8

Horatian moments in Ovid's career and the end of *Fasti* 6

Gail Trimble

This chapter is a piece of teaching-led research (a Heyworth phrase): it stems from my experience of teaching Ovid, and specifically *Fasti* 6, after having been taught Horace.[1] As I worked with students who had written essays on closure in the *Fasti*, I found myself repeatedly articulating the kind of understanding of Horace's final ode that I shall outline below, and encouraging them to see that much more might be implied by Ovid's allusion to it in the last line of *Fasti* 6 than simply the sense of an ending. I am grateful to the editors of this volume for the opportunity to explore in writing the ideas I had been trying out in tutorials, and to connect them with a 'Horatian' interpretation of aspects of Ovid's exile poetry which I had also been keeping in mind, and discussing with colleagues and students, for some years;[2] I would like to thank the editors, too, for their advice on this chapter. But above all I am grateful to Steve for teaching me so much both formally and informally, and I ask for his forbearance if I include in what follows more about 'late Horace' in full Augustan flow than he would normally have the taste for.[3]

With the end of the sixth book of the *Fasti*, Ovid's poem on the Roman calendar stops after only (exactly) half the year. As my students learn, this is not normally now understood as an accidental ending, falling where it does simply because Ovid happened to have reached the end of June when Augustus sent him into exile. At *Tr.* 2.549–52, indeed, Ovid claims that his relegation did 'break off' his work on the poem (552 *sors mea rupit opus*), but also that he had already written six books of *Fasti* and the same number again (549 *sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos*)—and yet there is no evidence elsewhere that the books

[1] When I was an undergraduate at the beginning of the 2000s there were papers available in the Final Honour School of Literae Humaniores at Oxford called simply 'Ovid' and 'Horace': it was not possible to take both. By the time I started teaching a few years later, the Ovid paper still existed and was (as it remains) one of the most popular, while the Horace paper had been abolished. *Fasti* 6, however, is currently a set text as part of the core Latin literature paper in the Final Honour School, alongside *Carm.* 3.

[2] I touch on this idea briefly in Trimble (2010).

[3] Steve has published (early in his career) on 'early Horace': Heyworth (1988), (1993). He used to teach the Oxford undergraduate Horace paper (n. 1).

Gail Trimble, *Horatian moments in Ovid's career and the end of* Fasti *6* In: *Essays on Propertian and Ovidian Elegy: A Limping Lady for Stephen Heyworth.* Edited by: T. E. Franklinos and Jennifer Ingleheart, Oxford University Press.
 DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198908111.003.0009

covering July to December ever existed.[4] Rather, the *Fasti* as it stands is a complete poem which sometimes pretends to be half a poem, whether in order to encourage Augustus (or Germanicus)[5] to recall its author from exile so that he might write or publish the remaining books,[6] or, as Feeney proposes, in order to present itself as an example of free speech forcibly silenced.[7] As a whole, it hints at a six-book structure by staging a 'proem in the middle', including a recommitment to an inspiring divinity, exactly where one would be expected, at the beginning of (what does indeed turn out to be) the second half.[8] The final sections of Book 6 include a 'countdown' to the end of the month and the end of the poem,[9] in which the voice of Ovid notes that twelve days are left (725 *iam sex et totidem luces de mense supersunt*), that the days are running away as time slips by and 'we' grow old (771–2 *tempora labuntur, tacitisque senescimus annis | et fugiunt freno non remorante dies*),[10] and that there are three days left, the ominous number of the Fates (795 *tot restant de mense dies, quot nomina Parcis*).[11] Then, as has been explored in particular by Newlands and Barchiesi,[12] the final panel on the foundation date of the temple of Hercules Musarum (*Fast.* 6.797–812) combines some

[4] See in detail Ingleheart (2010) ad loc. The only possible exception might be the forward references to events to be treated in the second half of the year (*Fast.* 3.57–8, 199–200, 5.145–8, as well as 6.797, discussed below); but these are now usually read as promises that Ovid deliberately left unfulfilled.

[5] As we have it, the proem to *Fasti* 1 shows every sign of being a late addition to be dated after the death of Augustus, rededicating the poem to Germanicus instead, and displacing an original proem addressed to Augustus to the opening of *Fasti* 2. See Fantham (1985); S. J. Green (2004) 15–25; Myers (2014); Franklinos (2022). The final version of the *Fasti* thus marks itself from the very beginning as having been revised in exile (at least in part) as well as broken off by exile.

[6] *Fasti* 7–12 would begin with two months named after Augustus' adoptive father and himself, and full of anniversaries significant to him: see Syme (1978) 34; Barchiesi (1997a) 199. Barchiesi (1997a), which I cite throughout this chapter, translates Barchiesi (1994) 245–78, while in English Barchiesi (1997a) 197–208 is substantially identical to Barchiesi (1997b) 259–72.

[7] Feeney (1992) esp. 15: 'important sections of the poem were re-written from exile so as to make the *Fasti* read like a poem whose *licentia* has been suppressed, which has not been allowed to keep speaking, which has become *nefas*'. Cf. also Heslin (2005) 65–6, who compares the *Fasti* and Statius' *Achilleid* with a fragment of an epic in praise of Elizabeth I written by the imprisoned Walter Raleigh as an experiment in 'deliberate incompleteness'.

[8] For proems in the middle, see Conte (1992). As well as Ovid's rapprochement with Venus (*Fast.* 4.1–18; cf. below, pp. 177–8), note the appearance of Erato (*Fast.* 4.195), which evokes her presence at the beginning of the second halves of Apollonius' *Argonautica* (3.1) and of the *Aeneid* (7.37). The early part of *Fasti* 4 contains the poem's only explicit reference to its author's exile at 4.81–4, where Ovid reminds Germanicus (see n. 5 above) of how far his home town of Sulmo is from his current location in 'Scythian soil' (4.82 *Scythico . . . solo*); perhaps this book's proem became more of a proem in the middle in the process of Ovid's exilic revisions. Note in particular Venus' words at 4.16 *coeptum perfice . . . opus*, 'finish the work begun', and cf. below, n. 13.

[9] Barchiesi (1997a) 200–3.

[10] As noted by Barchiesi (1997a) 200, *tempora* can represent the *Fasti* itself, since the poem's first word is *Tempora*. Cf. n. 85 below and see further Franklinos (2022) on *tempora* as a reference to the *Fasti* elsewhere in Ovid's corpus; note in particular *Tr.* 3.3.11–12 *labentia tarde | tempora*, 'the times [or: progress on the *Fasti*] slowly slipping away'. For a possible Horatian influence on Ovid's use of *labuntur* here, and perhaps on the briefly evoked image of the aging poet, see below, n. 59; the combination of aging and falling silent also suggests, Ovid's exile.

[11] This is a vivid example of what Volk calls 'poetic simultaneity'. See Volk (1997) on this dynamic in the *Fasti*, though I do not agree with her dismissal of the closural implications of this 'countdown'.

[12] Newlands (1995) 209–36; Barchiesi (1997a) 203–7. See also Littlewood (2006) 229–35.

elements that appear to look forward to the rest of the year, or the putative rest of the poem, with others that strongly indicate that the end has been reached. So, for instance, the reference ahead to 'tomorrow', the Kalends of July (797 *tempus Iuleis cras est natale Kalendis*) is immediately followed by Ovid's paradoxical appeal to the Muses to add the final touches, *summa*, to the project he has begun (798 *Pierides, coeptis addite summa meis*).[13] The primary honorand of the section is Marcia, the daughter of the temple's re-founder L. Marcius Philippus, wife of Ovid's friend Paullus Fabius Maximus, and cousin of Augustus;[14] Ovid might perhaps have achieved more obvious closure by turning instead to Augustus himself or to Germanicus (thus creating ring-composition with the opening of *Fasti* 1), but the prominence given to a virtuous *matrona* with connections to the imperial family gains its own closural force by being borrowed from Propertius 4.11, in which the final words of that other collection of Roman-Callimachean aetiological elegies are given to the *princeps*' stepdaughter Cornelia. And the temple of Hercules Musarum itself had originally been founded by M. Fulvius Nobilior, the patron of Ennius; if Book 15 of Ennius' *Annales* ended with some kind of reference to this,[15] then Ovid would be evoking the original ending of Ennius' epic—which ceased to be the ending when Ennius went on to produce *Annales* 16–18.

I would like to argue, however, that there is more to be said than scholars have previously articulated about the way in which the very last words of the passage and the *Fasti* contribute to the perfectly closed openness of this ending. While the praise of Marcia in lines 801–10 is in the voice of Clio (801 *sic ego. sic Clio . . .*), the last couplet is in Ovid's voice again (811 *sic cecinit Clio*), but its final words are 'not Ovid's own' in a different sense. In lines 811–12 he tells the reader that the other Muses, Clio's learned sisters, agreed to her words, and 'Hercules nodded his assent and twanged his lyre' (*adnuit Alcides increpuitque lyram*):[16] the echo, almost verbatim, is of Horace, *Carm.* 4.15.2 *increpuit lyra*. Németh notes that the allusion to Horace's final lyric poem helps to imply that this is the very end of the *Fasti*,[17] while Newlands and Barchiesi again explore how differences in the

[13] In *coeptis*, the poem claims not to be finished (Feeney [1992] 17; Barchiesi [1997a] 203 n. 41), and we might wonder whether the word implies that it is half-finished (cf. esp. *Ars am.* 1.711 *pars superat coepti* ('part of what is begun remains'), with reference to a projected two-book structure, and see above, n. 8, on *Fast.* 4.16); however, Barchiesi (1997a) 203 shows that *summa* cannot literally mean the 'remaining books' covering the rest of the year, even if the reader might initially feel 'tempted' by such an interpretation.

[14] Philippus (Marcia's father) was also Augustus' stepbrother: his father had married Augustus' mother Atia, the older sister of the younger Philippus' own second wife. On the prosopography, see further Bömer (1957–8) on *Fast.* 6.801, and on Paullus Fabius Maximus see also below, p. 178.

[15] As speculated by Skutsch (1968) 18–20.

[16] All English translations are my own. Here, however, I borrow 'twanged' from Frazer (1989[2]); cf. Newlands (1995) 234–5; A. Hardie (2007) 567 for Hercules as an incompetent lyre player.

[17] Németh (1992) 80–1. The closural force of the Horatian *increpuit* is strengthened by the fact that Ovid had already used it, with an intervening god as the subject, in the final poem of the *Amores*, at *Am.* 3.15.17: see below, pp. 180–1.

detail suit the context and some of Ovid's other aims.[18] Where Horace, apparently trying to spread his lyric sails too wide, was interrupted by Phoebus Apollo, the god here is Hercules Musarum himself, present among the *doctae sorores* in their joint temple,[19] and perhaps also appearing as a compliment to Paullus Fabius Maximus, since the Fabian *gens* claimed descent from Hercules. Ovid's *increpuit*, with the direct object *lyram*, has the sense of 'made a noise on' and seems to underline the agreement indicated by *adnuit*—even if its 'twanging' sound suggests that it does so in a slightly dubious, discordant manner—whereas *increpuit* in *Carm.* 4.15.2, with the direct object *me* in line 1, means 'reproached'—though with *lyra* the ablative of instrument with *increpuit*,[20] it is still a reproach that is noisily conveyed.[21] The *Fasti*, that is, apparently receives final divine approval where *Carm.* 4.15 had required redirection. Further implications, however, will emerge if we look more broadly at Horace's poem and at how it develops after Apollo's intervention to reach its own ending, since in *Carm.* 4, unlike in the *Fasti* (in the form in which we have it), *increpuit lyra* was only the beginning of the end rather than the last sound heard in the work.

In *Carm.* 4.15, Horace bows out of lyric. The opening, of which *increpuit lyra* is part, appears to be a new iteration of the familiar poetic *recusatio*, specifically the version in which a god—ideally, as here, Apollo—diverts the poet from an overambitious style, genre, or subject-matter to something more appropriate.[22] Callimachus at the beginning of the *Aetia* had been told to set 'one continuous poem' on 'kings or heroes' aside in favour of a 'slender Muse' and a host of other influential metaphors;[23] *proelia*, 'battles', in the first line of Horace's poem looks back to Virgil's reworking of Callimachus in the opening of *Eclogue* 6, when Apollo had told him ('as' the shepherd Tityrus) to stop singing about 'kings and battles' (*Ecl.* 6.3 *cum canerem reges et proelia*) in favour of a 'finely spun song' (*Ecl.* 6.5 *deductum . . . carmen*). Virgil had also made the Roman *recusatio* political, going on to explain that others might sing the praises of Varus and 'grim wars' (*Ecl.* 6.6–7 *laudes,* | *Vare, tuas . . . et tristia . . . bella*); and Propertius in his elegy 2.1 had made it Augustan, addressing Maecenas and specifically rejecting 'Caesar's

[18] Newlands (1995) 218, 233–5, Barchiesi (1997a) 205–6.

[19] There may have been a statue of Hercules alongside the statues of the Muses, looted from the sack of Ambracia in 189 BC, which Nobilior had installed (Plin. *HN* 35.66; cf. Liv. 38.9.13–14): it has been suggested that this statue is depicted on the coins minted by Q. Pomponius Musa around 66 BC that show 'Hercules Musarum' playing a lyre.

[20] I think that the juxtaposition *increpuit lyra* makes this the more likely sense, although Thomas (2011) ad loc. prefers the view of the ancient commentators pseudo-Acro and Porphyry that *lyra* goes with *loqui* in line 1, 'wanting to speak with the lyre'. Cf. also below, n. 100.

[21] *OLD* s.v. *increpo* 2 and 4, respectively.

[22] For this aspect of the background to *Carm.* 4.15, see in detail Putnam (1986) 265–9; Thomas (2011) on lines 1–4.

[23] Call. *Aet.* fr. 1 Pf./Harder; lines 3–5 *ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ[η* | . . . | *ἢ . . .] . . . ἤρωας*, line 24 *Μοῦσαν . . . λεπταλέην*.

wars' (Prop. 2.1.25 *bella . . . Caesaris*) as the topic of his poetry.[24] In his earlier collection of *Odes*, similarly, Horace himself chose erotic 'battles' as the right subject-matter for lyric, rather than the battles of Agrippa and 'Caesar' (*Carm.* 1.6.17 *proelia uirginum*; 2.12.20 *proelia Caesaris*). And crucially, all of these poets, after uttering a *recusatio*, duly carry on in what they have established as the preferred or divinely sanctioned mode—even if high style, epic, war, or panegyric may continue to surface indirectly later in the poetry, as they already have by means of their very rejection in the *recusatio* itself. *Carm.* 4.15 is different. When Horace wanted to speak about battles (*Carm.* 4.15.1 *uolentem proelia me loqui*), Phoebus reproached him on the grounds that 'Caesar' has now brought plenty and peace (*Carm.* 4.15.4–5 *tua, Caesar, aetas | fruges et agris rettulit uberes*, 'your age, Caesar, has restored rich harvests to the fields'). The god's intervention now represents not so much divine concern for the most appropriate deployment of this particular poet's powers, as a straightforward response to a change in circumstances in the outside world. Horace responds in turn by setting *proelia* aside not, as before, for his own concerns, but for the very *laudes* rejected in *Eclogue* 6, as the rest of *Carm.* 4.15 describes Augustus' peaceable empire and predicts its continuance into the future. In the Horatian text, however, this new lyric project only lasts for as long as this final poem. After *Carm.* 4.5, which presented similar images of rural fecundity, familial morality, and unthreatening enemies in another direct address to Augustus, the poetry had continued, because the *princeps* still had to return to Italy. But by the end of *Carm.* 4.15 nothing else is needed from Augustus, and it also appears that there is nothing more for Horace to do. A *recusatio* is usually associated with an opening, at least of a book or of the second half of a collection if not of an entire oeuvre: this is Horace's final lyric poem.

Paradoxically, however, Horace's own last word is a promise of future song. As also in *Carm.* 4.5 (38, 39 *dicimus*, 'we say'), he uses a first-person plural, and ends the poem with *canemus*, 'we shall sing' (*Carm.* 4.15.32); the object of the song is initially specified as *duces* (29), that is, 'kings and heroes'. This plural verb seems to position Horace as one of the group of loyal Romans evoked in the last two stanzas of the poem,[25] pious, rather drunkenly happy, and duly accompanied by

[24] The intervention here comes apparently from Propertius' Muse (1.2.35); cf. also Prop. 3.3 (with Apollo and Calliope) and 3.9 (to Maecenas) and with them Heyworth (2007b). In Prop. 4.6, Propertius—partly in the voice of an Apollo introduced under his warlike aspect (31–6)—does describe the battle of Actium, but is then apparently cut off by the same god now asking for his lyre again in order to lead peaceful dances (69–70 *citharam iam poscit Apollo | uictor et ad placidos exuit arma choros*, 'Apollo already demands the lyre and, as victor, divests himself of his arms for the peaceful dances'); Propertius himself declares 'I have sung enough of wars' (69 *bella satis cecini*). On the closing section of this poem, see Heyworth (1994) 62–7.

[25] I follow this traditional interpretation despite Zarecki (2010), who maintains that the subjects of *canemus* are only Horace himself and (a resurrected) Virgil. For allusions to Virgil's poetry in *Carm.* 4.15, however, see below, p. 180.

wives and children (26–8).[26] As Oliensis in particular has shown, Horace here 'erases himself'.[27] At the very least his individual voice, hitherto so strong throughout the *Odes* and still 'wanting to speak' at the start of this poem, merges with the voice of this chorus singing on into the endless Augustan future that lies in store for the world outside the poetry after the end of the book;[28] or '[p]erhaps the silence that follows *Carm.* 4.15 marks the poet's disappearance from, rather than into, the choral plural of *canemus*',[29] so that Horace's voice is not only drowned out, but ceases entirely. If this is right, then Ovid's quotation of *Carm.* 4.15 at the end of *Fasti* 6 implies closure in the strongest possible terms: not only the end of a book, but the disappearance of a voice, the end of a career, perhaps even death. Moreover, Ovid does not say whether or not he will sing in the future tense, plural or singular:[30] having just asked the Muses to say (*Fast.* 6.799 *dicite*) a final few words, he tells us only that the last flourish on Hercules' lyre comes after one Muse, Clio, has sung (811 *cecinit*).[31]

Is *Carm.* 4.15 or *Fasti* 6 actually the end for either poet? I would now like to follow a line of enquiry that seems to be gaining momentum in scholarship by looking at some suggestive congruences (and oppositions) in Ovid's and Horace's careers.[32] This is not, of course, the only way to consider the two poets together. In Fulkerson's recent and extremely helpful survey,[33] she notes, for instance, the work that has been done on Ovid's responses in the *Metamorphoses* and elsewhere to precepts from the Horatian *Ars poetica*,[34] and (an interesting complement)

[26] This detail may itself imply a lack of importance for Horace in the imagined group, since his persona elsewhere in his poetry is always unmarried and childless; contrast n. 57 below on Ovid as a family man. Contrast also the group of drunken poets imagined in the celebration of Actium at Prop. 4.6.69–84 (very probably in Horace's mind); their subject-matter is wars of the present and future as well as the past, and Propertius reasserts his own presence in the first-person singular at the end (85–6).

[27] Oliensis (1998) 150–3, at 152.

[28] In general terms, this Augustan singing evokes the real choral performance of the *Carmen saeculare* at the *Ludi saeculares* of 17 BC; but this is quite a different chorus from the team of girls and boys that sang the *Carm. saec.* under the instruction of its proud composer (and, according to *Carm.* 4.6.35–6, accompanist), the distinct, individual *uates* Horace (*Carm.* 4.6.44). Horace's self-naming in the last line of *Carm.* 4.6 resonates with his credit in the inscribed *acta* of the games: *CIL* 6.32323.149 *carmen composuit Q. Horatius Flaccus.*

[29] Oliensis (1998) 153; cf. Lowrie (1997) 349. A chorus is particularly implied by the accompaniment of 'Lydian pipes' (*Lydis . . . tibiis*) at *Carm.* 4.15.30, contrasting with Apollo's lyre, the symbol of monodic lyric, at the start of the poem (Lowrie [2009] 101).

[30] Contrast the first-person future tenses at the end of the *Metamorphoses*, esp. *Met.* 15.878 *ore legar populi*, 'I shall be read in the mouth of the people', 879 *uiuam*, 'I shall live'; cf. below, pp. 178–9.

[31] Ovid, that is, responds only in the third person here to his first-person uses of *canere* in the opening lines of most of the *Fasti*'s books: 1.2 *canam* ('I shall sing'), 2.7 *cano* ('I am singing'), 3.4 *canitur* ('[the month] is being sung'), 4.12 *cano* (replacing *canam* at the end of a couplet, 4.11–12, which otherwise repeats three-quarters of 1.1–2 word for word), 6.9 *cano*. See further below, p. 180, and note esp. how Ovid's use of *canere* to mark his progress through the *Fasti* follows Virgil's use of the same technique in the *Georgics* (n. 95).

[32] Literary careers were demonstrably meaningful both in the Greek and Roman worlds and in subsequent traditions: see, in general, Cheney & de Armas (2002); Hardie & Moore (2010).

[33] Fulkerson (2019).

[34] See esp. G. D. Williams (1994) 83–91; Barchiesi (1997b) 246–51; Galasso (2014); Tamás (2014).

Gibson's reading of the *Ars amatoria* as a critical response to Horace's preference for the Aristotelian 'mean'.[35] There is probably room for a study that would revisit more analytically the work of Zingerle and Einberger by offering some kind of systematic account of small-scale points of contact in the two corpora;[36] Fulkerson discusses many such herself but '[is] especially interested in the larger-scale',[37] while Ingleheart has investigated the large number of allusions to Horace in *Tristia* 2 specifically.[38] Interesting too are those moments at which Ovid pointedly does *not* mention Horace where we might expect him to:[39] in addition to Horace's absence from Ovid's list of love poets in *Tristia* 2.361–470,[40] I am not the first person to suspect a snobbish dig at Horace the social climber when, in his earliest *sphragis* and just before citing the respectable provincial origins of Virgil and Catullus that resemble his own, Ovid states that *he* was not 'an equestrian recently created in the whirl of military service' (*Am.* 3.15.6 *non modo militiae turbine factus eques*), and when he repeats the point in his later and fuller poetic autobiography, this time attributing the advancement of such an *eques* to 'the gift of fortune' (*Tr.* 4.10.8 *fortunae munere*).[41] Several recent studies, however, convincingly maintain that Ovid invited comparisons between his own career and that of Horace—and indeed encouraged particular interpretations of Horace's career. Again, this argument may be developed in various directions. Fulkerson discusses several, and ends, following a suggestion from Oliensis, by proposing that Ovid became particularly interested in casting his own career as a reversal of Horace's, in which, where the older poet had started with angry poetry (*Satires* and *Epodes*) and a politically precarious personal situation, before moving on to a high-genre masterpiece of political engagement (*Odes*) and finishing with more personal works written from a position of accommodation with his political surroundings (*Epistles* and *Ars poetica*), the younger starts out in 'the private

[35] R. K. Gibson (2007).
[36] Zingerle (1869–71) III.9–40; Einberger (1960).
[37] Fulkerson (2019) 27.
[38] Ingleheart (2009), (2010b) ad locc.
[39] Ovid only names Horace once, at *Tr.* 4.10.49–50: see below, pp. 176, 181. Thorsen (2014) 73–8, however, sees rivalry between Ovid and Horace lurking behind what 'Sappho' says about her rivalry with Alcaeus at *Her.* 15.29–30 *nec plus Alcaeus, consors patriaeque lyraeque, | laudis habet, quamuis grandius ille sonet*, 'nor does Alcaeus, who shares my homeland and lyre, receive more praise, although he makes a fuller sound' (I am grateful to OUP's anonymous reader for drawing my attention to this passage). While Horace's invention of himself as a Roman Alcaeus is well known, Ovid's self-identification with Sappho in his early poetry is the central theme of Thorsen's book. *Her.* 15.29–30 itself emulates Horace's description of Sappho and Alcaeus singing in the underworld at *Carm.* 2.13.24–8; moreover, although in both passages Sappho and Alcaeus are, of course, both lyric poets, it could be argued that Ovid noticed the potentially elegiac implications of Horace's reference to Sappho 'lamenting about girls' at *Carm.* 2.14.24–5 *querentem | Sappho puellis de popularibus*, and that Alcaeus' 'fuller sound' at *Her.* 15.30 *grandius* might imply the higher genre of Horatian lyric as opposed to Ovidian elegy. Steve is 'now inclined to think that the *Epistula Sapphus* is a basically Ovidian text' (Heyworth [2016] 153 n. 37).
[40] See esp. Ingleheart (2009) 134–5; Fulkerson (2019) 30.
[41] Schmitzer (1994). For Horace as an *eques*, a status he may first have achieved when he became a *tribunus militum* under Brutus (*Sat.* 1.6.48), see also D. Armstrong (1986); Lyne (1995) 3 n. 7. On *Am.* 3.15, cf. below, pp. 180–1.

world of love' (*Amores*, *Heroides*, *Ars amatoria*, *Remedia amoris*), climbs to epic and public elegy (*Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*), and then falls to embittered invective written in political disgrace (*Tristia*, *Ex Ponto*, *Ibis*).[42] Korenjak, on the other hand, places more emphasis on the hope implied in Ovid's exile poetry that he might be able to emulate Horace in receiving Augustus' *clementia* despite having written offensive poetry (this would make the *Ars amatoria* parallel to the *Satires* and *Epodes*), and this is also one of the possibilities discussed by Ingleheart.[43] Interested in the new genre of the 'book of verse letters' explored by both poets, Wulfram reads the early *Satires* and *Amores* as respectively developing into *Epistles* 1 and the single *Heroides*, before the form is transformed again into *Epistles* 2 and *Heroides* 16–21.[44] There is obviously potential, then, for the two poets' careers to be interpreted together in a range of ways, arising from the fact that neither followed the comparatively straightforward path of generic ascent and metrical uniformity associated with the career of Virgil.[45] I shall look at some particular moments of connection between the later careers of Horace and Ovid which, I think, help to illuminate further the link between the end of the *Fasti* and the end of the *Odes* set up by *increpuitque lyram*.

I suggested above that when Ovid falls silent at the end of *Fasti* 6, this may be understood—especially with *Carm.* 4.15 in mind—as implying a kind of death.[46] But Ovid subsequently presents himself as continuing to write after his 'death': beginning with his description of the 'mourning dress' of the book sent back to Rome at *Tr.* 1.1.5–6, death is one the regular metaphors he uses in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* for his exile.[47] And it is the many resemblances between Ovid's two main collections of exile poetry and Horace's *Epistles* that create one of the clearest ways of seeing their two careers as running in parallel rather than in opposite directions.[48] However, although the overarching similarities between the exile poetry and the *Epistles* are obvious, significant differences are obvious too. Both works, of course, collect together poems which present themselves as letters (this is predominantly true of the *Tristia* and universally of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*); at the same time, both represent a return by each poet, with an epistolary twist, to a first-person mode he had used at the very beginning of his career, in which the speaking voice is a version of the poet's 'own' persona, the concerns are those arising from his personal experiences in the contemporary world, and the

[42] Fulkerson (2019) 41–3; cf. Oliensis (2004) 307–8.

[43] Korenjak (2007) esp. 249–54; Ingleheart (2009) 134–9. [44] Wulfram (2008) 211–13.

[45] Though both, from time to time, defined aspects of their own careers against the Virgilian model: see Tarrant (2002) 23–7; Farrell (2004); Barchiesi & Hardie (2010) on Ovid; Harrison (2010) on Horace (with some comparison to Ovid).

[46] See further below, p. 179, on Horace's figurative death at the end of *Carm.* 4.15, his actual death, and his final poetry.

[47] See esp. Ingleheart (2015) 287–9.

[48] See esp. Rahn (1958) 107–9; Korenjak (2005), (2007); Wulfram (2008); Ingleheart (2009).

form is rather rambling and chatty.[49] The individual addressees are (typically) friends of the poet, male, with a status in Roman society broadly comparable to that which the poet himself has—or had; the letters themselves take friendship, *amicitia*, as one of their main topics, although Ovid's exile limits the extent to which the mutual obligations of Roman *amicitia* can still function for him.[50] Some of the Ovidian poems have a specific Horatian parallel or model: most obviously, *Tr.* 1.1 reworks *Epist.* 1.20 as the poetry book itself is addressed and vividly personified, and its reception in Rome imagined—with, in Ovid's case, considerably more anxiety;[51] and in *Tr.* 2 as in *Epist.* 2.1 the poet writes at length to Augustus, with deference, trepidation, and surprising authority, about the role of poetry in late Augustan Rome, and about the author's own position in particular—which (on the surface at least) is, for Ovid, a far more vulnerable one.[52] I would go so far, in fact, as to argue that Ovid's situation as he writes the exile poetry can be read as a kind of bitter parody of Horace's as he writes the *Epistles*, and that this reading is invited by the Ovidian text.

One way in which this is true is in the replacement of Horace's voluntary retirement to the pleasant countryside with Ovid's unwilling exile to an inhospitable landscape.[53] The poems of *Epistles* 1 typically justify their epistolary form by claiming to be written from a country town just outside Rome to someone in the city (e.g. *Epist.* 1.2.2 *Troiani belli scriptorem, Maxime Lolli,* | *dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi*, 'while you are declaiming in Rome, Lollius Maximus, I have been reading the poet of the Trojan War in Praeneste'); this physical distance symbolizes Horace's detachment from hectic urban life, and his ethical authority. For Ovid in exile, the distance his letters must travel to return to Rome has become hyperbolic, and in *Pont.* 1.3, after a typical characterization of Tomis as the 'edge of the world' (49 *orbis . . . extremi*), cold, barren, stormy, and inhabited only by savage enemies (49–60), he even seems to allude to one of Horace's favourite retreats, as he concludes a list of exiles whose fate was easier than his own with a reference to the early history of Rome, when exiles would be sent to Tibur (80–1 *quid referam ueteres Romanae gentis, apud quos* | *exulibus tellus ultima Tibur erat?*, 'why should I tell of the ancient peoples of Rome, among whom

[49] For Horace, the throwback can perhaps be seen most clearly in the return to the informal hexameter style of the *Satires*; for Ovid, in the reappearance of the (purportedly) anecdotal, autobiographical content which had not been the main focus of any of his work since the *Amores*.

[50] See esp. Oliensis (1997a), showing how in the *Tristia* in particular, with their lack of named addressees, 'exile has jammed the works of *amicitia*' (178); on *amicitia* as a central concern of Horace's *Epistles*, in particular Book 1, see esp. Macleod (1979); Kilpatrick (1986). For a gendered reading of this dynamic, in which Ovid cannot establish functional *amicitia* between himself and his friends because he has written himself into the position of an abandoned heroine from his own *Heroides*, see Trimble (2010).

[51] See Hinds (1985) 13–14; Mordine (2010) 534 n. 29.

[52] See esp. Barchiesi (2001) 79–103 (translating Barchiesi [1993]); Korenjak (2007) 245–7; Lowrie (2009) 367–8; Ingleheart (2010b) 8–10.

[53] On Ovid's exaggeratedly bleak portrayal of Tomis, see G. D. Williams (1994) 3–49.

Tibur was the furthest place for exiles?'). This doubles a moment from the passage on the Lesser Quinquatrus in *Fasti* 6, in which the striking flute-players take themselves off into 'exile' in Tibur: 665–6 *exilio mutant Vrbem Tiburque recedunt: | exilium quodam tempore Tibur erat*, 'they exchange the City for exile and retire to Tibur: at one time Tibur was a place of exile'. It seems very plausible that this passage of the *Fasti* was one of those revised in Tomis; the appearance of the comment in the pentameter, as if it had escaped Ovid on a bitter reflex, is particularly reminiscent of *Fast.* 1.540, 4.82.[54] But the appearance of Tibur in both *Pont.* 1.3 and *Fasti* 6 is even more pointed if the reader remembers that the Horace of the *Epistles* had also voluntarily left Rome for Tibur at *Epist.* 1.7.44–5 *mihi iam non regia Roma, | sed uacuum Tibur placet aut imbelle Tarentum* ('now royal Rome does not please me, but leisured Tibur or unwarlike Tarentum').[55] Ovid may also have Horace in mind when, once or twice in the exile poetry, he claims to miss not the city of Rome, or even his suburban *horti*, 'gardens',[56] but something that sounds more like a provincial Italian villa: at *Tr.* 4.8.5–12 he associates leisure and his 'pursuits' or 'literary studies' (*studiis . . . meis*) with a 'small house' (*paruam . . . domum*) and 'ancestral countryside' (*rura paterna*),[57] while at *Pont.* 1.8.39–62 it is apparently as a consolation—if he cannot have either Rome, his *horti*, or his family estate—that he wishes for a farm in Tomis.

Horace's persona in his later poetry is aging and grey-haired. The motif bookends *Epistles* 1, which opens with the announcement that Horace's age is 'not the same' as it once was (*Epist.* 1.1.4 *non eadem est aetas*) and closes with a *sphragis* in which he states that he was forty-four in the year of Lepidus' and Lollius' consulship, i.e. 21 BC (*Epist.* 1.20.26–8), and describes himself as *praecanus*, 'prematurely grey' (*Epist.* 1.20.24).[58] Closer to the middle of the book, Horace tells Maecenas that if he wants him to live in Rome permanently, he should give him back his youth and black, unreceded hair (*Epist.* 1.7.26 *nigros angusta fronte capillos*). But a similar characterization is already part of Horace's

[54] See Littlewood (2006) on *Fast.* 6.665–6, also comparing *Fast.* 1.481–2 and 5.653 and remarking that Ovid 'appears to have tweaked almost every passage which contained some allusion to exile'. See further Heyworth (2019) 12 on the dynamics of mutual allusion between connected passages of the *Fasti* and the exile poetry.

[55] Tibur is also cast as a place of retreat for Horace or his friends, sometimes specifically fitted for old age or for composing poetry, at *Carm.* 1.7.13, 21, 1.18.2, 2.6.5, 3.4.23, 3.29.6, 4.2.31, 4.3.10.

[56] Besides *Pont.* 1.8.43–4, cf. *Tr.* 1.11.37 and 4.8.27 (see below, p. 177).

[57] Ovid's desired retreat does swerve away from its Horatian model with the appearance of the house's 'mistress' alongside 'friends' at *Tr.* 4.8.11 *inque sinu dominae carisque sodalibus* ('in my mistress' embrace and among my dear comrades'); cf. above, n. 26, on Horace's bachelor persona. The fact that it also seems to be Ovid's Paelignian family home (*Tr.* 4.8.10, 12; *Pont.* 1.8.42) may perhaps be read as a deliberate contrast with the Sabine and Tiburtine estates that the self-made Horace had acquired: cf. above, p. 171, for Ovid's possible opinion of Horace's origins.

[58] Horace's hair is white earlier in his career at *Epod.* 17.23, but that is purportedly as a result of Canidia's magical interference. For *Epode* 17 as a model for *Tristia* 2, partly through its portrayal of the speaker as an 'aged suppliant', see Ingleheart (2009) 126–30.

self-presentation in *Carm.* 1–3,[59] even if *Carm.* 4 opens with the poet's protest to Venus that he is (even more) 'not what I was' (*Carm.* 4.1.3 *non sum qualis eram*) now that he has put youthful love affairs aside. Although Ovid claims at *Tr.* 2.543–4 to have been injured as an 'old man' (*seni*) by what he had written when 'young' (*iuueni*),[60] he really begins to emphasize his own age in *Tristia* 4, giving himself grey hair at *Tr.* 4.1.74, 4.8.1–2; and in the autobiography of *Tr.* 4.10 he, like Horace in *Epistles* 1.20, backdates this sign of age, telling the reader that he was already grey-haired when he was exiled (*Tr.* 4.10.93–4).[61] For a typical Roman love elegist, grey hair is in the future (Prop. 3.5.24; [Tib.] 3.5.15). In exile, the aging elegist Ovid has rather become a sadder version of the grey-haired Horace, similarly maintaining a friendship with an equally grizzled friend (*Pont.* 4.12.29–30), though at a distance rather than over shared wine and perfume (*Carm.* 2.11.14–17). He even tells us that he was fifty at the time of his relegation (*Tr.* 4.8.33 *decem lustris . . . peractis*, 4.10.95–6), the same age as the Horace of *Carm.* 4 (*Carm.* 4.1.6 *circa lustra decem*).

Most significantly of all, the exiled Ovid encourages a comparison and contrast between himself and 'late Horace' in terms of the extent to which either of them has really retired from their earlier poetry. In the opening of *Epistles* 1.1, Horace describes his changed age and attitude (4 *aetas . . . mens*) with two images: a gladiator who has hung up his weapons (*armis . . . fixis*) and is lying low in the country (4–6) having been presented with the wooden sword, a traditional marker of retirement (2); and an aging racehorse who ought to be withdrawn from competition rather than run the risk of falling in a race (7–9).[62] Horace writes that Maecenas, the letter's recipient, wants to re-enrol him in the gladiatorial 'school' (2 *ludo*), but that he has put aside poetry and other 'games' (10 *et uersus et cetera ludicra*) in favour of ethical philosophy (11 and passim to the end of the poem). Ovid first alludes to this passage in the opening of *Tristia* 2, comparing himself, as he continues to write in exile, to a defeated gladiator (unlike Horace's apparently successful one) who nevertheless goes back to the arena (17 *ut uictus repetit gladiator harenam*), and then to a foundered ship which takes to the stormy seas again (18).[63] He returns to

[59] Grey hair at *Carm.* 2.11.6–8, 15, 3.14.25. The more general references throughout the *Odes* to the passing of time and the inevitability of death are too many to note, but a well-known example, *Carm.* 2.14.1–2 *Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume,* | *labuntur anni*, 'Alas, how fleetingly, Postumus, Postumus, the years slip away', is a possible influence on *Fast.* 6.771 *tempora labuntur, tacitisque senescimus annis* (see above, p. 166).

[60] The contrast is exaggerated given Ovid's likely age when the *Ars amatoria* was published: see Ingleheart (2010b) ad loc.

[61] At *Pont.* 1.4.1–20, on the other hand, exile itself has aged him 'before my time' (20 *ante meum tempus*).

[62] The horse can be traced back to Ibycus 287 *PMG* and in Latin to Enn. *Ann.* 522–3 Skutsch (see Mayer [1994] on *Epist.* 1.1.8); the gladiator, necessarily a Roman image, is less common, but Ingleheart (2010b) on *Tr.* 2.17 compares [Sen.] *De spe* 27–8.

[63] On these allusions, see Wulfram (2008) 258, 344–5; Ingleheart (2009) 135–6.

this pair of images at *Pont.* 1.5.37–40, with the gladiator who picks up his *arma* again now described as *saucius*, 'wounded', and a shipwrecked sailor rather than a personified ship; in *Tristia* 4.8, on the other hand, in which he imagines the comfortable retirement he ought to be enjoying,[64] he cites ships in dry dock, a racehorse at grass and an old soldier hanging up his *arma*, and concludes that he too should have been given the wooden sword by now (22 *me quoque donari iam rude tempus erat*, 'already it was time for me to be granted the wooden sword')—he too, *quoque*, like the other retirees he has just mentioned,[65] or rather like Horace-as-gladiator (*Epist.* 1.1.2 *donatum iam rude*, 'already granted the wooden sword'). The difference between the two poets, though, is that Horace claims in *Epistles* 1.1 to have left poetry behind successfully, since *uersus et cetera ludicra* apparently refers to the lyric poetry of the *Odes*, more poetic but also 'lighter' (and implicitly associated with erotic content), while the hexameters he is actually writing presumably constitute a return to the *sermo* or 'conversation' of the *Satires*, not 'proper' *uersus*;[66] Ovid, in contrast, draws no distinction in these passages between the kind of poetry he is writing now, which is still elegy, and the erotic poetry which 'defeated', 'wounded', or 'shipwrecked' him.[67] Ovid, always an elegist,[68] 'cannot' adopt a less dangerous form in exile, whereas Horace, metrically versatile (the usual interpretation of *Tr.* 4.10.49 *numerosus Horatius*),[69] takes full advantage of his ability to change genre.

Horace's retirement, however, is not as secure as the opening of *Epistles* 1.1 might seem to suggest. Later in the *Epistles*, he maintains that he has been tempted by a prevailing fashion, and, as a result, writes, 'I myself, who declare that I write no poetry, am discovered to be a worse liar than the Parthians, and, awake before sunrise, demand pen, paper, and book-boxes' (*Epist.* 2.1.111–13 *ipse ego, qui nullos me adfirmo scribere uersus, | inuenior Parthis mendacior et prius orto | sole uigil calamum et chartas et scrinia posco*). This is often understood as suggesting that Horace is contemplating a return to lyric poetry, but he is asking

[64] Cf. above, p. 174.

[65] This had been how Ovid used *me quoque* at *Am.* 2.9.23, after a similar list: but there the gladiator formed part of the list, not of the reference to Ovid himself, and there was no echo of Horace's *donatum iam*.

[66] Cf. *Sat.* 1.4.39–44; *Epist.* 2.2.24–5, 55–60, 141–4.

[67] Cf. Ingleheart (2009) 136 on how Ovid's use at *Tr.* 2.17 of the Horatian image of the gladiator 'suggests, in marked contrast to Horace, continuity in Ovid's *corpus*'; she also notes that the immediately preceding characterization of poetry as madness (*Tr.* 2.13–16) evokes Horace's depiction of the 'mad poet' at *Ars P.* 295–301. Ovid's compulsion to keep writing poetry even though it is poetry that caused his exile is often depicted as a difficult, even abusive relationship with the Muses (e.g. *Tr.* 2.3): see Lieberg (1980) esp. 20 n. 138. The theme co-exists with protestations (e.g. *Tr.* 5.1.15–26) that Ovid is now writing an elegy of lament quite different from love elegy.

[68] This is, of course, tendentious: Ovid ignores his past departures from elegy in the *Medea* and *Metamorphoses*.

[69] On this passage see also below, p. 181.

for writing materials, not a lyre,[70] and at *Ars poetica* 306 he claims to be giving advice on poetry-writing despite writing *nothing* himself, *nil scribens ipse*. What seemed at the beginning of *Epistles* 1.1 to be a stable division between *uersus* (lyric) and epistolary (and therefore written) hexameters is confused as Horace declares, in verse, that he is not writing verse, and that he needs pen and paper in order to write verse.[71] Among other things, Horace is playing here with his characteristic self-presentation as incurably fickle. He might go back to poetry (if he is not already writing poetry), just as he might fluctuate between Stoic immersion in public concerns and the flexibility of Aristippus (*Epist.* 1.1.16–18 *nunc agilis fio et mersor ciuilibus undis* |…| *nunc in Aristippi furtim praecepta relabor*, 'now I become agile and immerse myself in civic waters […] now I furtively slip back into Aristippus' teachings'), and just as he might pop back to Rome from Tibur, if he feels like it (*Epist.* 1.8.12 *Romae Tibur amem uentosus, Tibure Romam*, 'in my changeability I long for Tibur when at Rome, for Rome when at Tibur')—that is, his physical retreat from the city is entirely reversible, too.[72] Ovid, in Tomis, hopes that he too will be able to come back to Rome, perhaps able to divide his time between the city and his *horti* (*Tr.* 4.8.27–8 *sed modo, quos habui, uacuum secedere in hortos,* | *nunc hominum uisu rursus et urbe frui*, 'but now, at my leisure, to withdraw into the gardens I had, now again to enjoy the sight of people and the city').[73] He would also, presumably, like to return to higher genres or better poetry,[74] perhaps something of the calibre of the *Metamorphoses*, or even the second half of the *Fasti*, just as Horace did indeed come out of epistolary retirement in order to come back to lyric with *Carm.* 4.

This point, however, further complicates the question of how we should interpret the intertextual connection between the end of *Carm.* 4 and the end of *Fasti* 6 with a view to the place of these two texts in their respective authors' careers. From the first word of its first poem, *Intermissa*, 'Interrupted', the fourth book of *Odes* is articulated as a return to lyric after a period of time away.[75] Part of the point of the mention of Horace's fifty years in the second stanza of *Carm.* 4.1 is to quantify the time that has passed since he was forty at *Carm.* 2.4.23–4; the combination with the comment about his forty-fourth

[70] On the concepts of singing and performance, writing and books in Horace, Ovid and elsewhere in Augustan culture, see Lowrie (2009).

[71] Harrison (2007) 32–5 has similar doubts.

[72] Horace had taken a rather different attitude at *Sat.* 2.1.59–60, where he attributes some constancy to himself in saying that he will continue to write 'whether rich or poor, at Rome or (if chance decrees it) in exile' (*diues, inops, Romae, seu fors ita iusserit, exsul*). Oliensis (1998) 44 imagines the exiled Ovid reading these lines.

[73] For Ovid's *horti*, see above, p. 174.

[74] On Ovid's 'pose of poetic decline' in the exile poetry, see Nagle (1980) 109–40; G. D. Williams (1994) 50–99.

[75] For an introduction to Horatian chronology, see Nisbet (2007). Cf. also below, pp. 179–80 and nn. 86–7.

birthday at *Epist.* 1.20.26–8,[76] together with the references to contemporary events in all three collections, creates the clear chronological sequence of *Carm.* 1–3, *Epistles* 1,[77] then *Carm.* 4. *Intermissa* agrees with *bella*, 'wars' (*Carm.* 4.1.1–2), with the typical content of lyric poetry again characterised as erotic 'battle',[78] even though this is a disingenuous opening to this particular lyric book, much of which is concerned with public issues. For the moment, however, it is Venus who has brought Horace back to lyric; an unwilling Horace begs the goddess to afflict Paullus Fabius Maximus instead (*Carm.* 4.1.9–20).[79] Newlands suggests that the implicit appearance of the same Maximus, via his wife, in the final panel of *Fasti* 6 may indicate that Ovid would hope for his public, Roman poem to be continued after its own 'interruption';[80] but I think it is more important that Ovid had already revisited *Carm.* 4.1 in the opening of *Fasti* 4, where he too (now in a fully staged conversation) comes to terms with the renewal of Venus' influence over his poetry.[81] If Ovid's version of *Carm.* 4 perhaps starts at the beginning of the second half of the six-book *Fasti*, then the final *increpuitque lyram* certainly implies that it ends at the end.[82]

Yet more significant is the fact that Horace resumed composing lyric not only after a period of retirement and epistolary writing, but after he had already marked the end of his lyric achievement years earlier with the last poem in his initial lyric collection, the apparently definitive *Carm.* 3.30. Proudly self-assertive throughout, this poem opens with Horace's claim to have completed a lyric 'monument' (1 *Exegi monumentum*), before stating that this monument will be more enduring that any physical structure, and then shifting into a prediction of immortality for Horace himself as he, personally, 'will be spoken of' (10 *dicar*) in the future and all over the world. Ovid makes use of *Carm.* 3.30 at the end of his (other) high-genre masterpiece, the *Metamorphoses*, replacing Horace's sixteen lyric lines with a *sphragis* of nine hexameters (*Met.* 15.871–9) that begins with the same assertion (871 *iamque opus exegi*, 'and now I have completed a work') before making a very similar prediction for his own immortality on almost the same basis (878 *ore legar populi*, 'I shall be read in the mouth of the people').[83]

[76] Cf. above, p. 174.

[77] If not also *Epistles* 2.2, or perhaps all the remaining epistolary poetry: see below, p. 179.

[78] See above, p. 169, on *Carm.* 1.6.17 *proelia uirginum*.

[79] This is agreed to be an allusion to Maximus' imminent marriage to Marcia (cf. above, p. 167 and n. 14). See Habinek (1986), and further on Maximus and his appearances in the poetry of both Horace and Ovid, Syme (1978) 135–55, (1986) 396–402, 403–20.

[80] Newlands (1995) 233.

[81] See esp. Barchiesi (1997b) 53–60, and, on this passage as a 'proem in the middle', cf. above, p. 166 and n. 8.

[82] Cf. Farrell (2004–5) esp. 53–4 'a formal similarity between the *Fasti* as a whole (that is, in its surviving condition as a six-book corpus) and Horace's fourth book'.

[83] For more detailed analysis of Ovid's reworking of Horace here—which also incorporates aspects of *Carm.* 2.20, the final poem of its own book—see e.g. Korenjak (2007) 241–2; Lowrie (2009) 374–9; Hoces Sánchez (2016). Ovid also picks up his own earlier nod to *Carm.* 3.30 at the end of the *Remedia amoris* (811 *hoc opus exegi*, 'I have completed this work').

The combination of this reprise of *Carm.* 3.30 with the allusion to *Carm.* 4.15 at the end of the *Fasti* creates a powerful effect as it invites the reader to set Ovid's career against Horace's. Encouraged by Ovid himself in *Tristia* 1 and 2, we usually understand the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* as works written simultaneously, both belonging to the same period that ended with Ovid's relegation.[84] But the Horatian elements in their endings ask us to see the *Metamorphoses* as the earlier work, with the *Fasti* as the final end, the end that matters.[85] The same combination also casts doubt on the idea that Ovid might ever be able to return from exile to continue with public poetry: Horace returned after *Exegi monumentum* to open a new book of lyric with *Intermissa . . . bella*, but Ovid leaves the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* in a form which manages to imply that his pre-exilic works included both '*Carm.* 3' and '*Carm.* 4'.

Both *Carm.* 4.15 and the end of *Fasti* 6 mark a key moment of closure in the career of an Augustan poet and in the way in which he presents his voice as able to speak—or sing—in a public setting. I have gone so far as to associate *Carm.* 4.15 with the prospect of Horace's death; while it is certainly possible that Horace went on to write some or all of the three long hexameter epistles that we know as *Epistles* 2 and the *Ars poetica* between *Carm.* 4 and his actual death,[86] it is notable that these poems do not explicitly present themselves as postdating *Carm.* 4 in the way that *Epistles* 1 positions itself after the initial lyric effort of *Carm.* 1–3.[87] Horace had already said at the end of *Carm.* 4.1 that his 'eloquent tongue' was beginning to fall silent 'in the midst of its words' (35–6 *facunda . . . | inter uerba cadit lingua silentio*), there because of the erotic disturbance caused by Ligurinus;[88] at the end of the book, as we have seen, his individual voice indeed ceases to be heard, whether because it joins in with a group of other singers or because it fades out as they take over.[89] Readers of *Carm.* 4.15 naturally take different views on where this 'remarkable conclusion', this 'self-effacement' replacing the self-assertion of *Carm.*

[84] *Tr.* 1.1.117–18, 1.7.13–14, 2.549–52 (cf. above, pp. 165–6).

[85] Cf. Heyworth (2019) 7 on the two works' beginnings: Steve reads *Met.* 1.4 *tempora* ('times') as indicating that the *Fasti*, that is *Tempora* (cf. above, n. 10), should be seen as 'the next work in the corpus'.

[86] Harrison (2008) contends that these three poems were designed to constitute one book, and that they were all composed after the publication of *Carm.* 4, which Harrison dates to around 13 BC. The Suetonian *Life of Horace* gives the date of Horace's death as 27 November 8 BC.

[87] *Epist.* 2.2 contains several references to Horace having given up lyric which are themselves couched in terms so similar to those used in the opening of *Epist.* 1.1 (see above, pp. 175–6 and n. 66) that the poem is usually dated close to the first book of *Epistles* (around 19 BC); Harrison (2008) 179–81 can only argue that these '*could* refer to *Carm.* 4 just as well as to *Carm.* 1–3' (my emphasis). The exact dates of *Epist.* 2.1, the *Ars poetica*, and *Carm.* 4 itself all remain controversial (see Nisbet [2007]); I would not place too much stress on the fact that the Suetonian *Life* describes Augustus' supposed 'commissioning' of *Carm.* 4 before his demand for *Epist.* 2.1. Fraenkel, for one, chooses to respond to the closural force of *Carm.* 4 by ending his book on Horace with it and with *Carm.* 4.15, 'possibly the latest of all his poems' (Fraenkel [1957] 449).

[88] The image is owed to Sappho fr. 31.9 Voigt, perhaps via Catul. 51.9: see Putnam (1986) 40–1 and Thomas (2011) ad loc. on Horace's response to Sappho in the whole stanza.

[89] See above, pp. 169–70.

2.20 and 3.30,[90] leaves both Horace and his praise of Augustus:[91] for instance, Putnam argues that Horace's 'originality' precisely in evoking a chorus beyond himself actually maintains his poetic identity and leaves the *princeps* 'beholden' to him,[92] while Thomas is suspicious of the final *canemus* itself (*Carm.* 4.15.32), writing of Augustan song 'never actually realized in the poem', 'never to be realized'.[93] The question partly depends on how we read the echo of another final *canemus*, the last word of Virgil's ninth *Eclogue* (67), when Moeris predicts that he and Lycidas 'will sing' again, but only when their teacher Menalcas returns, a dubious prospect in that poem. Menalcas, however, is another of Virgil's apparent 'disguises' in the *Eclogues*,[94] and Virgil himself would articulate his progress through the *Georgics* with future, present and past tenses of *canere*,[95] before returning with the first line of the *Aeneid* and its present tense, *cano*, 'I sing'; the content of the *Aeneid* seems to be indicated in Horace's intimation that his future chorus 'will sing' of Troy, Anchises, and the descendants of Venus (*Carm.* 4.15.31–2).[96] But Ovid, as we saw, marks the end of *Fasti* 6 with the perfect tense of the same verb, *cecinit*;[97] this sounds more like the end of the last *Eclogue*, as Virgil tells the Muses that their poet has sung enough, *sat . . . uestrum cecinisse poetam* (*Ecl.* 10.70).[98] In changing Horace's *canemus* to *cecinit*, Ovid brings his own Augustan poem to a close, and suggests that he at least will not sing indefinitely into the future as part of the chorus that Horace had predicted.

At the same time, by closely echoing *Carm.* 4.15.2 in the words *increpuitque lyram*, Ovid very effectively drowns out his own voice, merging it first into Horace's and then immediately into a Horatian silence. I noted above that *increpuit lyra* came at the beginning of *Carm.* 4.15 and seemed, as part of a *recusatio*, to be an opening move more generally, yet it introduced only one last poem;[99] when Ovid had previously borrowed this closural *increpuit* for the end of the *Amores*, Bacchus 'reproached' him a few lines from the end of the final poem

[90] Quotations from Putnam (1986) 273, 274.
[91] Memorably, Lowrie (1997) 351 'my skin crawls'.
[92] Putnam (1986) 273–4. [93] Thomas (2011) 260.
[94] Cf. above, p. 168, on Tityrus. At Verg. *Ecl.* 5.86–7, Menalcas appears to have composed *Eclogues* 2 and 3.
[95] Verg. *G.* 1.5 *canere incipiam* ('I shall begin to sing'), 2.1 *canam* ('I shall sing'), 176 *cano* ('I am singing'), 3.1 *canemus* ('we shall sing'; a promise that is now, like those made in the future tense at the beginning of the other books, immediately kept), 4.559 *canebam* ('I was singing'; apparently of the period of the *Georgics*' composition), 566 *cecini* ('I sang'; with reference to the *Eclogues*). See above, n. 31, for Ovid's adoption of the same system in the *Fasti* itself (another example of the 'poetic simultaneity' characteristic of didactic poetry: above, n. 11).
[96] As Zarecki (2010) emphasizes (cf. above, n. 25), Virgil's epic here seems to have been transmuted into (choral) lyric form.
[97] See above, p. 170.
[98] Cf. also Prop. 3.25.17 *cecinit*, at the end of the book and (what seems to be) the last Cynthia poem. Heyworth & Morwood (2017) ad loc. compare Verg. *Ecl.* 10.70, and I owe the further connection to *Fast.* 6.811 to Tristan Franklinos, as relayed by students to whom we had both taught all these texts.
[99] See above, p. 169.

(*Am.* 3.15.17) and pushed him on to a new genre, tragedy.[100] But at *Fasti* 6.812, the noisy divine intervention provokes nothing further from Ovid at all. The missing second half of the *Fasti* is aligned both with the direct praise that Horace does offer in *Carm.* 4.15 and with the silence (at least from Horace) that follows it: we may remember that, in comparison with *Carm.* 3 and its thirty poems,[101] *Carm.* 4, like the *Fasti*, is a work which is half as long as it 'ought' to be, and that Horace has indeed fallen silent in the middle of what he was saying (*Carm.* 4.1.36).[102] On the one occasion when Ovid names Horace, he depicts him playing his lyre (*Tr.* 4.10.49–50): like Hercules Musarum at the end of the *Fasti*, he seems to have a slightly violent or clumsy technique as he 'strikes' the instrument, *ferit*.[103] By concluding his most Augustan poem with a vehement flourish on a borrowed Horatian lyre, and then silence, Ovid insinuates that not even Horace could continue singing the praises of Augustus for ever.

[100] The instrumental ablative with *increpuit* here is *thyrso* ('with his thyrsus'), so that the sense 'make a noise' is not so strongly felt with *increpuit* as with Horace's ablative *lyra*: see above, p. 168.

[101] I ask for Steve's indulgence again: he believes that there is only one 'Roman Ode'. Making the case for reading *Carm.* 3.1–6 as one poem, in particular because of the continuity of their Alcaic metre, see Heyworth (1995a) and cf. Griffiths (2002); Steve also discusses the case of *Carm.* 4.14–15.

[102] See above, p. 179.

[103] So Fulkerson (2019) 28–9; contrast however Alcaeus at *Her.* 15.30 *grandius ille sonet* (see above, n. 39).