The Classical Quarterly (2023) 73.2 729–741
doi:10.1017/S000983882300068X

HORACE, *ODES* 3.13: INTERTEXTS AND INTERPRETATION*

ABSTRACT

This article argues that the literary contexts of Horace's Odes *3.13, especially archaic Greek poetry, have been relatively neglected by scholars, who have focussed on identifying the location of the* fons Bandusiae *and on understanding the significance of the sustained description of the kid sacrifice. This study presents a more holistic interpretation of the ode by exploring Horace's interactions with previously unnoticed (Alcaeus, frr. 45 and 347) and underappreciated (Hes.* Op. *582–96) archaic Greek poetic intertexts, which also offer a fresh perspective on earlier debates. Horace's use of Alcaeus' fr. 45, a key intertext, firmly places the* fons Bandusiae *within the literary landscape of Horace's Sabine estate, and offers a structural and argumentative model for* Odes *3.13; further, Alcaean and Hesiodic allusions also suggest that the kid is sacrificed as a surrogate for Horace for keeping him safe. These conclusions are used to offer a new interpretation of the ode on metapoetic, political and philosophical levels, and to explore how these different aspects of the ode interact with Horace's other odes.*

Keywords: Horace; *Odes* (abbreviated *Carm.*); Bandusia; Alcaeus; Hesiod; lyric; metapoetics

Despite broad agreement on its argument, Horace's *Odes* 3.13 remains controversial, largely owing to debates on two thorny issues that have so far eluded consensus—the location of the *fons Bandusiae* and the prolonged focus on the kid. Amidst these debates, less attention has been paid to the ode's literary—particularly, archaic Greek—contexts and their significance for the interpretation of the ode. This study will present a new interpretation of *Odes* 3.13 by exploring allusions to archaic Greek poetry (Alcaeus' frr. 45 and 347, Hes. *Op.* 582–96) as the basis of the ode's structure and logic.

I. FINDING THE *FONS*: BANDUSIA'S ALCAEAN SOURCE

A key intertext of *Odes* 3.13 is Alcaeus' fr. 45. Although the fragment had been identified as a parallel for Horace's hymnic form, further connections were dismissed by Syndikus based on the fragment's incompleteness.[1] However, the striking similarities are multiplied in the new text of fr. 45 based on the discovery of signs of a coronis marking the fragment as complete. The fragment reads:[2]

* I am grateful to my colleagues in Oxford and Cambridge and to *CQ*'s reader for their comments and suggestions. This research was undertaken with support from the Leverhulme Trust.

[1] C. Theander, 'Ad poemata aliquot Sapphus et Alcaei adnotatiunculas', *Humanitas* 2 (1948/1949), 33–9, at 38; H.P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Eine Interpretation der Oden*, 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 1973), 2.132.

[2] I.-K. Sir, 'New light on Alcaeus fr. 45', *ZPE* 216 (2020), 1–8, with apparatus criticus and arguments on supplements and construal.

⊗ Ἔβρε, κ̣[άλ]λιστος ποτάμων πὰρ Ἀ̣[ῖνον
ἐξί[ησθ' ἐς] πορφυρίαν θάλασσαν
Θ̣ραικ[ίας ἐρ]ευγόμενος ζὰ γ̣αίας
ν̲]ίπ̣π̣[α] π̣[όλη]ϊ̣· 4
καί σε πόλλαι παρθένικαι 'πέπ̣[οισι
κὰκ κά]λων μήρων ἀπάλαισι χέρ[σι
νίπτρ]α· θέλγονταί τε̣· σ̣ὸ̣ν ὡς ἄλει[ππα
θ̲ή[ϊο]ν ὕδωρ. ⊗ 8

Hebrus, you flow out as the most beautiful of rivers by Aenus into the heaving sea, pouring forth through the land of Thrace as the water in which the city washes. Many maidens apply you down their fine thighs with their soft hands as water for washing. They are enraptured as they do so; for your divine water is like unguent.

Formal parallels include: movement from Ἔβρε (1) to καί σε (5) and from *o fons Bandusiae* (3.13.1) to *te* (3.13.9)—both at halfway points of the poem; direct address followed by descriptions of comparison (κ̣[άλ]λιστος ποτάμων, 1; *splendidior uitro*, 3.13.1; *nobilium ... fontium*, 3.13.13); two stanzas of praise (3.13.9–16); the similarity of καί σε … (ἐ)'πέπ̣[οισι … ἀπάλαισι χέρσι (5–6) and *te ... nescit tangere* (3.13.9–10); the closing σ̣ὸ̣ν …ὕδωρ (7–8) and *lymphae ... tuae* (3.13.16); and the emphatic position of the second person in σ̣ὸ̣ν ὡς ἄλει[ππα | θή[ϊο]ν ὕδωρ (7–8) and *tu ... praebes* (3.13.10–12).

The case for allusion is further supported by the fact that Alcaeus—and fr. 45 specifically—is already in the mind of Horace's audience. Horace's preceding poem, *Odes* 3.12, in its opening motto famously alludes to Alcaeus' fr. 10, a fragment in ionics *a minore*—a metre found only here in Latin poetry.[3] However, it is rarely noted that *Liparaei nitor Hebri | simul unctos Tiberinis umeros lauit in undis* (3.12.6–7) alludes to Alcaeus' fr. 45, with none considering its literary effect beyond a contrast for *Tiberinis*.[4] Alcaeus' male gaze on bathing maidens is transformed into Neobule's gaze on the swimmer Hebrus in *Odes* 3.12 in parallel with the likely switch in gender of the speaker from female in Alcaeus' fr. 10,[5] reversing the direction of desire from the male for the female and exploiting the play of genders carefully cultivated in Alcaeus' fr. 45: the similarities in phrasing with the congress of rivers and women in the Homeric poems hint at narratives of desire,[6] and the roughness, movement and power of the masculine river in the first stanza contrast with κά]λων μήρων ἀπάλαισι χέρσι and enchantment of the maidens in the second. Such deep engagement in *Odes* 3.12 not

[3] G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico* (Florence, 1920), 86, also noting the allusion in *Carm.* 3.12.4–6 to Sappho, fr. 102; A. Cavarzere, *Sul limitare. Il "motto" e la poesia di Orazio* (Bologna, 1996), 229–32.

[4] The allusion is noted in H. Fränkel's review of E. Lobel, *Σαπφοῦς Μέλη* (Oxford, 1925) and E. Lobel, *Ἀλκαίου Μέλη* (Oxford, 1927), in *GGA* 6 (1928), 258–78, at 273 n. 3, and M. Treu, *Alkaios* (Munich, 1963[2]), 173–4, but only to supplement Alc. fr. 45.4—in vain. It is not mentioned by commentators of *Odes* 3.13 who consider the relevance of *Odes* 3.12.

[5] On the gender of the speaker of *Odes* 3.12: R.G.M. Nisbet and N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace,* Odes, *Book III* (Oxford, 2004), 164–5.

[6] River Axius is called κάλλιστον ὕδωρ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἴησιν (*Il.* 21.158) in a seduction narrative; similarly, Enipeus (*Od.* 11.238–40) and Spercheius (*Il.* 16.174–6). Alcaeus' fr. 45 also chimes with the ultimate scene of maidenly sexuality—Nausicaa's riverside bathing: αἳ δὲ λοεσσάμεναι καὶ χρισάμεναι λίπ' ἐλαίωι (*Od.* 6.96).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882300068X Published online by Cambridge University Press

only generally with Alcaeus[7] but also specifically with fr. 45 further supports a purposeful continued engagement with fr. 45 in *Odes* 3.13.

How does this allusion aid interpretation? First, it contextualizes the *fons* in Horace's literary landscape and offers new insight into our first thorny issue that has been central to many readings—its location. Most agree that 'nobody *knows* where Bandusia was, but it is a fair guess that … it was on Horace's Sabine estate',[8] echoing ancient judgements (Acro on *Carm.* 3.13.1, Porphyrio on *Epist.* 1.16.12). However, Morgan recently revived an eighteenth-century theory, which links Horace's *fons Bandusiae* with a *Bandusinus fons* in an 1103 papal bull of Pascal II that places the spring near Venusia, Horace's birthplace; Morgan further claimed that Horace never explicitly situates the *fons Bandusiae* on the Sabine estate and that famous inspirational literary springs and rivers are tied to poets' birthplaces.[9]

However, neither claim is satisfactory. First, while Horace does not say that the *fons Bandusiae* is Sabine, he mentions a *fons* on his Sabine estate at *Epist.* 1.16.12–14 (and *Sat.* 2.6.2), which is rarely mentioned by commentators:

> fons etiam riuo dare nomen idoneus, ut nec
> frigidior Thracam nec purior ambiat Hebrus,
> infirmo capiti fluit utilis, utilis aluo.

Here, the Sabine *fons* is directly compared to the Hebrus through previously unnoticed allusions to both Alcaeus' fr. 45 and *Odes* 3.13. The comparison of *Epist.* 1.16.12, *frigidior* (1.16.13) and *purior* (1.16.13) glance back at *Odes* 3.13, while winding through Thrace recalls Alc. fr. 45.1–3; the point of mentioning the *fons* being beneficial, phrased with reference to body parts, draws on both. Nods to *Odes* 3.13 further abound in the surrounding lines (*Epist.* 1.16.9–16):

> si quercus et **ilex**
> multa fruge **pecus** multa dominum iuuet **umbra**?
> dicas adductum propius frondere Tarentum.
> …
> hae latebrae **dulces**, etiam, si credis, amoenae,
> incolumem tibi me praestant Septembribus **horis**.

The *ilex* is particularly telling: in *Odes* 3.13, the *fons* becomes *nobilis* because Horace sings not of the *fons* but of the *ilex*: *me dicente cauis impositam ilicem | saxis* (3.13.14–15).[10] For readers of the later *Epistles* 1.16, then, a Sabine *fons Bandusiae* is a natural assumption.

Moreover, these allusions are fundamental to the argument, making the identification more secure: as the *fons Bandusiae* keeps the animals, representing Horace and his pursuits, safe during the *hora Caniculae* (3.13.9), the Sabine *fons* keeps Horace safe and free from cares. Many Sabine estate passages present very similar elements (shade, animals, flowing water, drinking under a tree, escaping cares) which go beyond

[7] Where even those who see Alcaeus in *Odes* 3.13 stop: e.g. D. Curley, 'The Alcaic kid (Horace, *Carm.* 3.13)', *CW* 97 (2004), 137–52 cannot identify any likely Alcaean allusion in *Odes* 3.13.

[8] D. West, *Horace Odes III. Dulce Periculum. Text, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford, 2002), 120.

[9] Ll. Morgan, 'The one and only *fons Bandusiae*', *CQ* 59 (2009), 132–41; similarly, P. Fedeli, 'Il *fons Bandusiae*: Hor. *Carm.* 3,13', in P. Arduini (ed.), *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli*, 2 vols. (Rome, 2008), 1.475–96.

[10] The holm-oak is unpoetic, unlike Greek epigrams' plane or laurel trees by springs: Syndikus (n. 1), 130; cf. also M.R. Lefkowitz, 'The ilex in *O fons Bandusiae*', *CJ* 58 (1962), 63–7.

creating generic *loci amoeni*: most striking are the references to the Dog-days at *Carm.* 1.17.17–18 (*Caniculae | uitabis aestus*) and 3.29.18 (*iam Procyon furit*).[11] Indeed, the theme of escaping the distress of the Dog-days seems to be localized in the Sabine estate in the *Odes*,[12] where Dog-days are only mentioned in connection with it. Finally, while *Odes* 3.13 works regardless of the location of the *fons Bandusiae*, why would Horace confusingly compare another *fons* in *Epistles* 1.16 to a known *fons* that he had already celebrated in *Odes* 3.13 in a similar setting alongside an allusion to Alcaeus' Hebrus—only to compare this different *fons* to Alcaeus' Hebrus. Instead, a Sabine *fons* makes the allusive joke of *Epistles* 1.16 more piquant: the *fons* may be *riuo dare nomen idoneus* but, far from naming a river, it is merely compared to the Hebrus—which names the swimmer in *Odes* 3.12—and is actually instead named after a backwater spring without literary pedigree. The *fons Bandusiae* is thus intricately connected to the literary landscape of Horace's Sabine estate.

Morgan's second claim too—that poetic waters are linked to poets' birthplaces—is only partly true: some are not associated with particular poets, notably Castalia. The related claim that 'the poetic spring entails some indication of the provenance of the poet to whom it provides inspiration' is untrue:[13] Pindar draws inspiration from his native waters (*Ol.* 6.85–7, *Isthm.* 6.74–5)[14] but also from Castalia (*Pae.* 6.7–10). Further, poets are often associated by others with multiple springs or rivers: in [Mosch.] *Ep. Bion.* 70–7, Bion and Homer are considered 'sons' of the river Meles near Smyrna, their birthplace, but Bion drinks from Arethusa, associated with Theocritus, and Homer from Hippocrene, associated with Hesiod from the *Theogony*.[15] The location of Horace's spring, then, need not be bound to his birthplace.

Still, why would Horace name a Sabine spring after a landmark near his birthplace?[16] Waters are not ennobled by the very poets who are associated with them, but by later poets picking up mentions in earlier poets' works and biographies; thus Arethusa became the source of bucolic inspiration as Theocritus is from Sicily, though he never mentions Arethusa as a source of inspiration.[17] Horace inverts this trope temporally (*fies*, 3.13.13), prophesying that the spring will become *nobilis* because of him (*me dicente*, 3.13.14) with the hymnic language suggesting that Horace's poetry is the cause and the means.[18] Looking more closely, there are at least two kinds of associations

[11] The dramatic date is unclear: the third stanza is best read as providing a reason for thanksgiving (below), not the temporal setting. Cf. L. and P. Brind'Amour, 'La fontaine de Bandusie, la canicule, et les *Neptunalia*', *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 276–82; F. Cairns, 'Horace, *Odes*, III, 13 and III, 23', *AC* 46 (1977), 523–43.

[12] Elsewhere in Horace: *Epist.* 1.10.15–16, where the speaker, possibly at the Sabine estate (*post fanum putre Vacunae*, 49), says that there is nowhere *ubi gratior aura | leniat et rabiem Canis* than the country; *Sat.* 1.7.24–7, where Persius calls Rupilius Rex—who rushes *flumen ut hibernum* (cf. Hebrus' proverbial coldness: see below)—the Dog-star (*inuisum agricolis sidus*, contrasting with Brutus' salubrious companions); also *Epod.* 1.26–8, *Sat.* 2.5.39–40.

[13] Morgan (n. 9), 135.

[14] On drinking water for poetic inspiration: N.B. Crowther, 'Water and wine as symbols of inspiration', *Mnemosyne* 32 (1979), 1–11.

[15] In no surviving *Vita Homeris* is Homer mentioned near Helicon; Ps.-Moschus seems to make Hippocrene represent hexameter poetry with Hesiod considered its originator.

[16] A. Kiessling and R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden* (Dublin and Zurich, 1966[12]), 316 suggests Verg. *Aen.* 3.302–50 as parallel.

[17] A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1950), 1.xv–vi; R. Hunter, *Theocritus. A Selection* (Cambridge, 1999), 1–2.

[18] For Horace's phatic voice here: G. Davis, *Polyhymnia. The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley, 1991), 126–32.

between poets and poetic waters: (1) waters of the originators (πρῶτοι εὑρεταί) of poetic genres mentioned in their poetry or biographies (for example Arethusa for Theocritus and bucolic poetry); and (2) native waters that are sometimes recognized as poetic for nourishing the poet, but are not invoked to inspire others. The second type becomes common in Roman poetry, for example Virgil's Mincius (*Ecl.* 7.12–13, *G.* 3.14–15) and Ovid's *aquosus* Sulmo (*Am.* 2.1.1, 16.1–2, 3.15.11, *Tr.* 4.10.3, *Fast.* 4.685–6).[19] Indeed, [Mosch.] *Ep. Bion.* 70–7 highlights this difference: though the river Meles is addressed as 'the sweetest-sounding of rivers' (ποταμῶν λιγυρώτατε, 70), it is ennobled by—and for having raised—Homer and Bion,[20] not because it inspired Homer or Bion. Horace uses this idea, but collapses the difference instead: Horace glorifies—cheekily, through a Greek model—a Sabine *fons* as the inspirational spring of Roman lyric and names it *fons Bandusiae* as it has fulfilled the functions of other poets' native springs by providing the conditions for his poetry (see below).[21] Moreover, Horace provides 'autobiographical' near-death—and symbolic rebirth—narratives,[22] the latest of which—the falling tree (*Carm.* 2.13, 3.4.27, 3.8)—also happened on the Sabine estate.[23] Finally, Horace compares his Sabine idyll and spring to the countryside along the Appian Way near his birthplace again elsewhere: *dicas adductum proprius frondere Tarentum* (*Epist.* 1.16.11).

Triangulating the location of the *fons Bandusiae* therefore requires more than a 'fair guess' or finding historical documents. Examining the intertextual relationships of the *fons* with *Epistles* 1.16 and Alcaeus' fr. 45 and the associations of poetic waters has demonstrated the importance of the *fons* in Horace's literary and literal landscape, offering a more nuanced understanding of its significance in the ode.

II. KILLING THE KID

A literary historical approach can also help elucidate the ode's most confounding element—the prolonged focus on what is not the formal honorand of the hymn: the kid. Responses have ranged from disgust to claims about poetic technique and religious realism.[24] An overlooked reason is structural similarity with the poem's formal and

[19] This qualitative difference is not recognized by Morgan (n. 9), 136.

[20] Also for having sired Homer (cf. Homer's name—Melesigenes—and parentage in *Vitae Homeris*).

[21] Horace as the originator of Roman lyric: cf. *Carm.* 3.30.13–14. Peace enabling poetry and leisure: e.g. *Carm.* 1.1, 1.17.17–18, 2.11, 3.8, 3.15.25–8, 3.16.29–32, 3.29.

[22] The theme of the countryside as relief from distress is a kind of near-death narrative: cf. Catull. 44, where the Sabine or Tiburtine farm cures Catullus, and Horace's emphasis on the countryside's salubrity (e.g. *Epist.* 1.16.16, *Sat.* 1.7.24). In *Odes* 3.13, the *fons* provides animals respite from the ominous *flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae* (3.13.9).

[23] On the tree incident: S.J. Harrison, *Horace Odes Book II* (Cambridge, 2017), 156, 160.

[24] Notably: A.Y. Campbell, *Horace. A New Interpretation* (London, 1924), 2; E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 203; J.R. Wilson, '*O fons Bandusiae*', *CJ* 63 (1968), 289–96; G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 148–51; G. Williams, *The Third Book of Horace's Odes* (Oxford, 1969), 88–90; D. West, *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh, 1967), 129–30; West (n. 8), 119–20; G. Nussbaum, '*cras donaberis haedo* (Horace, *Carm.* 3.13)', *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 151–9; G. Nussbaum, 'Sympathy and empathy in Horace', *ANRW* 31.3 (1983), 2093–158, at 2133–5; Syndikus (n. 1), 133–4; D.R. Smith, 'The poetic focus in Horace, *Odes* 3.13', *Latomus* 35 (1976), 822–6; R. Hexter, '*O fons Bandusiae*: blood and water in Horace *Odes* 3.13', in M. Whitby, P. Hardie and M. Whitby (edd.), *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol, 1987),

argumentative model—Alcaeus, fr. 45.[25] Both poems play with the hymnic form, but neither functions as a hymn, as there is no request, narration, prayer or attempt to gain the deity's *charis*; instead, the speakers recognize the addressee's divinity or immortalize it. Alcaeus' fr. 45 also begins as a hymn with an invocation followed by an expansion of the addressee's attributes before unexpectedly shifting focus to something else, only to return to the honorand at the end. Moreover, Alcaeus' maidens and Horace's kid are depicted physically beside the honorand and mingling with water. Further, fr. 45 surprises the audience with the final sentence (σὸν ὡς ἄλει[ππα | θή[ϊο]ν ὕδωρ), which reveals the reason for Hebrus' divinity to be its unguent-like water that enchants the maidens, unrelated to the grand physical descriptions earlier. Scholars have similarly been puzzled because the enumerated qualities of the *fons*—its splendour, worthiness of dedications, and heat-quenching coolness—do not match the praise of the spring in the final stanza, where the reason for it becoming *nobilis* is left inexplicit. The strongest connection appears, like Alcaeus' ὡς ἄλει[ππα (7), to be the closing *unde loquaces | lymphae desiliunt tuae* (3.13.15–16). Moreover, the kid is a pun on the name Hebrus of fr. 45—ἔβρος means 'he-goat' (Hsch. ε104). Alcaeus' fr. 45 therefore offers a structural and logical parallel for Horace's extended digression, marked by an allusive pun on the digressive element (the kid).

Some readers' uneasiness with the sacrifice of the kid further appears anachronistic, as it is a normal ritual precursor to an imagined feast.[26] The choice of kid as meat here seems additionally influenced by Hesiod's *Op.* 582–96, which depicts a meal while escaping the distress of the Dog-days:

ἦμος δὲ σκόλυμός τ' ἀνθεῖ καὶ ἠχέτα τέττιξ
δενδρέωι ἐφεζόμενος λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' ἀοιδήν
πυκνὸν ὑπὸ πτερύγων θέρεος καματώδεος ὥρηι,
τῆμος πιότataί τ' αἶγες καὶ οἶνος ἄριστος,
μαχλόταται δὲ γυναῖκες, ἀφαυρότατοι δέ τοι ἄνδρες
εἰσίν, ἐπεὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ γούνατα Σείριος ἄζει,
αὐαλέος δέ τε χρὼς ὑπὸ καύματος· ἀλλὰ τότ' ἤδη
εἴη πετραίη τε σκιὴ καὶ Βίβλινος οἶνος
μᾶζά τ' ἀμολγαίη γάλα τ' αἰγῶν σβεννυμενάων
καὶ βοὸς ὑλοφάγοιο κρέας μή πω τετοκυίης
πρωτογόνων τ' ἐρίφων· ἐπὶ δ' αἴθοπα πινέμεν οἶνον
ἐν σκιῆι ἑζόμενον, κεκορημένον ἦτορ ἐδωδῆς,
ἀντίον ἀκραέος Ζεφύρου τρέψαντα πρόσωπα·
κρήνης δ' αἰενάου καὶ ἀπορρύτου, ἥ τ' ἀθόλωτος,
τρὶς ὕδατος προχέειν, τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ἱέμεν οἴνου.

When the golden thistle flowers and the chirping cicada, sitting on a tree, pours out its clear-sounding song continuously from under its wings in the season of toilsome summer, then goats are fattest and wine is best, and women are most lustful and men most feeble, since Sirius dries their head and knees, and the skin is dry from the heat; at that time then let

131–9; G.J. Mader, 'That st(r)ain again: blood, water, and generic allusion in Horace's Bandusia ode', *AJPh* 123 (2002), 51–9; Nisbet and Rudd (n. 5), 174–5; Morgan (n. 9).

[25] I do not deny the parallels in Hellenistic epigram (Pasquali [n. 3], 553–9 and Cairns [n. 11]) or the importance of Hellenistic poetry (D.J. Coffta, 'Programmatic synthesis in Horace, *Odes* III,13', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* IX [Brussels, 1998], 268–81), but rather highlight Horace's underappreciated allusion to his lyric model.

[26] West (n. 24), 130; Nussbaum (n. 24 [1971]), 157–8, rightly explaining the dual function of sacrifice and meal, linked explicitly at *Carm.* 3.17.14–16 and one implying the other at *Odes* 2.17, 3.22, 4.2; Davis (n. 18), 129–30; Cairns (n. 11), 531 notes the kid is a 'first fruit'.

there be a rock's shade, Bibline wine, cake made with milk, milk from goats that are drying up, and meat of a wood-grazing cow that has not yet calved and of first-born kids; drink some glistening wine while sitting in the shade, having sated one's heart of food, with the face turned towards the fresh Zephyr; from an ever-flowing and running spring which is untroubled, pour three portions of water and add a fourth of wine.

This passage is not only a situational parallel[27] but also another intertext, to which Horace alludes through Alcaeus' fr. 347 in a previously unnoticed 'window allusion':[28]

⊗ τέγγε πλεύμονας οἴνωι, τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται,
ἀ δ' ὥρα χαλέπα, πάντα δὲ δίψαισ' ὑπὰ καύματος,
ἄχει δ' ἐκ πετάλων ἄδεα τέττιξ < … >
ἄνθει δὲ σκόλυμος, νῦν δὲ γύναικες μιαρώταται 4
λέπτοι δ' ἄνδρες, ἐπεὶ <δὴ> κεφάλαν καὶ γόνα Σείριος
ἄσδει

Wet your lungs with wine; for the star is coming round, the season is harsh, everything is thirsty under the heat, and the cicada sings sweetly from the leaves … the golden thistle flowers and now women are most defiled and men feeble, since Sirius dries their head and knees.

Allusive details beside the kid include *tangere* (3.13.10), which looks to τέγγε (Alc. fr. 347.1);[29] *atrox hora* (3.13.9) (∼ ὥρα χαλέπα, fr. 347.2); *flagrantis … Caniculae* (3.13.9) from καύματος (Alc. fr. 347.2, Hes. *Op.* 588) and Σείριος ἄσδει/ἄζει (Alc. fr. 347.5–6, Hes. *Op.* 587); *lasciui* (3.13.8) from μαχλόταται (*Op.* 586); *inficiet* (3.13.6) from μιαρώταται (fr. 347.4); Horace's singing and the loquacious spring under the tree and cave (3.13.14–16) parallelling the cicada singing under the tree (Alc. fr. 347.3, Hes. *Op.* 582–4) and πετραίη τε σκιή (*Op.* 589); wine from Βίβλινος οἶνος (*Op.* 589); the spring from Hesiod's ever-flowing spring (*Op.* 595); and flowers from ἀνθεῖ/ἄνθει (Hes. *Op.* 582, Alc. fr. 347.4). Further, *fessis uomere tauris* (3.13.11) may draw on θέρεος καματώδεος (*Op.* 584) and feeble men (Alc. fr. 347.5, Hes. *Op.* 586), while *lasciui suboles gregis* (3.13.8) may invert βοὸς … μή πω τετοκυίης (*Op.* 591). Two Alcaean allusions in one ode is unsurprising: we saw a similar double Alcaean allusion in *Odes* 3.12. The Horatian ode's engagement with Alcaeus' fr. 347 and with Hes. *Op.* 582–96 is thus deep and sustained, adding climatic, contextual and festal details to the poem that tie into the Horatian theme of the countryside as a retreat from distress.[30]

However, blood staining the water is absent from the referents, and the image's vividness and the difference in focus require an explanation. The chromatic contrast

[27] Nussbaum (n. 24 [1971]), 152–4; E.A. Schmidt, 'Das horazische Sabinum als Dichterlandschaft', *A&A* 23 (1977), 97–112, at 109–11, based on the Hesiodic comparison, claims that the sacrifice of the goat expresses thanks for the spring's gift—water to mix with *merum*—since it allows moderate passion from mixed wine instead of fiery fights (*uenerem et proelia*). The passage is neglected in commentaries: Nisbet and Rudd (n. 5), 177 only mention it to explain *Canicula* as Sirius; D.W. Vessey, 'The *fons Bandusiae* and the problem of the text', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* IV (Brussels, 1986), 383–92, at 389 mentions it to note the Dog-days' erotic aspect.

[28] The closeness between Hes. *Op.* 582–96 and Alcaeus' fr. 347 is well known: R. Hunter, *Hesiodic Voice. Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's* Works and Days (Cambridge, 2014), 123–6.

[29] Doubts about the relationship between *tangomenas faciamus* (Petron. *Sat.* 34.7) and Alcaeus' fr. 347.1 (G. Schmeling, *A Commentary on the* Satyrica *of Petronius* [Oxford, 2011], 123) do not affect the punning allusion here.

[30] On the significance of these allusions, see below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882300068X Published online by Cambridge University Press

is anticipated in *splendidior uitro* | *dulci digne mero* (3.13.1–2),[31] which underlines the parallel of the two offerings to the spring as they both mix with its waters. Further, blood mixing with water may be a circumlocution for a more visceral killing-scene, just as some films avoid graphic murder-scenes by showing blood on the floor; indeed, the murderous element of sacrifice is generally distanced by the Greeks and the Romans.[32] Still, qualms about the image cannot be dismissed as it actively attracts attention:[33] Horace, after just two lines on the *fons*, dedicates six to this kid; the delay of *frustra* (3.13.6) to the opening of the following line mimetically parallels the suddenness with which the kid's fate is lost; and we turn away from the kid with *te* (3.13.9), which jolts us back to the *fons* and continues the hymnic list of attributes, making the kid section a digression.

Scholars sense 'callous irony of pathos' or some 'unsettling' feeling.[34] Some leave it there, or explain it away through allegory, but Morgan suggests that it has a purpose. He sees the kid as Horace's surrogate sacrificed at the 'cusp of maturity', like the young Horace who left Venusia for education, in recompense for Horace's success, and suggests that 'we cannot appreciate the richness of Horace's life—the generosity of Bandusia's gift, in other words—unless the inversion of this gift, the curtailment of life endured by the kid, is developed with proportionate intensity'.[35]

I agree that the kid is a surrogate—but a parallel in age between the kid and Horace is unconvincing. Why should Horace give thanks to his native spring with a kid, if it is education and life in Rome that brings Horace success? According to this reasoning, Horace should thank a Roman spring with an adult goat. Rather, the kid is a surrogate for Horace because the *fons* has kept Horace safe, just as it protected animals. The kid's age reflects the usual appropriate sacrifice—a victim without blemish, since it has not been involved in the violent mating rituals (*uenus* and *proelia*, 3.13.5), as at *Odes* 3.18.5 and 4.2.53–60, where there is an even more extended focus on a young victim whose life is curtailed. This reading has the advantage of integrating the third stanza, often overlooked by scholars, into the logic of the poem. The pathos of the sacrifice intensifies the joy from the gift of the *fons*—not straightforwardly success but keeping animals safe during the summer and thus Horace, who presumably also benefitted from its *frigus amabile* (3.13.10). Crucially, the kid's—and Horace's—mortality contrasts with the immortality of Horace's *fons* and poetry. This interpretation further chimes with the Alcaean and Hesiodic allusions, as Hesiod (*Op.* 582–96) mentions the spring and the shade as providing escape from the heat, and Alcaeus' fr. 45 ends by praising the river for benefitting humans.

III. METAPOETIC, POLITICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVES

Many have rightly sought to read *Odes* 3.13 metapoetically, offering varied interpretations.[36] Commager and Hexter divine that mixing blood and water represent

[31] *splendidior* (3.13.1) of the water and *rubro* (3.13.6) of the blood are perhaps drawn from αἴθοπα … οἶνον (Hes. *Op.* 592).

[32] J.-P. Vernant, 'Théorie générale du sacrifice et mise à mort dans la *Thusia* grecque', in *Le Sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (*Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 27) (Geneva, 1981), 1–21.

[33] The futurity hardly dulls the clarity of the image, *pace* Vessey (n. 27), 386.

[34] Irony: Williams (n. 24 [1969]), 89, refined, for example, in Nussbaum (n. 24 [1971]), 158. Unsettling feeling: Wilson (n. 24); Mader (n. 24); Morgan (n. 9), 137–40.

[35] Morgan (n. 9), 138–9.

[36] Since Horace emphasizes this aspect (3.13.13–16), a one-dimensional nature poem (e.g. Syndikus [n. 1]) seems unlikely.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882300068X Published online by Cambridge University Press

transformation of life into art;[37] it is unclear how. Mader sees the water as representing Callimachean poetry and the blood as epic and the *uenus* and *proelia* (3.13.5) of the kid as lyric and epic respectively to suggest that the sacrifice of the kid grants the Callimachean and lyric water the power to immortalize and prophesy, ignoring the non-erotic element of lyric.[38] Curley claims that the kid is both a Callimachean ('a product of *eros*')—an oversimplification of Callimacheanism in Horace—and an Alcaean offering (*uenerem et proelia destinat*, 3.13.5).[39] Morgan suggests that the kid's denied future of both *uenus* and *proelia* represents Alcaeus' treatment of both themes.[40]

We should go further. The mingling of the pure Callimachean water, marked by another allusion (*splendidior uitro*, 3.13.1 ~ ὑάλοιο φαάντερος οὐρανός, Callim. *Hecale* fr. 18.2 Hollis = fr. 238.16 Pfeiffer),[41] and the blood of a kid destined for *uenus* and *proelia* (3.13.5) clearly signpost the mixture of erotic and political/martial themes in relation both to Alcaeus' reputation in Horace (especially at *Carm.* 1.32.5–12)[42] and to the Hellenistic and Roman framing of smaller-scale and larger-scale poetry.[43] The exploration of the Alcaean and Hesiodic allusions discussed above add an important layer to this interpretation, as the reworking of Alcaeus' frr. 45 and 347 represents Horace's Alcaean debt, and the Hesiodic allusion shows an engagement with larger-scale poetry.

Horace's Callimachean influence too can be seen from this perspective. The description emphasizing the victim's youth is part of Horace's nexus of humble sacrifices that toys with Callimachus' contrast between the fat victim and the slender Muse (*Aet.* fr. 1.23–4). As at *Carm.* 4.2.53–60, where the allusion to the *Aetia* is explicit and Horace outdoes Callimachus with a *tener uitulus*,[44] here and elsewhere (for example *Carm.* 3.18.5) the youth and humility of the sacrificed kid cast the poet's sacrifice as that of a super-refined Hellenistic poet. Indeed, a humble goat-sacrifice, found in two metapoetic 'rustic' Theocritean epigrams, has literary pedigree:[45] in *Epigram* 1, a goat is sacrificed at an altar (probably) to Apollo; in *Epigram* 4, a goatherd in a Theocritean bucolic world is told to sacrifice a χίμαρον καλόν (15) to stop the speaker's love for Daphnis, in contrast to the promise of a heifer, a he-goat and a lamb if he wins Daphnis, in a setting very similar to that of *Odes* 3.13. Thus Horace's kid engages with Hellenistic metapoetics of sacrifice, and the kid's blood turns out not simply to be martial, heroic or political but also itself something worthy of Callimachean λεπτότης.

The transformation of Alcaeus' fr. 45 similarly engages with Callimachean poetics of the small: Horace miniaturizes the great and famous river into a small, private *fons*,[46] paralleling the contrast between the Euphrates and the holy spring of Callim. *Hymn*

[37] S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace* (New Haven, 1962), 323–4; Hexter (n. 24), 132.
[38] Mader (n. 24). Similarly, Fedeli (n. 9), 494.
[39] Curley (n. 7), 144.
[40] Morgan (n. 9), 139.
[41] Noted already by Williams (n. 24 [1969]), 88 n. 1.
[42] However, Horace is inconsistent: cf. *Carm.* 2.13.21–32.
[43] For Hellenistic poetry, cf. especially Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1 and *Epigr.* 28 Pfeiffer with A. Harder (ed.), *Callimachus* Aetia, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2012), 2.44–5. For Roman poetry, cf. especially Hor. *Carm.* 2.12.
[44] R.F. Thomas, *Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare* (Cambridge, 2011), 120–1.
[45] These epigrams' authorship and dates are controversial: L. Rossi, *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach* (Leuven, 2001), 125–9, 166–7, 355–9.
[46] For the typological parallel of spring and river, cf. the list of springs building up to one of rivers at Ov. *Met.* 2.238–58.

2.108–12. Indeed, Alcaeus' fr. 45 and Hes. *Op.* 582–96 resonate with Hellenistic and Roman aesthetics: the former is a short poem about something large and powerful with epigram-like concision and turn of phrase, interaction between nature and humans, and erotic undertones; the latter explores idealized hyperrealistic nature. Both could be read metapoetically from a Hellenistic perspective, particularly the inspirational river and the singing cicada.[47] Therefore, the cliché that *Odes* 3.13 makes the spring *ex humili potens* ('powerful from having been lowly', *Carm.* 3.30.12) like Horace should be inverted to *e potenti humilis* ('lowly from having been powerful') as the large, powerful river and the 'higher' genres are turned into a small local spring and a short lyric poem; yet *ex humili potens* still works as *Odes* 3.13 is twice the length of Alcaeus' fr. 45.

In my metapoetic reading, then, the relief from the heat can be understood as the pleasant conditions in which Horace could sing like the Hesiodic and Alcaean cicada, while the sacrifice gives thanks for such conditions. The poem further works on political and philosophical levels. The conditions conducive to Horace's poetry are not just respite from the heat but also a kind of Epicurean *ataraxia* enabled by the political peace of Augustan Rome.[48] This is represented by the Sabine estate, usually considered the means of Horace's financial independence as well as philosophical, political and literary freedom.[49] Thus in *Epistles* 1.16, Horace emphasizes the restorative quality of the *fons* and the estate as a foil for the ever-busy Quinctius to show that a *uir bonus et sapiens* (1.16.73) is without worries: *perdidit arma, locum Virtutis deseruit, qui | semper in augenda festinat et obruitur re* (1.16.67–8).[50] Horace's choice to rework the Hebrus can also be seen in this light. The Hebrus is proverbially ice-cold (Theoc. *Id.* 7.112, *Anth. Pal.* 9.561.1 [Philip], Verg. *Ecl.* 10.65, *Aen.* 12.331, Hor. *Carm.* 3.25.10, *Epist.* 1.3.3), often suggesting unpleasant or ineffective surroundings; in *Odes* 3.13 and in *Epist.* 1.16.13, Horace inverts this cliché of Hebrus' unattractive, harsh *frigus* to offer a *fons* whose refreshing *frigus* offers nourishment and sanctuary, mirroring the inhospitable river's transformation into a source of philosophical, political and literary freedom in an idealized landscape.

In the *Odes*, the same Horatian–Epicurean argument with an explicit political element is found in 3.8, where Maecenas is told to stop worrying about matters abroad and drink to celebrate Horace's escape from the falling tree (3.8.13–14), because Maecenas —unlike Augustus—is a private citizen (*priuatus*, 3.8.26). Similarly, in 3.29, Maecenas is told to forget his political worries and come for a drink, since the seasonal heat calls for it (3.29.21–4; cf. 3.13.9–12). The themes are united in *Odes* 2.11. Possibly the same Quinctius as in *Epistles* 1.16 is told to stop worrying about far-off enemies, which leads into a *carpe diem* poem, where Horace envisions a symposium under a tree, drinking wine (*dissipat Euhius | curas edacis*, 2.11.17–18) with water from a nearby spring

[47] On the cicada as poet and the influence of the Hesiodic cicada: Harder (n. 43), 2.70–1.

[48] Horace's undogmatic approach to philosophy and Epicureanism: J.L. Moles, 'Philosophy and ethics', in S.J. Harrison, *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (Cambridge, 2007), 165–80.

[49] The idea is common enough to be used in passing: e.g. *cur ualle permutem Sabina | diuitias operosiores?* (*Carm.* 3.1.47–8). Political and financial emphasis: A. Bradshaw, 'Horace *in Sabinis*', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* V (Brussels, 1989), 160–86; K. Dang, 'Rome and the Sabine "farm": aestheticism, topography, and the landscape of production', *Phoenix* 64 (2010), 102–27. Philosophical emphasis: J.L. Moles, 'Poetry, philosophy, politics and play. *Epistles* 1', in T. Woodman and D. Feeney (edd.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge, 2002), 141–57. Literary perspective: E.W. Leach, 'Horace's Sabine topography in lyric and hexameter verse', *AJPh* 114 (1993), 271–302. It matters little here whether Horace is philosophically consistent or is pro- or anti-Augustan in his literary use of the estate.

[50] On business and illness, cf. e.g. Hor. *Epist.* 7.3–4.

(*praetereunte lympha*, 2.11.20), while Lyde plays the lyre: in the idyll similar to that of *Odes* 3.13, political cares are banished for a feast and musical entertainment. *Odes* 3.13 assumes these underlying ideas with another rhetorical point: instead of calling to dispel worries, worries have already been dispelled and the rhetorical point is thanksgiving for dispelling worries. *Epod.* 2.23–7, which clearly interacts with *Odes* 3.13 (it too imagines an overhanging holm-oak, burbling springs and trickling water), presents the same idea as a timeless truth (*quis non malarum, quas amor curas habet, | haec inter obliuiscitur? Epod.* 2.37–8), while *Odes* 1.17 presents it as a future certainty (*uitabis aestus*, 1.17.18; *nec metues*, 1.17.24).

Odes 1.17, set on the Sabine estate, provides the closest parallel to *Odes* 3.13. Like the *fons*, Faunus protects Horace's goats from the weather (1.17.2–4) and keeps them safe in the woodland (1.17.5); goats are sexual (*olentis uxores mariti*, 1.17.7) and young kids are present (1.17.9; horn of plenty at 1.17.14–6 ~ *frons turgida cornibus* at 3.13.4) in a musical setting by rocks (1.17.10–13). The Horatian Epicureanism of escaping to the countryside can be found too in the safety of animals, especially in their lack of fear (*nec uiridis metuunt colubras | nec Martialis haediliae lupos*, 1.17.8–9), the remoteness of the valley (1.17.17), and the sweetness of music (1.17.10). This time, the estate, providing relief during the Dog-days, will inspire not Horace but Tyndaris: *hic in reducta ualle Caniculae | uitabis aestus et fide Teia | dices* (1.17.17–19). The different gender of the singer, crowned like the *fons* (*haerentem coronam | crinibus*, 1.17.27–8), is also metapoetic; the lyre is Tean, suggesting Anacreon's love poetry, and though the subject matter appears epic, the focus is on love (*laborantis in uno | Penelopen uitreamque Circen*, 1.17.19–20). The wine is Lesbian, pointing to Sappho or Alcaeus, while the avoidance of fights (*nec Semeleius | cum Marte confundet Thyoneus | proelia*, 1.17.22–4) suggests Sappho (cf. *Carm.* 2.13.30–2)—another nod to love poetry and to a literary and erotic extension of Epicurean *ataraxia* (*nec metues proteruum | suspecta Cyrum*, 1.17.24–5). Further, the similarity and the repetition of themes in the two halves of the poem, and especially the position of Tyndaris as musician like Faunus, assimilate one to the other, rendering the poem praise for a divinity on the Sabine estate who provides protection and musical inspiration, like the hymn of *Odes* 3.13 to the *fons*.

Thus a closer reading of *Odes* 3.13 within its literary contexts opens up new exciting interpretative avenues. Horace appears to suggest its multivalent possibilities through the spring's paradoxical nature: it can be stained (*inficiet*, 3.13.6) but not touched (*nescit tangere*, 3.13.10). On a metapoetic level, mixing of blood in the pure water, like Callimachus' mud in the Euphrates, represents an intrusion of thematic materials not usually associated with smaller-scale poetry of Callimachean λεπτότης, while that mixing itself is presented as Callimachean. Horace avoids a blanket negative judgement of the intruding blood and martial or political themes, as it is this sacrifice and intrusion that elevate the *fons* and the poetry—just as sacrificial blood both defiles and purifies. It is significant that the Callimachean allusion in *Carm.* 3.13.1 (*splendidior uitro*) is to *Hecale*, a longish hexameter poem with heroic material that adheres to Callimachean metapoetics of the small; with the very words describing the spring's purity, Horace claims a literary precedent for mixing themes of smaller-scale and larger-scale poetry. Similarly, on political and philosophical levels, the kid's blood can be seen as the blood of the Civil Wars and the worries of contemporary life; Horace again avoids a simplistic reading of wars and worries, as they pave the way for—and are the price of—peace and *ataraxia* necessary for his poetry.

IV. *ODES* 3.13 WITHIN *ODES* BOOK 3

We now turn to the place of *Odes* 3.13 in the collection. On a sequential reading, the generic nods of *uenus* and *proelia* are found in Neobule's unrequited love of *Odes* 3.12 and in Augustus' return in *Odes* 3.14; however, this is not a shift to grander themes, as *Odes* 3.14 turns to prepare a symposium with Neaera,[51] and the political and philosophical themes hinted at in *Odes* 3.13 are only given greater emphasis. Indeed, as if there were a change of day with the change of poem, the feast envisioned for tomorrow (*cras*, 3.13.3) is realized with a different feast in the next poem (*hic dies uere mihi festus*, 3.14.13) and the concerns of *Odes* 3.13 are picked up in *Odes* 3.14 with a more explicitly political and philosophical angle: Augustus has banished all cares (3.14.13–16), which allows Horace to enjoy the symposium with wine, song and love (3.14.17–22).

Odes 3.13 has resisted analyses of the broader structure of the book. In Santirocco's carefully considered scheme, *Odes* 3.13 is omitted with the justification that 'excessive neatness in such matters is rare among poets—it is apt to result in what Collinge has dubbed "aesthetic indigestion"—and suspect among critics'.[52] His arrangement is also odd because he claims that the 'Roman Odes' (3.1–3.6) are answered not by another group of six odes but by a group of nine (3.7–3.15), with the following pattern: amatory admonition in *Odes* 3.7 and 3.15; Maecenas/Augustus and politics in *Odes* 3.8 and 3.14; lovers' duet and lover's soliloquy in *Odes* 3.9 and 3.12; lover's persuasion in *Odes* 3.10 and 3.11; and *Odes* 3.13 left out. Similarly, Porter resorts to special pleading to make *Odes* 3.13 pair with 3.9.[53]

It seems unlikely that such an important programmatic poem should be out of place in an otherwise tightly structured book. We should instead see a group of six poems (3.7–3.12) as the formal counterpart to the six 'Roman Odes', and see a group of three poems (3.13–3.15) as a group of its own providing a programmatic summarizing end to the first half of the book. A new dedication to Maecenas would then mark a new beginning for the second half of the book in *Odes* 3.16 as at *Odes* 1.20 and 2.12.

Indeed, my 6+6+3 structure has many advantages. *Odes* 3.7 and 3.12 answer each other with two lovesick women (Asterie, Neobule) and two men with names of rivers (Enipeus, Hebrus)[54] swimming in the Tiber. Similarly, *Odes* 3.8 and 3.11 pair well: in both, the poet tells someone (Maecenas, who is fraught with worry; Lyde, who has no worries) a story of near-death escape (Horace from the tree, Lynceus from the Danaids). Finally, *Odes* 3.9 and 3.10 complement each other: the former depicts lovers' mutual successful persuasion and the latter presents unilateral and likely unsuccessful persuasion. The group of *Odes* 3.13–3.15 thus closes the first half of the book; it is introduced by a programmatic poem (3.13) that highlights the diverse contents of the book and contains erotic, political and philosophical themes, and is followed by a poem with a political focus (3.14) and a poem with an erotic focus (3.15) that still contain all these themes. There is also apt movement within this group, as we saw, between *Odes* 3.13 and 3.14 and with a contrast between the exemplary and harmonious family of the imperial household (*Carm.* 3.14.5–12) and the dysfunctional and adulterous family of *Odes* 3.15. This grouping does not preclude continuing to see other patterns of

[51] *Pace* Curley (n. 7).
[52] M.S. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes (Chapel Hill, NC and London, 1986), 126.
[53] D.H. Porter, *Horace's Poetic Journey. A Reading of Odes 1–3* (Princeton, 1987), 43.
[54] Enipeus, like Alcaeus' Hebrus, is θεῖος and κάλλιστος ποταμῶν ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἴησι (*Od.* 11.238–9).

arrangement,[55] but it has the benefit of a neater contrast with the 'Roman Odes' while still allowing for a broader grouping of *Odes* 3.7–3.15 that harmonizes with Porter's and Santirocco's broader schemes.

V. CONCLUSION

Despite its fame, the workings of *Odes* 3.13 appear to have been underappreciated. This article has shown the importance to the ode's interpretation of understanding the literary contexts—particularly archaic Greek poetry—which had been neglected owing to long-standing debates on the location of the *fons Bandusiae* and the propriety of the sacrifice. By exploring allusions to Alcaeus (frr. 45 and 347) and Hesiod (*Op.* 582–96), I have provided a multilayered interpretation of the poem and suggested a more refined understanding of the place of *Odes* 3.13 in the broader structure of *Odes* Book 3.

University of Cambridge I.-K. SIR
iks24@cam.ac.uk

[55] Individual structural analyses need not be exclusionary; for another Roman example: B.W. Breed, 'Time and textuality in the book of the *Eclogues*', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (Leiden and Boston, 2006), 333–67.