

17

A Question of Taste:
Horace, *Epistles* 1.14.6-9

E. J. KENNEY

I

“The first book of *Epistles* is, after all, the consummation of Horace’s poetical development.” So A. Y. Campbell;¹ and so, more recently, Carl Becker: “Erst in den Briefen und in der späten Lyrik vollendet sich das, was in seinen früheren Dichtungen angebahnt ist; diese Gebilde sind die Krönung des horazischen Werkes”.² Yet the volume of critical and scholarly literature on the first book of the *Epistles* is modest in comparison with that on the *Odes* or the *Satires*,³ and in this reticence of the interpreters may perhaps be discerned a warning. With all their charm and superficial lucidity the *Epistles* are curiously elusive compositions: “ces textes . . . continuent de résister aux tentatives modernes de définition”.⁴ I do not know that the problem has been better posed than by Professor Rudd: “The trouble is that once the naively literal approach is abandoned it becomes very difficult to define the nature of the *Epistles* in a way which will give due weight to both art and life”.⁵ For whereas the assessment of the balance of *Wahrheit* and *Dichtung* in the *Odes* may be, to some extent at least, assisted by considerations of genre and precedent, no such guidance is available to the critic of the *Epistles*. For these poems

¹ A. Y. Campbell, *Horace: a new interpretation* (1924) 257. The attribution of a similar verdict to Montaigne by J. Préaux, *Q. Horatius Flaccus Epistulae Liber primus . . .* (1968) 13 n. 1 seems to be based on a lapse of memory. Montaigne’s words “le plus accompli ouvrage de la Poësie” refer to the *Georgics*.

² C. Becker, *Das Spätwerk des Horaz* (1963) 10.

³ As was remarked many years ago by Richard Heinze in his preface to the 3rd edition (1908) of his revision of Kiessling’s commentary; a glance at *L’année philologique* will show that things have not changed.

⁴ Préaux (n. 1) 1.

⁵ N. Rudd, reviewing McGann (below, n. 9), *C.R.* n.s. 21 (1971) 56.

there is no real precedent and they cannot be assigned to a genre; whatever partial antecedents we may trace for this or that feature, as a whole they are, as Fraenkel has said, a unique literary creation: "nothing comparable . . . had ever existed in Greek or Roman literature".⁶

The epithet chosen by Fraenkel to characterize Epistles I is interesting: he calls the collection "the most harmonious of Horace's books".⁷ It is, I believe, the *mot juste*; but before simply acquiescing in it we should ponder its implications. "Harmony" implies a good deal: that the content of the letters harmonizes with the form, that the personal and autobiographical elements harmonize with the didactic and doctrinal, that the individual letters harmonize with each other to combine into a rounded whole: to give, in Horace's own words, a *libellus* that is *totus teres atque rotundus*. Horace clearly went to some pains to contrive a formally symmetrical structure for the book;⁸ and recent work on the relationships of the individual letters with each other has shown, in spite of differences of emphasis between the critics, that this static symmetry is complemented by a dynamic "plot" which entails that each letter should be read in the light of those that precede and follow it.⁹

Such, briefly, are the considerations—the elusiveness of Horace in these poems and the principle *Epistulas ex Epistulis interpretari*—that we shall do well to bear in mind in investigating the problem of lines 6 to 9 of the fourteenth Epistle.

II

me quamuis Lamiae pietas et cura moratur
fratrem maerentis, raptō de fratre dolentis
insolabiliter, tamen istuc mens animusque
fert et auet spatiis obstantia rumpere claustra.

9 auet *Bentley*: amat *codd.*

This passage has become something of a cardinal text in the discussion about whether, or to what extent, the Epistles are "real" or "genuine" letters. Fraenkel argued strongly that it "clearly shows that this is not a 'sermon' hung up on some arbitrarily chosen peg, but a true letter, spontaneously written in circumstances which are still recognizable . . .

⁶ E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957) 309 and n. 1. ⁷ *Ibid.* ⁸ See *Appendix*.

⁹ See G. Maurach, "Der Grundriss von Horazens erstem Epistelbuch," *Acta classica* 11 (1968) 73-124; M. J. McGann, *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles* (Coll. Latomus 100, 1969). Maurach takes the notion of a "plot" very much further than McGann is prepared to do, but both agree independently, for instance, on the need to read *Ep.* 11 as in some sense correcting 10 (Maurach 104, McGann 60).

These lines [6–9] bear the stamp of reality. Horace's sympathy for Lamia has prevented him for the time being from returning to his Sabine farm. Otherwise he would not have written this letter but would have talked things over with the bailiff."¹⁰ How literally Fraenkel meant the last sentence of this to be taken we have no means of knowing; possibly he really did intend to suggest that the very existence of this artfully written piece is due to the (presumably untimely) demise of Lamia's unfortunate brother, who thus all unwittingly played the part of a sort of anti-Person from Porlock. Be that particular point as it may, Fraenkel's argument has not carried much weight with subsequent interpreters of the poem. Williams allows that "the occasion which keeps him in Rome is certainly genuine; the very mention of it is a compliment to Lamia . . . and a consolation." However, he also contends, citing in support Catullus *cc.* 65 and 68, that "this fact does not in the least prevent the lines also being an artistic device intended to mark the composition formally as a letter."¹¹ This too is how the question is viewed by McGann: "Yet the passage can equally well be regarded as an indication of Horace's skill in giving the impression that he is writing a real letter."¹² Becker on the one hand rejects the notion that Horace can have invented his excuse—this is ruled out by the evident sincerity and warmth of the verses; on the other hand he finds it difficult to accept that the poem sprang from the (regarded from a purely literary point of view) fortunate conjunction of Lamia's bereavement and the bailiff's discontent. Having posed this dilemma he evades it by declaring it to be irrelevant: "der Brief will nicht in eine bestimmte Lage eingreifen."¹³ This, substantially, is also the position of Hiltbrunner, who concludes that our understanding of the poem does not depend on a solution of this problem.¹⁴

I cite these recent discussions in some detail because it seems to me that they illustrate the way in which consideration of the passage and of the problem which it poses—which I believe to be a real and important one—has gradually drifted away from the essential point which engaged the attention of at least some of the older interpreters. With Becker and Hiltbrunner, indeed, we are perilously close to what Stephen Potter called "the 'for God's sake' branch of the 'After all' section of writership."¹⁵ With a careful writer like Horace it is simply not good enough to resort to such a *pis aller*, at least until alternative possibilities have been adequately

¹⁰ Fraenkel (n. 6) 310–311.

¹¹ G. Williams, *Tradition and originality in Roman poetry* (1968) 13.

¹² McGann (n. 9) 90. ¹³ Becker (n. 2) 21–23.

¹⁴ O. Hiltbrunner, "Der Gutsverwalter des Horaz (epist. 1, 14)," *Gymnasium* 74 (1967) 301. ¹⁵ S. Potter, *Some notes on Lifemanship* (1950) 75.

explored. Whether or not Horace really had a bailiff who was the exact antitype of the ideal Catonian *vilicus* is, we may agree with Williams, irrelevant.¹⁶ For the purpose of this Epistle the bailiff, if he did not exist, had to be invented; none of Horace's contemporary readers would have been disconcerted to discover on enquiry that the real man was actually a frugal and sturdy hind in whom there well appeared the constant service of the antique world—and no more should we. The case of Lamia and his brother is different. To justify his staying in Rome Horace could have made any excuse that he chose, so long as it appeared dramatically plausible. Why did he choose this one? Mention of an actual contemporary in an Epistle might be simply complimentary and honorific; but was the occasion in this case tactfully chosen? It is a matter of taste and propriety.

This seems to be what lies behind Wickham's note: "The feeling of this reference to Lamia's sorrow and Horace's sympathy, though it would be rather incongruous in a letter actually intended for the 'vilicus,' is natural and appropriate if we look on the Epistle as intended rather for the eyes of the poet's friends."¹⁷ But Wickham's conclusion will not really do, for the letter is after all addressed to the bailiff, and even if the choice of addressee is no more than a convenient literary device (as was held, for instance, by Morris),¹⁸ yet a competent literary craftsman may surely be expected to preserve and enhance the epistolary illusion that he has created rather than to go out of his way to undermine it. In general Horace went to some trouble in the Epistles to do just that,¹⁹ and the discussion that has centered on our passage now and again betrays an uneasy feeling that the illusion has here somehow been impaired. Argument on such a point is bound to be partly, if not very largely, subjective, but questions of taste by definition *are* subjective; that is no reason for banishing them from critical argument. When McGann criticizes Morris's arguments about the "reality" of *Ep.* 1.5 as resting "on an *a priori* idea of what is not admissible in a real letter written in verse by a poet," he does not thereby disable them.²⁰ In matters of literary decorum *a priori* arguments are sometimes the only ones available, and they are not to be despised.

We come back, then, to the question broached but sidestepped by Wickham: what is the effect in this particular Epistle of a reference such as we here encounter to a friend's bereavement? The tone of the poem

¹⁶ Williams (n. 11) 12.

¹⁷ E. C. Wickham, *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera omnia* . . . II (1891) 278.

¹⁸ E. P. Morris, "The form of the Epistle in Horace," *T.C.S.* 2 (1931) 102.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 109-112. ²⁰ McGann (n. 9) 90.

as a whole is light: Horace resurrects his former self, the spruce boulevardier and squire of dames, in language that recalls the Odes:

quem tenues decuere togae nitidique capilli,
 quem scis immunem Cinarae placuisse rapaci,
 quem bibulum liquidi media de luce Falerni,
 cena brevis iuvat et prope riuum somnus in herba. (32-5)

These are the genteel counterparts of the bailiff's coarser diversions (24-26); the revocation of an (agreeably) misspent youth is in Horace's best ironical vein. Could Lamia really have been pleased to find his heartfelt grief figuring in such a context? And if Horace was really Lamia's friend, would he even implicitly have admitted to wanting to be anywhere but at his side at such a time? The possibility that a reader of the Epistle might imagine that his attendance on Lamia was one of the *inuisa negotia* (17) that were all too apt to detain him in Rome was categorically denied by Kiessling,²¹ but I do not see what his denial was based on, and other interpreters such as Préaux and Stégen are prepared to admit it.²² If that difference of opinion connotes a real ambiguity, can Horace be acquitted of a charge of careless writing? Would he, of all poets, have exposed himself and a friend to such an uncharitable misconstruction?

The time has come to look at the passage more closely and see what Horace in fact says in it. However, the answer to that question turns in large measure on a close examination of the language used. It is emphatic, more than a little solemn, and, as the commentators have not failed to point out, heavily tinged with Lucretian influence.

7 The anaphoric phrases *fratrem maerentis . . . de fratre dolentis* are managed (chiasmus avoided) so as to throw great weight on the word *fratrem*, which occupies the first foot. The line has as a result a slightly archaic "feel."

8 *insolabiliter* is ἀπαξ εἰρημένον and seems to be a Horatian coinage on the model of Lucretius' *insatiabiliter* (3.907). *mens animusque* is of course a Lucretian tag. Rhythmically the line is, by Augustan standards, stiff and archaic.

9 It would beg the question to plead in evidence Bentley's correction *auet*, which is founded on an appeal to *D.R.N.* 2.265.²³ But leaving that

²¹ "*negotia*, also Geldgeschäfte u. dgl.: keine *officia*." How can he have known that?

²² Préaux (n. 1) 147; G. Stégen, *L'unité et la clarté des Épîtres d'Horace. Étude sur sept pièces du premier livre* (4, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16) (1963) 75.

²³ Cf. Fraenkel (n. 6) 311 n. 1. The arguments of Préaux (n. 1) 145 and Stégen (n. 22) 73 n. 6 in favour of the transmitted *amat* do not carry conviction. In the context *amat* is intolerably feeble and spoils the tonal unity of the verses.

word aside, both image and language are Lucretian: Horace seems to have had in mind, not only the race-course image of *D.R.N.* 2.263–265 but also, and perhaps predominantly, the *arta naturae claustra* through which the mind of Epicurus yearned to burst. So, rightly, Stégen: “Son amitié pour Lamia n’empêche pas que cette ville où il s’attarde soit pour lui une prison.”²⁴ This gives a more natural sense to *claustra*, which is not a usual equivalent for *carceres*; in fact no example of this sense appears to be attested before Horace.²⁵ There is enjambment between all verses, especially strong between 6–7 and 8–9; the movement of the passage contributes to its urgency and in particular imparts emphasis to the concluding verse: Horace’s longing for the country is so intense that it can only be conveyed in words that recall the daemonic urge that sent Epicurus on his mental voyage of discovery round the cosmos.

Might Lamia and his friends perhaps have felt that this was laying it on a bit thick? Can the language of these verses have been intended to be taken seriously? If the race-course metaphor is present, what is its propriety in the context? Of if, as seems more probable, the lines are meant to remind the reader of Lucretius, and the *spatia* are the distance that separates Horace from his country retreat, is not the implied equation of Epicurus’ immense voyage with the road from Rome to the *Sabinum* somewhat overdone—if it is seriously intended? That the third book of the *De Rerum Natura* was in Horace’s mind when he wrote this Epistle is indicated by vv. 12–13, which condense in a nutshell the thought of *D.R.N.* 3.1053–1075.²⁶ And vv. 7–8 inevitably recall another passage from the same book:

*insatiabiliter defleuimus aeternumque
nulla dies nobis maerorem e pectore demet.* (907–908)

Lucretius’ tone in that passage is mordant and sarcastic;²⁷ unless Horace had totally misunderstood him, which I am reluctant to believe, it was hardly tactful to recall it at this juncture if vv. 6–9 were meant to appear as a serious reflection of Lamia’s grief. And, to come back to our first question: was it appropriate to represent that grief in such high-flown language when the objective at the other end of the intervening *spatia* turns out to be nothing more urgent or uplifting than a comfortable little dinner with a snooze by the brook to follow,

cena breuis . . . et prope riuum somnus in herba?

²⁴ Stégen (n. 22) 75.

²⁵ Two only in *T.L.L.* III 1321.8–9: Manil. 5.76, Sidon. *Carm.* 23.331.

²⁶ Cf. especially 1058–1059 *quaerere semper/commutare locum*; 1068–1070 *hoc se quisque modo fugit, at quem scilicet, ut fit, effugere haud potis est, ingratis haeret et odil/ propterea, morbi quia causam non tenet aeger.*

²⁷ Cf. my note *ad loc.*

That is all that Horace's restoration to himself (1), in this Epistle, seems to amount to.

III

Had Lamia's brother really died, or was Lamia merely carrying on as if he had? Horace only says that he was *raptus*; by death, say the commentators, quoting parallels, but not such as prove the point. We may, however, compare *C.* 4.2.21-22 *febili sponsae iuuenemque raptum | plorat*; but there the context is unambiguous, which is not the case here. A person may be ravished by other agencies than death, and *maeror* may be due to other causes than bereavement. Not the least powerful of the forces that may sweep a man away is love: *Prop.* 2.25.44 *utraque forma rapit*, *Ov. Am.* 2.19.19 *rapuisti . . . ocellos*, al.; cf. *A.R.* 3.1018-1019 $\tau\eta\varsigma \delta' \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma | \acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \eta\eta\rho\alpha\acute{\zeta}\epsilon\nu$. Is it possible that Lamia's brother had got himself entangled with just such another as the *rapax Cinara* that Horace himself remembered from his own young days, and that Lamia was, shall we say, slightly over-reacting? In that case there would be an obvious point in the use of the inflated language borrowed from Lucretius as conveying a strong hint of the essential triviality of the *inuisa negotia* that kept the poet from his comfortable villeggiatura. On this interpretation the ambiguity of *raptus* is part of the playful effect; for this a parallel is at hand in Horace himself, at *C.* 2.9.9-12:

tu semper urges flebilibus modis
Mysten ademptum nec tibi uespero
surgente decedunt amores
nec rapidum fugiente solem.

Professor Quinn is surely right to suggest on this passage "that Mystes, unlike Antiochus and Troilus, had been 'snatched away' (*ademptum* leaves the issue very open), not by death, but by our old friend the rich admirer—*diues amator*".²⁸

That interpretation is recommended, as Quinn rightly argues, by the tone of the rest of the Ode. So with our Epistle. This is not a solemn composition: "the mood is the product of the desire to escape from entanglement, viewed half-lightly."²⁹ Horace is not seriously concerned to straighten out his bailiff so much as to use him as a foil for an aspect of that most perennially fascinating of all topics, himself.³⁰ At the end of

²⁸ K. Quinn, *Latin explorations. Critical studies in Roman literature* (1963) 160. On this poem see now P. Murgatroyd, *Mnem.* 4, 28 (1975) 69-71. ²⁹ Morris (n. 18) 102.

³⁰ K. J. Reckford, *Horace* (1969) 113: "unlike Fuscus, he [the bailiff] shares less in Horace's humor than bears its brunt." The engaging picture of the bailiff as partner of Horace's joys and sorrows drawn by J. Perret, *Horace* (1959) 144, can hardly be extracted from the text.

the Epistle the man is in effect told pretty brusquely to grin and bear his lot—"halt's Maul und weiter dienen." There is no real attempt to *reason* him out of his belief that city life is the life for him. Horace has been reasoned out of his own affection for Rome by the passage of the years: since he no longer wants to dress sharply, chat up girls, and get drunk, these things have lost their virtue for him. It is not that he is ashamed of having sown wild oats, but enough is enough (39). In spite of the efforts of interpreters to invest the Epistle, if not with profundity, with significance, there is precious little here that deserves to be called serious argument. One well-worn commonplace from the diatribe provides what doctrinal basis the poem may boast. To say that is not to criticize it adversely or to belittle Horace's art: it is greatly to his credit that he has written so pleasing a piece on this slender foundation. But what we have here is a soufflé, not an argumentative pièce de résistance. That indeed I believe to be the whole point: the insubstantial character of the argument is meant to suggest the insecurity of Horace's philosophical position.

If then the Epistle is very largely a joke at Horace's own expense, a reference to a real bereavement, even by way of literary compliment to the bereaved, must in terms of the taste of any age be accounted a lapse of propriety. A jocular reference to the amours of a friend's brother, however, would be quite another thing. Once upon a time Horace himself had played the fool with the Cinaras of this world and had taken an interest in the similar affairs of his intimates, had pressed for details and had been lyrically sympathetic to the ensuing revelations—

a, miser,
 quanta laborabas Charybdi,³¹
 digne puer meliore flamma. (C. 1. 27. 18-20)

Sed haec prius fuere: nowadays to have to stay in Rome to help Lamia to prise his silly young brother loose from one of the tribe—especially with Lamia carrying on as if the boy had come to an untimely end—was simply a monumental bore. He does not say so in so many words, but the ironical echo of Lucretius strongly suggests that this was what he felt. This is not the only passage in the Epistles where Horace twists a Lucretian allusion to his own purposes.³² If the tone of vv. 6-8 implies that Lamia is making an excessive fuss, equally the tone of vv. 8-9 may imply that Horace himself is at fault for equating a retreat to the country with

³¹ On Charybdis as a symbol of rapacity in the orators and poets see Nisbet-Hubbard *ad loc.* For the role of the confidant cf. *Epod.* 11.25-26.

³² Cf. 1.11.9-10 and the comment of C. Diano, "Orazio e l'epicureismo," *Atti dell'Ist. veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti.* Cl. di sc. mor. e lett. 120 (1961-1962) 43-58.

escape: for if it is true that a man can never escape himself (13), then—as indeed the Stoics held—place is neither here nor there, and Horace's rural idyll was to a large extent a confession of weakness and self-indulgence. Not entirely so, perhaps; other things being equal a man was no doubt better employed looking after his farm than wasting time in Rome. But the Lucretian language and ideas of vv. 8–9, 12–13 expose the lack of a real philosophical basis for the argument. If Lamia's brother is in some sense Horace's old self, his tribulations to be viewed with a certain detachment, if not impatience, Horace's new self is, philosophically speaking, a bit of a fraud. He may be consistent (16) and to that extent a better man than his bailiff, but he is still as yet some way from a solution to his problems.

IV

We may now look outside the Epistle itself and consider its place in the general scheme or what I have called the "plot" of the book as a whole. It will in fact be enough to take into account only *Epp.* 10–14, which form a group (the function of *Ep.* 13 being mainly that of what may be called punctuation)³³ in which the chief emphasis lies on the connexion, or lack of it, between happiness and place. In *Ep.* 10, as in 14, Horace contrasts his love of the country with his correspondent's attachment to Rome. As often in the Epistles, the argument is not easy to follow when one attempts to get to grips with it, but the end of the letter finds Horace apparently in no doubt about where, for him, contentment is to be sought: the last word of the text is *laetus*. In the following letter this position is by implication subjected to a fresh examination and, if not rejected, at least somewhat qualified, for at the end of it Horace reasserts the standard philosophical precept that the true *sapiens* can achieve contentment anywhere. In *Ep.* 11, as between town and country, he is neutral: happiness is in the mind. *Ep.* 12 is addressed, like 14, to a steward, though one of superior class to the *vilicus*, one Iccius, a figure whom we have already encountered in the Odes. Again the theme is contentment (2 *si recte frueris* e.q.s.), though the idea of place, in so far as it is present, is given a different turn: Iccius, it is suggested with unmistakable irony (15), would be more likely to find contentment with his lot if he came down to earth and attended to what is going on around him. Irony, "l'arme des gens du monde,"³⁴ would be wasted on Horace's own steward, who, as we have seen, is put in his place in *Ep.* 14 without any of the

³³ See *Appendix*.

³⁴ E. Courbaud, *Horace, sa vie et sa pensée à l'époque des Épîtres* (1914) 151.

ceremony deemed tactful for Iccius. But one of the underlying implications of both letters, as of *Epp.* 10 and 11, is the same: in all of them Horace presents himself, in contrast with the addressees, as having attained to some measure of equanimity, as having to some degree succeeded in coming to terms with himself and his surroundings. *μεμψιμοιρία*, it is rather smugly implied, is something other people suffer from, and Horace has earned the right to offer advice from a point of relative vantage. It is true that in *Ep.* 14 he stops short of the extreme position that he seems to commend at the end of *Ep.* 11, that true equanimity and place are unconnected, but at least he can claim that he knows what is best *for him* and that his behaviour is consistent. His preference for a quiet and frugal life in the country may not be based on fundamental philosophical considerations, but at any rate his experience has taught him what best suits his case. To that extent contentment has not only been secured but is seen to be allied to self-knowledge.

The impression cumulatively built up in *Epp.* 10–14 is blown to the winds by the opening sentence of *Ep.* 15. A monster indirect question, inflated by parentheses, of twenty-five verses shows Horace as a fussy valetudinarian, intensely preoccupied with the choice of a suitable spa for his cure, with the right kind of wine for seaside drinking, and with the availability of game and seafood—so much for the *cena brevis*! For, as he archly tells us at the end of the letter, his self-denial can resist anything but temptation (42–46). Several features of *Ep.* 15 distinguish it from all the other poems in the book and suggest an affinity with the Satires. Whether Horace deliberately wrote it in this style for this place between *Epp.* 14 and 16³⁵ or whether it was an earlier piece that he still had by him³⁶ and which luckily came pat, makes no difference to its effect in its context—one of robust deflation. The general impression of Horace as, if not *sapiens*, at least *proficiens*, that had seemed to emerge from *Ep.* 10 onwards is abruptly and rudely dissipated.

Whatever reservations one may have on the score of technique about this sudden reversion to the manner of the Satires, the intention is clear: Horace has humorously destroyed the self-portrait that he has been engaged in painting. Yet hints that the portrait was not to be taken with entire seriousness can be detected, as has already been argued, in *Ep.* 14—indeed the motto of that poem might have been *satis inter uilia fortis* (15.43). It is because the pursuit of Cinara and what is associated with it are now *uilia* to Horace that he can afford to renounce them so cheerfully. The bailiff still hankers after such things, but that is his bad luck;

³⁵ For the suggestion that it provides an effective foil to the serious and noble *Ep.* 16 see McGann (n. 9) 73.

³⁶ So Courbaud (n. 34) 195.

he has no choice but to fall in with Horace's wishes, not because Horace is a better philosopher than he, as the beginning of the Epistle appears to suggest will emerge from the discussion (4-5), but because he is the master. In this light-hearted and humorously self-critical atmosphere the theme of grief for a dead brother is intrusive. It strikes a quite inopportune note of solemnity, which is at odds, not only with *Ep.* 14 itself but with the whole tone and tenor of the group of Epistles of which it forms part. If I am wrong about this and Horace did mean to refer seriously to a serious subject, he seems to me to have been guilty of a bad error of literary and social taste. I prefer myself to believe him incapable of such a solecism; I suspect, however, that most of his admirers will not after all these years readily countenance the demotion of the lachrymose Lamia from a figure of tragedy to one of high comedy, and I look forward to reading more than one impassioned defence of Horace's warm humanity and compassion for his grief-stricken friend.

APPENDIX

The "static" schema, as I have called it, of Epistles Book I is simple:

1	To Maecenas
	2-6
7	To Maecenas
	8-12
13	To (Augustus)
	14-18
19	To Maecenas
	20

The separate status of *Ep.* 20 (analogous to but more sharply defined than that of *Eclogue* 10) is reinforced by the double responson of the addressees of 1 and 19 (Maecenas), 2 and 18 (Lollius). *Ep.* 13, ostensibly to Vinnius Valens, is really to the address of Augustus. Its status in the architecture of the book is seen more clearly if it refers, not as has usually been held to *Odes* I-III, but as Professor M. L. Clarke has convincingly argued,³⁷ to *Epistles* I itself. The above analysis, which I formulated independently, is in basic agreement with that of Préaux;³⁸ his further elaborations strike me as in some respects questionable.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

³⁷ M. L. Clarke, "Horace, *Epistles* i. 13," *C.R.* n.s. 22 (1972) 157-159.

³⁸ Préaux (n. 1) 6.