

A Translation and
Interpretation of
Horace's *Iambi*

A Translation and Interpretation of Horace's *Iambi*

By

Andy Law

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



A Translation and Interpretation of Horace's *Iambi*

By Andy Law

This book first published 2024

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2024 by Andy Law

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-0364-0027-1

ISBN (13): 978-1-0364-0027-9

For Alessandra

tu mihi omnia

CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	ix
Preliminary Notes.....	xi
Introduction	xii
Iambus 1	1
Iambus 2	35
Iambus 3	91
Iambus 4	109
Iambus 5	127
Iambus 6	163
Iambus 7	178
Iambus 8	192
Iambus 9	210
Iambus 10	235
Iambus 11	252
Iambus 12	283
Iambus 13	303
Iambus 14	326
Iambus 15	341

Iambus 16	356
Iambus 17	408
Bibliography	459
Sources Cited.....	488
General Index	498

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. (i) The structure of the <i>Iamborum Liber</i>	xxxv
Fig. 1 <i>Iambus</i> 1. A Basic Structure.....	7
Fig. 2 ‘ <i>persequemur</i> ’ and ‘ <i>sequemur</i> ’	16
Fig. 3 Undulations and Inversions (i)	18
Fig. 4 Undulations and Inversions (ii)	53
Fig. 5 <i>Iambus</i> 2. The Basic Structure and Obvious Echoic Resonance	54
Fig. 6 Undulations and Inversions (iii).....	97
Fig. 7 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 3 based on Cavarzere.....	99
Fig. 8 <i>Iambus</i> 4 A Design Which Replicates Itself.....	113
Fig. 9 Undulations and Inversions (iv)	115
Fig. 10 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 4	117
Fig. 11 Undulations and Inversions (v)	139
Fig. 12 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 5	140
Fig. 13 Ingredients for Canidia’s Revenge Spell, ‘ <i>In Hostilis Domos</i> ’ ..	146
Fig. 14 Undulations and Inversions (vi)	170
Fig. 15 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 6	171
Fig. 16 Undulations and Inversions (vii)	182
Fig. 17 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 7	183

Fig. 18 Undulations and Inversions (viii)	198
Fig. 19 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 8	202
Fig. 20 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 9	219
Fig. 21 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 10	244
Fig. 22 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 11	263
Fig. 23 Repeated Ideas in <i>Iambus</i> 11	263
Fig. 24 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 12	292
Fig. 25 From Iambic Trimeter, to Iambic Trimeter	309
Fig. 26 Verbal Associations in <i>Iambus</i> 13	312
Fig. 27 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 13	316
Fig. 28 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 14	333
Fig. 29 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 15	347
Fig. 30 Repeated Words/Synonyms in <i>Iambus</i> 16	361
Fig. 31 Twelve Connections Between <i>Iambi</i> 7 and 16	365
Fig. 32 Six Connections Between <i>Iambi</i> 10 and 16	367
Fig. 33 Unrealised and Realistic Harms	375
Fig. 34 A Basic Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 16	377
Fig. 35 A Detailed Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 16	378
Fig. 36 A Golden Line	383
Fig. 37 Three Voices. Three Directions	416
Fig. 38 A Structure for <i>Iambus</i> 17	427

PRELIMINARY NOTES

The Latin text is that of D. Mankin, *Horace Epodes* (Cambridge 1995), which relies mostly on the ancient evidence. I have followed Lewis and Short (LS) with regards to ‘v’ and ‘u’ and have made some minor punctuation changes which I remark on as they occur. I note in the Interpretations the rare occasions that I make any other deviations.

All translations from Greek and Latin are my own unless stated otherwise.

Horace’s *Iambi* are referenced by *Iambus* and line, e.g., 2.35. Other works of Horace are referenced by book, poem, and line, e.g., *Carm.* 1.3.2. Works by other Latin and Greek writers are indicated by Author, book (where relevant), and line/section, e.g., Vergil. *Aeneid.* 6.30, and are referenced according to The Loeb Classical Library.

Non-English words are in italics. Very occasionally English words are italicised for emphasis.

Words and phrases placed in quotation marks are either from original Latin or Greek texts, are my translations, are external quotations or, occasionally, they are so marked simply for ease of emphasis.

All reference books, and Horace *Iambi* texts, editions, and commentaries that I consulted are contained within the Bibliography.

Dictionary references: Lewis and Short (LS), Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD), *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL), and logeion.uchicago.edu.

INTRODUCTION

HORACE'S POETRY BEFORE THE *IAMBI*

In 36/35 BCE, some five years before publishing his *Iamborum Liber*, Horace had made his poetic debut with his *Sermonum Liber* (*Serm. Lib. I*), ten accomplished pieces which, rather than simply a collection of poems, together combine to make a wiry, tight, muscular, interlaced hexameter artwork¹. These *sermones* rehearsed, examined, and re-examined a nerve-racking personal journey from rural ‘nobody’ to urban ‘somebody’.

What he might have lacked in physical stamina and public confidence Horace made up for in poetic muscle and bold verbal expression. He let the *membra* and *pedes* of his poetry stretch him to literary extremes. His voice boomed from the pages belying his description of himself as ‘*inops*’ and ‘*pusilli / ...animi*’. Although he eschewed a public persona, ‘*vulgo recitare timentis*’, and claimed to speak rarely and very little, ‘*raro et perpauca loquentis*’, his book did the talking for the poet². ‘*ingenium cui sit, cui mens diviniior atque os / magna sonaturum, des nominis huius honorem*’ (i.e., ‘*poetam*’), he says with a wink at *Serm.* 1.4.43–44³. It was surely this *ingenium*, this particular poetic skill, that secured him an introduction to Maecenas the *eques* without portfolio, with whom he would claim shared values, by whom he would be lifted into rarefied heights and to whom his fortunes were shackled for the foreseeable future. Horace is the poet who slipped through a crack in Roman social order and sat where no one in his family, or of his ‘kind’, had ever sat before. We left him at the end of his first book as a writer who worked hard to be a re-inventor of Latin writing, sitting at the top table of late republican literati; Horace had metamorphosed from tongue-tied ‘*infans*’ to a poet who wrote words that would stand the test of time, ‘*iterum quae digna legi sint / scripturus*’⁴. The *liber* was his *ōs*.

¹ Commentaries: Brown (1993); Gowers (2012); Law (2021). For publication date of the first book of *Sermones* see DuQuesnay (1984) pp 20. See also Freudenburg (1993, 2001, 2006) and Rudd (1966).

² *Serm.* 1.4.17–18.

³ ‘You would give the title of “poet” to an ingenious, inspirational person who has a voice [*ōs*] suited to expounding great things’.

⁴ For Horace’s ascent see Law (2021) pp 252–293 and pp 422–423.

Serm. Lib. I is not a book about the civil war that had been raging in Italy for the nine years since Caesar's assassination in 44 BCE. It is about the battle Horace has with his own self-identification and the self-inflicted wounds that ensue. That the war did indeed rage is attested by history, but we don't learn any history from these poems. Horace was not a historian, or biographer, or letter writer. He was a poet. We can't expect, and we don't get, true pen-portraits, tidy factual records, or useful insights into the political shenanigans of Rome in Horace's day. In fact, we get the opposite. In *Serm. Lib.* I, characters names are often playful. Sometimes they might be, for example, simply alphabetic characters, *exempla* rather than authentic characters. Time is not linear; and events, including those that might hint at current affairs, are often manufactured, or viewed through a kaleidoscopic glass. Communication with others might well be no more than Horace just talking to himself. Ordinary scenarios lack focus. Anchoring specific *sermones*, lines or, even, words to specific dates is invariably frustrating and ultimately (poetically) fruitless.

One thing we do learn, however, is that Horace likes to *illudere chartis*. He employs wordplay; he hints, and he hides; he stretches the elasticity of his inflected language and is not afraid to use Greekisms, *hapax legomena*, colloquialisms and rare words. We learn that he likes to push his *mediocria vitia*, teasing us about whether they are in fact *vitia* at all. He is self-aware; he is self-deprecating. He sees his *liber*, or as he calls it, *libellus*, as a quasi-synonymous vehicle for him to speak freely '*liberius*'. His art is nothing if not self-confident. His first published work puts us on notice that we are to expect a poet who crafts with deliberation, '*saepe stilum vertas*'⁵. We are expected to witness not just the *scribendi labor* but '*scribendi recte*'⁶. We learn very quickly that with Horace, every word counts. Each has potential. Often they have resonance, connecting with other words in unexpected ways like the way one subtle colour of a mosaic draws your eye to a similar other.

Horace's *Iamborum Liber*, whilst retaining the conversational/colloquial strains, will have no less rigour or vigour; but to this he will add a new vocal/verbal register, that of utterly intense emotion⁷.

⁵ '*saepe stilum vertas*', *Serm.* 1.10.73.

⁶ *illudere chartis*, *Serm.* 1.4.139; *mediocria vitia*, *Serm.* 1.4.130-140; *libellus*, *Serm.* 1.10.92; *scribendi recte*, *Serm.* 1.4.12-13.

⁷ Quintilian. *Inst. Orat.* 9.4.75-76, noted that both *sermones* and *iambos* were close to ordinary conversational speech; '*iambi minus sunt notabiles, quia hoc genus*

FIVE IMPORTANT YEARS

The years 36/35 BCE, the years Horace made his writing debut, turn out to be pivotal. They change the story of the warring parties, Octavian, Antony and Sextus Pompeius; and they propel the future of Rome into a different trajectory⁸. Here starts a five-year passage of time in which individualistic drive and momentum (and violence) can be narrowed down from three pretenders to two antagonists, and, eventually, to one outright winner. Now the emphasis shifts from pitched civil war on the Italian mainland, and largescale land appropriations, to threats to Rome from, and on, the sea. Now the enemies are not only known, Roman and from famous families, they are also foreign and exotic (and female).

On September 3rd 36 BCE Octavian and Agrippa fought and routed Sextus Pompeius at the sea-battle of Naulochus, just off the north-eastern coast of Sicily; Maecenas stayed behind to govern affairs in Rome and the rest of Italy⁹. Sextus had become a magnet for those who had become disenfranchised by the Triumvirs' violent initiatives, and his effective sea force had placed the grain supply to Rome under constant threat. The win was clearly deemed to be highly significant. Octavian awarded Agrippa a golden crown for his success in the naval battle. The award had never been given previously, and it would never be given again¹⁰.

After his defeat, Sextus fled to Asia Minor and in 35 BCE was captured and executed at Miletus by a certain Marcus Titius¹¹. His forces were transferred

sermoni proximum est, 'iambi stand out less noticeably because this kind of meter is closest to ordinary speech'.

⁸ For the history of this period in more detail, Syme (1939) and Osgood (2006). I have excluded Lepidus from the list of key players, and not just for brevity. He was a weaker player than Antony and Octavian and never posed an existential threat to the central power base of Rome. Dio Cassius tell us that his name was often not included on official edicts of the triumvirs (Dio. 48.22.2). He was eventually forced into retirement. Sextus Pompeius, on the other hand, was much more at the centre of events in the final years of the republic and posed a genuine threat to Octavian, see Welch (2012) and Powell and Welch (2002).

⁹ Dio. 49.16.2

¹⁰ Livy. *Perioch.* 129. Dio 49.14.3 ff, 'στέφανον χρυσοῦν'.

¹¹ Appian. *Bell. Civ.* 5.143-144.

to Antony who by this time was already a slave to passion, 'bewitched' by Cleopatra, according to Dio¹².

The history of the following five years is amply covered and needs no detailed referencing here. Octavian consolidated in the West (but not without more riots, murders, and arson in Rome), and Antony in the East (but not without considerable push back from the Parthians)¹³. The divide between the two kept widening, becoming both tangible and appreciable. Octavian was married to the very Roman Livia and Antony was in a relationship with the very un-Roman Cleopatra. Octavian was presiding over structural improvements in Rome and Antony was plotting to build the private fortunes of Cleopatra's children¹⁴. A decisive wedge was driven between the two when Antony recognised Caesarion as Julius Caesar's rightful heir. Caesarion, living with his mother Cleopatra in the East, was supposedly a direct blood descendent of Julius Caesar; Octavian's link to Caesar was no more than a sentence at the bottom of Caesar's will, '*in ima cera Gaium Octavium etiam in familiam nomenque adoptavit*'¹⁵.

In 32 BCE, sensing danger, supporters of both sides manoeuvred to ensure that they were properly located, either in the West or in the East, further defining the divide. Octavian's blistering PR coup this year was the exposure of Antony's will to the senate which requested that his body be buried in Alexandria, in Cleopatra's mausoleum. The rumour mill added fuel to this fire by claiming that Antony was also intending to move the seat of Roman power to Egypt. This swayed the senate who stripped Antony of his powers and, to avoid connotations of (more) civil war, declared war on Cleopatra as a foreign enemy rather than the Roman Antony; 'ἅπερ πον λόγῳ μὲν πρὸς τὴν Κλεοπάτραν, ἔργῳ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἔτεινεν'¹⁶. In response, Antony stationed garrisons along the west coast of Greece,

¹² Dio. 49.34.1 'καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον τῷ τε ἔρωτι καὶ τῇ γοητείᾳ τῇ τῆς Κλεοπάτρας ἐδούλευε', 'he became more and more enslaved to the erotic passion and witchcraft of Cleopatra'.

¹³ Disorder in Rome, Dio. 50.10.4-6. Parthia, Sampson (2020) pp 213-238.

¹⁴ For example, Agrippa rebuilt the Aqua Marcia and Aemilius Lepidus Paulus rebuilt at his own expense the Basilica Aemilia, Dio 49.42.2. Antony's gifts to Cleopatra's children are known as The Donations of Alexandria.

¹⁵ It is not recorded that Caesarion was definitely Julius Caesar's son – he would not have been a Roman citizen in any case, given his mother was not Roman. Cicero seems to imply that the weight of opinion was that he *was* Julius Caesar's son, Cicero. *ad Att.* 14.20.2. For the will see Suetonius. *Jul.* 83.2.

¹⁶ Dio. 50.5.1 'these proceedings were directed towards Cleopatra, but obviously they were meant for Antony'.

positioned his fleet at Actium and established his headquarters at (west facing) Patrae (Patras). A period of spying and harassing each other ensued.

The battle came on 2nd September 31 BCE. Octavian and Agrippa commanded their forces, as they had done at Naulochus. According to Dio, Maecenas was again left behind, entrusted with the management of Rome and the rest of Italy¹⁷.

Octavian's victory over Antony and Cleopatra at Actium brought an end to civil war on land and sea; '*post bellum Actiacum ab imperatore Caesar Augusto pace terra marique parta*'¹⁸. Antony and Cleopatra both died by suicide in August of the following year, 30 BCE¹⁹. After more than thirteen years of struggle, Octavian emerged the sole victor, and ruler.

HORACE'S TWO BOOKS OF 30 BCE

Some four or five years after the *Serm. Lib. I*, Horace published two books: one, this book of seventeen *iambi*, and the other, a second book of (eight) *sermones* (*Serm. Lib. II*). Although *Serm. Lib. II* is, like *Serm. Lib. I*, also composed in hexameters, it is structured differently. It is not a direct sequel to the first book, and, although there is some obvious connectivity it can be read independently of its predecessor²⁰. As with *Serm. Lib. I* any historical snapshots found in *Serm. Lib. II* or *Iamborum Liber* prove to be no more than faint or smudged fingerprints, although Actium is surely referenced in *Iambus* 9 and probably in *Iambus* 1. Both books are better taken as the purely personal poetic statements they were intended to be. The order of publication is not known (but has been feverishly debated), but the *scribendi labor* and its torments is an evident and important strain in both books. In fact, given their proximity of publication, it can be no surprise that *Serm. Lib. II* resonates with the *Iamborum Liber*²¹.

This is not the place to delve too deeply into *Serm. Lib. II*, but it is noteworthy that Horace published two completely different books of poetry at roughly the same time. In the *Serm. Lib. II* he puts most of his expression

¹⁷ Dio. 51.3.5.

¹⁸ Livy. 1.19.3

¹⁹ A comprehensive storyline of Antony and Cleopatra is given in Goldsworthy (2010).

²⁰ Rudd (1966) pp 160 ff. Freudenburg (2021) pp 10 ff.

²¹ Freudenburg (2021) pp 12 and 316-317 and Cucchiarelli 2001 pp 152-154 believe the *iambi* appeared after the second book of *sermones*.

into the mouths of others (*'nec meus hic sermo est'*), whereas the *Iamborum Liber* is a heartfelt exclamation from (the mouth of) Horace himself. In fact, the dramatic impetus and the emotional timbre of the *Iamborum Liber* set it apart from the *sermones*. *Serm. Lib.* I and II are replete with Roman characters, whereas the cast of the *Iambi* is weighted much more toward the foreign, the legendary or the transmundane. The *sermones* of 30 BCE suggest that Horace is just as socially integrated, maybe more so, as he was in 35 BCE. *Sermo* 2.6 (famously) reveals that he has by this time gained a property, rather than lost one (as he had after Philipippi)²². This acquisition of more than he expected, and maybe more than he ever had before (c.f., *'macro ... agello'* *Sermo* 1.6.71), is an indication that Horace's prospects were on the up. In 30 BCE, he was an established, recognised, and rewarded poet.

Octavian and Maecenas appear in all three books, as does Canidia, whose specific deployment makes this character a particular preoccupation of Horace's work to date. Her position at the head of the last line of *Sermo* 2.8, breathing foul serpent-breath, might be a formal exit from Horace's stage²³. Canidia is not name-checked again in any of Horace's published works after 30 BCE.

One obvious difference between the *sermones* and the *iambi* is meter. Both books of *sermones* are straightforwardly composed in hexameters, whereas the metrical structure of the *Iamborum Liber* is both more varied and more strategic. The first ten (of seventeen) *iambi* are written in couplets consisting of iambic trimeter followed by iambic dimeter. The remaining seven are written in various meters²⁴.

²² We learn of the loss of his property over a decade later in *Epist.* 2.2.49-50. By 30 BCE Horace says he has property more generous than the *'modus agri non ita magnus'* he might have wished for, *Serm.* 2.6.1; for his *ager Sabinus*, *Serm.* 2.7.118.

²³ Canidia appears in the opening and closing of the second book of *sermones*, 2.1.48 and 2.8.95. For the 'structural rounding off' of *Serm.* 2.8 see Gowers (1993) pp 179. For the ending being an 'effective finale' see Caston (1997). See also Freudenburg (1995).

²⁴ Giarratano (1930) pp viii summarised the meters: *'I primi undici epodi hanno come primo verso il trimetro giambico: nei primi dieci il secondo verso è il dimetro giambico, nell'undecimo l'elegiambico. Seguono cinque epodi che hanno come primo verso l'esametro, e i due epodi che hanno come secondo verso il dimetro giambico sono stati posti l'un dopo l'altro. L'ultimo componimento non è propriamente un epodo, ma è costituito da trimetri giambico κατά στίχον'*. ('The first eleven epodes have iambic trimeter as their first line: in the first ten the second line is iambic dimeter, in the eleventh the elegiambus. Five epodes follow which have the

IAMBI OR EPODES?

I have used the word ‘*Iambi*’ in the title of this book and throughout. Should I have used ‘*Epodes*’? Convention, or maybe convenience, says yes; but there is more than convention and convenience at stake²⁵.

As far as we know, Horace did not give a collective title to the seventeen poems in this book, nor did he give a name to his two books of *sermones*. Every word counts in the *scribendi labor recte*, and one feels that if he had given any of these three *libri* names, we would know about it²⁶. We do know, however, how he chose to describe the poetry of these works. If posterity demands titles for his works, then these descriptions offer an authorial basis for any titles we might choose.

In *Serm. Lib.* I (1.4.40-42) Horace writes:

*‘neque enim concludere versum
dixeris esse satis; neque, si quī scribat uti nos
sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam’.*

‘After all, one would not say that it was enough just to confine a line of words within a metre. Nor is one likely to consider someone a poet were he to write (as we do) material that approximates more to ordinary conversation [‘*sermoni*’].’

The term ‘*sermones*’ captures the writing style (conversational, chatty) of the book, but it is not a book of ‘conversations’.

He opens *Serm. Lib.* II with:

‘sunt quibus in satura videar nimis acer ...’

hexameter as the first verse, and the two epodes which have the iambic dimeter as the second have been placed one after the other. The last composition is not strictly an epode but is made up of the iambic trimetric κατὰ στίχον [i.e., the same meter throughout].). See also Carrubba (1969) pp. 18-21.

²⁵ Horsfall (1993) pp 13. ‘*Le opere di Orazio viaggiano attraverso i secoli sotto bandiere di convenienza*’. It was a question which vexed Lambinus, (1561) pp 442 (ed. Hoelscher 1829), ‘*Diu multumque dubitavi et quaesivi neque dum dubitandi finem feci*’.

²⁶ As, for example, with Ovid. *Rem. Am.* 1 ‘*legerat huius Amor titulum nomenque libelli*’.

'There are those for whom, in respect of my *satura* I may seem too harsh'.

This is Horace's first use of the word '*satura*' (he uses it just once more at *Serm.* 2.6.17). Whilst *sermo* can be clearly defined as 'conversation' or 'discourse', the word '*satura*', boasts a *smörgåsbord* of meanings, (one of which is 'a dish of mixed ingredients'), giving Horace licence to tease and toy with the word²⁷. Horace's use of the word *satura* at *Serm.* 2.1.1 refers to work available to his readers at the time of writing and may refer to *sermones* of sharp tonality (maybe 1.4), as well as other work, perhaps, even, the *iambi* it is not clear. For example, the expression '*nimis acer*' (2.1.1) fits well with these *iambi*. In any case, as, Freudenberg remarks, compared to the first book, the 'satires of the second book are conversations in a more obvious sense'²⁸. They are actual conversations whether with Horace as a participant, or reported as in 2.6, or sidestepped as in 2.2. Horace deploys the word '*sermones*' in *Serm. Lib.* I and II eleven times and it is the word used by Suetonius, and, later, Porphyrio to describe these two books²⁹. For the record, one word never used by Horace in any of his work, is (the post-classical) *satirae*, or as Cruquius (1579) for example, had them, *satyrae*.

Horace was also not averse to describing his *labor* as '*haec, sint qualiacumque*'³⁰; perhaps he also referred to the poetry of his first three books simply as '*carmina*', or just '*scripta*'³¹.

As it happens, Horace did not describe his lyric poetry as *odae*, ('*ὕδαί*'). 'This is a real and important discussion, not a piece of idle pedantry', Horsfall remarked³². '*ὕδαί*' belonged to Pindar et al. For Horace these were simply *carmina*, the meaning of which stretches from song, through verse and poetry, to incantation³³. Cavarzere, is clear: '*almeno per l'opera lirica e satirica, carmine e sermones sono i titoli genuini, uniformemente attestati dalla tradizione manoscritta, dalla citazioni dei grammatici, dall'uso*

²⁷ See Law (2021) pp xxiii-xxiv.

²⁸ Freudenberg (2021) pp 5.

²⁹ The word *sermones* is found at, 1.3.65, 1.4.42, 1.4.48, 1.7.7, 1.10.19, 1.10.31, 2.2.2, 2.3.4, 2.4.9, 2.5.98 and 2.6.71. Suetonius. *Vita Hor.* Porphyrio, '*nam hos priores duos libros Sermonum, ... inscripsit*'.

³⁰ *Serm.* 1.10.88.

³¹ Mankin (1995) pp 230 and Watson (2003) pp 446 take (the singular) *carmen* at 14.7 to mean poetry collection. See also the anagram, '*carinam*' at 10.20.

³² Horsfall (1981a) pp 107.

³³ e.g., *Carm.* 3.1.2

*oraziano*³⁴; ‘at least for the lyric and satirical work, *carmina* and *sermones* are the *bona fide* title names, uniformly attested by the manuscript tradition, by the citations of the grammarians, and by the usage of Horace himself’.

The misnomers continue. Horace never uses *epistulae* to describe what we call his ‘Epistles’, although Porphyrio does³⁵. The word ‘*epistula*’ is found only once in all of Horace’s work, and although, as it happens, it is in the ‘Epistles’ (2.2.22), it is used there for an actual letter in return for Florus’ own. Horace himself may well have referred to these hexameter poems as (again) *sermones* (*Epist.* 1.4.1, 2.1.4, 2.1.127 and 2.1.250).

One of the ‘Epistles’ was given a nickname by Quintilian. In a letter to the bookseller Trypho he called Horace’s longest hexameter poem the ‘*Ars Poetica*’, or (*Liber*) *De Arte Poetica*³⁶. The nickname was adopted by Porphyrio and has fallen into common usage. Some argue that this moniker was known and used during or very shortly after Horace’s lifetime, others that Quintilian has led us astray³⁷. In the Middle Ages the poem acquired the curious name *Poetria*. Outside of the English-speaking scholastic world the work was also known as the *Epistula ad Pisones*. The plain fact is none of these names can be attributed to Horace³⁸.

In fact, of all of Horace’s poetry, only the *Carmen Saeculare*, written uniquely for a public ceremony (*Ludi Saeculares* of 17 BCE) can be said to have an official title³⁹.

So, what of the name ‘*iambi*’?

Horsfall argued strongly that the poems of this book should be called *iambi*⁴⁰; and Horace himself clearly states he wrote *carmina*, *iambi* and *sermones*:

³⁴ Cavarzere (1992) pp 10.

³⁵ In the preface to his commentary on the ‘Epodes’. He gives a run-down of Horace’s works in his *Vita Horati*, ‘*Aeolium carmen ad Italos deduxisse modos, artis poeticae unum, epodon unum, epistularum duos, sermonum duos libros ...*’.

³⁶ Quintilian. *Ep. Ad Tryph.* 2.

³⁷ Ferris-Hill (2019) pp 8 - 12. Also, Brink (1963) pp 233.

³⁸ Frischer (1991) pp 6.

³⁹ Putnam (2000) pp 1.

⁴⁰ Turolla (1957), Horsfall (1981a), Barchiesi (2001 and 2002) and Günther (2013c) are a few who formally titled the poems ‘*iambi*’. Curiously Kiessling-Heinze (1930) titled their book *Oden und Epoden* but chose *Iambi* as a title for each of the *Epoden*. Otherwise, in the main, the poems are titled Epodes.

*'carmine tu gaudes, hic delectatur iambis, / ille Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro'*⁴¹.

'You take joy in the lyric *carmen*, this man is delighted by the *iambi*, that man by the Bionesque *sermones* and their salt-sharp wit.'

And in the *Iamborum Liber* itself, he describes his poetry as both '*carmen*' and '*iambos*' (14. 7).

*deus, deus nam me vetat
inceptos olim, promissum carmen, iambos
ad umbilicum adducere.*

'You see it's that God, that God, who prevents me from bringing to the end of the roll the poetry I promised you, the iambics that I began a while back'.

Given the stretch of meanings one can ascribe to *carmen*, *iambi* must be *carmen* approached in a certain way. It looks like Horace is using '*iambos*' in much the same way as he used the word *sermones* when describing his first hexameter work - as a poetic style. (Horace suggests that his *sermones* are also *carmina* at *Serm.* 1.10.75). Neither *iambi* nor *sermones* describe a specific metrical system.

Aristotle discussed the roots of the iambic metre. He claimed that (at some point pre-Homer) poetry broke into two strands, the noble poetry of grave and solemn poets (*οἱ σεμνότεροι*), and the vulgar poetry of 'cheaper' ones (*οἱ εὐτελέστεροι*)⁴². The latter type at first produced invective poetry (*πρῶτον ψόγους ποιοῦντες*), the earliest examples of which could only be found in the (non-epodic) iambic trimeters of the comic poem *Margites*, loosely attributed to Homer⁴³. This invective naturally suited an iambic metre (*'τὸ ἱαμβεῖον μέτρον'*), which, according to Aristotle gave us the term 'iambic', because it was the metre of choice to lampoon one another (*'ἱαμβίζον'*). The earliest example of the use of the word *ἱαμβος* comes from Archilochus where, as Gerber notes, 'it can hardly refer exclusively to meter'⁴⁴. That 'iambic' can refer to metre and, separately, to

⁴¹ *Epist.* 2.2.59-60.

⁴² Aristotle. *Poet.* 1448b [4] ff.

⁴³ The attribution of *Margites* to Homer is not certain.

⁴⁴ Gerber (2009) pp 1. Frag. 111 is a trochaic tetrameter. The Inscription of Mnesiepes, (Frag. 3, col. III. 38) has the descriptor *'ἱαμβικώτερο[v]* meaning, 'in an iambic manner', or 'too iambic', clearly not referring to metre. Lennartz (2022) pp

style/voice/tone, is an important distinction which Horace will exploit in his *Iamborum Liber*

Some seven years after publication of the *iambi* Horace looked back to his ‘youthful days’ and the passion that drove him to write ‘*iambos*’⁴⁵:

*‘compesce mentem: me quoque pectoris
temptavit in dulci iuventa
fervor et in celeris iambos misit furentem’*

‘Keep a cool head: As a charming youth I too suffered from a hot temper which drove me furiously into rapid *iambi*’.

Horace is referring to a time when he was young. *fervor*, *celer* and *furens* provide his description of the tonality of this book; ‘*fervor*’ and ‘*furentem*’ encase ‘*iambos*’. His use of ‘*iuventa*’ suggests Horace saw himself writing (all of/some of/parts of) these *iambi* as, or in the spirit of, a younger man, something he hints at in the important, and invective-fuelled ‘reboot’ of his angry iambics, (*Iambus* 12.3). Although dating individual *iambi* is an imprecise science, many have been undeterred⁴⁶. What is clear, however, is that the date of initial writing is less important than the final edited assembly, which presents the book as a unified, inter-locked piece and the poems in the order in which the poet wished them to be read.

Around 20/19 BCE, Horace gives a more measured assessment of his iambic work; he prides himself on being an innovative pioneer⁴⁷.

*‘Liberā per vacuum posui vestigia princeps,
non aliena meo pressi pede. qui sibi fidet,
dux reget examen. ‘Parios ego primus iambos
ostendi Latīo, numeros animosque secutus
Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben’*

208, ‘most scholars support a content-based definition’. See earliest example of the word *ἰαμβος* at Frag. 215, ‘καί μ’ οὐτ’ ἰαμβῶν οὐτε τερπωλέων μέλει’. Rotstein (2010) pp 117 ff gives detail on the derivation of *ἰαμβος*, including the often-reported derivation from *ἰάπτειν* meaning ‘to throw’, or ‘hurl’ (e.g., Huxley (1964) pp 61).

⁴⁵ *Carm.* 1.16.22-25. For date of publication of Horace’s first book of *Carmina* see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) pp xxxvi.

⁴⁶ See Carrubba (1969) pp. 16 for a useful selection of chronologies for each *iambus*. Also, Herrmann (1953) pp 32.

⁴⁷ *Epist.* 1.19.21-25. For publication date of *Epist.* Book 1 see Mayer (1994) pp 11.

'I was a pioneer; I left my tracks on virgin soil; I didn't follow in another's footsteps. He who trusts in himself is a leader ruling a multitude. I was the first person to show Latium the *iambi* of Paros, following the metres and emotions of Archilochus, but not the subject matter and words which harried Lycambes.'

He says that he adopted the '*numeros animosque*' but not the '*res et ... verba*' of Archilochean poetry.

What Horace adopted is less precise than what he did not. *numeri* are normally taken here to mean metres, but it could also mean (the less specific) rhythms. The *animi Archilochi* might be the emotions (emotional quality) of Archilochus; others have translated *animos* as 'spirit'⁴⁸. Quintilian considered Archilochus to be the best of the Greek iambic writers. He describes Archilochus' writing as '*vis elocutionis, cum validae tum breves vibrantesque sententiae, plurimum sanguinis atque nervorum*'⁴⁹; [he has] 'a delivery of real force, with powerful, concise, and moving *sententiae*, full of blood and guts'. That might perhaps be a good, if long, summation of '*animos*'. Archilochus' surviving work is fragmentary and 'demonstrates a proliferation of metrical choice'⁵⁰. If *numeri* are a reference to metre, then Horace must mean he adopted (some of) the Archilochean metres. As we shall see, in the *Iamborum Liber*, like Archilochus, Horace adopts more than one metre. The expression '*numeros animosque*', albeit a compounded idea open to suggestion, must mean that Horace takes together (some of) the metres of Archilochus as well as his force of expression.

He does not take '*res et ... verba*' from Archilochus, i.e., the subject matter, '*res*', and words, '*verba*'. Here is Horace editing out what he doesn't need/want from Archilochus, just as at *Serm.* 1.10.5 he asserted from the get-go that he is not a slavish copier of Lucilius⁵¹. But what is he editing out

⁴⁸ 'spirit' Fairclough (1970) and Wilkins (1886) *ad loc.* See Ferry (2001) pp 101: 'his rhythms and what they were capable of'. For Brink (1963) pp. 181, *animos* translates as 'mood'.

⁴⁹ Quintilian. *Inst. Orat.* 10.1.60.

⁵⁰ Bather & Stocks (2016) pp 7.

⁵¹ '*nec tamen hoc tribuens dederim quoque cetera*'; later in this *sermo* Horace admits that if Lucilius was alive 'today' he would be editing and polishing his work, to keep it contemporary, 1.10.64 -75. Lucilius was '*garrulus atque piger*' (1.4.12), poured out a lot of crap, even, 1.4.10 – 11.

exactly? The sort of invective that was so viciously aimed at Lycambes that it famously caused him to commit suicide⁵²?

In *Iambus* 6 (11-16) he says that he is ready to attack like Archilochus and Hipponax.

*'namque in malos asperrimus
parata tollo cornua,
qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener
aut acer hostis Bupalos.
an si quis atro dente me petiverit,
inultus ut flebo puer?'*

Careful, careful! I lift up my horns at the ready against bad people and I am rough and rude, like that son-in-law who was rejected by the treacherous Lycambes, or that fierce enemy of Bupalos. If anyone attacks me with a black tooth, am I going to cry like a child and remain unavenged?

Horace had just challenged someone known only as '*canis*', or '*tu*'. After a series of false starts (see Interpretations of *Iambi* 3, 4 and 5) Horace is ready to make a formal declaration that his 'iambic project' is underway, and that the attacks made by Archilochus and Hipponax are, somehow, his inspiration. But scansion aside, he cannot mention their names directly, making his opening iambic declaration less specifically in honour of the two Greek iambicists.

Although Horace makes a commitment to Latin over Greek at *Serm.* 1.10. 20-35, (ending the passage '*in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si / magnas Graecorum malis inplere catervas*'⁵³), the lines are, of course, playful and nuanced. Horace's debt to his Greek and Roman forbears (like Archilochus, Anacreon, Callimachus and Lucilius) shines through his work, but his innovations and remodelling shine brighter⁵⁴. If there is anger or angst or

⁵² Archilochus (seventh-century BCE) was almost a son-in-law to Lycambes. Lycambes had promised his daughter Neobule to Archilochus, but then reneged on the deal. His story is similar to that of Hipponax (sixth-century BCE) also spurned, this time by Bupalos, on account of his ugly physical appearance. Gerber (2009) Archilochus pp. 5-6. Hipponax pp. 8-9. Also, Bather & Stocks (2016) pp 5-6.

⁵³ 'Contributing yet more to that mighty force of Greek writers would be as insane as taking logs to a forest.'

⁵⁴ See Morrison (2006) for a good example of Horace's work *apropos* Callimachus' *Iambi*.

invective in Horace's *Iamborum Liber* such emotions are marshalled more for Horace's personal reflections on himself, than for attacks on others. Throughout the *Iamborum Liber* there are strains of Plautus, Terence and, for sure, Catullus, who was himself prone to shoot out harsh iambics, '*truces vibrare iambos*' (36.5)⁵⁵. All this makes Horace's reference library much wider than Archilochus and Hipponax and ensures that he is crafting an intensely unique and personal statement.

Rotstein demonstrates that *ἰαμβος* 'was associated with entertainment, jokes, mockery, and relaxation', and evidence from the classical period indicates that it 'was used for a type of rhythm, a type of melody, a literary genre, and a type of performance, and was only occasionally related to abuse'⁵⁶. (Indeed, Archilochus' poetry itself was not uniformly of an invective nature⁵⁷). In the '*Ars Poetica*' written maybe as late 10 BCE, Horace himself endorsed the view that *ἰαμβος* was not limited to abuse⁵⁸:

*'Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo;
hunc socci cepere pedem grandesque coturni
alternis aptum sermonibus et popularis
vincentem strepitus et natum rebus agendis'*⁵⁹.

'An uncontrolled frenzy mobilised Archilochus with an *iambus* of his very own. Both the socks of Comedy and the boots of Tragedy took to the feet of this metrical rhythm which adapts to alternate lines of speech, and both overcomes the clamour of the audience and naturally suits action scenes.'⁶⁰

⁵⁵ c.f., also Catullus 54.6. See Skinner (2013) who argues that *Iambus* 3 is a reworking of Catullus 14.

⁵⁶ Rotstein (2010) pp 284. See also Nesselrath (1997) pp 180-181, '*Die Iambos (ein vorgriechisches, das offenbar mit διθύραμβος, θρίαμβος u. ä. verwandtes Wort) scheint ursprünglich mit ländlichen Riten für Demeter und Dionysos verbunden zu sein, die Spott und skurrile Witze aller Art (ἰαμβοί) enthielten*'; 'The iambos (a pre-Greek word apparently related to διθύραμβος, θρίαμβος, etc.) seems originally to be associated with rural rites for Demeter and Dionysus, which contained mockery and whimsical jokes of all kinds (*ἰαμβοί*)'.

⁵⁷ West (1974) pp 22.

⁵⁸ For date of publication of *Ep. Ad Pisonem* see Rudd (1989) pp 19-20

⁵⁹ *Ars Poet.* 79-82. See Brink (1971) pp 168-169 where apart from discussing the three characteristics of the iambic trimeter put forward by Horace, he notes Steidle's (*Studien* pp 48) view that '*proprio*' should be taken with '*rabies*'.

⁶⁰ Cicero confirms the use of iambics in drama, *Orat.* 57 [191]. Bowie (2001) pp 26 provides another spectrum of identifying features of *iambos*; 'narrative; speeches embedded in narrative; ψόγος (vituperation) either in the narrative frame or in such

Horace later in the same poem (251-258) provides an elementary metrical definition of *iambus*.

The *Etymologicon Magnum* includes ἰὼν βάλλειν, ‘to speak an arrow’, as a root for ἱαμβος, i.e., casting words as weapons, which is, at least, consistent with ‘armavit’, (and Catullus 36.5), and is perhaps a reference accessed by Horace at 17.10, ‘et in quem tela acuta torserat’⁶¹.

The fractured and uncertain etymology and history of *iambi* confirms only one thing; that *iambi* are more than metre and more than invective. ‘Like elegy, iambus is a wide-ranging and flexible form’⁶². Quintilian’s ‘passionate blood and guts’ definition may be the best summation offered so far.

The word *iambus* is also to be found in Republican writing other than that of Cicero and Horace. Catullus’ *iambi* were *immerentes*⁶³. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Horace’s coeval (and extensive networker amongst Rome’s intelligentsia), also used the word ‘ἱαμβίζειν’ in a context in which it could only mean ‘lampoon’, rather than ‘abuse’⁶⁴. In the early days of the Empire we find that Ovid makes mention of the *iambi* of a certain Bassus⁶⁵.

In the fragments of a completely different Bassus, Caesius Bassus, the mid-1st century CE author of *de Metris Horatii*, there are three or four mentions

speeches; self-defence that naturally led to criticism of others; just occasionally reflection or exhortation’. These might be addressed to an individual and sometimes to a group. Also see Allan (2019) pp 4 who adds ‘moralizing’, ‘philosophical’ and ‘political’ to the list of attributes.

⁶¹ Sylburg (1816) *EM* 463.

⁶² Allan (2019) pp 5.

⁶³ Catullus. 54. 6-7. Heyworth (2001) pp 130 shows how Catullus exploits the iambic tradition with ‘the use of anecdote; passion in friendship and enmity; frankness of expression (especially in sexual matters); the importance accorded to literary judgements.’

⁶⁴ Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Rom. Ant.* 7.72.11. ‘ἱαμβίζειν τε καὶ κατασκόπτειν, τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους ἄνδρας αὐτοῖς στρατηλάταις’, to satirise and ridicule the most distinguished men – even the generals. Note that Olson (2007) pp 470 translates ἱαμβίζειν as ‘writing abuse-poetry’ and Laks and Glenn (2016) pp 136 translate the same use of the word as ‘to write satire’. For Dionysius date of arrival in Rome (in the 187th Olympiad, i.e., 32-29 BCE) and subsequent networking see Hunter and de Jong (2018) pp 1.

⁶⁵ Ovid. *Trist.* 4.10.47-48. Intriguingly, and a rabbit hole too long for this book, Heslin (2011) believes ‘Bassus’ in Ovid’s lines is a pseudonym for Horace.

of *iambi*⁶⁶, but in Atilius Fortunatianus' 3rd/4th century CE work, which relied on Caesius Bassus, the word *epodus* is to be found⁶⁷.

What of the term 'epode'?

Although Horsfall was clear that the poems of this book should be called *iambi*, Cavarzere, who concedes that '*le cose si complicano per i cosiddetti Epodi*', concluded that the term 'epodes' could not be immediately dismissed, and indeed for his book (and title) he chose the term '*gli Epodi*'⁶⁸.

I start with Quintilian in attempting to unravel *la storia complicata* of the word 'epode'. Quintilian, albeit somewhat enigmatically, formed a bridge between *iambi* and *epodi*: '*iambus non sane a Romanis celebratus est ut proprium opus, [sed est a] quibusdam interpositus: cuius acerbitas in Catullo, Bibaculo, Horatio (quamquam illi epodos intervenit) reperitur*'⁶⁹; 'the Romans have not really engaged with the *iambus* as a genre of its own; but some have interposed it [into other metres]: the severity of the *iambus* can be found in Catullus, Bibulus and Horace; (although in Horace's case, he makes epodic interventions)'.

Whether Horace ever spoke of his iambic poetry in terms of 'epodic interventions', is not known. What is known is that the word 'epode' does not appear in the *Iamborum Liber*, and neither does it appear anywhere else in the entire Horatian *Opera*⁷⁰. Not that the word would have been

⁶⁶ Caesius Bassus. *De Met Hor.* In Keil (1874) *Gramm. Lat.* 6. pp 306. Fortunatianus' dates are uncertain.

⁶⁷ Caesius Bassus [Atil. Fortunat.] *de Metris (de Reliquis Horatii Metris)* 8.3 Keil (1874) *Gramm. Lat.* 6 pp 266-267.

⁶⁸ Cavarzere (1992) pp 14, '*Per concludere, in mancanza di precise indicazioni oraziane, il titolo Iambi non ha elementi per imporsi; e d'altra parte contro Epodoe, per quanto suffragato dall'uniformità della tradizione, la riserva che si è ora esposta sembra mantenere tutto il suo peso e potrebbe forse essere superata solo per via di ipotesi*'. 'To conclude, in the absence of any precise indications from Horace, there are no factual arguments that promote the title 'Iambi'; and on the other hand, arguing against Epodes, although supported by the uniformity of the tradition [of use], the reservation that has now been exposed seems to keep all its weight and could perhaps only be overcome by way of hypothesis'. Most other Italian commentators have also opted to call the poems '*Epodi*', e.g., Giarratano (1930) and Colamarino and Bo (1969).

⁶⁹ Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 10.1.96.

⁷⁰ Seiss (1875) pp 21, '*Was zunächst den Namen 'Epoden' betrifft, so rührt dieser keineswegs von Horaz selbst her, sondern von den Erklärern seiner Gedichte und*

unavailable to him. As well as the verb *ἱαμβίζειν*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (who probably arrived in Rome 30/29 BCE) also mentions ‘so-called epodes’, *τὰς καλουμένας ἐπωδοὺς* in his book on literary composition, *Περὶ Συνθεσεως Ονοματων* and refers to them (as not being discernible) in an analysis he makes of Simonides’ (c.550–460 BCE) lyric poetry⁷¹.

In the Greek of Euripides (c.480–406 BCE) an *ἐπωδός* was someone who deals in spells⁷²; and for Plato *ἐπωδοὶ* could be words that could cast a spell *ἐπωδοὶ μῦθοι*⁷³. Plutarch, writing roughly at the same time as Quintilian, used the word to mean an ‘old saying’ a ‘familiar refrain’, but importantly also to describe Archilochus’ metrical inventions⁷⁴.

It is the 2nd century CE interpretive commentators and grammarians, (like the rhetors Zenobius and Hermogenes of Tarsus, and the grammarians Hephaestion and Terentianus Maurus) who take up the term ‘epode’ (*ἐπί* + *ὥδή*, ‘added on’ + ‘ode’) more regularly, and there now begins a process of more formally describing Horace’s iambic poems based specifically on the long-line, short-line metrical pattern of the Archilochian distichs, or epodic couplets⁷⁵. While Terentianus invoked Horace by name (*‘talis carminibus Flacci reperitur epodos’*), Hephaestion used the word *ἐπωδοί* more generally in his book *Περὶ ποιήματος*, ‘On Poems’: *‘εἰσὶ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ οἱ ἀρρενικῶς οὕτω καλούμενοι ἐπωδοί, ὅταν μεγάλῳ στίχῳ περιττόν τι*

von den Grammatikern’. ‘As for the name ‘Epodes’, it in no way comes from Horace himself, but from the interpreters of his poems and from the grammarians’.

⁷¹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *De Comp.* 19 (‘so-called epodes’) and 26 (Simonides).

⁷² Euripides. *Bacch.* 234 and *Hipp.* 1038.

⁷³ Plato. *Laws.* 10. [903b], *Charm.* 158C. *Euth.* 290A.

⁷⁴ Familiar refrain: Plutarch. *Moral.* 507d; Archilochus: Plutarch. *Moral.* (1140f) 1141a. Also, see Plutarch. *Moral.* 51e for *ἐπωδός* as a charm/spell.

⁷⁵ Zenobius. 5.68 (*Paroem.* Gr. i. 147.7 L.- S.): *‘μένεινται ταύτης Ἀρχιλόχος ἐν ἐπωδῇ’*; West (1971) pp 78 quotes scholiasts describing Archilochus 200 and 201 as *ἐπωδοί*. Hermogenes. *Περὶ Εὐρέσεως* 4.4.[158–159 Spengel (1853) pp 243–244]; *ἐπωδοί* are mentioned briefly and in technical terms, along with *κόμματα* and *κῶλα* (attempted definitions given by Quintilian at *Inst. Orat.* 10.9.122–130) in his chapter *Περὶ Πνευμάτος*. Mueller (1882) pp 190 wrapped the debate up in a brief statement: ‘Das Buch der Epoden ist verfasst in den J. 41–30. Der Titel rührt von den Grammatikern her und geht darauf, dass, mit Ausnahme des letzten, alle Gedichte epodisches Versmaßs ... haben. Horaz nennt die Epoden stets "Jamben", mit welcher Bezeichnung nicht bloss auf das Metrum, sondern auch auf den bissigen Inhalt vieler Gedichte hingedeutet wird’; ‘The Book of Epodes was written in the years 41–30. The title comes from the grammarians and means that, with the exception of the last one, all the poems have epodic verse. Horace always calls the epodes "iambi", which refers not only to the meter, but also to the biting content of many of the poems’.

ἐπιφέρηται, οἶον'; 'and there are also to be found in poetry the masculine gendered so-called epodes, [denoting] whenever something surplus is put onto a long line of verse'⁷⁶. We might more formally call the 'μεγάλῳ στίχῳ περιττόν' a *clausula* after Porphyrio, who titled Horace's book *Liber Epodon*, 'liber hic EPODON inscribitur' and explained 'epodon'; 'scilicet quod ita uersus in eo ordinati sunt, ut singulis quibusque clausulae suae recinant'; 'self-evidently that the verses are so organised that they sing again in each and every one of their little clauses'. By this definition, of course, *Iambus* 17 is not technically an 'Epode'.

By the by, it is of note that Hephaestion goes out of his way to mention that the gender of ἐπωδός is masculine (ἄρρην), but he makes no reference to the original Greek meaning of ἐπωδός. Following the sense of the original meaning, the (regular) feminine form ἐπωδή means 'incantation' or 'charm'⁷⁷. One feels this is a word Horace would have played with (c.f. *Iambi* 5 and 17), along with the sonically similar ἐπόδης meaning foul-smelling (c.f. *Iambi* 3. 10 and 12) and even ἐπόζω used of a mother bird sitting over her eggs (c.f. *Iambus* 1). But he doesn't, and the search for such serendipitous wordplay only leads one down an unrewarding *cul-de-sac*. Hephaestion goes on to mention that the reverse of an ἐπωδός is a προωδός (i.e., a short-line followed by long-line), and he quotes an example from Anacreon. ἐπωδός now has an additional meaning, and a new (albeit rare) word, προωδός has joined it in the ancient grammars.

From the 3rd century CE onwards writers such as Atilius Fortunatianus and Diogenes Laertius continue the process of using the word *epodus* as a grammatical term and metrical form, the latter referring to Solon as having composed 'καὶ ἰάμβους καὶ ἐπωδούς'⁷⁸. By the 4th century CE the

⁷⁶ Terentianus Maurus. *De Metr.* 2099 Keil (1874) pp 388. 2099 Hephaestion. *Περὶ ποιήματος* 7.2 (p. 71 Consbruch). For as much as we know about Hephaestion, (e.g., that he is probably to be identified with the tutor of the Emperor Lucius Verus 130–169 CE, see entry in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (4th ed.) 2012. Also see van Ophuijsen (1987) pp 3ff. Nesselrath (1997) pp 352 explains Hephaestion in more detail.

⁷⁷ Homer. *Od.* 19.457, 'ἐπασιδῇ δ' αἶμα κελαινὸν / ἔσχεθον'. Aeschylus. *Eum.* 649 – 650, 'τούτων ἐπωδᾶς οὐκ ἐποίησεν πατήρ / οὐμός'. Also, Lucian. *Doubt.* 11. Plotinus. *Enn.* 5.3. 17. 20.

⁷⁸ Atilius Fortunatianus. *De Rel. Hor. Metr.* Keil (1874) pp 266-267: 'Monostropha vocantur haec carmina, quia ad primam strophē cetera respondet nulla interveniente epodo, quae cum a prima strophe differat, faciat eam, quam musici et grammatici triada nominat'. 'These poems are called monostrophes, because the rest answers to the first strophe with no intervention of the epode, which differs from

grammarian Marius Victorinus commented on Horace's use of 'epodes'⁷⁹. Diomedes too enshrined a definition of 'epode' that specifically related to the work and metres of Horace, and he also declared that an *iambus* was a *carmen maledicum*, a foul-mouthed poem⁸⁰. (He follows soon after by declaring that satire too had been considered by the Romans to be a '*maledicum*'). Servius and Sidonius carry references to Horace's 'epodes' into the 5th century CE⁸¹.

Unlike Vergil, we have no manuscripts of Horace before the 9th century CE, so we cannot know if the use of 'epode' by these grammarians was at the same time formally attributed to copies of the *Iamborum Liber*. Whether it was, or it wasn't, overwhelmingly by both ancient and modern convention, the book is called 'Epodes', or *Liber Epodon*, following another convention that uses *-ōn*, or *-eōn* (the Greek genitive plural *-ων* Latinised) for the titles of books, e.g., *Georgicon*, *Metamorphoseon*⁸².

Despite these conventions many commentators up front admit that Horace never called the book 'epodes', and that he probably called them *iambi*⁸³. But this is said under cover of the name 'Epodes', perpetuating the misnomer, and thereby further building precedent for so titling the book⁸⁴.

But, at the end of the day, does it really matter? In today's search-driven market, at least 'Epodes' takes you straight to Horace and it might seem

the first strophe, making what musicians and grammarians call the triad.' Diogenes Laertius. *Solon*. 61.

⁷⁹ Victorinus. *De Metr. Horat.*, Keil (1874) pp 161 [20,21].

⁸⁰ 'epodus': Diomedes. Keil (1858) pp 485 [15]: '*Epodoe dicuntur versus quo libet metro scripti et sequentes clausulas habentes particularum, quales sunt epodoe Horatii, in quidem singulis versibus singulae clausulae adiciuntur*'. *iambus*': Diomedes. Keil (1874) p. 485, 10 – 31.

⁸¹ Servius. *De Metr. Horat.* 472.10: '*His omnibus metris scripti sunt quattuor carminum libri, epodon ...*'. Sidonius. *Carm. ad Felicem* 222. '*sermonumque sales novumque epodon, libros carminis ac poeticam artem*'.

⁸² viz. Cruquius, Lambinus, and Minell, Rappolt and Feller.

⁸³ For example: Wickham (1877) pp 325; Thompson (1895) pp 8; Gow (1896) pp 23; Garrison (1991) pp x; Mankin (1995) pp 12 and (2010) pp 93; Levi (1997) pp 45; Kiernan (1999) pp 51; Hills (2005) pp 23; and MacLennan (2010) pp 9. Fraenkel (1957), Carrubba (1969) and Harrison (2001) pp 166 are content to call them Epodes. Watson (2007) pp 94 prefers to leave the question open.

⁸⁴ Lyne (2005) pp 2 confessed his use of 'epodes' up front: '*iambi* is indeed the title he [Horace] gave to his collection ('Epodes' is grammarians' talk, though since it is conventional, I shall use it)'.