Humanitas Supplementum

Horácio e a sua Perenidade

Maria Helena Rocha Pereira,
José Ribeiro Ferreira
e Francisco de Oliveira

Epigrammatizing Lyric: Generic Hybridity in Horace's *Odes*

Regina Höschele
Toronto University

At the outset of the *Odes*, Horace expresses the wish to be inserted into the canon of lyric poets, to become number ten in a group of nine: *quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres / sublimi feriam sidera vertice* (1.1.35-6). Notwithstanding the temporal and cultural gulf that separates him from the poets of archaic and classical Greece, Horace attempts to resuscitate the genre of lyric poetry and to establish himself, the Roman *vates,* as the primary heir to that great tradition – a project he declares fulfilled in the last poem of the three-book collection, where he envisions his future glory and prides himself on being the first to have "spun the Aeolian song to Italian rhythms" (*princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos,* 3.30.13-4). Given the emphasis with which Horace conceives his *carmina* as lyric poems and repeatedly evokes his lyric models (both via textual allusion and direct mention)[1], one may not necessarily expect to find the *Odes* as intensely engaged with other genres. However, the inclusion of generically alien elements is an essential feature of Horace's lyric discourse[2] and may be associated with the fundamental changes that have taken place in the literary landscape since the times of Sappho or Pindar.

As Dennis Feeney has pointed out, "between Horace and this remote world was interposed yet another culture, that of Hellenistic Greece, of Alexandria – at first sight another barrier, but also a corridor, for Hellenistic Greece was […] the only medium through which he had access to the earlier archaic and classical culture" (1993: 44). Thus Horace encountered the texts of the lyric poets not in live performances, but on the page, in editions put together by Alexandrian scholars, and by artfully arranging his own *carmina* into books he clearly followed in the footsteps of Hellenistic authors, who were the first to treat the book as a compositional and semantic unit[3]. What is more, the incorporation of non-lyric elements into the *Odes* is a device very similar to the intrinsically Alexandrian technique of *Kreuzung der Gattungen.* Among the genres popular in the Hellenistic era, there is one that gained

---

[1] On Horace and the Greek lyric poets cf. e.g. Feeney (1993), Cavarzere (1996), Barchiesi (2000), Woodman (2002) and the essays in Paschalis (2002).

[2] I borrow the term from Davis (1991), who analyses the dynamics of generic disavowal and assimilation, i.e. the ways in which Horace incorporates other genres within lyric, even those which, at first sight, he seems to reject. More recently, Harrison (2007) has studied the phenomenon of generic enrichment in Horace and Vergil, tracing, among other things, non-lyric elements in the *Odes* (pp. 168-206).

[3] It is interesting to note that Horace, in organizing his poems, even alludes to the arrangement of Alexandrian editions by evoking poems which were obviously conceived as programmatic by the Alexandrians (and therefore put first) at the outset of his own books; cf. Barchiesi (2000) 171-3; Barchiesi (2001) 156 and Lyne (2005).

particular prominence and was destined to have a great impact on Roman poets of the first century BC, not least of all Horace. I am thinking of Greek epigram, traces of which we can detect throughout the *Odes*, above all, however, in the context of Horatian amatory verse. In what follows I would like to investigate some of the ways in which Horace, as a love poet, engages with the epigrammatic genre and reflect upon possible implications of this generic dialogue. The aim of the present paper is not to offer a detailed analysis of all poems that allude to specific epigrams or appropriate topoi usually associated with epigram – this would require a much longer study –[4], but attempts to outline in a more general way and on the basis of select examples what it means to *inscribe* epigram into lyric.

In a recent article, Kathryn Gutzwiller has underlined the paradoxical nature of amatory epigram, which casts the private, oral speech of erotic poetry in a form originally conceived for public inscription[5]. At first sight the presence of epigrammatic elements in poems such as the *Odes* seems equally paradoxical. After all, Horace does everything to maintain the generic pretence that these are *songs,* not written texts. Significantly, within the first three books, there is not a single reference to writing with regard to the *carmina*[6], as opposed to numerous mentions of musical instruments or singing[7]. Epigram, by way of contrast, is *per definitionem* a written genre, indeed the most lettered of all, and very aware of its inscriptional roots[8]. To be sure, one has to distinguish between epigrams that pose as being chiseled on stone, i.e. fictive epitaphs or dedications, and sympotic or erotic poems that reproduce acts of oral communication (yet, even within this sub-genre, self-conscious references to the written medium are not infrequent[9]). But the genre as a whole is inextricably linked with the idea of writing, and it should be noted that this aspect is *prima facie* at odds with the poetic agenda of Horace's lyric collection.

---

[4] Buchmann (1974) and Citti (2000), 141-60 offer a survey of parallels between Horace's poems and Hellenistic epigram, without, however, delving very deeply into interpretative matters.

[5] Cf. Gutzwiller (2007a).

[6] Cf. Feeney (1993), 55. Only in book 4 (8.21 and 9.30-1) are Horace's *carmina* presented as written texts.

[7] Cf. e.g. *tibias* (1.1.32), *Lesboum barbiton* (1.1.34), *cantamus* (1.6.19), *canam* (1.10.5), *lyra* (1.12.1), *tibia* (1.12.2), *fidibus* (1.12.11), *fistula* (1.17.10), *fide Teia* (1.17.18), *canto* (1.22.10), *cantus* (1.24.3), *fidem* (1.24.14), *fidibus* (1.26.10), *Lesbio plectro* (1.26.11), *Latinum carmen* (1.32.3f.), *barbite* (1.32.4), *canebat* (1.32.10), *testudo* (1.32.14), *fidibus* (1.36.1), *modos* (2.1.40), *plectro* (2.1.40), *cantemus* (2.9.19), *cantus* (2.12.14), *Aeoliis fidibus* (2.13.24), *plectro* (2.13.27), *carminibus* (2.13.33), *carmina* (2.19.1), *cantare* (2.19.11), *carmina* (3.1.2), *canto* (3.1.4), *lyrae* (3.3.69), *tibia* (3.4.1), *melos* (3.4.2), *voce* (3.4.3), *fidibus* (3.4.4), *citharaque* (3.4.4), *testudo* (3.11.3), *resonare* (3.11.3), *modos* (3.11.7), *tibiae* (3.19.19), *fistula* (3.19.20), *lyra* (3.19.20), *barbiton* (3.26.4), *cantabimus* (3.28.9), *recines* (3.28.11), *lyra* (3.28.11), *carmine* (3.28.13), *Aeolium carmen* (3.30.13), *modos* (3.30.14).

[8] For the self-conscious writtenness of inscriptions and Callimachus' reception of epigraphic poetry cf. Meyer (2005).

[9] Cf. e.g. Asclepiades 4 G-P (= *AP* 5.158), where the girdle of a hetaira bears a witty inscription; on this poem cf. Bing (2000).

On the other hand, we have to keep in mind that the *Odes* are not really what they purport to be: both their orality and occasionality are staged, the individual *carmina* are meant to be read (they may have been recited in front of an audience, but they were hardly sung to the lyre by Horace)[10]. Since Alexandrian scholars were exclusively interested in gathering textual material, the poems of the Greek lyricists had been deprived of their melody; it seems almost ironic that the term *lyrikos* starts being used with reference to melic poetry at precisely the moment when the genre became separated from the lyre[11]. In the case of Horace, by way of contrast, musical tunes presumably never existed in the first place[12]. Significantly, the loss of lyric's performative dimension that is tied to its entry into books is paralleled by the transformation that epigram undergoes in the Hellenistic age[13]: assembled in books, epigrams, quite literally, become two-dimensional, as their physical context (e.g. the monument, tombstone, or votive offering) is stripped away. In both cases, the *mise en page* entails that the reader has to envisage the original or fictive setting before his mind's eye[14]. One could say, then, that the new medium, common to both, reduces the generic differences and eases the passage of epigram into lyric; as Peter Bing aptly remarks: "all poetry has moved in the direction of epigram, a poem is always now an inscription"[15].

In fact, the poetological imagery with which Horace closes his collection virtually turns the three books of *Odes* into one gigantic epigram. To be sure, the *monumentum aere perennius* pictured in *c.* 3.30 is not inscribed with, but constituted by poems[16]. However, by verbally erecting a textual tombstone in honor of himself, Horace, no doubt, exits the world of lyric poetry with a distinctively epigrammatic gesture[17]. As Pasquali has noted, this self-monumentalization likely imitates the

---

[10] As Barchiesi (2000) 176 states, "Horace begins from a reception of Greek lyric where the quest for original occasion is a dominant feature, and then he folds the occasion into a thematic 'inside' of his poetry", which may in part account for the poet's preoccupation with time and temporality. The position of the texts within a book becomes, as Barchiesi observes, "a surrogate occasion."

[11] Cf. Peponi (2002) 21: "the term *lyric* becomes the emblem of a non-entity, the mark of an absence".

[12] As far as we can tell, the only poem actually performed is the *carmen saeculare*, which was sung twice on the last day of the *ludi saeculares* of 17 BC by twin choruses of 27 boys and 27 girls. In a way the *CS* presents the highest possible degree of occasionality, since it was composed for a performance destined to take place only once during the lifetime of its participants; Feeney (1998) 37 draws an intriguing parallel between the ritual's obsession with transience and permanence and Horace's lyric obsession with these two phenomena. Remarkably, the performance of this song is attested by an inscription discovered in 1890 (*CIL* 6, 32323).

[13] For analogies between epigram and lyric cf. Höschele (forthcoming).

[14] On *Deixis am Phantasma* in lyric poetry cf. Rösler (1983) 15ff., in epigram Meyer (2005) 17ff.

[15] Bing (1988) 17.

[16] According to Woodman (1979) 116 "Horace's *Odes* are his tombstone, and this final ode, the epilogue, is the epitaph inscribed upon them". For the inscriptional aspects cf. also Korzeniewski (1968) and (1972) and Habinek (1998) 110-1.

[17] As has been seen, the first lines of *c.* 3.30 simultaneously allude to Pindar's sixth Pythian ([ὕμνων θησαυρός] τὸν οὔτε χειμέριος ὄμβρος, ἐπακτὸς ἐλθών / ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας / στρατὸς

manner in which several Hellenistic epigrammatists sealed their books (or, at least, concluded sub-sections within a given *libellus*)[18]. At any rate, it has been plausibly conjectured that the self-epitaphs of poets like Nossis (*AP* 7.718) or Callimachus (*AP* 7.415 and 525) served precisely such a function[19]. Here, too, the *sêma* is made up of words, and the image of the tombstone, into which the poet's *sphragis* has been inscribed, fittingly marks the end of the poetic undertaking[20].

Like any good epigram book, the Horatian *monumentum* contains poems belonging to various categories, including – to name just a few – political, sympotic, hymnic, philosophical and erotic texts. Remarkably, it is the group of amatory poems that Horace chose to frame by two obviously epigrammatic speech acts. To begin with the beginning, let us take a closer look at *c.* 1.5, the very first of Horace's love poems. In the opening strophe the poet wonders about the identity of the *gracilis puer* who, lying among roses and drenched in perfumes, presently rejoices in Pyrrha's company. This initial idyll is thoroughly shattered by what follows, a vision of the boy's future fate: as so many before and after him, he, who naively trusts in Pyrrha's fidelity, will come to bewail her fickleness (the impending danger is illustrated via the image of a seastorm taking the unsuspecting sailor/lover by surprise). After deploring the lot of all those who equally fall for Pyrrha, Horace reveals that he too had been one of them, but, having survived the tempest, he is now in a position to recall the whole affair with a wink of irony. It has long been noticed that the last stanza, in which the poet appears in the role of a shipwrecked voyager making thank offerings to Neptune, shows clear affinities with dedicatory epigram[21]:

> *Quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa*
> *perfusus liquidis urget odoribus*
>   *grato, Pyrrha, sub antro?*
>   *cui flavam religas comam,*
>
> *simplex munditiis? heu quotiens fidem*   5
> *mutatosque deos flebit et aspera*
>   *nigris aequora ventis*
>   *emirabitur insolens,*

ἀμείλιχος, οὔτ' ἄνεμος ἐς μυχοὺς / ἅλὸς ἄξοισι παμφόρῳ χεράδει / τυπτόμενον, vv. 10-14) and Simonides (ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' εὐρὼς / οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος, 531.4-5 PMG); cf. e.g. Pasquali (1920) 749, Pöschl (1991) 253-5 and Cavarzere (1996) 237-9. However, the existence of lyric models does not preclude an association with epigram; on the contrary, the Simonidean passage, which belongs to a song commemorating those fallen at Thermopylae, adds to the epitaphic dimension. For the closural force of *c.* 3.30, as opposed to the openendedness of the *Epodes*, cf. Oliensis (1998) 102-5.

[18] Cf. Pasquali (1920) 320-4.

[19] Cf. e.g. Reitzenstein (1893) 139; Gabathuler (1937) 56 and Gutzwiller (1998) 85-6 and 210-13.

[20] One may also compare Posidippus' *Seal* poem (*SH* 705 = 118 A-B), in which he envisions the erection of a statue representing himself with a bookroll in the marketplace of Pella.

[21] Cf. e.g. Kiessling-Heinze (1968) 33 and Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) 72-3.

qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,
qui semper vacuam, semper amabilem   10
   sperat, nescius aurae
    fallacis! miseri, quibus

intemptata nites. me tabula sacer
votiva paries indicat uvida
   suspendisse potenti   15
    vestimenta maris deo.

Like many of the poems assembled in book 6 of the *Palatine Anthology*, *c.* 1.5 names the offering's divine recipient (*potenti maris deo*), refers to the place of dedication (*paries sacer*) as well as to the votive object (*tabula votiva*, *vestimenta*) and relates what had led to the act of dedication. The metaphor of the sea of love permits Horace to slip into the role of a man who dedicates his clothes to Neptune after a shipwreck, a topic perfectly suited for an anathematic epigram. In fact, the *Palatine Anthology* transmits a poem by Diodorus, which features as its speaker a garment that a certain Diogenes, caught in a storm, had vowed to dedicate, if he should be rescued (*AP* 6.245)[22]. As Meredith Hoppin, who convincingly reads this ode against the backdrop of the epigrammatic tradition, states: "*Odes* 1.5 bears all the marks of a dedicatory epigram"[23]. She furthermore suggests that the poem itself (as a whole or in part) is a description of what can be seen on the votive tablet attached to the temple's wall. According to the ancient commentator Porphyrio the scene painted on the *tabula votiva* illustrates the shipwreck from which the speaker has been rescued[24], a scene very similar to the one conjured up in lines 6-8. Alternatively, Hoppin argues, the picture's subject may be the grotto with Pyrrha and her lover depicted in the first stanza (in which case the anonymous boy would turn out to be Horace's former self), or else a continuous narrative comprising more than one episode, i.e. the love scene plus the ensuing storm. Horace's questions, exclamations and reflections in the first three strophes would then serve to guide the reader's/viewer's gaze, as he contemplates the fictive painting – a technique quite typical of ecphrastic poetry. In Hoppin's words: "Thus the poet invites us to pretend that we are standing before the temple wall on which the *tabula votiva* hangs, and that the poem we are reading is inscribed on the same tablet, perhaps beneath the picture" (1984: 58).

Even if it is impossible to determine what precisely the tablet illustrates – this ambiguity is built into the poem –, the ecphrastic character of the first strophes (note in particular the manifold color terms) goes nicely with

---

[22] Cf. also [Lucian] *AP* 6.164, where the survivor of a shipwreck dedicates his hair to the marine deities, ironically claiming that this is all he has left.

[23] Hoppin (1984) 56.

[24] He claims that the dedication of such paintings (and of clothes) is still common practice in his time and day (ad v. 13): *videmus autem hodieque pingere in tabulis quosdam casus, quos in mari passi sint, atque in fanis marinorum deorum ponere. sunt etiam qui vestem quoque ibi suspendunt, diis eam consecrantes.*

the idea of a painting evoked at the end. However – and this is crucial to the dynamics of the ode – such an association of the initial scenes with pictorial representations only suggests itself on a second reading: it is triggered by the final reference to Horace's dedication. What starts out as a purely lyric poem is thus, so to speak, retrospectively "epigrammatized". It is important to note, though, that Horace relates what could be taken as the text of an epigram in indirect speech, that is to say, he does not insert any verbatim quotation of the inscription into his ode, as is common practice, for instance, in Roman love elegy[25]. Yet, with the phrasing *me tabula sacer votiva paries indicat uvida suspendisse potenti vestimenta maris deo* we may compare an epigram ascribed to Antiphilus, which starts as follows (*AP* 6.97): "Spear of Alexander – the inscription *(grammata)* says that after the war he dedicated you to Artemis as a token thereof, the weapon of his invincible arm" (1-3)[26]. Though similar in structure, Horace's indirect statement lacks a crucial bit of information that *anathematika* (the one by Antiphilus included) usually provide: the identity of the dedicator. It can, of course, be inferred from the personal pronoun *me*, but the absence of the proper name points, once more, to the mediated nature of this inset "epigram": it has been thoroughly absorbed by the lyric poem and adapted to its discourse (from more than just a metrical point of view). At the same time, the very idea of a votive tablet invites the reader to envision what is depicted or written upon it – in the reader's mind the entire poem might thus morph into an inscription.

Significantly, however, Horace leaves this last step to the recipient, who may or may not go so far as to picture the *carmen* itself as a written, let alone inscribed, text. After all, it would be contradictory to the poetics of the *Odes,* if Horace were to present the poem explicitly as anything other than an orally performed song. As previous scholars have argued, *c.* 1.5 is likely to serve a programmatic function[27]. Considering its prominent position as the very first of the love poems (and number 5 among the parade odes), it is all the more striking that Horace would enter the world of *erôtika* with a text that contains such distinctively epigrammatic elements, subtly combining the amatory with the dedicatory. Is he perhaps marking his generic debt by means of this gesture? In any case, it is noteworthy that, when bidding farewell to love and love poetry toward the end of book 3[28], Horace will, once more, appropriate the language of anathematic epigram. As the fifth to last poem of the collection, *c.* 3.26 is structurally linked with *c.* 1.5, a connection that is strengthened by the idea of a temple in which a dedication is being

---

[25] Cf. Ramsby (2007).

[26] Δοῦρας Ἀλεξάνδροιο· λέγει δέ σε γράμματ' ἐκεῖνον / ἐκ πολέμου θέσθαι σύμβολον Ἀρτέμιδι / ὅπλον ἀνικήτοιο βραχίονος.

[27] Cf. in particular Santirocco (1986) 32-4.

[28] Eicks (2001) convincingly interprets *Odes* 3.26-28 as a triptych of love and argues that each of the poems presents a farewell to love; cf. p. 142: "Doch sind die drei Gedichte mehr noch als Liebesgedichte, sie sind zugleich allesamt Gesten des Abschieds von der Liebe, von der (Liebes-)Dichtung".

made and by a clear verbal concatenation: the word *paries,* i.e. the wall to which the votive offerings are attached, occurs exclusively in these two odes (at 1.5.13 and 3.26.4)[29].

> *Vixi puellis nuper ideoneus*
> *et militavi non sine gloria;*
>   *nunc arma defunctumque bello*
>   *barbiton hic paries habebit,*
>
> *laevum marinae qui Veneris latus*
> *custodit. hic, hic ponite lucida*
>   *funalia et vectis et arcus*
>   *oppositis foribus minaces.*
>
> *o quae beatam diva tenes Cyprum et*
> *Memphin carentem Sithonia nive,*
>   *regina sublimi flagello*
>   *tange Chloen semel arrogantem.*

The poem's incipit, *vixi,* evokes the diction of sepulchral epigram and casts the speaker for a moment in the role of a deceased person talking to the passer-by from his tomb[30], which is very much in line with the closural allusions that pervade the final *carmina* of book 3[31]. As we move on in our reading, it becomes clear that the speaker, i.e. Horace, is not actually dead, but simply looks back at the life he has led until recently: *vixi puellis nuper idoneus*[32]. Picking up the well-known *militia amoris* metaphor (popular particularly in Roman elegy), he presents himself as a soldier who, having fought *non sine gloria* (v. 2) on the battlefield of love, is at last retiring from his profession and dedicating the arms with which he used to attack – doors (vv. 3-8): "now this wall, which guards the left side of maritime Venus, will bear my arms and lyre discharged from warfare. Here, here lay down the blazing torches and the crowbars and the bows, menacing to opposing doors". This symbolic offering is reminiscent of similar acts in Hellenistic epigrams, where we encounter soldiers, craftsmen, farmers, hetairai and so on dedicating the tools of their trade to various deities[33]. It is followed by a hymnic apostrophe of Venus combined with the wish that she arouse desire in the hitherto arrogant Chloe (*sublimi flagello / tange Chloen semel arrogantem*).

Considering the previous stanzas, in which Horace pronouncedly abdicates the life of a lover, this plea comes as an *aprosdoketon,* and scholars

---

[29] For the structural frame cf. Wili (1948) 182; for further links between the two poems see Helzle (1994).

[30] For inscriptional parallels cf. Nisbet-Rudd (2004) *ad loc.*

[31] Santirocco (1986) 132-49 reads the whole second half (starting with *c.* 3.17) as pointing toward the approaching end.

[32] For the effects of a progressive reading ("surprises progressives") cf. Van Hoof (2004) 319-24.

[33] For examples cf. Nisbet-Rudd (2004) *ad loc.*

have puzzled over the question whether he wants Chloe to fall in love with him or with another man indifferent to her advances (just as she – we may infer – used to ignore Horace's longing)[34]. However we read it, the final strophe adds an unexpected twist to the poem's train of thought, as did the last verses of *c.* 1.5: both here and there Horace reveals, much to the reader's surprise, that he is or was emotionally not as uninvolved as the preceding lines had suggested. While the reference to his votive offering gives Horace away in *c.* 1.5, the anathematic act of 3.26 creates the impression that the poet is no longer interested in amatory affairs, an impression which is, at least partially, undermined by the wish expressed in the concluding stanza[35]. As in the Pyrrha ode, Horace does not insert a direct citation of the epigram that we may picture next to the dedicated objects, but again the poem's language is evocative of the epigrammatic genre (note, in particular, the deictic pronoun/ adverb *hic* in v. 4 and 6).

In discussing the performative aspects of epigraphic poetry, Joseph Day has argued that inscriptional epigrams verbally reenact actual ceremonies (be it burials or dedications): "An epigram fixes such an occasion (or its results) in writing and provides a script for its enactment in reading, which is typically presented as an original occasion's reenactment"[36]. Interestingly, Horace seems to reverse this process by turning his readers into eye witnesses of an ongoing, albeit made up, ritual (*hic, hic ponite*!) and projecting the text of the commemorative inscription into the future: the anathematic elements of the ode invite us to envision words recalling those uttered during the dedication (i.e. within the poem) chiseled on stone and attached to the temple wall, which will henceforth display Horace's arms and lyre (*habebit*). This leaves us with two layers of fictionality: a ceremony performed exclusively in writing, a "ritual in ink" (to use Barchiesi's term[37]), foreshadows through certain generic markers its future reenactment in another medium, which itself exists only on the written page – or, in this case, in the reader's imagination.

While the laying down of torches, crowbars and bows amusingly seals Horace's decision to stop acting as an *exclusus amator*, the dedication of the *barbitos* signals that his poetic undertaking (not just the serenades) is coming to an end. What is more, Horace turns the instrument which can be said to emblematize lyric poetry *per se* into the subject matter of a (still-to-be-written) epigram, while, once again, adapting epigrammatic diction to lyric discourse. As it happens, one of the recently discovered epigrams by Posidippus also features the dedication of a lyre: the *lyra* of 37 A-B, which is solemnly offered

---

[34] For the latter interpretation cf. Jones (1971). Van Hoof (2004) 321-4 discusses the various readings of the last stanza, focusing in particular on the question of how to understand the word *semel* in this context.

[35] For the turn of direction in both poems cf. Helzle (1994) 56. According to him "the two poems present a circular pattern that seems capable of never-ending repetition […] if read together, the poems suggest that Horace (or the persona he tries to project), when re-entering the game of love, puts himself back in the position of the *puer* of *Odes* 1.5".

[36] Day (2007) 35; cf. also Day (1989), (1994) and (2000).

[37] Barchiesi (2000).

to Philadelphus' wife Arsinoe by the keeper of her temple at Cape Zephyrium, has – with the help of a dolphin like that of Arion – miraculously traveled across the sea and has been cast ashore in Egypt. It is very tempting to see in this lyre the embodiment of Hellas' literary heritage, which is transferred from its original location to Ptolemaic Alexandria, as has been convingly argued by Peter Bing[38]. Centuries later Horace, once more, takes up the Lesbian *barbitos* (cf. *c.* 1.1.34) and in doing so, he brings about a radical transformation of the instrument: in his hands the Greek lyre shall play Latin songs (*Latinum carmen*, 1.32.3-4), which indicates that we are dealing here not merely with a geographical, but with a more drastic cultural and linguistic shift.

From a generic point of view Horace's dedication is, I submit, somewhat more complex than the one we encounter in Posidippus. The Hellenistic epigrammatist may symbolically illustrate the transfer of the lyric tradition from Lesbos to Egypt, but the differences between the two genres have no bearing on the epigram's status as an epigram: the lyre is an object like any other, its dedication a perfectly adequate topic for a poem of this genre. By way of contrast, the incorporation of epigrammatic elements into one of Horace's songs creates a certain tension, insofar as the idea of writing, which is above all linked to the epigrammatic genre, is problematic with regard to the *Odes'* staged orality. In this context it appears by all means striking that Horace both inscribes epigram into lyric and bids farewell to the lyric genre by "epigrammatizing" its very emblem. Maybe it goes too far to speak of a two-way appropriation here (epigram-into-lyric-into-epigram), but I dare say that Horace offers us a poetic experiment that quite deliberately confronts one genre with the other.

There can be no doubt that the *Odes* betray a high degree of generic self-awareness, so a playful engagement with a non-lyric genre such as this does not at all seem out of place. If we take account of the differences between epigram and lyric, as outlined above, the presence of epigrammatic elements within the *carmina* is something we cannot simply pass over. At the same time, however, we should not forget about the similarities. In many ways Hellenistic amatory epigram had become the new lyric, providing a novel and, in its paradoxical way, enticing medium for the expression of feelings traditionally associated with lyric song[39]. The Alexandrians seem to have been much more interested in conserving, categorizing and canonizing the existing lyric texts than in producing new ones; even if poems in lyric meters were still composed[40], the genre certainly had no longer the significance (neither in society nor in literary culture) it used to have before the advent of the bookish age. This is not to say that love and drinking songs would have completely vanished from

---

[38] Cf. Bing (2002/03) 260-5 and (2005) 127-31.

[39] Many themes were, of course, not exclusive to lyric poetry, but were also treated in elegy, and since most epigrams are written in elegiac distichs, it is not always easy to distinguish between the two. In the context of this paper it would, however, lead too far astray to take the triangular relationship between Greek epigram, lyric and elegy into further consideration.

[40] For a brief survey cf. Gutzwiller (2007b) 38-9.

the literary landscape, but Hellenistic epigrammatists were highly successful in appropriating lyric topics, and it is their work that demonstrably had a profound and lasting impact on the later tradition, while post-classical lyric sank into almost complete oblivion.

The picture is further complicated by the fact that a number of epigrams were actually ascribed to lyric poets of the archaic and classical period: in the preface to Meleager's *Garland* (*AP* 4.1), which contains a list of authors included in his anthology, we find, for instance, the names of Sappho (6), Simonides (8), Bacchylides (34) and Anacreon (35). Though hardly genuine, such ascriptions show that for people living in the Hellenistic era it was not inconceivable to view the ancient lyric poets as epigram authors[41]. Benjamin Acosta-Hughes rightly remarks "the lyric poets have then themselves already effected the generic 'crossing' into epigram, and a later epigram tradition evokes, rather than effects, this transference"[42]. That people would attribute anonymous epigrams to the stars of the lyric canon (or write such poems under their name) attests, I think, to epigram's newly acquired prominence and suggests a certain affinity between the two genres: obviously it seemed more plausible and tempting to turn Sappho, Anacreon & Co. into epigrammatists than, for instance, composers of epic or tragedy.

It is intriguing to note how epigram and lyric, once so distinct, converged during the Hellenistic era: as the written word displaced the living voice, the most lettered of all genres became an increasingly important, if not the primary vehicle for the representation of erotic desire or reflections on *la condition humaine,* such as one might encounter in a symposiastic setting. This does not, of course, mean that epigram would have treated the same themes in the exact same manner as lyric (the question of how the new medium and other factors transformed e.g. the portrayal of love is a fascinating one, but a further discussion of such issues would lead too far astray in the present context). With regard to the poetics of the *Odes* it is, in any case, significant that Horace had not only the texts of the lyric poets in front of him, but also the works of Hellenistic authors, who in many ways had inscribed lyric into their epigrams[43]. One might say that the insertion of epigrammatic elements into Horace's *carmina* reverses that process: what we are dealing with here is clearly not a simple one-time

---

[41] It is very likely that poems had been circulating under the names of lyric poets well before Meleager's time (if he considered their authorship plausible, earlier generations probably did the same). The so-called *Sylloge Simonidea,* a collection of inscriptional epigrams ascribed to Simonides, probably goes back to the fourth century BC, if not further; for a recent overview of the scholarly discussion cf. Petrovic (2007), 99-109 and Sider (2007). On the collection of Anacreon's epigrams that can be inferred from a cluster of alphabetically arranged epigrams in *AP* 6 amd 7 cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 51-3.

[42] In Acosta-Hughes & Barbantani (2007) 447. Apart from alluding to their texts Hellenistic epigrammatists have turned the lyric poets into subjects of their poetry; on literary epitaphs cf. Bing (1988) 58-65; Rosen (2007) and Radke (2007) 68-85.

[43] As Macleod (1979) 94 (= 1983: 250) notes, imitation of Hellenistic epigrams "should not be seen as a contrast to imitation of the archaic lyrists, but rather, since the tradition of Greek personal poetry flows down from lyric into epigram, as its natural accompaniment".

crossing from one genre into the other, but a rather complex back-and-forth, which in my view calls for a more detailed examination.

To conclude my discussion I would like to contemplate one further instance of epigrammatic traces in the *Odes,* which is noticeably different from the examples investigated above. In the case of *carmina* 2.4 and 2.5 we do not encounter any elements that are *per se* recognizably epigrammatic, like the votive offerings in 1.5 and 3.26. Instead, the two odes contain allusions, in fact a whole cluster of allusions, to erotic epigrams by Horace's contemporary Philodemus. These allusive recollections do not play with the generic conventions of (pseudo-)inscriptional poetry, but require the reader's knowledge of the model texts in order to be identified as epigrammatic, which poses a completely different hermeneutic challenge.

In *c.* 2.4 Horace tells his friend Xanthias that love for a slave girl is nothing to feel ashamed of. Not only have mythic heroes such as Achilles, Ajax, Agamemnon and Hector done the same, but in view of Phyllis' noble traits he should realize that she probably is of royal stock. Horace concludes his admonishments by a praise of the girl's arms, face and calves (*bracchia et vultum teretesque suras / integer laudo*, vv.21-2), quickly adding that he does so without any ulterior motives: he is already over 40 and hence past the age of amorous pursuits. The last stanza evokes (at least) two Philodemean epigrams, one of which looks back to the previous strophes, while the other connects this poem with the subsequent ode. The speaker of *AP* 5.132 (= 12 Sider) enthusiastically praises various body parts of a girl, from the foot up to her eyes[44] – a reversal, it seems, of the more common rhetorical technique, whereby descriptions of a woman's body move from the top downwards (also, they normally stop before reaching the genitals, while Philodemus' list includes the girl's thighs, buttocks, pudenda and flanks)[45]. After lauding her sophisticated movements, tongue kisses and voice, the speaker remarks that Flora's nationality (Oscan) and her lack of culture (she does not sing Sappho's songs) do not prevent him from desiring her – after all, Perseus, too, had been in love with Andromeda[46].

Just as Philodemus turns the usual order of a *descriptio puellae* upside down, Horace inverts the structure of his Greek model. While Philodemus' praise of Flora's body is followed by a justification for his love with the help of a mythic paradigm, Horace demonstrates the legitimacy of Xanthias' desire via similar examples before launching into a praise of Phyllis' beauty (note, too, that the relation between the two parts is the same, insofar as the second is in each case much briefer than the first, appearing almost like an afterthought, *c.* 2.4.1-20 > 21-24 and *AP* 5.132.1-6 > 7-8). What is more, Horace's ode also reverses the

---

[44] ὢ ποδός, ὢ κνήμης, ὢ τῶν (ἀπόλωλα δικαίως) / μηρῶν, ὢ γλουτῶν, ὢ κτενός, ὢ λαγόνων, / ὢ ὤμοιν, ὢ μαστῶν, ὢ τοῦ ῥαδινοῖο τραχήλου, / ὢ χειρῶν, ὢ τῶν (μαίνομαι) ὀμματίων (vv. 1-4).

[45] For examples of descriptions in "ordine discedente" cf. La Penna (1997), who reads Philodemus' epigram as a parody of traditional erotic motifs.

[46] ὢ κατατεχνοτάτου κινήματος, ὢ περιάλλων / γλωττισμῶν, ὢ τῶν (θῦέ με) φωναρίων. / εἰ δ' Ὀπικὴ καὶ Φλῶρα καὶ οὐκ ἄδουσα τὰ Σαπφοῦς, / καὶ Περσεὺς Ἰνδῆς ἠράσατ' Ἀνδρομέδης (vv. 5-8).

cross-cultural perspective: while Philodemus, as a Greek, is commenting on an Italian girl, Horace, as a Roman, is commenting on a Greek one (even if not on his own behalf); the Latin name Flora within the Greek poem stands over against the Greek name Phyllis within the Latin text (and do Miss Flower and Miss Leafy not form a nice pair?) Philodemus obviously equates Flora's Oscan origin with a lack of erudition – we might wonder whether Xanthias' beloved Phyllis, as a Greek girl with possibly royal ancestors, would, by way of contrast, be able to sing Sappho's songs. The ode does not provide a definite answer, but it should be noted that Phyllis is conspicuously presented to us in the context of Sapphic stanzas, so the implication may be that, yes, *she* does know her Sappho[47].

In the light of Horace's allusions to Philodemus (a further intertextual link will be discussed in a moment) and his transformation of the Latin girl into a Greek one, I wonder whether a translinguistic pun on the epigrammatist's name might be lurking in the fifth stanza, where Horace assures Xanthias that the girl he loves (*dilectam*, v. 18) hardly descends from wicked folk (*de scelesta plebe,* vv. 17-8): are the words *plebs* and *diligere* not exact equivalents of the two Greek words δῆμος and φιλεῖν from which (in reverse order!) *Philo-demos* may be said to derive?[48] This idea is, I submit, corroborated by a further bilingual pun in line 14: the adjective *flava*, which characterizes Phyllis, obviously refers back to the name of Horace's addressee Xanthias (from Greek ξανθός = blond)[49]. Moreover, Philodemus himself plays with his name in one of his epigrams (*AP* 5.115 = 10 Sider), where he amusingly presents himself as being destined to love all girls called Demo: αὐταί που Μοῖραί με κατωνόμασαν Φιλόδημον,/ ὡς αἰεὶ Δημοῦς θερμὸς ἔχοι με πόθος[50]. I think it is very likely that Horace offers us here – translated into his own language – an alternative etymology of his model's name, which is highlighted by the emphatic juxtaposition of the two words right before the fifth-syllable caesura that Horace had introduced into the Sapphic stanza[51].

It remains to be asked what meaning the affirmation *crede non illam de scelesta plebe dilectam* could have in the context of this word-play. On the surface Horace denies Phyllis' low-life origins in order to reassure his friend; the idea that she stems from a noble family may well be made up out of thin air for Xanthias' sake. But what does Horace's statement imply metapoetically, in terms of the pun

---

[47] I owe this observation to Peter Bing, who *in litteris* also raised the question whether one could read the description of Phyllis as a commentary on the transmission of Greek poetic models into Latin verse (enslaved, but of royal stock).

[48] For *dêmos = plebs* cf. *LSJ* s.v. II.

[49] As Nisbet-Hubbard note *ad loc. Xanthia* (v. 2) "implies fair hair" and is "corresponding to that of Phyllis".

[50] The pun on Philodemus' name seems to have had an afterlife in the Renaissance, when Daniel Heinsius published a cycle of erotic epigrams addressed to one Demophile (I am grateful to David Sider for this observation).

[51] The same etymology may implicitly underlie Horace's mention of Philodemus in *Sat.* 1.2.121, where he is said to have advocated the love of women who "do not cost much and do not hesitate to come when ordered" (*hanc Philodemus ait sibi quae neque magno / stet pretio neque cunctetur cum est iussa venire*) as opposed to the love of free, married women; cf. Holzberg (2009) 68.

on Philodemus' name? Is he suggesting that, contrary to appearances, Phyllis, i.e. his poem, does not descend from Philodemus? Is he pointing to another, more elevated source? Or is this denial just tongue in cheek, a comic attempt to disclaim his poetic debt, which is all too obvious? To my mind the last of these readings seems the most likely, though we should not exclude that Horace plays with the possibility of another non-epigrammatic model, one which may no longer be accessible to us (yet, the game only works, if Philodemus' epigrams are indeed the primary intertext: only a reader who has recognized the overtly Philodemean elements will be in a position to appreciate the pun).

At any rate, the name of Horace's addressee, Xanthias, also shows a distinctly Philodemean coloring, insofar as the central female figure in Philodemus' epigrams is called Xanthippe and variously nicknamed as Xantharion, Xantho and Xanthion (cf. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 Sider and P.Oxy. 3724 iv 1)[52]. Thus the girl of Horace's poem is punningly associated with Philodemus, while the male lover is connected with Philodemus' beloved – yet another reversal! Significantly, Xanthippe also features in the epigram to which the last two lines of *c.* 2.4 allude: Horace's remark that his age "has hurried to conclude the eighth lustrum" (*cuius octavum trepidavit aetas / claudere lustrum*) recalls the beginning of *AP* 11.41 (= 4 Sider), where Philodemus observes ἑπτὰ τριηκόντεσσιν ἐπέρχονται λυκάβαντες, / ἤδη μοι βιότου σχιζόμεναι σελίδες ("Seven years are coming up on thirty; papyrus columns of my life now being torn off", transl. Sider). Contrary to Horace who wants to make us believe that his life as a lover is over, Philodemus is still interested in "chatty harp-play and revels" (ψαλμός τε λάλος κῶμοί τε, v. 5), but, considering his years, he now wishes to devote himself entirely to one woman, to have Xanthippe inscribed as the *koronis* of his "madness" (αὐτὴν ἀλλὰ τάχιστα κορωνίδα γράψατε, Μοῦσαι, / ταύτην ἡμετέρης, δεσπότιδες, μανίης, vv. 7-8)[53].

Philodemus equates here the end of a phase in his life with the end of a paragraph on a papyrus scroll. Horace fittingly concludes *c.* 2.4 with a reference to this epigram, so full of closural allusions, sealing the sense of an ending that pervades the last lines with his final adoneus *claudere lustrum*. Could the Roman poet be responding to Philodemus' book metaphor by mentioning the approaching end of the *lustrum*, i.e. a five-year period, at the very end of the *fourth* ode? Be that as it may, the final poem of the first pentad (or *lustrum*) of Book 2, *c.* 2.5, will reveal that Horace's erotic desire has, quite contrary to his assertions, not yet been exhausted, provided that we take the anonymous addressee of the text to be none other than the poet himself[54]. If we read the ode as a monologue, then Horace tells himself to be patient and wait until Lalage, who is not yet ready for sexual intercourse (she is equated with a heifer frolicking through meadows and an unripe grape), becomes, for her part, sexually aggressive.

---

[52] On the Xanthippe cycle and the implications of the name cf. Sider (1997) 33-9.

[53] For the various interpretations of this line cf. Sider (1997) *ad loc.*

[54] The question of who is speaking was already raised in ancient scholia (*incertum est quem adloquatur hac ode, utrum amicorum aliquem an semet ipsum*); for a brief discussion cf. Nisbet-Hubbard (1978) 77, who favor the second interpretation.

As Colin Macleod has shown (1983), *c.* 2.5 is imitative of various Greek texts, including, not least of all, Anacreon's poem on the Thracian filly (335 W). What interests me in this context is – needless to say – a possible allusion to one of Philodemus' epigrams, *AP* 5.124 (= 16 Sider), which, too, is about a girl on the threshold of adulthood:

> οὔπω σοι καλύκων γυμνὸν θέρος, οὐδὲ μελαίνει
> βότρυς ὁ παρθενίους πρωτοβολῶν χάριτας·
> ἀλλ᾽ ἤδη θοὰ τόξα νέοι θήγουσιν Ἔρωτες,
> Λυσιδίκη, καὶ πῦρ τύφεται ἐγκρύφιον.
> φεύγωμεν, δυσέρωτες, ἕως βέλος οὐκ ἐπὶ νευρῇ·
> μάντις ἐγὼ μεγάλης αὐτίκα πυρκαϊῆς.

> Not yet bare of its cover is your summer growth; not yet do you have a dark grape cluster to shoot forth the first rays of a young girl's charms, but already the young Erotes are whetting their swift arrows, Lysidike, and a secret fire smolders within. Let's flee, unfortunate lovers, while the arrow is off the string. I am a prophet of a great and imminent blaze. (Transl. Sider).

The two poems not only treat the same topic, but are, more specifically, connected via the image of unripe grapes, which in Philodemus refers to Lysidike's pudenda (not yet darkened by pubic hair), in Horace to the girl as a whole (*tolle cupidinem immitis uvae,* vv. 9-10). Moreover, the first word of *c.* 2.5 (*nondum*) is identical with the first word of Philodemus' epigram (οὔπω), and the Latin conjunction *nec* (v. 3) equals the Greek οὐδέ (v. 1). Thus the Philodemean *conclusio* of *c.* 2.4 is followed by a Philodemean *incipit* in the subsequent ode, which links the two poems in a significant manner.

The movement from Horace's "not any more" to Lalage's "not yet, but soon" (note the temporal inversion!) is replicated by the epigrams evoked at the end and beginning of the two *carmina*. We have no way of telling in which relation the Greek poems stood to one another in the original edition of Philodemus' *epigrammata,* which Horace possibly had in front of him, since Philip rearranged everything in alphabetical order when putting together his *Garland*. But by intertextually juxtaposing the two poems Horace shows that he perceived a thematic connection between them, of which he availed himself when editing his own collection. Tentatively I would like to suggest that Horace has created a further link between *c.* 2.4 and 2.5 by calling his beloved Lalage: her name can be derived from Greek λάλος ("chatty"), the very word by which Philodemus characterizes the harp-play that is still of concern to him in *AP* 11.41 (see above). In any case, Horace's waiting for Lalage's pursuit (*iam te sequetur,* v. 13) stands in contrast (and reverses) Philodemus' warning to flee before it is too late: φεύγωμεν (16.5 Sider).

No doubt, more traces of epigrams by Philodemus and further Hellenistic authors are still waiting to be discovered, while others may forever remain concealed. But I hope to have given a first impression of how Horace inscribes epigram into his lyric poetry by means of both generic markers and intertextual references.

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin and Silvia Barbantini (2007): "Inscribing Lyric". In P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (edd.): *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* Leiden: 429-57.

Barchiesi, Alessandro (2000): "Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition". In M. Depew and D. Obbink (edd): *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge MA: 167-182.

—— (2001): "Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian". In A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (edd.), *Iambic Ideas. Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire,* Lanham, MD: 141-164.

Bing, Peter (1988): *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets,* Göttingen (Hypomnemata 90) [2nd edition: Ann Arbor 2008].

—— (2000): "The Writing on the Girdle: Asclepiades 4 Gow-Page (AP 5.158)". In *Alexandrian Studies II in Honour of Mostafa el Abbadi* (*Bulletin of the Archaeological Society in Alexandria* 46): 245-8.

—— (2002/3): "Posidippus and the Admiral. Kallikrates of Samos in the Milan Epigrams". *GRBS* 43: 243-66.

—— (2005): "The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus, Section One: On Stones (AB 1-20)". In K. Gutzwiller (ed.): *The New Posidippus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book,* Oxford: 119-40.

Buchmann, Jürgen (1974): *Untersuchungen zur Rezeption hellenistischer Epigrammatik in der Lyrik des Horaz*, Diss. Konstanz.

Cavarzere, Alberto (1996): *Sul limitare. Il «motto» e la poesia di Orazio*, Bologna (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino 47).

Citti, Francesco (2000): *Studi oraziani. Tematica e intertestualità*, Bologna (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino 65).

Davis, Gregson (1991): *Polyhymnia. The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*, Berkeley / Los Angeles / Oxford.

Day, Joseph W. (1989): "Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments". *JHS* 109: 16-28.

—— (1994): "Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual". *HSPh* 96: 37-74.

—— (2000): "Epigram and Reader: Generic Force as (Re-)Activation of Ritual". In M. Depew and D. Obbink (edd.): *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge, MA: 37-57.

—— (2007): "Poems on Stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram". In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (edd.): *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* Leiden: 29-47.

Eicks, Mathias (2001): "Triptychon der Liebe — die Oden III, 26-28 des Horaz." *A&A* 47: 117-145.

Feeney, Denis C. (1993): "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets". In Niall Rudd (ed.): *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium*, London: 41-63.

—— (1998): *Literature and Religion at Rome. Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs,* Cambridge.

Gutzwiller, Kathryn (2007a): "The Paradox of Amatory Epigram". In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (edd.): *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* Leiden: 313-32.

—— (2007b): *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature,* Oxford.

Habinek, Thomas N. (1998): *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome,* Princeton.

Harrison, Stephen J. (2007): *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace,* Oxford.

Helzle, Matthias (1994): "Εἰρωνεία in Horace's *Odes* 1.5 and 3.26". *Antichthon* 28: 52-57.

Höschele, Regina (forthcoming): *Die blütenlesende Muse. Poetik und Textualität antiker Epigrammsammlungen,* Tübingen (Classica Monacensia) Holzberg, Niklas (2009): *Horaz. Dichter und Werk*, München.

Hoppin, Meredith Clarke (1984): "New Perspectives on Horace, *Odes* 1.5". *AJPh* 105: 54-68.

Jones, C.P. (1971): "*Tange Chloen semel arrogantem*". *HSPh* 75: 81-3.

Kiessling, Adolf and Richard Heinze ([13]1968): *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden*, Dublin/Zurich.

Korzeniewski, Dietmar (1968): "*Monumentum regali situ pyramidum altius* (Zu Hor. *C.* 3,30)". *Mnemosyne* 21: 29-34.

—— (1972): "Exegi monumentum. Hor. carm. 3,30 und die Topik der Grabgedichte". *Gymnasium* 79: 380-8.

La Penna, Antonio (1997): "Il ritratto rovesciato della bella donna (a proposito di un epigramma di Filodemo, *AP* V 132)". *Maia* 1997: 99-106.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (2005): "Horace *Odes* Book 1 and the Alexandrian Edition of Alcaeus". *CQ* 55: 542-58.

Macleod, Colin (1979): "Horatian *imitatio* and Odes 2.5". In D. West and T. Woodman (edd.): *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge, 89-102 [reprinted in C. Macleod, *Collected Essays,* Oxford 1983: 245-261].

Meyer, Doris (2005): *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen. Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*, Stuttgart (Hermes Einzelschriften 93).

Nisbet, Robin and Margaret Hubbard (1970-78): *A Commentary of Horace: Odes, Book 1-2*, 2 vols. Oxford.

Nisbet, Robin and Niall Rudd (2004): *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book III*, Oxford.

Oliensis, Ellen S. (1998): *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Cambridge.

Paschalis, Michael (ed.) (2002): *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, Rethymnon (Rethymnon Classical Studies 1).

Pasquali, Giorgio (1920): *Orazio lirico. Studi*, Firenze (reprinted 1966, ed. Antonio La Penna).

Peponi, Anastasia-Erasmia (2002): "Fantasizing Lyric: Horace, Epistles 1.19". In M. Paschalis (ed.) (2002): 19-45.

Petrovic, Andrei (2007): *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*, Leiden (Mnemosyne Suppl. 282).

Pöschl, Viktor (²1991): *Horazische Lyrik. Interpretationen*, Heidelberg.

Radke, Gyburg (2007): Die Kindheit des Mythos. Die Erfindung der Literaturgeschichte in der Antike, München.

Ramsby, Teresa R. (2007): *Textual Permanence. Roman Elegists and the Epigraphic Tradition,* London.

Rosen, Ralph (2007): "The Hellenistic Epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax". In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (edd.): *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* Leiden: 459-76.

Rösler, Wolfgang (1983): "Über Deixis und einige Aspekte mündlichen und schriftlichen Stils in antiker Lyrik". *WJA* 9: 7-28.

Santirocco, Matthew S. (1986): *Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes, Chapel Hill/London.

Sider, David (1997): *The Epigrams of Philodemos. Introduction, Text and Commentary,* New York/Oxford.

—— (2007): "*Sylloge Simonidea*". In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (edd.): *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* Leiden: 113-30.

Van Hoof, Lieve (2004): "Horace, *Odes* 3,26: gemme taillée au début de la fin". *Latomus* 63: 310-26.

Wili, Walter (1948): *Horaz und die augusteische Kultur*, Basel [reprinted 1966].

Woodman, A.J. (1979): "*EXEGI MONUMENTUM.* Horace, *Odes* 3.30". In A.J. Woodman and D. West (edd.): *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry,* Cambridge: 115-28. 151-56.

—— (2002): "*Biformis vates.* The Odes, Catullus and Greek Lyric". In A.J. Woodman and D.C. Feeney (edd.): *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace,* Cambridge: 53-64.