

UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

Review of Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes by M. C. J. Putnam

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9tz7v1jh>

Journal

New England Classical Newsletter & Journal, 17(4)

ISSN

0739-1188

Author

Hexter, Ralph Jay

Publication Date

1990-05-01

Peer reviewed

NEW ENGLAND
CLASSICAL NEWSLETTER
&
JOURNAL



Published at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst
for the Classical Association of New England

Co-Editors:

Elizabeth E. Keitel, University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Gilbert W. Lawall, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Associate Editors:

John W. Ambrose, Jr., Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine
Matthew I. Wiencke, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire
William F. Wyatt, Jr., Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

Book Review Editor:

Thomas A. Suits, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

VOLUME XVII

MAY 1990

NUMBER 4

book. At times the macrons seem to be Sinkovich's nemesis. The worst instances are in the third declension, where the false length is given in the model *corpus, corpōris, corpōrī*, etc. (p. 52, reinforced by *tempōris* and *arbōris* in the Latin-to-English vocabulary): *lītoris*, however, is right. She usually leaves "hidden" length (as in *plēbs* and *āctor*) unmarked. However, in verbs of the third conjugation, if the present has a long vowel in the root, she is liable to carry it through the principal parts, regardless of the evidence; thus, "dīcō, dīcere, dīxī, dīctus" in contrast to "regō, regere, rexī, rectus," whereas the true forms are *dīctus, rēxī, and rēctus*.

She gives the perfect passive participle in the masculine form, even if the verb is intransitive—e.g., "veniō, venīre, vēnī, ventus come"—and therefore only the neuter singular, used impersonally, is possible: *Ventum est* "People came." Grammars and dictionaries would serve their users best by listing the fourth principal part of transitive verbs in *-us* and of intransitive verbs in *-um* (if attested).

I know of no beginners' book that delays the future indicative of the third and fourth conjugations until the present subjunctive has been introduced, so as to explain how in the first person singular the subjunctive form *pōnam, audiam*, etc., does double duty. An untoward result of taking "pōnam, pōnēs, pōnet" for a valid paradigm of the future indicative is to create non-existent future forms "volam, nōlam, mālam" (p. 154), on the basis of "volēs, volet," etc.

This book also perpetuates the age-old mislabeling of the gerundive as "future passive participle"; yet all the examples are close enough to real Latin and therefore do not bear out the false characterization. Thus, "*Urbs capienda est*. The city *must be* (ought to be, has to be) captured" (p. 205), but "*Urbem captūrī sumus*. We are going to capture the city" (p. 207). If the gerundive were really a future passive participle, the meaning would be "The city is going to be captured."

There is much more right than wrong in Sinkovich's book. I point out the shortcomings because, in order to write a reliable elementary grammar, you must know the in's and out's of the language thoroughly.

Saul Levin
SUNY—Binghamton

Michael C. J. Putnam, *ARTIFICES OF ETERNITY: HORACE'S FOURTH BOOK OF ODES*. Cornell University Press, 124 Roberts Place, Ithaca, NY 14851. 1986. 352 pp. Hardcover (ISBN 0-8014-1852-6) \$25.00.

In 1985, Professor Putnam inaugurated the Townsend Lectures at Cornell University, and if this handsome volume is any indicator, the Townsend Lectures will join the Sather and Martin series in inspiring distinguished contributions to the study of the Classics. While Putnam's role for the series is originary, his service to Horace is, in his own words, "an act of rehabilitation" (9). While several of *Odes* 4 have received intense study over the years and some of them high praise—Housman is said to have told his Cambridge undergraduates that he considered *Odes* 4.7 "the most beautiful poem in ancient literature"—as a whole Horace's fourth book has always stood in the shadow of *Odes* 1-3, the *monumentum aere perennius* (3.30.1), and the perception that Horace's hitherto proud independence had given way to forced admiration of Augustus, an idea promoted, as Putnam says, by Suetonius' life of the poet (*eumque coegerit . . . tribus carminum libris ex longo intervallo quartum addere*). By contrast, Putnam contends "that the fifteen odes which comprise Horace's last lyric offering are the rightful capstone of his accomplishment, beautifully crafted in themselves and shaped into a composition of exceptional power and brilliance" (9). Over the next 317 pages Putnam manages to convince the reader, this reader at least, of the rightness of his view. The only word in his thesis that gives me pause is "rightful," which betrays the close reader for whom the unity of the text is overdetermined and for whom every great poem is the best of all possible poems, created by an omniscient and omnipotent poet. I raise this issue not to undermine Putnam's appreciation or interpretations of the poems, but to remind us that these seemingly unquestionable assumptions themselves mark a position. Nor do I mean to suggest that Putnam interprets either the individual poems or the whole book out of either historical or literary context. Putnam is quite right that whatever the date of composition of the individual odes, our task is to try to understand the carefully structured whole which Horace published at a certain point—Putnam retains the traditional 13 B.C.

as the most likely date—in the histories of Rome and Roman poetry. Putnam's comments remind the reader of the most recent landmarks in each series, from the passage of Augustus' moral legislation to his military campaigns and triumphs in the first, and from Propertius' third book (which takes us back to the late 20's) and Vergil's *Aeneid* (19 B.C. or shortly thereafter) to the entire series of Horace's own poetic achievement, notably the *carmen saeculare* of 17 B.C. in the second.

Putnam takes up each of the fifteen odes in the order in which the reader moving through the book would come upon them: "a book of poems should be read as a developing entity" (24). The text he prints (without apparatus) is with one exception that of Klingner's third Teubner edition; his prose translations are accurate, and while they are meant to be modest, they are at times artificial (*abi, quo* [4.1.7–8] becomes "away, whither" [34]; 4.12.28 is rendered "sweet is un wisdom opportune" [199]). Putnam's discussions move from expanded paraphrase and commentary on those points of interest to him and his particular reading of the poem (or the collection) to analysis. Particularly in the closing sections of the analyses, and increasingly toward the end of the volume—treatment of the final two odes occupies more than a fifth of the entire text—Putnam draws out the recurrent cycles of themes and images of the book. The translation of poetry into thesis is itself reductive, so that to report that the basic theme and pattern Putnam finds in *Odes* 4 is political and poetic renewal, the latter memorializing the former, is less a betrayal than it might be of a more complex argument. Putnam appreciates complexity, but he is interested in showing us Horace's, not his own.

Odes 4 in Putnam's view may be *unum*, but it is hardly *simplex* (cp. *A.P.* 23). The basic structure is of five blocks of three odes, each of which has coherence as a triad and, more complexly, of which the first poem, "standing more or less alone, deals with personal loss, and the second two, explicitly linked by verbal and thematic echoes, are devoted more to poetry, its content, power, and importance in the Roman community" (211). In "Ode 15 and the Structure of Book 4" (291–306), Putnam attempts to describe the warp and woof of the whole rich design in all its complexity.

It is perhaps inevitable that, given his for-

mat and program, Putnam's analysis of individual poems is sometimes sacrificed to the larger whole he is trying to adumbrate. For example, it is book 4 in its entirety that leads Putnam to see Ligurinus as both "real and symbolic" (41); the dream image of Ligurinus, which haunts Horace at the end of the first poem, becomes "also the lure of the lyric past, the pull toward the voice and song of private desire that once was, but can no longer be, his. Ligurinus is very much the speaker-poet's former self" (45). I still find this allegorization troublesome, but by the time I reached the end of the book, I could at least appreciate what the interpretive gains of such a reading would be. This is the first sounding of a theme which readers may find quite strange. There is some sort of "spiritual eroticism . . . which gradually becomes paramount as book 4 evolves" and which displaces "the fading, private sexuality of ode I" (107). While the erotic overtones of Ganymede at 4.4.4 are not developed because they are not to Putnam's purpose, Putnam is generally attentive to details of style. Many a note points to words or senses that only or first appear in Latin or in Horace in *Odes* 4. Putnam's insistence on the reader's experience itself might provoke the rejoinder that Horace and his readers had no concordances, and the significance of any particular word should not come from the silence around it, especially since for us that silence may be due to incomplete transmission. Nonetheless, the cumulative evidence Putnam offers makes one aware of Horace's lexical innovation in book 4; while Putnam sees this pattern involving both archaisms and neologisms as reflecting the larger theme of renovation both poetic and political, it seems to me that a good number of the words may well have been colloquial, which would serve to link *Odes* 4 more closely with *Epistles* 1, which, like the final book of odes, also begins with a refusal to return to the lists (n.b. especially *antiquo . . . ludo*, 1.1.3).

Other of Putnam's interpretations turn on etymologies; here, quite properly, the supporting footnotes direct us to ancient Roman etymologies attested in Varro or Festus or explicit paranomasia in other classical authors. Only occasionally does Putnam's serious wordplay appear strained (e.g., *icta* and *ictum* of 4.6.9 and 36 respectively [124]). For a more extensive example of Putnam's inventiveness, consider some of his points on the final lines of the

last two poems, *compositis venerantur armis* (4.14.52), and *progeniem Veneris canemus* (4.15.32). *Vener-* in the same metrical slot in both poems (as Putnam notes, only here in book 4 are two consecutive poems in the same meter, alcaics [239]) is supposed to bring out the Venus in *veneror*. I find other arguments about Venus' central but evolving role in the collection more compelling (especially 295–298). On the other hand, the interpretive profit Putnam derives from hearing behind *canemus* (4.15.32) the *canamus* of *Eclogue* 4.1 and the *canemus* with which *Eclogue* 9 concludes (v. 67) is impressive.

Putnam addresses the charge, mentioned above, that in *Odes* 4 Horace surrendered his voice to Augustus. By Putnam's reading, the proud and individual voice of *Odes* 1–3 does not so much bend in adulation of Augustus in *Odes* 4 as it merges itself into a chorus of popular praise. Putnam is perhaps at his best when he teases out the paradoxical aspects of the final ode: "The reader schooled in the endings of Horace's earlier books of odes . . . expects a pronouncement on the singular accomplish-

ment of the speaking 'I' . . . Instead, individuality seems exchanged for a social 'we,' and self-effacement, in the midst of public celebration, replaces any prideful boasting of unique mastery. Yet these very metamorphoses . . . point up an irony. . . . Horace's handling of the initial *apologia* and of the *sphragis* as a whole, by varying the tradition of previous poets and confounding the reader's expectations arising from the poet's own past performance, is in fact a boldly innovative stroke" (273–274).

The aim of the critic is not to displace the author but to increase our appreciation of him. Whether or not we agree with all Putnam's suggestions, we will return from his book better readers of Horace, more alive to the themes and structures of *Odes* 4, to the contemporary context, political, military, even architectural, and more alive to Horace's own reflections on poetry, his own as well as that of his predecessors, Greek and Roman.

Ralph J. Hexter
Yale University

BOOKS RECEIVED

This column lists books that will be of interest to our readers even though they will not receive a complete review. Included are paperback reprints of earlier editions, works on the remoter fringes of classical studies, and books of highly specialized scholarly content.

Aeschylus, *PROMETHEUS BOUND*, translated by James Scully and C. John Herington. Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016. 1989. xi + 117 pp. Paper (ISBN 0-19-506165-9) \$6.95.

—Paperback reprint of the 1975 edition.

THE AUGUSTAN AGE, Vol. 7: The Aeneid Institute Teaching Materials and Papers, edited by Robert J. Rowland, Jr., and guest editors Robert M. Wilhelm and Michelle P. Wilhelm. The Vergilian Society of America, The University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. 1987. 173 pp. Paper.

—See review of Vol. 6 in *NECN&J* XVII.2. In addition to the teaching materials for elementary schools, this volume includes three more plenary lectures.

L. Frank Baum, *THE CLASSICAL WIZARD/ MAGUS MIRABILIS IN OZ*, with pictures by W. W. Denslow, translated into Latin by C. J. Hinke and George Van Buren, edited by

Konrad Gries. Scholar Press, Box 1511, Capitola, CA 95010. 1987. 261 pp. Hardcover (ISBN 0-85967-723-0) \$19.95.

—Dorothea, Toto, and friends proceed down the "via lateribus flavis strata." The Latin is remarkably good. A selective glossary is available on request.

BEDE'S HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA: A selection, with introduction, text, notes, and vocabulary by F. W. Garforth. Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1000 Brown Street, Unit 101, Wauconda, IL 60084. 1988. viii + 142 pp., 8 plates. Paper (ISBN 0-86516-218-2) \$11.00.

—Paperback reprint, originally published by Bell & Hyman, Ltd. in 1967.

Mark W. Edwards, *HOMER: POET OF THE ILIAD*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 701 West 40th Street, Suite 275, Baltimore, MD 21211. 1990. x + 341 pp. Paper (ISBN 0-8018-4016-3) \$11.95.

—Paperback reprint of the 1987 edition (reviewed in *NECN&J* XVII.2).