The fame of Pindar as a lyric poet was well established among the Alexandrians, one of whom edited his works in seventeen books. But to the Romans of the early, middle, and even late Republic, Pindar was better known by his reputation than by his writings. It was in the Augustan age that Rome began to take a serious interest in Pindar, and also to further her knowledge of other Greek writers. This trend may well have been motivated by Rome’s consciousness of her world role as ‘orbis terrarum perdomitor’, as Mieciclaus Brożek¹ has recently suggested, though his explanation of a literary phenomenon as mere political expediency seems hardly adequate. Horace, despite his apparent recusatio, was clearly the most successful aemulus of Pindar in the Augustan age; Ovid and Horace appear to regard Rufus and Titius respectively as the Roman Pindar, but there is no doubt that it was Horace to whom the Augustans, and their successors, accorded the title. Later Roman attempts to imitate or to emulate Pindar were few, and generally worthy of little mention, with the exception of the fourth century Christian writer Prudentius.

Brożek, in his broad survey of Pindaric aemuli, spends little time on Horace: ‘scripserunt alii rem’ is his comment. But it is noteworthy that Brożek, in an article published in 1971, gives only two main references on the subject, one an article by Highbarger in an American journal in 1935, the other a German dissertation of 1936. And in fact treatment of Horace as aemulus of Pindar is scattered, mostly perfunctory, and rarely in the English language. I therefore make no apology for approaching a subject which has for the most part been seriously dealt with only in Latin, Italian and German. A comprehensive treatment is still awaited. My remarks here will of necessity be selective, not comprehensive; much of what I say will not of course be new; but my aim is to stress what I think are the salient features of the subject, and perhaps to offer some original comments and guidelines.

I shall begin by making brief reference, for purposes of comparison, to the Lesbian poets Sappho and Alcaeus, and shall then consider the superficial appearances of Pindar’s name or Pindaric motifs in Horace. After touching on the question of Alexandrian influence, I shall discuss the concept of vates. Then, making certain concessions to a distinction between the genres of Pindaric and Horatian poetry, I shall examine in some detail the internal structure of one poem from each writer. This examination will form the core of the paper. I shall then discuss certain similarities in thought and attitude between the two

poets, and shall also examine certain common critical approaches to them, suggesting various areas for reassessment. Finally I shall face the charges of irrelevance and disunity commonly levelled at each poet, and consider these charges in the light of two further poems.

It is a commonplace in criticism of Horace's *Odes* to say that he is influenced by the Greek lyric poets Sappho and Alcaeus, and this is clear not only from Horace's use of their favoured metres and themes, but also from Horace's own protestations. In the *Epistles* (1.19.28ff.) he recalls the art of Sappho and Alcaeus, claiming to have brought Alcaeus to the notice of the public (this being a reference to his first collection of odes). In 2.13.27, the 'log of wood' poem, he anticipates meeting the two Lesbian poets in Hades - 'Aeolii fidibus querentem/Sappho puellis de popularibus/et te sonantem plenius aureo/Alceae, plectra dura navis,/dura fugae mala, dura belli'. The metre is Alcaic. In 4.9, also in Alcaics, he refers in his series of famous lyric poets to the 'minaces ... Camenae' of Alcaeus, as well as to Sappho whose love and passions still endure in the annals of music. Again in Book 4, Ode 3, he claims in effect that he is 'Aeolio carmine nobilem', and he concluded his first collection, in 3.30, by arrogating to himself the glory 'princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos/deduxisse modos' - an interesting example of a double transferred epithet, since his song is not Aeolian, but Roman, and his 'measures' are not Italian, but Aeolian. In 4.6.35 (Sapphic metre) he bids the choir observe the Lesbian beat, and in 1.26.11 (Alcaic metre) he calls upon the Muse to honour Lamia 'Lesbio plectra'. He also unites the two poets by referring to the 'Lesbio ... civi', i.e. Alcaeus, in 1.32.5, which is written in Sapphics.

It will be noticed that these references to the Lesbian poets range over all four books of the *Odes*, and are not restricted to either the earlier or the later stage of his lyric development. Book 2, with its almost exclusive use of Sapphic and Alcaic metres, is the ultimate testament to the esteem in which he held the two poets; but the other books all show considerable Lesbian dependence.

On Pindar there is, at least superficially, less dependence. In Book 1, Ode 12, there is the direct imitation of the *Second Olympian* - 'quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri/tibia sumis celebrate, Clio ?/quem deum ?'; and in the first three books there are various more or less definite reminiscences of Pindar. but there is no reference to him. However, in the first book of *Epistles*, published some three years after *Odes* I–III, three years before the *Carmen Saeeculare*, and about seven years before *Odes* IV, Horace (Epistles 1.3.9ff.) speaks of Titius, who is not afraid to drink deep of 'Pindarici fontis', and who is perhaps intent on fitting 'Thebanos ... modos' to 'fidibus Latinis'. From this point Horace's interest in Pindar becomes more direct: he writes the *Carmen Saeculare*, not for a literary coterie, but for a public performance, thereby returning to the Pindaric tradition of functional poetry which occupied little place in Roman life. Then in Book 4 he makes direct reference to Pindar in two odes, besides composing at least two epinicians. In 4.2 ('Pindarum quisquis studet aemu-
lari') he suggests that any attempt to emulate Pindar is doomed to failure, like Icarus' attempt to fly; though curiously, in 2.20, he compares his own successful poetic flight to the flight of Icarus, apparently without any sense of incongruity (unless we read Bentley's 'tutor' for 'notior'). In 4.9, in a context already mentioned, the series of famous lyric poets, Pindar holds first place (they were, after all, in Petronius' felicitously inaccurate phrase, 'Pindarus novemque lyrici', Petr. Sat. 2), followed by Simonides, Alcaeus, Stesichorus, Anacreon and Sappho. We can hardly suppose that these names have been chosen at random; they are all models for Horace himself, though very different in kind. Sappho and Alcaeus were of course vitally important to him, and in his lighter poems he often makes use of Anacreontic themes. Time has been unkind to Stesichorus, and so little of his poetry remains that it is well-nigh impossible to assess his influence. More of Simonides survives, and an assessment of his influence on Horace is overdue, but I shall not attempt it here. It is the first-named figure, Pindar, on whom I shall concentrate.

J. K. Newman, in his 'Augustus and the New Poetry', has stressed Horace's affinity with Callimachus and Alexandria, but there is a danger that his emphasis on the more recent poets may obscure the 'classical' influence. Of course, the distinction is often difficult to determine, since some of Pindar's characteristics reappear in Callimachus; but Horace's own protestations go further than those of his contemporaries in asserting links not with the Alexandrian and Neoteric schools, but with ancient Greece; and we ignore these protestations at our peril.

It would of course be futile to suggest that any particular feature of Horace's *Odes*, other than direct and unmistakeable *imitatio*, derives solely from Pindaric precedent; what I am suggesting is that by building up a structure of affinities we can perceive a general pool of reminiscence and attitude on which Horace draws, and which is therefore an important factor in understanding the effect of the *Odes* upon his educated contemporaries.

Since we have already touched upon Horace's self-appraisal as poet, I shall begin by considering his attitude towards the function of poetry and of the poet.

Newman makes great play with 'The Concept of Vates', and in fact has published a separate book with that title. Followed by Gordon Williams, Nisbet and Hubbard and others, he has elevated the *vates* concept to a key position in Augustan poetry, and believes that it is *essentially* Augustan, and quite foreign to previous attitudes. He argues that the word *vates*, and what it stood for, had been held in disesteem by Ennius and Lucretius, but was rehabilitated by the Augustan poets, who applied it to themselves as a dignifying epithet. But we must not take this word out of its context. Ennius and
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Lucretius are both concerned to attack traditional beliefs in the mumbo-jumbo of charlatan prophets; there is nothing very original about that, since these had been under attack since Homer and the tragedians. The office of prophet was open to abuse, whether at Delphi or elsewhere. Whether you believed in a prophet’s words depended on (a) whether you believed in the gods, (b) whether you believed that the gods would speak to prophets, and (c) whether you trusted the prophet. If condition (b) was unfulfilled – i.e. if you did not believe the gods would speak to prophets – then, of course, all prophets were untrustworthy. But quotation of isolated passages from Ennius, and from the lone rationalist Lucretius, is not enough to prove a common poetic attitude; nor, therefore, do we need to posit a ‘rehabilitation’ process by Varro, as Newman does. What is interesting about the Augustans’ use of vates is not that they approved of him, but that they extended his functional capacity from that of seer to that of poet. He was a superior kind of poet, endowed with special knowledge or insight by the Muses or by the gods.

In the Odes Horace uses the word vates nine times; it occurs in each book, but four times in the fifteen odes of the fourth book, a high proportion. I will briefly paraphrase these references:

1.1 Horace regards inclusion in the ranks of lyricis vatibus as the highest honour;
1.31 the vates prays for honour and poetic ability even in old age;
2.6 Horace refers to himself as ‘vatis amici’;
2.20 Horace will be famous as a vates;
3.19 Horace as vates will drink nine cups of wine, matching in number the Muses;
4.3 Rome ranks Horace now amongst the choirs of vates;
4.6 the girl in the chorus will remember how she sang the Carm. Saec. of ‘vatis Horati’;
4.8 vates and his Muse keep men alive;
4.9 heroes need a ‘vate sacro’, or their fame dies.

You will notice how, as Horace’s confidence in his own immortal fame grows, so also he comes to emphasize the immortalizing effect of his poetry upon others. This effect is stressed in Pindar, so frequently as to appear almost cliché, certainly a feature of the genre. To give but a few examples: in Olympian 10, the poet proclaims (91ff.) that a man of great achievement who dies unsung has achieved but emptiness and brief joy: ‘when a man does glorious deeds without song and comes to the hall of Hades, his breath has been given in vain, and little joy rewards his endeavours’; in Pythian 1 (92ff.) men’s achievements are recorded for all time by λογία καὶ ἀοιδοῖς; in Nem. 7 (12-16) only song can preserve powers from oblivion; in Isth. 7 (16-19) men forget deeds unrecorded in song; and so on.

But Pindar does not regard the poet simply as ὀσφίς, a singer; the poet has achieved a special skill or understanding. This skill is ὀσφίς and its possessor is ὀσφός. To quote but a few examples, again choosing one from each epinician group to suggest its frequency of application: in 01. 1 (8ff.) from Olympia song is woven in the hearts of the wise, to praise Zeus – ὅθεν ὁ πολυφατος ἄμοιος ἀμφιβάλλεται/ὄσφόν μητίσσαι; in Py. 1 (12) song enchants even the gods, by the wisdom of Apollo and the Muses – ὁμφί τε Ἀστός/ὁ σοφός μαθακόλλων τε Μοισάν; in Nem. 8 (40-42) virtue grows among the σοφοὶ like a vine – ἀφετεῖ δ’ ἄρετα, χλωραίς ἐξέρχεται / ὧς δὲ δένδρων οῖνας, / ἐν σοφοῖς ἄνδρῶν ἀμφίθεθη ἐν δικαίοις τε πρὸς ὑγρῶν / αἰθέρα – this incidentally sounds like the original of a stanza in Horace’s ‘quem virum’ poem, (45ff.) ‘crescit occulte velut arbor aevojfama Marcelli; micat inter omnes Iulium sidus, velut inter ignes luna minores’; in Isth. 8 (52f.) it is the lips of σοφοὶ that have told men of Achilles – καὶ νεαρὰν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν/στὸματ’ ἀπείροισιν ἄρετὰν Ἀχιλέως.

With this last passage we bring together the concept of ὀσφός and the immortalizing effect of poetry, later to be recalled by Horace as vates; but whereas Horace sees his poetry as immortalizing himself, Pindar is not quite so bold; as he tells Hieron (01. 1. 114ff.), be content with success that lies within your powers, and so will I as long as all Greece knows me for my σοφία (πρέσαν-τον σοφία καθ’ Ἐλλανας δόντα παντῆ). I have concentrated on bringing out a general affinity of theme between Pindar and Horace within this area, and have not tried to elicit any examples of positive, direct imitatio; if one were searching for such traces, one would look closely at the last examples that I quoted on vates/ὄσφός from each poet; in Hor. 4.9 pre-Trojan War heroes are unknown because unsung, ‘carent quia vate sacro’ (4.9.28); in Pi. Is. 8.52–3, men would be ἔπειροι, ignorant of Achilles, but for the σοφοὶ.

I shall touch again later on the question of poet qua poet, but first I want to look at structural matters in some detail.

In terms of external structure there is no comparison between the two poets. Pindar’s poems were never grouped by him into separate categories: it was Aristophanes of Byzantium who effected the division into 17 books, of which only the four epinician books survive in unfragmented form; even if there is any purpose in the sequence employed, it is not Pindar’s. Horace, on the other hand, clearly employed much deliberation in establishing the order in which his poems should be placed within each book, and within the collection of books 1 to 3 as a whole; this much at least will be granted even by those who cannot accept the more refined of Collinge’s arguments.7

This area of divergence between the two poets helps to underline the difference of milieux for which they wrote. Pindar wrote, on demand, ‘occasional’
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poems in the literal sense; they celebrated particular men for particular achievements, and their literary power lay wholly within themselves: whereas Horace’s *Odes*, rich as they are within themselves, often gain added force from their context. For example, it is surely no accident that 1.38 ('Persicos odi, puer, apparatus') – a condemnation of Oriental luxury – follows the celebration of Cleopatra’s fall in 1.37 (‘nunc est bibendum’); nor that in Book 4 poems 5 and 15, celebrating Augustus’ rule, follow immediately upon the epinician poems to the Claudian house. But any contextual convenience enjoyed by *Pindar’s* odes is either pure chance, or due to the perspicacity of the Alexandrian editor.

However, when we look at the internal structure of the respective poems, we begin to understand why Horace’s references to *Pindar* are not mere lip-service. *Pindar* is, of course, notoriously hard to translate; one remembers A. Y. Campbell’s words: ‘Schoolboys are sometimes told, or used to be, that after all *Pindar* did not write his epinicians in order to provide hard work for them. I am not quite so sure.’ Some of *Horace’s* odes may be, at first acquaintance, almost equally hard, but in general translation of *Horace* does not present such problems. Nevertheless the meaning of certain *Horatian* odes as unities has often been disputed: for example, are ‘diffugere nives’ and ‘iam veris comites’ mere spring poems, as Wilamowitz supposed, or are they works of deep pessimism, or of distasteful pragmatism, or what? The problem encountered here is very similar to that which has confronted *Pindaric* scholars since Boeckh’s edition of 1821. Unity? Disunity? Or variety?

Elroy Bundy and David Young have done much to re-instate – or rather, to establish for the first time – *Pindar* as a poet who does, despite initial appearances, display and explore a profound unity in all his poetry, even where centuries of scholarship have failed to recognise this. *Pindar* scholars since Boeckh’s edition of 1821. Unity? Disunity? Or variety?

Elroy Bundy and David Young have done much to re-instate – or rather, to establish for the first time – *Pindar* as a poet who does, despite initial appearances, display and explore a profound unity in all his poetry, even where centuries of scholarship have failed to recognise this. Pasquali, Collinge, and Gordon Williams have performed a similar service for *Horace*.

To establish this unity over the whole lyric corpus of these two poets is of course not possible within my present scope. But in discussing one poem from each poet and in singling out certain aspects of similarity and of dissimilarity between the two, I shall also be endeavouring to demonstrate their coherence.

For the purposes of this comparison I shall use epinician composition from both poets. My choice from *Horace* lights upon 4.4, not only because it is epinician but also because it is crowded with *Pindaric* features.

Some of these features, however, are overstressed by commentators: for
example, the opening simile – 'qualem ministrum fulminis alitem' – is hailed as an unmistakable Pindarism: and yet Pindar himself only once begins an epinician with a simile, that is, in *Olympian 7*. I shall therefore use *Olympian 7* and *Odes 4.4* for analysis.

*Olympian 7* begins with a stanza that recalls much of Pindar's most glorious poetry, and that presages the light-hearted invitation songs of Horace. The simile is a cup of wine, toasting a bridegroom; and it illustrates Pindar, pouring a poetic draught for the victors. There is no hint of "Ἀριστον μὲν ὅδοι" here, though the *gold* of the first *Olympian* does recur. Incidentally this change in ideal from water to wine is a good illustration of a vital point to remember about both Pindar and Horace, but one that is still too often ignored: the poet, even when he uses the first person singular, is not necessarily expressing his own opinion, any more than need a chorus in a Greek tragedy: the poem stands by itself, it should not be taken as evidence for the poet's so-called 'views'. A good deal of lumber needs to be cleared from modern 'Lives' of Pindar: most of their material derives from ancient commentators who clearly derived their information, ultimately, from Pindar's poems themselves, without external corroboration.

To return to *Olympian 7*. Pindar's poetry is the gift of the Muses, Μούσων δόσιν (7), just as Horace is 'Musarum sacerdos' (3.1.3). Pindar stresses that good reputation, preserved by song, gives a man true happiness. This theme has no parallel in the poem of Horace's that we are using for purposes of comparison, but it *is* echoed in the eighth and ninth poems of the fourth book, and this, I think, is no accident: for the long and submissive speech of Hannibal in 4.4 is picked up in 4.8.13ff., where Roman triumph over Hannibal is recognised to live in the memory of men above all by its celebration in song, the poetry of Ennius. The trail of connection is hard to follow – Horace is too subtle a poet to make it otherwise; but the links are there.

In Horace there are *two* similes before we discuss the subject of the poem in line 18; in Pindar, the simile is followed by gnomic utterances, and the subject is similarly delayed, until line 13. Horace's first simile is that of the eagle, the bird which, together perhaps with the swan, we may regard as Pindar's most potent symbol: memorable is the sleeping eagle of the first *Pythian*, lulled by the power of song – and this echo on Horace's part is surely not accidental; but Horace is thinking not only of this eagle, but also of the eagle in the last stanza of the third Nemean (80ff.): 'among winged creatures swift is the eagle, who hovers on high, then sudden snatch's in his claws his bleeding prey'; the third Nemean eagle is a fierce predator, a champion of birds, there symbolising Aristokleides' status as champion pancratiast. Horace is revelling in his art of allusion.

Drusus, then, is the fierce eagle, swooping on the Vindelici; but he is also the
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lion cub making its first kill. This second simile (13–16) is taken seriously by commentators, and was probably so taken by Augustus; but in the light of what follows in lines 18ff. – the ‘deliberately irrelevant digression’ – one suspects that Horace has his tongue tucked surreptitiously into his cheek here; the twelve-line opening simile, with its flowing clauses, has evoked the Pindaric mood, but the next four lines, though the focus changes to the victim rather than the victor, look to me like a literary gesture: Horace will not take his task too seriously.

Each poet now states his subject: Horace’s subject is Drusus, though the focus is to widen as the poem progresses and to include Drusus’ ancestors and Rome itself; Pindar, contrary perhaps to expectation, now states his subject unequivocally and without delay: it is to be Diagoras the boxer, his father and ancestors, and their island of Rhodes.

In neither poem does the writer seem, at least at first sight, to elaborate much on the *laudandus*’ abilities: Drusus savaged the Vindelici, and showed good sense; Diagoras is a heavyweight, and has won victories throughout Greece. Each poet uses the surface theme to convey deeper ideas of a gnomic character.

First we learn that Pindar’s hero enjoys descent from Zeus himself; we remember that Drusus is also linked with ‘rex deorum’ whose bird the illustrative eagle is.

Now Pindar passes to the story of Rhodes’ founder, Tlepolemos, and from there to the story of Rhodes’ first emergence from the sea. The gnomai which occur in this account are paraphrased as follows:

1. It’s easy to make mistakes (24–26), particularly when you’re angry (30–31).
2. A man of foresight has ἀρετή and happiness, though it is easy to forget the right way (43–47).
3. σοφία is good, but better if it’s honestly used (53).

In the course of this account, during the second, third and fourth triads, Diagoras, the *laudandus*, is not mentioned. This is the kind of feature which has so often led critics to assert a disunity in Pindar’s odes. But a careful sifting of these gnomai in their context shows that in fact they are fully relevant to Diagoras’ situation. We may summarise them as follows: a man must seek σοφία, ἀρετή, happiness, and honesty, and the ‘right way’, and must shun the reverse of these, as well as violence arising from anger.

So what does Pindar tell us of Diagoras at the close of the poem (89–95)? He shows ἀρετή in boxing, he is happy because respected, he walks the path that hates ὅθος, he has inherited the good sense of his ancestors. Put like this, it seems obvious that Pindar’s poem used the central μῦθος to illustrate and stress virtues which belong to his *laudandus*; but of course read straight through, in context, the connection is not so obvious, and this is why com-
mentators so often claim that Pindar makes only perfunctory gestures towards commemorating a victor. In fact, Pindar never forgets who is paying the piper. Nor, for that matter, does Horace. He, too, incorporates gnomic utterances: but in his case the connection is obvious between subject and gnomai; and there is no attempt to increase the complexity of the ode by dispersing the gnomai as does Pindar. The enemy have been vanquished by Drusus, who owed his worth to his family upbringing: Gnome, 'fortes creanur fortibus et bonis', etc. (29–36). The gnome lasts for eight continuous lines, and there is an end of it. Horace does the work for the reader here; Pindar makes greater demands.

The Horatian virtues bear a remarkable resemblance to those of Pindar: in fact they may be summarised as 'virtus' (31) and 'vis' (33), though 'consilia' were also mentioned, outside the gnome itself, in line 24. 'Virtus' and 'vis' both come under the category of Pindar's ἀρετή, and 'consilia' is essentially Pindar's σοφία. Furthermore the theme of 'vis insita' – of nature as a vital necessity to the efficacy of nurture – is familiar in Pindar; it appears in Isthmian 3.13–14 – 'the familial virtue of men', in Nemean 3.40 – 'the glory of one's race is a weighty asset'; in Pythian 8.45–5 – 'inherited valour shows its progress from father to son'; and frequently in the Olympians, where we may especially compare 9.100–2 – 'nature is best, but men often strive after glory with virtues they have learned'. As is in keeping with his explosive style, Pindar leans to the side of 'ingenium' rather than to that of 'ars'; Horace, as befits the elegant artist, stresses rather the importance of the training programme, the 'doctrina' and 'recti cultus' (33–4).

I have not emphasized Horace's little parenthesis in lines 18–22 – 'for whom from where came the custom that for all time arms their right hands with an Amazonian axe, I have refrained from enquiring, nor is it respectable to know everything'. – it is of course intended as parody of Pindar, though like most parody it exaggerates, somewhat in the style of Houseman's 'Fragment of Greek Tragedy'. Pasquali quite misses the point here when he quotes these lines as evidence for Horace's comparative lack of success in imitating Pindar; 15 Horace is deliberately keeping his distance.

It is not only at the beginning of the poem that Horace uses similes. He compares Hannibal to a forest fire or to the East wind in Sicilian waters in lines 42–44. Hannibal then calls his army deer preyed upon by wolves, comparing the Roman race to a resilient oak-tree. By contrast Pindar, after the opening of the poem, indulges not at all in similes, though he does employ much imagery and metaphor; he speaks of a 'golden snowfall' (χρυσός οίκωδεστος, line 34), the sky 'shivers' (ξυρίζε, line 38), and the poem closes with an evocative image, 'in one portion of time the shifting winds flare in new directions', (ἐν δὲ μηλῷ μοίρῃ χρόνου / ἡλιοτροπί άλλοτι διαμιθόσσοσιν αὔραι, lines 94–5).
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Here we see, I think, a significant difference between the two poets: Pindar is vibrant with meaningful, though difficult, images, especially in his verbs, while Horace’s images are more predictable and less stirring.

Imagery in any poetry has of course the virtue of introducing variety and colour to straightforward statements; it is in fact what Bundy calls ‘foil’. He actually uses the term not for imagery but for the μύθος, that is, the story which Pindar provides as background for most of his odes. Olympian 7 is no exception to this rule; all the characters of this μύθος are partly or wholly mythical, drawn from the ranks of gods and heroes. Horace is not unmindful of Greek myth; but his references to it are all contained within passages of comparison, not passages of narrative: Ganymede is mentioned in passing as a former captive of Zeus’ eagle, the hydra and the prodigies of Colchis and Thebes were no more mighty than the Roman race. The other characters mentioned are men, not heroes or gods – Augustus, the Nerones, Hasdrubal, Hannibal: and it is on them that the weight of the poem rests. Horace, as befits the author of the Satires and Epistles, is at his best when he deals with reality: by that I mean not necessarily historical events, but everyday situations treated with poetic sympathy; when by contrast he indulges in full-blown myth, as in 3.27 (Europa and the bull), he rivals the tedium of Ovid’s worst poetry. But Pindar writes with such vigour that obscure stories or origins spring to life, like the island of Rhodes here springing from the water; his comparative freedom and looseness of metre must take much of the credit for this.

We can find plenty of verbal echoes of Pindar in Odes 4.4: for example, ‘testis Metaurus flumen’ (38), ‘witness the Metaurus river’, recalls a passage in Nemean 6, τεκματρει ταῖν Ἀλκιμιδας τὸ συγγενὲς ίδετιν (8a & b), ‘witness even now with your eyes how lineage works in Alcimidas’, and part of fragment 152, τεκματροματ ἔργοισιν Ἡράκλεος, ‘I witness this by the deeds of Hercules’.

But in phraseology Horace makes less use of Pindar, I think, than Highbarger16 seems to suggest. The similarity in formal structure and in thought is far more important.

And although, as I said earlier, Horace’s Pindarizing mood does not seem to take full flight until Book 4, there are plenty of earlier signs that Horace knew Pindar: in the Roman odes certainly, but even earlier in the sequence of the first collection. Book 1 begins with a reference to the Lesbian lyre (1.34) and one therefore expects an imitation of Sappho or Alcaeus in the second poem. In metrical terms, Horace does imitate Sappho in 1.2: and it is going too far to say, as does Waszink,17 that the poem has nothing except its metre in common with the Lesbian genre: the mood of political tension is essentially Alcaean. But this mood is not wreathed in the pessimism of the epodes; there is a saviour

at hand, escapism is not (as it was in *Epode* 17) the only answer. Lines 25–26: ‘quem vocet divom populus ruentis/imperi rebus?’ (‘which of the gods can the people call to the aid of the falling empire?’). The Latin words sound familiar, and they are indeed echoed by the opening of 1.12 that I quoted earlier (‘quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri/tibia sumis celebrare, Clio/?quem deum?’ lines 1–3). But in 1.12 the mood of growing optimism has reached its height, there is no longer any fear of danger; Horace in 1.2 could not yet afford to echo too closely the words of Pindar in the second *Olympian*, for there were too many uncertainties in the political situation; but by 1.12 the stability of the empire is assured, and the imitation can be bold.

This kind of political involvement on Horace’s part does not endear him to all his readers, many of whom condemn him for servile flattery. One can make the now conventional reply that flattery is a requirement of the genre; and one could with justification argue that the relief heard in Horace’s voice at Augustus’ pre-eminence is in fact a fair echo of the relief of the whole Roman people at the final cessation of war and bloodshed. (This latter argument tends to be best received during, or immediately after, a period of war, and is regarded with scepticism in times of peace.) But the imputation of servility is less damaging to Horace than the imputation, equally prevalent, that he is really a rather boring poet with nothing much to say but willing to say it many times over. (One remembers Byron’s ‘Farewell Horace, whom I hated so’, though one must also remember that he continues, ‘Not for thy faults, but mine’.) Horace is here in the same predicament as Pindar, of whom Voltaire wrote that nobody understands him but we must all admire his empty and prolix verses (‘Toi qui possedas le talent/De parler beaucoup sans rien dire;/Toi qui modulas savamment/Des vers que personne n’entend,/Et qu’il faut toujours qu’on admire’). This type of criticism differs slightly in the case of each poet, but its substance is the same. Pindar is an upper-class snob, Horace a petit-bourgeois, but they alike excel at the mouthing of trite pomposity. How can one answer this charge?

I think that the first, and perhaps most important, reply is that the fundamental truths of life are simple, even trite, in what they say, but that their unique value resides in the way they are expressed. This is why the teaching of poetry, above all lyric poetry, through the medium of translations is distorting and dangerous: if we can imagine the singing of τὸ διδότασθαι δὲ τοι / εἰδότι ρήτερον. ἄγνοιμον δὲ τὸ μὴ προμοθετήν in its proper occasion, there is nobility in the sentiments; but if we take even a good translation, Lattimore’s (‘It is better to know what you teach if you teach it; not to study beforehand is thoughtless’), what endless wastes of banality suggest themselves! The mistake here is, having discerned the ‘message’ of a poem, to regard that as an adequate summary of the poem. This practice naturally gives the impression that the poet is simply a moralist. Pindar and Horace do, of course, give vent to moral

---

reflection, but this reflection plays a vital role in achieving – and this is the second point – the universality of their situations. In Pindar the character who is the subject of the gnome is often a victor or a hero; in Horace he is often a man, or woman, of no particular external consequence, may even be a type-name: but the situation is made of universal application through the gnome. This is not a problem that can easily be resolved by argument; only a reasonably fluent reading of the original poetry, allied to a sympathy with the nature of the genre, can provide the ultimate rationale.

The setting of the gnome in the two poets is markedly distinct. Pindar regularly follows the sublime style, with an elevated tone; Horace is much more matter-of-fact and homely. This is an impression which Horace himself is at pains to emphasise. Pindar, says Horace, is a swan soaring to the clouds: ‘multa Dircaeum levat aura cyncum, tendit, Antoni, quotiens in altos/nubium tractus’. (4.2.25–27). Horace himself by contrast is an industrious low-flying bee: ‘ego apis Matinæ/more modoque//grata carpentis thyma per/laborem/plurimum circa nemus uvidique/Tiburis ripas operosa parvôs/carmina fingo’. (4.2.27–32). But how genuine is this modesty? Horace closed the second book of his Odes (2.20) with a picture of himself turning into a tuneful white bird – that is, a swan – with a world-wide reputation. David West is at pains to point out that Horace thinks metamorphosis ridiculous, and cites Ars Poetica, 185–8, in support. But his laboured explanation is quite unnecessary, the Ars Poetica is referring to stage presentation; not lyric content, and, in any case, this metamorphosis is merely a light-hearted image. Furthermore, the industrious bee is admired by Pindar himself as a model for the fashioning of stories: ‘γραμματίων γάρ ἄνωτος ώμοιον / ἔκ ἄλλοις ἄλλον άντε μέλισσα θύσιν λόγων (Py. 10, 53–54): ‘the shimmer of praise-songs skims like a bee, story to story’. Similarly in the Sixth Olympian, he speaks of πλέκων/ποικίλον ὕμνον (86–87), ‘weaving a colourful tale’, Both Horace and Pindar are well aware of this element of labour in the composition of poetry.

If we accept the arguments advanced by Norwood in his book on Pindar, we shall be able to stress still further Pindar’s use of bee-symbolism, and thereby to cast more doubts on the sincerity of Horace’s distinction between himself and Pindar. Norwood points out that commentators from a scholiast to Wilamowitz have found the Eleventh Pythian obscure and notoriously irrelevant; he then spends several pages in describing what he calls, after Anatole France, his soul’s adventures in a masterpiece. I will not attempt to describe his adventures here; but I shall cite his conclusions, as exemplary of the kind of symbolic criticism which can find something out of nothing. Bees are not mentioned in the Eleventh Pythian. There is however a sort of noise, which might even be a humming or a buzzing: ἵσχετε γὰρ ὄλβος ὥς μείονα φθόνον/.
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'Wealth incurs considerable jealousy; but one who breathes in a lowly place βρέμει murmurs, unseen.' The meaning is clear, and not an uncommon theme in Pindar: insignificance means safety, fame means danger. But Norwood, very likely influenced by the second ode of Horace's fourth book (though he does not say so), asserts that the whole poem revolves around bees: the lowly-breather is the bee, βρέμει is his buzzing, the Ismenian shrine to which the heroines are invited derives from ζυγίνος and so is a beehive, even Cassandra is a bee. One is only surprised that the wealthy man incurring jealousy in line 29 is not made a μέρωψ or bee-eater. The dangers of such gratuitous symbolic interpretations are equally apparent in certain critics of Horace; L. P. Wilkinson puts the matter in a nutshell when he comments on Quinn's 'Latin Explorations': 'Quinn makes most of the poems more interesting - if only one could believe that that was what the poet intended!' Horace shares with Pindar not only certain of his stylistic traits, but also his susceptibility to misinterpretation.

However, the charge that the Eleventh Pythian is obscure, or contains an irrelevant myth, needs to be answered; and I shall follow up my assertion of the unity of this poem by a defence of Horace's Odes 3.4, against which similar charges have been brought.

Pindar's opening address to the daughters of Kadmos leads to the naming of the laudandus, Thrasydaios, whose victory was won in the land of Pylades, who was the friend of Orestes. This seemingly tangential reference to Orestes leads in fact to the main myth of the poem: the myth is in ring-composition form, with Orestes as beginning and end, and Clytemnestra and Cassandra as inner frames. Conventional sentiments follow, recalling Pindar to the laudandus and Thrasydaios' father, whose deeds he acclaims. Pindar then asserts the theme of the blessings of the middle way (μέρωψ αισθαν[της] τωρινηδον, line 53) allied to a good name, and Iolaos and the Dioscuri are cited as exemplars to close the poem.

This ending sounds familiar to a reader of Horace's odes: Iolaos rounds off the poem as the famous companion of Heracles; in Horace Odes 4.7 it is Pirithoos, the famous companion of Theseus, whose mortality provides the conclusion to the poem - and it is no coincidence that this similarity occurs in the Pindaric fourth book; furthermore, Horace Odes 3.4 - the poem which I have already selected as sharing apparent irrelevance with the Eleventh Pythian - also closes with the fate of Pirithoos. The gentle close of each of the three poems is a frequent feature of both poets' writing, and Horace has clearly learned the technique from Pindar.

But to return to the central crux of the poem: what is the relevance of the Orestes-myth? The message which Pindar stresses in his gnomic comments after the myth and the praise is that modest achievement, preserved in the

memory of man, is more desirable than excessively high ambition and achievement, which leads to ruin. Pindar expresses these sentiments in the first person, but they are clearly aimed at Thrasydaios, the laudandus. Now, right at the heart of the myth, Pindar expresses exactly the same sentiments, though in different words: the passage I quoted earlier concerning the wealthy man and the humble. The sentiments are here expressed with references to Clytemnestra, whose pride and self-assertion brought ultimate downfall at her son’s hand.

The coherence of the poem is perfectly clear when seen in this light. Clytemnestra fell through excessive ambition; Thrasydaios must keep his ambition within modest bounds. The actual method of linking the two stories, through Orestes, is subtle and low-keyed; but it helps to distribute the balance of the poem more equably, and gives a denser texture to the simple message.

The traditional charge of irrelevance in this poem is often supported by reference to lines 38-40: ‘Come, friends, have I, who before followed the straight course, whirled astray at the shifting crossroads? Or has some wind cast me from my course, like a boat upon the sea?’ Pindar says, in effect, ‘careful, this might all seem irrelevant to the listener’. This may seem a naive sentiment; but it is equally naive for the listener, or modern reader, to take Pindar’s words at their face value. Pindar knows very well that he is not being irrelevant. The approach is in fact a convention of the genre, used by Pindar elsewhere, for example, at Nemean 3.26-7 (‘My heart, to what foreign cape do you turn my course?’) and at Pythian 10.4 (‘Why do I boast to no purpose?’). It serves the same kind of purpose as a Horatian recusatio: to alert the listener or reader to an underlying seriousness.

The sentiment of the middle way which I quoted earlier (μέμφομαι αἴσιν τότινιίδον, line 53) has been taken by at least one scholar (Rauchenstein) to indicate Pindar’s personal hostility towards Hiero’s court in Sicily; David Young has shown how prevalent and how dangerous this kind of autobiographical fallacy is: Pindar has been accused of flattering the Sicilian tyrants and of opposing them, of Medizing and of not Medizing, and of other contradictory attitudes. If we could remove the excessively historical and autobiographical approach (such as Bowra’s) from interpretation of the works of Pindar, many of the traditional arguments for dating the poems fall away. To take a further example from this same poem, there is no need to posit a ‘Spartan colouring’ in the introduction of Iolaos and the Dioscuri: their introduction is due to their characteristics of prowess, renown, and loyalty, qualities with which Thrasydaios, the laudandus, is also endowed.

Horace Odes 3.4 (‘Descende caelo’) is not conspicuous for its affinities with Pythian II, though I have already pointed out a similarity in the respective
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22. '3 Odes of Pindar'.
closing stanzas. It is frequently compared (e.g., by Highbarger, Commager, and Gordon Williams) with Pythians 1 and 8, which contain comparable reference to, for example, the gods’ victorious struggle against the overweening giants; or with Pindar’s resounding phrase in Isthmian 4, χρὴ δὲ πᾶν ξυρὸν ἀμαμαρνασια τὸν ἔχθρον (52), ’You must blot out your enemy by hook or by crook’.

But I think that the comparison with the Eleventh Pythian is, though not so obvious, even more meaningful in its exposure of basic structural technique.

Like Pythian 11, Odes 3.4 begins with a summons: Horace calls the Muse to sing. He tells (through the Muse) of his original dedication to poetry: the ‘fabulosae . . . palumbes’ covered him in childhood with leaves of myrtle and of laurel. Critics have often attacked this passage for its irrelevance; but its relevance only gradually becomes apparent.

Horace continues (21–36) by describing how the Camenae, the Muses, have protected him in all his moments of danger – at Philippi, at sea, or when threatened by the falling tree: and how they will protect him in all his journeyings.

Now, at about almost exactly the centre point of the poem, come the vital lines (37–42):

‘vos Caesarem altum, militia simul
fessas cohortes addidit oppidis,
finire quiserentem labores,
Pierio recreatis antro.
vos lene consilium et datis et dato
gaudetis, almae.’

The Muses, says Horace, refresh Augustus and give him ‘lene consilium’, which to their delight he accepts. That is, he opts for peace.

There follows the story of the gigantomachy, and the victory of the gods. The gnome is drawn: mere brute force, ‘vis’, is inadequate unless tempered by good sense, ‘consilium’. The poem concludes with exempla of those who have learnt their lesson to their cost: the lesson is referred to as ‘my views’, ‘mearum . . . sententiarum’ (69–70).

It is now possible to see the relevance of the initial invocation and the autobiographical element. These elements are not merely to be ‘excused’, as Williams puts it. They are essential to the poem.

Horace must convince the reader, and particularly Augustus, that he is genuinely ‘Musarum sacerdos’, and that his precepts have more than mere mortal validity. He therefore explains that the Muses have shown their care for him from an early age, and that he can interpret their advice. He calls upon them

---

24. op. cit.
27. op. cit. p. 54.
for their ‘consilium’ on a political question – what policy should Augustus follow? – and receives the answer ‘lene’, one of peace and reconciliation. The giants serve as a dread warning for those who fail to take such advice: and the message here is both for Augustus himself and for his potential opponents.

The poem therefore presents the Muses, Horace, and perhaps Augustus, as champions of peace: the validity of Horace’s sentiments is supported by his invocation of his guardian spirits, and his association with them. It is this which gives the poem its personal and poetic quality; without the autobiographical verses we should simply have a political tract.

What then, has this to do with Pindar? The links at beginning and end have already been mentioned; but there are other facets. The restricted space occupied by the laudandus (here not more than six lines) is a typical Pindaric characteristic: the emphasis is laid on the laudandus not by sheer weight of words, but by careful positioning and use of foil. The myth, the gigantomachy, acts as foil, and is supported by the gnome (65–68) in Pindaric fashion. The gnome itself is personalised (‘mea... sententiarum’), though as in Pindar the superficial personalisation conceals a common sentiment of the people.

It is not only in the initial invocation (the ‘ке’ and ‘Descende’) that similarity lies. Each poet introduces a second invocation, and in similar words: ‘vester, Camenae, vester’ (21) says Horace, and Pindar Μοισια, τὸ δὲ τέσσερ (41).

The single ‘message’ of the poems, too, has much in common: Clytemnestra fell due to excessive ambition, so did the giants; Thrasydaios must beware this fault, so too must Augustus and his enemies.

But more important than all these resemblances, I think, is the manner in which the structure of the poem, and the direction it takes, are concealed from the casual listener or reader: for centuries critics have failed to see any relevance in the ‘Orestes-myth’, as it is usually called (though the ‘Clytemnestra-myth’ would be a better title), or in Horace’s autobiographical account: yet each passage, properly understood, provides a key to its poem.

I have been able to touch upon only a few poems of these two poets, but I have tried to make these poems representative of their total opera. I have suggested that although Horace does openly imitate certain obvious aspects of Pindaric writing (the rolling periods, the naive digressions), the spiritual kinship of the two lies rather in certain attitudes towards art and towards society, and in an ability to integrate seemingly diverse elements into a harmonious, though complex, whole. Metrically, Horace made no attempt to emulate Pindar: but, as Campbell put it, ‘In the metres of Alcaeus and Sappho he wrote with the art of Pindar’. The art, yes; but also the ingenium of Pindar.29

28. op. cit. p. 201.
29. Since writing this paper (which was delivered to the Conference of the South African Classical Association in January 1975) I have seen Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones’ article in JHS XCVIII 1973, 109ff., entitled ‘Modern Interpretation of Pindar: the Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes’, with which I find myself very much in sympathy. But it is interesting to note that W.S. Barrett, in an article in the same volume, moves entirely within the historiobiographical tradition, and apparently sees no reason to apologise for so doing.
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