

**University of Massachusetts Boston**

---

**From the Selected Works of Emily A. McDermott**

---

1982

## Horace, Maecenas and Odes 2.17

Emily A. McDermott, *University of Massachusetts Boston*



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/emily\\_mcdermott/13/](https://works.bepress.com/emily_mcdermott/13/)

Sonderdruck

# HERMES

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

JOCHEN BLEICKEN

HARTMUT ERBSE · WILLY SCHETTER

110. BAND · 1982 · HEFT 2

2. QUARTAL



FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH · WIESBADEN

das Proömium der Aeneis für viele ein gedächtnismäßiger Besitz gewesen sein, den sie sich beliebig oft vergegenwärtigen konnten. Schließlich ist für die Schicht der gebildeten Hörer oder Leser eine beträchtliche Sensibilität für sprachlich-formale Feinheiten anzunehmen. So mochten manche Leser imstande sein, die aufgewiesenen Korrespondenzen partiell sogar sehr bewußt nachzuvollziehen<sup>34</sup>. Doch kommt es darauf nicht einmal an. Denn das Wirken solcher rhythmischen Phänomene ist unabhängig von ihrer Erfassung durch die Ratio<sup>35</sup>.

Augsburg

WOLFGANG D. LEBEK

<sup>34</sup> Hierfür sei zumal an den Maecenas-Kreis und darüber hinaus an die zahlreichen Dichter und Dichterlinge aus Vergils Zeit (vgl. Hor. epist. 2, 1, 108 ff.) erinnert. Ein interessanter späterer Vergilleser ist Lucan. Vgl. oben Anm. 27. Unempfindlichkeit gab es selbstverständlich ebenfalls: *non quivis videt immodulata poemata iudex*.

<sup>35</sup> Für eine kritische Lektüre des Manuskripts danke ich CLEMENS ZINTZEN.

### HORACE, MAECENAS AND ODES 2, 17

Few of Horace's Odes have occasioned as little recent critical commentary as his poetic pledge to die along with Maecenas (Odes 2, 17). Although a profitable direction for analysis was indicated by Meineke's outraged condemnation of the fourth stanza and PEERLKAMP'S even earlier obelization of a full five of the poem's eight stanzas<sup>1</sup>, the road most commonly taken by critics has been to ignore this ode altogether, or to mention it in passing only. Of the most recent studies on Horace, only FRAENKEL and (necessarily) NISBET and HUBBARD'S exhaustive commentary on Odes II meet the poem head on<sup>2</sup>.

Critics' difficulties with the ode have most often centered in the fourth to sixth stanzas, where the poet first defies the fire-breathing Chimaera and hundred-handed Gyas to pluck him from Maecenas's side on the road to death and then adduces astrological evidence to guarantee the truthfulness of his pledge. The grandiloquence of the former and the presumed hypocrisy of the latter have subjected the poet to uneasy suspicions of a maudlin and obsequious lapse of taste.

<sup>1</sup> A. MEINEKE, ed., Q. Horatius Flaccus (Berlin, 1874), xv; P. HOFMAN PEERLKAMP, ed., Horatius: Carmina (Amsterdam, 1862), ad loc. See esp. PEERLKAMP'S snide paraphrase of A. P. 3-4 to characterize the ode: *Nunc enim turpiter atrum desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne*.

<sup>2</sup> ED. FRAENKEL, Horace (Oxford, 1957), 216-219; R. G. M. NISBET and M. HUBBARD, A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II (Oxford, 1978), ad loc.

The opening lines of the ode introduce Maecenas in a less than flattering light:

*Cur me querelis exanimas tuis?  
nec dis amicum est nec mihi te prius  
obire, Maecenas. . .* (Odes 2, 17, 1–3)

We are presented first with a Maecenas who suffers not only from fear of imminent death, but also from an irrational resentment that his friend will live on after him; then with a Horace who hastens to console him, not with a soothing assurance that Maecenas will live to a ripe old age, but by answering the less worthy half of Maecenas's complaint with a promise to die along with him. It is an odd scenario, if taken at face value. Schooled by Seneca's acerbic comments on Maecenas' *philopsychia* (Epp. 101, 10–14), we might accept the querulousness attributed to him, but – to those who admire Horace for an amused and detached appreciation of the human comedy – it is difficult to imagine him encouraging Maecenas's self-indulgence. It is right here in the first three lines (and *not* just with the extravagance of the fourth to sixth stanzas) that a suspicion of obsequiousness on Horace's part is liable to strike the reader who takes these lines as a straightforward mirror of a real situation.

The difficulties with the scene set by the first stanza disappear if one reads the entire poem as humorous<sup>3</sup>. In order to document this interpretation, I shall turn first to a reexamination of certain aspects of Maecenas's character and of the relationship between Horace and Maecenas (as depicted in their poetry), then to an exposition of this poem in comparison with Epodes 14, which I believe the poet meant his readers (including, and especially, Maecenas) to keep in mind as they read Odes 2, 17.

Underlying the view that this ode must be a tactfully solemn pledge of friendship and solicitude (into which humor may intrude discreetly here and there, but which as a whole is gravely serious in tone) is the tacit assumption that Maecenas suffered from such a dire and abnormal fear of death that Horace would never have written a poem treating his patron's fears humorously. But, whereas commentaries on Odes 2, 17 and character

<sup>3</sup> Several other critics have seen isolated parts of the poem as humorous. For instance, FRAENKEL (218) styles the mythological section 'longue-in-cheek' but denies that the astrological section is similarly humorous, as suggested by F. BOLL, *Paralipomena I*, Philol. 69 (1910), 166ff.; Zu Horaz, od. II 17, Z. f. d. Gymnasialw. 65 (1911), 765; and Sternfreundschaft, Sokrates 5 (1917), 1 ff. L. P. WILKINSON, *Horace and his Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1946), 63, finds humor in both these sections; STEELE COMMAGER, *The Odes of Horace* (New Haven, 1962), 311, characterizes lines 21 ff. as 'half-humorous', but in passing only. On the other hand, KENNETH A. RECKFORD, *Horace and Maecenas*, TAPA 90 (1959), 203, styles the whole ode a 'humorous consolation' to Maecenas, but does not expound this view. NISBET and HUBBARD also see a sort of humor in the ode as a whole and essay a brief, but perceptive, assessment of its effect (p. 274).

descriptions of Maecenas almost without exception portray Maecenas in these psychopathological terms, it is difficult to find sufficient justification for such a view in the ancient sources. Pliny informs us that in his final three years Maecenas suffered from recurrent fevers and a resultant insomnia (N. H. 7, 172). Yet Horace's ode predates Maecenas's death by at least fifteen years. Although we know from Horace's own testimony that Maecenas had already suffered through one serious bout of disease, we may not conclude even that his ill health was chronic at the time this ode was written, let alone draw inferences concerning his resultant state of mind.

It is only when one turns to Seneca that a black picture of Maecenas's psyche emerges. At Epistles 114, 4 and Dialogus 1, 3, 10, for example, Seneca attacks Maecenas for effeminacy, self-display, and tortuousness of expression and describes the sleeplessness which Pliny attributes to physical causes as the natural concomitant of a mind sick with the anxieties of love and various other debaucheries. In Epistles 101, 10ff., he launches a full-scale attack on Maecenas's *philopsychia*, citing as evidence the following *turpissimum votum* by Maecenas:

*Debilem facito manu, debilem pede, coxa,  
tuber adstrue gibberum, lubricos quate dentes:  
vita dum superest, bene est! sustine hanc mihi: acuta  
nil est si sedeam cruce! . . .* (BAEHRENS, fr. 3)

This poem is such a made-to-order foil for Seneca's little treatise on the *carpe diem* theme that one can almost see him licking his lips with anticipation as he read it. But precise literary interpretation is likely to be given low priority by someone with a moralistic ax to grind. In fact, the poem's outlandish extremism is a suitable vehicle for a wryly humorous rebuttal (*skolion*-like) of more standard, 'noble' poetic sentiments. And as long ago as 1911 LUNDERSTEDT laid bare the egregiously circular reasoning which imputes a dread fear of death to Maecenas's lines from the evidence of Horace's solemn pledge in Odes 2, 17, while also denying the possibility of humor to the ode as a result of the pathological state of mind revealed by Maecenas's poem<sup>4</sup>. Perhaps Maecenas was a bit of a hypochondriac<sup>5</sup>; but there is absolutely no

<sup>4</sup> P. LUNDERSTEDT, *De C. Maecenatis Fragmentis, Commentationes Philologiae Ienenses*, vol. 9 (Leipzig, 1911), 51. His conclusion that Maecenas had written the poem impelled by *hilaritate et comitate* exactly fits my own view. On the other hand, it is even conceivable, as he has suggested (51), that Maecenas is not speaking for himself here, but glancing satirically at others' behavior. The poem is incomplete by at least half a line and may have been plucked out of context by Seneca or an earlier commentator.

<sup>5</sup> See NISBET and HUBBARD, pp. 273–274: »Our ode tends to confirm his hypochondria even in the days of his power; though there is a conventional element in his *querelae* . . .), the

ancient evidence to justify the conclusion that his neurosis was so extreme as to bear no well-intentioned mockery.

A second (and related) question which should be examined before discussion of Odes 2, 17 is whether the relationship of Horace and Maecenas would allow such mockery of the patron by the poet. The degree of warmth of the friendship shared by the biographical Horace and the biographical Maecenas is one of those issues which (barring fortuitous uncovering of pertinent new source material) is doomed to fluctuate with the tides of scholarly vogue and individual temperament. However, it is clear from Horace's Odes themselves that the poet felt at liberty to incorporate criticism and even a certain amount of mockery into his poetic communiqués to his patron. Maecenas's tastes, his values, and his demands on Horace all come under a measure of attack.

Although Maecenas surrounded himself with a circle of first-class writers and poets, his own writings have incited little enthusiasm<sup>6</sup>. A 'hopeless epigone' whose poetry abounds with inept reworkings of Catullus, he is addicted to outré coinages, singularly artificial word-order, and 'fantastical conceits'<sup>7</sup>. Suetonius, in describing the purism and elegance of Augustus's style, concludes by saying: *in primis Maecenatem suum [exagitat], cuius 'myrobrechis', ut ait, 'cinnos' usque quaque persequitur et imitando per iocum irridet* (Aug. 86).

This sneer by Augustus at Maecenas's fondness for neologizing and precious Grecizing (*myrobrechis*) recalls the theory voiced by the latter-day neoteric (*simius iste*) parodied in Horace's tenth Satire (Sat. 1, 10, 17-24):

... quos neque pulcher  
Hermogenes umquam legit, neque simius iste  
nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.  
20 »at magnum fecit quod verbis Graeca Latinis  
miscuit.« o seri studiorum! quine putetis

coherence with the later portrait cannot be entirely explained away. « But, while it is of course in the realm of fancy to try to imagine what words of Maecenas (if any) occasioned the poem, certain non-neurotic possibilities do exist. Perhaps it was merely a casual remark (of the same type as, »Oh, you'll be around long after I'm gone«) humorously blown up by Horace. Alternatively, it is suggestive that Horace uses the term *querelae* of elegiac poetry at Odes 2, 9, 18 (cp. *querentem* of Sappho at 2, 13, 24) and of an epitaph (cp. the genre of funerary elegy) at 3, 11, 52. The *querelae* of Maecenas may not have been oral, or conversational, complaints at all, but a poem or poems in the elegiac mode, relating to the subject of death (cp. fr. 3).

<sup>6</sup> The dichotomy between Maecenas's tastes as composer of poetry and as patron of poets suggests a comparison with Catullus's *Suffenus iste* (Poem 22), a man of elegance and charm who, when he turns to composing poetry, *tantum abhorret ac mutat* that he loses all claim to *urbanitas*.

<sup>7</sup> FRAENKEL, 17; RONALD SYME, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 342.

*difficile et mirum, Rhodio quod Pitholeonti  
contigit? »at sermo lingua concinnus utraque  
suavior, ut Chio nota si commixta Falerni est»<sup>8</sup>*

And, in fact, Horace makes the parallel between the two epigones, Maecenas and *simius iste*, almost explicit when he later addresses his patron as *docte sermones utriusque linguae* (Odes 3, 8, 5). This phrase's double echo of the neoteric catchwords from the Satires passage (cp. *doctus* [1, 10, 19]; *sermo lingua* ... *utraque* [1, 10, 23]) was surely clear to Maecenas and to Horace's audience as a whole. Horace's mockery in this characterization of Maecenas is dry and light – certainly not sharp. One might imagine his train of thought as follows: »As you know, Maecenas, I find your style of composition a little absurd. One could almost accuse you of being like that ape I wrote about in my tenth Satire, if you didn't prove otherwise by offering patronage to the best poets and writers of our era«.

On the other hand, despite Maecenas's unhealthy predilection for the artificialities and extremes of neoteric style, there was a great deal in one of his chief models – Catullus – worthy of imitation, and Horace pays his patron an adept compliment on two early poetic occasions by drawing from a Catullan fount when addressing him. Horace's first Epode is an elaborate variation on the theme of Catullus 11, in which Horace plays a faithful Furius and Aurelius to Maecenas, while Maecenas does the same for Octavian<sup>9</sup>. Epodes 3, his playful rebuke to Maecenas for having served him a meal too strongly flavored with garlic, is Catullan in its mock-serious tone and is filled with more 'neotericisms' of diction than Horace usually allows himself<sup>10</sup>. Thus, just as he becomes Pindaric (*immensus* ... *profundo* ... *ore*) when speaking of Pindar's style in Odes 4, 2, 5–24, in these two epodes Horace defers to his friend's taste in poets by adopting a Catullan tone to address

<sup>8</sup> The artistry of this parody is consummate. Note esp. the neoteric catchword *doctus* (19) turned against its user, whose claim to learning is based solely on slavish imitations of Catullus and Calvus; the mocking adoption of the so characteristically neoteric usage, *suavior* (see D. O. Ross, *I.C. and Tradition in Catullus* [Cambridge, Mass., 1969], 79–80); and the purposely heavy-handed translation (*seri studiorum*) of the Greek *ὀνυμαθεῖς*, by which the poet comically bolsters his argument against extreme Grecizing.

<sup>9</sup> Epodes 1 and Catullus 11 are linked by (a) parallel use of a geographical excursus (cp. Epod. I, 11–14 with Cat. 11, 2–12); (b) several Catullan reminiscences within Horace's poem: *paratus* (3), cp. *parati* (11, 14); *comes* (17), cp. *comites* (11, 1); and possibly *satis superque* (31; cp. Cat. 7, 2) – a common enough phrase, but within a generally Catullan context perhaps suggestive of Catullus's line.

<sup>10</sup> For neotericisms, see the characteristically Catullan use in lines 9–18 of mock-elevated mythological and geographical *exempla* (see COMMAGER, 122–123; ROSS, 95 ff.); the *-osus* adjectives *siticulosae*, *aestuosius* and *iocose* (see ROSS, 53–60, and below, pp. 224 and especially the urbane colloquialism *savio* (see ROSS, 104–105), which appears only here in all of Horace.

him. In intent, this sort of compliment is the converse of the teasing tone of *docte sermones utriusque linguae*, but the two phenomena have a common ground in the poet's assumption of neoteric prerogatives and/or Catullan imitation as a gloss on the tastes of his poems' addressee.

Horace and Maecenas's tastes (so Horace repeatedly tells us in his poems) differ even more notably in the way of life each chose for himself. The odes to Maecenas abound with comparisons of Horace's own modest needs with Maecenas's more lavish style of life. Although the distinction is always tactfully expressed, an implied criticism of the latter is always present, for Horace was firmly convinced that his own way was superior, in life as in poetry<sup>11</sup>.

Finally, Horace takes some pains to portray himself as habitually forced (long before the famous 'retirement' poem, Epistles 1, 7) to parry the demands of an importunate Maecenas. In Odes 2, 17 itself, the presumptive 'occasion' for the poem is Maecenas's exasperating *querelae*; the poet's apology in Epodes 14 for his inability to complete his collection is occasioned by Maecenas's repeated inquiries about the progress of the work (*occidis saepe rogando* [Epod. 14, 5]); Odes 2, 12, purportedly written in answer to proddings by Maecenas, is a *recusatio* in which Horace opts to sing of amatory themes while neatly handing over to the prodder the task of recording Augustus's exploits.

While the fragmentary nature of Maecenas's own poetic corpus precludes any sure inferences concerning its portrayal of the *personae* Maecenas and Horace, two of his fragments may suggest that the converse picture (of a complaining Horace occasioning a poem by Maecenas in his own defense) was a recurrent element in his poetry. Maecenas's epigram on his great love for Horace (a parodic reworking of the first few lines of Catullus 14) contains no explicit mention of a previous complaint by Horace, but its oath-form seems to presuppose some expressed need on Horace's part to be convinced:

*Ni te visceribus meis, Horati,  
plus iam diligo, tu tuum sodalem  
hinnulo videas strigiosiore.* (fr. 2, BAEHRENS)

The occasional aspect of the epigram's Catullan model (Calvus's gift of the *horribilem et sacrum libellum* [Cat. 14, 12]) may also lend support to the view that these lines too are written to 'answer' a friend. Similarly, when Maecenas addresses to Horace his lines repudiating various precious stones (fr. 1, BAEHRENS), it is tempting to imagine that he did so at least partially in

<sup>11</sup> See esp. Odes 1, 20; 2, 17, 30 ff.; 3, 8, 13 ff.; 3, 16, 17 ff.; 3, 29, 1-16 et al.; Sat. 2, 6, 40 ff. Cp. RECKFORD, 203.



response to the charges of materialism so often levelled at him by Horace (see above, p. 216 and n. 11).

These factors in their poetry lead plausibly to an inference that the two men carried on over the years an extended poetic dialogue in somewhat the same tradition as the single evening's entertainment engaged in by Catullus and Calvus (*uterque nostrum . . . reddens mutua per iocum atque vinum* [Cat. 50, 4–6]) or to the emulous exchanges of amoebean verse portrayed in Virgil's Eclogues. The spirit of this protracted exchange was, on the other hand, different from the two parallels cited, since its emphasis was not on capping one another poetically (that is, by further refinement of style or by a more exquisitely expressed riposte), but was concerned instead with a genial, but somewhat barbed, exchange of advice or mild criticism.

It is in the light of these observations on the relationship of Horace and Maecenas that the critic should examine Odes 2, 17. In sum, he should recognize first that there is no real evidence to support the view that Maecenas was so frightened by death that Horace's poem must be a serious attempt at consolation and, second, that there is internal evidence in the two men's poems that a frank notation of the differences in their tastes and values was not at all interdict.

The crux of the difficulty with the opening scenario of Odes 2, 17 lies in the phrasing of the first line. The poet could easily have avoided all implication of querulousness on Maecenas's part by omitting mention of Maecenas's *querelae* and simply starting the poem with a statement that his own fate and his friend's are inextricably intertwined. FRAENKEL characterizes the tone of the first line's question as one of 'gentle reproach' and perhaps, 'slight impatience' (217). I would say rather that, if taken at face value, the words are abrupt and perhaps even downright offensive. Other critics seem undisturbed by the presumed change in tone after the first line to what FRAENKEL (217) styles a 'deep and urgent' voice. But if the poem indeed represents a serious attempt to ease Maecenas's mind of a legitimate burden, then why does it begin with a rebuke at all? And if the poet sees the complaint as querulous and silly, as the opening line implies, then why does he go on to defend himself elaborately against it?

One crucial, yet almost unnoted, point concerning this puzzling first line is that it contains a clear and strong reminiscence of Horace's fourteenth Epode: *candide Maecenas, occidis saepe rogando* (5)<sup>12</sup>. The identical grammatical structure of *occidis rogando* and *exanimas querelis*, the similarity of the image evoked by each verb, and the fact that both are addressed to the same man combine to make the echo clear. The effect of such an allusion is twofold. Substantively, it suggests to the reader that this sort of exchange (an initial

<sup>12</sup> NISBET and HUBBARD, ad loc., do note the parallel, but attach no special significance to it.

complaint by Maecenas, answered in turn by a complaining Horace) is a habitual component of their relationship (see discussion above, p. 216). Formally, the recall of an earlier poem in the ode's very first line serves as a clue to the alert reader that there may be further similarities between the two, which will enhance his appreciation of the new poem.

The plot of Epodes 14 comprises Horace's self-defense against a charge of unnecessary delay in bringing his collection of Epodes to completion. His argument is, in sum, that being in love has sapped his strength for any disciplined self-application, and that Maecenas of all people should sympathize with his plight, since he too is the victim of love. This argument follows an almost identical structural pattern to that of Odes 2, 17, and within that pattern the overall similarity of the two poems is emphasized by individual parallels in thought and mode of expression.

The two poems' structure can be charted as follows:

|  | Epod. 14              | Odes 2, 17            |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| (A) Statement (a) and summary (b)<br>of Maecenas's complaint                       | 1-5<br>b: 1-4<br>a: 5 | 1-4<br>a: 1<br>b: 2-4 |
| (B) Statement of Horace's grounds<br>for self-defense                              | 6-8                   | 5-12                  |
| (C) <i>Exemplum</i> / - a reinforcing self-<br>justification                       | 9-12                  | 13-20                 |
| (D) <i>Equation of Maecenas's and Horace's</i><br>situations (= appeal to empathy) | 13-16                 | 21-31                 |

The tone of the fourteenth Epode is clearly playful; its techniques will be instructive in comparison with Odes 2, 17. The poem opens with the striking image of *inertia* diffusing forgetfulness into Horace's limbs like an opiate (1-4). The expressiveness of this first section (A b above) prepares us for a poem in which the poet reflects - seriously, perhaps wistfully - on the cause of this inactivity. The impact of the imagery is compounded by the use of distinct poeticisms: *pocula* in its transferred sense and the epithet *Lethaeos*.

Our expectations are quickly reversed, however, when Horace completes (A a) his indirect question: *candide Maecenas, occidis saepe rogando* (5). The epithet *candidus* is poetic and carries on the tone of the previous lines, but in the second half of the line the mood is abruptly broken. *Occido*, an unpoetic word even when used literally, here appears in a transferred sense ('to plague to death') used frequently in comedy (cp. especially *occidis me, quom istuc rogitas* [Pseud. 931]), and once (= 'ruin') by Cicero in a popular jest (De Or. 2, 302), but nowhere else before its appearance in Epodes 14<sup>13</sup>. Horace's two

<sup>13</sup> For *occido* as an unpoetic word, see ThLL, s. v.; B. AXELSON, Unpoetische Wörter (Lund, 1945), 65 ff. For transferred usage, see also LS II. A.

later uses of the word (A. P. 475, Epp. 2,2,138) are similarly colloquial in tone (note especially the former: *quem vero arripuit, tenet occiditque legendo*). The appearance of *occido* in this epode thus creates an anomaly: *candidus* Maecenas becomes a comic nag, and the dreaminess of the first four lines is put into ironically stark contrast with the harassing demands of the poet's everyday world, as invoked by this homely phrase.

This undercutting of the tone of the first lines gives the reader his first clue that the poem is to be a playful one. When the poet proceeds to open his argument of self-justification (B) with an elevated *conduplicatio* (*deus, deus nam me vetat . . .* [6]), we are left in little doubt that this is *mock-elevation*. In order to counter Maecenas's nagging inquiries, Horace disavows responsibility by claiming a divine source for his inactivity. The playful exaggeration of the claim is enhanced by the anonymity of the god responsible. This is the *deus incertus*, equivalent to *numen* or *divinitas*. Its use here has a certain oracular ambiguity and maintains the loftiness, or mock-loftiness, of tone much better than if Horace had here named Venus or Cupid as the cause of his trouble: though we may suspect, we are still kept in suspense about the nature of the poet's problem.

The next lines resolve our doubts – albeit obliquely – as the poet proceeds with an *exemplum* (C)<sup>14</sup>: when struck with love for Bathyllus, he tells us, Anacreon too had been unable to do anything but while away his time singing in free (i. e. unpublishable) verse. After this *exemplum* from the past, the poet goes on to use the example of Maecenas himself to clinch his self-justification (D). But this section, which in the flow of logic stresses the similarity between Horace's and Maecenas's plights, is subdivided to suggest as well a contrast, for Maecenas is more fortunate in his choice of a lover:

- D<sub>1</sub>    *ureris ipse miser: quodsi non pulchrior ignis*  
           *accendit obsessam Ilion,*  
 D<sub>2</sub>    *gaude sorte tua; me libertina neque uno*  
           *contenta Phryne macerat. (13–16)*

The explicit contrast of his own Phryne with the nobility of Maecenas's love is reinforced implicitly by the quality of his diction in the two characterizations. Maecenas's affair is couched in a mythological allusion whose phrasing would not be out of place in an epic. Further, the poet has created a neat *double entendre* here by making the content of his metaphor (similarity to Helen) pick out a more literal meaning in its stock trochaic use of *ignis* for the beloved object: Helen inflamed Troy not only figuratively, by winning Paris's love,

<sup>14</sup> See COMMAGER, 122–123, for discussion of similarly parodic use of the elevated technique of argument by *exemplum* in Epodes 3.

but also literally, by bringing about the holocaust that signalled the city's ultimate destruction.

By contrast, the pains inflicted on Horace by his ignoble love are expressed through the somewhat ignoble image evoked by the verb *macero* (to 'soak' or 'soften by soaking')<sup>15</sup>. The poet deliberately plays on the contrast of the noble flame which has kindled Maecenas's love and the base love which is draining away his own strength like a long soak in a hot tub. The frequent application of the term *macero* elsewhere to the debilitating effect of disease, moreover, returns us to the terms in which Horace's ailment is described in the first lines of the poem: it is his love for Phryne which has seeped through his veins and into his whole system.

The tone of these lines is clearly self-deprecatory, as the contrasts Horace makes between his own and Maecenas's lives so often are. But (as so often) this self-deprecation is ironic. Horace's contrast of Maecenas's love and his own Phryne centers on the latter's social (*libertina* [15]) and moral (*neque uno contenta* [15–16]) inferiority. Yet the view of Maecenas's love as more constant is somewhat paradoxically undercut by the specific comparison chosen to prove her nobility (i. e. similarity to Helen): the very hallmark of Helen's fame was her *failure* to remain *uno contenta*. The precise tone of the resulting insinuation that Maecenas's love had the same failing as his own Phryne would of course vary according to whether Maecenas was playing Menelaus or Paris to his Helen. But either way, Maecenas's *ignis* is slyly

<sup>15</sup> ThLL, citing the connection of *macero* with *ignis* here, at Odes 1, 13, 8 and at Ciris 244, concludes that the verb can become so neutral as to be an effective synonym in these cases for *uror*. I think that this conclusion blurs the actual force of the word in Horace. In its second Horatian locus, the poet describes his wrath at Lydia's infidelities with Telephus:

*tum nec mens mihi nec color  
certa sede manent, umor et in genas  
furtim labitur, arguens  
quam lentis penitus macerer ignibus.  
uror . . . (Odes 1, 13, 5–9)*

This later passage contains an even more elaborate contrast between the pains caused by the stereotyped fires of love and the dull sapping of strength experienced by the poet. The anomaly of the two conceits is emphasized first by the fact that the poet's burning love (*penitus . . . ignibus*, followed by a resumptive *uror*) is said to be proved by the 'liquefaction' of his cheeks which is explicitly mentioned in *umor et in genas furtim labitur* and which I further contend is the image evoked by *macerer*; and, second, by the oxymoron of the phrase *lentis ignibus*. One certainly does not normally associate with fire the concepts of stickiness or even toughness. Rather, Horace has here purposely chosen an oxymoronic mode of expression (as he so often does), in order to assert subtly the difference between the pains of love as he is trying to explain them in these two poems (as dull, sapping sensations) and the stock fire metaphors of amatory verse. I do not claim that *macero* in its tropic senses *always* maintains any of its primary force – merely that Horace has seen fit to pick out that primary force by twice setting the word in an oxymoronic context.

likened to Horace's in a passage where the poet is on the surface saying how much better off Maecenas is in his choice of lover.

A similar process of undercutting may be at work in Horace's 'denigrating' remark on Phryne's social class (*libertina*). The clear implication that Maecenas's love (again like Helen) was of the *matrona* class might well be intended to recall, ironically, Satires 1, 2's characterization of the *libertina* as a more proper medium for love (see especially lines 47–48, 77 ff.). Further, it is tempting, despite chronological uncertainty, to see section C's *exemplum* of Anacreon as a subtle allusion to Maecenas's intoxication with the freedman actor Bathyllos<sup>16</sup>. On the one hand, such an allusion would have the effect of strengthening the poet's argument of his own self-justification, by bringing to bear a second case of Maecenas's subjection to love. On the other, Horace's characterization of Phryne as *libertina* right after a veiled allusion to Maecenas's freedman love would have the effect of reminding Maecenas wryly that he himself has been in the same boat.

Odes 2, 17 recalls Epodes 14 not only in the similarity of the two poems' structure but also in its deliberate variation of poetic tone and its resultant 'between-the-lines' undercutting of its own surface statement. Inadvertent failure to achieve a consonant poetic tone throughout a single ode would, of course, be the mark of a poor poet. But (pace AXELSON) such failure is not endemic to Horace's poetry<sup>17</sup>. Rather, Horace purposely alternates in these two poems from poetic to colloquial to 'high' style. The effect of these extreme changes in tone is (perhaps intrinsically) comic. Working on a principle of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* akin to word-play, the poet can, for instance, flatten a grandiloquent conceit by a swift change to the colloquial, thus making clear that his earlier elevation was mock-elevation, or – conversely – he can assure by a homely cast of expression that a later flight into the grandiose will be viewed as mannered, or overdone<sup>18</sup>. The overall effect of this variation in tone in Odes 2, 17 is to create a poem which is neither a simple and straightforward emotional statement (as FRAENKEL would have it) nor a

<sup>16</sup> See Tacitus, Ann. 1, 54; Dio, 54, 17, 5; Seneca, Contr. 10 par. 8; Schol. Persius 5, 123. As F. VILLENEUVE, *Horace: Odes et Épodes* (Paris, 1927), ad loc., has pointed out, such an allusion would be characteristic of the liberties so often taken by the iambic genre.

<sup>17</sup> AXELSON, p. 112, suggests that Horace's frequent use of prosaisms in his Odes argues that »dieser große Sprachkünstler trotz allem als Lyriker kein allzu sicheres Stilempfinden besessen habe...« But, in so concluding, AXELSON fails to appreciate fully the poetic potential of (e.g.) new importations to the poetic vocabulary (such as *praesidium*) or a deliberately matter-of-fact poetic tone.

<sup>18</sup> To the contemporary native speaker of Latin, such techniques would not be at all arcane, for the changes in tone involved would be immediately perceptible. Unfortunately, however, they are determinable by the modern critic primarily through such artificial methods as the assignment of individual words to one or the other 'vocabulary' (poetic, prosaic, etc.) and subsequent analysis of their combined effect.

piece of fawning overstatement, but a communication between friends which is characterized by humor, irony, and subtlety of poetic expression and technique.

After the first line's exasperated reminiscence of Epodes 14, 5, there is a change in tone, as FRAENKEL and others have noted; but it should also be pointed out that these lines do not represent an entirely unedged emotional outburst, for it is in this oblique description of the content of Maecenas's unreasonable complaints (*nec dis amicum nec mihi te prius / obire Maecenas* [2-3]) that the anomalies of the scenario (discussed above, p. 211) are made apparent. In the closing apostrophe of this first stanza — *meorum grande decus columenque rerum* (3-4) — Horace finally drops the edged tone of the previous lines. This description of Maecenas clearly testifies to a warmth of feeling on the part of the poet<sup>19</sup>. Its complimentary force may even be enhanced (as in Epodes 1 and 3) by the use of Catullan allusion: the ascription to Maecenas of the unusual epithet *columen* (which appears only here in all Horace's works and is otherwise absent from Augustan poetry) may be intended to recall Catullus's similarly laudatory address to Peleus at Poem 64, 26: *Thessaliae columen Peleus*<sup>20</sup>.

The tone of the poem, however, undergoes a further change (not recognized by other critics) as the genuine feeling of this address to Maecenas gives way — or actually mounts — to a mock-serious exaggeration of conceit and diction:

*a! te meae si partem animae rapit  
maturior vis, quid moror altera,  
nec carus aequae nec superstes  
integer? (5-8)*

FRAENKEL and NISBET and HUBBARD attribute this extraordinary appearance of the pathetic *a!* in Horace to the vehemence of his emotions here. But the rarity of Horace's use of this interjection reflects not a general slowness to rise to emotional heights but a reluctance to adopt as his own a usage redolent of a peculiarly neoteric type of poetic affectation<sup>21</sup>. After the opening exclamation

<sup>19</sup> Cp. *o et praesidium et dulce decus meum* (Odes 1, 1, 2) and *Maecenas, equitum decus* (Odes 3, 16, 20).

<sup>20</sup> *Columen* in this metonymical sense (*de ipsis personis*) appears only here and at the cited Catullan locus in non-comic poetry before the Silver Age. The rarity of the usage makes it more likely that Horace chose it as a recognizable reference to Catullus.

<sup>21</sup> For detailed discussion of the neoteric nature of *a!*, see ROSS, 49-53. Horace uses *a!* twice in line 71 of the Hellenistically-inspired fifth Epode (for witchcraft as a subject, cp. Theocritus, Pharm.; Virgil, Ecl. 8; for bibliography on the Hellenistic spirit of Horace's poem, see FRAENKEL, 64, nn. 3-4). Its only other occurrence in Horace is at Odes 1, 27, 18, in conjunction

tion, this second stanza continues with an elaborate variation on the theme so simply voiced at Odes 1, 3, 8 (*serves animae dimidium meae*): whereas it is clearly poetically effective to say, 'You are my other half', it is somehow stiltedly manneristic to proceed – as Horace does here – to the overly literal sequel, »And I am my *other* half«. The conceit is further complicated by its rather tortuous expression, through which the poet (as subject of *moror*) is modified in quick succession by the feminine *altera* (sc. *pars* from the previous line), then by the masculine *carus* and *integer* (sc. *ego*). Straightforwardness of expression is, then, momentarily abandoned for an artificiality reminiscent of one of Maecenas's own 'fantastical' neoteric conceits. The poem thus changes tone for a second time, passing to a bantering tone achieved by parody of the neotericism that Maecenas the writer revelled in: *imitando per iocum irridet*.

The poet drops this mock-neotericism abruptly<sup>22</sup>, as he completes his defense (section B above) by swearing a military oath of loyalty (*sacramentum* [10]) to his 'commander', Maecenas, promising (10–12) to follow whenever the latter leads the way on life's last journey (*supremum... iter*). The final sentiment of the stanza (*ibimus, ibimus... comites parati*) echoes the poet's promise in his first Epode to follow Maecenas into battle (cp. *ibis, paratus*, and *comes* [Epod. I, 1, 3, 17]) and highlights the two poems' parallel assertions that, bereft of Maecenas, Horace's life could no longer be pleasurable (cp. Odes 2, 17, 5–8 with Epod. I, 5–6). Thus, while in the logical flow of 2, 17 the past tense of *dixi sacramentum* refers back to the previous sentence's avowal that the two friends' deaths will be simultaneous, in effect these lines say also: »I pledged my loyalty and friendship to you once before, Maecenas, when you were about to go to war to support Octavian. How can you imagine that that pledge would prove false (*perfidum*) should you face that greatest of all trials, the march to death?«

The metaphorical expression of these lines is highly poetic and contains none of the mock-elevation or tortuousness of expression which characterized the previous stanza. This drop in tone is further marked by descent from neoteric parody to 'straight' Catullan allusion: the echoes here of Epodes I necessarily recall that poem's model, Catullus 11 (see note 9 above). If there is any element in its diction which is intended to keep the ghost of a smile playing around the reader's lips by recalling the verbal exaggeration of the

with other characteristically neoteric elements: first, the use of a common Hellenistic trope (raillery at an enamored friend); then a string of exaggerated mythological exempla (*Charbydi* [19], *Pegasus* and *Chimaera* [24]), along with references – as in Epod. 5 – to witchcraft and sorcery (*saga* [21]; *Thessalis magus venenis* [21–22]).

<sup>22</sup> The abruptness of the change in tone is marked by line 8's abnormal sense pause at //<sup>3</sup>. (On the other hand, FRAENKEL, 217 n. 4, tentatively agrees with HEINZE that this break is intended to convey emotion.)



previous stanza, it is the 'pathetic' *conduplicatio* of line 10. Although *ibimus ibimus* is obviously not meant to be mock-elevated in the same way as *deus deus* in Epodes 14, it is notable that these two occurrences of a device which is relatively rare in Horace are found in parallel sections (B as listed above) of two poems whose structure is almost identical. The reader might, then, be meant to extrapolate from the earlier *conduplicatio* a certain conscious dramatization in *ibimus ibimus* and to smile at the poet's attempt to make the rhetoric of his defense in Odes 2, 17 all the more convincing thereby.

The tone of the poem rises again to mock-elevation with the poet's entry upon mythological and astrological *exempla* to strengthen his case (section C above). Individual elevated elements include the appearance of the Chimaera (which Horace reserves for the most elevated – or mock-elevated – contexts)<sup>23</sup>, couched in the periphrasis *Chimaerae spiritus* and coupled with the transferred epithet *igneae*; the resounding triple anaphora of *seu*; and the lofty epithet *tyrannus undae*. Two particular usages (*centimanus* [14] and *formidulosus* [18]) indicate that again (as in lines 5–8) the verbal extravagance of these *exempla* is meant by the poet to be of a particularly neoteric variety. Compound adjectives, which are common in light neoteric poetry but otherwise are characteristic of only the most elevated genres, are infrequent in Horace<sup>24</sup>. Since *centimanus* (Horace's own coinage) occurs also in his genuinely elevated fourth Roman Ode (3, 4, 69, again linked with Gyas), it cannot be labelled an intrinsically parodic usage; it is notable, however, that this coinage occurs immediately following the third stanza's echo of Catullus 11, whose neoteric geographical excursus contains the two Catullan compound coinages *sagittiferus* (11, 6) and *septemgeminus* (11, 7). It certainly would not be beyond Horace to use his own coinage – especially in a poem where other Catullan echoes are found – as a subtle allusion to neoteric practice in regard to both compound adjectives and neologizing. Adjectives in *-osus* are also common both as elevated epicisms and in lighter neoteric poetry. *Formidulosus* is an improper formation, metrically barred from epic,

<sup>23</sup> The Chimaera otherwise appears in Horace only at Odes 1, 27, 24 and 4, 2, 16. In the latter, the Chimaera is one of the notably elevated subjects attributed to Pindar in the lines where Horace deliberately assumes Pindar's grand style for six stanzas, only to contrast it with his own finely-wrought and laborious efforts as a poetic *apis Matina*. The tone is not exactly mock-elevated, but there is restrained humor in the poet's conscious assumption of the prerogatives of a style so different from his own. FRAENKEL's comment on the earlier passage in which the Chimaera appears catches its tone admirably: »... its rolling sounds and awe-inspiring images render the mockery of its thought the more delightful« (183). The reader who later came upon the Chimaera in the second book of Horace's collection, then, especially in combination with two of Odes 1, 27's other mock-elevated elements of diction – *a!* and a compound adjective (*triformis* [23]; cp. *centimanus* [2, 17, 14]) – would naturally sense in the later poem the same mock-grandiosity as was clear in the first.

<sup>24</sup> See ROSS, 17–22, for general discussion; 19 n. 9 on Horace's practice in particular.



and so falls into the category of *-osus* adjectives which »... suggest both their colloquial origin and the poetic potential of the termination to create the playfully elegant combination of lightness and learning so characteristic of the polymetrics«<sup>25</sup>. Except for comedy and its appearances here and in the Hellenistically-inspired fifth Epode (55), *formidulosus* is absent from Latin poetry. It might well have been chosen by Horace as the sort of outré usage which would best serve to signal his adoption here of the mock-seriousness of diction so characteristic of neoteric poetry.

One final point should be made concerning the phrasing of the astrological section of the ode. While the *seu... seu... seu* construction of these lines adds to their resounding effect, on a substantive level it has the effect – as ORELLI has pointed out – of disassociating the speaker from any sure knowledge of, or confidence in, his own horoscope<sup>26</sup>.

When, at the beginning of his sixth stanza, the poet comes to the apodosis of his *seu* construction, the tone suddenly drops:

*utrumque nostrum incredibili modo  
consentit astrum. . . (21 – 22)*

The word *incredibilis* is a distinct prosaism, perhaps with colloquial overtones<sup>27</sup>. Line 21 is also notable for a rare metrical license: the 'imperfect' caesura at the fifth position of the Alcaic hendecasyllable (*nostrum in //*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>25</sup> ROSS, 58. See his general discussion, 53–60.

<sup>26</sup> J. K. ORELLI, ed., Q. Horatius Flaccus (Berlin, 1886), ad. loc. Cp. NISBET and HUBBARD, p. 273. This view is certainly preferable to the outlandish theory voiced by JACQUES PERRET, Horace, tr. B. HUMEZ (New York, 1964), 7, that Horace's »exact knowledge of the planetary configuration existing at his birth« indicates that his parents had had a horoscope drawn up upon the occasion of his birth. NISBET and HUBBARD give a balanced assessment of the question of Maecenas's own relation to the astrology craze in Rome: »... in view of [Horace's] skill elsewhere in evoking an addressee's ethos, it is likely that Maecenas was interested in the subject and knew his own horoscope; such a blend of erudition and fantasy would suit the modish Etruscan... Yet there is no need to exaggerate the strength of his devotion to astrology; Horace's affected magniloquence of manner together with his insouciance about the actual details suggests that badinage on the subject was not unacceptable« (p. 273). On the other hand, FRAENKEL – without citing supporting evidence – labels astrology Maecenas's 'creed' and goes on to generalize grossly: »If you take your religion seriously (and to its adepts astrology is a religion), you do not care to have it treated in a jocular manner« (p. 218, n. 5).

<sup>27</sup> *Incredibilis* appears in poetry only here, in comedy, and once in Virgil (Aen. 3, 294). However, a distinction may be made between the Virgilian locus and the Horatian and comic loci: while Virgil uses the word *literally* (i. e. 'not believable', connected with *fama*), in Horace – as always in comedy – it is used *tropically* (= *eximius*). The link of Horace's usage with comedy suggests that in this sense the word has a colloquial flavor (much, in fact, like its English counterpart, 'incredible', in modern usage).

*credibili*) blurs the caesura which is all but inevitable in Horace<sup>28</sup>. By thus breaking the rhythm of the poem, this irregularity emphasizes even further the prosy tone established by *incredibili*, in abrupt contrast to the rolling sound and elevated diction of the previous two stanzas. The purpose and tone of the astrological agnosticism hinted at by the protasis's *seu...seu...seu* construction is now clear. In effect, the poet says to Maecenas: »Never mind all this fancy astrological hokum – you don't have to be an astrologer to see how closely our destinies are tied together.« And, on a second level, he comments on the poetic techniques adopted in the preceding stanzas, underlining by his sudden drop in tone their tongue-in-cheek overstatement.

The poem's final section (D) on the similarity of Horace's and Maecenas's situations divides into four subsections which (as in Epodes 14) paradoxically emphasize a contrast between those similar situations:

|                |                      |          |
|----------------|----------------------|----------|
| M <sub>1</sub> | (escape from death): | 22 – 26  |
| H <sub>1</sub> | (escape from death): | 27 – 30a |
| M <sub>2</sub> | (votive sacrifice):  | 30b – 31 |
| H <sub>2</sub> | (votive sacrifice):  | 32       |

Maecenas's genuine escape from severe illness is set against the comically expressed incident of the falling tree, just as the greatness of Maecenas's tutelary deity, Jupiter, is offset by Horace's humbler savior, Faunus. The grandiose (and fantastic) vow to be discharged by Maecenas is contrasted with the single modest lamb to be offered up by Horace himself. And again the substantive contrast between Maecenas's and Horace's situations is reflected by changes in diction.

A high poetic tone is set in the first subsection by the complex interlocking of nouns and epithets (a b / A B) of lines 22 – 23; by the occurrence of the poeticisms *refulgens* and *volucris*; and by the artfully symmetrical shaping of line 26 (*laetum // theatris // ter // crepuit // sonum*). The graphic and concretely mythological picture of Faunus *praesens* standing by Horace's side to flick away the blow of the tree (*ictum dextra levasset*) gives the second subsection too a distinctly epic cast<sup>29</sup>. But this epicism is rendered anomalous – and, so, comic – by both context and diction. The reader's reaction to the tree episode would already be conditioned as comic by the exaggerated apos-

<sup>28</sup> There are only two Alcaic hendecasyllables in the Odes which completely lack caesura at five (1, 37, 14; 4, 14, 17); imperfect caesura (where caesura falls after the prefix of a compound word) appears only here and at Odes 1, 16, 21 and 1, 37, 5.

<sup>29</sup> Cp. the roles of the gods as on-stage actors in epic: e.g. Poseidon – Aeneas, Il. 20, 31 ff.; Athena vs. Hector, Il. 22, 224 ff.; and (later) Juturna – Turnus, Aen. 12, 468 ff.; Venus – Aeneas, Aen. (*passim*) (cp. Odysseus – Athena in Od.).

trophe to the *triste lignum* at 2, 13, 1 – 12; the further insertion of the *praesens* goat-god into Horace's everyday landscape takes us one step further into the humorous extravagance of mock-epic. On a verbal level, the two synecdoches *truncus* and *cerebrum* combine to evoke a humorously off-key image: a shorn-off trunk falling upon his brain-matter. In addition, Horace seems to have deliberately misapplied the 'epicism' *cerebrum*, which appears frequently in epic *de corporali materia*, but whose two metonymical meanings (= intelligence, or = *caput*, as here) are generally limited to prose and the lower poetic genres (e.g. satire, comedy)<sup>30</sup>. By placing a distinctly non-elevated sense of the word in an epic context, then, the poet emphasizes the non-serious use he is making here of such elevation. The overall contrast between the genuinely poetic expression of Maecenas's serious brush with death and this comically hyperbolic section on Horace's miraculous escape makes it clear that the *incredibilis* identity of the two men's fates is, in fact, incredible – for the equation can only be made by the comic and specious exaggeration of one of its two sides.

The poem ends with two subsections ( $M_2$  and  $H_2$ ) devoted to explicit contrast of Maecenas's resources with Horace's. This final and seemingly minor contrast serves to pick out all the major contrasts in the two men's personalities upon which the humor of this ode is largely predicated (despite its surface insistence on their wondrous similarity). The recurrent chord of Maecenas's materialism, as opposed to the poet's own modesty, is again struck (see note 11); the supposed self-deprecation of the contrast specifically recalls the parallel section of Epodes 14, in which the stated superiority of Maecenas's love to Horace's is riddled by implicit insinuations of just the reverse. And the sudden drop in poetic tone from the magniloquence of lines 13 – 30a further glosses the two men's differing tastes: just as (substantively) the 'reassuring and life-giving ritual of a modest country sacrifice' is more natively Horatian than the 'fiery Etruscan demonology' and 'terrifying astrological dynamics' adduced for Maecenas's sake<sup>31</sup>, so the return to simplicity of diction in these last two and a half lines constitutes a good-humored comment on the (specifically neoteric) excesses of diction and conceit assumed in this ode as characteristic of Maecenas the poet.

By means of the extended allusion to Epodes 14 and a conscious manipulation of various traditions of diction, then, Horace has created a graceful and witty poem whose protestation of intertwining fates is paradoxically filled with humorous allusions to the two men's differences.

<sup>30</sup> Horace uses *cerebrum* = 'intelligence', 'passion' twice in his Satires (1, 9, 11; 2, 3, 75). *Cerebrum* = *caput* never occurs (besides here) until Pliny and Juvenal. Evaluation of its tone here is vexed by the fact that ThLL seems inadvertently to have omitted the reference in Odes 2, 17 from its listings.

<sup>31</sup> These quotations are excerpted from NISBET and HUBBARD, p. 274.

But, far from being meant to go over Maecenas's head, these joking allusions are to be shared with and appreciated by Maecenas. The textures of Odes 2, 17 thus include irony and parody as well as sincere warmth of feeling; its subject is not only friendship, but also poetry, and both personal and aesthetic values.

Boston

EMILY A. McDERMOTT

### EPIC INTO ELEGY: PROPERTIUS 4, 9, 70f.

*Sance*<sup>1</sup> *pater salve cui iam favet aspera Juno:*  
*Sance velis libro dexter inesse meo.*

So ends, if we accept SCHNEIDEWIN's transposition, Propertius 4, 9. In a recent article<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth MCPARLAND has raised some questions about the significance of this conclusion. Why, she asks, should the poet appeal to Hercules who was not noted as a patron of the arts to be propitious to his book? And how does the concluding prayer relate to the elegy as a whole?

MCPARLAND's questions are better than her answers. According to these we are supposed to read in the final appeal an identification of the poet with Hercules. Propertius like Hercules has been for too long a pleading lover; and just as Hercules excluded women from his rites, so Propertius wishes to exclude women from his life and from his poetry. It is for this that he prays for the god's assistance. In other words the poem should be read as a rejection of love poetry for other themes. This it seems to me would introduce certain incoherences into the poem as a whole. a) The poem is presented throughout as objective narrative. It would be strangely abrupt — even for Propertius — to shift the whole direction to redefine the intent of the poem in the final couplet. This is not to deny that Propertius is master of the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, that he can keep a reader perplexed as to the direction a poem is going to take. But this would be an extreme and rather ill-managed case. There is no hint of such a meaning earlier in the poem; this is not one of the ingredients in the dense texture of the poem. So that it comes at the end as a distraction and an irritation. b) The satirical thrust of the poem is directed against Hercules. Many of its elements — the *apta puella*, the monstrous appetites — only make sense in those terms. The act of rejection, the breaking down of the doorposts, is the culmination of this satire, and can be read, in

<sup>1</sup> On the reading see below note 32.

<sup>2</sup> Propertius 4, 9, Transactions of the American Philological Association 101, 1970, 349–355.

KARL LEO NOETHLICH

## Beamtentum und Dienstvergehen

Zur Staatsverwaltung in der Spätantike

1981. X, 256 Seiten. Kart. DM 64, -. ISBN 3-515-03424-2

*Inhaltsübersicht:* Begriffliche Grundlegung – Vergleich spätrömischer/moderner Beamtentypus – Spätrömisches Verwaltungssystem – Spätantike Amtspflichtverletzung bezüglich der behördeninternen Organisation – Dienstvergehen gegenüber dem Bürger (bes. Steuerwesen und Gerichtsbarkeit) – Beamtentum und Amtspflichtverletzung bei Amminianus Marcellinus – Auswertung: Spätrömische Verwaltung – Amtspflichtverletzung – Kaiserliche Gegenmaßnahmen  
Die Arbeit untersucht zunächst den „Beamtenbegriff“ der Spätantike. Ausgehend von Erkenntnissen der modernen Verwaltungswissenschaft, vom heutigen deutschen Beamtenbegriff und vom europäischen Beamtenstatut zeigt sich, daß alle wesentlichen Elemente, die den modernen deutschen Beamtenbegriff bilden, bereits in der Spätantike vorhanden waren und den heutigen Beamtenbegriff wesentlich mitgeprägt haben. Anschließend werden die Formen der Dienstvergehen der spätrömischen Beamten anhand des Codex Theodosianus und der posttheodosianischen Novellen behandelt. Ergebnisse moderner Korruptionsforschung bilden dabei den Ausgangspunkt, ferner die Amtspflichtverletzung unter juristischem Aspekt. Eine allgemeine Schlußauswertung setzt die Einzelergebnisse in einen allgemeinen Bedingungsrahmen spätrömischer Beamtentätigkeit und behandelt zusammenfassend die kaiserlichen Gegenmaßnahmen, insbesondere die Strafen.

## PALINGENESIA

Monographien und Texte zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft

herausgegeben von Peter Steinmetz und Otto Lendle

---

WILLIBALD HEILMANN

### Ethische Reflexion und römische Lebenswirklichkeit in Ciceros Schrift *De officiis*

Ein literatursoziologischer Versuch

Bd. 17. 1982. IX, 212 Seiten. Kart. DM 46, -. ISBN 3-515-03565-6

*Inhaltsübersicht:* Einleitung – Erster Teil: Der eingeschränkte Bezug zur Realität in *De officiis* – Die Position der ‚Befreier‘ – Ergebnisse – Zweiter Teil: *Tusc.* 2, 14–31; *De leg.* 3, 12–39 – Cicero in den Jahren 44/43 v. Chr. – Briefe des Brutus – Anhang: Briefe von Caesarianern: C. Matus und A. Hirtius

Die Arbeit ist literatursoziologisch in dem Sinne, daß die Beziehung Ciceros zu einem Gruppenbewußtsein als ein entscheidendes Moment für die Gestaltung der Schrift *De officiis* dargelegt wird. Die Untersuchung von Argumentationsabläufen in *De off.* zeigt, daß das Übergewicht idealer Normen die Erörterungen bestimmt, der Bezug zur Realität römischen Lebens dagegen nur eingeschränkt zur Geltung kommt. Die in *De off.* faßbare Bewußtseinsstruktur weist deutliche Korrespondenzen zu derjenigen auf, die im Planen und Handeln der Caesarmörder zu erkennen ist. Cicero hat in seiner Schrift ein traditionalistisches Bewußtsein, das einer Gruppe der führenden Schicht eigen war, mit besonderer Konsequenz zum Ausdruck gebracht.

---

FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH · WIESBADEN

ISSN 0018 – 0777