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"You're going to include this in your book on the Ars Poetica?" asked my friend, Ann Scott, looking incredulously at my tables and charts on the date of the poem. The idea of publishing the material that follows as a separate book was born that day. My motivations in dividing my work on the poem into at least two publications are several. First, the methodological and literary styles of the following work are quite different from those in the purely interpretative book that I also hope to publish on the Ars Poetica. The two works may thus appeal to two rather different readerships, neither very interested in the concerns of the other. Secondly, since the longer, interpretative book I plan to publish elsewhere contains a re-reading of the poem as a parody, it makes sense to precede that book with the present study, which provides some of the background assumptions and scholarly underpinnings for my new reading. Not that my new interpretation could not stand on its own, in the event that the following study falls on deaf ears or on minds more mathematically, or prosopographically, agile than mine.

The statistical analyses that follow are based on the digitized text of Horace edited by F. Klingner and kindly made available to me in Macintosh™ format by Tad Brennan of Princeton University with the consent of the publisher, the Packard Humanities Institute. I wish to thank Dr. David Packard for permission to use the text and Dr. John Gleason for helping me to obtain a copy. Mr. Brennan informs me that "the Horace files were created using the Ibycus Scholarly Computer; the P.H.I. Demonstration CD-ROM #1, a collection of Latin texts published by the Packard Humanities Institute; and Ibyxfer, a file-transfer program written by Wilkins Poe of Yale University. The Packard Humanities Institute CD-ROM describes itself as 'partially corrected,' and this must be taken at face value; errors are sure to exist." I have not had the resources to proofread the text nor to do more than correct a few errors that I happened to note in the course of these investigations. Since there are over 40,000 words of Horace extant, I would hope that any textual errors that may
have crept into the P.H.I. text will have but little impact on the statistical studies that follow.

Once transferred to Macintosh format, analysis of the text was aided by the text-processing program, Doug Clapp's Word Tools™, published by Aegis Development, Inc. Most of the statistical analyses and graphics were produced with the help of the statistics package, Systat 3.2™, published by Systat, Inc. I also used the Data Desk—Student Version™.

Readers who are unfamiliar with statistics will inevitably be disappointed to find that this book presumes at least a basic understanding of the field and does not attempt to provide more by way of background than references to the first-year college textbook that I myself used in getting started (A. Agresti and B. Finlay, Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences [San Francisco and London, 1986])]. Before tackling such a work, students of literature may be directed to A. J. Kenny's approachable book, The Computation of Style (Oxford 1982), which introduces many of the fundamental concepts of statistics through literary examples and problems.
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INTRODUCTION

About one instance of the relationship between historical background and poetic foreground in the works of Catullus, Sir Ronald Syme wrote:

The proconsul and his 'comites', Veranius and Fabullus, have a chronological bearing on the life and writings of Catullus, that imbroglio of problems where dogma and ingenuity have their habitation, where argument moves in circles, and no new passage in or out.¹

These words might seem to provide an inappropriate—or, at least, inauspicious—beginning to a new study of the centuries-old and interrelated problems of the title, date, addressees, and genre of the poem we call Horace's Ars Poetica. Dogma and ingenuity have certainly found their habitation in scholars' treatment of these problems, too. About this work, Horace's longest and most influential, we know much less than we sometimes assume. Moreover, much of what we think we know about these topics is subject to doubt and perhaps even revision. The purpose of this study is to support these claims, which, once demonstrated, set the stage for the new interpretation of the poem as a parody of Peripatetic poetics that I will adumbrate here and present with full details elsewhere.

By subtitled this book, New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica, I want, first of all, to allude to Syme's phrase, "new passage in." By using the plural, I also want to suggest that a historical reading of a poem as complex and elusive as the Ars Poetica requires that we make our way not along a single royal road, but through a variety of approaches, old and new, if we are to stop moving in the same interpretive circles. Progress in this as in any scholarly project comes from our ability to bring to bear new evidence, new methods, or

both to address old problems. These methods help us to eke out more information from the evidence contained within the poem itself and to find more unexploited historical evidence that can help us to calibrate our reactions to the poem with the knowledge and assumptions of Horace's informed, contemporary readership. For the first, I would single out statistical stylistics, which, applied here for the first time to the problem of dating Horace's poetry, can rely on data within the poems themselves to suggest a probabilistic dating of the *Ars Poetica*. Applying art-historical analysis to the interpretation of the opening lines of the poem exemplifies the second way in which a newly applied methodology can provide a richer context for historical understanding of the *Ars Poetica*. Of course, traditional philological techniques have a contribution to make, too, e.g., in helping us to determine the poem's genre and to make sense of the ancient and medieval evidence about its title and position in Horatian manuscripts.

Progress can also be made by shifting our perspectives as critics. For far too long the *Ars Poetica* has been read as something that would be rather anomalous among Horace's poems: a sincere and almost confessional “how-to-do-it” booklet. Read in this way, the poem can be—and in this century generally has been—too easily dismissed as disappointing or worse. “The nineteenth century, like the twentieth so far, did without the *Ars*,” wrote the translator C. H. Sisson with much justification. In their history of literary criticism, Wimsatt and Brooks wrote rather dismissively that “the *Ars Poetica*...is a nice mélange of objective and critical rules with snatches of studio wisdom.” It is a telling fact that even the most historically-oriented literary critics of Horace have rarely found insights in the *Ars Poetica* that aid them in understanding his other poems. To cite perhaps the most striking example, in his influential book on Horace, Fraenkel did not discuss the poem at any length, mentioning it mainly in footnotes. Yet, if the *Ars Poetica* were really Horace's poetic credo, it ought to be of some utility in the practical criticism of his poetry. Persona-theory, applied so fruitfully to other Roman poetry, including Horace's own, can also serve us well in this endeavor to break free of critical ruts and circles. Once we dis-

---


3 W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. and C. Brooks, *Literary Criticism. A Short History* (New York 1957) 94. They go on to write: “Keep your pencils sharpened, carry a pocket notebook, drink a pint of beer with lunch...take your time in publishing. It is no derogation from such statements to say that they are not strictly parts of criticism. In the *Ars Poetica* of Horace they are, despite the random structure of the poem, not actually in great danger of being confused with criticism.”

4 E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957). As far as I can tell, the only references to the poem occur at pp. 77n2, 125n3, 148n2, 177n2, 299, 308n1, 347n4, 365n1, 382, 389n3, 389n5, 393n3, and 398n4.
sociate Horace, the poet, from the speaker of the *Ars Poetica*, the poet’s fictional creation, we can stop having to explain or edit away the poem’s deficiencies and dullness, and we can begin to appreciate in it the same techniques of wit and satire that are so characteristic of Horace’s poetry.  

The itinerary we will pursue through these approaches is as follows. In Chapter 1 I discuss the ancient and medieval evidence about the title of the poem and its location in the ancient manuscripts of Horace’s poetry, showing that modern editors’ habit of printing the poem after or even with *Epistles II* and of giving it the title *Epistula ad Pisones* goes against the grain of the evidence and reflects the (in most cases probably unconscious) influence of some rather flimsy Renaissance theorizing. The evidence strongly suggests that we should view the poem as an independent work in the Horatian corpus. In Appendix I, the pertinent Renaissance texts for the letter-theory are reproduced.

In Chapter 2 I tackle the problem of the poem’s date, using statistical stylistics and more traditional historical and literary arguments to advocate an early date (i.e., 24-20 B.C.) against the currently fashionable late dating to the end of Horace’s life. Appendix II presents some technical details.

In Chapter 3 several of the major prosopographical and interpretive consequences of chronology are discussed. Of these, the first and perhaps most important is that the early dating does not force us—as has been assumed for over a century—into the uncomfortable position of having to identify Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 23) as the senior addressee of the *Ars Poetica*. Rather, there is good reason to assign that role to L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cos. 58), a candidate never before considered, doubtless because of modern scholarly speculation that he died well before the *Ars Poetica* was written. In Appendix III is related the historical evidence from Pola supporting my suggestion that this speculation is probably wrong. Caesoninus—who had been memorably pilloried by Catullus for bad taste in choosing his literary companions and who had been branded the “Phalaris of grammatici” by Cicero—stood for bad literary taste in this period. The fact that the speaker of the *Ars Poetica* mentions him and Hor-  

---

5 I am aware of only one earlier attempt to apply persona-theory to the *Ars Poetica*: A. G. Wood, *Literary Satire and Theory. A Study of Horace, Boileau, and Pope* (New York and London 1985) passim. As will be seen below in Chapters 3 and 4, I do not agree with Wood’s statements that “the ‘I’ of the [*Ars Poetica*] is portrayed much like the poet...” (p. 4) and that “we should not expect to find great differences between the texts and the stated beliefs of Horace. In the case of Horace it is extremely difficult to find inconsistencies between the poet and his personae” (p. 14). Wood’s analysis, while claiming to be based on persona-theory, makes very little progress beyond earlier interpretations of the *Ars Poetica* precisely because it fails to find any inconsistencies between the poem and the behavior and “stated beliefs” of the poet.
ace's bête noire, Sp. Maccius Tarpa, as respected authorities on literature naturally calls the speaker's own authority into question—a suggestive piece of evidence for the parody-theory. This chapter concludes with a reading of the poem's opening lines, where I argue that through his misuse of rhetoric and his display of ignorance about new developments in Roman painting, the speaker is characterized right from the start as a pretentious pedant who abuses poetic license and is out of touch with the taste of Horace and his circle.

In Chapter 4 I reconsider the generic classification of the poem, arguing that it more closely conforms to the features of Horatian sermo than to those of epistula—an exercise of interest for at least three reasons. First of all, refutation of the letter-theory reinforces the view that the Ars Poetica should not be printed with Epist. II or interpreted in the light of those poems. Secondly, the case for classifying the poem as sermo on the basis of formal features adds strength to the conclusion of Chapter 2 that the poem was composed in the period between Sat. II and Epist. I: for, although, as Carm. IV shows, Horace could revisit a genre after a long absence, he generally did not do so, and hence our dating is more plausible to the extent that it puts the poem into a period of Horace's life when he was writing poetry of a similar kind. Finally, the classification of the Ars Poetica as sermo lends obvious support to its interpretation as a mock-didactic parody, since, especially in Sat. II, we find some striking passages and even whole poems in which Horace sends up pedants and their foolish dogmas.

Before joining the imbroglio that rages around these matters, I should stress that one of my main goals here is less to offer new solutions to the old problems than to reveal how speculative our answers to all these questions have been and—in view of the evidence—must, perforce, be. Another goal is to re-open discussion of these major problems facing a critic of the poem, something desirable, I think, because our most recent studies of the Ars Poetica, for all their virtues, have been lacking in this regard. Since some of these problems have not been thoroughly reconsidered for a century or more, solutions originally offered as speculations have almost come to have the status of facts. In pursuit of this second goal, I will be proposing some new solutions that, if not necessarily always more cogent than the possibilities encountered in the scholarly literature, are at least no more speculative than those they would replace.

As in the case of Catullus' poetry, which cannot be diachronically understood without bringing to bear what can be ferreted out about such historical personages as Piso, Veranius and Fabullus, the importance of this enterprise lies in the new framework for interpreting the Ars Poetica to which it gives rise. As we will see, once we show that there are new possible ways of solving such basic—if seemingly antiquarian—problems as dating and classifying the poem and identifying its addressees, we are well on our way to constructing a fresh reading of what may well be not merely the longest, but also the wittiest, of Horatian poems.
CHAPTER 1

THE TITLE OF THE POEM: ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL EVIDENCE VS. RENAISSANCE SPECULATION

What we know, or think we know, about the background of a literary work can have a decisive effect on our interpretation. Clues provided by the author—particularly the title—and facts uncovered, or commonplaces created, by scholars and recorded in introductions, prefaces, or even, in modern times, on dust jackets create certain expectations in us even before we read the first words of a text. As S. J. Wilsmore has recently written, "the literary work often possesses its title essentially in that it could not be the same literary work without it. Moreover, it often possesses many of its essential aesthetic properties—those that must necessarily be perceived if it is to be 'appreciated'—as titles reveal them." J. Fisher noted that "the unique purpose of titling is hermeneutical: titles are names which function as guides to interpretation." These points are so obvious that they need not be elaborated here. They bear repeating because they have often been forgotten, or at least ignored, by critics of the poem that, as I will show presently, should be called the Ars Poetica but which is all too often given the misnomer Epistula ad Pisones—as it is, for example, in two otherwise excellent new studies recently published by Rudd and Kilpatrick.

1 Cf. H. Adams, "Titles, Titling, and Entitlement To," JAAC 46 (1987) 7-21, at p. 17: "Titles don’t come at the ends or middles of texts, so the relation that we have been considering is always one involving expectation...."
It is thus useful to begin this study by reviewing what is known about the poem’s title. The titles that we find in modern editions—Ars Poetica, Epistula ad Pisones, or Epist. II.3—are not supported by any evidence dating from Horace’s lifetime. How Horace and his contemporaries referred to the poem is a mystery and is likely to remain one. Information about the title starts to become available about one hundred years after Horace’s death in references to it by other writers. More information is contained in the late-antique scholia and in the medieval manuscript tradition. Now, normally such a wealth of material would be sufficient to establish something like the title of an ancient work, assuming, of course, that the evidence points in a certain direction, as it does in the present case. Why, then, do so many scholars use the titles Epistula ad Pisones or Epist. II.3 when the only title with strong ancient and medieval support is Ars Poetica?

Let us start by looking at the work’s location in the ancient and medieval manuscripts of Horace’s poetry and in modern printed editions. My aim is simple: not so much to add to our knowledge of such matters as to remind readers of Horace that the custom of printing the Ars Poetica at the end of the corpus with (or, next to) the “sincere” poetic letters to Augustus and Florus in Epistles II is modern and is not supported by any credible ancient evidence.

Where the Ars Poetica appeared in late-antique texts of Horace’s works can be inferred from the arrangement of the poems in the principal medieval manuscripts and from the order in which the ancient commentator Porphyrio discusses the works, as Vollmer’s table (TABLE I, next page) indicates. Vollmer compiled this table in order to try to group the mss. into families—that is, for purposes of textual history and criticism. This attempt failed, as Brink trenchantly showed, but the information is still useful for another purpose. With its help, we can easily see that in the ancient texts, the Ars Poetica came either fourth, after the Carm. Saec. (CLASS I), or else second, after the Odes (CLASS II). In either case, the poem was kept quite distinct from Epist. I and II. The ancients considered it an independent work in Horace’s corpus.

We do not understand why, nor do we know exactly when, the poems of Horace were arranged in these ways. Wickham thought that the Ars Poetica and Odes appeared as the first two works because of their utility in the schools, but

---

5 His commentary presumably follows the order of the works in the ancient edition he was using.

6 See Brink, II, 14; F. Vollmer, “Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz,” Philologus Suppl. 10 (1907) 290. The abbreviations for the sigla are from Brink (see II, 53); here and there Vollmer’s differ.

7 Brink, II, 15.
this arrangement only pertains to Vollmer’s CLASS II. Vollmer thought that the principle of arrangement of the second class was alphabetical order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS I</th>
<th>CLASS II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C(E)</td>
<td>V(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Epod.</td>
<td>Epod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ars Poetica</td>
<td>Ars Poetica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Serm.</td>
<td>Epist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is, in any event, clear is that before Henricus Stephanus (Henri Estienne), whose influential edition of Horace was first published in 1549, almost no editor placed the Ars Poetica after Epist. II at the very end of the Horatian corpus. It is also clear that Stephanus’ location was not immediately accepted by everyone: for example, the new version of the great variorum edition of Parrasio, Badius van Assche, Poliziano, Sabellico, et al., published in Venice

10Vollmer, op. cit. (supra n. 6) 278n30. Brink rightly expresses scepticism at II, 14.

An earlier edition to print the Ars Poetica as the last work in the Horatian corpus was that of Joannes Aloisius Tuscanus published in ca. 1474 (= Mills 32, with a date of ca. 1475; ca. 1474 is the date given in the British Library catalogue for L.B. 18046, which I have examined in London). There may well have been other pre-Stephanus editions to print the Ars Poetica last; I cannot claim to have inspected every printed edition of Horace predating 1549.
in 1553, kept the Ars in its old position after the Carmen Saeculare and before Sermones I, the position in C(E). This is the same place in which the anonymously edited opera omnia published ex officina M. Vascosani put the Ars Poetica in 1551. In Georgius Fabricius' Horace edition, which appeared in Basel in 1555, the poem also appeared after the Carmen Saeculare and before Sermones I, and was to remain there as late as the Leipzig reprint of 1593. That Stephanus' rearrangement of the corpus became canonical—and remains so to this day—is probably due to Lambinus' great edition with commentary of 1561, where the Ars Poetica is printed last, after Epistles II.

As the material collected in Appendix I shows, no one seems to have called the Ars Poetica the Epistola ad Pisones before Jason De Nores, the professor of Moral Philosophy at Padua from 1577 to his death in 1590, who in 1553 wrote a commentary on the poem based on the ideas of his friend and teacher, Horatius Flaccus, Poetae Venusini Omnia Poemata (Venice 1553) = Mills 154 (and cf. Mills 97, 112, 119, etc.). On Aulo Giano Parrasio and his work on Horace's Ars Poetica, see F. D'Episcopo, Aulo Giano Parrasio, fondatore dell'Accademia Cosentina (Cosenza 1982). In M.-A. Muret's edition published in Venice in 1555 (Horatius. M. Antonii Mureti in Eundem Annotationes), the Ars Poetica is printed as a separate work after Epistles II but before Serm. I. Muret entitled the work, "Q. Horatii Flacci De Arte Poetica Liber. Ad Pisones" (p. 189).

Q. Horatii Flacci Poemata (Paris 1545-1551) = Mills 137. This edition appeared in five parts; the part containing the Ars Poetica was issued in 1551.

See Mills 160 for the 1555 printing; I examined the 1593 reprint in the Bib. Marciana. On Fabricius (1516-1571), see Biographie universelle, 13 (Paris 1855) 294.

Lambinus' work appeared in two volumes, of which the first contains the lyric poems and the second the hexameters: Q. Horatii Flaccus, Ex fide, atque auctoritate decem librorum manuscriptorum, opera Dionys. Lambini Monstroliensis emendatus: Ab eodemque commentariis copiosissimis illustratus, nunc primum in lucem editus (Lyon 1561) (= Mills 168); and Q. Horatii Flacci sermonum libri quattuor, seu satyrarum, libri duo, epistolarum, libro duo, a Dionysio Lambino Monstroliensi ex fide novem librorum manuscriptorum emendati ab eodemque commentariis copiosissimis illustrati (Lyon 1561) (= Mills 171). Note that Mills 171 = Mills 124, the copy in the California State Library, Sutro Branch, which Mills, following the Sutro catalogue entry, erroneously dates to 1541. As I suspected, and as Mr. Clyde Janes, Director of the Library, kindly confirmed in a personal communication, the title page of the Sutro copy dates the book to MDLXI, which was apparently misread as MDLXI. Despite the possible implication of the title of the second volume containing the hexameters, Lambinus did not include the Ars in the second book of Epistles but printed it as an independent work after Epist. II. For an appreciation of Lambinus' edition, see C. O. Brink, "Horatian Poetry. Thoughts on the Development of Textual Criticism and Interpretation," Wolfenbütteler Forschungen 12 (1981) 7-17, at p. 10.
Padua professor Trifone Gabriele (Appendix I [3]). In the preface to the work, De Nares gave a fairly detailed justification of this title, stating that the poem had the form of a letter, not of a technical treatise. Dismissing the testimony of Quintilian on the title, De Nares argues against possible critics of his new title by noting that letters can offer precepts and treat serious matters; he points out that in several of Horace's own indisputable letters, he does just this. De Nares also sees in the poem's lack of elaborate structure a further argument in favor of the letter-theory, since "the letter likes a certain familiarity of tone, and a highly precise structure tends more towards severity than familiarity."

It is likely that sensitivity of Gabriele and De Nares to the characteristics of the epistolary genre reflects the influence of earlier sixteenth-century works on the epistle, such as that by the northern Italian humanist, Marino Becichemo, who wrote a lengthy and perceptive treatise on this topic, without specific reference to the Ars Poetica (Appendix I [1]). Another possible influence was Erasmus. At any rate, it is certain that De Nares knew the work of Francesco Robortello, whose career as public humanist took him to teaching positions in Venice, Bologna, and Padova. In his Paraphrasis of the poem, printed in 1548 (Appendix I [2]) Robortello cautiously called the poem "Libellum...Qui Vulgo De Arte Poetica Inscribitur," and his introductory explanation for the poem's lack of structure foreshadowed De Nares' epistle-theory.

---


17 For a brief vita of and bibliography on Robortello (1516-1567), see W. McCuaig, Carlo Sigonio. The Changing World of the Late Renaissance (Princeton 1989) 9; Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy (Cambridge 1988) 835.
De Nores' work was to have great influence through the centuries. The idea of classifying the *Ars Poetica* as a letter first spread through northern Italy. In 1555, Marc-Antoine Muret—who had been living in the Veneto since the previous year, having fled charges of sodomy and heresy in his native France—also implicitly embraced De Nores' theory. In his *In Horatium Scholia* (Venice 1555) he called the poem “Epistola in Artem Poeticam” (*Appendix I* [4]). Another French scholar in Italy in the 1550s was Muret's friend Denis Lambin, whose headnote to the *Ars Poetica* in his great Horace edition of 1561 (*Appendix I* [5]; and cf. above n. 14) repeats De Nores' defense of the letter-thesis against a possible attack that a letter should offer precepts and also suggests that the poem's length is no impediment to interpreting it as a letter. From Henri Estienne's *Schediasmata* (*Appendix I* [10]), we learn that Lambin spent some time in Padua “many years ago” where he discussed Horace's poetry with Estienne. From Lambin's love letters to Lucia of Padua, we can date their Padua sojourn to 1549-1552. It was doubtless in these years that Lambin and Estienne had their discussions, after exposure to Robertello's and De Nores' new ideas.

With Lambin, De Nores' ideas spread to northern Europe, and not a moment too soon. In 1561, Julius Caesar Scaliger, who praised Horace's lyric poetry, attacked the *Ars Poetica* for displaying a lack of craftsmanship (cf. *Appendix I* [6a-c]). Scaliger's criticisms caught on among such non-scholarly writers as Claude Du Verdier and Henry Peacham, but fell on deaf ears among philologists, who grew ever more bold in their application of the epistle-

---


19 See H. Potez and F. Préchac (eds.), *Lettres galantes de Denys Lambin, 1552-1554. Publications de la Faculté de l'Université de Lille* 6 (1941) x (for the chronology of Lambin's first Italian trip with Cardinal de Tournon), and 1-3 for a letter dated 5 December 1552 to Lucia, the last lines of which read: “Quoties ad me scribere voles, huic recte dare poteris. Habitat cum Legato Regio. Est huic nomen Henrico Stephano.” On Lambin (1516-1572), see *Biographie universelle*, 23 (Paris n.d.) 58-59. Lambin's observation that some letters could be quite long was a Renaissance commonplace; cf. J. L. Vives, op. cit. (*supra* n. 16) 125-126 (§101).

thesis.\textsuperscript{21} Thus, Johann Sturm—perhaps most famous as the teacher of Petrus Ramus\textsuperscript{22}—suggested that the poem belonged in \textit{Epistiles} II. Rejecting as inconclusive the argument that the poem is a letter simply because it was addressed to the Pisones, Sturm rests his case on the facts that \textit{Epistles} I has about 1,000 lines and that \textit{Epistles} II would be approximately as long if the \textit{Ars Poetica} is combined with the letters to Augustus and Florus (cf. \textit{Appendix I} [9]). Sturm also points out that the \textit{Ars Poetica} treats the same subject as \textit{Epist.} II.1 and II.2. Despite his belief about the genre of the poem, Sturm retained the traditional title, \textit{De Arte Poetica Liber}. Sturm's work was published in 1576 by his student Joannes Lobartus Borussus. It was not long before Iacobus Cruquius, in his Antwerp edition of 1578, took the next logical step and actually called the \textit{Ars Poetica} "Epistola Tertia Libri Secundi, Ad Pisones De Arte Poetica."\textsuperscript{23} Cruquius' new position and title were accepted by other scholars almost immediately. Petrus Gualterius Chabotius, for example, called the poem "Epistola Tertia Libri Secundi Ad Pisones De Arte Poetica" in his \textit{Expositio analytica et brevis in universum Q. Horatii Flacci poema} (Paris 1582).\textsuperscript{24}

Since the late sixteenth century, the speculations of Stephanus, De Nores, Sturm, and Cruquius have become deeply ingrained in our editions, literary histories, and therefore in our assumptions about the poem. Today it comes as a surprise to most non-specialists to discover that, in fact, the ancient and medieval evidence offers virtually no support to the placement of the poem with
Epistulae II nor even to its classification as a letter.\textsuperscript{25} As we have seen, these humanist speculations were presented with great boldness but little argumentation. In particular, De Nores and Lambin did not so much positively establish that the poem is an epistle as defend the unargued epistle-thesis against hypothetical attacks about subject matter and length. Sturm's argument about book-length, while ingenious, is hardly compelling: 500 lines is not abnormal in this period, as Virgil's \textit{Georgics} shows.\textsuperscript{26} One can also argue that the \textit{Epodes} (625 lines), \textit{Ars Poetica}, \textit{Epistles} II, and \textit{Odes} IV (580 lines) give sufficient evidence for the existence of modest-sized, "Homerical" books in the Horatian corpus.

In this century, editions, commentaries, and translations either print the poem as \textit{Epistles} II.3 or else put it in Stephanus' position after \textit{Epistles} II.2, which, in both cases, gives the unwary reader the impression that the \textit{Ars} is somehow to be associated with the second book of letters.\textsuperscript{27} To the contrary, the evidence strongly suggests that—whatever the basis of the ancient arrangement of Horace's works—the \textit{Ars Poetica} was a separate \textit{liber}, not part of the \textit{Epistles}. We may here express the hope that future editors will restore the \textit{Ars} to its pre-sixteenth century position in the corpus, somewhere after the \textit{Odes} and before the \textit{Satires}. The point is not so much to put it back where Horace wanted it—

As for the title, we have seen that in reclassifying the poem, neither De Nores nor Sturm cited any ancient evidence. Within a few decades of De Nores' treatise, Henri Estienne, in his \textit{Diatribeae} (1575), noted that, in two places, the late-antique grammarian Charisius quotes words from the \textit{Ars} as coming from Horace's \textit{epistulae} (cf. Appendix I [7]).\textsuperscript{28} These are the passages:

\textsuperscript{25}Cf. below, Chapter 4, where I show that the poem does not display the generic features of Horatian (or, for that matter, other ancient) letters.


\textsuperscript{27}By the words "somehow to be associated with" I mean that the poem is either part of \textit{Epistles} II or else is at least written in the same style, genre, or spirit as the poems immediately preceding. While editors who print the \textit{Ars} at the end of their editions as a separate work could claim to be implying nothing of the sort, we might ask why they have not simply kept the \textit{Ars} in one of its less pregnant positions in the medieval mss. Cf. the perceptive comment of Brink (I, 239) on the tendency to date the \textit{Ars} late: "without much reasoning [scholars] assigned to the \textit{Ars} the last place in the chronology...often, one suspects, because H. Stephanus had assigned to it the last place in the sequence of the poems."

\textsuperscript{28}See H. Stephanus' new edition of the \textit{Poemata} of Horace, to which he appended (separately paginated) \textit{Diatribeae De Hac Sua Editione} (Paris 1575 = Mills 200; cf. Mills 199). On Charisius, see \textit{Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Litera-
Aldus Manutius (II), in his commentary on the poem of 1576, summarily rejected Charisius’ testimony, noting that it contradicts all other ancient evidence (see Appendix I [8]). In favor of Manutius’ position, we may note that Charisius, while generally reliable, is not perfect when it comes to citing titles. At 268.5 (Barwick), he refers to Lucretius 1.525 as *Lucretius... de rerum natura libro III.* At 100.18, he calls Caesar’s *ad Pisonem* the *de Pisone.* The incipits and explicits of the manuscripts of the poem and the scholia are all but unanimous in calling the poem the *Ars Poetica.* Charisius himself twice refers to Terentius Scaurus’ second-century A.D. *Commentarii in Artém Poeticam,* thereby showing awareness of a very different title. One such reference comes in [1]. Even if unlikely, his reports that the poem belonged in the letters need to be examined in some detail here because they have been taken more seriously than they should by recent commentators.

We may begin by granting that it is, of course, possible that Charisius was correct in assigning the poem to Horace’s *epistulae.* If so, we have no way of knowing, on the basis of Charisius, to which book of *Epistles* the *Ars* would have been attached (advocates of the epistle-thesis, following Sturm, too quickly assume *Epist. II*), and we can say that such a text, if it ever really existed, must have been late-antique. Vollmer’s observation about Charisius remains valid, at least as far as the original publication of the *Ars* and the early ancient texts of Horace are concerned: “mit keiner in Hss. sich findenden Ordnung deckt sich, daß...”

---


Horatius corr. n1 [= codex Neapolitanus IV A 9 saec. xv/xvi]

persius N [= codex Neapolitanus IV A 8, olim Bobiensis, saec. vii/viii]

2. Charisius, p. 265.1-5 Barwick-Kühnert (= p. 204.5-10 Keil):

Longum clamet Horatius epistolarum [*Ars Poet. 459*], ‘licit succurrite longum clamet’; ut Maro quoque [Ecl. 3.79] ‘et longum...Jolla.’

---

29 For Aldus Manutius (II), Paulli filius, Aldi nepos, see his *In Q. Horatii Flacci Venusini Librum De Arte Poetica...Commentarius* (Venice 1576).


31 Cf. Charisius 263.11-12, 272.27-28 Barwick.
Charisius gram. I 202,26 und 204,5 die ars poetica als in epistulis citiert, während doch schon Quintilian das gesonderte Buch kennt. As Bowersock has aptly observed in another context, "the mere antiquity of a testimony is no guarantee, especially when it is testimony of some four hundred years after the text."

However, even the hypothesis of a late-antique text of Horace calling the Ars a letter is subject to serious doubts. Charisius, his source(s), a glossator, or the scribe of Naples codex IV A 8 may have simply erred. Insufficient attention has been paid to how Charisius cites his literary parallels. There are, in general, two classes of citations: those with writers cited by name and frequently by title; and those often cited by name but never by title. In the first class belong quotations of, e.g., Cicero, Cinna, Sallust, and Virgil. In the second class are to be found Ovid, Persius, Propertius, and Tibullus. Where does Horace belong? In his grammar, Charisius cites passages of Horace a total of nineteen times. Aside from the problematic passages [1] and [2] above, he never gives the title. In four cases he does not even mention Horace's name. The seventeen secure cases all but ensure that Charisius cited Horace without title and sometimes without name. On this basis, the title cited in [1] and [2] is suspect insofar as it cannot in all probability be supported by the authority of Charisius.

32 Vollmer, op cit. (supra n.6) 290n67.
34 The passages in Charisius (= C., with pagination of Barwick's edition) are the following (* = no mention of Ovid's name): De Medic. Fac. 39 = C. 114.13; Art. Am. 1.249 = C. 91.29; Art. Am. 2.67 = C. 132.19; Art. Am. 2.375 = C. 131.28; Art. Am. 2.653 = C. 92.1; Metam. 1.13 = C. 82.6; Metam. 3.79 = C. 368.7*; Metam. 3.522 = C. 172.12; Metam. 4.494 = C. 102.10.
35 Persius (= Ps.): 1.25 = C. 109.10 (as printed by Keil, not Barwick, i.e., without Putschens supplement in sat. I); Ps. 4.43 = C. 332.3; Ps. 6.4 = C. 88.4; Ps. 6.10 = C. 124.18; Propertius (= P.): P. 2.33.37 = C. 137.25; P. 2.13.35 = C. 113.5; P. 3.11.15 = C. 131.19; P. 3.14.1 = C. 85.9; Tibullus (= T.): T. 1.5.3 = C. 184.1; T. 1.8.20 = C. 114.11; T. 1.8.26 = C. 109.16, 166.26; T. 2.4.31 = C. 160.8.
36 The passages in Charisius (= C., with pagination of Barwick's edition) are the following (* = no mention of Horace's name): Carm. 1.1.33ff. = C. 350.30*; Carm. 1.4.1 = C. 104.2; Carm. 1.6.6 = C. 357.20; Carm. 1.12.41 = C. 133.11; Carm. 1.29.7ff. = C. 136.8 = C. 351.1*; Carm. 2.18.7ff. = C. 127.15; Carm. 3.1.7ff. = C. 355.6*; Carm. 3.5.10 = C. 77.22; Carm. 3.14.9ff. = C. 83.5; Epod. 12.25 = C. 201.2; Serm. 1.1.94ff. = C. 295.7; Serm. 1.2.89 = C. 128.14; Serm. 1.9.13 = C. 123.2; Serm. 2.2.122 = C. 123.4; Epist. 1.7.22 = C. 352.11; Epist. 1.16.20 = C. 354.3.*
37 It is reassuring that the same two classes with the same breakdown of authors are to be found in the fifth-century grammar of the Anonymus Bobiensis, which belongs to the "Charisius-group" of late-antique grammarians. See the edition of M. De Nonno, La grammatica dell'Anonymus Bobiensis (GL I 533-565 Keil), especially pp. xvi-xvii (on the "Charisius-group"); xix-xx (date); 89 (index
That Horace belongs to the second class is also suggested by the information in the apparatus criticus under [1]. Here we see that the original reading Perius epistolarum in N has been corrected in n1 to Horatius epistularum. This is not the only corruption of an author’s name in N. Some other examples are: Varrus instead of Varro (p. 69.2 Barwick); et Ennius instead of Titinius (p. 69.3); Plautus instead of Plautus (p. 69.16); Aelius Cinna instead of Helvius Cinna (p. 101.23); Aediliius Cilo instead of Aelius Stilo (p. 106.8); Vergilius instead of Verrius (p. 107.14); Patulus instead of Pacuvius (p. 115.29); Lucilius instead of Lucretius (p. 116.8); Lucius instead of Lucilius (p. 125.1); Vergilius instead of Velius Longus (p. 145. 18); and Ninnius instead of Naevius (p. 184.16). These corruptions are all examples of errors arising from the confusion of similar letters, from the omission of letters, and the like. The corruption of Horatius into Perius is different. Two explanations are possible. Instead of a scribal confusion or omission of similar letters, we may have to do with a marginal note or a superscript written in a crabbed hand that was misread when added to the text of Charisius sometime between the first version in the fourth century and the transcription of N, three or four centuries later. The same hand was doubtless responsible for the similar notation (Horatius epistolarum) that we see in the nearby passage [2].

That Horatius epistolarum in [1] is an intrusive note is furthermore suggested by the fact that Terentius Scaurus’ commentary on the Ars Poetica is cited later in the sentence. Is it likely that the same person would have written in the same sentence “Horatius epistolarum” and “ubi Q. Terentius Scaurus in commentariis in artem poeticam?” As a parallel for adscripts of titles in the textual tradition of Charisius, we may cite the example of in scauro (at p. 97.19 Barwick) in the margin of N itself. Many citations in Charisius are without author or title, so the impulse for readers to add such notes is obvious. A second possibility is more complicated but perhaps more likely: Charisius may originally have written Verrius Flaccus epistolarum, citing two passages where Verrius—who did write epistulae on grammatical problems—quoted scriptorum); cf. also the review article by A. C. Dionisiotti in JRS 74 (1984) 202-205. In the Anon. Bob., Virgilian titles are cited rarely (only once out of 36 citations), suggesting that Virgil may have originally belonged to the second group and that most titles were added between the time of Anon. Bob. and N.

Another possibility, of course, is that [2] also had Persius, but this was corrected before or after N, or by the scribe of N himself. A reexamination of N, unfortunately, reveals nothing. Notoriously in a poor state of preservation, N may no longer be consulted in Naples. Prof. David Konstan informed me in a personal communication that the photographs of the manuscript in the Naples library are mostly black and illegible and that the legible parts do not include our passage.

For examples, see s.vv. incerti poetae and incerti scriptores in Barwick’s index scriptorum (p. 484).
Horatian examples without mention of Horace or the title of his work. Sometime between Charisius and N, Verrius Flaccus was changed to the two more famous Flacci: Persius in [1] and Horatius in [2].

Thus, Charisius' testimony should not be allowed to cast doubt on the otherwise unanimous witness of ancient authors for three reasons. First, even if we suppose that epistularum in [1] and [2] was written by Charisius, this attests only a late textual tradition and cannot, in isolation, drive the unequivocal ancient evidence from the field. Secondly, even if written by Charisius, epistularum may be wrong, since we have parallels for incorrect titles in the Ars Grammatica. Finally—and most likely—the attribution to Horace's letters of the words cited in [1] and [2] may well be an intrusive note that postdates Charisius and predates N since Charisius never elsewhere cites Horace with title.

How, then, did the ancients refer to the Ars Poetica? The evidence is overwhelming that, no later than one hundred years after Horace's death, it was considered a separate book called either the Ars Poetica or the (Liber) De arte poetica. These titles are so similar that we need not expend any effort trying to choose between them. The fact that the poem consisted of only one book is attested by the latter title, by the Vita Horatii in Ps.-Acro, and by a reference in Quintilian to the prima parte libri de arte poetica. What, then, are we to call the poem? In several recent publications, Nicholas Horsfall has reminded us how unreliable our modern—and sometimes even our ancient—titles of the Latin classics really are. The Ars Poetica presents an excellent case in point: despite modern speculation, we have no reason to think that Horace or most ancients called the poem an epistula. It is welcome news to report that in our latest Teubner editions of Horace by Borszak and Shackleton Bailey the proper titles are now used. However, as noted, these editors have still printed the poem in a misleading position at the very end of the corpus, just after Epistles II.

40Note that Charisius referred to Verrius as Verrius Flaccus at p. 73.9 Barwick. For a similar confusion of Flacci (Persius for Horace), cf. Servius on Georg. 3.363.

41Quintilian, Epist. ad Tryph. 2; Sidonius 9.223; [Probus] De ultimis syllabis 223.9 Keil; Priscian Inst., vol. II, 271.19 Keil.

42Quintilian, Inst. 8.3.60; Terentius Scaurus apud Charisius, pp. 263.11-12, 272.27 (Barwick); Priscian Inst., vol. I, 267.23, vol. II, 254.16, 331.15 (Keil); the second Vita Horatii in O. Keller's edition of the Pseudoanon Scholia in Horatium vetustiora, vol. 1 (Leipzig 1902) 3 (line 6).

43"Scripsit autem carminum libros IIII, carmen saeculare, epodon, de arte poetica lib. I, epistularum lib. II, sermonum lib. II" (ed. Keller, ibid.).

44Inst. 8.3.60.

CHAPTER 2

THE DATE OF THE POEM

The argument for keeping the Ars separate from Epistles II can also be supported by chronology, for, as we will see, the Ars Poetica probably predates the two works in Epistles II. In any event, the date of the Ars Poetica, and, indeed, of any literary work, provides an indispensable framework for interpretation, and so the dating of the Ars Poetica would be worth reexamining for this reason alone.

Of all Horace's poems, the Ars Poetica is the hardest to date. Scholars have proposed dates ranging from the early 20s B.C. to the very end of Horace's life. In 1965, Duckworth published a useful overview of the various attempts at a date.1 This may be updated, corrected and augmented as follows:

28-27, between Satires II and Odes I-III2
23-20, between Odes I-III and Epistles J3

1G. E. Duckworth, “Horace's Hexameters and the Date of the Ars Poetica,” TAPA 66 (1965) 73-95, at pp. 84-85.
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20-19, between Epistles I and Epistles II.2

18, between Epistles II.2 and the Carmen Saeculare5

17-16, after the Carmen Saeculare and before Odes IV6

15, before Epist. II.17

13-8, after Odes IV, making the poem Horace's last8

In the absence of the kind of fairly reliable information that permits us to date Horace's other poetic books with some precision, how have scholars arrived at such widely divergent datings of the Ars Poetica? Three distinct approaches to chronology can be identified in the scholarship: (1) placing the Ars within some developmental pattern of Horace's ideas about poetry; (2) establishing dates for the other books of Horace's poetic works; and (3) using literary and textual evidence to determine the sequence of Horace's works.

4A. S. Wilkins, The Epistles of Horace (London 1902) 320-32; E. Stemplinger, RE VIII s.v. Horatius (Stuttgart 1913) 2367 (in col. 2375 he dates the poem to 17); O. Immisch, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 1-8; J. C. Rolfe, Horace. Satires and Epistles (Boston 1935), Appendix, p. 13.


Richard Bentley, on the penultimate page of the unpaginated preface to his edition of Horace (Amsterdam 1713), puts the Ars Poetica and Epistles II after the Carmen Saec. and C. IV, saying that they are annis incertis; A. Rostagni, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 19-21.

lishing a terminus ante- and post quem based on historical persons mentioned in the poem; and (3) stylometrics, including diction and meter.

The first approach I will employ elsewhere to show that the ideas of the *Ars* differ so strongly from those found in Horace's other poetry that we cannot properly speak of an evolution of thought but must, instead, consider the possibility that in the *Ars Poetica* Horace contradicts himself. In earlier scholarship, the discontinuity between the *Ars Poetica* and Horace's other expressions of poetic belief was emphasized by L. Ferrero. Ferrero interpreted the evidence in a biographical and rather psychological way, as the sign of an unresolved struggle in Horace's spirit. The parodic reading of the poem offers another and more simple explanation: the *Ars* contradicts much of what Horace says about poetry because it represents a send-up of a pedantic, academic view of poetry put into the mouth of a fictional speaker who we have no reason to suppose is Horace himself (or the Horatian poetic persona). At any rate, since the *Ars Poetica* does not fit into any discernible and datable pattern of Horace's intellectual development, I do not include here a history-of-ideas approach to chronology.

If we generalize this approach and look for any kind of relationship between the *Ars* and Horace's other poems, then we may observe that in the *Ars* there are two echoes of other works of Horace. In line 269 there is an allusion to Epist. 1.19.11; in line 457 there is an echo of *Odes* I.1.35-36.10 If either passage were the only one from Horace's corpus alluded to in the *Ars Poetica* we would not be able to make much use of it for the dating. With two such passages, so close in date (*Odes* I-III were published in 23; *Epistles* I in 20), we may guess that Horace echoed these passages because they were still fresh in his mind when he was composing the *Ars*. Later (see pp. 59-61), I will discuss some other important connections between *Epist.* I.19 and the *Ars Poetica*, perhaps implying an affinity in date. We do not know the date of *Epist.* I.19, but, as mentioned, the collection in which it appears was published in c. 20 B.C.11

The second approach is more solid. These contemporaries are mentioned in the *Ars*: [1-3] Calpurnius Piso and his two children (lines 6, 24, 235, 291-

10Here are the texts: *AP* 269 nocturna versate manu, versate diurna ~ *Epist.* I.19.11 nocturno certare mero, putere diurno; *AP* 457 hic, dum sublimis versus ructatur et errat ~ *C.* I.1.36 sublimis feriam sidera vertice. In this connection, the repeated line *Sat.* 1.2.13 and *Ars Poetica* 421 (dives agris, dives positis in fenore nummis) is not relevant for dating (except as a post quem, assuming with, e.g., Shackleton Bailey that the earlier occurrence in the *Satires* is not an interpolation, as most modern editors suppose).
11So, e.g., Brink, III, 277 (ad *Epist.* II.2.20), and many others earlier.
20 New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica


Of these ten, only numbers [4], [5], [7], and [10] are sufficiently well-known to help with chronology. Quintilius Varus [10] died in 24/23 B.C., and Horace uses the imperfect tense in speaking of him, so that it is clear that he is deceased when the Ars Poetica was published. This gives us a terminus post quem of 24/23 B.C. Virgil [4] and Varius [5] are mentioned in the poem as representatives of contemporary poetry, and so the implication is that they are still alive when the poem was published. This would give us a terminus ante quem of 19/15 B.C. (since Virgil died in 19 and Varius in c. 15),14 if not for the fact that line 55 of the poem does not necessarily require that such famous poets as Virgil and Varius are still alive.15 This is, however, the obvious interpretation of the line, and the fact that Aulus Cascellius [8], who was born in c. 100 B.C., would have been in his eighties after 20 B.C. could also be taken as supporting 19/15 B.C. as a terminus ante quem.16 Nevertheless, the cautious conclusion to be drawn from a study of the historical persons mentioned in the Ars Poetica is that it provides a firm post quem but is only suggestive about a date ante quem.

A Reexamination of Duckworth's Metrical Arguments for Dating

To make further progress, we need to try to find stylistic criteria for dating Horace's poetry, and, as we will see, stylistic and metrical evidence also supports the conclusion that the Ars Poetica is an independent work in the corpus, less related to the second book of Epistles than to Epist. I or Satires II. Probably the most impressive attempt to date the Ars Poetica by stylistic means was undertaken by G. Duckworth. Although Duckworth read his evidence as linking the Ars Poetica to Epist. II.1, we will see, by reexamining his data, that if anything they suggest a date for the Ars Poetica in the period of Epist. I (i.e., 23-20 B.C.).17

---

12On whom, see below, pp. 52-59.
13On Tarpa and Quintilius, see below, pp. 61-62, 66-68.
14On the death of Varius, see P. L. Schmidt in Der Kleine Pauly 5 s.v. Varius III (Munich 1975) cols. 1130-1131.
15See, e.g., Brink, I, 240n3.
16But see Brink, I, 240n3, where, as in the case of Virgil, he points out that the text does not necessarily require that Aulus Cascellius was alive when the Ars Poetica appeared.
17G. E. Duckworth, op. cit. (supra n. 1) 73-95. Metrical features linking the Ars Poetica to Epist. I were earlier pointed out by H. Nettleship, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 46-47.
The reexamination will proceed in two stages: first we will present an inner critique of Duckworth's work by employing his own dubious statistical methodology to show that his numbers do not say what he thinks they do. Second, we will develop an external critique in which Duckworth's naive methodology will be replaced with normal statistical tests used by statisticians. In this part of our study, we will perform new analyses of some, but not all, of Duckworth's data, limiting ourselves to those data sets that Duckworth thought most supported his late dating of the *Ars Poetica*.

Duckworth's methodology is quite simple: he tabulates metrical features and summarizes them as percentages according to poem or poetic book (*Satires* I, *Satires* II, *Epistles* I, *Epistles* II.1, *Epistles* II.2, and *Ars Poetica*). He assumes that when two or more poems or books show the same or nearly the same percentage, they must be close in date. When percentages are not close, he looks for trends in Horace's use of a certain metrical feature, assuming linear development from a lower to a higher percentage, or from a higher to a lower.

Duckworth's first test (p. 86) is the frequency of the four most common patterns of dactylic and spondaic feet. Of these, the *Ars Poetica* resembles *Epist.* II.1 for only the first pattern (*Epist.* II.1 = 11.85; *Ars Poetica* = 10.32; *Epist.* I = 12.82). For the rest, the *Ars Poetica* is closer to *Epist.* I than to *Epist.* II.1 (Second Pattern: *Ars Poetica* = 9.68; *Epist.* I = 10.74; *Epist.* II.1 = 11.11; Third Pattern: *Ars Poetica* = 8.62; *Epist.* I = 9.24; *Epist.* II.1 = 9.26; Fourth Pattern: *Ars Poetica* = 8.21; *Epist.* I = 8.05; *Epist.* II.1 = 9.26). So, the results of the first test place the poem closer to *Epist.* I than to *Epist.* II.1.

Duckworth's second test (p. 87) shows the same results. The percentage of the first four patterns in the three works is: *Ars Poetica* = 36.84; *Epist.* I = 40.85; *Epist.* II.1 = 41.48. For the second four, the percentages are: *Ars Poetica* = 29.05; *Epist.* I = 25.45; *Epist.* II.1 = 27.79. For the first eight, the percentages are: *Ars Poetica* = 65.89; *Epist.* I = 66.30; *Epist.* II.1 = 69.26. So, here, again, the *Ars Poetica* is closer to *Epist.* II.1 than to *Epist.* I in only one case.

In Duckworth's third test (p. 87), the results do show, as his thesis requires, the resemblance of the *Ars Poetica* to *Epist.* II.1. In the fourth test (pp. 87-88), the results are about equal. The percentage of units with eight or more different patterns in the *Ars Poetica* is 100%, as it is in *Epist.* II.1; however, the percentage for *Epist.* I is similarly high (97.67%)—a striking figure in view of the much lower results for *Epist.* II.2 (84.62%), *Sat.* I (83.64%), and *Sat.* II (86.67%).

I omit Duckworth's tables and definitions of the various patterns he works with on the assumption that they serve no useful purpose here and can easily be found in the original publication. To have done otherwise would have meant taking up much valuable space recapitulating research that, as we will see, is inconclusive at best.
Duckworth's fifth test (p. 88) does not align the *Ars Poetica* with any of the other hexameter poems, and so need not be considered here. In the sixth test (of fourth-foot homodyne), the *Ars Poetica* (50.84%) again turns out to be closer to *Epist. I* (51.69%) than to *Epist. II.1* (52.22%). In the seventh test (p. 89)—rates of metrical repeats—the *Ars Poetica* (one every 12.2 lines) is closer to *Epist. I* (one every 12.2 lines) than to *Epist. II.1* (one every 16.9 lines).

In three parts of the eighth test (pp. 89–90), the *Ars Poetica* is closer to *Epist. I* than to *Epist. II.1*; in one part it is closer to *Epist. II.1* than to *Epist. I*; and in the fifth part, it is closer to *Sat. II*. Summing up, then, the eighth test favors the correlation of the *Ars Poetica* with *Epist. I* more than any of the other hexameter poems and indicates a date earlier than *Epist. II.1*. The ninth test (p. 90)—use of opposite metrical patterns—confirms Duckworth's thesis. The results of the tenth test (p. 90) partly confirm (part 2: ddsd—ssds) and partly disconfirm (ssdd—dss) the thesis. The eleventh test (p. 91)—reverse patterns—put the *Ars Poetica* (one every 25 lines) again closer to *Sat. II* (one every 25.8 lines) and *Epist. I* (one every 27.9 lines) than to *Epist. II.1* (one every 54 lines).

To conclude this purely internal critique of Duckworth, of his eleven tests, six (1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11) associate the *Ars Poetica* more closely with *Epist. I* than with *Epist. II.1*. In two tests (11 and the fifth part of 8), the *Ars Poetica* is most closely linked with *Sat. II* of c. 30 B.C. Only two tests (3, 9) confirm Duckworth's thesis. Three tests (4, 5, 10) are neutral.

Duckworth's methodology and his results can be attacked on several fronts. First, Duckworth's assumption of a correlation between date of composition and the metrical features he chose to study is assumed but nowhere defended. It is, however, possible, that the features Duckworth used for dating are not, in fact, chronometers. Second, Duckworth never explained the choice of features he selected for analysis. Some are intuitively obvious—for example, patterns of spondees and dactyls in the first four feet of the line. Others are less intuitively acceptable. For example, Duckworth pays attention to opposite patterns in adjacent lines consisting of spondees and dactyls in the first four feet of the line (dsss, sddd, etc.), as if poets strove for or avoided such patterns. Even if we grant that poets may sometimes have paid attention to such things, Duckworth still ought to have gauged the extent to which pure randomness affects his results. Thus, for example, for the *Ars Poetica* he reports 31 such opposites. Yet, random variation alone would lead us to predict 29.69 cases: since there are 16 metrical patterns, any of which can occur after any others (including itself), there are 16 * 16 = 256 possible pairs of patterns. Of these, 16, or 6.25%, are opposites. In the 476 lines of the *Ars Poetica*, there are 475 possible pairs of lines (lines 1 and 2, 2 and 3, 3 and 4, etc.). Multiplying 475 by .0625 gives us the number of opposites that we should have expected from chance alone, viz., 29.69. Our impression that the observed number (31) is not
very far off from the expected number can be confirmed by a standard statistical test, the so-called z-test. Let our null-hypothesis (H₀) be that the proportion of opposites in the Ars Poetica is the same as we should have expected by chance alone and let us (here, as elsewhere in this study) reject H₀ at alpha = .05. Our alternative hypothesis (Hₐ) is that the proportion of opposites in the Ars Poetica is larger than we should have expected by chance alone (the assumption behind Duckworth's work). The z-value is .244, giving us an alpha-value of .405. So, we do not reject H₀ in favor of Hₐ, and we conclude that the observed number of opposite patterns in the poem has no particular statistical significance.

Duckworth's main contention is that as time went on, Horace became more concerned about achieving metrical variety in his poetry. He writes: "To summarize, of the eleven categories listed above, some have more significance than others. Those dealing with larger totals, e.g., the frequency percentages of the first four and the first eight patterns, are the most decisive; they show a steady trend toward less concentration and greater variety...." This hypothesis is, according to Duckworth, his most important, and it may be subjected to rigorous statistical testing in the form of a chi-square test of the data presented in Duckworth's first table (cf. TABLE II, next page).

The chi-square test indicates that the hypothesis that the two variables of poem and metrical pattern are dependent fails at the alpha = .05 level, since the significance ("prob.") is .270. Thus, Duckworth has failed to find a significant correlation between the poems and the distribution of metrical patterns.

20 Cf. Duckworth, op. cit. (supra n. 1) 91.
21 Statisticians distinguish between three kinds of variables: nominal variables, which differ in some quality but not in quantity (e.g., different books of poems in Horace's corpus; different metrical patterns in the dactylic hexameter line); ordinal variables, which differ from each other according to quantities that are vaguely ranked (e.g., top score on an examination, second best score, worst score); and, finally, interval variables, which differ from each other according to a precisely defined quantitative scale (e.g., average number of words or verses in a poem). The chi-square and association tests are applied to nominal variables and determine the probability that the distribution of the actual values of the variables differs very much from their expected distribution. If the actual values do not so differ, then we say that the variables are independent; if they do differ, then we say that they are dependent. The association tests determine the degree of dependence obtaining between two variables. In the present case, no association tests have been reported (though they have been run) because we only test the strength of a dependence once the chi-square test indicates that the variables are not independent (which, as will be seen from TABLE II, is not the case). See, in general, e.g., A. Agresti and B. Finlay, op. cit. (supra n. 19) 14-16; 201-212.
Another way of stating this conclusion is that the overall distribution of metrical patterns does not give us a reliable chronometer for the date of a poem.

Duckworth's words cited above would lead us to expect the highest association between poem and metrical pattern in the four most frequent patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET. PAT.</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>SII</th>
<th>EPI</th>
<th>EPII1</th>
<th>EPII2</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obs. dsss</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. ddss</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. dsds</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. sdss</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. ssss</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. ddds</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. ssds</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. sdds</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. dssd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. ddsd</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. ssdd</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. dsdd</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. ssdd</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. sddd</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. dddd</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. sddd</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>4,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST STATISTIC</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>82.063</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: Chi-square test of data in Duckworth's Table I

Yet, the total of chi-square values for the first four patterns is only 13.78, far less than one-fourth the total value of chi-square; and when the first four patterns are considered in isolation from the rest of the table, the chi-square value is 17.67 with a significance of .609 (cf. Table III, next page). Thus, once again, the test of dependence fails, and we see that the four most frequent metrical patterns are not reliable chronometers for Horace's hexameters.

Much more of the chi-square value of Duckworth's first table is concentrated in the last group of metrical patterns. Yet, as Table IV (next page) shows, even here, where the chi-square value rises to 29.855 and the significance level reaches .072, the coefficients of association are quite low, indicating that the dependence between poem and metrical pattern is weak.
The Date of the Poem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>2360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>4080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST STATISTIC</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>17.669</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III: CHI-SQUARE TEST OF DUCKWORTH'S FIRST FOUR PATTERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>4080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST STATISTIC</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>29.855</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>ASYMPT STD ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRAMER V</td>
<td>.0428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>.0852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA</td>
<td>.0087</td>
<td>.00410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td>.00081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV: CHI-SQUARE TEST OF DUCKWORTH'S LAST FOUR PATTERNS

In TABLE IV the chi-square value is more indicative of the non-independence of the variables than was the case with the first four metrical patterns, but the significance level (.072) still fails to meet the test of \( \alpha = .05 \). Examination of the various tests of association (the Cramer V, Uncertainty Coefficient, etc., all of which vary from 0 to 1.0) confirm that the variables of poem and metrical pattern are weakly associated.

Our conclusion is thus that Duckworth has failed to find any useful indicator of date in his metrical studies. The search for a valid chronometer of Horace's hexameter poems must turn elsewhere for clues–our next task.
Dating the *Ars Poetica* through Style: A Statistical Approach

The foregoing has shown the utility of statistics for disproving a quantitative argument about the date of the poem. Statistical tests can, of course, also have a more positive, albeit never probative, value. In what follows, I will present some new studies of word frequency which suggest that the *Ars Poetica* should be dated in the period of the composition of *Epistles* I and before the publication of *Epistles* II.2, i.e., c. 24-20 B.C.

This is not the place for even a brief history of stylometrics. Suffice it to say, by way of introduction, that statistical studies of vocabulary have had some success in identifying reliable quantitative chronometers for attribution and relative chronology of works by different authors. They have less often been used for relative chronology within a single author's corpus. Recent work by Lindsay and Mackay suggests that for the latter, the word class that offers the best hope for reliable results is that of the function word and the best analytical tool is the chi-square test. In their classic study, Mosteller and Wallace define function words as: "the filler words of a language, such as a, an, by, to and that. Generally they include prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, and certain adverbs, adjectives, and auxiliary verbs."

Cf. A. Agresti and B. Finlay, op. cit. (*supra* n. 19) 293: "we can never prove that one phenomenon is a cause of another, since causation is imputed by the observer but never actually observed. We can disprove causal hypotheses, however, by showing that empirical evidence contradicts them."


F. Mosteller and D. L. Wallace, *Inference and Disputed Authorship: 'The Federalist'* (Reading, Mass. 1964) 20-21, note briefly that the function words *in* and possibly *from* may serve as chronometers for the works of President James Madison. They pay little attention to words in an author whose frequency changes in a patterned way over time (our third class of function words) since their concern is to distinguish one author (Madison) from another (Hamilton).

Cf. Lindsay and Mackay, op. cit. (*supra* n. 23) 15-25, especially p. 25: "word frequency is the most sensitive wordprint." For the purposes of their inter-authorial study of distinguishing Pauline from non-Pauline authorship of Biblical texts transmitted under Paul's name, "sensitivity" was not desirable and so Lindsay and Mackay do not use word frequency. For our intra-authorial study of Horace, it is precisely this high degree of sensitivity that makes function word frequency the proper tool.

F. Mosteller and D. L. Wallace, op. cit. (*supra* n. 24) 17.
Function words are words useful for research on the authorship or chronology of texts because they are not dependent on content, context, or genre. Since, in Latin, about half are monosyllabic, Latin function words are also fairly independent of meter. Examples of such words are *et, in, ut, ad, sub*, etc. In addition to being fairly non-contextual, function words also have the advantage of being more frequent than other words, thus lending themselves more readily to statistical analysis. Since they are used so often and have so little connotative value, speakers of a language employ them with very little awareness of doing so. They are thus potentially good reflectors of a speaker's linguistic sense and development since it is generally through our more automatic behavior that we most plainly give ourselves away. In this sense, the stylometric use of function words is analogous in literary history to the Morellian method in art history.

Authors may use individual function words in any of three ways: (1) with little, if any, change over time; (2) with random fluctuation over time; and (3) with patterned variation over time. The first usage is most valuable for interauthorial analysis, such as we find in the Mosteller-Wallace study of the authorship of certain *Federalist* papers. On the other hand, it is of no help in determining the relative chronology of the works of one author's corpus. The second kind of usage is by far the most frequently encountered, as was pointed out in an important article by Damerau and as is confirmed by the case of Horace. Function words displaying random fluctuation are of little, if any, use in stylometric analysis since they allow us neither to distinguish one author's works from another's nor to find trends in the individual works of an author's corpus.

For our purposes, then, words of the third type—relatively few as they may be—are the most important. These are words that meet four criteria: (1) as function words, they must, of course, be fairly independent of context, genre, and meter; (2) they must be common enough so that their frequency does not fall below five cases in any single unit of analysis more than 25% of the time; (3) the frequency of their usage must vary according to a trend or pattern (whether linear or non-linear) from Horace's early to his late works; finally, (4) the number of words meeting the first three criteria must surpass, in a statistically significant way, the number expected from chance alone.

The third requirement brings up an important methodological consideration. For over a century, at least, the relative chronology of all the poems and poetic books in Horace's corpus, save the *Ars Poetica*, has been fairly well established on non-stylometric grounds. Even an approximate absolute chrono-
logy has long been known. In most cases in which stylometrics is used for attribution or dating, we are not so fortunate, and statistical arguments alone are used by default. Given what we think we know from non-stylometrical sources about the chronology of Horace's poetry, we would be ill-advised to limit our methodology to stylometrics alone, since that would be to forego a finer for a blunter instrument. Indeed, respecting "time order" is a principle of statistical methodology in any case. Thus, I propose to start from the assumption that the conventionally accepted relative chronology is essentially correct and complete, with the exception of the Ars Poetica. I do not think this assumption is likely to be controversial. Since, as we have seen, non-stylometric information cannot narrow down the date of that poem to anything less than the long period between the deaths of Quintilius Varus and Horace (24-8 B.C.), we shall resort to the instrument of statistics only to see whether stylometrics (and, in particular, vocabulary analysis) can help decide the issue of whether I am correct in dating the poem to the early part of that period, or Duckworth and others are in putting it at the end. My approach to chronology is thus interdisciplinary: we will, so to speak, triangulate on the date with historical and statistical methods.

The analysis will proceed in two steps. First, the variable of poem will be considered nominal. The object of this part of the study will be to model the data in the most economical way such that the value of the test statistic is optimized. The test statistic used is the chi-square test, which essentially gauges

30 Cf., e.g., C. Franke, Fasti Horatiani (Berlin 1839), 80-81, where we already find the following chronology based primarily on historical references, prosopography, etc.: Serm. I, 41-34; Serm. II, 35-30; Epod. 41-30; Carm. I-III, 30-24; Epist. I, 24-20; Carm. Saec., 17; Carm. IV, 17-13; Epist. II ("primo jam edito et post carmen saeculare scriptus est, sed incertum quo anno," p. 81). On the date of the Ars Poetica, Franke simply writes: "aetate nil constat" (p. 81). Modified by J. Vahlen's dating of Epistles II (op. cit. [supra n. 5] 46-61), Franke's chronology is still more or less accepted today; cf., e.g., K. Vretska, Der Kleine Pauly 2 s.v. Horatius (8) (Munich 1975) cols. 1219-1225, for the following dating of the composition and publication (indicated with an asterisk [*]) of Horace's works: Epodes-40-30*; Sat. I-1-35/34* ("or, 33?"-col. 1221); Sat. II-30/29*; Carm. I-III-c. 35 ("Horace began writing the Odes in the time of the Satires"; col. 1222)-23*; Epist. I-23-20*; Epist. II-2-"before 20"* (col. 1223); Carm. Saec.-17*; Epist. II-1-"after 14"*; Ars Poetica-23-18* or 13-8*. Thus, Carl Becker, op. cit. (supra n. 5) 12-13, is correct to note that chronological studies of Horace are in a very fortunate position because "über ein ganzes Jahrzehnt hin—von 23 bis 14/13—lassen sich fast jedem Jahr horazische Dichtungen zuordnen." For work on Horatian chronology before Franke, see the survey in J. Tate, Horatius Restitutus, Or the Books of Horace Arranged in Chronological Order according to the Scheme of Dr. Bentley (London 1832), 1837?) 1-20.

31 Cf., e.g., A. Agresti and B. Finlay, op. cit. (supra n. 19) 293.

32 For a definition of this concept, see n. 21 above.
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the degree to which actual values of the variables differ from values we would expect to find if the variables are independent. The greater the difference, the greater the chi-square value and the greater the likelihood that the variables in question are not independent. Modelling the data, in the present case, means combining values for the poems that relate to their expected values in the same way: the result is a grouping of poems according to actual values that are above, below, or about the same as what we would have expected. The assumption here is that the poems grouped together belong to the same period of composition. At this first step of analysis, then, the dating of Horace's poetry—and, in particular, of the *Ars Poetica*—is quite approximate. At best, we can distinguish between early, middle, early-middle, middle-late, and late groups. The study of each function word will include a frequency graph, in which the poem will be arranged in order of relative chronology, with the *Ars Poetica* included in the appropriate group, but with no firm claim about its relative position in its group. In practice, this means that, although the tests indicate that the *Ars Poetica* belongs in Horace's middle period, we can only guess whether it is earlier or later than the other hexameter poem in the group, viz., *Epist.* I.

In a second step of the analysis, we will treat the poem variable as an interval variable. To do this, we will assign to all the poems except the *Ars Poetica* their generally accepted dates. We will then determine the most probable date for the *Ars Poetica* by inferential and exploratory statistical techniques. It should be stated here that each step of the analysis has an obvious weakness: the first step is too vague, the second too precise. These weaknesses are compensating, and our point is not so much to establish a precise date for the *Ars Poetica* as to demonstrate the greater probability that the poem is to be dated to Horace's middle period of poems than to his late period.

One final word about methodology. In studying the third class of function words, I have spoken till now only of a vague "trend" or "patterned development" in their usage, from, e.g., higher to lower frequency, or vice versa. I have also said that function words are, in general, attractive as chronometers because they are relatively non-contextual. At this point, one clarification should

---

33For a brief discussion of modelling by means of collapsing categories, see S. G. Levy, *Inferential Statistics in the Behavioral Sciences* (New York 1968) 210-213; and cf. P. M. Bentler, *Theory and Implementation of EQS: A Structural Equations Program* (Los Angeles 1985) 28: "when two models... are special cases of each other, chi-square difference tests can be used to evaluate the structural importance of the parametric constraints that differentiate two models. In the... most typical application, two models would differ in that one model would contain extra parameters beyond those provided by the other model: all other parameters would be the same. In such a case, the chi-square difference test evaluates whether the added parameters, considered simultaneously, are necessary to the model."
be made: few words (in Latin, at any rate) are completely "functional" and hence totally devoid of content and connotation. Accordingly, the rate at which a function word is used in Horace is modulated by the demands of genre, sometimes for reasons that may be unclear.\(^{34}\) So, in establishing trends, we must keep the lyric poems separate from the hexameters, as far as frequency value is concerned; but we also must see the same pattern of development in both the lyric and hexameter group. In statistical terms, we must control for meter. As a result of doing so, another kind of triangulation becomes possible: the prime assumption behind chronology by stylometrics is that some aspects of an author's linguistic sense change in a measurable and consistent way over time. The fact that we can very neatly divide the Horatian corpus by meter and genre into two groups of poems and that members of each group represent Horace's early, middle, and late periods is thus extremely fortunate: it means that the probable explanation for any similarity in trends of function word use in both the lyric and hexameter groups is likely to be Horace's evolution as a speaker of the Latin language and not, e.g., metrical or generic exigencies.

### Relative Chronology—Function Words as Chronometers of Horace's Poetry

To implement this methodology, we thus need to tabulate the frequencies in Horace of the major function words in Latin (see TABLE A). The following words seemed from inspection of the computer-generated frequency lists to have the greatest promise of surmounting the barrier of at least five cases in each unit of analysis (or, cell). Those in capitals and boldface turned out to satisfy the criteria of chronometers: sufficient frequency and the same pattern of development in the lyrics and hexameters. Most words turned out to be rejected because of low frequency—i.e., in at least 25% of the cells the frequency fell below 5 cases. These words are followed by "l.f." in parentheses. Other words passed the frequency test but failed the "trend" test of patterned development; Damerau's work had prepared us to expect to find just such words, whose random fluctuations make them unsuitable as chronometers. In the following list, they are followed by "n.p." (= "no pattern") in parentheses.\(^{35}\)

\(^{34}\)E.g., Horace's consistent preference for \textit{sub} in the lyric [frequency: \(c. \cdot .0016\)] as opposed to hexameter [frequency: \(c. \cdot .001\)] poems. Let our null hypothesis be that the frequency in the two groups is the same; our alternative hypothesis is that the frequency of \textit{sub} in the lyrics is greater than in the hexameters. The z-value of \(H_0\) is 3.94, giving a P-value of \(P < .000233\). So we reject \(H_0\) in favor of \(H_a\).

\(^{35}\)The following function words were not studied since inspection of the word sorting and counting program's output indicated that they would fail to satisfy
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The frequency test could not be used as chronometers because their distribution among the poems was more or less random, which in this context means that the trends observed in the hexameters (no matter how the *Ars Poetica* is dated) is different from that seen in the lyrics. Since these words will not be of interest, it would be tiresome to discuss them all (see TABLES B-G). *Cum* may serve as a typical example. As the frequency graph of *cum* shows (TABLE C, top), the word changes its frequency with a nonlinear (probably convex parabolic) pattern in the hexameter poems, while in the lyrics, it is used much more often in the epodes of the mid-30s than in the odes of the middle or late periods. In fact, the pattern of the lyrics is linear, with a negative slope. Thus, *cum* fails our test because the linear pattern of the lyrics is not mirrored in the hexameters, with their nonlinear trend. Without a metrical control for *cum*, we are helpless in trying to situate the *Ars Poetica*: arguments can be imagined justifying its location just about anywhere on the graph. For example, it might be considered the low point of the hexameter parabola, in which case we would date the *Ars Poetica* between *Epistles* I and *Epistles* II.2. Contrariwise, if we posit a change in Horace's *Sprachgefühl* from high to low use of the word *cum*, then we might decide to dismiss as anomalous the high frequency of the word in *Epistles* II.1 and place the *Ars Poetica* last among the hexameters so that the result is a linear pattern with negative slope in both the hexameters and lyrics. The point is that such arguments are merely speculative, because we cannot control for meter.

Before proceeding to discuss the four words that satisfy our first three criteria to be considered as chronometers, let us see if our fourth criterion is satisfied, viz., that the number of words satisfying the first three criteria exceed, in a statistically significant way, the number expected from chance alone (supra, p. 27). The details of the argument may be found in the *Appendix II*. In brief, the frequency requirement: ante, at, circum, contra, denique, ex, extra, haud, ita, num, numquid, ob, olim, pacto, porro, praefer, quae, quin, siquid.
our three-point lines (i.e., lyrics) have nine possible distinct trend lines. Our hexameters form eighty-one five-point lines; of these, eight may be considered equivalent to the relevant three-point lines. Thus, we have 9 x 81 different combinations of three-point and five-point lines, for a total of 729. Of these, eight are possible matched pairs, so that the odds of finding a matched pair are 8/729, or 0.010974. In our study, we have sixteen cases of function words with sufficient frequency; hence, we would expect 16 x 0.010974 matched pairs, or 0.176. Instead of the expected number of zero or, at most one matched pair, we have two exactly matched pairs and two similar pairs. We run a binomial test to determine the probability of our result. The test shows that there is less than a 1.2% probability that this could happen by chance. We may conclude that our fourth criterion is satisfied because there is only a very small possibility that our four words display similar trend lines in the hexameters and lyrics due to random variation alone.

The words that satisfy our criteria and hence are useful for chronology divide into two types: a group of three words (ad, per, sed) whose frequency has a high-low-high pattern (i.e., Type I) in the early (Epodes and Satires), middle (Carm. I-III, Epistles I) and late (Epistles II, Carm. IV) periods; and a second type (nee) whose pattern (Type II) is the mirror-reversal of the first. In all four cases, as we will see, the Ars Poetica falls between Epistles I and Epistles II.2

TABLE V shows a tabulation and chi-square test of the data from the first group of function words. The chi-square test statistic (99.2, with twenty-four degrees of freedom) tells us that the variables are not independent: in fact, its probability level of 0.000 far surpasses our requirement that alpha < .05. The degree of dependence, or association, of the variables can be gauged by the Cramer V, Contingency, Lambda, and Uncertainty coefficients, which are measures appropriate to nominal variables. To interpret these, we need to know that all these coefficients vary between 0, indicating little or no association, and 1.0, indicating the highest degree of association. In the present case, the values for the coefficients appear, at a first glance, to be quite low.

Before concluding that the function words sed and ad are only weakly associated with Horace's poems, and hence are poor chronometers, we need to determine why the coefficients are so much closer to 0.0 than to 1.0. The reason is not far to seek: the category "rest"—with 43,066/43,415 (or, 99.2%) of the cases and with an observed distribution very close to what was expected—is so predominant that there is very little scope for the remaining data to be distributed in a way that appears strong according to the association tests.
That the association tests are quite sensitive to such a condition is clear from their formulae. For example, the Contingency Coefficient (C) is defined as follows:

\[ C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{\chi^2 + n}} \]

Thus, the greater the number of cases (n) whose observed values do not depart very much from their expected values (that is, whose chi-square values are low), the smaller the value of C. To give a fair interpretation to our results, we must accordingly determine how high the coefficients can rise toward their theoretical limit of 1.0, given the limitations of the present case. This we do by an experiment in which we control for the category "rest" by keeping it constant while putting the greatest possible number of cases of ad, per, and sed into the cells of Ep. II.2 (hexameters) and the Carm. IV, where they will generate the maximum values for the coefficients since these works are both late and have the fewest words. The fact that both poems are late is important: it means that the trend in the hexameters and lyrics is the same—another requirement of our test. The other cells are given the minimum number of cases needed to satisfy our requirement.
that no more than 25% of all cells have fewer than 5 cases. The results are
given in TABLE VI (on the next page).

In this experiment, the chi-square value rises to 2171.8 and that of the
coefficients go up about sixfold. Thus, we may say that, controlling for “rest”
taking into account our frequency and trend requirement, the degree of
association that we find in Horace’s use of *sed* and *ad* is approximately 15-20%
of what is actually possible for a function word fulfilling our minimum
conditions for consideration as a chronometer. Seen in this light, *ad*, *per*, and *sed*
may be considered modestly useful chronometers.

Our next question is what the distribution of *ad*, *per*, and *sed* suggests
about the date of the *Ars Poetica*. Since we are now treating poems as nominal
variables, we have no way of determining a precise date. What we can do is
attempt to model the data to see if we can combine the *Ars Poetica* with any
other poem in such a way that there is no loss of significance. Our working
assumption is that the most parsimonious model is the best and that poems
grouped together belong to the same period of composition. In trying different
combinations, we will, of course, respect time order and genre. In practice this
means an experiment in which the *Ars Poetica* is combined with *Epistles I*,
*Epistles II.2*, and *Epistles II.1*, first singly and then in the various combinations
(e.g., *Ep*. I + *AP* + *Ep*. II.2; *AP* + *Ep*. II.2 + *Ep*. II.1; etc.).

TABLE VII (next page) reports the results of experiments run using the
data in TABLE V. In TABLE V, we have a “full model” of the data: that is, the
frequency of each word is studied in each poem or poetic book. The resulting test
statistic is reproduced at the top of TABLE VII (under model I = “FULL”). In the
following lines of the table, the data from the *Ars Poetica* are combined with
those from the other hexameter poems (with the exception of the very early *Sat.
I*) in an attempt to simplify and clarify the analysis: the strategy is to find the
combinations of poems that give us the maximum and minimum values of the
test statistic. The maximum values tell us the most likely period of composition
of the *Ars Poetica*; the minimum values tell us the least likely date. Since we
are, in effect, comparing the same test statistic at different levels (or, “degrees
of freedom” [“DF”]), we must standardize our results by comparing our various
collapsed models to the full model. To do this, we simply subtract the $\chi^2$ values

---

36In practice, this means that the remaining cells are given values of 5 for
these words. This we do because we would not be considering a function word as a
possible chronometer in the first place if its distribution throughout Horace’s poetry
violated the requirement that it occur at least five times in 75% of the poems. Since
*Carm*. IV and *Epist*. II.2 are late works (or middle-late, in the case of *Epist*. II.2), the
resulting trend lines are similar in the lyrics and hexameters—a second important
criterion for consideration of a function word.
### Table V: Table V Recalculated to Minimize the Effect of “REST”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>EP1</th>
<th>EP2.1</th>
<th>EP2.2</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>6980</td>
<td>7207</td>
<td>6671</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6995</td>
<td>7222</td>
<td>6686</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EPD</th>
<th>C1-C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>2980</td>
<td>10679</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>2995</td>
<td>10694</td>
<td>2559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Statistic**

- **Pearson Chi-Square**: 2171.8, DF 24, Prob 0.000
- **Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square**: 0876.3, DF 24, Prob 0.000

**Coefficient**

- **Cramer V**: .1291
- **Contingency**: .2183
- **Lambda**: .0049, .00042
- **Uncertainty**: .0050, .00042

### Table VI: Comparisons of the Full and Various Collapsed Models of the Data in Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>Difference in $\chi^2$ from Full Model (I)</th>
<th>Significant at $\alpha = .05$?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>99.20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>98.25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.951, 3</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.362, 3</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>97.71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.493, 3</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>16.042, 3</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>96.42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.778, 6</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>95.01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.193, 6</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>80.73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>18.472, 6</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Models: I = FULL; II = AP+S2; III = AP+E1; IV = AP+EP2.2; V = AP+EP2.1; VI = AP+S2+E1; VII = AP+E1+EP2.2; VIII = AP+E2
of the full and collapsed model, as well as the difference in their degrees of freedom. We can then consult a standard table of χ² distributions to see if the difference results in a significant gain or loss in probability. This is reported on the table in the last column: if, at the α = .05 level, there is no loss in probability, then we enter “NO” in the column. If the collapsed model is inferior to the full model—i.e., if there is a loss in significance—we enter “YES” in the column.

As can be seen, however we model the data, the Ars Poetica is best grouped with Sat. II, Epist. I, and Epist. II.2. The best models are: AP+SII and AP+SII+EI. Models combining the Ars Poetica with Epistles II.2 are also good. The worst models are those in which the Ars Poetica is grouped with Epistles II.1. Since the Epistle to Augustus is generally considered a late hexameter poem, the implication of our study is that the Ars Poetica is most likely a middle-period, not a late-period, hexameter poem. On TABLES H-P, the Ars is placed in the position indicated by these tests.

On the graph in TABLE H (a chart showing the frequency of ad in Horace’s poems), we can see similar nonlinear trends in the lyrics and hexameters. The pattern of usage in both groups is a convex parabola. In accordance with the principle of parsimony in model-building, we disregard the value of Satires I. In the hexameters, we find high frequency in the early poems, lower frequency in the poems of the 20s, and higher frequency in the late works. In the case of the non-hexameters, use of ad is highest in the early period, with the late Carm. IV showing a steep rise as compared to Carm. I-III, but not steep enough to overtake the rate of the Epodes. The Ars Poetica takes its place between Epist. I, the nadir of the curve, and Epist. II.2.

The somewhat different shapes and values of the curves here and elsewhere in this group are not unexpected or disturbing. They are presumably the result of differences of genre and meter; of the greater number of hexameter as opposed to non-hexameter poems; and of the fact that the time intervals between the different poems (hexameter and non-hexameter alike) are not uniform. Complicating the last factor is the probable overlap in time of the different poems and poem categories. For example, it is likely that Horace was writing some of Carm. I-III in the 30s, when he was mainly composing his Satires. It is impossible for us to determine which odes date from which period, with a few possible exceptions, like the Cleopatra Ode (1.37) or the poem consoling Virgil for the death of his friend Quintilius (1.24). In general, this limitation does not matter since we are concerned with relative chronology and dating the Ars Poetica between Epist. I and Epist. II.2. For this task, it is sufficient that we assume
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that the linguistic data of the various works reflect Horace's habits of speech in the year or so of revision before final publication.

On TABLE I we have a graph showing Horace's use of per. As can be seen, per resembles ad in its general development, except this time the word is used more frequently in the lyrics than in the hexameters and in both groups of poems the highest use occurs in the late works. The frequency of the Ars Poetica is closest to Epistles I, though it is harder to visualize whether the data for the Ars Poetica fit better before or after those of Epistles I. By the principle of parsimonious modelling, the slight increase in value of Epistles I is not interpreted as evidence counter to a parabolic trend.

On TABLE J, showing Horace's use of sed, we again see a definite non-linear pattern. The frequency of sed falls somewhat in the 20s from the level found in the 30s (disregarding, as in the case of ad, the data of Satires I), and we find this both in the hexameter and in the non-hexameter works. The Ars Poetica fits nicely after Epistles I in the middle-period poems, whose observed frequencies are lower than expected. In the late poems, the rate with which Horace used sed rose again. Thus, the graphs of both hexameters and non-hexameters are convex parabolas described by quadratic equations. The similar trends observed for ad, per, and sed can be seen from the composite graph on TABLE K.

As mentioned, a fourth function word, nec, has the opposite trend—a concave parabola. We begin with a table of the data subjected to chi-square and association tests. The results show high statistical significance and non-independence of the variables (TABLE VIII, next page).

Once again, to interpret the degree of association, we need to determine the maximum possible level of association that can be obtained with our frequency requirement and in view of the preponderance of data in the “rest” category ($43,146 / 43,415 = 99.38\%$). Running an experiment similar to that used for ad, per, and sed, we obtain the results seen on TABLE IX (next page). Compared to the maximum values we can expect to find in one of our chronometers, the degree of association actually observed for nec is about the same as we found for ad, per, and sed.

In modelling the hexameters, we may legitimately ignore the departure of Satires I from the parabolic model without postulating a cubic model; on the principle of parsimony in model-building, see A. Agresti and B. Finlay, op. cit. (supra n. 19) 363-64; P. Turney, “The Curve Fitting Problem: A Solution,” The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science 41 (1990) 509-530.
## New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>EP1</th>
<th>EP2.1</th>
<th>EP2.2</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>6972</td>
<td>7199</td>
<td>6651</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>6972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6995</td>
<td>7222</td>
<td>6686</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>6995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EP2</th>
<th>C1-3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>3060</td>
<td>2969</td>
<td>10576</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>43146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>2995</td>
<td>10694</td>
<td>2559</td>
<td>43415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST STATISTIC</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>75.529</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>76.994</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>ASMPT. STD. ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRAMER V</td>
<td>.0417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>.0417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.00010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VIII: Frequency of NEC in Horace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>EP1</th>
<th>EP2.1</th>
<th>EP2.2</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>6990</td>
<td>7217</td>
<td>6681</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>6990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6995</td>
<td>7222</td>
<td>6686</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>6995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EP2</th>
<th>C1-3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>10689</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>43156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>2995</td>
<td>10694</td>
<td>2559</td>
<td>43415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST STATISTIC</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>2064.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>915.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>ASMPT. STD. ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRAMER V</td>
<td>.2180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>.2130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA</td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>.00033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td>.0053</td>
<td>.00042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IX: Table VIII Controlled for "REST"
The Date of the Poem

Next, we run some modelling tests, combining the *Ars Poetica* with the other middle and late hexameter poems, to see whether we can improve on the results obtained from the full model. The best reduced model once again turns out to be the one combining the *Ars Poetica* and *Epistles* I, though this time, there is no close runner-up.

As TABLE X shows, in the reduced model combining the *Ars Poetica* with *Epistles* I, we lose just 1.24 of chi-square value at one degree of freedom, which is not statistically significant. Thus, this reduced model is preferable to the full model. The other reduced models, combining the *Ars* with other poems, are much less compelling: the *AP + Epist.* II.2 model, with a chi-square value of 68.99, actually represents a result significantly worse than the full model and hence can be rejected, as can that combining the *Ars* with *Sat.* II. The model combining *Ars Poetica + Epist.* II.1 is an acceptable reduction, but barely so and with less probability than the model collapsing *AP + Epist.* I. The *Ars Poetica + Sat.* II + *Epist.* I model, with a chi-square value of 72.16, is almost significantly worse than the full model: 75.53 - 69.55 = 5.98, with one degree of freedom. To reject a reduced model of this type, we would have had to have a remainder of 5.991 or more. As it is, we can simply say that it is much less probable than the reduction *Ars Poetica + Epist.* I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN $\chi^2$ FROM FULL MODEL (0)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT AT $\alpha = .05$?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>70.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>74.29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>68.99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>72.16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>69.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>66.99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>67.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MODELS: I = FULL; II = AP+S2; III = AP+E1; IV = AP+EP2.2; V = AP+EP2.1; VI = AP+S2+E1; VII = AP+E1+E2.2; VIII = AP+E2

§The difference would be significant if it were 3.841 instead of 3.37.
*The difference would be significant if it were 5.991 instead of 5.980.

TABLE X: COMPARISONS OF THE FULL AND VARIOUS COLLAPSED MODELS OF THE DATA IN TABLE VIII
New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica

Having seen the strong evidence associating the Ars Poetica with Epistles I, we can now place the Ars Poetica on a frequency graph of the data for nec (see TABLE L). Although we once again put the Ars Poetica after Epistles I, we make no claim at this point of our argument about its relative position with respect to Epistles I. As the graph shows, the Ars Poetica takes its place alongside Epistles I at the peak of the parabola, which falls off quickly in the late works. For the sake of parsimony, we do not postulate a cubic equation because of the anomalously low frequency of Epist. II.2.

It is interesting to note here that the trend in Horace's use of ne is much the same as that of nec, except that the overall frequency is in general quite a bit lower than it is for nec, and the effects of genre are just the reverse. Whereas for nec, the non-hexameters showed a higher rate of usage, for ne the frequency in the non-hexameters is quite low—so low, indeed, that ne has been excluded from our study on account of low frequency. So it must remain. Since ne and nec are so similar in sound and sense, it is at least worth reporting here the fact that the trends in Horace's use of them are similar, too. Although of no probative value for our argument, the resemblance of the trend of ne to that of nec may add support to the principal theoretical assumption of this study—namely, that some function words may serve as chronometers because their use changes in a patterned way over time according to quite unconscious linguistic processes.

As before for the first "concave" group, it is useful to combine the graphs of the "convex" group so that we may visualize just how closely the frequency trends of nec and ne resemble each other (cf. TABLE M). In so doing, we will use two scales to compensate for the fact that ne is so much rarer than nec. This is justified, needless to say, because we are interested only in the convexity of the pattern, and not in the absolute frequencies of the words in the Horatian corpus. Of course, the fact that ne peaks over Epistles I and nec over the Ars Poetica is equally irrelevant: there is no reason why the two words should follow the exact same development. As a further visual aid, we will use the bar graph for nec and superimpose a line graph for ne.

To conclude this part of our stylometric attempt to date the Ars Poetica: two classes of functions words emerge from a study of function words in Latin as satisfying the frequency and pattern requirements of chronometers. They are ad/per/sed, on the one hand, and nec, on the other. The first group has the pattern of a concave parabola; the second class, that of a convex parabola. In both classes, the Ars Poetica takes its rightful place next to Epistles I. In neither of the two classes do we find any compelling evidence that the Ars Poetica should be combined with Horace's late poetry.
Possible Macrochronometers: Characters, Strings, Strong Stops

Many other stylometric tests for relative chronology are conceivable, and, while it is not my intention to try to exhaust all the possibilities here, it is at least prudent to see if the results reached so far can be confirmed or disconfirmed by other means.

Up to now we have looked at one category of vocabulary—function words. To compensate for this rather restricted approach, let us consider some typical tests of Horace's entire vocabulary. By examining features common to all of Horace's use of language—which we may call macrochronometers—we will have looked at Horace's word usage from, so to speak, both ends of the telescope. Once again we will be trying to find some feature that can serve as a chronometer because its usage in the corpus shows patterned development.

Statisticians of style often look at such things as the average number of characters per word, words per sentence, and unique strings as a percentage of all strings. These will serve as our macrochronometers, and we may begin by measuring the average number of characters per word in the works of the corpus. From the graph on TABLE N, it can easily be seen that there is no developmental pattern here. Rather, Horatian usage remains quite stable from poem to poem and genre to genre. The mean values for the poems are 5.636, with a standard deviation of .052. If the Horatian mean turns out to be significantly different from that of other Latin writers, then it could serve as a criterion of attribution. It is clear, however, that it cannot be of much help for establishing a relative chronology of Horace's own works.

The situation is much the same for the ratio of words per strong stop, though for a different reason. Here the problem is not stability but random fluctuation—especially opposite trends in the hexameters and non-hexameters, as can be seen on TABLE O.

The hexameters show a steady rise from Satires II through Epistles II.2 and II.1 (leaving out of account, of course, the Ars Poetica, so as not to be guilty of a petitio principii). The hexameters are thus linear. The non-hexameters, on the other hand, have fewer words per stop in Carm. I-III of the mid-20s than they did in the Epodes, giving them a parabolic shape. It is perhaps just as well that this ratio turns out not to be useful: the pointing is completely dependent on the single text of Horace that has been digitized to date (Klingner's Teubner), and pointing is notoriously arbitrary. For this reason, I first converted all colons and semi-colons to periods before the computer scanned the text to tabulate "sentences." Nevertheless, although "strong stop" is a vaguer category than is "sentence," the result will hardly be found to agree with any other edition.
so modified. If for this practical reason words/stop is not a very reliable measure, then it is equally suspect on statistical grounds.39

Our last hope for a macrochronometer that can confirm or disconfirm the results of our study of function words is the ratio of unique strings to non-unique strings in Horace.40 Normally, one would prefer to study words—i.e., lexemes—per se, not strings, or inflected forms of words. However, given the current lack of a parser for Latin, it is impractical to study a corpus as large as Horace's in this way. On the other hand, in the present case very little inaccuracy is likely to result from using for analysis strings, as opposed to words, since Latin does not have many homonyms like *uti*. TABLE P reports the rate at which unique and non-unique strings appear in Horace's works.

As can be seen from TABLE XI, our intuition that we have, indeed, identified a statistically significant pattern is confirmed by chi-square and associ-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRING</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>EP1</th>
<th>EP2.1</th>
<th>EP2.2</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIQUE</td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>3988</td>
<td>3804</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>6995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-UNIQ</td>
<td>3204</td>
<td>3234</td>
<td>2882</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>6621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6995</td>
<td>7222</td>
<td>6686</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRING</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EPD</th>
<th>C1-3</th>
<th>C4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIQUE</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>7529</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-UNIQ</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>2995</td>
<td>10694</td>
<td>2559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST STATISTIC</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON CHI-SQUARE</td>
<td>1147.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>ASYMPT. STD. ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRAMER V</td>
<td>.1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>.1605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA</td>
<td>.0042</td>
<td>.00245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>.00039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XI: CHI-SQUARE TEST OF THE FREQUENCY OF UNIQUE AND NON-UNIQUE STRINGS IN HORACE


40This kind of "type/token" analysis was used by Grayston and Herdan in an authorship study of works in the New Testament attributed to Paul; see K. Grayston and G. Herdan, "The Authorship of the Pastorals in Light of Statistical Linguistics," *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959-60) 1-15; the study is usefully criticized by Lindsay and Mackay, op. cit. *(supra* n. 23) 6-7. Grayston and Herdan studied words, not strings (arrays of characters, i.e., forms of words).
The Date of the Poem

...tion tests of the data. The high chi-square value tells us that there is very little chance indeed that the figures for the strings are the result of chance and a very high probability that the variables of poem and string-type are not independent. Their degree of dependence is expressed by the various coefficients, which indicate a modest degree of association reflective of the fact that the slopes of the lines in TABLE P are so gentle.

Attempts to model the data by combining the Ars Poetica with other poems do not succeed in establishing a more economical model without loss of significance. In fact, collapsing the data in any of the ways used earlier results in significant losses of chi-square value, as TABLE XII shows. The fact that the full model is preferable to any reduction means that we have no basis at this point in the analysis for associating the Ars Poetica with one of the datable hexameter poems.

On TABLE P, the location of the Ars Poetica between Epistles I and Epist. II.2 is thus purely speculative, supported only by the smooth linear pattern that results. In a moment we will convert the nominal poem variables to interval variables. Our first order of business will then be to see whether other tests, appropriate only to interval variables, can confirm or disconfirm this speculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>LOSS OF $\chi^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$AP + Ep. I$</td>
<td>82.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AP + Ep. II.2$</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AP + Ep. II.1$</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AP + Ep. II$</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XII: ALTERNATIVE MODELS FOR GROUPING THE DATA OF TABLE XI

Absolute Chronology: Conversion to Interval Variables

A number of statistical analyses were unavailable to us because the variables we have been considering so far were nominal, not interval. It is prudent to consider Horace's poems as simple categories; on the other hand, in view of their generally accepted absolute chronology, they can also be taken as points on an interval scale of time. If we do this with due awareness of how approximate our results must be, we can make a provisional attempt to determine whether the Ars Poetica should be dated before or after Epistles I and we can obtain added confirmation for our rejection of the late dating of the poem.
Because we did not make such a conversion, we could not mathematically describe the linear and quadratic equations that may describe Horace's evolving use of *ad, sed, ne, and nec* as well as his ratio of unique to non-unique strings. Only after arriving at such equations, by building linear and non-linear regression models[^41], can we attempt to make our date of the *Ars Poetica* more precise.

In what follows, the conversion to interval variables will be based on the publication dates given by Vretska (see n. 30 above), with the exception that the *Epodes*—which were written over such a long period of time—are dated to the approximate mid-point of their period of composition (c. 35 B.C.) and *Epistles II.2* is dated to 19/18[^42]. To circumvent the problem that dates B.C. are regressive, dates will be expressed variously in terms of Horace's age or in years *ab urbe condita* (AUC), as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEX AUC = AGE</th>
<th>NON-HEX AUC = AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI 718 30</td>
<td>EPD 718 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S II 723 35</td>
<td>C1-3 730 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP I 733 45</td>
<td>EP II.2 735 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP II.1 740 52</td>
<td>C4 740 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table XIII: Approximate Publication Dates of Horace's Poetry**

First, equations will be derived for the data from poems, excluding the *Ars Poetica*. Then, the *Ars Poetica* will be dated by means of the equations. As before, the hexameters and non-hexameters will be treated separately. We may note here that our results will only relate to the terminus ante quem of the *Ars Poetica* as we have it. No attempt will be made to determine whether the poem we have is, e.g., a revised version or a second edition of an earlier poem.

Let us first examine the unique strings in the non-hexameter poetry. As we recall, these showed a strong linear pattern of development, with increasing rates of unique strings as time went on. We want to see whether there is support for our speculation that the *Ars* belongs roughly in the period between the composition of *Epist. I* and *Epist. II.2*.

[^41]: Cf. A. Agresti and B. Finlay, op. cit. (*supra* n. 19) 243-288, 316-356.

[^42]: Vretska says the date is “before 20,” but most scholars put it in 19/18; see Brink, I, 184n1.
The figure $R^2$ is the coefficient of determination, which varies from 0 (indicating that the variables are independent) to 1.0 (indicating that they are strongly associated). In this case, the coefficient is practically 1.0, so that we may be quite confident that the rate of unique strings in a Horatian poem is determined by its date.

The frequency of unique strings in the hexameter poems also increases over time, as the table on the next page shows.
Dependent variable is: HexUnStr (hexameter Unique Strings)  
\[ R^2 = 69.6\% \quad R^2 \text{ (adjusted)} = 59.4\% \]
\[ s = 6.119 \text{ with } 5 - 2 = 3 \text{ degrees of freedom} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>256.923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>257.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>112.345</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.4482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>s.e. of Coeff</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-609.812</td>
<td>256.5</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>0.921136</td>
<td>0.3517</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formula: \[ Y = -609.812 + 0.921136X \]

**TABLE XV:** PERCENTAGE OF UNIQUE STRINGS IN HORACE’S HEXAMETER POETRY

In this case, the results are more scattered, but the coefficient of determination is still quite high at .696. This means that about 70\% of the variability of unique strings from poem to poem is explained by the dates of the poems, as opposed to other (non-specified) factors. The formula resulting from our analysis gives us the Y-intercept and slope of the linear equation that best describes this data: \[ Y = -609.812 + 0.921136X \]. With the Y-value for the *Ars Poetica* (66.1) in hand, we
can solve the equation for X (i.e., for date) for the *Ars Poetica*. The answer is 733.728 a.u.c., or 21/20 B.C. On the scattergram, I have entered the poem into the locus indicated by the equation. The high reliability of this dating is suggested by the t-ratio for the variable “Date.” The value of 2.62 with three degrees of freedom results in a rejection of the null hypothesis that the true slope coefficient is 0 (that is, that the variable Y, or frequency of unique strings, does not depend on the variable X, or date) at an alpha-level of less than .05.  

Since the fit of our nonlinear data to the most descriptive quadratic equations is not as tight as it is for these two linear patterns, and since the number of poems in our sample is so low in any case, our approach to the words with quadratic equations (i.e., *ad, sed, nec, and ne*) is somewhat different. Instead of deriving a date from all the hexameters except the *Ars Poetica* and then determining the date of the poem by substituting the value of the dependent variable, we will use an exploratory modelling approach. With this method, we increase the plausibility, if not probability, of our results by including the *Ars Poetica* in our regression analysis. Controlling for all the other poems, we run the regression seventeen times by varying the date of the *Ars Poetica* from its earliest to its latest possible year of composition (i.e., 24 to 8 B.C.). We then pick out the years that are most and least likely, as determined, respectively, by the greatest and lowest \( R^2 \) value of the regression. This procedure tells us which dates of the *Ars Poetica* are the most and least likely for these data. The results may be seen on TABLE XVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>( R_1^2 )</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>( R_2^2 )</th>
<th>( R_1^2 )/( R_2^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SED</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XVI: BEST AND WORST REGRESSION MODELS FOR DATING THE *ARS POETICA* BY MEANS OF FUNCTION WORDS

43 When the t-ratio is 2.62 with three degrees of freedom, alpha is < .05 and > .025.

44 For the difference between an explanatory and exploratory use of regression, see A. Agresti and B. Finlay, op. cit. (*supra* n. 19) 379-80, especially the following: “in exploratory research...the goal is not to explain relationships among variables so much as it is to find a good set of predictors. Here we want to maximize \( R^2 \), and we do not worry so much about theoretical explanations.”

45 The principle of parsimonious model-building suggests that the anomalous *Epist.* II.2 be excluded from consideration.
R², as noted earlier, measures the strength of the association of the variables; here, $R_1^2$ is the correlation coefficient of the best model and $R_2^2$ that of the worst. Three of the function words (sed; per; nec) give us $R_1^2$ values superior to that found for the unique strings; one (ad) is quite similar. While these absolute values are sufficient to permit the conclusion that, on this basis, the *Ars Poetica* should more likely be dated to the period 24-20 B.C. than to Horace's last years, they do not give us a sense of the degree to which the earlier datings are preferable to the latter. For this, we need to consider the ratio $R_1^2/R_2^2$, which quantifies the advantage of the best model over the worst. Perusal of the table confirms that sed and per are very reliable chronometers indeed, both in absolute and relative terms.

The $R^2$ value expresses the fit of the observed frequencies of ad, per, sed, and nec to those that can be predicted by the appropriate quadratic equation. The closer the fit, the higher the value of $R^2$, which varies, as previously noted, from 0.0 to 1.0. The graphs in TABLES Q-T will help the reader visualize the fit of the data to the predictive equations. In examining them, the reader should bear in mind that a quadratic equation can be derived to fit any three points on a graph; thus, it is not surprising that two or three points always fall on or very near the prediction parabolas. Visualization of the goodness of fit ($R^2$ values) of the predicted to the observed values depends on developing a sense of the number of points off the parabolic line and their distance from their predicted values on the line. The graphs are presented in descending order of their $R_1^2/R_2^2$ ratios, beginning with sed.

**Summary of Arguments for Dating the *Ars Poetica***

At this point, a summary of our statistical investigations and other arguments for dating the *Ars Poetica* is in order.

Of the three approaches to dating the poem, the first—comparing and contrasting ideas of the *Ars Poetica* with Horace's beliefs about poetry in his other, datable poems—was rejected because the ideas in the *Ars* are so different from what we find in his other poems that the poem cannot readily be fitted into a chronological scheme of Horace's ideas about poetry. We did, however, note that the only echoes in the *Ars Poetica* to other passages in Horace's poetry were to poems published in 23-20 B.C., thus suggesting that the *Ars* dates from the same period. The second approach—based on dating the work by reference to biographical information available from other sources about historical personages mentioned in the poem—provided a firm post quem (24/23 B.C.), but was only suggestive about a terminus ante quem (19 B.C.).
The third approach of stylometrics confirmed this terminus post quem and added better evidence for an ante quem of c. 20 B.C. Starting from a reexamination of Duckworth's metrical arguments for dating the Ars Poetica—which he adduced in favor of a late date—we found that, by his own "naive" statistical methodology, the evidence supported dating the poem in Horace's "middle" period, well before the late hexameters of Epistles II. Subjecting the data to standard statistical tests, we then found that his metrical tests did not give strong support to even this revised dating. Instead of looking further for metrical chronometers—something presently difficult to do in the absence of a commercially available metrical scanner for Latin—we shifted our evidentiary base from meter to vocabulary, treating the books of poetry as nominal variables that can be arranged according to a relative chronology. We then sought criteria for dating the poems by running tests on Horace's use of function words, on the average number of characters per word and of words per strong stop, and on the ratio of unique to non-unique strings in Horace. The studies of word-length and words per stop were inconclusive, since no development over time was noted. On the other hand, our examination of function words and ratio of unique to non-unique strings proved fruitful: here we discovered linear and non-linear patterns of development over Horace's career, and both batteries of tests suggested that the Ars Poetica fell into Horace's middle period of hexameters. Finally, converting the nominal variables into interval variables by assigning the various poems their generally accepted absolute dates, we ran tests of the ratio of unique to non-unique strings and of the changing frequency of function words. These tests agreed in indicating a date in the period 24-20 B.C. as most probable for the composition of the Ars Poetica. The tests of the function words also showed that, the later we attempted to date the Ars Poetica down to 8 B.C. (the year of Horace's death), the less likely the result in terms of statistical probability. Three of the four function words indicated a best dating of 24 B.C.; one dated the poem to 20 B.C. Our conclusion is thus that the most likely date of the Ars Poetica is between 24 and 20 B.C.
CHAPTER 3

INTERPRETIVE IMPLICATIONS OF CHRONOLOGY: THE *ARS POETICA* IN ITS CULTURAL CONTEXT

The problems considered thus far will almost certainly never have definitive answers: we simply lack the kind of information we need to have in order to know what Horace himself called the *Ars Poetica* and when he wrote the poem. Our effort has been much more modest: to show that some possibilities have been overlooked by earlier scholars and to demonstrate that some of these possibilities are even—statistically speaking—probabilities. The poem's title and date are not merely of antiquarian interest. They have a direct and indirect impact on how we construct our reading of the poem.

At this point, then, we need to address three issues. First, what consequences would our dating have for the relationship of the poem to its historical milieu? Secondly, in view of those consequences, what effect can an early dating have on our interpretation and understanding of the *Ars Poetica*? Finally, to what extent are these external and internal implications of the date consistent with—or, indeed, supportive of—a parodic reading of the poem?

For the first issue, the identity of the Pisones to whom the work is dedicated is of paramount importance. In the past, scholars have thought themselves forced by a date in the late 20s to see Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 23) as the senior dedicatee of the poem. This has been resisted because, from what we know about him and his family, they do not seem appropriate recipients of a work on poetics. On the other hand, the favored candidate, L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex (cos. 15), was too young in the 20s to serve as the senior dedicatee.¹ Once we have offered a new solution to the problem of identifying Piso père, we will examine the implications of our candidate for interpretation of the poem, particularly in the light of Horace's relationship to contemporary literary critics. We will see that by aligning the speaker of the *Ars Poetica* with such critics as

¹Cf., with admirable succinctness, Brink, I, 239-240.
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Piso and Sp. Mæcius Tarpa, Horace undermines the speaker’s authority in a way suggestive of parody.

Similarly, the dating proposed here invites us to examine the relationship between the poem and contemporary painting and art criticism, which, from the very first lines of the poem, play a prominent part in the Ars Poetica. A close reading of the opening lines of the poem will show that, right from the start, Horace portrays the speaker of the poem as a pedant and an ignoramus. This characterization, like the attack on his authority, is consistent with a parodic reading of the work.

Finally, dating the Ars Poetica to the 20s, and seeing it as a separate work in the corpus unrelated to the Epistles and replete with parodic elements should naturally make us wonder about the genre of the poem. In tackling this matter in Chapter 4, we will try both to put the Renaissance epistle-theory to rest once and for all and to link the Ars Poetica to the traditions of Horatian sermo.

The Identity of the Pisones

Foremost among the ten historical personages mentioned in the Ars Poetica are the Pisones, who are the addressees of the poem. Since their identification is closely connected to the poem’s chronology and tone, I will have to delve into the matter here.

A full account of the extensive scholarship on the identity of the Pisones is no longer necessary after the thorough recent contributions of Brink and Syme, on which we can safely try to build. In particular, the claims of the unpoetical Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 23) need no longer be rehearsed and refuted. As mentioned above, Cn. Calpurnius Piso has, since the nineteenth century, been the Piso to whom scholars dating the poem to the 20s have had to turn, since L. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 15) was too young in the 20s to have had children old enough to be called iuvenes (cf. Ars Poetica 366). Our task here, then, is to find someone other than Cn. Calpurnius Piso who can serve as senior addressee in the late 20s.

Horace addresses his poem to Pisones (6, credite, Pisones...). Although there were several important late-republican families with this cognomen, it is at

least clear that we have to do with Calpurnii Pisones, because lines 291-292 (vos, o / Pompilius sanguis) imply that our family descends from Calpus, the son of King Numa. Moreover, verse 366 (o maior iuvenum) tells us that our family consists of a father and two children, who must range in age somewhere between about 16 and 45 years of age. Lines 385-388 suggest that the elder child is (or, plans to be) a poet and that his father is (or, considers himself to be) an authority on literary criticism. So much for the internal evidence.

The late-antique commentator, Porphyrio, in a note on the first line of the poem, identifies Piso père as L. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 15; RE Calpurnius 99): hunc librum, qui inscribitur de Arte Poetica, ad Lucium Pisonem, qui postea urbis custos fuit, et liberae studiorum antistes. This notice may, however, be incorrect because this Piso is not known to have had any children. Syme, presenting some possible sons of this Piso, must admit a lack of certainty about his candidates, though he sensibly points out that the silence of the ancient sources anent children may be the result of any number of good reasons, e.g., adoptions, early deaths, or political inactivity. However, even if children are postulated, one problem remains with Porphyrio’s Piso père. The text of the poem presumes that the father is primarily a critic, not a poet: he is mentioned as such (388), and Horace says nothing about his poetry, which is strange if he has written anything of note. We are told by Porphyrio that the consul of 15 was a poet (nam et ipse poeta fuit), and we may even have some of his poetry in the Greek Anthology. Moreover, Poro-

3And not, e.g., Domitii Pisones (Pliny, NH praef. 17), or Pupii Pisones (cf. RE Pupius 10-12; M. H. Crawford, Roman Republican Coinage, vol. 1 [Cambridge 1974] 87, 442-443, with bibliography).


5Cf. OLD s.v. iuvenis I.

6"Tu nihil invita dices faciesve Minerva: id tibi iudicium est, ea mens, si quid tamen olim scripseris, in Maeci descendent iudicis auris et patris et nostras...."


8Cf. C. Cichorius, Römische Studien (Leipzig 1922) 325-327, 338-341; E. Groag, PIR2 (Berlin 1936) Calpurnius 289 (p. 66). Because Porphyrio tells us that his Piso père was a poet, AP 11.424, attributed to a certain Piso, has been thought to be by this man. That Piso père is presented in the poem largely as a critic and the
phyrio's candidate was born in 48; any children he may have had would accordingly have become iuvenes only in the very last years of Horace’s life—say after 12, if Piso married young and had his first child early on (e.g., born in 48; married in 29; first child born in 28 and Horace’s maior iuvenum at age 16 in 12).9

If the period 24-20 is considered the likeliest for the composition of the Ars Poetica, then we must face the instant repercussion that Porphyrio must be wrong about the identity of Piso père.10 Or, perhaps, partly wrong.

It is quite possible that Porphyrio has the right family, but the wrong generation.11 If Piso père is more a critic than a poet and if his elder child is a poet, not a critic, then these requirements are better met by assigning to L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cos. 58; RE Calpurnius 90) the role of père and to his son, L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex (cos. 15; RE Calpurnius 99), the part of maior iuvenum (25-28 years old in 23-20 B.C., since he was born in c. 48 B.C., according to Tac. Ann. 6.10). The consul of 15 was, as has been noted, a poet, according to Porphyrio; he is maior iuvenum, despite his famous elder sister Calpurnia (Caesar’s last wife; RE Calpurnia 126), because she—betrothed to Caesar in 59, before her brother was even born—was too old in the 20s to be called iuvenis, assuming she was even alive (we hear no mention of her after 44). Their father was facetiously called a critic (grammaticus) by Cicero.12 The implication behind Cicero’s invective (on which, see pp. 57-59) is that the consul of 58 prided himself on being a literary critic—not unexpected in a man who we know was a patron of poets, including the poet-philosopher Philodemus.

elder child as a budding poet was noted by E. C. Wickham, Quinti Horatii Flacci, Opera Omnia, vol. 2, (Oxford 1891) 383-384.

9Cf. R. Syme, “The Sons of Piso,” op. cit. (supra n. 2) 338-339, for speculation along these lines. Note that a iuvenis is “technically, any adult male up to the age of 45” (OLD). The toga virilis was assumed, in this period, at c. 16 years of age (cf. J. P. V. D. Balsdon, Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome [New York 1969] 120). Thus, in a technical sense, the senior dedicatee of the Ars Poetica must have children aged 16-45. To be sure, the term iuvenis could also be used more loosely, but the technical sense at least gives us guidance as to what Horace means.

10That a date in the 20s B.C. rules out Porphyrio’s candidate has been seen since J. H. van Reenen’s Disputatio philologico-critica de Horatii Epistola ad Pisones (Amsterdam 1806). As noted, Van Reenen and his followers have recourse to Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 23). Ars Poetica 306, “nil scribens ipse,” has sometimes been connected with the so-called Intervallum lyricum of 23-18 B.C., when Horace wrote no lyric poetry. Equally possible is an interpretation based on persona-theory: the Ars Poetica speaker is presented as a typical grammaticus, who has never written poetry and has no plans to do so.

11Similar prosopographical confusions in Porphyrio are collected by A. Michaelis, op. cit. (supra n. 10) 421.

12In Pisonem 73.
Although the identifications of Caesoninus and Pontifex fit quite well with the evidence of the *Ars Poetica*, there still remain two potential difficulties that should be explored now. In his influential *RE* article on Caesoninus, Münzer suggested that Caesoninus died shortly after the Battle of Mutina, for he is no longer mentioned in the literary sources after 43 B.C. This is, of course, a speculative argument from silence, but it has apparently been powerful enough to discourage earlier students of the problem from proposing Caesoninus as the senior dedicatee of the *Ars Poetica*. Let us note, first of all, that other speculations about Caesoninus after 43 are possible: we may, for example, just as easily imagine that the conciliatory and Epicurean Piso withdrew in disgust from politics into the pleasures of retirement, or semi-retirement, after 43. In favor of this, we may recall Piso's reluctance to hold the office of censor in 50.

We do not have to content ourselves with guesses that Caesoninus lived on after 43. After Münzer wrote, three inscriptions in Pola mentioning L. Calpurnius L.f. Piso Caesoninus have gradually been published. Here are the texts:

L·CASSIUS·C·F·LONGIN(US) | L·CALPURNIUS·L·F·PISO | IIVIR(I)...

[[CIL V 54 = ILLRP 639 = Inscr. Ital. X.i.81 (with photo), from the Porta Herculea]]

L·CALP[URNIUS·L·F ] | PISO·CA[ESONINUS] | CO[S]

[[= Fig. 1; CIL V.2512 = ILLRP 423 = Inscr. Ital. X.i.65 (with drawing); found in v. Castropola (= M. Gupca Street); A. Gnirs, *JOAI* 13 (1910) 196; P. Sticotti, *AMSt* 30 (1914) 114; A. Gnirs, *Pola* (Vienna 1915) 53; museum, inv. nr. 316]]

[L·CALPUNNIUS·L·F]

[CAEJSONINUS]

[[ILLRP 424 = Inscr. Ital. X.i.708 (with photo); now missing, formerly on a wall of the duomo; see M. Mirabella Roberti, *Il Duomo di Pola* (Pola 1943) 31n1]]

---


14 So E. Scuotto, "Realità umana e atteggiamenti politici e culturali di Lucio Calpurnio Pison Cesonino," *RAAN* 47 (1972) 149-166, at p. 162.

15 Dio 40.63.2.
In an article published in an out-of-the-way journal, seventeen years after Münzer's article, Sticotti convincingly identified the Piso mentioned in these inscriptions as our man, the consul of 58. Since the first of the three can be dated as contemporary with Pola's first permanent wall (i.e., to c. 33 B.C.; see Appendix III for details), Pola provides important evidence of Piso's survival into the triumviral period. In 23-20, he would have been about 80 (77-85 is the probable range), and in this connection we should note that his son lived to be 80.

The second difficulty with our identifications of Piso père et fils is that we still lack a younger child. This will be held against my theory by any adherents of the claims of the family of Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 23), who is known to have had two sons. However, one attested son is better than none (a disadvantage taken in stride by such recent supporters of Porphyrio as Brink and Syme). In addition to the reasons given by Syme for the absence of sons from the historical record, we might note that it is not even clear from the text of the Ars Poetica that we have to do with two sons, as has always been assumed: the words iuvenes (24, 366) and liberi (Porphyrio on verse 1) do not rule out the possibility that one of the children was, in fact, a daughter. The odds of a daughter being mentioned in an independent historical source are not very high.

Two final points, this time in favor of my identification of the Pisones. First, we ought to bear in mind that the problem we are trying to solve has another aspect. Thus far, we have been concentrating on whom Horace intended by Piso père and the maior iuvenum. Equally important is who Horace's educated reader would have understood these people to be. There is obviously a relationship between these two problems: Horace reveals his intentions to the reader by the information he provides in the poem. That information indicates, as we have seen, Calpurnii Pisones (291-292). Of the two possible families—the Cnaei and Lucii Calpurnii Pisones—only the Lucii have a connection with


17For his birth year, see R. G. M. Nisbet, Cicero, In Pisonem (Oxford 1961) v (c. 105-101 B.C.); A. Degrassi, ibid., Il confine, 66 (Scritti vari, p. 918).

18For examples, see OLD s.vv. iuvenis 2 ("a young person of either sex") and liberi ("sons and daughters, children"). Young women did, of course, write poetry in the first century: cf. the cases of Sempronia, whose works do not survive (Sallust, Cat. 25), and Sulpicia, on whose poems see D. Roessel, "The Significance of the Name Cerinthus in the Poems of Sulpicia," TAPA 120 (1990) 243-250.
literature that is knowable, not only by us, but very likely also by Horace's contemporaries. For Horace's reader, then, the question was simply which Lucius, the consul of 58 (Caesoninus) or of 15 (Pontifex).

From the reader's point of view, I do not think that there could have been much hesitation in identifying Piso père as the consul of 58, only assuming that Caesoninus was still alive or very recently deceased when the poem was circulated—something, as we have seen, that we have no grounds for doubting. The reason for this is obvious: Piso Caesoninus was famously connected to literature and to literary criticism. Philodemus dedicated epigrams and at least one philosophical work to him; Catullus wrote two poems about him; and, most importantly, Cicero branded him a cruel "Phalaris of literary critics" in an oration (the In Pisonem) that Cicero tells us (doubtless with some exaggeration) quickly became a school text. On the other hand, his son, though rising politically in the period 23-20 B.C., was at best tangentially associated with poetry throughout his career. Tacitus, in his famous obituary, does not even mention this facet of his personality.

Once we view the problem of the addressee from the vantage point of the reader instead of the author, then the choice of Caesoninus as Piso père becomes stronger still. He is the literary Piso who would prob-


21Tacitus, Ann. 6.10.
ably have leapt to the mind of Horace's average reader, especially in the absence of any strong counterindications from Horace that someone else was meant.22

Our second point is this: we have evidence that Horace knew the works in which Cicero attacked the consul of 58 and his literary pretensions. Keller-Holder give the following loci similes between Cicero's *In Pisonem* and *Pro Sestio*23 and works of Horace. I put them in order of their cogency as evidence that Horace was familiar with the Ciceronian text:24

[1] *In Pisonem* 37:  
*Epist.* 1.4.15-16:  

---

[2] *In Pisonem* 73:  
*Ars Poetica* 450-51:  

---

[3] *In Pisonem* 20:  
*Epist.* 1.18.94:  

---

[4] *Pro Sestio* 42:  
*Epist.* 1.18.81:  

---

The first piece of evidence is doubtless the most important and persuasive: Horace applies to himself in a jocular vein the same kind of striking animal comparison that Cicero had used in his bitter invective against the consul

---

22 Cf. now E. Champlin, op. cit. (*supra* n. 4) 122: "no other branch of the [Calpurnii Pisones] family comes near to rivalling this pair [viz., the coss. of 58 and 15] in war and the patronage of literature."

23 Where Piso is attacked in 19-24.

24 Two cases that I consider fortuitous I omit: Cic. *In Pis.* 47, "furiosum...dementiorem" ~ Hor. *Sat.* II.3.303 (sic: should be 133?) "demens"; and Cic. *Ad Q. fr.* 3.1.11, "meam in illum [seil. orationem] pueri omnes tamquam dictata perdiscant" ~ Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.13-14, "ut puerum saevo credas dictata magistro reddere...."

25 Nisbet (ad *Pis.* 20) points out the Horatian reminiscence but also presents Greek parallels which show that the background of Horace's text may not be Cicero's.
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Moreover, in both cases it is their allegiance to Epicureanism (which, according to its ancient opponents, debased man to the level of beast because it defined pleasure as the highest good) that justifies the comparison. However natural the metaphor might seem to us, the ancient evidence does not suggest that it was commonplace. So here, as I will argue elsewhere, we have the same humorous association of Horace with Piso that we find in the *Ars Poetica*.26 If these *loci similes* suggest that Horace had read works in which Piso is attacked, then they also suggest when he did so: during the period in which he was composing *Epistles* I and the nearly contemporaneous *Ars Poetica*.

To conclude the discussion thus far: the *Ars Poetica* was probably written in 24-20 B.C. and dedicated to L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cos. 58) and his two children, the elder of whom may have been the politician (and amateur poet?) L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex (cos. 15), the younger of whom is unknown. Our next concern is why Horace should have dedicated the poem to Caesoninus. This raises the question of Horace’s relationship to contemporary literary critics.

The *Ars Poetica* and *Epistles* I.19: Horace and his Critics

As Carl Becker noted, dating the *Ars Poetica* with respect to Horace’s other poetry is a “Kardinalfrage.”27 Assigning the poem to the late 20s raises the questions of its relationship to the themes of *Epistles* I, especially as contained in poems like I.19 that deal in a humorous, but ultimately bitter, way with contemporary poets and critics.

If our suggested date of the *Ars Poetica* is correct, then the work was composed at a time when Horace was not yet the grand old man of Latin letters he may have been considered by the end of his life. To the contrary, *Epistles* I.19 suggests that—despite protestations of indifference to his reputation as a poet28—Horace was still rather insecure about his place in the literary firma-

26 This association is most explicit in lines 386-89: “si quid tamen olim 1 scripseres, in Maeci descendat iudicis auris 1 et patris et nostras...” See, in general, for animal language used of scholars and philosophers I. Opelt, *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen* (Heidelberg 1965) 233-235.


28 *Epistles* I.19.35-40: “scire velis, mea cur ingratus opuscula lector 1 laudet ametque domi, premat extra limen iniquus: 1 non ego ventosae plebis suffragia venor 1 impensis cenarum et tritae munere vestis; 1 non ego, nobilium scriptorum auditor et ulterior, 1 grammaticas ambire tribus et pulpitA dignor.”
ment. Like Virgil, he had his *obrectatores* and was annoyed, too, by imitative poetasters, as the poem makes clear.

In the first part of the poem (lines 1-20), Horace complains about how bad poets mimic him and naively follow any advice that falls from his lips, so that if, for example, he writes that wine is essential to poetic inspiration, legions of poetasters spend their nights in wine-drinking competitions (cf. lines 1-11). Similarly, if Horace appears pale, his piteous imitators eat cumin to make their skin whiter (cf. 17-18). Horace exclaims that the servile herd of imitators stirs him to anger, but also to laughter (19-20). In the poem’s second section (lines 21-34), Horace says that his achievement has been to find an untrodden path for Roman poetry: the implication is that the poetasters are behaving illogically in trying to equal Horace by copying him. In the last section of the poem (35-49), Horace vents his spleen against hypocritical readers, particularly the “tribes of grammarians,” who praise Horace’s poetry at home but condemn him before the public because Horace does not kowtow to them (35-41). It is important, in this connection, to note how often and how bitterly Horace, in his early and middle periods, expresses his dismay with the contemporary critical reception of his work and how unreceptive the *grammatici* generally were to new poetry, according to Suetonius. We need to think away Horace’s millenial status as a classic author and recall that in his lifetime Horace’s ultimate reputation was not clear, least of all to the poet himself (Odes II.20 and III.30 notwithstanding). Horace concludes *Epistles* I.19 with a testy exchange with a grammaticus—the kind of imaginary conversation that we would like to have when we find someone particularly galling. That he should write, in this

---


31 Thus, Suetonius (*De gramm.* 16) singles out Caecilius Epictota for the innovation of reciting in class the works of Virgil and other contemporary poets.

troubled period, a poem like the *Ars Poetica* as a parody of pedantic critics and as an intentionally misleading "instruction booklet" for poetasters on how to write good poetry is thus psychologically comprehensible.

Read as the parody of a pedantic member of the grammarian tribe, the *Ars Poetica* gives the reins to Horace’s anger and sense of humor toward the annoying poetasters and critics. To the poetasters, Horace seems to give, in the *Ars Poetica*, not only a “secret ingredient” like wine or cumin, but the very recipe book for great poetry. In reality, the recipes are not so much tried and tested as trite and bland, and so the unwitting imitator, eagerly following Horace’s instructions, ends up with very little poetic sustenance. By aping the grammarians Horace shows that, much like Nabokov, David Lodge, or Malcolm Bradbury in their satires (or like Horace himself in *Sat.* II.3 and 4), he can transmute the leaden utterances of dull academics into brilliantly amusing fiction.

If we read the *Ars Poetica*, not as Horace’s sincere declaration of poetic belief but as the monologue of a fictional *grammaticus*, unsympathetic to contemporary poets and talented at composing, not poems, but only tedious ramblings on poetics; then we expect that Horace somewhere in the poem will give us a clue dissociating himself from his speaker, who is linked to critics and poetic doctrines with which Horace himself disagrees. That is, we would expect Horace to undermine the authority of the speaker of the *Ars Poetica*.

**Critics in the *Ars Poetica*: Maecius, Piso, and Quintilius**

The speaker’s authority is an issue implicitly raised in lines 385-390:

\[
\begin{align*}
tu & \text{ nihil invita dices faciesve Minerva;} \\
id & \text{ tibi iudicium est, ea mens. si quid tamen olim scripseris, in Maeci descendat iudicis auris} \\
et & \text{ patris et nostras nonumque prematur in annum membranis intus positis. delere licebit} \\
quod & \text{ non edideris; nescit vox missa reverti.}
\end{align*}
\]

In this passage, the elder son of Piso is urged to submit anything he may write to Maecius, his father, and the speaker—“a trio of formidable critics,” writes Brink.\(^{33}\) But how formidable were Maecius and Piso père as critics? The advice given in 388-389 is absurd—as Horace himself tells us in *Epistles* II.1.34-35: *si meliora dies, ut vina, poenata reddit, scire velim chartis pretium quotus arroget annus*. Poetry does not improve simply by aging. Horace never practiced what he might naïvely be taken to be preaching here. The fatuousness

\(^{33}\)Brink, II, 509.
of the speaker's advice ought to have alerted readers that our critical trio habitually plays out of tune. Investigation of its other two members reinforces the interpretation that, in verses 385-390, Horace not only undermines the speaker by putting words of dubious wisdom into his mouth but also by putting him into some very dubious literary-critical company.

Maecius, all agree, is Sp. Maecius Tarpa, the man who chose the plays performed at the opening of Pompey's theater in 55. Maecius' old-fashioned taste on that occasion was belittled by Cicero in a letter written just after the opening. Cicero's opinion was, of course, privately expressed in a collection of letters probably not published for quite a few years. However, its importance for us lies not in its influence but in its reflection of what literati of Cicero's caliber thought of the man and his taste in the 50s. We do not have to guess about Horace's opinion of Maecius some twenty years later, for in Sat. I.10.36-39 he writes that Tarpa would hardly approve of what he was composing:

Turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque
diffindit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo,
quae nec in aede sonent certantia iudice Tarpa
nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatris.

The implication is that Horace and Tarpa disagreed on the crucial question of what sort of poetry was worth writing: for Tarpa, it was drama; for Horace, satire. If the speaker of the Ars Poetica, a promoter of dramatic literature (cf. verses 86-127, 153-294), thinks highly of Tarpa (and he obviously does), then that is only one sign, among many, of his questionable and old-fashioned taste; and it is a strong indication that he is to be distinguished from Horace. As the passage just quoted from Sat. I.10 indicates, Horace was little inclined to write for the theater, and he never wrote a play. This attitude Horace explains in detail in Epistles II.1, from which it emerges that in rejecting the dramatic genres,

\[34\text{Cic. Ad Fam. 7.1.1: "nobis autem erant ea perpetienda, quae Sp. Maecius probavisset."}\\
\[35\text{For the background to his critical activity in approving works for the Roman stage see N. B. Crowther, "The Collegium Poetarum," Latomus 32 (1973) 575-580 and N. Horsfall, "The Collegium Poetarum," BICS 23 (1976) 83. Crowther and Horsfall are correct in claiming that in Sat. I.10 Horace does not ridicule Tarpa (Crowther, p. 578; Horsfall, p. 93n38), yet Tarpa is clearly mentioned as the kind of critic who is not sympathetic to Horace's poetry. The justified opposition of these two scholars to wild speculation about the collegium poetarum has led them to misinterpret the tone of this section of Sat. I.10 and to forget that Horace could disagree with Maecius' taste in literature even if Maecius was not the magister of the college. On the collegium, see now E. Gruen, Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy, Cincinnati Classical Studies 7 (Leiden 1990) 87-91.}\\
Horace felt weighed down by the dual burdens of the literary past (Plautus, Terence, Pacuvius, Accius, etc.) and of the debased taste of the contemporary audience.

The striking portrayal of the speaker here as a conservative in literary taste complements his ignorance of the contemporary scene in poetry. This comes across in small ways—for example, in his neglect of love elegy in lines 75-76,36 where the speaker mentions only funerary and votive uses for the elegiac meter. It also comes across in larger ways—for example, the speaker's emphasis throughout the Ars on the genres of tragedy, comedy, and epic—departments of literature most important in Roman literature fifty to one hundred years before the Augustan age.37 Even more surprising than his omission of love elegy is, in this context, the speaker's failure to mention contemporary plays written by acquaintances of Horace such as Varius' Thyestes and the fabula trabeata of C. Melissus, a freedman of Maecenas and librarian of the Porticus Octaviae library.38 The latter might have served various purposes in the Ars Poetica, e.g., as an example of how Roman writers can succeed by writing drama on national themes (cf. 285-288). This is not to say that the speaker is depicted as the kind of Varronian archaizer attacked by Horace in the Letter to Augustus.39 The speaker is, characteristically, inconsistent in his attitude toward the past: after he praises the audience and music of the early Roman theater in

37Accius (tca. 85 B.C.) was "the last of the professional playwrights" (E. Fantham, Seneca's Troades [Princeton 1982] 5); in the decades after his death—with few notable exceptions—little new tragedy was written (cf. Fantham, pp. 4-7, and for a similar ancient perspective see Velleius Paterculus 1.17; for a different view cf. Rudd, 30). On comedy, see H. D. Jocelyn, "Studies in the Indirect Tradition of Plautus' Pseudolus," BICS Suppl. 51 (1988), 57-72, at pp. 57-60. As C. Segre noted, "the Ars Poetica...ends up being astonishingly anachronistic...unless we wish to regard it as the manifesto of a classical revival which never took effect" (Introduction to the Analysis of the Literary Text, trans. J. Meddemmen [Bloomington 1988] 202).
38On C. Melissus, see Schanz-Hosius, VIII.2, 176-177; H. Bardon, La littérature latine inconnue, vol. II (Paris 1956) 49-50. As Maecenas' freedman, he was doubtless known to Horace; cf. L. Müller, "Die Trabeatae des Gaius Melissus," PhW 13 (1893) col. 1468f.
39See the excellent analysis of Varronian criticism and its possible influence on Epist. II.1.50-59 in Brink, III, 83-92. Also important, we might note, was the quarrel over Sallust's archaizing, which was attacked by Asinius Pollio; see Suetonius, De gramm. 10 ("...Sallusti scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum verborum affectatione oblit..."). For literature and discussion, see L. Duret, "Dans l'ombre des plus grands," ANRW II.30.3 (Berlin 1983) 1507.
verses 202-207, we find him criticizing Plautus' wit and metrics and accusing Plautus' audience of stupidity and a lack of sophistication in lines 270-274.40

Piso père is an even more famous, or infamous, literary critic. Whatever Horace may privately have thought of Piso as a man of letters (and earlier in his career, he probably thought very highly, indeed, of Piso and his Epicurean circle), Cicero forgettably branded him non Aristarchus sed Phalaris grammaticus (In Pis. 73) in a speech that quickly became popular in the schools.41 Cicero's immediate motivation for so labelling Piso was Piso's charge, in a speech given in the senate in 55, that Cicero had meant to belittle Pompey's military accomplishments in his poem, De consulatu suo.42 As evidence, Piso cited the line: cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi.43 Cicero claimed that Piso had missed the point that arma and toga were meant figuratively, not literally, and that he had been speaking generally, without specific reference to Pompey.44

This must have been a rare, if not unique, instance in which a senator's literary criticism of a colleague's poem became the subject of a published exchange of speeches. Cicero's characterization of Piso as Phalaris grammaticus45 must have been all the more effective if Piso prided himself on being something of a literary critic. That he did is suggested by the fact that he was patron of the poet-philosopher Philodemus, one of whose epigrams to Piso is

40 To be sure, music is the topic in the earlier passage and meter and wit in the later, so that radically different appraisals of the historical development of the Roman theater can be defended. Harder to defend or explain, however, is the opposite opinion of the taste of early Roman audiences in the two passages. First, the speaker sounds like a "soft primitivist," then like a "hard primitivist" (for the concepts, see A. O. Lovejoy and G. Boas, Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity [Baltimore 1935]). At no point does he praise a specific Roman dramatist; he remains ever the carping critic, able to find fault with—but seldom willing to express admiration for—Roman poets. I will treat elsewhere the speaker's habitual hostility toward writers.


42 Remains in Morel-Büchner, FPL, M. Tullius Cicero, frs. 5-13; for discussion of the date and related problems see K. Büchner in RE s.v. M. Tullius Cicero (Stuttgart 1939) cols. 1245-1250.

43 Morel-Büchner, FPL fr. 11, with the text of W. Allen, Jr., "O fortunatam natam...," TAPA 87 (1956) 130-146, at p. 133.

44 In Pis. 73-75.

45 On which see Nisbet ad Pis. 73.7 and Grimal, loc. cit. (supra n. 20).
preserved. This also helps explain Catullus' obvious gall at being passed over by Piso for political and poetical patronage. It is amusing to suppose that Horace's source of inspiration in writing this mock didactic poem about poetics and in dedicating it to the Pisones was Cicero's barbed rhetorical question directed at Piso: quid nunc te, asine, litteras doceam? (73). That the work dedicated to Piso consists largely of a versification of the poetic theories of Neoptolemus of Parium (cf. Porphyrio on line 1 and Brink, I, 43ff.), must have intensified the fun, since Neoptolemus' poetics had been savagely attacked by Piso's client Philodemus in Book V of his Περί τοιχυμάτων (cf. Brink, I, 48ff.).

A parallel for Horace's ironic invocation of critical authority in verses 385-390 may not be far to seek. It has been noted that line 387 (in [Maeci] descendat ... aures) contains an allusion to a line in Book XXVI of Lucilius: haec tu si vales per auris pectus irrigarier (610 Marx).\(^{47}\) Now it is interesting to note that in this, his earliest book of satires—and possibly in the first satire of the book—Lucilius expresses the wish that his poem be read, not by learned critics like C. Persius, but by such undistinguished and perhaps even dull readers as M. Iunius Congus, Decimus Laelius and the people of Tarentum, Cosentia, and Sicily (592-596 Marx). Here we may have the source of a second Horatian allusion to the same Lucilian satire. As Erich Gruen notes, "these passages [in Lucilius] have usually been taken seriously by moderns, but they are surely ironic....That is unquestionably true of Cic. De Fin. 1.3.7 (592 Marx) and, I believe, for the other lines as well.\(^{49}\) To be sure, in Lucilius' case, the poet speaks of his own poetry and the readers he desires to find for it; whereas in the Ars Poetica, Horace has the speaker recommend proper readers—not for the speaker's own works—but for those that Piso's elder son, the speaker's addressee,
may someday write. Aside from this minor difference between the first and second person, however, the passages are similar in that both ironically advert to the authority of readers whose criticism cannot be accorded much respect.

In view of Horace's longstanding connections with the circle of Piso and Philodemus, we naturally wish to know why Horace dedicated the Ars Poetica to L. Calpurnius Piso Cesoninus, of all people. Of course, our answer can only be guesswork. My motivation in presenting a speculative explanation is simply to show that we are not necessarily forced into either of two extreme positions: [1] that for our identification of the senior dedicatee and for our interpretation of his role in the poem to be right, we must posit a strain or, indeed, break in Horace's relationship with Piso. Or, [2], if we have the right Piso, we cannot be correctly interpreting his role in the poem—or, indeed, the tone of the poem. Horace may have been treading a fine line between angering and amusing Piso: on the one hand, advertit tacitly to Piso's notorious reputation as a critic, he utilizes the public stereotypes of Piso and Maecius as critics in order to alert readers to his send-up of academic criticism in the Ars Poetica. On the other hand, by associating Piso with a poetic theory condemned so vehemently by Philodemus, and with which the Epicurean Piso will not have agreed, he winks at the old man and suggests that he not take the whole thing too seriously. In any case, Roman grandees of the first century B.C. had—or, at least, affected—a self-deprecating sense of humor in the face of poetic abuse. Catullus' raillery against Piso for his lauta convivia (47.5) was apparently echoed in poems by Piso's friend, Philodemus (cf. Cicero, In Pis. 70).50 Horace made bold to convict Maecenas of guilt by association for attending the infamous Nasidieni cena of Sat. II.8. If Maecenas or Piso felt hurt by Horace's treatment, the poet could have pointed out that in poems like Sat. II.3 (cf. lines 305-326) and II.7 he gave himself a much rougher time.

If the two critics mentioned in lines 387-388 of the Ars Poetica represent dullness and dubious taste, then the same cannot be said about a third and last critic whose company the speaker seems to keep. The words on poetics of a certain Quintilius are quoted near the end of the poem in verses 438-444:

Quintilio si quid recitares, 'corrige, sodas,
hoc' aiebat 'et hoc.' melius te posse negares,
bis terque expertum frustra delere iubebat
et male tornatos incudi reddere versus.
si defendere delictum quam verte malles,
nullum ultra verbum aut operam insumebat inanem,
quin sine rivali teque et tua solus amares.

Quintilius is probably, as Porphyrio says, Quintilius Varus Cremonensis, the Epicurean friend of Virgil, Horace, and Philodemus, who died in c. 24/23.\textsuperscript{51} Horace consoled Virgil for his death in \textit{Odes} 1.24, a poem combining traditional paramythetic motifs\textsuperscript{52} with Epicurean ideas about the value of friendship, the inevitability and finality of death, and the survivor's need for self-control.\textsuperscript{53}

The premise of the ode, then, is Horace's desire to mourn with Virgil for their departed friend in the proper Epicurean manner—a desire that is perhaps not so much appropriate because Horace and Virgil are still Epicureans (a doubtful assumption at this advanced stage in their intellectual development) as because Quintilius was.

Quintilius' Epicurean background is important for understanding his role in the \textit{Ars Poetica}. He is the only critic quoted in the poem, and so we need to ask why Horace has presented him to us in this way. To the speaker, Quintilius embodied the same sort of arrogance toward poets that the speaker himself displays throughout the \textit{Ars Poetica}. Quintilius' laconic words, \textit{corrige, sodes, hoc...et hoc} (438-439), and his icy silence in the face of a poet's defense of a criticized passage (442-444) are, for the speaker, indicative of an attitude of admirable toughness toward self-indulgent and self-enamored poetasters (444).

The speaker may accurately quote Quintilius and relate his silence in lines 438-444, but another interpretation of his behavior toward poets and his theory of poetics is possible. As an Epicurean and student of Philodemus, Quintilius must have believed that poetics is not a rational science that can be articulated and taught, but is instead an intuitive art, the practice of which depends to a large extent on natural ability.\textsuperscript{54} Quintilius' polite words of criticism (\textit{sodes}, 438) and his habitual unwillingness to debate with defensive poets understandably reflect just such an Epicurean view of poetry. For

\textsuperscript{51}Philodemus mentions Quintilius two times in his \textit{περὶ κολακείας} and \textit{περὶ φιλοσοφίας}; see A. Koerte, “Augusteer bei Philodem,” \textit{RhM} 45 (1890) 172-177. For discussion of the ancient sources on Quintilius see C. L. Neudling, \textit{op. cit.} (supra n. 13) 151-153; Nisbet-Hubbard, p. 279.

\textsuperscript{52}Cf. Nisbet-Hubbard, pp. 279-281.


\textsuperscript{54}On the Epicurean critique of the “sciences,” see, in general, M. Gigante, \textit{Scetticismo e epicureismo} (Naples 1981) 179-224; for a recent survey of Philodemus' poetics see E. Asmis, “Philodemus' Epicureanism,” \textit{ANRW} II.36.4 (Berlin 1990) 2400-2406. Possibly also relevant to Quintilius' poetics was the intuitive approach of Ser. Clodius, who, according to Cicero, could speak as laconically as Horace's Quintilius when separating authentic from false Plautine verses; cf. Cic. \textit{Ad Fam.} 9.16.4: “facile diceret 'hie versus Plauti non est, hic est' quod tritus aures haberet notandis generibus poetarum et consuetudine legendi....” Cf., in general, J. Zetzel, \textit{op. cit.} (supra n. 20) 18-21; E. Rawson, \textit{op. cit.} (supra n. 20) 278.
Quintilius the Epicurean the appreciation of poetry is a matter of taste, not science. While he is quite willing to express an opinion about a poem, he is utterly unwilling to debate or to defend his views. This is because, in contrast to the Peripatetic speaker of the *Ars Poetica*, Quintilius' views do not derive from a set of “scientific” principles but from good taste alone.

How different is the speaker's approach to poetics! Quintilius' politeness toward the poets contrasts sharply with the speaker's pathological hatred of them, an attitude most clearly expressed in the very next section of the poem (lines 453-476). Quintilius' five words (three of them monosyllabic) of “literary criticism” contrast even more markedly with the speaker's analogous performance, viz., the *Ars Poetica* itself, Horace’s longest poem by far and one filled with advice and rules as useless as they are dull and jejune. The appearance of Quintilius near the climactic end of the poem thus functions in two ways which enhance Horace’s parody. First of all, the speaker is made to discredit himself by invoking Quintilius as his critical ideal because the appearance of Quintilius allows us to see how far short of Quintilius the speaker falls and how badly the speaker misinterprets Quintilius' behavior and words. Secondly, Quintilius can emerge from the speaker's mistreatment of him with his reputation as the ideal critic intact, because the speaker cites his *ipsissima verba*. As a result, we are not dependent upon the speaker for what we know about him. Thus, Horace has it both ways: the speaker's critical authority is debased by his misunderstanding of Quintilius; but Quintilius remains the standard by which critical excellence can be assessed. By Quintilius' standard, obtusely invoked by the speaker, the speaker's whole enterprise of an *ars poetica* is called into question.

These thoughts are consistent with a dating of the *Ars Poetica* in the period 24-20. If Quintilius has just died, this helps us understand why Horace gives him—of all possible candidates—such prominent notice near the end of the poem. Much evidence suggests that he was by no means the “inevitable” choice for the role of ideal critic: for example, in Horace’s long list of ideal readers of his poetry in *Sat.* 1.10.78-88, Quintilius is not mentioned. If Maecius and Piso Caesoninus are still alive, as they may well have been in the late 20s, then this helps explain Horace’s strategy of making the speaker proclaim his own poetological guilt by association with these two notoriously old-fashioned and censorious critics.

The Parodic Introduction: The *Ars Poetica* and Contemporary Painting

But we do not have to wait until verses 385-90, let alone till the end of the poem, to sense that Horace was sending up his speaker as a tiresome and old-fashioned pedant. Although it is by no means a requirement of the parodic mode
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that hints of the parody be given at the very beginning of the work, such indications are to be found in the very first lines of the *Ars Poetica*:

Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
iungere si velit et varias inducere plumas
undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum
desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne,
spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?

The speaker begins his *ars poetica* in a seemingly strange way: with the description of the painting of a monster with a woman's head, the neck of a horse, the feathers of a bird, and the tail of a fish. He claims that such a painting would be so absurd as to cause its viewers to laugh. In lines 6-9 the speaker provides his own gloss on the meaning of these lines and their relevance to what follows: *ut pictura, poesis*. The painting described in lines 1-4 is comparable to a book lacking unity, with no beginning and end, and filled with the empty imaginings of a sick man's dreams. The speaker thus would appear to find two things wrong with such a monstrous figure or book: formally, it lacks unity in the sense of a clearcut division between beginning, middle (we may presume), and end. Substantively, it lacks verisimilitude. The background is clearly Peripatetic: in the *Poetics*, Aristotle stresses the importance of unity of plot, which must have a beginning, middle, and end. Interestingly, he compares such well-made plots to animals, just as the *Ars Poetica* speaker compares disunity to a monster. Next, the speaker confronts the only possible excuse for such a creation: poetic license. Licenses are, to be sure, permissible, he tells us, but not if the result is an *adynaton*: "sed non ut placidis coeant immitia, non ut serpentes avibus geminentur, tigribus agni" (12-13).

---

55"Credite, Pisones, isti tabulae fore librum | persimilem cuius, velut aegri somnia, vanae lingentur species, ut nec pes nec caput uni | reddatur formae."

56Cf. lines 8-9: "ut nec pes nec caput uni | reddatur formae." Unity is, of course, a touchstone of poetic virtue in the Peripatetic tradition; cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* 1450b23 and see also Brink, II, 77-85; M. Heath, *Unity in Greek Poetics* (Oxford 1989).

57Cf. lines 7-8: "velut aegri somnia, vanae lingentur species...."


59Lines 9-13: "pictoribus atque poedis | quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas.| Scimus, et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim| sed non ut placidis coeant immitia, non ut serpentes avibus geminentur, tigribus agni."
Despite their obvious importance, these lines have rarely been subjected to close analysis. The most important problem in lines 1-13 for our purposes is what kind of unity the speaker means by the phrase, "uni...formae" (8-9). The precedent of the Poetics would lead us to expect that the speaker refers to unity of plot or, more generally, structure. This interpretation is firmly rejected by Brink, and since antiquity other readings have been proposed. In Ps.-Acro, the monster represents a violation of dispositio et convenientia; in Porphyrio, of ἀκολούθια, or inconsequencefulness. Porphyrio elaborates what he means, saying that the painter of the monster "valde ridebitur, quod contra naturam omnia faciat: ita poetice, si ornatus causa plus, quam exigit materia, aliquid institutum ornetur, meretur contemnī." Porphyrio combines the two faults into something composite: a poem that has formal qualities inappropriate to its subject matter is contrary to nature, that is, lacks verisimilitude. Ps.-Acro's interpretation stresses the shift in subject matter from beginning to end of the work: "unde in primordio dicit, deridendum eum, qui de una re disputare inchoans diversitatem materiarum conponit ...." For Ps.-Acro, then, a book is monstrous if it lacks unity of subject. If we ask what has motivated ancient and modern commentators to propose these different explanations of the first lines of the Ars Poetica, then the answer must be that verses 1-13 are not self-contained but must be read in the context of the first section of the poem, which ends at line 40. The range of subjects touched on in this section is so broad as to make it necessary to interpret the monster of lines 1-5 and the disunity she represents in a way that transcends structure alone.

Perhaps the most interesting interpretation of the passage is to be found in Quintilian. For him, too, the issue is not disunified structure; instead he sees in the monster a symbol of inappropriately mixed dilectus verborum, the fault he called ἵνα φυλάσσῃ, or, in Latin, the infelicitous combination of different kinds of vocabulary (poetic and vulgar, elevated and humble, archaisms and neologisms, etc.). How did Quintilian arrive at such a relatively restricted view of the

61 Brink, II, 80-81: "Horace too talks largely of tragedy and epic. Aristotle's confrontation of the whole and its parts appeals to him. But the unity that these forms evince to him is not simply unity of plot. It is the unity of a work of poetry seen by a poet."
62 Quintilian 8.3.59-60: "Σαρδιομος quoque appellatur quaedam mixta ex varia ratione linguarum oratio, ut si Atticis Dorica, Ionica, Aeolica etiam dicta confundas. Cui simile vitium est apud nos, si quis sublimia humilibus, vetera novis, poetica vulgaribus miscet. Id enim tale monstrum, quale Horatius in prima parte libri
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monster’s meaning? I would suggest that he did so, not by trying to subsume all
the artistic faults discussed in the first section of the poem, but by focussing
specifically on lines 11-13 where poetic license is mentioned.

Poetic license was an aspect of poetics about which the ancient theore­
ticians—including the speaker of the Ars Poetica—had definite ideas. Licenses
include any unusual use of words, such as neologisms, metrical anomalies (e.g.,
systole and diastole), and the rhetorical device of metaphor. According to Aris­
totle and later ancient literary critics, poetic license, as such, can be either good
or bad. Speaking of what later came to be called ποιητικὴ ἔξοδος or ἀδίκεια63
(he himself used no technical term for the phenomenon), Aristotle wrote:

The merit of diction is to be clear and not commonplace. The
clearest diction is that made up of ordinary words, but it is
commonplace. An example is the poetry of Cleophon and of
Sthenelus. That which employs unfamiliar words is dignified
and outside the common usage. By ‘unfamiliar’ I mean a rare
word, a metaphor, a lengthening, and anything beyond the
ordinary use. But if a poet writes entirely in such words, the
result will be either a riddle or jargon; if made up of meta­
phors, a riddle, and if of rare words, jargon.64

So, unusual words are the spice of good poetry. Without them, liter­
ature seems too bland; with too many, it becomes distasteful and obscure. A
little later, Aristotle says that the effect of excessive use of metrical, verbal, or
rhetorical license is unintentionally comic.65 The speaker of the Ars Poetica
obviously agrees.66

dec arte poetica fingit: ‘humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam i iungere si velit,’ et
cetera ex diversis naturis subiciat.” It is odd that Brink, II, 85, should write that “the
wider context was discerned by Quintilian” (my emphasis); in fact, Quintilian’s
interpretation is the narrowest on record. On this passage, see the critical and inter­
285-286.

8 (1879) 260-262.

64Poetics 1458a.18-26 (translation by W. Hamilton Fyfe).

65Poetics 1458b.11-13. Among Roman writings, we might compare Rhet.
ad Heren. 4.10.15, where archaism and bad metaphors are condemned as elements of
the “swollen” style, the perversion of the grand style of oratory: “Nam ita ut corporis
bonam habitudinem tumor imitatur aque, item gravis oratio saepe ineptus videtur ea
quaetur et inflata est, cum aut novis aut priscis verbis aut durtier aliunde translati
aut gravioribus quam res postulat aliquid dicitur...” W. Lebek, Verba Prisca, Hypo­
mnemata 25 (1970), reasonably notes that the author of the Rhet. probably did not
It is important to note that in the poetic tradition prior to Horace, poetic license is limited to meter, vocabulary, and the use of rhetoric. Nowhere is plot, or, more generally, structure, included among the elements of poetry through which a poet can achieve a special effect by violating normal usage. Given Aristotle's stress on the importance of a unified plot, this is hardly surprising.\(^6\) It is doubtless for this reason that Quintilian “misinterpreted” the sense of the first five lines of the Ars Poetica by limiting the application of disunity to dillectus verborum alone. Quintilian's error is an intelligent one: this is what the poetic tradition on license would lead one to expect. Brink, on the other hand, perceiving that for Horace “unity...is not simply unity of plot,” must argue that lines 1-13 pertain—in some vague way he does not specify—to unity of all the elements of poetry, including structure, something which, if true, he acknowledges to be an Horatian contribution to poetic theory.\(^6\)

Quintilian’s overly precise and Brink’s overly broad interpretation of the monster of lines 1-3 results from the fact that, even after two millennia of trying,\(^6\) we still cannot be certain we understand what the speaker intends to say in the opening lines of the poem. If the monster represents poetic license carried too far (implied by verses 11-13), then we expect the monster to represent (as Quintilian saw) a misuse of vocabulary, meter or figures of rhetoric. It should not symbolize a work with little or no structure, for we have no evidence that intend to condemn all archaism, just “an excessive use of such idioms.” (p. 23; my translation). However, it should be noted that the quality of clarity (explanatio) is said to be derived, in part, from the use of “current vocabulary” (usitata verba, defined as sunt ea quae versantur in consuetudine cotidiana, Rhet. ad Heren. 4.12.17). It would be nice to be able to include the pertinent parallels that must have been present in Q. Laelius’ “De vitulis virtuibusque poematorum” (see Charisius, p. 179.18-20 Barwick); if this is Laelius Archelaus (cf. Suetonius, De gramm. 2), the expounder of Lucilius (as Münzer thinks: RE s.v. Laelius [13]), then Horace must surely have known his writings. After Horace, we find Aristotle’s view on the necessary balance of common and unusual words in, e.g., Seneca, Epist. 114.13-14.

\(^{66}\)Cf. lines 9-13 (general limits of license); 48-51 (limited use of neologism approved); and 263-268 (critics give poets too much metrical license). On excessive license as risible, cf. lines 1-5 (especially 5: “spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?”).

\(^{67}\)Cf. Poetics, 1450b24ff.

\(^{68}\)Cf. Brink II, 81: “But the unity that these forms evince to him [i.e., to Horace] is not simply unity of plot. It is the unity of a work of poetry seen by a poet. It lacks Aristotle’s clarity of concept and coherence of argument. It cannot ultimately be resolved into a series of propositions.”

the ancient theorists were willing to bend their firm rules about the necessity of structural unity. On the other hand, the speaker’s comparison of a monster to a book (“isti tabulae fore librum I persimilem,” 6-7) would seem better adapted to express problems of relating parts to a whole (i.e., structure) than those of style. Moreover, the simile comparing the contents of such a book to the “dreams of a sick man” (“velut aegri somnia,” 7) raises an entirely different matter: the verisimilitude of an artistic representation. Could the subject of a poem or painting really exist, or is it the feverish product of a demented mind (cf. “vanae I fingentur species,” 7-8)? That the simile ends with the metaphor “nec pes nec caput” obfuscates rather than clarifies the speaker’s meaning because the metaphor must apply simultaneously to four realms—the book, the sick dreams, the idle imaginings, and the monster. The fact that this phrase was proverbial does not diminish its literal force here, which simply cannot bear the weight put on it by the speaker’s multiply mixed metaphor. What does it mean for a book to have “caput et pes,” and while the monster has a woman’s head, it has a fish’s tail, not “pes”; etc.70

Brink has rightly observed that the speaker, who condemns a descriptio in verses 14-19, himself begins with a descriptio in lines 1-4. This inconsistency is typical of the speaker and can be seen elsewhere: he does not practice what he preaches. I would suggest that an even greater inconsistency can be found in the whole introduction (1-13): roundly condemning the abuse of poetic license, the speaker hypocritically falls into the error of taking the license of metaphor too far in lines 1-9 as evidenced by the fact that we have no way of understanding how he wants us to apply the monster simile to poetry. Later in the poem, he will likewise botch the simile comparing painting to poetry because, while he tells us a good deal about painting, he says absolutely nothing about poetry (361-365). The literal defectiveness of the simile (it lacks a sic-clause) makes it impossible to know in what way poetry is similar to painting. In the Poetics (1459a1ff) Aristotle said that metaphor (by which he also meant simile)71 is the “most important” form of poetic diction because it cannot be acquired from someone else and is a “sign of genius.” The speaker’s clumsy use of metaphor (or simile) can be attested so frequently in the Ars Poetica that we may view the botched metaphor as the speaker’s typical rhetorical figure.

70Cf. G. Lakoff and M. Turner, More than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor (Chicago and London 1989) 203: “Though wide-ranging metaphorical interpretations are possible, they are far from arbitrary. A metaphor, after all, is not a linguistic expression. It is a mapping from one conceptual domain to another, and as such it has a three-part structure: two endpoints (the source and target schemas) and a bridge between them (the detailed mapping). Such structures are highly constrained. It is not the case that anything can be anything.”

proper use of metaphor is a sign of genius, then consistent misuse of metaphor is not only an example of the abuse of poetic license but also an indication of a lack of genius.

The introduction throws the speaker's authority on poetry into doubt in two other ways. Even so apologetic a critic as Brink has noted that the speaker begins his speech with no formal introduction: "there are no preliminaries. The poem, as it were, jumps into a subject."72 Similarly, the poem is open-ended, lacking a conventional conclusion.73 The middle is the most problematic section of all: for centuries, the greatest scholarly issue about the Ars Poetica is whether it has a clearcut structure.74 The monstrous book decried by the speaker and the monstrous image used to represent it, we may conclude, are exemplified by the Ars Poetica itself. One might, to be sure, excuse the speaker for these faults by recalling that with mock modesty he does not claim to be a poet,75 so that the Ars Poetica ought not to be judged as a poem. Yet, this actually weakens the case for clemency, since, according to the speaker, poetic licenses such as lack of a proper introduction and ending are granted only to writers of poetry, not prose. As Quintilian put it, "meminerimus tamen, non per omnia poetas esse oratorum sequendum nee libertate verborum nee licentia figurarum..." (10.1.28).

There is another way—even more important—in which these key introductory lines discredit the speaker. Since the eighteenth century it has been commonplace to connect the speaker's outburst against monsters in painting to Vitruvius' polemic against contemporary art:76

Sed haec, quae ex veris rebus exempla sumebantur, nunc iniquis moribus inprobantur. <Nam pinguntur> tectoris monstra potius quam ex rebus finitis imagines certae: pro columnis enim struuntur calami striati, pro fastigiis appagineculi cum crispis foliis et volutis, item candelabra aedicularum sustinentia figure, supra fastigia eorum surgentes ex radicibus cum volutis teneri plures habentes in se sine ratione sedentia sigilla, non minus coliculi dimidiata habentes sigilla alia humanis, alia bestiarum capitibus.

72Brink, I, 85.
73Cf. below, p. 94.
74I will elsewhere discuss the structural issues and show that the poem also exemplifies the fault of Ἀρμομέτρος.
75Lines 301-305: "o ego laevus, qui purgor bilem sub verni temporis horam; non alius faceret meliora poenata. verum nil tanti est: ergo fungar vice cotic, acutum reddere quae fermen valet essors ipsa secand..."
76The first reference to the passage in a commentary on the Ars Poetica appears to be in R. P. Sanadon, Les poesies d'Horace, traduites en français, tome septième (Amsterdam, Leipzig 1756) 57.
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Haec autem nec sunt nec fieri possunt nec fuerunt. Ergo ita novi mores coegerunt, uti inertiae mali iudices convincerent artium virtutes: quemadmodum enim potest calamus vere sustinere tectum aut candelabrum ornamenta fastigii, seu colicus tam tenuis et mollis sustinere sedens sigillum, aut de radicibus et coliculis ex parte flores dimidiataque sigilla procreari? At haec falsa videntes homines non reprehendunt sed delectantur, neque animadvertunt, si quid eorum fieri potest necne... Neque enim picturae probari debent, quae non sunt similes veritati, nec, si factae sunt elegantes ab arte, ideo de his statim debet 'recte' iudicari, nisi argumentationes certas rationes habuerint sine offensionibus explicatas.77

The relationship of Vitruvius' passage with the introduction of the Ars Poetica has never been explored in detail.78 The context is Vitruvius' account of the development of wall painting in homes. Painting should represent "quod est seu potest esse, uti homines, aedificia, naves, reliquarumque rerum" (7.5.1), and in the earlier phases of wall painting, this was the case. First, painters imitated marble (this is equivalent to what, since the last century, we have called the First Pompeian Style; Vitruvius, 7.5.1); then they imitated buildings, columns, gardens, scenery, etc. (the Second Pompeian Style; Vitruvius, 7.5.2). In the passage quoted, Vitruvius recounts the latest developments, the final phase of the Second Style, in which realism has given way to fantastic creatures and architectural constructions.79 In such works may be seen monsters, stalks functioning as

77Vitruvius 7.5.3-4. For a recent philological and archaeological commentary on the passage see W. Ehrhardt, Stilgeschichtliche Untersuchungen an römischen Wandmalereien von der späten bis zur Zeit Neros (Mainz 1987) 152-162.

78Commentators on the Ars Poetica simply note the Vitruvian passage and its polemic against monsters in painting without further analysis; Vitruvian scholars, too, have failed to pursue the relationship in any depth. See, most recently, W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 162: “Eine Untersuchung dieser Fragen unter Berücksichtigung der historischen und literarischen Quellen geht über den Rahmen einer stilgeschichtlichen Analyse ebenso hinaus wie der Vergleich der von Vitruv angewendeten moralisch-ästhetischen Kriterien mit denen, wie sie z.b. Horaz in seiner Ars poetica und Augustus nach der Überlieferung Suetons [Augustus 86] gegenüber Marc Anton auf literarisch-rhetorischem Gebiet erhebt.”

79The classic work on the Second Style is by H. G. Beyen, Die Pompeianische Wanddekoration vom zweitem bis zum vierten Stil, 2 vols. (The Hague 1938, 1960). Beyen divides the Second Style into Phase I and Phase II; each phase has two sub-phases (Phase Ia, Ib, etc.; cf. vol. II, 20; cf. also his article on “Pompeiani, Stili” in EAA 6 [Rome 1965] 356-366, at pp. 358-362). The beginning of Phase II Beyen dates to the years 50-30. Beyen's classification has recently been criticized as too elaborate by A. Barbet, La peinture murale romaine: Les styles décoratifs pompéiens
columns, men and animals growing up out of plants, etc. (7.5.3). Since such fantasies violate the principle of realism and verisimilitude80 ("haec autem nec sunt nec fieri possunt nec fuerunt"; 7.5.4), Vitruvius roundly condemns them and the debased taste that approves of them. Telling the anecdote of how Licymnius the mathematician forced the scenery painter Apaturius to replace some overly imaginative sets with more conventionally realistic designs (7.5.5-6), he longingly recalls the good old days when such violations of nature were not permitted and were felt to be signs of bad taste and dullness ("quod enim antiqui insumentes laborem ad industriam probare contendebant artibus, id nunc coloribus et eorum alleganti specie consecuntur"; 7.5.7).

The passage in Vitruvius is important to readers of the Ars Poetica for several reasons. First of all, Vitruvius' polemic is roughly contemporary with the Ars Poetica, if we date the poem to the late twenties, since 22 B.C. is the last possible date for the composition or revision of the De Architectura.81 Vitruvius' vocal rejection of contemporary tendencies in wall painting is thus consistent with our dating of the Ars Poetica to the same period because it shows that, in a period of dramatic change in painting, such reactions as we find in Horace and Vitruvius were understandably topical. Secondly, Vitruvius shows us that Classicizing theorists were just as outspoken and influential in the fine arts as we know they were in literary criticism.82 Although Vitruvius' condemnation of what we might call the "fantasy-style" was, in the end, to be ignored by painters and patrons, he does seem to have had a restraining influence for several decades.83 We can only imagine how closely twentieth-century characterizations of him as a pedantic conservative84 correspond to what artists and

(Paris 1985) 36-37. Problems of Beyen's dating of Phase II of the Second Style are discussed by Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) xiv-xv.

80Brink, II, 85, errs in saying that Vitruvius is concerned only about the truth of the representations, not their verisimilitude. Verisimilitude is implied by the words "seu potest esse."

81For literature on the date of Vitruvius' publication of De Architectura in 22 B.C. at the latest, see W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 153n1330; B. Baldwin, "The Date, Identity, and Career of Vitruvius," Latomus 49 (1990) 425-434.


83Cf W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 157-162.

84See the examples from the older art-historical literature collected by W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 155n1343 and add, more recently, J.-M. Roddaz, Marcus Agrippa, BEFAR 253 (1984) 252.
architects of his day thought of him. In any case, his fulminations against contemporary "avant-garde" painting give us a taste of what an equally avant-garde poet like Horace must have had to hear from his critics.

Besides serving these purposes, the Vitruvius passage can also help us to see the most important way that Horace undermines the authority of his speaker and hence clues the reader into his parody in the very first lines of the poem. Interestingly enough for our purposes, where Vitruvius seems to have had least success was in suppressing paintings of monsters, which, as Ehrhardt notes, were quite common during and just after the period when he was writing.85 We should note that, whereas Vitruvius condemns actually existing paintings for an excess of imagination, the *Ars Poetica* speaker talks as if no contemporary painter—unless mad—would actually paint the monster described in verses 1-4. So right from the start, the speaker (who elsewhere shows himself to be ignorant of contemporary poetry) shows himself equally uninformed about contemporary painting. In fact, archaeological evidence—which, oddly enough, has hitherto been neglected by commentators on the poem—shows that from the late thirties to the late twenties B.C., Roman painters were experimenting with monsters and other unreal subjects condemned by Vitruvius.86 So, to any reader knowledgeable about the state of contemporary Roman painting, the speaker's character emerges clearly from his first words: he is not only a pedant of old-fashioned taste like Vitruvius, but—unlike Vitruvius—he is also an ignoramus.

We will soon see which of Horace's readers would have been able to appreciate this clue. The evidence for monsters in Roman painting and from sculpted and stucco friezes of the 30s and 20s has not yet been assembled. The following list of monsters from the city of Rome in the period of ca. 40-20 B.C. will let us see how common *Mischwesen* were in this period and which patrons encouraged their artists to work in the fantasy-style condemned by Vitruvius.87

---

85See W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 157.
86Gantar, op. cit. (supra n. 59) perceptively notes the frequency of monsters in contemporary literature (pp. 90-91) but thinks the pertinent comparandum in painting comes not from contemporary Roman works of art (which he does not mention) but from Zeuxis' hippocentaur (pp. 91-92). Rudd, 36, writes: "why should an artist not produce grotesques? Granted. Vitruvius disliked them (7.5.3-4), but medieval stone-masons and illuminators thought otherwise" (my emphasis). E. Leach, in *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome* (Princeton 1988) 6n8, perceptively notes that Horace's monster "may well refer to specific examples of contemporary art."
87The best collection of the visual material is to be found in I. Bragantini and M. De Vos, *Le decorazioni della villa romana della Farnesina, Museo Nazionale Romano: Le Pitture*, II.1 (Rome 1982) 32-35, 52-55, 60 (figs. 3-14; 29-35; 60), with examples from the House of Livia, the Villa of the Farnesina, and Pompeii.
New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr./DATE</th>
<th>BLDG</th>
<th>M/C</th>
<th>FIGURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 42-29</td>
<td>Temple of J. Caesar</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Winged Victory terminating in shoots (fig. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 36-27</td>
<td>House of Augustus</td>
<td>P/5</td>
<td>Winged females growing from plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P/13</td>
<td>Winged females growing from plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P/14</td>
<td>Marine centaurs atop frieze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P/15</td>
<td>Walls: Winged griffins with shoot tails on sides of a floral obelisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P/15</td>
<td>Ceiling: Winged male and female figures growing from plants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XVII: MONSTERS IN WALL PAINTING, STUCCOES, AND SCULPTED FRIEZES FROM THE CITY OF ROME, C. 35-20 B.C.**

---

88 M/C=Medium/Context. P=painting; St=stucco; S=sculpture (including sculpted frieze); numbers and letters given under “C” correspond to standard spatial denominations in the referenced archaeological publications.


91 Carettoni I, 396; Carettoni II, 56.

92 Carettoni I, 400; Carettoni II, 60-66.


94 Carettoni I, 499; Carettoni II, 83.
The Interpretive Implications of Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr./DATE</th>
<th>BLDG</th>
<th>M/C</th>
<th>FIGURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7) 36-30</td>
<td>House of Livia</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Left Ala: Winged male and female figures with <em>kalathiskos</em>(^95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Left Ala: Griffins on shoots (fig. 3)(^96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Left Ala: Winged victories seated on shoots(^97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Triclinium: Griffins with shoot tails(^98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) 30-20?</td>
<td>Villa of the Farnesina</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Fauces: Griffins with shoot tails(^99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>S t</td>
<td>Cubic. B: Winged griffin with human head and shoot tail(^100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) c. 20</td>
<td>Aula Isiaca</td>
<td>P/B</td>
<td>Birds ending in shoots(^101)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{95}\)See G.E. Rizzo, *Le pitture della 'Casa di Livia,'* Monumenti della pittura antica, III.3 (Rome 1937) 9ff., figures 8-10; Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) fig. 12. Note that it is possible that the House of Augustus and House of Livia were part and parcel of the same palace complex, not two separate dwellings as they appear today; see W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 3n74. On the date, see F. Coarelli, *Roma* (Bari 1980) 131.

\(^{96}\)See Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) fig. 10; Rizzo, op. cit. (supra n. 95) fig. 9.

\(^{97}\)Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) fig. 13; Rizzo, op. cit. (supra n. 95) fig. 9.

\(^{98}\)See Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) fig. 3.

\(^{99}\)See Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) fig. 11, tav. E. See Bragantini and De Vos, ibid., with literature speculating on the identification and date reported on p. 23 and their own view (20s B.C.) suggested on p. 40. W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 3, implies a similar dating, as does A. Bartet, op. cit. (supra n. 79) 96-97. E. Leach, “Patrons, Painters, and Patterns,” in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, ed. B. Gold (Austin 1982) 135-173, at p. 164 suggests that the owner was the equestrian A. Crispinus Caepio. Roddaz, op. cit. (supra n. 84) accepts the identification as the Villa of Agrippa (passim; cf. 249n108, 321n55).

\(^{100}\)See Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) fig. 14.

\(^{101}\)See G. E. Rizzo, *Pitture dell'Aula Isiaca di Caligola, Monumenti della pittura antica* III.2.2 (Rome 1936) tav. A. On the date of the building, see A. Barbet, op. cit. (supra n. 79) 97.
I stress that the examples on TABLE XVII are from the city of Rome and date to this limited period. Later, monsters become even more common, as Roman painting moves into the Third and Fourth Styles. This means that our need to interpret the discrepancy between the opening lines of the Ars Poetica and trends in Roman painting is not dependent on dating the poem to the period 24-20 B.C. but arises even if we date the poem to the last years of Horace's life.

Late Second-Style monsters are also to be found in Campania at, e.g., the House of Obellius Firmus in Pompeii, the wall from Portici in the Naples National Museum (inv. 8593), the Caserma of the Gladiators at Pompeii,102 and at the villa in Boscoreale.103 Outside of Campania, we find painting reminiscent of this style at a villa in Sabine country north of Rome near Licenza (ancient Digentia), where, amid fragments of wall painting, we find a griffin, two sphinxes, and fragments of a wing and the hind parts of creatures that are perhaps also remains of monsters. The villa seems also to have had a mosaic with griffins, now vanished.104

102For these examples from the first century B.C. and others from the first century A.D., see Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) 50-61; W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 17-31.
104Only the griffin (from riquadro 31) is published; see G. Lugli, “La villa sabina di Orazio,” Monumenti Antichi 31 (1926) cols. 456-598, at col. 570 (with fig. 52). The sphinxes are from riquadri 3 and 20; the hind parts of an animal and a wing (?) are from riquadro 15.

The griffin mosaic is known only from a literary source: like most of the mosaics of the villa, it has vanished. In 1828 Filippo Alessandro Sebastiani, in Viaggio a Tivoli (Fuligno 1828) wrote: “mi aveva assicurato il sig. cav. Gell gentiluomo inglese, persona di vastissima erudizione, e già nota per le sue produzioni geografiche, che vi aveva rilevato un altro pezzo di mosaico ornato di piccoli grifi, ma o fosse, che il guidatore non lo conoscesse, o che quest'avanzo venisse distrutto, io non fui così fortunato da poterlo vedere” (395-396).

Gell is Sir William Gell (1777-1836), “Resident Plenipotentiary” of the Society of Dilettanti in Italy; see The Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 7 (Oxford 1963-1964) 994-996. He was, indeed, known for his erudition and accuracy; cf. E. Clay (ed.), Sir William Gell in Italy. Letters to the Society of Dilettanti (London 1976) 18-36, especially p. 30. Gell himself appears to corroborate Sebastiani's report when he writes in The Topography of Rome and Its Vicinity (London 18341, 18462) vol. 2, p. 350: “The ruins of this famous villa consist only of a Mosaic pavement, and of two capitals and two fragments of Doric columns lying among the bushes...The pavement has been much ruined by the planting of a vineyard, and can only be seen on removing the earth which covers it. The groundwork is white, with a border of animals in black.”
We can now see what kinds of persons patronized the late Second-Style and Third-Style painters condemned by Vitruvius and the Ars Poetica speaker: in the first instance, Livia, Augustus, and the powerful owners of the Villa of the Farnesina and the Villa in Boscotrecase. It is even remotely possible that the same workshop of artists was active at all four projects. Be that as it may,

The fact that Sebastiani saw only one mosaic on his visit and not the griffin mosaic reported to him by Gell is typical of the period. Different visitors saw different remains, doubtless depending on the knowledge, vigor, and mood of their guides. Thus, some travellers reported seeing two or more mosaics—see Andrea Manazzale, Viaggio da Roma a Tivoli, Palestrina, Frascati, ed altri contorni di Roma (Roma 1817) 31 (“in una vigna situata a’ piedi del monte Lucretile, si vede qualche vestigio di questa Villa, consistente in differenti camere pavimentate di mosaico….”); Giuseppe Antonio Guattani, Monumenti Sabini, tom. 3 (Rome 1830) 16 (“concludiamo che da questi campi Oraziani ore gran parte della sua vita menò il genio delle muse latine non devi partir lettor cortese senza osservare, in mancanza di significanti rovine, i pochi rimasugli de’ pavimenti a mosaico della sua casa….”); Fabio Gori, Viaggio pittorico-antiquario da Roma a Tivoli e Subiaco (Rome 1855), parte seconda, pp. 22-23 (“il Garzone che n’è custode, alla tua richiesta rompe con la marra la terra e mostra un bel frammento di musaico. Fattagli la domanda, se vi è altro da vedere, ei ti risponde che scavando profondamente il suolo, si trovano altri pezzi di pavimento di musaico, e resti di antico edifizio, gli stessi che vi scopri il Baron di Santedille”). Other visitors saw just one (in addition to Gell and Sebastiani, cf. A. Nibby, “Viaggio antiquario alla Villa di Orazio, a Subiaco, a Trevi, presso le sorgenti dell’Aniene,” Memorie Romane di Antichità e di Belle Arti [Pesaro 1827] 37 [=Analisi storico-topografico-antiquaria della carta de’ dintorni di Roma, tomo 3 (Rome 1849) 720] or even none (cf. J. H. Westphal, Die römische Kampagne [Berlin und Stettin 1829] 115: “Trümmer derselben sind nicht mehr vorhanden”). Knowledge of the various mosaics probably goes back to the amateur excavations carried out on the site over a thirty-year period from 1755-1783 by the Scottish artist Allan Ramsay; see I. H. Holloway, “Two Projects to Illustrate Allan Ramsay’s Treatise on Horace’s Sabine Villa,” Master Drawings 14 (1976) 280-286. On Ramsay (1713-1784) see DNB vol. 16 (London 1909) 676-677.

The Villa at Boscotrecase is the latest of the group and represents the Third Style; see von Blanckenhagen and Alexander, op. cit. (supra n. 103). For speculation about the owners of these villas see Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) 22-24; von Blanckenhagen and Alexander, ibid., 59; Simon, op. cit. (supra n. 82) 182; Zanker, op. cit. (supra n. 82) 279-284.

Cf. von Blanckenhagen and Alexander, op. cit. (supra n. 103) 58-59, on the similarity of the Farnesina and the villa in Boscotrecase; for the similarity of the Farnesina and the House of Livia and House of Augustus, see Bragantini and De Vos, op. cit. (supra n. 87) 30; Carettoni 1, p. 408. Both Carettoni and Bragantini—De Vos think the workshop was of Alexandrian origin. R. E. Ling, “Studies and the Beginnings of Roman Landscape Painting,” JRS 67 (1977) 1-16, at pp. 11-12, sees no need to invoke a non-Roman origin for motifs that are vaguely Egyptian.
the evidence from Campania suggests that once given this powerful impetus, the new style caught on rather quickly and spread to households much lower down the socio-economic ladder.\textsuperscript{107} These were certainly some of the readers who would have noted, right from the start, that something is quite odd about the \textit{Ars Poetica}.

The material from the Sabine villa is particularly interesting because it was very possibly Horace's own. Its site and characteristics correspond well to the literary evidence from Horace's own poetry, and so it has been identified by twentieth-century Roman topographers and archaeologists.\textsuperscript{108} The monster paintings and griffin mosaic—the one lost, the others hidden away in an ill-lit museum of difficult access—have never been the subject of a detailed scholarly study, and the villa as we have it is the result of several building phases, so we cannot be certain that we have here evidence dating from Horace's own lifetime. The extant mosaics of the villa find their closest parallels with mosaics found in the House of Livia on the Palatine and in the Villa of Livia ad Gallinas Albas.\textsuperscript{109} The vanished griffin mosaic may have come from a later phase of the building—a possible candidate would be the bath complex on the west—since such creatures are common enough in bath contexts, particularly from the Antonine period. On the other hand, there is a chance that the work was contemporary with the other four preserved mosaics in the villa, which like it, were black and white.\textsuperscript{110} As for the wall paintings, these fall into different groups.

\textsuperscript{107}Cf. Zanker, op. cit. (supra n. 82) 282; Roddaz, op. cit. (supra n. 84) 250-251; a similar diffusion has been observed for the so-called sacral-idyllic landscape; see S. R. Silberberg, \textit{A Corpus of the Sacral-Idyllic Landscape Paintings in Roman Art} (Diss. UCLA 1980) xx, 35. E. Leach, op. cit. (supra n. 99) 164-167, has perceptive remarks on the reasons for the revolutionary change from the middle to late Second Style. See also her book, op. cit. (supra n. 86) 373-377.


\textsuperscript{110}That the mosaic was black and white is indicated by Gell's description; see n. 104 above. The earliest griffins of which I am aware are those on a pavement (now vanished) from the Casa del Cinghialie in Pompeii (VIII, 3, 8). The mosaic is described by M. E. Blake, op. cit. (supra n. 108) 99 as follows: “sea griffins and dolphins were swimming about between a meander center and a border representing a...
The Interpretive Implications of Chronology

stylistically, and we thus far have no records of their original location in the villa which would help us establish a chronology. Pasqui—who, according to the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio, did not leave behind such records—made later study of the fragments harder than it had to be by attaching them to thirty-eight *riquadri* according to subject and color. Thus we have a group of *riquadri* with yellow ground (R.1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 37); white ground (R. 7, 8, 14, 17, 19, 23, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38); red ground (R. 5, 13); and mouldings from cornices (R. 5, 8, 20, 26, 34, 35, 36). Some fragments may well be from one of the later building/remodelling phases of the villa. Published scholarly opinion on the painting is scarce and quite divergent: Lugli thought they were mostly “secondo stile pompeiano”; Borda, in brief remarks about the fragments, claimed that they were an academic revival of the Second Style during the Flavian or Trajanic period. Borda’s position is not so surprisingly different from Lugli’s as it might, at first, appear to be: the Fourth Style involves, among other things, a revival of late Second-Style motifs. Though this is not the place to decide the dispute between Lugli and Borda, I can report that Roman painting experts Volk­er Strocka and Irene Bragantini have informed me in personal communications that they exclude an Augustan date, assigning the paintings to the Fourth Style.

Of course, if the villa is Horace’s and if the monster paintings or at least the griffin mosaic are Augustan, then we have striking evidence that Horace and the *Ars Poetica* speaker must be strictly distinguished from one another, for it would mean that Horace, in his beloved Sabine villa, which was completed in the late 30s or early 20s before the *Ars Poetica* was written, chose to decorate his walls and floors with precisely the kind of creatures condemned without qualifi­cation by the *Ars Poetica* speaker. As we have seen, the material from Licenza
turretted wall." E. La Rocca, et al., *Guida archeologica di Pompeii* (Verona 1976) 139, date the mosaic to the first half of the first century A.D.; Blake states that it is "pre-­earthquake" (p. 99). For monster designs in general, see Blake, ibid., 123. The fact that a griffin design would be an "advanced" trait for a villa of the late 30s B.C. should not necessarily deter us from considering such a dating since, for example, the mosaic in room B of the villa also has a design only popular in the next century; cf. M. E. Blake, ibid., 90. We need to keep in mind that our corpus of domestic mosaic designs is biassed against the first century B.C. and earlier, since most of our Roman houses are later.

111Lugli, op. cit. (*supra* n. 104) col. 571; M. Borda, *La pittura romana* (Milan 1958) 90, 266.

112Cf. W. C. Archer, “The Paintings in the Alae of the Casa dei Vettii and a Definition of the Fourth Pompeian Style,” *AJA* 94 (1990) 95-123, especially p. 121: “as has been noted in other studies, each of the principal compositional possibilities comprising the Fourth Style...can be found directly previewed in the Second or Third Style...."
must be subjected to further investigation before it can safely be used in this discussion. In any case, it can only have been known to a select few of Horace’s readers. Much more important is the fact that, on the basis of the examples of the fantasy-style known from Rome, we can already say that the taste condemned by the speaker in lines 1-5 closely reflects that attested for the imperial circle in which Horace moved.

Is there any way to spare the speaker our unequivocally negative interpretation of his introductory lines? Ehrhardt attempted to moderate Vitruvius’ critique and thus make him appear less distastefully extreme by suggesting that Vitruvius did not condemn standard mythological monsters like griffins, but only new-fangled monsters, like the many Mischwesen in our list that belong to both the animal and plant kingdoms. If this were the case, then Vitruvius’ harsh condemnation of monster painters would apply to a much more restricted set of Mischwesen, but Ehrhardt’s suggestion is merely a hypothesis and an unlikely one at that. While it is true that griffins, for example, are encountered (albeit rarely) in early Second-Style painting—a fact that might make it appear less likely that Vitruvius could object to them in “decadent” late Second-Style paintings—it is probably not their existence in a painting per se but their verisimilitude that mattered to Vitruvius. In an early Second-Style painting like that in the House of the Labyrinth, griffins are represented as part of the realistic scene: they decorate corbels holding up a construction that could really exist and could really have corbels with griffins. In the late Second-Style examples, they are not integrated into a realistic scene as decorative elements of objects that might actually exist; rather, they are para­tactically isolated within a purely whimsical and painterly fancy.

However we understand Vitruvius, the Ars Poetica speaker condemns, not (as has sometimes been thought) a painting of a Scylla—that is, a standard mythological creature—but a unique Mischwesen that has no exact parallel in

---

113 See W. Ehrhardt, op. cit. (supra n. 77) 157: “Mythische Mischwesen, wie z.B. Sphingen und Kentauren, sind von vornherein von dieser Kritik [scil. of Vitruvius] auszunehmen....”

114 See Beyen, op. cit. (supra n. 79), vol. I, p. 261 with 261n3 on the difference between the griffins in the early Second-Style House of the Labyrinth and those in the House of Livia.

115 Cf. Beyen, loc. cit. (supra n. 79). E. Leach, op. cit. (supra n. 99) 162-167, has attractive suggestions about the overall decorative scheme. The primary object, she thinks, is to create a pinacotheca and “the unreal structures and impossible ornaments deplored by Vitruvius, however fantastic they may sound in the abstract, explain themselves perfectly in context as the elements of an appropriately rich setting for the display of pictures” (p. 162).
literature or art. While the speaker's creature with a woman's head, birds' feathers, and a fish's tail resembles a Scylla in many respects, it lacks the crucial component of dog protomes at the waist. To this extent, at least, the speaker might be compared to Vitruvius, as interpreted by Ehrhardt. Such an interpretation might spare the speaker our harshest criticism, but it still leaves him open to criticism enough, for by concocting and ridiculing a new Mischwesen, the speaker, like Vitruvius, expresses his hostility toward the very skill in inventing monsters in which contemporary Roman painters revelled. As is clear from the material cited in TABLE XVII, this was a period in which painters tried to devise uniquely original monsters, and so we find few, if any, exact correspondences between the monsters found at the different sites. The lack of any exact correspondence between the Ars Poetica monster and the monsters of TABLE XVII is thus no surprise and, far from being problematic, is just what we would expect: Horace's monster painter is very à la mode in creating a type that, as far as we can tell, is new. Of course, we should not neglect to notice the similarity of Horace's monster to many of the extant examples: they often involve a fusion between the animal and vegetable realms (e.g., nrr. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6) or between sea, land, and air creatures (e.g., nrr. 4, 5, 12). The Ars Poetica monster is also such a fusion, with characteristics of the the sea (the fish-tail), land (the human head and horse's neck) and sky (the bird feathers).

The most important point of all is that, unlike Vitruvius, the Ars Poetica speaker seems totally unaware of the fact that such a painting was not only conceivable but, indeed, common, particularly in works commissioned by members of the imperial circle. And so, in the end we laugh, not at the painter of verses 1-4, but at the hapless speaker, whose pretentious claims to expertise on the arts are undermined by his eccentric taste, his inept way of expressing himself, and his ignorance of the subject. Right from the start of the poem Horace gives us and his contemporary reader ample reason to suspect that the Ars Poetica is to be the inept ramble of an unreliable narrator.

On the Ars Poetica monster as a Scylla, cf. Ps.-Acro and later commentators such as Dillenburger and Orelli. Brink, II, 85, following Rostagni ad loc., writes more accurately: “inevitably the painting resembles the hybrid monsters of Classical art.—scyllas, sirens, centaurs, goat-stags, etc.”

On the iconography of the Scylla, see E. Paribeni in EAA 7 s.v. Scilla (Rome 1966) 109-110.
CHAPTER 4

GENRE OF THE *ARS POETICA*: EPISTLE, DIDACTIC POEM, OR TERTIUM QUID?

An interpretation of the *Ars Poetica* based on the assumption that the work contains the speech of a very unauthoritative dullard, holding forth *ad nauseam* about a subject about which he is poorly informed and can only mouth trite truisms, raises important generic questions: how can such a parody be classified and can it be paralleled within the Horatian corpus?

If, as we saw earlier in this study, the *Ars Poetica* is not to be associated with *Epistles II*, what kind of work is it? A debate has continued for centuries over classifying the *Ars Poetica* as a letter or as a didactic poem. Much labor was spent in this century and the last tracing the alleged derivation of the *Ars Poetica* from the genre of the technical handbook—the revival of an idea driven from the field by the epistle-thesis in the sixteenth century. Is the *Ars Poetica* a letter, didactic poem, or technical handbook (or, at least, essay)? The issue is important: classification by genre is not simply a matter of defining a literary work; it concerns the very essence of the communicative act joining author and reader.

1 Cf. the works of Vahlen, Wecklein, Birt, Cauer, Norden, and others discussed by Brink, L 18-40. For the sixteenth-century literature, see below, n. 3.

2 Cf. J. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics* (Ithaca, New York 1975) 147-148 (cf. p. 147: "the function of genre conventions is essentially to establish a contract between writer and reader so as to make certain relevant expectations operative and thus to permit both compliance with and deviation from accepted modes of intelligibility"); A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford 1982) 37-53 (cf. p. 22: "of all the codes of our literary langue, I have no hesitation in proposing genre as the most important, not least because it incorporates and organizes many others. Just how many other codes are generically articulated remains uncertain...At any rate there is no doubt that genre primarily has to do with communication. It is an instrument not of classification or prescription,
Of commentators working on the poem in recent decades, C. O. Brink has perhaps devoted the most attention to this matter. He has persuasively discredited the view that the *Ars Poetica* is a technical handbook on poetics, noting that although it may share certain structural features that come from the technical tradition of literary criticism, the poem is not to be reduced to a handbook.\(^3\)

\(^3\)See Brink, I, 15-40. As I plan to show elsewhere, the debate about whether the poem is an *ars* or merely something loosely derived from the technical tradition of poetics may be traced back to the sixteenth century, particularly the polemics of Antonio Riccoboni and Nicolaus Colonius. See (in chronological order): *Antonii Riccoboni a quodam viro docto dissensio de epistola Horatii ad Pisones: quae nullam quidem methodum habere: sed ad methoduni redigi posse ostendituir*, printed at the end of *Compendium Artis Poeticae Aristotelis ad usum conficiendorum poematum ab Antonii Riccobono ordinatum et quibusdam scholiis explanatum* (Padua 1591); *Nicolai Coloni responsio adversus absurdissimam sententiam Antonii Riccoboni de Horatij libello ad Pisones de poetica* (Bergamo 1591); *Antonii Riccoboni I.C. humanitatem in Patavino gymnasio profitenis defensor seu pro eius opinione de Horatij epistola ad Pisones in Nicolaum Coloniun ad Ethica Aristotelits in eodem gymnasio interpretda designatum* (Ferrara 1591); *Epistola Nicolai Colonii Ad Antonium Riccobonum* (n. p. 1591); *Conciliatio Antonii Riccoboni cum Nicolao Colonio ad Illustiss. et Excellentissimum Principem, Alexandrum Estensem* (Padua 1591). Riccoboni's first contribution to the quarrel was written in reaction to Colonius' earlier treatise, *Q. Horatii Flacci Methodus De Arte Poetica: Per Nicolam Coloniun Exposita Quomodo antehac ab alto nemine* (Bergamo 1587).

In their debate, Colonius (c. 1520-1602) represented the view that the *Ars Poetica* had a "method," or plan, and that the plan was based on a technical treatment of all the literary genres, which, according to Colonius, numbered four (epic, tragedy, comedy, satyr drama). Riccoboni (1541-1599) maintained the thesis of Robortello, his predecessor as professor of Humanities at Padua, and of his friend and colleague De Nores (Colonius' predecessor as professor of Moral Philosophy at Padua) that the *Ars Poetica* was not a technical treatise but a loosely written letter. He may be said to be partly responsible for attempts, over the next three centuries, to transpose hundreds of lines of the *Ars Poetica* in a vain attempt to restore order to the poem because, in arguing against Colonius' assertion that the poem had a plan, Riccoboni showed how the poem would have to be rearranged to correspond to the plan of Aristotle's *Poetics*. In contrast to D. Heinsius (*Q. Horatii Flacci Opera cum Animadversionibus et Notis Daniels Heinsii* [Leiden 1612] 295-307), a student of Riccoboni's adversary Joseph Scaliger, Riccoboni did not believe that his wholesale transpositions were to be taken seriously; they were merely illustrative of the informality with which Horace re-worked the Aristotelian technical tradition. Incidentally, Heinsius rewrote through transposition, not only the *Ars Poetica*, but also—a fact rarely mentioned—the *Letter*
Brink does not go on to define the genre of the Ars Poetica in any detail, simply asserting baldly that “of course, the Ars is a letter.” \(^4\) Be that as it may, it should by now be clear that determination of the genre of the Ars cannot proceed from any assumption about its title and alleged inclusion in Epistles II.

Once we see that the Ars is most likely an independent work in the corpus, three possible ways of classifying it as something other than a handbook come to mind, of which the second two have rarely, if ever, been raised in this century: a verse letter, a didactic poem, or some tertium quid. The first two possibilities generally stand for distinct categories of writing: a letter is usually informal in spirit and supplies or requests information of some sort from or to a friend. As Ps.-Acro and Porphyrio sensibly remark on Sat. I.1.1, a letter presumes an absent recipient: “epistulis enim ad absentes loquimur, sermone cum praesentibus” (Ps.-Acro); “in sermonum autem libris vult intelligi, quasi apud praesentem se loqui, epistolas vero quasi ad absentes missas” (Porphyrio). In a didactic work like Lucretius’ De Rerum Natura or Virgil’s Georgics, formal instruction in moral, technical, and like matters is offered to an interlocutor who is imagined to be present listening to the speaker and with whom the speaker has some social bond. \(^5\)

Now, this clearcut distinction between the formal instructive genre of didactic literature and the informal reportorial genre of the letter can and does break down, for it is, of course, possible for a letter to be didactic, and, indeed, in the Augustan age such letters, in prose form, are known to have existed. Interestingly enough, the ones we happen to hear about all resemble the Ars

to Florus (pp. 289-294). His methodological model was undoubtedly Joseph Scaliger’s edition of Propertius and Tibullus in Catulli, Tibulli, Properti Nova Editio (Paris 1577), on which see A. Grafton, Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship, vol. 1 (Oxford 1983) 177-179. The first scholar seriously to propose large transpositions of the Ars Poetica was Francisco Sanchez, explicitly stating that Scaliger’s Propertius was his inspiration; cf. Francisci Sanctii Brocensis... In Artem Poeticam Horatii Annotationes (Salamanca 1591) fol. 6r (transposing 136-152 to follow 38-45, with reference to Scaliger’s Propertius) and fol. 9r (putting 251-274 after 73-85).

\(^4\)Brink, III, 556. The poem has recently been categorized as epistolary—without detailed argument—by W. Hering, Die Dialektik von Form und Inhalt bei Horaz (Berlin 1979) 78-85; and by R. S. Kilpatrick, The Poetry of Criticism. Horace Epistles II and Ars Poetica (Edmonton, Alberta 1990) 34-35. Brink (II, 518) and Kilpatrick (p. 54) also (rightly, in my opinion) connect the work to sermo.

\(^5\)E.g., Perseus is Hesiod’s brother; Maecenas is Virgil’s benefactor. Lucretius’ exact relationship with Memmius is not known, but he appears to have been on “intimate terms” with Memmius, as Bailey puts it (vol. I, p. 6).
Poetica in concerning grammatical and literary topics. Adding to the difficulty of distinguishing the two genres from each other is the fact that, since Hesiod, it had been conventional for a didactic poem, like a letter, to have an addressee (cf. Hesiod's Perses, Lucretius' Memmius, etc.). Moreover, the conventions (if any) of the verse letter could only have been loose indeed when Horace wrote the Ars Poetica, since the genre, as far as we can tell, was still in its infancy.

It is strange that the case for categorizing the Ars as a didactic poem has not, to my knowledge, been made in a serious way during this century: Lucretius' De Rerum Natura and Virgil's Georgics certainly show how popular and prestigious was the genre in the mid- to late first century. The question of genre


7 For a useful survey of the conventions and examples of wisdom literature from around the world see M. L. West, Hesiod. Works and Days (Oxford 1978) 3-25 (with sensible comments about the addressee on pp. 23-25). On the addressee in the Roman didactic poem, see E. Pohlmann, "Charakteristika des römischen Lehrgedichts," ANRW I.3 (Berlin 1973) 850, 900.

8 The earliest verse letters on record are those of Sp. Mummius in 146 B.C.; see Cicero Ad Att. 13.4 and cf. P. Cugusi, Evoluzione e forme dell'epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell'impero con cenni sull'epistolografia preciceroniana (Rome 1983) 129-130.

9 The Ars Poetica has occasionally been classified as a didactic poem in previous centuries; cf., e.g., Petri Nannii Alcmani Commentarius in Q. Horatii Flacci de arte poetica librum, bound with Laevinus Torrentius, In Q. Horatii Flacci Satyras et Epistolas Commentarius (Antwerp 1608) 783: "hoc porro poema Horatii nostri versatur in genere didactico. Docet quippe Poeta, qua ratione tractanda s int poemata"; R. Hurde, Q. Horatii Flacci Epistolae ad Pisones et Augustum, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1757) vol. 1, xiii; F. Dorighello, Q. Horatius Flaccus Illeustratus (Padua 1774) 3-7; W. Scherer, Poetik, ed. G. Reiss (Tübingen 1977; originally published in 1888) 41: "Horaz gehört in weiterem Sinn selbst zur Schule des Aristoteles, die aristotelischen Grundsätze von Nachahmung, Handlung, Führerrolle der Tragödie u.s.w. finden sich bei ihm wieder. Aber er hat doch eine besondere Strömung begründet: das Lehrgedicht über die Poesie hat er eingeführt. Den Brief an die Pisonen, Epist. 2.3...., nennt schon Quintilian Ars poetica: und damit dass man eigentlich wohl Horaz Unrecht, denn er hat gewiß nicht die Absicht gehabt, hiermit eine vollständige Poetik zu liefern, obgleich man die Schrift oft so angesehen hat" (my emphasis). See also Orelli-Baiter-Mewes, Q. Horatius Flaccus (Berlin 1892) vol. 2, 566: "Quod ad ipsam poematis formam attinet, illi tantummodo interpretes verum viderunt, qui 'epistulam didacticosatricam' esse contenderunt, non poema didascalicum universae poesis leges ac regul-

10 For a useful survey of the conventions and examples of wisdom literature from around the world see M. L. West, Hesiod. Works and Days (Oxford 1978) 3-25 (with sensible comments about the addressee on pp. 23-25). On the addressee in the Roman didactic poem, see E. Pohlmann, "Charakteristika des römischen Lehrgedichts," ANRW I.3 (Berlin 1973) 850, 900.

11 The earliest verse letters on record are those of Sp. Mummius in 146 B.C.; see Cicero Ad Att. 13.4 and cf. P. Cugusi, Evoluzione e forme dell'epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell'impero con cenni sull'epistolografia preciceroniana (Rome 1983) 129-130.

12 The Ars Poetica has occasionally been classified as a didactic poem in previous centuries; cf., e.g., Petri Nannii Alcmani Commentarius in Q. Horatii Flacci de arte poetica librum, bound with Laevinus Torrentius, In Q. Horatii Flacci Satyras et Epistolas Commentarius (Antwerp 1608) 783: "hoc porro poema Horatii nostri versatur in genere didactico. Docet quippe Poeta, qua ratione tractanda s int poemata"; R. Hurde, Q. Horatii Flacci Epistolae ad Pisones et Augustum, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1757) vol. 1, xiii; F. Dorighello, Q. Horatius Flaccus Illeustratus (Padua 1774) 3-7; W. Scherer, Poetik, ed. G. Reiss (Tübingen 1977; originally published in 1888) 41: "Horaz gehört in weiterem Sinn selbst zur Schule des Aristoteles, die aristotelischen Grundsätze von Nachahmung, Handlung, Führerrolle der Tragödie u.s.w. finden sich bei ihm wieder. Aber er hat doch eine besondere Strömung begründet: das Lehrgedicht über die Poesie hat er eingeführt. Den Brief an die Pisonen, Epist. 2.3...., nennt schon Quintilian Ars poetica: und damit dass man eigentlich wohl Horaz Unrecht, denn er hat gewiß nicht die Absicht gehabt, hiermit eine vollständige Poetik zu liefern, obgleich man die Schrift oft so angesehen hat" (my emphasis). See also Orelli-Baiter-Mewes, Q. Horatius Flaccus (Berlin 1892) vol. 2, 566: "Quod ad ipsam poematis formam attinet, illi tantummodo interpretes verum viderunt, qui 'epistulam didacticosatricam' esse contenderunt, non poema didascalicum universae poesis leges ac regul-
Genre of the Ars Poetica

does matter: if we read the poem as a normal letter, then we expect and gladly tolerate a good deal of informality in tone, content, and structure; and, taken as

as proponens, ut olim plerique rati sunt, non animadvertentes praecpta psene omnia referri ad genus dramaticum, ea vero ipse excellebat, lyricum (quod leviter dumtaxat attingit vv. 83-85), satiras, epistulas, epigramma, poema didascalicum, quamquam ipse Lucretium suspiciebat, prorsus praeteriri.

This point was already made by De Nores in 1553 (App. I [3]), who wrote, "amat enim epistola familiaritatem quandam. At nimirus accuratus ordo ad severitatem potius, quam ad familiaritatem propendet." For an amusing statement of the effect our generic expectations have upon our interpretation of the Ars Poetica, see R. K. Hack, "The Doctrine of Literary Forms," HSCP 27 (1916) 1-55, p. 14. Cf. also l'Abbé Bateau, Les quatre poétiques d'Artiste, d'Horace, de Vida, de Despréaux (Paris 1771), vol. I, II Partie, pp. 1-4: "le Poète n'a pas toute fois eu dessein dans cet Ouvrage, de nous donner un traité complet de Poétique,...C'est un Epître qu'il adresse à Lucius Pison, homme de goût, l'un des plus grands Seigneurs de Rome,...D'après cette idée, on sent que l'ouvrage d'Horace ne devoit pas être une suite systématique de préceptes, rangé par ordre dans des articles séparés. Ce ne pouvot être qu'une sorte de Recueil de maximes de goût, d'axiomes presque isolés, renfermons tout leur sens sous une forme sententieuse, et applicables chacun à leur object, indépendamment de ce qui pouvoit les précéder ou les suivre....On ne pouvoit guère en demander davantage, sur-tout à un Poète, qui aux privilèges de la Poesie, déjà très-étendus, avoit joint ceux du Genre épistolaire, dont le premier est la liberté. Il est donc inutile de nous fatiguer, avec Daniel Heinsius, pour remettre dans l'Art Poetique d'Horace, un ordre qui, selon toute apparence, n'y fut jamais." See also Orelli-Baiter-Mewes, op. cit. (supra n. 9) vol. 2, 567: "Sententiarum ordo atque mutus nexus a multis reprehensius, a pluribus etiam parum perspectus, mihi quidem semper admirabilis visus est et talis profecto, quals debet esse in epistula, vera sermonis familiaris imagine, id est occultior et laxior quam qui requiritur in poemate mere didascalico"; H. Schütz, Q. Horatius Flaccus, Epistela (Berlin 1883) 238: "Die Stellung nach den Episteln...ist die naturgemäße....Nur wenn man einen anderen Maßstab anlegt, nämlich den eines wirklichen Lehrbuches der Dichtkunst...verdient das Werk den Tadel, den man über die Lückenhaftigkeit, mangelhafte Anordnung, einseitige Hervorhebung einzelner Teile u.a.m. ausgesprochen hat."

In ancient theory, the looser structure of the letter was noted; cf. Demetrius 229. In recent research on epistolography, the structural conventions of the genre have been emphasized; see the literature cited by K. Berger, op. cit. (supra n. 6) 1326-1327; and cf. J. L. White, "New Testament Epistolary Literature in the Framework of Ancient Epistolography," ANRW II.25.2 (Berlin 1984) 1730-1756, especially pp. 1733-38. Pietro-Antonio Pettrini, La poetic di Orazio restituita all'ordine suo (Rome 1777) 9, noted that the argument from genre was a red herring since "costoro per difendere il componimento, fanno manifesta ingiuria all'Autore, il quale era uomo troppo illuminato per non comprendere, che un tal qual metodo è necessario anche in una Lettera, quando è dottrinale, ed instruttiva, e che i documenti perdono assai di vigore, e di efficacia, se sono confusamente proposti."
a letter, then a necessary but not sufficient condition for including it in the sec­
cond book of Epistles is satisfied. After all—despite what we know about the title
and place of the text in the Horatian corpus in antiquity—the ancient scribes may
have erred in separating the Ars Poetica from the Epistles. Horace could clearly
write verse letters of the normal type but also of the didactic variety (for the first,

There are perhaps one or two indications that Horace was thinking of the
Ars Poetica more as a didactic poem than as a conventional epistolary poem,
or at least that he did not consider the poem a letter, whatever else he did consider
it. In all but one of Horace's poems that are indisputably epistles, the addressee
is named, or referred to by some form of tu or a verb in the second person
singular, in the first sentence and usually in the very first line.11 The Ars Poetica
does not begin in this typically epistolary way. In it, the first sentence proceeds
through clauses in the third person singular about a hypothetical painter and
grotesque figure (lines 1-4) before ending with a clause in the second person
plural, the subject of which appears, on a first reading, to be generic, not specific
(amici, the last word of line 5). The addressees of the poem, the Pisones, are first
mentioned in line 6. In having multiple addressees, the Ars Poetica also departs
from the indisputable epistles. Moreover, nothing about the way they are spoken
to in this part of the poem indicates that the Pisones are absent, as the addressee
of a letter normally would be. Indeed, in lines 9-10, as if they are present, Horace
gives us the response of his addressees to what he has just said—something he
frequently does in the Satires (especially in Book II) but rarely, if ever, in the
first or second book of Epistles.12

The subject of the first lines—painting, or proper artistic representation
in general—is, of course, not a standard introductory topic of a letter. Virtually
all of the indisputable letters treat topics—at least in the opening section—
appropriate to that genre and are strongly motivated as letters. They convey
information and/or greetings (Epist. I.1, 2, 8, 10, 16), request information or

11Cf. Epist. I.1 (quaeris / Maecenas, 2-3); 2 (Maxime Lolli, 1); 3 (Iuli Flori, 1); 4 (Albi, 1); 5 (potes...Torquate, 1-3); 6 (Numici, 1); 8 (Celto...Albinovano, 1); 9 (Claudi, 1); 10 (Fuselum, 1); 11 (Bullati, 1); 12 (Icici, 1); 13 (te...Vini, 1-2); 14 (Villic, 1); 15 (Vula, 1); 16 (Quinti, 1); 17 (Scaevia, 1); 18 (Lolli, 1); 19 (Maecenas, 1); 20 (liber, 1); Epist. II.1 (sustineas...Caesar, 1-4); 2 (Flore, 1). The exception is
Epist. I.7, where Maecenas is not adddressed until the second sentence, beginning at
the end of the second line of the poem: he is actually named in line 5.

12For examples, cf. Sat. I.9.1-8; II.1.1-12; II.3.1-18; II.4.1-3; II.5.1-8;
II.7.1-5; II.8.1-5. In the Epistles, Horace often quotes the typical or imaginary
saying or statement of a stock (usually unnamed) character (cf., e.g., Epist. I.1.82
["nullus in orbe sinus Bais praeluet amoenis"]), but Horace is not imagining himself
actually conversing with such persons in the same way he, say, exchanges words with
Davus in Sat. II.7.1-5.
news (Epist. I.3, 4, 11, 15), issue an invitation (Epist. I.5), moralize (Epist. I.6, 12, 14, 17, 18), seek forgiveness (Epist. I.7), or commend one friend to another (Epist. I.9). The five literary letters (Epist. I.13, 19, 20; II.1, 2) have different points of departure. Epist. I.20 is written like a conventional letter of farewell; the wit of the poem lies in the fact that the departing "person" is Horace's book of letters. Epist. II.1 begins with Horace telling Augustus that he writes so as not to waste Augustus' precious time with idle conversation. Epist. I.19 and II.2 begin in a more round-about manner. Epist. II.2 tells a moralizing tale in lines 1-24, the point of which becomes clear in verses 24-25: Horace has not answered some letters Florus has sent him from abroad and, in particular, has not responded to Florus' request for new lyric poems. Although it is slow to get to the point, the poem thus concerns a typical epistolary topic.

Epist. I.19, addressed to Maecenas, is less ostensibly epistolary; Horace seems, rather, to use the letter format as a mere excuse for publishing a defense of his poetry. Before considering the piece an exception to the epistolary nature of this group of poems, we might note that the addressee has not been chosen accidentally, however small a role he plays in the text itself, for Horace offers his poetic apology to none other than his most illustrious friend. Thus, even this poem has an epistolary occasion—sending someone a letter "accidentally on purpose" in order to be sure that he is apprised of a matter of mutual concern. In this case, Horace wants Maecenas to know that he does have something to say for himself and his poetry in the face of recent critical attacks—attacks that might conceivably make his friend think twice about continuing his support. Epistles I.13 is another matter; we will return to it in a moment.

The Ars Poetica also stands out from Horace's poetic letters because of its ending—or, better, lack of ending. As Berger has noted, the topics appropriate to the closing section of a letter are: summation; general sententia; threats; self-commentary; "epistolaria" (e.g., "I leave here in a week"); demand to pay heed. In Horace's undisputed letters we can readily find such standard endings, as the table on the next page shows.

In contrast to Horace's verse letters, the Ars Poetica has no conventional conclusion. As Brink observes (ad 453-476), "like many poems of Horace the Ars is open-ended. No attempt is made to bring to a close the conceptual schema of his literary theory." Instead, the poem ends as the speaker of the Ars Poetica compares the mad poet to a bear or leech (472-476), who must be avoided lest he "read you to death." While it is true that many Horatian poems are open-ended, this is not true, as we have seen, of his epistles. Open-endedness is, however, a


typical feature of the *Satires*, which frequently conclude abruptly with the end of a story (*Sat. I.5, I.7, I.8, I.9, II.5, II.6, II.8*) or a conversation (*II.1, II.3, II.4, II.7*). More rarely, they finish with a moment of self-reflection (*I.1, I.3, I.4, I.6*) or with a general *sententia* (*I.2*) and thus have a more substantial sense of an ending. Indeed, as Griffin has noted, “given the special decorum of satire—an aroused or merely a chatty speaker, a virtually unlimited subject matter—endings present a problem which satirists have historically had difficulty solving.”

In having a “non-ending,” the *Ars Poetica* resembles more a *sermo* than an epistle. If it is a letter, then the *Ars Poetica* stands out from the indisputably “normal” epistles in not having a typically epistolary motivation, topic, situ-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epist.</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Su</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1</td>
<td>106-08</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ad summam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2</td>
<td>67-71</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>adhibeo...verba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vestrum reditum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>omnem crede diem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>tu...rescribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6</td>
<td>67-68</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>si quid novistis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.7</td>
<td>96-98</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metiri se quemque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.8</td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ut tu fortunam....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.9</td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scribo tu gregis hunc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.10</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dictabam post fanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.11</td>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quod petis hic est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>ne tamen ignores....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cave ne titubes....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...exerceat artem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.15</td>
<td>42-46</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nimirum hic ego sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mors ultima linea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.17</td>
<td>43-62</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coram rege sua....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.18</td>
<td>104-112</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>me quotiens....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.19</td>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ludus enim genuit...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.20</td>
<td>19-28</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>me libertino natum....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1</td>
<td>250-270</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nec sermones ego....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>205-216</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non es avarus? abi....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Su=Summary; S=Sententia; T=Threats; C=Commentary; E=Epistolaria; H=Heed

**TABLE XVIII. CONCLUDING TOPICS IN HORACE’S EPISTLES**

Genre of the Ars Poetica

The poet Christoph Martin Wieland, in his 1782 translation of the poem, proposed an interesting variation on the epistle-theory: Horace's motivation was to do a favor to Piso père by implicitly warning off his elder son from becoming a poet by showing, in the Ars, how few really great poets there are and how many ridiculous poetasters. Cf. Horaz, Über die Dichtkunst, in Christoph Martin Wieland Werke, 5. Band, ed. H. W. Seiffert (Munich 1968) 586-604, especially p. 591: "Dies vorausgesetzt, stelle ich mir die Veranlassung zu dieser Epistel so vor. Der junge Piso zeigte im Lauf seiner Schulstudien eine besondere Liebe zur Poesie, und einen so starken Hang zum Versemachen, daß der Vater endlich unruhig darüber wurde...." Note that Seiffert, in his excellent Nachwort to the edition, errs in claiming (p. 885) that Wieland was the first to explain Horace's lack of "Methode" because the poem is supposedly not a technical treatise on poetics but an informal letter: exactly this explanation was set forth in 1591 by Antonio Riccoboni in the works mentioned above in n. 3.

16 Many commentators since the early Middle Ages have imagined just this—or some such similar—background to the poem. The most recent (and, perhaps, original) example is T. P. Wiseman, "Satyrs in Rome? The Background to Horace's Ars Poetica," JRS 78 (1988) 1-13, at p. 1: "Horace's poem quite clearly presupposes a Calpurnius Piso, the elder son of a morally exemplary Roman aristocrat, proposing to write a satyr-play...." For examples in medieval scholia, see C. Villa, "'Ut Poesis Pictura': Appunti iconografici sui codici dell'Ars Poetica," Aevum 62 (1988) 187-189. For example, the anonymous author of the Scholia Vindobonensia wrote: "Facit autem hunc librum amicis suis, patri ac filis quorum maior erat scriptor comoediarum; ideo istis facit, quia volebant scribere, ut Romano populo placenter et eorum fama tali modo cresceret et quoniam multi scriptores reprehendeabuntur non habentes certam regulam dictandi, rogaverunt Pisones Horatium, ut certas poeticae artis daret praecipuas...." (apud Villa, p.187). Cf. also Kiessling-Heinz, Q. Horatius Flaccus, Briefe (Berlin 1959) 283: "irgend ein AnlaB des Schreibens wird nicht einmal entfernt angedeutet, und der Leser muB sich bei der Moglichkeit beruhigen, daß die Pisonen...dem Dichter den Wunsch geäußert haben mögen, über Fragen der Dichtkunst...unterrichtet zu werden."

17 Here are the lines: "Tu nihil invitae dices faciesve Minerva: l id tibi iudicium est, ea mens. si quid tamen olim l scripseris, in Maeci descendat iudicis aures l et patris et nostras, nonunque prematur in annum, l membranis intus positis; delere licebit l quod non edideris, nescit vox missa reverti." The tu addressed is the maior iuvenum, previously addressed in verse 366; the conditional clause in 385-86 ("si quid tamen olim l scripseris") shows that the posited epistolary situation is, at best, implied.
rather puzzling. On the other hand, their role becomes more comprehensible as the addressees of a didactic poem. Although it must be granted that no other known didactic poem has multiple addressees, in such a poem the addressee is imagined to be present listening to the speaker and need only have a tangential relationship to the topic under discussion. This is, for example, the case with Lucretius' Memmius, whose relevance to the De rerum naturae is quite problematic. As for Hesiod's Erga, West has well observed that “it is apparent that Perses is a changeable figure that Hesiod stations in his poem as he chooses.”

The same might be said of the Pisones: unlike the addressees of the poems that are clearly letters, the Pisones change identity to suit Horace's didactic intent: they seem to be critics of poetry in vv. 6 and 292; poets in v. 24; one a critic (the father) and one a poet (366-369, 385-388); and it is even possible to see their number change from plural (16, 235, 291) to singular (102, 119, etc.). If we may say that, generally, the addressee of an epistle determines the writing and contents of a letter and that the needs of instruction dictate the mutable nature of the addressee in a didactic work, then for this reason, too, the Ars Poetica more closely resembles a didactic than an epistolary poem.

Nevertheless, at least two technical points, one minor and one major, militate against taking the Ars as a didactic work: first, Horace twice uses the word iste, which had been avoided by Lucretius and Virgil in their didactic poetry. This is, to be sure, a minor point, but given what we know about the tendencies of Golden Latin poets to associate vocabulary with genre, it may, nevertheless, be telling. Perhaps what Brink rightly calls the word's “derisory nuance” explains the apparent exception: if this is in some sense a mock didactic poem, then iste helps make the speaker look unsympathetically supercilious. This is consistent with the speaker's lack of any positive social bond with his addressees. The second point is more telling: a didactic poem generally begins with an invocation to a god, which the Ars, of course, does not. Hence, even the apparently anomalous case of the invocation of Tiberius at the beginning of the Astronomica is not, in fact, exceptional at all since Manilius calls Tiberius a god (deus ipse mereris, I.9).

So, if the simple alternatives of letter or didactic poem are not wholly convincing, then some tertium quid solution to the problem of genre is worth consideration. At this point we encounter some complications that may make us

---

18 See C. Bailey on Lucretius L26 (Memmiadæ).
19 West, op. cit. (supra n. 7) 40; E. Pohlmann, op. cit. (supra n. 7) 900, with useful comments on the addressee in Greek and Roman didactic poems.
21 See Watson, loc. cit.
22 Brink, II, ad 376.
want to throw our hands up in despair. Some poems in Epistles I are either only weakly motivated as letters or else do not seem to be letters at all but conversations. This is particularly true of Epist. I.13, the poem in which Horace gives Vinnius instructions on how to deliver his poetry to Augustus. Support for blurring the hard and fast distinction we have up to now been observing between the epistolary and didactic genres comes from Horace himself, who in Epist. II.1.250 (and, implicitly, in Epist. II.1.4) refers to both his Sermones and Epistulae as sermones. Now, the Sermones contain two clearcut paraenetic poems: Sat. II.2, Ofellus’ discourse on the virtues of simple living; and II.4, the lessons of Catius the cook on correct preparations for a dinner party. So there is nothing generically inconsistent about a didactic sermo. Nor is it surprising that the second poem is mock didactic, since Sat. II contains several other extended parodies: II.3, the philosophical parody of Damasippus and the Stoic philosopher Stertinius; II.5, the epic parody of Odysseus’ katabasis in Odyssey XI; and II.7, the philosophical parody of the Stoic philosopher Crispinus. In the didactic satires, Horace sets the scene with an exposition which, however brief (that of II.2 is only a parenthetical aside in lines 2-3) does make it plain that the precepts being offered are not Horace’s own. Given Horace’s own hints that the Sermones descend from the traditions of literary moralizing to be found in Old and New Comedy and Platonic philosophy, it is not surprising that the collection should contain didactic poems like these. On the other hand, the Satires also contain poems that are not conversations but monologues addressed to no one in

23Epist. I.1 and I.2, on which see M. J. McGann, Studies in Horace’s First Book of Epistles, Collection Latomus 100 (1969) 39.
24A whole list of such examples is given by N. M. Horsfall, “Horace, Sermones 3: Epilegomena,” LCM 4.8 (1979) 169-171. Of the poems cited there, the best is Epist. I.13.
26Sat. I.7 also has striking elements of mock epic.
particular: cf. Satires I.2, I.3, I.4, I.7, I.8, and II.6. True, all of these poems contain lively snatches of conversations, but they are conversations reported or imagined by the speaker, not acted out in the fictional present between the speaker and an interlocutor. In one of these poems, the speaker is not Horace (Sat. I.8, whose speaker is Priapus). In others, the speaker is anonymous and could be almost anyone since Horace takes no pains to characterize him (Sat. I.2, I.7). In similar fashion, Horace is absent from the mock epic dialogue between Ulysses and Tiresias in Sat. II.5, and there is no exposition whatsoever preparing us for the sudden switch from Horace's day and age to the world of epic.

These complications lead us to the following observations that are helpful in considering the genre of the Ars Poetica as some tertium quid between the epistolary and didactic genres. In accordance with his understanding of the genre of sermo, Horace could: [1] write a “letter” that is a conversation (Epist. I.13); [2] present a “conversation” that is a monologue or even soliloquy and which hence could easily be a letter if it had a salutation (Sat. I.2, I.3, I.4, I.8, II.6); [3] therefore subsume both the Epistulae and Sermones under the common generic rubric of sermo (Epist. II.1.4, 250); [4] present didactic monologues in this genre (Sat. II.3, II.4); [5] populate poems with dramatis personae other than himself (Sat. I.8, II.5)—even without an exposition (Sat. II.5)—or make his speaker nondescript (Sat. I.2, I.7, II.8); and [6] base poems on the parody of other genres (Sat. I.7, II.3, II.4, II.5, II.7). Clearly, then, if we seek a genre that is a tertium quid between didactic and epistolary poetry, we could do no better than choose Horace’s version of sermo, a genre so obviously based on a very Hellenistic attempt at Kreuzung der Gattungen.

It would be sufficient to classify the Ars Poetica as a Horatian sermo on the basis of features [1]-[4], and such a classification is likely to be uncontroversial and greeted, I would hope, as a definite improvement over viewing the poem as a letter when it displays so few epistolary features. Even those who insist on classifying the poem as a letter can console themselves with point [3], just as those who would read the poem as didactic (or mock didactic) can take comfort in point [4]. That the Ars displays features [5]-[6] as well has emerged from our examination of the speaker’s authority. Needless to say, much more can be—and needs to be—said before a reading of the poem along these lines may be called exhaustive. Lest the suggestion that the Ars Poetica be classified as exemplar:

28At Sat. 1.3.63-64 Maecenas is addressed; but the poem as a whole is not presented as a conversation with Maecenas. It might more accurately be called a monologue directed at him in a way that recalls Epist. 1.19.

29Such “reported” or “imaginary” conversations are also frequent in the Epistles; cf., e.g., Epistles I.15.11-12, 39-41.

30Sat. I.3 belongs in this class but for the slight brush stroke in lines 63-5, where Horace personalizes the speaker’s voice as his own by addressing Maecenas.
plifying the mixed genre of *sermo*—an *Aufhebung* of the simple forms of technical handbook, didactic poem, and letter—seem strange or unlikely, it may be well to point out that such portmanteau arrangements of genres-within-genres have been encountered in other periods and literatures, as the genre-theorists Dubrow and Fowler have noted. Indeed, in a famous poetological statement in *Epistles* 1.19, Horace claims that his achievement was due to his originality in mixing generic characteristics—for example, combining the meter of Archilochus with a content and tone different from cruel, Archilochean invective.

Here we may simply conclude by noting that, in answer to the questions asked at the beginning of this chapter, Horatian precedents can be cited for some of the key features we have so far identified in the *Ars Poetica*—in particular, the Horatian version of *sermo* can easily accommodate a mock-didactic parody of a pedantic speaker not to be confused with Horace himself or his usual poetic persona. Moreover, finding features [5] and [6] in the *Ars Poetica*—otherwise attested in the *Satires* but not in the *Epistles*—accords well with dating the *Ars Poetica* to the period just after Sat. II, as was suggested in Chapter 2.

For now, having adumbrated several key features of how a new reading can result from this “paradigm shift” in the way we view the genre of the *Ars Poetica*, we can stop and summarize our efforts in this book as having mainly concerned the background and external features of the poem. Its title was

---

31 H. Dubrow, *Genre* (London and New York 1982) 28-30 (cf. p. 29: “often the Chinese-box arrangement of genre within genre that we observed in *The Jew of Malta* is a reflection of a pattern writ large in the literary system of the period: frequently when two forms assume the relationship of genre and counter-genre they enact their dialogue within poems of either genre as well as in the larger literary culture”); A. Fowler, op. cit. (*supra* n. 2) 179-188. At pp. 188-190, Fowler discusses how “many satiric works can be looked on as hybrid.” See also the brilliant treatment of generic “inclusionism” in R. L. Colie, *The Resources of Kind. Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*, ed. by B. K. Lewalski (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973) 76-128.


33 The concept of a paradigm shift I borrow from T. S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago 1962, 1970). For an introduction to Kuhn and the reception of his work, see B. Barnes, *T. S. Kuhn and Social Science* (London 1982). On p. xiv Barnes discusses the terminological controversies surrounding the term paradigm, which he defines simply as “an accepted problem-solution in science, a particular concrete scientific achievement.” Though devised by Kuhn with reference
probably something like *Ars Poetica*, not *Epistula ad Pisones*. It almost certainly has nothing to do with *Epistles* II but was an independent work in the corpus, written in the period 24-20 B.C. Generically, it resembles the parodic monologues of *Sat.* II and displays other characteristics of the genre of *sermo*. We have traced the imbroglios arising from these fundamental and intertwined problems back to their sources and have seen—at the very least—that our arguments do not have to keep moving in the same circles. By a variety of approaches we have certainly found new passages in. Whether they also lead out in the directions I have indicated is, of course, for others to determine.

The invocation of paradigm theory at this late point in our discussion is perhaps not unexpected in a work that began with a discussion of the importance of titles. A new paradigm for *Ars Poetica* interpretation such as that sketched here is, to be sure, very much in keeping with the aesthetics of postmodernism, a time aptly called by Malcolm Bradbury the "age of parody." Yet this may just as easily be a case of the way in which anachrony can serve the ends of diachrony by sensitizing us to ancient precedents for seemingly modern developments, since, in the case at hand, "the parodic tone recently adopted in criticism" can be traced back to ancient sceptics like Timon of Phlius. Moreover, the late Renaissance (or, better, Counter-Reformation) paradigm of "saving" the poem's authority as a poetic rulebook by inventing a generic excuse for its lack of method was itself no less anachronic. Similarly the Romantics' indifference to the *Ars Poetica* was a consequence of their rebellion against a rule-based approach to artistic creativity. The theologian, Hans Küng, has emphasized how paradigm shifts generally involve as much continuity as discontinuity. Such is certainly true in the present case: the new parodic paradigm, far from invalidating earlier models of *Ars Poetica* interpretation, explains how they are possible. But that is another story.
APPENDIX I

KEY DOCUMENTS FOR THE RENAISSANCE THEORY THAT THE 
ARS POETICA IS AN EPISTLE

Since the sixteenth-century texts referred to in Chapter I are by no means available in the collections of even very good university libraries, I reprint the key passages here.

[1] Marini Becichemi Scodrensis Epistolarum Quaestionum Centuria (Brescia 1504) (unpaginated; printer not indicated). Caput duodecimum (pp. 59-67):

Francisci Robortelli Utinensis Paraphrasis in Libellum Horatii, Qui Vulgo De Arte Poetica Inscribitur, 19 pages, printed after Francisci Robortelli Utinensis, in Librum Aristotelis De Arte Poetica, Explicationes (Florence, in officina Laurentii Torrentini Ducalis Typographi, 1548)\(^1\): 1:

Etsi libellus hic de Arte poetica inscribitur, videturque ipsa inscription prae se ferre, methodo quadam certa et ordinata, praeceptiones tradi scribendorum poematum. Puto tamen ego inscriptionem illam a Poeta nonuisse appositam, neque cum ad Pisones scriberet, in animo habuisse artem ullam aut methodum praecelarum huius facultatis tradere. Nam si id efficere voluisset, ab inutio omnia repetens, et naturae ordinem sequens, praeceptiones omnes singillatim esset persecutus, quae ad poema recte scribendum spectant: hoc enim commodiore ratione potuisse artem poeticae facultatis describi ab Horatio satis patet. Nunc vero quis credit hominem doctissimum de arte tam confuse tuisse locutum. Sic igitur omnino sentiendum. Cum Romae sua aetate videret Horatius esse multis, qui poetae nomen sibi falso vindicabant, diesque totos in scribendo aliquid poematonebat, et ignorabant tamen quanto in versibus scribendis opus esset artificio, diutius illorum inscientiam, et insolentiam aequo animo cum ferre non posset, sermone hoc satis longo cum Pisonibus habitu, eos reprehendere instituit, ac singillatim omnes illorum errores demonstrare: quibus patfactis, dat operam ut eos ad meliorem frugem reducat, praescribens rectam rationem scribendi poematem: in eo praesertim, in quo eos labii animadvertat. Quo fit, ut ego existimem, temere a multis libellum hunc in plurimas ac minutissimas praeceptiones fuisse dissectum, cum miro ordine totus liber sit contextus, perpetuamque prae se ferat et minime interpellatam de eadem re orationem, ut conabor ostendere, ac facile perspicient ii et probabunt, opinor, qui cognitam habent scribendi rationem, quam ubique secutus est Horatius in Epistulis.

In Epistulam Q. Horatii Flacci De Arte Poetica Jasonis de Nores Cyprii Ex Quotidianis Tryphonis Gabrielii Sermonibus Interpretatio. (Venice, apud Aldi filios, 1553).\(^2\) From the Preface to the reader; fol. 3v-4v:

Quare adductum me primum sciant ad inscriptionem operis immutandum non levioribus de causis, et quod formam epistolae, non autem libri, in quo praecipita

\(^1\)This has been republished in the series Poetiken des Cinquecento, vol. 8, ed. B. Fabian (Munich 1968). In 1555, the work was reprinted in Basle, “per Ioannem Hervagium Iuniorum.”

\(^2\)There was a second Venetian edition, “apud A. Arrivabenum,” in 1553, according to Mills, 15 (nr. 157). A Paris edition was published in 1554, “ex Typographia M. Dauidis.”
tradantur, vel ex ipso principio prae se ferat, et quod in vetustis exemplaribus epistolae libros subsequatur, et quod etiam summi, et praestantissimi homines ita sentiant, et quod minime nobis obstet Quintilianius testimonium, ut nonnullis videtur. Nam etsi librum appellat Quintilianus, non est cur non possit inter epistolas enumerari, cum et illae ab Horatio in libros digestae fuerint. Quod vero de arte poetica idem Quintilianus adiungat, nihil commoveor, cum et in epistolis praecepta de aliqua re tradi possint, ab eodemque in omnibus paene et in iis ad Scaevam et Lollium praecipue iam factum videatur, in quibus breviter eos instituit, qua ratione apud maiores facile versarentur....Quod autem attinet ad ea, quae ab ipsis, qui interpretant, ante ipsum interpretationem adderi solent: ea propter eam causam omittemus, quia ordinem in arte poetica demonstranda non ita servatum ab Horatio videmus, ut ab aliis, qui de aliqua re documenta litteris tradiderunt. Est ille quidem peracutus et diligens in praecipiendi ratione, ordinem tamen, cum epistolam scriveret, non ita custodiret, ac tuetur ut si librum scriberet. Amat enim epistola familiaritatem quandam. At nimis accuratus ordo ad severitatem potius, quam ad familiaritatem propendit. Itaque non est alienum ab epistolae decoro non imitari rationem illam, quam ceteri servare in explicanda doctrina. Quo circa ne nos quidem operam non necessariam adhibebimus in ordine declarando.....

Poteram facile supersedere hoc labore annotandi quicquam in epistulam de arte poetica: tot enim eruditi homines in eam scriberunt scribuntque quotidie, ut ea brevi pauciores aliquanto versus, quam interpretantes, habita videantur.

[5] Q. Horati Flacci Sermonum Libri Quattuor...a Dionysio Lambino Monstrolensi Ex Fide Novem Librorum Manu Scriptorum Emendati, Ab Eodemque Commentaris Copiosissimis Illustrati (Lyons, apud Ioan. Tornasium, 1561), 480. The second edition was published in Paris in 1568. Where the readings differ, the variant of the first edition is in parentheses. Angular brackets indicate my supplements.

De inscriptione autem huius libri, seu epistolae ad Pisones de arte poetica paucis tibi, lector, sentientiam quorundam doctorum nostrae aetatis virorum, et meam aperiam. Illi igitur eam inter epistolas referendar, et ita inscribendum censemus, ad Pisones: nihil praeterea: a quibus dissentire difficile est. Nam, quin ad Pisones scripta sit [est], quemadmodum aliae ad Maecenatem, aliae ad Iulium Florum: una, ad Augustum: aliae, ad alios, negari id quidem non potest. Neque est, quod
quemquam vel longitudo, vel argumentum moveat. De longitudine facilis responsio est. Epistola ad Augustum, epistola ad Iulium Florum lib. 2 longae sunt. Platonis, et M. Tull<ii> epistolae quaedam sunt longissimae, quae tamen non idcirco epistolarium nomen amittunt. De argumento, suo quaque epistola constat argumento: neque debent esse inanes epistolae. Exempli causa, in prima epistola lib. I hortatur ad studium philosophiae, eius utilitatem demonstrat, vulgi opinionem sequi vetat....Possem eodem modo singulas epistolae percurrere, et quodnam sit cuiusque argumentum indicare, nisi vererer, ne alieno loco haec videar inculcare. Sic igitur Horatius in hac ad Pisones epistola, cum de omni poeseos genere disputat, tum maxime de comedia, et tragoedia utilissima praecepta dat, non ut philosophus, sed ut poeta. Haec me ratio adduxit, ut putem cum multis doctis, primum bane esse epistolam, deinde simpliciter ita esse inscribendam epistola ad Pisones. Quod si quis volet, haec addi, de arte poetica, non reclamabo, modo idem facere licere in omnibus epistolis, fataetur. Ego interea tamen receptam consuetudinem, vulgique opinionem in eo secutus sum, quod hunc titulum de arte poetica retinui: in altero, quod epistolam appellavi, doctorum sententiam approvavi [probavi].


(a) From Preface, p. iii (unpaginated):

Nam et Horatium Artem quum inscripsit, adeo sine ulla docet arte, ut Satyrae propius totum opus illud esse videatur.

(b) p. 336:

Age vero quando non solum Satyra ipsa, verum etiam quodvis opus scripturaeque simplex esse debet et unum: neque in Satyras, neque in Epistulis, at ne in Poetica quidem, in qua hoc ipsum praecipit, observavit.

(c) p. 338:

Haec est Horatii ars: quam si praeceptores nostri nobis olim ad hunc modum partiti essent, eius sane facies nota fuisset, ita ut altius auxilium petendum esse intelligeremus.
Appendix I: Key Texts for the Epistle-Theory


[8] In Q. Horatii Flacci Venusini Librum De Arte Poetica Aldi Manutii Paulli F. Aldi N. Commentarius (Venice, Apud Aldum, 1576), on p. i of the (unpaginated) Prolegomena:


...Quod autem quidam genus huius scripti, volunt esse ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΝ: quidam δΙΑΣΧΟΛΙΚΟΝ. Scendium, si scripsit Horatius ad Pisones, fuisse epistolam, si vero recitavit praesentibus Pisonibus, non iam esse epistolam, sed δΙΑΣΧΟΛΙΚΟΝ. Quicquid tandem sit hoc scriptum Horatii, sive epistola, sive δΙΑΣΧΟΛΙΚΟΝ est ars poetica, docens quomodo faciendus sit λόγος ποιητικός;
ostendens qua ratione possis esse poeta, qua ratione possis vultum poeticum repreaesentare.


Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere, fidus Interpres [Ars Poetica 133-134]. Quotusquisque est enim qui hunc versum Horatii statim in ore non habeat et auctoritate eius nifatur ut verbum verbo reddere, fidi interpretis non esse probet? At ego illis qui in ea sunt opinione non suffragari sed refragari hunc versum Horatii, et contrarium ei quod dicunt, illo probari, atque adeo quod illo probatur, verissimum esse, contendo: esse nimium fidi interpretis, verbum verbo, quantum fieri potest, reddere. Sed quoniam nunc sat est cem quam dico fuisse Horatii mentem ostendere, lectorem moneo subesse huic versui familiarem illi poetae ellipsis particulae Ceu vel Tanquam, aliusve huiusmodi: et intellegi debere, Nec verbum verbo reddere curabis, tanquam fidian interpres. Id est, Perinde acsi fidum interpretum agere velles. Vel, fidi interpretis officio fungi. Tantum
enim abest ut Horatius ei quem compellat, et cui praecepta dat, neget fidi esse interpretis verbum verbo reddere, ut contra diligentiam hanc, seu diligentem operam, fido interpreti relinquendum esse dicat. Esse autem morem Horatii, relinquere subaudiendum illam vocabulum, multis exemplis docui in quaedam Diatriba ex his quas operibus huius poetae in mea editione subiuxi. Atque hanc meam observationem ante multos annos Dionysio Lambino communicavi, cum Patavii degeremus....
APPENDIX II

CALCULATING THE ODDS OF FINDING MATCHED PAIRS OF TREND LINES IN THE LYRICS AND HEXAMETERS

Our fourth criterion for determining whether we have found a good chronometer for Horace's poetry is that the effect we are measuring is not the result of chance (see above, p. 27). In this Appendix, I will show that chance is probably not responsible for our discovery of four function words with similar trend lines in the hexameters and lyrics.

Since our sample consists of the sixteen function words satisfying the requirement of frequency, we have to do with a small sample, since \( n < 30 \). Four of the sixteen members of our sample display the categorical characteristic of similar trend lines in the lyrics and hexameters; twelve do not. We must thus determine whether finding a sample in which—at first glance—25% of the members may be classified as having the required characteristic is statistically significant or not. The test appropriate to making this determination is the binomial test.\(^1\) The formula for this test is:

\[
P(H) = \frac{n^X}{X!(n-X)!} \pi^X (1-\pi)^{n-X}
\]

where \( P \) means probability, \( X \) the number of observations in sample-size \( n \) classified in the required way, and \( \pi \) is the proportion of \( n \) that we expect to be classified as \( X \). To solve this equation with \( n = 16 \) and \( X \leq 16 \), we need to know \( \pi \).

The value of \( \pi \) is dependent on a typology of line types: to know the percentage of matched lyric-hexameter patterns that are theoretically possible—

and hence to calculate how many we ought to find given sixteen chances—we need to determine how many combinations of lyric and hexameter trend lines can occur. To perform these calculations, we need a model of line-types.

The very simplest model of line-types is one that standardizes the interval values of the points constituting a line. The simple model is good enough for our purposes because, by standardizing intervallic values, it gives us a sharp reduction of line-types, hence simplifying the task of classification but also making it more difficult to achieve statistical significance. The simple model is thus quite practical for the case at hand. It gives us, as we will see in a moment, 9 three-point and 81 five-point line types \((3^3)\), whereas a model only modestly more complex—one in which we distinguish two interval increments and decrements on the \(Y\) axis—yields an unworkable 125 three-point and 3,125 \((5^5)\) five-point line types with 390,625 combinations of 3- and 5-point line types.

In the simple model, each point on a line may be followed by one of three new points: a point of greater value (+); a point of the same, or roughly the same, value (0); and a point of lesser value (-). Thus, from any existing point or line of \(x\) points, we may generate three new lines of \(x + 1\) points. The simplest line has two points with three types (positive slope, no slope, and negative slope: Types I-III, not shown). From the two-point lines, we may generate nine three-point lines, as follows:

### Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>positive slope, no slope, negative slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>positive slope, positive slope, no slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>positive slope, no slope, positive slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>positive slope, negative slope, no slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>no slope, positive slope, negative slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>no slope, no slope, positive slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>no slope, no slope, negative slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>no slope, negative slope, positive slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>no slope, negative slope, negative slope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since in this study we are using three books of Horatian lyrics (Epodes, Carm. I-III, and Carm. IV), the shapes in Table 6 provide the typology for the lyrics. We begin our numeration with Type IV, because the complete typology of lines begins with the three two-point lines that generate our nine three-point lines. It may bear repeating that in designing this typology, we are not at all concerned with the
values of actual points on the lines, simply in the mere quantitative relationship of successive points.

Horace's hexameters consist of five works (combining the Satires and placing the Ars Poetica after Epistles I, as implied above in Table VII and as seen in Table K), and so we move now to the five-point lines. These may be generated from the three-point lines by the same procedure, omitting, for the sake of space, an intermediary generation of twenty-seven four-point lines, from which we derive the 81 five-point line types, such as the following:

![Diagram of five-point lines]

**Table β: Types of Potential Patterns in Horace's Use of Function Words in the Hexameters**

We begin numbering this set at xl and end at cxx, since there are altogether thirty-nine two-, three-, and four-point line ancestors to the five-point lines. From Table β, it is easy to see that five-point type xl can be considered equal to three-point type IV; five-point type xlviii can be equated to three-point type VI; etc. The generating principle of such equivalences is symmetry, which is achieved by the insertion of the fourth point between the first and second point of the three-point line and the addition of the fifth point between the second and third point of the three-point line. We will call these equivalences the set \{centered\}, or \{C\}.

Since we are disregarding interval values in this model, it is important to recognize another possible generating principle for equivalence: asymmetry. Two asymmetrical conversions are possible. The first, in which we may imagine the two new points to be added in between points one and two of the three-point line, we will...
call the set \{left\}, or \{L\}. In a second conversion, the two new points are added between the second and third points of the three-point line. This set, asymmetrical to the right, we call \{R\}. Note that it makes no difference whether we visualize our two additional points as being inserted between the preexisting points of the three-point line (as we have done) or before/after the end-points of the three-point line.

From this it follows that there are nine five-point lines in each of the three sets that are exactly equivalent to the nine three-point lines. It also follows that, having converted each three-point type into a five-point equivalent, we can also establish three 81 x 81 matrices—one for each set \{L\}, \{C\}, and \{R\}—measuring the degree of similarity of all five-point lines to each other. The method of measurement is simply the subtraction of one type from another, absolutizing the remainder. If the remainder is 0, the lines are exactly equivalent; if the remainder is 1, they differ slightly at one point; etc. The smaller the remainder, the more similar the lines. Establishing an objective measurement of “similarity” is important, since in statistics, the similarity of line-types is potentially just as important as their exact equivalence.

For the 6,561 combinations of 5-point types in each set, we have the following histogram of equivalence/similarity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REMAINDER</th>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>.0658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>.1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>.2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>.2475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>.1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>.0731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>.0195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.0024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7: COMBINATIONS OF TWO 5-POINT LINE TYPES IN EACH SET**

The “Percentage” column will help us determine the value of \(\pi\) in the formula of the binomial test. Since an equivalent or similar combination can be made by matching a given three-point line to a five-point line in any of the three sets, we must multiply the values in the “Percentage” column by three to establish the probability of finding a pair with these remainders. For example, given a three-point line and a five-point line, the odds of finding a exact match (i.e., remainder = 0) are \(.0123 \times 3 = .0369\). The odds of finding a similar pair with remainder 1 are much higher: \(.0658 \times 3 = .1974\). We can see immediately that similar pairs will prove nothing in our case, since \(.197 \times 16 = 3.15\): that is, all things being
equal, we should expect at least 3 similar pairs among our 16 pairs of function words. We thus limit our search to exact pairs, of which we expect only .590 among our 16 words.

In looking through the five-point line sets for exact matches, we need the following table of the three- to five-point line-type conversions for each set:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>(L)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td>x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>xli</td>
<td>xlii</td>
<td>xlii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>xlii</td>
<td>xlviii</td>
<td>lviii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>lxix</td>
<td>lxvi</td>
<td>lxvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>lxxx</td>
<td>lxxx</td>
<td>lxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>lxxvi</td>
<td>lxxvi</td>
<td>lxxvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>cxvii</td>
<td>cxvii</td>
<td>cxvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>cxx</td>
<td>cxx</td>
<td>cxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8: CONVERSION OF THREE-POINT LINE-TYPES TO THEIR EXACT FIVE-POINT EQUIVALENTS IN THE SETS (L), (C), AND (R)**

The following table reports the remainders of the combinations of lyric and hexameter line-types for the function words with sufficient frequency to be investigated in this study. In boldface are the two words (ad and sed) with an exact correspondence; in capitals are the two words (nee and per) that are very similar (remainder = 1):

**TABLE 9: CLASSIFICATION OF FUNCTION WORD PATTERNS IN HORACE'S LYRICS AND HEXAMETERS**

We now have all the information we need to determine the \( \pi \)-value and to run the binomial test. In testing the odds of calculating \( \pi \) on the basis of three \( 9 \times 81 \) matrices of three-point and five-point combinations, we limit our calculation to the types of three-point lines that satisfy our third criterion of a...
potential chronometer (above, p. 27) that there be a trend in the variation of a word's frequency. Once we apply this requirement, fully five of our nine three-point types can be eliminated from consideration (Types V, VII, VIII, IX, and XI), for these types either imply no change in frequency at all (Type VIII) or else random variation. Two of the remaining four three-point types (IV and XII) are the same in all three five-point sets; we count them only once. The other two (VI, X) are different in all three sets, giving us six possible matches. Thus, out of a total of 729 possible combinations per set, we have globally 8/729, or .01097, possible combinations satisfying all our conditions. We can now solve the binomial test with a π-value of .01097 to see if our two exact equivalences are statistically significant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prob. of X:</th>
<th>X or fewer:</th>
<th>X or more:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P(0)</td>
<td>0.838154</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(1)</td>
<td>0.148798</td>
<td>0.986952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(2)</td>
<td>0.012383</td>
<td>0.999335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(3)</td>
<td>0.000641</td>
<td>0.999976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(4)</td>
<td>0.000023</td>
<td>0.999999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(5)</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(6)</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(7)</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(8-16)</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11: RESULTS OF BINOMIAL TEST, N = 16, π = .01097

In this test of the odds of finding two cases like *ad* and *sed*, the probability that chance alone is responsible is quite low—just 1.2%.

What about *per* and *nee*? It may be granted that chance alone may well have given us the similarity of their hexameter and lyric frequencies. However, when we see that the result of using all four of our function words as chronometers is a date for the *Ars Poetica* in a single period of Horace's life (24-20 B.C.), then the probability that mere randomness is at work is reduced—logically, if not statistically—for, if any or all of our four words were not valid chronometers, then we should expect them to indicate widely different dates for the *Ars Poetica*. This is not the case.
APPENDIX III

PISO IN POLA. THE DATE OF INSCR. ITAL. X.I.81

As noted in the body of this study, three inscriptions from Pola mention a certain L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, whom Sticotti recognized as the consul of 58 B.C. and father-in-law of Julius Caesar.¹ These monuments are of interest because, if datable, they permit us to determine the validity of Münzer's influential theory that Piso died shortly after the Battle of Mutina—a theory based on Piso's alleged absence from the historical record after April of 43 B.C.² Needless to say, Piso's survival well beyond Mutina is a necessary but not sufficient condition for my theory that he is the senior addressee of the Ars Poetica. Inscr. Ital. X.i.81, from a gate in the city wall, is the only inscription of the three found in a datable context. Neither it nor the other two inscriptions (cf. fig. 1) mentioning Piso were taken into account by Münzer. In this appendix, I will reargue the case that Inscr. Ital. X.i.81 is triumviral (42-31 B.C.),

¹Inscr. Ital. X.i.65, 81, 708. See P. Sticotti, "Nuova rassegna di epigrafi romani," AMSI 30 (1914) 113-114. Sticotti's identification can be supported by the facts that the consul's family owned land in Illyria since the second century B.C. (cf. infra, n. 34), the inscription is late-Republican in style, and the city gate, contemporaneous with the city wall, can be dated to the 40s or 30s B.C. (cf. B. Forlati Tamaro AMSI 44 and 48, infra, n. 3) when the consul of 58 was the only known bearer of the name. On Sticotti, see A. Degrassi, "Pietro Sticotti," AMSI 55 (1954) 35-41 (= Scritti vari, vol. 4 [Trieste 1971] 187-192).

²RE III s.v. Calpurnius 90 (Stuttgart 1897) cols. 1387-1390. Münzer, of course, must himself be put into an historical context: the identification of the Piso of the three Pola inscriptions as the consul of 58 occurred almost two decades after Münzer was writing.
something necessitated by two recent studies by Fraschetti and Keppie that independently put the monument into the Caesarian period (46-44 B.C.).

Dating the inscription is unfortunately not a straightforward matter, since it contains no explicit chronological indication. We must thus approach the problem by trying to find the most likely political and archaeological context into which the monument can be fitted. The political context at once supplies a solid *terminus post quem* and a somewhat more fluid *terminus ante quem*. In the inscription Piso and L. Cassius Longinus are called *duoviri*, and the existence of this office in Pola presumes that the Roman colony, *Pietas Iulia*, also exists. Although this name, which is transmitted by Pliny, may be incomplete or otherwise inaccurate, the epithet *Iulia* may be safely accepted as a constituent part of the colony's title. This gives us our *post quem*: after the three Caesarian colonies created at Capua in 59 B.C., no colony is known to have been called *Iulia* before Julius Caesar's foundations of the period 46-44. A less firm *ante

---


4 On Longinus, see Münzer, *RE* III s.v. Cassius (Stuttgart 1897) col. 1739; Longinus was identified as Cassius (65) by P. Sticotti, loc. cit. (*supra* n. 1), and this identification has been accepted by later scholars.

5 *N.H.* 3.129 is our source for the name of the colony.

6 Caesar's earlier colony at Capua came to be known as *Concordia Iulia Felix Augusta*, perhaps indicating that the earliest title was *Concordia Iulia*, as suggested by Mommsen, *CIL* X.1, p. 368. There is no reason to suppose the creation of any Caesarian colonies between 59 and 46. On the colonies of 46-44, see L. Keppie, op. cit. (*supra* n. 3) 49-58.
quem is provided by the bestowal of the title Augustus on Octavian in 27. After that date, Augustan colonies were generally, though not always, given the epithet Augusta or Iulia Augusta. Although the absence of Augusta from Pola’s name would seem to provide a solid enough ante quem, it is important to bear in mind that Pliny always omits Augusta from his references to colonies, unless the colony is founded at a new site with no preexisting name, leaving him no other recourse. When we know that a colonia Iulia mentioned by Pliny is really a colonia Iulia Augusta, this is only because of local inscriptions giving a fuller title. In the case of Pola, we have no such inscriptions from the first century B.C. or A.D. so that we cannot be certain that Pola’s full name did not contain the epithet Augusta. Thus—because such an inscription might someday turn up—in fixing our ante quem we cannot completely rule out the possibility of an Augustan (i.e., post-27 B.C.) foundation. For our purposes, this matters but little, since our main aim here is simply to show that Münzer’s guess that Piso died just after the Battle of Mutina is likely to be wrong. However, if anyone someday makes the case for a deductio of Pola in the years just after 27 B.C., that will only help bolster our interpretation of the Ars Poetica.

Within the period 46-27 B.C. there are three moments at which we would expect a colony to have been planted at Pola; and, as might be expected, each possibility has found its scholarly advocate: (1) 46-44, by Julius Caesar; (2) 42-41, by Octavian; and (3) 41-31, by Octavian. For purposes of refuting Münzer, it is not absolutely necessary to reject any of these dates: the context of Inscr. Ital. XI.81 is a city gate known to be contemporary with the earliest city


8Examples of the latter in Italy are Augusta Praetoria, Augusta Taurinorum, and Augusta Bagiennorum (for the archaeological evidence that these were not founded on preexisting sites, cf. The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites [Princeton 1976] 114, 116, 118). Outside Italy, Pliny’s policy can be similar: cf. the case of C(colonia) C(aesarea) A(ugustae) A(sido) (CIL IL5407), called Asido Caesarina by Pliny in N.H. 3.30. Cf., in general, B. Galsterer-Kröll, op. cit. (supra n. 7) 57-59. This is an important point because in the period 46-27 B.C. Pola was not yet in reg. X Italia. Until c. 18-12 B.C., Pola and Istria formed part of Illyria; see Weiss in RE VIII s.v. Histria (Stuttgart 1913) cols. 2111-2112; E. Polaschek, op. cit. (supra n. 3) cols. 1219-1220; A. Degrassi, Review of Polaschek in AMSI n.s. 2 (1952) 226-227 (= Scr. vari, vol. 4 [Trieste 1971] 244-245).

9L. Kepple and A. Fraschetti, opp. cit. (supra n. 3).

10A. Degrassi, B. Forlati Tamaro, and E. Gabba, opp. cit. (supra n. 3).

11T. Mommsen, E. Pais, E. Kornemann, B. Forlati Tamaro (AMSI 44 and 48), M. P. Charlesworth, and M. Zanimovic, opp. cit. (supra n. 3).
walls of Pola. These walls may be contemporaneous with the founding of the colony, or, as we will see, they may date from a few years later. Thus, even if the controversy over the founding of the colony at Pola should be settled in favor of 46-44, this does not necessarily mean that Inscr. Ital. X.I.81 cannot have been inscribed in the 30s. But does the colony date to the Caesarian period?

The odds are against such a date: Octavian/Augustus founded many more colonies than did Julius Caesar. Caesar's colonies were concentrated in a few provinces—particularly in Africa and Spain. Augustus' were spread all over the empire. Of the three kinds of colonies—civilian settlements, titular colonies, and veterans' settlements—Pola almost certainly falls into the first class. We know that, in provincial colonization, Caesar favored the last class, for he was, of course, mainly preoccupied with finding land for his veterans. Augustus was also heavily involved in settling veterans on the land. He was, however, also more apt than Caesar to upgrade a conventus civium Romanorum into a colonia, reinforcing the Roman population with new settlers. Finally, Octavian was personally active in military campaigns on the Dalmatian coast, whereas Caesar did not live long enough to undertake his Balkan expedition. This puts Octavian, but not Caesar, in the immediate vicinity of Pola and makes an Octavian foundation more likely.

Against this background, we can appreciate why, before 1983, the consensus of scholars was that Pola became a colony under Octavian sometime between Philippi and Actium. What arguments did Keppie and Fraschetti bring forward in that year in favor of an earlier, Caesarian date?

Keppie begins by trying to disprove a triumviral date. He first claims that Degrassi probably erred in using the Arch of the Sergii in Pola as evidence of the settlement of military colonists in the town after Philippi. Granting that Piso would have been an excellent candidate to help either Caesar or Octavian organize the new colony because of his experience at Capua in 58, Keppie finds...
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a Caesarian date more likely "in that Piso is not known to have been alive after 43 B.C." Finally, the second duovir on Inscr. Ital. X.i.81, L. Cassius Longinus, as brother of the tyrannicide C. Cassius, is unlikely to have been reconciled with Octavian after Philippi, though Keppie does note that Longinus was pardoned by Antony. 17

In rebuttal of Keppie, let us first note that he has not fully appreciated how Degrassi uses the Arch of the Sergii as chronological evidence. 18 Degrassi does not state that Pola was a military colony. 19 Establishing the family relationships of L. Sergius and C. Sergius (brothers) and of L. Sergius L. f. (son of L. Sergius), Degrassi uses the disbandment of Legio XXIX after Actium as a terminus post quem for the aedileship of L. Sergius L. f., which he dated to c. 25. Postulating a gap of at least ten years between the aedileships of father and son, Degrassi puts the founding of the colony in the year 35, at the latest. Degrassi then speculates that the gap between the aedileships was a few years greater, considering it unlikely that L. and Cn. Sergius would have colonized Pola when Lucius already had a grown-up child of military age. Degrassi's use of the inscriptions on the Arch of the Sergii can be criticized, but the point is not that Degrassi is wrong to use the arch's inscriptions for chronology, but that he has perhaps tried too hard to push the date back as far as he can toward 42/41. In fact, we can just as easily push the date forward a couple of years, e.g., by imagining that L. and Cn. Sergius did not arrive with the founders of the colony, but a few years later, or by not balking at the idea that L. Sergius L. f. was a teenager when his father settled in Pola.

The arguments about Piso and Longinus are also not compelling. Following Münzer's theory about Piso's demise just after Mutina is fallacious: Münzer wrote before Sticotti identified the Polan Piso as the consul of 58, so he could not take the material from Pola into account in his RE article; thus, following Münzer is a petitio principii. As for Longinus, it is likely that he was much more in Antony's debt than in Octavian's after his return from exile in Asia in 41 B.C., for it was Antony who permitted his return. 20 This can be taken as evidence supporting a triumviral date, for, invoking the model of the colonization of Capua (to be discussed in a moment in our critique of Fras-

17 L. Keppie, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 204.
19 All the evidence is against a military colony at Pola; cf. E. Polaschek, op. cit. (supra n. 3) col. 1246; in Degrassi's rather critical review of Polaschek (op. cit. [supra n. 8], he does not object to Polaschek's observation "daß Pola eine Militärkolonie gewesen wäre erfährt von keiner Seite eine Bestätigung."
20 Appian Bell. Civ. 5.7.28.
chetti), we might have expected Pola to be organized precisely by a stand-in for each of the two principal triumvirs, if not by the principals themselves.\(^{21}\)

Fraschetti's case is similar but more complex. Taking aim at Degrassi's date of 42/41, which is based on the theory that the colony's epithet *Pietas* makes most sense just after Octavian's vengeance against his father's murderers at the battle of Philippi,\(^{22}\) Fraschetti tries to show that a date in Caesar's lifetime is also consistent with the slogan *Pietas*.\(^{23}\) Of course, such a demonstration cannot be decisive, since it does not, per se, rule out a date after Philippi, nor does Fraschetti deny the possibility that Degrassi is correct. Moreover, Fraschetti's case for 46-44—which is dependent on Caesarian coins issued in 48/47 with *Pietas* themes\(^{24}\)—is not very cogent. Had it been possible to argue that Pola was founded in 49/48, this evidence might have been useful: however, as Fraschetti is well aware, "Caesar's work in founding colonies did not begin before 46."\(^{25}\) A date of 46/45 is, however, quite damaging to Fraschetti's thesis, since precisely in that period the slogan of *Pietas* was appropriated by the Pompeian side in the civil war. At Munda in 46, *Pietas* was the battle cry of the Pompeians, *Venus* of the Caesarians.\(^{26}\) Starting the year after Munda, Sex. Pompeius made *pietas* toward his father a hallmark of his propaganda, especially through his coinage.\(^{27}\) Moreover, as used by Caesar in 48/47, *pietas* was by no means a novel concept and hence one that the Romans of the period might primarily associate with him. It had been used in several political contexts during the previous fifty years and even during the early triumviral period could be exploited by Antony just as easily as Octavian, judging from the numismatic evidence.\(^{28}\) The epithet, *Pietas*, then, cannot be a decisive factor in determining

---

\(^{21}\)Cf. A. Fraschetti, op. cit. (*supra n. 3*) 93, who astutely recognizes the political balancing act involved in the colonization of Capua whereby a Caesarian law favored settlement of Pompeian veterans and was implemented, first in 58 by Piso—i.e., Caesar's father-in-law—and then, then next year, by Pompey himself.

\(^{22}\)A. Degrassi, op. cit. (*supra n. 3*) 62.

\(^{23}\)A. Fraschetti, op. cit. (*supra n. 3*) 80-90.

\(^{24}\)Fraschetti refers (p. 86) to denarii minted by the Caesarian D. Junius Brutus Albinus and by Caesar himself; for the coins, see, respectively, *nrr* 450, 2 and 452, 3 in M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge 1974).

\(^{25}\)P. A. Brunt, op. cit. (*supra n. 7*) 101; Z. Yavetz, *Julius Caesar and his Public Image* (London 1983) 144; L. Keppie, op. cit. (*supra n. 3*) 50. Note that Fraschetti himself writes, “nell'ambito delle due datazioni proposte (47 e primi mesi del 46 o ultimi mesi del 46 e 45 a.C.) la più probabile appare forse la seconda” (p. 102).

\(^{26}\)Appian *Bell. Civ.* 2.104.

\(^{27}\)Cf. *nrr* 477, 3a-3b; 478, 1a; 479, 1 in M. H. Crawford, op. cit. (*supra n. 24*).

\(^{28}\)Cf. M. H. Crawford, op. cit. (*supra n. 24*) *nrr* 308 (108/107 B.C.); 374 (81 B.C.); 477, 3a-3b; 494, 19 (42 B.C.—triumviral); 516, 4 (41 B.C.—M. Anto-
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the circumstances of Pola's foundation. If anything, it tends to rule out Caesar and the period 46/45.

Fraschetti next turns his attention to Piso and Longinus, whom he cogently identifies as the primi duoviri of the new colony, invoking the parallel case of [L.] Marcus Philippus, the consul of 56 or suffect consul of 38 B.C., who served as primus duovir of Herculaneum.\(^29\) Recalling the “compromise” of Capua in 59-57, whereby a notable Caesarian (Caesar’s father-in-law, Piso) alternated with Pompey himself as duovir of the new colony (see above, n. 21), Fraschetti is perplexed to find such marginal and politically ambivalent men as Piso and Longinus serving as duoviri in Pola in the early triumviral period. For Fraschetti, their collaboration in Pola makes much more sense in the mids-40s, when both were ardent Caesarians.

Now, first of all, it should be noted that Fraschetti assumes that the “Capuan compromise” represented a norm in colony foundation, whereas it may only reflect the exceptional and very delicate political situation of the early years of the first triumvirate. In the 40s and 30s, so many colonies were founded that we cannot assume that the same standards obtained in the section of primi duoviri (always assuming that Piso and Longinus were such). Secondly, Fraschetti misrepresents Syme on Piso and the historical record when he says that Syme characterized Piso as “as ex-Caesarian turned independent.”\(^30\) When he made that statement, Syme was referring to Piso in the fall of 44 B.C.; later, he saw Piso acting as a wise statesman trying to mediate between Antony and the Senate on the eve of the battle of Mutina (April, 43): “Piso stood for concord and good sense when others...were for extreme measures against Marcus Antonius in 44 and 43.”\(^31\) Such a stance must have endeared him to Antony as much as it renewed Cicero’s old feud with his erstwhile nemesis.\(^32\) It certainly would have positioned him well to serve the interests of Antony and Octavian in the early years of the second triumvirate. As for Longinus, a strong supporter of Caesar in the civil war, his flaw was the guilt-by-association that came from being the brother of the tyrannicide, C. Cassius. Syme called him “a brother of...
the assassin but a Caesarian in sympathy."33 When circumstances after Caesar's murder made it dangerous for Longinus to tarry in Rome, he fled to Asia, where, as noted above (cf. n. 20) Antony met and pardoned him in 41. Finally, Piso and Longinus are thus by no means an odd couple to be serving as duoviri (whether primi duoviri or not) in Iulia Piaetas in the triumviral period. It was undoubtedly possession of large family estates in the neighborhood of Pola that made their choice seem not only appropriate but logical.34

That neither Keppie nor Fraschetti has succeeded in finding a good reason to date the colony to the Caesarian period does not, of course, mean that no good argument or decisive piece of evidence may someday be found, nor does their failure to move the date back necessarily justify our leaving it where it was before 1983. To make further progress, we need to put Pola into a larger geopolitical and archaeological context, which will present us with some evidence less ambiguous than colonial nomenclature and late-republican prosopography.

Doubtless influenced by Pola's later incorporation in regio X Italia, scholars from Mommsen onwards have viewed the problem of Pola in the context of colonial policy in Italy.35 Yet, as noted above (see n. 8), Pola belonged to Illyria, not to Italia, when it was colonized. Seen as a key base on the eastern Adriatic coast,36 Pola naturally takes its place among Octavian's colonial foundations or augmentations after his successful Illyrian campaign of 35-33.37 In fact, all up and down the coast from Epidaurum to Tergeste we find evidence of Roman colonization in the period 47-33. The result was a well-spaced series of colonial ports, each one about sixteen to twenty-four hours sailing time from the next.38 Here are the approximate sailing distances in Roman miles:

33R. Syme, op. cit. (supra n. 30) 132n3. On Longinus in the civil war, see Caesar Bell. Civ. 3.34-35.
35Cf. T. Mommsen, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 182, 192, 212; L. Keppie, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 203-204.
36As suggested, in passing, by M. P. Charlesworth, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 88 and J. J. Wilkes, op. cit. (supra n. 34) 57: “in Illyricum, the achievement of Octavian was modest and solid rather than spectacular...On the coast colonies were established at Pola in Istria and Iader in Liburnia, and the older Caesarian colonies, Salona, Narona, and Epidaurum, were strengthened by new settlements.”
37On the campaign, see Wilkes, op. cit., (supra n. 34) 46-56.
38Roman ships averaged from 2.5 knots (unfavorable winds) to 5.0 knots (favorable); see L. Casson, Ships and Seamen in the Ancient World (Princeton 1971) 281-296. It is possible that Senia should also be included here, but whether the
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Tergeste—Pola: 70 miles
Pola—Iader: 95 miles
Iader—Salona: 100 miles
Salona—Narona: 70 miles
Narona—Epidaurum: 115 miles

This looks very much like a planned occupation of a strategically vital and agriculturally rich coast, reminiscent of the early Roman maritime colonies on the Tyrhennian coast and—more pertinently—of Caesar's coastal colonies in Spain and Africa. About the date of most of these colonies, the same debate rages that we have seen in the case of Pola, and so trying to settle the date of Pola by recourse to such slippery data might seem to exemplify explaining obscurum per obscurius. This is not, I think, the case, because once these towns are considered together—as, to my knowledge, they never have been—common features emerge that can be decisive for breaking up chronological and other logjams.

One feature common to all the eastern Adriatic colonies is a peculiar form of centuriation in which we find the usual 200-iugera unit with a rather unusual orientation on a NW-SE axis and with a rare system of limites demarcated by means of stones. We might explain this distinctive form in one of two ways: either it results from a long-standing regional tradition, or it is the signature of a team of agrimensores active at all the sites. In the second case, colony there (known from Tac. Hist. 4.45) dates from our period (46-27 B.C.) or later is not known; see the discussion in G. Alföldy, op. cit. (supra n. 15) 362-363.

Strabo 7.5.10 attests the area's economic advantages and implies that Roman appreciation of the Illyrian coast was a relatively recent development: τοινάτι διόδα δαλιγαρίτω πράγκεραν ή Ι'λλυρική παραλία, τάγα μάλιστα κατ' αγνοιαν τής δάρης, τό μέντοι πλέον δια τήν αγριώτητα τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὸ λιπασμάτων ἰθός.

On Tergeste, see L. Keppie, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 201-202; on the Dalmatian towns, see J. J. Wilkes, op. cit. (supra n. 34) 207 (Iader), 220-238 (Salona), 245-252 (Narona), 252 (Epidaurum).

centuriation can be a factor for chronology, since the agrimensores will have worked along the Illyrian coast for a relatively short period of time, and if we can date one colony's centuriation, we have an approximate date for them all. The second explanation seems more likely because such regional traditions are hard to find elsewhere. Of the Illyrian centuriations in question, we do have one firmly datable case—Iader, where the colony was planted in the late thirties or early twenties. Such a period—after Octavian's triumph in the Illyrian campaign of 35-33—is more probable in any case on geopolitical grounds than the period 46-41, since centuriation presumes good enough regional security for exploitation of the territory and hinterlands of a colony. On the other hand, the successful conclusion of the Illyrian war provides more than a mere post quem: centuriation generally coincides with the founding of a colony. These considerations make it likely that the colony at Pola was founded by Octavian in the period 33-27 B.C.

A second common element in these colonies is a town wall in stone. As with centuriation, we can use any firmly datable examples to give us a probable time frame for all the sites. Two walls are securely datable by inscriptions giving credit to Octavian/Augustus for their construction: Tergeste (33/32 B.C.) and Iader (27 B.C.). It is sometimes assumed that, like centuriation, the construction of permanent city walls was immediately undertaken when a new colony was started; but this was not always the case. Fanum Fortunae, a triumviral colony, received its first walls decades later in 9/10 A.D. Closer to home, we know that the first colony at Salona had no wall in the 40s B.C. To resist a seige by the Pompeian commander, M. Octavius, the pro-Caesarian


43The date of the colony is approximately given by CIL 3.2907, where Octavian is called Imp(erator) Caesar Divi F(ilius) Aug(ustus).

44This is a scholarly commonplace: cf., e.g., F. Vittinghoff, op. cit. (supra n. 13) 24, "Landvermessung durch Agrimensoren und Landzuweisung durch kaiserliche Beauftragte waren die selbstverständliche Begleitakte jeder Kolonisation." See also E. T. Salmon, op. cit. (supra n. 13) 20. Here I should note that Salona—already a colony in the Caesarian period—is not necessarily counter-evidence of a single centuriation project because it was a double foundation. For the evidence, see J. W. Kubitschek, Imperium Romanum Tributum Discriptum (Prague, Vienna, Leipzig 1889) 236; cf. G. Alfoldy, op. cit. (supra n. 15) 358; J. J. Wilkes, op. cit. (supra n. 34) 223-224. The centuriation at Salona may thus be associated with the second colony of the late 30s.


46Cf. CIL XI.6219; A. Degrassi, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 52.
Salonians quickly erected a wooden wall that successfully served its purpose.\(^{47}\) Beseiged on all sides by five castra, and protected only by their wooden towers, the Salonians thwarted Octavius' siege, forcing him to withdraw. This episode gives us concrete information showing why stone walls were not a high priority for new colonies, at least on the Illyrian coast. They could be built later, in times of greater peace and security, as happened at Tergeste and Iader. The parallels of these two cities—and the perpendicular of the absence of a stone wall at Salona in the 40s—make a date of c. 33 B.C. the likeliest for the walls of Pola, too.

In conclusion, we may say that the rare form of centuriation found at Pola and other Roman colonies on the Illyrian coast suggests that the territory of Pola and of the other cities was first exploitable after Octavian's Dalmatian campaign of the 30s firm up Roman control of the hinterland; the date of the founding of Iader supports such a chronology of the centuriation project. At the same time the fields were centuriated, the town centers were protected by a permanent wall, as is securely known from the datable examples at Tergeste and Iader. Since their names appear on the oldest gate of the wall at Pola, the duoviri Piso and Longinus must have held office in the colony in the late 30s when the wall was built, and Münzer's theory of Piso's demise soon after Mutina—proposed, as we have seen, before Sticotti identified Piso in Pola—can be considered highly unlikely.

\(^{47}\)Caesar Bell. Civ. 3.9: “Sed celeriter cives Romani ligneis effectis turribus his sese munierunt et, cum essent infirmi ad resistentium propter paucitatem hominum crebris confecti vulneribus, ad extremum auxilium descederunt servosque omnes puberes liberaverunt et praeseptis omnium mulierum crinis tormenta effecerunt.”
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GENERAL INDEX

Accius, L.: 63n
Actium: 119
ad: 32, 36, 47-48
addressee: changeable in didactic poem, 95-96; characteristics in Ars Poetica, 96
adynaton: 69
Anonymous Bobiensis: 14n
Antonius, M. (Antony): 119-121
archaism: Varronian, 63; Sallustian, 8n
Arístarchus: 64
Aristotle: 69, 71
Asinius: C. Asinius Pollio: 63n, 90n
association tests: 32; controlling for “rest”: 33-34, 37; defined: 23n
Augustus: colonies of: 117-118
Becichemo, Marino: 9, 101
book-length: 11-12
Borussus, Joannes Lobartus: 11
Boscotrecase: 80-81
Bradbury, Malcolm: 61, 100
Caecilius: Q. Caecilius Epírrotas: 60n
Caesar: (see under Julius)
Calpurnia: 54
Calpurnius: identification of family in Ars Poetica: 52-59; and Horace’s contemporary reader:
56-58; Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 23): 3, 51, 52, 56; L. Calpurnius Piso Caesóninus (cos. 58): 3; and Cícero, 54, 57; dedicatee of Ars Poetica, 66; in Pola, 115-125; is Piso père of Ars Poetica, 54, 59; property in Illyria, 122; year of his death, 55-56; L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex (cos. 15): 51-53, is maior iuvenum of Ars Poetica, 54, 59
Calpus: 53; and legendary genealogies: 53n
Campania: late Second Pompeian Style in, 80
Capua: 116, 119, 121
Cascellius, A.: 20
Catius: in Sat. II.4: 97
Catullus: 1, 4, 65, 66; and Piso: 57
centuriation: and regional security, 124; on Illyrian coast: 123
Chabotius, Petrus Gualterius: 11
Charisius: 12-16; erroneous titles in: 13; two classes of citations: 14; erroneous names of authors in: 15
Charisius-group: 14n
chi-square test: 23-25; and nominal variables, 28; defined: 23n
Cicero: 3; and L. Calpurnius Piso Cae­s­soninus: 54, 64; attacks on Piso known to Horace: 58-59; opinion of Maecius: 62;
colonies: and centuriation: 123-124; nomenclature: 116-117; on Illyrian coast: 122-123
Colonius, Nicolaus: 88n
Concordia Iulia Felix Augusta: 116n
Contingency test: 32
Cosentia: 65
Cramer V test: 32
Crispinus: in Sat. II.7: 97
Cruquius, Iacobus: 11
cum: no trend in Horace’s use: 31
Damasippus: in Sat. II.3: 97
De Nores, Jason: 8-9, 88n, 91n, 102
descriptio: 73
didactic letters: 89
didactic poem: addressee of: 90; relevance of addressee in: 96
Digentia: 80 (see also under Licenza)
Domitii Pisones: 53n
drama: in decline in Horace’s lifetime: 63
Du Verdier, Claude: 10
duoviri: 121
Epicureanism: 59; and poetry: 67
Epidaurum: 123
epistle-theory: and De Nores: 9
Erasmus: 9
Fabricius, Georgius: 8
fantasy-style: 76-77
Fanum Fortunae: 124
Federalist Papers: authorship of: 27
function words: 113; and connotation: 27, 29-30; and genre: 30; and random fluctuation in use of: 27, 30; and trends in use of: 27, 29; defined: 26; and Horace: 31
Gabriele, Trifone: 9
Gell, Sir William: 80n
genre: and interpretation: 87; Horatian mixed: 99; of Ars Poetica: 87-99
grammatici: unreceptive to new poetry: 60
griffins: 80, 83, 84
Heinsius, Daniel: 88n
Hesiod: 90
Horace: and critics, 59-61; drama: 63; and mixture of genres: 99; and Philodemus: 64; characteristics of his verse epistles: 92-96; chronology of his poetry: 27; hexameter poems and five-point lines: 111; knew Cicero’s attacks on Piso: 58-59; lyric poems and three-point lines: 110; opinion of Maecius: 62; Sabine villa of: 82;
—Ars Poetica = Epistula ad Pisones?
3, 5; = Epist. II.3? 6, 11; echoes of Horatian poems in: 19; and Epist. II.19: 59-61; and Epist. II.3; and persona­theory: 2-3; and Roman painting: 52, 74-85; and sermo: 4, 98; ante quem date: 20, 48-49; classified as didactic: 90n; confessional? 2; date: 3, 17-49; date and strings: 42-47; dated with Epist. I: 22, 29, 39, 43, 59; didactic features of: 89-92, 96; ending of: 93; epistolary features of: 92-95; genre: 4, 52, 87-100; history-of-ideas and dating: 19; independent work in corpus: 3; meter and date: 21-25; methods for dating: 18-19; not dated with Epist. II.1: 36; not technical hand-book: 88; position in
mss.: 2-3, 6-7; post quem date: 20, 49; problem of its structure: 74, 89n; reception of: 2; senior addressee of: 3; speaker's abuse of license: 73; speaker's authority in: 4, 61-65; speaker's conservatism: 63; speaker's ignorance: 85; speaker's inconsistency: 63-64; speaker's misuse of metaphor: 73-74; speaker's pedantry: 4, 61; title: 5-16; titles in Charisius: 12-16
Lader: 123; date of founding: 124; date of city wall: 124
interval variables: 29; and absolute chronology: 43-44; defined: 23n
iste: 96
Lunius: M. Lunius Congus: 65
juvenis: defined: 54n, 56n
Julius: C. Julius Caesar: 115, 116, 117, 118
Laelius, D.: 65
Laelius, Q.: 72n
Laelius Archelaus: 72n
Lambda test: 32
Lambinus, Dionysius (= Denis Lambin): 8, 10, 103-104, 107
Legio XXIX: 119
letter: informality of: 91
license: poetic: 69, 71-74
Licenza: Horace's (?) villa at: 80, 82-83
lines: conversion of three-point to five-point: 111-112; definition of "similarity": 112; three- and five-point types: 32; typology of: 110-111
Livy: 89n
Lodge, David: 61
Lucilius, C.: 65
Lucretius: 89, 90
macrochronometers: and length of words, words per sentence, unique vs. non-unique strings: 41; defined: 41
Maccenas, C.: 63, 66, 93; gave Horace his Sabine villa? 82n
Manutius, Aldus (II): 13, 105
Melissus, C.: 63
metaphor: mixed: 73; sign of genius: 74
meter: controlling for: 30; Horace's lyric and hexameter poems: 30; misuse of: 72
method: Morellian: 27
methodology: and persona-theory: 2-3; art-historical: 2; statistical: 2, 26-30
model-building: principle of parsimony: 36, 37n, 40
modelling: exploratory: 47; of data: 29, 36, 39, 43
monsters: in late Second Pompeian Style: 75-85; interpretation of in Ars Poetica: 70-73
Muret, Marc-Antoine: 10, 103-104
Mutina: Battle of: 115; and death of Piso: 55
Nabokov, Vladimir: 61
Narona: 123
nec: 37, 47-48; and ne: 40
Neoptolemus of Parium: 65
nominal variables: 28; defined: 23n
Numa Pompilius, king: 53
obtrectatores: of Virgil and Horace: 60
Octavian: 118, 119, 120, 122, 124, 125; Illyrian campaign: 122
(see also under Augustus)
Ofellus: in Sat. II.2: 97
ordinal variables: defined: 23n
paradigm: 99-100
parody: xi, 4, 19, 51, 52, 61, 77, 97, 100; at beginning of Ars Poetica: 68-85
New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica

Parrasio, Aulo Giano: 7
Peacham, Henry: 10
per: 37, 47-48
Persius, C.: 65
Phalaris: 3, 57, 64
Philodemus: 65, 67; and Horace: 64n; and Piso: 57, 64; poems about Piso: 66
pietas: 120
Pietas Iulia: (see under Pola.)
pinacotheca: 84n
Pisonis: (see under Calpurnius.)
Plautus: 64
Pliny: colony names in: 116-117
Pola: 3; Arch of the Sergii: 118-119; centuriation of: 123-124; city wall of: 56, 115-117; incorporated into regio X Italia: 122; inscriptions mentioning L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in: 55-56, 115-125; part of Illyria: 122; Pietas Iulia: 116, 120
Pompeian Styles: first and second: 75
Pompey: Cn. Pompeius Magnus: 64
Porphyrio: 53, 56, 70, 82n, 89; and mistaken identifications in: 54
Priapus: in Sat. I.8: 98
prosopography: 3
Ps.-Acro: 16, 70, 82n, 89
Pupii Pisonis: 53n
Quintilian: 9, 16, 70, 72
Quintilius: Quintilius Varus Cremonensis: 20, 28, 36, 66-68
Ramus, Petrus: 11
regression analysis: 44-48
rhetoric: misuse of: 4, 72
Riccoboni, Antonio: 9n, 88n
Robortello, Francesco: 9, 88n, 102
Sallust: 63n
Salona: 123; city wall of: 124-125
Sanchez, Francisco: 89n
Sardianus: 70, 74n
Scaliger, Julius Caesar: 10, 104
Scaliger, Joseph: 88n
Scylla: 84-85
Sebastiani, Filippo Alessandro: 80n
sed: 32, 37, 47-48
sermo: 4; and Horatian persona: 98; and monologues: 97; Horace's definition: 96-97; open-ended: 93; mock-didactic features of: 97; parody in: 97
Sicily: 65
Sinnius Capito: 90n
Sosius: 20
sphinx: 80
Stephanus, Henricus (= Henri Estienne): 7, 10, 12, 105, 106-107
Stertinius: in Sat. II.5: 97
stops: and sentence length, 41-42
Strabo: on advantages of Illyrian coast: 123n
strings: defined: 42; unique vs. non-unique: 41, 42-43, 44-47; and date of Ars Poetica: 47
Sturmi, Johann: 11, 105-106
stylistics: statistical: 2, 26-30
Suetonius: 60
Tarentum: 65
Tergeste: 123, 124
time-order: 28
Timon of Phlius: 100
Tiresias: in Sat. II.5: 98
titles: and interpretation: 5
Tuscanus, Joannes Aloisius: 7n
Ulysses: in Sat. II.5: 98
Uncertainty test: 32
unity: in Aristotle's *Poetics*: 69n
Valerius: M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus: 20, 90n; C. Valerius Catullus: (see under Catullus)
Valgius: C. Valgius Rufus: 90n
variables: three kinds defined: 23n
Varus: (see under Quintilius)
Venus: 120
verisimilitude: 73, 76
Verrius: M. Verrius Flaccus: 16, 90n
Virgil: 20, 67, 89, 90
Vitruvius: a "pedantic conservative": 76; condemnation of late Second Pompeian Style: 74-76
vocabulary: misuse of: 72; and stylo-metrics: 26
walls: of Illyrian colonies: 124-125; wood vs. stone: 125
wisdom literature: 90n
word-length: 41
Zeuxis: 77n
### Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>EPD</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>EP1</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EP2.2</th>
<th>EP2.1</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>TOT</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATOE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONEC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENMD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCFN</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEQUE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUNC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUDEM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERPE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANDEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTE</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTEL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L.F. = low frequency (25% of cells [i.e., 2.25, rounded up to 3] have fewer than 5 cases; C.1-III count as one cell)  
N.P. = no pattern  
\( \equiv \) meets conditions for consideration as chronometer
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