

2-2018

A Mixed Place: The Pastoral Symposium of Horace

Kristen Ehrhardt

John Carroll University, kehrhardt@jcu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://collected.jcu.edu/fac_bib_2018



Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ehrhardt, Kristen, "A Mixed Place: The Pastoral Symposium of Horace" (2018). *2018 Faculty Bibliography*. 14.
https://collected.jcu.edu/fac_bib_2018/14

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Bibliographies Community Homepage at Carroll Collected. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2018 Faculty Bibliography by an authorized administrator of Carroll Collected. For more information, please contact connell@jcu.edu.

A Mixed Place: The Pastoral Symposium of Horace, *Odes* 1.17

KRISTEN EHRHARDT

ABSTRACT: When Horace invites Tyndaris to an outdoor drinking party in *Odes* 1.17, he mixes the *locus amoenus* of pastoral with the trappings of symposia. I argue that the mixture of the two poetic spaces creates a potentially volatile combination by muddling the expectations of each place's safety and danger. I read 1.17 in light of other pastoral poems in *Odes* 1 to establish Horace's creation of safe places through the negation of natural perils. Although pastoral has its own dangers, the addition of sympotic motifs in 1.17 attracts different beasts—sexual predators—to Tyndaris' party.

A central conceit of Horace's pastoral poems is the preternatural safety of their speakers: despite whatever dangers might lurk in the natural realm, the speaker himself remains unharmed. The tensions between safety and danger in these poems can nevertheless be acute, and safety is not assured for everyone. *Odes* 1.17 is frequently read as a pastoral poem,¹ but its Lucretilian field includes a number of overtly sympotic references,

This article began as a part of a chapter of my dissertation and was presented at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association. I owe a great debt of gratitude to Patricia Rosenmeyer, Valerie Reed Hickman, Nathan Huber, and to CW's editors and anonymous reviewers for their comments, which helped to strengthen the piece.

¹ While Horace's *Odes* do not employ bucolic characteristics to the same extent as Theocritus' *Idylls* or Vergil's *Eclogues*, natural tropes and pastoral models appear throughout book 1. Horace hints at the importance of pastoral places to the poetic program of *Odes* 1 in 1.1 twice, first by including a man stretched out under a wild strawberry tree, a species which reappears in 1.17 (*viridi membra sub arbuto / stratus*, 1.21-22; cf. Mayer 2012: 57 for the pastoral nature of *arbutus*), and later by highlighting his own cool grove (*gelidum nemus*, 30) as something that sets him apart from others. Indeed, descriptions of natural locations appear in roughly a third of the book's poems: 1.2, 1.7, 1.9, 1.17, 1.19, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.26, 1.32, 1.38.

many more than one might expect to find in pastoral.² In fact, over the course of the poem, the locale that begins as a *locus amoenus* morphs into a symposium—a much different poetic place. Issues of personal safety shift in tandem with the change of location: safety in pastoral is not the same in the symposium and as the pastoral landscape is transformed, the safety of the scene becomes more tenuous. Indeed, although the narrator is never in jeopardy, 1.17 ends on a note of sexual assault.

In what follows, I begin with an analysis of the pastoral elements of the poem, comparing Horace's creation of a bucolic landscape in 1.17 with Theocritus' *Idyll* 1 and Horace's own *Odes* 1.22 and 1.23. Next, I examine the elements that mark a shift to a second place within the poem: an outdoor iteration of a Greek symposium that is juxtaposed with the previous pastoral scene. The transition from pastoral to sympotic space is made possible, in part, by the way the poem functions within the genre of invitation poems, especially in light of other invitation poems in the *Odes*. At the heart of any invitation is the creation of a shared place, in this case a place for Horace's speaker to share with his addressee Tyndaris; but the abrupt inclusion of Cyrus, as a potential—and potentially dangerous—party-crasher, threatens the safety promised by the previous stanzas. Reading 1.17 through this lens reveals the crucial contradictions at the heart of the poem that subvert the safety of the proposed site. Horace tempts his addressee with an idealized sympotic scene to delight the senses: peaceful and pleasurable drinking along with musical entertainment. But because the poem incorporates two poetic spaces, it carries the potential dangers of both spaces as well: threats from both the natural and the political realms for men, and for women the danger of sexual predators, despite the narrator's repeated pledges of safety. By manipulating the spaces of the poem and creating a place marked with sexuality, Horace controls the scene as far as his own safety

² Verrall 1884: 150 calls 1.17 a "Sabine idyll." Commager 1962 examines the pastoral aspects of 1.17. In general, Pucci 1975, Putnam 1994, Davis 1991: 200–204, and Oliensis 1998: 121–24 provide useful summaries of late-twentieth-century scholarship. Leach 1993: 284 briefly discusses the first few stanzas of *Ode* 1.17 in her broad examination of Horace's descriptions of his Sabine farm as a poetic and cultural space that mixes rural life with conventions. Nagel 2000 investigates the shift toward violence over the course of the poem. Spencer 2006: 267 suggests that Cyrus is a straw man and "almost comical." Breaking from a trend that ignored the dangerous potentials of 1.17, Pucci 1975 argues that the mix of safety and disquieting danger within the poem creates a more ambiguous feeling than had previously been supposed. Dunn 1990 exposes the violence of Horace's seduction by focusing on the rhetorical strategy of the invitation within the poem.

is concerned. But the intrusion of Cyrus at the poem's conclusion presents a threat of violence to Tyndaris beyond any expectation of danger found in either pastoral or sympotic poetry.

Much of the analysis that follows depends on an understanding of the text as a whole, so I begin by *presenting* *Odes* 1.17 in its entirety.³ The poem may be divided into three sections: the first section (lines 1–12) presents a pastoral scene; in the shorter second section, the central “Horatian turn” of the poem (lines 13–16), the pastoral bounty overflows thanks to divine powers;⁴ finally, in the last section (lines 17–28), sympotic elements take the place of pastoral ones.

Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem
mutat Lycaeo Faunus et igneam
defendit aestatem capellis
usque meis pluviosque ventos.

inpune tutum per nemus arbutos 5
quaerunt latentis et thyma deviae
olentis uxores mariti,
nec viridis metuunt colubras

nec Martialis haediliae lupos,
utumque dolci, Tyndari, fistula 10
valles et Usticae cubantis
levia personuere saxa.

di me tuentur, dis pietas mea
et musa cordi est. hic tibi copia 15
manabit ad plenum benigno
ruris honorum opulenta cornu.

hic in reducta valle Caniculae
vitabis aestus et fide Teia

³ All quotations from the *Odes* come from Wickham and Garrod 1963; all translations are my own.

⁴ Harrison 2004: 82 explores and categorizes Horace's use of the central stanza as “a fulcrum in the middle at which the poem in some sense diverts or turns away from its initial course.” The turn of 1.17 seems to defy the categories Harrison develops (gnomic, sympotic, hymnic, authorial, and false closure). It is perhaps most similar to the gnomic middle, as Horace offers a form of moralizing as he proclaims that the gods watch over him. Yet this morality is not universal but exceptionally particular—the safety of the Sabine farm is limited to the repeated first-person pronoun and pronominal adjective (*me . . . mea*, 13).

dices laborantis in uno
Penelopen vitreamque Circen: 20

hic innocentis pocula Lesbii
duces sub umbra, nec Semeleius
cum Marte confundet Thyoneus
proelia, nec metues protervum

suspecta Cyrum, ne male dispari 25
incontinentis iniciat manus
et scindat haerentem coronam
crinibus immeritamque vestem.

Quick Faunus often leaves Lycaeus for flowery Lucretilis and continually defends my goats from fiery summer heat and rainy winds. The wives of stinky husbands, safely straying through a safe grove, seek hidden arbutus and thyme. The kids fear neither the green snakes nor Mars' wolves whenever the valleys and smooth rocks of reclining Ustica resound with sweet pipe, Tyndaris.

The gods keep me safe: my loyalty and Muse please the gods. Here, for you, a rich abundance of the country will overflow from the kindly horn of plenty.

Here, in a tucked away valley, you'll avoid the heat of the Dog-Star and with a Teian lyre you'll tell of Penelope and gleaming Circe, worked up over one man. Here you'll drink cups of harmless Lesbian wine under the shade. And Bacchus, son of Semele, won't mix with Mars in a battle, nor will you, under suspicion, fear reckless Cyrus, lest he wickedly strike his unequal with intemperate hands and rip the garland clinging to your hair and your undeserving dress.

The first section begins by creating a place firmly within the bucolic tradition, and ends by opening this bucolic landscape to Tyndaris. These lines are awash with pastoral imagery, beginning with the second word of the very first line, *amoenum*, which marks the creation of a *locus amoenus* on Horace's own farm, Lucretilis. The creation of the space continues with the overtly pastoral tokens of grove (*nemus* 5), shade tree (*arbutos* 5), and fragrant groundcover (*thyma* 6) as well as obviously pastoral characters, namely Faunus (2) and stinky goats (*capellis* 3 and *olentis uxores mariti* 7).

The safety of this farm is highlighted repeatedly in the first half of the poem: *defendit* 3, *impune* and *tutum* 5, *tuentur* 13, and *benigno* 15.

But, although Horace seems to create a safe pastoral locale, he complicates these efforts with intimations of danger throughout the same lines, naming a host of typical threats to the agrarian calm: the summer's heat and rainy winds (*igneam aestatem* 2–3, *pluuio ventos* 4) and predators—snakes and wolves (*colubras* 8, *lupos* 9). As part of the natural world, Horace's farm is not immune to the elements; danger is a necessary component of the pastoral. That danger, however, is constrained: Horace's tutelary divinity, Faunus, together with other gods (*di . . . dis*, 13), helps to maintain the safety of the place, even allowing the speaker to let his livestock wander while remaining unscathed (*impune . . . quaerunt* 5–6). In this way, the beginning of the poem creates a rural tranquility that recalls the innocence of golden-age pastoral landscapes as Horace's kids are left to frolic blithely with wolves in sunny fields (8–9)—all, of course, perfectly safe.

The familiarity of this landscape comes from the presence of numerous tropes of pastoral poetry. Much of the poem is marked by echoes of Theocritus—in particular, *Idyll* 1. Horace's stinky goats—which are simultaneously elevated through the anthropomorphic use of marital status (*uxores mariti*, 7) and debased by reference to their scent (*olentis*, 7)—are reminiscent of the goatherd's command in the final line of *Idyll* 1: “She-goats—stop leaping around, lest the he-goat get up for you” (αἰ δὲ χίμαιραι, σὺ μὴ σκιρτασῆτε, μὴ ὁ τράγος ὕμμιν ἀναστῆ).⁵ And if Horace's goats remind a reader of the conclusion of the bucolic model Theocritus provides, the sweet pipes (*dulci fistula*, 10), whose music fills Horace's hills and valleys, recall the sweet pipes at the beginning of the *Idyll* (ὁδὸν σοφίσδεσ 2–3).

In addition to creating a space that reminds us of rural life and poetic goatherds, 1.17, through its description of Faunus' travel between lands, Horace may provide another Theocritean intertext, here with the latter part of *Idyll* 1.⁶ Near the end of his lament for Daphnis, still within the song-within-the-song section, Thyrsis summons Pan, asking him to leave Lykaios for Sicily—Theocritus' own home.⁷ Here, Thyrsis sings:

⁵ Hunter 1999: 107 discusses the potential pun of ἀναστῆ, meaning both “get up” and “have an erection.”

⁶ Edinger 1971: 307 notes this connection but doubts that this “constitutes a conscious reference.”

⁷ Vergil's summoning of Pan near the beginning of *Georgics* 1, lines 16–17 (*ipse, nemus linquens patrium saltusques Lycae / Pan, ovium custos*, “you, Pan, guardian of sheep, leaving your native grove and glades of Lycaeus”) may offer a more contemporary

ὦ Πάν Πάν, εἴτ' ἐσσίκαιτ' ὄρεα μακρὰ Λυκαίω,
εἶτε τύγ' ἀμφιπολεῖς μέγα Μαίναλον, ἐνθ' ἐπὶ νῆσον
τὰν Σικελίαν, Ἑλικας δὲ λίπερίον αἰπύ τε σῆμα
τῆνο Λυκαονίδαο, τὸ καὶ μακάρεσσιν ἀγητόν.

(Theoc. 1.123–125)

O Pan, Pan—whether you are on the tall mountains of Lykaeos or if you watch over great Maenalos—come to the Sicilian island. Leave behind the tomb of Helice and the steep grave of the Lykanides, admired by the blessed ones.

Horace places his own poem in the pastoral tradition by summoning Theocritus and creating a parallel between his own poetic voice and that of the singing shepherd, Thyrsis. Horace's speaker, however, does not request the presence of a god: in contrast to Thyrsis' prayer to Pan beseeching the god's presence through the imperative, "leave" (λίπε, 124), Horace's characterization of Faunus' presence is entirely in the indicative: *mutat, defendit* (2–3). Indeed, as noted above, Faunus' divine presence helps to maintain the bucolic status quo at Lucretilis.

Rather than issuing an invitation to the gods, Horace invites a *puella* to his field. Line 10 introduces Tyndaris as the poem's addressee, invited to share in the rustic bounty. This *puella* is so imbued with pastoral overtones that her name is framed between the sweet pipes of bucolic poetry (*dulci, Tyndari, fistula*, 10).⁸ Presumably, the safety afforded to the livestock should apply equally to her. Yet, any poetic heroine versed in literary tradition ought to know the erotic implications of such a place.⁹

The emphasis on safety from the overt dangers of the natural landscape, combined with erotic themes, is a common aspect of Horace's

connection to the Greek for Horace. Putnam 1994: 372–73 notes that this instance Horace's use of Vergil's pastoral poetry is one of numerous underlying connections to Vergil throughout 1.17.

⁸ Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 221 suggest that her name itself may have pastoral overtones. Mayer 2012: 149 notes that the placement of her name in the middle of the pipes highlights the importance of music to the girl. Griffin 1986: 20, on the other hand, proposes a mythical lineage for her as a daughter of Tyndareus, thus a relative of Helen and Clytemnestra.

⁹ The age of Tyndaris is uncertain, but the placement of a young girl in a similarly fresh environment certainly has poetic precedents. Indeed, we might well assume that Tyndaris, who knows her Homeric heroines well enough to sing about them, would also be aware of the dangers of outdoor escapades endured by Persephone in the *Hymn to Demeter*, or Moshcus' Europa. On the tenuous eroticism of meadows, see also Carson 1999: 77–100; Calame 1999; Rosenmeyer 2004; Deacy 2013.

pastorally located poems. A few poems later in the collection, *Odes* 1.22 and 1.23 also combine pastoral and erotic motifs and despite differences in tone, meter, and content, both poems continue to juxtapose the dangers of places with the safety of the poet. In *Ode* 1.22, the poet's safety accompanies him to any place, regardless of its inherent dangers.¹⁰

Integer vitae scelerisque purus
non eget Mauris iaculis neque arcu
nec venenatis gravida sagittis,
Fusce, pharetra,
sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas 5
sive facturus per inhospitalem
Caucasum vel quae loca fabulosus
lambit Hydaspes.

(1.22.1-8)

He, untouched by life and free of crime, has no need for Moorish missiles, nor a bow or quivers heavy with poison arrows, Fuscus; whether he is about to make a trip through sweltering Syrtes, or the inhospitable Caucasus, or the places that the storied Hydaspes laps.

A list of exotic locales (*Mauris* 2, *Syrtis* 5, *Caucasum* 6, *Hydaspes* 7) entwines with a list of weapons (*iaculis* 2, *arcu* 2, *venenatis sagittis* 3, *pharetra* 4) as the poem names a variety of possible perils that stand both in contrast with, and as a threat to, the idealized, unblemished, characteristics that open the poem (*integer vitae scelerisque purus*, 1). Horace neutralizes these dangers through strategic negation, by beginning with the *non eget* of the second line and continuing with *neque . . . nec* (2–5). Despite these negations, the list—including arrows and missiles, as well as distant places—casts an essential shadow over the poem through *praeteritio*.

As the poem continues, the foreign locales emphasized at the beginning are contrasted with a new description in the poem's middle stanza. In this pastoral forest, Horace is a poor excuse for a *miles amoris*; rather than highlighting the poet as a soldier of love, here again the poem emphasizes place and its attendant dangers. Horace's Sabine estate centers

¹⁰ Pucci 2005: 1–21 provides a comprehensive summary of previous scholarship on 1.22. More recently, Harrison 2007: 265–69 uses 1.22 to demonstrate the densely stylistic nature of the poem, but does not delve into the metapoetics, while Mayer's commentary focuses on the use of irony and Horace's poetic persona (2005: 168–69).

the poem as the poet emphasizes his personal safety despite the potential for catastrophe beyond the *terminum* (9–12).

Namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
dum meam canto Lalagem et ultra
terminum curis vagor expeditis,
fugit inermem,

(1.22.9–12)

For indeed, in the Sabine wood a wolf fled from me, defenseless, while I was singing my Lalage and wandering beyond the edge, unburdened by cares,

Any understanding of the Sabine wood as a pastoral locale derives from the context of *silvae* in *Odes* 1 generally, where a wood, a wolf, and a girl with a rustic name become the poetic shorthand for bucolic. Yet, the landscape description here is scant, and the dangerous encounter with the Sabine *lupus* makes these woods no more hospitable than the distant wild locations that populate the rest of the poem. At the same time, the poem hinges on the poet's acknowledgement of his own obliviousness to danger and his dedication to his song even in the face of the cruelest beasts. Put him anywhere, he claims, and Horace will continue to love Lalage.

Pone me pigris ubi nulla campis
arbor aestiva recreatur aura,
quod latus mundi nebulae malusque
Iuppiter urget;

pone sub curru nimium propinqui
solis in terra domibus negata:
dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo,
dulce loquentem.

(1.22.17–24)

Put me in the sluggish plains where no tree is revived by a summery breeze, in a part of the world where clouds and bad weather threaten. Put me under the too-near chariot of the sun in a land refused to houses: I will love Lalage sweetly laughing, sweetly speaking.

In this final section of this poem, a wide-ranging geography returns, though here topographical descriptions take the place of the specific, named places at the beginning of the poem. Plains (*campis*, 17), summer

or green lizards rustle a bramble, she trembles both in her heart and knees. But I'm not like that to you—I'm not like a ferocious tiger or a Gaetulian lion, pursuing you to subdue you. Now stop following your mother—you're ripe for a man.

Like 1.17, this poem begins with a markedly pastoral space; yet this space functions at a further remove, in a simile of a young woman as a wild young beast.¹² In this simile, the sought-after girl, Chloe, becomes a fawn, while her world becomes one of untrod mountains, breezes, trees, leaves, and lizards (*montibus aviis*, 2; *aurarum*, 4; *silvae*, 4; *folliis*, 4; *virides lacertae*, 6–7). Although the space is not in itself terrifying, the poem's emotional tone is one of fear: the *pavidam* (2), which looks ahead to the fawn's mother in the following line, might well be said to apply to the fawn herself, as the poet coaxes her to not be fearful of the landscape (*non sine vano . . . metu*, 4–5). Indeed, at the center of the poem, fawn and mother become folded into one lost and fearful creature. The language of the landscape shifts and moves around her, and the deer's own reactions mirror these motions; thus main verbs that mean “shiver” end both the first and last lines (*inhorruit*, 5 and *tremitt*, 8) of this stanza, marking the continuity between landscape and deer, the natural and the female.

Finally, having established a tone of trepidation in the previous lines, Horace changes tactics at the *atqui* (9), describing himself as a pursuer. Here he moves both within and outside the overarching simile. Playing within it, he tells her that he will not hurt her, that he is no lion or tiger (9–10), while outside the simile, he extracts himself and the poem from his constructed natural world, and ends by stating what he is, namely a *vir* (12). As the poet, he has complete control over this situation. The negation at the beginning of the stanza, *atqui non ego te*, emphasizes the deliberate ambiguity of this situation. Although Horace's speaker promises not to harm, he does so in a hyperbolic way, in the guise of a ferocious cat, making no promises of safety should Chloe succumb to him as a man.

As potential comparanda of Horace's pastoral odes, we can see that *Odes* 1.22 and 1.23 continue to explore the issues of love, safety, and potential danger that we saw in the first half of 1.17. In 1.22, Horace's

¹² Scholarship on 1.23 often focuses on the springtime youthfulness of Chloe (Porter 1985) or on the danger of the desire; see Ancona 1989 and Fredricksmeier 1994.

speaker is afforded the luxury of safely moving through spaces with ease, but it is not clear that women can expect similar circumstances: after all, Lalage is kept safe by staying away.¹⁵ Indeed, the simile in 1.23 of Chloë-as-fawn puts the young woman in the position of prey, with Horace as a predator. By contrast, the invitation of 1.17 allows Tyndaris an element of choice in the situation. But as the poem moves to the center, and then beyond, Horace creates a space that mixes pastoral with sympotic and, in doing so, presents a more serious challenge to the woman's safety.

In the first section, as we have seen, Horace introduces his safe patch of land with a claim that Faunus watches over his livestock. But at the poem's central turn, the description of rural extravagance overwhelms our earlier expectation of the farm, and Horace presents us with thrice plenty (*copia* 14, *ad plenum* 15, and *opulenta* 16). The abundance contained in these lines verges on excess. In the same stanza, he reiterates that the gods keep him safe (*di me tuentur*, 13), but it remains in question whether the same security that he and his animals enjoy will be provided for his guest. This central stanza also highlights the importance of this particular poetic space by introducing a central *hic* (14), a marker that ties the next half of the poem together as a part of a spatial tricolon through its repetition as the first word in the following two stanzas.

In the poem's final section, Horace switches from the bucolic description of his farm to possible pastimes for himself and Tyndaris. The specifically sympotic terms he uses here—the lyre (*fide*), drinking cups (*popula*), and wine—function as tokens that redefine the space in the second half of the poem, as it changes from pastoral to something somewhat different. This portion of the poem provides an archaizing description of a Greek symposium—quite different from a Roman drinking party—that creates a nostalgic, idealized symposium as a complement to the first section's golden-age, bucolic landscape. Traditionally, symposia attempted to create safe locations for men to sing, drink, and discuss politics, but they were not immune to outside danger; archaic Greek poems often incorporated the political dangers of their world into verses meant for intimate performances. This was particularly the case with the poems of Alcaeus, whose meter Horace borrows for this poem. The

¹⁵ Throughout *Odes* 1, Horace never finds his life in peril in poems that highlight outdoor imagery. However, this does not quite hold true in subsequent books, as he experiences danger in his own poetic *silva* in *Odes* 2.17 when Faunus once again protects him from a tree that nearly falls on him.

transformation from pastoral to sympotic scene thus has the potential to raise new issues for the safety of both the speaker and his invited guest.

It is Tyndaris' appearance in the poem that triggers the shift in scene. Now aspects of the countryside begin to morph, so that even the landscape itself takes part in the symposium. After Horace invites Tyndaris, invoking her name in line 10, we see that the countryside itself reclines, *Usticae cubantis* (11), becoming another guest at this event. Although the extensive description of the natural environment in the first section might seem contrary to the usually enclosed, private nature of symposia, this is no symposium in the wilds: the event is contained within the confines of Horace's own property. Moreover, this particular spot in the poem itself—one that contains both pastoral and sympotic elements—functions as the pivot point at the absolute center of the entire poem, thanks to the *hic* of line 14.¹⁴ Our attention is drawn back to this point twice by the repeating *hic* at the beginning of the next two clauses (17 and 21). The deictic tricolon ties together the attributes of the space of the shady hollow (*reducta valle* 17): as a particular place that provides shade for drinking cups of wine, a pastoral place fit for singing sympotic poetry. This *reducta valle* becomes the poem's equivalent of an *andron*, a secluded space away from the bustle of daily life, fit for a symposium. As the rural landscape shifts into a sympotic mode, the underlying meta-poetics shift from Theocritus to include Greek lyric poetry.

Tyndaris—no timid Chloe of 1.23—has been invited to drink and recite poetry at this outdoor manifestation of a symposium.¹⁵ Tyndaris appears as a lyric version of an elegiac *docta puella*: a girl who can read and understand poetry, is inclined to attend parties, and may decide on her own whether she wishes to listen to poetry or attend those parties.¹⁶ Now, in an allusion to the poetry of Anacreon, Tyndaris is urged to play the *fide*

¹⁴ Syndikus 1995: 17–31 examines the different ways Horace manipulates the shifts in movement in various *Odes*.

¹⁵ Pavlock 1982: 79–98 traces the roots of the invitation poem to archaic lyric poetry and points to its great popularity in the Hellenistic period. See also Cairns 1992; Dunn 1990.

¹⁶ As James 2003: 22–23 notes, “the elegiac *puella* is necessarily not a simple character but a complex one, just as her reading task is complex. . . . The elegiac *puella* must necessarily be intelligent and literate in order to understand the poetry directed at her. She must also therefore refuse it by becoming regularly unavailable in order to supply material for its frequent mournful contents lamenting her absence. Yet if she understands his poems, she may reject his persuasion on its own merits and faults rather than because of her fickleness or cruelty.”

Teia (18) and sing of Penelope and Circe *laborantes* over one man (19).¹⁷ While it might seem fitting for Tyndaris to sing about the female side of Homeric tales, the epic women's worrying about and struggling over Ulysses foreshadows the potential struggle in the final stanza.¹⁸

Another metapoetic reference with a sympotic context appears a few lines later when Horace's speaker presses her to drink *pocula Lesbii* (21); here the reference to Lesbos may be seen as a reference to the wine's appellation, but also to poets—Sappho or Alcaeus (or both). Recalling the Lesbian *barbiton* of 1.1, as well as Anacreon's Teian lyre only a few lines prior, we have little difficulty identifying a metapoetic reference to Alcaeus and Sappho here. Sappho might be the obvious reference in a number of ways, both on account of the gender she shares with Tyndaris and the way Tyndaris' proposed poetry could mirror the love triangle of Sappho 31. Yet as the poet associated with often stasiotic poetry intended for sympotic performance, we cannot rule out Alcaeus' influence here as well—either as political or love poet. And the inclusion of Lesbian wine (of whichever flavor) marks the beginning of a turmoil that rocks the rest of the poem.

The wine itself is described as *innocentis* (21). The term introduces a measure of suspicion by verbally injecting a hint of *nocens* hidden beneath its negation—the definition of wine as harmless leads us to wonder about the presence of harm in this place. The proleptic negation contained within the word *innocentis* continues throughout the penultimate stanza, as can be seen in the next clause, *nec Semeleius cum Marte confundet Thyoneus proelia*, “Thyoneus, son of Semele (i.e., Bacchus)

¹⁷ The Teian lyre reference here placed in a setting of an outdoor drinking party is more similar to the Anacreontea, the Hellenistic corpus of poetry written under the name of Anacreon (poems 5, 18, 32, and 41 are particularly relevant here), than to any archaic Greek poetry that we can trace to Anacreon.

¹⁸ Davis 1991: 203 examines the significance of these two women singing songs of epic women with an Anacreontic lyre (*fide Teia*, 18), noting the irreverence of the poetic reversal of epic stature that results from placing the legitimate wife, Penelope, in competition with her would-be usurper, Circe, in the context of “erotic rivalry.” Yet it must be remembered that Circe is not Calypso. Although Odysseus certainly followed Circe to her bed and stayed with her for a year, Circe not only allowed the hero to continue his journey, but also gave him directions to help him (*Od.* 10.466 ff.). Mayer 2012: 151 suggests a memory lapse; Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 225 propose that the conflation between Calypso and Circe was fairly common in antiquity and cite Plutarch as another instance. But I would suggest that perhaps Horace himself makes no mistake here, but instead introduces the sort of mistake that his *docta*, but not too *docta, puella* might make.

will not join in battle with Mars” (22–24). This claim runs parallel to the poem’s earlier claim about the safety of Horace’s goats, both by incorporating a counterintuitive *nec . . . nec* claim, as well as through a reference to the god of war. In the same way that *metuunt . . . nec Martialis haediliae lupos* (8–9) seemed to be an overly optimistic claim, even for a utopic pastoral place, so too does the later reassurance of a lack of drunken brawls seem naively positive. In a sympotic setting, both Mars and Bacchus may readily appear as thematic emblems of lyric poetry. Nevertheless, the suggestion of divine battles begins to cast a sinister shadow over the proceedings.

Throughout the poem, the possibility of injury reveals the linguistic cracks in the façade of Horace’s safe countryside party. These fissures lead to the accumulation of unease in the final two stanzas, ultimately ending with a detailed, yet similarly elided, threat against Tyndaris’ safety. The *coronam* (27), the sympotic garland that clings to Tyndaris’ hair and is potentially torn asunder in the final stanza, brings the use of sympotic tokens to a markedly personal level, marking Tyndaris’ own body as part of the sympotic site.

Before examining this jarring final stanza, I would like to pause for a moment to explore the importance of the invitation in the poem and its interactions with the poem’s preoccupations with space and place. When Horace as speaker addresses Tyndaris in line 10, the poem shifts from a pastoral description to an invitation poem.¹⁹ At the center of the poem (13–16), following the invitation, the pastoral landscape description continues to expand, incorporating an abundance worthy of a golden age while continuing the theme of safety. Yet, as we have seen, this description shifts quickly again as the pastoral party becomes a drinking party which the violent Cyrus crashes, if only potentially. The invitation

¹⁹ 1.17’s status as a variation on an invitation poem is mostly accepted by scholars. Cairns 1992: 86 lists it among other invitation poems. Yet Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 216 propose a reading in which Tyndaris is understood to be neither a real person nor even an invitee; rather, she is a “dream figure, belonging to the world of Alexandrian pastoral,” along the lines of Theocritus’ Galatea. Except, they continue, she is not truly a pastoral figure but “an urban *hetaera*, like the Phyllis to whom Horace gives a rustic party in 4.11.” This characterization of the poem’s addressee is perplexing, even counterintuitive: if she is a *hetaera*, then going to parties to entertain men is her stock and trade—does a *hetaera* want to go to a party and get her clothes ripped off during her spare time? Is this really her idea of fun? In fact, Nisbet and Hubbard’s primary suggestion, that Tyndaris is just a “dream figure,” is itself a heteronormative male fantasy—they have essentially turned Tyndaris into a Playboy bunny in a sexy shepherdess costume who not only makes her trade in male party entertainment but also revels in her off-time.

is itself a space that bridges the poem's pastoral and sympotic sites. As such, it highlights the poem's investment in spatiality by encouraging movement from one place to another. The implication here is that if Tyndaris comes to Lucretilis, the site of Horace's lush picnic, her action might be understood to parallel Faunus' own trips there. Yet Tyndaris is no divinity, and her presence does not assure safety. The invitation, as well as the partygoers, creates a volatile mixture.²⁰

Odes 1.17 defies the usual expectations of an invitation poem, partly because typically Horace invites men over for drinks and partly because this is an atypical description of a drinking party.²¹ In *Odes* 1.20, for example, Horace invites Maecenas to come drink cheap Sabine wine:

vile potabis modicis Sabinum
cantharis, Graeca quod ego ipse testa
conditum levi, datus in theatro
cum tibi plausus,

(1–4)

You'll drink a cheap Sabine from modest cups, which I myself sealed, preserved in a Greek jar when you were given applause in the theater. . . .

In this case, Horace's invitation flatters Maecenas by recalling a specific, important event and continues by highlighting his family's status as *eques* and noting the fine wines he could drink on his own. The theatrical achievement of the first stanza marks a specific occasion for this particular drinking party: this cheap wine is special because it represents Maecenas' return to public life.²² Likewise, other invitation poems throughout the *Odes* tend to suggest some reason for drinking: usually

²⁰ Deacy 2015: 398 has argued compellingly that "what young women desire is the meadow and what takes place in the meadow"; that is, that they know what they are doing and we, as readers, deny them a certain amount of agency by simply reading mythical abduction scenes only as rapes. Yet in the case of Tyndaris, the objection arises that this is not a scene of a sexual encounter but one of violence committed against the body and belongings of the young woman.

²¹ Williams 1968 examines the interactions between invitations and sympotic scenes in the *Odes*; Edmunds 1982 discusses invitations in Latin poetry from Catullus to Juvenal generally; Cairns 1992: 86 lists 1.20, 2.11, 3.8, 3.29, 4.11, and 4.12 as other instances of invitation poems within the *Odes*. 4.11, addressed to Phyllis, proving another exception to the male-invitee rule.

²² Cairns 1992: 91–96 discusses the events surrounding the applause of 1.20 at length.

either to forget troubles the world (as in 2.11 and 3.29) or to celebrate particular days (3.8 and 4.11). By contrast, 1.17 features no markers of any occasion: indeed, a party with Tyndaris is its own occasion.

While 1.17 might not be an invitation to celebrate a particular holiday, Horace creates a specific place drawing on expectations of the invitation genre, intending to persuade Tyndaris to join him here. Indeed, the landscape appears to be custom-made for her. The poem's central *hic* is followed immediately by *tibi* (14): this place and its abundance is staged to appeal to her. The emphatic use of the second person continues through the fifth and sixth stanzas. Here, the language with which Horace addresses Tyndaris is similar in form to the *potabis* in the invitation of 1.20. Through the repeated use of the future tense (*vitabis, dices, duces, metues* 19–24), he creates the party by declaring what awaits them in what appears at first to be a tricolon: avoiding heat, reciting poetry, and drinking wine. All of these actions are in harmony with the expectations of an invitation to a drinking party. Horace then customizes this outline to appeal to Tyndaris the *docta puella*, suggesting poetic topics and wine with poetic lineage.

Nevertheless, in the last line of this penultimate stanza, he exceeds the anticipated tricolon, adding one last loaded verb addressed to Tyndaris: *metues*. Admittedly, this verb is negated, but the suggestion of even negated fear creates a presence for it in the text. We have already noted proleptic hints of fear throughout the poem, from the *innocentis* Lesbian wine (21) to an earlier negated claim of fear (*nec . . . metuunt* 8) with respect to his livestock. Unlike the earlier use of *metuo*, however, this *metues* leads directly into a final stanza that seems to upend the entire creation of a safe place that has guided the rest of the poem. Indeed, this *metues* copies the *copia* of the invitation by exceeding a tricolon of verbs, and this final abundance is one of fear.

Immediately following *metues*, the line ends with the adjective *protervum* (“reckless,” 24), hinting at what Tyndaris need not fear, even as the following lines rush headlong through a fear clause. The next line begins with *suspecta* (25), casting Tyndaris, who up until now has received no questioning of her moral standing, in a new light—she is under suspicion, even as the subject of *metues*. The passive nature of the adjective prompts the audience to shift our perspective, while the next word introduces the possible object of fear: Cyrus. Who is this Cyrus? At first glance, he does not seem to fit the themes of the poem, for he has no marks of a shepherd. Cyrus is not invited; instead, he crashes

the poem. Indeed, this final stanza loses spatial attributes—for all the emphasis on the place of this party previously, the end of the poem is wholly atopic. Cyrus’ non-presence in the poem may be read as a pointed representation of the stasis that Mars and Bacchus introduced in previous stanza, shifting the battle to the clothing and body of Tyndaris. Cyrus exists only in a negated claim, his actions only in the subjunctive, yet though *praeteritio* his absence becomes a presence that shifts our understanding of the poem from a lighthearted invitation to something verging on a sexual assault.

The poem’s finale comes as a shock.²⁵ Cyrus’s intrusion is made possible through the sympotic elements of the poem, yet his implied violence is more in line with the lurking dangers of the wild animals evoked in pastoral. Indeed, by introducing Cyrus, Horace anticipates his later claim in 1.23, when he appeals to Chloe that “I’m not like a ferocious tiger or Gaetulian lion” (*atqui non ego te tigris ut aspera / Gaetulusve leo* 9–10). At the same time, although Cyrus brings feral danger, the natural setting has faded away: mentions of pastoral safety are wholly absent in the last few lines. Cyrus’ presence returns the poem to a version of pastoral, in other words, but one in which the beasts are no longer kept in check.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
kehrhardt@jcu.edu

Works Cited

- Ancona, R. 1989. “The Subterfuge of Reason: Horace *Odes* 1.23 and the Construction of Male Desire.” *Helios* 16: 49–57.
- Cairns, F. 1992. “The Power of Implication: Horace’s invitation to Maecenas (*Odes* 1.20).” In T. Woodman and J. Powell, eds., *Author and Literature in Latin Literature*. 84–109. Cambridge.
- Calame, C. 1999. *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- Carson, A. 1999. “Dirt and Desire: The Phenomenology of Female Pollution in Antiquity.” In J. Porter, ed., *Constructions of the Classical Body*. 77–100. Ann Arbor.

²⁵ In his study of Horace’s final lines, Schrijvers 2009: 56–71, classifies 1.17 outside his main categories as a poem “ending with a concrete and evocative picture,” in which the final lines “enhance the emotional character of the ode’s final movement.” Schrijvers also notes that some poems end with “a surprise effect”—though he does not directly discuss this effect in relationship to 1.17.

- Commager, S. 1962. *The Odes of Horace*. New Haven.
- Davis, G. 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley.
- Deacy, S. 2013. "From 'Flowery Tales' to 'Heroic Rapes': Virginal Subjectivity in the Mythological Meadow." *Arethusa* 46: 395–413.
- Dunn, F. M. 1990. "An Invitation to Tyndaris: Horace, *Ode* 1.17." *TAPA* 120: 203–208.
- Edinger, H. G. 1971. "Horace, C. 1.17." *CJ* 66: 306–11.
- Edmunds, L. 1982. "The Latin Invitation-Poem: What Is It? Where Did It Come From?" *AJP* 103: 184–88.
- Fredricksmeier, E. A. 1994. "Horace's Chloe (*Odes* 1.23): Inamorata or Victim?" *CJ* 89: 251–59.
- Griffin, J. 1986. *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. Bristol.
- Harrison, S. 2004. "Lyric Middles: The Turn at the Centre in Horace's Poems." In S. Kyriakidis and F. De Martino, eds., *Middles in Latin Poetry*. 81–102. *Collana di Studi e Testi* 38. Bari. .
- 2007. "Style and Poetic Texture." In S. Harrison, ed., *Cambridge Companion to Horace*. 265–69. Cambridge.
- Hubbard, T. K. 2000. "Horace and Catullus: The Case of the Suppressed Precursor in *Odes* 1.22 and 1.32." *CW* 94: 25–37.
- Hunter, R. 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection*. Cambridge.
- James, S. L. 2003. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley.
- Leach, E. W. 1993. "Horace's Sabine Topography in Lyric and Hexameter Verse." *AJP* 114: 271–302.
- Lowrie, M. 2009. *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*. Oxford.
- Mayer, R. 2012. *Horace: Odes Book 1*. Cambridge.
- Nagel, R. 2000. "The Lyric Lover in Horace *Odes* 1.15 and 1.17." *Phoenix* 54: 53–63.
- Nisbet, R. and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1*. Oxford.
- Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge.
- Pavlock, B. 1982. "Horace's Invitation Poems to Maecenas: Gifts to a Patron." *Ramus* 11: 79–98.
- Porter, D. H. 1985. "Chloe and Phyllis: Horace *Carmina* 1.23 and 4.11." *CP* 80: 137–39.
- Pucci, J. 2005. "Originary Song, Poetic Composition, and Transgression: A Reading of Horace, *Odes* 1.3 and 1.22." *Ramus* 34: 1–21.
- Pucci, P. 1975. "Horace's Banquet in *Odes* 1.17." *TAPA* 105: 259–81.
- Putnam, M. 1994. "Structure and Design in Horace *Odes* 1.17." *CW* 87: 357–75.
- Rosenmeyer, P. 2004. "Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry." *TAPA* 125: 163–78.
- Schrijvers, P. H. 2009. "How to End an Ode? Closure in Horace's Short Poems." In M. Lowrie, ed., *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Horace: Odes and Epodes*. 56–71. Oxford.
- Spencer, D. 2006. "Horace's Garden Thoughts: Rural Retreats and the Urban Imagination." In Rosen, R. M and I. Sluiter, I. eds., *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. 239–74. Boston.
- Syndikus, H. P. 1995. "Some Structures in Horace's *Odes*." In S. J. Harrison, ed., *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*. 17–31. Oxford.

- Verrall, A. W. 1884. *Studies Literary and Historical in the Odes of Horace*. London.
- Wickham, E. C. and H. W. Garrod, eds. 1963. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Oxford.
- Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.