

Trinity University

Digital Commons @ Trinity

English Honors Theses

English Department

5-2020

Tenues Grandia: Lyric Performance in Horace and Marvell

Tiffany Diem-Suong Nguyen

Trinity University, tiffanyn4267@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/eng_honors

Recommended Citation

Nguyen, Tiffany Diem-Suong, "*Tenues Grandia*: Lyric Performance in Horace and Marvell" (2020). *English Honors Theses*. 33.

https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/eng_honors/33

This Thesis open access is brought to you for free and open access by the English Department at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.

Tenues Grandia: Lyric Performance in Horace and Marvell

Tiffany Nguyen

A DEPARTMENT HONORS THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF English AT TRINITY UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION WITH
DEPARTMENTAL HONORS

DATE April 28, 2020

Willis Salomon

THESIS ADVISOR

Claudia Stokes

DEPARTMENT CHAIR



Michael Soto, AVPA

Tenues Grandia: Lyric Performance in Horace and Marvell

Tiffany Nguyen, Classical Languages and English

Poetic performance does not just refer to the public recitation of a prepared work of poetry. Poems bear witness to and construct acts of social performance and contribute to the creation of personae. Because it commonly draws attention to its audiences and speakers, lyric poetry is particularly suitable for such performances. Alessandro Barchiesi “tentatively (transhistorically)” defines lyric poetry as the “first person utterance whose performative conditions are somewhere in a continuum whose extremes are generic voice and some individual idea of the author.”¹ In other words, lyric poetry usually entails a first person speaker who mediates between generic convention, the expectations of a literate audience, and the poet’s innovation. Jonathan Culler restricts performative poetry to “special cases whereby a poem succeeds in bringing about what it describes”² Culler’s claim highlights that, whether literal or metaphorical, the lyric speaker, which is possibly conflated with the poet, enacts changes. They are not merely fictional creations of a poetic imagination, but an agent in their own right. In this way, lyric poetry exhibits such compelling power because its interactions between speakers and addressees recreate and reconstruct their socio-historical contexts in imaginative ways.

The *Odes* of the Latin poet Horace explore the possibilities of performative personae through their variance, in form and content, within one generic body. In his four books of *Odes*, Horace incorporates many social moments, from the determined pursuit of love to conversations about the emperor Augustus’ feats in war. While some of these performances are clearly public, such as his address of Augustus in *Odes* 1.2, there are just as many poems in which his

¹Alessandro Barchiesi (2007), “*Carmina: Odes and Carmen Saeculare*,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, ed. Stephen Harrison (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 150.

² Jonathan Culler (2015), *Theory of the Lyric* (Cambridge: Harvard UP), 129.

performances are private. 1.9, an ostensible meditation on winter with Thaliarchus, and 1.22, a tribute to the beautiful and charming Lalage, depict private performances, personae created not for the sake of a large public audience, but small, intimate social interactions with another person, an internal audience. Within his private poetry, Horace creates a private, lyric space where he can maintain his poetic independence, despite being unable to escape from politics or the public rule of Augustus.

In a similar manner, the Early Modern English poet Andrew Marvell keeps himself aloof from the public through his private poetic voice. Blair Worden states that the English poet “himself can be vividly alone in his verses,” introducing Marvell in his book *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England* as someone withdrawn from society who keeps his own company.³ Marvell is a poet similar in some respects to his Latin predecessor. Both were writing in periods of political upheaval, and both are elusive in terms of their poetic identities, especially regarding their political ideologies. When Kathleen McCarthy talks of “poetic stubbornness, which prevents [the poet] from fitting his poetry into the grooves that have been laid down by the tradition,” she describes Horace, but these words just as aptly characterize Marvell’s poetry.⁴ Marvell’s “An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell’s Return from Ireland,” an explicitly Horatian and political poem, presents a speaker ambivalent and cautious towards Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland for the brief period following the death of Charles I. John S. Coolidge in “Marvell and Horace” highlights the parallels between Marvell’s treatment of Cromwell in this ode and Horace’s treatment of Augustus in his poetry. According to Coolidge, Marvell must have recognized “an element of reserve” in Horace”; both Horace and Marvell give “conditional praise”: “It is a kind of compact, the ruler

³ Blair Worden (2007), *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England* (Oxford: Oxford UP), 54.

⁴ Kathleen McCarthy (2019), *I, the Poet* (Ithaca: Cornell UP), 111.

committing his power to the civilized tradition that is the poet's trust, and the poet bringing to the regime the needed sanction of that tradition."⁵ Marvell's poetry is also marked by private spaces, particularly in his famous poem "The Garden," which depicts a lone speaker in a paradisaical pastoral space. Marvell, like Horace, never truly extricates himself from the public and politics. As Murray states in his biography, "Drawn toward solitude and the reflective life, he could not ignore the divided society around him, its tensions and conflicts, its calls to public duty."⁶ Marvell was a politically active man throughout his life and a friend to politically influential people such as Cromwell and Milton. Together, these poets demonstrate the impossibility of truly private spaces or the escape from public affairs. Still, they both continue to define themselves in relation to their constructed private, lyric spaces, despite their inability to escape their socio-political contexts. Within their similarly tumultuous socio-political contexts, Horace and Marvell transform such political chaos into charged, ostensibly apolitical private spaces as a means of retreat and poetic creativity.

Odes 1.6 is a good poem for examining the relationship between private and public in Horace's poetry. The poem details how Horace cleverly refuses Agrippa's request to be praised in poetry. Horace's main argument is that, as a lyric poet of banquets and love, he does not have the capability of writing poetry of such epic matters as Agrippa's achievements. The technical term for this refusal is *recusatio*, a poetic form in which the speaker-poet refuses an honor on the grounds that he is somehow unworthy of the honor, but in refusing, "effectively does, at any rate in part, what he declines."⁷ By its speaker's simultaneous fabricated presentation of both

⁵ Coolidge (1965), 119.

⁶ Nicholas Murray (2000), *World Enough and Time: The Life of Andrew Marvell* (New York: St. Martin's Press), 1.

⁷ Mayer (2012), *Horace: Odes I* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), quoting Lucas (1900), 96. Mayer discusses the *recusatio*, expressing dissatisfaction because the term implies that the response is given to an actual request. He seems to believe that there does not need to be real-life context for the poem, but that Horace could be rhetorically positioning himself in such a social context as an excuse to praise Agrippa.

capability and inability to accept the honor, the *recusatio* is itself an act of performance. Kirk Freudenburg examines how such acts of refusal in the *Epistles* replicate Augustus' refusals of certain powers during his rule as *princeps*: "[Augustus'] repeated refusals to take on excessive powers served to set respectable Roman limits around his highly contradictory person, and to program his art of governance in terms of restraint, thereby gaining him the very powers that he so persistently sought to eschew."⁸ Such performances clearly "advertise" Augustus' political "moderation," "hesitancy to power," and "expression of traditional Roman values," which allows him to establish himself within his public, political sphere.⁹ In the poet's case, *recusatio* likewise highlights his political moderation, hesitancy to power, and expression of traditional Roman values, not for his own political esteem, but for the sake of maintaining autonomy in his writing. Furthermore, as poets are compared to rulers, rulers are likewise compared to poets. After introducing the idea of "the king as god," Don Fowler asks in his article "Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics," "How could any mortal artist hope to compete with such perfection?"¹⁰ Fowler sees this question as the encapsulation of the *recusatio*, for the "poet cannot compete with regal and divine artists: it is not his thunder, but theirs."¹¹ Accordingly, Fowler makes the argument that the "polite tones of the *recusatio*, it is cliché to say, conceal a poetic manifesto in which the small-scale genres are *preferred* to sublimity on aesthetic grounds."¹² Following such an argument, Horace's denials of greater honors, his *recusatio*, elevates the small-scale lyric genre because it is one of the few means by which the poet's artistry can compete with the grand poetics of the state.

⁸ Freudenburg (2014), "'Recusatio' as Political Theatre: Horace's Letter to Augustus," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 104, 111.

⁹ Freudenburg (2014), 112.

¹⁰ Don Fowler (2009), "Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics," in *Horace Odes and Epodes*, ed. Michèle Lowrie (Oxford: Oxford UP), 253, emphasis in original.

¹¹ Fowler (2009), 253.

¹² Fowler (2009), 254.

If we follow Fowler's argument, Horace's poetry is clearly implicated in politics and the public sphere. However, in *Odes* 1.6, Horace establishes a dichotomy between the grand, epic achievements of state figures such as Agrippa and the frivolous private matters of Horace himself. Horace quickly delineates a difference between his own deficient poetry and Varius', a poet worthy of composing lines on the "grave irritation of Achilles" and the "course of two-faced Ulixes through the sea" (C.1.6.5-7: *gravem / Pelidae stomachum...cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei*) as well as "Mars' impervious armor" (C.1.6.13: *Martem tunica tectum adamantina*). The epic tradition and the armor are both related to the divine and reflective of military glory. Horace's association of these things with Agrippa and the Roman state is blatant flattery, serving to honor Agrippa even as his pretense of lacking praise suggests that Agrippa deserves even grander praise. Four stanzas are devoted to this kind flattering praise-not-praise, but only one stanza lists what Horace is worthy of writing about: "feasts" and "the battles of virgins" (C.1.6.17-19: *convivia...proelia virginum*). Not only is the subject matter not important to the maintenance of the state, Horace also characterizes this writing as ephemeral. Unlike the unyielding, everlasting epic tradition and armor, Horace will write this kind of poetry whether he is "free, or whether [he] burns for something, habitually light" (C.1.6.19-20: *cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur / non praeter soltium leves*). The word *leves*, "light," is contrasted against *gravem*, "heavy." Moreover, while Horace characterizes Agrippa, Augustan Rome, and the other epic stories as enduring and long-lasting, he presents himself as someone who quickly alters between being free and burning in love, which demonstrates that Horace and his writing are neither unchanging nor lasting, though perhaps only ironically so. Even as he flatters Agrippa and Augustus for their achievements, Horace's performance as a "frivolous" poet separates him from Augustan Rome and creates two worlds: Augustus and Agrippa's public world and his own

poetic one. This juxtaposition emphasizes that Agrippa and Augustus's Rome will last for a long time to come, if not forever, and at the same time, allows Horace to maintain a sort of poetic independence. Rome and her leaders will last, a legacy another poet will sing about beautifully, but Horace will retain the agency to present himself and his poetry however he wishes.

However, Horace complicates this separation of his world from Agrippa's world – the things he is fit to write and the legacy he is incapable of adding to – by also using the same language to speak about both. He uses similar images of the military to talk about both Agrippa's achievements and his frivolous love poetry. For example, he praises Agrippa for successfully leading an army by land or sea (C.1.6.3-4: *ferox navibus aut equis / miles te duce gesserit*). At the same time, he also characterizes love as “battles between maidens and young men” (C.1.6.17-18: *proelia virginum / sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium*). Agrippa's military achievements are literal, while the battles between lovers are metaphorical; in this way, rather than confusing his structural argument, Horace's military references maintain the differences between the private and public spheres by its distinction between literal and metaphorical. Still, this emphasis on the military cannot help but to confuse the dichotomy as well, for, beyond Horace's use of it as a facetious metaphor for love, the military does strongly affect both the public and private. Love elegy, a private kind of poetry, often incorporates military themes, both as a public duty (usually to be dismissed or complained about) or a private metaphor for the interactions of lovers.¹³ Later in the *Odes*, Horace further plays with this love and war motif. For example, in *Odes* 3.26, he wittily jokes that the “wall will now have his arms and his lyre discharged from service,” an explicit link between lyric poetry and military service (3-4: *nunc*

¹³ E.g. Ovid's *Amores* 1.9, which compares soldiers and lovers. The poem's back-and-forth shifts between describing the life of a soldier and giving the lover's equivalent demonstrate the clear public/private dichotomy Horace portrays in 1.6, albeit with a more comical emphasis on the male lover.

arma defunctumque bello | barbiton hic paries habebit). Furthermore, while the military is a major component of maintaining state power, it also disturbs families by sending husbands and sons to war. Thus, though he insists on maintaining his separation between public and private, Horace is able to almost seamlessly shift from the literal power of Agrippa's army to the almost comical metaphor of struggling young lovers, because there is an inextricable connection between the public and private spheres. Rather than a true distinction, Horace is creating artificial boundaries between public and private in order to reinforce his *recusatio*. By bringing out a connection between the public and private, Horace acknowledges that his division of the two is an artificial one, but one he insists on preserving. By emphasizing the division between public and private, Horace's performance as a frivolous poet unworthy of such stately honors works to reinforce his *recusatio* and to assert his own poetic authority. His rejection of praising Agrippa, a public honor, serves to emphasize and honor his private poetry, even as such poetry manages to stay private and, more importantly, within Horace's control.

If Horace's distinction between public and private unravels upon further scrutiny, it stands to reason that Horace's performance is not necessarily as sincere as he would have a reader believe. Horace's goal in composing the *recusatio* is to decline an honor without incurring offense, which he artfully accomplishes through his self-deprecating insistence that he is a frivolous poet. However, in other odes within the first three books, Horace presents himself contrarily. In his programmatic first ode, 1.1, Horace dedicates a poem to his patron Maecenas and outlines what kind of poetry his books of *Odes* will contain; in this programmatic ode, Horace does not seem so unwilling to accept honors:

*me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium
dis miscent superis [1.1.29-30]*

For me, the ivies, the prize for learned brows

Mix me among the gods above.

*quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera vertice.* [1.1.35-36]

But if you accept me among the lyric poets,
I will strike the stars with my lofty head.

Rather than worrying about maintaining his private lyric space, the Horace of 1.1 appears eager to be considered among the *lyrici vates*, something Maecenas can confer on him. Though he considers himself unworthy of writing about the immortal legacies of heroes in 1.6, here he appears willing to mingle among the immortal gods themselves through his poetry. The only semblance of the Horace from 1.6 in this ode is Horace's deference to Maecenas, despite – or because of – his poetic ambitions: he attributes any lofty poetic elevation to his patron's acknowledgment of his greatness (C.1.1.35: *quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres*). Additionally, as the concluding poem of his three books of *Odes*, 3.30, Horace boastfully declares that his poetry is everlasting:

*Exegi monumentum aere perennius
regalique situ pyramidum altius* [3.30.1-2]

I have completed a monument more everlasting than bronze
and loftier than the regal structure of pyramids.

By the end of the *Odes*, Horace has not only apparently proven himself to be a great poet, but he has created something “more everlasting,” *perennius*, and “loftier,” *altius*. He assures Agrippa that he did not have these traits in 1.6, but in 3.30, he uses the comparative forms for both words, indicating that his poetry was not only everlasting and lofty, but more everlasting and loftier than other monuments that already exist. In one poem, Horace is unwilling to write public praise poetry, but in the other, he is building his own public monument.

Furthermore, as a shift from both 1.1 and 1.6, in which he measures his worthiness as a poet in part through Maecenas and Agrippa's perceptions of his poetry, in 3.30, Horace is the one who achieves poetic success for himself. Horace's self-presentation shifts from ode to ode for the sake of what he is accomplishing in each poem, and as his poetry achieves more prominence, he needs to perform less for others to maintain his poetic independence. As Oliensis states,

Horace proudly submits himself here to the Muse, and to no other. Certainly not to Maecenas, nor even to Augustus. Near the beginning of his lyric collection, Horace invited a quasi-deified Augustus to linger on earth to enjoy "great triumphs" and the "name of father and *princeps*" (C.1.2.49-50); by its close, the poetic *princeps* is celebrating his own triumph, having displaced Augustus altogether.¹⁴

No longer subject to his socio-political superiors, Horace only has to obey his divine Muse, who becomes emblematic of Horace's privacy and, thus, his poetic autonomy. As 3.30 demonstrates, regardless of whether his detached poetic world is a fabrication so that he may write what he wishes, Horace has represented poetic autonomy, and by 3.30, he is able to write what he wants without having to explicitly consider anyone else, be it Augustus or Maecenas or Agrippa.

Still, if Horace does in fact wish to present himself as an immortal poet, his choice to present himself contrarily in 1.6 is confusing, as such a performance would undermine his own work in *Odes* 1.1 and 3.30. I believe that a key to understanding this discrepancy lies in the final lines of 1.6:

*cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur
non praeter solitum leves.* [1.6.19-20]

I will sing whether I am free or burn for something,
as I am accustomed, lightly.

¹⁴ Oliensis (1998), *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 104.

Besides underscoring that Horace is not a good fit to praise Agrippa, these words diplomatically assert Horace's independence as a poet. Like the artificial boundary he establishes between public and private, Horace establishes a similar line between the Roman state, as represented by Agrippa, and his poetry. Clearly, Roman politics will remain an important topic in Horace's *Odes*, but this topic will be written about as Horace wishes, and possibly even through a veneer of private poetry. In these final lines, Horace is performing as a "thin" (*tenues* [1.6.9]) poet in order to maintain his freedom to continue performing many roles, whether or not they are political, rather than be forced into the single role of Roman poet for Augustus and Agrippa. Of course, this "poetic stubbornness," as McCarthy calls it, does not necessarily require Horace to take any particular stance for or against Augustus; according to her,

the impression of an artistic consciousness that stands slightly aside from the position of the speaker certainly could be evidence of political critique on Horace's part, but it also could be evidence that Horace is marshaling all his most innovative poetic skills to render his praise of Augustus as powerful as possible.¹⁵

Horace's poetry does not fully adhere to either side – political praise or powerful critique. Rather, the poet carefully manages to develop both, which further enables him to maintain his poetic autonomy. Since Horace's poetry is accomplished praise, it is easier for him to express ideas that might not be so easily acceptable to Augustus otherwise. This idea of "poetic stubbornness" as a means of poetic artistry returns to Fowler's argument that "the task of panegyric for a writer like Horace [is]...to keep the aesthetic preference for a particular type of poetry separate from the political endorsement of a particular ruler."¹⁶ In his article "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference," Duncan Kennedy claims:

Every utterance...enacts a relationship of power, challenging or confirming superiority or inferiority, exercising 'a gentle, invisible form of violence,' which can be at its most

¹⁵ McCarthy (2019), 111-113.

¹⁶ Fowler (2009), 254.

effective when it is not seen in terms of authority and compliance, but concealed under titles such as ‘politeness,’ ‘deference,’ ‘appropriateness’ etc.¹⁷

Horace’s insistence does not mark his private space as an apolitical or anti-political; rather, it highlights just how political this private lyric space is. Horace’s insistence on poetic autonomy is a political choice, but perhaps not a political judgment on Augustus and his public state. Rather, it can just as easily reinforce the power dynamics Augustus wants to reify. If so, Horace is “poetically stubborn” in order to gain that retreat he establishes for himself within this private space to freely write “as he is accustomed.”

Now that we have considered the dichotomy of public and private through *Odes* 1.6, let us further explore his construction of private space. *Odes* 1.17 is an explicit laying out of such a space in lyric poetry. Similar to *Odes* 1.6, this poem is split into two parts. In the first part, he extols his haven, the Sabine farm, and in the second part, he extends an invitation to Tyndaris to come enjoy these blessings with him. In the very first stanza, Horace highlights that this safety is divinely sanctioned:

*Faunus...igneam
defendit aestatem capellis
usque meis pluviosque ventos. [2-4]*

Faunus protects
the she-goats of mine from fiery heat
and from rain and winds continuously.

Not only does this opening stanza emphasize that Faunus provides protection from the elements, but even the second stanza begins by describing the she-goats’ meanderings through the pasture as “without punishment, safely,” two further emphatic expressions of shelter (C.1.17.5: *impune tutum*). However, safety is only one of the appeals of Horace’s private space; it is also a place

¹⁷ Duncan Kennedy (1997), “‘Augustan’ and ‘Anti-Augustan’: Reflections on Terms of Reference,” in *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, ed. Anton Powell (Bristol: Bristol Classical P), 29.

that overflows with a “rich abundance of countryside glories” (C.1.17.14-16: *copia...ruris honorum opulenta*). In this way, Horace marks his Sabine farm, his private paradise, by its seclusion, its safety, and its abundance.

However, despite his Sabine farm being a private space, Horace appears willing to widen this space to other people. In the ode, he invites Tyndaris onto his Sabine farm by telling her that all these benefits, the safety and the abundance, will “flow for [her]” (C.17.14-15: *tibi...manabit*). As someone who would benefit from Horace’s invitation, Tyndaris parallels the “wives of the smelly husband,” who are also in Horace’s care (C.1.17.7: *olentis uxores mariti*). Yet, as a musician, she also brings music to the Sabine farm with her “Teian lyre,” which in turn benefits all those who hear her song within this lyric space (C.1.17.18-19: *fide Teia | dices*). On the connection between Horace’s Sabine farm and music/poetry, Gregson Davis states:

...the very security enjoyed by the community is crucially dependent on music – that is, poetry. The moderate weather, suspension of predatory attacks, absence of anxiety – all these are manifest “whenever” the music of the panpipe is heard in the land.¹⁸

Tyndaris’ song sounds pleasant to the ear, but even more importantly, it helps to sustain Horace’s private lyric space. She plays the lyre belonging to Anacreon, the Greek poet who was “famous above all for light love-poetry,” and by this gesture, Horace signals again to the Greek lyric tradition and his own lyric endeavors.¹⁹ Thus, Tyndaris holds a paradoxical role in the poem. Though she is the important addressee of Horace’ poem, Tyndaris is not named until line 10. Nisbet and Hubbard posit that she is a “dream figure, belonging to the world of Alexandrian pastoral,” so, in that sense, she is both present and apparently not in the poem.²⁰ Moreover, Tyndaris is not only one who would benefit from Horace’s private space and protection, but also

¹⁸ Davis (1991), “Modes of Praise and Dispraise,” in *Polyhymnia* (Berkeley: U California P), 201.

¹⁹ Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace’s Odes, Bk 1* (Oxford: Clarendon P), 224.

²⁰ Nisbet and Hubbard, 216.

someone who offers benefits and protection in return as a presence Horace wants at his Sabine farm. Like his Muse, this ephemeral Greek woman who benefits Horace even as she is benefited by it represents another embodiment of Horace's private lyric space.

Moreover, Tyndaris, directly or indirectly, also introduces several sources of tension to both Horace's constructed private space and the poem itself. One source of tension is the epic-lyric dichotomy already discussed in *Odes* 1.6. Horace asks that she "sings of Penelope and glassy Circe laboring over one man" (C.1.17.19-20: *dices laborantis in uno / Penelopen vitreamque Circen*). Pietro Pucci notes that "Tyndaris' ode, though sung in Anacreon's style, will recount an epic theme, or at least involve epic characters, Penelope and Circe."²¹ At the same time, Tyndaris' name also evokes Helen, another famous epic woman. Of course, as he does in *Odes* 1.6, Horace subverts the epic themes he alludes to. He reduces Odysseus, the hero of the *Odyssey*, to *uno*, and he equates the devoted wife Penelope, who labored night and day while she waited twenty years for her husband to come home, with the witch Circe, who turns men into animals. Still, like Horace and Tyndaris, who alter these epic themes through their lyric song, these epic themes alter the quality of Horace's lyric in turn. By their mythic quality, these epic allusions further separate Horace's lyric space from the rest of the world, and, at the same time, by their epic nature, they also call to mind the very grand sphere Horace tries so hard to avoid in 1.6.

Therefore, Horace's lyric space, far from being the simple paradise he presents it as, is full of tensions and contradictions. Victoria Rimell makes use of the *angulus* to convey this elusive quality of Horace's lyric:

It is under the sign of the *angulus* that contraction and seclusion coincide in Horace (sometimes painfully, sometimes optimistically) with expansionism, terror, and triumph.

²¹ Pucci (1975), "Horace's Banquet in 'Odes 1.17,'" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 105, 262.

In Horace's vision the *angulus* – which Bachelard calls a 'psychologically primitive image' – is the space that houses not just lyric self-containment, but imperial literature's distinctive incorporation of a Callimachean poetics of the small.²²

According to Rimell, Horace's lyric space is an *angulus*, a "corner," for it "figures retreat close to home, but also retreat as remoteness."²³ Horace's retreat is both here and far away, both peaceful and violent, both lyric yet somehow epic as well; and, just as important, the lyric poem manages to accommodate all these contradictory elements, both the peace and the violence.

For if Horace invites, he also keeps out. In the last stanza of the poem, Horace introduces Cyrus, a man familiar to Tyndaris, and the possible violence he would bring:

nec metues protervum

*suspecta Cyrum, ne male dispari
incontinentis iniciat manus
et scindat haerentem coronam
crinibus inmeritamque vestem.* [24-28]

Nor should you fear

the violent Cyrus, being suspected, lest on ill-matched you
he should throw his intemperate hands
and rend the crown clinging to your hair
and your innocent clothing.

The evocation of Cyrus and his potential for violence within the boundaries of the lyric poem suggests an attempt at controlling both Cyrus and his violence within Horace's more tranquil space. Horace may not be able to physically compete with this violent man, but within this poetic space, he is one with the upper hand. Furthermore, the anaphoric *nec ... ne* reinforce how suppressed Cyrus' violence is, and the subjunctive form of *inicio* shifts this jealous lover's violent actions from reality to possibility, which demonstrates that, as long as Tyndaris is with Horace within his lyric space, Cyrus cannot physically touch her. At the same time, *ne...iniciat*

²² Rimell (2015), *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 83.

²³ Rimell (2015), 90.

marks a fear clause, and fear does not only exist for thing that *will* happen, but also things that *could* happen. Tyndaris fears the *possibility* of Cyrus laying his hands on her, and through this fear, Cyrus is present in Horace's lyric space psychologically and verbally, if not, in fact, physically.

Thus, by controlling – or trying to control – these forceful elements within his lyric poems, Horace calls to mind “potential violence of an erotic encounter, whose intensity and allure are fomented precisely by their being (incompletely) contained and concealed.”²⁴ Violence may be another facet of the *proelia virginum* Horace refers to in 1.6, but it has no apparent place in Horace's Sabine farm, which he promises to be “free of punishment, safe” (C.1.17.5: *impune tutum*). However, as Rimell notes, the very act of naming does more than just delineate what is prohibited from Horace's lyric space; it also re-introduces the very dangers it prohibits. In 1.17, Horace describes Cyrus' offence in detail, taking the time to note the tearing of the “crown clinging to her hair” and the “innocent clothing” (27-28). According to Pucci, Cyrus does not only appear at the end of the poem, but throughout:

Cyrus at the end appears hyperbolically, as the embodiment of all these mentioned threats, the martial wolves and Mars, the snakes, the Magician [Circe] and Bacchus. All these disparaging and negative attributes ascribed to Cyrus result from a structure of figurative references, metaphors and allusions, hinting rather than stating, implying analogies which are bold or excessive and therefore suspended between the modes of amusement and abuse.²⁵

Pucci's claim highlights an integral aspect of Horace's poetry that has been raised before: subversion. Just as Horace transforms epic themes into lyric songs, he also disperses any possible violence throughout his poem, though it remains most prominently in his reference to Cyrus. Thus, Horace is able to continually employ the oftentimes chaotic topics of lyric poetry – love

²⁴ Rimell (2015), 91.

²⁵ Pucci (1975), 266.

and wine – within a private space that is calm and peaceful, the violence smoothed out, the effects of wine watered down. In his discussion of *Odes* 2.11, William Fitzgerald notes that Horace often uses his strategy of subversion in order to turn “worry about what cannot be controlled on the borders of empire” into a “display of mastery which draws what is spatially removed on a smaller scale.”²⁶ By placing sources of concern, such as violence – potential or otherwise – and tension at the fringes of his poetic space, Horace gains a measure of control over them, for even as he introduces Cyrus, he can dismiss him just as easily. As Kennedy would say, Horace is enacting his own “gentle, invisible form of violence.”²⁷ As Oliensis states, though Horace is “relapsing from order into disorder, overriding closure” in his *Odes*, Horace’s “relapses are now contained within the security of a relatively well-delineated poetic, historical, and ideological frame.”²⁸ Despite his inability to suppress all signs of chaos and violence, Horace encloses his private space from the chaotic and violent outside world.

Thus, as an expression of his attempts to control and maintain power, Horace’s introduction and devaluation of Cyrus serves as a political statement. Still, if Cyrus serves a political purpose, Horace does not neatly reveal either what that purpose is or what kind of political stance he himself takes in relation to Augustus. As previously cited, McCarthy appears ambivalent on Horace’s political stance, offering up both the possibilities that Horace’s poetry could either be “political critique” or “innovating” for the sake of “render[ing] his praise of Augustus as powerful as possible,” or even both.²⁹ Meanwhile, Fowler claims that a “poet like

²⁶ William Fitzgerald (2018), “The Space of the Poem: Imperial Trajectories in Catullus and Horace,” in *The Production of Space in Latin Literature* (Oxford: Oxford UP), 158: Fitzgerald’s discussed poem, *Odes* 2.11, works well in discussing kinds of spaces in Horace’s poetry, for it is a “prime example of Horace’s way of aligning poetic and geographic, or imperial, space” (156).

²⁷ Kennedy (1997), 29.

²⁸ Oliensis (1998), 105.

²⁹ McCarthy (2019), 113.

Horace, in his historical situation, cannot successfully praise a dictator like Augustus.”³⁰ Additionally, to add to the complexity of pinning down Horace’s political stance, Kennedy argues that the “so-called ‘personal’ is ‘political’ in that the constitution and exercise of power involves compliance.”³¹ While Fowler undermines Horace’s praise by claiming that such praise cannot be successful, Kennedy emphasizes the power of Horace’s poetry to uphold Augustus’ political regime. Nevertheless, though seemingly disparate views, all three emphasize that Horace utilizes his poetics to achieve some political goal, namely manipulating his relationship with Augustus through praise and artfully disguised critique. Significantly, Horace himself decides what his poetry accomplishes, rather than his *princeps*, Augustus. Therefore, I would argue that in fact Horace may very well be praising Augustus and his accomplishments, for the *princeps* guarantees the continuation of Horace’s private poetic space. As Fowler eloquently advances, “It is not just that the Epicurean good life for Horace is compatible with the epic achievements of the Boss, the latter ensures the former.”³² Yet, what seems to be even more important to consider than Horace’s political stance is to what extent Horace can maintain his poetic autonomy, in which case, it appears that Horace does succeed, to a limited degree. While Fowler objects that Horace’s “inheritance of Epicurean and Stoic moral philosophy...conjoined with Callimachean poetics to produce Callimachean ethics” cannot “produce successful panegyric,” Horace manages to write the poetry he wants, which sometimes includes praise of Augustus.³³ In this way, Horace’s poetry evinces a greater need to remain secluded from the public sphere than definite judgments of that public sphere and Augustus.

³⁰ Fowler (2009), 267.

³¹ Kennedy (1997), 34.

³² Fowler (2009), 258.

³³ Fowler (2009), 267

Now, to explore more comprehensively Horace's private space, let us examine a variation of this space in *Odes* 1.22. 1.22 presents an interesting example within the dichotomy of private and public, for it concerns not one, but two relationships: Horace and Fuscus as well as Horace and Lalage. These two relationships are juxtaposed in several ways. For example, it has been shown that the Fuscus in the poem is Aristius Fuscus, a close friend of Horace. According to Nisbet and Hubbard, Fuscus "wrote comedies and seemed to have a sense of humor."³⁴ Mayer reinforces this idea when he, citing *Satires* 1.9, states Fuscus "liked a joke."³⁵ *Satires* 1.9 details Horace's futile attempts to escape an unnamed social climber. At the end of the poem, Fuscus, whom Horace describes as someone "dear" to him (S.1.9.61: *carus*), appears as Horace's potential source of salvation; unfortunately, rather than offer aid to Horace, Fuscus, a "very witty man," "laughingly pretends" not to see what trouble Horace is in (S.1.9.65-66: *male salsus ridens dissimulare*).³⁶ Given that Fuscus is such a character, it is difficult to see why Horace would choose to address him in a love poem – especially since Lalage, current object of Horace's affections, would be such a reasonable addressee. Certainly, Fuscus is an unusual choice, which likely means that this poem is not without some irony. Conversely, Lalage is accepted to be another of Horace's fictive creations: "There is no such person as Lalage: the name, and indeed the whole circumstance, is chosen because it suits the artistic needs of the poem."³⁷ In comparison to the complexity of Fuscus' relation to this poem, Lalage's role in the poem is significantly simpler. She appears to only exist as Horace's artistic construct for the sake

³⁴ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 262.

³⁵ Mayer (2012), 168.

³⁶ *Satires* 1.9 is an interesting poem for my purposes, for it demonstrates that, if Horace is within a circle exclusive to his unnamed nuisance, Fuscus even more adept than Horace in maintaining that exclusivity, for he can avoid both the pest and Horace. As Emily Gowers describes him, "Fuscus is face-saving, self-effacing, scrupulously polite and yet a master of evasion in a way that leave Horace far behind" (2012, 282). This kind of polite enclosure of an inner circle of people demonstrates another way in which Horace's poetry is political or involved in social power hierarchies.

³⁷ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 263.

of a good poem. In this way, Fuscus and Lalage serve as two contrasting characters in Horace's ode. Fuscus is a close male friend of Horace outside of his poetic context, while Lalage is a construction internal to that context. In other words, one way of considering the difference between Horace's relationships with Fuscus and Lalage is the contrast between a public relationship, Horace and Fuscus, and a private one, Horace and Lalage. For not only does Horace interact with Fuscus in public settings, especially within their inner circle writing for their patrons, Maecenas, but Lalage, this love, fictive or otherwise, does exist in a setting very restricted from public view, the poem itself. Thus, 1.22 parallels in some senses 1.6 in the fact that both apparently delineate quite clearly two distinct spheres of public and private, though of course the parallel is not exact. Though 1.6 keeps the demarcation between the public and private, for the most part, distinct, 1.22 somewhat complicates this distinction, for Horace talks to his public relation, Fuscus, about his private lover, Lalage.

However, before we consider further the complications, let us consider this public/private dichotomy. Ostensibly, this poem marks an interaction between Horace and Fuscus, in which Horace tells his friend about an experience he has in the woods. Within that conversational context, Horace manages to speak (sing?) about the beautiful Lalage and his love for this woman. As aforementioned, this poem constructs itself with an external (public) and an internal (private) context, which is further reinforced by the fact that Fuscus is a part of Horace's circle of writers and Lalage is a beloved. The poem begins generally enough:

*Integer vitae scelerisque purus
non eget Mauris iaculis neque arcu
nec venenatis gravida sagittis,
Fusce, pharetra. [1-4]*

The man of untouched life and unstained by crimes
does not need Moorish javelins nor a bow,
nor a quiver full of

poisoned arrows, Fuscus.

This general statement about mankind could easily apply to anyone, and by starting the poem out in this way, Horace purports to be sharing his wisdom about life to his friend. However, the poem quickly shifts from this general statement to a more personal narrative:

*Namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra
terminum curis vagor expeditis,
fugit inermem [9-12]*

For in the Sabine wood, a silver wolf flees from me,
while I sing of my Lalage and wander beyond
the boundaries with my cares set free,
though I was unarmed.

The shift from a general statement to a specific personal example is a common rhetorical technique, but in the case of this poem, it also marks the shift between the public world of universal humankind to the private world of Horace's own experiences, especially since Horace is "singing of [his] Lalage" (C.1.22.10: *meam canto Lalagen*). By the end of the poem, Horace creates a ring composition, returning to his earlier general statement, though with a slight difference:

*Dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo,
Dulce loquentem. [23-24]*

I shall still love my Lalage with her sweet laughter and her sweet talk.

Interestingly enough, in a poem about his contrasting circles of relations, Horace also constructs the poem itself as a ring composition, in which the work's ending echoes or recalls its beginning, starting and ending with a man's heart. What begins as a poem about a "man of untouched life and unstained by crime" (1.22.1: *Integer vitae scelerisque purus*), some general man whose heart is good, ends with Horace's heart, which loves the "sweetly laughing, sweetly speaking Lalage." In their commentary, Nisbet and Hubbard state that "the *integer vitae* is thus revealed as the

lover; the poem which began so pompously is shown not to be so earnest after all.”³⁸ While it is not quite clear what they mean by their critique of Horace’s earnestness in this ode, this comment does hint back to the connotations discussed earlier. In *Odes* 1.6, Horace’s characterization of the public sphere as a grand space as well as his suggestion that his private space is where he can “sing whether [he is] free or burn[s] for something, as [he is] accustomed, lightly,” words that do indicate a certain kind of capriciousness, if not outright lack of sincerity (C.1.6.19-20: *cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur non praeter solitum leves*). Therefore, by his own characterization of public and private, Horace does appear to be playing with these two different kinds of spaces in this poem, not the least through his representations of Fuscus and Lalage as well as his progression from the general to the personal in respect to his love for Lalage.

Another gesture to the private is contained in Horace’s anecdote about the wolf in the middle of his poem. Let us return to the aforementioned quote:

*Namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra
terminum curis vagor expedites,
fugit inermem [9-12]*

For in the Sabine wood, a silver wolf flees from me,
while I sing of my Lalage and wander beyond
the boundaries with my cares set free,
though I was unarmed.

The briefly mentioned Sabine forest denotes the kind of pastoral space Horace likes to be alone in, and within this stanza, he does appear to be alone, for he does not make note of anyone to help him with the wolf other than his song. Moreover, even the wolf itself plays a role in creating this pastoral space, for it poses no danger, repelled by Horace’s song. Just as in 1.17, in which

³⁸ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 263.

the Sabine farm is protected by song, this space too is encircled by song, this time Horace's, which allows it to be peaceful, although dangerous animals wander nearby. Thus, not only does the mention of Lalage spark the idea of a private space within the poem, Horace creates a pastoral lyric space for himself within his wolf anecdote as well, which is supported in part by his song about Lalage. Like 1.6 and 1.17 before it, 1.22 stubbornly maintains a separation between Horace's private space and the public sphere, and in fact, 1.22 pushes this separation even further, for he upholds this space even when talking to a public acquaintance, Fuscus. By singing to Fuscus about Lalage, Horace widens his lyric space to encompass more ground instead of introducing a public disturbance into his private space; after all, the poet illustrates that his song can be sung anywhere, even in Rome. Instead of keeping the public sphere completely separate from his private space, Horace once again introduces it through his address to Fuscus; and, in doing so, Horace incorporates this public space into his private lyric one, which thereby demonstrates again just how powerful and flexible this lyric space is. At the same time, if Horace can bring his private space into the public sphere, that also means that the public sphere has infiltrated the Horatian private space. After all, Horace's poetry reaffirms, not undermines, the power of Augustan Rome. Nonetheless, though his poetic autonomy may be in some ways restricted, Horace proves again and again that he can shape his poetry how he wishes. The last lines of 1.22 say it well:

pone me pigris ubi...campis
 ...
pone sub curru nimium propinqui
solis in terra domibus negata:
dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo
dulce loquentem. [17, 21-24]

Place me in unfruitful plains

...

Place me in the land denied to houses

under the chariot of the excessively close sun:
I will love Lalage, who laughs sweetly,
who talks sweetly.

Regardless of what he might be required to do and wherever he might be required to go, at least Horace can always continue singing his *carmina*.

Much like Horace, Andrew Marvell is also preoccupied with carving out for himself a private, lyric space separate from the public realm. Worden describes Marvell as someone who seems like “a spokesman for solitariness.”³⁹ Marvell’s construction of his private space can most clearly be seen in “The Garden.” Like *Odes* 1.17, “The Garden” delineates a natural space marked by its seclusion, its safety, and its abundance – in this case, a garden rather than a farm – closed off figuratively and literally from the rest of the world. Horace’s farm is enclosed “within the magic circle of Faunus’ music” and the vales encircling the “enchanted valley”⁴⁰; Marvell’s garden is closed off by the boundaries set in place by the garden walls. In the first three stanzas, the speaker systematically rejects public concerns and values. Marvell begins by rejecting public achievements:

How vainly men themselves amaze
To win the palm, the oak, or bays;
And their uncessant labours see
Crowned from some single herb or tree [1-4].⁴¹

According to Nigel Smith, the “[w]reaths” signify “the following virtues: military (made from palm leaves), civic (oak leaves), [and] poetic (laurel (‘bay’) leaves).”⁴² This list of public honors is fairly comprehensive in its scope, and as A. D. Nuttall states, “[t]hese plants are not rooted in

³⁹ Worden (2007), 54.

⁴⁰ Oliensis (1998), 121.

⁴¹ This introduction evokes Horace’s *Odes* 1.1, which begins with a priamel rejecting non-poetic endeavors, such as chariot-racing, sailing, and soldiering. The priamel ends – thereby valuing – the leisure of stretching out under a wild-strawberry tree, an image Marvell also evokes in “The Garden.”

⁴² Nigel Smith (2003), “The Garden”, in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell* (London: Routledge), 155.

the soil; they have become their public meanings.”⁴³ Thus, in this private garden space removed from the public, these plants cease to retain their meanings as signs of socio-cultural approval. At the same time that he erases these public meanings, Marvell also reduces their worth. Rosalie Colie notes that the word “single” “unmetaphors a huge tradition of fame, reduces it to an imaginary literal actuality.”⁴⁴ In other words, Marvell strips the traditional plant-as-reward metaphor of its figurative meaning, which thus leaves it only in its insignificant physical form. Once an abundance of collective value for soldiers, politicians, and poets to strive for, these wreaths become vain parts of a once-living tree. The act of creating metaphors itself is a public one, for it draws on and in turn influences the poetic tradition of figurative language, which can be traced back to Horace’s own poetry, or, even further, to the Greek lyric tradition Horace himself draws on. While Marvell’s choice to “unmetaphor” marks an innovative way of looking at conventional metaphors, it also marks another rejection of public traditions; even as he faithfully reproduces the elements of his literary tradition, he also simultaneously rejects this tradition by playing with it to offer new meanings. By rejecting these public values, Marvell makes clear that his private space follows different customs, which thereby distinguishes his garden from the public world beyond its borders.

“The Garden’s” speaker further separates himself from the public sphere by rejecting human company and women. The second and third stanzas illustrate the speaker’s choice of plants over other humans. In the second stanza, he finds “Society all but rude, | To this delicious solitude” (15-16), and in the third stanza, he states, “No white nor red was ever seen | So am’rous as this lovely green” (17-18). Most scholars writing on “The Garden” note the irregularity of

⁴³ A. D. Nutall (1993), “Marvell and Horace: Color and Translucency,” in *Horace Made New*, ed. Charles Martindale and David Hopkins (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 86.

⁴⁴ Rosalie Colie (1970), “*My Echoing Song*”: *Andrew Marvell’s Poetry of Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton UP), 155.

Marvell's preference of "lovely green" over "white [or] red," the two colors that represent women and, thus, love poetry.⁴⁵ His poem may operate within the pastoral mode, which usually favors solitude to be alone with lovers, but in the private space Marvell creates, he rejects even this conventional subject in favor of complete solitude among greenery.

The fourth stanza, in which Marvell refers to the gods Apollo and Pan, further highlights Marvell's subversion of common lyric and pastoral subjects:

Apollo hunted Daphne so,
Only that she might laurel grow;
And Pan did after Syrinx speed,
Not as a nymph, but for a reed. [29-32]

As Colie states, "The Garden" is "precisely the right sort, lyric and pastoral, which environ and celebrate; however, 'the girls have been invoked only to be dismissed, disembodied, into trees.'"⁴⁶ Unlike the "palm, the oak, or the bays," which were lifeless emblems of public value, the speaker of the poem favors the "laurel" and "reed" more. While the "bays" represent social recognition of poetic achievement, an external signification, the "laurel" and "reed" symbolize lyric poetry within a poetic context, the Ovidian poems Marvell alludes to. These plants, like Marvell's garden, exist within their natural pastoral context free from public scrutiny. By emphasizing the plants more than the women of these Ovidian stories, Marvell doubly underscores the "laurel" and the "reed" as symbols of private lyric poetry: first as rejection of human companionship and second as living symbols that are a part of his private garden. Thus, Marvell's garden reconstructs what constitutes a pastoral space into a space that emphasizes poetic creativity and vegetal fecundity over the conventional blossoming of young love.

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Leishman (1966), *The Art of Marvell's Poetry* (London: Hutchinson & Co), 296: "Generations of poets had declared that the white and red of roses was nothing in comparison with the white and red in their mistress's cheeks, but no poet before Marvell had ventured to declare that" green was more amorous than red and white.

⁴⁶ Colie (1970), 160.

Nevertheless, while the garden may exist for the speaker alone, it is not a passive sanctuary for him to enjoy. The fifth stanza illustrates how all the plants actively interact with the speaker:

Ripe apples drop about my head;
 The luscious clusters of the vine
 Upon my mouth do crush their wine;
 The nectarine, and curious peach,
 Into my hands themselves do reach;
 Stumbling on melons, as I pass,
 Insnares with flow'rs, I fall on grass. [34-40]

Here is another parallel between Horace and Marvell: Horace's "rich abundance of countryside glories" (C.1.17.14-16: *copia...ruris honorum opulenta*) has now become fruit that throws itself at Marvell's speaker. Colie states that, "[i]n stanza 5, the plants are literally more amorous than red or white, than ladies."⁴⁷ However, not all scholars agree with Colie's claim. Joan Faust argues that, "instead of a vegetative rape, we [see] the speaker as artist undergoing the creative process."⁴⁸ While perhaps contrary, these two arguments can both provide some insight into this stanza. Following Colie's argument, as Horace's deferral of Cyrus conceals the potential jealousy of lyric poetry, Marvell's fifth stanza reveals what sexuality his rejection of "red" and "white" has until now dismissed. Marvell displaces the sensuality of women, "red" and "white," on the fertility of green plants in the garden. As demonstrated above, in a typical pastoral space, there are strong associations between young women and flowers; Colie notes that "[a young girl] is a figure in the pastoral scene, herself *carpens*, picking the flowers of transience all about her, but a flower-element herself as well, in the 'prospect of flowers.'"⁴⁹ Marvell subverts this connection between girls and flowers by replacing all traces of women in "The Garden" with

⁴⁷ Colie (1970), 161.

⁴⁸ Joan Faust (2012), *Andrew Marvell's Liminal Lyrics* (Newark: U of Delaware P), 65.

⁴⁹ Colie (1970), 53.

flowers as a means of retreat. Faust believes that Marvell's speaker retreats into the garden for the sake of his poetry. Following this line of reasoning, we can conclude that Marvell, like many poets, Horace included, utilizes lyric poetry to discuss poetry and its creation. Culler, considering the "self-consciousness of lyric," notes that, along with understanding "what can be said about [the affective states of joy, hope, despair, etc.]," such poetry is "frequently about poetry."⁵⁰ In giving life to his garden, Marvell highlights how generative this private garden is, for it not only generates such an abundance of fruits, but also a wealth of different understandings of the poem itself.

Nonetheless, Faust's point that Marvell establishes his garden for the sake of artistic creation resonates in some respects with my point earlier that Horace, in *Odes* 1.6, restricts himself to his private poetry in order to write the poetry he wants to write. According to Faust,

Marvell's "Garden" needs no female presence, not because the speaker desires the lushness of green over the sensuality of red and white, but because the subject of the poem is a solipsistic one that requires solitude: the creation of art itself.⁵¹

Faust argues that the garden is the perfect place to contemplate art and creation, for gardens are "liminal areas": "Any garden, for example, automatically refers to what lies beyond its boundaries, since it is constructed in and out of the materials outside the garden walls."⁵² Considered in this way, the inability of Horace and Marvell to completely forsake the public world, even in their most private poetry, attests not only to a failure to separate themselves from the public world, but also to the liminal nature of these artistic private spaces they create for themselves. Faust's point parallels nicely Rimell's argument about the *angulus* and about lyric poetic production more generally. Both Faust and Rimell emphasize how imperfectly enclosed

⁵⁰ Culler (2015), 21.

⁵¹ Faust (2012), 54.

⁵² Faust (2012), 57.

these lyric spaces are, but even more importantly, how such an imperfection in some ways transforms a simple garden or farm into a space worthy of poetic fame and creativity. This liminal creativity does not mean that these poets struggle any less to somehow escape the contexts they exist in, but it does highlight how powerful these struggles and the resulting private spaces are for these two poets. By putting themselves in such creatively charged spaces, both Horace and Marvell are able to talk about their socio-political contexts how they wish, thus maintaining their poetic – and to an extent, their political – autonomy.

Likely Marvell's most famous work, "To His Coy Mistress" is also another good example of the attempted creation of ambiguously private space. In the poem, the speaker attempts to convince a woman to have sex with him. This private moment is different from that of "The Garden," which revolves around one's own solitude. In this poem, the privacy concerns the interaction between the male speaker and the woman he is trying to persuade. As a *carpe diem* poem, "To His Coy Mistress" importantly makes "the oldest of *carpe diem* arguments, an appeal to the girl on the basis of her own transience."⁵³ As Colie remarks of the poem,

The implication of *carpe diem* are explored in the poem; the lady, and by implication all love, are threatened by time; the speaker is as aware of his imminent death as he is of hers.⁵⁴

Carpe diem poems are obsessed with time – the fleetingly youthful time of the young girl, the potential moment of time the two can spend together, the time of the world continuing around them moving toward its end. In fact, time is so important to the poem that the speaker begins with a reference to the concept:

Had we but world enough, and time,
This coyness lady were no crime.
We would sit down, and think which way
To walk, and pass our long love's day. [1-4]

⁵³ Colie (1970), 52.

⁵⁴ Colie (1970), 54.

Though placement of “time,” after a comma with “and,” suggests an ancillary importance of time, “time” also functions as a line end word in a rhyming couplet with “crime.” Moreover, the second couplet has the word “day,” another identifier of time. From there, the poem continues to be preoccupied with time throughout the remainder of the poem: explicit time identifiers alone include “ten years” (8), “An hundred years” (13), “Two hundred” (15), “thirty thousand” (16), “An age” (17), “the last age” (18), and, in the following stanza, “Deserts of vast eternity” (24). From these explicit measures of time, there is a clear trend of grander and more extravagant lengths of time, starting with a long, but quantifiable ten years that quickly escalates into indeterminate ages before the speaker finally speaks of “vast eternity.” Moreover, the speaker’s acknowledgement that the lady “deserves this state,” not any “lower rate” in that first stanza must be referring to the luxury of freely spending time without worry, which explicitly makes the connection that *carpe diem* poems often makes: time is a valuable currency (19-20). In this first stanza, the speaker presents a fantasy, a pastoral scene for him and his would-be lover, not with the demarcated walls of a green garden, but with the temporal markers of a timeless moment in which the two can conduct their love affair.

However, the second stanza quickly turns this ideal situation into a contrafactual. For the speaker and his addressee, life and time are not limitless. The speaker hears “Time’s winged chariot hurrying near,” which restricts him from giving the lady the time she needs and deserves (23). Though, as previously mentioned, the temporal markers become even more grand with the image of “Deserts of vast eternity,” this “eternity” is not the “state” the speaker refers to, but an undesirable barren world:

Thy beauty shall no more be found;
 Nor, in thy marble vault, shall sound
 My echoing song: then worms shall try

That long-preserved virginity:
 And your quaint honour turn to dust;
 And into ashes all my lust. [25-30]

Though this stanza parallels the first stanza in the sense that both catalogue the speaker's interactions with his addressee in an immeasurable expanse of time, in this case, this eternity marks the eternity of time after their deaths, at which point it is impossible for either of them to enjoy themselves. Thus, time exists in this poem as both something that flees quickly away and something that potentially lasts eternally; both kinds of time serve to highlight that this poem and the events in it exist in a possible world different from the everyday world outside of the poem. By manipulating time in this manner, Marvell's created world rejects the very social convention of time itself, another way in which the poem distinguishes itself from the public world. As he does in "The Garden," Marvell again and again undermines social and poetic conventions, an act which suggests a critique of the public world from which he tries so hard to distinguish. Likely composed circa late 1640s-early 1650s, during a tumultuous period in England of civil wars and the execution of Charles I, this critique reveals Marvell's disapproval of and anxiety about the current state of affairs, which makes this poem an implicit political statement.⁵⁵ Within this context, "world enough" could almost mean "enough of this private, poetic world," which indicates a rejection of the world at large. Though this poem's speaker introduces another person into Marvell's constructed private space, Marvell the poet does not appear any more willing to associate with the public world than he does in "The Garden," and in this case, the speaker uses the threat of the outside world and the limits of time to inject urgency into the wooing of the girl.

Along with time, Marvell also plays in this poem with the conventions of love poetry. Unlike "The Garden," which may only have one person, but was overflowing with greenery, "To

⁵⁵ Smith (2003), 75.

His Coy Mistress” appears completely devoid of any living entities, human or plant, except the male speaker and his potential lover. As Colie notes,

Further, there is no shred of flower imagery in the poem. Rosebuds are not gathered; the lady does not put on her foliage, is never seen in a prospect of flowers – rather, surrealistically, she stands against a background of desert sand stretching to infinity.⁵⁶

In the beginning of her chapter on *carpe diem* poems, Colie discusses the prevalence of flower imagery in Western love poetry, especially with the *carpe diem, carpe florem* theme. Marvell’s inversion of this common trope creates a further sense of privacy for the two people in the poem, for they are in a world completely their own. Of course, unlike many poetic speakers, especially Cavalier ones, who try to tempt their potential lovers with inviting pastoral scenes, full of plants and life, this speaker’s persuasive tactic involves death and decay. He depicts for her a marble vault” where “worms shall try | That long preserved virginity” and “[her] quaint honor turn[s] to dust,” at which point it is too late for her to enjoy anything, including sex with him (26-29).

There is something sterile about this moment, as noted by the speaker himself when he states, “The grave’s a fine and private space, | But none I think do there embrace” (31-32). Here, though in the opposite direction from “The Garden,” it appears that Marvell gestures once again to the idea of complete solitude. Yet within this context, absolute solitude is to be avoided rather than striven for. In such a sterile environment, solitude does not bring about peace and productivity, but rather, a cold grave. Likely this kind of private space, which features death all around, mirrors too closely the civil wars England has recently faced, which makes it an unsuccessful retreat from the public sphere. Thus, within Marvell’s light-hearted love poem, there appears a serious note. Jonathan Crewe states eloquently in his article “The Garden State: Marvell’s Poetics of Enclosure”:

⁵⁶ Colie (1970), 54.

In it a problematic relationship between a pastoral and a historico-political condition remains unresolved. The phrase can imply a unified or total condition of pastoral well-being (*otium*) from which the political is virtually excluded, or it can be taken to project a merger of two still antithetical realms: garden and state.⁵⁷

Even in his insistence to withdraw from the public world, Marvell here qualifies how that private retreat should look, and in doing so, he hints at the world beyond his poetry and at an unresolved dichotomy between public and private lyric aims.

Finally, after laying out two kinds of eternity – one of idealized wooing, the other of desolate barrenness – the speaker returns to the present moment they do have together, or one they at least potentially have together. He makes his claim clear in the first few lines:

Now, therefore, while the youthful glew
Sits on thy skin like morning dew,
And while thy willing soul transpires
At every pore with instant fires,
Now let us sport us while we may. [33-37]

At last in this final stanza, the speaker explicitly states his point he has been implicitly hinting at, ironically delaying in a manner he argues against. The images he uses to describe her transience, the “youthful glew...like morning dew” and the “willing soul” that “transpires...with instant fires,” reintroduces the vitality the previous stanza is void of. The morning dew suggests Marvell’s green garden, the fire the warmth of living things. This hint of pastoral space places this poem on familiar lyric grounds once again, but it quickly shifts back to time.

And now, like am’rous birds of prey,
Rather at once our Time devour,
Than languish in his slow-chapped power. [38-40]

As if the speaker is not clear enough before, he rephrases his *carpe diem* argument, now with even more explicit language of time. Again, Marvell argues for throwing off the time’s

⁵⁷ Jonathan Crewe (1994), “The Garden State: Marvell’s Poetics of Enclosure,” in *Enclosure Acts*, ed. Richard Burt and John Michael Archer (Ithaca: Cornell UP), 271.

restrictions by living life as fully as possible in this one moment and thus to “devour” Time rather than “languish in his slow-chapped power.” By presenting two ways of interacting with time, devouring and languishing, Marvell once again juxtaposes the private action of the lovers with the power of Time, which represents public control. Crewe astutely remarks that the lyric poetic “tradition is always in historical crisis, and can never be otherwise since it embodies a poetic formalism continuously at odds with historical actuality.”⁵⁸ Here too Time always intrudes, and if we take the concept of time to represent public conventions and constrictions, we can easily see how “slow-chapped power” can allude to the public sphere’s slow destruction of human life. Humans die often in the name of public duty; while war is by far the most fatal service, humans often die while doing other public services as well, in their everyday lives and everyday jobs. In other words, the figure of Time here can easily stand in for the problems of the public sphere, namely England’s civil wars. Like “slow-chapped” Time, the continuing civil wars are taking away lives day by day. Finally, the speaker ends the poem, “Thus, though we cannot make our sun | Stand still, yet we will make him run” (45-46). Once again, Marvell asserts his poetic autonomy in spite of his recognition that he cannot in fact change the public sphere. Instead, rather than lamenting what he cannot do – make the sun stand still – he persists in doing what he can: write ideologically influential lyric poems. Through these poems, the poet comments on his poetic autonomy as well as on the historical complexities of the public sphere.

Therefore, private spaces are more complicated than mere solitude, even solitude within idyllic, pastoral settings. In the first stanza, the speaker presents an ideal, but impossible private space, in which the speaker and his would-be lover have immeasurable time to flirt with each other. In the second stanza, the speaker subverts this space, illustrating a scene of complete and

⁵⁸ Crewe (1995), 271.

deathly solitude (rather than a private moment with someone), even as he maintains the aspect of immeasurable time. Though one is preferable over the other, neither are in fact the private space, the “world” the speaker refers to in the first line. In the final stanza, the speaker does manage to establish somewhat a private space, even hinting at a pastoral one with the image of “morning dew” and “fires.” Nonetheless, he also reaffirms the fact that they simply cannot escape Time by stopping it; rather, they can only shift how it moves by doing what they wish now. This tension between the private moment between lovers and the public intrusion of Time demonstrates once again Rimell’s idea of the *angulus* in Horace’s lyrics, as Marvell constructs another creatively charged space, an attempted withdrawal from Time set against the understanding that Time, and thus the public, is always present. Yet rather than limiting his poetry, this paradoxical space only serves to elevate this poem from mere witty love poem to the more lasting private, ethically-charged poem that suggests ideological statements about the outside world.

Thus are the private spaces of Horace and Marvell: complicated poetic spheres in which these poets separate themselves from but also contemplate their public social contexts. Of course, if these private spaces are as complex and implicated by the public sphere as they appear to be, the question remains whether these private poetic spaces can remain even in more overtly public spaces and poems. In order to explore this question, in the last part of my paper, I will turn to some more overtly public poems, starting again with Horace.

As already mentioned earlier, Horace’s private space develops over the course of his three books of *Odes* as he gains political influence as Augustus’ advisor. The once wholly deferential Horace develops into the confident poet of 3.30, who believes he can create lasting monuments. Thus, in *Odes* 3.14, Horace writes an ode to Augustus’ return from Spain, a poem that is wholly public, at least at first. The poem begins as a public welcome of Augustus, with

Horace telling the people (*o plebs*) about Augustus' return as a *victor* (C.3.14.1-4). The poet ceremoniously describes the happy reactions of his family as well as the people of Rome (C.3.14.5-12). However, as the poem continues, Horace shifts from this public welcoming celebration to a private one:

*i pete unguentum, puer, et coronas
et cadum Marsi memorem duelli,
Spartacum si qua potuit vagantem
fallere testa. [17-20]*

Go seek perfume, boy, and crowns
and the wine jar that remembers the Marsian war,
if any jar was able to escape from the
wandering Spartacus.

These marks of a party – perfume (*unguentum*), crowns (*coronas*), and Marsian wine-jug (*cadum Marsi*) – once again establish Horace's private space, made complete with the addition of "clear-voiced Neaera" (3.14.21-22: *argutae...Neaerae*). Structurally, this poem mirrors 1.6 in its progression and distinction of public and private space, for like that poem, 3.14 separates the public celebration from the private one. Yet, as a more overtly political poem, and perhaps because this poem was presumably written later in Horace's career, Horace presents public and private differently from the former poem. In 1.6, the public and private spheres work against each other, with Horace insisting that his private poetry cannot operate within the public sphere. However, in 3.14, the two spheres work together: while one celebration is public and the other private, the two coexist to celebrate Augustus. Horace now manages to integrate his private space into the overall public sphere. As stated above, Horace's smooth integration of public and private in 3.14 might suggest "that Horace is marshalling all his most innovative poetic skills to render his praise of Augustus as powerful as possible," as McCarthy posits.⁵⁹ In that case,

⁵⁹ McCarthy (2019), 113.

Horace might be insisting on poetic autonomy because he believes that he knows best how to praise Augustus, though perhaps confidence itself marks a kind of resistance of the public – and political – sphere. Nevertheless, at the same time, Oliensis considers Horace’s private party another way in which Horace slips from Augustan control:

The rhetorical strategies with which Horace confronts Augustus are visible in all their disparateness in *Odes* 3.14, Horace’s notoriously eccentric celebration of the emperor’s victorious return home from Spain. As in the “Cleopatra” ode, but more pointedly, Horace here exploits the potential of the false ending. Where Horace’s *fatale monstrum* eludes the ending designated by Augustus, in *Odes* 3.14 it is Horace himself who slips out of the Augustan enclosure.⁶⁰

In this way, Horace is not creatively deferential to his *princeps* so much as rebellious. Yet it is Horace’s ability as a *tenues* poet that allows him to construct such an ambivalent persona in his poetry, so, in reading Horace, one has difficulty distinguishing between praise and critique.

Overall, this poem demonstrates how Horace’s private space has become a more flexible means by which he exerts his own autonomy, even as he manages to perform successful praise of Augustus.

Like Horace, Marvell also composes an ode marking the return of a promising leader. Marked as “Horatian” by Marvell himself, “An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell’s Return from Ireland” is entirely and overtly political, unlike “The Garden” and “To His Coy Mistress,” which are implicitly political to varying degrees. This poem deals with England’s tumultuous power dynamics of that moment in time. Composed in June or July of 1650, Marvell’s “Horatian Ode” comes soon after the execution of Charles I in 1649; during this year, Cromwell had been leading successful military expeditions in Ireland, which marked him as a successful military commander. At the same time, Cromwell must have been a source of uncertainty as well, for he resisted Parliament’s attempts to call him home through the first half of 1650, raising worries

⁶⁰ Oliensis (1998), 145.

about tyranny and of having replaced a long-reigning with a newly emerging one tyrant with another.⁶¹ Even with *Odes* 3.14, Horace manages to shift from praising Augustus' return from Spain to his own private symposium. However, with "An Horatian Ode," there appears to be no room for Marvell to escape into his own private spaces. In all of Horace's poems already considered, the Roman poet can slip in between his private lyric spaces and the public sphere, even in an overtly political poem, 3.14. However, if he does not keep himself entirely separate in different spaces and times – as in "The Garden" and "To His Coy Mistress" respectively – Marvell cannot escape into his own private lyric spaces. For, as Horace makes evident, such lyric spaces are a product of a stable political state, when its citizens do not have to worry about matters such as civil wars and power struggles. Thus, this disparity perhaps stems from the fact that Horace's *Odes* and Marvell's "Horatian Ode" are composed within different stages of political instability. Although their historical contexts are similarly tumultuous and fraught with civil wars, Horace's *Odes* exist after the fact, during which time the poet can process the political instability of Rome; meanwhile, Marvell composes his "Horatian Ode" in the midst of England's civil wars and power struggles. During this period, with England in a state of chaos, there is likely no place for Marvell to escape politics, even outside of the poem. If private spaces are an important characteristic of Horace and Marvell's poetry, the question now remains whether they can preserve those private spaces even in wholly political contexts in which the poet cannot escape. Moreover, even if the poet manages to escape within such a political context, does he therefore take an implicit political position by that retreat, one shaped by poetic autonomy?

Of course, the poem itself rejects many aspects of the privacy Horace and Marvell extol in the poems analyzed up to this point. "An Horatian Ode" begins with a call to war:

'Tis time to leave the books in dust,

⁶¹ See Worden (2007) for more detail, especially 88-90.

And oil th' unused armour's rust;
 Removing from the wall
 The corslet of the hall. [5-9]

Interestingly, Marvell begins his “Horatian Ode” with an utterly un-Horatian sentiment: a call to war. After his experiences with war, Horace again and again talks about putting up his shield in favor of more peaceable pursuits, which is itself a political position.⁶² The famous *Odes* 1.37 begins with “Now we must drink, now we must beat the ground with free foot” (C.1.37.1-2: *nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero / pulsanda tellus*). The passive periphrastic *bibendum* and *pulsanda* make weightier the celebratory acts of drinking and dancing, presenting these acts as necessary for the people. Again, this poem is a product of peace-time, at which point Horace has the luxury of making celebratory declarations. In contrast, Marvell does not have this luxury of peacetime, so while Horace commends celebration and drinking, the English poet writes about going to war. If Horace puts up his shield, Marvell believes that it is time to “[Remove] from the wall | The corslet of the hall” (8-9). The line “time to leave the books in dust,” possibly a conscious reference back to the act of reading or writing poetry, implicitly rejects private pursuits more generally as well as the retreat that comes with such pursuits. Within this political context, Marvell appears to value active engagement over private retreat, at least in his characterization of Cromwell.

Following shortly that early stanza, the poem proceeds with Cromwell’s choice to leave his own private lands, another rejection of Horace and Marvell’s private space, albeit one from perceived necessity and the sacrifice of a devout Puritan leader. At this point, Marvell presents this rejection of the private as a sacrifice on Cromwell’s part:

And, if we would speak true,
 Much to the man is due:
 Who, from his private gardens, where

⁶² *Odes* 2.7, most famously.

He lived reservèd and austere,
 As if his highest plot
 To plant the bergamot,
 Could by industrious valour climb
 To ruin the great work of time,
 And cast the kingdoms old
 Into another mould. [27-36]

In contrast to “The Garden,” in which Marvell elevates being in a garden over “the palm, the oak, or bays,” Cromwell here rejects his own “private gardens” for both military and civic duties. In this case, moreover, he appears to be making a great act of sacrifice, for Marvell states that “Much to the man is due.” Yet, though Cromwell leaves his private gardens, Marvell does not leave his horticultural metaphor. Cromwell’s “highest plot” is to “plant the bergamot.” Smith notes that the “bergamot pear was considered to be the pear of kings,” which alludes to Cromwell, who seizes power and takes control of England after the overthrow of Charles I.⁶³ In other words, Cromwell only leaves his “private gardens” to tend to larger, public ones.⁶⁴ Then, Marvell shifts his metaphor slightly in stating that Cromwell works to “cast the kingdoms old | Into another mould.” Still, the molding metaphor retains a connection to horticulture through the idea of creation, which once again alludes to idea of creativity and private, cultivated space in “The Garden.” Crewe states that the Cromwell of the “Horatian Ode” “who explodes out of his garden “plot” and into political history is the dynamic alter ego of the pastoral dreamer.”⁶⁵ As in *Odes* 1.6, the poet makes a connection between public and private, though in this case, Marvell links not public and private contexts, but Cromwell and the “pastoral dreamer.” In discussing Horace, I have already introduced Fowler, who parallels poets and rulers: “If we start to think of the deeds of the Great and Good in aesthetic terms, as rival artists, then poetics have a potentially

⁶³ Smith (2003), 274.

⁶⁴ Worden (2007) is critical of this apparent sacrifice, stating that “Cromwell’s ostensible self-effacement conceals self-advancement and is an instrument of it” (89).

⁶⁵ Crewe (1994), 280.

political import.”⁶⁶ Marvell appears to be appealing to the same motif in constructing Cromwell as both a gardener and a creator, an act that complicates the public/private distinction. For, while Marvell does establish a Cromwell who rejects the private, he uses the language of the rejected private space in order to do so. In this way, the poet manages to introduce elements of his private space into this wholly public poem, at least implicitly.

Thus, Marvell presents an interesting kind of rejection of the private, because he uses the very language of his private spaces in order to talk about the overtly political subject, Cromwell. In one sense, this borrowing of language to talk about both public and private mirrors Horace’s 1.6, which only serves to further distinguish the two spheres. However, in employing the military, Horace blurs the division between private and public by using military language to describe both spheres. Marvell likewise complicates what is meant by public and private in his discussion of the public affairs of England with his private garden language. As Worden affirms, Marvell is at once both a “lyric writer as well as a political writer,” which cannot be separated chronologically, which means that, just as Marvell is a “political animal” in his pastoral poetry, he is a pastoral dreamer in his political poetry.⁶⁷ The juxtaposition between the horticultural language Marvell uses to praise Cromwell and the same language he will later use in “The Garden” to describe his private space marks these two kinds of spaces as opposites, but, furthermore, it underscores once again the fact that private and public are not so easily separated.

Since “An Horatian Ode” is a poem in which Marvell so skillfully creates his public space by his rejection of, but also his assimilation of private language, it becomes difficult to pin down where – and even whether – the poem retains any of the private voice Horace and Marvell appear to be at such pains to maintain in all the other poems analyzed in this paper. I would

⁶⁶ Fowler (2009), 254.

⁶⁷ Worden (2007), 56.

argue that Marvell maintains his private space within this poem through the “Horatian” connection he makes. Coolidge notes their shared trait of “conditional praise,” and Annabel Patterson discusses how Marvell, along with praise poetry, has been “unusually concerned with...an obligation to accuracy, to telling the precise truth, which has always been recognized as running counter to the exemplary function of literature.”⁶⁸ This tension between praise and truth, which Patterson so elegantly lays out, recreates the dichotomy between private and public at the level of the speaker rather than in the poem itself. Praise poetry, as Horace suggests in 1.6, is associated with the public, for it not only revolves around public political figures. Praise functions publicly for the sake of both the political figures and the people in the particular society, for it shapes how the people perceive their political figures and, in turn, how political figures should act. For example, while other scholars may argue that Marvell’s ambivalence in the “Horatian Ode” conveys his “even-handed detachment of a ‘balanced’ sensitivity,” Worden argues that “the ode, rather than taking neither side, takes both,” Cromwellian and royalist.⁶⁹ Worden develops this argument further to underscore that Marvell’s ambivalence is born from a psychological struggle “of allegiance and emotion.”⁷⁰ He argues that Marvell does not characterize Charles I with a “taint of evil”; instead, Marvell’s Charles I is a “victim of history.”⁷¹ Because of the “obligation to accuracy” Patterson observes, Marvell cannot wholeheartedly advocate Cromwell’s claim to leadership, for he himself is unsure. Marvell simultaneously attempts to maintain a distance from Cromwell, the object of his praise as well as the object of his critique, and elevate Cromwell poetically to indicate his desire to maintain a kind of privacy, an ethical autonomy. Even at such a politically charged moment, Marvell does

⁶⁸ Patterson (1978), *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton: Princeton UP), 54.

⁶⁹ Worden (2007), 86.

⁷⁰ Worden (2007), 100.

⁷¹ Worden (2007), 106.

not want his poetry to be dictated entirely by the public world, even if the generic expectations of the public ode require him to restrict himself to a public statement. This poetic resistance, however, conveys a political statement, though perhaps not necessarily a negative one. Poets can only write what they wish in politically stable and prosperous times, in which rulers are not worried about losing their power because they rule badly. As Horace does in his *Odes*, perhaps the Marvell of 1650 hopes for a time England is politically stable as Rome, so that he too can finally retreat into his private pastoral space.

Marvell's reserved private voice can perhaps best be seen in his comparison of Cromwell with Caesar, both Augustus Caesar and Julius Caesar. Patterson eloquently notes:

The identification of Cromwell, through echoes from Thomas May's translation of *Pharsalia*, with Lucan's hated Julius Caesar, killer of Pompey, bringer of civil war, is balanced by the fact that the poet identifies himself through the poem's title with Horace's role as counselor to Caesar Augustus, personification of peaceful rule and cooperation between literary and political values. The contrasting allusions offer the audience, and Cromwell himself, a choice of two Caesarian roles, which is still further complicated by the statement that Cromwell, like Olympian lightning, had blasted "Caesars head" through the very laurel crown that was supposed to protect it.⁷²

According to Patterson then, Marvell, as an advisor, wants to make clear to Cromwell what choices he has a ruler, an indication of Marvell's dedication to truth telling. I have already discussed how Marvell's poetry portrays a kind of Horatian quality, a kind of distance from the politics, and, moreover, how Marvell composes his lyric poetry at a different stage of political transition from Horace's *Odes*. This difference alters how Marvell constructs his pastoral space, most notable in the deathly desolation of "To His Coy Mistress" as well as his inability to create a private retreat in "An Horatian Ode." Furthermore, it does appear that, by importing the Horatian private space, Marvell is hopeful that England will, like Rome, eventually reach a more stable state. These two implications, Marvell as Cromwell's poetic advisor and Marvell's poetry

⁷² Patterson (1978), 60-61.

as future “now,” returns us to why Marvell, and Horace, produce lyric poetry in the first place: the right kind of lyric poetry “succeeds in bringing about what it describes.”⁷³ It is not, as Michèle Lowrie would describe it, representation as “mere imitation,” but “enactment, whereby the object of representation is brought (really) into the present.”⁷⁴ In writing in such modes as an advisor, Marvell does in fact hope that he can influence Cromwell to turn England into a less war-torn state, ideologically and poetically, if not personally. In order to achieve such public and private goals, Marvell, and Horace before, must have understood that lyric poetry, a flexible kind of performative poetry, is the most effective genre for creating private spaces that can address the public sphere.

Ultimately, though they may present privacy and private spaces as simple, if rigid spaces, both topographically and psychologically, these two poets make apparent that private spaces are quite complex and flexible. Both Horace and Marvell, especially the latter as he draws on Horace’s poetry, shift this space as well as its characteristics for their own purposes from poem to poem. Both manage to retain these spaces even in their most public, political poems, though they at first declare that their poetry cannot operate in that sphere. At the same time, we see that Horace and Marvell only pretend to separate the two spheres, though they know well that public and private are intertwined, with each hinting at the other throughout the poems discussed. Together, their public awareness and their persistent fiction of private separation allow Horace and Marvell to add nuance and complexity to their poems and the imagined worlds they create in them. By understanding their implicit restrictions, the two poets are able to create even greater

⁷³ Culler (2015), 129. One major point Culler emphasizes about lyric poetry is its iterability, a “special ‘now’ of discourse of writing and of poetic enunciation” (229). Though it plays a smaller part in my argument about Horace and Marvell’s poetry, this lyric quality is what allows Horace and Marvell to achieve the effective (affective?) political statements they do in their poetry.

⁷⁴ Michèle Lowrie (2009), *Writing, Performance, and Performativity* (Oxford: Oxford UP), 71.

works of poetry. By pushing themselves into Rimell's *angulus*, that poetically charged space full of tranquility and violence, Horace and Marvell further rather than limit their poetic autonomy and the range of expressive performance they are able to achieve by means of it.

Bibliography

- Barchiesi, Alessandro. "Carmina: Odes and Carmen Saeculare." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by Stephen Harrison, 144-161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Colie, Rosalie L. 1970. *"My Ecchoing Song": Andrew Marvell's Poetry of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Coolidge, John S. 1965. "Marvell and Horace." *Modern Philology* 63 (2): 111-120.
www.jstor.org/stable/435711.
- Crewe, Jonathan. 1994. "The Garden State: Marvell's Poetics of Enclosure." In *Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property, and Culture in Early Modern England*, edited by Richard Burt and John Michael Archer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Davis, Gregson. 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Faust, Joan. 2012. *Andrew Marvell's Liminal Lyrics: The Space Between*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Fitzgerald, William. 2018. "The Space of the Poem: Imperial Trajectories in Catullus and Horace." In *The Production of Space in Latin Literature*, edited by William Fitzgerald and Efrossini Spentzou, 147-167. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, Don. 2009. "Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics." In *Horace Odes and Epodes*, edited by Michèle Lowrie, 247-270. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freudenburg, Kirk. 2012. "Recusatio as Political Theatre: Horace's Letter to Augustus." *Journal of Roman Studies*, 105. doi:10.1017/S007543581300124X.

- Garrod, H. W, ed. 1901. *Q. Horati Flacci: Opera*. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gowers, Emily. 2012. *Horace: Satires Book I*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1992. "Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, edited by Anton Powell, 26-58. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Leishman, J. B. 1966. *The Art of Marvell's Poetry*. London: Hutchinson Press.
- Lowrie, Michèle. 2009. *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, Roland. 2012. *Horace: Odes Book I*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, Kathleen. 2019. *I, the Poet*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Murray, Nicholas. 2000. *World Enough and Time: The Life of Andrew Marvell*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and Margaret Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nutall, A. D. 1993. "Marvell and Horace: Color and Translucency." In *Horace Made New: Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*, edited by Charles Martindale and David Hopkins, 86-102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Patterson, Annabel. 1978. *Marvell and the Civic Crown*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pucci, Pietro. 1975. "Horace's Banquet in Odes 1.17." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 105, 259-81. doi:10.2307/283945.
- Rimell, Victoria. 2015. *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics: Empire's Inward Turn*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Nigel, ed. 2003. *The Poems of Andrew Marvell (Longman Annotated English Poets)*. London: Routledge Press.
- Worden, Blair. 2007. *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.