

EIGHT HORATIAN 'BRIDGES'

MIROSLAV MARCOVICH

When Horace chooses to combine, in a single ode, two blocks of sense equal in length, he sometimes links them by an additional stanza placed in the middle: this central stanza I shall call 'bridge.'¹⁾ There seem to be eight clear instances of such a 'bridge' in the *Odes*: 1.2; 1.4; 1.16; 1.17; 2.14; 3.8; 3.14, and 4.7. I shall briefly examine here the functional role of 'the bridge' in the thought-structure of these odes.²⁾

I. TWO POLITICAL ODES: 3.14 AND 1.2

3.14 *Herculis ritu modo dictus, o plebs*. The bipartite structure of the ode (stanzas 1-3 v. 5-7) becomes clear from the following elements. (1) Two different addressees: 1 *o, plebs*, v. 17 *puer* ('O people of Rome,' v. 'You, slave boy'). (2) Two different roles assumed by the poet: a *praeco* ('pub-

1) Eduard Fraenkel (*Horace*, Oxford 1957, 290) and Gordon Williams (*The Third Book of Horace's Odes*, Oxford 1969, 22f.; 93) were aware of the presence of such an 'intervening,' 'central stanza' securing 'a smooth transition,' while N.E. Collinge (*The Structure of Horace's Odes*, Oxford 1961, 99f.; 120) calls it a 'transition-passage,' 'lead-in' or 'overlap.' I think a 'bridge' is much more than that: see the conclusion.

2) Only the scholarship directly related to my topic will be referred to. The text is basically that of Friedrich Klingner (Teubner, 3rd ed., 1959). The knowledge of the standard running commentaries is presupposed, such as: Dionysius Lambinus (Lyons 1561 = Coblenz 1829); Richard Bentley (Cambridge 1711 = Berlin 1869); J.C. Orelli, revised by J.G. Baiter and W. Hirschfelder (4th ed., Berlin 1886); O. Keller and A. Holder (2nd ed., Leipzig 1899); Lucian Müller (2 vols., St. Petersburg and Leipzig 1900); A. Kiessling, revised by R. Heinze (10th ed., with an Appendix by Erich Burck, Berlin 1960); Karl Nummerger (*Horaz lyrische Gedichte*, Münster 1972); and especially R.G.M. Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard (*A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*, Oxford 1970; *Book II*, 1978).

lic announcer') in part I: a private giver of a drinking-party, in part II. Accordingly, two different places of action: *forum Romanum*, in I: the poet's home, in II. (3) Two different sets of persons mentioned in the poem: (a) a god (Hercules), Augustus himself (likened to that god), his wife Livia, and his sister Octavia; (b) then mothers, wives, brothers, and sisters of the homecoming soldiers, in part I: (a) a *hetaera* (Neaera), and her hateful janitor; (b) persons from the turbulent past of Rome (the Marsians, Spartacus, and the consul Plancus), in part II.

Furthermore, (4) Two different poetic dictions. The solemn tone of an official triumph, comprising religious injunctions, in part I (the homecoming of a victorious commander in chief; sacrifices to the just gods; the rejoicing Livia and Octavia process; the suppliant garlands; every participant refrain from ill-omened words), is contrasted by usual symposiac terminology, in part II (ointment, garlands of flowers, a cask of old wine, the clear-voiced Neaera, her janitor, a spirit eager for disputes and quarrel). (5) Finally, and this is the most important point, the present security (24 B.C.), both public and private, as a consequence of the victory of Augustus, the new Hercules, benefactor of mankind (*Herculis ritu... Caesar... victor*), in part I, is clearly opposed to Civil and Slave wars from the recent past, in part II: the *bellum Marsicum* (91-89 B.C.); the War of Spartacus (73-71 B.C.), and especially Philippi (42 B.C.). The ode opens with the winners Hercules and Caesar (24 B.C.): it closes with the defeat at Philippi (28 *consule Planco*).

We may ask now which ones of these antithetic images and ideas are being bridged by the central stanza 4? I think, points (2), (4), and especially (5):

Hic dies vere mihi festus atras
eximet curas: ego nec tumultum
15 nec mori per vim metuam tenente
 Caesare terras.

Point (2): 13 *mihi* and 14 *ego* mark the transition from the public 1 *o, plebs*, to the private 27 *ego*, explaining the two

roles played by the poet in the ode. Notice especially two different givers of orders, in 6 *prodeat* ('let Livia take part in the solemn procession') and 12 *parcite verbis* (= εὐφημεῖτε), as against 17 *i pete*; 21 *dic*, and 24 *abito*.

Point (4): 13 *hic dies... festus* bridges an official triumph (in I) with a private celebration (in II). Now point (5): the Adoniac 16 *Caesare terras* serves as a bridge between 3f. *Caesar... victor* and 28 *consule Planco*, stressing the present security from civil wars under the *pax Augusta*: 'I shall fear neither revolution nor death by violence as long as Caesar rules over the world.'

The 'bridge' reveals careful craftsmanship: notice, e.g., the alliteration of the *t* sound at the end of each line (eight of them), and the contrasting juxtaposition, 13 *festus atras*. For the political implication of these *atrae curae* compare 1.14.18 *curaque non levis*.

In conclusion, in addition to achieving structural unity of the poem, the 'bridge' enhances its *political* message: the year 24 B.C. is clearly opposed to the year 42 B.C. Thus, 13 *hic dies vere mihi festus* takes the ode from the genre of symposiac celebrations (such as *Odes* 3.8.9 *hic dies... festus*) to the category of political poems, such as 1.37.1 *Nunc est bibendum*, or Epode 9.³⁾

*

Odes 1.2 *Iam satis terris nivis atque dirae*. Again, the bipartite structure of the ode seems to be clear enough. The grim image of part I (stanzas 1-6) -- ill-omened bad weather, Tiber floods the city, the fear of another Age of Flood, the real possibility of an Italy depopulated through many civil wars (24 *rara iuventus*) -- is being contrasted by the epiphany of a Savior of the state, in part II (stanzas 8-13), such as Apollo, or Venus, or Mars, or even better Mercury disguised as Augustus.

In part I we learn that Rome and Italy have been punished long enough (1 *iam satis*: by January of 27 B.C.?) by Jupiter (*terris... dirae grandinis misit pater et... terruit Urbem, terruit*

3) On *Odes* 3.14 compare Udo W. Scholz, *Wiener Stud.* 84 (1971) 123-137.

gentis...; on the agglomeration of the *r* sound see Kiessling-Heinze). 'We already have experienced (13 *vidimus*) the avenging flood of Tiber: we may as well experience depopulation of Italy, and our scarce posterity will blame only us (21 *audiet... audiet pugnas vitio parentum rara iuventus*).

In part II, however, the verbs are invoking the παρουσία of a divine Savior ('O come and stay with us'), as in a κλητικὸς ὕμνος: 30 *tandem venias precamur*; 45ff. *serus in caelum redeas diuque laetus intersis populo... neve te... ocior aura tollat*. This advent is capped by the anaphora in the *peroratio* (stanza 13): *hic... hic* (i.e., 42 *in terris*, as opposed to 45 *in caelum*).⁴⁾

In brief, the opening phrase, *Iam satis* -- which reveals 'the language of prayer' (Nisbet-Hubbard) -- finds a logical hymnic sequel in part II (*tandem venias* and *serus in caelum redeas*). The Savior Mercury-Augustus will avenge the murder of Julius Caesar (44 *Caesaris ultor*) and the ensuing civil war; he will also take vengeance on the Parthians (51 *neu sinas Medos equitare inultos*): both revenges are required in stanza 6 of part I (*civis... Persae... pugnas vitio parentum*). Finally, the catalogue of part II (Apollo, Venus, Mars, Mercury) contrasts that of part I (Pyrrha, Proteus, Tiber, Ilia, all of them being of a lower rank). So much for the bipartite structure of the ode.

What is now the role of the 'bridge' (25-30)? Formally, it consists of three questions, rhetorically arranged in a *tricolon polyptoton*: *quem vocet... populus? prece qua fatigent... virgines? cui dabit... Iuppiter?*⁵⁾

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

4) Compare *Odes* 3.5.2f. *praesens divus habebitur / Augustus; Serm.* 2.3.68 *praesens Mercurius*, and Karl Keyssner, *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griech. Hymnus* (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswiss. 2, Stuttgart 1932), 103.

5) For such a series of questions compare *Odes* 1.12.1ff. (inspired by Pindar *Ol.* 2.2), *Quem virum aut heroa?...quem deum?...cuius...nomen? ... quid prius dicam?; 2.7.23ff. quis?...quem?*

cui dabit partis scelus expiandi

30 Iuppiter?

Now question 2 looks back, to part I. *Prece qua fatigent virgines sanctae... Vestam* is a bridge to 15 *ire deiectum... templa-que Vestae*, implying: 'The traditional prayers (*carmina*, as opposed to new *preces*) are not able to appease Vesta: so huge was *the crime*.' I think (*contra* Nisbet-Hubbard) that 29 *scelus* refers to *both* Caesar's murder and the ensuing civil war ('*et necem Caesaris et bella domestica inde orta*,' Orelli).

Much more functional are, however, questions 1 and 3, which look forward, to part II. They complement each other: *Quem vocet divum populus? ≈ Cui dabit partis... Iuppiter?* Evidently, the prayer of the Roman people (*quem deorum vocet*) coincides with the decision of Jupiter (*cui deorum dabit*). Horace prays for the advent of Mercury, and Jupiter sends down Mercury: the exactor of the *expiatio sceleris* and the Savior of the *ruens imperium* will be the heaven-sent Mercury in the shape of Octavian, as both 44 *Caesaris ultor* and 50 *pater atque princeps*.

At the same time, questions 1 and 3 directly lead to the hymnic πολυωνυμία of a divinity (τίνα σε χρῆ προσεῖπεῦν; πότερον... ἦ... ἦ...;),⁶⁾ which is verbatim expressed in part II: Apollo or Venus or Mars or rather Mercury.

In brief, the key words of the 'bridge' -- *scelus*, *ruens imperium*, and above all a Savior (*cui dabit*) sent by Jupiter -- serve as a strong functional connection between part I (2ff. *pater terruit Urbem, terruit gentis*;⁷⁾ 21ff. *civis* [sc. *contra civis*]... *pugnas vitio parentum*) and part II (44 *Caesaris ultor*; 47 *nostris vitiis*; 50 *pater atque princeps... Caesar*). Jupiter (2 and 30) is the agent of the παρουσία of the Savior Mercury-Octavian on earth (41-52). *Pater* Jupiter in stanza 1 ends with *Caesar pater* in stanza 13, and the 'bridge' plays a pivotal role. (*Aliter* H. Womble, *A.J.P.* 91 [1970] 1-30, esp. 9f.)

6) See Keyssner 46f., and Fraenkel 247 n.1.

7) But the excessive avenging action of the god Tiber could not find the approval of Jupiter: 19 *Iove non probante*.

II. FOUR *CARPE DIEM* ODES:
2.14 AND 3.8; 1.4 AND 4.7

Odes 2.14 *Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume*. The opening word *Eheu* gives the tone of 'doom' to the entire ode: it is enhanced by the emotional (and rare) anaphora, *Postume, Postume*.⁸⁾ Each stanza is carefully built upon a *tricolon*, but the point is that the gloomy atmosphere of the inevitability of death persists throughout the poem. Here is how it works.

Stanza		<i>Tricolon</i>		<i>Pulvis et umbra sumus</i>
1	fugaces	labuntur	nec...moram	Eheu
	rugae	senecta	mors	indomita mors
2-3	Geryon	Tityos	omnes (mor- tales)	non inlacrimabilis Pluto tristis unda enaviganda
'Bridge' 4	Mars	Hadria	Auster	frustra... frustra
	cruentus	raucus	nocens	
5	Cocytos	Danai	Sisyphus	visendus
		genus		
	ater	infame	damnatus	
6	tellus	domus	uxor	linquenda
				invisae cupressi brevis dominus
7	Caecuba	merum	(vinum)	absumet... tinguet
	servata	superbum	potius	

The moral of the poem does not become clear until we reach the word 25 *dignior*, in the final stanza: 'Your heir is worthier of the old good wine than you are (*heres... dignior*), for the simple reason that he will *not* keep the wine behind one hundred locks (26 *servata centum clavibus*), as you do, but will enjoy it himself (25 *absumet heres Caecuba dignior*).'⁸⁾ That was well put by Lambinus (1561): '*Dignior te, quia utetur, fruetur, cum tu parcas, ut sacris.*' The implication is clear enough:

8) Compare *Odes* 3.3.18; Herodas 10.2, and Nisbet-Hubbard, II, 227.

'Your heir proves to be a 'wise man,' for he knows that he is on earth but a *brevis dominus*, while you yourself prove to be a fool: why don't you adopt the same *Carpe diem* philosophy?' In brief, the appearance of the traditional 'prodigal heir'⁹⁾ in the final stanza puts the ode in the *Carpe diem* genre. Compare *Serm.* 2.3.122f.

Filius aut etiam haec libertus ut ebibat heres,
dis inimice senex, custodis? ne tibi desit?

and *Odes* 2.3.17-20; 3.24.61f.; 4.7.19.

Now, the central stanza 4 forcefully bridges both halves of the poem:

Frustra cruento Marte carebimus
Fractisque rauci fluctibus Hadriae,
15 frustra per autumnos nocentem
corporibus metuemus Austrum.

(1) It sums up the idea of inevitability of death expressed in part I (*Eheu fugaces... nec... non*) by introducing yet another anaphora, *frustra... frustra*, to match that of line 1, *Postume, Postume*, and by producing an impressive παρήχησις through agglomeration of the *f* and *r* sounds.

(2) Furthermore, the 'bridge' uses the same tenses of 'futility and necessity' as do both parts of the poem: 2 *nec pietas moram... adferet*; 11 *enaviganda*; 13 *frustra... carebimus: frustra... metuemus*; 17 *visendus*; 21 *linquenda*; 22ff. *neque... te... sequetur*; 25ff. *absumet... tinguet*. Notice that most of these words are placed either at the beginning or at the end of a line.

(3) Finally, by stressing the futility of the efforts of an 'unwise man' to take every precaution against death ('one avoids war, avoids sea-voyage, avoids winter: all to no avail'), the 'bridge' directly leads to the *Carpe diem* way of life suggested in part II by 25 *absumet heres... dignior*. The stanza then seems to say much the same as *Odes* 2.3.1 *Aequam memento... servare mentem*; and the reasons adduced there are the same in nature as the reason in our ode: 2.3.4 *moriture Delli,*

9) Compare Nisbet-Hubbard, II, 237f.

seu... seu; 25 *omnes eodem cogimur, omnium...* (where 28 *cumba* matches 8 *tristis unda* and 17 *ater Cocytos* of our ode); finally, 2.3.17ff. *cedes... cedes et... divitiis potiatur heres.*

*

Odes 3.8 *Martiis caelebs quid agam Kalendis*. Part I (stanzas 1-3) explains why a bachelor like Horace is celebrating the *Matronalia*, by giving a feast (6 *dulcis epulas*) and a drinking-party. Part II (stanzas 5-7) exhorts Maecenas to 'put aside political worries about Rome,' to enjoy the gifts of the present drinking-party, and (by implication), to enjoy the gifts of *any* present hour. (For such an interpretation of line 27, *dona praesentis cape laetus horae*, see IV. *Appendix*.)

This is an elliptical poem of 'insinuation.' Accordingly, the functional role of the 'bridge' (stanza 4) is rather elusive:

Sume, Maecenas, cyathos amici
sospitis centum et vigiles lucernas
15 perfer in lucem: procul omnis esto
 clamor et ira.

(1) Maecenas is present at the drinking-party throughout the poem, but the reader is certain about this only when he reaches the 'bridge:' 13 *sume, Maecenas*, links 3ff. *miraris... docte* (of part I) to the verbs in the second person singular of part II.

(2) The explicitly symposiac character and language of the 'bridge' is of importance for the unity of the poem. In part I a puzzle has been asked (*quid agam... quid velint... miraris*) and convincingly answered (*voveram... hic dies anno redeunte festus*). As a consequence, bottle of a very old wine has been opened (in stanza 3). Now, the exhortation expressed in the 'bridge,' *sume, Maecenas*, and *perfer in lucem*, is a logical sequel of the fact that the *amphora* has been opened (in the previous stanza). But, at the same time, this exhortation directly leads to the rest of the imperatives throughout part II: 17 *mitte... curas*; 26 *parce... nimium cavere*; 27 *dona... cape laetus*; 28 *linque severa*.

In addition, the traditional symposiac exaggeration -- 13

sume... cyathos... centum and *perfer in lucem* -- emphasizes the importance of the occasion, expressed by another exaggeration, *prope funeratus arboris ictu*, in part I. Hence also the presence of *amici sospitis* in the 'bridge:' it contrasts this *prope funeratus*.

(3) Furthermore, the subject of part I is Horace (*1 quid agam; 6 voveram... prope funeratus; 9 hic dies [sc. mihi] festus*). The subject of part II is Maecenas. The 'bridge' forms a transition from Horace (*amici sospitis*) to *Maecenas*.

(4) Finally, the traditional symposiac injunction against $\beta\omicron\eta$ and $\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ at a sacred drinking-party dedicated to Bacchus (*procul omnis esto clamor et ira*)¹⁰⁾ may well play a special part in the poem. 'Let all shouting and anger stay far away!' seems to lead to the peaceful happiness and freedom from anxiety which perspire throughout part II: 17 *mitte... curas; 26 parce... nimium cavere; 27 cape laetus; 28 linque severa*.

*

Odes 1.4 *Solvitur acris hiems* and 4.7 *Diffugere nives* have a common theme (so already Lambinus).¹¹⁾ In part I (stanzas 1-2) of the former ode we learn that the life-bringing Spring is back again: a joy for men (sailor, shepherd, ploughman), a joy for gods (Venus, Vulcanus, Graces and Nymphs). As a contrast, in part II (stanzas 4-5) we are suddenly reminded that Death comes to all, and comes sooner than we expect her.

In part I, Venus uses her feet to beat the ground while dancing (*alterno terram quatunt pede*): in part II, Death uses her feet to kick house-doors. This gloomy alliteration, 13f. *pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas regumque turris* (reminding us of the inevitable *Odes* 3.2.32 *pede Poena claudo*), contrasts the playful one with which the ode opens: *Solvitur... vice veris et Favoni*.¹²⁾ Finally, Death is described by

10) For the force of such injunctions compare M. Marcovich, 'Xenophanes on Drinking-Parties and Olympic Games,' *Illinois Classical Studies* 3 (1978), 1-26, esp. 11.

11) Compare Fraenkel 419-21, and Nisbet-Hubbard, I, 60f.

12) Compare Jules Marouzeau, 'Horace artiste des sons,' *Mnemosyne*,

another tricolon (16f. *nox, Manes, domus... Plutonia*), contrasting two already mentioned tricolons of part I.

The conclusion of the poem was to expect: 'O prosperous and fortunate Sestius, both (18f. *nec... nec*) enjoy the symposia and admire the young handsome boy Lycidas while you can, i.e., *carpe diem*.' Incidentally, after a display of the *carpe diem* paraphernalia, the ode closes with a rather frivolous detail, about the *tener Lycidas*. So do the odes 1.9; 1.17; 2.12; 3.14. This must have been an Alexandrian device. Apparently, Fraenkel (291) was not happy with such a *specimen doctrinae* in the political ode 3.14, while adding: "A critic who voices such misgivings is sure to be denounced as completely devoid of sense of humour. I am not afraid of that." Evidently, we are not dealing here with 'a sense of humor,' but rather with a Hellenistic refinement, a special sensitivity for picturesque details.

How does the 'bridge' (stanza 3) fit into this antithesis?

Nunc decet aut viridi nitidum caput impedire myrto
 10 aut flore, terrae quem ferunt solutae;
 nunc et in umbrosis Fauno decet immolare lucis,
 seu poscat agna sive malit haedo.

This carefully elaborated and balanced stanza shows a clear binary structure: *nunc decet... caput impedire* (followed by *aut... myrto, aut flore*) is matched by *nunc et... Fauno decet immolare* (followed by *seu poscat agna sive malit haedo*). Such a special attention dedicated to this central stanza may well be explained by its role of bridge. The stanza seems to have a double function.

(1) On the one hand, the anaphora *nunc... nunc* seems to echo the joyful one of the part I: *iam... iam*. (For the use of the anaphora *iam... iam* to announce the coming of something pleasant, compare *Odes* 4.12.1 *Iam veris comites... iam nec prata rigent nec fluvii strepunt...; or Carm. saec. 53, 55, 57.*) On the

II ser. 4 (1936) 85-94 = *Wege zu Horaz*, ed. Hans Oppermann (Darmstadt 1972) 62-73, esp. 63, and L.P. Wilkinson, *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge 1946) 39f.

other hand, the same anaphora *nunc... nunc* seems to anticipate the *Carpe diem* message expressed in part II: 15 *vitae summa brevis* and 16 *iam te premet nox*, clearly implying 'all too soon.' For the hedonistic force of the *nunc... nunc* compare *Odes* 1.9.18ff., where *nunc... nunc* (i.e., *donec virenti canities abest / morosa*) expresses the same sentiment of *Carpe diem*.

(2) While 10 *terrae quem ferunt solutae* clearly resumes 4 *nec prata canis albicant pruinis*, of part I, the mention of a garland of myrtle or of flowers, and especially of a sacrifice to Faunus (i.e., a feast), seems to anticipate the symposiac atmosphere of part II: the election of a *magister bibendi* at the ensuing symposium (18 *nec regna vini sortiēre talis*), and the presence of a *puer delicatus* (19 *nec tenerum Lycidan*).

In brief, the 'bridge' seems to look forward to the final stanza. Even so, I must admit that the coming of the *pallida Mors*, at the beginning of part II, is rather abrupt. To solve this difficulty, W. Barr tried to explain the presence of the *pallida Mors* by seeing in the sentence of the 'bridge,' *in umbris Fauno decet immolare lucis*, a reference to the annual festival of the dead, the *dies parentales*, culminating in the *Feralia*.¹³⁾ Then the presence of a chthonic Faunus in the 'bridge' would logically lead to the mentioning of Death in the next stanza.

One cannot be certain, however, that there is a reference to death, in the central stanza. If the joyful anaphora *nunc... nunc* really echoes the initial hilarious *iam... iam*, announcing the coming of Spring, then I find it difficult to take it to mean, 'on the one hand, a garland for us, on the other, a sacrifice to the dead.' In view of the evidence, *Odes* 3.18.1ff. *Faune, Nympharum fugientum amator*; 1.17.2; 2.17.28, I would rather think that Horace is offering Faunus a sacrifice of either a lamb or a kid, at the beginning of a new year, as a *fertility* god, a rural deity, the protector of flocks. For the possibility that Faunus here is playing the part of Priapus in Horace's Greek models -- and for other

13) *Class. Review*, N.S. 12 (1962) 5-11, esp. 9.

arguments against Barr's suggestion, -- see Nisbet-Hubbard (I, 60; 67).

*

Ode 4.7 Diffugere nives, redeunt iam gramina campis is more sophisticated than 1.4, for it introduces an effective Hellenistic antithesis: that between *temporary* death in the ever-lasting Nature, and the *final* death of men. Already Lambinus had referred to the *Epitaphium Bionis* 99ff., and to Catullus 5.4ff. (*soles occidere et redire possunt: nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux, nox est perpetua una dormienda*).

Part I (stanzas 1-3): the spring is here again (lines 1-6). But not for long (7 *inmortalia ne speres*): for, the cycle of changes = deaths in Nature is interminable: Winter > Spring > Summer > Fall > Winter again, and so on (lines 7-12). Now comes the 'bridge' (stanza 4): There is, however, a *fundamental difference* between 'death' in Nature and the human death: the former is only a *temporary* one (13 *damna tamen... reparant*), the latter is *final*. Part II (stanzas 5-7): So, then, Torquatus, enjoy the present bliss while you can (stanza 5).

The 'bridge' is the bearer of the mentioned antithesis:

Damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae:
nos ubi decidimus

15 quo pius Aeneas, quo dives Tullus et Ancus,
pulvis et umbra sumus.

(1) The Heraclitean and then Stoic equation of change of an element in Nature with its 'death' -- maybe best expressed by Lucretius 1.70f.:

nam quodcumque suis *mutatum* finibus exit
continue hoc *mors* est illius quod fuit ante¹⁴⁾

-- is presupposed in lines 7-12. Compare especially 7 *inmortalia ne speres*; 9f. *ver proterit aestas, interitura simul*. And the eternal cycle of changes-deaths in Nature is succinctly and

14) Compare the testimonia ad Heraclitus Frr. 66 and 33 (36 and 60 Diels-Kranz) in M. Marcovich, *Eraclito: Frammenti* (Florence 1978; *Bibl. di Studi Sup.*, vol. 64), e.g., Philo *De aet. mundi* 109 τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ταῖς εἰς ἄλληλα μεταβολαῖς, τὸ παραδοξότατον, θνήσκειν δοκοῦντα ἀθανατίζονται δολιχεύοντα αἰεῖ...

Part II (stanzas 5-7) then logically follows: 'So restrain your temper (22 *conpescere mentem*): vengeful anger has before now ruined heroes and entire cities. I promise to recant you: now promise to give me your affection in return.'

The whole poem is written in a spirit of repentance and reconciliation: it opens with a compliment for the girl (it little matters whether it is Stesichorian in origin or not), and it closes with the hope of the girl's affection (26 *dum mihi / fias... amica / ... animumque reddas*). The reason is simple: the poet is really sorry for his libellous iambs against the girl (2 *criminosi... iambs*; 24 *celerēs iambs*), which he promises to recant in a palinode to come (27f. *recantatis... / opprobriis*).

What is now the role of the 'bridge' (stanza 4)?

Fertur Prometheus addere principi

limo coactus particulam undique

15 desectam et insani leonis

vim stomacho adposuisse nostro.

(1) The key-word of the poem is 'anger' (especially 'vengeful anger,' as in the case of the girl, and of 17 Thyestes as well): 9 *tristes ut irae*; 17 *irae*; 24 *fervor*. Now the 'bridge' explains the origin of anger in man (τὸ αἷτιον). On the one hand, anger is a constituent part of our very nature (*vim stomacho adposuisse nostro*), a particle (μόριον) in the original matter (*princeps limus*), added to the body by our creator (*Prometheus*). That explains its presence in the girl (stanza 1), and the fact that the young poet himself was afflicted by the same passion (22ff. *me quoque pectoris / temptavit in dulci iuventa / fervor et in celeres iambs / misit furem*). This piece of physiology of anger, lurking in our stomach (hence *stomachari*) or boiling in our heart (*pectoris... fervor*), functionally looks in both directions: back to stanza 1, and forward to stanza 6.

(2) On the other hand, anger is not a welcome element in our body. Most probably, it was only out of scarcity of raw materials that Prometheus felt compelled to use this particle as well (*coactus*). What is more important, its origin is

not commendable: anger comes from the violent temper of a raving lion (*insani leonis / vis*). That is why the bestial anger drives us headlong into recklessness (9 *irae, quas neque Noricus / deterret ensis nec mare naufragum / nec saevus ignis nec tremendo / Iuppiter ipse ruens tumultu*) and even into total destruction (the picturesque stanza 5). Notice that these examples are placed by the poet around the central stanza.

The 'bridge' then shows understanding for the presence of anger in both the young girl (stanza 1) and the young poet (stanza 6). But, what is much more important, it also shows why the girl should restrain her temper (22 *conpesce mentem*) and put an end to her anger (2 *modum ponere*), no matter how well founded it may be: because (1) anger is only a *vis insani leonis*, unworthy of man; and (2) the poet is ready to recant. The 'bridge' proves to be the pivot of the entire poem.

*

Odes 1.17 *Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem* is more sophisticated than 1.16. The whole poem is actually a veiled *comparison*, implying: 'As I stand here, on my Sabine farm, under the protection of the gods, enjoying the heaven-sent bliss, so will you too, Tyndaris, should you decide to join me.' *Ut Faunus dique omnes hic me tuentur, sic te quoque hic tuebuntur*. This comparison becomes clear from the fact that Horace uses no less than six verbs in the *present* tense, referring to 'me and mine,' in the first half of the poem (lines 1-14: *mutat; defendit... capellis... meis; quaerunt; nec... metuunt; di me tuentur; dis pietas mea et musa cordi est*), leading to other six verbs, now in the *future* tense, referring to Tyndaris, in the second half of the ode (lines 14-28: *tibi copia manabit; vitabis; dices; duces; nec... confundet; nec metues*). And lest no doubt be left in the minds of the readers about the poet's intention, Horace places 8 *nec... metuunt* at the end of the second stanza, to face 24 *nec metues* at the end of the sixth stanza.¹⁵⁾ This

15) This was pointed out by Klingner, *Philologus* 90 (1935) 292 = *Studien zu griech. u. röm. Literatur* (Zürich 1964) 317-21. For further analysis of *Odes* 1.17 compare Fraenkel 204ff.; Irene Troxler-Keller, *Die Dichterlandschaft des Horaz* (Heidelberg 1964) 108-18; Nisbet-Hubbard, I, 215ff.

17-28; 4.6.29f. Elsewhere Horace's *custos maximus* is Mercury (*Odes* 2.7.13f.; 2.17.29f.; *Serm.* 2.6.5 and 15), probably because he was born when Mercury was in the ascendant, hence being a *vir Mercurialis* (*Odes* 2.17.29f.).¹⁷⁾

(2) The poet's Sabinum is the only abode of bounty, bliss, security, peace, and happiness. For the anaphora *hic... hic... hic* compare *Odes* 1.2.49f.; 1.19.13; 3.26.6. It is pastoral in origin (compare Theocritus 11.42 and 45ff.; Vergil *Ecl.* 9.40-43; 10.42f.), as is the name of the girl, Tyndaris.¹⁸⁾

(3) While the anaphora *hic... hic... hic* (ἐντὶ... ἐντὶ of Theocritus) leads directly to the invitation extended to the girl (in part II), two other elements of the 'bridge' -- *musa* and *copia* -- masterly link both parts of the poem in a cogent unity. *Musa* echoes the divine pipe of Faunus, of part I (10 *utcumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula*), and anticipates the lyre of Anacreon (18 *fide Teia*), in part II. We cannot be certain about Faunus' pipe as having 'a particular appeal for Tyndaris' (in view of the word-order, 10 *dulci, Tyndari, fistula*), as Nisbet-Hubbard wanted it, for Tyndaris seems to be much more sophisticated with her poetry from Teos, dealing with Odysseus between Penelope and Circe (stanza 5). But the fact of musical affinity between Faunus, Horace, and Tyndaris remains.

As for the other element (*copia*), I need only quote Nisbet-Hubbard (I, 222): "here you will see plenty flowing to the full, rich with a horn that lavishes the glories of the fields.' The opulence of the pleonasm suits the scene of abundance that Horace is describing." To be sure, neither in part I nor in part II 'abundance' is literally mentioned. But it is easily implied. So that is seems safe enough to suggest that these pastoral *ruris honores* of the 'überleitende Strophe' (Kiessling) are here to bridge: (a) 1 *amoenus Lucretilis* and 11 *valles et Usticae cubantis / levia... saxa* with 17 *hic in reducta valle*; (b) 5 *impune tutum...*; 8 *nec viridis metuunt*

17) So Franz Boll, *Philologus* 69 (1910) 165f., and Nisbet-Hubbard, I, 127f.; II, 286; differently Kiessling-Heinze ad *Odes* 2.17.29; 1.10.

18) So Nisbet-Hubbard, I, 216; 221.

colubras / nec Martialis... lupos with 21 *innocentis pocula Lesbii... nec... confundet... proelia, nec metues protervum / ... Cyrum*, where the *protervus* *Cyrus*, facing *Martialis lupos*, elicits comparison: both behave in the same way (stanza 7). Finally, (c) 2 *igneam / defendit aestatem* with 17 *Caniculae / vitabis aestus* and 22 *sub umbra*. In brief, the pleonasm employed in the 'bridge' serves to sum up the pastoral bliss of the entire poem. What is more important, the 'bridge unites the poet with the girl (*me... mea... hic tibi*).

IV. APPENDIX:

DONA PRAESENTIS CAPE LAETUS HORAE (ODES 3.8.27)

Could Horace -- or could he not -- try to sell his Epicurean *Carpe diem* view of life (compare Epicurus, *Epist.* 3.126 Ὁ δὲ σοφὸς... καὶ χρόνον οὐ τὸν μήκιστον ἀλλὰ τὸν ἥδιστον καρπίζεται) to such an important man as Maecenas? Gordon Williams seems to feel that he could not: "The 'philosophy' of drinking-parties is 'eat, drink, and be merry' and 'take no thought for the morrow;' basically it is a half-centred, self-interested view of life, a weak hedonism that only becomes strong when emphasis is put on death and the uncertainty of life. It simply would not do for Horace to urge this view of life on an important man like Maecenas for it would be to debase and ignore the importance of the great political issues in which he participated."¹⁹⁾

I would challenge this interpretation. I think Horace could -- and that indeed he did -- recommend his own view of life to his very close friend Maecenas, to whom he felt especially attached through 'Sternenfreundschaft' (συναστροία,²⁰⁾ *Odes* 2.17.21 *utrumque nostrum incredibili modo / consentit astrum*, and to whom he dedicates *Epodes* 1; *Serm.* 1.1; *Odes* 1.1; *Epist.* 1.1. Let us compare *Odes* 3.8 with the much more complex 3.29.

19) G. Williams (above, note 1), 73.

20) Compare Franz Boll, 'Sternenfreundschaft: ein Horatianum,' *Zeitschrift f. Gymnasialwesen (Sokrates)* 1917, 1-10 = *Kleine Schriften zur Sternkunde des Altertums* (Leipzig 1950) 115-24 = *Wege zu Horaz*, ed. Hans Oppermann (Darmstadt 1972) 1-13.

3.29.25ff.

3.8.17ff.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Tu civitatem quis deceat status
curas et Urbi sollicitus times
quid Seres et regnata Cyro
(28) Bactra parent Tanaisque discors:

prudens futuri temporis exitum
caliginosa nocte premit deus
ridetque si mortalis ultra
(32) fas trepidat. quod adest memento

componere aequus: cetera fluminis
ritu feruntur...</p> | <p>Mitte civilis super Urbe curas:
occidit Daci Cotisonis agmen,
Medus infestus sibi luctuosus
(20) dissidet armis,

servit Hispanae vetus hostis orae
Cantaber sera domitus catena,
iam Scythae laxo meditantur arcu
(24) cedere campis.

neglegens ne qua populus laboret,
parce privatus nimium cavere et
dona praesentis cape laetus horae:
(28) linque severa.</p> |
|--|---|
- (41) Ille potens sui
laetusque deget, cui licet in diem
dixisse 'Vixi:' cras vel atra
(44) nube polum Pater occupato

vel sole puro; non tamen irritum...

(1) Horace does not find fault with Maecenas' being actively and closely involved in the highest affairs of state; what he does object, however, is Maecenas' excessive political worries about Rome: 'god laughs if a mortal is *unduly anxious*' (3.29.31 *si mortalis ultra fas trepidat*); 'cease to be too anxious' (3.8.26 *parce... nimium cavere*). But the reasons why Maecenas' excessive worries are not justified, are different in each poem. In 3.8 they are: (a) Rome is in good shape now: no immediate danger is at sight (17-24, starting with the perfect tense, 18 *occidit*, 'has fallen,' ending with 22 *iam*). And (b), Maecenas holds no office of state (26 *privatus*): hence the presence of the strong word, 25 *neglegens*. In 3.29, however, there is one good philosophical reason: excessive worries of *any* mortal are unfounded, for the future is inscrutable -- 'god hides it in blackness of night' (30 *caliginosa nocte premit deus*).

(2) Both poems reach the same conclusion: 'Mind to make the best of the *present moment* with equanimity' (32f.); 'That man shall live as his own master and in happiness who can say *each day, I have lived*' (41ff.); 'Seize happily on the gifts of the *present hour*' (3.8.27). Now, when compared to

3.29.32 *quod adest memento componere aequus*; to 42 *laetusque deget, cui licet in diem dixisse 'vixi;* to 2.16.25f. *laetus in praesens animus quod ultra est / oderit curare*; finally, to 1.11.3 *ut melius, quidquid erit, pati,*²¹⁾ our injunction -- *dona praesentis cape laetus horae* -- gains in force, becoming a philosophical precept. I think what Horace is saying to Maecenas is, 'Happily enjoy the gifts of any present hour: this one today, and any other *nunc... nunc* (1.9.18 and 21) of your life,' which is much the same as *Carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero* (1.11.8). I think Lambinus had correctly grasped the force of *dona praesentis cape laetus horae*, when writing (ad *Odes* 2.16.25): '*suaedet enim, ut in diem vivamus, ut Od. VIII. lib. 3. [v. 27]...*'

(3) For *Odes* 2.16.25 *laetus in praesens animus* etc. Kiessling had referred to the Epicurean philosophy in Cicero *De finibus* 1.62 *Sic enim ab Epicuro sapiens semper beatus inducitur... Neque enim tempus est ullum, quo non plus voluptatum habeat quam dolorum. Nam et praeterita grate meminit et praesentibus ita potitur, ut animadvertat, quanta sint ea quamque iucunda, neque pendet ex futuris, sed expectat illa, fruitur praesentibus.* I would like, however, to draw attention to the striking similarity between 3.29.32f. *quod adest memento / componere aequus* and the old Greek precept τὸ παρὸν εὔ θέσθαι. Plato, *Gorgias* 499 c 5, refers to it this way, κατὰ τὸν παλαιὸν λόγον "τὸ παρὸν εὔ ποιεῖν" (and Diogenes Laertius 1.77 attributes it to Pittacus in this form). The adage, 'Make the best of the present moment,' and 'Always be content and satisfied with your present situation' (ἀρέσκεισθαι καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τοῖς παροῦσι, Lucian *Mortuorum dial.* 8 [26]. 2) was very popular among the Cynics (Lucian *Necyom.* 21 τὸ παρὸν εὔ θέμενος).²²⁾ Marcus Aurelius refers to it (6.2); and Diogenes Laertius 2.66 reports about Aristippus of Cyrene: αἰεὶ τὸ προσπεσὸν εὔ διατιθέμενος. ἀπέλαυε μὲν γὰρ ἡδονῆς τῶν παρόντων, οὐκ ἐθήρα δὲ πόνω τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν τῶν οὐ παρόντων. I think there is only one small step from here to Epicurus and Horace's *quod adest compone aequus*.

21) On which compare Nisbet-Hubbard, I, 139; 141f.

22) See Rudolf Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig 1906) 37f.; 212.

In view of this evidence, I think Horace meant his categorical precepts for happiness -- *quod adest memento componere aequus; aequam memento... servare mentem* (2.3.1f., a clear example of the ἀταραξία-*aequanimitas*); *laetus in praesens animus; dona praesentis cape laetus horae; carpe diem* -- to be of universal value applying to everybody, Maecenas not being excluded: *contra* Williams' interpretation of *Odes* 3.29.29-34: "but the real point is that the poet's thoughts are moving over an awkward moment to a view of life that he can exemplify in himself, yet cannot really recommend with conviction to Maecenas" (p. 148). I think Horace *could* recommend with conviction the Epicurean way to happiness to his close friend Maecenas, and that he did.

V. CONCLUSION

Horatian 'bridge,' linking two blocks of sense equal in length, may be compared to the central section of a horse-shoe: it is the strongest part which keeps the whole structure together. Whatever its origin (ὄμφαλός of a Greek poem composed according to the rules of the Ringcomposition?), the 'bridge' achieves the unity of the thought-structure of the entire ode. It looks in both directions, backwards and forwards. The former it does by summing up the content of the first half of the poem; the latter, by slightly changing the subject. But in both cases the 'bridge' resumes the key-words, ideas or images of both parts.

As for the style and diction, the 'bridge' is elaborated and balanced (1.4) with special care and craftsmanship: an aetiological myth (1.16); a pregnant pleonastic ephrasis (1.17); a tricolon of questions arranged in a polyptoton (1.2); an effective maxim or slogan (4.7 *pulvis et umbra sumus*; 3.14 *tenente / Caesare terras*; 3.8 *procul omnis esto / clamor et ira*); a meaningful anaphora (1.17 *di me... dis mea... hic tibi*; 2.14 *frustra... frustra*; 1.4 *nunc... nunc*); an antithetic juxtaposition (3.14 *festus atras*); an alliteration (3.14; 2.14; 3.8), etc.

In the present paper, only the clearest cases of a

'bridge' have been briefly examined. Possible 'bridges' consisting of more than one stanza; those linking two sense-blocks of unequal length; 'responsive' odes with more than one bridge, etc., will be explored in another paper.

University of Illinois at Urbana