Klotz who wanted to insert \(<etiam urbem ceperunt>\) after \(illiqte\). I should prefer to believe that \(<ol1nl>\) was omitted before \(illiqte\), which, with its much greater MS. authority, is preferable to \(illincque\); \(illiqte\ et inde\) presents no difficulty. As Wirz pointed out, \(illi\) merely means \(illo tempore viventes\); \(quo metu\) will then equal \(quorum metu\) (cf. Virgil \(Aen. 8, 705\) eo terrore).
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HORACE, ODES II 9

The general view of the older critics on Odes II 9 was that Valgius is in mourning for the death of Mystes, who is a relative or favourite slave 1). More recently Kenneth Quinn 2) suggested that Mystes was a lover who had been snatched away not by death but by a \(dives amator\). It is this interpretation and its bearing on the final two stanzas that I intend to discuss.

It seems unlikely that Horace is talking of an actual death here. The build-up of images in the first two stanzas 3) and the continual repetition of the unending nature of Valgius’ grief 4) combine to produce an emphasis that is bordering on the ridiculous, while the advice to turn to epic poetry in the final stanzas would be somewhat unfeeling. Such a turn would hardly be appropriate for one who is really bereaved, especially in the case of Valgius, who is elsewhere included among Horace’s friends 5). On the contrary there are a number of hints of an amatory situation. The most obvious is \(amores\) (11), but the two epithets chosen to qualify the mythological parallels, \(amabilem\) (13) and \(impubem\) (15), also suggest a \(puer delicatus\). In addition, there seem reasonable grounds for supposing that Valgius was an elegist: \(mollis\) (see line 17) is a word frequently applied to love-poetry 6), and both \(querelarum\) (18) and \(fleblibus modis\) (9) suggest elegy 7). In fact, there are extant fragments of

1) Orelli maintained that Mystes was a \(puer delicatus\), but thought that he had died.
2) Latin Explorations, 160 f.
3) The images are themselves suggestive of Valgius’ grief (see Page ad loc.).
4) \(Semper\) (1), \(usque\) (4), \(menses per omnes\) (6), \(semper\) (9), \(nec \ldots Vespero/ surgente \ldots / nec rapidum fugiente solem\) (10-12), \(omnes\ldots / \ldots annos\) (14-15)
and \(semper\) (17). The words are usually in emphatic position.
5) Satires I 10, 81 ff.
6) Cf. e.g. Catull. 16, 8, Prop. I 7, 19, II 1, 2, Ov. Tr. 2, 307, Ex. P. III 4, 85.
7) Cf. e.g. Tib. I 4, 71 f., Prop. I 18, 6, 29, Ov. Am. III 9, 3. At Odes I 33, 2 f. Horace describes Tibullus’ elegies on his rejection by Glycera as \(miserables \ldots elegos\).
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elegiac poetry by a Valgius 8), who may well be the poet of this ode. In view of the above, then, Quinn's interpretation seems likely.

This revised view of the background-situation in turn necessitates a revised view of the advice given in the last stanzas 9). The constant emphasis on Valgius' everlasting grief gives the ode a teasing tone which is not uncommon in his addresses to other poets 10). So the exhortation to turn to epic poetry seems mock-serious, implying that such themes are beyond the love-poet. This is an adequate explanation of the poem's conclusion but I believe that there is more to it than this. Quinn makes the valid observation that, as mythology and mythological exempla are common in existing elegy, they may well have played a part in Valgius' poetry and that therefore in the fourth stanza "it is as though Horace were saying '... for a time I'll speak your own language'". This application to an elegist of his own themes and terms is also evident elsewhere in Horace 11), and the same process seems to be at work in the final stanzas.

A common elegiac theme was the rejection of epic subjects, including both the deeds of ancient heroes 12) and the achievements of early and contemporary Roman arms 13), in favour of love-poetry. At times the love-poet addresses an epic poet and warns him that his genre would be of little use to him if he were in love. So Propertius says to Ponticus at I 7, 15 ff.:

\[
\begin{align*}
te & \text{ quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu,} \\
& (\text{quod nolim nostros evoluuisse deos}) \\
& \text{longe castra tibi, longe miser agmina septem} \\
& \text{flebis in aeterno surda iacere situ.}
\end{align*}
\]

Again at I 9, 9 ff. he exhorts an epic poet who has fallen in love to turn to love-poetry:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{quid tibi nunc misero prodest grave dicere carmen} \\
& \text{aut Amphioniae moenia flere lyrae?} \\
& \text{plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero:} \\
& \text{carmina mansuetus levia quaerit Amor 14).}
\end{align*}
\]

8) Isidorus Orig. XIX 4, 8, Servius on Virg. Ecl. 7, 22, Aen. 11, 457.
9) Quinn's suggestions are unconvincing.
10) See Nisbet and Hubbard on Odes I 6 and I 33. The same tone is probably evident in the reference to Cassius of Parma at Epist. I 4, 3.
11) See Nisbet and Hubbard on Odes I 33, where Horace addresses Tibullus in a similar situation.
12) Ovid Am. I 1, II 1. Cf. also Tib. II 4, 15 ff.
13) Propertius II 1, III 3, III 9.
14) See also Ovid Am. II 18 (esp. 39 f.).