HORACE AND THE NEW REGIME

by

Robert Donald Gold

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Classics,
McGill University,
Montreal.

August, 1960.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont.)

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between Horace and the new regime of Augustus has been the source of many varied opinions. Some critics, especially those of the nineteenth century, have deplored the abandonment of the poet's early Republican principles in favour of the rule of Octavian. To them Horace was a servile political opportunist obeying the dictates of Maecenas and the Princeps. In recent years, however, more moderate and even opposing views have been suggested by commentators who point to evidence in Horace's own works and in the Vita Horati of Suetonius to emphasize the poet's independence of spirit. This thesis, by examining the more important political poems, will attempt to trace the gradual development of the poet's respect for Augustus and the regime he represented.

In studying the growth of Horace's loyalty to the new regime, I hope to emphasize the fact that throughout his life the poet's allegiance was linked not to the interests of any one party, but to Rome's best interests as he saw them. From the uncertainty of the Triumviral period to the security that found expression in the fourth book of the Odes, the standard by which he judged events was not their effect upon the fortunes of a party or individual, but their importance to the nation. The extent of the poet's support for a leader closely corresponded to the significance of the services he performed for the state. Horace's main political concern was not for the personal success of Augustus but for moral and material prosperity of Rome.

The needs of the state in the years following the battle of Philippi were indeed great. Horace was fully aware of the necessity for an end to civil strife, for the reconciliation of warring factions, and for the revival of morality, home life, and the stern, simple, manly virtues of earlier days. These were the benefits a truly great leader would bring to the state. Such policies would not only win the support of the Muses and their poet, but also bestow immortality upon the man who enacted them.

Horace's earliest political poems, by their hopeless pessimism, indicate that at that time the poet could see no leader who might satisfy the first need of the nation, the restoration of peace and order. As we shall note in Chapter II, his pacifism may have led him to oppose some of the acts of the young Octavian. Although moral considerations seem to have been responsible for Horace's support of Octavian at Actium, the fear of a renewal of civil war exerted a powerful influence over the poet's political sympathies long after the strife had ceased. Evidence of this early support for the order imposed by the Princeps, and Horace's opposition to all who would threaten his rule will be examined in the first part of Chapter III. The main purpose of this chapter, however, will be to show that at that time Horace withheld full approval of the regime until he could evaluate its civil and moral policies. Although Wickham interpreted certain passages in the Roman Odes as promises that Augustus would undertake the reform of the excesses described in these poems, I suspect that these references may be tactful attempts in support of earlier, more direct appeals, to commend those reforms to the Princeps.

Certainly, the lack of any extensive praise for the character or achievements of Augustus does not suggest that Horace was a convinced partizan of the new regime; when the Princeps is praised, it is for his benefits bestowed upon the state. In addition, between the years 30 and 23 B.C., the unfulfilled needs of the nation are stressed more often than the achievements of the government. The fourth book of the Odes and the Epistles reveal the poet's unreserved support for Augustus, but an examination of the references to the Emperor will show that he was commended not for personal achievements, but for the enactment of many of the reforms for which Horace had appealed earlier. Even in his latest poems, the poet avoids flattery, basing his approval of the regime on the benefits it had brought to Rome instead of on the glories of its leaders.

CHAPTER I

THE LIFE OF HORACE

Few Latin poets have revealed themselves both with respect to their personalities and the facts about their lives as completely as Horace has in his works. Many of his poems contain reminiscences of his earlier days and personal comments on the passing scene that serve to enable the reader to become, in time, almost a close acquaintance of the poet. Indeed, I suspect that it is this personal quality that has proved so attractive to men and women throughout the ages. Yet, at first glance, the attitudes of Horace are not without their contradictions. While in one ode he may praise devotion to duty,[1] in another he calls men to withdraw to a simple life free from the anxieties of public office;[2] at one time he seems to support the state religion but always there is the feeling that the Epicureans are right.[3] Many critics, especially those of the nineteenth century, have been troubled by the fact that in his youth the poet had supported Brutus whereas in his last years his allegiance belonged wholly to the new regime of Augustus. This thesis will attempt to determine the various stages through which this allegiance passed in making the transition from Republicanism to Imperialism and to examine the causes underlying this apparent conversion.

---

1 Ode III-2 and III-5.

2 Ode II-16 etc.

3 Wilkinson, Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 82.

Horace bears witness to the fact that his full name was Quintus Horatius Flaccus by using each of these three names in referring to himself on various occasions.[1] He also openly admitted his age: forty-four in the year 21 B.C.[2] Suetonius, the other main source for information about the poet, adds the date and so we can give the date of his birth as December 8, 65 B.C.[3] In later life he was to admit that he did not know whether he was Lucanian or Apulian "nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus."[4] The nomen Horatius also suggests Venusia as his place of birth since the Horatia tribus was the country tribe in which that colony was enrolled.[5] In Ode III-4 lines 9-16, we have a description of his early childhood as he wandered on trackless Mount Voltur and throughout the towns and countryside of that region. The familiarity with which he referred to places in Apulia in his later poems[6] also indicates his affection for that part of Italy.

Although Horace never mentions his mother, his references to his father show a deep respect and affection.

> "Nil me paeniteat sanum patris huius, eoque
> non, ut magna dolo factum negat esse suo pars,
> quod non ingenuos habeat clarosque parentis,
> sic me defendam....."[7]

---

[1] Quintus, Sat. II-6.37; Horatius, Ode IV-6.44; Flaccus, Sat. II-1.18.

[2] Epistle I-20.26-28.

[3] De Viris Illustribus, De Poetis, Vita Horati.

[4] Sat. II-1.35.

[5] Wickham, Works of Horace, Vol. I, p. 15.

[6] Ode III-4.9-16; IV-14.25; II-9.7.

[7] Sat. I-6.89-92.

The poet also tells us that his father, in addition to owning a small farm (macro pauper agello),[1] worked as a coactor,[2] an occupation which Fraenkel[3] identifies as that of a coactor argentarius who fulfilled the function of a banker at an auction by paying the seller and then collecting the price from the buyer. When the time came for Horace to begin his formal education, his father, not wishing to send his son to the local school of Flavius

> ".....magni
> quo pueri magnis e centurionibus orti,
> laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto,
> ibant.....,"[4]

took the boy to Rome "to be taught those subjects that any knight or senator would have his own offspring taught."[5] He also accompanied the young student through the streets of the city in the guise of his paedagogus, keeping him from the many pitfalls that doubtless confronted the country lad in the metropolis. In later life the poet was to recall the moral guidance of his father and the study of Livius Andronicus and Homer under the rod of plagosus Orbilius.[6] Yet Horace makes it clear that in spite of this good education, he was left free to make his own choice of a career.[7]

---

1 Sat. I-6.71.
2 Sat. I-6.86.
3 Horace, p. 5.
4 Sat. I-6.72-75.
5 Sat. I-6.76-78 (Loeb Translation).
6 Epistle II-1. 69 f.; Epistle II-2.43 f.
7 Sat. I-6.85 f.

The poet chose to continue his education and went, therefore, to Athens,[1] where he studied philosophy at the Academy and probably also began to lay the foundation for his wide knowledge of Greek lyric poetry. However, late in 44 B.C. Athens welcomed a much more celebrated visitor, Marcus Brutus, who, having failed to gain support against Antony in Italy, now arrived to study and to recruit young men in the cause of the Republic. One of those who joined him was Horace, who seems to have campaigned with him in Asia.[2] Although the poet himself admits that he had had no previous military experience, his advancement was swift. Indeed, he seems to have encountered envy "quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno,"[3] and this is quite understandable since the rank of tribunus militum was usually reserved for young men of senatorial or equestrian birth and often led to magistracies at Rome. For this position to be filled by the son of a freedman was most unusual. However, if Horace had any political aspirations, these were soon destroyed by the outcome of the battle of Philippi. Some readers have been dismayed at what they consider to be an open admission of cowardice in Ode II-7. In reminiscing with Pompeius about the days of their comradeship, the poet recalls the celerem fugam and his shield "non bene relicta" and with a humourous touch attributes his escape denso aere to Mercury. But W.H. Alexander,[4] in

---

[1] Epistle II-2. 43 f.

[2] Sat. I-7.

[3] Sat. I-6. 48.

[4] Relicta non bene parmula, Royal Society of Canada Transactions, Series III, Vol. XXXVI, sec. 2, pp. 13-24 (1942).

defense of the poet's flight, has pointed out that in a major rout when discipline, morale and all order break up, there is often little choice, and certainly Horace, completely inexperienced and, by his own admission, terrified, probably was quite willing to allow himself to be swept along in the general confusion.

> "Unde simul primum me demisere Philippi,
> decisis humilem pinnis inopemque paterni
> et laris et fundi Paupertas impulit audax
> ut versus facerem....."[1]

With these words, Horace briefly sums up the situation when, pardoned by the general amnesty, he returned to Rome. As it was obvious that without a patron he could not support himself by writing alone, he obtained, according to Suetonius,[2] the position of quaestor's clerk. However, Fraenkel[3] has pointed out that this post was not as lowly as it might seem. It required not only intelligence but also some knowledge of the business world and of law, and seems to have been sufficiently profitable to make it worth purchasing. Nevertheless, the early satires and epodes reflect the dissatisfaction and often the bitterness of the young scriba quaestorii. Yet some of these poems attracted the attention of Vergil and Varius and induced them, probably in 38 B.C.,[4] to arrange a meeting for Horace with Maecenas, Octavian's chief adviser, who was at

---

1 Epistle II-2. 49-52.
2 Vita Horati.
3 op. cit., pp. 14-15.
4 Sat. I-6. 54 f. For a note on the date see Wickham p. 16.

that time extending his patronage to promising young poets. In the sixth satire of the first book, we are given an account of that interview, the poet's nervousness in the presence of the great man, Maecenas' reticence and finally, after nine months, the invitation to join the circle of his friends. Thus the son of a freed slave, a former officer in the army of Brutus, became a member of the literary group centered upon one of the leaders of the party he had opposed at Philippi.

The motives of Maecenas in supporting writers and the influence he exerted upon their works have been the subject for much discussion. To Beulé, the answer was obvious; "Mécène eut donc la mission d'attirer chez lui tous les poëtes, et de diriger doucement leur inspiration de commande dans les voies favorables à la conservation de l'ordre etabli."[1] Campbell also suspected that the minister's interest in literature was no mere dilettantism but connected in the most vital manner with his whole policy which was to establish the new regime in the strongest possible way by commending it indirectly to the imagination of the public.[2] This view, on the other hand, is challenged by Dalzell. After noting the character of Maecenas, as far as it can be implied from references to him, and examining those passages in the ancient critics and in the works of the poets themselves which seem to indicate pressure from Maecenas, he came to the conclusion that it cannot be claimed that Maecenas was directly responsible for the "Augustan" elements in the works of Virgil, Propertius,

---

[1] Auguste, Sa Famille et Ses Amis, p. 292.

[2] Horace, p. 90.

or Horace.[1] He saw nothing in the literary activities of the Princeps' chief adviser or in the early work of his protégés to suggest that he had assumed the role of propagandist. Yet, although Horace seems to indicate in Satire II-6 that he seldom discussed political matters with his patron, there can be little doubt but that there was an informal exchange of views within the circle of friends, and, as Wilkinson has suggested,[2] the protégés would be anxious to say what their patron approved. However, if the Princeps' adviser had definite political motives underlying his support of writers, he seems to have had the tact not to try to buy or force from them praise for the new regime until they themselves were convinced of its truth. Thus Fougnies concluded that "S'il est vrai que la pensée du ministre du prince se retrouve à chaque instant dans les oeuvres de 'ses poetes,' il n'en faut conclure qu'à leur affectueuse reconnaissance, et nullement à un travail de commande."[3]

Yet, to many critics, especially those of the nineteenth century, Horace's acceptance of Maecenas' patronage was the beginning of the dissolution of his republican principles, and his subsequent support of the new regime an example of despicable political opportunism. Voltaire called him an "adroit esclave,"[4] Beulé described his behaviour before his patrons as "sinon servile, du moins digne d'un affranchi,"[5] while Noyes,

---

[1] Maecenas and the Poets, Phoenix, X (1956), p. 157.

[2] op. cit., p. 20.

[3] Mecene, Ministre d'Auguste, p. 61.

[4] As quoted by Martin in Horace, p. 172.

[5] op. cit., p. 301.

the reforms needed to bring his idealized vision of Rome closer to reality.

If, as Syme has suggested,[1] it was Maecenas' task to nurse the most promising writers into the Principate, the nursing process, in Horace's case, lasted a very long time. Both those who criticize the poet for political opportunism and those who emphasize the role played by Maecenas in the development of his attitudes towards the new regime tend, I believe, to pass over the fact that his active support for the government of Augustus came only by stages.

In the eleven years preceding the battle of Actium, Horace produced three books of poetry; the first book of the Satires published probably in 35 B.C., the second book of the Satires, and the Epodes which seem to have appeared around the year 30 B.C. Some of these works, even those written after 38 B.C., are not favourable to Octavian. Indeed, certain epodes and early odes appealing for an end to further civil strife were probably embarrassing to his new patron's political associates in their struggles with Sextus Pompey. In addition, as E.T. Salmon[2] has pointed out, in the Epodes and the first book of the Satires the poet is more than a little critical of Octavian's Rome. The pictures of the defamer in Epode VI, the upstart slave in Epode IV, the references to superstition in Epodes V and XVII and in Satire I-8, to adultery and sensual indulgence in Satire I-2 and to slander in Satires I-3.61 and I-6.48 all indicate his dissatisfaction with the administration of the city. In the same

---

[1] Roman Revolution, p. 460.

[2] The Political Views of Horace, Phoenix, I (1942) no. 2, p. 9.

article, Salmon also notes that some of the figures directly criticized in the Satires were friends and supporters of Octavian.[1] In the first satire of the second book, the Princeps himself is portrayed as a bad-tempered horse and there is doubtless a touch of irony in the advice of Trebatius:

> "Aut si tantus amor scribendi te rapit, aude
> Caesaris invicti res dicere, multa laborum
> praemia laturus....."[2]

Yet there is evidence in an ode that may possibly have been written before the battle of Actium that Horace had at that early time at least begun to see some hope for the restoration of order.[3] However, Octavian's identification of Cleopatra with the vices and excesses of the East and his claim that the war with Egypt was a war to protect Rome from these evils won Horace's support at that time. The young triumvir then appeared as the saviour of the poet's idealized state from the threats of a corrupt enemy.

With the defeat of Antony, Octavian gained sole control of the Roman world thus ending a century of civil war and disorder. For Horace, the restoration of peace and order marked the first stage of Rome's progress towards the realization of his vision. The importance he attached to this achievement is clearly evident from his repeated references to the horrors of civil war in his poetry, passages which, by portraying the degradation and sorrow of the past one hundred years doubtless

---

[1] op. cit., p. 9.

[2] Sat. II-1.10-12.

[3] Ode I-14, see pp. 30 f.

had a powerful deterrent effect upon many who might have supported an uprising against the new regime. Shortly before the publication of the second book of the Satires and the Epodes, Maecenas had presented him with a Sabine farm, a gift which gave the poet great pleasure.[1] On this moderate estate, far from the distractions of the big city, Horace composed and perfected his greatest achievement, the first three books of the Odes. While it is true that of the eighty-eight poems that make up this collection, only about twenty can, by any stretch of the imagination, be called political, nevertheless, they indicate the poet's attitude to the new regime by clearly setting forth the second stage in Rome's restoration, the need for reconciliation, moral reform and the reassertion of her supremacy abroad. Indeed, by a close examination of these odes, many of which have been interpreted as praising Octavian, I hope to be able to show that Horace, far from being an "adroit esclave," was seeking to lay before the Princeps the deeper needs of Roman society and to encourage him in the often unpopular task of enacting the required reforms. Further indications of the poet's independence of spirit can be seen in his continued friendship with men like Pollio,[2] a former adherent of Antony's party, and Pompeius, an old comrade from Brutus' army with whom he reminisced about the battle of Philippi

> "cum fracta Virtus et minaces
> turpe solum tetigere mento."[3]

---

[1] See Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 15.

[2] Ode II-1.

[3] Ode II-7.11-12.

In addition to reminding his readers twice of Cato's noble death,[1] Horace in two odes refused to praise the victories of the leaders of the new regime.[2] In one of the few instances we know of when Maecenas seems to have suggested a political topic to the poet, he tactfully replied that the glories of Caesar were more suited to his patron's own prose style. In another ode addressed to Agrippa, he protested his own inability to celebrate adequately his and Caesar's achievements. Thus Horace appears to have accepted the new regime as a safeguard against a renewal of civil anarchy but to have reserved his full approval until he ascertained how closely the civil policies of the Princeps corresponded to his own evaluation of the needs of the state. In the meantime, as the sacerdos Musarum, it was his duty to give their gentle counsel to Augustus.

The influence of Horace's appeals on the policies of the Princeps will never be known. Although the first three books of the Odes were not published until 23 B.C.,[3] it is quite likely that Augustus had either seen the manuscripts of individual odes or at least heard some of them recited before they were collected. Thus the poet was probably aware that some of his poems would be heard in the not too distant future by the master of the Roman world. Indeed, certain critics[4] have noted the change that the character of the young demagogue whom Maecenas once called

---

[1] Ode I-12.35 f.; II-1.23 f.

[2] Odes I-6 and II-12.

[3] See Appendix p. 122.

[4] Conway, Octavian and Augustus, p. 5; Zielinski, op. cit., p. 23 and 31.

carnifex[1] underwent in the period immediately before and after Actium. Conway[2] gives much of the credit for the enlightening and humanizing of the struggling Octavian to the two great poets, Virgil and Horace, supported later on by the historian Livy. It is perhaps significant to note that all three were protégés of Maecenas, who himself seems to have exerted a moderating influence on the character and policies of the Princeps. In addition, certain passages in Horace's later poems praising the achievements of Augustus are, as we shall see in Chapter IV, reminiscent of earlier appeals found in the first three books of the Odes. However, due to the lack of conclusive evidence, the effect of this literary circle upon imperial policy must remain a matter for speculation.

The public reception of the first three books of the Odes seems to have been very disappointing to the poet. This was reflected in his decision, announced in the first epistle of book one, to abandon the composition of lyrics in favour of philosophical studies, while his deep resentment of the criticisms his odes had received from the grammaticas tribus is evident in Epistle I-19. Thus, between the years 23 and 20 B.C., Horace turned his attention to the first book of his metrical letters. Since the majority of topics in this collection are philosophical, political matters are mentioned only incidentally, but two epistles are interesting for the light they shed on the relationship between the poet and his patrons. The short note[3] addressed ostensibly to Vinius Asina,

---

[1] Martin op. cit., p. 41. Dio (lv.7) uses "δήμιε".

[2] Octavian and Augustus, p. 6.

[3] Epistle I-13.

but really intended for the Emperor, conveys the sense of gratification felt by the poet at Augustus' request for a copy of the collected odes and its tone suggests a closer personal relationship than is evident in any of his earlier poetry. Another epistle (I-7), on the other hand, demonstrates the nature of the friendship between Horace and Maecenas. The latter, who was apparently in Rome, seems to have reproached the poet for staying in the country longer than he had promised, and possibly had hinted at his obligations to his patron. In reply to this, Horace openly asserted his personal freedom but also clearly indicated his lasting affection for his benefactor. The gradual manner in which he attempted to approach the true reason for the rejection of his friend's request is evidence of his concern for his patron's feelings. He begins by laying the blame for his prolonged absence on fears for his health, an excuse which, in Fraenkel's opinion,[1] Maecenas would not have taken too seriously. His independence is suggested by the fact that when winter removed the threat of epidemics in the city, he would return, not to Rome, but to the seashore; when spring returned, he promised to visit his patron, if the latter permitted it. Thus there was another reason for his absence besides health. With a short anecdote, he pays tribute to his friend's true generosity,but the words "quod si me noles usquam discedere" seem about to introduce the painful fact of the poet's independence. Instead, however, he demands, not his freedom, but the health, appearance and pleasures of years past. Approaching the subject afresh in line 29, Horace recounts the fable of the fox and the weasel concluding it with a statement of his

---

[1] op. cit., pp. 327-328.

own position:

> "Hac ego si compellor imagine, cuncta resigno;
> nec somnum plebis laudo satur altilium nec
> otia divitiis Arabum liberrima muto."[1]

To emphasize that this freedom does not indicate a lessening of his affection for and devotion to his patron, the poet reminds Maecenas of the true nature of their long friendship and solemnly reaffirms his loyalty and gratitude:

> "Saepe verecundum laudasti, 'rexque paterque'
> audisti coram, nec verbo parcius absens;"[2]

Yet Horace was willing to return all he had received if it were to limit his freedom:

> "inspice si possum donata reponere laetus."[3]

Another indication of the increasing interest shown by the Emperor in Horace's poetry can be seen in the fact that he was commissioned to compose the hymn with which the Ludi Saeculares were to close. Thus the poet was recalled to lyric poetry. In this work, he noted the fulfillment of many of the aspirations expressed in the first three books of the Odes, and looked forward to the future, not with the reservations so common in his earlier poems, but with confidence in the gods and Rome. The following year (16 B.C.), was marked by the final retirement of Maecenas from public life. Some historians[4] have dated the decline of his influence from the

---

[1] Epistle I-7.34 f.

[2] Epistle I-7.37 f.

[3] Epistle I-7.39.

[4] Syme, op. cit., p. 409. Fougnies (op. cit., ch. IV) noted the displeasure of the emperor but pointed out that he had sufficient confidence in Maecenas to consult him later about his prospective son-in-law (Dio liv.6.5.).

betrayal to his wife, Terentia, of the danger to which her brother was exposed as a result of Fannius Caepio's plot, which was discovered in 22 B.C. However, according to Dio,[1] the final break in relations between the Princeps and his adviser was due to Augustus' attraction to the latter's wife. At any rate, in 16 B.C., the Emperor departed for Gaul leaving Statilius Taurus, not Maecenas, in charge of the city. Indeed, Tacitus[2] was later to describe the last years of Maecenas' life as peregrinum otium. Although the eleventh ode of the fourth book indicates, as Fraenkel has noted,[3] that Horace still retained his affectionate friendship towards his first patron, another more powerful benefactor was nowemerging to encourage the poet to undertake new tasks.

Suetonius records a letter from Augustus in which the Princeps indicated that he was offering Horace the post of private secretary.[4] Even when the poet declined, we are told that the Emperor showed no resentment and continued his efforts to gain his friendship. Surely, the words "Neque enim si tu superbus amicitiam nostram sprevisti, ideo nos quoque ἀνθυπερηφανοῦμεν"[5] would not have been addressed to an "adroit esclave." Convinced that Horace's poetry would be immortal, Augustus requested that he celebrate the victories of Drusus and Tiberius over the

---

1 liv.19.6.
2 Annales, XIV.53.2.
3 op. cit., pp. 416-417.
4 Suetonius, Vita Horati.
5 Suetonius, Vita Horati.

Vindelici in 15 B.C.[1] and encouraged him to complete the fourth book of the Odes. Although in Ode IV-2 he had rejected a suggestion by Iullus Antonius that he praise the triumphs of Caesar, the poet complied with the request of the Emperor, but, as we shall see in a later chapter, he still maintained his freedom to place the emphasis where he wished. He still refused to write conventional panegyrics. While, in the fourth book of the Odes, the praise of the Princeps is whole-hearted, it is also impersonal. The Emperor's achievements are consistently presented in such a manner that the emphasis falls not on their personal significance to Augustus but on their importance to the state. When the poet joins the peasants in their toasts to the master of the Roman world, it is in a spirit of genuine gratitude, not flattery. The dignified nature of this relationship can also be seen in the epistle which Horace addressed to the Emperor at the latter's request.[2] He shows that he is fully aware of the burdens of the state and praises his patron for his services to mankind. Nevertheless, he is careful notto isolate the Princeps from the rest of the human race. In this work, he is treated as only one, though perhaps the most influential, of the Roman citizens interested in poetry. Horace even criticizes early Roman comedy, a form of entertainment which, we are told,[3] Augustus enjoyed. Thus Conway seems to have summed up well the attitude of the poet towards the Emperor when he wrote, "He refused

---

1 Suetonius, Vita Horati.

2 Epistle II-1.

3 Suetonius, Divus Augustus, 89.1.

to forget his nation in his patron, refused to think of his patron save as the servant of the nation."[1]

After the publication of the fourth book of the Odes, probably about 13 B.C., Horace seems to have spent his last five years completing the second book of the epistles and the Epistle to the Pisos. As if his words in Ode II-17 were prophetic, the poet did not live long after the death of his first patron. Suetonius tells us that fifty-nine days after the death of Maecenas, Horace died suddenly in his fifty-seventh year. He named Augustus as his heir and was buried near the tomb of Maecenas on the Esquiline Hill.[2]

Thus a brief preliminary examination of the facts concerning Horace's life, as mentioned in his own works and as reported by Suetonius,[3] gives little indication that he was ever a mere tool of the regime or a flatterer of its leaders. It is true that in the "Vita Horati," the word used to describe the poet's entry into the circle of Maecenas is <u>insinuatus</u> but, as Fraenkel[4] has pointed out, its ignoble implications are refuted by Satire I-6 lines 52 following and by the subsequent relationship between the poet and his patron. We have already seen that there is no definite evidence to suggest that the Princeps' adviser made any obvious effort to impose support for the new regime upon Horace. At the most, he seems to

---

[1] New studies, p. 54.

[2] Account taken from Suetonius, Vita Horati.

[3] Vita Horati.

[4] op. cit., pp. 15 f.

have confined himself to making suggestions and, on at least one occasion,[1] his advice was rejected. As has been noted earlier in this chapter, Horace's continued friendship with men of uncertain loyalties, and his refusal to forget his opposition to the regime at Philippi are not the acts of one who has surrendered his political integrity to the dictates of his patron. Nor does his later relationship with the Emperor himself indicate a less independent attitude. Indeed, the letters of Augustus as quoted by Suetonius suggest that it was the master of Rome who actively sought a closer acquaintance with the poet whom he described once as proudly spurning his friendship.[2] In later chapters, those passages in which Horace addressed Augustus will be examined more carefully and it will be noted that in none of them did the poet sink to servility or flattery. There is, therefore, little reason to suspect that the political opinions expressed in the works of Horace were insincere or dictated by Maecenas or Augustus. Thus, a closer examination of those poems revealing the poet's attitude towards the government at Rome should enable us to trace the stages by which his support for the new regime gradually developed, to note the reasons for his acceptance of its rule and the conditions to be fulfilled before he gave it his complete allegiance, and to show that his final loyalty to Augustus was based primarily not on personal considerations, but on his recognition of the benefits derived by the state from the administration of the Princeps.

---

[1] Cde II-12.

[2] Vita Horati. For quotation, see page 16.

However, to appreciate fully the poet's gratitude to the Princeps for the restoration of peace and order and the effect it had upon his attitude towards the new regime in the years following the battle of Actium, it will be necessary to consider poems revealing the depths of Horace's despair at the prospect of unceasing civil strife and his opposition to all parties threatening to continue it. These works and the first indications of his support for Octavian will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

THE CIVIL WAR PERIOD (43 B.C. - 30 B.C.)

Although the forces led by Antony and Octavian had been victorious over the Republican armies of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, it soon became evident that the problem of political instability which had led in the preceding century to no less than twelve separate civil wars, a long series of political murders and five deliberate massacres,[1] had not yet been solved. Shortly after the battle, signs of dissention began to appear between the two most powerful leaders in the Caesarian Party, and the Roman World became a witness to their intrigues and political manoeuvres. To Octavian had fallen the task of settling in Italy large numbers of discharged veterans, both from his own armies and from those of Antony. Dissatisfaction was widespread among the former soldiers to whom poorer areas had been allotted, and mutinous groups seized lands not assigned to them. The dispossessed landlords, in the meantime, flocked to Rome where they augmented the idle mob. The discontent fomented by these two classes and by the Republicans opposed to the Triumvirate, was increased by the attempts of Fulvia, Antony's wife, and Lucius Antonius to obstruct the distribution of land and to inflame public feeling against the regime at Rome. This led to open violence which in 41 B.C. culminated in the siege and capture of Perusia by Octavian, who showed no mercy to

---

[1] See Conway, New Studies, pp. 49-50.

those who had opposed him.

During the Perusine War, the grain supply at Rome was in constant jeopardy due to the actions of Sextus Pompey, and when in 40 B.C. a rumour arose that Antony was about to form a coalition with him there was fear that it would destroy the balance of power and lead to a renewal of open warfare. This alliance, however, was averted by the Compact of Brundisium,which reconciled the Triumvirs, but in the following year Sextus reduced Rome to such a state of famine that action was deemed necessary. Popular demonstrations against the taxes needed to finance this new campaign convinced Octavian and Antony that it would be politic to make peace. An agreement was reached near Misenum in 39 B.C. but it remained in effect for less than one year. Octavian, having broken the treaty by accepting the island of Sardinia from a treacherous vice-admiral of Sextus, attempted to invade Sicily but was forced to abandon this expedition by the destruction of much of his fleet. After two years of intensive preparation under Agrippa, the Roman fleet was finally victorious at the battle of Naulochus in 36 B.C.

Following the defeat of Sextus Pompey, each Triumvir sought to enhance his reputation by engaging in campaigns against races beyond the borders of the Empire. Octavian gained considerable prestige by his pacification of Illyricum in contrast to Antony, who, in 36 B.C., was forced to abandon his invasion of Parthia and to content himself with the rather inglorious conquest of Armenia. In 33 B.C., by publicly revealing his relationship with Cleopatra, he brought about the final phase of the struggle for supremacy. Early in the following year, the consuls and three hundred senators who supported Antony left Rome for the East. A short time

later, the divorce of Octavia and the publication of Antony's will aroused indignation throughout Italy, which, together with Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily and Sardinia, took an oath of allegiance to Octavian and called for him as its leader in the imminent contest. The rout of the forces of the East at Actium, the surrender of Alexandria and the suicides of Antony and Cleopatra left Octavian the undisputed master of the Mediterranean world.[1]

Noyes, in describing Horace's attitude to the party politics of this period of uncertainty and tension, has noted that, "His only political concern was to oppose with everything that was in him any new outbreak of the civil war."[2] The poet clearly saw the detrimental effect of violence and instability upon the security and moral character of the Roman nation. It was imperative that some form of order replace the anarchy which was dividing citizens against each other, not merely that Rome might achieve the future greatness he foresaw for her, but that she might survive. A grim picture of the city's destruction and of the desolation to come is one of the most striking features of the sixteenth epode. Although we are not able to date this poem by internal references, it is generally agreed[3] that it is a very early, if not the earliest, attempt by Horace to deal with political matters. Most critics[4] place it in the period

---

[1] This summary is based mainly on T. Rice Holmes, Vol. I, p. 89 f.

[2] op. cit., p. 63.

[3] e.g., by Franke, Orelli, Shorey and Laing, Page, Noyes, Sellar (p. 122), Macleane.

[4] Orelli, Franke, Shorey and Laing, Moore, Noyes.

preceding the outbreak of the Perusine War in 41 B.C. although Fraenkel has speculated that a date as late as 38 B.C. cannot be dismissed in view of Horace's technical proficiency in meter and in form, especially if the priority of Virgil's fourth eclogue is accepted.[1] Probably all that can be said with any degree of certainty is that Epode Sixteen was written before either party had given the poet reason to hope that an end to factional strife was possible.[2]

The first fourteen lines of this epode are an expression of genuine indignation and sorrow at Rome's self-destruction. Recalling the earlier foes whose attacks the city had withstood, Horace grimly foretells its downfall and vividly pictures the desolate ruins:

> "Impia perdemus devoti sanguinis aetas,
> Ferisque rursus occupabitur solum."[3]

In the following passage (lines 15-38), the poet calls upon the "melior pars" to follow the example of the citizens of Phocaea and to migrate with him "wheresoever o'er the waves Notus or boisterous Africus shall call."[4] To this proposal is added a vow not to return until certain inversions of nature take place. The remainder of the poem (lines 39-66) consists of an idyllic vision of their journey's end, the Isles of the Blest, a land flowing with milk and honey where nature is always bountiful.

Had this suggested migration seemed a serious recommendation,

---

1 op. cit., p. 52 f.

2 For a further discussion of dates see Appendix p. 118.

3 Epode XVI, 1.9-10.

4 Epode XVI, 1.21-22, translated by C.E. Bennett.

Horace would no doubt have incurred the vigorous disapproval of the government, a dangerous situation indeed for one who owed his life to an amnesty granted by that government. However, the manner in which he proposed this action clearly indicated its separation from practical politics. As Wilkinson[1] has pointed out, it was remarkable that a Roman lyric poet, especially one of humble birth, should have ventured to address his countrymen at large. In addition to this fact, Fraenkel[2] has also demonstrated how Horace, instead of using the terminology and procedure of any single, legal assembly, chose to employ a strange mixture of phrases usually associated with meetings of the contio, comitia and the senate. In this manner, the poet made it clear that his harangue was directed at an imaginary gathering of the Roman People and that the proposed migration was not to be taken seriously.

What then, were Horace's motives for thus addressing his readers and adding the pretty pastoral scene with which this epode concludes? Did the change of caelum only symbolize the needed change of animus as Campbell[3] has suggested, or was the poet a young idealist who, since his vision was apparently beyond realization in Italy, sought to transfer it to a world elsewhere?[4] Was this poem an expression of Horace's yearning for the discovery of a land far from the uncertainties and violence

---

1 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, pp. 65-66.

2 op. cit., pp. 43 f.

3 Horace, p. 134.

4 Noyes, op. cit., p. 55.

of contemporary Rome? In rejecting these interpretations, I agree with Fraenkel that, "He was no adolescent when he wrote the epode. Nor was he by nature a sentimentalist remote from the struggles of the world. He was a level-headed man always on guard against any kind of delusion and long inured to party strife and civil war."[1]

If we accept Snell's[2] theory that Virgil's fourth eclogue was written before Epode Sixteen, is it not possible that the latter poem was composed as a reply to the optimistic delusions of the former work? To a well-educated man, deprived of his property and hopes for political advancement, earning a meagre living as a quaestor's clerk, surrounded by poverty and brooding over the anarchy that gripped his native land, the pretty picture of sheep conveniently tinted in pleasant pastel shades[3] must have seemed pathetically far-removed from actual conditions in Italy and from any that he could foresee. The true situation as he observed it and the future destruction which would result from a continuation of the civil wars were vividly described in the first fifteen lines of Horace's poem. What better way was there to emphasize the fact that Virgil's vision had nothing to do with Italy than to move it to some distant isle? As Fraenkel has pointed out, "A flight to the Happy Isles is the last thing anyone would dare to propose to an Assembly of Roman citizens however disheartened."[4] Yet this, claims Horace, is the very

---

1 op. cit., p. 46

2 Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 50 f.

3 Virgil, Eclogue IV, lines 42-45.

4 op. cit., p. 49.

thing they must do if ever they wish to see Virgil's unherded goats bring home their udders swollen with milk and the untilled land sprout grain. Indeed, the idea of cattle not fearing the lion was so absurd that it was included, not in the description of the Happy Isles, but as one of the inversions of nature found in the oath.[1] Thus, by suggesting that the better part of the population leave Rome and migrate to the semi-mythical isles of the West where the idyllic life of the Fourth Eclogue might be found, the poet sought to impress upon the reader his utter hopelessness for Rome's future and his rejection of Virgil's optimism. If this interpretation is accepted, the sixteenth epode becomes not a melancholy yearning for pastoral perfection, but the pessimistic reaction of one for whom the unpleasantness and suffering of the civil wars were still grim realities to what seemed to him a hopeful delusion.

Syme[2] has pointed out that Messianic theories were prevalent during this period and that they were quickly adopted for purposes of propaganda by the rulers of the world. Epode Sixteen, by contradicting the most outstanding expression of these aspirations, must have been very displeasing to the supporters of the new regime. The poet's complete lack of confidence both in the government at Rome and in the future of the state could hardly have aided the stability of Octavian's administration. Thus, in what is probably his earliest political poem, Horace foresees only the city's destruction, a calamity which no party seems able to

---

[1] Compare Virgil Ecl. IV.21 with Ep. XVI.49-50; Ecl. IV.40 with Ep. XVI.43; Ecl. IV.22 with Ep. XVI.33.

[2] The Roman Revolution, p. 218.

prevent. Here there is no indication of support for any faction, only grief at the imminent ruin of his homeland.

A similar despair arising from the poet's abhorrence of civil strife for which he could perceive no practical remedy is also the dominant mood of Epode Seven. Although mention is made of a period in which the swords were sheathed, fresh bloodshed once again seemed imminent. In this poem, Horace reproached those who were rushing off to renew the struggle. Had not enough Roman blood been shed already? Such madness of self-destruction was not natural;

> "Neque hic lupis mos nec fuit leonibus,
> Umquam nisi in dispar feris."[1]

An explanation for their actions was demanded, but none could be given. The bitter fates pursuing the Romans were the result of Romulus' murder of Remus, nor was there any mention of possible atonement. Thus the poet displayed little hope for the future of his accursed homeland.

It is indeed unfortunate that there is nothing to fix the date of this epode with any degree of certainty. The identity of the "scelesti" to whom the poem is addressed must therefore remain a matter for speculation. A.Y. Campbell[2] has suggested that Horace was condemning the action of the consuls and senators who left Rome for Antony's camp shortly before the battle of Actium. Ferrero, accepting this date, has written, "Horace ventured upon political composition for the first time,

---

1 Epode VII.11-12.

2 op. cit., pp. 97 f.

and in vigorous iambic lines expressed the opinion of impartial men, regarding both parties as equally criminal.... The authority of the triumvirs must have grown very weak if a man of letters who owed his position to the kindness of Maecenas could judge his patron's master with such impartiality"[1] Fraenkel, however, dismissed a date as late as 32 B.C. on the grounds that by that time Horace had given up haranguing the people in the manner of Archilochus.[2] Certainly, the pessimism and doubt about the future found in this work resemble the attitudes expressed in Epode XVI more closely than those of either Epode I or IX. Thus, I am inclined to accept Orellius' suggestion, "Referri videtur hoc carmen ad id bellum quod cum S. Pompeio a.718 ad Siciliam gestum est."[3] It is quite possible that Horace, reflecting the displeasure of the people at the burden of a new war[4] and his own opposition to any renewal of violence, was addressing the followers of Octavian about to embark on the final campaign against Sextus. Zielinski, applying the "scelesti" to both sides, has commented, "Je m'imagine que César n'a pas fait trop bonne mine, en se voyant traité de scelestus en même temps que Pompée et même à plus forte raison que lui, comme le prouve l'allusion au 'sang latin,' dont les pirates et esclaves du roi des mers ne disposaient pas en grand

---

1 The Greatness and Decline of Rome, Vol. IV, p. 72.

2 "κατὰ τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον," op. cit., p. 56, note 3.

3 Q. Horatius Flaccus, Vol. I, p. 656. For further discussion of date, see Appendix p. 119.

4 Dio, xlviii,43.1 and Appian, Bell. Civ., v.92.

quantité."[1] Thus once again, Horace's aversion to civil war may have led him to oppose the policies of the regime he was to support in later years.

In the fourteenth ode of the first book, however, there is evidence that the pessimism with which Horace had hitherto viewed the fortunes of Rome was gradually being replaced by hope. Quintilian[2] tells us that in this poem the poet is using the allegorical device of a ship to represent the state and that the waves and storms refer to the civil wars. There is also a resemblance to a fragment of Alcaeus[3] in which the city of Mytilene is portrayed as a vessel in danger. But unlike the earlier poet, Horace addresses the ship directly as though it were a human being. He appeals to it to make for port and not allow itself to be carried out to sea by the rising waves. He reminds it of its weakened condition:

> ".....Non tibi sunt integra lintea,
> Non di, quos iterum pressa voces malo."[4]

As in both Epodes XVI and VII, the nation lacks the good will of the gods. Its unatoned guilt still stands in the way of the pax deorum. The personification of the vessel, as Fraenkel has pointed out,[5] greatly intensifies the feeling of profound anxiety expressed by the poet. Thus, even before

---

[1] op. cit., p. 29.

[2] De Institutione Oratoria, VIII.6.44. Acron (Scholia Horatiana, p. 65), on the other hand, claims that the ship refers to the party of Sextus Pompey whom Horace is warning not to break the Treaty of Misenum. However, its similarity to the fragment of Alcaeus leads me to agree with Quintilian.

[3] Fragment 18 Bergk. See introduction by Pseudo-Heraclitus.

[4] Ode I-14.9-10.

[5] op. cit., pp. 156-157.

he comes to the final stanza, the reader can sense that the despair and pessimism of the earlier epodes has been replaced by some hope for the future. The seventeenth and eighteenth lines of this ode openly confirm this change of attitude;

> "Nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium,
> Nunc desiderium curaque non levis,"[1]

It is indeed unfortunate that we are unable to date this poem with any degree of certainty.[2] Although it reflects an important change in Horace's views towards the state, we know nothing of the circumstances which inspired it. Did the novi fluctus threatening the ship refer to the impending struggle with Sextus Pompey in 38 B.C.? Could they have referred to the deteriorating relations between Antony and Octavian which, on more than one accasion, threatened a fresh outbreak of civil strife? Certainly, if this poem was circulated at Rome when the government was attempting to arouse public opinion against either Pompey or Antony and to prepare it for the possible demands of a new war effort, its pacifism and lack of confidence in the ability of the state to survive the imminent dangers would hardly be pleasing to the followers of Octavian. Such opinions would be very detrimental to the war effort. The possibility that, at the time this ode was composed, too outspoken an utterance may have been politically undesirable has been suggested by Fraenkel as a reason for the restraint shown by Horace in not fully explaining the allegory. In the Appendix, page 124, I will also discuss the

---

[1] Ode I-14.17-18.

[2] See Appendix p. 123.

suggestion made by Torrentius and accepted by Orelli, Franke and Wilkinson that this ode was written shortly after Actium when Octavian considered retirement from public life and that it was prompted by the fear that the Republic might really be restored and the whole fatal process begun again. For the present, I will note merely that the poem is addressed to the state, not to the Princeps, that there is no indication of partizanship revealed, and that there is no mention of any pilot or helmsman, an unusual omission if Horace were urging Octavian to continue to guide the state. If the poet deliberately avoided referring to any single individual, then this ode was probably composed before he had become reconciled to the leadership of one man.

Five years after the defeat of Sextus Pompey at the battle of Naulochus, another naval engagement decided the future of the whole Roman world. The battle of Actium brought to a close a period in which the prevailing atmosphere had been one of tension and uncertainty accompanied by dire forebodings as men watched the relations between Antony and Octavian gradually deteriorating. During this period, however, Horace enjoyed the increasing favour and confidence of Maecenas to whom he addressed Epode I, the first of three poems dealing with the final struggle for supremacy. In this work, the poet proclaimed his desire to accompany his patron, who was about to set out for Actium, even though he himself admitted that he was "imbellis ac infirmus parum."[1] In spite of the fact that he had been relieved of the duty of accompanying his patron,[2] the

---

[1] Epode 1. 16.

[2] Epode 1. 7.

poet felt impelled by his fears for his friend's safety to follow him to war. Fraenkel,[1] noting this anxiety for the fortunes of one whose future was closely linked with that of Caesar, saw in this poem an indication of the concern with which Horace was viewing the political and military situation. In addition, this display of loyal devotion to Maecenas and of willingness to share his hardships is evidence of the influence that their growing intimacy was having upon the poet's attitude towards his patron's political associates. This is, in fact, the earliest poem in which the poet clearly indicated support for the cause of Octavian.

Horace's concern over the outcome of the battle of Actium is very evident in Epode IX. The opening lines of this work express the poet's anxious longing to celebrate in Maecenas' palace at Rome Caesar's new victory as they had the defeat of Sextus Pompey. At line eleven, however, the author turns to the disgrace brought upon Rome by Roman soldiers serving a woman and her withered eunuchs. Because of this, two thousand Gauls had deserted the foe, and the opposing fleet,[2] summoned to the left, lay hidden in the harbour. Anxiously Horace anticipates victory and imagines Antony, already disheartened, about to make for Crete with unfavourable conditions hampering him. But even these pleasant dreams cannot dispel his cares and so, in the last six lines, he calls for more

---

[1] op. cit., p. 70.

[2] "sinistrorsum citae" (line 20). An accurate description of its retreat into the Bay of Arta as seen from Caesar's camp to the north.

wines;[1]

"curam metumque Caesaris rerum iuvat
dulci Lyaeo solvere."[2]

This epode has been the subject of many interpretations arising mainly from arguments concerning the time and place of its composition. Bücheler,[3] interpreting the word "nauseam" as a reference to seasickness, suggested that it was written on board ship at Actium. In reply, other critics[4] reasserted the earlier view that it was composed at Rome upon receipt of the first inconclusive reports of the battle. In defense of their theory, they quoted passages from Dio Cassius,[5] Velleius Paterculus,[6] the epitomist of Livy,[7] and Appian[8] which seemed to indicate that Maecenas at Rome had suppressed the conspiracy of the younger Lepidus at about the same time as Actium. Since Horace was probably with his patron, the ancient sources, in their opinion, refuted Bücheler. This view and the rejection of the statement in the "Elegia ad Maecenatem"[9]

---

[1] This summary is based mainly upon the views of Wistrand, Horace's Ninth Epode, and A.E. Housman, Horatiana, Journal of Philology, X (1882).

[2] Epode IX.37-38.

[3] See Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 71 f.

[4] Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 71 f.; Wilkinson, Horace Epode IX, Class. Rev. Vol. 47 (1933), p. 4.

[5] Dio. 51.3.

[6] Velleius Paterculus 88.1.

[7] Livy 133.1.

[8] Appian, Bell. Civ. IV.50 f.

[9] lines 45 f.

that Maecenas had been present at the battle moved Wistrand[1] to point out that none of the ancient sources gave direct, unassailable evidence that he had remained at Rome. He thus concluded that both Horace and his patron were probably in the general vicinity of the battle although he does not go so far as to infer that the poet was actually on board ship.

Those who support the theory that Epode IX was written when the first news from Actium reached Rome, generally interpret this poem as a mixture of joy and anxiety, a hope that nothing might delay the triumph which seemed so close at hand. In contrast, A.E. Housman, placing its time of composition shortly before the final engagement began, saw only fearful concern. "Truth to tell the poet is trying....to cheer himself with glowing anticipations, and finding this unavailing is driven to 'capaciores scyphos.' "[2] Wistrand suggests that this poem may have been written at Octavian's camp north of the harbour occupied by Antony's fleet shortly before the final attempt was made to break through Agrippa's blockade.[3] He agrees with Housman that lines 27-32 are probably wishful thinking and seeks to strengthen this view with examples of the use of the "praesens pro futuro."[4] His conclusion is that Epode IX reflects "the tense, impatient atmosphere reigning among the adherents of Octavian

---

1 op. cit., pp. 5-16.

2 A.E. Housman, Horatiana, Journal of Philology, X (1882), p. 195.

3 op. cit., pp. 34-35.

4 op. cit., pp. 26-32; Appendix IV, pp. 49 f.

just before the battle whose issue was to decide their fate and Rome's."[1] However, Wilkinson, unable to think of the "Io Triumphe" as being merely anticipatory, suggested that the poem was written in tranquillity, presumably at Rome not long after the battle, but that it was "a dramatic representation of the supposed feelings, the changing moods, of a participant on the Caesarian side during those days off Actium."[2] Although it is unlikely that this problem will ever be solved to the satisfaction of all critics, the poem, nevertheless, bears witness to the extent to which Horace had identified his own interests with those of Caesar and the extreme anxiety with which he awaited the final outcome.

It is generally agreed that the third poem dealing with this period was written one year after Epode IX in the autumn of 30 B.C., when the news of the capture of Alexandria and of the suicides of Antony and Cleopatra arrived at Rome. The first four stanzas of Ode I.37 are a song of triumph, a call to celebrate the downfall of Egypt's queen who, attended by her foul crew and drunk with fortune's favours, had plotted the destruction of Rome. The fifth stanza, however, does not continue the spirit of the first section of the poem but acts, as Commager[3] has pointed out, as a transition in which the use of the images of the hawk pursuing the gentle dove and of the hunter following the hare serve to divert our initial sympathies from Octavian to Cleopatra. In the last section of

---

1 op. cit., p. 35.

2 Horace, Epode IX; The Classical Review, Vol. 47 (1933), p. 4.

3 Horace, Carmina I-37, Phoenix, XII (1958), p. 50.

this ode, Horace praises the resolution and courage with which that queen, sobered by Actium's grim realities, took her own life thus cheating Caesar of the satisfaction of leading her through the streets of Rome in his triumph. The magnanimity with which the poet praises the defeated monarch indicates that his support for Octavian had not become so enthusiastic as to blind him to the noble deeds of Rome's opponents. Referring to his poem, Wilkinson has written that in it "partizanship loses itself in a deeper feeling for humanity."[1]

What was, in Horace's view, the main significance of this struggle? An examination of those poems dealing with Actium reveals that its importance as the deciding factor in the rivalry between Antony and Octavian is ignored. The name of the general who commanded the forces of the East is not even mentioned, and only once is reference made to him.[2] On the other hand, corruption, immorality and hostility to Rome are depicted as the attributes of Cleopatra and her court. The single reference to Roman soldiers in the forces of the enemy which, it must be remembered, included the two consuls for that year and some three hundred senators, portrays them as slaves to a woman and her eunuchs, a disgrace to their native land.[3] The poet, therefore, seems to have regarded this war not as a contest between two Roman generals commanding Roman armies, but as a campaign against a corrupting foreign threat to everything that was Roman. "Pour

---

1 Horace and His Lyric Poetry, p. 72.

2 Epode IX.27 f.

3 Epode IX.11 f.

les contemporains et surtout pour les Romains, dans les deux camps l'alternative revêtait un autre aspect: ils devaient se dire que le parti de César était celui de l'honneur, tandis que dans l'autre régnaient la volupté et la débauche....Bref, la cause d'Horace était dans ces conditions des plus simples: il alla où l'appelait la voix de l'honneur secondée par celle de l'amitié qu'il avait pour Mécène."[1] The identification of his own cause with traditional Italian respectability and that of Antony with Oriental luxury and vice was one of the main aims of Octavian's propaganda.[2] There can be little doubt that Horace, with his distaste for "Persicos apparatus," accepted this attitude to Actium and the subsequent campaign and supported Caesar as the true protector of the ancient spirit and heritage of Rome.

Before Actium, there is no evidence to indicate that Horace followed any policy other than that of condemning indiscriminately any action which, in his opinion, threatened to continue the civil strife of the preceding century. Epode XVI, composed at a time when there seemed to be little hope for the permanent restoration of peace and order, displayed only the deepest pessimism and despair. Indeed, the poet's hopeless attitude towards the future clearly indicated his lack of confidence in the leaders of the nation. In addition, if this work was a cynical reply to the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, it must not have been welcomed by those who were seeking to make use of the vague Messianic aspirations of the populace

---

[1] Zielinski, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

[2] See Syme, op. cit., pp. 270-275.

as propaganda. Epode VII, depicting Rome as a city cursed by the gods to endure civil strife, still implied that Horace could not foresee any practical remedy for the dissension between the powerful factions that divided the state. To the future Princeps, attempting to consolidate his position and to win the confidence of the people, such opinions were not helpful, especially if they were expressed at a time when the regime at Rome was imposing the burden of new campaigns upon its citizens. Although Ode I-14 indicated that the pessimism and despair of the earlier epodes was being replaced by anxiety and even hope for the future, the weariness of strife, the pacifism and the lack of open support for any party remained unchanged. It is quite obvious, however, that the poet did not look upon Actium as a continuation of the civil wars that had plagued the state for so long, or, if he did see its true significance, he avoided mentioning that aspect of the struggle. If we judge by the prominence given to moral issues in Epode IX and Ode I-37, the campaign was seen by the poet primarily as a contest between virtue and vice. Although under these conditions Horace found Caesar preferable to Antony, it would be wrong to assume that his conversion was complete. Many fears for the stability of the new regime and reservations concerning the policies it might pursue still remained in the mind of the poet. It will be the purpose of the next chapter to examine these considerations and to attempt to trace their influence on Horace's attitude towards the new regime.

CHAPTER III

THE PERIOD OF CONSOLIDATION (30 B.C. - 23 B.C.)

Following the capture of Alexandria in 30 B.C., Octavian turned his attention to stabilizing the political situation in the Eastern Mediterranean. Although he had earlier condemned Antony's practice of delegating the powers and responsibilities for the administration and defence of the area to client princes, he now, nevertheless, preferred to leave things generally as he had found them, confirming the position of the greater vassals and, in some cases, augmenting their territory. In the summer of 29 B.C., he returned to Rome and celebrated a triple triumph for his campaign in Illyricum, for Actium, and for the war of Alexandria. During the two years that followed, the Princeps remained in Italy dealing with various problems. In 28 B.C., he dedicated a temple to Apollo on the Palatine Hill and repaired numerous other temples in the city. It is also possible that this period witnessed an attempt to introduce some moral and sumptuary legislation, but if such a law was promulgated, it seems to have been hastily withdrawn in the face of public protest and opposition.[1] However, Octavian's most significant act was the restoration of the Republic in January, 27 B.C. According to Dio,[2] the Princeps seems to have considered the

---

[1] Syme, op. cit., p. 443.

[2] op. cit., lii.1 f.

possibility of retiring completely from public life at this time but refrained.[1] After a ruthless proscription and a purge of the senate in which unworthy members were either persuaded to resign or expelled, Octavian surrendered all his powers and provinces to the senate. In return, that body persuaded him to accept a special commission for ten years, in the form of proconsular authority over Spain, Gaul, and Syria, the Empire's most powerful military territories. This gave the Princeps command of about twenty legions, and Egypt remained his personal property. In addition, Caesar occupied one of the consulships every year until 23 B.C., thus acquiring the right to initiate and direct public policy at Rome and to control the other proconsuls abroad through his consular imperium. About the middle of the year 27 B.C., he went to Gaul and from there proceeded to Spain where he commanded in person the Roman forces attempting to pacify the Cantabrians. Ill health, however, compelled him to leave the completion of that campaign to his legates and to delay his return to Rome until the middle of 24 B.C. In the following year, the Princeps suffered a severe illness which almost proved fatal and in the latter part of that same year, C. Marcellus, Augustus' nephew and expected successor, died. Shaken by these events, the Princeps resigned the consulship and accepted in its place various powers, among them proconsular imperium over the whole empire. From this time onward, he also made fuller use of his tribunicia potestas. Thus the year 23 B.C. marked the second major reorganization of the powers held by the Princeps.[2]

---

[1] Tacitus, Annales I.2.

[2] This summary is based mainly on Syme, op. cit., pp. 300-348.

A. Peace and the Memory of Civil War

"Peace was a tangible blessing. For a generation all parties had striven for peace: once attained, it became the spoil and prerogative of the victors."[1] Nor were Octavian and his followers slow to capitalize on the population's weariness of the unsettled conditions that had prevailed during the preceding century. Order had finally been restored, a fact symbolized for all to see by the closed doors of the temple of Janus and the inscriptions on the coinage. Indeed, there was no peaceful alternative to the rule of Octavian. As the sole power possessing sufficient ascendancy over his rivals to impose law and order upon them, the Princeps emerged as the obvious choice either to reconcile or to crush those whose actions were likely to disturb the peace. To Horace, in whom the possibility of unceasing strife had aroused such utter despair and hopelessness as that found in Epodes XVI and VII, the party that had the power to suppress any further self-destruction must have seemed worthy of his support even though he may have reserved his full approbation until its civil policies had become clearer. Wilkinson, commenting upon the effect the restoration of order had on the poet's attitude towards the new regime, has stated that Horace's enthusiasm for Octavian was the complement of his horror of civil war.[2] While I feel that the word enthusiasm is too strong a term to describe the poet's acceptance of the new regime, especially from 30 to 23 B.C., yet it cannot be denied that the memory of the horrors of

---

1 Syme, op. cit., p. 303.

2 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 72.

the past aroused in Horace a sense of gratitude to the man who had rescued the state from anarchy.

Horace did not forget the miseries of inter-party strife nor did he allow his readers to forget them. Conway, after noting his outspoken condemnation of the civil wars, pointed out that the same thought appears many times in his first volume containing the first three Books of the Odes, published in 23 B.C., eight years after those wars had all ceased.[1] The manner in which many of these references are made betrays the poet's anxiety and concern over the possibility of fresh outbreaks of violence. Syme has claimed that the position of the Princeps and of his restored Republic was by no means as secure and unequivocal as official acts and official history sought to demonstrate.[2] There were far too many capable leaders who had supported defeated causes and whose subsequent loyalties were at best uncertain. Syme indicated the size and importance of this unreliable group when he pointed out that there was scarce a man among the consulars but had a Republican- or Antonian-past behind him.[3] Many concealed animosities still lingered after Actium, hatreds which, if stimulated, could once more plunge the nation back into civil strife. Until those men who were suspected of retaining earlier loyalties were shifted from positions of power, any revival of Republican or Antonian sentiments could be a serious threat to the security of the state. Thus,

---

1 New Studies, p. 52.

2 Syme, op. cit., p. 328.

3 op. cit., p. 308.

there was good reason for Horace to be concerned about the future order and security of Rome, and in the first three books of the Odes, he both reminded men of the miseries from which they had only recently been delivered and warned them against ill-advised opposition to the rule of Octavian.

Indeed, it was to one of these able men whose loyalties were not yet certain that Horace addressed the first ode of the second book. C. Asinius Pollio, a former consul, had been a general in the service of Antony's party and had chosen neutrality in the final struggle for supreme power. Although he had not yet presented himself at court to obtain the approval of the new regime, he was undertaking the task of writing an account of the civil wars,

> "Ludumque Fortunae gravisque
> Principum amicitias....."[1]

The gravis amicitia of Antony and Octavian was an extremely delicate subject especially for one whose opinions might still be influenced by his past association with the defeated leader. Such a history could easily revive old animosities and cause unrest unless great caution and discretion were exercised. Thus Horace warned his friend of the perilous nature of his project:

> "Periculosae plenum opus aleae,
> Tractas et incedis per ignis
> Suppositos cineri doloso."[2]

The fires of civil strife were not extinguished but merely smouldering;

---

1 Ode II-1.3-4.

2 Ode II-1.6-8.

too generous a view of Antony could easily stir them to new life. However, in spite of the danger, Horace, in lines 17-28, expressed his enthusiastic anticipation of the work. Already he seemed to hear the tumult and shouting, to behold the brilliance and the glory, and to see all the world subdued except stern Cato's soul. Yet all this swiftly gave way to the grim realities of the slaughter. The eighth and ninth stanzas are a dirge lamenting the unholy strife of the past. The heroism, renown and valour of war are not allowed to obscure the Roman blood shed by fellow-citizens and the senseless waste of life. There can be little doubt that the poet had no intention of allowing the populace at Rome to forget the miseries and sorrows from which they had only recently emerged. A vivid recollection of the effects of anarchy would act as a deterrent both for those who were plotting insurrection against the regime of Octavian and for those who might support it.

Memories of the unhappy past are also revived by Odes I-2 and III-6. The second ode of the first book[1] begins with the poet recalling the catastrophies that had befallen the state as a result of the assassination of Julius Caesar. This section concludes with Horace reminding his readers of the continuing shame:

> "Audiet civis acuisse ferrum,
> Quo graves Persae melius perirent,
> Audiet pugnas vitio parentum
> Rara iuventus."[2]

Rome's guilt was still unatoned and the poet sought to impress this fact

---

[1] For the date of Ode I-2, see Appendix page 125.

[2] Ode I-2.21-24.

upon the people; the nation was not yet free from the spectre of renewed strife. The last half of the poem, however, did put forward the possibility that the young Caesar, endowed with the peaceful attributes of Mercury, might effect the needed reconciliation.[1] In the sixth ode of the third book, the misfortunes and griefs of the civil war period once again appear in an atmosphere of pessimism that closely resembles that of Epodes XVI and VII. This poem, probably composed in the year 28 B.C.,[2] lays the blame for the state's disasters upon the neglect of the gods and the degeneration of home life. Among the woes sent by the offended gods to plague Italy, Horace reminds his readers that

> "Paene occupatam seditionibus
> Delevit urbem Dacus et Aethiops."[3]

Fraenkel, commenting upon this ode, has noted that, "It is likely that Virgil, and probably Caesar and Maecenas as well, were convinced that easy-going optimism was dangerous and that, when peace and order seemed to be restored, the terrifying picture of civil war with all its misery and degradation should once more, in the poet's powerful vision, be brought before the nation. In the case of Horace, we may be sure that this was his conviction."[4] The poet was fully aware of how swiftly complacency follows the restoration of personal security. The renewal of civil strife, however, was not yet improbable; the maintainance of order required the

---

[1] See pp. 51 f.

[2] See Appendix p. 132.

[3] Ode III-6.13-14.

[4] op. cit., p. 288.

conscious effort and obedience of all. By keeping fresh the memory of past sorrows, he sought to emphasize the horrible results that might follow a revolt against the orderly rule of the Princeps.

An indirect warning to those who would overthrow the regime of Augustus is also discernible in the fourth ode of book three.[1] Beginning at line 42, Horace describes the revolt of the Titans against Jupiter. Relying on brute force, they had attempted to upset the benign rule of the king of the gods, but were beaten back by the great Olympians who symbolized the powers of order, wisdom and culture. So too, Horace implied, would those men, bereft of wisdom, who dared to revolt against the moderate and gentle rule of Caesar, be defeated by the forces of the Princeps who was heeding the "lene consilium" of the Muses. Thus the poet pointed out that a revolt against the government would mean a return to the use of force and violence, the overthrow of the supporters of peaceful reconciliation and culture, and a revolt against the gods themselves;

> ".....idem odere vires
> Omne nefas animo moventes."[2]

It was without doubt the dreaded possibility of some uprising again throwing Italy into the turmoil of inter-party violence that prompted Horace to utter the cry of remorse with which he concluded Ode I-35. This work, written probably in 26 B.C.[3] upon Octavian's departure on an expedition to Gaul and perhaps to Britain, commended the Roman forces and

---

[1] For the date of Ode III-4, see Appendix p. 131.

[2] Ode III-4.67-68.

[3] See Appendix p. 134.

their leader to the goddess Fortuna to whom kings and tyrants prayed,

> "Iniurioso ne pede proruas
> Stantem columnam, neu populus frequens
> 'Ad arma' cessantes, 'ad arma' [1]
> Concitet imperiumque frangat."

Having begged this goddess whom, in his apprehension, he associated with revolutions, to preserve Caesar, he sets before his readers in the final two stanzas a grim reminder of the sins committed during the long period of inter-factional violence. Fraenkel well expressed the purpose of this passage when he wrote,"It is from these dark recollections that the prayer for Caesar's safety derives its force. Men possessed of a true insight into the nature of human affairs and the moods of Fortune would not venture to assert, not even in the year 26 B.C. when this ode was written, that the calamity of fratricidal war could never recur; what they could do was to strive to avoid it by remaining conscious of their own guilt and to pray for the support of Heaven."[2]

Thus we have seen that the same horror of civil war which had earlier caused Horace to abandon all hope for Rome's future now led him to support the regime by which order and security had been restored. He realized that there was no practical peaceful alternative to the rule of the Princeps and that if the new regime were overthrown, Italy would once again be plunged into the miseries of civil strife. He therefore sought to dissuade those who might hinder the vital work of reconciliation, and to denounce all who would plot against the enlightened

---

[1] Ode I-35.13 f.

[2] op. cit., p. 253.

measures of the government. By moving descriptions of the misery and the degradation of the past, Horace attempted to keep vivid the memory of the anarchy from which Rome had been delivered; by subtle warnings, he sought to impress upon the people that the fall of Augustus would herald a return to that anarchy; by perpetuating in his poetry the despair and sorrow of those unhappy years, he helped to remind the Romans of the debt they owed to the Princeps and to preserve much of the initial flood of gratitude and relief that had followed the capture of Alexandria. As long as the people regarded Octavian as the saviour of the state, and were not allowed to forget the misery from which, under his leadership, they had recently emerged, dissenters would find little public support for any attempt to overthrow the government. Thus, the poet's search for security and order led him to oppose all those who opposed the Princeps. His support for the new regime at this time was in reality support for the peace it was imposing upon Italy. To those Romans who had found in Epodes XVI and VII, and in Ode I-14, a reflection of the pessimism and anxiety that had once been theirs, a deep sense of gratitude and respect must have seemed due to the man whom Horace greeted with the words,

> ".....ego nec tumultum
> Nec mori per vim metuam tenente
> Caesare terras."[1]

B. Augustus, Immortality and Apotheosis

Although Horace firmly supported the rule of Octavian as

---

[1] Ode III-14.14 f.

Rome's best hope for peace and stability, the first three books of the Odes do not reveal him as an enthusiastic partizan of the new regime. The general criticism of the immorality and self-indulgence that had replaced the older virtues of devotion to duty and to the fatherland still continued.[1] Indeed, it would seem from the last stanza of Ode III-6 that public morality, instead of improving under Augustus, had continued to deteriorate:

> "Aetas parentum, peior avis, tulit
> Nos nequiores, mox daturos
> Progeniem vitiosiorem."[2]

Although the poet realized that the laws were ineffective if the populace lacked the moral character to support them,[3] yet there is evidence that he expected the Princeps to take the initiative by adopting measures designed to restore the traditional Roman character. In directing Augustus' attention to those areas in which reform was needed and in appealing to him for action, Horace had to exercise great tact. Direct criticism of the policies of the government or of its delay in acting to counteract the rise of luxury and vice was doubtless hazardous, especially if the regime was not yet firmly established. Nevertheless, the poet, in his capacity as sacerdos Musarum, sought to encourage the new leader of the Roman world to undertake enlightened policies. Occasionally a direct appeal was made, but more often Horace predicted that when certain tasks had been achieved Augustus would become immortal. Frequently the Princeps'

---

[1] Odes II-15, II-16, II-18, III-1, III-24.

[2] Ode III-6.46-48.

[3] Ode III-24.33 f.

future position was linked with that of Hercules, Castor, Pollux and Romulus, all men who had earned divinity by their services to mankind. However, nowhere in Odes I-III does the poet assert the present divinity of Augustus; his apotheosis is merely foreseen as a result of his services to Rome and usually those passages which predict it also include the conditions by which it might be achieved.

To my knowledge, there is only one passage in which the possibility of Augustus being the incarnation of one of the established Olympians is seriously suggested.[1] This occurs in the last three stanzas of Ode I-2, a poem which, although it contains no specific references to enable us to fix the date of its composition accurately, is generally considered to be one of the first odes written after the fall of Alexandria in 30 B.C.[2] Opening with the words, "Iam satis," a cry for peace which to Fraenkel[3] betrayed anxiety rather than impatience, the first part of the poem echoed the populace's weariness and apprehension at the succession of natural catastrophies which seemed to portend the destruction of the city. The shame of civil war was also recalled. Indeed, the somber tone

---

1 Wilkinson notes that twice Horace uses Jupiter as a pseudonym for Augustus, once in Epistle I-19.43, a complimentary reference by disappointed poets to whom Horace has refused to recite, and in Ode II-7.17 in which he calls upon Pompeius, who had recently been restored to citizenship, "Ergo obligatam redde Iovi dapem..." There is also a possible reference to Augustus as Jove in Epistle II-1.68 although this, like that of Ode II-7, is not stated but merely implied. There is no religious significance in these allusions, as Wilkinson has pointed out (Horace and his Lyric Poetry, pp. 33-34) as at the most they are only complimentary forms of address.

2 See Appendix p. 125.

3 op. cit., p. 244.

of this section resembles that of the earlier political epodes. Jefferson Elmore, commenting upon Horace's insight into the problems facing Rome, has written, "Recovered from his exultation over Cleopatra, he could see that neither the victory at Actium nor the taking of Alexandria could wipe out the effects of civil strife continued now for twenty-five years almost without interruption. And so, in the first part of the poem, he seeks to convey a sense of these deep injuries and dangers."[1] As in Epode XVI, where the poet had described his generation immersed in civil strife as "impia...devoti sanguinis aetas" and in Epode VII, where Rome's bitter fate was attributed to the wrath of the gods at the murder of Remus by Romulus, so too in this ode Rome's distress was the result of divine anger at the assassination of Julius Caesar. However, this poem foresaw the possibility of redemption:

"Cui dabit partis scelus expiandi
Iuppiter.....?"[2]

After suggesting Apollo, Venus, or Mars, the poet concludes,

"Sive mutata iuvenem figura
Ales in terris imitaris almae
Filius Maiae, patiens vocari
Caesaris ultor:

Serus in caelum redeas diuque (45)
Laetus intersis populo Quirini,
Neve te nostris vitiis iniquum
Ocior aura

Tollat; hic magnos potius triumphos,
Hic ames dici pater atque princeps, (50)
Neu sinas Medos equitare inultos,
Te duce, Caesar."[3]

---

[1] Horace and Octavian (Carmina I-2), Classical Philology, XXVI (1931), p. 260.

[2] Ode I-2.29-30.

[3] Odes I-2.41-52.

The grammatical relation of this passage to the stanzas preceding it and its implications are by no means clear. Many critics take the stanza "Sive mutata....ultor" as the culmination of a series of parallel clauses depending on the verb venias in line 30. Thus Mercury is the last of the gods to whom Jupiter might give the task of expiating Rome's guilt. Although the subject of the verbs redeas (line 45) and intersis (line 46) could, therefore, be any of the gods mentioned, the proximity of the reference to Mercury and the allusion to the possible incarnation in lines 43 and 44 make that deity the most likely choice. The last two stanzas of this ode, with their fusion of divine and mortal personalities, are thus seen as an unusually extravagant flattery of the Princeps. However, as Fraenkel has pointed out, far from stating that the god had borrowed or was going to borrow the shape of the Princeps, Horace merely pointed to the possibility of such a change as one of several acts of divine mercy, although the same critic admitted that in this passage the poet had approached certain Eastern conceptions of incarnation more closely than anywhere else.[1] But Wilkinson has also remarked that such flatteries were a legacy of the Hellenistic baroque and that Horace would expect his educated readers to recognize them as such.[2]

A different interpretation, on the other hand, is suggested by the note to lines 41 and 42 of this ode in the Shorey and Laing edition. Commenting on "sive....imitaris," they state that the wish is no longer

---

1 op. cit., p. 249.

2 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 31.

venias but serus redeas. Wistrand further strengthens this view by writing that, "it is manifest that the sive-clauses are not parallel but anacoluthic; there is a gradual emancipation from the constraint of logical symmetry."[1] The clause "sive....Caesaris ultor," therefore, marks the transition from prayers for the intervention of some god to help the Romans to the realization that in Caesar they might already have a god incarnate among themselves.[2] The conditional force of the sive in line 41 thus becomes more pronounced. If Mercury was assuming the guise of Caesar, the poet prayed that, as the Princeps, he might remain long on earth.

What was the significance of the god Mercury for Horace, who, despite his professed conversion, remained, in my opinion, an Epicurean at heart throughout his life?[3] Campbell has already shown the use he made of the Olympian gods to symbolize certain qualities[4] and the appropriateness of Mercury in this context has been noted by several commentators.[5] Could not the poet here be tactfully suggesting to his readers, among whom was possibly the young Octavian, who had only recently emerged

---

[1] op. cit., p. 48.

[2] Wistrand, op. cit., p. 31.

[3] Although Horace asserts Jove's supremacy (Ode III-1.4-8, and Ode I-12.13 f.), in Epistle I-1.14 f. he binds himself to no one creed, but his support of Aristippus (Epistle I-17.17) and his description of himself as "Epicuri de grege porcum" (Epistle I-4.16) indicate Epicurean opinions. In addition, Wilkinson felt that in the simple life odes there was always the tacit assumption that the Epicureans were right. For further discussion, see Wilkinson, Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 82 and pp. 24 f.

[4] op. cit., pp. 105 f.

[5] Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 248; Campbell, op. cit., p. 220; Wickham.

the victor from a long series of bloody civil conflicts, that if the gentler arts of persuasion, conciliation and commerce as personified by Mercury were to become identified with the personality of Caesar's avenger, he might well be the saviour whom Rome needed so badly? By fusing the spirit of the god and the Princeps, the poet's prayer "Serus... tollat" becomes both a prayer for the long life of Caesar and for the adoption of gentler methods. The ode ends with a request that Octavian restore Rome's military reputation. Thus, while doubtless complimenting the new master of the empire by suggesting the possibility of future immortality, Horace was nevertheless hinting that he prove his merit by bringing about the reconciliation of gods and men.

For Horace, a lyric poet and a man of humble birth, to suggest policies to the ruler of the Mediterranean world would have seemed to many Romans great presumption. Thus, in Ode III-4, a poem which dates possibly from 29 B.C.,[1] the relationship between poetry and politics is defined. In the first nine stanzas, the poet clearly asserts his right as one who has enjoyed and continues to enjoy the protection and blessing of the Muses to speak in their name. Here he sets forth his credentials as the sacerdos Musarum, tracing from childhood the influence and power of these deities upon his life. Fraenkel, comparing the positions of Pindar and Horace, has pointed out that whereas Pindar could start from premises of unchallenged validity and, without an effort, make the transition from the μουσικόν that was operative in the present performance to the

---

[1] See Appendix p. 131.

power of harmony that governed the world, Horace, lacking Greek tradition, was left to his experience as an individual and to his personal inspiration.[1] Thus, to avoid appearing presumptuous, it was necessary that he set forth the qualifications enabling him to advise those in positions of authority.

In the tenth stanza, the Muses are pictured giving refreshment to Caesar, who is seeking to finish his toils after settling his legions. The counsel of these deities, as it found expression in the poetry of their servant, was gentle:

> "Vos lene consilium et datis et dato
> Gaudetis, almae....."[2]

This passage is immediately followed by a graphic description of the uprising of the Titans against Jove and of their final defeat. The significance of this story has been the subject of much discussion. It has already been interpreted in this thesis as a warning to those who might seek to overthrow the mild rule of Octavian, an illustration of the maxim which follows it, "Vis consili expers mole ruit sua."[3] Both Wilkinson[4] and MacKay,[5] on the other hand, believe that it is a tactful plea for clemency towards the defeated adherents of Antony. The latter critic,

---

1 op. cit., p. 284.

2 Ode III-4.41 f.

3 See p. 47.

4 op. cit., pp. 69 f.

5 Horace, Odes III-4: Date and Interpretation, Classical Review, XLVI (1932), pp. 243-245.

contrasting the crushing defeat of the Titans with the lines immediately preceding it, has asked whether Jove's treatment of his foes could reasonably be described as lene consilium, an example of the advice given to Octavian by the Muses. "Are we to think of him as finire quaerentem labores in this Sullan fashion? What then is the lene consilium that the Muses, in this case through Horace, give Augustus? Surely that such crushing revenge against rebels is a prerogative of omnipotence; let Augustus rather show mercy."[1] This interpretation takes the line "Vis consili expers mole ruit sua" not only as a deterrent to possible insurgents, but also as a warning to Octavian that in his relations with the state he avoid armed intervention like that employed by Julius Caesar and Antony. In the reference to Orion, Tityus and Pirithous, whose crime lay in their attempt to assume the privilege of gods, MacKay saw a subtle warning that the Princeps must not institute a monarchy by divine right.[2]

Could not the battle with the Titans, on the other hand, be included by Horace to impress upon both Octavian and those likely to oppose him by force the formidable power of those gods who favour and protect vim temperatam whenever it is challenged by senseless violence? In this scene we see Jupiter, Minerva, Juno and Apollo, symbolizing order, wisdom, the sanctity of marriage and the refining power of culture,[3]

---

[1] op. cit., p. 244.

[2] D.A. Malcolm (Horace, Odes III-4, Classical Review, V(1955), pp. 242-244), has further suggested that the struggle between the Titans and Olympians symbolized the conspiracy of young Marcus Lepidus and that the poem was a plea for compassion towards those guilty of the new crime of maiestas.

[3] Campbell, op. cit., pp. 105-107.

deities usually peaceful and benign, crushing the supporters of brute force.

"Vim temperatam di quoque provehunt
In maius; idem odere viris [1]
Omne nefas animo moventis."

The lene consilium of the Muses is supported by these great gods; they will increase power tempered with wisdom and oppose violence. We have already noted that in Ode I-2 Horace suggests that Hermes, the god of the peaceful arts, of persuasion and of commerce, in the person of Octavian might restore the pax deorum. Here once again, the poet suggests that moderation and reconciliation will bring with them the divine favour of those gods whose power against evil was so clearly illustrated by the fall of the Titans. Thus to Octavian the sacerdos Musarum commends the temperate use of his military might as the policy most likely to succeed, and to those who would oppose the new regime by force he points out the folly of rebellion against a just and benign rule. Line 65, therefore, holds a warning for both the conqueror and the conquered. Although Ode III-4 may well contain other inferences, it remains, in my opinion, primarily an appeal for all sides to lay aside naked force, to refrain from ill-advised vengeance, and to heed the advice of those advocating gentler policies.

Sellar, commenting on the various factors influencing Horace's poetry, has stated that, like Virgil, he had an ideal Rome, glorified in his imagination, and that of that Rome Augustus gradually became the

---

[1] Ode III-4.66 f.

representative. He added that it was this ideal that made the poet more vividly conscious of the degeneracy and corruption of the actual Rome and moved him to assume the function of a censor and reformer.[1] Although most of Horace's poems dealing with morality seek to dissuade the individual from pursuing a course of extreme indulgence, there are one or two in which he seems to be calling for government action. Perhaps the most striking of these poems is Ode III-24, which is generally considered to have been composed sometime between the years 30 B.C. and 28 B.C.[2] In this work, the poet contrasts the cooperative life and stern morality of the Getae with that of the Roman scouring the ends of the earth in search of wealth and luxury. The degrading effect of the scramble for money and material comforts upon the character is clearly stated. As in Ode III-6 where the adulterer is described as the "dedecorum pretiosus emptor,"[3] Horace sees avarice as a cause of perjury, fraud and immorality;

> "Magnum pauperies opprobrium iubet
> Quidvis et facere et pati,
> Virtutisque viam deserit arduae."[4]

Rome is in dire need of a leader who can curb the lawless vice of her people:

> "O quisquis volet impias
> Caedis et rabiem tollere civicam,
> Si quaeret pater urbium
> Subscribi statuis, indomitam audeat

---

1 op. cit., p. 149.

2 See Appendix p. 127.

3 Ode III-6.32.

4 Ode III-24.42 f.

Refrenare licentiam,
Clarus post genitis:....."[1]

There can be little doubt that this challenge was directed at Octavian, who was already claiming the credit for the restoration of peace and order and who later appeared in an inscription as parens coloniae.[2] Thus Horace called upon the Princeps to take the initiative in inaugurating a programme of moral reform. However, the passage following this appeal clearly indicates that the poet was aware of the dual nature of such reforms:

"Quid tristes querimoniae
Si non supplicio culpa reciditur;
Quid leges sine moribus
Vanae proficiunt.....?"[3]

Moral legislation must be enforced by the government but its final effectiveness depends upon the acceptance and support of the people. Having made his request to the Princeps, Horace, in the final lines of this ode, appeals to the people of Rome to destroy their wealth, the cause of their perverted greed, and to turn their attention to sterner tasks.

Materialism, avarice and ambition are frequent subjects in Horace's earlier poems. The contentment and joys of the simple life are repeatedly contrasted with the cares and anxieties accompanying wealth and power.[4] The poet's frequent references to death, the great leveller,

---

1 Ode III-24.25 f.
2 Note to line 27 in Shorey and Laing.
3 Ode III-24.33 f.
4 e.g. Odes II-16, III-1, III-16.

clearly point out to his reader the futility of amassing great riches.[1] However, most of these passages are obviously directed at the individual in an effort to reform the character of society. Nevertheless, the desirability of sumptuary legislation is once again implied in Ode II-15. In this poem, Horace deplored the disappearance of productive farmlands which were swiftly being replaced by the palaces and pleasure gardens of the wealthy. Comparing the prosperity of the state when it was supported by small farms with its condition at that time when much of the land had been absorbed into large estates, the poet concluded that:

> "Privatus illis census erat brevis,
> Commune magnum:....."[2]

The poem concludes with a rather pointed reference to the laws which, in earlier days, had not permitted men to scorn simple altars but had bade them adorn their cities and the temples of the gods at public expense.[3] Wickham, commenting on Odes II-15 and 18, has written that "Both Odes (and to some extent 16 also) deal with the evils which in iii.1-6 and 24 the social and religious legislation of Augustus is set forth as about to remedy." Yet, as we have already seen, the appeals for moderation and reform in Odes III-4 and 24 would seem to be directed as much to the Princeps as to the people. I shall later attempt to show that this is also true of Odes III-3 and 5. Thus Horace's commendation of the laws by which the wealthy had in the past been forced to support public works may well have been intended for the attention of Augustus.

---

[1] e.g. Odes II-18, II-14.

[2] Ode II-15. 13 f.

[3] Ode II-15. 17-20.

The greatness of Rome's future and the conditions which were to govern that future are prominently displayed in Ode III-3. The first two stanzas of this poem extol in majestic language the man who with steadfast determination pursues a righteous course in the face of opposition from the people, tyrants and even the gods. Because of this virtue, Hercules and Pollux received immortality and in their company Augustus will sip nectar. Perseverance was also the reason why Bacchus was glorified and Romulus ascended to heaven. It was on this last occasion that Juno revealed her reconciliation to the descendants of Aeneas in a speech which occupies most of the poem. First she revealed the immorality and perfidy by which her wrath had been aroused. However, since Troy was no more, she was willing to assent to the deification of Romulus; indeed, she was even reconciled to Rome's supremacy:

> ".....stet Capitolium
> Fulgens triumphatisque possit
> Roma ferox dare iura Medis.
>
> Horrenda late nomen in ultimas
> Extendat oras....."[1]

To this prophecy the goddess added a warning against greed and, even more important, set forth, as the condition of her appeasement, the demand that Troy be left in ruins. Her speech ends with a stern admonition of the consequences that would follow if Troy were ever rebuilt.

The purpose of this ode and the meaning of Juno's provision have long exercised the ingenuity of commentators. Warde Fowler,[2]

---

[1] Ode III-3.42 f.

[2] Roman Essays and Interpretations, pp. 216 f.

discovering in other literary works of the period a strong indication that the Romans may have suspected Augustus of considering the possibility of moving the capital of the empire to the East, saw in this poem Horace's opposition to such a plan. An attempt to reconcile the reluctant to the rule of Augustus was the purpose suggested by Wilkinson,[1] who, attracted by Pluss' theory that Troy symbolized the decadent Republic, interpreted this ode as a call for Rome, under Augustus its second founder, to turn its back resolutely on the past, on luxury as well as on civil war. Wickham's reading,[2] on the other hand, was more complicated. To him, Troy represented Asiatic perfidy, luxury and greed for treasure thus making Juno's condition a demand that Rome resist the incursions of Oriental vices and excesses. The words <u>mulier peregrina</u> called to his mind Cleopatra, who doubtless would have orientalized the empire thus breaking Juno's covenant. From this threat, Augustus had rescued Rome. Thus, the main purpose of this poem, as Wickham saw it, was to express one of the reasons for Horace's acceptance of the new regime. These ingenious interpretations, on the other hand, are rejected by Fraenkel,[3] who saw in Juno's condition no political or moral implications. In his view, it was merely a face-saving device employed by a proud goddess.

Another historical interpretation has been implied by Syme.[4]

---

1 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, pp. 73 f.

2 op. cit., pp. 199-200.

3 op. cit., p. 268.

4 op. cit., p. 443.

In mentioning the marital legislation which Augustus seems to have attempted to introduce probably in 28 B.C. and which apparently had to be withdrawn in the face of public protest,[1] he pointed out that that unpopular task called for a statesman of resolution-"iustum et tenacem propositi virum."[2] The reference to the Princeps as Augustus in line 11 of Ode III-3 indicates that this poem could not have been composed before January, 27 B.C., and there is nothing to suggest a later date.[3] Thus, this ode was probably written in the year following the forced recall of measures for which Horace had earlier appealed to the Princeps. The virtue of pursuing a righteous, but unpopular course, therefore, may well have had special significance. It is also interesting to note that the future position of Augustus is among those who gained immortality because of their steadfast determination in the face of great opposition, a fact made clear by the thrice repeated hac. Could not the first four stanzas, therefore, have been an attempt to encourage Augustus to persevere in his unpopular task of reforming Roman morals by reminding him that this was the path to immortality in spite of the "civium ardor prava iubentium"? It is also noteworthy that marital abnormalities played a major role in arousing Juno's wrath against the Trojans. This can be seen in her scornful references to Helen as mulier peregrina and Lacaena adultera, to Paris the incestus iudex and in the fact that it was to casta Minerva and to herself,

---

1 Propertius, Elegies II.7; Suetonius, Divus Augustus, 34.

2 Odes III-3.1.

3 See Appendix p. 134.

the sanctifier of marriages that Troy was given in its destruction. Could not the rebuilding of Troy symbolize the resurrection of these vices? After having praised steadfast determination in a righteous cause, Horace makes Juno clearly assert that Rome's future greatness depends on her morality. Let the Princeps continue in his efforts to purify the Roman character and thus lead the state to its destiny.

However the words ".....triumphatisque possit
Roma ferox dare iura Medis "[1]

doubtless had special significance for both the Princeps and the people. The mention of this nation which had remained unsubdued and was a continuing threat to Rome's power and prestige in the Eastern Mediterranean clearly reminded them that the destiny of world domination foretold by Juno would not be unchallenged and that difficult campaigns still lay ahead for ferox Roma. Nor was this the only place in which Horace referred to the Parthians and other unpacified races. All three unsuccessful expeditions into Armenia are recalled in Odes III-5 and 6. The first of these disasters, the defeat of Marcus Licinius Crassus in 53 B.C. at Carrhae and the shame of Roman soldiers living and serving under foreign rulers form the introduction to the story of Regulus in Ode III-5. The victories of Pacorus over Decidius Saxa in 40 B.C. and that of Monaeses, which Mommsen[2] interpreted as referring to Antony's campaign of 36 B.C., are included in Ode III-6 in the list of misfortunes

---

1 Odes III-3.43-44.

2 Res Gestae Divi Augusti, 5.40-43.

imposed by the outraged gods upon Italy. The hostility of the Parthians to Rome is mentioned as early as Epode VII where the self-destruction of the city is described as "Secundum vota Parthorum,"[1] while as late as 25 B.C. this same foe was still "Latio imminentes."[2] Nor was Rome's supremacy acknowledged by the Cantabrian "indoctum iuga ferre nostra"[3] nor by the Dacian "qui dissimulat metum Mersae cohortis."[4] By frequent references to these races, Horace reminded his readers of past insults and injuries, and of present defiance of Rome's power and prestige.

Perhaps the earliest appeal to Caesar to avenge the defeats inflicted by the Parthians upon Roman armies is found in Ode I-2. It has been suggested that this poem may have been composed while Augustus was in the East[5] stabilizing the political situation there following the fall of Alexandria and that the words,

> "Neu sinas Medos equitare inultos
> Te duce Caesar "[6]

may have been intended to encourage him to take advantage of a dispute over the Parthian throne[7] for armed intervention thus avenging past defeats

---

1 Epode VII.9.
2 Ode I-12.53.
3 Ode II-6.2.
4 Ode II-20.18.
5 By J. Elmore, op. cit., p. 259.
6 Ode I-2.51-52.
7 See Dio Cassius li. 18.

and reasserting Rome's power in Asia Minor. Earlier in the same poem, the poet had suggested that the swords lately engaged in civil war could be used more profitably against this race. A similar attitude towards foreign campaigns as a more suitable outlet for the martial energies of the Romans than civil war can be found in the last stanza of Ode I-35;

> ".....O utinam nova
> Incude diffingas retusum in
> Massagetas Arabasque ferrum!"[1]

These passages led Wilkinson to write, "The attitude of Horace to foreign campaigns was also coloured by his fear of civil war. Although he occasionally refers to the positive and professed aim of Augustan imperialism, to spread civilization by arms - dare iura Medis - yet he has at the back of his mind the idea that foreign war was a cure for civil strife."[2]

In Ode III-2, Horace again calls for military expeditions, but here the purpose is to teach the young men of Rome manliness and devotion to their fatherland.

> "Angustam amice pauperiem pati
> Robustus acri militia puer
> Condiscat et Parthos feroces
> Vexet eques metuendus hasta."[3]

In this poem he commends campaigning as the best method to develop in the younger generation the stern, simple military spirit that had built Rome and was necessary for it to achieve its future destiny. Let the youths

---

1 Ode I-35.38 f.
2 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 76.
3 Ode III-2.1 f.

of Rome prove their virtue by engaging in combat Rome's bitterest foes, the Parthians. Thus Horace combined the popular longing for a renewal of Rome's military glory and prestige abroad with the need to replace debilitating self-indulgence by the simple, manly virtues developed on the battlefield.

The political, artistic and moral implications to be drawn from the account of the shameful conduct of the Roman soldiers captured at Carrhae as it is contrasted with the steadfast devotion to duty displayed by Regulus in Ode III-5 has long been a subject of controversy. The eloquence of the arguments expressed against the ransoming of prisoners of war led Warde Fowler[1] to speculate that at the time this poem was being composed the possibility of a negotiated settlement was being rumoured. He, therefore, interpreted this poem from a political point of view as a protest against any attempt to buy back those whose devotion to the fatherland was so weak as to permit the disgraceful behaviour described in the second and third stanzas. Fraenkel, on the other hand, emphasized that it was the artistic possibilities of the story of Regulus and not its usefulness in a political debate that led Horace to make use of it in his poem: "And yet the reader, unless he is of the dogmatizing sort, will feel that it is not because Horace wants to illustrate the case of the prisoners of Carrhae that he tells the story of Regulus, but that he dwells on the disgrace of the prisoners because he wants to pave

---

[1] op. cit., pp. 223 f.

his way to the story of Regulus."[1] The implications perceived in this ode by Sellar, Wickham and Noyes[2] were primarily moral. Interpreting tame acquiescence in the dishonour clinging to Roman arms since the defeat of Crassus as a sign of degeneracy, Sellar[3] saw in the story of Regulus an appeal to history to impress the old ideal of loyalty to duty on the imagination of that generation. To Wickham,[4] however, Ode III-5 was not so much an appeal as demonstration of yet another phase of Augustus' rule - a policy that was to retrieve the deeply-felt disgrace of Carrhae, and to restore the healthy military spirit of ancient Rome.

In forming an interpretation of this ode, the opening lines require careful examination.

> "Caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem
> Regnare; praesens divus habebitur
> Augustus adiectis Britannis
> Imperio gravibusque Persis."[5]

We believe in Jove because of his thunder; Augustus will be considered a god on earth when he has subdued the Britons and Parthians. Noyes[6] found in this passage a touch of irony for the shallower kind of believers in both the heavenly and earthly power. But could not Horace here be setting

---

1 op. cit., p. 273.
2 op. cit., p. 159.
3 op. cit., p. 155.
4 op. cit., p. 208.
5 Ode III-5.1-4.
6 op. cit., p. 159.

before the Princeps the means by which he could gain immortal glory? By naming Augustus as the man who will gain divine status on earth after conquering Rome's most formidable enemies, the poet tactfully commends these projects to his attention. The immediate need for such action is emphasized by the shame being brought upon Rome by the disgraceful conduct of those who, forgetful of their fatherland, were living with and serving their former foes. Their lack of devotion to duty is strikingly contrasted with the military spirit of old Rome which is exemplified by Regulus. Thus Horace respectfully appeals to the Princeps to undertake campaigns which would once again restore Rome's power abroad, foster the manly virtues and rescue the reputation of the race of Regulus.

Although Horace in Ode II-9, which was probably composed in 25 B.C.,[1] gives the impression that the Parthians had already been added to the list of conquered races,[2] Ode I-12, written at about the same time,[3] describes them with perhaps some poetic exaggeration as still threatening Latium. In the final three stanzas of this ode, the poet prays to Jupiter to favour Caesar with power second only to his own. Second only to the king

---

[1] See Appendix p. 123.

[2] Ode II-9.20 f. led many scholars to place the date of publication of the Odes I-III as late as 19 B.C. However, Gow (Horatiana, Classical Review, IX (1895), pp. 303 f.) has shown that there is numismatic evidence that Augustus had claimed to exercise some authority in Armenia before Tiberius' expedition in 20 B.C. He suggested that this reference was inspired by some transactions with Armenia about 25 B.C. and not by the long-desired total subjection of that country.

[3] See Appendix p. 134.

of the gods, Augustus will rule the world justly,

> "Ille seu Parthos Latio imminentis
> Egerit iusto domitos triumpho,
> Sive subiectos Orientis orae
> Seras et Indos."[1]

But as before, the future greatness is still subject to certain conditions; as in his earlier poems, Horace reminds the Princeps of the need to conquer those races not acknowledging Rome's supremacy, and commends to him a policy of expansion of Roman power by conquest. However, in spite of these tactful attempts to remind Augustus of the popular desire for the defeat of the Parthians and the subjection of the other border races, before 23 B.C. Horace obviously met with little success. As we shall see in the last section of this chapter, only two victories, those at Actium and in Spain, were sufficiently inspiring to stimulate the poet to compose odes. The victories still to be won, in the poet's estimation, seem to have overshadowed the other military successes of the new regime.

Thus during the period between the years 30 and 23 B.C., Horace seems to have maintained an uncommitted position. Although he supported Augustus as Rome's best hope for order, security and efficient government, yet, as Sellar has pointed out, his idealized vision of Rome's future made him conscious of the failings of contemporary society.[2] His political allegiance was tempered by the realization that to restore Rome's moral and political well-being, the administration would have to undertake many projects, some of which would be unpopular. Nevertheless, the poet

---

[1] Ode I-12.53 f.

[2] op. cit., p. 149.

asserted his right as the sacerdos Musarum to speak on behalf of the forces of moderation, civilization, and morality and to encourage the Princeps to take action to curb the materialism and vice rampant in the city and to foster the old military virtues. By the occasional appeal to the Princeps, but more often by foretelling the glory he would gain and by giving frequent expression to the needs of the state as he saw them, Horace tactfully sought to commend these policies to the attention of the new master of the Roman world.

C. Horace's Attitude Towards the Princeps.

Equally interesting and significant in an examination of Horace's attitude towards the new regime is the manner in which he presented the personality of the central figure of the government to his readers. The extent to which he extolled the virtues of the new leader and made him a symbol of his idealized vision of Rome should aid us in gauging the warmth of the poet's enthusiasm for Augustus personally, and the frequency with which the Princeps' accomplishments were praised in the first three books of the Odes should give some indication of Horace's opinion of their significance to the nation. Finally, such an examination should also help to clarify the poet's views on the relationship of the Princeps to the state.

In the eighty-eight poems that comprise the first three books of the Odes, Augustus is mentioned by name in only nineteen places. This is meager praise indeed, especially when one considers that, as Salmon has pointed out, at that time the Princeps was the cynosure of

all Romans'[1] eyes. In addition, many of these references are very brief passing allusions and do not occupy more than two or three lines. Some of these passages, on the other hand, seem, on first reading, to shed great glory upon Augustus personally by associating him with divine beings. Upon closer examination, however, these references are seen to deal with the possibility of the Princeps becoming immortal in the future as the result of his services to Rome. Thus, as we have already seen in this chapter, they become hortatory rather than laudatory.

Of the three references mentioning the possible deification of the Princeps, only Ode I-2 suggests the incarnation of one of the established deities.[2] As we have seen earlier in this chapter, Horace, after emphasizing the need for the reconciliation of gods and men in the first part of this poem, turns to the gods for aid and sees in the possible fusion of the spirit of Mercury with the personality of Octavian salvation for the state. The poet thus commends to the new master of the Roman world the use of the peaceful arts of persuasion associated with that deity.

Nor do the two other passages in which the Princeps is portrayed as a man destined to become immortal praise him for any personal quality or achievement. They emphasize his potential glory instead of his present power. In Ode III-3, we are told that Augustus will sip nectar in the company of Pollux and Hercules. Salmon dismisses this reference as a significant indication of Horace's views because to him, it "reads like

---

[1] op. cit., p. 10.

[2] See above pp. 51 f.

a perfunctory insertion; if it were omitted the ode in which it occurs would not be disrupted in any way: the words could quite easily have been gratuitously added - under official pressure - after the poem had been completed."[1] Even more significant is the fact that the future divine status of the Princeps is closely associated with those whose immortality was gained by the steadfast determination with which they had served mankind in spite of its opposition. As we have already seen,[2] the poet may have employed here the promise of immortality to encourage Augustus to persevere with the moral reforms that had raised so much protest in 28 B.C.

In the first stanza of Ode III-5, the third passage in which the possibility of Augustus becoming a god is mentioned, it is clear that to become a <u>divus praesens</u> the Emperor had first to fulfil the condition of subduing the Parthians and the Britons. Thus those passages which would seem to shed the most glory on the Princeps personally by suggesting his divine nature often serve rather to remind him of the tasks still to be accomplished. These references suggest not that Horace had become a flatterer of the Emperor, but that he preferred to withhold praise for Augustus and to reserve his final judgement until subsequent developments could prove whether or not he was truly worthy of immortality.

Another ode which is frequently quoted as an example of Horace's flattery of the Emperor is Ode I-12. In this poem, he considers what god, demigod or man his Muse should praise. Beginning with Jupiter

---

1 op. cit., p. 11.

2 See above pp. 62 f.

and the Olympian gods, Horace passes on to the great heroes of Greek myth and legend. Romulus, the peaceful reign of Pompilius, the proud fasces of Tarquinius and the noble death of Cato follow, forming a transition from Greek mythology to Roman history. The military spirit of old Rome which proved its true greatness in times of defeat is represented by Regulus, the Scauri and Paulus while Fabricius, Curius and Camillus are cited as examples of the gallant austerity of the Republican period. Horace moves on to recognize the preeminent position of the Julian clan and to see hope for the future in the growing reputation of Marcellus. Finally, in the last three stanzas, the Princeps is mentioned. After commending him to the care of Jupiter, the poet prophesies that he will rule the world justly, being second only to the king of the gods, but once again certain tasks will have to be accomplished before this earthly supremacy is attained. As we have already seen on page 71, Horace, in this passage, tactfully reminds Augustus that he has first to conquer either the Parthians or the Seres and Indians. What at first appears to be praise of the Princeps is, in truth, a gentle reminder of unaccomplished tasks.

This poem also illustrates a tendency of Horace in the first three books of the Odes to choose his examples of courage, devotion to duty and morality from among the great heroes of the years before the civil wars.[1] Indeed, the most outstanding personality to emerge from this collection of poems is not the master of the Roman world, but Regulus. Ode III-5

---

[1] Only once is Marius referred to (Epode IX.23) while the great accomplishments of Julius Caesar pass unmentioned. See Syme, op. cit., pp. 441 f.

proves Horace's power to immortalize the personal virtues of great men, yet the poet never chooses to ennoble Augustus in this manner. Nowhere do we find the personality and virtues of the Princeps warmly commended. Although to describe Augustus Horace uses adjectives such as egregius, altus, unicus and clarus, his praise is usually cool, restrained and formal, far removed from that conceived in enthusiastic support for a person or from that designed to unite a nation behind a single leader.

Are there, then, no indications in the first three books of the Odes by which we may reconstruct the poet's personal attitude towards the Emperor? Noyes finds in some passages a rather daring irony directed towards the Princeps. In his view, the comparison of Octavian to a bad-tempered horse found in the first satire of the second book is hardly complimentary.[1] A similarily ironic comment on the Princeps' desire to be praised in verse may also be implied in the advice of Trebatius:

> "Aut si tantus amor scribendi te rapit, aude
> Caesaris invicti res dicere, multa laborum
> praemia laturus....."[2]

The English poet also found indications of the same attitude in Ode III-3, where he sensed in the meter and sound of the words with which Augustus' deification was foreseen a brief Aristophanic beatification.[3] In addition, he noted similar implications in the picture of Octavian as a hawk pursuing Cleopatra the dove, a fatale monstrum to be sure![4] While it is

---

1 op. cit., p. 144.
2 Sat. II-1.10 f.
3 Noyes, op. cit., p. 156.
4 op. cit., p. 129.

possible that there are traces of irony in these poems, I have already mentioned other explanations for the passages in Odes I-37 and III-3.[1] There are, therefore, no references to the Princeps in Odes I-III that praise him enthusiastically.[2] At the most, he is mentioned with hope, cool formality and sometimes with a slight trace of irony.

There is one ode, however, in which the poet describes an overpowering impulse "which forces him to immortalize the decus Caesaris in tones of overwhelming emotion and of the most genuine sincerity." Thus Fraenkel[3] saw in the Bacchic frenzy of Ode III-25 a poetic representation of the creative urge to celebrate the glory of Augustus.

> ".....Quibus
> Antris egregii Caesaris audiar
>
> Aeternum meditans decus
> Stellis inserere et consilio Iovis?"[4]

What, then, was the result of this fervor? In what poems did this compelling desire to exalt Caesar's immortal splendor find expression? Fraenkel[5] takes this ode as an indication that poems of the type of the Roman Odes had already begun to shape themselves in the poet's mind. Yet, as we have already seen, the tone of these poems is often that of admonition, not praise. Except for those works celebrating the victory over Cleopatra[6] and the

---

[1] See above, pages 36 and 62 f.

[2] Except for the obviously exaggerated comparison of Octavian to Marius and Scipio Africanus in Epode IX.23 f.

[3] op. cit., p. 260

[4] Ode III-25.3 f.

[5] op. cit., p. 259.

[6] Epodes I and IX, and Ode I-37.

return of the Princeps from the Spanish campaign in 24 B.C.,[1] the successes of Octavian are not employed by the poet to enhance the reputation of the master of the Roman world. In the poems published before 23 B.C., I can find no passage that in any way suggests that it was inspired by so fervent a desire to praise the glories of the Emperor as that expressed in Ode III-25. Indeed, many of the early odes imply rather that the decus Caesaris was still to be achieved. Whether this frenzy was feigned, as Wilkinson claimed,[2] or sincere, there is little evidence in Horace's early works to indicate any serious attempt to extol the successes of the Princeps. Although he called upon Valgius[3] to sing of the new trophies of Augustus, Horace himself mentioned them only briefly and usually in very general terms.

Various explanations have been advanced to account for the absence of poems praising the character and triumphs of the Emperor. On two occasions, Horace himself excused this omission on the grounds that the glories of the leaders of the new regime were not suited to his light lyrical style. Thus, in Ode I-6 he recommended Varus' epic Muse to Agrippa and described himself as,

> ".....tenues grandia, dum pudor
> Imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
> Laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
> Culpa deterere ingeni."[4]

---

1 Ode III-14.

2 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 92.

3 Ode II-9.17 f.

4 Ode I-6.9 f.

The same reason is advanced in Ode II-12, where the poet suggested that the battles of Caesar and the spectacle of once threatening kings led by the neck along the streets would be better described by Maecenas' own prose. Wickham has pointed out that even a recusatio of this type praises the Princeps, but if these passages are compared with Ode IV-2, the brevity and austerity of the references to Augustus in the earlier poems at once become evident. The unsuitability of lyric poetry for lofty themes is also reflected in the concluding stanzas of Ode II-1 and III-3. In both, the poet recalls his Muse from the serious subjects to which it had strayed.

> "Non hoc iocosae conveniet lyrae:
> Quo, Musa, tendis? Desine pervicax
> Referre sermones deorum et
> Magna modis tenuare parvis."[1]

However, when one considers the success with which Horace dealt with serious themes in the first six odes of the third book, his lack of confidence in his own ability seems somewhat excessive. Even if battles were unsuited to his lyre, yet, in the Regulus Ode he demonstrated its use to glorify the character of a human being and to give it immortality by his art. Without portraying the actual battle scenes, he could easily have increased the military renown and personal reputation of Caesar.

"The plain fact is that Horace declines to write up Augustus' achievements simply because to him they do not as yet appear sufficiently

---

[1] Ode III-3.69 f. See also Sat. II-1.12 f.

memorable."[1] Cf the eight acclamations[2] granted to the Princeps before 23 B.C., two were for victories won by other generals[3] and the reason for one is unknown. Cf the five remaining acclamations, three were granted before the battle of Actium.[4] As has been noted in an earlier chapter, there is no indication that at that time Horace supported any political party. There remain, therefore, only two major successes achieved by the Princeps between the years 31 and 23 B.C. These the poet found sufficiently memorable to celebrate in his poetry but it is interesting to note the reasons why they were important. On both of these occasions, the main emphasis seems to have been placed not on the decus Caesaris, but on the significance of these events to the state. Perhaps the best example of this can be seen in Ode III-14, which celebrated Augustus' return from the Spanish campaign in 24 B.C. Wilkinson, in commenting upon Page's contrast of the "formal and official frigidity" of the first three stanzas in which Horace described the preparations for the hero's homecoming, with the "licentious vigour" of the rest of the work, has concluded that, "it is true enough that the public part of the victor's welcome leaves Horace cold, its significance for him lies in the assurance of personal safety, and his enthusiasm is reserved for the 'licentiousness.'"[5]

---

1 Salmon, op. cit., p. 11.

2 As listed by Mommsen, Res Gestae I.21,22.

3 By Agrippa against the Aquitanians and the Germans, and by Crassus in Thrace and Dacia.

4 For the victories at Mutina and against Sextus Pompey and for the Dalmatian campaign of 35 B.C.

5 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 75.

The other victory which inspired Horace to express his feelings in verse was the battle of Actium. As has already been noted, Horace obviously saw this conflict as a contest between the luxury, vice and excesses of the East and the traditional Roman way of life. The impression left upon the reader by Epode IX is that the poet's joy at the defeat of Cleopatra was due mainly to his anxiety for the morality and civil order of Rome, and not to the glory it bestowed upon Octavian although the latter is compared in lines 23-26 to Marius and Scipio Africanus. Of the two other poems which deal with the battle of Actium, Epode I is simply a statement of loyalty to Maecenas while Ode I-37 casts more glory upon the conquered queen than it does upon her conqueror. The poet, therefore, seems to have judged the importance of these two victories not by the glory and prestige they bestowed upon the Emperor, but on their significance to the state. What really mattered was the preservation of the Roman way of life and the assurance of peace, order and security in Italy.

There is little in the references to Augustus, therefore, to suggest whole-hearted support for the new regime. The lack of any allusion to the personal qualities and virtues of the Princeps and the cool formality with which he is mentioned imply instead that the poet chose to reserve his judgement until he saw to what extent the Emperor was willing to adopt the lene consilium of the Muses. Although Horace was very grateful for the return of order and security which had followed Actium and which was being maintained by successes like that of Augustus in Spain, yet the Princeps' past achievements were overshadowed by the deeper needs of the state. The contrast between the poet's idealized vision of Rome and the Rome he saw about him reminded him that many more important

challenges still lay ahead. He indicated, therefore, that he would be willing to acknowledge the greatness of Caesar and even his divinity but only after he had shown himself worthy by reviving Rome's moral and spiritual health and by restoring her prestige abroad.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINAL YEARS (23 B.C. - 8 B.C.)

Following the redefining of his constitutional powers in 23 B.C. and the suppression of the conspiracy led by Fannius Caepio and involving Licinius Varro Murena, Maecenas' brother-in-law, Augustus set out on an administrative tour of the East. During this trip, certain Armenian nobles met him and suggested that Tigranes, a deposed ruler of Armenia, be restored to the throne with Roman aid.[1] This was accomplished by an army under the command of Tiberius, who, in 20 B.C., as a result of negotiations which had been begun earlier and which had involved restoring to Phraates, king of Parthia, his son who had been held hostage at Rome, received the standards and prisoners of war captured by the Parthians from Crassus and Antony. This diplomatic success was hailed with great enthusiasm at Rome and Augustus himself, obviously regarding it as equal to a military victory, later boasted that he had forced the Parthians to restore the standards and implore the friendship of the Roman people.[2] Another constant threat to Roman power, the Cantabrians of northern Spain, were finally thoroughly defeated and pacified by Agrippa in 19 B.C. Meanwhile, in compliance with the appeals of the senate alarmed by riots in the city, the Princeps returned to Italy. The following year was marked by the renewal for five years of Caesar's proconsular authority, a purge

---

[1] For a discussion of these events see Rice Holmes, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 260 f.

[2] Res Gestae V.40-42.

of the senate, and the passage of the Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus supplemented by additional moral and possibly sumptuary legislation.

According to Augustus' calculations, ably supported by those of the XV viri sacris faciendis of whom he was president, a new saeculum was discovered to begin in 17 B.C. For this occasion, the Princeps devised an elaborate three day celebration "to encourage the belief in himself and the consequent active loyalty to himself, as the restorer of the pax deorum - the good relation between the divine and human inhabitants of Rome."[1] However, the new saeculum was scarcely one year old when the serious defeat of Marcus Lollius, the governor of Gaul, by the Sugambri, Usipetes, and Tencteri hastened Augustus' departure from Rome for the north. Finding that his opponents had withdrawn and given hostages, the master of the Roman world turned his attention to the problems of Gaul. In the meantime, raiding parties from the tribes inhabiting the Alpine passes had descended upon northern Italy demonstrating the instability of the northern frontier. Against these, in 15 B.C., the Emperor sent his two stepsons, Drusus and Tiberius. While Drusus forced the Brenner Pass, Tiberius, breaking away from Augustus' armies in Gaul, attacked the enemy from the rear penetrating the gorges of the upper Rhine and Inn rivers. Thus, they defeated the Rhaetians and the Vindelici, completely subduing that area. The return of the Emperor to Rome in 13 B.C., therefore, was especially triumphant and, in the following year, he assumed the additional title of Pontifex Maximus.

---

[1] Warde Fowler, Roman Essays, p. 111.

As we have already seen, prior to 23 B.C. Horace's support of Augustus was based partly upon the realization that he was Rome's best guarantee of peace, and partly on the hope that he would by his actions prove himself to be the man to bring to reality the poet's idealized vision of Rome. However, his references to the Princeps were always cool and formal or, as Noyes[1] has pointed out, faintly ironic. There is evidence, on the other hand, in the thirteenth epistle of the first book that a closer relationship began to develop shortly after the publication of the first three books of the Odes in 23 B.C.[2] Although the Emperor had probably read or heard recited single poems by his chief adviser's protégé at various times in the past, the request by Caesar for a copy of the collected odes must have been most gratifying and encouraging to Horace. To accompany his fasciculum he penned a delightful little set of admonitions[3] addressed to his messenger but doubtless also intended for the ears of Augustus. The gentle humour of the poet's instructions to intrude only if the Princeps were healthy and receptive, the warning not to press the book upon him too zealously, not to drop the burden heavily at the end of the journey, not to clutch the parcel under his armpit in the presence of the great man, and the worried caution not to talk too much, not to stumble, not to injure the books, all hint that here Horace was on closer personal terms with Caesar than in any of his earlier works. As Fraenkel had commented,

---

1 op. cit., pp. 129, 144, 156.

2 See Appendix p. 135.

3 Epistle I-13.

"This letter shows how much the approval of the Princeps and the encouragement coming from him meant to Horace. His respect for Augustus and his considerate regard for his heavy burden remain unaltered, but there is in the letter a light touch, a happy mood, and a quiet confidence that make the reader feel that Horace is at ease not only with Vinnius but also with Augustus."[1]

Even though Horace seemed now to enjoy a closer personal relationship with the Emperor, there is no indication in his poetry that he forfeited any of his independence of spirit. Indeed, the letters of Augustus, as quoted by Suetonius,[2] indicate that it was the Princeps, not the poet, who sought a closer friendship. Horace's attitude to his new patron is evident from the dignified manner in which he answered his complaint that he had not been mentioned in the sermones. The four opening lines of Epistle II-1 clearly show how fully aware Horace was of the heavy burdens borne by the Princeps. In three short statements, he set forth the security, moral and legislative functions performed by the man he was addressing. To intrude too long upon such important matters would be a sin against the publica commoda. This was followed by a passage (lines 5-17) concerning the fate of the great benefactors of mankind who,

> "dum terras hominumque colunt genus, aspera bella
> componunt, agros assignant, oppida condunt."[3]

---

1 op. cit., p. 355.

2 Vita Horati.

3 Epistle II-1.7-8. For date see Appendix p. 135.

Fraenkel,[1] in his careful analysis of this poem, has pointed out that agros assignant cannot be attributed to Romulus, Liber, Castor, Pollux or Hercules, but can be applied to Augustus. The Princeps is thus associated by implication with those who by their services to mankind became divine.[2] While the similarity between the Emperor and the great civilizers is only implied in the first part of this passage, in the following lines the contrast between their fates is clearly stated; instead of ill-will and even death, the Princeps, admittedly a unique man, is honoured by the people and his genius worshipped. Thus, the epistle begins with the dignified recognition, not of Augustus' personal virtues, but of his role in restoring the security, moral well-being and legal basis of the state. Because of his services to Rome, Horace associated him with the great divine benefactors of mankind although he, on earth, was enjoying the gratitude they had received only after death.

The wisdom of the people in recognizing the services of Augustus provides Horace with an introduction to his next subject, their lack of wisdom in judging literature. The veneration of ancient literature simply because of its age and the subsequent scorning of modern poetry is held up to ridicule. Suggesting that this was due to envy among his contemporaries, Horace points to the early development of literature in Greece, where newness was no disadvantage. Its frivolity, however, is contrasted with the Roman's traditionally practical nature. Although enthusiasm for writing poetry was sweeping Rome, the poet sought to show

---

[1] op. cit., pp. 385 f.

[2] Compare Ode III-3.9 f.

that the true poet had some virtues and that he was not altogether useless to the state. He could be of service by purifying the speech and temperament of the young and by inspiring them with good examples; songs were a solace to the sick and could win the support of the gods. However, the danger of a lack of firm stylistic standards and the influence of popular taste led Horace to criticize early Roman comedy for its technical weaknesses and to condemn elaborate stage productions which appealed more to the eye than to the ear even though Suetonius wrote of Augustus, "delectabatur etiam comoedia veteri et saepe eam exhibuit spectaculis publicis."[1] Nevertheless, this fact did not deter the poet from giving his own judgement in this letter to the Princeps. "It is of a piece with Horace's dignified freedom in conversing with the first man of Rome that he is not afraid of going counter now and then to some predilection of Augustus."[2]

Lines 214-228 have been very carefully analysed by Fraenkel.[3] He noted that although this passage was obviously addressed to the Princeps and that it was his opinion that mattered, yet the three clauses from line 221 cum laedimur to 225 tenui deducta poemata filo are unmistakably concerned with the reception of the book by the reading public in general. He further concluded that this apparent inconsistency in referring at one moment to one reader and at the next to another was

---

1 Divus Augustus, 89.1.

2 Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 395.

3 op. cit., p. 395.

intentional and indicated Horace's unwillingness to isolate the Princeps from the rest of the reading public. The Emperor was to appear as one, though the most distinguished, of the educated Romans interested in poetry.

The letter next considered the importance of the quality of the writers by whom the great are praised and Augustus was commended for his support of Vergil and Varius. However, the Princeps also supported Horace, so that, in view of Horace's past refusals to extol the decus Caesaris, it was necessary once again to declare his willingness but inability to adequately glorify Rome's leader. But in so doing, he briefly summarized the results of the recent military successes,

> ".....tuisque
> auspiciis totum confecta duella per orbem,
> claustraque custodem pacis cohibentia Ianum,
> et formidatam Parthis te principe Romam.."[1]

Emphasizing the dangers of ill-advised flattery, the poet closed his letter with a touch of quiet humour.

To summarize, then, the relationship between Horace and Augustus as demonstrated by this epistle, it is obvious that they were on fairly intimate terms of friendship and that the poet's gratitude for the tasks accomplished both at home and abroad by his patron and his consideration for the burdens of government which he bore were very great. However, Horace also implies that although Augustus was probably the greatest Roman of all time, "nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale,"[2] he

---

1 Epistle II-1.253 f.

2 Epistle II-1.17.

was not to be set up on a pedestal remote from his fellow citizens. The Princeps was truly the first citizen of Rome but only that; the tone throughout this poem, though respectful, bears no trace of adulation. In addition, the poet gives us evidence that he felt free to disagree with his patron's tastes in literary matters and that he still found panegyrics, however gratifying to the regime, distasteful to his Muse.

Unfortunately, the public reaction to the Odes was not as favourable as that of the Princeps. The bitter disappointment felt by the poet is evident in the nineteenth epistle of the first book and, in the first letter of that same collection, he announced his resolve to give up lyric poetry to devote himself to philosophical studies.[1] Fortunately, Augustus did not approve of this decision. Convinced that his works were destined for immortality,[2] he commissioned Horace to compose the hymn with which his great festival, the Ludi Saeculares, was to close. But before we can examine the Carmen Saeculare for indications of the poet's attitude to the government and its central figure, we must consider the extent to which Horace was allowed to choose both the form and content of this poem. Warde Fowler has asserted that definite instructions and possibly a rough draft of the subject matter were given to the poet by Augustus.[3] In his view, the inspiration came not from Horace's native genius, but from the policies of the Princeps. However, Noyes, seizing

---

1 Epistle I-1.10 f.

2 Suetonius, Vita Horati.

3 op. cit., pp. 115 f.

upon the suggestion that the Emperor instructed the author not to refer directly to Jupiter in the fourteenth stanza in order to give himself the limelight, has pointed out that the reference to the king of the gods is much more obvious than the allusion to the descendant of Anchises and Venus, his suppliant.[1] He concluded, therefore, that Augustus neither sent Horace a rough draft of the poem nor gave him other instructions. An interesting point has been raised by Fraenkel, who, noting that the Carmen Saeculare was not a conventional hymn, felt that it was highly probable that Horace himself was consulted before the final plans were made.[2] In the face of all precedents, the Princeps had accepted the poet's innovations and had respected the limits which he had set to his art. If the form was thus left to the poet's discretion, is there any reason to think that the subject matter was dictated? The very nature of the celebration doubtless influenced the tone and contents of the poem but the claim that both were the results of official instructions seems to me quite unlikely.

However, it is noticeable that in the Carmen Saeculare Horace refers with satisfaction to the fulfilment of many of the reforms for which he had called in the first three books of the Odes. After the opening invocation to Apollo and Diana, the poet called upon Ilithyia, who had received offerings on the second night of the festival, to bless the <u>patrum decreta super iugandis feminis</u>. This probably referred to the <u>Lex Julia</u>

---

[1] op. cit., pp. 207 f.

[2] op. cit., pp. 381 f.

de maritandis ordinibus, which had been enacted in the previous year to revive the moral and spiritual basis of the family. I have already suggested that Ode III-3 may have sought to encourage Augustus to persevere after he had been forced to withdraw similar legislation in 28 B.C.[1] and certainly, this law was clearly in keeping with Horace's plea in Ode III-24, lines 25-30. There follow prayers to the Fates, Ceres and the first half of the poem ends, as it began, with a prayer to Apollo.

The second half of the poem opens with an invocation to gods whose identity is not clear. Although Warde Fowler argued that Apollo was the protecting deity of Troy and that therefore the divine beings addressed were Apollo and Diana,[2] I agree with Fraenkel, who concluded from the structure of the hymn that the gods here referred primarily to the Capitoline deities.[3] In addition, Wickham found in this passage echoes of Ode III-3. "There is the same contrast between the 'remnant' preserved and the guilty city destroyed: 'Castus....patriae superstes'; the rest were 'incesti' (see 3. 3. 19 and 23): there is the same emphasis on the fact that they were bidden as a condition of protection 'mutare Lares'. That there is a moral meaning here at least, is clear from the petition in which this appeal ends, 'Di probos mores,' &c...."[4] Thus, the second part of the Carmen Saeculare may begin with the memory of Juno's condition that Rome not revive the immorality of Troy.

---

[1] See above pp. 63 f.
[2] op. cit., p. 121.
[3] op. cit., p. 370.
[4] note on lines 37 f.

In Fraenkel's estimation, this hymn reaches its climax in the second triad of this section.[1] Here is described the sacrifice made to Jupiter by the descendant of Anchises and Venus,

> "....bellante prior, iacentem
> Lenis in hostem."[2]

Augustus seems to have accepted the policy of vim temperatam advocated by the Muses in Ode III-4. The second stanza of this triad notes the success of Italian forces over the once dreaded Medes, Scythae and Indi recalling passages such as that in Ode I-12, lines 53 following, while the return of the ancient blessings, Fides, Pax, Honos, Pudor, Virtus, missing so long from a nation undergoing political upheaval and civil war, is heralded in lines 57-60. The poem is concluded with a prayer in which the conventional forms are maintained but in which the indicative mood of the verbs signifies the confidence with which the chorus speaks. The tone has now become one of trust in the benevolence of the gods; the pax deorum for which Rome longed in Ode I-2 has been restored.

We have already seen how Horace progressed from the utter despair of Epode XVI to the hope that the new regime might be able to bring his idealized vision of Rome to reality. I have sought to show how, while remaining uncommitted, the poet attempted to encourage and challenge the government. In the Carmen Saeculare, the anxiety of the earlier poems is gone. Many of the problems that had faced Augustus had been solved and

---

1 op. cit., p. 375.

2 Carmen Saeculare, lines 51-52.

Horace, noting these accomplishments, looked forward to the new age with fresh confidence in the administration of the Princeps. However, it should be noted that there is no direct praise of the government or its leader with the possible exception of lines 51-52 in which mention is made of the Princeps' clemency to the fallen. Although the poet could have given credit for the Lex Julia and the victories of the Roman armies to the Emperor, he chose instead to state simply that they had been achieved. Indeed, the only reference to Augustus portrays him as the representative of the Roman people, a suppliant to the king of the gods.

Horace's reluctance to praise the acts of Augustus in lyric poetry is also evident from Ode IV-2,which he was forced to address two years later to Iullus Antonius, who, although the son of Mark Antony and Fulvia, had been brought up by his stepmother Octavia. This young man seems to have suggested that the poet follow up his successful quasi-Pindaric hymn for the Ludi Saeculares with an epinikion for the occasion of Augustus' triumphant return from Gaul. This evoked an immediate recusatio. After an ironic comparison of Pindar, the mighty Dircean swan, with himself, the tiny bee of Matinus, Horace pleaded his inability to do justice to so great a theme. Here there is none of the Bacchinal courage of Ode III-25, only the fear of losing by comparison. Instead, the poet suggests that the younger man might undertake the task with more success than he. There then follows a stanza of some of the most effusive flattery ever given by Horace to the Princeps:

"Quo nihil maius meliusve terris
Fata donavere bonique divi
Nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum
Tempora priscum."[1]

In their note on these lines, Shorey and Laing quote Sellar's remark[2] that in the fourth book of the Odes the adulation which was the bane of the next century began to be heard. Noyes, on the other hand, sees this passage as part of Horace's irony in passing off the task to a second-rate poet of whose literary ability we have no evidence and in relegating himself to the mob shouting the nonsensical cry, "O sol pulcher, O laudande!"[3] While I feel that in the poet's self-depreciation and even in his suggestion there are traces of irony, I agree with Fraenkel's careful reconstruction of Horace's motives for writing as he did in this poem.[4] The loyalty so strongly professed in lines 37-40 was interpreted as an attempt to impress upon Augustus, whose increasing favour and encouragement the poet obviously prized, the fact that this refusal to praise his acts was not due to any lack of sympathy. The cry that had appeared so ludicrous to Noyes, was to Fraenkel a simple expression of deep affection. In his view, Horace did not feel that the gratitude, admiration and finally affection with which all Italians had come to

---

1 Ode IV-2.37 f.
2 op. cit., p. 157
3 op. cit., p. 216 f.
4 op. cit., pp. 437-440.

regard the Princeps was adequately expressed in the language of the bard. The Pindaric ode moved in a higher, more limited sphere of poetry. "Just as devotion to Augustus was not the privilege of any individual, but was felt by thousands of ordinary citizens, so the language in which that devotion was voiced should be one that seemed to come from the heart of the common man."[1] Thus artistic considerations could still induce Horace to refuse projects that would have doubtless gratified the Princeps.

"Scripta quidem eius usque adeo probavit mansuraque perpetuo opinatus est, ut non modo Saeculare carmen componendum iniunxerit sed et Vindelicam victoriam Tiberii Drusique, privignorum suorum, eumque coegerit propter hoc tribus Carminum libris ex longo intervallo quartum addere...." Thus Suetonius[2] reported the request of the Emperor, a favour which Horace could hardly deny to one for whose services to the fatherland he had such respect and who had lately shown such interest in his work. However, the first of these, Ode IV-4,[3] clearly illustrates Noyes' claim that, "It may be true that Horace was requested to write poems; but he certainly showed extreme skill in omitting what he might be expected to say."[4] Although this poem was supposed to celebrate the victory of Drusus over the Rhaetians, there are only four lines that could be taken as referring directly to that campaign. The major part of the ode is composed of two

---

1 Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 439 f.

2 Vita Horati.

3 For the date of composition, see page 138.

4 op. cit., p. 217.

similes and a long historical digression. This led Wilkinson to suspect that the task was not altogether congenial, and that rather than strike out on a line of his own, the poet settled down to the facile but dangerous alternative of reproducing Pindar.[1] After the first eighteen lines in which Horace describes the young eagle and lion venturing out upon their first kill and compares them in the last two lines of the passage to the young Drusus, there follows a digression concerning the armament of the Vindelici which Wickham describes as an intentional, if not very successful, imitation of Pindar. Fraenkel, on the other hand, noting that anything even remotely reminiscent of a panegyric was distasteful to Horace, has suggested that he may have taken the advantage of the Pindaric character of this parenthesis to poke fun, in passing, at the silly pedantries of certain panegyrists.[2] The final three stanzas of the first half of this ode deal with the necessity of good training to bring out the natural abilities of the young. The successes of Drusus are thus attributed partly to his own inherited virtues and partly to the good home and education provided by Augustus. The emphasis, however, is clearly placed on the necessity of proper training to develop even innate ability;

> "Utcumque defecere mores,
> Indecorant bene nata culpae."[3]

The second half of this ode also illustrates Horace's desire

---

1 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 108.

2 op. cit., p. 430.

3 Ode IV-4.35 f.

to avoid personal flattery and, in addition, his tendency to praise great acts, not for the glory they shed upon those who achieved them, but for their significance to the state. This passage is introduced by a reference to the defeat of Hasdrubal at the river Metaurus by Drusus' ancestor C. Claudius Nero. Without dwelling on the audacity which made that victory possible, the poet swiftly proceeds to emphasize its importance as a turning point in the war with Hannibal. "Thenceforth the Roman youth, through undertakings ever prosperous, waxed stronger...."[1] Even Hannibal's thoughts on his defeat were concerned mainly with the marvellous resiliency of the Roman race and only in the last three lines of his speech does he mention the defeat of Hasdrubal as the point at which his fortunes began to decline. The final stanza, which some editors include in Hannibal's speech although it seems out of character, foresees further success for the Claudian might supported by Jupiter's power and guided by wise counsels.

Thus, throughout this ode, Horace successfully avoided any extensive, detailed description of the military exploits of either Drusus or his ancestor and included no praise of any specific virtues displayed by either of them. Indeed, as Fraenkel has pointed out, the digression at line 18 may well be a parody of the type of panegyric which many probably expected Horace to produce.

However, direct praise for conduct in battle, something never given by Horace to either Augustus or Drusus, is given to Tiberius in Ode

---

[1] Ode IV-4.45 (translation by C.E. Bennett).

IV-14.[1] Although Drusus had been compared to the young eagle and lion,[2] and the Princeps to Marius, Scipio Africanus,[3] and even Hercules,[4] they were never described as Tiberius is in this poem:

> "Spectandus in certamine Martio
> Devota morti pectora liberae
> Quantis fatigaret ruinis....."[5]

Wilkinson saw in this surrender to the will of Augustus a certain blunting of Horace's sensibility. "The poet who had shown such fine imaginative sympathy for the captive barbarian boy and girl in the ode Icci beatis (I, 29) now mentions the courage of the Rhaetians in defense of their freedom merely as enhancing the prowess of the young Tiberius."[6] Tenney Frank's comment on this ode was that it showed the effect of an uncongenial subject.[7] The first half of this poem describing the ferocity of the young soldier is certainly less successful than the earlier ode praising Drusus.

Although Tiberius was ostensibly the main subject of the poem, he is overshadowed by the figure of the Princeps. In Ode IV-4, the greatness of Drusus' acts were attributed in part to the training given

---

1 For the date of this ode, see the Appendix, p. 139.
2 Ode IV-4.1-16.
3 Epode IX.23 f.
4 Ode III-14.
5 Ode IV-14.17 f.
6 Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 86.
7 Catullus and Horace, p. 256.

by Augustus but reference to the Emperor was confined to only one stanza. Ode IV-14, on the other hand, is openly addressed to the Princeps and the last five stanzas deal exclusively with the success achieved under his auspices. Although Tiberius was portrayed as a vigorous leader, the credit for the victory reverted to the head of state.

> "Te copias, te consilium et tuos
> Praebente divos....."[1]

In the last five stanzas of this ode, the poet turned to the other tribes already subdued and listed the races that held Augustus in awe. Notable among them were several frequently mentioned in Odes I-III as unconquered or threatening. Yet this man, under whose auspices so much had been accomplished and who was so widely feared and respected abroad, was hailed as "tutela praesens Italiae dominaeque Romae."[2] Although Tiberius was praised in the first part of this ode, its main subject was Augustus, the guardian of the state. Rome was still mistress, Augustus her protector.

This same relationship is present in both of the two other odes that deal with Augustus and his regime. Odes IV-5 and 15 sum up the results of the Princeps' rule and record the fulfilment of what were only aspirations in the earlier books. The first of these Fraenkel regards as one of Horace's most perfect poems.[3] In contrast to Ode IV-4 and 14, we know of no request for this work which seems to have sprung spontaneously

---

1 Ode IV-14.33 f.

2 Ode IV-14.43-44.

3 op. cit., p. 440.

from the poet's desire for the return of his patron. Indeed, Noyes finds in this poem almost the only passage in all the writings of Horace where one can discover what may be called an expression of real regard for Augustus the man, and this is put into the mouth of a personified Italy, and is supposed to convey the feelings of her peasantry towards the ruler with whom they associated the blessings of peace.[1] Even in the first stanza, the Emperor is appealed to as "optime Romulae custos gentis." There follows a particularly moving simile in which Rome is pictured as awaiting Augustus' return as a mother waits for her son returning from across the sea. At line 17, however, begins the passage describing the achievements of the new regime. Here Horace expresses the sense of quiet security and peace of mind that had replaced the anxiety and despair caused by the long civil wars. Not only had order been enforced on land and sea, the rustic gods ingratiated and honesty restored, but the purity of the family had been safeguarded in response to the appeals of Odes III-6 and 24. In answer to the lament

> "Quid leges sine moribus
> Vanae proficiunt....?"[2]

the poet reassured his reader that now both <u>lex</u> and <u>mos</u> had curbed vice and that punishment followed wrong as its companion.[3] The trust in Caesar as a bulwark against Rome's foreign foes again finds expression in the following stanza while the picture of rustic life commencing at line 29,

---

[1] op. cit., p. 212.

[2] Ode III-24.35.

[3] "Quid tristes querimoniae
Si non supplicio culpa reciditurr?"
Ode III-24.33 f.

although idealized in view of the continuing expansion of the large estates, does reflect by comparison with the dispossessed family of Ode II-18 (line 26 f.) the stability that had been restored to the ownership of property. The following lines (31-36) contain the only reference to the possibility of deification for Augustus found in this book and a comparison is made to Greece mindful of Castor and Hercules, both of whom, as we have already seen, received immortality in return for their services to mankind. Although Noyes[1] saw irony in the Princeps being made a god alteris mensis, I feel that Fraenkel is probably closer to the truth when he wrote, "To understand the simple ideas underlying the last three stanzas of the ode we need not think of any legalized form of worship, for such ideas arise in the ancient world spontaneously whenever thankfulness for salvation from great peril leads men to believe that he who has rescued them must have been endowed with more than human powers."[2] At any rate, when in the last stanza Horace joins the people of Italy to salute the master of the Roman world, Augustus is hailed, not as a god, but simply as dux bone.

The last ode in this collection and possibly the latest of all Horace's poems,[3] Ode IV-15, sums up in a similar manner the benefits of Augustus' rule thus praising the Princeps for his services to the

---

1 op cit., p. 213.

2 op. cit., pp. 446-447.

3 See Appendix p. 139.

state and justifying the poet's support of his regime. Phoebus, as if recalling Horace from the strained effort to praise Tiberius in the previous ode, rebuked him when he wanted to sing of wars lest he undertake too great a task. But, as Fraenkel has pointed out, the subsequent lines indicate that now that peace and order had been restored, a poet had better things to do than proelia loqui.[1] As before, the real subject of the poem is the peace, order and stability Rome was enjoying. The restored productivity of the land,[2] the standards returned to Jove (not to Augustus) by the Parthians, the closing of the doors on the temple of Janus, the application of "ordinem rectum evaganti frena licentiae,"[3] and the return of those personal qualities through which Rome's reputation and dignity[4] had been extended from sunset to sunrise all had taken place in Caesar's lifetime. These benefits, separated by a recurring et and -que, suggest "an almost unlimited sequence of beneficial achievements."[5] Here too is mentioned the freedom from fear of civil disturbance and violence "custode rerum Caesare." This is followed by yet another reference to the tribes, once described as hostile to Rome, the Getae, Seres and the Persae, who now obey the edicta Julia, thus reminding the Romans of the restoration of order both at home and abroad. This

---

1 op. cit., p. 449.

2 Compare Ode II-15.

3 Ode III-24.28 ".....indomitam audeat
Refrenare licentiam"

4 Compare Ode III-5;Ode III-24.53 f.

5 Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 450.

ode closes, like Odes III-14 and IV-5, with a modest celebration at which the citizens of Rome, surrounded by their families sing the praises of the heroic dead, of Troy and Anchises and of the offspring of benign Venus.

There can be no doubt but that during this period Horace's support of Augustus was complete. Yet the poet himself took pains to make it clear why he had given the Princeps his allegiance. Throughout the odes of the fourth book, Horace looks with satisfaction upon the achievement of most of the reforms he had called for in the first three books of the Odes. Caesar was the custos rerum, under whose guidance Rome had advanced from the desolation of the civil wars to its present prosperity. Abroad, his policies had led to a restoration of Rome's supremacy and had brought about the subjection of many of the races which in earlier poems Horace had represented as challenges to her power. Although it has been suggested that, as a bachelor the poet celebrated the Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus[1] with a somewhat artificial ardour, I feel that in view of the fact that he had called for just such legislation in earlier odes, his concern for Rome's morality overcame his personal feelings. Indeed, as Sellar has pointed out, the poet now saw that Augustus had come to represent that idealized vision of Rome which had guided him from the days of the civil war.[2] For these services to the nation Horace praises the Princeps, but nowhere do we find any

---

1 Shorey and Laing note on the Carmen Saeculare lines 17-20.

2 op. cit., p. 157.

reference to any personal quality possessed by Augustus. The immortal fame of the Emperor was to be based like that of Hercules, Castor and Pollux, on his services to mankind. Yet in spite of the fact that Horace accepted the association of Augustus with these deities, he, nevertheless, refused to separate his patron from the rest of the reading public and to isolate him from his fellow citizens. Although he was clearly grateful to the Princeps for the benefits he had brought to the state and gave ample evidence of his deep respect for one who alone bore the burden of the administration of the nation, he still maintained his right to disagree with him on literary matters. Panegyrics continued to be distasteful to him and when in deference to the Emperor's request he undertook to celebrate the victories of Drusus and Tiberius, his greatest praise was still reserved for Rome and the benefits she had received. In both odes, the Princeps was seen as the ultimate source of these benefits, in the first because of his training of the innate abilities of his stepson, in the second because it was he who had provided the troops, strategy and divine good will. In short, Augustus is never praised except in connection with his services to the state. Thus Horace demonstrated that his first concern was not the <u>decus Caesaris</u> but the prosperity, moral health and glory of his fatherland.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION.

This study has been an attempt to trace the stages by which Horace's support for the new regime of Augustus grew. His partizanship did not suddenly develop as a result of his friendship with Maecenas, nor was it influenced, as far as I can see, by any personal relationship with the Emperor himself although, in the last years of his life, the poet enjoyed the Princeps' favour. His allegiance matured slowly out of the despair of the civil war period through years in which Horace sought to commend tactfully to the leader of the state those enlightened policies by which his full approval could be won. Only after many of these earlier aspirations had been fulfilled did the poet give Augustus his unreserved support.

The poet's hopeless despair of an end to the instability and bloodshed that was ruining his native land is very evident in his early epodes. He could foresee for Italy no pleasant landscape, safe and secure from the ravages of civil war as Vergil had in Eclogue IV. In Epode XVI, he made it clear that if men sought that life, they would have to migrate from their accursed native land to the Isles of the Blest. This poem contained no political partizanship, only despair at the self-destruction of Italy and the apparent inability of any party or leader to prevent it. The first ray of hope, the sheathing of swords, appeared in Epode VII but this brief respite from bloodshed was about to be ended by a renewal of civil strife. It is not known to whom Horace addressed

the words, "Quo, quo scelesti ruitis?"[1] or if, indeed, they were addressed to any specific party. The pessimistic conviction that his native land had been doomed by the curse of Remus' murder to self-destruction indicated, however, that the poet was not aware at that time of any practical solution to the situation. Although there had obviously been a short period of calm, no mention was made of any leader who might lift the curse and bring the anarchy to an end. This epode, therefore, echoes the hopeless despair of Epode XVI.

Ode I-14, on the other hand, indicates a change in the poet's attitude. The ship of state, which had lately been a source of weariness and worry, was now one of longing and anxious care. But the nation, shattered and without the good will of the gods, was once again being drawn into a war, and Horace, still giving no indication of support for any party, pleaded for peace. There is, therefore, no definite evidence that the poet identified himself with any political faction before the battle of Actium. His sole guiding principle seems to have been to oppose any party that threatened to continue the civil wars. The pessimism of the earlier epodes clearly indicates that neither party had impressed the poet as being able to restore order. Indeed, on more than one occasion, his pacifism may have been embarrassing to the adherents of Octavian, his future patron and friend, especially if they were attempting to arouse public support for the struggles with Sextus Pompey or Antony.

With the Mediterranean world divided into two factions, one

---

[1] Epode VII.1.

of which was posing as the defender of the Roman way of life against the other which it astutely identified with the vice and corruption of the East, Horace had little choice. The emphasis he placed on the immorality of those opposing Octavian and his single reference to the large Roman force in the enemy camp[1] clearly indicate that he viewed this contest not as the culmination of the civil wars but as a struggle between virtue as personified by Caesar and vice as represented by Cleopatra. This conviction, however, was not strong enough to blind the poet to the nobility of the death of Egypt's queen and in Ode I-37 it is she, and not Octavian, who wins the reader's sympathy and admiration.

The battle of Actium and the ensuing campaign had effectively eliminated all major, organized opposition to Octavian and had thus brought the civil wars to an end. The Princeps promptly took the credit for rescuing the state from the anarchy of the preceding century and Horace now saw in the person of the young Caesar Rome's best safeguard against the renewal of the civil strife which had earlier been the cause of his despair and pessimism. The new regime, however, was by no means as stable as it tried to appear; old animosities, rekindled by recollections of the past, could once again plunge Italy into inter-party violence. This fear can be seen in the ode which Horace addressed to Pollio,[2] who was writing a history of the civil strife. The poet warned his friend that in undertaking that task he was walking on embers that still had fires

---

[1] Epode IX.11 f.

[2] Ode II-1.

beneath them and urged him to exercise caution. In contrast to the brilliance and glory of battle, Horace presented in vivid language the grim realities of war, the carnage, misery and sorrow. Throughout the early odes, the horror and degradation of the past frequently appeared to remind his readers of the era from which they had only recently been rescued and to deter those who might support insurrections against the man who had restored order to the state. The shame of citizen pitted against citizen and the dangers it invited from abroad are recalled in Odes I-2 and III-6. There was doubtless special significance in the prayer to Fortuna[1] to protect Caesar and in the cry of remorse with which that ode closed. The description of the crushing victory won by the gods of of Olympus over the rebellious Titans in Ode III-4 could easily have been interpreted as a warning to those who were plotting to overthrow the rule of the man who listened to the gentle advice of the Muses. Horace thus indicated his support for the leader who had brought Rome's self-destruction to an end and was imposing order in Italy.

But the restoration of order was only the first step towards the realization of Horace's idealized vision of Rome. Although he supported the new government as the state's best safeguard against the resumption of civil war, he was also fully aware that the task of reconciliation and reform was one of great necessity and sought to impress this upon the Princeps. In one of his earliestodes (Ode I-2), the poet reflected the people's longing for an end to the strife and the catastrophies that had beset the

---

[1] Ode I-35.

city since the assassination of Julius Caesar. At the end of a list of possible divine saviours who might expiate the guilt of the past and restore the pax deorum, we find the god Mercury, and the suggestion of his incarnation in the person of Octavian. While this was doubtless complimentary to the young master of the Roman world, I suspect that the poet was also hinting at the way in which he could become this saviour. For an Epicurean like Horace, the poetic significance of Mercury probably rested in the qualities he represented, namely the peaceful arts of reconciliation and persuasion. By taking the sive clause in the eleventh stanza with the stanzas following it, the prayer for the continuing rule of Octavian becomes conditional on the assumption by the Princeps of the task of reconciliation and the promotion of peaceful enterprises, the functions of the god Mercury. Such gentle policies, we are told in Ode III-4, are pleasing to the Muses who delight in giving lene consilium. In addition, Horace is careful to indicate that he himself was their sacerdos, protected by them since early childhood. He also portrayed the might of the gods who would support vim temperatam against brute force, here represented by the Titans.

However, in addition to order and the reconciliation of gods and men, both moral and marital reforms were badly needed. The vices rampant in the city had provided the subjects for some of the satires while greed which led men and women to sell their virtue was the main topic of one of Horace's earliest odes, Ode III-24. Here, the appeal to the Princeps was very thinly disguised. The words "O quisquis volet.....

statuis"[1] left little doubt whom the poet was addressing. Much more subtle was the encouragement given in Ode III-3. This poem opens with one of Horace's most majestic stanzas praising the man of steadfast resolve who is not deterred from a righteous course by the opposition of the people, tyrants or even the gods. The poet makes it clear that it was because of this quality that Pollux, Hercules, Bacchus and Romulus merited their divine positions. In the midst of these deities, Augustus would sip nectar and the implication is that he would gain his immortality because of that same quality. The significance of this passage was probably quite obvious to Augustus especially if it was written in 27 B.C., the year after he had been forced by public outcry to withdraw his proposed marital legislation. Horace then proceeds to remind his readers that Juno's reconciliation to Troy's descendants depended upon the condition that Troy never be rebuilt, but the emphasis on the immorality of that city as the cause of its downfall suggests that Juno's prohibition had moral implications. Thus the poet may well have sought to impress upon the Princeps the fact that Rome's future prosperity depended upon its righteousness and that he must not be deterred from enacting his moral legislation by the opposition of the people.

Horace was also fully aware of the need to restore Roman prestige both at home and abroad and to foster the simple military virtues which had built the Roman Empire and were now needed to maintain it. He also saw in foreign campaigns an outlet for the martial energies which

---

[1] Ode III-24.25 f.

had in the past been squandered disastrously on civil strife. Thus, the first three books of the Odes abound in references to tribes as yet unconquered and to races hostile to Roman supremacy. The Parthians who had thrice defeated Roman armies without punishment were most frequently mentioned. In addition to calling attention to these peoples, Horace, on three occasions, tactfully commended expeditions against them to Augustus. The earliest of these was the direct appeal in Ode I-2 that the Princeps not allow the Medes to ride unpunished. Ode III-5 opens by predicting that Augustus would be deemed a <u>divus praesens</u> after he had added the Britons and the Persians to the empire. The poet then proceeded to demonstrate the lack of patriotism and military spirit of his fellow citizens by contrasting the behaviour of those captured at Carrhae with the devotion to duty displayed by Regulus. In Ode I.12, a triumph over the Parthians or the Seres and Indians was mentioned as a prerequisite to Augustus' achieving world domination, second only to Jove.

Nor do the poet's references to the Princeps personally in Odes I-III indicate unconditional support. Here too, Horace reserved his judgement until he could evaluate Augustus' civil and military policies. It is true that he foretold immortality for the Princeps, but these passages always included conditions that had to be fulfilled first and praise of personal qualities, though given to Regulus and other Republican heroes,was only once given to Caesar when the victor of Actium was compared to Scipio Africanus or Marius.[1] There is one poem, however, in which

---

[1] Epode IX.23 f.

Horace, in a burst of enthusiasm, describes the impulse to celebrate the decus Caesaris,[1] but in no ode composed before 23 B.C. does this eagerness result in any extensive praise of Augustus' personal achievements. This can, perhaps, be best explained by the fact that Horace viewed Augustus not as the master, but as the servant of the state. His praise of Augustus was based not on the significance of his achievements to his personal prestige and glory, but on their importance to the nation. The poet was grateful for the return of order and security, as Ode III-14 shows, but he reserved his whole-hearted approval until he could judge the foresight and effectiveness of the Princeps' policies. In the meantime, as the sacerdos Musarum, he sought to lay the deeper needs of the nation before its leader and to commend tactfully the measures required to achieve his idealized vision of Rome.

In contrast to the cool formality with which Augustus was addressed in Odes I-III, Epistle I-13 shows a gentle humour that suggests a more personal relationship. Yet this personal contact was completely free from flattery by the poet; when he praised the Emperor, Horace was careful to list the reasons. Their friendship seems to have rested on a sober realization by both parties of the merit of the other. Horace saw in Augustus a man who was earning immortality by bearing alone the burdens of government and by restoring security, morality and the rule of law to the state;[2] Augustus, on the other hand, saw in Horace a poet

---

[1] Ode III-25.

[2] Epistle II-1.1-4.

whose works, he believed, would gain immortality[1] and thus give everlasting fame to those they celebrated. The dignity and independence of the poet's dealings with the head of the state is clearly indicated in the letter which was addressed to the Emperor at the latter's own request.[2] He opens the epistle by commending the Princeps' services to the nation, pointing out that he was performing tasks similar to those undertaken by the great benefactors of mankind who had become immortal. The opposition they had incurred, however, was contrasted with the honours bestowed upon Rome's leader. Instead of dwelling on the successes of Augustus, as some may have expected he would, Horace turned to a common interest, the condition of literature in Rome. Although he was probably aware of the Emperor's delight in the old Roman comedies, the poet did not hesitate to criticise them. In addition, care was taken not to isolate the first man of Rome from the rest of the reading public. The poet refused to set his Emperor apart from his fellow citizens and speak to him as though he were above the rest of mankind. The impression gained from this letter was that the writer was impressed but not overawed by the man to whom he was writing.

In his later lyrics, Horace's attitude towards the government and its central figure was one of satisfaction, gratitude and confidence in the future. This is quite evident in the Carmen Saeculare. Here, in formal language, the poet confidently asks the gods to favour the city

---

1 Suetonius, Vita Horati.

2 Epistle II-1.

of Rome. He prays for the success of the Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus but mentions it only as the patrum decreta without reference to its sponsor. This is the only reference to the achievements of Augustus in the first half of the poem. The second part of this hymn opens with a prayer for morality which, in its references to Troy, recalls the moral warnings of Ode III-3. In the thirteenth stanza, we find the only reference to the Princeps in the poem, a description of the sacrifice to the king of the gods which the "Clarus Anchisae Venerisque sanguis"[1] had performed earlier. This is followed by one of the few references to the personal virtues of the Emperor; first in war, he is merciful to the fallen, an example of the vim temperatam advised by the Muses. But the tone swiftly becomes impersonal again as the poet proceeds with satisfaction to report the subjection of Rome's foes, all of whom were mentioned in Odes I-III, and to welcome the return of the ancient virtues. The poem closes on a note of confident trust in the gods, the pax deorum had at last been restored.

However, Horace still found panegyrics distasteful and the suggestion that he write one to welcome Augustus back from the West resulted in a recusatio.[2] Nevertheless, he was careful to make it clear that this was not because he did not recognise the preeminence of the Emperor. Instead, he hinted that the Pindaric ode was not suitable to express the universal gratitude due to Rome's defender. He did comply, however, with the Emperor's request that he celebrate the victories of Drusus and Tiberius.

---

1 Carmen Saeculare line 50.

2 Ode IV-2.

In the ode praising Drusus,[1] he succeeded in reducing the allusion to the campaign to two lines and used the occasion to produce two magnificent similes and a passage emphasizing the necessity of good training to develop the natural abilities of the young. The success of the pueros Nerones was thus made to reflect credit upon their stepfather. The last half of this ode supposedly praising the victory of Drusus' ancestor at the Metaurus River is mainly taken up with Hannibal's musings about the resiliency of the Roman race. We learn more of the ferocity of Tiberius from the ode written to celebrate his part in the double campaign,[2] but overshadowing all his achievements stands the figure of the Emperor. Although his stepson may have slaughtered Rome's foes, it was Augustus who supplied the forces, strategy and good will of the gods, and Augustus was the guardian of mistress Rome. Thus, once again, the poet refused to think of the Princeps and his heirs apart from their nation. The military prowess of Tiberius was praised, but the poem ended with its true significance for the poet, namely that it protected the state and its interests from the races beyond its boundaries.

Odes IV-5 and 15 sum up the benefits derived by the nation from the rule of Augustus. Here Horace clearly sets forth the reasons for his support of the Princeps. The serenity of the countryside, the security at home and supremacy abroad, and the active intervention of the government to raise the standards of morality at Rome all fulfilled the

---

1 Ode IV-4.

2 Ode IV-14.

aspirations of the sacerdos Musarum of Odes I-III. The Princeps had accepted the lene consilium of the Muses and had heeded the appeals of their poet. If the state fell short of Horace's idealized vision of Rome, it was not the fault of Augustus.

Thus the development of Horace's allegiance to Augustus can be traced from its first stirrings in the days preceding Actium to its final whole-hearted support. Its growth was by no means rapid and in the period between 30 and 23 B.C., there were many conditions that had to be met before the poet was convinced that the Princeps really deserved immortality. Indeed, those years were years of hopeful anxiety rather than support, of attempts to show the Princeps the way to everlasting fame and of gentle encouragement. In return for the achievement of these tasks, Horace gave to the Emperor not servile adulation but deeply felt gratitude. Throughout his writings, he maintained his independence and dignity and, as the sacerdos Musarum, sought to serve mankind by advocating the gentle policies loved by his mistresses, the Muses.

APPENDIX

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE POLITICAL ODES, EPODES AND EPISTLES.

The Epodes

All the references in the Epodes can be dated to the decade following the battle of Philippi. Unfortunately, however, these allusions are frequently obscure, especially when they deal with the political situation. This may possibly reflect the need for prudence in an unsettled period. Various critics, nevertheless, have attempted to speculate concerning the possible dates of composition of these poems and it is with these speculations that this section will be mainly concerned. Epode XVI. There is no internal evidence other than the mood of utter despair to indicate when this poem was written. Wickham has admitted that it may have been written at any time when Horace had begun to sicken of the aimless bloodshed, and before he had seen, or reconciled himself to, the practical remedy which Octavian offered for it. Nevertheless, the general consensus of opinion (Orelli, Franke, Macleane, Noyes (op. cit., p. 63), Page, Shorey and Laing) seems to be that this epode was composed about the beginning of the Perusine War in 41 B.C. Sellar places it slightly later noting that, "Horace seems to express the feelings of the losing side before the peace of Brundisium; Vergil, those of the winning side after its conclusion."[1] Fraenkel,[2] on the other hand, assuming that

---

[1] op. cit., p. 122.

[2] op. cit., pp. 50-53.

Vergil's fourth eclogue predated this epode, makes use of this assumption in his speculation as to its date of composition. He points out that if Vergil's poem was written in 41 B.C. and Horace read it soon after, it would be possible to place the composition of "Altera iam teritur" in the last months of the Perusine War or during the subsequent campaign which was brought to an end by the Pax Brundisina (40 B.C.). If the fourth eclogue was written in the latter part of the year 40 B.C., the earliest likely date would be the spring of 38 B.C., when hostilities broke out between Sextus Pompey and Octavian. Fraenkel felt that the fact that this work shows the poet's mastery in handling a difficult meter and also his remarkable skill in composing a poem of an exacting genre yet unknown in Roman literature, a remarkable achievement if attained at the earlier date, is better explained by the later date. However, he emphasizes that this is only speculation, as are the other attempts to date this epode.

Epode VII. As in Epode XVI, there are no references which enable us to date this poem with any degree of certainty. The only clue is found in the reference to the enses conditi but to what lull in the struggle for power this alludes is, like the date of this poem, a matter for speculation. As has been noted in the main body of this thesis,[1] both Campbell and Ferrero[2] have suggested the year 32 B.C., a possibility also accepted by Franke[3] and Tenney Frank. If this theory is correct, the swords were

---

[1] See pp. 28 f.

[2] Fasti Horatiani, p. 130.

[3] Catullus and Horace, p. 188.

sheathed after the battle of Naulochus. However, the words sua dextera in lines 9-10 indicate that Horace viewed the impending conflict as a continuation of the civil wars. The propaganda of Octavian, on the other hand, stressed the fact that Cleopatra was the official enemy and that the war was not a civil contest but a war to protect Rome and its morality against the threats of a foreign power. This position is clearly reflected in the three poems written by Horace dealing with the battle of Actium. In these, there is no mention made of Antony and the only reference to the Roman soldiers opposing Octavian placed them under the command of a woman or her eunuchs. Therefore, if this poem was composed during this period, it was probably written well before the final rupture in relations between the Triumvirs. Another widely accepted theory,[1] which I find more attractive, assigns this epode to the years 38-36 B.C. during which Octavian was fighting against Sextus Pompey, the son of Gnaeus Pompey. His forces, composed largely of unconverted Republicans among whom were probably some of Horace's old comrades from the army of Brutus, would be more appropriately called Rome's dextera than the forces of the queen of Egypt. The sheathed swords could refer to the Treaty of Misenum (39 B.C.), which lasted only one year. In addition, the hopelessness evident especially in the last stanza links this epode more closely with Epode XVI than with the poems dealing with Actium. Thus I feel that the date on which this epode was composed was probably between the years 38-36 B.C. although the despair of the poem seems to me to fit the

---

[1] Shorey and Laing, Orelli, Page, Moore, Fraenkel (op. cit., pp. 56 f.).

commencement of hostilities better than the second phase of a war already begun.

Epode I. This epode seems to have been written early in 31 B.C. before Octavian set out for Actium.

Epode IX. Although it is fairly clear that this poem was written either at the battle of Actium or shortly after it, the exact time and place of its composition, as we have already seen, have been the subject of much controversy. As the problem has been discussed at some length in Chapter II, I will merely restate the two conclusions which seem the most likely. Both Housman[1] and Wistrand[2] believe that this poem was composed near Actium, possibly in Caesar's camp north of the Gulf of Arta into which the fleet of Antony had withdrawn ("sinistrorsum citae"; see note 2 page 33), shortly before the final engagement. The first part of this epode (lines 1-20), in their opinion, reflects the tense atmosphere at this time while in lines 21-32 the poet is attempting to cheer himself with hopeful anticipation making use, as Wistrand has pointed out, of the "praesens pro futuro." Failing to quiet his qualms over the fortunes of Caesar by these dreams, he is driven to "capaciores scyphos" to relieve his "curam metumque."

Wilkinson,[3] on the other hand, accepts the theory that Horace was not in the vicinity of Actium but at Rome during the battle and suggests that this epode was written some time after the defeat of Antony as an imaginative summary of the changing emotions of a participant on board

---

[1] op. cit., p. 195.

[2] op. cit., pp. 35 f.

[3] Horace, Epode IX, Classical Review, XLVII (1933), pp. 2-6.

one of Octavian's ships. The "curam metumque" which is to be banished, in his interpretation, refers to Antony's large land army still intact after Actium while he feels that there is some reason for supposing that Buecheler was right in referring "fluentem nauseam" to seasickness, even though it was, like the rest of this poem, imaginary. If Horace was not at the scene of the battle, this is an extremely skillful reconstruction of both the mood and events surrounding that contest. Whether this epode was composed in Caesar's camp in the tense atmosphere before the final engagement, or expressed the poet's personal recollections after he had returned to Rome, or whether Horace was merely portraying the emotions of others as seen in his imagination will probably never be able to be proved to the satisfaction of all commentators.

The Odes I-III

As we shall see when we come to examine the possible dates for the composition of individual odes, the period which produced the first poem to be written in this collection is very much in doubt. The first clear allusion to any contemporary event is in Ode I-37, which was written in the autumn of 30 B.C. although it is not impossible that others[1] may have been composed before this. The date of publication is, fortunately, attested to by more dependable evidence. Marcellus, who had been praised in Ode I-12.45-48, died in the autumn of 23 B.C. It is very unlikely that such hopeful praise would have been published within a year

---

[1] Ode I-14 and Ode II-1.

or two of that great disappointment of the hopes of Rome and of the Emperor. In addition two odes had mentioned Licinius Murena, Maecenas' brother-in-law, who was executed in 22 B.C. for complicity in the plot of Fannius Caepio. It is improbable that Horace would have wished to remind his patron of that displeasing event. Thus, the early part of the year 23 B.C. seems the most suitable choice. Some critics, quoting the reference to the conquered Parthians in Ode II-9 (lines 21-22) have delayed the publication of the first three books until 19 B.C. after Tiberius' successful campaign and the return of the standards. Gow,[1] however, noted that there was a set of silver denarii dating from the years 29-15 B.C. all bearing the inscription ARMEN. RECEP. or ARMEN. CAPT. Therefore, he suggested that this reference alluded to some transaction with Armenia about 25 B.C. This date he based on the other references in the poem. He identified the nova tropaea (lines 18-19) with the monument voted or projected by the senate in 25 B.C. (Dio.liii.4.5) and the Geloni with the Scythian embassy which came to Augustus in Spain (Orosius 6.21.19). Thus 23 B.C. is generally accepted as the date of publication for the first three books of the Odes.

Ode I-14. There is no reliable reference by which this ode may be dated and various suggestions have connected it with at least three crises between the years 36 B.C. and 29 B.C. The only reference by the poet to contemporary events in this allegory are the lines,

---

[1] op. cit., pp. 303 f.

"Nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium,
Nunc desiderium curaque non levis."[1]

Orelli, Franke, Page, Wilkinson and Moore interpret the words sollicitum and taedium as allusions to the politics of the triumvirate period or to Actium and thus assign this ode to the early years of the sole rule of Octavian. Some[2] follow Torrentius' conjecture that this poem was written in 29 B.C., the year in which, according to Dio,[3] Octavian considered retirement from public life. They note that he was dissuaded by Maecenas, who also compared the state to a ship. But if this was the reason for Horace's anxiety, Noyes has indeed pointed out a significant omission.[4] He has called attention to the fact that in no part of this ode is any mention made of the helmsman; nowhere do we find a reference to any single individual who might guide the ship to safety. To the English poet, Horace seemed to be carefully avoiding the anti-democratic aspects of Plato's description of the ship of state. If this omission was deliberate, then this ode was probably composed before the poet had become reconciled to the leadership of one man. In addition, if Horace was urging the Princeps not to desert the state, why did he address the ship instead of its pilot? The poet here seems to be appealing to the whole state, not just to its leaders. Tenney Frank,[5] feeling that it would be hazardous to place any

---

[1] Ode I-14.17-18.

[2] Orelli, Franke and Wilkinson (Horace and his Lyric Poetry, p. 72).

[3] Dio lii.16.

[4] op. cit., pp. 66 f.

[5] Catullus and Horace, p. 188.

ode earlier than 32 B.C., has interpreted this ode as Horace's first expression of dismay at the rumours which preceded Actium. However, Fraenkel, weighing the full heaviness of the words "nuper sollicitum..," felt probably justified in agreeing with those scholars who believed that this poem was written several years before the final defeat of Antony.[1] Both Sellar[2] and Noyes[3] agree with this early date. Indeed, Acron[4] saw in the reference to the "Pontica pinus" an allusion to Pompey the Great and interpreted the whole poem as a warning to Sextus Pompey against renewing hostilities. However, due to the lack of more conclusive evidence, it must be admitted that this poem could have been inspired by any alarming situation before the final establishment of the principate, although I feel that the heaviness of the last stanza and the omission of any reference to the pilot suggests an early stage of Horace's reconciliation to the rule of Octavian.

Ode I-37. This ode seems to have been composed in the late summer or early autumn of 30 B.C. when the first news of Cleopatra's death reached Rome.

Ode I-2. The date of the composition of this ode, like many others, depends mainly upon the inferences drawn by various critics from statements in the text. The natural catastrophies described in the first twenty lines have led some commentators[5] to date this ode both before and after 29 B.C. on

---

1 op. cit., pp. 158 f.
2 op. cit., p. 122.
3 op. cit., p. 66.
4 op. cit., Vol. I, p. 65.
5 See Franke, op. cit., pp. 136 f.

the assumption that Horace was referring to contemporary events rather than recalling those that occurred shortly after the death of Julius Caesar. Franke, however, directs our attention to the last four lines of the poem:

> ".....hic magnos potius triumphos,
> Hic ames dici pater atque princeps,
> Neu sinas Medos equitare inultos
> Te duce, Caesar."

Noting that it was the poet's wish that Octavian might enjoy triumphs and the titles of pater and princeps, he assumed that Horace was looking forward to the great triple triumph to be celebrated upon the return of Rome's new master from the East. In addition, the mention of the Parthians suggests that the victor of Actium may have been in a position to engage them with the strong Roman force fresh from the capture of Alexandria: "Quis est, quin apertum esse dicat, carmen ante Octaviani reditum ex Oriente, quo Parthica composuerat, scriptum esse, et quidem ineunte anno 725., quo splendidissimus ille triumphus a Romanis praepararetur aliique honores ei decernerentur?"[1] This date is also supported by Orelli and Elmore[2]. Fraenkel[3] felt that this ode was probably later than Ode III-24 while Page has suggested that 28 B.C., when Octavian actually received the title of Princeps, would be a more appropriate date. However, it is quite possible that the conferring of these titles was being considered as early as 29 B.C.

---

1 Franke, op. cit., p. 144.
2 op. cit., p. 259.
3 op. cit., pp. 242 f.

Although no date between the end of the civil wars (30 B.C.) and the reorganization of the state in 27 B.C. can be ignored, the period between the fall of Alexandria and the return of Octavian to Rome in the summer of 29 B.C. seems, in my opinion, the most suitable time for the composition of this ode.

Ode III-24. Once again, the lack of clear contemporary references forces critics to speculate about the date of this ode. Fraenkel, noting the indirect appeal to the Princeps in lines 25-30, has concluded that it is not likely that if the ode had been written a long time after the return of Octavian from the East in 29 B.C., Horace, in alluding to him, could have chosen words such as quisquis volet.....rabiem tollere civicam.[1] To support this early date, he also noted the general, non-individual expression of these lines, and the fact that the general structure and the execution of some of the details of this ode were somewhat clumsy, a fault not usually found in Horace's more mature works.[2] Franke also supports an early date for this ode assigning it to the year 28 B.C. or earlier: "Cum Octavianus jam a.726. de moribus emendandis cogitaverit, non dubito quin oda aut ante hunc a., aut ad summum eo ipso scripta sit."[3] With this conclusion Orelli also agrees.

Ode III-25. In the absence of more definite evidence, most critics have been forced to depend upon the enthusiasm of the language and the resolve

---

1 op. cit., p. 242.
2 op. cit., p. 240.
3 op. cit., p. 196.

to sing of "...insigne recens adhuc indictum alio ore"[1] to date this poem. Orelli, therefore, places this ode shortly after the battle of Actium while Macleane links it with the capture of Alexandria. But Horace himself seems to have already celebrated the fall of Cleopatra[2] and it is unlikely that he was alone in this. Franke accepts Sanadon's opinion that it was composed in 29 or 28 B.C., "quo tempore communis populi Romani assentio eaque vel vera rerum gestarum admiratione vel foeda adulatione coorta potentem Octavianum in deorum numerum retulit."[3] Shorey and Laing place the date still later with the suggestion that the event to be praised was more probably the bestowal of the title of Augustus in B.C. 27. Thus, the only conclusion that seemspossible is that this ode was written during the first wave of enthusiasm for Cctavian that marked the early years of his supremacy.

Ode II-1. There is nothing in this ode which enables us to fix its date beyond question. The latest incident it mentions is Pollio's Dalmatian triumph in 39 B.C.[4] Macleane, attempting to limit further the period in which this poem might have been written, has noted a passage in Suetonius' de Illustribus Grammaticis in which it appears that Atteius, the philologist, after the death of Sallust in 34 B.C., gave Pollio, who was beginning to write his history, the rules for the art of composition. If

---

[1] Ode III-25.7-8.

[2] Cde I-37, Epode IX.

[3] op. cit., p. 196.

[4] Ode II-1.16.

this was so, Macleane points out that it was improbable that such a large work could have been so far completed as to be communicated to his friends before the year A.U.C. 723. The fact that in writing a history of the civil wars, Pollio is treading on ashes implies that the strife is over, but the warning that there are fires underneath clearly indicates that peace has not yet become secure. In addition, the phrase "arma nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus" recalls passages in Odes I-2 and 14 which emphasize the need for atonement and the restoration of the pax deorum. Finally, the lament found in the eighth stanza has a vividness that suggests that it was written while the memory of the struggle was still fresh. Therefore, I agree with Franke that "Totus color, si quid sentio, bellis civilibus id admodum propinquum esse probat."[1] I would suggest 28 B.C. as the latest limit at which this poem could have been written since in that year Octavian undertook the restoration of the temples and the pax deorum, although an earlier date than this seems more suitable. For these reasons, I agree with those who assign this ode to the period between 30 and 28 B.C.

Ode III-8. There are two conflicting dates suggested for the composition of this ode. The year 29 B.C. is supported by Orelli, Page and Shorey and Laing, whereas Franke[2] and Macleane assign it to the year 25 B.C. Wickham, on the other hand, contents himself with demonstrating that the events

---

1 op. cit., p. 174.

2 op. cit., pp. 158 f.

referred to in this ode give no sure indication of when it was written. The evidence quoted as the basis of both theories is found in the fifth and sixth stanzas:

> "Mitte civilis super urbe curas:
> Occidit Daci Cotisonis agmen,
> Medus infestus sibi luctuosis
> Dissidet armis,
>
> Servit Hispanae vetus hostis orae
> Cantaber sera domitus catena,
> Iam Scythae laxo meditantur arcu
> Cedere campis." [1]

Those who favour the later date point to the victory of Lentulus over the Dacians although its date is uncertain, and the success of Augustus and his legati against the Cantabrians in 25 B.C. The reference to the Parthians they link to the flight of Tiridates to Augustus in Spain as reported by Justinus (Book XLII). However, Dio reports this incident, or one very like it, under the year 30 B.C.[2] while Augustus was still in the East following the fall of Alexandria. Macleane, in accordance with Mommsen's views, has accepted both accounts as two phases in the struggle for the Parthian throne.[3] Thus the reference in Ode III-8 could conceivably allude to either event. Those who favour the earlier date claim that these lines refer to the Parthian uprisings of 30 B.C., the defeat of the Cantabri by Statilius Taurus in 29 B.C., and the victory of M. Crassus over the Dacians in 30 B.C. The reference to the Scythians is perhaps best explained by Macleane in his note:"Franke supposes these to be the Scythians who had helped Phraates. Orelli and Dillenbr. imagine them to be the Geloni and

---

[1] Ode III-8.17 f.

[2] op. cit., li.18.2.

[3] See Rice Holmes, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 260 f.

other trans-Danubian tribes. I believe that Horace meant no more than generally to say that the enemies of Rome were no longer disturbing her." The first line of the passage quoted above also seems to imply that Maecenas was in charge of the city. This we know was the case in 30 B.C. (Dio 51.3; Tacitus, Annales 6.11) although it also seems probable that similar powers were granted to him during Augustus' absence in Spain. The dating of this ode has special significance because it was apparently written on the first anniversary of Horace's narrow escape from a falling tree. The date of this incident would, in turn, greatly aid us in determining the periods during which other important odes were composed. Indeed, because of the connection of this ode with Ode III-4, I believe that the earlier date is the more probable.

Ode III-4. The earliest possible time at which this ode could have been written is fixed by the reference to the accident involving the falling tree in line 27. This, as we have seen in our discussion of Ode III-8, could have been either 30 or 26 B.C. There is, however, one other passage in which the poet seems to be referring to contemporary events:

> "Vos Caesarem altum, militia simul
> Fessas cohortis abdidit oppidis,
> Finire quaerentem labores,
> Pierio recreatis antro."[1]

But once again, as Wickham has pointed out, this reference could allude to the settlement of troops either following Actium (Dio 51.4) in 30 B.C. or following his Spanish campaign in 25-24 B.C. (Dio 53.23). However,

---

[1] Ode III-4.37.

D.A. Malcolm,[1] accepting the earlier date, has seen special meaning in the picture of the Muses refreshing the battle-weary Princeps in a Pierian grotto. He has connected this passage with that in Suetonius' Life of Virgil (27) which states that Octavian, on his return from Actium in the summer of 29 B.C., halted for a few days in Campania at Atella to cure himself of a throat complaint and that there Virgil entertained him by reciting his new poem, the Georgics. Tenney Frank,[2] also supports the earlier date and if one accepts MacKay's interpretation of this ode, as I have in this thesis,[3] 29 B.C. is obviously more suitable to the mood and meaning of the poem than 26 B.C. "There is then reason to believe that the ode dates from 30-28 B.C., probably from 29, about the time of Augustus' return, when men were still wondering what the opponents of Augustus might expect."[4]

Ode III-6. It is generally agreed[5] that this poem was also composed in the early years of Octavian's rule but, once again, there are no definite references to fix its date. If the Dacus and Aethiops in line 14 allude to their presence in the forces of Cleopatra, the earliest possible date for this poem is 31 B.C. Fraenkel, noting the restoration of the temples in 28 B.C., has concluded that it could not have been written after that

---

1 op. cit., pp. 242-243.

2 Horace, Carm. III-4: Descende Caelo, American Journal of Philology, XLII (1921), p. 170.

3 See pp. 56 f.

4 L.A. Mackay, op. cit., p. 244.

5 Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 261; Franke, op. cit., p. 193; Nettleship, Lectures and Essays, p. 160.

year and sees no reason for assigning it an earlier date since, in his opinion, it seemed the far more natural inference that at the time of the poet's writing, the plan of restoring the temples was settled and its execution perhaps begun.[1] This would indeed be true if the poem were written in support of the policies of the new regime, but we have already seen how Horace frequently set forth the lasting needs of the state and appealed for government action. Warde-Fowler has suggested that this ode, inspired not by any definite policy but by the general needs of the state, was composed before the return of Octavian from the East.[2] As there is no proof to contradict either of these views, the reader must choose for himself according to his interpretation of the purpose of the poem. While the year 28 B.C. is quite possible, I would not exclude the years immediately preceding it.

Ode III-2. Few commentators attempt to date this poem. Instead, they state that it seems to have been written at about the same time as the other Roman odes. Franke,[3] however, sees in the fifth stanza an indirect reference to Octavian's contemplated retirement from public life in 28 B.C. Macleane, on the other hand, sees no necessary connection and chooses to give 26 B.C. as its date of composition.

Ode III-1. There is no indication as to when this poem may have been written. However, F. Solmsen (American Journal of Philology, lxviii, 1947, pp. 337 f.) has shown that it was planned and executed as an organic part

---

1 op. cit., p. 261 note 4.

2 op. cit., p. 227.

3 op. cit., p. 187.

of the cycle of Roman Odes, not written earlier and later adapted. Thus it probably dates from the period 29-26 B.C.

Ode III-3. The name Augustus in line 11 indicates that this ode could not have been composed before January,27 B.C. Thus Orelli commented, "In eo consentiunt plerique anno 727 hoc carmen attribuendum esse."

Ode III-5. As in Ode III-3, the reference to Augustus shows that this ode must have been written after January,27 B.C. Orelli, influenced by the allusion to the Britons and Parthians in lines three and four also assigns this poem to 27 B.C., in which expeditions to the North and East were being prepared.

Ode I-35. Basing their opinions on the eighth stanza of this ode, Franke, Orelli, Wickham and Page assign it to the year 27 B.C., when Augustus was about to send expeditions against Britain and the East. Shorey and Laing, on the other hand, refer it to the expedition planned by Aelius Gallus in 26 B.C.

Ode I-12. The passage seized upon by most commentators to date this poem are the lines referring to Marcellus. Franke, Orelli, Wickham, Macleane, and Shorey and Laing all agree that this reference excludes a date later than 23 B.C., when Marcellus died and that the reference to the young man's increasing reputation followed immediately by the praise of the Julian family suggests that the occasion of the ode may have been the betrothal or marriage of Marcellus to Julia in 25-24 B.C. This reference is also cited as an indication that the Odes I-III were not published later than 23 B.C.

Ode III-14. Written to welcome Augustus upon his return from his Spanish campaign in 24 B.C.

The Epistles Books I & II

Although some of the epistles may have been written before the publication of the first three books of the odes, Wickham has noted that all those epistles which can be dated fall in the years between 23 and 19 B.C.

Epistle I-13. Fraenkel suggests that this poem was written probably in late 23 or early 22 B.C. before the Emperor left for Sicily and the East.[1]

Epistle I-7. The date of this epistle is by no means certain. Franke assigns it on the basis of lines 10 and 11 to the same year as Epistle I-15, i.e. 23 B.C.[2] Wilkins, on the other hand, also refers to Ritter's suggestion dating it in 21 B.C.

Epistle II-1. Various attempts have been made to date this poem by references within the text and from Suetonius' statement: "Post sermones vero quosdam lectos nullam sui mentionem habitam ita sit questus: 'Irasci me tibi scito, quod non in plerisque eius modi scriptis mecum potissimum loquaris; an vereris ne apud posteros infame tibi sit, quod videaris familiaris nobis esse?' Expressitque eclogam ad se, cuius initium est:

> Cum tot sustineas et tanta negotia solus,
> res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes,
> .....!"[3]

If we take sermones to refer to epistles, as Horace himself does in line 250 of this poem, then this epistle can not have been composed before the

---

1 op. cit., p. 352.
2 op. cit., p. 204.
3 Vita Horati.

the publication of the first book of epistles in 20-19 B.C. The date is further advanced if we interpret lines 132 f. as referring to the Carmen Saeculare of 17 B.C. Two other methods to fix the time at which this poem was written have been attempted. Wilkins quotes Ritter's identification of the reference in line 16, "iurandasque tuum per numen ponimus aras" with the altar at Lugdunum which he claimed had been dedicated in 12 B.C. although Macleane has shown that this assumption is not without doubt. Indeed, Dio's reference (liv.32) implies that such worship was already in existence in 12 B.C. Wilkins, however, felt that the general nature of the reference denoted a habit rather than a single act and suggested that instead, the passage may have alluded to the altar of Fortuna Redux decreed in honour of Augustus by the senate in 19 B.C. Thus this reference is of little help in dating this epistle. Wickham,[1] on the other hand, has noted certain similarities between this poem and the fourth book of the Odes; the echo of Ode IV-14.4 in line 252, the general resemblance of the topics suggested in the verse "Terrarumque situs...." to the geographical passages in Odes IV-4, 5, 14, and 15, and the correspondence between the subjects of the panegyric in line 254-256 and those in Ode IV-15.6-9. If these are accepted as sufficient evidence, Wickham suggests that they indicate the last months of 13 B.C.[2] Both Sellar and Page also assign it to the years 14-13 B.C. although it is not clear whether this letter was sent to Augustus in Gaul or at Rome. Thus, this

---

[1] op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 328-329.

[2] op. cit., p. 102.

epistle seems to date from about the time of Augustus' return from the East.

Odes IV

Wickham,[1] in discussing the general period in which the poems of this collection were composed, has noted that with the exception of Ode 6, which was manifestly written at the same time as the Carmen Saeculare, i.e. in B.C. 17, all the odes that can be dated refer immediately to two events, namely the return of Augustus to Rome in B.C.13 after three years' absence in Gaul, and the double campaign of Tiberius and Drusus in Raetia and Vindelicia in 15 B.C.

Ode IV-2. This ode was obviously composed between 16 and 13 B.C. while Rome was awaiting the return of Augustus from Gaul. Fraenkel has assigned it to the second half of the year 16 B.C., when, after receiving the news of the defeat of the Sygambri, the senate began to make plans for Caesar's reception.[2] The fact that the triumph anticipated in line 33 f. included only the Sygambri and not the Rhaetians and Vindelici, conquered by Tiberius and Drusus in 15 B.C., has led both Fraenkel and Franke[3] to suggest a date before the composition of Odes 4, 5 and 14. Although Shorey and Laing, and Orelli give later dates, I feel that, in the absence of any definite evidence to support this possibility, the latter part of 16 and the early part of 15 B.C. is the more likely time of composition.

---

1 op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 279 f.

2 op. cit., pp. 432 f.

3 op. cit., p. 207.

Ode IV-4. The campaign celebrated in this ode, we are told in Ode IV-14.34 f., was completed in the month of August, 15 B.C., but whether this poem was composed immediately after the receipt of the news of Drusus' victory or upon the return of Augustus to Rome in 13 B.C. is not known. Franke has suggested that it is improbable that Horace would have ignored Tiberius' victories won in conjunction with his brother had they been known at Rome when this ode was written.[1] Macleane agrees with this view and, commenting on the relationship of this ode with Ode IV-14, has added, "I incline to think that they were written at different times, and should rather, from the character of the odes themselves, infer that the first was written immediately on the tidings of Drusus' victory before his brother joined him; and that the second, which has much less spirit in it, was composed on Augustus' return and by his desire, as a supplement to the first." Drusus' victory mentioned here seems to be his rout of the Vindelici near the Tridentine Alps which Dio[2] reports separately from the later double invasion of the Alpine passes. However, we are told by Suetonius[3] that the Emperor requested that Horace celebrate the victory of Tiberius and Drusus. If we accept the interpretation quoted above, there must have been two requests, for Augustus would hardly ask the poet to praise Tiberius before he had won his campaign. In addition, since the Princeps was at that time in Gaul, the suggestion that Drusus be praised

---

1 op. cit., p. 215.

2 liv.22.3.

3 Vita Horati.

must have been enclosed in a letter. It is likely, therefore, that this poem was composed not immediately after the first news of Drusus' victory reached Rome but after the Emperor's request was received. In addition, we have already seen that, except for lines 17 and 18, there are no references to that campaign and that praise is given to both brothers ("Nerones") and their common ancestor. Thus, I feel that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that this ode was written before the news of Tiberius' success reached Rome. The fact that this ode is obviously more successful than Ode IV-14 could quite conceivably be due to the fact that Drusus' popularity made him a more attractive subject to the poet than the less colourful, but equally efficient soldier, Tiberius. Therefore, this ode could have been written at any time between the news of the victory and the publication of the fourth book of the Odes.

Ode IV-14. I have already quoted above Macleane's opinion that this ode was written at the request of Augustus upon his return to Rome in 13 B.C. As this view rests wholly upon the tone of the poem, however, it would be folly to exclude an earlier date. Thus the period within which this ode was probably written is between the years 15 and 13 B.C.

Ode IV-5. This ode was obviously written before the return of Augustus to Rome and probably in the latter part of his absence although I do not agree with Franke that lines 26 and 27 necessarily refer to the victories of the year 15 B.C.[1] Macleane suggests 14 B.C.

---

[1] op. cit., p. 217.

Ode IV-15. Some critics[1] have assigned the date of composition of this ode to 10 B.C. on the grounds that lines 8 and 9 refer to the closing of the doors of the temple of Janus for the third time. However, there is nothing to indicate that Horace was not referring to the second occasion on which Augustus closed them in 25 B.C. On the other hand, Franke, Macleane and Fraenkel all assign this ode to the year 13 B.C. soon after Augustus' return to Rome.

---

[1] See Franke, op. cit., pp. 223 f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Editions of Horace

Bennett, C.E. Horace, the Odes and Epodes The Loeb Classical Library. Text, translation and introduction. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1934.

Macleane, A.J. Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia. Text, introduction and notes. London, George Bell & Sons, 1894.

Moore, C.H. Horace: The Odes, Epodes and Carmen Saeculare. Text, introduction and notes. New York, American Book Co., 1902.

Orelli, I.G. (ed. I.G. Baiter and G. Hirschfelder). Quintus Horatius Flaccus. Volumes I and II. Text, introduction and notes. Berlin, S. Calvary and Co., 1886.

Page, T.E.; Palmer, A.; Wilkins, A.S. Q.Horati Flacci Opera. Text, introduction and notes. London, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896.

Rolfe, J.C. Horace, Satires and Epistles. Text, notes and appendix. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1949.

Shorey, P.; Laing, G.J. Horace, Odes and Epodes. Text, introduction and notes. Chicago, Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., 1925.

Wickham, E.C. Quinti Horati Flacci Opera Omnia. Volumes I and II. Text, introduction and notes. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896.

Wilkins, A.S. The Epistles of Horace. Text, introduction and notes. London, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1907.

II. Ancient Sources

Acron (ed. F. Pauly). Scholia Horatiana. Volumes I and II. Prague, C. Bellmann, 1858.

Porfyrio, P. (ed. A. Holder). Commentum in Horatium Flaccum. Ad Aeni Pontem, 1893.

Appian (ed. H. White). Roman History The Loeb Classical Library. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1913.

Augustus (ed. Th. Mommsen). Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Berlin, Apud Weidmannos, 1883.

Florus (ed. E.S. Forster). Florus and Cornelius Nepos The Loeb Classical Library. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1929.

Dio Cassius (ed. E. Cary). Roman History The Loeb Classical Library. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1927.

Justinus. Historiarum. Venice, Thomam Bettinelli, 1786.

Velleius Paterculus (ed. F. Shipley). Compendium of Roman History The Loeb Classical Library. London, William Heinemann, 1955.

Suetonius (ed. E.S. Shuckburgh). Divus Augustus. Cambridge, University Press, 1896.

Suetonius (ed. J.C. Rolfe). De Viris Illustribus The Loeb Classical Library. Volume II. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1950.

Tacitus (ed. H. Furneaux). Annalium Libri I-IV. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1904.

Tacitus (ed. E.C. Woodcock). Annals Book XIV. London, Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1939.

Quintilian (ed. H.E. Butler). Institutio Oratoria The Loeb Classical Library. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1921.

Virgil (ed. H.R. Fairclough). Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI The Loeb Classical Library. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1932.

Propertius (ed. H.E. Butler and E.A. Barber). The Elegies of Propertius. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933.

III. Modern Studies

Beulé, M. Auguste, Sa Famille et Ses Amis. Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1875.

Campbell, A.Y. Horace, A New Interpretation. London, Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1924.

Conway, R.S. New Studies of a Great Inheritance. London, John Murray, 1921.

Duff, J.W. (ed. A.M. Duff). A Literary History of Rome From the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age. New York, Barnes and Noble Inc., 1953.

Ferrero, G. The Greatness and Decline of Rome (Translated by H.J. Chaytor). London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1908.

Fougnies, A. Mécène, Ministre d'Auguste, Protecteur des Lettres. Brussels, Collection Lebrègue, 1947.

Fowler, W. Warde. Roman Essays and Interpretations. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1920.

Fraenkel, E. Horace. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957.

Frank, T. Catullus and Horace. New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1928.

Franke, C. Fasti Horatiani. Berlin, Guilelmus Besserus, 1839.

Holmes, T. Rice. The Architect of the Roman Empire. Volumes I and II. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928.

Martin, T. Horace. Edinburgh, Wm. Blackwood and Sons, 1870.

Nettleship, H. Lectures and Essays. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1885.

Noyes, A. Portrait of Horace. London, Sheed and Ward, 1947.

Sellar, W.Y. The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1892.

Syme, R. The Roman Revolution. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939.

Wilkinson, L.P. Horace and His Lyric Poetry. Cambridge, University Press, 1946.

Zielinski, T. Horace et la Société Romaine du Temps d'Auguste. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1938.

IV. Pamphlets and Periodical Literature

Conway, R.S. Octavian and Augustus. A Lecture in the John Rylands Library, Aberdeen, The University Press, 1928.

Wistrand, E. Horace's Ninth Epode and Its Historical Background. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Vol. LXIV, Gothëborg, 1958.

Alexander, W.H. Relicta non bene parmula. Royal Society of Canada Transactions, Series III, Vol. XXXVI, sec. 2, pp. 13-24, (1942).

Commager, S. Horace, Carmina I.37. The Phoenix, XII (1958), pp. 47-57.

Dalzell, A. Maecenas and the Poets. The Phoenix, X (1956), pp. 151-162.

Elmore, J. Horace and Octavian (Car.I-2). Classical Philology, XXVI (1931), pp. 258-263.

Frank, Tenney. Horace, Carm. III-4: Descende Caelo. American Journal of Philology, XLII (1921), pp. 170-173.

Gow, J. Horatiana. Classical Review, IX (1895), pp. 302-304.

Houseman, A.E. Horatiana. Journal of Philology, X (1883), pp. 187-196.

MacKay, L.A. Horace, Odes III-4: Date and Interpretation. Classical Review, XLVI (1932), pp. 243-245.

Malcolm, D.A. Horace, Ode III-4. Classical Review, V (new series) (1955), pp. 242-244.

Salmon, E.T. The Political Views of Horace. The Phoenix, I (1946), no. 2, pp. 7-14.

Wilkinson, L.P. Horace, Epode IX. Classical Review, XLVII (1933), pp. 2-6.