

WOJCIECH KOPEK

**THE CONCEPT OF AN ARTIST
AND THE CONFLICT OF GENERATIONS
IN “EPISTLE TO THE PISOS” OF HORACE.
A GLOSS ON ANCIENT LITERARY CRITICISM**

In 1916 Roy Kenneth Hack¹ pointed to an interesting paradox present in the research on “Epistle to the Pisos”. Two approaches, or ‘schools’ can be distinguished. The first one, represented by Eduard Norden², treated “De Arte Poetica” as *isagoge*, a short survey of literary criticism and theory; while the second one, represented by Oskar Weissenfels³, treated it as a letter. The paradox resulted from the fact that *isagoge* as a treatise must be structured according to a set logic-rhetorical theme, while the letter is written in a light and loose conversational style. And therefore “Ars Poetica” at the same time has and does not have a set structure.⁴

Some time ago Charles Oscar Brink wrote one of the fundamental works devoted to Horatian criticism, built on this apparent paradox: *Horace on Poetry*, subjecting to analysis the theoretical, critical and poetic dimensions of this text. The method of analysis chosen by Brink pointed towards a very interesting problem of the reader of “Ars”, who

¹ R.K. Hack, *The Doctrine of Literary Forms*, “Harvard Studies in Classical Philology”, vol. 27 (1916), 1-65 (particularly 11-14)

² E. Norden, *Die Composition und Litteraturgattung der Horatizischen Epistula ad Pisos*, „Hermes” XL (1905), 327-32.

³ O. Weissenfels, *Aesthetisch-kritische Analyse der Ep. ad Pis. von Horaz*, „Neues Lausitzisches Magazin”, LVI (1880), 118-200.

⁴ C.O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*, vol. I, Cambridge 1963, 15 ff.

is given both by the form of the “treatise”, that is numerous audience, and the “letter”, that is an individual reader. An important factor unifying “Ars” is the formula of “speaking to”, characteristic both of the *isagoge* and the letter.

Setting aside the issue of identification of the Pisos to whom Horace turns in his letter, a phrase formulating in the general and symbolic way recipients and readers of “Ars” is line 24 *pater et iuvenes patre digni* (“the father and the youths worthy of him”). Two generations connected with one another by the rule of *pietas*, a vertical dependence of sons on fathers, the rule of respect and obedience mark two different goals of this text of double nature. It seems that the superior concept of literature was marked by *dignitas* (dignity) of Piso-father, who becomes the guardian of the relationship master—disciple (critic—poet) symbolizing traditional Roman values: It should be stressed that the figure of a father is constantly present in such phrases in the “Epistle to the Pisos”:

<p>O maior iuuenum, quamuis et uoce paterna fingeris ad rectum et per te sapis (l. 366-368)</p>	<p>O thou, my Piso’s elder hope and pride! tho’ well a father’s voice thy steps can guide.⁵</p>
---	--

<p>Tu nihil inuita dices faciesue Minerua; id tibi iudicium est, ea mens. Siquid tamen olim scripseris, in Maeci descendat iudicis auris et patris et nostras, nonumque prematur in annum membranis intus positis; (l. 385-389)</p>	<p>Nothing, in spite of Genius, you’ll commence; Such is your judgment, such your solid sense! But if you would hereafter write, the verse To <i>Metius</i>, to your <i>Sire to me</i>, rehearse. Let it sink deep in their judicious ears!</p>
---	---

⁵ All the English quotations of fragments from “Ars” come from the translation by George Colman. <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/9175/pg9175-images.html>, retrieved on 27.10.2018.

The praise of the son becomes also the praise of the father. The addressees of the letter serve as an example of model nobleman in the treatise, because being civil servants (*negotium*) they at the same time understand poetry, which they do not push off to the opposite sphere of *otium*. This was not a common stance, which is testified by the letters to Lollius (I 2; I 18), in which Horace makes the young poet looking for a patron aware of the specificity of this kind of relationship,⁶ to the lack of understanding of the poetic fascination of a creator on the side of a patron. This, which is the sense of life for a poet, for a patron might be only an entertainment, and boring entertainment at that in comparison with hunting. These two relationships: father and son and patron and client, are grounded in the reluctance of Roman society not only to literary and cultural novelties, but to poetry at all.⁷

That is why, in "Epistle to the Pisos", Horace could not go beyond a specific concept of literature, which *a priori* sets key postulates about a "poet's education", comparable with the postulates of an "orator's education" A perfect example of such an exterior criticism is Quintillian, who analysed the value of literature from the perspective of educational values at the subsequent levels of the development of a child and a youth. That is why it is not surprising that Quintillian decided to exclude "autonomous"—that is closed to educational needs—literature completely from the system of education for example of learning grammar or as an ethical *exemplum*),(Quint, Inst. I 8, 6).

However, the role of a poet in the ancient world was described a long time before Horace, even before Aristotle and Plato,⁸ although it was in the classical period of the development of Greek literature

⁶ E. Flaig, *Zrytualizowana polityka. Znaki, gesty i władza w starożytnym Rzymie*, transl. and ed. by L. Mrozewicz, A. Pawlicka, Poznań 2013, 13-20.

⁷ M. von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature. From Livius Andronicus to Boethius*, vol. 1, Leiden – New York – Köln 1997, 7-48.

⁸ R. Harriott, *Poetry and Criticism Before Plato*, London 1969, 148-160; M. Heath, *Hesiod's Didactic Poetry*, "The Classical Quarterly", Vol. 35, No. 2 (1985), 245-263; A. Ford, *The Origins of Criticism, Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical*

that there appeared one of the most interesting ways of dealing with it, presented in the comedy *The Frogs* by Aristophanes.⁹ Aristophanes, including in his play material of both literary and fictional nature, created the first, serious school of art criticism. In the famous debate between Aeschylus and Euripides he contrasted two models of criticism: literary and social-political. The protagonists of the play, characters clearly based on two Greek authors of tragedy, analysed the works of their rival in a distinctive literary agon—an institution the critical role of which had been known at least from the period of *Homeric Hymns*, and probably even in the period of Homer.¹⁰

The tradition of agon and constructing the second part of the comedy on the scheme of a contest were responsible for the development of the plot. The younger poet, the pretender, throws out a challenge to the older one, with an established reputation. During the debate the poets test their technique, style, vocabulary, metre, ways of constructing characters and tragic plots. None of them gets the upper hand. It is only when they move from literary issues to more general ones—social and political—that a clear boundary starts to be drawn, not only between two ways of criticism, but, in

Greece, Princeton, Oxford 2002, 113-130 [Pindar and Bakchylides]; G. M. Ledbetter, *Poetics before Plato*, Princeton 2002, 1-7.

⁹ Z. P. Biles, *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition*, Cambridge 2011, 211-256.

¹⁰ Por. J. Burckhardt, *History of Greek Culture*, transl. by P. Hilty, New York 1963, s. 104-114; 263-265; J. Danielewicz, *Morfologia hymnu antycznego*, Poznań 1976, 20-35, 48-49; W. J. Ong, *The Agonistic Base of Scientifically Abstract Thought*, "Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association", Vol. 56, 1982, 109-124; M. W. Humphreys, *The Agon of the Old Comedy*, "The American Journal of Philology", Vol. 8, No. 2 (1887), 179-206; W. Ong, *Oralność i piśmienność. Słowo poddane technologii*, transl. by J. Japola, Lublin 1992, s. 38-54; E. Csapo, W.J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama*, Ann Arbor 1994, s. 103-138; J. Lungstrum, E. Sauer, *Introduction*, in *Agonistics: Arenas of Creative Contest*, ed. By J. Lungstrum, E. Sauer, New York 1997, 1-32; B. C. Sax, *Cultural Agonistics: Nietzsche, the Greeks, Eternal Recurrence*, in *Agonistics: Arenas of Creative Contest...*, 46-69; M. Burger, *The Shaping of Western Civilization: From Antiquity to the Enlightenment*, Toronto 2008, 47-51; E.T.E. Barker, *Entering the Agon. Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*, Oxford 2009, 1-5 (passim).

general, between two basic models of literature. The turning point here comes with the question about the social role of a poet:

Aeschylus
Why should anyone
admire the man who is a poet?
Euripides
For cleverness
and good advice — and since we help improve
the men who live within our cities. (l. 1008-1010)

[...]

Aeschylus
But it's a poet's task
to conceal disgrace — not put it on parade
front and centre and instruct men in it.
Small children have a teacher helping them,
for young men there's the poets — we've got
a solemn duty to say useful things. (l. 1053-1056)¹¹

The context in which these words are spoken is clearly moralistic. The question about the role of a poet is just an introduction to the critique of Euripides's strategy to show anti-models, while Aeschylus proposes a kind of self-censorship, which allows the creation of a model worth following. It is interesting that both of them agree on the role of a poet and the role of poetry, but they understand their artistic goals very differently, which influences the ways of fulfilling moralistic and didactic goals. While Aeschylus wants to concentrate on positive examples, Euripides shows the negative side. When Aeschylus constructs mighty heroes and heroines, Euripides boasts of opening the doors of houses and presenting on stage every-day life with characters on the level of the audience. Aeschylus accuses him of breaking *decorum*: "don't you see that noble thoughts and fine ideas perforce / produce a language of commensurate size?"

¹¹ Aristophanes, *Frogs; A Dual Language Edition*, transl. by Ian Johnston, Fenum Publishing, Oxford, Ohio, 2015, 121, 123.

(l. 1058-9). That is why Aeschylus, opting for pathos and serious didactic literature, ultimately became the victor of the poets' agon. But the verdict was clearly formulated in reference to the social and political mode of criticism. Aristophanes, although he saw progress in the development of dramatic technique in the plays of Euripides, ultimately skipped artistic issues. Taking into consideration the position of Athens in the Peloponnesian war at the time, Aristophanes brought back to life Aeschylus, a hero from Marathon, a symbol of what was heroic in Athenians. So, ultimately the verdict was decided by the method of criticism which was the result of an *a priori* definition of the superior goal of art.

The debate between Aeschylus and Euripides in *The Frogs* can be used to undertake an analysis of the fragment from "Epistle to the Pisos" dealing with the role of a critic in the shaping of poetry. It is not only the issue of the drama, but of a certain scheme of writing poetry which was set by Aristophanes. Such a comparison is not to show the identicalness of both texts and ideas, but to point to a certain analogy, or rather common topics used in both texts. This parallel in *The Frogs* is set by parabasis, while in "Art Poetica by the verses 304-418. They can be divided in the following way:

1. 304-308—the introduction of a figure of a critic, who states goals for criticism, poetry, poet, points to sources of creativity, mistakes and merits of literary works.
2. 309-322—wisdom, philosophy as a source of good poetry, a pyramid of values—*res, virtutes, mores* against *ars, techne* [theme, moral virtues, good customs against art, technical aspect of works],
3. 323-332—Greeks versus Romans.
4. 333-346—*prodesse* (bringing benefits), *delectare* (bringing pleasure), didacticism, school-poetry
5. 347-360)—mistakes in the art of poetry
6. 362-365—a strategy of reception—*ut pictura poesis*
7. 366-390—*ars-techne* [role of art—learnt skills]: 366-390

8. 391-407—canon of poets: Orpheus (religion, moral obligations), Amphion (civilization, culture, law), Homer, Tyrtaeus (military art, inciting bravery);

9. 408-418 *ingenium, ars, studium* [talent, technical skills—art, literary practise].

Horace introduces the figure of subject—critic writing:

Ergo fungar uice cotis, acutum reddere quae ferrum ualet exsors ipsa secandi; munus et officium, nil scribens ipse, docebo, unde parentur opes, quid alat formetque poetam, quid deceat, quid non, quo uirtus, quo ferat error. (l. 304-308)	So as mere hone, my services I pledge; Edgeless itself, it gives the steel an edge: No writer I, to writers thus impart The nature and the duty of their art: Whence springs the fund; what forms the bard, to know; What nourishes his pow'rs, and makes them grow; What's fit or unfit; whither genius tends; And where fond ignorance and dullness ends.
---	---

The definition consists of three elements: 1. metaphor critic-hone, 2. didactic formula of criticism, 3. range of interest of critic/criticism. The first element introduces a clear trace of the division of ancient literature into poetry and "other" spheres of writing. Similar declarations can be found in *Satires*,¹² for example in the satire I4, 39-40. *primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetis, excerptam numero* (first of all I exclude myself from the group of those whom I consider poets). Such an approach builds a foundation to show the distance with which the subject/narrator deals with an issue discussed. This distance suggests the objective attitude of the disinterested one, that is a creator with no conflict of interest, the one who is an expert and approaches the whole issue from the outside. At the same time this point of view protects the critic himself against his own critique.

This is the basis on which Horace constructs the key thought of the fragment, condensed in the phrase: *docebo: munus et officium*

¹² See K. Quinn, *Texts and Contexts. The Roman Writers and their Audience*, London 1979, 194-198.

docebo. The most important role of a critic is to be a teacher of a poet. In his “hexameter essays” Horace builds an analogy between literature and philosophy, transforming the function of a philosopher in the Plato-Socrates tradition—“a midwife of wisdom”, into a critic “a midwife” and a teacher of good poetry.¹³ “Ars” was shaped as a lecture also in terms of connection with philosophical writings, satire, cynical diatribe or rhetorical treatises.¹⁴ Particularly since the narrator starts with the declaration of teaching the “calling and duty” of a poet.¹⁵ The expression *munus et officium* introduces straight away the addressee-poet into the Roman circle of values. The critic not only defines the duties of a poet, but through this definition includes the profession of poet into the milieu of the Roman state, putting him next to other respected jobs and people of set duties.

Summing up, it can be said that the critic’s fundamental task is to define the goals of poets towards the society, hence *officium* as *virtus Romana*, and finding their role in the society, which is defined by these duties. And hence the detailed roles given in lines 307-308. These are *inventio* (in the text marked with the expression *unde parentur opes*), issues dealing with shaping the personality of a poet, moral and artistic issues *ars—virtus*, that is the merits and values of a literary work.

Further on (lines 309-322) the narrator-critic consistently fulfils the programme of stating the basic duties and role of a poet in the society. *Inventio* locates creation of poetry at the border of philosophy, ethics and didactics. Philosophy provides necessary wisdom, and engagement in issues of state will teach Roman virtues, and will allow the poet to get acquainted with the everyday life of Roman citizens, which, apart from didactic values, will be

¹³ G. Highet, *Masks and Faces in Satire*, “Hermes”, 102 No. 2 (1974), 321-337; Z. Pavlovski, *Aristotle, Horace, and the Ironic Man*, “Classical Philology”, Vol. 63, No. 1 (1968), 22-41.

¹⁴ C.O. Brink, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, 15 ff.

¹⁵ Kwintus Horacjusz Flakkus, *Dzieła wszystkie*, vol. II: *Gawędy, Listy, Sztuka poetycka*, ed. by O. Jurewicz, Wrocław 1988, 452. Synonyms placed in such a way strengthen their meanings and can also be regarded as *hendiadys*.

useful in constructing feasible plots for the stage. This is particularly important because Horace, in "Epistle to the Pisos", is focused mostly on the drama, and that is why by using the term 'a poet', he means, first of all, a playwright. Apart from the parallel with Aristotle's *Poetics*,¹⁶ this issue is important to show the social aspect, because ancient theatre was not elite and had the widest appeal and the most diverse audience.

At the same time we can discern in such an approach the separateness of a writer from the theme dealt with, which was mentioned above. The theme and knowledge, from where to get information for content belong to the general issue of writers' participation in social life. That is why a theme is, in a way, given by forces beyond him. Of course, a certain 'expedient' can be seen here. If these forces are understood as Roman virtues and duties, which in "Epistle to the Pisos" are represented by Tarpa (*magister ludi*, a civil servant representing the majesty of the state in accepting or rejecting plays for public performance) and *Piso pater* (symbolizing *mos maiorum* and *pietas*), then the thematic range will be in concord with the requirements of political correctness. However, it should be pointed out that the argument for the rejection of dealing with 'high' issues, assigned by social and political order, was constructed in the same way; the most drastic example here is Ovid, in whose *Amores* the very theme is decided by Amor, who represents the higher power a poet must succumb to. (Am. I 1-5)

A certain safeguard for the 'serious' criticism is a pyramid of themes which is constructed by the superiority of the moralistic *exemplum* over "nothings", which are devoid of important content. (Ars 317-322):

¹⁶ C.O. Brink, op. cit., vol. 1, 79 ff.

COLLOQUIA LITTERARIA

Respicere exemplar uitae morumque iubebo doctum imitatore[m] et uiuas hinc ducere uoces. Interdum speciosa locis morataque recte fabula nullius ueneris, sine pondere et arte, ualdius oblectat populum meliusque moratur quam uersus inopes rerum nugaeque canorae. (l. 317-322)	On Nature's pattern too I'll bid him look, And copy manners from her living book. Sometimes 'twill chance, a poor and barren tale, Where neither excellence nor art prevail, With now and then a passage of some merit, And Characters sustain'd, and drawn with spirit, Pleases the people more, and more obtains, Than tuneful nothings, mere poetick strains
---	--

Fulfilling the double didactic aspect, a critic shapes the poet-teacher-moralist. Similarly to rhetoric, Horace sees the source of *inventio* in philosophy; however, not only in the area of finding arguments in dialectic and logic, but also in moral philosophy, connected with the school of Socrates, that is—generally speaking—with ethics.¹⁷ But this is why criticism itself is not contained within the theory of poetry.

¹⁷ See Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric, A Foundation for Literary Study*, transl. by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, David E. Orton, Brill, 1998, 29-30 ff. § 64; 129-130 § 260-261: "Not all ideas discovered by natural *ingenium* and *ars* are suited for the particular matter at issue or a given audience. *Ingenium* and *ars* must be corrected by *iudicium*". *Iudicium*, in turn, in the area of rhetoric tends to be understood in the practical way. Those thoughts should be selected which are going to best serve the given cause. In this perspective one more term exists – *consilium*. While *iudicium* refers to the internal *aptum* and is oriented towards the text, *consilium* is connected with the external *aptum* oriented towards the recipient, and ultimately towards *utilitas*. Cf. H. Lausberg, op. cit., § 1152-1154. However, *aptum* itself refers both to the harmony writer-text-recipient, and the sphere of relations between rhetoric (literature) and ethics. (H. Lausberg, op. cit., § 1055). In "Epistle to the Pisos" the rules of *aptum/prepon* and *utilitas* – in the area of ethics – are identical, because of the addressees. In the context of the youths this is the formula of the foundations of art, while in the context of Piso-father, it

This fragment is also based on the relationship *docebo* (l. 306) to *didicit* (l. 312) (I will teach—he learnt) While the verbs define the clear relation between a master and a disciple, the simple past form shows the competencies of the disciple-poet, who has acquired some concrete knowledge or a skill. In this case the second pillar of Roman literature is at stake, that is the old Roman *virtutes* and *mores* connected with Stoic philosophy. Learning about and fulfilling the *officia* (duties) of a Roman citizen, a poet becomes a lawful member of the society—*civis Romanus*. This gives him a proper reputation for the role of a teacher, and gravity, *gravitas*. At the same time learning about the customs of his readers, that is of the community in which his future works will function. Its problems, system of values, habits, and expectations will let a poet become a 'learned imitator'. Skilful and feasible representation of the world known to the audience will enable, in the long run, the creation of models, properly motivated as characters; models which the audience will be able to accept and which it, actually, expects.

It should be remembered that the fragment quoted above, and the whole letter, has two key aspects. On the one hand, it is a literary treatise; on the other hand, it is a poetic letter directed at young men at the beginning of their poetic careers. Therefore, it seems that in this context the question of whether "Epistle to the Pisos" had concrete addressees with concrete problems and literary ambitions is of no importance, as Horace generalized the quoted issues. However, it is important that the addressees are young men; the letter, therefore, was directed to all young disciples of poetic art. And this implies (according to *aptum*) *prepon*, defining priorities in the lecture. Horace describes the relationship critic—poet; but he also implements it, presenting the moral, social role of poetry to young addressees. Even the conclusion that *res*, that is a proper theme, and its seriousness is held by recipients in higher esteem than even those trifles (*nugae*)

is about convincing him of the moral benefits of his sons' writing poetry. *Utilitas* and *aptum* connected in the identified goals become an apologetic argument for art, directed towards conservative recipients, in "Ars".

which are implements in the best way, is more moralistic than critical. Therefore, it should not be forgotten that in this approach the didactic imperative is dictated by the rule of didacticism, because the sender, turning to 'sons', in reality turns to 'father'.

This is the result of the difference in axiological preferences¹⁸ of the double addressee of "Epistle to the Pisos"—young people, addressees and also beginning writers, and the father, a representative of the wider audience—the society. This is included in two aspects of criticism: artistic, expected by younger recipients, and didactic, expected by *centuriae seniorum* (*Ars*, 341). Particularly because of the fact that the critique of art as not practical, not necessary, or even downright harmful, comes from the conservative part of the society. And therefore Horace's didacticism in "Epistle to the Pisos" is at the same time a counter argument to such quasi criticism. Horace, in a way, implements his didactic rule. If it is possible to create a poet of high moral standards, then the issue of didacticism and the moral aspect of art will be implemented in a natural way. A poet of high moral standards, being a model himself—a *vir bonus dicendi peritus*—will create works full of good examples. And it is in such absurdly built structures that the ironic humour of Quintus Horatius Flaccus is revealed most fully.

However, structurally it resembles the debate between Euripides and Aeschylus in the play by Aristophanes. If we put artistic issues aside, we might claim that Aeschylus represented what in the Athenian society and democracy was great, and he created his works accordingly. Euripides was, perhaps, more realistic, and therefore able to discern such things as human wickedness, littleness and meanness. He represented not the whole community, but only a tiny part of it; not democracy, but ochlocracy, sophistic and rhetorically sly demagogy. And although both of them wanted to teach and improve the society, Aristophanes decided that Euripides could not achieve this, because

¹⁸ Cf. A. Tyszczyk, *O pojęciu wartości negatywnej w literaturze*, in *Problematyka aksjologiczna w nauce o literaturze*, ed. by S. Sawicki, A. Tyszczyk, Lublin 1992, 137-152.

the showing of painful truths is connected with numerous anti-models. The problem with such an approach is connected with the lack of competencies of the general audience to verify anti-models and draw positive conclusions, but also to condemn certain behaviours. Aristophanes' concern, expressed through the mouth of Aeschylus, was focused on the conviction that 'people', the audience, would not be able to see the sense of showing anti-models, but that they would imitate behaviours which otherwise would never occur to them. And that was the crux of the Horatian strategy of building the ideal and idealistically thinking poet *quid alat formetque poetam, / quid deceat, quid non* (Ars 307-308). However, this is still a statement more of a teacher or a censor than a critic of poetry.

The connection of the literary sphere, unknown and not fully accepted by the majority, different from the common oral culture, because based at that time mostly on writing, with the known sphere of school education, allowed the creation of a field of agreement to show the positive aspect of poetry, because the canon had been used for a long time in schools. This metaphor, or rather dogma of the poet—teacher was an important aspect of ancient literary criticism. After all, this 'dogma' was at the centre of poetry's apology and the only certain channel of communication between writers, audiences and critics, regardless of their views on philosophy, tradition, politics or art. This argument in the times of Horace, and presumably also much earlier, was a kind of truism, with which each writer, theoretician or critic had to cope in one way or another. Or at least this is how old commentators seem to have treated it.¹⁹

At the same time, Horace formulates in the separate parts two different models of literature: *aut prodesse aut delectare* and then consistently implements the strategy of joining them, in which

¹⁹ *Pomponii Porphyrii Commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum*, rec. Gulielmus Meyer, In Aedibus Teubnerii, Lipsiae 1874, 356; *Acronis et Porphyrii Commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum*, ed. F. Havthal, vol. II, Berolini 1866, 631-632.

delectare is to strengthen the function of *prodesse*. The narrator, the author of the letter, moulds an addressee, in the wide sense, a young disciple of the art of poetry, showing on the one hand a lofty ideal of art, and on the other playing on the young artist's ambitions. It shows the way toward the social acceptance of the person of a poet, and, what is more, it opens the possibility of a career, profits and fame through the fulfilling of the social need for the proper handling of specific themes.

Horace most clearly formulates the didacticism of literature in the fragment of "De Arte Poetica": in lines 99-100 and 333-346. The text presents the ancient didactic method of connecting *prodesse* with *delectare*. This was not the first time in Horatian writing. The first book of satires started with it:

praeterea, ne sic ut qui iocularia ridens	Then again, not to pass over the matter with a smile
percurram: quamquam ridentem dicere verum	Like some wit—though what stops one telling the truth
quid vetat? ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi	While smiling, as teachers often give children biscuits
doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima	To try and tempt them to learn their alphabet? ²⁰
(Sat. I 1, 23-26)	

This is a specific place. Satires, which are on the border between poetry and philosophy, are related to old comedy and cynical diatribe, and are the form most involved socially of all the literary genres Horace ever wrote. This telling of the truth with a smile, a method used not only by Cynics, was compared with the didactic method of giving sweets to pupils for the correct recognition of a letter.²¹ In the metaphor *poeta doctus—doctor blandus* (learned poet—cajoling

²⁰ Translated by A. S. Kline, <https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/HoraceSatiresBkISatI.php>, retrieved on 27.10.2018.

²¹ Quintillian Inst. Or. I 1, 26; Hieronymus Epist. 128, 1.

teacher) he cajoles his readers with 'sweet' jokes, so that they readily accept his teachings.

In this aspect a poet and poetry should be treated together, without reference to the issue of the influence of Neoptolemos's division on the order of the material in "Epistle to the Pisos". Horace did not separate the subject from the object of didactics in the treatment of poet—teacher and poetry—teachings. It was the necessity to build the authority of a poet and poetry, which legitimized the adopted moralistic and didactic goals. The argument which was building the authority of a thinker or a poet was the canon of predecessors of firm reputation, whose teachings had been tested by time. In the area of Greek culture the canon undoubtedly included a long list of poets, in a way, victors of a great agon of literature. Its shape must have been established relatively early and it must have been quite stable. But for the considerations in this paper the most interesting canon is the one which Aristophanes showed in *The Frogs*. Not because of the mentioned writers, but because of the function. It is placed in the central part of the debate about the role of a poet in a state; it is, as might be assumed, an argument for the existence of poetry accepted by both parties, and directed at the external, extra literary critique. At the same time putting it into the mouth of Aeschylus, who is about to win, it is, in a way, a prophecy of including him in the canon of distinguished benefactors of humanity and poets:

Aeschylus:

Poets need to work on things like this.²²
Look back — they've been useful from the start,
the noble race of poets. There's Orpheus —
he taught us rituals and not to kill,
Musaeus showed us cures for sicknesses
and oracles as well, and Hesiod
taught farming, harvest times, and how to plough.
As for divine Homer, where's his renown,

²² This is the way in which Aeschylus sums up his programme of inciting bravery, duty and love for one's country.

COLLOQUIA LITTERARIA

his special fame, if not in what he taught,
those useful facts about courageous deeds,
and battle ranks and how men arm themselves.²³

This topos introduces the key structure, or even a hierarchy between an author and a recipient, funding this relationship: master—disciple, usually associated with philosophy and didactics. The canon placed in “Epistle to the Pisos” has a similar function. It—similarly to Aristophanes’s text—has a special position, and at the same time is a sum of the themes dealt with in earlier lines and an introduction to ask’ a question about the relationship between talent and art:

Natura fieret laudabile carmen an arte, quaesitum est; ego nec studium sine diu uena nec rude quid prosit uideo ingenium; alterius sic altera poscit opem res et coniurat amice. (Ars 408-411)	Whether good verse of Nature is the fruit, Or form’d by Art, has long been in dispute. But what can Labour in a barren soil, Or what rude Genius profit without toil? The wants of one the other must supply Each finds in each a friend and firm ally.
---	--

The interconnection of talent and hard work (*studium, ars*) is at the centre of the Horatian vision of an artist,²⁴ but it was also an important element of literary criticism in this period. Horace connects these two spheres and, at the same time, defines a border between them, separating what is inborn from what is acquired. So, while in the case of talent a critic may state that it exists or not, and not much more, in the case of art a critic becomes a judge and a teacher.

²³ Aristophanes, *Frogs*; op. cit., 121, l. 1030-36.

²⁴ The very relationship of talent and art was widely discussed in Horatian literature. See, for example. W.Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of The Augustan Age. Horace and The Elegiac Poets*, Oxford 1899, 114-118; C.O. Brink, op. cit., vol. 2, 394-400; A. Wójcik, *Talent i sztuka. Rzecz o poezji Horacego*, Wrocław 1986, passim (particularly 233 ff.).

So, in a word, Horatian 'unity in duality' of talent and art, apart from many other aspects, determines the possibility of didactics in the sphere of poetry and the range of activities of the critic—teacher. In this context, the reference to the form of an agon is not strange at all:

Qui studet optatam cursu contingere metam, multa tulit fecitque puer, sudavit et alsit, abstinuit uenere et uino; qui Pythia cantat tibicen, didicit prius extimuitque magistrum. (Ars 412-415)	Much has the Youth, who pressing in the race Pants for the promis'd goal and foremost place, Suffer'd and done; borne heat, and cold's extremes, And Wine and Women scorn'd, The Piper, who the Pythian Measure plays, In fear of a hard matter learnt the lays.
---	---

Both a young sportsman and a beginning poet who wanted to win in the games had to devote themselves totally to improve their abilities and skills. Both of them *didicit prius extimuitque magistrum* (learnt first and were afraid of the teacher). The teacher focuses on two thoughts: firstly, the need for didacticism being the result of the connection of talent and art, which penetrates all spheres of human activities; secondly, it transforms the master—disciple relationship from the poet—recipient model to the critic—poet model. Horace used all the possibilities of the topos of the canon, and through showing it in a new light, he infused it, in a way, with the content, greatly widening the formula of didacticism of literature onto didacticism of criticism.

However, taking into account the whole of the apologetic argumentation of Horace, which in a simplified version might be summarized as wisdom—philosophy—*virtutes* (moral values)—*mores* (good customs)—*officium* (duty)—education, only the postulate of formal excellence is a support of the preferences of 'the youths', whose literary tastes had been formed by the sublime Alexandrian literature. All the rest had been oriented towards the requirements

set according to the rule *mos maiorum* (customs of ancestors). But the third proposition of the model of literature and an artist which was being shaped in “Epistle to the Pisos” forces the need to re-evaluate the attitude to the archaic literature in Latin and understanding the key postulate of Alexandrian writers and critics.

This simplifying dichotomy ‘the old ones—the young ones’, ‘conservatives—progressivists’ was not new in Roman culture; it is enough to recall the context of the comedy, where plots were built on generational conflicts, with characters of clearly drawn features: an impulsive, unreasonable youth and a prudent, cautious and conservative old man. However, from the perspective of the reception of literature and the axiological preferences of recipients, in the frame *patres—iuvenes* (fathers—youths), *rusticitas—urbanitas* (folk culture—city culture), these dichotomous contrasts, although in a simplified version, led to the conflict which at that time was still valid between different concepts of Roman literature and culture. These concepts concerned not only an assessment of the heritage of Romans, but also its relationship to Greek culture and the fundamental problem about ways of development for the Roman culture of the period and in the future. And all these problems were focused around the necessity for the construction of a new model of a poet.

And although at that time the conquest of Greece was a thing of the past, Horace points to the difficult beginnings of Hellenic culture in Rome. (Epist. II 1, 156-168). Horace clearly implies that Romans were equal to Greeks in loftiness and the sense of the tragic, but were inferior in the technical aspects of writing literary works. Additionally, in the first phase of interest in foreign culture, what mattered a lot was profit (Epist. II 1, 163): *quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent* (what profit will they bring...). However, this Roman *utilitas*, connected with downplaying the subtleties of the technical finish of literary works, is a result of the rustic origins of Roman literature:

Graecia capta ferum uictorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio (Epist. II 1, 156-157)	Greece, the captive, made her savage victor captive, and brought the arts into rustic Latium ²⁵ .)
---	---

Agreste Latium—that land of primitive farmers—warriors was contrasted with Greece, which represented city culture, the art of polis. This is not the only opinion of that kind on Latin soil. In this case it is more like a stereotype,²⁶ because Horace attempts to check this opinion—it is not talent which Romans lack, but more care about technical, artistic details.

This idea should be presented in the context of the debate between philhellenes and conservatists, which is included in the formula of the permanent Roman debate *urbanitas*—*rusticitas*.²⁷ This led to the raising of the issue of Roman cultural identity. This issue

²⁵ Epistles 2.1.156, in Horace: Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica, ed. and transl. by H. R. Fairclough, Heinemann, London, 1929, 408.

²⁶ Cf., S. Tzounakas, "Rusticitas" versus "urbanitas" in the Literary Programmes of Tibullus and Persius, "Mnemosyne", Vol. 59, Fasc. 1 (2006), 111-128. It should be stressed that in this context *rusticitas* is understood negatively, but not the country itself, particularly in Horace's writings; he constructs the motif of Sabinum as a rustic, natural poetic utopia—*locus amoenus*. Nature and rustic culture are connected with the type of satire which is expressed as *urbanitas*, as is the case with Alexandria mimes or Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Horace describes himself as *ruris amator* (Epist. I 10, 2).

²⁷ E.S. Ramage, *Early Roman Urbanity*, "The American Journal of Philology", Vol. 81, No. 1 (1960), 65-72.

It is difficult to find a definition of *urbanitas* as a term, either from rhetoric theory or literary criticism. It should be instead understood as a natural feature of people growing up in the city culture or a desired feature acquired by newcomers (*homines novi*). If we were to risk a definition, we would have to say that *urbanitas* is a natural feature in reference to in what way, in what situation and what objects can be made fun of in a cultural and tasteful way. In this context it is similar to the Neoteric term *venustus*, "refined" (Cf., A. Klęczar, *Wstęp*, in Katullus, *Poezje wszystkie*, transl. by G. Franczak, A. Klęczar, Kraków 2013, 64). It is very telling that the word *urbanitas* appears so often in *Satiricon* by Petronius Arbiter. E. S. Ramage defined three main features of this term on the basis of Cicero's writings:

1. urbane refinement and polish (manners and appearance);

was also debated in the Augustan period, when—because of the far ranging consequences of conquests, as well as political and social changes—it became particularly poignant.

In the period of Cicero (c.a. 90-40 B.C.) another issue became prominent. The basic difference (if we disregard historical reality) between the Neoterics-Cicero debate and the philhellenes-Cato debate was grounded in the status of Greek and Roman cultures.²⁸ Writers of the philhellenic circle of Scipio the Younger did not declare uncritical, slavish imitation or the re-construction of Greek culture in Rome. Despite this, the conservative stance of Cato, affirming Roman heritage and the role of the Latin language in the creation of native Roman culture, in a way forced this dichotomy: Greeks versus Romans.²⁹ While the debate of Orator with the Neoterics was not about the issue of whether Greek culture should be included in the Roman discourses, or rejected, but about which aspects of Greek heritage should be imitated and in what ways Greeks should be competed with.³⁰

2. *salet urbanitas*—intelligence and humour (also with a clear distance from oneself, others and circumstances, which requires a distinguished sense of humour)

3. *latinitas*—the urbaneness in expressing himself of an educated man, purity of language, sophisticated vocabulary and (presumably) proper pronunciation and accent. *Urbanitas* is connected with such terms as *litterae* i *humanitas*.

It should be added that the key rule should be moderation in all the issues listed above, because the exaggerated stressing of these issues would lead to artificiality and pretentiousness, features which are later mocked by Petronius.

²⁸ Supporters of the influence of Greek culture centred themselves around Scipio the Elder (236-183 B.C.) and Scipio the Younger (185-129 B.C.), with whose names the so called “Scipio’s circles” were associated, which included: Terencius, the comedy writer, Lucilius, the satirist, Polibius, the historian, and Panajtios, the philosopher—distinguished intellectuals of this period. Marcus Porcius Cato the Elder (234-149 B.C.) was the icon of the supporters of the primacy of Old Roman culture. Cf., M. von Albrecht, op. cit., 58-61, 490ff.

²⁹ St. Stabryła, *Wstęp*, in: *Rzymska krytyka i teoria literatury*, Wrocław 1983, xxxi ff.

³⁰ The general overview of this issue can be found in: E. Gee, *Cicero’s poetry*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, ed. by C.E. W. Steel, Cambridge 2013, 88 f. (particularly the chapter “Catullus and Cicero”, 101 ff.); W.R. Johnson, *Neoteric Poetics*, in: *A Companion to Catullus*, ed. M. B. Skinner, 2007, 175-189. These works

The Augustan period (from the threshold between the fourth and third decade of the first century B.C to 14 A.D.) totally altered this debate, because it turned out that the new priority was to create intellectual foundations for the new system of rule: the Principate, which was the outcome of civil wars in the declining Republic. This does not mean, however, that strictly literary issues automatically stopped being of importance. However, the type of discourse changed. It had to cover both the social and political roles of literature, and its theoretical and cultural aspects in the new political situation.

Therefore, Horatian literary considerations might be shown as an oscillation between his reflection on the role of poetry in the society, the essence of art, thus coming close to the philosophy of art and early aesthetics, and the analysis of particular artistic issues (such as creative techniques, *ars*), aesthetic values (*virtutes operis*,) and ethical values (*virtutes, mores*). This leads directly to the crucial relationship between talent and art: *ingenium—ars*.³¹ However, it is not possible to separate criticism of this period, from social, cultural and political changes, which at the end of the Republic and during the Principate led to re-arrangements in art and the very status of poets in Rome.

Gawin Townend argues that the imitative model of Roman literature and the limitation of imagination understood as creative freedom, resulting from duties imposed by the patronage on creators-clients and also the normativity of rhetoric and literary theory led to the phenomenon of dependence and the self-defining of concepts

are of summative character. A more detailed treatment of these issues can be found in W. Clausen, *Cicero and the New Poetry*, "Harvard Studies in Classical Philology", Vol. 90, (1986), 159-170; N.B. Crowther, *OI NEOTEROI, Poetae Novi, and Cantores Euphorionis*, "The Classical Quarterly", Vol. 20, No. 2 (1970), 322-327; R.O.A. M. Lyne, *The Neoteric Poets*, "The Classical Quarterly", Vol. 28, No. 1 (1978), 167-187. It should be stressed that the name of the new movement came from its opponent, Cicero, and was supposed to be pejorative: *oi neoterói poietai* or *poetae novi*, pointing towards 'revolutionary', 'rebellious' attitude of its members and their young way, which, in a way, pushed the movement into the opposition "the old versus the young", thus putting them at a disadvantage in the public discourse.

³¹ A. Wójcik, *op. cit.*, 300 ff.

of art in the context of certain political options, represented by the affairs of patrons.³² In such a situation concrete literary genres connected with a given concept of literature could easily and quickly develop thanks to political orders (for example Georgics), or could fall down (for example, Gallus's writings). Yet another thing was the probably clearly Roman necessity of justifying the existence of poetry, determined by the *utilitas* of literature understood as its moralistic and educational role.³³

In the Augustan period the accepted model of poetry was shaped by three key theoretical issues. They centred around the problem of accepting a certain literary model: (*imitatio, aemulatio*³⁴) the general goal of poetry and linguistic and stylistic issues.

J.W.H. Atkins presented it in a similar way in *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*.³⁵ He regarded the search for the proper literary model as a key point in Augustan criticism. Atkins defined Augustan literature through the debate with Alexandrianism of Neoterics³⁶ and the transition from primacy of rhetoric to primacy of poetry. On

³² G. Townend, *Literature and Society*, in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. X *The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.—A.D. 69*, ed. by A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, A. Lintott, Cambridge 2006, 907-929.

³³ *Ibid.*, 921-926.

³⁴ See D.A. Russell, *De imitatione*, w: *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. by D. West, T. Woodman, Cambridge 2001, 1-16; C.W. Macleod, *Horatian Imitatio And Odes* 2.5, op. cit., 89-102. The fact that the rule of *imitatio / aemulatio* was valid for all arts was stressed in Ellen Perry's text devoted to visual arts: E. E. Perry, *Rhetoric, Literary Criticism, and the Roman Aesthetics of Artistic Imitation*, in *The Ancient Art of Emulation*, ed. E.K. Gazda, 2002, 153-171.

³⁵ J.W.H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity. A sketch of its development*, vol. II *Graeco-Roman*, Cambridge 1934, s. 42 nn.; J. Farrell, *The Augustan Period: 40 BC-AD 14*, in *A Companion to Latin Literature*, ed. S. Harrison, 2005, b 44-57.

³⁶ "For one thing it raised anew the question of 'the Ancients and the Moderns', since with the success of the Alexandrian vein of poetry, a clash between the two schools had otherwise become inevitable; and in addition, it gave direction to much of the subsequent theorising, which ended finally in a re-statement of the classical

the one hand, the preceding period brought huge interest in literature, introduced to Rome the achievements of Alexandrian thought, and led to a high level of the technique of the artistic composition of texts. On the other hand, such a model was not congruous with the new social and political goals of Augustan poetry. And therefore new writers faced this choice, either accept the Alexandrian model or search for new sources. Then, two possibilities were proposed: the classical model, referring to archaic and classical Greek literature (Horace, Virgil), and the archaic model, referring to old Latin literature. This search also had consequences of a more detailed nature: linguistic and stylistic. Depending on the position the following issues were considered: neologisms, barbarism, Greek expressions, and archaisms.

While stressing the role of the literary debate, Atkins at the same time pointed to the fact that generally Alexandrians supported learned poetry, mythological tales, themes mostly light, although expressed in a subtle form, which was not becoming in the case of serious themes, which the new imperial, politically involved poetry was to develop. Literary issues were connected with the political changes of this period; with which a different debate was also connected: between archaists, conservatives and classicists. It was about the attitudes to the old Roman culture. The antiquarian movement, started by Varro, strengthened by the restorative politics of the Princeps, resulted in considerable interest in early poetic-religious and legal texts (the Law of the Twelve Tables³⁷), as well as in the works of Ennius and Naevius. However, in certain circles this interest was transformed into a type of mannerism. Classicists, on the other hand, were looking for a model different from the Hellenistic one, and found it in the works of Homer, Alkajos, Safona and Pindar, as well as other writers hallowed by time and the glory of old masters.³⁸ Its source, according to Atkins, was in

creed. The conflict between these two traditions must then be described as the all-important critical matter at this date". J. Atkins, *op. cit.*, 52.

³⁷ Cf., H. Insadowski, *Prawo rzymskie u Horacego*, Lublin 1935, 34.

³⁸ Atkins's different treatment of archaism and classicism is also important because of the difference in attitude to Greek and Roman culture, which were put against

“the spirit of the age”, when the new ‘national’ identity was being born, when Rome was becoming the world’s superpower, taking upon itself the duty to maintain universal peace. In such a climate, as had been the case in Athens before, expressing serious emotions and ambitions became the domain of poetry, speaking in the name of the society.³⁹ For such a goal of poetry the Alexandrian model was too ‘light’. It was associated with the poetry of the Neoterics, with not serious elements which can be located in the expression *nugae*, the expression which Horace used in the sense of a trifle. (*Ars* 319-322). The archaic model was also not proper, because of too low a level of development, and technical weaknesses of the meter, language and poetic stylistics. That is why, as Atkins wrote, the classical model triumphed.⁴⁰

However, it cannot be unequivocally stated that in the Augustan Age just one literary model was developed. Another important issue is the vision of this period which was held then by Romans themselves. While the key debates presented by Atkins, and the defining of criticism through a discussion of literary parties allow us to introduce key limitations in the understanding of the range of criticism, we should also remember that the ‘Romantic’ vision of Augustan culture presented by Atkins should be balanced. Particularly from the perspective of the pessimistic vision presented by Townend, who has been quoted before.⁴¹ Neither of these arguments can be defended:

one another by Horace. (*Ars*, 323-326). However, it is difficult to separate these issues in the analysis of specific texts. See E. O’Gorman, *Archaism and Historicism in Horace’s Odes*, in *Clio and the Poets, Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, ed. D.S. Levene, D.P. Nelis, Leiden 2002, 81-101; C. Damon, *Ab Inferis: Historiography In Horace’s Odes*, in *Idem*, 103-120.

³⁹ J.W.H. Atkins, *op. cit.*, 52, “[...] the real cause of the new classicism may more probably be found in the ‘spirit of the age’, in that sudden awakening of national feeling that marked the Augustan era. By this time Rome had become a great world-power, entering on a reign of peace, and fired with a sense of a great national mission. And now, once again, as formerly at Athens, poetry aimed at voicing the feelings of the community and at singing of things that came home to the hearts of all”.

⁴⁰ J.W.H. Atkins, *op. cit.*, 47-54.

⁴¹ E. Oliensis, *op. cit.*, 64-101; Ph. Lowell-Bowditch, *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*, Berkeley 2001, *passim*; R. Syme, *Rewolucja rzymska*, ed. by L.

about the total subservience of poetry of this period to politics, and about the literal understanding of Roman propaganda *pax Romana* and peaceful leadership of the world.⁴² In the case of Horace, different shades of the role of poetry in this period can be found in his works, depending on the choice of his texts for analysis, and the depth of interpretation. Ultimately, we can distinguish three elements: 1. The need for aesthetic autonomy, 2. Dependence on the duties of a client, 3. Real interest in Roman cultural and political identity and the role of Rome in the Mediterranean region.⁴³

The issues which have been mentioned above, about the presence of poetry in Roman society, are the foundation of the Horatian definition of criticism as the oscillation between the duty of art towards the society and towards itself. However, political issues seem to concern more Horace-poet than Horace-critic, because he was the writer most susceptible to pressures from patrons and had to be very careful in order to avoid the dangers connected with these

Mrozewicz, transl. by A. Baziór, Poznań 2009, 241-245, 374-392; E. Flaig, op. cit., 13-31.

⁴² The literary character of Roman historical writings should be stressed. Apart from the imperative to stick to facts, they also had an artistic goal, measured by linguistic and compositional aspects, or even by making the plot dynamic and introducing fictitious elements to the discourse. Moreover, early Roman historical texts, often written in Greek, were also written for a wide audience in the Mediterranean region. Therefore, it is not difficult to find in these works grand ideas, which are not always propaganda, but which sometimes happen to be a form of self-definition of a community, a construction of an exterior image of Rome, which educated Romans wished to be accepted abroad Cf., A. Dziuba, *Teoria historiografii w epoce cesarstwa. Garść rozważań*, „Collectanea Classica Thorunensia” XIII, Toruń 2002, 39-44; A. Dziuba, *Sentencja w tekście Historii rzymskiej Wellejusza Paterkulusa*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, vol. LIII, (3), 2005, 89-100; I. Lewandowski, *Historiografia rzymska*, Poznań 2007, 28-32.

⁴³ W. Kopek, *Bellum civile, bellum externum. Ambivalencja obrazów wojny w twórczości Horacego*, „Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis”, „Studia Historicolitteraria” XV (2015), foil 185, 3-14.

pressures. From this perspective the apologetic role of criticism should be presented—as a form not only of the defence of poetry against politics, but also as justification for the very existence of art, in other words the idea of the didacticism of poetry. It is only then that we can really locate poetry and criticism as *agon* functioning in the general frames of ancient culture, which leads to constantly making more and more subtle the notions of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*.

While analysing this fragment from the perspective of the ancient theory of literature, we should refer to the triad of Neoptolemus: creator—creations—created object.⁴⁴ This triad is traditionally used to analyse satires and letters, in which *eirōnē*⁴⁵ and a critic as a theoretician are clearly defined, and who speak through the mouths of others, in the manner of philosophical dialogues, or undertake the role of teachers and tutors, who themselves do not deal with creation: *munus et officium, nil scribens ipse, docebo* (*Ars* 306).

However, it should be stressed that the moulding of new writers becomes in “The Letter to Pisos” an art in itself. The rules of constructing protagonists or elements of the presented world influenced the concept of the educational process: of moulding man’s *ethos*. Criticism as a process influencing the character, personality and technical skills of a young writer was an activity analogous to education. This is underlined by the verb Horace used for both of these areas: *ingere*. It refers to an act of creating something out of nothing, of a whole out of elements. That is why the compound phrase *ars ingendi* becomes the term for sculpture. And, therefore, everything which is connected with an act of creation—*ingere*, is a very concrete element of the depicted world—a figure or a thing on the level of depicted objects. This word in “Ars” is used eight times; seven times in the context of creation, and once in the context of education-moulding.

⁴⁴ C.O. Brink, op. cit., vol. I, 43-74.

⁴⁵ A philosopher in a Socratic mask, in search of truths, using so-called philosophical irony.

Fingere in lines 7-8 *vanae fingentur species* referred to an apparition being moulded in nightmares, in lines 50 and 52 to create neologisms, in line 119 to construct new literary characters—in the drama *ethopeja* etc.,⁴⁶ in line 240 *fictum carmen* to create poetry, similarly in line 331; in line 338 to juxtapose *ficta* 'things invented' and *vera* 'real things'; in line 382 to the essence of creation. Only in line 366-367 is this verb used in a different context:

O maior iuuenum, quamuis et uoce paterna
fingeris ad rectum et per te sapis,

This phrase, addressed to the older of the young Pisos, shows him as a material for creation in the hands of two sculptors: the father, who 'moulds' him for public life and a political career, and the critic, who builds his creative personality. At the same time, this use of the quasi-term can be inscribed into the particular thematic and structural parts of "Epistle to the Pisos". The first two (lines 7-8, 50 and 52) are quite loose and do not directly belong to the critical and literary context. It has already been mentioned that line 119 opens the part devoted to literary genres, and in some treatments also to style and *imitation*; similarly, line 240 is part of the analysis of the drama. Therefore, it can be claimed that the uses of *fingere* in these lines belong to the sphere of *poiema*, while all the remaining ones belong to the sphere of *artifex/poietes*, unanimously located in verses 295-476.⁴⁷

In certain ways the analysed fragment of "Art of Poetry" dealing with the duty of a poet towards the society and the duty of a critic towards

⁴⁶ It should be stressed that according to C.O. Brink, lines 119-130 deal generally with new and traditional characters in the drama. Brink connects the Latin term *fingere* with the English term *fiction*, claiming that a quasi-term introduced by Horace is clearer than the terminology used in literary theory *historia - verisimile - fictum* (gr. i(stori/a, pla/sma, mu=qoj). See C.O. Brink, op. cit., vol. 2, 197-198.

⁴⁷ Brink put together proposals for the structural divisions of Norden (1905), Jensen (1918), Rostagnini (1930) and Immisch (1932). He pointed towards their general similarity (differences can be found in details). His own structural division does not diverge from the general tendency. C. O. Brink, op. cit., vol. 1, 15-40 (particularly 31).

both the society and the poet might be understood as a metaphor for literary debates in the Augustan Age. The role of the mediator of the letter's author, a friend of both Piso-father and Pisos-youths, showing an understanding of the needs of both parties, is transformed into a debate between antiquarians, those moving in the direction of archaization and Alexandrians, the umbrella term which covers the Neoteric movement of Cicero's period, their followers in *collegium poetarum*, and the Elegiac poets of the Augustan period. The former prioritized old Roman writers, and demanded respect for the values underlying the social group of the nobility, with the rule of *mos maiorum*, while the latter challenged these rules, and acted as rebels in the reality of the declining Republic and the budding Principate. And although at the time when Horace's letters were written most of these writers were already old, it seems that the debate between great concepts in Roman literature from the perspective of Romans looked like a traditional 'family quarrel', and was conducted within the borders set by Cicero, between supporters of *mos maiorum* and of *oi neoterói, poetae novi* and between their successors. And it might be assumed that Horace was also shaped by this heritage.