Dithyrambic Iambics: *Epode* 9 and its General(s') Con*fusion*[*]

'Dionysus is not a useful god who helps weave or knot things together,

but a god who loosens and unties.'

Calasso (1993) 45.

Recent revaluations of Dionysiac themes in the poetry of Horace have apparently left out the world of the *Epodes*, whose pivotal *carmen*, *Epode* 9, displays the earliest literary features of what has been properly recognised in the *Odes* as Horace's 'Bacchic/Dionysiac Poetics'.[1] The absence of such readings of *Epode* 9 is all the more striking when one considers the poem's anticipation of *Ode* 1.37, whose close relations to Dionysiac dithyrambs were elucidated by Alex Hardie in 1976.[2] Critics from Fraenkel onwards[3] have recognised that the Epode opens with a question (*Epod*. 9.1-4 *quando… bibam?*, 'when… shall I drink?') which will only find its answer towards the end of Horace's first lyric collection (*C*. 1.37.1 *nunc est bibendum, nunc…*, 'Now it's the time to drink, now…'). There, after Octavian's victory over Cleopatra, Horace is finally allowed not only to uncork the precious Caecuban wine (*C*. 1.37.5-6), put aside for this very occasion (*Epod*. 9.1

[1] See Silk (1969), Batinsky (1990-91), Schiesaro (2009), Feldherr (2010).

[2] A. Hardie (1976).

[3] Fraenkel (1957) 159.

repostum), but also to sing a *carmen*, a Pindarising dithyramb, already previewed in the musical concoction of *Epod*. 9.5-6.[4]

In *Ode* 1.37, the mirroring rapport between Cleopatra and Caesar, highlighted by what Feldherr reads as an alternating identification with Dionysus[5] leading up to the final double-reading of *triumpho* (ablative noun or first-person verb?),[6] befits a god defined by his ability to dissolve boundaries and engender confusion.[7] In addition, it evokes the reality of civil war, a zero-sum game which commonly wipes out distinctions between friends and enemies, winners and losers, conquerors and conquered.[8] In *Epode* 9, the (con)fusion of friends and enemies, systemic in this

---

[4] As deplored by Ableitinger-Grünberger (1968), 74 and Watson (2003), 310, the secondary literature for *Epode* 9 is exceptionally vast (see Setaioli (1981), 1716-32 and Kraggerud (1984), 66-128), especially for what concerns the question of whether Horace and Maecenas were present at Actium (see n. 24). Among the studies that have emphasised its sympotic nature, see Bartels (1973), Slater (1976) and Macleod (1982), the latter also proposing a dithyrambic influence. On the political context, Nisbet (1984) and Watson (1987) are the inevitable points of reference. Loupiac (1998) and Cucchiarelli (2006) reunite these two main strains of the poem, the latter emphasising how the only apparent dichotomy between symposium and ship triggers a superimposition of private and public spheres, on which see also Cucchiarelli (2004).

[5] Feldherr (2010) 228-9: the initial 'analogy between the victorious Caesar and Dionysus' is later superseded by the Bacchic features of Cleopatra, whose 'apparent madness is really a form of Dionysiac enlightenment'.

[6] Lowrie (1997) 141 n. 3 notices that '*non* applies to every word in the last line: she is not humble, she is not a woman, it was not a triumph'; see Feldherr (2010) 231 for the *sous rature* reading "I triumph, a not humble woman".

[7] See Segal (1997) 12-3.

[8] See Henderson (1987a), Masters (1992) 40-1.

orientalising civil war, is more prominently foregrounded and explicitly enclosed within a Bacchic sympotic frame which – paradoxically – breaks down barriers and drags its readers into a topsy-turvy world where the enemy is *amicus* (10), Cleopatra's eunuchs are Romans (11) and the Gauls sing the name of Caesar (18).

Both in the central narrative and in its frame, differences and identities are blurred and the past is rewritten: both Hannibal and Scipio are *Africanus* (25) and it is not clear whether lines 29-32 refer to Antony, Hannibal,[9] or to Henderson's 'Hanntonybal'.[10] The Caecuban whose bottle Horace hits (35) might or might not be the one put aside at the beginning of the poem. *Metus hostilis*, whose disappearance was deplored in *Epode* 7, has given way to *metus Caesaris rerum* (37), either fear *for* or fear *of* Caesar, depending on which side one is on: in any case, a fear which can only be dissolved by Bacchus himself (37-8).

In what follows, I analyse first the Bacchic border of *Epode* 9 and secondly the fusions of the *duces* therein enclosed, but I argue for a symbiotic interrelationship between the two, suggesting ways in which frame and content play off one another. Horace's confusion of generals depends on a general confusion of friend-enemy roles which is inherent in the very concept of civil war. And Bacchus plays a key role in this. On one hand, wine-drinking may promote truth-telling, betraying the 'Art of Falsehood'[11] which underpins the poem, but on the other, *ebrietas* also leads to falsification and deceit: Bacchus, whose perversion and corruption is highly contagious,[12] can always be the one to blame.

I. It is but a sweet danger…

---

[9] See Cairns (1983).

[10] Henderson (1987) 111.

[11] Watson (1987).

[12] A. Hardie (1976) 125.

A sympotic *carmen* is one thing,[13] a dithyramb is quite another. *Epode* 9 is both and neither, stepping out almost lyrically[14] from a collection of poems which problematise generic affiliation under the slippery, but all-encompassing label of 'Iambics'.[15] What's more, this poem is positioned both at the mid-point of the *Epodes*,[16] and also at the centre of a recognised 'trilogy of Actium' which takes off from an epodic 'pastiche d'élégie' (*Epode* 1)[17] and lands on a dithyrambic Ode[18] (*Ode* 1.37).

The thematic link between these three poems maps a criss-crossing path between *Epodes* and *Odes*, with significant results for both emperor and poet. The uncertainty inherent in Maecenas' future movement (*Epod*. 1.1 *Ibis*, 'You will go'[19]) is still apparent within the iambic frame (*Epod*. 9.1 *Quando?*, 'When?') only to be dissolved towards the end of the first lyric collection (*C*. 1.37.1 *Nunc*, 'Now'). Octavian's crucial victory in the battle helps the poet transform his hesitancy in accepting the benefits of patronage (*Epod*. 1.31-4), first into a temporary forgetting of the risks of 'Caesarism' (*Epod*. 9.37 *curam metumque Caesaris rerum*, 'the worry and fear for/of Caesar's cause,' 'a vague and perhaps deliberately ambiguous phrase'[20]) and later into a proper participation

---

[13] On *Epode* 9 as a *carmen symposiacum* see Bartels (1973), Slater (1976), Loupiac (1998).

[14] Barchiesi (2001) 157 n. 41.

[15] See Harrison (2001) 165.

[16] But this is also the penultimate movement of Horace's attempt to match the *Eclogues*, see Cucchiarelli (2008) 80 and Goh in this volume.

[17] Loupiac (1998) 251.

[18] A. Hardie (1976).

[19] Not to mention the 'alternative title' invective, which I completely endorse. See Heyworth (1993), Sullivan and Hawkins in this volume.

[20] Mankin (1995) 181.

in the triumph, if Horace's voice is also audible in the 'first person verb' *triumpho* which seals the Cleopatra Ode (*C.* 1.37.32).[21]

Epode 9 is in constant tension between what precedes and follows it. The poem first seems to endorse the idea that *otium* can't be sweet without Maecenas (*Epod.* 1.8 *non dulce, ni tecum simul*, 'not sweet, unless with you,' and *Epod.* 9.3-4 *tecum… beate Maecenas, bibam*, 'with you, happy Maecenas, I shall drink'), but finally admits that Bacchus alone suffices (*Epod.* 9.38 *dulci Lyaeo*, 'sweet Lyaeus'), and in fact Maecenas will play no role in the final, triumphant Ode, where he is replaced by anonymous *sodales* (*C.* 1.37.4).

In narrating the whole battle of Actium in the form of a 'running commentary'[22] from the *Liburna* of Maecenas,[23] Horace demonstrates that he has become the proper Polybius of his Octavian-Scipio,[24] an aim that he seemed very far from achieving in the self-debasing presentation of the first Epode. However, the Archilochean vein of the Iambics[25] still makes him far from

---

[21] See n. 6.

[22] Nisbet (1984) 16.

[23] At least, in the poetic fiction; the question of whether Horace and Maecenas were physically present at Actium has been endlessly debated (see Setaioli (1981) 1716-28 and Watson (2003) 310-12). In my 'negligent' attitude to the issue, I follow Cairns (1983) and Williams (1968) 214: 'not only is the answer to this question hardly even ascertainable… but the answer, even if it is obtainable, has no necessary relevance to the interpretation'. Pasquali (1964) 38-44 and Kraggerud (1984) 67 also stressed the importance of distinguishing reality from poetic fiction.

[24] For the comparison between Octavian and the *Africanus* (*Epod.* 9.25-6), see *infra*, and Goh in this volume.

[25] On the contrast between the Archilochean Horace of *Epode* 9 and the Alcaic Horace of *Ode* 1.37, see Macleod (1982) 374.

suitable (*Epod*. 1.16 *firmus parum*, 'not firm enough') for a proper celebration of the battle, and the programmatic impotence of the whole collection[26] finally expresses itself at its greatest strength:

> capaciores adfer huc, puer, scyphos
>
>> et Chia uina aut Lesbia,
>
> uel quod fluentem nauseam coerceat
>
>> metire nobis Caecubum.
>
> curam metumque Caesaris rerum iuuat
>
>> dulci Lyaeo soluere.
>
> (*Epod*. 9.33-8)

Bring here larger cups, boy, and pour us Chian or Lesbian wine, or rather Caecuban, so that it may dam our flowing nausea. It's a joy to dissolve our worry and fear for Caesar's cause with sweet Lyaeus.

After the apostrophes to Maecenas (4) and posterity (10), Horace tries to summon Triumph (21 and 23), but nausea suppresses his poetic voice and pushes him to summon the servant. The precious Caecuban wine which in the first line had been carefully put aside for a final celebration with Maecenas (1 *repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes* 'the Caecuban that has been put aside for a banquet of celebration') is now to be uncorked and wasted as a medical remedy against sea-sickness (ναυϛea) or else hangover.[27]

---

[26] See Fitzgerald (1988) and Oliensis (1991) and (1998) 68-77; Gowers and Bather in this voume; but *contra* Watson (1995).

[27] *Nausea* is the key-word for understanding the setting of the symposium, in my view left deliberately ambiguous: scholars seem to prefer the location on a ship (*nausea* from Greek ναῦς)

What Horace is suggesting here is a major *nefas*, as his lyric *persona* will later emphasise (*C.* 1.37.5-6 *antehac nefas depromere Caecubum / cellis auitis*, 'before this it was a sacrilege to bring the Caecuban out from our fathers' cellars'), and the excuse that this might be a different Caecuban from the initial one cannot but sound – to say the least – suspicious.[28] Yet, even though uncertainty remains about the two Caecubans, there are at least two banquets to be envisaged in this sympotic frame: the first has a celebratory intent, is postponed to a still uncertain future and is destined to be properly fulfilled only in a different Book and with an Alcaic metre;[29] the other, firmly rooted in the

---

from Bücheler onwards (*Kleine Schriften*, ii Leipzig and Berlin 1927: 320-1) to Fraenkel's view that the term indicates sickness caused by excessive drinking at a normal banquet and that neither Horace nor Maecenas were at Actium (Fraenkel (1957) 71-5). The different positions also need to confront with the comparative *capaciores* (33), either absolute ('sc. *solito*': Watson (2003) 335) or relative, in which case Horace would seem to have already been drinking before calling (back) the servant.

[28] Almost all scholars agree on the 'theory of the two Caecubans,' but see *contra* Williams (1968) 214 and Mankin (1995) 181. It needs to be emphasised that since Horace doesn't specify whether he drinks the Caecuban at the end of *Epode* 9, nothing prevents it from being the same wine of *Ode* 1.37, if the banquet is not set on a ship, but close to the cellars where the precious wine is conserved.

[29] Yet it must be noted, as Andrew Feldherr points out to me, that the poem's sympotic context itself allows Horace to downplay the anxiety of the ending much earlier than *Ode* 1.37: whatever claims the poem may make, its performance suffices on its own to ensure the battle's happy ending.

Archilochean poem, is hastened by the necessity to *Liber*ate[30] the poet from the turmoils of the present, and assimilates him to excessive, and therefore 'incorrect,' sympotic modalities.[31]

The closure of an Actian poem in the name of Bacchus the 'Obliviator' also indicates an 'incorrect' overlapping of two politically opposed dimensions of the same deity: the Alexander-like Dionysus, peacemaker and civilising conqueror of the East, who was assimilated to Octavian-Augustus in his victory over Egypt, and the deity of wine and orgiastic cults, equated with Antony in his unrestrained ebriety.[32] It can only sound decidedly odd that at the close of an allegedly Augustan propagandistic poem Horace should alleviate the fears of the former by invoking the latter. In short, the double symposium matches Bacchus' duality, perhaps unexpectedly in a poem which ultimately reports the final confrontation between two parties. Indeed, *Epode* 9 opens with reference to a mixture of musical modes:

Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes
    uictore laetus Caesare
tecum sub alta – sic Ioui gratum[33] – domo,

---

[30] The common Latin pun on the adjective *liber* and the alternative Latin name of Bacchus (*Liber*) is here rendered with a bilingual pun (38 *Lyaeo soluere*) on the Greek name of Dionysus (*Lyaeus*) and the verb λύειν = *soluere*.

[31] A 'correct' sympotic modality involves moderation in wine driking, in contrast to the barbarian costume of the Thracians (*Ode* 1.27), or to the *ebria* Cleopatra of *Ode* 1.37. According to Cucchiarelli (2006) 41, this is one of the main reasons why we should reject the interpretation of Horace's *fluens nausea* as sickness derived by excessive, i.e. 'incorrect,' drinking.

[32] See Schiesaro (2009) 77 and Cucchiarelli (2012).

[33] I do not accept Shackleton Bailey's emendation *si Ioui gratum*.

beate Maecenas, bibam

sonante mixtum tibiis carmen lyra,

hac Dorium, illis barbarum?

(*Epod*. 9.1-6)

When, happy Maecenas, shall I drink with you, in joy at Caesar's victory, in your high house (for

that's what Jupiter intends), the Caecuban wine that has been put aside for a banquet of celebration,

while the lyre sounds forth a song mixed up with the pipes: a Dorian mode, mingled with their

barbaric notes?

Clearly this music is postponed to the world of the *Odes*, and it must be applied to the future

carmen of line 5, namely *Ode* 1.37, rather than to the Epode. Yet its insertion at the beginning of

this poem, and the shift to a comparable past in the following line (7 *ut nuper*, 'as recently'),

indicates that it also carries significant implications for the present song.

Ode 1.37 is initially presented as a Pindarising victory ode, such as *Olympian* 3, which similarly

opens with a mixture of lyre and flutes (Pind. *Ol*. 3.8-9 φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν

αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν / Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, 'to mix in due measure the

varied strains of the lyre, the sound of pipes, and the setting of words for Ainesidamos' son'). The

Olympian's rhythm, however, is pre-emptively specified as wholly Dorian (*Ol*. 3.5 Δορίῳ…

πεδίλῳ, 'Dorian measure'), whereas Horace's *carmen* vaunts a mixture of Dorian and barbarian-

Phrygian mode, which, in Aristotle's words, 'has the same effect among harmonies as the flute

among instruments – both violently exciting and emotional'.[34] The Phrygian rhythm is specific to

---

[34] Arist. *Pol*. 8.7.8 1342b ἔχει γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν ἡ φρυγιστὶ τῶν ἁρμονιῶν ἥνπερ αὐλὸς

ἐν τοῖς ὀργάνοις· ἄμφω γὰρ ὀργιαστικὰ καὶ παθητικά. On Horace's passage see L. E. Rossi

(2009) 364-5.

the dithyramb,[35] yet the so-called Hyporchema of Pratinas, which has been recognised as a dithyramb by many after Wilamowitz, displays what looks like an innovative mixture of aulody and Δώριος χορεία.[36]

Dithyramb is the key musical label that recurs in interpretations of both *Epode* 9 and *Ode* 1.37, and it is especially apt for two poems which are, in terms of both content and addressees, neither epinicians nor informal sympotic songs. The fact that the earliest mention of the dithyramb goes back to Archilochus further testifies to its likely significance as a musical and thematic model for Horace's Epode.[37] Here the Greek poet explicitly identifies the dithyramb as a song to Dionysus, inspired by proper Dionysiac inebriation:[38]

ὡς Διωνύσοι' ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος

οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνῳ συγκεραυνωθεὶς φρένας

(Arch. fr. 120W)

For I know how to lead off the dithyramb, the pretty tune of Lord Dionysus, with my wits thunderstruck by wine.

There are other connections between *Epode* 9, *Ode* 1.37 and the dithyrambic genre, the firmest of which lies in Horace's composition of two triumph poems rich in Dionysiac elements when seen in the light of the close relation between διθύραμβος and θρίαμβος.[39] Of the 'three general

[35] Aristotle (*Pol*. 8.7.9 1342b) refers the failure of Philoxenus' experiment to compose a dithyramb in the Dorian mode.

[36] Pratinas, fr. 1. Page *ap.* Athen. 14, 617b. See Ieranò (1997) 224.

[37] See Macleod (1982) 372.

[38] See Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 1-7, Mendelsohn (1991-1992) 109.

[39] See Cairns (1972) 95-7, Macleod (1982) 372-3, A. Hardie (1976) 132.

features' singled out by Alex Hardie in his interpretation of *Ode* 1.37 *qua* dithyramb, namely the fact that it is a 'narrative poem,' the 'concentration on the heroic' and the 'motif of Dionysiac drinking,'[40] at least two are also applicable to *Epode* 9. However, it must be noted that neither the Ode nor the Epode belong altogether to the dithyrambic genre: just as Archilochus may have jokingly called 'an informal sympotic song by the name of a genre which belongs to more solemn festivities,'[41] these poems are mainly *carmina symposiaca* marked by a wider afflatus and a delusion of triumphal grandeur vis-à-vis Pindaric victory odes.

Phrygian rhythm and its ἐνθουσιασμός, the dithyr*amb*ic nature of the i*amb*ics,[42] stand in the way of composing an epinician marked by a 'more sedate and manly' Dorian mode,[43] yet at the same time the tutelage of Bacchus invoked by means of the god's appropriate song provides the poet with the conditions necessary to sing about the Princeps for the very first time. *Epode* 9 is thus the earliest, almost embryonic example of Horace's use of a recognizably Bacchic/Dionysiac poetics which has appeared to some to mark his 'political reconciliation to the Augustan regime' in the *Odes*.[44]

---

[40] A. Hardie (1976) 113-4.

[41] Macleod (1982) 372.

[42] Cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 8: 'The syllable –*amb*–… may well mean 'step' or 'movement,' and the three words *iambos, thriambos, dithyrambos* seem to form a series 'one (or two) step, three step, four step'.

[43] Arist. *Pol.* 8.7.10 1342b περὶ δὲ τῆς δωριστὶ πάντες ὁμολογοῦσιν ὡς στασιμωτάτης οὔσης καὶ μάλιστ' ἦθος ἐχούσης ἀνδρεῖον, 'And all agree that the Dorian mode is more sedate and of an especially manly character'.

[44] Batinsky (1990-1991) 362 and 374. Silk (1969) first sees Horace's treatments of Bacchus as arranged in meaningful sequence and considers his Bacchic Odes as a political allegory which matches the poet's gradual assent to the Augustan regime. Schiesaro (2009) expands on this further.

As agent of a temporary oblivion,[45] wine is the only medical and poetic remedy to face the fears

for/of the morrow, whether one reads concern and fear *for* Caesar's deeds, or anxiety and terror *of*

his outstanding results in ~~civil~~ war.[46] This final dual possibility is symptomatic: the sympotic frame

of the first poem to immortalise the battle of Actium is concerned with a series of doubles and

pairings: two symposia, two Caecubans, two Bacchuses, two musical instruments and modes which

broadly recall the overly strict Apollonian-Dionysian polarity that we modern readers struggle to

get rid of. 'Doubling,' inscribed in the duplicity of the word διθύραμβος,[47] is the key-word of this

song, and it carries consistent political meaning.

The Dorian-Phrygian polarity clearly matches the Roman-Egyptian one,[48] emphasising the gulf

between WE (*hac*) and THEM (*illis*). Like the harmonies, these two opposing parties are being

mixed up and confused (*mixtum*) in the present sea battle. However, even though Horace's 'Art of

Falsehood'[49] and his ultimately 'mendacious lyre'[50] (*Epod*. 17.39 *mendaci lyra*) will lend a helping

---

[45] Cf. Feldherr on *Ode* 1.37 (2010) 226: 'it is the wine of forgetfulness, but a forgetfulness that cuts

two ways, implying a forgetting of the troubles of civil wars in the context of the joyous, lyric

present but also a forgetting to forget… telling the story of forgetting always opens the doors to

memory.'

[46] Cf. Schiesaro (2009) 76: 'Much as we are often invited to think that the repressed emotions of

Augustan poetry must inevitably harbour an anti-Augustan message, in poetic, if not in political

terms, it is precisely the ability and willingness to praise the ruler that represents at crucial junctures

the unsayable, the *nefas*, of poetry.'

[47] For the 'philologically impossible derivation,' though popular in antiquity, of *dithyrambos* from

'two-doors,' being the 'song of the god who, having been born a second time, came 'through two

doors,'' see Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 7 and Mendelsohn (1991-1992) 115.

[48] See L. E. Rossi (2009) 364.

[49] See Watson (1987).

hand to construct such polarity, emphasising the otherness (*barbarum*) of the Egyptian enemy, the ghost of unmentionable Antony comes back to haunt this friend-enemy distinction. Civil war barges into the musical performance devoted to the god who dissolves boundaries, blasting the Augustan 'invention of the barbarian,'[51] and confusing the roles and features of these ultimately very similar opponents.

II. …to see History double

The narration of the battle in *Epode* 9 nestles within Bacchus' sympotic, intoxicating frame, which sets in motion a distorted and blurred vision of the events and characters involved. More specifically, the doubles evoked by this frame are paralleled in the narrative section of the poem, while the role of Dionysus is both that of 'undoing' the poet's worries, and of 'loosening up' the dichotomies of the poem as a whole.

This Bacchic frame of dissolution arguably helps readers deal with the poem's inconsistencies. Yet the allegedly propagandistic nature of the poem is already undermined by observing 'what these various kinds of poems… have to say to and about each other'.[52] In terms of the structure of the *Epodes*, the only celebratory poem for the Princeps is oddly crammed between the exhalations of the *putida* hag of *Epode* 8 and the stink of *olens* Mevius in *Epode* 10,[53] completely *nausea*ted by the undulation of her sagging breasts on the one side, and Mevius' unstable ship on the other. Moreover, especially in view of an immediate verbal link between the end of *Epode* 9 (38 *soluere*)

---

[50] On which see Johnson (2012) 153-79.

[51] To steal Edith Hall's phrase (1989).

[52] Oliensis (1998) 65.

[53] See Henderson (1987) 115-6; on *Epode* 8, and the gender(s) of this 'hag', see Gowers in this volume.

and the beginning of 10 (1 *soluta*), the 'evil omen' (*Epod*. 10.1 *mala… alite*) under which Mevius'

ship sets sail may also cast a dark shadow on the warships of the previous poem, where the adverb

sinistrorsum (20), opening the second half of the Epode, cries for attention with 'sinister' echoes

while critics struggle to make sense of it geographically.[54]

    Stomach-churning disgust/nausea is calmed with Caecuban wine and a Bacchic voice which

helps the poet in composing a celebratory *carmen* for the battle. Yet the civil war of *Epode* 7 is all

but forgotten, and we might also begin to look ahead to the only other poem of the collection

dedicated to civil war, *Epode* 16,[55] where a Barbarian will tread the ashes of Rome (16.11 *barbarus*

heu cineres insistet uictor, 'a barbaric conqueror, alas, will tread on its ashes') and an *eques* will

lash its soil, echoing Horace's celebratory lyre with the clattering hoof of his horse (cf. *Epod*. 9.5

sonante mixtum tibiis carmen lyra and 16.12 *eques sonante uerberabit ungula*).

    In addition to this, at the very centre of Mevius' poem – a happy coincidence for those who read

Epode 10 as a caricature of 9, especially if one thinks that the name Mevius may also bring to mind

an homonymous soldier of Octavian who is supposed to have committed suicide after the unwitting

murder of his own brother at Actium (*Anth*. 460-1)[56] – stands the genitive plural *uictorum* (*Epod*.

10.12 *Graia uictorum manus*), singled out by Henderson in *Ode* 2.1.27 as the ultimate symbol of

the fusion between winners and losers characteristic of the civil wars: ''*VICTORUM, 'THE*

CONQUERORS' = VICTORUM, 'THE CONQUERED'. Here 'the winners' become and are 'the

losers''.[57] The word perfectly captures the tragic irrationality of a civil conflict: it renders precisely

---

[54] See in particular Pelling (1986).

[55] On which see Stocks in this volume; it is worth noticing that Carthage appears in all the Epodes

dedicated to civil war: 7, 9 and 16.

[56] See Woodman (1983) 119 with n. 42 and Mankin (1995) 184.

[57] Henderson (1996) 106 = (1998) 140.

the (con)fusion between two fighting parties which has just been immortalised in the poem dedicated to the battle of Actium.

Towards the centre of *Epode* 9, it is the word *par* at line 23 which stands out as an ambiguous clue for the revelation of civil war in its Augustan guise. Both *Epode* 7 and 16 lament, in properly Sallustian fashion, the disappearance of *metus hostilis* as the first spark of a crisis which is now pushing the city towards her suicidal collapse. In both cases, Horace inserts a list of foreign enemies which have or could have been fought in order to avoid this unnatural and irrational shedding of brotherly blood:

> non, ut superbas inuidae Carthaginis
>> Romanus arces ureret,
> intactus aut Britannus ut descenderet
>> sacra catenatus uia,
> sed ut secundum uota Parthorum sua
>> urbs haec periret dextera?
> neque hic lupis mos nec fuit leonibus
>> numquam nisi in **dispar** feris.
>
> (*Epod*. 7.5-12)

Not so that the Roman could burn the arrogant citadel of jealous Carthage, or so that the unconquered Briton would walk down the Sacred Way in chains, but to ensure that in answer to the Parthians' prayers this city shall perish by its own hand? This is not even the way of wolves or lions: *they* are never ferocious except to other species.

> quam neque finitimi ualuerunt perdere Marsi

> minacis aut Etrusca Porsenae manus,
>
> aemula nec uirtus Capuae nec Spartacus acer
>
> nouisque rebus infidelis Allobrox,
>
> nec fera caerulea domuit Germania pube
>
> parentibusque abominatus Hannibal,
>
> impia perdemus deuoti sanguinis aetas,
>
> ferisque rursus occupabitur solum.
>
> (*Epod*. 16.3-10)

The city which neither its Marsian neighbours managed to destroy, nor the threat of Porsena's Etruscan troops, nor the valour of its rival Capua, nor fierce Spartacus, nor the rebellious and disloyal Allobroges; which wild Germany with its blue-eyed youth never mastered, nor Hannibal, the dread of parents – that city will be destroyed by *us*, an unholy generation whose blood is accursed; and the ground will be taken over once again by savage beasts.

The future envisaged for Rome in *Epode* 16 is that of a return to wild nature, with ferocious beasts occupying the soil of the city which only in the Augustan age would have been made eternal.[58] Yet the core of *Epode* 7 had specified quite explicitly that such beasts should be regarded as far less savage than the Romans of the civil wars, since *they* at least attack only the *dispar[es]* species, those who are dissimilar to them.

Such was the case before the civil wars, but things have changed now, and Romans do indeed attack their *pares*. It is with these two Epodes in mind that we shall address a similar, but shorter list of pre-civil wars *exempla* encapsulated in *Epode* 9:

---

[58] See Labate (1991) 170-1 and Stocks in this volume.

io Triumphe, nec Iugurthino **parem**

    bello reportasti ducem,

neque Africanum, cui super Carthaginem

    uirtus sepulcrum condidit.

(*Epod*. 9.23-6)

Hail, Triumph! You did not bring back such a general from the Juguthine War, nor was Africanus such, whose valour built a tomb over Carthage.

Contrary to the other lists, these past *exempla* apparently shed positive light on the present: Octavian is the general in question who will soon be brought back by Triumph, a general greater (23 *nec... parem*) in his victory than both Marius and Scipio Africanus. Horace's aim is clearly to declare the superiority of the present *dux* but to argue the toss about past ones: therefore we should take it for granted that the *dux* of line 24 must be Marius, all the more since the prefix *re-* of the verb *reportare* (comparable to the German *zurück-*[59]) clearly indicates the re-patriation of the general and his troops. The war against Jugurtha, which saw for the first time a reaction to that *superbia* which had become widespread in the moral crisis following the destruction of Carthage,[60] would be the most appropriate example to mediate the comparison between the Punic Wars and Actium,[61] both in terms of geography and kinship, since Caesar was *C. Marius sanguine coniunctissimus*.[62]

---

[59] Kraggerud (1984) 102.

[60] Sall. *BJ* 5.1 *tunc primum superbiae nobilitatis obuiam itum est*.

[61] Kraggerud (1984) 103-4: 'Jugurtha war nicht nur ein hervorrangender Gegner, sondern der Krieg mit ihm war auch innerlich mit dem moralischen Verfall Roms verknüpft. Marius brachte den

And yet the lines sound distinctly odd when set against the pessimistic stance on the present crisis as a direct consequence of the disappearance of *metus hostilis* in *Epodes* 7 and 16, especially since Horace here specifically brings to mind the father of the 'theory of *metus hostilis*'[63] through explicit mention of his *Bellum Iugurthinum* (23-4 *Iugurthino… bello*).[64] So it is not unthinkable that we might hear through these lines an echo of the meaning 'to bring home (spoils) from war' in Horace's use of the verb *reportare* (*OLD* s.v. 3), a meaning which would suddenly turn the *dux* of line 24 into Jugurtha, 'who was not "equal" to Antony either as a general or, what is especially cogent, in nationality'.[65]

Par, the term chosen for 'equal,' would directly connect the passage to the unnatural brutality of the civil war Romans as depicted in *Epode* 7, in comparison to wolves and lions, *nisi in dispar feris*. Sallust himself had already presented the *Bellum Iugurthinum* as a 'debased version'[66] of the wars against Carthage, whose destruction had marked the end of *metus hostilis* and the beginning of moral decline for both Rome and Numidia.[67] The *uirtus* of Marius was nothing but a spark of hope in the context of an irremediable and deep-rooted decay. Yet, although the crisis had already

---

wenig ehrenvollen, langwierigen Krieg zum Abschluss; laut Sallust trug er damit dazu bei, die Übermut (*superbia*) der Nobilität zurückzuschlagen.'

[62] Vell. Pat. 2.41.2 on the young Marius, Caesar's cousin.

[63] Also called 'Sallust's Theorem' or the principle of 'Negative Association': see Wood (1995), Evrigenis (2008).

[64] Kraggerud (1984) 103: 'Mit *Iugurthino...bello* scheint Horaz anzudeuten, dass seine Quelle die Monographie Sallusts war.'

[65] Mankin (1995) 173-4.

[66] Comber – Balmaceda (2009) 25.

[67] Cf. Adherbal's speech to the Senate at *BJ* 14.10.11, where Jugurtha is presented as a consequence of the peace brought about by the destruction of Carthage.

started, triumph was nonetheless still awarded only in the context of a war against foreign enemies. In the light of these observations, lines 23-4 of *Epode* 9 (*io Triumphe, nec Iugurthino parem / bello reportasti ducem*) offer a different reading, for sure implausible but undoubtedly made available to us: 'Hail Triumph! From the Jugurthine war, you did not bring home from war a commander of the same species'.[68]

Such reading *sous rature* is further confirmed by the preceding lines of the Epode. The same poet who, only two Epodes earlier, had tragically deplored the civil wars, and among them the one against Sextus Pompey, wishes now in *Epode* 9 to celebrate a victory over these unmentionable enemies in exactly the same way (7 *ut nuper*) that the victory over Sextus had been celebrated:

> ut nuper, actus cum freto Neptunius
> > dux fugit ustis nauibus
> minatus urbi uincla, quae detraxerat
> > seruis amicus perfidis.
> (*Epod*. 9.7-10)

That's what we did, not long ago, when the ships of Neptune's general were burnt, and he fled, driven from the sea – the man who had threatened to fasten on the capital the chains he had removed from the treacherous slaves whom he had befriended.

---

[68] Even if one does not accept this perhaps excessively ambiguous reading, it must be noted that the comment that Octavian is not equal to Marius can be considered equally double-edged in the light of Sallust's intertext: as Andrew Feldherr points out to me, Octavian's 'aboveness' signals either the same kind of *superbia* that the Jugurthine war was meant to challenge, or, what is more cogent, 'precisely the claims of superiority that fuel civil conflict'.

The battle of *Actium* is equated here with the chasing (*actus*) of the 'Neptunian leader' from the sea, further reinforced by the parallel with the burning of Sextus' ships at Naulochus and those of Antony at Actium.[69] The intertextual reminiscence of *Epode* 7, where the poet lamented the shedding of Latin blood from Naulochus onwards[70] (*Epod*. 7.3-4 *parumne campis atque Neptuno*[71] *super / fusum est Latini sanguinis*, 'has too little Latin blood been shed on land and sea?') pictures the Mediterranean sea turned into a lake of uncontainable blood[72] and a city forced by the lack of foreign enemies to drive a sword into her own chest. In addition, the 'completely one-sided,'[73] reference to Pompey's 'army of slaves' takes readers back to *Epode* 4, a poem whose conclusive 'relevant moral' pointed to a similar degeneracy on both sides,[74] and further drew on recognisable associations between the picture of *that* military tribune and the biography of *this* poet.[75]

The following line (11 *Romanus eheu – posteri negabitis –*), when read on its own, 'A Roman, alas! Posterity will deny it!,' points towards the internal nature of this conflict, betraying that 'Art of Falsehood' according to which, as Watson puts it, 'no cognizance is taken of the awkward fact

---

[69] Note that only some of Sextus' ships were actually burnt at Naulochus. In addition, Antony too claimed associations with Neptune, see Watson (2003) 320.

[70] I will not treat the difficult and much debated dating of *Epode* 7, for which see Setaioli (1981) 1710-2 and Watson (2003) 266-71, but I share Kraggerud's *Doppelperspektive*, both pre- and post-Actian.

[71] All commentators agree in reading here a reference to Sextus.

[72] *super-fusum* < OLD *s. u. superfundo* 2 'to pour over the brim, spill over'.

[73] Watson (2003) 169-71.

[74] Oliensis (1998) 67: 'What is the point of fighting Pompey's army of slaves if the same rot has invaded our own side?'

[75] Cf. *S.* 1.6.45-8 with Fitzgerald (1998) 182-3; see also Goh, Bather and Hawkins in this volume.

that a triumph could not, strictly speaking, be awarded to the victor in a civil war'.[76] And yet Horace's poetic strategy is once again very subtle, since the sentence goes on, transforming the object of posterity's denial into Antony's submission to an Egyptian woman, and mingling Romans and Barbarians in a tight knot, one that is hard to unravel:

> Romanus eheu – posteri negabitis –
>> emancipatus feminae
> fert uallum et arma miles et spadonibus
>> seruire rugosis potest
> interque signa turpe militaria
>> sol adspicit conopium.
>
> (*Epod*. 9.11-6)

A Roman, alas! (you future generations will refuse to believe it) enslaved to a woman, carries a stake and weapons, and in spite of being a soldier can bear to serve a lot of shrivelled eunuchs, while the sun gazes down on the degenerate mosquito net among the army's standards.

The mention of *spadones* and *conopium* does not suffice here to convey the impression of a real war against Egypt: rather, what we are witnessing is a battle against an egyptianised *Romanus*.[77] Like the military tribune of *Epode* 4, this anonymous character bears some similarities to the poet himself, who, at the close of the collection, will equally hand over full legal ownership of himself to

---

[76] Watson (2003) 316; cf. Watson (1987). Actium was of course technically announced as a foreign war by a revival of the Fetial rite in 32 B.C., a ceremony that Octavian initiated himself in his anxiety to cover the civil nature of the confict: see Dio 50.4.4-5 with Wiedemann (1986).

[77] On Roman eunuchs in the *Epodes*, see Gowers in this volume.

his 'personal Cleopatra,'[78] acting like Plautus' Pistoclarus when confessing Bacchis' complete control over him (Plaut. *Bacch*. 92-3 *mulier, tibi me **emancupo**: / tuo' sum, tibi dedo operam*, 'madam, I surrender myself to you. I'm yours, I'm giving you my attention'; *Epod*. 17.1 *iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae...*, 'All right, all right! I yield to the power of your magic').[79]

Surrender to barbarism is an irredeemable characteristic of these times, where the Apolline sun manages to single out an orientalizing mosquito-net half-hidden among proper Roman military standards. In this confused and confusing climax to a mixed Dorian/Phrygian *carmen* which stages the fusion of Romans and Barbarians, it is not even surprising to witness the apex of the paradox, when charging this way come two thousand Gauls, as disloyal as the Allobroges of *Epode* 16,[80] chanting the name of Caesar:[81]

at huc frementes uerterunt bis mille equos

Galli, canentes Caesarem

(*Epod*. 9.17-8)

But two thousands Gauls have turned their snorting horses in our direction, chanting Caesar's name.

---

[78] Oliensis (1998) 77.

[79] On this passage and the legal metaphor of *emancipatus feminae*, see Brophy (1975).

[80] In *Epode* 16, the mention of the disloyalty of the Allobroges (*Epode* 16.6) seems to allude to the Catilinarian conspiracy ('hidden' behind the *nouae res*), from which they defected (Sall. *BC* 44.1-3; 45.1; 49.1-4; 50.1), but it may also refer to the disloyalty to Caesar in 48 B.C. (Caes. *BC* 3.59-61, see Cavarzere (1992) 222). In *Epode* 9, Horace refers to the defection of the two thousand Galatians of king Amyntas, who went over to Octavian's side just days before the battle of Actium (Serv. *ad A*. 6.612). On infidelity as a common trait of the Gauls, see Caes. *BG* 3.10.3 and 4.5.1.

[81] On this passage, see Goh in this volume.

As final confirmation of this friends/enemies, Romans/Barbarians fusion, the second historical *exemplum* to which the present battle is compared features an historico-geographical puzzle which includes an overlap of Scipios, immediately followed by another geographical puzzle which prompts a superimposition between Hannibal and Antony.

Just as we were unsure whether lines 23-4 referred to Marius or Jugurtha, the next character, the *dux Africanus*, is without doubt a Scipio, but Horace won't say *which* Scipio.[82] Perhaps ironically, given the cogent issue of the enemy's nationality, he chooses to identify him first precisely with that *praenomen*, 'the African,' which stresses his similarity to Hannibal, and then with the obscure clarification that his valour 'built him a tomb over Carthage'. The notion is problematic precisely because no tomb of a Scipio ever existed in Carthage. Nor was the truly African commander buried in Carthage: with much irony inscribed in the ancient oracle Λίβυσσα κρύψει βῶλος Ἀννίβου δέμας ('Libyan/Libyssan earth shall cover the form of Hannibal'),[83] Hannibal was not buried in Libya, but in the utterly remote Libyssa (modern Gebze), on the northern shore of the Sea of Marmara.

Commentators must first decide which of the two 'African Scipios' Horace is referring to. If we opt for Scipio Aemilianus, then the reference may be to the destruction of Carthage (thus Watson's

---

[82] See Goh in this volume. Confusion may have also surrounded Lucretius' reference to a Scipio (more plausibly, as here, Africanus Major) at *DRN* 3.1034 (*Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror*) and Virgil's (probable) reference to the two *Africani* at *A*. 6.842-3 (*geminos, duo fulmina belli, / Scipiadas*). Here, Servius thought that Virgil meant the two Scipios defeated and killed in Spain in 212 B.C., on the basis of Cic. *Balb.* 34, where Cn. and P. Scipiones are apparently called *duo fulmina nostri imperii*, likely a corruption from the more plausible reading *lumina*, see Reid (1890), 78.

[83] Plut. *Flam.* 20.3.

translation, 'whose valour established a tomb over Carthage'[84]), which would have become a sepulchral city like the Rome of *Epode* 16. While Cairns suggested conflating the two *Africani*, as similarly attested in *Ode* 4.8,[85] perhaps the most plausible interpretation is that Horace has in mind the Hannibalic War, and thus Publius Cornelius Scipio, whose 'virtue (demonstrated) over Carthage built him a sepulchral monument'.[86] We might add that *sepulcrum*, occupying the centre of the iambic line, evokes both the Mausoleum of Augustus,[87] under construction as Horace wrote, and the famous Tomb of the Scipios where, ironically enough, Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus was apparently *not* buried. In fact, uncertainty about the date of his death and the place of his burial became the topic of heated debate in antiquity.[88]

Others have proposed[89] that the *sepulcrum* of *Epode* 9 may be identified with the *Annales* of Ennius broadly in the same way as Statius, many years later, refers to Lucan's *Pharsalia* as *Pompeio Sepulchrum* (*Silu*. 2.7.72). If this is the case, then Horace may hint that *Epode* 9 is to be conceived as another *monumentum* such as the famous one of *Ode* 3.30, directing the attention of readers (including Princeps) to the superiority of both Ennius' and his *monumenta* over those massive funeral monuments such as the Tomb of the Scipios and the Mausoleum of Augustus. In

---

[84] Watson (2003) 330.

[85] Cairns (1983) 83-4: 'Horace will naturally not himself have been confused about the historical facts. He simply wanted to adopt a peculiarly Roman way of looking at men of the same family by conflating the pair. But the elder Africanus is the more prominent in Horace's mind.'

[86] I read *super Carthaginem* as dependent on *uirtus*. Cf. Kraggerud (1984) 104, who reads *super Carthagine* and translates 'anlässlich (des Sieges über) Karthago'.

[87] Kraggerud (1984) 106.

[88] Liv. 38.56; Sen. *Ep*. 86.1; Strab. 5, p. 243C. The most probable solution is that Africanus was buried at Liternum but the tomb at Rome had a statue of him, see Briscoe (2008) 197-8.

[89] Since Bentley; see Cairns (1983) 84.

addition to this, the strength of the word *sepulcrum* in this comparison brings death and its levelling nature into the picture, underlining the notion that, after all, both the Tomb of the Scipios and Augustus' Mausoleum are not so different from the tombs of the *plebs* observed by Priapus in Satire 1.8 (10 *hoc miserae plebi stabat commune sepulcrum*, 'here was the common burial-place fixed for pauper folk'). Like the Dionysus of the sympotic frame, death is also a dissolver of boundaries: in the end, all these *duces* will come to share the same underworld seats, where the distinction between *uictus* and *uictor* will be made meaningless, and foreign enemies will also be *pares*, as Propertius stresses for the case of Jugurtha and Marius in his *Elegy* 3.5:

uictor cum uicto pariter miscetur in umbris:

     consule cum Mario, capte Iugurtha, sedes.

 (Prop. 3.5.15-6)

Victor and vanquished meet as equals among the dead: beside consul Marius sits captive Jugurtha in the boat.

When we finally reach the end of the narrative section of this dithyrambic Epode, the distinctions between Romans and Barbarians are already in crisis, and Antony and Hannibal, the Roman and the Carthaginian, now merge into the same character, 'The Enemy':

terra marique uictus hostis punico

   lugubre mutauit sagum,

aut ille centum nobilem Cretam urbibus

   uentis iturus non suis,

exercitatas aut petit Syrtis Noto

   aut fertur incerto mari

(*Epod*. 9.27-32)

Defeated on land and sea, the enemy has put on a cloak of mourning instead of his scarlet one. The man may head to Crete, famous for her hundred cities, though the winds are not in his favour, or he is making for the Syrtes that are buffeted by the South Wind, or else he is carried along over an uncertain sea.

Again, Horace refers to a conquered enemy, but he won't say *which* enemy. Geographical difficulties stand in the way of an identification with Antony: Antony did not 'try to go to Crete,' although it was on the route to Egypt, nor did he come close to the Syrtes, although his stronghold was in Cyrenaica. On the basis of such difficulties, Francis Cairns[90] decides to read in these lines the same *celeres fugae* of Hannibal as those of *Ode* 4.8.15, and he finds confirmation for this view in a passage in Livy (Liv. 33.47) where Hannibal leaves Carthage, towards evening, *uestitu forensi*, a scene which may match his change of dress in these lines of the Epode. Although the description of the conquered general putting off the insignia of command is a well known topos of historiography,[91] *punico* in line 27 already suffices as a hint of ambiguity between the two commanders, or, in Cavarzere's more cautious words, of 'an intentional and ironic pickup of the *Carthaginem* in line 25'.[92]

---

[90] Cairns (1983) 85-93.

[91] See Cavarzere (1992) 179. There might also be a Sallustian allusion: see Sall. *Hist*. fr. 1.87 M: *togam paludamento mutauit*, in reference to Sertorius (although the fragment may indicate precisely the opposite, namely that Sertorius is trading the *toga* for the *paludamentum*).

[92] Cavarzere (1992) 179.

Uncertainty (32 *incerto mari*), both as to the outcome of the battle and the identification of this enemy, finally closes the narrative section of the Epode, and reconnects with its sympotic framing. The unstable sea of the enemy reflects the volatility of fortune, looking backwards to the sinister echoes of *sinistrorsum* and *sepulcrum* and forwards to the ship of 'smelly Mevius'. While this doubt as to who will turn out to be the *uictor* and who the *uictus* of the battle has the effect of entwining Antony's vacillating fortune with Octavian's, the swinging of the ship of 'Hanntonybal'[93] becomes to be associated with Horace's ship, and we are suddenly back in the Dionysiac frame, with Horace crying out for bigger cups of wine.

The Chian wine, the Lesbian, even the untouchable Caecuban are to blame, it seems, for Horace's inability to hide the internal nature of the conflict with Egypt. Dionysus, the god of wine, together with the inebriation he instils, seems to produce the double visions that have haunted and ruined Horace's sympotic poem of celebration: he is possibly present behind the *Galli* (18) chanting Caesar's name – if one is allowed to hear the echo of the Phrygian priests of Cybele (*galli*), all the more so in view of the proximity of the verb *fremere* = βρέμειν (17) applied to their horses – and its double-edged liberation/enslavement can also be perceived behind the uncertain status of the *emancipatus* Roman (12); finally, and most importantly, he is the god of (Theban) Civil War.[94] Yet the god who 'is the cause of madness and the liberator of madness, Βάκχος and Λύσιος,'[95] is also the one to thank for Horace's *liber*ation from the panegyrical straitjacket imposed on this poem:[96] a

---

[93] Henderson (1987) 111.

[94] I owe these final suggestions to Andrew Feldherr and Fiachra Mac Góráin.

[95] Dodds (1960) xvi.

[96] That is perhaps the meaning of uncorking the Caecubum, the real *nefas* of this poem. On a similar connection between Liber and truth-telling, see *S.* 1.4.89 *condita cum uerax aperit praecordia Liber*: here, as Fiachra Mac Góráin points out to me, *condita* seems to double *repostum* (Epod. 9.1), whereas *aperit* works as a convivial pun, 'uncork,' already for Gowers (2012) 173.

liberation which ensures that a dithyrambic/sympotic ode maintains an iambic bite, while also forecasting the more official tone of the *Odes*.

For us, the specular games *Epode* 9 plays recall the recognised mirroring between Marius and Jugurtha in Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum*,[97] between Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's Third Decade,[98] and between Aeneas and Dido in Virgil's *Aeneid*.[99] They also revisit the specular relationship between Caesar and Cleopatra in *Ode* 1.37, on which Feldherr comments that 'the Dionysiac blurring of the distinction between "us" and "them"… so specifically undoes the device for "transforming" civil war with which we began: the displacement of victimhood from citizens to foreigners.'[100] As in *Ode* 1.37, *Epode* 9 has Bacchus, god of dissolution, contain the blurring of distinctions that such mirroring entails. And yet the discovery of this mirroring, in a poem where 'Antony is simply ignored and Cleopatra is too abominable to be named,'[101] is only found under a very heavy mask of propagandistic disguising. And it is exactly with this Dionysiac mask that Horace makes his first poetic and political entrance into the – (con)fusing – logic of the Augustan Revolution and its generalissimo.

Bibliography

Ableitinger-Grünberger, D. (1968), 'Die neunte Epode des Horaz'. *WS*[2] 2: 70-91.

---

[97] See Kraus – Woodman (1997) 27.

[98] A. Rossi (2004).

[99] P. Hardie (2006).

[100] Feldherr (2010) 229.

[101] Nisbet (1984) 12.

Barchiesi, A. (2001), 'Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian.' in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (eds.), *Iambic ideas. Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Lanham, MD): 141-64.

Bartels, C. (1973), 'Die Neunte Epode des Horaz als Sympotisches Gedicht'. *Hermes* 101: 282-313.

Batinsky, E. E. (1990-91), 'Horace's Rehabilitation of Bacchus'. *CW* 84: 361-78.

Briscoe, J. (2008) *A Commentary on Livy Books 38-40* (Oxford).

Brophy, R. H. (1975), '*Emancipatus feminae*: A Legal Metaphor in Horace and Plautus' *TAPA* 105: 1-11.

Cairns, F. (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).

—— (1983), 'Horace's *Epode* 9: Some New Interpretations'. *ICS* 8: 80-93.

Calasso, R. (1993), *The Marriage of Cadmus and Harmony*, transl. T. Parks (London).

Cavarzere, A. (1992), *Orazio, Il Libro degli Epodi* (Venezia).

Comber, M − Balmaceda, C. (2009), *Sallust. The War against Jugurtha* (Oxford).

Cucchiarelli, A. (2004), 'La nave e lo spettatore. Forme dell'allegoria da Alceo ad Orazio'. *SIFC* 2: 189-206 and 3: 30-72.

—— (2006), 'La tempesta e il dio (forme editoriali nei *carmina* di Orazio)'. *Dyctinna* 3: http://dictynna.revues.org/204

—— (2008), 'Eros e Giambo (forme editoriali negli *Epodi* di Orazio)'. *MD* 60: 69-104.

—— (2012), *Publio Virgilio Marone, Le Bucoliche* (Roma).

Dodds, E. R. (1960) *Euripides Bacchae* (Oxford).

Evrigenis, I. D. (2008), *Fear of Enemies and Collective Action* (Cambridge).

Feldherr, A. (2010), '"Dionysiac Poetics" and the Memory of Civil War in Horace's Cleopatra Ode', in B. W. Breed, C. Damon and A. Rossi (eds.) *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars* (Oxford): 223-32.

Fitzgerald, W. (1988), 'Power and Impotence in Horace's Epodes'. *Ramus* 17: 176-91, repr. in M. Lowrie (2009) (ed.), *Horace: Odes and Epodes, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies* (Oxford): 141-59.

Fraenkel, E. (1957), *Horace* (Oxford).

Gowers, E. (2012), *Horace Satires Book I* (Cambridge).

Hall, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford).

Hardie, A. (1976), 'Horace *Odes* 1,37 and Pindar *Dithyramb* 2'. *PLLS* 1: 113-40.

Hardie, P. (2006), 'Virgil's Ptolemaic Relations'. *JRS* 96: 25-41.

Harrison, S. J. (2001), 'Some Generic Problems in Horace's *Epodes*: Or, On (Not) Being Archilochus', in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (eds.), *Iambic ideas. Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Lanham, MD): 165-86.

Henderson, J. G. (1987), 'Suck it and See (Horace, *Epode* 8)', in M. Whitby, P. Hardie and M. Whitby (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol): 105-18.

—— (1987a), 'Lucan/The World at War'. *Ramus* 16: 122-64, rev. in Henderson (1998): 165-211.

—— (1996), 'Polishing off the Politics: Horace's Ode to Pollio, 2,1'. *MD* 37: 59-136, rev. in Henderson (1998): 107-62.

—— (1998), *Fighting for Rome. Poets & Caesars, History & Civil War* (Cambridge).

Heyworth, S. J. (1993), 'Horace's *Ibis*: on the titles, unity and contents of the *Epodes*'. *PLLS* 7: 85-96.

Ieranò, G. (1997), *Il ditirambo di Dioniso. Le testimonianze antiche* (Pisa and Roma).

Johnson, T. S. (2012), *Horace's Iambic Criticism* (Leiden and Boston).

Kennedy, D. F. (1992), ''Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference', in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (London): 26-58.

Kraggerud, E. (1984), *Horaz und Actium: Studien zu die politischen Epoden* (Oslo).

Kraus, C. S. – Woodman, A. J. (1997), (eds.), *Latin Historians* (Oxford).

Labate, M. (1991), 'Città morte, città future: un tema della poesia augustea'. *Maia* 43: 167-84.

Loupiac, A. (1998), 'Le trilogie d'Actium et l'*Épode IX* d'Horace: document historique ou *carmen symposiacum*?'. *BAGB* 3: 250-9.

Lowrie, M. (1997), *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford).

—— (2009), *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome* (Oxford).

Macleod, C. W. (1982), 'Horace and his Lyric Models: a note on Epode 9 and Odes 1,37'. *Hermes* 110: 371-5.

Mankin, D. (1995), *Horace Epodes* (Cambridge).

Masters, J. (1992), *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's* Bellum Civile (Cambridge).

Mendelsohn, D. (1991-1992), 'Συγκεραυνόω: Dithyrambic Language and Dionysiac Cult'. *CJ* 87: 105-24.

Nisbet, R. G. M. (1984), 'Horace's *Epodes* and History', in T. Woodman and D. West (eds.), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge): 1-18.

Oliensis, E. (1991), 'Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's Epodes." *Arethusa* 24: 107-38, repr. in M. Lowrie (2009) (ed.), *Horace: Odes and Epodes, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*, (Oxford): 160-87.

—— (1998) *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge).

Pasquali, G. (1964), *Orazio Lirico* (Firenze).

Pelling, C. B. R. (1986), '*Puppes sinistrorsum citae*'. *CQ* 36: 177-81.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. (1962), *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd. ed. rev. T. B. L. Webster (Oxford).

Porter, D. H. (1995), '*Quo, Quo Scelesti Ruitis*: the Downward Momentum of Horace's *Epodes*'. *ICS* 20: 107-30.

Reid, J. S. (1890) *M. T. Ciceronis pro L. Cornelio Balbo Oratio ad Iudices*, Cambridge.

Rossi, A. (2004), 'Parallel Lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's Third Decade'. *TAPA* 134: 359-81.

Rossi, L. E. (2009), 'Horace, a Greek Lyrist without Music', in M. Lowrie (ed.), *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies* (Oxford): 356-77.

Schiesaro, A. (2009), 'Horace's Bacchic Poetics', in L. B. T. Houghton and M. Wyke (eds.), *Perceptions of Horace. A Roman Poet and His Readers* (Cambridge): 61-79.

Segal, C. (1997), *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides'* Bacchae, Expanded ed. (Princeton).

Setaioli, A. (1981), 'Gli 'Epodi' di Orazio nella critica dal 1937 al 1972 (con un'appendice fino al 1978)'. *ANRW* II.31.3: 1674-788.

Silk, E. T. (1969), 'Bacchus and the Horatian *Recusatio*'. *YCS* 21: 193-212.

Slater, W. J. (1976), 'Symposium at Sea'. *HSCP* 80: 161-70.

Watson, L. C. (1987), '*Epode* 9, or the Art of Falsehood', in M. Whitby, P. Hardie and M. Whitby (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol): 119-29.

—— (1995), 'Horace's *Epodes*: The Impotence of *Iambos*?', in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace* (Oxford): 188-202.

—— (2003), *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford).

Wiedemann, T. (1986), 'The Fetiales: A Reconsideration'. *CQ* 36: 478-90.

Williams, G. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford).

Wood, N. (1995), 'Sallust's Theorem: A Comment on 'Fear' in Western Political Thought'. *HPT* 16: 174-89.

Woodman, A. J. (1983), 'From Hannibal to Hitler: The Literature of War'. *University of Leeds Review* 26: 107-24.