that must be considered, but also the theory of genres. We have had more than one occasion to mention the ancient tendency to regard Homer and Archilochus as the two ancestors of poetry. This dichotomy has different aspects; sometimes it is a dichotomy between the serious and the « comic », but it could also be viewed as a dichotomy between poetry on a large scale and poetry on a small scale. It is possible that Horace felt (not altogether consciously, perhaps) some kind of analogy between his own evolution as a poet and what he regarded as the evolution of archaic Greek poetry?

M. Treu: Vor allem ist die dichotomische Einteilung der Dichter ethisch. Dio Chrys. spricht vom Tadler Archilochos im Gegensatz zu Homer, dem Verherrlicher (s. Tr. p. 138).

M. Wistrand: Horace presents Archilochus as his predecessor and model for the epodes; Alcaeus and Sappho claim the same functions for the odes. But when he looks at the whole of his non-hexametric production and regards it as an organic unity, he may refer to Archilochus as the archegetes of that poetry, following the tradition that made Archilochus the father of all non-epic poetry.

M. Page: Much as I dislike having to take the words *Archilochi pede* together, with *musam* governed by *temperat* in the sense «Sappho modified her poetry with Archilochian metres», I do not see how the argument of the whole can be understood otherwise.

M. Bühler: Und wie verstehen Sie dann V.52 *sed rebus et ordine dispar*?

M. Page: I can only suggest that the contrast implied by *sed* lies in the alleged slightness of the change made in the metre with the much greater change made *rebus et ordine*.

M. Bühler: Herr Wistrand hat hervorgehoben, dass Oden und Epoden nicht etwas vollkommen verschiedenes sind, sondern sich in mehrfacher Hinsicht berühren, in der Thematik und vor allem im Metrum. Ich möchte dazu auf eine Parallel verweisen. Kallimachos verwendet in zwei Epoden eine Kombination von iambischem Trimeter und Ithyphallikon. Nun schliessen sich an das Iambenbuch vier Gedichte an, die man als lyrisch aufzufassen hat und von denen das erste eine Verbindung von iambischem Dimeter und Ithyphallikon aufweist. Hephaistion führt die beiden ersten Verse dieses Gedichtes als Beispiel für das sog. Euripideion an, d.h. er fasst das ganze als ein zusammengehöriges Metrum auf; aber der Dieget zitiert zu Beginn seiner Inhaltsangabe nur den Dimeter, was bedeutet, dass in seinem Exemplar das Ithyphallikon als $\epsilon\pi\omega\delta\circ\varsigma$ geschrieben war. Wie immer wir heute einteilen, es lässt sich nicht leugnen, dass eine metrisch enge Beziehung zwischen diesem «lyrischen» *Fr. 227* und den *Epoden* 6 und 7 besteht.

M. Wistrand: Was Herr Bühler gesagt hat über den fliessenden Übergang zwischen den *genres* bei Kallimachos, ist eine will-

kommene Stütze für meine Auffassung, dass auch Horaz mitunter mehr auf das für seine Epoden und Oden Gemeinsame sehen konnte als auf das Trennende. — To Mr. Dover I should like to say he has explained my thoughts better than I was able to do myself. In fairness I must add, however, that the idea that Horace may have regarded his artistic development as a sort of repetition of the historical evolution of Greek poetry was new to me. It surely deserves to be considered carefully and at leisure.

M. Page : What is meant by *quod timui mutare modos*, and how does it cohere with what follows ? Horace in this phrase is admitting, in effect, that he did *not* « change the metre » of the epodes. What follows should be a reply to this criticism for lack of originality in this respect: but in fact he seems to defend himself against the criticism that he did *not* change the metres of Archilochus by the statement that the Lesbians *did* make changes therein. I find it hard to accept an interpretation of *temperare* which involves no notion of modification or change: yet any such interpretation seems to make the reply irrelevant to the criticism.

M. Reverdin : Revenant sur ce que disait tout à l'heure M. Pouilloux, je voudrais citer un autre exemple de méprise d'Horace. C'est l'histoire du bouclier. L'épisode se situe vraisemblablement dans le cadre d'opérations pour la conquête ou la défense de la Pérée thasienne. Les combats qui se déroulaient dans cette contrée entre Grecs et Thraces n'étaient certainement pas des batailles rangées. Ils n'opposaient pas des phalanges d'hoplites sur une ligne continue. Dès lors, l'abandon d'un bouclier n'avait pas la gravité qu'il devait avoir plus tard, lorsqu'il eut pour conséquence de découvrir des camarades de combat et d'ouvrir une brèche dans la phalange (soit dit en passant, la restitution φαλάγγων, dans l'inscription de Sosthénès, *Fr.* 51 D., IV A. 1.3, me paraît contestable).

La méprise dont Horace est victime est excusable. Pour Aristophane, qui fait chanter ces vers par le fils de Cléonymos (*Pax* 1296 sqq.), comme pour Critias, Archiloque est un vulgaire

ρίψασπις. C'est qu'ils situent la mésaventure dans le seul contexte qu'ils connaissent: la bataille rangée. Et toute l'Antiquité les a suivis (Critias, *Fr.* 44 Diels-Kranz: τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀπέβαλεν; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrh. Hyp.* III. 216: τὴν ἀσπίδα ρίψας; Plutarque, *Lac. inst.* 34 p. 239 b: ἀποβαλεῖν τὰ ὅπλα; Strabon, XII. 3.20 p. 549: τὴν ἀσπίδα ρίψαι; Schol. ad Ar. *Pal.* 1296: ρίψας ἔσυτοῦ τὰ ὅπλα.

C'est au bouclier d'Archiloque, de toute évidence, qu'Horace fait allusion dans l'*Ode 7* du livre II. L'épisode qu'il raconte se situe en effet à Philippes, donc dans la contrée même où Archiloque a abandonné son bouclier. Or, pour Horace, l'acte est vil:

... et celerem fugam
Sensi relicta non bene parmula,
Cum fracta virtus et minaces
Turpe solum tetigere mentio.

Nous voyons par cet exemple qu'Horace se méprenait sur le sens du *Fr. 6 D*. Il ignorait le contexte historique dans lequel avait vécu Archiloque. Il le situait dans un autre contexte. Erreur naturelle de son temps. Nous en savons davantage, et nous voyons bien que le poète, qui ne songe qu'à acquérir un nouveau bouclier, n'est pas un lâche; que le mobile de son acte, ou la cause de sa mésaventure, n'est peut-être même pas une défaillance (*fracta virtus*).

M. Page: Since the shield of Archilochus has been mentioned, may I ask why it is assumed that Archilochus means that he threw his shield away in battle? He does not say so. He says he «left it beside a bush». In this style, no words are wasted: if he had meant that he threw away his shield in battle, there could have been no point in telling us that the place where the shield fell was «beside a bush»; he would have said «on the field», or the like. This detail suggests rather the picture of a man taken by surprise, — not throwing his shield away, but simply having no time to pick it up when the enemy attacked him while he was resting in the shade. Is that heretic?

M. Reverdin : Hérétique, non, si l'on s'en tient à l'interprétation du fragment lui-même; c'est bien plutôt l'interprétation que lui a donnée l'Antiquité qui est hérétique. Mais ce consensus qui d'Aristophane à Horace et à Strabon fait d'Archiloque un vulgaire $\rho\acute{\iota}\psi\alpha\sigma\pi\iota\varsigma$ a créé une sorte d'orthodoxie dont le caractère abusif a échappé à plus d'un interprète moderne !

M. Dover : Yet he says « But I saved my life », and that is hard to explain if his shield had been stolen.

M. Kontoleon : Was Herr Page gesagt hat, ermutigt mich, eine Vermutung etwas klarer als in meinem Exposé auszusprechen: ob nicht eventuell Archilochos keine eigenen Erlebnisse in seinen Versen, wie z.B. bezüglich des Schildes, beschreibt, sondern als ein Führer des Chors, der aus den Bürgern besteht, in jedem wichtigen Moment beispielhaft, was zu tun ist, wie sich der Bürger zu verhalten hat, durch seine Verse lehrt. In diesem Falle wäre der Vorwurf, dass er seinen Schild tatsächlich weggeworfen hatte, unberechtigt; er hätte nur das allgemeinere Urteil ausgesprochen, es sei wichtiger die $\psi\psi\chi\eta$ als den Schild zu retten.

Wenn man hinzudenkt, dass die Gegner Barbaren waren, denen der Aretebegriff der Griechen unbekannt war, ist dieser Verzicht auf den Wert des Schildes noch verständlicher; will das $\grave{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ vielleicht die elementare Freude der Barbaren an etwas ihnen sehr kostbar Erscheinendem, wie der Schild war, ausdrücken ?

M. Treu : Die geäusserte Ansicht ist nicht häretisch. Dass Kritias ein Wort gebraucht, das « verlieren », aber auch « wegwerfen » heissen kann, in seinem Kontext aber in diesem odiösen Sinn verstanden werden muss, wurde schon vor Jahren gesagt (Tr. p. 157). *P. Oxy.* 2317 (Tr. p. 12): « das hat dir keinerlei Schande gebracht, dass du den wohlgefertigten (Schild) von dir geschleudert hattest », von einem anderen Menschen gesagt, verrät etwas davon, wie Archilochos in solchen Fällen urteilte. Die weiteren Sätze sind dort stark ironisch.

