

## Epode 2

'earn, gain'; it is possible that Horace based his moneylender on this personage in part because of the possibilities offered by his name for etymological play, much as he chose the significantly named, but real Cupiennius as the representative of the sexually incontinent man at *Sat.* 1. 2. 36.

68. **iam iam**: used of an event whose realization is imminent (Fordyce on Catull. 63. 73), and highly ironic in the present context, since, as the concluding couplet shows, Alfius will never get round to implementing his dream.

69–70. **omnem redegit Idibus pecuniam, | quaerit Kalendis ponere**: Alfius gets in his money on the Ides, but instead of using this to retire to the country, lends it out again on the next possible day for conducting such a transaction, the Kalends of the following month, interest being paid monthly (*CIL* viii. 9052, *Dig.* 16. 3. 26. 1). The usual day for payment of the interest on a loan, or the principal, was the Kalends, but such payment might also take place on the Ides or Nones: cf. Cic. *Cat.* 1. 14 'praetermitto ruinas fortunarum tuarum, quas omnis proximis Idibus tibi impendere senties', *Verr.* 1. 149, *Att.* 14. 20. 2, Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, ii. 60.

69. **omnem...pecuniam**: i.e. the principal, rather than the interest, which supports Porphyrio's view that Alfius had formed the intention of purchasing a farm—until his natural greed reasserted itself.

**redegit**: sometimes interpreted to mean that Alfius 'called in' his money on the Ides, i.e. announced to his debtors that they must pay up on the following Kalends, but as Bentley ad loc. showed, the verb means to 'get in' or 'collect' money: cf. Cic. *Flacc.* 89 'si ista omnis pecunia huic adulescentulo L. Flacco reddita est, si petita, si redacta per hunc Antiochum', *Div. in Q. Caecil.* 56 'cogit quaestorem suum pecuniam, quam ex Agonidis bonis redegisset, eam mulieri omnem adnumerare et reddere'.

70. **quaerit Kalendis ponere**: he used the interval between the Ides and the Kalends to seek new customers. *Ponere* is the technical term for 'lending out' money at interest: cf. *Sat.* 1. 2. 13 and *Ars* 421 'dives agris, dives positus in faenore nummis', *OLD* s.v. 14b.

## Epode 3

Horace is at table, suffering agonies of indigestion from the effects of a meal (*dapes* 8) which Maecenas, it appears, has as a practical joke seasoned rather too liberally with garlic (*iocose* 20)<sup>1</sup>—possibly in ironic response to the exaggerated celebration of rustic life in the previous *Epode*,<sup>2</sup> since garlic is above all the food of country-dwellers (*o dura messorum ilia!* 4). The effects of garlic, Horace avers, match those of the most lethal or fiery substances known to humankind. The poem concludes with a light-hearted curse against Maecenas: 'if you ever again conceive a desire for such noxious food, may your *puella* ward off your garlicky kiss, and edge away to the far side of the bed.'

Iambic and its kindred genre Satire display a marked interest in the topics of eating, gastronomy, and foods suitable and unsuitable,<sup>3</sup> while the pain and discomfort of indigestion had long been regarded as a subject for humour in the popular literary genres.<sup>4</sup> Such jokes—which are sometimes as in *Epode* 3 tied to the consumption of one specific foodstuff<sup>5</sup>—often took the form of lavatory humour or related forms of vulgarity.<sup>6</sup> Consequently it is noteworthy that

<sup>1</sup> For the principle that the epithet applied by Horace to his patron or other addressee is central to the subject-matter of the poem in question, see on 1. 2. Some commentators adopt a slightly different construction of *iocose*: that Horace has eaten at Maecenas' table a dish containing garlic, is afterwards gripped by indigestion, and jokingly affects to believe that Maecenas set out to 'poison' him with garlic.

<sup>2</sup> For the suggestion, see Kiessling, L. Müller, and Olivier (1963), 108, referring in particular to the celebration of country food at 2. 49–58. Carrubba (1969), 64–70, Plüss (1904), 19–20, and W. Port, *Philologus*, 81 (1926), 294 go further, arguing that *Epode* 3 is, like *Epode* 2, on the theme of country life: cf. also Fedeli (1978), 112–13. But this approach is not borne out by the contents of the poem.

<sup>3</sup> West (1974), 31–2 (iambus); L. R. Shero, *CPh* 18 (1923), 126–43, Rudd (1966), 202 ff., Muecke (1993), 9–11, Gowers (1993), 109–219 (satire).

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Hipponax fr. 118. 9 W. with the scholiast ad loc., *Ar. Plut.* 1128–31, esp. 1131 with Holzinger ad loc., Antiphanes fr. 175. 3–4 K.–A.; cf. Henderson (1991), 199. The indigestion of Lucilius fr. 136 M. is probably caused by a coarse, rustic meal.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Ar. Eq.* 893–901, *Vesp.* 1126–8.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Hipponax fr. 114c W. μεσσηγυδορποχέστης, *Ar.* fr. 477 K.–A., *Vesp.* loc. cit., *Av.* 790–1, *AP* 9. 642–3, *Laber.* 82 Bonaria 'foriolus esse videre: in coleos cacas', *Mart.* 12. 48. 5–8, Henderson (1991), loc. cit., Richlin (1979), 340 ff.



Horace, notwithstanding the tendency of the *Epodes* and iambic in general to indulge in coarse descriptions of basic physiological processes, completely eschews realistic description of his symptoms, and instead utilizes legal, mythological, and climatological paradigms to produce an absurdly overblown account of his intestinal distress.

In addition to the interest of the popular literary genres in the subject of food and eating, there are traces of a tradition of comic anecdote dealing with fatal mishaps at table, and linked to the consumption of certain undesirable types of food, such as garlic. One such was included by Aristodemus<sup>7</sup> in his *γέλοια ἀπομνημονεύματα* (the death of an *ἰχθυοφάγος* after gulping down a piece of hot fish, and the *bon mot* of a fellow-*ἰχθυοφάγος* on hearing the news).<sup>8</sup> Another is the amusing account by Machon,<sup>9</sup> a Hellenistic writer of humorous anecdotes, of the fatal bout of indigestion suffered by Philoxenus, the dithyrambic poet, after eating nearly a whole octopus at a single sitting.<sup>10</sup>

In Latin there is the remark of Lucilius 54 M. 'occidunt, Lupe, saperdae te et iura siluri', where it may be that Lupus was in reality no more 'killed' (*occidunt*) by the poor-quality fish<sup>11</sup> than was Horace by the 'poisonous' garlic, which he absurdly describes as more toxic than hemlock, and identifies with hellish witches' brews (3, 5-8): that is to say, the same quality of humorous exaggeration is common to both texts.<sup>12</sup> We also have an amusing account by Cicero (*Fam.* 7. 26) of how a severe gastric upset overtook him after dining on a vegetable dish at an augural dinner. The relevant passage is 'nam dum volunt isti lauti terra nata quae lege excepta sunt in honorem adducere fungos, helvellas, herbas omnis ita condiunt ut nihil possit esse suavius; in eas cum incidissem in cena augurali apud Lentulum, tanta me *διάρροια* adripuit ut hodie primum videatur coepisse consistere. Ita ego qui me ostreis et murenis facile abstinebam a beta et a malva deceptus sum.' An interesting feature of Cicero's letter is the use of personification ('a beta et a malva deceptus sum; in eas cum incidissem apud Lentulum') to bestow a sort of identity on

<sup>7</sup> Ap. Ath. 345 B-C.

<sup>8</sup> Fr. 9 Gow.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 7 *ad init.*, Val. Max. 3. 5. 3. 9. 12. ext. 8. For other instances of death after consuming certain foodstuffs, cf. *AP* 7. 621, Lucian, *Cat.* 7, *Vit. auzt.* 10, and DL 6. 76. Hipponax 128 W., on the death of a glutton, may also belong to this tradition.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Marx ad loc., further Varr. *Men.* 312 Büch. on *saperda*.  
<sup>11</sup> Marx assigns the fragment, cited by Varr. *LL* 7. 47 under the rubric 'apud Lucilium', to book I of the *Satires*, which contained a celestial debate on the death of Lupus, and treats 'occidunt' as literal. This may be valid. But 'occidunt' could also be the colloquial hyperbole 'finish off, do for': cf. 14. 5 n.

the guilty *herbae*; in comparable fashion it is garlic, rather than its human victim, that is the protagonist of *Epode* 3.

Finally in this connection, mention should be made of Plaut. *Pseud.* 810 ff., the tirade of a cook against vegetable dinners.<sup>13</sup> The exaggerated seriousness with which the cook treats his subject, as well as several of his themes, interestingly foreshadow *Epode* 3. The pertinent lines are 'non ego item cenam condio ut alii coqui, | qui mihi condita prata in patinis proferunt, | boves qui convivas faciunt, | herbasque oggerunt, | eas herbas herbis aliis porro condiunt, | induunt coriandrum, feniculum, alium, atrum holus...', in particular 819 ff. 'ei homines cenas ubi coquunt, quom condiunt, | non condimentis condiunt, sed strigibus | vivis convivis intestina quae exedint. | hoc hic quidem homines tam brevem vitam colunt, | quom hasce herbas huius modi in suam alvom congerunt, | formidolos dictu, non essu modo. | quas herbas pecudes non edunt homines edunt.' Thus overconsumption of vegetables (*herbae* 812, 813, 823, 825: *his...herbis Epode* 3. 6-7), garlic included (814), inflicts excruciating stomach pains ('vivis convivis intestina quae exedint': *Epode, passim*), and drastically truncates men's lives ('hoc... homines tam brevem vitam colunt'): in like fashion, the unrealized implication of the extreme toxicity which Horace imputes to garlic must be that his last hour is at hand. Food such as this, argues the cook, is of quite terrifying potency ('formidolos dictu, non essu modo') akin in its effects upon men's innards to the assaults of *striges*, aviform witches,<sup>14</sup> upon human flesh: cf. the assimilation of the workings of garlic to the effects of dangerous magic (H. 5-8). Vegetable dinners are moreover both coarse and rustic, in the opinion of the cook mere 'cattle-fodder', 811, 812, 825: with this compare the exclamatory 'o dura messorum ilia!' (H. 4), suggesting that garlic may be fit food for reapers, but is unsuitable for more refined stomachs.

Such traditions as the above probably helped to inspire Horace's account of his garlic-induced agonies in *Epode* 3. The *Epode* is by many commentators described as a 'iocosa execratio alii' or the like:<sup>15</sup> Naevius, *Apella* fr. 2 Ribb. 'ut illum di perdat, qui primam holitor protulit caepam' is sometimes compared. Kirn went further and attempted to link the *Epode*, through its mythological central section (9-18), to the Hellenistic *Ἀπαί*: 'also Hellenistic is the use of *ἀπαί*, a genre which, as is well known, was composed in whole

<sup>13</sup> On this scene, see Lowe, *CQ* 35 (1985), 411-16.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. on 5. 20.

<sup>15</sup> The phrase is Orelli's: similarly Schütz, Nauck, Latsch (see on 8), 84, and Porphyrio.



catalogues'.<sup>16</sup> However, the entire effect of these lines turns on the ludicrous improbability of putting mundane garlic on a par with substances whose heat-producing capacities were legendary. That is to say, the internal logic of 9-18 requires that the *exempla* be trite in the extreme, and the allusions instantly recognizable. They have nothing in common with the notoriously abstruse and allusive *exempla* used in curses of the Hellenistic 'Απαί, or indeed with the erudite and academic ethos of such productions as a whole.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the labelling of the poem as a curse on garlic is in itself questionable. There is in *Epode* 3 no trace of *dirae* against the offending plant: one may contrast here *AP* 11. 96 and Plaut. *Pseud.* 837,<sup>18</sup> which do contain imprecations against unsuitable foodstuffs.<sup>19</sup> Finally, to categorize the *Epode* in this fashion directs attention away from its real focus, which is to convey by means of preposterous suspicions and absurd hyperbole a ludicrously exaggerated account of Horace's symptoms.

The only indisputable<sup>19</sup> instance of a curse in the poem (lines 19-22) has nothing to do with garlic, or with the Hellenistic 'Απαί, but is directed against Maecenas, whose misguided sense of humour is responsible for Horace's plight. The lines invoke upon Maecenas an erotic rebuff if he ever again conceives a desire for garlic. Humorous maledictions of a sexual nature are widespread in literary and non-literary texts, and many, like the present, involve sexual frustration. An early example comes from the 'Herodotean' *Life of Homer*, ch. 30, which reports that the poet imprecated as follows a priestess who brusquely ordered him to absent himself from the rites which she was conducting: κλύθι μοι εὐχομένω Κουροτρόφε, δὸς δὲ γυναῖκα | τήνδε νέων μὲν ἀνήρασθαι φιλότῃτα καὶ ἐνὶν, | ἢ δ' ἐπιτερπέσθω πολιοκροτάφοισι γέρονσιν, | ὧν ὥρη μὲν ἀπήμβλυνται, θυμὸς δὲ μενοινῶ. This curse, which draws upon a rich tradition of jokes involving impotence, derives much of its humour from the contrast between the solemn imprecatory form and the risqué nature of the material. Much more drastic in its language is a curse from Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, ἐκπέσοι σου τὸ τῆμα | τὸ τ' ἐπὶ κλυτὸν ἀποβάλοις | βουλομένη σποδεῖσθαι (906-8), which, like the present instance, centres on a bed and frustrated desire for intercourse. Various

<sup>16</sup> Kirm (1935), 42. Cf. also NH ii. 202.

<sup>17</sup> See L. C. Watson (1991), *passim* (154-7 for more detailed rebuttal of Kirm's position).

<sup>18</sup> Rather than speak of a curse against garlic, it might be better to connect the *Epode* with the rhetorically inspired encomia and ψόγοι of trivial entities: cf. A. S. Pease, 'Things without Honor', *CPh* 21 (1926), 27-42.

<sup>19</sup> But see n. on 1-3.

humorously erotic curses are found in the *Anthologia Palatina*.<sup>20</sup> One by Meleager (*AP* 5. 165) has in common with Horace's the figure of the lover who climbs into bed with the beloved, but is prevented from consummating his desire. In Latin there are examples such as Tib. 1. 9. 56 'tecum interposita languida veste cubet', which is close in spirit to Horace's curse, and Ov. *Am.* 2. 10. 15-18. Predictably, too, curses involving unsatisfied sexual desire are a feature of the *Priapea*: see nos. 23, 47, 58, and 78.<sup>21</sup>

A notable feature of the concluding imprecation is its studied toothlessness. In the first place, the curse is provisional:<sup>22</sup> 'If you ever again desire such noxious food, may your girl be repulsed by your garlic breath.' Given that Horace claims to be in *extremis* on account of Maecenas' ill-conceived gastronomic joke, one might have expected a more vigorous and immediate<sup>23</sup> riposte—if only in the shape of an erotic repulse at the offending banquet. Nor does the curse itself involve anything more than a transitory rebuff: very different are Ar. *Eccl.* cited *supra*, Prop. 2. 9. 47-8 'atque utinam, si forte pios eduximus annos, | ille vir in medio fiat amore lapis', 2. 16. 13-14 'at tu nunc nostro, Venus, o succurre dolori, | rumpat (sc. *meus rivalis*) ut assiduis membra libidinibus', and Tib. 1. 4. 67-70, all curses where sexual satisfaction is denied in a rather more drastic or permanent form. In fact, the very idea of a feeble curse is something of a contradiction in terms: one may contrast the vicious, if apparently motiveless,<sup>24</sup> imprecations of *Epode* 10. One reason for the concluding delicacy of touch is of course to put the whole ludicrous affair in perspective after the grotesque comic hyperbole of 1-18. But the rather personal, light-hearted tone of the close also suggests the relaxed intimacy of two friends enjoying a shared, and private joke,<sup>25</sup> in which each laughs in turn at the foibles of the other.<sup>26</sup> Even those poems in which Horace discusses his

<sup>20</sup> See L. C. Watson (1991), 142-5. <sup>21</sup> Cf. Buchheit (1962), 93-6.

<sup>22</sup> For this category of imprecation, see L. C. Watson (1991), General Index s.v. 'Curses, provisional'.

<sup>23</sup> This fact has troubled some commentators; Kiessling remarks 'urbaner wird das (sc. Horace's revenge) für die Gegenwart abgelehnt und nur als in Zukunft möglich hingestellt'. Ussani, understanding *sponda* of the *lectus tricinarius* (see on 22), deduced that Horace was ironically referring the action of his curse to the future, when in fact this had already begun: Maecenas having eaten the same dish as Horace, the *puella* was shying away from him on the couch. Kumaniecki's interpretation (1935), 14 = (1967), 268-9, without acknowledgement of the fact, treats 'concupiveris' as if it were 'concupivisti'. <sup>24</sup> Introductory essay to 10.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Fraenkel (1957), 69: 'The touch is so light that the apparent curse sounds almost like an affectionate compliment to Maecenas.'

<sup>26</sup> It is possible that, in producing such a wildly overblown account of his symptoms, Horace means to reflect ironically upon the hypochondria to which he elsewhere (*Ode* 2. 17) accuses Maecenas of being prey.



relationship with Maecenas at some length<sup>27</sup> show nothing quite like this. Closest in spirit and setting to the present *Epode*, perhaps, is the idealized account of the relationship enjoyed by Lucilius with Scipio and Laelius, as portrayed at *Sat.* 2. 1. 71–4: 'quin ubi se a vulgo et scaena in secreta remorant | virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli | nugari cum illo et discincti ludere donec | decoqueretur holus soliti'. In implying that he is Maecenas' *convictor* on similar terms to the above, Horace throws light on a very different aspect of their *amicitia* from that on view in *Epode* 1, with its very public declaration of friendship for Maecenas in his capacity as Octavian's right-hand man.

**1–3: si quis...fregerit...edit:** parricides should be condemned to eat garlic, argues Horace, in language which overtly parodies legal phraseology: cf. the *lex Pompeia de parricidiis* of 55 or 52 BC, 'cavetur ut, si quis patrem...occiderit...ut poena ea teneatur, quae est legi Corneliae de sicariis' (*Dig.* 48. 9. 1), *Cod. Justin.* 9. 17 'si qui parentis...fata properaverit...insutus culleo et inter eius ferale angustias comprehensus, serpentium contuberniis misceatur et...vel in vicinum mare vel in amnem proiciatur', Carrubb (1969), 66. There is a marked syntactical parallelism between such texts and the imprecatory close of *Epode* 3, 'at si quid...concupiveris...opponat...cubet'. The explanation lies in the fact that, in common with many laws of classical antiquity, the punitive sanctions of early Roman laws such as the *leges sacrae* were originally expressed as curses: cf. L. C. Watson (1991), 18–22, Bennett (1930). Even if by Horace's time the imprecatory origin of such *si quis* formulations had become occluded and the primary effect of 1–3 is legal parody, the practical consequence of such terminological respension is an effect of ring-composition: for comparable framing, cf. *Prop.* 4. 5.

**1–2 parentis...guttur fregerit:** a particularly brutal type of parricide. *Parricida* at this period seems usually to have been taken to mean 'one who murders a kinsman' (J. D. Cloud, 'Parricidium', *ZRG* 88 (1971), 14–15, 47–66), but the phrase 'whoever throttles his *parens*' attaches to the noun its more restricted sense of 'murderer of one's *pater* or *parens*'. For the latter, cf. *Cic. Inv.* 2. 78, and Cloud 15 n. 16. *Parricidium* was in Roman eyes the 'nefas ultimum...velut incredibile scelus et ultra audaciam

positum' (*Sen. Clem.* 1. 23: cf. E. M. Lassen, *C&M* 43 (1992), 147–61), a crime so unnatural that it was treated as a religious abomination: cf. Cloud 34 ff. and M. Radin, 'The Lex Pompeia and the Poena Cullei', *JRS* 10 (1920), 119–30. That the perpetrator of so heinous a misdeed should be condemned to take garlic establishes by comic hyperbole its hellish toxicity.

**1. parentis:** used for *pater* or *mater*, parodying archaic and legal usage: cf. *Fest.* 260 L. (*lex Servi Tulli*) 'si parentem puer verberit ast olle plorassit paren(s), puer divis parentum sacer esto', Blok (1961), 38.

**olim:** *olim* (literally 'at that time') is used with future reference. Cf. *Verg. Aen.* 1. 19–20 with *Serv.*, *Ecl.* 10. 33–4 and in particular *Sat.* 2. 5. 27 'magna minorve foro si res certabitur olim', *AP* 387–8 'id tibi iudicium, ea mens. si quid tamen olim | scripseris, in Maeci descendat iudicis auris', and *Epp.* 1. 3. 18–20, which suggest that, in combination with *si*, *olim* has for Horace a formal or judicial colour, well suited to the pseudo-legalese of lines 1–3 and reflecting the rather elevated tone which *olim* often exhibits: see *TLL* and *OLD* s.v.

**si quis:** in a further piece of mock-solemn archaism, Horace opts for *si quis* + future perfect over *quisquis* + future perfect: the first predominated in early Roman laws (D. Daube, *Forms of Roman Legislation* (Oxford, 1956), 6–8): cf. 'si quis eum qui eo plebei scito sacer sit occiderit, parricida ne sit' (quoted by Bennett (1930), 10, from an archaic *lex sacra*).

**impia manu:** by his brutal deed the parricide flagrantly violates one of the most cherished ideals of the Romans, *pietas erga parentes* (Fugier 1963, 381, 391–6). Great loathing was felt towards those guilty of *impietas in parentes* (*Suet. Rhet.* 6, S. P. C. Tromp *De Romanorum piaculis* (Leiden, 1921), 7).

**2. senile guttur:** adds the shocking detail that the victim is not only the murderer's parent, but an aged one at that. The transference of *senilis* from *parentis* to *guttur* focuses attention on the murderous hands wrapped round the aged parent's neck. Horace may have in mind the unnatural son who grows tired of waiting for his inheritance: cf. Nero's poisoning of Pallas 'quod immensam pecuniam longa senecta detineret' (*Tac. Ann.* 14. 65).

**guttur fregerit:** 'throttled' (cf. *Luc.* 2. 154 'hic laqueo fauces elisaque guttura fregit'), a variation on the more common *cervices/-em frangere*: cf. *Ode* 2. 13. 5–6 'illum et parentis crediderim sui | fregisse cervicem', a mock-pathetic context very similar to the

<sup>27</sup> *Sat.* 1. 6, 1. 9, 2. 6. 40–58, *Epode* 1, *Ode* 2. 17, *Epp.* 1. 7.



present. *Guttur/cervicem frangere* in the Horatian passages are used anomalously. Such expressions are generally employed in the context of judicial execution (Cic. *Vat.* 26, Sall. *Cat.* 55. 5 'vindices rerum capitalium... laqueo gulam fregere').

**3. edit:** parricides should be compelled to eat garlic, so as to suffer the agonies which Horace is experiencing. The use of the old optative form *edit* (K.-Holz. 682-3) for subjunctive *edat* adds a touch of linguistic archaism appropriate to the pseudo-judicial context.

**cicutis:** in contrast to Greek κώνειον, Roman poets tend to use *cicuta* in the plural (cf. *Epp.* 2. 2. 53, Ov. *AA* 3. 465, Juv. 7. 206), possibly because the hemlock plant has a multiplicity of fibrous roots.

**cicutis alium nocentius:** hemlock is compared with garlic because, like the latter, it was taken by mouth, and because it was used for judicial executions in Athens and so offers a precedent for the ingestion of garlic in the 'law' which Horace is framing: cf. R. J. Bonner, 'The Use of Hemlock for Capital Punishment', *HSCP* Suppl. 1 (1940), 299-302. Garlic is on two counts 'more virulent' than hemlock, and hence more appropriately administered to a pitiless parricide. First, the latter induces a feeling of cold (Plat. *Phaed.* 118 A 2 ff. ἐπεδείκνυτο ὅτι ψύχαιτό τε καὶ πήγνυτο... ἡδὴ οὖν σχεδὸν τι αὐτοῦ ἦν τὰ περὶ τὸ ἥτρον ψυχόμενα, *Ar. Ran.* 125-6, Plin. *NH* 25. 95, 151 ff. 'semini et foliis refrigeratoria vis, sic et necat. incipiunt algere ab extremitatibus corporis', Juv. 7. 206, *Σ Pers.* 5. 145, Ov. *Am.* 3. 7. 13), but garlic produces a sensation of unbearable heat (11-18). Second, death by hemlock was not painful, at least according to Plat. *Phaed.* 118 (in fact the symptoms of hemlock poisoning are exceedingly unpleasant: C. Gill, *CQ*<sup>23</sup> (1973), 25-8); garlic causes unbearable agonies, as Horace knows to his cost.

**nocentius:** related to *nex* and *necare*, *nocens* characterizes 'harmful' or 'toxic' plants and substances: cf. *Sat.* 1. 8. 22 'herbasque nocentis', Juv. 6. 620-1 'minus ergo nocens erit Agrippinae | boletus', Ov. *MF* 38, Plin. *NH* 19. 133. In view of the pseudo-legal flavour of 1-3 and the proposed use of garlic as a means of execution it is relevant that *nocere* in legal contexts may signify 'the punishment itself, the harm inflicted on the culprit': cf. D. Daube, 'Nocere and Noxa', *Cambridge Law Journal*, 7 (1939), 54-5, also 44.

**4. o dura messorum ilia!** an emotional exclamation, 'oh the tough guts of reapers!', presumably caused by a spasm of pain, rudely interrupts the solemn movement of 1-3. For emotional 'o', cf. LHS

26 and Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 1. 76. Horace cries 'what tough insides reapers must have to stomach what is causing me such agony' because garlic was the food of reapers (Verg. *Ecl.* 2. 10-11 'Thestyli et rapido fessis messoribus aestu | alia serpyllumque herbas con-  
tundit olentis'). It was also a central ingredient in the rustic *moretum* (Col. 10. 110-13, *Moretum* 87 ff.). E. J. Kenney on *Moretum* 116 notes that, in the more elaborate recipes given for the dish by Col. 12. 59 and Apic. 1. 21, garlic is absent, presumably because they were writing for more refined stomachs. Garlic is a symbol of plain country fare for the rustic slave Grumio at Plaut. *Most.* 41 ff. and in general is closely identified with the country: cf. Don. on Ter. *Phorm.* 318 and Galen's description of it as τῶν ἀγροίκων θηριακή (x. 866 Kühn). It was, moreover, regarded as old-fashioned, plain, provincial, and harsh: cf. Varro ap. Non. Marc. 296 L., Ov. *F.* 4. 372, Plaut. *Poen.* 1313-14, Sidon. *Apoll. Carm.* 12. 14-15, Cels. 3. 22. 11, 4. 4, Prud. *Perist.* 10. 260, André (1981), 20, 199, Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen*<sup>8</sup>, 199-201, Gowers (1993), 289-97. The extreme rusticity and unfashionableness of garlic<sup>28</sup> greatly enhances the absurdity of Horace's identification of it in lines 9-14 with the most awesome *venena* known to Greek mythology.

**ilia:** 'guts', presumably chosen for its rather vulgar flavour (cf. Adams, *LSV* 50-1): it is not one of the usual terms for stomach or intestines (D. Gourevitch, 'Les noms latins de l' estomac', *RPh*<sup>3</sup> 50 (1976), 85-110). The *TLL* article, which recognizes two meanings for *ilia*, 1) the arteries situated in the lower abdomen, 2) the sides of the lower belly between hips and flanks, offers no convincing parallel for the present use. Closest are *Sat.* 2. 8. 30 and Mart. 10. 45. 7, which refer to animal entrails. Cf. also Marcell. *Empir.* 36. 73 'si ex eo illum aut venter imus fricetur' for the linking of *ilia* and intestines.

<sup>28</sup> Given this, how, commentators have asked, did Horace come to eat it in the first place? Or how Maecenas—who is known to have been a sophisticated diner (Plin. *NH* 8. 170)—to serve it? P. Colmant, 'Horace, Épode III', *LEC* 25 (1957), 107 indeed saw in *messorum* a pointed hint to Maecenas that his table had fallen below its usual high standards. Heinze supposed that garlic was one ingredient in a country picnic, others (see n. 2) that Maecenas served Horace garlic to mock the sentimental enthusiasm voiced for country food at 2. 49-58. Or does *messorum*, and particularly *herbis* (7) conceal a reference of a quite different sort—to sumptuary legislation, a feature of which was the promotion of vegetable dishes (cf. *Kl. Pauly*, v. 431 ff. s.v. 'sumptus', Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, i (Baltimore, 1933), 294)? Horace would not be the first to advert to such measures: cf. Lucil. 1172, 1200 M., and Cic. *Fam.* 7. 26. But all this is pure conjecture: Horace never explains to the reader how he came to eat the garlic (assuming that he actually did, and that the whole incident is not simply a fiction).



5-8. The spasm which attacked Horace in line 4 was apparently so severe as to make him wonder whether some agent other than garlic can be responsible. He now asks 'what is this poison that is raging in my vitals?'—viper's blood in the food, perhaps? Has the witch Canidia doctored the meal? The extravagance of these suspicions represents a comic overreaction to the pain Horace is experiencing.

5. **quid hoc veneni**: lit. 'what (in the sphere of) poison is this?' Such genitives, which depend on a neut. sing. pronoun nom. or accus., are sometimes called 'the genitive of the rubric, that is the class to which an individual belongs' (E. J. Kenney on *Lucr.* 3. 832). The genitive is usually singular, as also at 15. 12. Cf. *Plaut. Bacch.* 117 'quid tibi commercist?', *Poen.* 1297 'quid hoc est conduplicat-ionis?', *Liv.* 3. 17. 2, *Draeger, Historische Syntax*, i. 448-52, *Löfstedt, Syntactica*, i. 136-42.

**saevit**: for *saevio* of the effects of poison, cf. *Tac. Ann.* 13. 15 'sive temperamentum inerat (sc. *veneno*) ne statim saeviret', *Verg. Aen.* 12. 857, *Mart.* 10. 36. 4 'toxica saeva'.

**praecordiis**: of various meanings of *praecordia*, properly 'the parts below the heart', two are possible: 'vitals' (*Plin. NH* 30. 42 'praecordia vocamus uno nomine exta in homine', *Apul. Met.* 10. 28) or the more restricted sense of 'stomach', which arises from the proximity of the *praecordia* to the latter organ (cf. *Cels.* 4. 1. 6). The second alternative appears preferable: for the noun in this sense cf. *Sat.* 2. 4. 26-7, *Cic. Fin.* 5. 92 'cum is ipse anulus in praecordiis piscis inventus est' (= *Hdt.* 3. 42 ἐν τῇ νηδύνι), *Sen. Epp.* 95. 25 'illud sociorum garum... non credis urere salsa tabe praecordia?'

6-7. **his...herbis**: it appears from this that the offending garlic was one ingredient in a plate of greens—not, however, the so-called *moretum* (*Ov. F.* 4. 367 'herbosum...moretum'). Unlike the dish eaten by Horace, the latter was not 'cooked' (*incoctus*, 'cooked in', 7): cf. *Moretum* 85-116 with Kenney on 116.

6. **viperinus...cruor**: 'the ancients...regarded snake's blood as poisonous', state *NH* on *Ode* 1. 8. 8-10 'cur olivum|sanguine viperino|cautius vitat?', citing as evidence the present passage and *Plin. NH* 11. 279 'Scythae sagittas tingunt viperina sanie et humano sanguine; inremediabile id scelus: mortem ilico adfert levi tactu': cf. also *Ov. Pont.* 4. 7. 36 'vipereo tela cruore madent'. Their explanation is probably correct; since, however, *sanies* is often used of snakes' venom (*Verg. Aen.* 2. 221, *Vell. Pat.* 2. 87. 1, *OLD* s.v. 2),

and since the same meaning is borne by *cruor* at *Sil.* 6. 293 'bibit e serpente cruorem', the possibility cannot be excluded that *viperinus cruor* refers to snake venom.

7. **incoctus...me fefellit**: 'was cooked in without my noticing', a construction based on *λανθάνειν* with a participle: cf. 5. 67-8, *Epp.* 1. 17. 10, *Ode* 3. 16. 29-32, *Luc.* 6. 64, *Liv.* 3. 8. 6 'Lucretium... praedonum agmen fefellit supra montes Praenestinos ductum'. For *incoquere* of a magical additive, cf. *Ov. Met.* 7. 264-5 'illic Haemonia radices valle resectas|seminaque floresque et sucos incoquit atros'.

**an**: *an* does not introduce an alternative hypothesis, but amplifies and completes 'num...viperinus his cruor|incoctus herbis me fefellit?'

**malas**: both 'poisonous' (cf. *Sat.* 2. 1. 56 *mala...cicuta*, *Cic. Cluent.* 148) and *arte magica noxias* (*TLL* viii. 224. 55 ff.).

8. **Canidia**: in order to appreciate the comic hyperbole of 6-8, the reader must already be familiar with Canidia as a dangerous witch figure. That is to say, of the three pieces devoted to Canidia (*Epodes* 5, 17, *Sat.* 1. 8), one at least must precede *Epode* 3. Agreement is general that *Epode* 5 at any rate should be dated before *Epode* 3: details in Carrubba (1969), 16 ff. R. Latsch, *Die Chronologie der Satiren und Epoden des Horaz* (Würzburg, 1936), 84-5 argues that *Sat.* 1. 8, which he holds to be the earliest of the Canidia-poems, would alone suffice to make vv. 7-8 of *Epode* 3 intelligible to the reader (but on p. 116 he places the composition of both *Sat.* 1. 8 and *Epode* 5 before *Epode* 3). There is another passing hit at Canidia, in a context similar to the present, at *Sat.* 2. 8. 93-5 'quem nos sic fugimusulti,|ut nihil omnino gustaremus, velut illis|Canidia afflasset peior serpentibus Afris'. One reason for her appearance in both passages may be the association of witchcraft and cooking: cf. K. Freudenburg, *TAPhA* 125 (1995), 207-19. Here she also serves as a lead-in to the comparisons with Medea's magical concoctions: cf. 5. 61-8 for the two figures in association.

**tractavit**: 'has handled', not 'prepared' (so many), a meaning which it is questionable *tractare* can bear. The closest instance is *Lucr.* 5. 953 'necdum res igni scibant tractare', where the verb involves more than just cooking and *igni* makes a vital difference. In any case the translation 'prepared' involves the absurd idea that Maecenas has employed Canidia's services as cook. *Tractavit* must be joined with *malas*, which is proleptic. Horace is speculating



that Canidia has tampered with his food: cf. Hom. *Od.* 10. 235–6 (Κίρκη) ἀνέμισγε δὲ σίτῳ | φάρμακα λυγρά. *Tractare* is used elsewhere of 'handling' poisonous or magical things: cf. *Ode* 2. 13. 8–10 'ille venena Colcha [...] tractavit', 1. 37. 26–8, Sen. *Med.* 717–19.

**dapes:** it is difficult to gauge the force of this word. On the one hand, *daps* is stylistically elevated, which suits the mock grandiosity of the context. On the other, the noun may be used of a simple repast, without any connotations of sumptuousness (D. Williams on Stat. *Theb.* 10. 20; add *Catal.* 13. 27–8). The second possibility better suits the unpretentious *his...herbis*.

9–18. It was garlic that Medea used to protect Jason from Aeetes' fire-belching bulls, garlic that she employed to incinerate her rival Creusa. The heat of the Dog Star over Apulia was never as great as this, nor was that of the poisoned shirt on Heracles' flesh. The warming effect of garlic on the intestines was a well-recognized medical phenomenon (C. Deroux in id. (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, v (Brussels, 1989), 509).

9. **Argonautas:** *Argonautas* may pun on *candidum* (ἀργός, 'shining, gleaming') (Cavarzere).

**Argonautas praeter omnis:** best taken with *candidum*: cf. Ap. Rhod. 3. 443–4 θεσπέσιον δ' ἐν πᾶσι μετέπρεπεν Αἴσονος υἱὸς | κάλλει καὶ χαρίτεσσιν. Line 9 describes Jason's famously good looks (M. Hadas, *CPh* 31 (1936), 167, C. Beye, *GRBS* 10 (1969), 43–5), line 10 Medea's response to them. Some editors join *Argonautas praeter omnis* with *mirata est* or take it ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with adjective and verb. In favour of this one can point to the close association of *praeter omnis* with the verb at *Epode* 11. 3 'me praeter omnis expetit' and *Ode* 2. 6. 13–14 'ille terrarum mihi praeter omnis | angulus ridet', as well as the tendency of *praeter* in its present sense of 'surpassing, outdoing' others to be attached to a verb or verb-equivalent phrase (*OLD* s.v. 2b, Hand, *Turs.* iv. 541). But instances of *praeter* with an adjective are by no means unknown: cf. Hygin. *Fab.* 67 'fortissimus praeter ceteros erat', Justin. *Epit. Pomp. Trog.* 21. 6. 1 'Hamilcarem... virum sollertia facundiaque praeter ceteros insignem', Suet. *Galb.* 9. 1.

10. **mirata est:** 'adamavit' Ps.-Acro. For erotic 'admiration', cf. *Ode* 1. 4. 19–20 'nec tenerum Lycidan mirabere, quo calet iuventus | nunc omnis et mox virgines tepebunt', 4. 9. 15, *Sat.* 1. 2. 36, Prop. 2. 13. 9.

11–12. The context seems to require that these lines illustrate the heat-producing and destructive effects of garlic, as do the three succeeding couplets. Yet, in the legend of the fire-breathing bulls to which 11–12 refer, the action of the salve which Medea used to anoint Jason, here identified with garlic, was heat-repellent and protective: cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 221–2 σὺν δ' ἐλαίῳ φαρμακώσαιοσ' ἀντίτομα στερεᾶν ὀδυνᾶν | δῶκε χρίεσθαι, Ap. Rhod. 3. 1305 κούρης δέ ἐ φάρμακ' ἔρυτο, Apollod. 1. 9. 23, Ov. *Met.* 7. 109 ff., Val. Flacc. 7. 583 ff. The logic of the passage is as follows: so awesome is the power of garlic, it even shielded Jason from the scorching breath of the bulls; now it is working with the same formidable efficiency for Horace's 'destruction', just as it did for Creusa's (13–14). Diametrically opposite effects are often ascribed to the same magical substances. Indeed, at Sen. *Med.* 706 ff., one of the ingredients gathered by the heroine for the hellish brew which will incinerate Creusa is 'mala... quae fert opertis hieme perpetua iugis | sparsus cruore Caucasus Promethei', whereas in Apollonius the identical plant, Προμήθειον, forms the basis of the protective salve with which Medea anointed Jason (3. 851–3). Similarly the Gorgon's blood could be equally a deadly toxin or a powerful revivifying agent (Eur. *Ion* 1003–5, Apollod. 3. 10. 3). On this principle, see further von Staden (12. 11 n.), 14 with n. 55, 18, R. Wünsch in Hastings, *ERE* iii. 461, 463–4; Eitrem (1941), 60 n. 4; cf. also Faraone (1999) 121–2.

Other, less satisfactory explanations of lines 11–12 are: (a) the garlic salve, by its smell, drove off the bulls: cf. Pliny *NH* 20. 50 'serpentes abigit et scorpiones odore, atque, ut aliqui tradidere, bestias omnes', and *Geopon.* 12. 30. But this would pre-empt the joke in 21–2. It is also difficult to see how Jason could yoke the bulls, as required by Aeetes, if they had been put to flight by the *odor alii*: (b) the garlic salve generated such heat as to repel the bulls (without, apparently, harming Jason!). Further, still less plausible, interpretations are offered by Peerlkamp and Ps.-Acro.

11. **ignota:** sc. *eis*. To underline the fearsomeness of the bulls, and thus establish by implication the awesome power of garlic by which Jason was enabled to resist their onslaught, Horace follows the tradition that they had never before been yoked: cf. Ov. *Met.* 7. 118–19, Val. Flacc. 7. 602 ff. At Ap. Rhod. 3. 411–12 Aeetes states τοὺς ἐλάω ζεύξας στυφέλην κατὰ νειὸν Ἄρηος | τετράγυνον.

**tauris:** the fire-breathing bulls which Aeetes required Jason to yoke (*illigaturum*) as a precondition of getting the Golden Fleece, in the expectation that the task would prove fatal: cf. Soph. *Κολχίδες* fr.



1135 Radt, Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 225-38, Ap. Rhod. 3. 230-1, 409-1 δῶν μοι πεδίον τὸ Ἀρήιον ἀμφινέμονται | ταύρω χαλκόποδε, στόματι φλόγα φυσιόωντες, 495-6, 1289-92, Ov. *Met.* 7. 104 ff., *Her.* 12. 39 ff., Val. Flacc. 7. 581 ff. They were Ἡφαιστότευκτοι, Antim. *Lyd.* fr. 72 Matthews: cf. Ap. Rhod. 3. 230 ff., Apollod. 1. 9. 23. See further *Hibeh Papyri II*, ed. E. G. Turner (London, 1955), 53-5 and Robert, *Gr. Heldensage* 794-6.

**12 perunxit:** i.e. Medea gave Jason a drug with which to 'smear himself all over': cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 221-2 (11-12 n.), Apollod. 1. 9. 23, and Ap. Rhod. 3. 1042-3, where Medea tells Jason ἤρι δὲ μυδῆνας τόδε φάρμακον, ἥ' ἔστ' ἀλοιφή | γυμνωθεὶς φαίδρυνε τεὸν δέμας. For comprehensive anointing of the body with a magical salve, cf. Apul. *Met.* 3. 21, where the witch Pamphile 'ab imis unguibus sese totam adusque summos capillos perlinit (sc. unguedine)'. See also on 5. 57-9.

**hoc:** in keeping with the humorous illogic of 11-18, which requires the effects of garlic to be put on a par with the fieriest entities known to myth and climatology, *hoc* must refer to garlic, not to the alternative poison of lines 5-8, notwithstanding the (seeming) parallel with 'quid hoc veneni?' 5. This is confirmed by the *num* which prefaces 5-8, suggesting that the possibility there raised was not seriously entertained, and by the fact that garlic was actually employed as an unguent on humans (*perunxit*): cf. Plin. *NH* 20. 50-2, 54-5, Marcell. *Empir.* 4. 11, *ibid.* 44, Dioscor. *Mat. Med.* 2. 152 Wellmann, *Geopon.* 12. 30.

**12-13. hoc... hoc:** emphatic repetition: it was *garlic* that was responsible.

**13. delibutis... donis:** after Jason abandoned her in order to marry the daughter of Creon king of Corinth, Medea 'took vengeance' on her 'rival' by sending her bridal gifts smeared with incendiary substances which, when she put them on, consumed her (5. 65-6 with n.), and, in some accounts, the royal palace as well (Apul. *Met.* 1. 10, Sen. *Med.* 885-7 with Costa).

**delibutis:** 'smeared'. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 789 τοιοῖσδε χρίσω φαρμάκοις δωρήματα, Sen. *Med.* 575-6, Apollod. 1. 9. 28. For *delibuo*, 'smear' with drugs or medicaments, cf. 17. 31-2 'atro delibutus Hercules | Nessi cruore', Cic. *Brut.* 217 'qui devinctus erat fasciis et multis medicamentis propter dolorem artuum delibutus', E. Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Phoenix Suppl. 10; Toronto, 1972), 49.

**donis:** the parallel account at 5. 65-6 mentions only a single *munus*, a *palla*. *Donis* follows the version in which more than one gift was sent: cf. Eur. *Med.* 786, 1159-62 (a robe and a crown), Sen. *Med.* 570 ff. (the same two items plus a *monile*), D. L. Page, *Euripides; Medea* (Oxford, 1938), p. xxvi.

**paelicem.** Medea's 'rival', who is not named in the other allusion to her at 5. 63 or in Euripides' play, was variously known as Creusa or Glaucē: cf. G. Weicker, 'Glaucē' (5), *RE* vii. 1395. On a fourth-century Apulian amphora held in Munich, reproduced facing p. 406 of L. Séchan, *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique* (Paris, 1926), she is called Kreonteia, Creon's daughter. This suggests that legend had not at that stage assigned her a name. For the meaning of *paelex* (not 'concubine'), see on 5. 70.

**14. serpente fugit alite.** After destroying Creusa and killing her children, Medea fled Corinth in a chariot drawn by winged serpents, *serpente alite*, a notable oxymoron: cf. *Ode* 1. 22. 16 'arida nutrix', 2. 5. 23 'discrimen obscurum', 2. 18. 40 'non vocatus audit'. The present instance is not just 'pictorial', but reinforces the sense (see Maurach 1989, 99-100 for the distinction). By pointedly drawing attention to Medea's miraculous form of transport, the expression stamps her as a witch of unrivalled powers: her 'poison', from which Horace conjectures he is perishing, gains distinction thereby.

*Serpente alite* is collective singular: accounts of Medea's airborne escape are unanimous in equipping her with more than one *serpens*. Some sources merely speak of a team (Σ Eur. *Med.* 1320, Ov. *Met.* 7. 218 ff., 350ff., Hygin. *Fab.* 27, Apollod. 1. 9. 28, Pacuv. 398 Ribb. 'angues ingentes alites iuncti iugo'). Sen. *Med.* 1023 specifies two serpents, while the Munich amphora (n. on *paelicem*) and other vases and artefacts (A. D. Trendall and A. Cambitoglou, *The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia*, ii (Oxford, 1982), 497, 43, pl. 178. 1, LIMC vi/1. 391-2 nos. 35-7, 39, 45-6) depict Medea standing in her car, drawn by a pair of coiling python-like creatures which sometimes sport impressive wings. Another tradition awards her four serpents: cf. LIMC *ibid.* no. 41. Flying snakes are particularly associated with the East, whence Medea originally came, the home of the fabulous and the magical: cf. Cic. *ND* 1. 101 with Pease, Keller (1909-13), ii. 301-3, R. W. Hutchinson, *CQ* 8 (1958), 100-1, Sauvage (1975), 244, and Ov. *F.* 4. 497-8 with Frazer.

**15. siderum:** Sirius, the Dog Star (1. 27 n.). The plural refers to the stars in the proximity of Sirius, which were incorporated in the



# Epode 3

constellation of the *Canis*: cf. Avien. 2. 1231-2 'magni canis ignea ... | sidera', W. Gundel, *RE* iii. 327-8.

**insedit**: *figura etymologica* (Varr. *LL* 7. 14 'sidera quae (qua)si insidunt'). For the idea, cf. Sen. *Oed.* 47 'sed gravis et ater incubat terris vapor', Val. Flacc. 1. 682 ff. 'sic cum stabulis et messibus ... | ... Calabri populator Sirius arvi | incubuit'.

**16. siticulosae Apuliae**: Apulia suffered from a lack of water (*Ode* 3. 30. 11, *Sat.* 1. 5. 88-9, Ov. *Met.* 14. 510 ff., Strab. 281 *imit.*), on account of the parching heat for which the region was notorious: cf. Varr. *RR* 1. 6. 32, *Sat.* 1. 5. 77-8, *Epode* 2. 41-2 and the etymology reported by Paulus Diaconus (*PL* 95. 495 Migne) which fancifully derived its name from ἀπόλλυμι; 'Apulia autem a perditione nominatur; citius enim ibi solis fervoribus terrae virentia perduntur'. Apulia's 'thirstiness' also resulted from a want of sizeable rivers in the region (W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, i (London, 1856), 166), and its chalky, porous soil.<sup>29</sup> For physical confirmation of *siticulosa*, cf. M. S. Spurr, *Arable Cultivation in Roman Italy* (London, 1986), 25.

**siticulosae**: a calque on Homeric πολυδίψιος (*Il.* 4. 171). Adjectives in -osus are formed in imitation of Greek epithets terminating in -εις/-όεις and -ώδης. Many such Greek terms have an elevated, poetic flavour, and this colour is taken over by a number of Latin adjectives in -osus, the present instance being a case in point. Cf. A. Ernout, *Les adjectifs latins en -osus et en -ulentus* (Paris, 1949), 13-85; P. E. Knox, 'Adjectives in -osus and Latin Poetic Diction', *Glotta*, 64 (1986), 90-101.

**Apuliae**: the first two syllables of *Apulia* are long (Plaut. *Cas.* 702, *Sat.* 1. 5. 77 with Palmer), the first two of *Apulus* trochaic (2. 42, *Ode* 1. 33. 7, 3. 4. 9 with Wickham, Plaut. *Cas.* 77, *MG* 648).

**17-18. Heracles' poisoned shirt** did not burn more fiercely than my garlic-racked innards. In a similar effect of comic hyperbole, Lucian, *Podagra* 302-4 compared the pangs of gout to the effects of the poisoned shirt.

**17. munus**: the robe, imbued with the blood of the centaur Nessus and the Hydra's venom, which Deianeira sent to Heracles in the mistaken belief that she was giving him a love-charm: cf. Soph. *Trach.* 555 ff., Bacchyl. *Dith.* 16. 23-35 Snell-Maehler, and *Epode* 17. 31-2. Parts of Deianeira's story already featured in Archilochus

<sup>29</sup> For *siticulosus* of arid soil, cf. Col. 3. 11. 9, *De arbor.* 16. 1.

## Commentary on lines 17-19

(fr. 259 and 286-9 W.). The *munus* of 17 was parallel in its effects to the *dona* of 13, but the intention of the senders was very different. On the motif of death by a woman's textile, see Keuls (1985), 233-5.

**umeris**: in Sophocles the poison attacks Heracles' whole frame (δέμας | τὸ πᾶν *Trach.* 1056-7). Horace singles out Heracles' shoulders, presumably because *umeri* are associated with the idea of strength (Hom. *Il.* 18. 204, *Hy. Apoll.* 7 ὦμοι ἰφθίμοι, Cic. *Sen.* 33, Ov. *Met.* 12. 281, *F.* 5. 169), and in allusion to the legend that Heracles once bore the sky ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων (Σ *Ap. Rhod.* 4. 1396, Paus. 5. 11. 5, Roscher, *Lex. Myth.* i. 2227).

**efficacis**: not a 'stock epithet' (Porphyrio). Heracles subdued all comers (*Trach.* 1058-61, 1089-1102, *TGF Adesp.* fr. 653 Kannicht-Snell), but the poison subdued him. *Efficax*, which recurs at 17. 1, is elsewhere used of him only at Avien. *Or. Mar.* 163. The adjective is rarely applied to people before the late period: Cic. *Fam.* 8. 10. 3 is another exception.

**18. inarsit**: the force of the prefix is debatable. Either it governs *umeris*, or else *umeris* is *abl. loci*, and *in-* has an intensifying function. No parallel can be quoted for the first construction of *inardere*: the effect would be to stress the closeness with which the fiery garment adhered to Heracles' flesh: cf. *Trach.* 767-9 καὶ προσπύσσεται | πλευραῖσιν ἀρτίκολλος, ὥστε τέκτονος | χιτῶν, ἅπαν κατ' ἄρθρον. With the second alternative, which suits the emphasis in lines 17-18 on the idea of fiery heat (*nec ... aestuosius*), *in-* emphasizes the suddenness and intensity of the conflagration: cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3. 539 'hic ... subita face solis inarsit', Verg. *Aen.* 8. 623-4 'qualis cum caerula nubes | solis inardescit radiis longaeque refulget'.

**aestuosius**: *aestuosus* is employed almost exclusively of hot places or climates, or of seasonal heat. Only three times in all, and only once prior to Horace (Catull. 7. 5), does it refer to the heat experienced by a living creature. The adjective slyly alludes to Horace's intestinal sufferings: *aestuo* and its cognates are used to describe the pain of indigestion or heartburn: cf. Cels. 1. 3, Sen. *Epp.* 95. 21, *Helv.* 11. 3 'cuius desiderium ... ex aestu ardentium viscerum oritur', *NQ* 4. 13. 5 and 7, Plin. *Epp.* 6. 16. 19 and the similar use of καυσώδης in Ath. 79 F.

**19-22. Horace rounds off the Epode** with a humorous curse which unexpectedly turns the tables upon his tormentor, a tactic also seen in the concluding lines of Catullus 44, on the strange 'cold' contracted in pursuit of dinner with the 'frigid' writer Sestius: cf.



# Epode 3

Fraenkel (1957), 68 n. 3.<sup>30</sup> On curses or the like concluding a poem, see Kay on Mart. 11. 73.

19. **at:** an arresting word, used to preface the poet's imprecation (cf. Plaut. *Most.* 38–9 'at te Iuppiter | dique omnes perdant', Catull. 3. 13 'at vobis male sit', Verg. *Aen.* 2. 535 with Austin, Ruckdeschel (1910), 131 ff.), and to introduce the revelation, hitherto postponed, that Maecenas is responsible for Horace's symptoms.

**si quid umquam tale concupiveris:** not 'if you ever again desire to play such a detestable trick' (Kiessling, Curcio 1927, 317, Mankin), but 'if you ever again desire such food', which better suits the concluding joke on garlicky breath. The vagueness of *tale* stems from Horace's reluctance to name the loathsome substance. For *concupisco* of food, cf. Cels. 3. 6. 1 'quorum saepe stomachus hunc (sc. cibum) respuit, etiamsi mens concupiscit' and *cupedia*, 'comestibles', with Goetz-Schöll on Varr. *LL* 5. 146. It is a neat irony that desire for a particular foodstuff will frustrate erotic desire (21–2).

**umquam:** 'ever again'. Cf. Plaut. *Epid.* 593, *Bacch.* 1193–5 'non tibi venit in mentem, amabo, | si dum vivas tibi bene facias tam pol id quidem esse hau perlonginquom, | neque, si hoc hodie amiseri', post in morte id eventurum esse umquam?', L. C. Watson (1983a), 82–3. *Umquam* 'ever again' balances *olim* with future reference in line 1. Not realizing that *umquam* = 'ever again', Heinze, Giarratano, Plüss (1904), 17 ff. and Kirn (1935), 42 ff. put an entirely different construction on lines 19–20: that *iocose* means that Maecenas, instead of sympathizing with Horace's distress, makes fun of it, and even, in a fit of bravado, offers at some stage to try the noxious stuff himself, whereupon Horace retorts 'if you ever conceive a desire for such a food, then I pray that your *puella* will give you a wide berth on account of your garlicky breath'. But why in that case should Horace not simply wish upon Maecenas the same agonies as he is presently suffering?

20. **iocose:** on the significance of this word, see introductory essay. Other possible implications are (1) that Maecenas is laughing at

<sup>30</sup> This is only one of many resemblances between the two poems: cf. Fraenkel (1957), 68. Additional points of contact are: the intention of both poets to make us laugh at their physical discomfort, the exaggerated seriousness with which they describe this, and the parodic use of formal language, archaisms, and outmoded inflections in order to lend a comically inappropriate gravity to a trivial incident (for these last in poem 44, see C. P. Jones, *Hermes*, 96 (1968), 379–83, G. Williams, *TORP* 138 ff., Ronconi (1953), 202–4, E. S. De Angeli, *CW* 62 (1969), 354–6).

## Commentary on lines 20–21

Horace's sufferings, (2) that he will enjoy the humorous poem with which Horace responds, (3) that *iocosus* carries a suggestion of its meaning 'wanton' (Catull. 8. 6, *Priap.* 83. 24–5 Büch. 'puella nec iocosa te levi manu | fovebit adprimetve lucidum femur', Adams, *LSV* 161–2): in that case the adjective alludes ironically to Maecenas' coming sexual discomfiture.

21–2. Should Maecenas ever again conceive a desire for garlic, may his *puella* with her hand check his proffered—and malodorous—kiss, and sleep at the extreme edge of the bed: no doubt to get as far as possible from her garlicky partner, but with the concomitant effect of 'venus a puella negata' (Orelli). Comparable expressions in a bedroom setting at Prop. 2. 29. 39 'et opposita propellens savia dextra', Tib. 1. 9. 56 'tecum interposita languida veste cubet', and Prop. 3. 21. 8 'seu venit (sc. P.'s *puella*), extremo dormit amicta toro' guarantee that the reference in the closing couplet is to the bed used for intercourse, not, as suggested by Ritter, J. Gow, Ussani, and Valmaggi, *RFIC* 36 (1908), 230, to the *lectus convivalis*.

21. **manum...savio opponat tuo:** a joke of a familiar type, exploiting the supposed incompatibility of eating garlic, onions, and the like with kissing or other forms of sexual activity: cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 493–6 οὐδ' ὥς, ὅταν μάλισθ' ὑπὸ τοῦ ληκώμεθα | τὴν νύχθ', ἔωθεν σκόροδα διαμασώμεθα, | ἔν' ὁσφρόμενος ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τείχους εἰσιῶν | μηδὲν κακὸν δρᾶν ὑποτοπῆται, *Lys.* 798, Alexis 244 K.–A., Xen. *Symp.* 4. 8, Philochor. *FGrH* 328 F 89, Plaut. *Poen.* 1310–11, Mart. 13. 18 'Fila Tarentini graviter redolentia porri | edisti quotiens, oscula clusa dato': see additionally Lilja (1972), 121–31 on the erotic connotations of breath and Burkert, *CQ* 20 (1970), 1–16 on links between garlic and sexual abstinence. On the other hand, it is often alleged, for example by Plin. *NH* 20. 57, that garlic has a pronounced aphrodisiac effect: cf. E. Csapo, *Phoenix*, 47 (1993), 115–20, J. McMahon, *Paralysin Cave: Impotence, Perception and Text in the Satyrical of Petronius* (Leiden, 1998), 109–27. This adds a certain ironic piquancy to Horace's curse.

**puella:** surely just a girl invited to a dinner-party to provide sexual and other *divertissements*: cf. *Odes* 2. 11. 21–4, 3. 14. 21–4, Griffin (1985), 15–29. Much ink has been expended on the identity of the *puella*, whom commentators since antiquity have sought to identify with Maecenas' wife Terentia: Kumaniecki (1935), 142 = (1967), 269 even supposed that the girl's warding off of the garlicky kiss alludes to the *cotidiana repudia* to which, according to Sen. *Prov.*



3. 10, *Epp.* 114. 6, Maecenas was subjected by his *morosa uxor*. For a history of the question, see Orelli-Baiter, Ritter, and Giarratano ad loc. and, for the older scholarship, Latsch (8 n.), 85–6.

**savio:** notwithstanding the demonstration by Ph. Moreau, *RPh*<sup>3</sup> 52 (1978), 87–97 that the distinction maintained by ancient lexicographers between *osculum*, a chaste kiss and *s(u)avium*, an erotic kiss, cannot be sustained after Plautus, it would be perverse to deny *savium* an erotic flavour here, amusingly nullified by the action of the *puella*. *S(u)avium*, was popularly associated with the adjective *suavis* (cf. Apul. *Met.* 6. 8 ‘ab ipsa Venere septem savia suavia’): there may be an ironic implication that the garlic will make Maecenas’ kiss anything but *suave*. On the noun, which has a colloquial flavour appropriate to the undignified context, see further Heusch (intro. n. 125), 49 ff., Axelson (1945), 35 and Tränkle (1960), 126.

**22. sponda:** This could be used *pars pro toto* for *lectus*, as at Verg. *Aen.* 1. 697–8 ‘aulaeis iam se regina superbis | aurea composuit sponda’ and Ov. *Am.* 3. 14. 26. But it is often supposed that *sponda* is used here in its literal sense of the frame of the bed, especially its outer part (Isid. *Orig.* 20. 11. 5); cf. Smith, *Dict. Antiq.* ii (1914), s.v. ‘lectus’, Becker-Göll, *Gallus*, ii. 345, Marquardt-Mau<sup>2</sup> 724 n. 17, D-S. iv/2. 1441, C. L. Ransom, *Couches and Beds of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (Chicago, 1905), 111 n. 12 and many of the commentators. In that case, *extrema* serves additionally to underscore the idea that the girl moves as far as possible from Maecenas.

**cubet:** a highly ironic choice of verb, since *cubare* can be applied euphemistically to sexual congress (cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 56–7 ‘qui volt cubare, pandit saltum saviis. | at illa est pudica neque dum cubitat cum viris’, Adams *LSV* 177)—a possibility negated by the girl’s edging away. For a similarly ironic use, cf. Tib. 1. 9. 56 (21–2 n.).

*Epode* 4 is an attack on a worthless ex-slave who ostentatiously parades his new-found wealth before the eyes of the citizens, and provokes their anger both by sitting prominently upon the benches reserved for the *equites* in the theatre, and by serving as military tribune in the forces dispatched by Octavian to combat Sextus Pompey. The reference in the concluding lines to ‘latrones atque servilem manum’ establishes the historical context of the poem as Octavian’s struggle against the marauding fleets of Sextus (19 n.). *Duci* (18) suggests the sailing, actual or projected, of a fleet, *gravi... pondere* 17–18 that this fleet was the substantial one built for Octavian in the winter of 37–6 BC under Agrippa’s supervision, for the resultant vessels were of extraordinary bulk (n. ad loc.).

The poem has often been compared with Anacreon fr. 388 Page:

πρὶν μὲν ἔχων βερβέριον, καλύμματ’ ἐσφηκωμένα,  
καὶ ξυλίλους ἀστραγάλους ἐν ὧσιν καὶ ψιλὸν περὶ  
πλευρῇσι (...) βοός,  
νήπλυτον εἴλυμα κακῆς ἀσπίδος, ἀρτοπώλιν  
κάθελοπόρνοισιν ὁμιλέων ὁ πονηρὸς Ἀρτέμων,  
κίβδηλον εὐρίσκων βίον,  
πολλὰ μὲν ἐν δουρὶ τιθεὶς αὐχένα, πολλὰ δ’ ἐν τροχῷ,  
πολλὰ δὲ νῶτον σκυτίνῃ μάλιστα θωμιχθεὶς, κόμην  
πώγωνά τ’ ἐκτετιλμένος  
νῦν δ’ ἐπιβαίνει σατινέων χρύσεια φορέων καθέρματα  
† παῖς Κύκης† καὶ σκιαδίσκην ἐλεφαντίνην φορεῖ  
γυναιξὶν αὐτῶς (...)

Both pieces deal with a worthless individual of base origins who has come to possess great riches. Like Horace’s unnamed enemy, Artemon (7–9) has frequently undergone degrading punishments, including whipping (Anacreon l. 8, *Epode* 4. 11–12). Both now ride carriages (Anacreon l. 10, *Epode* 4. 14); and both deck themselves out in a showy manner (Anacreon ll. 10–11, *Epode* 4. 8).<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless,

<sup>1</sup> In Artemon’s case a sign of effeminacy, however: see C. Brown, *Phoenix*, 37 (1983), 1–15, also W. J. Slater, *Phoenix*, 32 (1978), 185–94, with the response by M. Davies, *Mnem.* 34 (1981), 288–99.