Neque te . . . dedecet myrtus

The speaker's unique choice of myrtle for his poetic *corona* has more semantic weight than is suggested by the mere antinomy of one to many (see my discussion above on *simplex*). The word *myrtus* is conspicuously repeated in the penultimate line of the ode with an expanded range of signification. Through its regular association with the goddess of love, Venus, the emblematic plant serves to foreground the erotic theme in Horatian lyric (cf. *C.* 1.4.5–10). Poet and addressee, both garlanded with myrtle, divide between them the heraldic image of a sympotic verse in which Eros is a central component. In addition, the litotes *neque . . . dedecet* graphically registers the idea of appropriateness (decorum), which, as I have previously observed, comprehends both a thematic and a stylistic dimension. As Meleager says, in a poem that Horace demonstrably knew, "sweet is the myrtle of Callimachus" (*Anth. Pal.* 4.1.21–22 = Gow-Page 3946–47). In place of the hard-to-obtain rose is to be substituted the humble myrtle, which, like the amatory subject, lies ever close to hand.

Neque me sub arta / vite bibentem

That the final word of the ode (and of the book it closes) is the present participle *bibentem* (drinking) is scarcely fortuitous. As Pasquali accurately observed, the ode functions as a kind of envoi (*commiato*) to the collection as a whole (Pasquali, 324). The poet deliberately leaves the reader with a symbolic distillation of the preponderant character of his convivial Muse. In locating the quintessentially convivial gesture *sub arta vite* ("beneath the dense vine"), Horace obliquely embraces the motif of the shade, or protective *umbra*, which is the generative matrix of the lyric *carmen*.[50] The *Persicos odi*, then, stands as a monument to the disingenuously "plain" style that dissimulates deep layers of meaning beneath a surface transparency.

Sacrifice and Song: *O fons Bandusiae*

Horace's hymnal invocation of a spring (*C.* 3.13) is rightly venerated as a chef d'oeuvre of Latin lyric. In my effort to elucidate its deeper meaning, I propose to focus on the metonymic relationship it appears to posit between sacrificial victim and poem. That complex relationship derives, in part, from the "perlocutionary effect"—to adopt J. L. Austin's well-known concept—of the speaker's utterances.[51] A preliminary glance at this aspect of the poem will provide the framework for my exegesis.

The ode's culminating strophe is a lucid example of what some linguistic theorists since Austin have characterized as a "speech act" (13–16):

> fies nobilium tu quoque fontium,
> *me dicente* cavis impositam ilicem
> saxis, unde loquaces
> lymphae desiliunt tuae.
>
> you also shall be classed among illustrious fountains *by virtue of my describing* the oak tree placed over hollowed rocks, from which your vocal waters spring downwards.

The verb of saying *dicente*, though occurring in an ablative absolute construction, clearly functions as a "performative" in the sense that it brings about the very phenomenon it describes. The coupling of a predictive statement, *fies . . . fontium*, with the explicit performative *dicente* has the self-fulfilling effect of ennobling the addressee. As is evident from a paraphrase that brings out the causal function of the participle—for example, "you will be made illustrious by virtue of my describing . . ."—the act of ennobling is at one with, and is inscribed in, the declaration itself. In the strictest sense, therefore, the recitation of the ode has the perlocutionary effect of elevating the *fons Bandusiae* to the stature of Hippocrene and the other *nobiles fontes* of Greek mythology.

If the speaker's utterances are magically efficacious, so presumably are those of the mimetic fountain, which, it transpires, is also endowed with the human capacity to speak (cf. *loquaces . . . lymphae*). Through the shared act of vivifying speech, poet and fountain come to mirror each other, or, to phrase it in a way that privileges the authorial voice, the fountain is made to reflect the "phatic" element in the composition—the manner in which the ode calls attention to its own "channel of communication" (Jakobson 1960, 355). It is against the background of a self-reflexive discourse that the entire infrastructure of the ode is to be interpreted.

What is more, some of the apparent paradoxes begin to evaporate as such when this dimension of the poem is accepted in all its repercussions.

One repercussion of the ennobling speech act is that the fountain is thereby equated with prestigious Greek "haunts of the Muses." This is tantamount to saying that the scene of the utterance becomes certified as an authentic (albeit Roman) locus of lyric creativity. The elevation process, however, actually begins in the initial lines, which, by their hymnal form, signal that the addressee is ipso facto lifted out of the world of the profane (1–3):

> O fons Bandusiae splendidior vitro
> dulci digne mero non sine floribus,
> cras donaberis haedo . . .

> O fountain of Bandusia, more resplendent than glass, deserving of mellow wine no less than flowers, tomorrow you will be offered a kid . . .

The expression *splendidior vitro* is doubly eulogistic in conventional terms. The "lustre" of the *laudandus* is a stock honorific metaphor, while the use of the comparative degree *splendidior* abbreviates the laudatory topos: "X is bright, but Y (my chosen subject) far outshines X."[52] As a resplendent, divinized object of veneration, the *fons* is declared worthy of ritual offerings and receives the promise of a sacrificial gift (*cras donaberis haedo*).

The understandable temptation to attach Horace's ritual oblations to a particular historical event—the festival of the Fontinalia—has led most commentators, despite the poet's noteworthy vagueness about the occasion, to ignore the thematic implications of the items concerned.[53] Unmixed wine, flowers, and young animal constitute the *sine quibus non* of the banqueting apparatus: the wine is destined to be mixed with water according to the dictates of the *magister bibendi;* the flowers will compose the obligatory wreaths worn by the participants; the sacrificed lamb will ultimately furnish the meat course. In fine, Horace's *fons* is to be honored with the irreducible tokens of convivial poetry. This ensemble of tokens, and not the presumed reference to an obscure festival, is what principally determines the speaker's choice of offerings.

If, indeed, Horace is primarily referring to basic ingredients of the banquet, what, we may well inquire, has become of the erotic motif, which, in my analysis of the *Persicos odi,* I have claimed to be equally essential to the sympotic nexus? The relative clause describing the sacrificial kid playfully thematizes *amor,* or, to be more precise, the anticipation of *amor* (4–5):

> cui frons turgida cornibus
> primis et venerem et proelia destinat

> whose forehead, swelling with first horns, marks him out for mating and battles.

The pubescent kid, whose burgeoning horns are a sign of erotic-aggressive activity, incarnates, no less effectively (though more obliquely) than the wine and the flowers, a thematic component of the symposium. The way in which Horace subsumes the erotic motif is, however, fraught with paradox; for it is not merely love-acts, *venerem,* but also battles, *proelia,* that the kid is "destined" to perform. The conjoining of battles and *amor* may, at first blush, appear to be contradictory to the lyric posture, since the latter typically and vociferously disavows bellicosity. As we have seen, however, in my discussion of the technique of "incorporation" (cf. *C.* 2.12.26), "battles"—the disavowed other—are often included in the lyric domain at the level of metaphor. In this case, the "incorporation" is engineered by what may be interpreted as a hendiadys. Like the *proelia virginum* of *C.* 1.6.17, the *proelia Veneris* of the libidinous goat (cf. *lascivi suboles gregis,* 8) embody aggressive *amor,* or, more aptly put, they testify to the inclusiveness of the amatory theme.[54]

The speaker's paradoxical formulations do not end, however, with the transference of erotic *proelia* to the personified animal. Having temporarily become, by a metonymic and ludic sleight of hand, a potential participant in the *convivium* (an erotic player), the kid is abruptly restored to its original role in the destined symposium—namely, that of sacrificial victim (6–8):

> frustra: nam gelidos inficiet tibi
> rubro sanguine rivos
> lascivi suboles gregis.

> in vain: for the progeny of the lusty herd will infuse your cool streams with red blood.

The explanatory *nam* clause, which glosses the pathetic *frustra*, contains a striking image that many critics have found disturbing, if not incongruous. The mixture of colors (red blood infusing white fountain), combined with the undercurrent of violence, seems to such readers an obtrusive element in an otherwise brilliant canvas. As far as the violence is concerned, the repulsion felt by the modern reader is doubtless anachronistic: blood sacrifice was so much an integral part of ancient society that Horace's lines are unlikely to have had intrinsic shock value to a contemporary audience. Anachronistic reactions aside, the commingling of the kid's blood with the pure waters of the fountain is presented so graphically as to invite speculation as to the speaker's rhetorical intent. From the perspective of my analysis, there are two primary structural explanations for Horace's note of pathos in portraying the transubstantiation of the kid: (a) the role of death as a standard foil to convivial celebration and (b) the figurative *fusion* of *fons* and victim, to which the death is logically prior.

In chapter 3, "Modes of Consolation," I shall examine at length the invariable introduction of "dark background"—usually in the form of a direct reference to death—in the context of a *carpe diem* argument. For my immediate purposes, it is sufficient to observe that, if I am right in reading the poem as an encapsulation of fundamental convivial motifs, then the presence of death is an obligatory part of such a rhetorical edifice. Like the erotic motif, the mortality topos is here transposed from the human to the animal sphere, and in the *frustra* we are made to feel empathy for the transience of the young personified *haedus*.

In addition to the inclusion of the mortality topos, there is another compelling raison d'être for the speaker's conspicuous conflation of the life-blood of the victim and the waters of the fountain. The animal, I have been arguing, has come to incarnate certain crucial features of erotic-sympotic lyric. As such, it is eminently transformable into, and in a sense, identifiable with, that other symbol of *poiēsis*, the *fons* itself. The mixture of liquids, blood and water, is strictly parallel to the mixture of metaphors. As my dissection of the Lamia ode indicates, the Horatian *carmen* is amenable to the interchange of emblems having the same referent. In the particular instance of the *fons Bandusiae*, the synecdochic transfiguration of the sacrificial victim into poetic fountain is quintessentially apt.

The transfusion of consecrated blood into sacred source serves to mark the process as deeply symbolic and to determine, once and for all, the metonymic status of the whole *sacrificio al fonte* (Pasquali's caption).

The second to last strophe, with its anaphoric *tu* predications, comprises the segment of the hymn devoted to the specification of the powers of the *numen* (9–12):

> te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae
> nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile
> fessis vomere tauris
> praebes et pecori vago

you cannot be touched by the ferocious season of the blazing Dog Star; you proffer your seductive coolness to the bulls weary with the ploughshare and to the wandering flock.

The numinous fountain, we learn, has the capacity to ward off excessive heat and to offer cool shade to the flocks. The *umbra* that protects the members of the larger community of man and animals is a pastoral motif that Horace often assimilates into his version of latinized Aeolic. In the ode to Tyndaris in which he wishes to sanctify his Sabine home as a favorite *sedes* of Arcadian Pan (= Faunus), he relies on a similar characterization (C. 1.17.1–4):

> Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem
> mutat Lycaeo Faunus et igneam
> defendit aestatem capellis
> usque meis pluviosque ventos.

Swift Faunus frequently changes Lycaeus for pleasant Lucretilis, and continually protects my she-goats from fiery summer heat and rainy winds.

In both poems the magically prophylactic power of song is in the forefront: extremely hot weather (*igneam aestatem; hora Caniculae*) is exorcised and the animals (*capellis; tauris, pecori vago*) are safely ensconced in the pastoral shade (cf. 1.17.17–18: "hic in reducta valle Caniculae / vitabis aestus"—"Here in a secluded valley you will avoid the heat of the Dog Star"). In these circumstances, the power of the *fons* to refresh the weary is an index of poetry's regenerative power (cf. the "recreative" role of the Muses in C. 3.4.37–40).

I began my inspection of the *fons Bandusiae* by stressing the phat-

ic element in the composition, and I interpreted the climactic utterance *me dicente* . . . as an explicit "performative" (in the jargon of speech-act theory). To round off my treatment of the poem, let us now redirect attention to the *prophetic* tonality of the ode's finale.

The future tense in "*fies* nobilium tu quoque fontium" ("You also shall be classed among illustrious fountains") masks, as I have already emphasized, a self-fulfilling prophecy. In terms of the ode's substratum, the word *prophecy* here has a double application—religious as well as rhetorical. The religious character transcends the obviously hymnal structure of the invocation and its central motif of ritual sacrifice: it embraces the fundamental notion, widespread in antiquity, of the *mantic* function of song—a function closely associated with sacred springs. As Kambylis has amply attested, powers of prophecy—especially those linked to cult centers of Apollo and the Muses—were thought to be derived from sacred sources (Kambylis, 27–30). The mention of the oak "placed over hollow rocks" makes the prophetic function even more prominent in view of the oracular cult-affinities of the plant. Thus in the closing sentences of his ode, Horace is speaking in the role of a *promantis*, an inspired devotee of the Muses who has the authority to pronounce in oracular tones on things to come. As one who has manifestly imbibed the magic waters of the fountain, he is capable of predicting the immortality of his own *fons* and declaring its future status as *fons nobilis*. Thus the epithet *loquaces* that modifes the *lymphae* is not only self-reflexive (in the sense defined above) but also predictive in terms of the afterlife of the *carmen*, for the "talking waters" (the mantic eloquence inherent in lyric utterance)[55] continue to dazzle posterity with their splendor, just as the poet prognosticated.

Despite the uncertainty in the critical literature about the location and even the correct name of the actual source, Horace's encomium of the *fons Bandusiae* remains a coherent meditation on the inherent power of lyric discourse. As with the *corona* in the *Persicos odi*, the poet objectifies the creative performance and the *carmen* itself as a means of clarifying his lyric program and validating his achievement. At this level of abstraction, fountain and sacrificial victim fuse into a complex image that reflects the virtues and thematic obsessions of the artist.

Plain Sacrifice, Plain Speaker: The Conclusion of *C.* 4.2.

Horace's intricate encomium to Augustus, *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari* (*C.* 4.2) terminates in a pictorial vignette in which two sets of sacrificial gifts, ascribed to the addressee and the speaker respectively, are vividly contrasted (53–60):

> te decem tauri totidemque vaccae,
> me tener solvet vitulus, relicta
> matre qui largis iuvenescit herbis
> in mea vota,
> fronte curvatos imitatus ignis
> tertium lunae referentis ortum,
> qua notam duxit, niveus videri,
> cetera fulvus.
>
> You will be released with a sacrifice of ten bulls and as many cows; I with one of a tender calf that has left its mother and is maturing on broad meadows in fulfillment of my vows, its brow copying the fiery curve of the moon at its third rising: white as snow where it bears a mark, otherwise ruddy.

Since the ode as a whole is, in certain important respects, an apologia for the poet's lyric praxis, the sacrificial vignette is no otiose appendage; rather, it subtly incarnates (and resumes) substantive points in the preceding stanzas. To appreciate the organic connection between the juxtaposed sacrifices and the rest of the ode, it will be useful to recall certain features of the larger design.

Broadly speaking, the ode may be bisected into (a) a long proem "disavowing" the grand style of Pindar and (b) a bifurcated eulogy of the *princeps*, comprising (1) a specimen in the grand manner (allocated to the addressee) and (2) a specimen in the plain style (allocated to the speaker). The following diagram may help to articulate the scheme:

(a) Disavowal of the grand style	(1–32)
(b) Double encomium of Augustus	(33–60)
(1) Grand-style specimen by addressee	(33–44)
(2) Plain-style specimen by speaker	(45–60)

POLYHYMNIA

THE RHETORIC OF HORATIAN LYRIC DISCOURSE

GREGSON DAVIS

University of California Press
Berkeley · Los Angeles · Oxford

and stylistic decorum (e.g., Borzsak 1984; Shackleton Bailey 1985). Cf. also the discussion of the passage in Fraenkel, 274–75.

25. On the literary-generic signification of the wolf in the symbolic universe of the *Integer vitae*, see Davis 1987a.

26. For the ambitious connotations of *animosus*, see *C.* 2.10.21.

27. The third incident involving near shipwreck is unmentioned elsewhere and is probably a rhetorical filler (see the literature thereon in Syndikus, 60, with n. 60).

28. For documentation of the topos, see Nisbet-Hubbard *ad C.* 2.6.1.

29. This facet is clear from the epithets Horace assigns to the geographical items: *ultimi; remotis; extremum.*

30. Cf. the globalizing function of the motif in *C.* 1.22.5–8 and 17–22.

31. Fraenkel, 199–201, vacillates somewhat between the two positions, but finally steers towards the believers. An Augustan parallel to Horace's vision is Virgil *Ecl.* 10.26, where the speaker claims to have seen Pan (*quem vidimus ipsi*).

32. In addition to the obvious Euripidean allusions noted by most commentators, cf. Pratinas 708 *PMG*, lines 3–5.

33. So (and rightly) Pöschl 1970, 167, with literature cited therein.

34. Cf. Commager, 326–28.

35. Kilpatrick 1969, 222–24, makes the interesting proposal of understanding *hunc sacrare* to mean *hunc honorem sacrare.* For poetic *honores* (*timai*), cf. Pindar *I.* 1.34; *N.* 9.10; *O.* 1.100–103; for an apt Horatian parallel, see Davis 1983b, 16, apropos of *C.* 3.2.18: *intaminatis . . . honoribus.*

36. There is a similar interchangeability of fountain and wreath in Lucretius 1.927–30—an acknowledged source for Horace's Lamia ode: "iuvat integros accedere *fontis* / atque haurire, iuvatque novos decerpere flores / insignemque meo capiti petere inde *coronam* / unde prius nulli velarint tempora musae" ("I take delight in approaching pure *fountains* and drinking from them; delight also in plucking fresh flowers and seeking an illustrious *wreath* for my head from a place whence the Muses have never before garlanded the temples of any person"). In this light the epithet *novis*, as applied to *fidibus*, probably does not, as some have supposed, imply that Horace is here carrying out a novel experiment in Alcaics, rather that he is celebrating a "fresh" theme in eulogizing Lamia.

37. On voluntative futures—a much-overlooked feature of ancient rhetorical practice—see Slater 1969; Davis 1983b, 24. Kilpatrick 1969, taking the future literally, sees the Lamia ode as containing a promise fulfilled in the following poem, *C.* 1.27.

38. In the phrase *in mare Creticum*, Horace may also be alluding to the well-worn heroic topos of the storm at sea, since the epithet *Cretan* is stereotypically employed to signify "proverbially stormy sea" (cf. Wickham *ad loc.*).

39. Cf. also *C.* 3.19.1–8; Callimachus *Aetia* 15–16 (Pfeiffer) (dismissing Massagetae and Medes); Nisbet-Hubbard *ad C.* 1.38.1. For a possible parallel in Alcaeus (the evidence is inconclusive), see Treu 1949.

40. Tedium is suggested by the anaphoric repetition of *quis . . . quid.*

41. In line 6 I read *cura* with Bentley—an emendation that has not gained the acceptance it merits. See further Nisbet-Hubbard *ad loc.*; Fraenkel, 297 n. 4.

42. See R. Reitzenstein 1963, 15–17; Nisbet-Hubbard, 422–23; for the contrary position (in favor of symbolism), see, e.g., Fraenkel, 297–99; Syndikus, 340–42.

43. On the other hand, Brink *ad loc.* reads the crown as given in compensation for poetic merit.

44. See documentation in Gow-Page, *HE*, 2: 593–97, apropos of *Anth. Pal.* 4.1; also Nisbet-Hubbard *ad C.* 1.26.7 (*flores*); Keller-Holder *ad* line 8 (*coronam*).

45. E.g., Philodemus: *Anth. Pal.* 11.35 (= Gow-Page, *GP* 3302–9); Nicaenetus 6 (Powell); cf. Hendrickson 1918, 32–41; Cairns 1979, 18–21.

46. Both Commager, 117–18, and Fraenkel, 299, rightly regard Horace's vociferous disavowal of elaborate poems as ironic and (partly, at least) insincere.

47. Sappho 55 LP, 2–3; see Kambylis 1965, 174.

48. Hendrickson 1918, 39, apropos of *C.* 1.38.

49. See references in note 42 above.

50. Cf. *Dionaeo sub antro* (*C.* 2.1.39); *sub lauru mea* (*C.* 2.7.19); *sub umbra* (*C.* 1.17.22; 1.32.1).

51. For the distinction between *illocutionary* and *perlocutionary* (often confused), see Lyons 1977, 730–32.

52. Cf. Pindar *O.* 1.1 ff.; Sappho 96.6–9 LP; Alcman 1.319–43 *PMG.*

53. See the strictures of Richard Reitzenstein (1963, 89, n. 2). When Horace refers to a festival, this is usually an explicit part of the poem's scaffolding.

54. For the ethnographic significance of the kid's burgeoning horns ("outcrop of the life-substance"), consult Onians 1951, 237–39, who actually cites the ode in illustration.

55. Cf. Kambylis 1965, 23–30.

56. Fries 1983 contains a thorough analysis of Horace's catalogue in relation to the Alexandrian canon of Pindar's works.

57. See Syndikus, 302 nn. 38 and 39; Gow 1950 *ad* Theocr. 1.146.

58. Cf. Varro *Rust.* 3.16.4: *aptissimum . . . ad mellificium thymum.*

59. See Fränkel, 323 (with n. 38); for testimonia consult Simonides 88 *PMG*; further discussion in Oates 1932, 99–100.

60. Cf. *Epist.* 1.19.44, where the context suggests that the expression was a contemporary platitude.

61. Bentley's contention that *plurimum* is to be construed with *laborem* in the idiomatic sense of "dense" is, in my opinion, decisive.

62. E.g., *O.* 1.97–108; *P.* 1.46–50. On the variety and function of Pindaric "vaunts," see Race 1982, passim.

63. The text of line 49 is a notorious crux. *Terque* (Pauly's emendation, adopted by Wickham-Garrod) is not a completely satisfactory remedy for