Polysystem theory, as proposed by Itamar Even-Zohar of the University of Tel Aviv in the 1970s, provides the structure for my talk today. As the name of this theory implies, polysystem theory takes a broad, encompassing, view of literature, positing that any literature is made up of many smaller systems that are in regular competition with another. It is most easy to think of these systems as genres: epic, drama, and even children's literature. When Even-Zohar began to formulate his theories, he was less interested in describing the translation of a single text than the process of translation production and change within the entire literary system. To explain the role of translations in the literary system, Even-Zohar adopted some of the theories from the literary models of the Russian Formalists, including the notion that there was a hierarchy to the literary system and that literature is central (primary) or peripheral (secondary).

In the systems models that were proposed before Even-Zohar, translations were thought to always be peripheral. But after his analysis of Israeli literature, Even-Zohar found that translations are positioned differently depending upon the age, strength, and stability of the particular literary polysystem. Specifically, he suggested (1978a: 24) that there are three social circumstances that enable translations to maintain a primary position in the polysystem: 1) the literature is young, or in the process of being established; 2) the literature is weak; and 3) the literature is experiencing a crisis or turning point.

In the first scenario, a young literature is unable to create all forms and genres, and thus translations function as substitutes for native examples. As examples, we may think of the Israeli literature that Even-Zohar studied, or nineteenth-century Czech literature; here the culture seeks to use its new language for as many different forms as possible. In the second scenario, the weak literature of an often smaller nation comes into contact with that of a stronger, larger system. The smaller system cannot produce all the kinds of writing of the larger system, and thus again translations serve as substitutes.

Crucial to these first two scenarios is the understanding that a system that lacks certain forms and genres will realize its defective status and seek to repair itself by importing the necessary foreign texts. In the third situation, established literary models no longer inspire writers, who then turn elsewhere for new ideas. In any of these scenarios, or combination thereof, writers produce translations and, most importantly, through the translations introduce new elements and innovations into the literary system. As their function is to import the foreign into the receiving culture, translations in these scenarios necessarily adhere to the form of the source text

But the social conditions opposite to those three I just mentioned result in translations that are of secondary importance in the polysystem. If a literature is strong and thus has well-developed literary traditions and many different kinds of writing, then *original* writing produces innovations in ideas and forms. The result is that translations in these polysystems conform to pre-established norms, reinforce the current dominant aesthetic, fail to import new ideas and techniques, and thereby act as forces of conservatism that are relegated to the peripheral position. Such a scenario may help to explain the remarks of Etienne Pasquier, a Renaissance French lawyer. His response to a requested translation is as follows: “So you want me to render Cicero in French. Please note the power you have gotten over me. There is nothing I detest as much as the translating profession.” Or of Jean Chapelain, the 16th century French poet who wrote in his preface to the translation of Mateo Aleman’s novel *Guzman de Alfarache* that “translation is an abject thing, and translation in those who practice it presupposes a servility of spirit and a deprecation of intellect.” Or of the English poet John Denham, who once quipped “Such is our pride, our folly, our fate/ that few but such as cannot write, translate.” These are certainly not encouraging words for a would-be translator, yet the sentiments of these men reflect the fact that their own literary system was strong. That is, by translating they do not hope to challenge for a central position, but only adopt established models and thus remain on the periphery.

Thus we have a structure that positions translations in a literary system: they can be either primary, or central, or they can function in secondary importance, or peripheral. Their positioning also

reflects *how* texts are translated: central translations adhere to the source text, peripheral to established models in the receiving culture. Even-Zohar further theorized why certain translations were chosen. As I mentioned, a literary system was aware of vacuums if features like forms or genres were missing. Like any vacuum, these literary voids need to be filled. Therefore, texts chosen for translations are those that are needed by the polysystem to achieve a complete, dynamic identity.

Thus Even-Zohar's polysystem theory provides some interesting background to a study on Roman translation. We can posit that there were times when translation was central to the Latin literary system, and times when translation existed on the periphery. My paper today mainly deals with the area in between, but before I move on to our ancient evidence, I wish to discuss one further translation theorist whose ideas of "norms" will help provide some framework to my discussion of Horace.

The notion that translations are a reflection of the target culture was further developed by Gideon Toury, a colleague of Itamar Even-Zohar. Toury might be credited for the foundation of descriptive translation studies, a branch of studies that is at odds with *prescriptive studies*, or that which imposes criteria stipulating how translation should be performed (*). In contrast, descriptive studies examines the phenomena of translating and translations by orienting itself towards the translated, or target, text. Perhaps Toury's greatest contribution to this branch was his formulation of "norms", which could be defined as a series of interrelated factors that govern the translation product. Toury finds three kinds of translation norms: preliminary, operational, and initial. Preliminary norms are best reflected in certain questions: what is the translation policy of the target culture? What is the difference between translation, imitation, and adaptation for the specific period? What authors, periods, genres are preferred by the target culture? Preliminary norms thus administer the choice of the source work and the overall translation strategy.

Toury defines operational norms as those that "direct decisions made during the translation process itself", including the extent to which omissions, additions, changes, as well as the actual selection

of target language material to replace the original textual and linguistic material (or, more simply,"linguistic and stylistic" preferences).

The concept of initial norms connects with Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, for these refer to the translator's initial choice between two distinct poles: either the translator can submit himself to the original text with its textual relations and norms and thus produce a translation that Toury calls *adequate*, or he may submit to the linguistic and literary norms that are active in the target literature, a process that would result in an *acceptable* translation. Yet if we suppose that these norms reflect "initial choices", we must clarify the vocabulary: they are not initial, nor are they truly choices. As Toury explains, all translational norms are dependent on the position held by translations in the target literary polysystem. The translator's attitude toward the source text, and also many of the decisions that will be made during translation, is thus largely predetermined by the socio-literary conditions of the receiving audience.

Let me then summarize: in certain socio-literary conditions translations are imported into the system in order to stimulate innovation. In this scenario the borderlines between original and borrowed are diffuse, and thus translations function as original work. Translations are then relied upon to provide this stimulation until native, non-translation takes over and forces translation into a peripheral, non-influential sphere. What I argue is that the translation poetry of Horace represents a transitional state in the position of translations in the Latin polysystem. In Even-Zohar's vocabulary, this is the period in which translations occupy neither the central nor peripheral position; in Toury's, it is both *adequate* and *acceptable*. In this period, translation is mixed with original poetry to satisfy the norms of the target literary culture to which the poet-translator belongs.

Horace

The evidence for Horace comes not only from his translations, but also from poems which are either prescriptive or autobiographical. His comments in the *ArsPoetica* and *Epistle* 19 are useful in establishing Horace's theory of translation, as well as the norms of translation in his own time. In the *ArsPoetica* (Handout #1) Horace provides some revealing advice: *And you do better if you bring a song of Troy into performance than if you are the first to bring forth unknown and unsaid things. Public material will become private rights, if you do not tarry around the common and open path, nor take trouble to translate word for word like a faithful translator, nor leap, as an imitator, into the narrows, from whence either shame or the rules of the genre forbid advancing a step.*

The message here is quite clear: take a known theme and make it your own. I suspect that everyone can recognize the value of this advice without further explanation on my part, but how does it relate to the introduction of my paper today and its focus on polysystem theory? I believe that this comment indicates that the role of translations in Horace's time was somewhere between the poles of central and peripheral. Horace does not recommend that a poet should always be original, nor does he allow that translation alone is satisfactory: a mixture is required. This is a telling remark in another way as well: I mentioned earlier that Even-Zohar tells us that the borderlines between original and translated texts are diffuse when translated literature is in the central position.To put it in a Roman context, we might postulate that Livius Andronicus' *Odyssia* was not recognized as something unoriginal. But here we see a clear separation between borrowed and original material, which indicates that we are no longer seeing a time when the borderlines between original and translated are diffuse, and thus translations are no longer central. Instead, translations are becoming of secondary importance; but if we are to judge from Horace's advice, they are not yet completely peripheral. Thus in this advice we have captured a transitional moment in the polysystem that is, after all, a dynamic and competitive system.

How then can we see Horace's advice in his own work? My paper today focuses on four poems of Horace that show how he uses translation, and specifically his relationship with a particular source, to establish himself as a poet. His Greek models for these poems are Archilochus and Alcaeus in the *Epodes*

and the *Odes,* respectively. Please note that I am not arguing that Alcaeus and Archilochus were his only models. The influence of Callimachus is notable in several instances throughout the *Epodes,* as is Hipponax; Sappho surely plays a role in the *Odes*, and Catullus' influence is a significant factor in much of Horace's poetry. Yet my examination of Horace's translations are less a search for models, but rather an exploration of how Horace used translation to identify himself and his poetry, and what this might indicate about contemporary literary society.

In *Epistle* 19 (handout #2), Horace associates himself primarily with Archilochus, declaring that: "*I was the first to show the Parian iambus to Latium, following the meter and spirit of Archilochus, but not the subject or words that were aimed at Lycambes"* He qualifies this assertion, simultaneously proclaiming his originality while associating himself with his source Archilochus by claiming that he diverged from his source in subject and word (*Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio, numerous animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben*,). Thus we see the fine balance that Horace hopes to maintain between allegiance and independence in his relation with his source. Horace projects the notion that his Greek source is but the framework of his own poetic project. There is a tension in these comments that is indicative of the positioning of translation in the polysystem. Not yet is Horace free to branch out on his own, unfettered from his sources and models, nor is he able to rely entirely on those same sources. The evidence from the four poems that I discuss here is further indicative of this tension.

Epode 11

In handout item 3, we see that *Epode* 11 opens with a withdrawal from writing: *Pettius, it pleases me not at all to write verses, as it did before, now that I am struck with painful love* (*Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuvat / scriber versiculos amore percussum gravi*[1-2] . This is an echo of Archilochus, handout item 4: and I have no interest in iambi or amusements(καί μ' οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει)*fr.*215

West). The scholia of Tzetzes (*Tzetz. alleg. Hom.* Ω 125 sqq.) that quotes the Archilochean fragment, indicates that Archilochus no longer takes pleasure from writing poetry because he is in grief, brought about by the death of a loved one .Conversely, Horace discloses that writing playful poetry no longer pleases him because he has been struck with painful love (*amore percussum gravi,* 2). Watson objects to this reading of *amore percussum gravi* as causal, arguing that we cannot be seeing the same type of poetic inactivity described in Archilochus because Archilochus' pain is from grief and Horace's is from love. However, I would suggest that that difference is exactly the point.

Horace's alteration from the pain of grief to that of love should make us aware of how Horace claims this theme of emotional distraction for himself. In Archilochus (and Catullus 65 and 68a), disinterest in writing is an aftereffect of grief. Here Horace modifies the idea, which forces us to recognize a thematic shift from the source in the very opening of the allusion to Archilochus' poem, a modification which allows us to see beyond the source as Horace steps to the forefront. And thus in the very act of associating himself with Archilochus, Horace reveals his independence from that source.

Unfortunately, we have nothing else from the Archilochean fragment other than the lines quoted above, and thus we cannot surmise what additional adaptations Horace may have made from that source material. However, many scholars, such as Mankin, Watson, Gentili, and Griffin, classify Horace's *Epode* 11 as a "blame narrative", and thus connect it with the best preserved example from Archilochus, namely *fr.*196a otherwise known as the *First Cologne Epode.* If we compare Horace's *Epode* with that of Archilochus, we are introduced to a persistent feature in Horace's adaptations of Archilochus' *iambi*.

In the *First Cologne Epode,* Archilochus aims his invective at his former lover Neobule. Archilochus informs his new lover that he is leaving his fiancée Neobule. His reasoning is simple (handout item 5) Neobule has lost her good looks (24 – 8: Νεοβούλη[ν / ἄ] λλοςἀνὴρἐχέτω. / αἰαῖ, πέπειρα, δὶς [τόση / ἄν]θοςδ' ἀπερρύηκεπαρθενήιον / κ]αὶ χάριςἢ πρὶνἐπῆν. [As for Neobule, let (some?) other man have her. Ugh, she's overripe, twice your age, and her girlhood's flower has lost its bloom as

has the charm which formerly was on it][1]). He further disparages her for her passions (30), and the affairs she has had while in a relationship with Archilochus (35 – 38). Archilochus claims that if he were to marry Neobule, he would become a subject of mockery (μὴ τοῦτ᾽ εφιταν [/ὅπωςἐγὼ γυναῖκατ[ο]ιαύτηνἔχων / γεί]τοσιχάρμ᾽ ἔσομαι [(Let) no (one bid?) this, that I have such a wife and become a laughingstock to my neighbours]). The notion of being a laughingstock finds a place in Horace's *Epode*11*,* but in a rather different context.

Here Horace exposes how he had not been able to act rationally in his affair with one Inachia. He was once in a mad passion for her (*ex quo destiti / Inachia furere,* 5 – 6) and acted a fool at parties. In (Handout #6): Alas! Throughout the City (for I am ashamed of so great a disgrace) I was such a joke. He reveals that he would take comfort with Pettius, but the path that the two decided on when together would not stick when apart (continues handout 6).

> When I, stern, had openly expressed approval of these (recommendations) to you,
> and ordered to go home I went with uncertain footsteps
> to a door that was no friend of mine,
> and to that hard threshold, on which I broke my loins and my sides, 19 – 22.

Whereas in Archilochus the poet describes a scenario in which he will become a laughingstock, Horace already has been the talk of the people. In further contrast, Archilochus' shame would result from Neobule's poor qualities. *She* would be his source of shame, but here Horace is the basis of his shame. The poem concludes (23 -28) with Horace revealing that, even with a new love, one Lyciscus, in his life, he has not changed from the state of his previous affair: he claims that *neither the frank advice of friends nor their painful insults are able to free him. Epode* 11thus discloses an embarrassing failure of Horace; even though he knows better, he is in the same situation as before. This failure to better his behaviour relates to Horace's adaptation of his source. As Burnett (1983: 59) once summarized, iambic poetry

[1] Translation by Douglas Gerber (1999).

"searched out what was shameful, obscene, deformed or grotesque," in order to "keep that part (the bestial part of humans which cause these qualities) from controlling society and offending gods." Iambic poetry, then, could serve as course–correction for citizens who veered from proper behaviour. Thus here Horace aims at himself, pointing out his shameful behaviour in an attempt to correct this negative emotional response. However, as we reach the end of the poem we see that his invective has failed, since it has not resulted in the improved behaviour of its target. Therefore, in the conclusion of the poem Horace depicts himself as a rather ineffective iambic poet in that he cannot achieve change, even in his own person.

Epode 12

The undermining of his position as an iambic poet continues in Horace's twelfth *Epode*, which again thematically echoes Archilochus' First Cologne Epode (*fr*. 196a West). Again, the Horatian poem takes the premise of the Archilochean source as Horace tells his lover that he is leaving her, at least partially because of her old age. Yet it is clear that Horace attacks the former lover in harsher tones than Archilochus had. In handout# 7, line 1, he calls her "a woman fit for a black elephant," in lines 4-5 he criticizes her smell: I smell either a cuttle-fish or an ill-smelling goat living in your hairy armpits (*polypus an gravis hirsutis cubet hircus in alis*, 5). He continues to make reference to her scent, commenting on its strength when she comes upon him (*qui sudor vietis et quam malus undique membris / crescit odor*, "what a sweat and what a wicked smell rises from her wrinkled limbs when she hurries to calm her untamable lust with me and my limp penis."

The harshness of the attack should draw our attention to a peculiar subtext to the poem. As Watson (2003: 384) cautions, we must be aware that the soon to be ex-lovers of both poems have a certain claim over the poets since both pairs were engaged in a relationship. Archilochus and Neobule were held by the ties of their apparent engagement to be wed, and there is no reason to question their

relationship. While she was young, she was attractive; now that she is older, he has found a younger lover. The fault of Neobule that Archilochus most forcefully identifies is her age. Yet we should be less accepting of Horace's relationship with the *vetula*. Due to his depiction of her as smelling as if an animal lives in her armpits, we question why he was ever involved with her. Whereas we can envision that the relationship between Archilochus and Neobule has worsened from a past state of mutual happiness, here we wonder if there was ever anything positive in this relationship. Horace's complaint of her smell and forceful approaches are not depicted as something new to the relationship; rather, it appears that she always smelled and that she always forced herself on him. By causing us to question his original attraction to the *vetula,* Horace turns the iambic attack back onto himself and thereby weakens his position.

The theme of undermining the invective continues when the mistress replies to his rejection with her own insults; she thus completes the reversal when Horace becomes the sole object of mockery. In lines 16-17 of handout item 7, the *vetula* reveals that she found Horace after taking the advice of one Lesbia: damnthat Lesbia who pointed me towards incompetent you when I was seeking a bull (*pereat male, quae te / Lesbia quaerenti taurum monstravit inertem,* 16 – 17). This turned out to have been poor advice: the *vetula* laments that all this time with Horace has been wasted, since she could have been with Amyntus of Cos, whose penis, she tells us, stands firmer in his untamable groin than a young tree on the hill. (*cuius in indomito constantior inguine nervus quam nova collibus arbor inhaeret* 19 – 20). In spite of the *vetula'*s attempts to win over Horace, there is no relationship beyond the sexual aspect, and even that facet of their liaison is lacking. As the mistress reveals, the blame for this failing belongs not only to her and her smell, but also to Horace and his lack of virility.

That the *vetula* is given a place to speak is remarkable in itself. In the Archilochean source, Archilochus explains to his *new lover* why he is leaving Neobule. Neobule's sentiments about being abandoned are left unexpressed; since she is not present in the poem she has no chance to defend herself. Conversely, Horace leaves a prominent place for the *vetula*to speak: her speech is the finale of the poem.

Anger inspires the beginning of her speech, yet the sentiment shifts: in a somber tone she rhetorically asks why she had gifted him woolen fleeces that were dyed with Tyrian crimson. She answers her own question: it was because she wanted nobody to appear more loved by a woman than Horace was. She laments her poor luck as Horace runs away from her like a lamb frightened by fierce wolves or a deer by lions. The Archilochean model ends with Archilochus making love to his new mistress and thus as the tone of the poem shifts to elegy, the focus is on the *new* love. In Horace we are nearly entirely held by the failure of this relationship, however peculiar that bond may have been. Any sympathy that we have for her, someone who appears to have actually once loved Horace, only strengthens the shift in focus from the attacked to the attacker that we have been observing.

As in *Epode* 11, we see how Horace uses the opportunity for translation to contextualize himself as an iambist. Horace's indication that he is working with a familiar theme and model generates certain anticipations in respect to the poetic content. Horace uses these expectations to show his poetic independence: despite the initial sign that he was leaving his mistress because she, like Neobule, is now too old, Horace quickly deviates into the *vetula*'s numerous failings. This variation produces some doubt and hesitation about Horace himself, as the verbal assault that began aimed at her turns back towards him. The final speech of the ex- lover, a character given no voice in the source, completes the shift in blame from the *vetula* back to Horace. One might question Horace's position as an iambist as he fails to make himself superior to his object in his invective. In these two *Epodes* we thus see translations as almost a platform for Horace; how is he the same as Archilochus? How is he different? It is this comparison that is foundational to his iambic identity. But he must have been writing in a literary world that allowed and encouraged him to manipulate and subvert his sources.

Let me now shift to the *Odes*. In the same *Epistle* mentioned in respect to the *Epodes* (1.19), Horace reveals his other great achievement. We recall that it was in this *Epistle* that Horace claimed that he was the first to show Latium the iambics, using the *numerous* and *animos*of Archilochus, but neither the *res* nor *verba* (23 – 25). Shortly after these lines (in handout item 8), Horace titles himself as the one to have made Alcaeus known among the people of Latin tongue (*hunc*[Alcaeus] *ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus / volgavi fidicen*, 31 – 32): *I was the Latin lyricist to make Alcaeus known, spoken before by no other mouth.* I suggest that it is revealing that in this piece Horace identifies his primary models as Archilochus and Alcaeus. Again, I am not arguing that Alcaeus was the greatest influence for Horace: in fact, the issue of who was the most significant influence on Horace in the *Odes* is quite complicated: a reference to a Lesbian barbitos in *Ode* 1.1 has scholars divided as to who is being referenced: as Quinn and West see both Sappho and Aclaeus, Nissbet and Hubbard just Alcaeus. Woodman helpfully points out that the term *barbitos* is not found in the extent remains of Alcaeus, and that if the end of 1.1 references Sappho it leads well to 1.2, which is written in Sapphics. Thus it would be foolish to deny that Sappho was an influence on Horace. Nevertheless, the remark from the *Epistles* show a clear, explicit, desire on Horace's part to associate himself with Alcaeus as he did with Archilochus, establishing them as his primary models.

Before I examine two of the *Odes* in some detail, I wish to explore two items that are revealing of Horace's agenda. There is a telling segment in the final lines of *Ode* 1.1 (handout item 9) where Horace expresses his hope to be entered into the canon of lyric poets [*But if you place me among the lyric poets, I will strike the stars with my elevated head*], 35 – 36). This would obviously be quite the achievement for Horace, since that particular canon was set in Alexandria some 150 years before Horace was writing, but it introduces an interesting concept and shows a difference between the *Odes* and the *Epodes,* but it starts with a similarity. Alcaeus in the *Odes* is situated in the same position as Archilochus in the *Epodes*: the lyric poet is the source, and we are to be reminded of the Greek poet when we see his poetry translated in

Horace's *Odes*. The most frequent type of translation evident in the *Odes* is by tag, rather than wholesale, translation: the tags and the metre of the translation recall the source poem or poet. Horace can use these audience anticipations to poetic effect when he alters the theme or the content in the poem.

However, in the *odes* Horace puts the effect of expectations and reversals to a somewhat different use than what we observed in the *Epodes.* I argued that in Horace's *Epodes* we saw the poet make alterations in his translation to contextualize himself in his poetic activity. The result is that Horace reveals himself as a certain type of iambist, different yet similar to his model Archilochus. However, in the *Odes* we find that Horace seems more concerned with contextualizing the poetry into a Roman setting. This may seem like a minor point, but the difference has an impact in the translation output. Horace's alterations from his source in the *Epodes* show Horace the iambist as someone willing to depart from his source and move to self-attack, regularly deflating his own iambics. In the poems I examine here, there is no destabilizing of the poetry.

And there is good reason for the difference in contextualization between the *Epodes* and the *Odes.* As Barchiesi (2000: 169) observed, lyric poetry presents special problems in imitation, since "more than other genres, it implies the imitation of individuals, not just texts." In Barchiesi's evaluation, Horace needs to become the Latin Alcaeus; he cannot, as he did with iambic poetry, step into the tradition with his own ideas about iambic. Macleod (1983: 245) comes to a similar conclusion about Horace's relationship with his source, detecting that "what he (Horace) imitates is not merely metres or lines or poems of Alcaeus, but a whole poet." Barchiesi (152 – 153) also puts this type of imitation into Platonic terms, arguing that "you work on a model by mimesis and end up being a replica or impersonation of its author." And thus in his hope to enter the lyric canon, Horace attempts to become the Roman Alcaeus, thus displacing his Greek source.

Finally, Horace says quite elegantly what he did in his poetry in *Ode* 1.32, handout item 10 Here he calls on his lyre to play a Latin song, again using the identifiably Greek word *barbitos*. (*age, dic Latinum, barbite carmen*, 3-4). And thus Horace implies that he has, and will, play a Latin song on a

Greek instrument or, to rephrase it, he will fill the framework provided by his Greek sources with Latin content. Below I offer two poems that provide evidence of such activity.

Ode 1.9

In *Ode* 1.9 we find Horace calling for his addressee to bring forth the wine (7), leave the rest to the gods (9) and leave tomorrow's cares for tomorrow (13 – 15). Horace modeled the opening two strophes of the poem on Aclaeus (*fr*. 338), handout item 11: *Zeus sends rain, a great storm comes from the heavens, running waters are frozen solid (missing lines) Down with the storm! Stroke up the fire, mix the honeysweet wine unsparingly, and put a soft fillet round your brows*." The Horace is similar (handout item 12): Do you see how Soracte stands there white with deep snow, and how the straining woods no longer sustain their burden, and how the rivers stand fixed by sharp ice? Melt away the cold by placing logs high above the fire and more generously bring forth the four-year old wine from the Sabine diota, O Thaliarchus.

As Bentley (1978: 29) detects, the opening lines of Horace are quite close to those of Alcaeus: in both, bad weather has forced the party inside, where there is the warmth of the fire and the comfort of wine; as Nisbet - Hubbard argue (116), Horace even "keeps something of the movement of the exemplar" as his call *dissolve frigus* follows the form of κάλλαβετὸνχείμων'.

Yet most commentators only allow the resemblances to go that far. We cannot accurately assess Horace's dependence on the source material due to the relevant portion of Alcaeus being lost, but some general alterations are notable in what we can compare: as Quinn identifies (1980: 140), in Alcaeus the storm that forces the group indoors for the comfort of warmth and wine is currently raging. Horace's storm here, however, is already over. Edmunds (1992: 5) notices the disappearance of Zeus in the Latin translation as Horace shifts the conversation between a speaker and an addressee. Nisbet and Hubbard look more to the background of the two poems, reasoning that the source must have been very different than Horace's *Ode*, since Alcaeus wrote for a society in which the symposium was an institution. The last

three stanzas take on a decidedly Epicurean colouring (like that famously seen in *Ode* 1.11 and the imperative *carpe diem* of line 8). Edmunds (10) further detects that our attention should be drawn to the Horatian description of the wine, since it is "fuller" than the relative description in Alcaeus (who refers to the wine only as sweet [μέλιχρος]). Edmund's remark introduces a noteworthy feature of the Horatian poem.

Horace creates a rich description of the wine by labeling it as four years old and coming from a Sabine jar. And here we begin a string of Greek elements. For we begin with an /o/, and then the command issued by the narrator is aimed at one Thaliarchus, a name which indicates him as a Greek, and likely a slave, and is qualified by the ablative *diota,* a recognizably Greek word that occurs nowhere else in Latin poetry. The sum of the description is that the Greek slave is to bring the wine in a Greek jar. A reader familiar with the Alcaeic source should be wondering why there is so much about the wine. The terms of the description reveal the reason as they create a Greek scenario.

The true effect of this string of Greek references is only realized when compared to the opening question posed to the narrator's fellow whether he saw how Mt. Soracte stood, bright with snow (1 – 2). Mt. Soracte, as various commentators have pointed out, is visible from *some* places in Rome. We are surely not to take this possibility of visibility, either from Rome or from a Sabine farm, as a sign that this poem represents an actual conversation that took place in Rome. Instead, the reference to Mt. Soracte conjures the image of Rome (Nisbet – Hubbard: 116). Thus, as we will see that he does in other poems, Horace provides the local (Roman) setting to his Greek theme. Despite this Roman setting, the poem retains its Greek themes. In this manner, Horace contextualizes his poem: in the language we have already encountered in *Odes* 1.32, it is the Latin song played on the Greek lyre. The instrument of expression is Greek, but the setting is Latin. In this particular poem, we see that Greece is moved to Rome, in view of Mt. Soracte itself. The transfer (or *transferre,* the root verb for translation) occurs rather quickly, as the close translation of the opening reminds us of Alcaeus while simultaneously situating us in Rome. The

call for wine further propels the idea of Greece in Rome, as the Greek elements find a place in a Roman poem.

Ode 1.37

As my final piece of evidence, I wish to show Horace being rather subversive in *Ode* 1.37 (handout item 13): *Now is the time to drink, now the ground must be beat with free feet, now is the time to decorate the couch of the gods with a feast of the Salii, my friends. Before it was unlawful to bring the Caecuban from the ancestral storerooms, when the queen was preparing mad ruin and death for the state*

On the surface, *Ode* 1.37 celebrates the death of Cleopatra, whom the poem positions as an enemy to Augustus and the state. She is defeated and so Horace exclaims that *now* is the time for celebration. In this call, Horace echoes Alcaeus (*fr*. 332 LP). (handout item 14*): Now must men get drunk and drink with all their strength, since Myrsilus has died.*

Alcaeus calls upon his audience to drink, and to do so with all strength. The occasion for this revelry in Alcaeus is the death of the tyrant Myrsilus. Here we might project some of Horace's translation onto the original in order to fill out the lost lines: the rule of the tyrant prohibited such joyous events, so now, freed from fear, the people should celebrate. In Horace Cleopatra is cast in a similar role to that of the Alcaean tyrant, portrayed as a threat to the daily lives of the people.

Yet Horace soon departs from the opening theme (handout item 15).*But the safety of barely one ship from the fire diminished her frenzy* And continuing in lines 21 –

Seeking a more noble way to die she did not fear the sword in a womanly manner, nor did she take in exchange a hidden shore with her swift fleet, even enduring to look upon her ruined kingdom with tranquil face, and strong she handled the cruel serpents, so that she could drink black venom in her body, more fierce when death was decided upon, begrudging, of course, the cruel Liburnians that she, deprived of her kingdom, be lead to a proud triumph, no humble woman she.

Here we see that with her madness now diminished, Cleopatra looks to die more nobly (21 – 22) and puts aside her "womanly" fear of the sword (22 – 23). The description of the Egyptian queen, which began as

deprecating account, strikingly develops into praise. To return to our source material, it is difficult to imagine that Alcaeus similarly moved from slander to praise. Horace opens with a familiar concept, taken from the Greek source that he names as his primary model, but soon veers into his own direction. As Clay (138) describes: "After the Alcaic opening, we immediately expect to hear whose death precipitates the festivities, but we wait rather a long time for the other shoe to drop; and when it does, Horace has manipulated us so that we celebrate not so much the death of an enemy as Cleopatra's triumph in her death." The effect is that the translation portion takes on a different colouring.

The different tone of the final 12 lines has caused Quinn (1980: 192) to wonder whether it was written separately from the rest of the poem. Yet the shift in tone makes us cognizant of Horace's authorial voice, of which we are not immediately aware. In general terms, Horace's ode celebrates the death of someone who would restrain the people, bring the state to ruin, and displayed a degree of madness. Yet Horace refuses this structuring in the final 11 lines (21 – 32). Instead, he reflects on the positive qualities of Cleopatra: furor gone, she sought a noble death, she showed no fear, she did not flee. She was calm in the face of disaster; she braved the serpents that meant her death. She refused to allow her defeat to strip her of her royal quality. The reflective nature of the finale is remarkable, and there is a somber ending as Horace reflects that Cleopatra was no humble woman (*non humilis mulier*, 32).

We thus detect a strong contrast between the opening and the ending. The finale, reflective and somber, stands apart from where the poem began with a call to drink (*nunc est bibendum*), to dance (*nunc pede libero / pulsanda tellus,* 1 – 2) and to feast (*nunc Saliaribus / ornarepulvinardeorum / tempus erat dapibus, sodales,* 2 – 4). We leave this poem with a different sentiment than the one we expected at the outset. It is through playing on our expectations that arose not only from the Latin phrases of celebration but also from the celebratory nature of the source behind them, that Horace achieves his final effect.

Above I have presented a general outline of Horace's translation modality. Each poem relies on the audience's knowledge of the source material in order for a higher level of reading to function. Without this familiarity, we are less able to read the poet. Other poems undoubtedly could have been included that show the same methodology. For instance, from the *Odes,* 1.4 features a fragment of Alcaeus (286 Lobel - Page), as does 1.10 and 1.18; in 3.2 Horace translates two tags from Simonides. In *Ode 1.12* Horace begins a progression from Greece to Rome by reversing the order of Pindar's "What god, what hero, what man shall we celebrate?" Similarly, there are other *Epodes* that contain translations: *Epode* 15 begins with a curse aimed at a former lover, but is destabilized when Horace makes a pun about his flaccidity; *Epode* 16 may take from Archilochus *fr.*13; the beginning of *Epode* 7 appears to have *fr.*88 as an influence; the kidnapped boy's impassioned plea to Zeus in the beginning of *Epode* 5 could be modeled on a similar call for justice in *fr.*177. Further, I say nothing here of Horace's translation of other sources, such as Callimachus, Sappho, or Hipponax. The aspect of translation and traces of influences are pervasive in Horace, but I believe that what I have presented above offers a representative and original reading of his translation methodology. In the *Epodes,* Horace presents his own version of an iambic poet. Here the poet is ineffective in his aims, consistently undercutting himself.[2] We are most aware of this with knowledge of how Archilochus handled similar themes; Archilochus may depict himself in a weakened position (Neobule), but his poetry is often a means for him to escape that situation. Horace achieves quite the opposite; instead of becoming the stronger, he becomes the weaker as he offers his own take on the genre. His translations in the *Epodes* are there to highlight how different Horace is from his source.

Horace aims much higher in the *Odes*: rather than attempt to provide a personal take on a literary model, Horace sets out to bring the lyric genre itself to Rome. He achieves this by becoming one of the members of the set lyric canon. If Horace wants to bring Alcaeus to Rome, he has to create a sense of placement for a Greek type at Rome. This he does with subtle means, by presenting Greek ideas and actions among Roman geographical locations. As Horace himself wrote, he played a Latin song a Greek

[2]Watson (1995: 199) reads a similar undercutting also in *Epodes* 2, 3, 6, 11, 14, and 17.

instrument. We are surely meant to imagine that Horace is the embodiment of Alcaeus, now come to Rome. So there is a reliance on the foreign to provide some stimulus to the Latin system, but it is clearly mixed with Horace's own poetics.

And now we return to the advice of the Ars Poetica, which we find completely in line with the poetry presented above. Horace told us that while a poet should follow along familiar paths, he must also make his own mark upon that path, thus demanding simultaneous faithfulness and originality when writing. His own observance to this mandate is apparent when he puts Roman aspects into Greek meters. What is apparent is that Horace perceived an audience that *did* want to hear familiar stories, but one that also sought out artists who could handle the source material in such a way that the poet's personality was evident in the poem.

Obviously these poems say a great deal about Horace, but I do not believe that the features of these poems can be entirely explained by his attitude. Rather, the receiving culture of these poems must have played a role in their format. The translations of Horace display certain norms of contemporary literary culture, and their adherence to those norms allowed these poems to be accepted by the target audience. These translations are thus useful for reconstructing the literary culture of the period in which they were written. These poems indicate a culture that is in flux: translations still have a role in Latin literature, but they are becoming less important and relevant. On the other side, the role of original poetry is strengthening. And thus while displaying knowledge of the source, claiming adherence to the practice of another poet, and inserting oneself into long-standing genres are all important goals of these poems that are achieved via translation, these features are not enough for either the poet or the audience.

1. ***Ars Poetica*** **128-135**

tuque
rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus
quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus. (130)
publica materies priuati iuris erit, si
non circa uilem patulumque moraberis orbem, nec
uerbo uerbum curabis reddere fidus interpres, nec
desilies imitator in artum,
unde pedem proferre pudor uetat aut operis lex (135)

And you do
better if you bring a song of Troy into performance
than if you are the first to bring forth unknown and unsaid things.
Public material will become private rights, if
you do not tarry around the common and open path, nor take
trouble to translate word for word like a faithful translator, nor
leap, as an imitator, into the narrows,
from whence either shame or the rules of the genre forbid
advancing a step

2. ***Epistle*** **19, 23 - 27**

Parios ego primus iambos
ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus Archilochi,
non res et agentia verba Lycamben

I was the first to show the Parian iambus to Latium, following the meter and spirit of Archilochus, but not the subject or words that were aimed at Lycambes

3. ***Epode*** **11, 1-2**

Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuvat
scribere versiculos amore percussum gravi

Pettius, it pleases me not at all to write verses, as it did before, now that I am struck with painful love

4.Archilochus, ***fr.*** **215 W. = Tzetz.** ***Alleg. Hom.*** **24.125.**

καί μ’ οὔτ’ ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει

Trans. D. Gerber.
and I have no interest in iambi or amusements

5. Archilochus, ***fr.*** **196a (First Cologne Epode), 24-28,**

Νεοβούλη[ν
ἄ] λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω. (25)
αἰαῖ, πέπειρα, δὶς [τόση
ἄν]θος δ’ ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήιον κ]αὶ
χάρις ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆν

μὴ τοῦτ’ εφ ιταν (32)
[ὅπως ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ[ο]ιαύτην ἔχων γεί]τοσι
χάρμ’ ἔσομαι

32 – 34 . Trans. D. Gerber.
As for Neobule, let (some?) other man have her. Ugh, she’s overripe, twice your age, and her girlhood’s flower has lost its bloom as has the charm which formerly was on it

(Let) no (one bid?) this, that I have such a wife and become a laughingstock to my neighbours

6. ***Epode*** **11, 8-9, 19-22, 25-26**

heu me, per Urbem (*nam pudet tanti mali*) (8)
fabula quanta fui!

Alas! Throughout the City (for I am ashamed of so great a disgrace) I was such a joke.

ubi haec severus te palam laudaveram (19)
iussus abire domum ferebar incerto pede ad
non amicos, heu, mihi postis, et heu
limina dura, quibus lumbos et infregi latus

When I, stern, had openly expressed approval of these (recommendations) to you, and ordered to go home I went with uncertain footsteps to a door that was no friend of mine, and to that hard threshold, on which I broke my loins and my sides

unde expedire non amicorum queant (25)
libera consilia nec contumeliae graves

neither the frank advice of friends nor their painful insults are able to free me

7. *Epode* 12,1, 4-5, 7-9, 16-19

mulier nigris dignissma barris (1)

odoror
polypus an gravis hirsutis cubet hircus in alis, (5)

qui sudor vietis et quam malus undique membris(7) *crescit*
odor, *cum pene soluto*
indomitam properat rabiem sedare

Pereat male, quae te (16)
Lesbia quaerenti taurum monstravit inertem, cum
mihi Cous adesset Amyntas,
cuius in indomito constantior inguine nervus quam
nova collibus arbor inhaeret

You woman fit for a black elephant

I smell either
a cuttle-fish or an ill-smelling goat living in your hairy armpits

What sweat and what a wicked odor rises from her withered limbs when she hurries to calm her untamable lust with me and my limp penis

Damn that Lesbia who pointed me towards incompetent you when I was seeking a bull,
when Amyntus of Cos was available, whose penis stands firmer in his untamable groin than
a young tree on the hill.

8. *Epistle* 19, 31-32

hunc [Alcaeus] *ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus volgavi fidicen*.

I was the Latin lyricist to make Alcaeus known, spoken before by no other mouth.

9. *Ode* 1.1,35-36

Quodsi me lyricis uatibus inseres sublimi
feriam sidera uertice

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

10. *Ode* 1.32, 3-4

Age, dic Latinum,
barbite, carmen

Come, my barbitos sing
a Latin song

11. Alcaeus *fr.* 338 (Lobel – Page). Trans. D.A. Campbell.

ὔει μὲν ὁ Ζεῦς, ἐκ δ’ ὀράνω
χείμων, πεπάγαισιν δ’ ὐδάτων ῥόαι...
….
κάβαλλε τὸν χείμων’, ἐπὶ μὲν τίθεις (5)
πῦρ, ἐν δὲ κέρναις οἶνον ἀφειδεως
μέλιχρον, αὐταρ ἀμφὶ κόρσα
μόλθακον ἀμφι<βάλων> γνόφαλλον

Zeus sends rain, a great storm comes from the heavens, running waters are frozen solid

Down with the storm! Stroke up the fire, mix the honeysweet wine unsparingly, and put a soft fillet round your brows

12. *Ode* 1.9, 1-8

vides ut alta stet nive candidum Soracte,
nec iam sustineant onus
silvae laborantes, geluque
flumina constiterint acuto

dissolve frigus ligna super foco (5)
large reponens atque benignius deprome
quadrimum Sabina,
O Thaliarche, merum diota:

Do you see how Soracte stands there white with deep snow, and how the straining woods no longer
sustain their burden, and how the rivers stand fixed by sharp ice?

Melt away the cold by placing logs high
above the fire and more generously bring forth the four- year old wine from the Sabine diota,
O Thaliarchus

13. *Ode* 1.37, 1-8

Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero pulsanda
tellus, nunc Saliaribus
ornare pulvinar deorum
tempus erat dapibus, sodales

antehac nefas depromere Caecubum
cellis avitis, dum Capitolio
regina †dementis †ruinas
funus et imperio parabat

Now is the time to drink, now the ground must be beat
with free feet, now is the time to decorate the
couch of the gods with a feast of the Salii, my
friends.

Before it was unlawful to bring the Caecuban wine from the
ancestral storerooms, when the queen was preparing
mad ruin and death for the state

14. Alcaeus *fr.* 332 (L-P). Trans. Campbell.

νῦν χρὴ μεθύσθην καί τινα πὲρ βίαν πώνην,
ἐπεὶ δ ἠ κάτθανε Μύρσιλος.

Now must men get drunk and drink with all their strength, since
Myrsilus has died

15. Ode 1.37, 12-14, 21-32

sed minuit furorem
vix una sospes navis ab ignibus

quae generosius
perire quaerens nec muliebriter expavit
ensem nec latentis
classe cita reparavit oras,
ausa et iacentem visere regiam
vultu sereno, fortis et asperas tractare
serpentis, ut atrum
corpore combiberet venenum, deliberata
morte ferocior,
saevis Liburnis scilicet invidens
privata deduci superbo
non humilis mulier triumpho

But the safety of barely one ship from the fire diminished her
frenzy

Seeking a more noble way
to die she did not fear the sword in a womanly manner, nor did
she take in exchange a hidden shore with her swift fleet, even
enduring to look upon her ruined kingdom
with tranquil face, and strong she handled the cruel serpents, so
that she could drink black venom
in her body, more fierce when death was decided upon,
begrudging, of course, the cruel Liburnians that she, deprived
of her kingdom, be lead to a proud triumph, no humble
woman she.

Select Bibliography

Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2000. "Rituals in ink: Horace on the Greek lyric tradition," in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of genre, authors, canons and society.* Harvard.

Burnett, A.P. 1983. *Three Archaic poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. Cambridge.

Clay, J.S. 2010. "Horace and Lesbian Lyric," in G. Davis, ed. *A companion to Horace*. West Sussex. 128 – 146.

Edmunds, L. 1992. *From a Sabine Jar: Reading Horace Odes* 1.9. Chapel Hill.

Even-Zohar, I. 1978a. "Papers in Historical Poetics," in B. Hrushovski and I. Even-Zohar, eds. *Papers on Poetics and Semiotics* 8. Tel Aviv.

_____1978b. "The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem," in J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert and R. van den Broeck, eds. *Literature and translation.* Leuven. 117 – 127.

Feeney, D. 1993. "Horace and the Greek lyric poets," in N. Rudd, ed. *Horace* 2000: *A celebration*. Ann Arbor. 41 – 63.

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.

Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and its public in ancient Greece*. Baltimore.

Griffin, J. 1986. *Latin poets and Roman life*. Chapel Hill.

Hutchinson, G.O. 2007. "Horace and archaic Greek poetry," in S. Harrison, ed. *Cambridge companion to Horace*. New York. 36 – 49.

Macleod, C.W. 1982. "Horace and his lyric models: a note on *Epode* 9 and *Odes* 1.37," *Hermes,* 110: 371 – 375.

Mankin, D. ed. and comm. 1995. *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. 1970. *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book* 1. Oxford.

Quinn, K. 1972. ed. and comm. 1980. *Horace: the Odes*. London.

Toury, G. 1978. "The nature and role of norms in literary translation," in J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert, and R. van den Broeck, eds. *Literature and translation*. Leuven. 83 – 100.

_____1995. *Description translation studies – and beyond.* Amsterdam.

Watson, L. 2003. *A commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford.

West, D. 1995. *Horace Odes* 1: *Carpe Diem*. Oxford.

Woodman, T. 2002. "*Biformis Vates:* the Odes, Catullus and Greek lyric*,"* in T. Woodman and D. Feeney, eds. *Traditions and contexts in the poetry of Horace*. Cambridge.