I. Odes 1.17, like many other Horatian odes, may be examined from four different standpoints. These are: 1. What is the concrete scene, occasion, or excuse for the ode? 2. What are its "philosophical" ramifications? 3. What significance does the ode have within the poetical or aesthetic conceptions of the Odes? 4. What significance does the position of the ode entail? In the following pages I propose to demonstrate how Horace "answers" these questions.

First a few words in general. It is stating nothing new to maintain that a poem can mean more than one thing. That Horace could have embodied "answers" to these four questions in a single ode is not a priori improbable. Most of Horace's odes are based on a concrete scene or occasion; this needs no stressing. Few would deny that this can be consistent with either questions two, three or four. That "answers" to questions two and three can on occasion be found in the one poem has been recognized by critics such as Mette and Cody: Horace's Epicurean preference for simplicity fits well with a Callimachean aesthetic theory opting for the restraint and, often, simplicity of the genos leptaleon, the genus tenue. To link the fourth point with the second, or third is perhaps more difficult. An example of a particularly fecund attempt at linking points three and four (albeit without recognizing my categorization) can be found in C. P. Jones' discussion of Odes 3.26. Here, he suggests, Horace attempts, by the union of martial and amatory imagery, to extend "notions of the lyric poet to embrace all (Horace's) lyric oeuvre." And at the same time 3.26 may be intended to recall 1.5 thus suggesting that the collection of Books 1-3 is coming to an end.
How does 1.17 fit this schema? The answer to the first question may be stated briefly. The ostensible reason for the poem is to invite Tyndaris to Horace's Sabine farm. It is an Einladungsgedicht. This calls for little amplification.4) The "answers" for points two, three, and four are less obvious. It is with these that the bulk of this paper will be taken up.

II. Before examining the second, third, and fourth propositions, we must deal with a small textual crux in Odes 1.17.14. Whether one reads hic or hinc in this verse is of considerable importance for an interpretation of the ode. The problem is, I realize, a tedious one. Hopefully the remainder of this paper will demonstrate its significance and excuse my travelling over such well-worn ground. The majority of modern editors and commentators support hic: amongst others we find Page, Wickham, Wickham-Garrod, Klingner, Villeneuve, Tesca, Syndikus, Kiessling-Heinze, Nisbet and Hubbard. The intrepid scholars who support hinc can be counted on one's fingers. The few I know of are Keller-Holder, Gow, Plessis, Lenchantin de Gubernatis-Bo.

A glance at Klingner's apparatus criticus will show that the ancient commentators, Porphyrio and the author of one MS of Pseudo-Acro, plus the majority of manuscripts support hinc. The authority of hic rests entirely on D and π. The best manuscript family for the Odes is E; V is the next best; the third is Q, a mixed family, whose derivation appears to be E and V. The manuscript D, unfortunately destroyed in the nineteenth century, falls into Q, the least respectable family; π falls into the second best family V, but has been contaminated from E. Thus hic lacks the support of almost all the manuscripts. What it does have comes from two inferior, contaminated manuscripts.

The most common justification for hic is that the scribal abbreviations for hic and hinc are easily confused. This may be true, but it presupposes that the "error" was made at a stage in the manuscript tradition prior to the postulated archetypes E and V. This is surely an assumption of unnecessary complexity. The major reasons for accepting hic are three: i. hinc...hic...hic disrupts an otherwise neat chain of anaphora.5) ii. the three clauses beginning hinc/hic...hic...hic form a tricolon structure whose movement is disrupted by the asymmetrical hic.6) iii. hinc would mean something in order of ob mean pietatem; thus the connection of the first clause is with what precedes, not with what follows; therefore the ode's symmetry is destroyed.7)

Reasonable objections, however, can be made against each of these
points: i. Technically speaking *hinc...hio...hio* destroys the anaphora. 8)

But aurally, at least, it seems to partake of the qualities of anaphora. The sound of *hinc* will associate it with the two following *hio*'s. The usage is not without parallels - see, for example Horace *Odes* 1.34.14 and 16 (*hinc...hio*) and Virgil, *Georgics* 2.145-6-9 (*hinc...hio...hio*).

ii. Tricolon is not necessarily disrupted; there is an aural link between *hinc* and *hio*. But what perhaps vitiates the tricolon theory is that the first element here is abstract or general. More expected would have been a concrete first element leading towards a summarizing abstract. To this reader the transition from the generality of the first clause to the concreteness of the two following is harsh.

iii. Perhaps the most telling objection is that *hinc* must refer to what precedes. (Bentley suggested that it would mean *ob meam pietatem*). 9)

Not that *hinc* in this sense is unparalleled (compare *Odes* 3.6.5-7: *dis te minorem quod geris, imperas; hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum*), rather it necessitates taking v.14b-16 with v.13-14a instead of v.17-28. Critics and editors have preferred this progressive orientation of v.14b-16 because a/ they feel that *hinc*, syntactically speaking, is awkward, while *hio* b/ creates the tricolon and anaphora, and c/ allows the poem to fall into two neat halves, v.1-14a and v.14b-28.

Bentley as stated, felt that *hinc* would mean *ob meam pietatem*. But why must one be so specific? Surely *hinc* will embrace 1/ the gods' protection, 2/ Horace's *pietas*, and 3/ Horace's *Musa*. I will attempt to outline below that *hinc*, read thus, makes perfectly reasonable sense in the overall logic of the poem. That *hinc* disturbs the anaphora and tricolon is, as we have seen, not vital. That it will not allow a bipartite symmetry is unfortunate, but not, as I hope to show, irredeemably so. It is fair to say, therefore, that the conservative position - the acceptance of the best manuscript reading - is the most justifiable one. In v.14 we ought to read *hinc*.

*Hinc* does negate the view which sees *Odes* 1.17 as composed of two approximately fourteen verse sections. However an equally symmetrical arrangement replaces it. Stanzas 1-3, with their "Golden Age" peace, form the first sense-block. Stanza 4, with its generalities, will form a second, stanzas 5-7, a mix of pastoral and erotic themes, form a third. The resulting tripartite structure with three followed by one followed again by three stanzas is not unattractive. This pattern, of a centrally placed stanza surrounded by two equal, longer ones, is reasonably common in Horace. It will be recalled that Williams in his commentary to Book 3 of the
Odes took pains to emphasize it.¹⁰ Some possible parallels are 3.10 (2+1+2); 2.14 (3+1+3); 3.8 (3+1+3); 3.14 (3+1+3); 3.11 (4+1+4 provided v.25-8 are genuine); 4.9 (6+1+6). The symmetry in Odes 1.17 may extend further. The two three stanza sense-blocks are both arranged into a pattern of 1+2 stanzas where, to some extent, the single stanza summarizes what the second and third stanzas make more explicit.

There are certain elements which reinforce this symmetry:¹¹ aestival (v.3) in the first sense-block picks up aestus (v.18) in the second sense-block; impune, v.5, picks up innocentis, v.21; there are also metuunt, v.8, and metues, v.24, fistula v.10, and fide, v.18. Among the repetitions which, while not occurring in a responsive position, none the less link the two sections, there are defendit, v.3, and vitabis, v.18; Martialis, v.9, and Marte, v.23; nec, v.9 and nec, v.22 and 24.

III. Let us now return to the main argument. The "philosophical" significance of Odes 1.17, if I may put it baldly, is an oblique product of its rejection of elegy, particularly the elegiac poetry of Albius Tibullus. I will not attempt to demonstrate an Horatian antipathy to elegy here. This has been convincingly done elsewhere.¹² Suffice it to say that I believe that Horace took his Lucretius, particularly the concluding sections of the DRN 4, quite seriously.¹³ In rejecting the elegiac conception of love, Horace is demonstrating his Epicurean orthodoxy. This is the poem's "philosophical" significance. But first of all elegy. Where are the references to it? Nisbet and Hubbard have demonstrated the pastoral background of Odes 1.17.¹⁴ The hyperbolic claim to a visit from Faunus, for example, seems an established topos in pastoral poetry.¹⁵ Similarly the cornucopia.¹⁶ The more realistic locus amoenus of stanzas 5 to 7 again seems indebted to the pastoral.¹⁷ Into this pastoral world however, intrudes an erotic element of a type perhaps more readily seen in an urban environment. This erotic intrusion is perhaps the most telling indication that elegy is being referred to. The best parallels for this blend of erotic and pastoral are to be found in elegy: Nisbet and Hubbard compare Propertius 2.5.21, Tibullus 1.10.6lf., and Ovid, Amores 1.7.47.¹⁸ It is most probable, as Nisbet and Hubbard recognize, that the blending of pastoral and erotic themes is a direct reference to elegy.

It is perhaps more contentious to maintain that Tibullus
may be being singled out in *Odes* 1.17. There are, however, certain indications which make this view probable. I would emphasize, primarily, two points 1) the blend of pastoral and erotic themes, a hallmark of Tibullan style, and 2) resemblances between 1.17 and 1.33, the latter in all likelihood addressed to Albius Tibullus. A third more contentious point is the use of *pietas* in v.13. But I will reserve discussion of this until the next section of my paper.

Consider the rejection of erotic violence in Horace's "pastoral" landscape. Or the rejection of elegiac behaviour from Horace's "pastoral" poetry. What is Horace up to? Is it possible that the rejection of erotic themes may constitute a reference to the work of Horace's friend Albius Tibullus? And further that the rejection of erotic violence may constitute a gentle criticism of Tibullus' work?

To some critics Tibullus' poetry is an unholy alliance of pastoral and elegiac (amatory) themes. Elder has maintained that "the key to pastoral poetry lies in the implied or suggested contrast between the created Arcadian world of goodness and our own actual world of virtues and vices." Tibullus does not create Arcadia, but he does form an idealized portrait of the country. Where, to follow Elder, we might find a contrast between Arcadia (the ideal) and the present (reality), we have a contrast between the country (the ideal - the pastoral element) and the city (reality - the "normal" milieu of the elegist). This contrast is at the core of many of Tibullus' poems: 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.7, 1.10, 2.1, 2.3 and 2.5. Tibullus exploits this dichotomy in amatory contexts. For lovers the city is a place which breeds discord. Conversely, the country is a place which breeds concord.

A brief example. In Tibullus, 1.5.19-40 the poet had imagined a *felix vita* for himself in the country with his sweetheart Delia. She would help with the running of the farm (v.21ff.) and would entertain Tibullus' friends (v.31). But something went wrong. His plans were frustrated (v.35-6) and now he finds himself the *exclusus amator* (v.39). The contrast is obvious: the country was the ideal but unreal locale for Tibullus' love; instead he finds himself in the city and
unloved.

The rural vision of Tibullus is an ideal which does not exist in reality. Contrast the position in *Odes* 1.17. A peaceful and secure life is, Horace vaunts, quite possible in the country. He banishes the possibility of tangled, urban amours. Horace's vision, though intimately related to Tibullus', though utilizing the same contrasts as Tibullus', seems to entail a negation, a rejection of Tibullus' amatory conceptions. Where Tibullus grudgingly admits the impossibility of idealized rural love, Horace rejects its urban counterpart and unreservedly commends the efficacy of the country.

At this point we ought to compare *Odes* 1.33 which is addressed to an Albius generally taken to be Albius Tibullus. It is usually accepted that Horace is parodying Tibullus' poetry here. Three aspects of this ode deserve attention: although emphasizing the *ronde de l'amour*, the fickleness of love, the stress is on triangular relationships; 2) the name Cyrus appears; 3) the *adunaton* of wolves mixing peacefully with goats occurs. These three elements may also appear in *Odes* 1.17. Horace's invitation to Tyndaris is surely to be taken in the amatory sense; if this is accepted, then the violent urban paramour of Tyndaris, Cyrus, is a rival; thus we have an amatory triangle. The name Cyrus appears four times in Horace. In *Odes* 2.2.17 and 3.29.27 it is used of the Persian King; its other appearances are in *Odes* 1.17 and 1.33. This strongly suggests a parallel between the two poems. The *adunaton* of 1.33.7-8 suggests, to some extent, 1.17.9. What are we to make of these parallels? I do not think that Horace is concerned to have us read 1.17 and 1.33 as a pair. Rather they suggest that we are not wrong to see Tibullus in *Odes* 1.17. The philosophical justification for Horace's rejection of the Tibullan position and, certainly, elegy, deserves reiterating. Horace's Epicureanism precluded any real sympathy for the elegiac mode.

IV. The third approach to 1.17 was in terms of poetry: what significance does the ode have within the poetical conceptions of Horace in the *Odes*? The foregoing sections, which attempted to demonstrate an Horatian rejection of Tibullan elegy and elegiac love, will go part of the way towards
answering this question. We can, however, approach the question from another angle.

In v.14 of Odes 1.17 I have argued that we should read hinc rather than the more generally accepted hic. This reading, as I have indicated, considerably alters the meaning of stanza 4. If we were to paraphrase stanza 4 accordingly, it would run like this: the gods protect me; my piety and poetry are dear to them; because of this, Tyndaris, you will see "plenty" lavishing fertility. Whatever else this stanza may imply, therefore, at base it is a vaunt praising the powers Horace's own poetry, one comparable to the vaunts of odes such as 1.1, 2.20, and 3.30.

Here, perhaps, we should pause briefly to consider the significance of the word pietas. It seems, in other contexts, to have had a technical literary meaning.24) The lyric poet was pius by virtue of his devotion to the Muses; in elegy he is pius by his devotion to Venus and Amor. Use of both of these senses can be seen in Horace. In Odes 3.4.6 the metaphorical landscape of poetic inspiration is described as pios lucoes. (Indeed all of the second stanza of 3.4 is of relevance to 1.17) The use of pius here is clearly technical. In Odes 1.22 the word pius is not actually mentioned. The conceit of the ode, however, functions about an implied pius or pietas. Stanzas 1 and 2 of 1.22 describe how the pius man has the protection of the gods; in stanzas 3 and 5 the conceit is exploited: the pietas is not the result of religious devotion, but of the amatory poet's devotion to Venus and Amor.

Pietas in v.13 of 1.17 is quite possibly used in this technical sense. That hinc turns Stanza 4 into a vaunt praising Horace's own poetry makes this even more likely. (We should note in passing that Horace may be pulling Tibullus' leg here. The concept of the pius amator may be a Tibullan invention).25) It is probable, moreover, that the di of v.13, while of course including Faunus, may also include those other plebes superum, the Musae. (The protection of the Muses, it will be recalled, is demonstrated in Odes 3.4.9-24.) Pietas, then, is a double-entendre - it explains the visit of Faunus as a result of Horace's religious "piety" and his poetic "piety." Interpreted thus, it renders the likelihood of stanza 4 functioning as an instance of Selbstlob even more convincing.

But let us return to the main concern. Two dominant motifs in Odes 1.17 are the transformation of Greek into Roman, and juxtaposition of fantasy and reality. If we examine the
deployment of these themes in *Odes* 1.17, I think that the significance of the poem within Horace's poetical conceptions will become more apparent.

The transformation of Greek into Roman is one of the better known self-advertisements of Horace (see *Odes* 3.30, 13-14: princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos/ deduxisse modos). I think that we can see this emphasized in 1.17 through the theme of the transformation of Greek into Roman. Consider these examples: Pan leaves the Arcadian Mt. Lycaon and, becoming Faunus, locates himself in an Italian locale - the countryside about Horace's Sabine farm. The addressee of the ode is possessed of a Greek name, Tyndaris. Instead of simply singing on the lyre, she sings on an Anacreontic (*Teia* v.18) lyre. The wine drunk is not the more normal Italian, such as Caecuban or Alban, but the more expensive Lesbian (which, appearing after *Teia Lyra*, must inevitably set Sappho and Alcaeus in the reader's mind). Bacchus and his mother are not designated by their more comprehensible Latin forms, but in their solemn Greek metronymics, Semeleius and Thyoneus. The bothersome paramour of Tyndaris is given a Greek name, Cyrus. But all of this in the Sabine countryside.

This theme, as stated, is of importance throughout the *Odes*. However, consider the poems surrounding 1.17.

1.12 Begins with a quote from Pindar (*O. 2.1ff.*)
1.13 Seems to be modelled on Sappho 31 LP
1.14 Based on Alcaeus' "ship of state", e.g. 326 LP
1.15 Based on a lost ode of Bacchylides
1.16 Based on Stesichorus' palinode 192 PMG
1.18 Begins with a quote from Alcaeus 342 LP

Although many other odes have direct Greek models, 1.12 to 1.18 is perhaps the most clear-cut series based recognizably on Greek forebears. It seems to me, at any rate, startling and significant, that an ode, so manifestly concerned with poetry, should emphasize this aspect of Horace's art at so obviously relevant a time.

The blend of fantasy and reality in 1.17 is in some ways too obvious to need mentioning. Contrast Faunus' visit with the smelly goats; Mt. Lycaon with Mt. Lucretilis; the cornucopia with the more realistic setting in *reducta valle*; the *reducta vallis* with Tyndaris' urban affairs. What is the purpose of this blend? the answer is straight-forward - humour.
But why humour? This question may be answered without recourse to other odes, but it is worthwhile and instructive to make the comparison.

In *Odes* 1.1, at the close of a long selection priamel, we find the stately effect of the vaunt of Horace's role as lyric poet undercut by these lines (35f.):

quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera vetviae.

In 3.30, after the hyperbolic vaunt of v.1-9, we find (10-12):

dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus
et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium
regnavit populorum...

Eternal fame in Horace's natal Apulia is hardly a stunning claim. Similarly the transformation of the poet into a swan in *Odes* 2.20 has been labelled, if not grotesque, at least tongue-in-check. In each of these cases the extravagance of the vaunt is undercut (but in fact undiminished). The humour resulting from the blend of fantasy and reality in 1.17 must perform the same function. It undercuts the pomposity of Horace's poetic vaunt.

Does *Odes* 1.17 have any significance in respect of Horace's conceptions of poetry? We have already interpreted stanza 4 as a vaunt praising Horace's own poetic abilities. What relation do the other stanzas have? The blend of fantasy and reality, particularly within the first three stanzas, is so pronounced as to rule out literal interpretation. It is improbable that Horace's proprietorial pride was such as to allow him this hyperbolic description. Two aspects are of paramount importance: the first, the literary (i.e. pastoral) nature of the "visit" of Faunus; the second, the consistent juxtaposition of Greek and Roman. The conclusion seems inescapable, stanzas 1-3 are a symbolic description of, as Com-mager put it, "the world of art." Not of anybody's art, but, as the transformation of Greek into Roman intimates, of the art of Horace. Stanza 4, thus, following as a vaunt in praise of Horace's own poetic abilities assumes a much greater importance.

What of stanzas 5-7? I have already mentioned their relation to the standardized *locus amoenus*. Is it possible that we have a reference to the *gelidum nemus Nympharum*? The emphasis on the valley's being withdrawn (compare Virgil, *Aeneid* 8, 609) and on its shade may hint at this – compare *Odes* 1.1.30-31,
Virgil, Aeneid 1.154ff., Horace, Epistles 2.2.77 (scriptorem chorus omnis amat nemus et fugit urbeum) and the description of the grove of the Muses in Tacitus, dialogus de oratoribus 9.6. But above all compare Odes 3.4.5-8 where pios lucos are the metaphorical landscape of poetic creation. There is ultimately no proof of this contention. The parallels are suggestive, however, of the relation stanzas 5-7 may have to the traditional depiction of poetic creativity.

V. The fourth question was: what is the significance of the position of the ode? Among the functions which I have attributed to 1.17 is a programmatic "description", for want of a better term, of one side of what Horace considered as his poetic mode in the Odes. It seems eminently possible that Odes 1.16 can be fitted into the same schema. It can be linked to 1.17 by several internal and external similarities.

First of all, is it likely that Horace would have allowed this type of pairing? The answer must be yes. In Book 1 of the Odes one might compare 1.1 and 1.38, 1.2 and 1.37, 1.3 and 1.36. 30) Within the collection some argue that pairs exist in 1.26 and 1.27, 1.32 and 1.33, 31) 1.34 and 1.35. 32)

Perhaps the two most important external similarities between Odes 1.16 and 1.17 are metre and length. Consider the metres by which they are surrounded: 1.13 Third Asclepiad. 33) 1.14 Fifth Asclepiad. 1.15 Fourth Asclepiad. 1.16 Alcaics. 1.17 Alcaics. 1.18 Second Asclepiad. 1.19 Fourth Asclepiad. The lesser frequency of the Asclepiadic metres within Odes, Books 1-4 must throw the more common Alcaic metres into prominence and, at the same time, perhaps artificially link them. The length of both odes, seven stanzas, is equally significant. Other examples of clear-cut tetrastichic odes of the same length are: 1.24 and 1.25 (4th Asclepiad, Sapphic), 1.32, 1.33, 1.34 (Sapphic, 4th Asclepiad, Alcaic), 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 (Sapphic, Alcaic, Sapphic), 2.8, 9, 10, 11 (Sapphic, Alcaic, Sapphic Alcaic), 3.17, 3.18 (Alcaic, Sapphic), 4.12, 4.13 (4th Asclepiad, 5th Asclepiad). It will be noted, therefore, that 1.16 and 1.17 are the only two contiguous poems of the same length and same metre in the Odes. It would be an act of hybris to ignore this fact.

Further, the structure of both odes is similar. 1.16 is
arranged in sense-blocks of 3+1+3 stanzas. In the first sense-block there is a movement from the personal (stanza 1) to the general (stanzas 2-3); stanza 4, the second sense-block, is best taken as a parenthesis. (The continuity between stanzas 3 and 4 is indicated by the anaphora of *ira e* v.9 and *ira e* v.17.) In the final sense-block, stanzas 5-7, there is a movement from the general to the personal.

Perhaps the most startling internal parallel between the two odes is the looming spectre of Helen of Troy. The ancient commentators inform us that 1.16 is based on Stesichorus' *palinode*. Nisbet and Hubbard suggest that 1.16.1 is taken from Stesichorus' poem (we have no corresponding fragment) and that the verb *rescantare*, v.27, may have been coined by Horace as a Latin equivalent of the Greek *palinode* to indicate the parentage of the ode. Certainly 1.16 is an apt description of Helen.

However, to maintain, as do Nisbet and Hubbard, that the name Tyndaris in 1.17 "may strike a pastoral note" is to dissemble. Although the name may have been common in pastoral its primary referent must be Helen of Troy. The word is used of Helen in Lucretius, *DRN* 1.464, 473; Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2.601, 569; Propertius, 3.30.31, 4.7.30; Ovid, *Ars Am.* 1.746. If one attempts to suggest that Tyndaris does not imply Helen in 1.17 then the onus is on that critic to show why, in the face of this evidence, not. Clear reference to Helen of Troy, therefore, appears in both odes. We may accept this as another decisive link between 1.16 and 1.17.

It is not my intention to conjure up hoary old ghosts by maintaining as, for example, do the scholiasts that the *pulchra filia* of 1.16 is the *eadem meretrix*, Tyndaris that is, of 1.17. Stern comments from Fraenkel have laid this wraith to rest. Rather it seems possible that one level of meaning in 1.16 is poetry itself. Examine v.22-26:

```latex
me quoque pectoris
tentavit in dulci iuventa
fervor et in celere iambos
misit furentem; nunc ego mitibus
mutare quaero tristia...
```

We have already noted the multilayered texture of 1.17. This is a constant feature of the Horatian ode. Granted, as Nisbet
and Hubbard maintain, that 1.16 may be a dissuasio against anger, granted even that it may have been the pulcher filia whose iambics are committed to the elements in stanza 1. No interpretation of stanzas 1-5, however, should distract us from the fact that v.22-26 are referring to an iambic, epodic poetry which the author of Odes 1.16 had utilized but has now abandoned. Horace, it seems thoroughly probable, is referring to his own adoption and abandoning of the epodic genre.

Thus Odes 1.16 is a recantatio, a palinode, but only in the most general sense. It need not refer to an actual biographical event which gave rise to poems of either Horace or the addressee. It refers, rather, to the epodic œuvre. Seen as a deliberate reference to the now abandoned epodic style 1.16 fits very neatly with 1.17. In the latter we have, on one level, a programmatic description of Horace's new themes, in the former a reference (though hardly a programmatic one) to the now abandoned style. Odes 1.16 complements and expands the relevance of 1.17. Such a reading of 1.16, I hasten to add, will explain almost all of the problematic parallels between the two odes. It will also explain why 1.17 appears where it does.

VI. One might observe, by way of a conclusion, how closely intertwined the "answers" to questions two, three, and four are. All are related to poetry. Horace obliquely affirms an Epicurean philosophy of love by rejecting the poetry of a most unepicurean poet. He provides us with a programmatic "description" of one side of his poetic mode in the Odes. And finally, by pairing 1.16 with 1.17, he contrasts symbolically his new style of the Odes with the now abandoned epodic style. These "answers" make up what some would term the "poetological" significance of Odes 1.17.

But one ought not be too procrustean. Much more emphasis may be placed on the "answer" to point one. The amatory nature of the poem could be stressed - either, as Pucci maintains, it depicts a triangular love relationship where Horace sees himself as threatened by Cyrus, or, as Quinn more convincingly maintains, it is an urbane and ironic invitation for Tyndaris to leave Cyrus and to come and "spend the
weekend" with Horace. Neither of these readings, however, need vitiate nor be incompatible with mine. If one thing is true of Horace it is that his odes can have more than one meaning.
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NOTES

1) My thanks for help in the composing of this paper to Prof. K. H. Lee, Mr. A. Treloar, and, above all, to Prof. K. F. Quinn who has read and commented on it at more than one stage. My views should in no way be held to be a reflection of theirs.


3) C. P. Jones, "Tange Chloem semel arrogantem," HSCP, 75 (1971), 81-3. Note, however, that this interpretation depends on what one makes of 3.27. If one follows Quinn, Latin Explorations (London, 1963), 253-66, then 3.27 is the last amatory ode of Books 1-3; thus the neat parallel between 1.5 and 3.26 will not stand.

4) Note, however, my remarks in Section VI of the text.


6) Suggested to me by Quinn whose views should receive amplification in his forthcoming commentary on the Odes. Some possible examples of anaphora in tricolon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Anaphora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.33-(35)-41</td>
<td>sive - (sive) - sive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.1-5-8</td>
<td>ille et - ille et - ille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.1-5-6</td>
<td>otium - otium - (otium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21.13-17-21</td>
<td>tu - tu - te</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.(10)-13-17</td>
<td>seu - seu - sive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.5-9-13</td>
<td>non - nec - non</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perfect symmetry, of course, is not vital. Compare Odes 1.29.5, 8, 10, or 1.8.5, 8, 13 where the change to quid from cur signals modulation. One would expect, however, the variant element to appear last.

7) See, for example, Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. in note 5, 222.


9) Quoted by Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. in note 5, 222.


12) A useful discussion of Horace's attitude to elegy may be found in Quinn, op. cit. in note 3, 154-162.

13) Lucretius, De rerum natura 4.1058ff.

14) See notes 15, 16, 17, and 18 below.


16) Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. in note 5, 222f., for parallels.

17) Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. in note 5, 223ff., for parallels.

18) Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. in note 5, 216, stress this point.

19) F. Solmsen, "Tibullus as an Augustan Poet," Hermes, 90 (1962), 295-325, 302f., cautions against viewing Tibullus as a pastoral poet. However, one would have to wear blinkers not to recognise and admit the presence of many pastoral ideas in his poetry. For example, J. P. Elder, "Tibullus: Terminus atque Elegans," Critical Essays on Roman Literature, ed. J. P. Sullivan (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), 65-105, and G. Lawall, "The Green Cabinet and the Pastoral Design: Theocritus, Euripides, and Tibullus," Ramus, 4 (1975), 87-100, have both allowed the presence of pastoral elements in his poetry.

20) Elder, op. cit. in note 19, 79.

21) Lucretius, DRN 2.20-33 ought to be compared. Horace, an Epicurean, may have inherited much of his rural vision from Lucretius. His clear belief in the efficacy of the country is something quite alien to the rural ideal of Tibullus.


23) So Pucci, op. cit. in note 29, and Quinn: see note 42.


25) See Henderson, op. cit. in note 24, 651n1.


27) Humour in Odes 1.1, 2.20, and 3.30 is discussed briefly by M. O. Lee, Word, Sound, and Image in the Odes of Horace (Ann Arbor, 1969), 91.


29) P. Pucci, "Horace's Banquet in Odes 1.17," TAPA, 105 (1975), 259-281, 260-261, feels that this indicates a preference for the Callimachean genos leptaleon. Note the objections to this type of approach made by Brink in Gnomon, 51 (1979), 60-62, 61.
30) So W. Wili, Horas (Basle, 1948), 154 and followed by Cody, op. cit. in note 2, 34.


32) E. A. Fredericksmeier, "Horace, C. 1.34. The Conversion." TAPA, 106 (1967), 155-176, suggests that Odes 1.34 acts as a preparatory poem to 1.35.


34) Helen also appears in 1.15. This need in no way, however, weaken the link between 1.16 and 1.17.

35) Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. in note 5, 204.


37) Fraenkel, op. cit. in note 11, 208f.

38) Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit. in note 5, 203.


40) Compare Epodes 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 12.

41) See op. cit. in note 29.

42) This position will be further clarified in his forthcoming commentary (cf. note 6 above). Prof. Quinn kindly communicated this view to me in private correspondence.