7

The Underwood of Satire

Reading the Epodes *through Ovid's* Ibis

Tom Hawkins

In 1693 John Dryden prefixed his *Discourse on Satire* to his translation of Juvenal and Persius. In this essay, he sought, among other things, to confirm Quintilian's opinion that Roman satire had not emerged from Greek literature but was, rather, purely Roman. To do this, he had to discount certain modes of poetry which seemed linked to satire and which clearly came to Rome from Greece. After dismissing Timon of Phlius' philosophical *silloi* as something other than true satire, he mentions 'Satires which were written against particular Persons, such as were the Iambiques of Archilocus against Lycambes' (xxi). He says that various Roman examples could be adduced of this satirical subcategory, but he names only Horace's *Epodes*, a few unspecified *Odes* (probably including 1.16) and Ovid's *Ibis*. He then does away with the lot by saying 'But these are the Under-wood of Satire, rather than the Timber-trees . . . And Horace seems to have purg'd himself from those Splenetick Reflections . . . before he undertook the Noble Work of Satires, which were properly so call'd.' Dryden's comments provide a helpful precursor to this project, which draws together the *Epodes* and *Ibis* in large part through their shared iambic influences; but whereas Dryden lumps all this material together into a category of stunted and overly narrow satire that does not deserve the same attention as Horace's hexameters or the poems of Juvenal and Persius, I aim to show how Ovid's *Ibis* reacts to, even upends, Horace's *Epodes* as part of a discourse about

society that goes well beyond the narrow confines of personal invective that Dryden scorns.[1]

The *Epodes* and the *Ibis*, in which Ovid viciously excoriates an enemy whom he identifies only with the Callimachean allonym Ibis, effectively bracket the Augustan era, but while politics certainly played a crucial role in shaping both works, it is Ovid's specifically literary strategies of reading and reacting to the *Epodes* that establish that collection as the *Ibis*' opposite in many ways. Thus, while the reign of Octavian-Augustus provides the most obvious reason for speaking of an Augustan Age as a seemingly organic and discrete periodization, Ovid's allusions to the *Epodes* in his *Ibis* offer a similar rationale for seeing the period between early Horace and late Ovid as defining an equally meaningful unit. In setting up his *Ibis* as a response to the *Epodes*, Ovid positions Archaic Greek *iambos* as a key element in this dialectic relationship.[2] And thus, if our notion of an Augustan Age 'is deeply collusive with strategies of self-representation in Rome during the watch of Octavian-Augustus', then Ovid's move toward Archilochean *iambos* sets his *Ibis* as the apocalyptic antipode to Horace's *Epodes*.[3]

Ovid constructs the years between the *Epodes* and his *Ibis* as an interregnum devoid of Archilochean carnage and his angriest poem puts a menacing twist on his repeated pleas for imperial mercy. The long catalogue of mythological curses that comprises the bulk of the

[1] As such, my argument parallels that of Bather, Chapter 8 in this volume, who demonstrates how Horace's *Epodes* 8 and 12 intermingle with Ovid's *Amores* 3.7 as the literary background to Petronius' *Satyricon* 130. Although the present piece focuses exclusively on the relationship between Horace and Ovid, this story, like Bather's, could be extended to include a third layer. In the first 'Interlude' of Hawkins (2014, 82–6), I show how Martial 7.12 does precisely this as Martial denies writing *iambus* by quoting Ovid's own facetious denial of *iambus* at *Ibis* 54, which in turn looks back to Horace's iambic collection.

[2] Schiesaro (2001), especially 126–9, has interpreted Ovid's poem as constructed around a network of inversions that lead him to conclude that the *Ibis* is a form of dissimulated but extreme iambic poetry. This subject is developed further in Schiesaro (2011) 89: 'The most wide-ranging—and far-fetched—negative statement in the poem concerns its generic status: *Ibis* is not, we are told, iambic poetry.' Recent interpretations have also tended to see Augustus as the target of Ovid's abuse: Casali (1997) 107, cf. 91; Schiesaro (2001) 136 and (2011) *passim*; Oliensis (2004) 316. Ovid does give some explicit praise to Augustus in the *Ibis* (23–8), but Casali calls this part of Ovid's 'insurance-policy' (89) that obfuscates dangerous attack on Augustus, and Schiesaro (2001) 107 similarly describes it as a key passage for understanding Ovid's *inversione sistematica di topoi*.

[3] Barchiesi (2005) 281.

Ibis (paralleling the similar, smaller inventory at the end of *Epode* 17) threatens to throw the world into the chaos of myth, a hellish abyss that evokes Roman civil war through the figure of Remus, who appears in the closing lines (635–6; cf. *Epod.* 7.19–21).[4] After analysing several key issues that link the *Epodes* and the *Ibis*—the word *ibis*, Archilochus fr. 1 W., and the themes of sailing and stinking—I will suggest that we can partially access and assess the climate of discourse in Rome through Ovid's choice not to give Ibis' true name as an inversion of Horace's apparent willingness to name names.[5]

7.1. GOING WITH *IBIS*

In an illuminating article Heyworth discusses the implications of the first word of Horace's *Epodes*.[6] At the head of that famous verse (*Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium*) sits the title of Callimachus' allegedly most invective poem: his *Ibis*. Of course Horace's word must mean 'you will go', but Heyworth recognized that the coincidence of the name of the bird and the verb stretches the plausibility of coincidence if we refuse to hear some echo of Callimachus' title. And as he notes, if

[4] The *Epodes* are hardly dominated by mythological imagery, and other themes, such as historical, agrarian, and weather-based motifs, exert parallel influences. The *Ibis*, by contrast, is a veritable encyclopedia of mythological disasters, a topic discussed most recently by Krasne (2012). Thus, we should not make too much of overlapping mythological references in these works. Nonetheless, it is helpful to have such points of contact set out (limited here to explicit narrative details rather than more oblique allusions). Medea and Hercules appear several times in the *Epodes* and *Ibis*, though only rarely is the same episode mentioned. Medea appears in both works only through the image of the fatal Corinthian bridal gifts: *Epod.* 3.10–14 and 5.61–66; *Ibis* 603–4; and Hercules does so only in terms of being burned by Nessus' poison: *Epod.* 3.17–18 and 17.30–2 and *Ibis* 347 and 605–6. Tantalus, Sisyphus, and Prometheus appear together at *Epod.* 17.65–9 and *Ibis* 175–94, though their narratives are so similar that this clustering is hardly surprising. The drowning of Ajax son of Oileus is mentioned at *Epod.* 10.11–14 and *Ibis* 341–2; and Telephus receiving help from Achilles is at *Epod.* 17.8–10 and *Ibis* 255–6. As discussed below, Remus appears at *Epod.* 7.19–21 and *Ibis* 635–6 (the last lines of the poem).

[5] Many of the characters whom Horace names will be discussed below. For Horace's attack on an unnamed figure in *Epode* 4 and for the possibility that this poem owes a debt to Anacreon's invective against Artemon (*PMG* 388), see Morrison, Chapter 1 in this volume, p. 38 and n. 32. Brown (1983) has interpreted the latter poem in terms of its connections with Archaic *iambos*.

[6] Heyworth (1993). Watson (2003) 59 disagrees with several of Heyworth's points. See also Mankin (1995) 6 n. 28 and 12 n. 44; Schiesaro (2001) 129–30.

we wanted a name for Horace's collection of poems, which are neither entirely epodic nor, in strict terms, iambic, we could do worse than calling this volume Horace's *Ibis*.[7] I agree with much of Heyworth's assessment, but especially in light of recent readings of Ovid's *Ibis* we can profitably revisit this matter.

Most importantly, and as Heyworth mentions in passing, much of what we think we know about Callimachus' *Ibis* comes from Ovid's poem of the same name.[8] That is: Ovid's *Ibis* helps us tie Horace and Callimachus together. But this also bears upon the close connection between Horace and Ovid, and I suspect that Horace's *Epodes* play a key role in Ovid's formulation of his invective poem. That does not mean that the connections with Callimachus that Ovid trumpets are not real, but rather that a more covert Horatian agenda is at work in the *Ibis* as well. When we return to Horace's opening lines in light of Heyworth's idea about a Callimachean allusion, Ovid's poem strongly suggests it is a reception of and response to Horace's collection.

Horace begins: *Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium | amice, propugnacula*, 'You will go with Liburnians, my friend, 'mid tall prows of battleships.' The Archilochean metre[9] and the collection's title, whether *Iambi* or *Epodes*, suggest invective.[10] A nod to Callimachus' scathing *Ibis* fits right into the mix, but it also creates the expectation

[7] Mankin (1995) 6 n. 28 and 12 n. 44 notes that there is no evidence that any of Horace's works were ever known by their first words nor do we have any clear evidence that Callimachus' *Iambi* influenced Horace's *Epodes*. The latter point seems excessively skeptical, and in this volume Morrison (Chapter 1) persuasively argues for stronger Callimachean influence upon the *Epodes* than has at times been acknowledged.

[8] Rostagni (1920), capped in typically biting style by Housman (1921), argued that Ovid's *Ibis* was a translation of Callimachus' poem with an original proem prepended. See Kolar (1933) for more on this topic. The best and most thorough treatment of Ovid's *Ibis* is Williams (1996).

[9] Horace's metrical variety in the *Epodes* reflects a strong Archilochean influence, and he altogether avoids both the choliamb, a veritable Hipponactean signature that was popular among both Hellenistic and neoteric poets, and the epodic forms found in Callimachus' *Iambi*. Of the seventeen *Epodes*, only *Epodes* 13 (dactylic hexameter followed by a dactylic tetrameter catalectic) and 16 (dactylic hexameter followed by an iambic trimeter) employ patterns not securely attested among Archilochus' extant fragments, though these metrical schemes may have been used in poems that are now lost.

[10] The title *Epodes* is first attested by Porphyrio, probably in the third century AD. Because of this, and Horace's own reference to his *iambi*, scholars (e.g. Mankin (1995) 12) have typically assumed the original title to have been *Iambi*. Yet Cavarzere (1992) 9–14 has made a powerful case for understanding *iambi* as a reference to a genre, rather than a title. Harrison (2001) 167 accepts Cavarzere's argument, as do Morrison p. 39 and Goh pp. 80–1 in this volume (Chapters 1 and 2 respectively). Watson (2007)

of a withering tone that Horace immediately undermines. By the time we hit *amice* in the second line, we have moved in a new direction. Tibullus, in a poem generally assumed to have been written *after* Horace's *Epode* 1, may provide a clue that this shift was recognized more or less immediately, since he seems to allude to Horace's opening when he asks Mesalla if he will go across the Aegean without him: *Ibitis Aegaeas sine me, Mesalla, per undas | O utinam memores ipse cohorsque mei*, 'Will you go over the waves of the Aegean without me, Mesalla? I hope that you and your crew will remember me', 1.3.1–2. Tibullus' lines exactly follow Horace's in stationing the poet at the dock as the patron sails off (*ibitis, ibis*) toward a military conflict in the east, but Tibullus' poem admits no obvious iambic colouring. If it is an allusion to *Epode* 1, therefore, it likely points up the ease with which the sentiment of that line fits into an elegiac context.

Tibullus' use of the elegiac form strikes a plangent tone as the two companions are separated, and that distance mimics the space between the typical elegiac lover and his beloved. Yet Horace's iambic form creates a different mood for his hail and farewell. From the late Classical era *iambos* tended to be virtually synonymous with blistering and low-register abuse, but such invective frequently involved the negotiation of friendships.[11] Group identity could be strengthened by the excoriation of a common enemy or stock boogeyman, but friendly raillery could also be delivered in joking fun or as a means of reprimanding behaviour. Archilochus' abuse of Pericles for barging into a symposium uninvited and drinking up all the wine presents an example of this (fr. 124 W.). A fellow symposiast is unlikely to be an enemy, so Pericles is probably enduring some form of friendly teasing

94 leaves the matter open. Barchiesi (2002) 64 plays with the potential evocations of magic, healing, and poison that emerge from accepting *Epodes* as the Horatian title.

[11] See Nagy (1979) 222–52, especially his idea of Archilochean *iambos* as offering an 'affirmation of *philotês* in the community' (251). Mankin (1995) 7–9 largely accepts this model in his reading of Horace's *Epodes*. Johnson (2012) takes a more nuanced approach in his overarching claim that Horace's hybrid iambic criticism of Roman society can produce positive benefits for the wider community. Rotstein (2010) shows that the fuller range of what archaic *iambos* actually had been narrowed in the classical era so that its enduring reputation focuses almost exclusively on strong invective. In this volume, Morrison, pp. 43 and 51 (Chapter 1), discusses the surprising presence of friendship at the opening of the *Epodes*; and Giusti p. 113 (Chapter 5) analyses Horace's strategic use of a 'general confusion of friend–enemy roles which is inherent in the very concept of civil war'.

or mocking chastisement. Whereas Tibullus presents Mesalla's departure in a form that shades into the realm of erotics, Horace may do so with a dash of joking camaraderie.

As we move to Ovid's poem, we can wonder to what extent he anticipated Heyworth's thesis. If Horace's *ibis* picks up on Callimachus' *Ibis*, then surely Ovid's poem picks up on Horace's. Schiesaro has already underscored this connection in his comment that Ovid transforms the emphasis of the first *Epode* by reworking Horatian friendship in a military context into a poem about personal hostility couched as all-out war.[12] Some years before Schiesaro's arguments, Casali had suggested a reading of Ovid's word *ibis* that we can try to apply to Horace's usage. Casali claims that Ovid's title evokes the verb 'you will go' in two reinforcing ways.[13] First, it recalls the verdict Augustus rendered against Ovid, 'you will go to the shores of the Black Sea', and throws it back in the emperor's face. As this word hurtles back toward the *princeps*, Casali hears a colloquial meaning of *ire* as 'to die.' Thus, the emperor's initial command, 'you shall go, Ovid', comes back as 'you will die, Augustus'. Casali's dynamic interpretation opens an Ovidian commentary on the Horatian scenario.

An Ovidian reception of Horace's *ibis* could be accusatory by pointing out the vastly different conditions of imperial patronage under which each author worked. Oliensis has shown how early Horace and late Ovid look like mirror reflections of one another:[14] one young poet began his career fighting against Octavian but soon found himself warmly embraced by the new regime; the other poet, who as a young man had been the darling of Rome without ever laying a finger on any *arma*, suddenly fell afoul of the long-tenured emperor and finally had to take up poetic weapons to fight for survival. Or perhaps we might use Casali's idea to move in a more ironic direction by seeing an attempt to simulate and insinuate antagonism into the relationship between Horace and Maecenas. Horace, whom Dryden called a 'well Manner'd Court Slave', claims that all is well with his patron, but Ovid could twist the opening sentiment of *Epode* 1 to suggest otherwise.[15] Ovid may hint darkly,

[12] Schiesaro (2001) 31–3. [13] Casali (1997) 104–6.

[14] Oliensis (2004) 307–8.

[15] *Sat.* 1.6.45–8 and 1.9.43–60 claim that long before Ovid others were already suspicious of Horace's flattery of Maecenas.

that is, at the burdens of patronage (from which his exilic persona is now distanced), and we can imagine him re-reading Horace's opening words as 'Go to Hell, Maecenas'. This is probably not what Horace intended; and it may not be what Ovid intended either; but Casali's method of reading beyond the written lines and Oliensis' careful attention to psychoanalytic implications at work in his poems generate a momentum that does not require the validation of authorial intention.

7.2. WAR AND POETRY IN ARCHILOCHUS FR. 1 W.

The elegiac couplet that we typically refer to as Archilochus' first fragment, preserved by Plutarch and Athenaeus, may have been the opening lines of an Alexandrian edition of Archilochean elegy, but whatever their position or prominence in ancient collections of Archilochus' poetry, the critical point to begin with is that these lines are not in an iambic metre. Yet Rotstein has compellingly argued that the range and variegation of Archilochean poetry was constrained in the Classical era in such a way that the invective portions came to dominate nearly everyone's thinking about him and his verse.[16] Thus, I will proceed on the assumption that poets such as Horace and Ovid likely understood these two lines as part of Archilochus' overall and overarching performance of his poetic biography. These lines are not in an iambic metre, that is, but their legacy probably impinged upon later imaginings of the great *iambopoios*.[17]

With the two lines of fr. 1 W., Archilochus constructs discrete but connected roles for himself: *εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος | καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος*, 'I am a servant of Lord Enyalius and know the lovely gift of the Muses.'[18] The opening line forms a perfect hexameter, and its martial theme fits the metre

[16] Rotstein (2010).

[17] In this volume, Morrison p. 33 (Chapter 1) similarly asserts 'a clear continuity of subject-matter and voice across the different poems of Archilochus, whatever their metre'. Harrison (2001) 167 takes a similar approach.

[18] I am grateful to Alison Sharrock for her suggestion that these puns and double-meanings surrounding the Latin word *ibis* could also pick up on the possibility of such a double reading of Archilochus first word. Archilochus' verb must mean 'I am', but

appropriately in recalling the various Homeric figures who receive the designation of being a '*θεράπων* of Ares'.[19] The second line of the couplet, however, changes all that. As the expected hexameter morphs—perhaps with a laugh—into a hemiepes, the metre and performative mode change simultaneously.[20] Ancient theorists and commentators spent a good bit of effort trying to figure out who invented the elegiac couplet, and although we need not put much stock in the historical validity of such debates, we should at least be open to the idea that this shift from a hexameter to a pentameter could have been remembered as the very moment in which elegiac poetry came into being.[21] The drama packed into these two lines certainly makes such a fantasy attractive, because Archilochus has effected a dazzling turn. The *θεράπων* of Enyalius, a figure whom we know only from characters embedded within an epic poem, now claims to be telling his own tale, for Archilochus also knows the gifts of the Muses. The move away from epic coincides with an intimate statement about the poet that would be wholly out of place in the world of Homer and which goes well beyond the Hesiodic narrator's stock mirror-of-princes biography.[22] The Archilochean voice here diverges from the hexametric tradition even as it effectively appropriates Hesiod's claim that the poet is a servant (*θεράπων*) of the Muses (*Th.* 100). The *θεράπων* of Ares and the *θεράπων* of the Muses have come together in narrative, form, and performance.

This couplet stakes two major claims in terms of the Horatian and Ovidian reception of these lines. Archilochus asserts that he is a warrior, and the prominent connection between invective and sharp weapons throughout later ancient literature suggests that his words

Horace's verb of motion could be punning on *ibis*, 'you will go,' as a conjugation of *εἶμι*, 'I will go'.

[19] Nagy (1979) 291–5.

[20] Ovid may have read Archilochus' couplet with a laugh, since his own elegiac debut at *Am.* 1.1.1–4 effects a similar though more obviously humorous turn, as Eros shoots a foot off the opening hexameter and forces Ovid's form and content away from epic warfare.

[21] Orion of Thebes (fifth century AD) preserves the claim that Archilochus invented the elegiac couplet in his *Etymologicon*, *s.v. elegos*; cf. Ps.-Plut. *De musica* 28.1140f–1141b.

[22] The Archilochean warrior here sets himself up for being an autodiegetic narrator. Odysseus, too, performs this role in the Phaeacian section of the *Odyssey*, though the poetic form of his speech is no more stressed than anywhere else in Homer. Carey (2008) has discussed Hipponax in similar terms.

could be understood as a conflation of verbal and physical armaments. Yet the iambic poet, for all his scurrility and transgressive reputation, operates under the auspices of the Muses. This double boast stations the poet as both dangerous and powerfully protected.

In reading Horace's *Epodes*, we cannot easily forget that Horace composed his iambic poetry in the years after he had given up his career as a soldier, during which time he served as a military tribune under Cassius and Brutus at Philippi in 42. The combination of iambic metres, which hark back to Archilochus, and Horace's own military experiences make it difficult not to agree with the notion, put forward by Barchiesi, that the first *Epode* effectively separates the two poetic strands that Archilochus had brought together in fr. 1 W.[23] The iambic poet may still be a favourite of the Muses, but he is no longer a practitioner of war. In other poems Archilochus discusses the life of a soldier at sea, but Horace eschews all that as he sends Maecenas off with his fleet and promises a form of devotion and support that does not extend to joining his patron on deck amid the fray. Furthermore, the attack on an unnamed and upstart military tribune in *Epode* 4 can easily (though not definitively) be read as a rejection of or commentary on Horace's own military career.[24] And if the poet's words do still call to mind 'the gifts of the Muses' (let alone Archilochus' servitude to a master), then that relationship may now be understood in terms of the workings of Roman patronage. The Muses' gifts imply some form of reciprocity, which we find instantiated in the story about the Muses taking the young Archilochus' cow and giving him a lyre in return. In Rome, however, such patronage worked on more strictly human terms, and Horace offers his devotion and poetry as a stand-in for his physical presence onboard Maecenas' Liburnian warship.

The friendly tone of Horace's first iambic poem, moreover, clashes not only with the martial posturing of fr. 1 W. but also the ubiquitous post-classical reputation of *iambos* as a virtual synonym for invective.

[23] Barchiesi (2001) 154: '[T]he Greek poet is a role model but Horace cannot be a follower.'

[24] Mankin (1995) 99 discusses the ancient identification of this tribune with Pompeius Menas, who had been one of Pompey's slaves, as well as the problems of accepting that interpretation. At *Sat.* 1.6.46–8 Horace discusses the opprobrium he has suffered on account of being the son of a freedman, and he focuses on how 'everyone gnaws' (*rodunt omnes*) on him for being a friend to Maecenas and a one-time tribune in command of a legion.

Callimachus, too, had backed away from the most ferocious aspects of the reputation of iambic poetry, but Horace does so in a manner that maps onto Archilochean poetry far more closely. The combined effect of Horace's warm affection toward Maecenas and his apparent move away from Archilochean aggression, sets the stage for the entire collection in which Horace's bile will only spew forth at figures such as the witchy Canidia or in mock fury over all the garlic in *Epode* 3 and at Mevius in that most archaic of *Epodes*. With whatever amount of seriousness and however closely tied to his own experiences fighting against Octavian, Horace has charted a new course for iambic poetics that largely does away with the warrior-poet and the sharpest forms of direct personal invective.

In the *Ibis*, Ovid complains about the disjunction between his elegiac form and aggressive content (45–6):[25]

> Prima quidem coepto committam proelia versu,
> non soleant quamvis hoc pede bella geri.
>
> For now I will enter the fray with the verse that I have begun,
> though wars are not usually fought in this metre.

His comments interact menacingly with Archilochus fr. 1 W. and in stark contrast with my reading of Horace's first *Epode*. Ovid wants us to notice that he has put his content into the wrong form, since wars, *bella*, should not be set to elegiac couplets. The word *bella* may suggest epic, but this is an Ovidian feint. He is not talking about war, but, rather, about personal animosity against an enemy whom he refuses to identify openly. Ovid has set iambic animus in elegiac couplets and called it martial aggression, and he persists throughout the proem at pushing the military imagery with words such as *arma* and *tela* and in his description of himself as a soldier brandishing his spear prior to an actual encounter (47–50). This is an impressive feat that harmonizes Archilochean and Ovidian elegy. It also upends the Horatian gambit of *Epode* 1 and situates that poem as an

[25] Ovid claims that the *Ibis* is not iambic and threatens to write a subsequent, truly iambic, poem if his enemy does not change his ways (53–4): *postmodo, si perges, in te mihi liber iambus | tincta Lycambeo sanguine tela dabit*, 'But after this, if you persist, my unleashed *iambus* | will send out weapons against you steeped in Lycambes' blood.' The last couplet of the poem returns to this threat and also reiterates the improper fit between the elegiac form and murderous hate (643–4): *Postmodo plura leges et nomen habentia verum | et pede quo debent acria bella geri*, 'Soon you will read more lines with your real name | and in the metre fit for waging harsh wars.'

intermediary between the world of the *Ibis* and Archilochus fr. 1 W. Horace had surrendered his soldiering as he crafted iambic lines in which the poet's persona rarely lashes out at historically recognizable targets; Ovid has infused such personal hostility into a non-iambic metre and thereby reinvigorated Archilochus' militant posturing. Ovid may be inexperienced in such aggression, but he recoups the Archilochean legacy that Horace had relinquished. And at this intersection of emotion, imagery, and metre, we might even look at Ovid's claim in the *Ibis* that up to this time *omne fuit Musae carmen inerme meae*, 'every song of my Muse has been unarmed' (2), as a comment not just about himself but about the career of his Roman model and predecessor. Horace's poetry had turned away from martial strife, and that habit runs through Ovid's early career too, as he dances mirthfully away from Virgilian *arma*.[26] For Ovid to reclaim iambic weaponry for the poet, therefore, can be seen as a gesture toward reversing what Horace had done. Both poets work creatively with the matrix of form and content, but Ovid tells us that *iambos* will bear its true edge once more. The world, he claims, demands this return from blithe Horatian garlic and witches to Archilochean swords and brutality.

7.3. SAILING AND STENCH

Horace uses imagery of sailing to construct emotionally powerful moments as well as the basic infrastructure of the *Epodes*. Nautical themes most often connect with some sort of strife, as we can see in a quick survey. Maecenas sails off to war in *Epode* 1. In 9, Horace again speaks to his patron as he hails the triumph at Actium and recalls various other military engagements. In 10, he prays that foul-smelling (*olens*) Mevius' sea voyage will end disastrously. And finally, the penultimate poem envisions an escape from Rome amidst the horrors of civil strife, and after briefly considering an overland route, he invites his countrymen onboard a ship to sail off to Golden Age bliss.

[26] One of the major claims of Johnson (2012) is that although Horace may have moved away from martial themes in his poetic biography, he engages with them deeply and powerfully in his social criticism.

In terms of structure, it may be important that two of these poems seem to feature the direct, dock-side involvement of the Horatian narrator. Horace's friendly bon voyage to Maecenas in the first poem opens the *Epodes* with a surprising combination of iambic metre and a tone antithetical to the reputation of *iambos*. And the poem against Mevius presents a similar trick. We might say that in this poem Horace has finally gotten it right (or, perhaps, that he has finally slouched into the most hackneyed of iambic storylines): direct, blistering aggression hurled at a named target intimately known to the speaker. But for whatever reason, this most iambic of iambic poems marks the point at which Horace moves crisply away from recognizable iambic patterns. *Epode* 11, the first poem in the collection not composed in alternating iambic trimeters and dimeters, presents a virtually lyrical story of love as the speaker laments his dearth of bile (16), which causes him to languish in erotic distress; *Epode* 12 gives us love gone wrong (though admittedly there are important iambic motifs here, such as the graphic depictions of sex and the low, misogynistic tone); in *Epode* 13 we cozy down and drink while a storm rages; in *Epode* 14 Horace cannot muster the energy to finish the iambic verses he has promised Maecenas (*inceptos . . . iambos*, 7); the pouty lover of *Epode* 15 refuses to be played the fool any longer but can drum up only enough spite to predict that his rival too will one day be abandoned for another; and *Epode* 16 deals with the horrors of the civil wars before the final poem returns us to the magical world of *Epode* 5. The poem against Mevius, that is, paradoxically marks a shift in a more lyrical and eclectic direction. *Epodes* 1 and 10, rather obviously, also contrast the expectation of success at sailing with the hope of a nautical disaster, friendship in opposition to enmity, while also bookending the series of ten poems composed in iambic strophes. Perhaps the recollection of victory at Actium in *Epode* 9 similarly contrasts with the fear of civil strife in *Epode* 16. Sailing, then, offers one way to map some of the tensions and boundary cases of the collection as a whole.

In the *Ibis* sailing plays a more dominant, if less pervasive, role in establishing the narrative conceit. In an imagistic description of his arrival at Tomis, Ovid claims that his ship has broken apart around him and that his enemy, who ought to have offered assistance, has tried to take advantage of his misfortune (17–20):

Cumque ego quassa meae conplectar membra carinae,
naufragii tabulas pugnat habere mei,
et, qui debuerat subitas extinguere flammas,
hic praedam medio raptor ab igne petit,

And as I cling to the shivered boards of my ship,
he fights to hold on to the planks of my wreckage,
and he who ought to stamp out the sudden blaze
turns pirate for booty amid the flames.

In *Epode* 10 Horace had performed his prayer that Mevius might perish, and here Ovid finds himself floundering in the sea, grasping after bits of flotsam. The two poets not only take up opposing positions in their shipwreck narratives, but Ovid may even pick up Horace's charge that Mevius is *olens* in his reference to himself as Naso, Mr. Nose, in his defense of his earlier career (3–4):

Nullaque, quae possit, scriptis tot milibus, extat
littera Nasonis sanguinolenta legi.

Not a word of Naso's exists, from so many thousands written,
that can be read as reeking with blood.

Ovid has virtually stepped into the role of Mevius from *Epode* 10.

Ovid's comment about his *tabulae* at *Ibis* 18 should be read as metapoetic and looking back to similar matters not only in the *Epodes* but probably also in a later Horatian poem. Between the starkly opposed shipwreck narratives of *Epode* 10 and the *Ibis*, *Carm.* 1.5 presents a middle ground in which Horace takes up the role of the shipwrecked seaman who uses *tabulae* to describe his experience. The poem opens with Horace asking a woman named Pyrrha what lad now woos her (*urget*, 2) so that she braids her hair with such care. The handsome lover smells of perfumes: *perfusus liquidis . . . odoribus* (2) suggests heavenly scents and erotic inspiration. But the second stanza quickly shifts tone, and Horace predicts that the lover will soon bemoan (*flebit*, 6, the same verb used in the final line of *Epode* 6: *inultus ut flebo puer?* 'will I cry like an unavenged boy?') the vicissitudes of love. The boy who had been actively pressing his suit will frequently lament his fate and passively marvel (*emirabitur*, 8) at the 'seas tossed by dark winds' (*aspera | nigris aequora ventis*, 6–7). At this point the initial description of the boy as *perfusus liquidis* takes on a more ominous colouring: 'overwhelmed with water'. Horace next describes the boy as ignorant (*nescius*, 11) of the grim realities

that await him, and the final sentence of the poem explains why Horace understands the situation with such clarity (13–16):

> me tabula sacer
> votiva paries indicat uvida
> suspendisse potenti
> vestimenta maris deo.
>
> With its votive tablet
> the holy wall proclaims
> that I dedicated my dripping clothes
> to the powerful god of the sea.

Like the boy, Horace, too, has gone from sweet-smelling suitor to a helpless shipwreck on the sea of love.

As in *Epode* 10, smell and shipwreck again come together, but unlike vile Mevius, Horace now stands as a sage survivor of an erotic shipwreck. And as at *Ibis* 18, Horace's use of *tabula* does double duty. His painted votive is also his written text. Moreover, as in Ovid's poem, Horace alerts his reader to a poem of beguiling complexities with his delightful description of Pyrrha's hair style as *simplex munditiis*, 'with simple refinements' (5). So Ovid's struggle to cling to his *tabulae* (the planks of his ship, the framework of his life as a poet, and his individual texts) offers a pitiable twist on Horace's relief at having survived a tempestuous affair. The fact that Horace's poem is directed at a temptress named Pyrrha even adds a Thracian element to the close interconnection of imagery. The Strasbourg Epode imagines its target washed up on the Thracian coast; the exiled Ovid, too, asks us to imagine him washing ashore further north in Thrace; but Horace's near-death experience comes from a romance gone wrong with a girl with a Thracian name. We might also see a connection between the erotic sea in which Horace nearly drowned and the erotic nature of the *carmen* and *error* that led to Ovid's relegation to Tomis. As always, Ovid's re-reading of Horace highlights (and constructs) the earlier poet's success at navigating treacherous waters (politics, patronage, romance, erotic poetry) vis-à-vis Ovid's own failures. His elegies have caused him more anguish than did Horace's brush with Pyrrha.

Ovid's comment about his *tabulae* recalls other themes in the *Epodes* as well. Ovid frequently refers to his poetry as a ship, and *tabula* also means 'writing tablet'. In *Epode* 12 we find that matters of smell are combined with similar tablets (12.1–3):

Quid tibi vis, mulier nigris dignissima barris?
Munera quid mihi quidve **tabellas**
mittis nec firmo iuueni neque **naris** obesae?

What do you want, you woman fit for dark elephants?
Why do you send gifts and **tablets** to me—
no hard youth, no insensate **nose**?

Horace dispatches one smelly enemy to die at sea and tries to avoid being entrapped by another, more amorous but no better smelling, who sends him mephitic love letters (a replay of the garlic-averse *puella*'s rejection of the amorous Maecenas imagined at the end of *Epode* 3). Ovid, the Roman Nose, brings these themes together in his efforts to survive a literary shipwreck and stave off the schemes of his enemy back in Rome. In the *Ibis* Ovid's angry persona absorbs such motifs from Horace's *Epodes* into his exilic autobiography.

This idea finds further corroboration at several other places. In *Epodes* 11 and 17 we see a concern for the damage that slander and gossip can do. In the former, Horace admits with some embarrassment that he was a *fabula per Urbem*, 'a rumor throughout City' (7–8) and wishes that he could muster enough good old-fashioned iambic bile (*bilis*) to snap out of his romantic malaise (15–18). And in *Epode* 17 Canidia demands revenge for harsher slander: *impune ut Vrbem nomine impleris meo?*, 'Do you think you can fill the City with my name and go unpunished?' (59). Ovid complains of a similar injury at the hands of Ibis (13–14):

Vulneraque inmitis requiem quaerentia vexat,
iactat et in toto nomina nostra foro.

He cruelly aggravates my wounds that need rest
and bandies my name about the Forum.

The poets' concerns for their reputations are couched among overarching themes of friendship and curses.

Horace uses themes of sailing as one of the orienting devices in the *Epodes*. Ovid reflects this not so much in the bulk of what he says about sailing but in the way that his one prominent reference to sailing sparks a chain of associations from the planks of a ship, to writing tablets, smell, and reputation—all themes that double back to the *Epodes*. But Horace does not sail, whereas Ovid cannot avoid sailing; Horace tries to be free of writing tablets foisted upon him by another, whereas Ovid cannot maintain a hold on his own

poems; Horace's enemy reeks, whereas Ovid has to protest that he does not; and whereas Rome tittered about Horace's tryst in *Epode* 11 and Canidia raged against slander in *Epode* 17, Ovid, as always, complains that he cannot control his reputation at Rome—even, of course, as he crafts his reputation through his poetry. Perhaps the most poignant reflection of Horace's nautical themes works at a more general level throughout Ovid's exilic poetry. In *Epode* 16 Horace fantasizes about sailing away from Rome and disembarking in some idyllic spot where, among other markers, Medea had never set foot (58). Ovid bemoans his life in Tomis, which, in *Tristia* 3.9, he connects geographically, via a grim etymological pun, with Medea's dismemberment of Apsyrtus. Horace, that is, complains of life in Rome and dreams of escape, whereas Ovid wants nothing more than to find some way back to the City.

7.4. FORM AND FRIENDSHIP

The preceding sections have highlighted a variety of specific ways that Ovid's *Ibis* engages with Horace's *Epodes*, and with that foundation in place we can now telescope out to see how the two poets frame the importance of Romanized *iambus* in contrasting ways. Horace uses his iambic collection to emphasize his *amicitia* with Maecenas in a manner that fits perfectly with what would become a slogan of the Augustan regime: *primus inter pares*; but Ovid's exilic persona, angry and distanced from all Roman social relationships, draws attention to his choice *not* to give his enemy's proper name and thereby promotes a sense of suspicion antithetical to the proper, frank, and reciprocal workings of Roman friendship.

The anecdote about Octavian's exchange with Pollio (consul in 40 BC and a supporter of Antony who nonetheless survived the civil wars) provides a salutary reminder of the social crisis of the late Republic and Triumviral eras that followed the threat of proscriptions and which forms part of the political background to the careers of Horace and Ovid. Macrobius records that Octavian had written some Fescennine verses against Pollio and that the latter responded with the quip: *At ego taceo. Non est enim facile in eum scribere qui potest proscribere*, 'But I'll remain silent. For it is not easy to play the scribe against one who can proscribe' (2.4.21). Pollio's response is witty and

damning in its claim that *parrhesia* is no longer possible when someone has gained the power to issue proscription lists. Yet his ironic response (he speaks but claims silence; he writes but claims it is dangerous to do so) also highlights a path for manipulating such authoritarian power.[27] Octavian, who wanted to maintain some façade of open discourse and political involvement (i.e. some trappings of the Republican system) could not easily punish Pollio, since to do so would have added power to his taunt and underscored its truth-value.[28] A high degree of egalitarianism is a virtual requirement for open and, at times, confrontational dialogue and debate; authoritarianism tends to suppress such forms of frankness, even if they are preserved in ritualized or otherwise circumscribed contexts (e.g. triumphs, the Kalends of January).[29] To put it differently, the new system that was emerging already during the Triumviral era had to accept some amount of antagonistic rhetoric, since it placed a high value on claiming continuity with the earlier regime.

When we consider Horace's poetic strategies in the *Epodes*, Mankin's idea that he had turned to *iambos* in this era as a way to reassert the importance of friendship rings only partially true, since Archaic Greece also offered models of poetry that could speak to the positive powers of friendship without implicating Horace so closely in the

[27] For an expanded discussion of this theme, see Hawkins (forthcoming).

[28] We can see a similar scenario in the legendary meeting between Alexander and Diogenes. The king becomes so enraged at the philosopher's taunts and insults that he nearly kills Diogenes. The Cynic essentially boxes Alexander into a corner with a quip that parallels Pollio's. Diogenes admits that Alexander can easily kill him, but that to do so would prevent him from ever hearing the truth from interlocutors again (Dio *Or.* 4.59). The fate of Gallus attests to Octavian's willingness to punish, but Gallus' transgression had none of the élan of Pollio's or Diogenes'.

[29] A year of conversations with David Smith has greatly helped my thinking on this subject. His forthcoming volume on invective and colonization in Sicily draws upon a vast, especially anthropological, apparatus and his insights will surely change how we understand the social role of invective speech and literature in antiquity. Other examples of similar connections between the presence or absence of an egalitarian ethos and the freedom to speak bluntly can easily be adduced. Diodorus Siculus (14.5) describes the lynching of Theramenes and the beginning of all-out proscriptions, among the first victims of which was Autolycus, whom Diodorus describes as a παρρησιαστής, 'frank speaker.' Aristotle describes the virtuous person as needing to be open in his love and hatred, φανερομισὴς καὶ φανερόφιλος, since to do otherwise shows cowardice (*N.E.* 1124b28–29). Foucault (1983) discusses this same theme in important ways, though his main interest is in those speakers who risk everything by speaking to authority. Feeney (1998) analyses the 'problem of free speech' as witnessed by Ovid's *Fasti*. For more on ritualized contexts for abuse, see Graf (2005).

dangerous associations of iambic invective.[30] Mankin notes that the blaming function of *iambos* could bring together those who shared bonds of *amicitia*, but examples of such a dynamic are difficult to find in the *Epodes*' narratives. Instead we experience a network of invective scenarios in which Horace largely avoids putting himself in the position of speaking abuse to prominent members of Roman society—i.e. he avoids the *agentia verba Lycamben*, 'words that hounded Lycambes' (*Ep.* 1.19.25). He accomplishes this by targeting characters who are historically dubious or historically unimportant and by putting invective into the mouths of characters who cannot definitively be equated with himself. The obvious and glaring exception to this strategy is *Epode* 3, in which Horace roundly abuses Maecenas for poisoning him with garlic, to which I will return below.

With the exception of Maecenas, Horace constructs his targets to feel less real than Archilochus' *bête noire*. Ever since Dover argued that Lycambes may be a stock character, many readers of Archilochus have doubted the historical reality of Archilochus' nemesis.[31] Lycambes' name, which evokes a fabular wolf and seems to mimic the word *iambos* with its central letter cluster—αμβ-, makes him a suspicious target for an iambic poet. Yet we get no sense in ancient sources that anyone doubted Lycambes' existence, and the third-century Mnesiepes Inscription, which claims to draw upon Parian lore, describes Lycambes as a prominent member of the community. So while modern scholarship has its suspicions about Lycambes, we have no reason to suppose that Horace shared those concerns.

When we look at Horace's targets in the *Epodes*, however, the scenario is quite different. Maecenas, mentioned in *Epodes* 1, 3, 9, and 14, is the only addressee about whose contemporary existence we can be certain, and only in *Epode* 3 does he serve as a target for open invective. Elsewhere, Maecenas is held up as a patron and friend, which urges us to read *Epode* 3 as a friendly joke. All the other characters who come in for abuse in the *Epodes* seem carefully constructed to elude historical certitude. The target of *Epode* 6 is beyond all hope of recovery. The nameless tribune of *Epode* 4 could

[30] Mankin (1995) 9: 'In the midst of a crisis which could be seen as a result of the decline and failure of traditional Roman *amicitia*, H. turned to a type of poetry whose function had been the affirmation of "friendship" in its community... he may have hoped that his *iambi* would somehow "blame" his friends and fellow citizens into at least asking themselves *quo ruitis?*'.

[31] Dover (1964).

have been a familiar figure, but Horace's dream for a wide and lasting readership suggests that he left this character intentionally vague, and he looks as much like Horace as anyone. Canidia, who features in *Epodes* 3, 5, and 17 (and may be the hag in 8 and 12), could be a cover for a recognizable historical person, as ancient commentators maintained in identifying her as Gratidia, but significant arguments position her as a comical or stock character.[32] Alfius (*Epod.* 2) and Mevius (*Epod.* 10) seem to have a bit more flesh, but both also generate significant scepticism.[33] I do not mean to imply that none of these targets is a real, historical person, but, rather, that Horace goes out of his way to leave them underdetermined. While each case must be evaluated on its own merits, one firm conclusion about these figures is that Horace could not have expected future audiences to know these stock, local, or pseudonymous characters in the same way that we know Maecenas.

Paired with Horace's efforts to make his targets other than Maecenas feel less real than Archilochus' Lycambes is a corresponding manipulation of his abusive and first-person speakers. Some of the explicit examples of strong invective in the *Epodes* are spoken by characters who most probably are not to be identified with Horace, such as Canidia and the boy in *Epode* 5. Furthermore, if we are willing to admit that not all of the first-person speakers should be equated with Horace (i.e. the literary construction of himself that Horace puts together throughout his corpus), then we can recognize that some poems have clearer markers of the first-person speaker's identity than others. We are probably safe to assume that the characters who take the role of friend to Maecenas are all Horace (*Epodes* 1, 3, 9, and 14).

[32] Canidia also appears at *Sat.* 1.8, 2.1.48, 8.95 and possibly *Carm.* 1.16. On this fascinating figure, see Mankin (1995) 299–301; Watson (2003) 174–90; Oliensis (2009a).

[33] Alfius is also mentioned as a usurer in a saying preserved at Col. 1.7.2, but this could either show that he was a real and famous person or that this was the name of a stereotyped lender, probably evoking *ἀλφή*, 'gain', and *ἀλφάνω*, 'to yield, produce'. Mankin (1995) *ad* 2.67 leaves the issue open, whereas Watson (2003) *ad* 2.67 is more confident that Alfius was a real person. Mevius could be the poet mentioned at Virg. *Ecl.* 3.90, though Horace does not identify his target as a poet; this name, although rare, was used as a placeholder in legal documents, which led Mankin (1995) *ad* 10.2 to suggest that he might be a 'John Doe'. Watson (2003) 338–43, again, shows more confidence in Mevius' historicity. Johnson (2012) addresses this issue at various points in his study, as in his analysis of the transition between *Epodes* 1 and 2 (88), where he emphasizes the overlap among Horace, Maecenas, and Alfius. Ruffell (2003) 61 makes a similar point about the dubious historical standing of Horace's targets in the *Satires*.

The association between the speaker and the Archaic iambicists in *Epode* 6 also suggests that we are hearing Horace. He names himself, Flaccus, at 15.12, and the speaker's description of himself as *nec firmus* at 12.3 could be a punning identification of himself as well.[34] The remaining poems, including the invectives against Alfius (2), the nameless tribune (4), and Mevius (10), give no hint that the speaker should be understood as Horace's authorial persona.[35] When we put all this together, the only poem in which Horace seems to expect his readers to feel certain that they are hearing Horace abuse a real and socially relevant figure is *Epode* 3, which surely is meant to sound like friendly teasing.[36] Every example of invective abuse in the *Epodes*, that is, is articulated in such a way that Horace can insulate himself from the *agentia verba Lycamben* (*Ep.* 1.19.25).[37]

This way of reading the *Epodes* emphasizes plausible deniability as a strategy for avoiding the most lethal and destructive aspects of archaic *iambos*' reputation. It may be that this format then allowed Horace to engage honestly and sincerely in a bit of teasing at Maecenas' expense in *Epodes* 3 as an example of what Roman *amicitia* can still be in the thirties. Horace's devotion to his patron in *Epode* 1, the

[34] In Chapter 1 of this volume (p. 55), Morrison discusses the Hipponactean flavour of Horace's use of his own name.

[35] We have particular reasons for reading each of these poems as coming from a voice other than Horace's: if we read *Epode* 2 as a companion to the first poem, then the description of Horace's villa at 1.25–30 could suggest that the lengthy praise of the rustic and agrarian life in *Epode* 2 is someone's commentary on Horace, as he enjoys the farm given to him by Maecenas. Since, as has regularly been noted, the tribune of *Epode* 4 resembles Horace in some ways, this too could be a poem in which someone speaks about Horace. And *Epode* 10 could easily be heard as a formal reworking of the Strasbourg Epode (Hipp. fr. 115 W.; both Mankin (1995) and Watson (2003) discuss the debate over authorship of this poem and its influence on Horace's poem in their introductions to *Epode* 10) or as a ventriloquial trick in which Virgil gives voice to abuse that goes well beyond what he had said about Maevius at *Ecl.* 3.90. I am not interested in pushing strongly for any of these interpretations but am, rather, primarily focused on the ways that Horace frustrates certitude.

[36] Plutarch describes mock abuse in thanks for services rendered as a fine form of friendly teasing, and he says that such raillery conveys a sense of δριμυτέραν χάριν, 'very sharp pleasure' (*Quaest. Conv.* 2.1.7).

[37] This is Horace's famous disclaimer about his adaptation of iambic poetics. I do not deny that the *Epodes* contain an abundance of invective that rises close to the Archilochean level, but my point is that Horace does not clearly and definitively attach that invective to his own person. Thus, I agree with Johnson (2012) 115–16, who sees *Epode* 7 as a blistering indictment of every Roman as complicit in the crime of fratricide, which leads him into a discussion of where the *agentia verba Lycamben* appear in the *Epodes* and to describe Horace's basic approach as 'serio-comic'.

joking relationship in *Epode* 3, the praise of military success in *Epode* 9, and the mock anguish of erotic distress that delays the completion of his iambic poetry in *Epode* 14 combine to offer a warm and well-rounded image of his relationship with his patron. Yet such an image, even if intended by Horace as forthright and philosophically grounded, nonetheless meshes neatly with the posturing of the emerging post-Actian regime.[38] Pollio's riposte must have made Octavian's bile rise in his chest, but it should come as no surprise that Horace's iambic invective, handled with an abundance of *urbanitas*, was supposedly welcomed by Maecenas and the *princeps*.[39]

In returning, once again, to Ovid I would now like to demonstrate how he has constructed his *Ibis* in a manner that counters many of Horace's strategies of elusion. Ovid names himself in the fourth line of the poem, and thus ties the narrator incontrovertibly to his exilic persona.

Furthermore, he presents his target and their relationship with one another in such detail and with such animosity that Ovid urges us to believe that he truly is angry at a real person. Ovid makes it plain that his enemy could have been or, quite probably, had been an *amicus*, when he describes their hatred as similar to that between the Theban brothers Eteocles and Polyneices and then complains of *gratia commissis, improbe, rupta tuis*, 'good will ruined by what you've done, scoundrel' (40). It is as if Ovid has grasped with both hands the *agentia verba Lycamben*, which Horace had used more cautiously in his iambic poetry, and ensconced them awkwardly, as Ovid himself claims, in elegiac couplets. Beyond this issue of metre, Ovid falls short of Archilochus (and Horace, Catullus, Lucilius, and others) by not giving us the one piece of information we most crave: Ibis' real name.

[38] On the philosophical, especially Theophrastan, basis for Horace's notion of friendship, see Kemp (2010). Ruffell (2003) discusses how Horace's *Satires* effectively recreate satirical discourse in line with the new, more authoritarian regime, and he concludes, in a manner that fits with my reading of the *Epodes*, that 'Horace . . . is an ideological foil for the political stability engineered, or in the process of being engineered, by Octavian' (64). Johnson (2012) esp. 84–5 finds a much more robust role for the iambicist here, in structuring *Epode* 1 in such a way as to highlight 'a definitive social strata: Octavian to Maecenas to Horace'.

[39] The Suetonian *Life* drips with their affection for the poet. For example, it claims that Maecenas' dying wish to Augustus was: *Horati Flacci ut mei esto memor*, 'be as mindful of Horace as of myself'; and even when Horace turned down a post as Augustus' personal secretary the emperor did not *aut suscensuit quicquam aut amicitiam suam ingerere desiit*, 'either feel a whit of resentment or stop courting his friendship' (p. 45 Reifferscheid).

Someone who has done what Ovid alleges ought to be named so that the world can know of his crimes and express their disapproval and so that the proper authorities can impose a fitting punishment. Yet Ovid's exilic persona has already learned about the limits of *parrhesia*. In his portrayal of the later Augustan period, the free and open discourse of the court system and the unwritten rules of *amicitia* have been swamped under the bilge of an authoritarian regime.

Naming names has become too dangerous, and so, like Pollio, Ovid takes a different tack. Pollio had used his words to articulate the need for silence in a manner that tied the regime's hands. Ovid does something similar by hurling the mystery of Ibis into Roman society. Who is Ibis? The question has no satisfactory answer, but it amounts to a statement about the dangers of open invective in a climate of suspicion and the limitations on interpersonal discourse imposed by an authoritarian power. Horace's attack on Maecenas in *Epode* 3 fosters the idea that post-Actian hierarchies can be fluid enough to encompass teasing abuse among friends, even within a hierarchical system of patronage. Ovid's decision to withhold Ibis' real name does the opposite by underscoring the impossibility of freely expressing one's personal animosity in a political climate in which *amicitia* in the Republican sense has all but disappeared.[40]

7.5. CONCLUSIONS

More could be said about the connections between the *Epodes* and *Ibis*, but by way of conclusion I would like to return to the image of Horace fantasizing about leaving Rome in *Epode* 16. Most assume that he composed this poem sometime in the dark decade before Actium, but even if that proves true, the majority of audiences (even ancient Roman audiences) first encountered this poem as a post-Actian recollection, a theatre of memory participating in the

[40] Ovid's emphasis on withholding Ibis' real name is important whether or not we believe that Ibis was a cover for a real individual. Housman (1920) 316 undermined the traditional starting point for approaching the poem: 'Who is Ibis? Nobody.' This battle-cry of the formalist approach to the poem has not stopped more recent scholars from finding someone behind the mask (see my n. 1). Yet even Housman's Ibis could have unnerved Ovid's audience, much as Jesus' claim that one of his followers would betray him inspired each to ask: 'It isn't me, is it?' (Matt. 26:22).

communal process of dealing with the after-effects of war from a safe distance. For Ovid, this escapist fantasy of leaving Rome must have given a cruelly ironic glimpse into the world as it was before the publication of the *Epodes*. In absorbing and inverting so many elements of that collection into his *Ibis*, Ovid underlines (perhaps even overemphasizes) the importance of the *Epodes* by positioning his poem as the mirror opposite. Young Horace had fought against Octavian but then became his friend; young Ovid had worked under Augustus' patronage of the arts but later felt the wrath of the Princeps. Horace wrote a collection of short, metrically varied poems that bounce around rather erratically but continually re-evoke iambic forms or themes; Ovid wrote a long, obsessively focused poem that starkly denies any iambic association even as it draws our attention to the strange fit between personal, murderous animus and its elegiac form. Horace suggests a connection with Callimachus' *Ibis* by using a form of the verb 'to go' that looks like the name of Callimachus' bird; Ovid suggests a connection with Horace by reusing Callimachus' bird-title that looks like Horace's verb. Horace stays on the dock, and even his fantasy of sailing away in *Epode* 16 never becomes reality; Ovid makes sure that none of us forgets that *he did sail*, against his will and with disastrous effects.

These many points of inverted symmetry highlight the impression of a disparity between Horace's success and Ovid's failure at working under the imperial system. Such symmetry establishes poetic biography as a fundamental measure of Roman time by showing how our thinking about Augustus can be accessed through the Ovidian ebb that followed the Horatian flow of professional fortune. And this symmetry also propels the *Ibis* to its most terrifying heights of malice: just as the *Epodes* clearly participate in the process of thinking the civil wars into the past, so too does Ovid threaten to cast Rome back into chaos reminiscent of the years before Actium. Horace had taken on the mantle of Archilochus as he set aside his soldiery, but Ovid reawakens the martial potential of Archilochean poetics, and as he reactivates the iambic soldier-poet, he brings every possible tale of hatred and excruciating torture back into the Roman world via his long catalogue of mythical tortures that he envisions for Ibis.[41]

[41] As I was preparing this piece, I watched Joss Whedon's 'The Cabin in the Woods' (2012), which accomplishes a similar trick. The spoofed horror plot leads toward the unleashing of a vast menagerie of recognizable monsters from the annals

Horace mentioned Remus at the end of *Epode* 7 in a comment about the perdurative taint of fratricide as it relates to the experience of civil war. Ovid, too, invokes Remus as part of his closural strategy in the *Ibis*, but he does so at the end of his dizzying catalogue of murderous fates he imagines for his enemy. His Remus, that is, has been absorbed into the raw material of mythology. Oliensis has argued that Ovid's use of Remus here signals his desire to replace Augustus, the new Romulus, and this threat, I would add, takes on its most sweeping power when we recognize that Remus exists as part of the panic-inducing vanguard of mythical forces that Ovid brings to the forefront of Roman consciousness.[42] Myth and poetry work on the level of representation, and in that realm Remus' death ensures his immortal life. He is the darkest Roman memory that cannot be forgotten, just as Ovid constructs his exilic biography as the great and unjust scandal that Augustus cannot put to rest. The most savage edge of Archilochean *iambos* went dull when Horace used the *Epodes* to construct his own poetic biography as part of the first breaths of the *pax Romana*, but with the *Ibis* Ovid vaunts that he can cast the world back into a pre-Actian anomie by overthrowing the Augustan settlement and Horace's *Epodes* as he unites his exilic persona with the dread, righteous, accusatory power of Remus.

of modern cinema. Those goblins, demons, and evil sprites were kept in check by a vaguely defined but virtually omnipotent regime, and their escape precipitates the apparent destruction of modern civilization. The film presents a rollicking twist on typical horror films, but its plot also hints at other, more realistic forms of annihilation that loom on our collective horizon. Ovid's *Ibis* may have had a similar effect: its encyclopaedic presentation of mythological terrors in carefully controlled couplets surely did not actually scare anyone, but audiences who perceived that chilling catalogue as a form of coded social commentary of whatever sort would have read that dense crowd of sadistic images as a cautionary tale about the state of the world.

[42] Oliensis (2004) 316.