The Word Order of Horace's *Odes*
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**Summary.** The intricate word order of Horace's *Odes* is brought about by the repeated separation of adjectives from their nouns. Sometimes adjectives and nouns are interlaced in a pattern attested in Hellenistic poets and developed by their Roman imitators. As a result the force of the adjective comes over more sharply, and the structure of the sentence is more tightly integrated. The word order of the *Odes* conveys subtle shades of meaning, especially when a word's place in the line is also considered: possessive adjectives and personal pronouns sometimes have more emphasis than is recognized. A few points are added about Horace's colometry: his Graecizing use of participial and similar clauses to extend a period, his partiality for prosaic ablative absolutes even at the end of a sentence, his transposition of words to a colon where they do not properly belong. But even his abnormalities follow a system, and though the mosaic is so artificial, he follows his own rules rigorously without showing any constraint.
Quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa
perfusus liquidis urget odoribus
grato, Pyrrha, sub antro?
cui flavam religas comam,
simplex munditiis? heu quotiens fidem
mutatosque deos flebit, et aspera
nigris aequora ventis
emirabitur insolens,
qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,
qui semper vacuum, semper amabilem
sperat, nescius aurae
fallacis. miseri quibus
intemptata nites. me tabula sacer
votiva paries indicat uvida
suspendisse potenti
vestimenta maris deo.

(Horace, Odes 1.5)

The familiarity of this poem disguises its oddity. The vocabulary is normal enough, sometimes even a little prosaic (gracilis, emirabitur, vacuum in a semi-legal sense, vestimenta); the constructions are straightforward; there is ambiguity indeed in the words that refer both to the girl and the sea, but none of the off-centre use of language that makes Virgil so elusive. Yet though the components are simple, the composition is intricate: we can say with more reason than Lucilius ever could 'quam lepide lexis compostae ut tesserulae omnes / arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato' (84–5 M.). A scrutiny of Horace's word order may explain something about the character of his lyrics; it also reveals shades of emphasis that have received regular attention only in H. D. Naylor's neglected commentary (1922). As situations recur, any study must deal with the Odes as a whole, but I shall revert from time to time to the ode to Pyrrha; when the composition of the individual poems is so carefully integrated, it is desirable as often as possible to look at the total context.

The distinctive word order of the Odes depends above all on the placing of adjectives, which Horace, like the other Roman poets of his time, uses far more freely than prose writers. Though his lines tend to be short, he averages about an attribute a line ('attributes' include not just adjectives but participles); and as a rule the nouns with attributes considerably outnumber those without. Of course particular circumstances may distort the statistics: when a noun has a dependent genitive, it is less likely to have an attribute as well; and when three parallel nouns are joined by connectives, one at most is likely to have an attribute (as at 2.4.21 'bracchia et voltum teretisque suras'). When an ode is elaborate and picturesque, the incidence goes up (with 22 attributes in the 16 lines of the ode to
Pyrrha), but it declines in an austere poem like 4.7 (‘diffugere nives’) or a boring poem like 4.8 (‘donarem pateras’). All in all, Horace uses far more attributes than Greek poets even of the Hellenistic age, and it is not till we come to Nonnus that we find a comparable profusion (Wifstrand (1933: 80)).

A poet’s adjectives, for the most part, are not simply objective (as in ius civile); so, though various factors may operate, they are usually placed before their nouns (Marouzeau (1922); Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 406–7); Adams (1976: 89)). What is more, 40 per cent of Horace’s adjectives are separated from their nouns (Stevens (1953: 202)); in the ode to Pyrrha this is always the case except for 12 fallaciæ, and even that is in a different line from 11 aurae. Hyperbaton was a familiar feature of literary prose that becomes more abundant in the imperial period (Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 690–1); Adams (1971)); but the Roman poets of the first century bc use it much more freely than contemporary prose writers. To some extent they are following the patterns of their Hellenistic predecessors (Van Sickle (1968)), but they go much further. Part of the reason lies in their greater number of adjectives: that helps to explain why the Aeneid has less hyperbaton than the Eclogues or for that matter than Lucan (Caspari (1908: 80–93)). Other factors were the avoidance of homoeoteleuton (for which see now Shackleton Bailey (1994)) and the attraction of rhyme; for Greek poets were less averse to homoeoteleuton and less attracted by rhyme.

Horace in the Odes often interlaces adjectives and nouns in a double hyperbaton: thus in the poem to Pyrrha we find 1 ‘quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa’, 6f. ‘aspera / nigris aequora ventis’, 9 ‘qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea’, 13f. ‘tabula sacer / votiva paries indicat’. Various sorts of interlacing are attested in Plato (Denniston (1952: 54–5)) and in late Greek prose, but Latin prose is much more restrained. Norden collected some examples in the notable third appendix to his commentary on Aeneid VI (1957: 393–6), and others have been added (Goodyear on Tac. Ann. 1.10.1, Woodman on Vell. 2.100.1, Winterbottom (1977a and 1977b)); but prose parallels to the verse pattern are rare in the central period, at least when special cases are excluded (as when one of the attributes is a genuine participle). There is a striking early instance at Rhet. Her. 4.63 ‘aut (ut) aliquod fragile falsae choragium gloriae conparetur’; but as that comes from a quotation it may be the rendering of a Greek orator. At Cic. Phil. 2.66 we find ‘maximus vini numerus fuit, permagnum optimi pondus argenti’; but here permagnum picks up maximus, and optimi pondus argenti can be regarded as a single unit (cf. Caes. Gall. 5.40.6 ‘multae praestae sudes, magnus muralium pilorum numerus’). There is a more unusual instance at Plin. N.H. 10.3 ‘caeruleam roseis caudam pinnis distinguen-
tibus'; but here the metrical caeruleam roseis may suggest the imitation of a poet or at least the manner of poetry.

For though so rare in classical Latin prose, this sort of interlacing is superabundant in the Roman poets of the first century BC and later. Norden attributed their predilection to the influence of rhetorical prose (cf. Rhet. Her. cited above); but in that case it is strange that the arrangement is not significantly attested in Cicero’s speeches or the declamations in the elder Seneca (though note Suas. 3.1 ‘miseri cremata agricolae lugent semina’). It is better to look for poetical origins for a poetical phenomenon (Boldt (1884: 90–6); Caspari (1908: 86–90)). The interlacing of adjectives is attested in Greek poetry as early as Theognis 250 ἄγλαα Μονιάων δωρα ἱοστεφάνων, and Pindar provides lyric examples, but they usually lack the symmetry characteristic of Roman poetry. Such symmetry appears occasionally in Hellenistic poetry (e.g. Call. H. 4.14 Ἰκαρίων πολλὴν ἀπομάσσεται ὅρατος ᾧχη, 6.9), and particularly in pentameters (ibid. 5.12 πάντα χαλυνοφάγων ἄφρων ἀπὸ στομάτων, 5.34); but among extant poets it is not common till Nonnus (Wifstrand (1933: 139–40)), who is likely to have been influenced by Hellenistic rather than Roman prototypes. On the other hand interlacing appears abundantly in Catullus 62–68 (so also Cinna, FLP fr. 11), occasionally in Lucretius, more often in an innovating earlier poet, namely Cicero (Pearce (1966: 164–6 and 299–301)). As both hexameters and pentameters naturally fall into two sections, this favoured a balanced distribution of adjectives and nouns (Patzer (1955: 87–9); Conrad (1965)); and as Latin hexameters usually have their main caesura after the first syllable of the third foot (rather than after the trochee as in Greek), this made it easier to deploy adjectives before this caesura. As the interlaced pattern was already established in Horace’s day, and was used by him both in the iambics and hexameters of the Epodes (2.15, 43, 47; 16.7, 33, 55), it is not surprising that he extended it to lyrics.

What then is the function of hyperbaton in the Odes? It is often pointed out that it adds ‘emphasis’ to the adjective (cf. Marouzeau (1922: 112–18); Fraenkel (1928: 162–8)), but some qualifications are desirable (Stevens (1953); Dover (1960: 32–4)). In the first place ‘emphasis’ in this context need not imply a raising or other modification of the voice: that might be superfluous in a language with a more flexible word order than English. In a complex sentence other factors may play a part, for instance rhythm in a prose writer (Quint. 8.6.62–7), metre in a poet. Sometimes there is a wish not so much to add emphasis to the adjective as to stow away less important words between the adjective and the noun. Hyperbaton also helps to bind the sentence into an integrated unit; this aspect is particularly important for Horace.

It should also be recognized that the Roman poets developed their own
conventions about word order and took a delight in their own symmetrical patterns. Sometimes an adjective is brought forward not because its semantic significance is great by prosaic standards but to set it against some parallel or contrasting expression: for one of many instances see 1.3.10f. ‘qui fragilem truci | commisit pelago ratem’, where by a typical chiasmus the fragility of the boat is set against the savagery of the sea. Even when there is no parallelism or antithesis a poet may highlight an adjective in a way that would seem excessive in prose: to cite again the ode to Pyrrha, 2 ‘liquidis | odoribus’ underlines the paradox that smells can be liquid, 4 ‘flavam | comam’ plays on the name ‘Pyrrha’, which suggests auburn hair, 14ff. ‘uida | vestimenta’ underlines in a vivid way that Horace has suffered shipwreck himself. Even adjectives that are described as ‘conventional’ may have more life in them than emerges from the English translations: thus at 1.38.1 ‘Persicos odi puer apparatus’ the adjective evokes a picture and expresses an emotion. So instead of denying any emphasis to such adjectives in Horace, we can sometimes say that he gives his adjectives more prominence than would be natural in prose.

We may go further. When an adjective is detached from its noun, ‘the temporary isolation of each word makes its own peculiar imagery the more vivid’ (T. F. Higham, cited by Leishman (1956: 85)). The ear is kept waiting for the corresponding noun, which often rhymes; this is a persistent feature of classical Roman poetry, notably in the ‘golden lines’ of Catullus and the pentameters of Ovid. Sometimes the noun may surprise the reader; thus at 1.5.6f. ‘aspera | aequora ventis’ it is a paradox that flat aequora should be rough, and ventis is also more arresting than the expected word for water. But it is the hardest thing for moderns to take the words in the order that they come: Milton is thought to force the English language when he translates 1.5.9 ‘qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea’ by ‘Who now enjoys thee credulous all gold’, but he is representing precisely what he found in the Latin.

The complexity of the Odes is not uniform throughout but is influenced by the context. Erotic and sympotic odes may be particularly intricate to suit the sensuous subject-matter; see the first line and last stanza of the ode to Pyrrha (1.5), the last stanza of the ode to Thaliarchus (1.9.21ff.) ‘nunc et latentis proditor intimo | gratus puellae risus ab angulo’ (with triple interlacing), the closing couplet of the ode to Quinctius (2.11.23f.) ‘maturet incomptum Lacaenae | more comae religata nodum’ (where the intricacy of the word order makes a piquant contrast with the simplicity of the girl’s hair). On the other hand the great political poems are often written more directly, in what Horace would have called a more ‘masculine’ style (cf. Serm. 1.10.16, 91; Pers. 6.4); there is nothing involuted about the end of the ode to Lollius (4.9.45ff.): ‘non possidentem multa vocaveris |
recte beatum; rectius occupat | nomen beati qui deorum | munerebus sapienter uti, | duramque callet pauperiem pati, | peiusque leto flagitium timet . . .'. Metre also plays a part: Sapphics give relatively little scope for complexity, and the Carmen Saeculare, which was meant to be sung, has a notably simple texture.

The word order of classical poetry is sometimes said to correspond to the situation described (Wilkinson (1963: 65–6)); thus at 1.5.1 'quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa' the girl and the boy are in the middle of the line surrounded by multa rosa, and in 3 'grato, Pyrrha, sub antro' Pyrrha is indeed enclosed by grato antro. This aspect of Horace's hyperbata is subsidiary at most, for it affects a very small proportion of the material; see for instance 1.3.21ff. 'nequiquam deus abscidit | prudens Oceano disso- | ciabili | terras', where the artificial placing of terras suits a special explanation (I owe this suggestion to Dr S. J. Harrison), 4.3.14f. 'dignatur | subtolos inter amabilis | vatam ponere me choros'. By a more general phenomenon a vocative is enclosed by words appropriate to the person addressed: thus at 1.5.3 (cited above) the cave is welcome to Pyrrha, at 1.17.10 'utcumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula' Tyndaris may enjoy the pipe because she is herself a musician (Fraenkel), at 2.1.14 'et consulenti Pollio curiae' the republican Pollio is associated with the senate-house (it is pointless to add that he is inside it), at 3.29.3 'cum flore, Maecenas, rosarum', the roses suit the notorious sybarite.

It has been calculated that in 85 per cent of the hyperbata in the Odes there is an interval of only one or two words (Stevens (1953: 202)); just as in hexameters and pentameters, the incidence of two-word intervals is greater than in prose. Longer hyperbata in prose tend to be reserved for special cases, as with interrogatives, or adjectives of size or quantity, or where there is a particular degree of emphasis or floridity (Adams (1971: 13)). In poetry longer hyperbata are used more freely: see for instance 1.17.1f. 'velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem | mutat Lycaeo Faunus', where the postponement of the subject makes us wonder who is bounding in, while the chiastic order sets Lucretilem against Lycaeo. In other places a special point may be recognized, or missed: thus at 1.4.7f. 'alterno terram | quatiunt pede, dum gravis Cyclopum | Volcanus ardens visit officinas' gravis underlines a contrast with the nimble feet of the Graces. At 2.14.5ff. 'non si trecenis, quotquot eunt dies, | amice, places inlacrimabilem | Plutona tauris . . .' the hyperbole justifies the unusual emphasis on trecenis (though numerals are sometimes separated even in comedy and prose). At 3.10.19f. 'non hoc semper erit liminis aut aquae | caelestis patiens latus' the emphatic hoc suggests 'whatever other people might put up with'. Occasionally a long hyperbaton recalls the grand style of Pindar: see 3.4.9ff. 'me fabulosae Vulture in Apulo | nutricis extra limina †Pulliae |
ludo fatigatumque somno | fronde nova puerum palumbes | texere', 4.4.7ff. 'vernique iam nimbis remotis | insolitos docuere nisus | venti paventem'.

One type of hyperbaton is too common to be noticed when a genitive depends on a noun that is qualified by an adjective, it is usually sandwiched between them. When this word order is upset, the effect is often to emphasize the genitive; Horace is particularly precise in his regard for such nuances (Naylor (1922: xxiii and xxvi)). See 1.10.6 'Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis': the balancing proper names frame the line (cf. 1.19.1 'mater saeva Cupidinum'). 1.13.1ff. 'cum tu, Lydia, Telephi | cervicem roseam, cerea Telephi | laudas bracchia...': in this position the first Telephi underlines Lydia's infatuation. 2.1.17 'iam nunc minaci murmure cornuum': cornuum balances litui in the next line. 2.1.23ff. 'et cuncta terrarum subacta | praeter atrocem animum Catonis': the proper name marks the climax.

3.5.53f. 'quam si clientum longa negotia | diiudicata lite relinquere': clientum emphasizes the mundane business that usually concerned Regulus. 3.28.1f. 'quid festo potius die | Neptuni faciam?': Naylor explains 'What better can I do on a feast-day, and that the feast-day of Neptune?' 4.7.19f. 'cuncta manus avidas fugient heredis, amico | quae dederis animo': the alien heir is contrasted with Torquatus' own dear heart (with appropriate stress on amico). The same principle operates with the ablative at 3.4.37ff. 'vos Caesarem altum, militia simul | fessas cohortes abdidit oppidis, | finire quaerentem labores | Pierio recreatis antro': here militia is not sandwiched between fessas and cohortes, but stressed to produce a balance with labores and a contrast with Pierio.

Little need be said about the position of genitives where no adjective is present. Here classical Latin uses both possible orders, with a tendency for the earlier position to add emphasis (Adams (1976: 73–82)). Horace sometimes highlights such genitives in the same way that he highlights adjectives: see for instance 1.2.9f. 'piscium et summa genus haesit ulmo | nota quae sedes fuerat columbis' (where by a characteristic chiasmus the fish are contrasted with the birds). There is an illuminating case at 1.1.6 'terrarum dominos evehit ad deos'; as Naylor points out, the emphasis on terrarum confirms that the first two words refer to the victors rather than the gods.

In classical Latin, adjectives derived from proper names regularly follow their noun, as forum Romanum, horti Sallustiani. In the Odes these adjectives often come first, sometimes with hyperbaton: thus in the opening poem we find 10 'Libycis ... areis', 12 'Attalicis condicionibus', 15 'Icariis fluctibus', 28 'Marsus aper'. Horace prefers the livelier order because he tends to treat such adjectives as ornamental and emotive rather than factually descriptive (Marouzeau (1922: 28–32)). On the other hand when an adjective describes a particular place, he often gives it its standard
position immediately after the noun: cf. 1.2.14 ‘litore Etrusco’, 1.3.6 ‘finibus Atticis’, 1.11.5f. ‘mare | Tyrrhenum’, 1.31.14 ‘aequor Atlanticum’, 3.4.15 ‘saltusque Bantinos’, 3.7.26 ‘gramine Martio’. Sometimes he reverses this tendency for particular reasons: cf. 1.1.13f. ‘ut trabe Cypria | Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare’ (another chiasmus), 3.5.56 ‘aut Lacedaemonium Tarentum’ (at the end of the Regulus Ode Lacedaemonium is evocative rather than merely factual), 3.14.3f. ‘Caesar Hispana repetit Penatis | victor ab ora’ (Hispana underlines the analogy with Hercules). Of course other exceptions to the general tendency can be noted: thus the adjective is ornamental at 1.31.6 ‘non aurum aut ebur Indicum’, 2.13.8 ‘venena Colcha’, 2.18.3 ‘trabes Hymettiae’ and particular at 2.1.16 ‘Deltatico... triumpho’ (yet emphasis is appropriate), 3.12.7 ‘Tiberinis... undis’. When people are given a geographical epithet this often comes immediately before the name (1.15.22 ‘Pylium Nestora’, 2.5.20 ‘Cnidiusve Gyges’); but this order is attested in Ciceronian prose (Amic. 88 ‘a Tarentino Archyta’ with Seyffert–Müller’s note).

I turn now to possessive adjectives, where Latin normally puts the possessive after the noun (pater meus); when this order is reversed the effect is to emphasize the possessive, especially when the two words are separated by hyperbaton (Marouzeau (1922: 137–44)). There are many instances in Horace of this kind of point, though the nuance is sometimes ignored. See 1.13.3f. ‘vae meum | fervens difficili bile tumet iecur’ (a contrast with 1 ‘tu, Lydia’), 1.15.7f. ‘conjurata tuas rumpere nuptias | et regnum Priami vetus’ (Paris is set against Priam, as Naylor says), 1.22.9f. ‘namque me Silva lupus in Sabina | dum meam canto Lalagen...’ (meam is not predicative, as Naylor suggests, but ‘my very own Lalage’, picking up the emphatic me), 1.26.9f. ‘nil sine te mei | possunt honores (mei is set against te as at 4.9.30), 2.6.6 ‘sit meae sedes utinam senectae’ (‘I’ and ‘you’ are often contrasted in the ode to Septimius, as in the following ode to Pompeius), 2.8.21 ‘te suis matres metuunt iuvencis’ (underlining the possessiveness of the mothers), 3.29.54f. ‘et mea | virtute me involvo’ (a man’s own virtus is contrasted with external possessions), 4.1.33f. ‘sed cur heu, Ligurine, cur | manat rara meas lacrima per genas?’ (correcting 29 ‘me nec femina nec puer’), 4.6.35f. ‘Lesbium servate pedem meique | pollicis ictum’ (Horace’s thumb balances Sappho’s metre), 4.10.2 ‘insperata tuae cum veniet poena superbiae’ (the penalty is least expected by Ligurinus). There is a more difficult case at 3.4.69f. ‘testis mearum centimanus Gyges | sententiarum’, where the emphasis on the trisyllabic mearum has seemed excessive to some editors; but the transmitted text is protected by Pindar, fr. 169.3f., where after saying that the violent are punished he adds τεκμαίρομαι | ἐργοιᾶν Ἡρακλῆσ. Perhaps Horace is saying with the self-assertion of a vates ‘That’s what I think, and Gyges proves it.’
Possessive adjectives that follow their nouns and are separated by hyperbaton sometimes have more emphasis than is realized, particularly when they occur at the end of a line; in the same way at the end of an elegiac pentameter the characteristic *meo, tuo, etc.* often have point. The situation is fairly clear at 1.16.15f. ‘desectam et insani leonis | vim stomacho adposuisse *nostro*’ (where the emphatic *nostro* is contrasted with *leonis*), 2.1.34ff. ‘quod mare Dauniae | non decoloravere caedes?’ | quae caret ora crucere *nostro?* (where *nostro* balances *Dauniae*). Sometimes there is a contrast between the first and second personal pronouns: 2.13.10f. ‘agro qui statuit *meo* | te, triste lignum’, 2.17.1 ‘*cur me querelis exanimas tuis?’ (followed by 2ff. ‘nec dis amicum est nec *mihi te prius | obire, Maecenas, meaurum* | grande decus columnaque rerum. | a, *te meae si partem animae* rapit, | *maturior vis, quid moror alteram*?’, 3.13.13ff. ‘*fies nobilium tu quoque fontium, | me* dicente cavis impositam ilicem | saxis, unde loquaces | *lymphae desiliunt tuae*’ (*tuae*, the last word of the poem, continues the ‘Du-Stil’ of this hymnal address, and is also contrasted with *me* at the beginning of line 14). In view of Horace’s liking for point, I also see emphasis in passages where some would deny it: 1.3.8 ‘et serves animae dimidium *meae*’ (‘I have entrusted you, the ship, with half of *my* life’), 1.7.20f. ‘*seu densa tenebit I Tiburis umbra tui?’ (Plancus came from Tibur), 3.4.65 ‘vis consili expers mole ruit *sua*’ (‘collapses from its own bulk’), 3.19.28 ‘*me* lentus Glycerae torret amor *meae*’. There is a puzzle at 2.7.18ff. ‘longaque fessum militia latus | *depone sub lauru mea, nec | parce cadis tibi destinatis*’; here *mea* seems to make a contrast with *tibi*, for though it follows immediately on *lauru* it comes at the end of its clause and at a very unusual position in the line.

After possessive adjectives I come to personal pronouns, where the distinction is familiar between emphatic *me*, the equivalent of Greek ἐμε, and weak *me*, the equivalent of enclitic με; on the same principle Milton spelt ‘mee’ when the pronoun was emphatic and ‘me’ when it was weak. In his famous article Wackernagel (1892) discussed the tendency of weak pronouns to occupy the second place in the colon, but the case should not be overstated; J. N. Adams (1994a) has shown that a weak pronoun sometimes nestles in the lee of a significant word, what he calls the ‘focused host’, even when this is not the first word in the colon. In the more informal registers the pronoun may come even at the end of the colon; thus Adams (1994a: 108) cites Varro. *Rust.* 1.2.2 ‘*nos uti expectaremus se, reliquit qui rogaret*’, 1.2.7 ‘*simul aspicit me, . . .*’. When we turn to Horace as to the other Roman poets, it is not always obvious whether a pronoun is weak or emphatic; but I believe that we should be readier to recognize emphasis than editors sometimes are, particularly when the pronoun comes at the end of the line.
Thus at 3.9.1 ‘donec gratus eram tibi’, I regard *tibi* as emphatic: the amoebaean ode to Lydia repeatedly underlines personal pronouns. 3.13.6f. ‘nam gelidos inficiet tibi | rubro sanguine rivos’; an emphatic *tibi* suits the hymnal aspect of the ode to Bandusia (cf. 9f. ‘te . . . tu’). 3.16.33ff. ‘quamquam nec Calabrae mella ferunt apes, | nec Laestrygonia Bacchus in amphora | languescit mihi, nec pinguia Gallicis | crescent vellera pascuis’; here weak *mihi* at the very end of the second colon seems too inert for the *Odes* (contrast Varro cited above), and I should rather place it in the emphatic position at the beginning of the following colon (positing an influence by the *ἀνδρὸ κοινωνία* principle on its two predecessors); for the same emphasis cf. line 27 ‘occultare *meis* dicerer horreis’ and in a similar context 2.18.1f. ‘non ebur neque aureum | *mea* renidet in domo lacunae’, probably also 2.18.7f. ‘ nec Laconicas *mihi* | trahunt honestae purpurae clientae’. 3.29.1 ‘Tyrrenna regum progenies, tibi . . .’; the pronoun is emphatic after the long vocative, which forms an independent colon (cf. 4 ‘pressa *tuis* balanus capillis’). 4.3.13ff. ‘Romae principis urbium | dignatur suboles inter amabilis | vatum ponere me choros’; here *ponere* does not seem significant enough to act as ‘focused host’, so I regard *me* as emphatic, balancing *vatum*. Contrast 4.15.1f. ‘Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui | victas et urbis increpuit lyra’; here Naylor again regards the delayed pronoun as emphatic, but this time *proelia* is important enough to be regarded as the ‘focused host’.

When *mihi, tibi, sibi* come after the main caesura in a Sapphic hendecasyllable, they may be either weak or emphatic according to circumstances. For weak instances (following a ‘focused host’) see 2.2.13 ‘crescit indulgens sibi dirus hydrops’, 2.4.1 ‘ne sit ancillae tibi amor pudori’, 3.11.38f. ‘surge, ne longus tibi somnus unde | non times detur’, 3.14.13f. ‘hic dies vere mihi festus atras | exiget curas’, 3.27.45f. ‘si quis infamem mihi nunc iuvencum | dedat iratae’. But at other times I regard the pronoun as emphatic, sometimes against the general opinion. See 1.20.5ff. ‘ut paterni | fluminis ripae simul et iocosa | redderet laudes tibi Vaticani | montis imago’ (the emphatic pronoun is natural in a panegyric, as also above at 2ff. ‘Graeca quod *ego ipse* testa | conditum levi, datus in theatro | *cum tibi* plausus’), 2.6.13f. ‘ille terrarum mihi praeter omnis | angulus ridet’ (cf. 6 ‘sit *meae* sedes utinam senectae’), 2.8.17 ‘adde quod pubes tibi crescit omnis’ (cf. 21 ‘*te* suis matres metuunt iuvencis’), 3.8.19 ‘Medus infestus sibi luctuosus | dissidet armis’ (sibi is to be taken with *luctuosus* and *dissidet*, but not with *infestus*), 3.11.15f. ‘cessit immanis tibi blandienti | ianitor aulae’ (following the hymnal *tu potes* at the beginning of the stanza), 3.18.14 ‘spargit agrestis tibi silva frondes’ (again hymnal, like 10 above ‘*cum tibi* Nonae redeunt Decembres’), 4.11.17f. ‘iure sollemnis mihi sanctorque | paene natali
propri’ (mihi like proprio underlines Horace’s respect for Maecenas’ birthday).

When the pronoun follows the central diaeresis in the Asclepiad line, I suggest that it is usually emphatic and perhaps always so. At 1.15.23ff. ‘urgent impavidi te Salaminius | Teucer, te Sthenelus sciens | pugnae’ the first te is emphatic (as the second clearly is) to underline the concentration of the Greeks on Paris. At 1.23.1 ‘vitae inuleo me similis, Chloe’ it is generally assumed that me is weak, stowed away as it is between inuleo and similis, but the meaning is perhaps rather ‘you avoid me’ or even ‘do you avoid me?’; in the last stanza (1.23.9f.) Horace proceeds ‘atqui non ego te tigris ut aspera | Gaetulusve leo frangere persequor’ (‘after all, I’m not pursuing you like a tiger . . .’). At 4.1.7f. Horace says to Venus ‘abi | quo blandae iuvenum te revocant preces’; here te may be the emphatic pronoun familiar from hymns. The case is clearer at 4.13.9ff. ‘importunus enim transvolat aridas | quercus, et refugit te quia luridi | dentes, te quia rugae | turpant et capitis nives’; here the position of 11 te at the beginning of its clause shows that 10 te in the middle of the Asclepiad line is also emphatic. There is a more problematic instance at 1.19.1f. ‘mater saeva Cupidinum | Thebanaeque iubet me Semelae puer | et lasciva Licentia | finitis animum reddere amoribus’; here most readers will regard me as weak (as at 5 ‘urit me Glycerae nitor’), but at 9 ‘in me tota ruens Venus’ me is undoubtedly emphatic. To return to the ode to Pyrrha, a similar situation arises in the first line (1.5.1) ‘quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa . . .’; here te seems usually to be regarded as weak, but perhaps the meaning is ‘What mere boy presses a voluptuous person like you?’ (with a contrast first between multa and gracilis and then between te and puer).

When the pronoun is first word in the line it cannot be enclitic, any more than με can begin a line of Greek verse. Consider the ode to Postumus, 2.14.21ff. ‘linquenda tellus et domus et placens | uxor, neque harum quas colis arborum | te praeter invisas cupressos | ulla brevem dominum sequetur’; here te must be emphatic, perhaps balancing uxor, which also derives point from its place in the line. 4.1.38ff. ‘iam volucrem sequor | te per gramina Martii | Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubilis’; the position of te at the beginning of one line and another clause underlines Horace’s obsession. 4.5.31f. ‘hinc ad vina redit laetus et alteris | te mensis adhibet deum’; here re, in spite of its position between alteris and mensis, has the emphasis common in panegyrics as in prayers (note also the following line ‘te multa prece, te prosequitur mero’). There is a striking instance at 1.8.1ff., where the commentaries offer no comment: ‘Lydia, dic per omnis | te deos oro, Sybarin cur properes amando | perdere’. If this had been prose we should all have assumed that te was weak, hidden away between omnis and deos; but that leaves us with weak te at the beginning of the
line, where με would be intolerable in Greek. It seems that τε is more insistent than is sometimes realized; τε ὠρο is a common word order.

It is already clear that metre has an effect on Horace’s word order, not because it imposes abnormalities (as is too often implied), but because certain positions in the line tend to suit particular elements. The word at the beginning of a self-contained line often agrees with the word at the end; this can sometimes produce an epigrammatic effect, as at 2.16.30 ‘longa Tithonum minuit senectus’. Such lines are attested in Greek and are familiar in Latin from the time of Cicero and Catullus (Norden (1957: 391); Conrad (1965: 225–9); Pearce (1966: 162–6); Van Sickle (1968: 500)); they are notably common in the Odes, where it has been calculated that 247 lines (one in fourteen) are thus bound into a single colon (Stevens (1953: 203)). The word before the caesura often agrees with the word at the end of the line, and the word after the caesura often agrees with the word at the beginning (cf. 3.3.5 ‘dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae’); for other standard distributions see Drexler (1967: 126–34). A word in one line is sometimes picked up by a corresponding word at the same place in a following line (for such ‘vertical responsion’ cf. Boldt (1884: 82–3); Stevens (1953: 203–4); Conrad (1965: 252–3)). See for example 1.1.9f. ‘illum si proprio condidit horreo | quidquid de Libycis vertitur areis’, and for longer intervals 2.14.5ff., 4.4.7ff.; for a less obvious instance one may cite the balancing adjectives at 1.22.5ff. ‘sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas, | sive factum per inhospitallem | Caucasum, vel quae loca fabulosus | lambit Hydaspes’.

The last word in the line may or may not be significant. One in three of the hyperbata in the Odes crosses verse boundaries (Stevens (1953: 203)), compared with one in seven in the Aeneid; when an adjective in such circumstances comes at the end of the line, its position may reinforce the emphasis imposed by the hyperbaton itself (as at 2.10.6ff. ‘tutus caret obsoleti | sordibus tecti, caret invidenda | sobrius aula’). On the other hand the last word may be a mere connective like et or neque; for an extreme instance of the former cf. 2.6.1ff. ‘Septimi, Gadis aditure mecum et | Cantabrum inductum iuga ferre nostra et | barbaras Syrtes’, where the repeated enjambment may be meant to suggest persistent scurrying. For other weak line-endings cf. such passages as 1.5.12f. ‘miseri quibus | inemptata nites’ (so 4.4.18), 3.7.14f. ‘nimis | casto Bellerophontae’.

When the first word in the line is followed by a pause (not always marked by punctuation in modern texts), it often has particular significance (just as in hexameters); thus we find in the ode to Pyrrha 1.5.10ff. ‘qui semper vacuum, semper amabilem | sperat, nescius aurae | fallacis’, where sperat and fallacis are given an extra edge by their position. The slight emphasis may easily be missed: cf. 1.9.17f. ‘donec virenti canities abest | morosa’, 2.2.19ff. ‘populumque falsis | dedocet uti | vocibus’ (‘empty
words’, as Naylor suggests), 2.11.21f. ‘quis devium scortum eliciet domo | Lyden?’ (the climax, with devium scortum in apposition, cf. 3.7.4f.), 2.16.9ff. ‘non enim gazae neque consularis | summovet lictor miserors tumultus | mentis’ (the tumult of the mind is contrasted with the tumult of the streets, and mentis derives emphasis from its place in the line as well as its place outside miserors tumultus; cf. 2.13.7f. ‘nocturno cruore | hospitis’), 2.16.21f. ‘scandit aeratas vitirosa navis | cura’ (the climax comes at the end of the clause and the beginning of the line), 3.2.5f. ‘vitamque sub divo et trepidis agat | in rebus’ (‘in action’, as Naylor says), 3.10.16f. ‘supplicibus tuis | parcas’ (the key word of the supplication), 3.17.65. ‘qui Formiarum moenia dicitur | princeps . . .’ (the founder was particularly important, cf. 1.3.12 ‘primus’ in the same position). When a first word followed by a pause seems over-emphasized, it may prove to be contrasted with another word in the context: see 1.3.21ff. ‘nequiquam deus abscondit | prudens Oceano dissociabi | terras, si tamen impiae | non tangenda rates transiliunt vada’, 2.1.1ff. ‘motum ex Metello consule civicum [. . . (7) tractas, et incedis per ignes’ (handling is balanced by walking), 2.3.9ff. ‘quo pinus ingens albaque populus | umbram hospitalem consociare amant | rumis? quid obliquo laborat | lympha fugax trepidare rivo?’ (the pause after ramis need not be strong, a fact obscured by the modern question-mark), 3.10.5ff. ‘audis quo strepitu ianua, quo nemus | inter pulchra satum tecta remugiat | ventis, et positas ut glaciet nives | puro numine Iuppiter?’, 4.1.38ff. ‘iam volucrem sequor | te per gramina Martii | Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubilis’. But not every word in this prominent position has point; see for instance 2.9.1ff. ‘at non ter aevo functus amabilem | ploravit omnis Antilochum senex | annos, nec . . .’ (where Naylor notes the oddity), 2.10.13ff. ‘sperat infestis, metuit secundis | alteram sortem bene praeparatum | pectus’, 4.13.9f. ‘importunus enim transvolat aridas | quercus’ (for further material see Drexler (1967: 128)).

Sometimes a different effect may be recognized. Consider 1.11.7f. ‘dum loquimur, fugerit invida | aetas: carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero’: not only does the emphatic aetas balance diem, but the enjambment seems to underline the speed of time (note also 5f. ‘mare | Tyrrenhenum’). There are a number of similar enjambments in the poem to the ship (1.14), perhaps suggesting that things are out of control: see 2f. ‘fortiter occupa | portum’, 6ff. ‘ac sine funibus | vix durare carinae | possint imperiosius | aequor’, perhaps 14f. ‘nil pictis timidus navita puppibus | fidit’ (though there the contrast between pictis and fidit may be more significant). In 3.19 (on the celebration for Murena) the combination of enjambments and short sentences may suit a party that is livening up: see 10f. ‘da, puer, auguris | Murenae’ (with emphasis on the proper name),
Sometimes the enjambment is so strange that the text has been doubted. Such a case arises at 2.18.29ff. ‘nulla certior tamen | rapacis Orci | fine destinata | aula divitem manet | erum. quid ultra tendis?; here the position of erum before the pause seems intolerable, and I have proposed joining the word to the following sentence (‘why do you strain proprietorship farther?’). Or consider 3.6.9ff. ‘iam bis Monaeses et Pacori manus | non ausplicatos contudit impetus | nostros, et adieiss praedam | torquibus exiguis renidet’. Here nostros before the pause seems too emphatic, seeing that impetus is already qualified by non ausplicatos; Bentley proposed nostrorum with impetus (it would be better with praedam), Shackleton Bailey considered nostratem or Romanam, I have tried praeclaram, which if it was corrupted to praedam would have caused rewriting. Some editors have felt difficulty at 4.11.4f. ‘est hederae vis | multa, qua crines religata fulges’: multa seems very emphatic in its isolated position at the beginning of the stanza. But here the adjective may be pointed, balancing 2 ‘plenus Albani cadus’; for other instances of an isolated multus at the beginning of a line cf. 2.16.17f. ‘quid brevi fortres iaculumur aevo | multa’ (a contrast), 3.17.10, 4.9.26.

This leads to the controversy about 3.6.25ff. ‘motus doceri gaudet Ionicos | matura virgo et fingitur artibus | iam nunc et incestos amores | de tenero meditatur ungui’. Here editors disagree about whether to take iam nunc with the preceding or the following clause; this is linked to the problem about de tenero ungui, which is explained as either ‘from earliest infancy’ or ‘with every fibre of her being’. I take it that the former is correct; this alone suits meditatur (‘practises’ or ‘rehearses’), which itself balances doceri and fingitur. If that is so, iam nunc must be taken with fingitur artibus and followed by a comma; now each clause includes an indication of time (matura, iam nunc, and finally the hyperbole of de tenero ungui). This is not the only place where Horace emphasizes an adverb by placing it at the beginning of a line and end of a colon: see 1.34.5ff. ‘namque Diespiter | igni corsusco nubila dividens | plerunque . . .’, 2.9.4 ‘usque’, 2.20.9ff. ‘iam iam residunt cruribus aspereae | pelles, et album mutor in alitem | superne . . .’. But though an adverb may come at the end of a colon, it is less natural at the end of a sentence; here the movement of formal Latin differs from Greek.

This leads one to ask what part of speech most often ends a sentence in the Odes. In prose of the first century BC there is still a considerable tendency to end with the verb: thus in a sample of Caesar 84 per cent of verbs come at the end of the main clause, and though the proportion declines in the imperial period, even in a sample of Seneca the figure is
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58 per cent (Linde (1923: 154–5)). In Horace, on the other hand, the last word is most often a noun, and a verb ends only a quarter of the sentences (Stevens (1953: 202)). This is partly a consequence of the greater use of adjectives than in prose and the higher incidence of hyperbaton; by an increasingly common word order a verb is often interposed between the adjective and noun (Adams (1971)). In rhetorical Latin there is some reluctance to let an isolated noun dangle at the end; but when the noun is supported by an adjective and the verb interposed, the sentence is clearly incomplete till the noun falls into place.

Horace sometimes places an adjective at the end of a sentence, usually with hyperbaton; this reversal of the normal tendency gives it particular point (see also above on possessives). Such adjectives may be contrasted with earlier words, sometimes with chiasmus: see 2.1.5ff. ‘nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus, | periculosae plenum opus alae | tractas, et incedis per ignes | suppositos cineri doloso’, 2.8.15ff. ‘semper ardentis acuens sagittas | cote cruenta’, 3.3.72 ‘magna modis tenuare parvis’, 3.6.35f. ‘ingentem cecidit | Antiochum Hannibalemque dirum’, 3.15.6 ‘et stellis nebulare spargere candidis’. Or the adjective may be important even where there is no antithesis: cf. 1.9.24 ‘aut digito male pertinaci’ (where the last word has the force of resistenti), 2.3.15ff. ‘dum res et aetas et sororum | fila trium patiuntur atra’ (but there may be a contrast with 14 rosae), 3.2.31f. ‘raro antecedentem scelestum | deseruit pede Poena cludo’, 3.6.7f. ‘di multa neglecti dederunt | Hesperiae mala luctuosa’, 3.24.44 ‘viritutisque viam deserit arduae’. There is an unusual case at 4.4.3f. ‘expertus fidelem | Iuppiter in Ganymede flavo’, where an ornamental adjective with no particular emphasis immediately follows its noun at the end of the sentence and the stanza. Here the word order seems to give a conventionally ‘poetical’ effect, like the relaxed closure of Catullus 64 ‘nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro’ or the mock-neoteric cadence of Juvenal’s ninth satire, ‘quae Siculos cantus effugit remige surdo’.

In considering word order, questions about colometry are sometimes relevant, though in the case of poets they seldom attract attention (Quint. 11.3.36–8, Serv. Aen. 1.1, (Norden (1957: 376–90)). A descriptive clause may be separated from the vocative to which it belongs (as sometimes in Pindar); cf. 3.29.1ff. ‘Tyrrhena regum progenies, . . . | . . . 3 Maecenas’, and in a hymnal context 3.21.1ff. ‘o nata mecum console Manlio, | . . . 4 pia testa’. There is a controversial passage at 1.12.19ff. ‘proximos illi tamen occupabit | Pallas honores. | proeliaudax, neque te silebo | Liber’; here in another hymnal context I am now inclined to take ‘proeliaudax’ not with Pallas but with Liber (note the weapons associated with Diana and Phoebus later in the same stanza). A different question arises at 3.14.1ff. ‘Herculis ritu, modo dictus, o plebs, | morte venalem petiisse laurum,’
Caesar Hispana repetit Penatis | victor ab ora’. Against the commentators I take Hercules ritu not with petisise but with repetit; Augustus was recently thought to have sought the bay-wreath at the cost of his life, but the resemblance to Hercules lies not in this but in his triumphant return from Spain. A short clause like Hercules ritu can be an independent colon, and need not cohere closely with what immediately follows.

Horace sometimes develops a sentence by means of a participial clause, in a manner more characteristic of Greek than of standard Latin; or sometimes the appended clause depends on an adjective where Greek would have supplied the participle of the verb ‘to be’. Thus in the ode to Pyrrha we find 2 ‘perfusus liquidis . . . odorisus’ (too compressed for Cicero), 5 ‘simplex munditiis’, 10f. ‘nescius aurae | fallacis’ (appendages more characteristic of Tacitus than of republican Latin). I add a selection of many other instances; just as in prose, editors do not always use punctuation to indicate colometry, preferring to follow irrelevant modern conventions. 1.29.7ff. ‘puer quis ex aula capillis | ad cyatham statutetur unctis, | doctus sagittas tendere Sericas | arcu paterno?’ 1.33.14ff. ‘grata detinuit compede Myrtale, | libertina fretis acrior Hadriae, | curvantis Calabros sinus’ (where many wrongly punctuate after libertina rather than Myrtale). 1.36.18ff. ‘nec Damalis novo | divelletur adultero, | lascivis hederis ambitiosior’ (a comparative may link an independent colon as at 1.18.16 ‘arcanique Fides prodiga, per lucidior vitro’, 2.14.28). 1.37.25ff. ‘ausa et iacentem visere regiam | vultu sereno, fortis et asperas | tractare serpentis, ut atrum | corpore combiberet venenum, | deliberata morte feroxior, | saevis Liburnis scilicet invidens | privata deduci superbo, | non humilis mulier, triumpho’ (the accumulation of appositions is remarkable even for Horace). 3.6.31f. ‘seu navis Hispanae magister, | dedecorum pretiosus emptor’ (here the sentence is developed by a noun in apposition). 4.9.49ff. ‘duraque callet pauperiem pati, | peiusque leto flagitium timet, | non ille pro caris amicis, | aut patria timidus perire’. 4.14.17ff. ‘spectandus in certamine Martio, | devota morti pectora liberae | quantis fatigaret ruinis, | indomitas prope qualis undas | exercet Auster, Pleiadum choro | scindentes nubes, impiger hostium | vexare turmas, et trementem | mittere equum | medios per ignis’ (another triumphant period).

Horace in the Odes shows a partiality for ablative absolutes that is unusual in a poet: the construction helps his desire for brevity, and if it suggests the language of historians and official discourse, that gives no cause for surprise. Sometimes he separates his ablative with the subject of the sentence or other elements (Naylor (1922: 23)); cf. 1.10.14 ‘Ilio dives Priamus relictio’, 2.7.27f. ‘recepto | dulce mihi furere est amico’, or with an interlaced word order 1.16.27f. ‘fias recantatis amica | opprobriis’, 3.16.39f. ‘contracto melius parva cupidine | vectigalia porrigam’. In these places the
components are short enough to be accommodated in a single colon; so there is no more difficulty in splitting the ablative than there would be with an ablative of quality. Such hyperbaton is rare in early Latin (cf. Plaut. *Stich.* 602f. ‘non me quidem | faciet auctore’, with emphasis on me), and though Cicero has no difficulty about interposing a connective or an adverb, he does not normally do so with more significant elements (Sest. 11 ‘quibus hic litteris lectis’ is an exception, but hic slips in very easily). On the other hand the subject is freely interposed in Caesar and particularly Livy (Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 402)). Here again we find that Horace’s practice has more affinities with historiography than with oratory or poetry.

Horace’s ablative absolute often comes after the main verb, sometimes at the very end of the sentence, even when it describes an antecedent action. See for instance 2.7.9f. ‘tecum Philippos et celerem fugam | sensi, relicta non bene parmulta . . .’, 3.1.33f. ‘contracta pisces aequora sentiunt, | iactis in altum molibus’, 3.3.17f. ‘gratum elocuta consiliantibus | Iunone divis’, 3.3.52, 3.3.65f., 3.5.2ff. ‘praesens divus habebitur | Augustus, adiectis Britannis | imperio gravibusque Persis’ (such ‘officialese’ suits the Roman Odes), 3.5.12 ‘incolumi Iove et urbe Roma’, 3.6.27f. ‘cui donet impermissa raptim | gaudia luminibus remotis’ (an austere description of an erotic situation), 3.14.14ff. ‘ego nec tumultum | nec mori per vim metuam, tenente | Caesare terras’, 4.5.27 ‘incolumi Caesare’. Such postponement of the ablative absolute is found occasionally in early Latin (Plaut. *Amph.* 998 ‘vobis inspectantibus’) and Cicero’s letters (*Q.R* 1.4.2 ‘infidelibus amicis, plurimis invidis’), but is untypical of his speeches, where he is working towards a climax. On the other hand the ablative absolute often follows the main statement both in Livy and Tacitus, though even in the historians it is relatively rare at the very end of the sentence.

I turn now to places where by a procedure common in Greek and Latin poetry the elements of two cola are intertwined. For a simple instance see once again the ode to Pyrrha, 1.5.1f. ‘quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa | perfusus liquidis urget odoribus? ’; here the main verb is included within the participial clause, as at 1.21.13ff. ‘hic bellum lacrinosum, hic miseram famem | . . . vestra motus aget prece’. For a somewhat different trajection see 3.27.18f. ‘ego quid sit ater | Hadriae novi sinus’, where novi is inserted in the indirect question that depends on it; cf. Soph. *O.T.* 1251 χώπως μὲν ἐκ τῶν οὐκέτοι διὸ ἀπόλλυται, Theoc. 16.16f. πάθεν οἶσται ἄθρει | ἄργυρος, Boldt (1884: 130–59). There is a more unusual case at 1.22.17f. ‘pone me pigris ubi nulla campis | arbor aestiva recreatur aura’; here the effect is to throw greater emphasis on nulla. See also 3.14.21f. ‘dic et argutae properet Neaerae | murreum nodo cohibere crinem’; far from being hidden away, properet is emphasized by its unusual position and
underlines the poet’s impatience. At first sight we assume that *properet*
means ‘hurry to come’ (cf. 2.11.23 *maturet*), so the infinitive *cohibere* comes
as a surprise; there is something to be said for Muretus’ *cohibente*, which
gives a more straightforward word order.

I come now to other sorts of dislocation, beginning with the Δπο κοωω construction, where an element common to two parallel clauses is post-
poned till the second clause (Leo (1896)); the figure is common in Greek
and Latin poetry, and though it may have originated as a metrical con-
venience, Horace must have felt it as an elegant poeticism that served the
interests of balance and economy. To turn first to the ode to Pyrrha, we
find ‘heu quotiens fidem | mutatosque deos flebit’ (1.5.5f.); here some
editors interpret *fidem* as *perfidiam*, but it suits Horace better to un-
derstand *fidem mutatum*. For other examples of the construction see for
instance 2.7.23ff. ‘quis udo | deproperare apio coronas | curatve myrto?’,
3.1.12 ‘moribus hic meliorque fama’, 3.4.19 ‘lauroque conlataque myrto’,
3.11.6 ‘divitum mensis et amica templis’, perhaps 4.2.41f. ‘concines lac-
tosque dies et urbis | publicum ludum’ (where Naylor explains the
unexpected prominence of *urbis* by taking it with *dies* as well as with
*ludum*). For an unusual repetition of the figure see the last three stanza-
s of the Alcaic ode to Bacchus, 2.19.23f. ‘leonis | unguibus horribilisque mala’
(where *horribilisque* is Bochart’s plausible conjecture for *horribilique*), 28
‘pacis eras mediusque belli’, 32 ‘ore pedes tetigitque crura’. Perhaps
Horace is using a construction that he regarded as typical of Greek hymns;
in similar contexts note 1.30.5f. (to Venus) ‘fervidus tecum puer et solutis
| Gratiae zonis properentque Nymphae’, 3.21.18 (the parodic hymn to the
wine-jar) ‘viresque et addis cornua pauperi’.

For a common kind of Δπο κοωω construction cf. 3.25.2 ‘quae nemora
aut quos agor in specus’; here by a figure common in Greek and Latin
poetry a preposition is attached to the second of two nouns to which it
applies. For more complex cases see 1.27.11f. ‘quo beatus | vulnere, qua
pereat sagitta’, where by a familiar elegance the common elements (*beatus*
and *pereat*) are distributed between the two clauses; so also 2.8.3f. ‘dente
si nigro fieres vel uno | turpior ungui’, 2.15.18ff. ‘oppida publico | sumptu
iubentes et deorum | templum novo decorare saxo’. There is a controversial
passage at 3.12.8f. ‘eques ipso melior Bellerophonte neque pugno | neque
segni pede victus’, where some take *segni* with *pugno* as well as with *pede*;
I have suggested elsewhere (1995: 263–4, 434) that the adjective conceals
a proper name, say *Cycni*, that again has to be taken with both ablative.

I turn now to a few places where there is a more unusual dislocation.
Consider 1.23.11f. ‘tandem desine matrem | tempestiva sequi viro’, where
*tempestiva viro* is interrupted by the intrusive *sequi*. The metre is not a
significant factor (for Horace could have written *tempestiva viro sequi*); in
fact the artificial hyperbaton emphasizes *viro* and sets it against *matrem*. A similar case may be suspected at the end of the ode to Pyrrha, 1.5.14ff. ‘*uvida suspendisse potenti | vestimenta maris deo*’; normally *maris* would come immediately after *potenti*, on which it depends, but its dislocation gives it unusual emphasis. This might support Quinn’s idea that there is a pun on Neptune who rules the sea and Venus who rules the male; it is desirable that the ambiguity of the ode should be sustained to the end, and Horace makes a similar pun at *Serm.* 2.8.14ff. ‘*procedit fuscus Hydaspes | Caecuba vina ferens, Alcon Chium maris expers*’.

There is a stranger instance of a displaced genitive at 1.35.5ff. (the ode to Fortune): ‘*te pauper ambit sollicita prece | ruris colonus, te dominam aequoris | quicunque Bithyna lacessit | Carpathium pelagus carina*’. Here *ruris* must be taken not with *colonus*, where it is otiose, but with *dominant*, where it is needed to balance *aequoris*. The emphasis on *pauper* might suggest a contrast with the merchant, but it is particularly difficult to give *ruris* the necessary emphasis when it interrupts the sequence of *pauper* and *colonus*. For these reasons I have sometimes been tempted to read ‘*te ruris ambit sollicita prece | pauper colonus, te dominam aequoris . . .*’. The long hyperbaton would put great weight on *ruris*, which combines with *aequoris* to show the extent of Fortune’s power (a kind of polar expression common in hymns); any contrast between the poor man and the rich man is much less significant in this context.

In discussing this last passage Housman said that ‘every Roman child felt in the marrow of his bones that *ruris* depended on *dominant*’ (*CR* 16 (1902) 445 = Diggle and Goodyear (1972: ii. 581)). That is an implausible assertion, even allowing for characteristic hyperbole: not just in this exceptional case but in general the word order of the *Odes* must have seemed strange to the uninitiated, and it is not surprising that the first reactions were disappointing (*Epist.* 1.19.35ff.). It is often remarked that in late antiquity the literary language was very different from spoken Latin, but the same was true to some extent of the Augustan poets, especially of one so original as Horace in the *Odes*. The formal organization of their verse is indeed remarkable, but it is unprofitable to look for explanations in the national character. Roman poetry was not an indigenous growth, and when it peaked it was very dependent on Hellenistic models, where the divorce from living Greek was greater than in the classical period.

All the same, Horace achieves such regularity in his self-imposed rules that they begin to seem inevitable. Far from cramping his style, they are an inseparable part of it. He achieves his effects not by flowery colouring but by balance and antithesis, precision and intensity, concentration and cohesion. The words interact as in a miniature physical system, the adjec-
tives may seem conventional but their placing makes them tell, the interlocking produced by the hyperbata helps to bolt the monument together. Nothing could be more unlike the triteness and triviality of the usual English translations.
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