verbal play, memory and so on) and the suggestion of continuity derives more from the form of an ordered collection of poems than from any writing in of identifying characteristics. The repitition, for instance, of both Pholoe and Chloris (2, 5) in 3, 15 draws attention to itself ([104]).

These recouplings, which depend on continuity of identity, form in themselves a demonstration of the kind of thing described in the central stanzas of *Odes* 1, 33 : they are, in effect, part of the structure of the *Odes* as a collection (even if one includes here the fourth book) ([105]).

As for Glycera ; she is loved by Horace in 1, 19, but with misgivings (8) and he prays that Venus will fall on him lightly (16). In 1, 30 a Glycera whose love life is flourishing ([106]) is treated to irony (but not bitterness). In 1, 33 a Glycera is leaving (vel sim.) someone else (Albius) and in 3, 19 Horace is in love with her again.

The only thing that prevents us from carrying over Glycera from poem to poem is the supposition that she belongs to or refers to the poetry of Albius and *therefore* not to Horace's. But even if Albius (whether or not he is Tibullus) had written about a Glycera, the position of *Odes* 1, 19 and 1, 30 and the comparative commonness of the name in Horace would make her a Horatian persona as well, and this would be confirmed by 3, 19. By including the other Glycera odes in the collection Horace would be creating an entirely plausible situation in which Glycera, in addition to Albius and the rival he will have had (or is attributed with by Horace) in his poetry, is given an extra former lover : Horace. If Tibullus could create a poetic fiction, why should not Horace add details ?

(104) In *O.* 2, 5 they are ex-loves of Horace, in 3, 15 a mother and daughter of amorous disposition, the daughter involved with Nothus. No contradiction. In *O.* 1, 33 the appearance of Pholoe is affected by Lycoris' company (not but what Cyrus, from the same locus, has already appeared (1, 17) in a not dissimilar role). Also in 2, 5 are Gyges (cf. n. 103 above) and Lalage. The fact that Horace love Lalage in 1, 22 and she is (perhaps : see JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 16) an unripe grape in 2, 5 is hardly much to shy at : note the 'purity' of Horace's love in 1, 22. There remains one awkwardness : Lyde is a musical *meretrix* in 2, 11 and 3, 28, but seems different at 3, 11, 7-12 (or is she again just a *deuium scortum* ? Note the musical element at 3, 11, 1ff). This leaves only Lyce who is unresponsive in 3, 10 and gets her just reward in 4, 13, and Ligurinus, clearly the same character in 4, 1 and 4, 10.

(105) Although overlapping and deviation occur there is a tendency for name usage in each genre to suit decorum. Obviously epic and tragedy have heroic names ; old comedy has fantastic names and real names in a comic mixture, new comedy has more realistic names suggesting a social setting (comedy of manners). Pastoral has what might be called eutopian names (cf. n. 96) : they suit the context, and satire has what might be called dystopic names (they are realistic, even when drawn from Lucilius, and suit the context : the follies and vices of the roman world) ; epigram, Roman elegy and lyric follow new comedy, but transfer the setting to Rome (this entails no change for the female names). Within specific authors one can go further : in the *Aeneid*, for example, many of the 'heroic' names serve an aetiological purpose (the origins of Roman families) which acts as an auxiliary to the main theme.

(106) See QUINN's comm. a.l ...

The *Fons Bandusiae* and the Problem of the Text

Though eternity is merely a concept, the *fons Bandusiae* has in a sense achieved the equality with 'noble springs' predicted for it in Horace, *Odes* III, 13, 13-14. Steele Commager remarked in 1962 that "so familiar is the poem that its true quality tends to be lost in the sentimental echoes it produces ..." (*The Odes of Horace : A Critical Study* [New Haven & London] 323). It may be thought strange that sentimentality and Horace should so often go together at least among English-speaking readers : but, for whatever reason, the ode has indeed been generally admired, even if from time to time sentiment has been confounded by the apparently unashamed reference to animal sacrifice in lines 3-8 ([1]). Attempts to explain and to defend Horace's inclusion of this passage have – needlessly – occupied the attention of many critics, who have seen it as a derogation from his 'humane' temper.

There has been debate too as to the ode's connexions with Greek poetry. Precedents in epigram and hymn are adduced ([2]). Francis Cairns has designated it an anathematikon, though composed with a "small sophistication" that "obscures the fact" (*Horace, Odes III, 13 and III, 23* in *AC* 46 [1977] 523-43 at 543) : not so small, however, as to have prevented scholars prior to Cairns from missing the point. And yet the ode does not really conform to any generic model, and the quest for one, or more, is unhelpful ([3]).

No more enlightening is the claimed establishment of a specific date on which we are to understand the poem to have been composed. Most writers

(1) So much so that David WEST, *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh 1967), p. 129-30 remarked : "So modern taste does not like blood in running water ...The critic must shed his local prejudices ...". This may be true : but the problem has nonetheless continued to occupy the attention of scholars.

(2) Cf. Eduard FRAENKEL, *Horace* (Oxford 1957), p. 202-4 ; N. E. COLLINGE, *The Structure of Horace's Odes* (London 1967), p. 106 ; Gordon WILLIAMS, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968), p. 150.

(3) See, e.g., Jasper GRIFFIN, *Genre and Real Life in Latin Poetry*, in *JRS* 71 (1981), p. 39-49, esp. at 40-42 (though his inferences about 'real life' must be regarded with some scepticism : see my *Pyrrha's Grotto and the Farewell to Love : a Study of Horace, Odes I, 5*, in *AJP* 105 (1984), p. 457-469.

maintain that the day in question is 12 October, just before the Fontinalia, the festival on which, according to Varro, "garlands were thrown into springs and placed around the top of wells" (4). L. and P. Brind'Amour have, by contrast, argued the claim of the Neptunalia on 23 July, asserting that "l'historien de la religion romaine se trouve devant un nouveau document qui lui révèle un rituel ..., un document qui précise la signification de ces obscures Lucaria et Neptunalia de juillet" (*La fontaine de Bandusie, la Canicule, et les Neptunalia* in *Phoenix* 27 [1973] 276-82 at 282). Their confidence has not been shared ; Cairns, for example, reverts to the *communis opinio*, rebutting, in detail, among other things, their view on the breeding habits of goats (*loc. cit.*, 529-30). Shared by both schools of thought is the belief that a Roman reader would have recognised the indirect allusion to one or other of the festivals, and that moreover this insight would somehow have enhanced his appreciation of the ode. It may be so (we can hardly be sure) : but such assistance is surely scant. It might fairly be argued that the Fontinalia and the "obscure" Neptunalia could scarcely have loomed large, if at all, in the consciousness of most Romans. Perhaps a contemporary, if the matter ever occurred to him, would have been no more able than we to decide between the two festivals. In any event, the debate can safely be left in suspense : *nescimus et nesciemus.*

The ode, too, is widely held to be a product of Horace's love of the countryside, as opposed to his urban side. This *rusticitas Horatiana* is largely, if not entirely, a figment of the modern mind, in which the poet's Sabine farm has achieved a quasi-mythical status. The proponents of the view are, one assumes, for the most part no more authentic countrymen than was Horace himself. The belief that "his personality had room for the town- and as well as the country-mouse," as Niall Rudd has quaintly expressed it, adapting a well-known Horatian contrast, is an unjustified biographical inference (5). There is an audacity in those who not only construct a personality for Horace out of his poems but then proceed to cleave it in twain. The urban and rustic Horaces have evolved out of the same texts that they are then called upon to illumine : a circularity of thinking no less dangerous because so often repeated. Not that there is anything especially countrified in *Odes* III, 13 ; its perspectives are wholly textual.

(4) H. H. SCULLARD, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (London 1981), p. 192.

(5) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. II, ed. E. J. KENNEY and W. V. CLAUSEN (Cambridge 1982), p. 394.

A high level of verbal specificity appears to establish itself in the first two lines : *O fons Bandusiae, splendidior uitro / dulci digne mero non sine floribus.* The introductory *o*, according to Gordon Williams, "signifies an address of emotional intensity : it is normal in hymnic addresses to the gods ..." (*The Third Book of Horace's Odes, edited with a Running Commentary...* [Oxford 1969] 88). It is, therefore, seen as, in a way, raising what might be termed the social standing of the *fons* in a manner that a simple vocative could not. Elsewhere, Williams has dismissed the notion that Horace is writing about "a real spring", no doubt quite correctly (*Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* [Oxford 1968] 673) ; but even if he had been, the identity and whereabouts of this *fons* would have been no better known to Horace's first readers than to ourselves, nor would their reading of the text have been any more enhanced (6). The sound of the name Bandusia has surely an unheroic ring to it. Not that topography is at all relevant in any case, save to extreme romantics (7). Pseudo-Acro felt constrained to gloss : "Bandusia enim Sabinensis agri regio est, in qua Horati ager fuit" (Keller 270) ; but we do not need Williams's warning not to follow through such naive inferences. Suffice it that Bandusia's spring is *ignobilis*, as line 13, no less than the name of the area, tells us.

Springs may be thought to bring a sparkle to the mind's eye. The *fons Bandusiae* is brighter than usual. The comparison between its waters and *uitrum* is more telling than we might suppose. *Vitrum purum*, clear, translucent glass, to which shining water might properly be compared, was in the age of Augustus a rare luxury, even of recent invention, so that not only is the appearance of water evoked, but also its value (8). It gleams and sparkles as *splendidior* implies, but it is also of greater value than the finest glass that adorns a rich man's table (and *splendidus* carries this meaning too) (9). However humble and provincial the *fons*, its waters are costly.

(6) The danger of and flaws in such speculations have been well brought out by R. F. THOMAS, *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry : The Ethnographical Tradition* (*PCPS* Suppl. 7, 1982), p. 8-27, esp. at 8, 17-18.

(7) Such as Gilbert HIGHET, *Poets in a Landscape* (London 1957), p. 130-2.

(8) On *uitrum purum*, see Earle R. CALEY, *Analyses of Ancient Glasses 1790-1957 : A Comprehensive Survey* (*Corning Museum of Glass Monog.* 1 [New York 1962], p. 94-5 ; on glass-making in the Augustan era, C. ISINGS, *Roman Glass from Dated Finds* (*Archaeologia Traiectina* 2 [Groningen/Djakarta 1957]) p. 4, 6, and P. FOSSING, *Glass Vessels before Glass Blowing* (Copenhagen 1940), p. 2.

(9) For *splendidus* cf. *OLD* s.v., p. 1807 (on its application to artefacts, section 2 (a)). From its connexion with value arose its use as a title of honour or indication of rank (section 4) : compare the English 'esteemed'.

It is the mention of *uitrum* that controls the second line. Contrary to the universal assumption of critics, Horace does not say that he proposes to offer the *fons* wine and flowers. Rather their verbal presence develops directly out of the preceding comparison in the following way : "O spring ... *splendidior uitro* and ‹because you are like the most precious glass› fit to receive ‹like it› the best wine" – and, when wine enters the scene, flowers follow, suggestive of garlands that might be worn at a banquet during which *dulce merum* – sweet wine without any admixture of water – would be served in *uitrum*. The litotes *non sine* is intensive in its effect : "yes, and plenty of garlands as well". The *fons* is, therefore, first likened to glass and then addressed as if it were glass. It is a valued and valuable object, an *objet de luxe*, however ignoble.

What the spring is to receive, it appears, is a kid : but not in July or October. It is to be given in an unspecified futurity : *cras donaberis haedo / cui frons turgida cornibus / primis et uenerem et proelia destinat ; / frustra : nam gelidos inficiet tibi / rubro sanguine riuos / lasciui suboles gregis* (4-9). *Cras*, as far as the ode is concerned, never comes ; it is an unwarrantable step to treat the futures (*donaberis, inficiet*) as if they are somehow going to become presents. If we may borrow (without endorsing) J. L. Austin's terminology, in the world of a poem a performative statement is never performed, any more than a constative statement is either true or false. Tomorrow is always tomorrow. This is sometimes forgotten. Even critics who reject as misplaced the distaste of their animal-loving predecessors still manifest a lingering disquiet that "the deeply humane poet" (to quote Eduard Fraenkel) ([10]) should threaten or vow a blood-sacrifice on the morrow. But this is to envisage the events of *cras* as in some way a historical act, by which Horace will abandon his *humanitas* to wield a slaughtering knife – an unpalatable vision that may, at some deep level, linger behind Williams's designation of the lines as "macabre" (*Tradition and Originality* 151). Much anxiety and special pleading is avoided if we bear in mind that this sacrifice is to take place *cras*, and that *cras* is just as much in the future in our own time as it was when the ode was written.

But, for some reason, the *fons* is associated with the idea of sacrifice. We are entitled to consider why this should be without feeling it at the same time obligatory to seek a means of acquitting Horace of an act of wanton

(10) FRAENKEL, *op. cit.*, p. 203. Horace's reputation for *humanitas* (one presumes in comparison with other Roman poets of his time), which has been for long a commonplace, more particularly in the English-speaking world, seems hard to explain and to defend.

brutality ([11]). Antitheses may help us. Light suggests darkness, metaphors for life and death. In Epicurean terms, banquets prompt us to meditate on the transience of life. The word *fons* itself means "origin" or "source" as much as "spring ‹of water›," and what is originary leads to thoughts of what is final. At a simple, associative level it might be held that a sacrifice (an imposed death) is predicted because it is inevitable (imposed) that light ends in darkness and life in decease, that, within the conditions of everyday causality, beginnings have endings. Wine, too, is evocative of blood. So the death, the outpouring of blood from the *haedus* will be offered to the *fons* when the time comes (which it never, and always, does). Not unfittingly : for water stands for death ([12]).

It never and always does : for kid and spring are text, script. Text is read with the intention of compelling a meaning to emerge from it, but its flowing has no past, present or future. What is textualised is all prehistory, embracing what lies already before it and what lies already after it ; it comprises and is comprised by all those manifold readings from which it is formed in itself, as well as from those readings to which it is to be subjected. No word of text has a present that can be realised ; it comes to us laden with its only partly excavated past – and gravid with a future that will never give birth. Realism, which would here endow spring and kid with some kind of historical, realisable reference, is merely a means of seeking escape from a textuality that provides no closure to its own play.

Textuality and sexuality are never far apart : not because authors deliberately 'choose' the vocabulary of 'eros', but rather because humans are sexual beings and their language cannot escape the consequences of that fact. The textual kid of Horace's ode is a sexual creature that has not yet fulfilled its potential ; its horns are still budding (*turgida cornibus / primis*, 4-5). Its course of life is fixed and ordained by this potentiality ; the *frons* "*et uenerem et proelia destinat*" (5) ([13]). Williams finds the nouns "mock-heroic" (*Com-*

(11) For a defence on the grounds of the concinnity of Horace's approach with contemporary sentiment, see J. P. SYNDIKUS, *Die Lyrik des Horaz : eine Interpretation der Oden* (Darmstadt 1972-3), I, p. 140-1. The comment by Niall RUDD, *op. cit.*, p. 383 is unhelpfully facetious : "The ode offers a subtle blend of realism and pathos. To call it callous is unnecessarily squeamish, unless one happens to be a vegetarian".

(12) The most obvious mythological parallel – recounted in Apollonius' *Argonautica* among other epics – was the death of Hylas. On water and death in Horace, see D. W. T. VESSEY, *Horace's Archytas Ode : a Reconsideration* in *Živa Antika* 16 (1976), p. 73-87.

(13) The implication of lines 4-5 was correctly explained by James HENRY, *Aeneidea or Critical, Exegetical and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneis* ... IV (Dublin 1889), p. 107-8, in comparison with *Aeneid* 10, 725.

mentary 150) – but the mockery lies principally in the sport that sacrifice is going to have at the expense of nature, in the envisaged cheating by death of the particular end or purpose for which the kid exists ; its designation, its fixing for amorous battles is to be cancelled by the arbitrary demand of the spring ; *fons* will destroy *frons*. For, if it grew to maturity, the kid would become a fighter, with love as the prize ; and beneath the phrase lies the whole rhetoric of sex as warfare. But if the death of the kid is always tomorrow, so too is its erotic/military destiny. One futurity annuls the other, and there is no present. The burgeoning horns are a waste, utterly wasteful. The word *frustra* that follows (6) – its "delicacy ... is not easily forgotten", says Fraenkel ([14]) – is not here pathetic, but has an illusionarily factual character. It might be rendered "What a waste of effort ! For ...", rather than "What a needless tragedy ! That ..." The second interpretation misreads the explanatory force of *nam*. It is a desire on the part of critics, not present in the Latin, to read pathos into the text that has led to the false weighting of *frustra* as a comment on mortality rather than an expression of the idea of waste, which follows from the concept of value contained in *uitrum*.

The sexuality of the kid emerges again in the lines that follow : *nam gelidos inficiet tibi / rubro sanguine riuos / lasciui suboles gregis* (6-8). *Lasciuus* is not "playful", as Williams renders it (*Tradition and Originality* 149), but rather "free from restraint in sexual matters" (*OLD* s.v. 1004, 4) : a notorious attribute of goats. The word *suboles*, an archaism according to Cicero (*de Orat.* III, 153, 2), glances towards that continuity of procreation – "the supply of offspring needed to maintain the race" (*OLD* s.v. 1884, 2 (c)) – that stretches back and forwards. *Lasciuia* leads to progeny, but death here intervenes, breaking the chain. The chill of the spring is to be stained by the warm blood of the kid. This coldness brings to mind sexual frigidity, even sexlessness, which prevents that shedding of blood that occurs when virginity is lost. The pattern is reversed : the kid, desexualised by death, bleeds into Bandusia's chilly waters, temporarily staining, or tainting (*inficere : OLD* 898, 2, 4) them (just as wine enters a glass, so *ruber sanguis* is poured into the spring), and the coldness of wasted sexuality, the inversion of value, passes from the *fons* to its victim. The waters remain *gelidi*, icy, devoid of warming passion. Death is the freezing end of *lasciuia*, the effusion of blood is in this instance wholly sterile.

For the *fons Bandusiae* is always cool, even during the Dogdays : *te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae / nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile / fessis uomere tauris / praebere et pecori uago* (9-12). This is the time when, according to Hesiod (*Works and Days* 586-7) and to Alcaeus (347 Voigt), the lusts of women are at their strongest, while men are enervated. The words *atrox hora* are themselves suggestive of death, but, in contrast, *flagrantis* hints at the burning force of sexual ardour as well as at the seasonal heat of midsummer ([15]). The *fons* is unaffected by any of them ; the spring is the bringer of death, while itself exempt from it, the queller of *lasciuia*, while itself immune, and a relief from fierce Sirius. The *atrox hora* does not know how (*nescit*) to touch (*tangere*) the *fons* ; *tangere* can have an emotional or a sexual import (*OLD* s.v. 1905, 4, 8 ; J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* [London] 1982, 185-6) ; the spring, however, remains untouched, unseduced, its *frigus* being 'lovely' (*amabile*) to animals tired by work and wandering. That *amabilis* (allegedly a prosaic word) suggests *amor* is manifest, and *frigus* may contain the sense "lacking sexual desire", so that the two words form a paradox ([16]). The *fons* is to be envisaged as female, and it is, at every level, frigid. The "hour of the little Bitch" – the time when females are 'on heat' – knows of no means of stirring the spring from this coldness – a coldness that can inspire affection only in animals wearied by labour or aimless wandering. In the waters is an end to passion, procreation, *uenerem et proelia* ; it is the *frigus* of death itself, death not as an *atrox hora*, but as emptiness, bloodlessness, cessation. For the *fons* is here viewed in its relation not to mankind but only to animals : it will bring a premature death to the kid, described as on the brink of sexual maturity, and refreshment to those beasts which, on the hottest days, have no energy for erotic diversions.

Heat and cold, then, in the first three stanzas exchange their metaphoric valencies between life and death. Wine, blood and the Dog-Star are set against the spring with its icy water. Though the spring delights the weary animals, it is still to receive the warm lifeblood of the *haedus*. The changing relationship of the words and concepts is reinforced by a nexus of responsions and balances, which sometimes serve to amend and sometimes to

(14) Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

(15) On the Alcaeus passage, see now Anne Pippin Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets : Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London 1983), p. 132-4. For *atrox*, cf. A. Debru, *Le masque de l'atrocité : sens et emploi du mot atrox en latin* in *RPh* 57 (1983), p. 271-83 at 272-5 with n. 24. Verbs relating to fire and burning were of course common metaphors for expressing sexual desires : for *flagrare*, see *OLD* s.v., p. 709, 3 (b).

(16) For *frigus* cf. R. Pichon, *Index Verborum Amatoriorum* (Hildesheim 1966) (= *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores* [Paris 1902]), p. 156 on *frigidus*. Though the noun seems not to be attested in the meaning of (female) sexual frigidity, it is used of (male) impotence at, e.g., Petronius, *Sat.* 129, 7. For *frigus* as the chill of death, see Lewis and Short, *s.v.* B (3) ; *OLD* s.v., p. 736, 4 (a).

cancel each other. The kid, with its *frons turgida cornibus*, finds its parallel in the *fessis uomere tauris* and the *pecus uagum* of 11-12 : promise against weariness, and the predestination suggested by *destinare* reflected in the aimlessness of the epithet *uagus*. The phrase *et venerem et proelia* finds its antinomy in *frigus amabile* : assertive desire against mere welcome coolness. *Gelidos ... riuos, flagrantis ... Caniculae* and *frigus amabile* form a contrasting chain. The verb *donaberis* (3) is echoed by *praebes* (12). The *lasciua grex* of 8 is recalled by *pecori uago* at the end of the next stanza ([17]). *Cras*, as a temporal term, responds with *atrox hora* (futurity as against nature's recurrent cycle). *Frustra* may be said to be linked, in its negating aspect, both to *nescit* and to *frigus*. What is notable about these interrelationships is that they are, to a great extent, resistant to precise definition. They shift and move within the text, leaving their traces upon each other in a way that defies interpretative reduction. Words that seem to have specificity become less distinct through semantic associations and agglutinative connexions.

For the sexual theme is only one strand. Lines 9 to 12 bring to mind topoi from pastoral poetry and, more especially, from Virgilian pastoral ([18]). By contrast, the description of the kid recalls in some fashion the subject-matter of epic ([19]). Bandusia's spring is accordingly accommodated within a literary, indeed a generic landscape, which embodies the post-Callimachean comparison between greater and lesser kinds of poetic composition. This is not unfitting, for the *fons* is related throughout the ode to poetic composition, culminating in the allusion to *nobilium ... fontium* in line 13 : that is to the springs of myth, like Arethusa, Castalia and Pirene, from which great poets

(17) For *uagus* as descriptive of the waywardness of lovers, see *OLD* s.v., p. 2005, 8 (b).

(18) In what follows one bears in mind that the terms 'pastoral' and 'bucolic' should not be regarded as genre-classifications in antiquity (cf. D. M. HALPERIN, *Before Pastoral : Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* [New Haven & London 1983] esp., p. 1 ff., 193 ff.), bucolic being a part of epos : but, after Virgil at least, its themes – which became in a sense normative through his work – were identifiable and associated with poetry written under the inspiration of a 'lighter' Muse. For passages in Virgil's *Eclogues* relevant to Horace's lines and showing their associative import, see I, 39, 52 ; II, 66-7 ; III, 111 ; V. 24-6, 45-7 ; VII, 11-13, 45-9, 51-2 ; VIII, 14-15, 85-8 ; IX, 19-20. The *haedus* itself might be thought to be a creature of pastoral too : but its envisaged future role as lover and *proeliator* is alien to the spirit of that tranquil world.

(19) *Proelia* is of course used in erotic contexts : see *OLD* s.v., p. 1474, 3 (b). The intimate connexion between sexual love and war in the epic tradition may be said to go back to the *Iliad* and pass through Apollonius Rhodius to Virgil, who – to the surprise of some – invokes Erato at *Aeneid* VII, 38, when he begins his account of the war in Italy that follows from Aeneas' betrothal to Lavinia. Blood staining water recalls an epic topos, found in many descriptions of battles fought near rivers.

had quaffed creative draughts. But Bandusia's *fons* seems more amenable to the lesser, pastoral/bucolic theme than to epic. This is in part predicated by its 'humble', rustic nature, its lack of aristocratic breeding (*nobilitas*). Motif often stands for genre or type : but pastoral/bucolic here equally represents all the 'smaller', Callimachean kinds, including lyric itself ([20]).

The kid, in so far as it embodies, potentially, themes with an heroic cast, is sacrificed to the *fons Bandusiae*, marking its waters with blood, rubricating it with a message of waste and empty aspiration : the inspiration of this 'ignoble' spring does not extend to the grandeur of epos. Both *frons* and *cornua* were parts of a book-roll (*liber*) ([21]) and the death of the kid – its blood staining the *gelidos riuos*, inscribing them briefly with evidence of its lost future – would be no less the death of poetic over-reaching in epic vein, a kind of *recusatio* under the veil of metaphor. The water of the *fons* is left for toiling bulls and nomadic flocks (even the articulacy of bucolic man is absent), but, as our discussion has revealed, this fact is not presented without regret. Epic is not so much renounced as deferred, while the *frigus amabile* of bucolic and lyric, drawn from the Bandusian spring, is provisionally admitted as an escape, a refuge from demands that burn and exhaust.

It is in these terms that the last stanza forms a completion of the ode, though it is not an everlasting closure : *fies nobilium tu quoque fontium, / me dicente cauis impositam ilicem / saxis, unde loquaces / lymphae desiliunt tuae* (13-16). Commentators have usually been much concerned with the supposed visual or pictorial effect of the lines, or with their sound as suggesting their sense ([22]). Other facets are easily overlooked, for the pictures that have been elaborated are produced by the commentators' own imagination rather the words of the text. The comparison between the Bandusian spring and the *nobiles fontes* is a restatement of that between the 'lesser' and 'greater' genres, for epic is above all *nobilis*, 'well-born', aristocratic, whereas pastoral and even lyric are without noble ancestry ([23]). The value of the *fons*, metaphori-

(20) "Landscape in pastoral is always inhabited", as R. COLEMAN has noted (*Vergil : Eclogues* [Cambridge 1977], p. 71) : but Horace here excludes all human inhabitants. This is in keeping with the ignoble, indeed marginal status of the *fons Bandusiae* save in respect to his 'ennoblement' of it.

(21) For *frons*, see *OLD* s.v., p. 738, 8 (b) ; *cornua*, *OLD* s.v., p. 446, 7 (d).

(22) See, out of many exx., Dieter ESSER, *Untersuchungen zu den Odenschlüssen bei Horaz* (*Beiträge zur klass. Phil.* 77 [Meisenheim-am-Glan 1976]), p. 122.

(23) For *nobilis*, cf. *OLD* s.v., p. 1183, 7 (b) ; HORACE, *AP* 259 (of Accius). The use of the words *ignobile carmen* at VIRGIL, *Eclogue* IX, 38 is worth noting, as is his assertion that the *Georgics* were the product of *ignobile otium* (*Georg.* IV, 564).

cally asserted in the first stanza, is here raised as a prediction, its limits defined. The verb *dicere* is appropriate to the *fons* as the subject of this ode, as opposed, say, to *canere* for something 'grander' ([24]). The *ilex* is again suggestive of pastoral, of the *uita umbratilis* of shepherds and other humble bards, and it is set above – masking – the 'hollow rocks', places of retreat and withdrawal ([25]). The epithet *loquax*, too, implies the casual, almost gossipy style of the lesser genres. In no other place is it applied to water (*OLD* s.v. 1043). The *lymphae* that 'leap down' ([26]) from this spring could bring inspiration only of a type suitable for those who deal in 'smaller', unpretentious themes. It is death for other books.

The poem does not solve the *aporia* of how words may be deemed to give the *fons Bandusiae* equality with noble springs. The equality is in a sense inherent in the words, a product of the act of textualisation, and certainly not in the *fons* itself. Its immortality, the enhancement of its value, is wholly textual. And yet the death of the kid – which is also a future event – must in the same way and in the same terms be immortalised, for the same collocation of words predicts it (*donaberis ... fies*). The poem cannot solve the *aporia* of value, of the hierarchy of genres, of sexuality that its words raise. The solution must be deferred, like the sacrifice and the immortality, into a tomorrow that is always tomorrow. For how are we to distinguish between the future in which the *fons Bandusiae* is to become *nobilis* and the future in which the kid will be sacrificed ? Neither future can ever be attained, for both are always already beyond and ahead of any reading of the text. The spring of Bandusia indeed still lives with the poem, and its status has accordingly been raised, though conditionally, to that of the *nobiles fontes*, but its equalisation with them, like the equalisation of epic and pastoral or lyric, in common with any contingency based on a present or future in a text, lies beyond our attainment, the subject of an infinite and indefinite postponement.

King's College London. D. W. Thomson VESSEY.

(24) On these two verbs, see the short treatment by J. K. NEWMAN, *De verbis 'canere' et 'dicere' eorumque apud poetas Latinos usu ...*, in *Latinitas* 13 (1965), p. 85-106. *Dicente* here attunes with Horace's policy of avoiding implications of grandeur in this ode.

(25) We may recall the *ilex* of VIRGIL, *Eclogue* VII, 1. The *caua saxa* are suggestive of those *antra* which stand as sources of poetic inspiration, as well as of pastoral shelter.

(26) Horace's use of *desilio* here of an inanimate object may well be more original than it seems to modern readers : cf. *OLD* s.v., p. 526 (b). Some personification of the waters is implied.

Conubium in the *Aeneid*

Marriage is a theme of the greatest importance in the *Aeneid*. The fall of Troy is made all the more appalling for Aeneas by his personal loss of Creusa as he escapes with his father and son. In Africa he is nearly diverted from the path of destiny when the unholy alliance of Juno and Venus attacks him through the attractions of Dido, who is herself inspired to abandon her sacred pledge to her deceased husband. The subsequent promise of an Italian bride is the cause of a war which forces the depleted and exhausted Trojans to fight against a second Achilles to gain a foothold in Italy. The focus is naturally on the troubles of the hero, but Aeneas' problems are also, more or less, those of his followers, the seed of the future race of Rome. *Tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*

The general theme of marriage has, however, received less attention from critics than individual passages, and the Dido episode in particular ([1]). This study will concentrate on the word and concept *conubium* and the overtones which, as a current legal notion, it had for the ancient Roman reader. The word occurs in fourteen places in the *Aeneid* (according to extant ancient texts and most modern ones) ([2]), and is distributed fairly evenly over the whole work, appearing eight times in the first half and six times in the second half, and in six of the twelve books ; the first use is found within the first hundred lines of Book 1 (line 73), and the last within the last hundred and fifty lines of Book 12 (line 821). Hitherto the word's anomalous prosody in Vergil has given it some prominence, but its possible thematic functions have been neglected, and it seems likely that Vergil's ancient readers were more open than modern ones to the possibility that the poet alludes to and exploits

(1) Note however the approaches of A. M. GUILLEMIN, *L'Unité de l'œuvre Vergilienne* in *REL* 26 (1948), p. 198 ff. ; J. BEAUJEU, *Le mariage d'Énée et de Didon* in *Revue du Nord* 36 (1954), p. 115-119 ; G. W. WILLIAMS, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968), p. 373 ff., and *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (Yale 1983), p. 125.

(2) There is some uncertainty about 4, 126, which is discussed below, and 7, 555, where *conubia* is read, according to Ribbeck, by the *Mentelianus prior* and certain inferior manuscripts, from which it entered Fabricius' edition of Servius' commentary.

1979

ILL record updated to IN PROCESS
Record 1 of 30

ILL pe Record 26 of 30
CAN YOU SUPPLY ? YES NO COND FUTUREDATE
:ILL: 9551394 :Borrower: VZS :ReqDate: 20010716 :NeedBefore: 20010815
:Status: IN PROCESS 20010724 :RecDate: :RenewalReq:
:OCLC: 5900307 :Source: OCLCILL :DueDate: :NewDueDate:
:Lender: NAM,NAM,WCM,*BMC,LFM
:CALLNO:
:TITLE: Studies in Latin literature and Roman history /
:IMPRINT: Bruxelles : Latomus, 1979-<2000 >
:SERIES: Collection Latomus ; v. 164, etc.
:ARTICLE: Vessey, DWT; The Fons Bandusiae and the problem of the text
:VOL: 4 :NO: :DATE: 1986 :PAGES: 383-92
:VERIFIED: OCLC
:PATRON: Curley, Dan DEPT: classics STATUS:fac

PA 6011 S86

:SHIP TO: ILL
Skidmore College Library
815 No.Broadway
Saratoga Springs
NY
12866

:BILL TO: Same
:SHIP VIA: Fastest at no chg. :MAXCOST: $0 IFM :COPYRT COMPLIANCE: CCL
:FAX: (518)580-5540 *** ARIEL ADDRESS 141.222.170.254
:E-MAIL: ILLDESK@skidmore.edu
:BORROWING NOTES: SUNY/OCLC Deposit Account# w/ UMI:D#800108 Oberlin Grp. Mem/CANNOT PAY INVOICE WITHOUT COPY OF REQUEST We do not charge for ILL services. Please reciprocate.
:LENDING CHARGES: :SHIPPED: :SHIP INSURANCE:
:LENDING RESTRICTIONS:
:LENDING NOTES:
:RETURN TO:
:RETURN VIA: