O FONS BANDUSIAE: BLOOD AND WATER IN HORACE, *ODES* 3.13[1]

Ralph Hexter

'Die Tiefe muss man verstecken. Wo? An der Oberfläche.'
(Hugo von Hofmannsthal)

Odes 3.13 is one of the most famous and beloved of Horace's poems.[2] The spring, the unforgettable and touching image of the kid, above all the manifest artistry of the poet, have inscribed the hymn in the memory of all readers. Analysis, however, has only rarely risen above the banal. The standard introductory note to the poem reprinted in dozens of sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and early eighteenth-century editions and translations gave the following information, with little variation: 'Sacrificium fonti promittit, eiusque amoenitatem summopere commendat.'[3] In recent years, critics have shifted the focus of their attention from the spring to the claims Horace makes for his poetry, and rightly so.

Interpretation of any poetry as carefully crafted as Horace's creates imbalances; a 'position' places more weight here, less there. This twentieth-century students of Horace see as they fall in behind a long line of interpreters. To offset our own necessarily limited response, we should consider incorporating all but the most aberrant interpretations and embracing even contradictory arguments as possible perspectives on a

1 I refer to the following by author's name only: A. Y. Campbell, *Horace. A New Interpretation* (London, 1924); Steele Commager, *The Odes of Horace. A Critical Study* (New Haven, 1962); D. West, *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh, 1967); J. R. Wilson, '*O Fons Bandusiae*', *CJ* 63 (1968), 189-96; G. Nussbaum, '*Cras Donaberis Haedo* (Horace, *Carm.* 3.13)', *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 151-9. A short title will distinguish G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968) [*Tradition*] from G. Williams, *The Third Book of Horace's* Odes (Oxford, 1969) [*Third Book*]. Titles of editions and translations of Horace's complete works are regularly omitted.

2 'Venustissimum ac dulcissimum carmen', Janus quoted in C. W. Nauck (ed., Leipzig, 1868), i. p. 148; 'miram venustatem hoc carmen habet cum a quaesitiore orationis cultu numerorumque suavitate, tum a naturali sententiarum progressione, tali argumento convenientissima', C. G. Mitscherlich (ed., Leipzig, 1800), ii. p. 150; 'a general favourite', P. Shorey, (ed.), *Horace,* Odes *and* Epodes (Boston, 1902[2]), p. 348; 'forse la più nota lirica di Orazio', F. Durand, *La Poesia di Orazio* (Turin, 1957), p. 94.

3 Variation in even a trivial headnote may provide a hint of shifting interest. For example, in *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina cum Annotationibus Joannis Bond ad Usum Scholarum* (Paris, 1765), the standard headnote (quoted above and appearing in one printing of editions with J. Bond's annotations after another) becomes 'fonti sacrificium, nomenque grande a suis versibus pollicetur' (p. 101, where the ode is number 9, since 3.7, 9, 10 and 12 are omitted, as often in expurgated texts).

poem.[4] At a place where most interpreters have stumbled, it might (in some cases) be better not to remove the block but to ask whether the difficulty was placed there by the poet. A stumbling-block on a false trail is a good thing; not all ways are meant to be easy.

Talk of stumbling-blocks may seem out of place in the case of 3.13, long celebrated for its simplicity. In D'Acier's words, 'Ceux qui examineront bien le tour & la simplicité inimitable de la description qu' Horace fait icy de la fontaine de Blandusia, la trouveront une des plus jolies choses du monde dans son genre.'[5] Indeed, the poem appears artless, but as always in the mature Horace, *ars celat artem* . Many of the deepest and most suggestive ideas of his poetry are only revealed by the art that conceals them from easy detection. Prose, the language of criticism, must paraphrase and cannot be so indirect. Critical moments occur between successive readings of a poem, fortunately leaving the poem undamaged. In this particular critical moment, I wish to propose that the image of the red blood of the goat staining the cold spring water reflects the transmutation of life into poetry. This insight is not new, and though it might occur 'independently' to many readers, the honour is Commager's:

> Destined for love and battle, the 'offspring of the wanton flock' epitomizes life's comprehensive vitality, and as his warm blood mingles with the lucid water it is easy to sense a suggestion of the transformation of life into art.[6]

That 'readers have often been repelled by the details of the kid's sacrifice' indeed has a reason. But instead of the 'union of vitality and calm' Commager finds, I read in the pathos many have felt (and others attempt to deny) a sense of loss for the life represented by the goat's vitality. I believe a close reading of the poem supports a further insight: that Horace means to show us how life is transferred to the water of poetry, and by showing us how it is, he shows us that it is.

The central 'scandal' of the poem is, as many have noted, the sacrifice of the young goat.[7] Discomfort at this point is not merely a twentieth-century

4 Certain lines of scholarly investigation, e.g. the question of the location of the spring, are of no moment for our present purpose.

5 M. D'Acier (Paris, 1681), iii. p. 262. 'Blandusia' was the prevalent spelling in the early editions and translations. D'Acier's judgement on the Ode's 'inimitable Simplicity of Description' forms the kernel of Philip Francis' note, 'A beautiful Fountain in the Estate of a great Poet, ought to be immortal...', *The* Odes, Epodes, Carmen Seculare *of Horace*, transl. P. Francis (London, 1743), ii. p. 64. Cf. Campbell, p. 1.

6 Commager, pp. 323 f. (in ch. 6, 'The World of Art'). Wilson expands on Commager and provides a generous sampling of ancient parallels to most aspects of the poem (e.g., the hymnic). Nussbaum is highly critical of both, admonishing us: 'if we hear the poem through...in just the way that Horace presents it and intends us to hear it, we cannot...know that it is "really" about poetry, and not about a spring' (p. 156); in his parting shot he raises the spectre of our upsetting Horace: 'Devotee of the Muse that he was, Horace might yet have been distressed to think that the kid of Bandusia would be seen as his symbol for the true relationship between Life and Art' (p. 158). While I reject M. O. Lee's elaboration of Commager's argument, in which 'the offering of life-images represents self-dedication' (*Word, Sound, and Image in the* Odes *of Horace* [Ann Arbor, 1969], p. 57), I concur with his conclusion: 'Doubtless Horace never intended the poem as a complete allegory, with the kid as symbol. There is only the pattern of his imagery to suggest more than the words denote' (pp. 57 f.).

7 'Scandal', Wilson, p. 289. Cf. 'Il particolare del capretto che verrà ucciso...potrebbe a

reaction, as West's rejection of Campbell's rhetoric implies.[8] It is easy to document an increasingly sentimental response to the kid over the past three centuries, and while that does not establish that such a response is appropriate, it does at least suggest that 3.13.3-7 present readers with something disturbing to which attention must be paid.

Horace's *frustra* (6) provides a convenient litmus test for response. Indeed, the matter of punctuation between verses 5 and 6 records editors' dramatization of *frustra*. None is needed, yet nearly all provide at least a comma, most a dash or semi-colon.[9] This, and the strong position of the word itself (at the end of the sentence and the beginning of a line), apparently tempted some translators to make of an adverb simply modifying *destinat* a veritable *cri de coeur* . Most mid-eighteenth-century translators, for example, are content with 'in vain' or 'but in vain' at line- or sentence-end,[10] but Thomas Creech writes 'Courage with Love together grows | In vain, in vain'.[11] In J. Duncombe's 1757 rendering, 'in vain' still hangs precariously between adverb and interjection.[12] Numerous nineteenth-century translators, German as well as English, free it from its moorings. 'Vain promise all!' stands as a separate sentence.[13] In C. Hartmann's German translation, 'Umsonst' stands not at the end of the previous but alone at the beginning of a new sentence.[14] To 'umsonst', Ludwig adds a 'doch' and Binder an 'Ach'; both add an exclamation point.[15]

French translations display a similar pattern. De Marolles' mid-seventeenth-century version is totally unsentimental,[16] but only a few decades later D'Acier's description of the kid already borders on the pathetic:

> je vous immoleray demain un petit Chevreau qui tout fier de sentir déja sur

taluno suonare non necessario e un poco disturbante', Durand, loc. cit.

8 So West, p. 129, and Nussbaum, p. 151; Campbell, pp. 1-3; cf. 211-12.

9 'Male alii iungunt "destinat frustra", quo perit poëtica loci virtus, quam habet acerbum illud ἐπιφώνημα', J. C. Orelli - J. G. Baiter, (edd., Zurich, 1850[3]), i. p. 424. Of the 'parallel' *frustra* at 3.7.21 (likewise followed by *nam*), they write 'sola haec particula integram exprimit sententiam' (i. p. 394); many editors punctuate the two differently, however, perhaps because 3.7.21 marks the beginning of a strophe. Cf. also *Serm.* 2.7.114.

10 J. Hanway (London, 1730), p. 73; T. Hare (London, 1737), p. 163; D. Watson and S. Patrick (London, 1741), p. 260 of the third edition (1750); P. Francis (London, 1743), ii. p. 65; C. Smart (London, 1756), i. p. 151 of the 1809 edition.

11 Horace, *Odes, Satyres & Epistles* , transl. T. Creech (London, 1720), p. 102. Alas, the quality of his translation suggests that this may be as much filler as doubled pathos.

12 'Tomorrow's rising Sun shall see | A beauteous Victim given to thee; | A Kid, with budding Horns prepar'd | The *Venus* of his Heart to guard: | In vain. - For soon his crimson Blood | Shall stain the Crystal of thy spotless Flood', transl. W. Duncombe and J. Duncombe (London, 1767), ii. p. 82. Cf. 'Schon zu Kämpfen bestimmt und zu verliebten Scherz; | - Ach vergebens!', *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus* Oden *und* Epoden, transl. E. Günther (Leipzig, 1830), p. 128.

13 *The* Odes, Epodes *and* Satires *of Horace*, transl. T. Martin (Edinburgh and London, 1870[3]), p. 146.

14 'Umsonst; denn mit dem Blute roth...', transl. selected by T. Obbarius (Paderborn, 1872[3]), p. 74. Cf. 'Fruchtlos; denn...', *Q. Horatius Flaccus' lyrische Gedichte* , transl. J. Strodtmann (Leipzig, 1852), i. p. 243.

15 'Doch umsonst!', *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus* Oden *und* Epoden, transl. G. Ludwig (Stuttgart, 1860), p. 122; 'Ach, umsonst! denn...', transl. W. Binder (Berlin, 1897[9]), i. p. 107.

16 'Tu receuras l'offrande d'vn Bouc à qui les cornes naissantes qui font dé-ja grossir le front, demander en vain le combat, & les delices de Venus', transl. M. de Marolles (Paris, 1660[2]), i. p. 86.

> son front des cornes naissantes, se prépare à l'amour & aux combats, mais en vain; car ce petit animal lascif teindra de son sang vermeil vos bords glacez.[17]

Most translators retain 'mais en vain';[18] Patin's 'vainement, hélas' of 1866 is the high-water mark in sentimental renderings of *frustra*.[19]

The ways in which modern critics and commentators strive to limit our and their response to the pathos also makes for instructive interpretive history. West regards A. Y. Campbell's response to the ode as 'a clear example of...egocentricity', i.e., giving in to 'any mental patterns of our own which are clearly different from the patterns of our poet and of his contemporary readers'.[20] West rejects Campbell's colourful metaphor of our thirst for poetic refreshment and begins his attack with the peevish 'So modern taste does not like blood in running water.'[21] He attempts to deflect response to the bloody sacrifice of the young goat with reference to Roman familiarity with animal sacrifice, on the one hand,[22] and, on the other, to 'density and vividness' of language in the service of

> a complex stimulus, the life blood spurting from an animal's jugular, an ancient religious observance..., the promise of a good supper, good wine and good company, perhaps with some music and love, and the canonisation of this little Italian spring for all time along with the great poetic fountains... The sensory precision of this and also its rich emotional overtones help to make a great Horatian poem, and it is a pity to have it spoilt by critics who are unwilling to let Horace be different from themselves.[23]

For West, 'you read him your way, I'll read him his' is no joke.

Literary commonplaces, like those of ancient ritual, are another favourite method of deadening response. In inept hands, the point of accumulating parallel passages seems to be to drain all meaning from the text. When properly evaluated, so-called 'parallels' - by definition parallel

[17] As above, n. 5, iii. p. 261. Note the second, final sentence of D'Acier's headnote (the first was quoted above): 'Et ce qui la doit encore faire plus estimer, c'est qu'elle nous fournit un exemple fort curieux des sacrifices que l'on faisoit aux fontaines.'

[18] E.g. N. E. Sanadon, S.J. (Paris, 1756), iii. p. 341, and F. Richard (Paris, 1931), i. p. 125.

[19] M. Patin (Paris, 1866), i. p. 247; M. Goupy's 'Mais n'importe' (Paris, 1841), p. 91, is a curiosity.

[20] West, p. 128. As an example of an approach to Horace I do find 'egocentric' in West's sense, cf. Robert Bradstreet, *The Sabine Farm. A Poem*... (London, 1819), esp. 2.98-111 (p. 80f.): 'O holy Nature! Thou, whose beauties pure, | For ever varying, ever still endure! | If e'er thy Fair-Sublime, unreach'd by art | In verse or picture, touch'd my boyish heart...: | If, with increasing love, those scenes I trod, | And, in thy face, ador'd the smile of GOD | Not dimly visible to mortal sight, | By the reflected beams of uncreated light - | Now give my raptur'd spirit to behold | Each charm that won thy Sabine Bard of old...'

[21] As we have seen, this modern taste must be at least several centuries long.

[22] 'The critic must shed his local prejudices', West, p. 129. Like West, dozens of commentators, early and late, adduce here Numa's sacrifice to a spring (Ovid, *Fasti* 3.300).

[23] West, p. 130. Cf. 'La consacrazione della fonte di Bandusia e quello stesso accento di crudeltà e d'insensibile freddezza della seconda quartina (che è poi la vita nella sua più tragica realtà) ti appare assunto in un mondo di ritmo e di luce', E. Turolla, ed. and transl. (Turin, 1963), p. lxxxvi (the introduction dates from 1931; see p. cxl, note). It is surprising that 'tragedy' does not appear more often in discussions of this song of the goat.

lines never intersect - serve as valuable markers of distance and difference between texts.[24] Gordon Williams handles a variety of Hellenistic parallels with characteristic dispatch. 'Greek epigrams in which animals are dedicated to deities' do not excite pathos, while two types of poems which do - epitaphs (real or feigned) on deceased pets and Vergil's *Georgics* - are again very different. Horace arouses

> pathos for an animal which, by his own free decision, he destines to death. This cannot avoid being somewhat macabre, especially when the poet goes on to evoke the visual effect of the red blood seeping into the chill water. But the use of the motif will be misjudged unless the detached, slightly callous irony of the pathos is appreciated: the mock-heroic combination of *et venerem et proelia* and the deliberately dropped *frustra* create a tone that is alien to the sympathetic Virgil.[25]

Here the pathos is not removed by the parallels but accommodated in a yet more complex response: irony. Is 'et venerem et proelia' really 'mock-heroic'? This may be a matter of personal response; it certainly seems a typically twentieth-century solution.[26] Late in the seventeenth, D'Acier wrote of this line, 'On ne sauroit donner une image ni plus naturelle ni plus vive',[27] and in the eighteenth, a Danish translator began a detailed note thus: 'A charming and lively description of the young kid'.[28]

Remarks two or three hundred years old may make us realize that our own responses are conditioned by our own time. However much Horace's poem diverges from Anyte's *epicedia* on deceased animals, these Hellenistic pieces preserved in a popular anthology nonetheless establish that pathos for animals is not an unclassical sentiment.[29] Rather than putting the 'problem' to rest it may be worth allowing it to well up.[30]

[24] Echoes and recurrent images within the corpus of one poet or one poetic collection present comparable challenges. For M. Santirocco (*Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes [Chapel Hill, 1986]), the motif of pathos for a sacrificial victim becomes a feature that at once links *Carm.* 3.13 with and differentiates it from other odes: with 3.12 and 3.14 (p. 127); with 3.22 and 3.23 (p. 138). Note that 3.13 'stands outside the concentric disposition of *Carm.* 3.7-15' (p. 173; cf. p. 126). Santirocco adduces 'Homer's description of Odysseus' dog' only to set Horace's innovation in relief (p. 138).

[25] Williams, *Third Book* , p. 89; cf. *Tradition* , pp. 151 f.

[26] Nussbaum finds Williams' light irony 'nearer the mark than Fraenkel's "deep humanity"' (p. 158; cf. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* [Oxford, 1957], p. 203). For another irony, cf. E. C. Wickham, who, thinking of the eating of the victim, comments: 'the offerer would take an interest in the delicacy of the offering, and would moralize with more complacency on the irony of its fate', (Oxford, 1874[1], 1877[2]), i. p. 211.

[27] As above, n. 5, iii. p. 266.

[28] 'En yndig og levende Beskrivelse paa et ungt Kid', transl. M. J. Baden (Copenhagen, 1732), i. p. 272 in the edition of 1792.

[29] For a selection, cf. A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (edd.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965): Anyte IX, XIII-XIV; Theodiridas III; Theokritos V. Cf. G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico* (Florence, 1920; rpid. 1964), pp. 557-9; Williams, *Tradition* , pp. 150f. There is indeed a Hellenistic melancholy, even mawkishness, in many of these epitaphs. See G. Herrlinger, *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung mit einem Anhang byzantinischer, mittellateinischer und neuhochdeutscher Tierepikedien* , Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 8 (Stuttgart, 1930). Herrlinger reminds us, 'fecit et divus Augustus equo tumulum, de quo Germanici Caesaris carmen est' (p. 11 n. 67, citing Pliny, *N.H.* 8.155).

[30] While Nussbaum believes that 'Quinn and West are, of course, right to castigate Campbell

Another aspect of the poem that has surprisingly not received the attention it deserves may be sketched in summary fashion, for the waters of Callimachean poetics are well-charted. Indeed, while commentators have noted Hellenistic epigrams dedicated to fountains or describing *loci amoeni*,[31] and while recent students of Augustan poetry have drawn our attention to Callimachean water imagery in Roman poetry and in Horace in particular,[32] few if any have considered the *fons Bandusiae* in this context.[33] For Callimachus and his followers, one should dip into the clear, small stream, and avoid the sullied spring or fast-flowing river which carries with it all sorts of mire and debris.[34] While running water is a frequent image of poetic inspiration,[35] Horace often employs it to represent the poet producing, and by extension the poetry produced.[36]

If by a further extension of the metonymy the *fons Bandusiae* can represent poetry, then Horace's reference to his own art enters not in the final strophe but is present from the very beginning. The poem, however, is complicated when its pure, unsullied spring is stained by the poet himself, who sacrifices the goat (even if this is prospective). What Horace emphasizes about the kid - his youth and his burgeoning sexual drive - supports the contention that the kid represents life itself. The poet knows that his art will demand tomorrow's sacrifice of a living being.

The strongest argument for what may seem to some a mechanical and artificial allegory is the poem itself. If one follows the language used for

for such egocentricity', he registers an important qualification: 'if culture is not to be divorced from life, we cannot, and should not seek to avoid the confrontation with our own humanity. We must first listen, and then respond, and seek - with proper tentativeness and humility - to evaluate and to integrate' (p. 130).

31 E.g. Leonidas of Tarentum III, V, LXXXVI; Anyte XVI, XVIII (in Gow-Page, as above, note 29); A. Kiessling - R. Heinze (edd., Berlin, 1930[7]), i. p. 316; G. Pasquali (as above, n. 29), pp. 149 f., 553-7; Williams, *Tradition*, pp. 149 f.; A. La Penna (ed., Florence, 1969), pp. 379 f.

32 *Inter alios* W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*, *Hermes* Einzelschriften 16 (Wiesbaden, 1960); A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (Heidelberg, 1965); F. Wehrli, 'Horaz und Kallimachos', *Mus. Helvet.* 1 (1944), 69-76; J. V. Cody, *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics* (Brussels, 1976).

33 But note the pregnant words: '*Digentia* might be regarded as bearing the same relationship to the *Epistles* as Bandusia and the waters of Tibur to the *Odes*', J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire. A Study in Form and Imagery* (Cambridge, 1974), p. 63.

34 Call. *Hymn* 2.106-12.

35 E.g. Call. *Hymn* 2.112, Lucr. 1.927, Prop. 3.1.3. Two recent discussions, with further bibliography, are those of N. B. Crowther, 'Water and Wine as Symbols of Inspiration', *Mnemosyne* IV.32 (1979), 1-11, and P. Knox, 'Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics', *HSCPh* 89 (1985), 107-19, who insists that 'Water, in and of itself, is not a literary symbol for Callimachus; what matters is its source...' (with reference to the *Aetia* preface).

36 Of Lucilius: *Senn.* 1.4.11, 10.36, 50-1; Cassius: *Senn.* 1.10.62; Pindar: *Carm.* 4.2.5-8; the ideal Latin poet: *Epist.* 2.2.120-1. Note that in the second member of both *Senn.* 1.4.11 and 1.10.50-1, Horace shifts the image from Lucilius to Lucilius' output. At 2.2.120, C. O. Brink notes, 'By an easy metonymy, the qualities of the poem are seen as those of the poet', *Horace on Poetry (III)*. Epistles *Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 339-43, at 340; cf. also *Horace on Poetry (I). Prolegomena to the Literary* Epistles (Cambridge, 1963), p. 188 n.4.

both goat and spring, one sees how life is gradually drained from the goat and transferred to the spring:

goat	**spring**
	O fons Bandusiae
	splendidior vitro
	digne mero
	donaberis
haedo	
frons turgida	
venerem et proelia	
destinat	
inficiet	
	tibi
	gelidos
rubro sanguine	
	rivos
lascivi suboles gregis	
[te nescit tangere]	
	te nescit tangere[37]
	tu frigus amabile
tauris et pecori vago	
	praebes
	fies tu
	me dicente
cavis impositam ilicem saxis	
	loquaces lymphae tuae
	desiliunt

While the kid first appears in the ablative, it is quickly equipped with signs of life and activity. Its forehead swells with horns, an image of fertility and youth whether we understand 'cornibus primis' as 'tips of horns' (Williams) or 'first horns'. It is so full of life that a mere part of its body is the subject of the first active verb ('frons...destinat'). The whole goat then serves as subject of 'inficiet' (6); indeed, it pours its 'red blood' into the 'cold streams'. This blood we feel is also hot, for with his typical economy Horace manages to insinuate three contrasts by means of two pairs: blood/stream, red/[clear], [hot]/cold.[38] The kid, indeed any natural object other than the stream, appears for the last time in the nominative in line 8 ('lascivi suboles[39] gregis'); with this curious renaming we begin to move from the individual

37 The referent of *te* 9 is technically ambiguous, although 'tu frigus amabile...praebes' (10-12) quite clearly refers to the spring. On the basis of this, the present *nescit*, and of course the whole ode, we must refer 'te...tangere' to the spring, although the very possibility of referring it to the goat would neatly represent the fact that the goat's blood will be subsumed into the stream, the living into poetry.

38 'A double antithesis is intended, Horace...indicating the contrast in each case by putting an epithet to only one of the two substantives', Wickham (as above, n. 26), i. pp. 211 f. Before him, Nauck: 'In *geluos* und *rubro* liegt der nicht ganz ausgesprochene Gegensatz: die kalten und klaren mit dem rothen und warmen' (as above, n. 2), i. p. 148.

39 Might Horace have permitted himself the hint of a pun in *suboles*? A verb *suboleo* means 'to give off a slight whiff' (*OLD* 1846). Goats were noted for their strong odour; presumably, a young goat would smell but faintly.

animal to the general, from a particular goat to the entire cycle of life. If the kid appears again at all it is as an overtone (or undertone) of the direct object *te* of line 9 (cf. n. 37). Other animals take its place in lines 11-12: plural bulls and the even less specific 'herd', all indirect objects. In the last strophe we have the spring, the poet, and - to represent the balance of nature - 'the holm-oak planted over the hollowed rocks', a living but immobile creature, planted on inanimate rocks, the recipient of action in the past (see below).

The spring appears first distanced in apposition, even a hymnic distance. It is compared to glass. G. Williams convincingly argues that *splendidior* is not 'more transparent', banal in any event for water, but 'more reflective'.[40] Reflectivity denotes total passivity. A reflecting surface gives back whatever is placed before it. But if the comparative indicates that the water is highly reflective - more indeed than (ancient) glass - it also implies that there are elements of non-reflectivity. It is thus possible for the water to be stained, to take in the blood and to be altered; some degree of revealing lies hidden beneath concealing reflectivity.

Significantly, the first verb the spring governs is passive: while it is the grammatical subject of *donaberis* , it is the recipient of the action.[41] The immobile glass of the first line is first liquified ('gelidos...rivos', 6 f.), and if coldness has any negative valuation in line 6, it is revalued in 'frigus amabile' of line 10.[42] (In lines 6 and 7 adjective and noun are held apart; in line 10 they are placed together.) From this strophe on the stream is alive, as subject of *praebes* (12) and *fies* (13). In the final lines it has achieved not only life - the vivid *desiliunt* (16) - but voice: its waters are downright talkative (15f.), as active in talking as the poet himself ('me dicente', 14).[43]

'Cavis...saxis' requires a comment all its own. It is fitting that at the end of a series in which all animate nature is gradually emptied of life and movement Horace mentions 'rocks', the last natural object other than the water, and describes them as 'hollow' or 'empty'. Hollow rocks are unsubstantial, no rocks at all. Or, as commentators and translators have glossed *cavis* , 'hollowed rocks'. Appropriately, we understand a passive. But who or what is the agent? (Cf. the unexpressed agent of *donaberis* .) Are we to understand that these rocks have been hollowed by the flowing spring? What a mark of the power and active valuation of the spring at the end of

[40] *Tradition* , p. 673 f. R. Heinze finally abandoned Kiessling's *vitro* = 'Krystall' in the seventh edition: 'hier wird nicht die Durchsichtigkeit des Glases...sondern der auf ihm glänzend spielende Lichtreflex verglichen' (as above, n. 31), p. 317. Like Williams, Heinze compares Ap. Rhod. 3.227. Reflection is much less frequent among translators than limpidity, but not unknown. Philip Francis, whom Dr Johnson preferred over other translators of Horace's lyrics, has 'Bandusia, that dost far surpass | The shining Face of polish'd Glass' (op. cit. ii. p. 65), and Herder has 'Silbern und Spiegelhell' (*Herders sammtliche Werke* , ed. B. Suphan, xxvi (Berlin, 1882), p. 220; more recently, Campbell writes 'more glittering than glass' (p. 2), Commager 'gleaming brighter than glass' (p. 322), and K. Quinn 'outglittering glass' (*Latin Explorations. Critical Studies in Roman Literature* [London, 1963], p. 76).

[41] The poet-donor remains unexpressed. Note also the progression of cases of the second person pronoun from dative (*tibi* , 6) to accusative (*te* , 9) to nominative (*tu* , 10).

[42] Cf. Wilson, p. 293, with apt comparisons to 'gelidum nemus' (*Carm.* 1.1.30, 'the programmatic opening ode'), and 'gelidus Digentia rivus' (*Epist.* 1.18.104).

[43] Translations of *loquaces* might also provide interesting insights. Nauck (as above, n. 2, p. 148) adduces Schiller's imitation: 'Und sieh, aus dem Felsen, geschwätzig, schnell, | Springt murmelnd hervor ein lebendiger Quell', 'Die Bürgschaft' (1799), lines 88-9; 'silberhell' (85) an unnoted reflex of 'splendidior vitro'?

this poem if it can be posited as the agent of an action hidden in the adjective *cavis* .

As often, one notes a significant linking of the opening and closing (*O*; *tuae*). The link measures for us the significant change in the relationship between poet and fountain. Granted, the whole poem is an apostrophe of the fountain, yet the opening *O* emphasizes the distance, the fact that the poet 'stands over against' the reflective spring. In the last stanza, fountain and poet have become more closely allied ('me dicente'): indeed, the onomatopoetic effects in the final lines allow us to say that fountain and poet have become one in the poem.

The importance of the poet in the last strophe, and the concomitant claim for poetry, has not gone unnoticed. It lies on the surface. I have argued that the spring has represented poetry all along; that the sacrifice of the kid represents the sacrifice of the living individual that poetry itself demands; and that in return, poetry transmutes individuality and immortalizes impermanent life. The spring - poetry - offers its coolness now as pleasing refreshment to others of the same sort as the sacrificed individual (bulls and the herd). All this in twelve lines. In the last strophe, where commentators have understood Horace to draw attention to the power of his poetry to celebrate and immortalize the Bandusian spring, I understand him to say that his poetry immortalizes the power of poetry itself.

It is characteristic of Horace that this meaning, if present, is distant and evanescent, as if we were looking at it beneath the shimmering water itself. I will have failed completely if argument on the poem devolves to a debate about Horace's pessimism and optimism about the poetic process. Does the sacrifice, the loss negate the victory? Does the immortality of poetry justify the loss of life, the freezing of growth? The distance at which Horace establishes this point suggests only that Horace regarded the objectification of subjective experience - a step necessary for great poetry - with some ambivalence, with at least some sense of loss. The futurity of the sacrifice is a further distancing device; does it also call the power of poetic transformation itself into question?

If we look back through the poem from the end, as it were, not to reread it, but literally, to try to see beneath the chattering waters of the final verses any traces of the blood of the sacrificial goat which stained them in the second strophe, we see nothing, so complete is the transformation of pain and loss into poetry. The water has returned to the purely reflective state it had at the beginning. Now, however, we have more appreciation of the initial comparison 'splendidior vitro': the spring is both like and unlike glass, which, depending on the angle at which one looks at it, either conceals by reflection or reveals by transparency. The phrase - truly a *callida iunctura* - is like the image: it too reveals and conceals. The misinterpretation of most commentators and translators, the construing of it as 'crystal clear' rather than 'reflective', is not simply an error but an unconscious recognition of the depths of the image. Likewise, if there is a 'message' about art in *Odes* 3.13, it is both revealed and concealed by the poem. When we look back, we see only water; its depths are hidden on the surface.

Yale University RALPH HEXTER