001435

HORACE AS A FRIEND OF AUGUSTUS

by James C. Schovánek

Thesis presented to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ottawa as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Latin.

Degree granted October 6, 1969

Ottawa, Canada, 1968.

uOttawa
Université d'Ottawa
LIBRARY ANNEX
BIBLIOTHÈQUE
LIBRARIES
University of Ottawa

UMI Number: EC56043

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.
In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform EC56043
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the supervision of Colin M. Wells, D.Phil. (Oxon.), Chairman of the Department of Classical Studies of the University of Ottawa.

The writer is indebted to Dr. Wells as well as the other professors of the Department of Classical Studies for their most constructive criticism and constant encouragement. He is especially grateful to Mrs. Giovanna Panico for her assistance in translating the Italian source materials, to Pierre Colaclidès out of whose suggestions grew the first chapter of this thesis and, last but not at all least, to Stéphane Krésic whose scholarly advice helped the writter modify several weak arguments in the original draft. Any deficiencies that remain are solely the fault of the writer himself.

James G. Schwarek

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

James G. Schovánek was born on November 17, 1937, in Cleveland, Ohio. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Latin and Greek from Saint Procopius College, Lisle, Illinois, in 1962.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

For the sake of brevity, periodicals and works frequently cited have been abbreviated in the notes of this thesis. Mainly they are those employed by L'Année Philologique. For the reader's convenience a list of them is included below:

AAT: Atti dell'Academia di Scienze di Torino.

AJPh: American Journal of Philology.

CIL: Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.

CP: Classical Philology.

CW: Classical World (formerly, Classical Weekly).

Fraenkel: E. Fraenkel, Horace, Oxford, University Press, 1957.

GIF: Giornale Italiano di Filologia.

PCPhS: Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society.

RAL: Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche dell' Academia dei Lincei.

RIGI: Rivista Indo-Greca-Italica di filòlogia, lingua, antichità.

Syme: R. Syme, The Roman Revolution, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1959.

TAPhA: Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.

TLL: Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The question of Horace's personal relationship with Augustus is related to the much greater question of his political relationship with the Princeps and his party. These two questions can, and indeed must, for the purpose and scope of the present study, be distinguished from one another. Many eminent scholars have studied the question of the sincerity and inclination of Horace's political views.[1] This thesis does not purport to modify or contradict their views on this question, although passing mention will be made of politics and patriotism since Horace was aware of and concerned with the possible fate of his country.

---

1 There are three main schools of thought on Horace's political relationship with Augustus and his party:

i) The German school maintains that Horace was truly sincere in his support of the new regime. (Cf. Kiessling-Heinze; Fraenkel; V. Poeschl, Horaz und die Politik, Heidelberg, 1956; E. Doblhofer, Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht, Heidelberg, 1966.)

ii) The English individualistic school sees him as polite but somewhat cold and formal. (Cf. L.P. Wilkinson, Horace and his Lyric Poetry, Cambridge, 1945; Steele Commager, The Odes of Horace, New Haven, 1962.)

iii) The Italian school sees in Horace's attitude a great deal of irony and even antagonism. (Cf. S. Jannaccone, "Il segreto di Orazio", GIF 13 (1960) 289-297; A. Solari, "Il tradizionalismo antimperiale di Orazio", RAL 8ª ser. 5 (1950) 139-142; A. LaPenna, Orazio e l'ideologia del Principato, Torino, 1963.)

It is, however, the personal relationship--whether or not Horace looked upon Augustus, the man, as an intimate friend -- that will principally occupy our attention. This latter question is related to that of the poet's political views, whatever these may really have been, as a possible motive is related to a succeeding act and not necessarily as cause is to effect. Since a man, a Roman, might be a political supporter or an opponent of another either because of his personal affection for him or in spite of it, the character of the personal relationship between Horace and Augustus need not have influenced the poet's political sentiments. The two questions may be, therefore, discussed separately. What we shall try to discover is whether it was personal affection for Augustus that prompted Horace to write the poems which at least seem to sing the praises of the Princeps.

It has been the confusion of political enthusiam with personal affection that has induced many Horatian scholars to rather hastily adopt the view that Horace had a mutual and intimate friendship with Augustus much like that which he had with Maecenas. Jacques Perret calls Horace "an intimate of Augustus"[2] and lists him among

---

2 Horace, transl. by Bertha Humez, New York, N. Y. U. Press, 1964, p. 17.

Horace's other close friends: Aristius Fuscus, the Visci, Bibulus and Furnius[3]. Fraenkel, on the other hand, discerns a development in the relationship. After giving the problem much consideration, he states that:

> ...nowhere (in the Odes of Books 1 to 3)is there any indication of personal intimacy.. It is indeed unlikely that at that time any such intimacy should have existed.[4]

He continues by attributing Augustus' letters to Horace, as quoted by Suetonius, to a period beginning no earlier than the publication of the first collection of Odes.[5] He then maintains that it was the publication of the Odes and the commission to compose the Carmen Saeculare which altered the relationship and bound Horace to the Princeps by a friendship which deepened with the passing years to such a degree that Fraenkel feels justified in thus explaining the paucity of praise for Augustus in Horace's later works:

> The more the poet's attachment to Augustus deepened and the more a real friendship -- something beyond what was commonly called amicitia -- bound the two men together, the more difficult Horace found it to eulogize the Princeps in poetry.[6]

---

3 Ibid. p. 56.

4 Fraenkel, p. 355. Cf. also Willamovitz' comment, note 8, infra.

5 Ibid. That this assumption as well as Fraenkel's statement that the letters "cannot be dated" is incorrect will be soon shown in the second chapter of this study, infra.

6 Op. cit. p. 356.

P. Senay, in his detailed study of Horace's role in the Augustan reform[7], gives a good synopsis of the traditional view of the relationship between the poet and the Emperor, and cites much of the evidence which purports to substantiate that view. Senay's purpose is, however, to show that Horace was an enthusiastic propagandist for the new regime. This may well be so, but that the poet's enthusiasm sprang from affection for Augustus, the man,is a question that is not at all certain nor proved by the evidence cited.

There has been however, an undercurrent of dissent from and dissatisfaction with the traditional conception of the personal relationship between the two men. As early as 1913, Wilamowitz objected to an early date for the beginning of any friendship between the poet and the Emperor.[8] This counterpoint of dissent has continued and

---

Horace, Propagandiste de la Reforme Augusteéne, diss. Univ. of Paris, 1964, catalogued in Central Library, Univ. of Ottawa, cf. esp. "L'Amitie, IV°Horace et Auguste" pp. 51-57.

8 Sappho und Simonides, p. 313 n. 1 :Daßder patriotische Libertinensohn sich in seinem Urteil (that there was a need for moral reform) mit dem Caesar zusammenfand, ist für beide ehrenvoll; eine auch nur mittelbare Beziehung zwischen beiden vor dem Jahre 23 ist weder erweislich noch wahrscheinlich."

has grown louder and more persuasive down through this century.[9] This opposition to the traditional view has reached a point where David Armstrong recently could suggest a modification of the view of so noted a scholar as Fraenkel.[10]

It was Armstrong's article in particular which signaled the need for a study such as this one. He questions the validity of assuming that Horace reciprocated Augustus' overtures to a more intimate relationship and calls for a more thorough investigation of the poet's attitude toward the relationship. Such an exhaustive and critical investigation devoted to this particular question has been lacking.[11]

---

9 Cf. e.g., A. Y. Campbell, Horace, a New Interpretation, London, Methuem, 1924, pp. 122-127; E. T. Salmon, "The Political Views of Horace," Phoenix, 1 (1946) 7-14; A. Solari, "Il tradizionalismo antimperale di Orazio," RAL 8ª ser. 5 (1950) 139-142; E. Bréguet, "Horace, un homme libre," Hommage à M. Niedermann (Collection Latomus 23), Bruxelles, 1956, pp. 82-89; S. Jannacone, "Il segreto di Orazio, " GIF 13 (1960) 289-297.

10 "Reconsiderations: Fraenkel's Horace," Arion 3 (1964) 116-128.

11 Wickert's article,"Horaz und Augustus." Wurzburger Jahrbuch, 2 (1947) pp. 158-172, although it discusses their relationship against the political background, does not treat the personal relationship between the two men as the author himself states in the first sentence. Senay's dissertation (op. cit. supra) has as its main purpose to show that Horace was a willing propagandist for the Augustan reform. His section on the friendship between the two men (pp.51-57) is merely a restatement of the traditional assumptions without a truly critical evaluation of the evidence.

Hence the need for a critical evaluation of the historical evidence pertinent to the personal relationship between Horace and Augustus, especially from Horace's point of view.

It shall be the purpose of this study to establish, after examining the pertinent evidence, a more precise and qualified delineation of Horace's relationship to Augustus in terms of an acceptable working notion of friendship. The problem seems to divide naturally into three parts: the establishment of an applicable notion of friendship; a consideration of the Vita Horati, the best single external witness to their relationship; and an examination of those passages in the Horatian corpus that deal with Augustus. These shall be the subjects, respectively, of chapters one, two and three.

CHAPTER I

HORACE'S IDEA OF FRIENDSHIP

Each individual has his own concept of what friendship means to him personally, what particular traits attract him to certain other individuals. There is also a more universal concept of friendship that defines the general conditions essential to its existence between any two men.

However a discussion of the more philosophical aspects of the question of friendship lies outside the scope of the present study.[1] What is more pertinent to our topic is an investigation of the specific qualities that Horace desired in his friends. We shall, therefore, devote most of this chapter to an examination of those passages in Horace's works which seem to indicate the traits he found attractive in others. But first we should establish the degree of interest Horace had in both the theory and practice of friendship.

It is well to clarify one other point before progressing further. We shall often be discussing friendship not only in the course of this chapter but also in the two that follow. Now, although the Latin word for

---

1 For a discussion of this subject as it related to the Present topic, cf. W. S. Maguinness, "Friends and the Philosophy of Friendship in Horace," Hermathena, 51 (1938) 29-48. On the development of the Greek concept φιλία and its modifications in Roman thought, cf. F.-A. Steinmetz, Die Freundschaftlehre des Panatios, Wiesbaden, Steiner, 1967.

friendship is amicitia, the word does not have precisely the same connotations as the modern English word, friendship. To the Roman of the First Century B. C. the word could also be used to signify a political alliance or sympathy divorced from or even opposed to personal sentiment, something which an Eighteenth Century Englishman might call a 'connexion'. From what has already been said in the introduction to this thesis, this 'political' connotation of amicitia lies, for the most part, beyond our scope and intention.[2]

1. Horace's interest in Friendship.

Even a casual reader of Horace notices his keen interest in both the theoretical and practical aspects of friendship throughout his life. Early in his poetical career when he expresses his concern with self-improvement, one of his objects is improvement as a friend:

> Hoc faciens vivam melius; sic dulcis amicis occurram.[3]

---

2 For the various conflicting opinions on the problematic relationship between amicitia and political power, cf. Syme, p. 12f.; F. Lossmann, Cicero und Caesar im Jahre 54; Studien zur Theorie und Praxis der römischen Freundschaft, Wiesbaden, Steiner, 1962 and esp. P. A. Brunt, "Amicitia in the Late Roman Republic," PCPhS 9 (1965) 1-20.

3 Serm. 1.4.135-136.

He also attributes to his father whatever virtues he possesses closing the list with:

si et vivo carus amicis[4]

While on a journey to Brundisium with Maecenas, he is so delighted at the arrival of Vergil, Varius and Plotius that he makes a remark indicative of the value he placed upon good friends:

Nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico.[5]

Even in middle age Horace was still concerned with this capacity to be a friend. In an Epistle of that period, we find him addressing to himself a list of questions aimed at self-improvement among which are:

Natales grate numeras? Ignoscis amicis?[6]

Late in his life he describes the good and happy man as one who would die for fatherland or friend:

Non ille pro caris amicis
aut patria timidus perire.[7]

We discern Horace's preoccupation with friendship most especially in Serm. 2.6. Here, after making clear his distaste for the turmoil and the gossip of the City, he relates how he pleasantly spends his time on the Sabine

---

4. Serm. 1.6. 70.

5 Serm. 1.5. 44.

6 Epist. 2.2. 210.

7 Carm. 4.9. 51-52.

estate Maecenas has given him. Chief among the pleasures during his sojourns at this retreat are the evenings spent in friendly conviviality with his guests, presumably also members of the circle of Maecenas with the possible addition of some congenial neighbors.[8] In contrast to the mundane, trite chatter of the Capital, the topics of conversation during these evenings, according to Horace, were mainly of a philosophical nature. One of the questions discussed was the origin of friendship:

quidve ad amicitias, usus rectumne, trahat nos.[9]

From the context this concise phrase would seem to indicate a discussion of the entire problem of friendship, a question of great importance in the philosophical systems of the

---

8 Thus Maguinness (op. cit. p. 29). Fraenkel (p. 143) presumes that the poet's guests were the "peasants in the region of Vicovaco" and thinks it unlikely that they could have engaged in such learned discussions. He therefore considers this portion of the poem to be "a vision of his Sabinum as it arises in a day-dream amist his hectic occupations in Rome." This is a plausible conjecture. We know, however, that Horace also invited his more literate friends to his farm. (cf. e.g. Carm. 3.21). It is equally credible therefore, to take Horace literally in lines 72 through 76 and then to suppose that his guests and convictores on such occasions were cultured literary friends such as Maecenas (who occupies an important place in the sermo which expresses the poet's gratitude) or Messalla or Vergil.

9 Serm. 2.6. 75.

ancients and a frequent and favorite topic of learned conversation.[10]

Such passages from the works of Horace prove that he was interested in both the theory and practice of friendship but it still remains to be seen what his own ideas about friendship were. Though his philosophical electicism could be shown by many citations from his works, we have his own statement that he was the slave of no one system:

> Nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri, quo me cunque rapit tempestas deferor hospes.[11]

As Maguinness points out[12], we need not take Horace's phrase in Serm. 2.6, usus rectumne, to mean that the Stoic and Epicurean teachings on utility or virtue as the source of friendship were the exclusive topics of discussion. That Horace was also acquainted with Socratic teaching and held it in his regard is attested by himself.[13]

Messalla, a close friend and frequent guest of Horace, was not unfamiliar with Socrates' wisdom.[14] Hence, we may safely conjecture that, in their discussions

---

10 Numerous examples might be cited; suffice these two: Plato's Symposium and Cicero's Laelius (de Amicitia), both of which strive to reproduce such conversations.

11 Epist. 1.1 14-15.

12 Op. cit. p. 30.

13 A. P. a 309-311

14 Carm. 3.21. 9-10

among themselves, Horace and his friends did not limit themselves to arguing the merits or defects of Stoic or Epicurean doctrines on the origin and nature of Friendship. Rather they discussed the problem from many points of views in order to discover what was practically valid for them.[15]

2. The qualities Horace valued in a friend.

A philosophical curiosity in the general topic of friendship does not, however, explain why two specific individuals become friends. To determine this in Horace's case we must refer to his works and there look for those qualities he considers attractive in a friend. Chief among these was affection. The importance that the ancients placed upon affection between friends is indicated by the proverb identifying friend and self which appears in various forms.[16] Horace adapts this concept to express his own affection when he describes Vergil as animae dimidium meae,[17] and when he calls Maecenas meae partem animae.[18]

---

15 Horace also displays a knowledge of and familiarity with other contemporary philosophical questions a propos friendship. In a novel approach he treats of the relationship between friendship and justice in Serm. 1.3; he discusses the difficulties of friendship between unequals in Epist. 1.17., 18.

16 Cf. Aristotle's ἕτερος γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ φίλος ἐστίν, or Cicero's alterum alterum anquirit cuius animum ita cum suo misceat ut efficiat paene unum ex duobus (de. Am. 21. 81.)

17 Carm. 1.3.8.

18 Carm. 2.17.5.

That Maecenas returned this affection with the same fullness is shown by his last request to Augustus: Horati Flacci, ut mei, esto memor.[19] Horace does indeed take delight in expressing his affection for Aristius Fucus as well,[20] but this is the limit of lengthy expressions of affection. This is due, no doubt, to his character and personality as Maguinness aptly explains:

> Though Horace lacks the youthful fervour of affection that characterises of Catullus, he has a gentle and wistful kind of tenderness, which often finds earnest expression in a few ~~sim~~ simple and quiet words; there is sometimes but unobtrusive feeling in his use of simple vocative amice.[21]

Another quality of friendship to Horace's mind is mutual aid and a community of goods. For if one shares his soul with a friend, he should not be unwilling to share with him also his possessions in so far as there is need. There is ample proof for this in the poet's relationship with Maecenas who saw to it that Horace's simple needs were supplied.[22] Horace in return felt that his debts to Maecenas and his other friends were repaid in full through his poetry:

---

19 Suet. Vita Horati

20 Epist. 1. 10.

21 Op. cit. p. 36

22 Cf. e.g. Serm. 1.6., 2.6.

Gaudes carminibus; carmina possumus
donare, et pretium dicere muneri.[23]

Men who are friends share not only their possessions but also interests and enjoyments. Both Aristotle[24] and Epicurus[25] stressed the function of common interests and enjoyments in strengthening and maintaining the bond of friendship. Horace himself seems to view the pleasures of life merely as promoters of comradship between friends.[26] Examples of his enjoyment of conviviality with his friends abound. Maecenas is often referred to in such a context but the passages are far too numerous to discuss them all within the scope of this study.[27] One of the best of these passages shall have to suffice as an example. The Ode[28] which Horace placed immediately before that in which he thanks and takes leave of his muse is addressed to Maecenas and urges him to leave behind the cares and troubles of state in order to enjoy life's simple pleasures with his friend. Since we know not what the future has in store for us, the poet gently reminds his friend and patron,

---

23 Carm. 4.8. 11-12

24 Nic. Eth. 8.5.3.: ἥνγδιάγειν δὲ μετ' ἀλλήλων οὐκ ἔστι μὴ ἡδεῖς ὄντας, μηδὲ χαίροντας τοῖς αὐτοῖς· ὅπερ ἡ ἑταιρικὴ δοκεῖ ἔχειν.

25 D.L. 10. 120.

26 Cf. S. Commager, "The Function of Wine in Horace's Odes," TAPhA 88 (1957), 68-80.

27 Cf. Carm. 2.17, 3.8, 3.39, 4.11, Serm. 1.6.

28 Carm. 3.29. See esp. the opening stanza.

let us enjoy today life's pleasures in one another's company; fortune shall never rob us of what we have already enjoyed together. The entire Ode is an excellent example of how well temperate indulgence in simple pleasures harmonized with meditative seriousness and philosophical reflection in Horace's personality and outlook on life.

Nor was Maecenas the only friend Horace took pleasure in inviting to enjoy a convivial evening. The homecoming of friends such as Numida[29] and that staunch republican former comrade-in-arms, Pompeius,[30] are the occasions for feasts which Horace anticipates with an almost Catullan[31] fervor of affection. Messalla Corvinus, too, is honored in a delightful Ode,[32] in which Horace, while selecting the wine for a feast at which Messalla was guest of honor, reflects upon the potencies for good or ill with which the jar stands charged. Again, enjoyment and meditation are linked together in the poet's mind.

It is not only the enjoyment of material pleasures that Horace shares with his friends; he shares with them also the goods of the mind and the pleasures of philosophy.

---

29 Carm. 1. 36.

30 Carm. 2.7.

31 Cp. these two poems with Catullus 9, Verani, omnibus e meis amicis.

32 Carm. 3. 21. Cf. also Epo. 13, a typically "convivial" poem though not addressed to any one person, wherein the wine Horace calls for is of the same vintage --the year the poet was born.

Traditionally, in ancient times the learning and teaching of wisdom was closely associated with friendship. Witness, for example, Socrates' condemnation of the Sophists for demanding money for teaching since this destroyed the bond of friendship between master and disciple.[33] The Academy itself resembled more a ἑταιρεία than a "school" in the modern sense. For Aristotle[34] as well as for Cicero[35], philosophy and the acquisition of wisdom and virtue were activities that friends would pursue in common. As has already been shown[36], one of the ways in which Horace and his guests spent their convivial evenings at the Sabine Farm was in the discussion of philosophy. Many passages in his works also show the poet addressing moral precepts to or discussing philosophical concepts with one or the other of his friends.[37] Often, too, he seeks to improve a friend's character by judiciously counselling him in the means of correcting a major fault.[38] It is clear,

---

33 Xen. Mem. 1. 2. 6-8.

34 Nic. Eth. 9. 12. 2.

35 de Am. 27. 104.

36 Cf. supra on Serm. 2. 6.

37 e.g. Carm. 1.18, 2.11, 2.16; Epist. 1.2, 1.6.

38 e.g. Carm. 2.3, addressed to the changeable Dellius begins with the friendly exhortation: Aequam memento rebus in arduis/ servare mentem; and Carm. 2.10, which is almost a homily on moderation to Licinius Murena whose ambition gained him both the consulship and a traitor's death in the very same year the Odes were published.

therefore, that one of the qualities Horace treasured highly in his friends was the ability and willingness to enjoy with him simple pleasures of life and the delights of philosophy.

We also find that Horace was always ready to console his friends in their griefs, and so may presume that another quality he himself looked for in a friend was the willingness to render such consolation.[39] He tries to allay Maecenas' morbid fear of death in a manner indicative of the deep affection he had for him.[40] At the death of Quintilius Varus he writes Vergil to console him in his bereavement at the loss of their common friend and invaluable literary advisor.[41] Horace even consoles Valgius[42] whose grief is not unmixed with some selfishness, and encourages Iccius who is anxious over his insecurity and discontent with his poverty.[43]

Finally, we should note the value Horace placed upon frankness. He denoted this quality by the words

---

39 In this respect, too, Horace agrees with Aristotle (cf. Nic. Eth. 9. 11. 2).

40 Carm. 2. 17.

41 Carm. 1. 24. Cf. also A. P. 438.

42 Carm. 2. 9.

43 Epist. 1. 12.

libertas and a person possessing it is termed liber.[44] Granted this quality can become excessive and abusive and degenerate into asperitas,[45] but properly employed it can be a means to aid a friend's efforts at self-improvement. This is how Horace himself hoped to eradicate the faults that remained in his personality in spite of his father's teaching, as he so states:

> Fortassis et istinc
> largiter abstulerit longa aetas, liber amicus,
> consilium proprium[46]

Nor was such friendly correction always heeded, as Horace himself lamented when entangled in a foolish love affair:

> Unde expedire non amicorum queant
> libera consilia nec contumeliae graves.[47]

Horace also popularized the word candidus in the sense of "truthful" or "frank".[48] He applies the term most often to fellow-poets or literary men for whose just criticism he is grateful. Thus Tibullus is addressed as: Albi,

---

44 W. S. Maguinness, op. cit., p. 45.

45 Epist. 1. 18. 5-8. The whole beginning of the epistle is a counsel to temper unfettered frankness with tact which alone keeps it from becoming obusive.

46 Serm. 1. 4. 131-133.

47 Epo. 11. 25. 26.

48 W. S. Maguinness, op. cit. p. 46.

nostrorum sermonum candide iudex,[49] and the orator Furnius, whose works Horace admired, is called candide Furni.[50] Maecenas is also called candidus when he has rebuked Horace for not writing.[51] Furthermore, Vergil, Plotius and Varius were all fellow-poets whose approval and advice Horace sought and whom he described thus:

> animae quales neque candidiores terra tulit,
> neque quis me sit devinctior alter.[52]

And, finally, it is this quality of frankness, also, which in Horace's estimation, made Quintilius Varius so invaluable as a friend and literary critic.[53]

Keeping in mind these qualities we shall, in the remainder of this thesis, examine Horace's attitude towards the personal relationship between himself and Augustus. Within this frame of reference we shall try to determine whether or not the existing evidence indicates that the relationship between the two men was one of reciprocal personal friendship..

---

49 Epist. 1. 4. 1.

50 Serm. 1. 10. 186.

51 Epo. 16.5.

52 Serm. 1.5. 41-42.

53 A.P. 483 sqq.

CHAPTER II

THE VITA HORATI

Apart from what Horace himself can tell us of his feelings to Augustus, there are but a few valuable passages in other ancient writers. Most of our knowledge must be gleaned from the Vita Horati attributed to Suetonius,[1] which has come down to us appended to several manuscripts of Horace.[2]

After a brief summary of Horace's early life, the poet's connections with Maecenas and Augustus are introduced in a rather curiously compressed manner:

> Ac primo Maecenati, mox Augusto insinuatus non mediocrem in amborum amicitia locum tenuit.

From what we know of the complex process whereby Horace gained acceptance in the elite circle of literati gathered under the patronage of Maecenas[3] Suetonius'

---

1 Porphyrio attests to this in his introduction to the commentary on the epistle to Augustus (2.1): Apparet hunc librum, ut supra diximus, hortatu Caesaris scriptum esse. Cuius rei etiam Suetonius auctor est. Nam apud eum epistula invenitur Augusti increpantis in Horatium, quod non ad se quoque plurima scribat.

2. Cod. Blandinianus Vetustissimus (V); cod. Parisinus, 7974, tenth century, (φ); cod. Parisimus 7971, tenth century (ψ); cod. Parisimus Lat. 8214, 12th century (ρ); and manuscripts which contain the Vita in an abridged form, omitting the section dealing with Horace's relationship with Augustus (ς).

3 Cf. Serm. 1. 6. where Horace gives a painstakingly detailed account of his introduction to Maecenas and the latter's long hesitation in inviting him to join the group.

statement seems an exceedingly hasty and condensed summary. Also the word insinuatus, if taken in the pejorative sense of "to ingratiate one's self"[4] is hardly in accord either with the details related in Serm. 1. 6. or with Horace's persistent and conscious indifference to wealth and position, as shown throughout his works.[5] Fraenkel is probably right in explaining the use of insinuatus as Suetonius' own interpretation of a man living at the court of Hadrian.[6] The account is correct inasmuch as it states that Horace's connection with Maecenas preceded his relations with Augustus but this is clear from the poet's works themselves.[7]

What follows is much more interesting:

non mediocrem in amborum amicitia locum tenuit.

The key word here is amicitia which most commentators have taken in the Ciceronian sense of 'friendship'.[8]

---

4 Of course, the word may also mean simply "to arrive at" or "to be introduced" see TLL, s.v. insinuo.

5 Cf. Epist. 1.18.

6. Fraenkel, p. 16, but see infra for Fraenkel's abuse of this explanation of Suetonian terms.

7 Cf. Serm. 1. 6; 2. 1 75-77; 2. 6. 40ff; Epist. 1. 17; 18.

8 This is obviously the way Fraenkel understood it (cf. Horace p. 15, as well as P. Senay, "Horace: Propagandiste de la Réforme Augustéenne", p. 351). But also see J. C. Rolfe's translation in the Loeb Suetonius.

In post-Augustan Latin, however, the abstract word was often used in place of the concrete amici.[9] We can, therefore, take the passage in the Vita Horati to mean that Maecenas and Augustus numbered Horace among their circle of official 'friends' without being compelled to infer therefrom that the poet himself ever reciprocated with anything more personal than the polite acceptance of the compliment this honour paid to his talent and achievements.[10] This is something quite different from simply stating that Horace was united to Maecenas and Augustus by mutual friendship.

The Vita continues with a very brief account of Maecenas' affection and regard for the poet as exemplified by two quotations. The second of these quotations purports to be from Maecenas' will:

Horati Flacci ut mei esto memor.

The person thus addressed is Augustus and it is somewhat odd that the Princeps needed such a reminder to take care of the then illustrious poet. We may wonder why, had the

---

9 A parallel is extant in Columella: hospitem nisi ex amicitia domini quam rarissime recipiat (de Re Rust. 11.1.23.) where amicitia means the circle of the lord's friends as can be seen from a similar passage which comes earlier in the same author: hospitem nisi amicum familiaremque domini necessarium receperit. Writing elsewhere Suetonius himself clearly so uses the word: omnes amicitias et familiaritates . . . intra breve tempus adflixit. (Tib. 51).

10 Cf. Serm. 2.1.82-83, see also the comments on the political meaning of amicitia, supra, Chapter One.

relationship between Augustus and Horace been one of mutual friendship and intimacy, there would have been any need for such an exhortation or the anxiety which seems to have prompted it. At any rate, this quotation, though very brief and enigmatic out of its context, clearly indicates that Maecenas only relinquished his patronage of Horace at his death and since that preceded the poet's own by a few months, we may conclude that, in spite of the Emperor's enticements[11], Horace was never under the direct patronage of Augustus during his productive years.

In the following section of the Vita, Suetonius makes much use of quotations selected from Augustus' correspondence to illustrate the Princeps' regard for the poet. These quotations appear to be arranged in chronological order.[12] Though quite possibly they had been published previously they must not have been too well known and Suetonius may have found copies of them in the Imperial Archives while he was a bibliothecis.[13] However this may be, we are given a great deal of insight into Augustus'

---

11 Cf. infra.

12 This has been demonstrated by Rostagni, "La Vita d'Orazio di Suetonio, ne'suoi elementi e nelle sue fonti," AAT 70, (1934-35), p. 28 and is consistent with the manner in which Suetonius uses them.

13 Rostagni, loc. cit.

attitude toward Horace because of Suetonius' preoccupation with quoting the private correspondence of the Emperor.[14]

From such quotations the biographer has tried to show the historical background of the poet's life.[15] The Vita lacks, on account of this, however, any indication of Horace's reciprocation, any quotation of Horace's private letters to the Princeps. There is, however, no justification for concluding that there were no replies or that none had been preserved in the archives to which Suetonius had free access. Nevertheless the relationship between the two men seems one-sided from Suetonius' account of it. This characteristic of the biography can probably be explained in part by Suetonius' presumption that any man to whom an emperor chose to show his friendship would enthusiastically reciprocate.[16] Such a presumption, though relatively easy and natural for a man living at the Imperial Court of the Second Century, is not necessarily valid when applied to the conditions prevailing during the early years of the

---

14 Fraenkel, p. 15 n. 8, has noted this tendency and has described it quite well: "But when full allowance is made... there still remains the impression that in writing the Life of Horace he (Suetonius) was mainly interested in the extracts he was able to produce from the correspondence of Augustus; he does not even seem to have gone to the trouble of re-reading the entire Satire 1. 6."

15 Cf. Rostagni, op. cit., p. 27.

16 Both the one-sidedness of the Vita and this probable explanation for it have been, for the most part, overlooked by scholars.

Principate. With these considerations in mind, then, let us examine what the Vita says about Horace and Augustus.

In the first of the quotations, we learn that Augustus offered Horace a position as his personal secretary (officium epistularum) and wrote Maecenas asking him to surrender his patronage of the poet in favor of himself:

> Ante ipse sufficiebam scribendis epistulis amicorum, nunc occupatissimus et infirmus Horatium nostrum a te cupio abducere. Veniet ergo ab ista parasitica mensa ad hanc regiam, et nos in epistulis scribendis iuvabit.

It is not entirely clear what the nature of this position was; it is certain that it was not that of Augustus' regular personal secretary (a manu). Although Julius Caesar had dignified this latter position by employing the knight, Pompeius, father of the historian Pompeius Trogus, Augustus employed as his a manu his slave, Thallus, whom he had completely at his personal command. As Augustus must have realised, to have offered such a position to Horace, the son of a freedman, would certainly have given the greatest offence and have alienated the poet who still retained some of his republican wariness to the new regime. Frank convincingly argues that:

> We may suppose that since the routine work of the office was given to a menial, Horace, who

> was to attend to the scribendis epistulis amicorum, which Augustus had hitherto done, would rather assume the position of a comes.[17]

I think it reasonable to conclude with Frank[18] that the position Augustus had in mind for Horace was that of comes scribaque and that it was similar to that held by Albinovanus Celsus in the retinue of Tiberius during his campaigns in Asia in 20 B.C.[19] Now Horace addressed Epist. 1. 8 to Celsus at this time to warn him in the poet's usual ironic manner to take care lest good fortune blind him to his old friends. If such a position implied such great fortuna on the staff of the youthful Tiberius, whose succession to the Principate was still uncertain while Agrippa was alive, it must have been, a fortiori, an extremely important post in Augustus' cabinet. It was a position of trust and discretion demanding intimate knowledge of the very complex and delicate relations within the Emperor's family and his extensive amicitia. Hence, by offering this important post to the urbane and

---

17 Tenney Frank, "On Augustus' References to Horace," CP 20(1925), 26; see also in this connection Fraenkel, pp. 17, 327-328.

18 loc. cit.

19 For the dates and details of these campaigns see Dio Cass. 54. 9.

judicious Horace, Augustus was exercising his noted talent for choosing the most able assistants as well as his political sagacity in reconciling men of former republican sentiments. Moreover he would have amply rewarded the holder of such an office; his liberality to his friends is explicitly stated by Suetonius.[20]

Now that the importance and dignity of the position of the ab epistulis has been shown, we may well look into the manner in which Augustus brought up the matter in a letter to Maecenas "com'era opportuno".[21] Rostagni's inference is open to question since it seems highly unlikely that so astute a politician as Augustus would have handed out so important a position in an off-hand manner by means of a passing, somewhat jocular reference in a letter addressed to a person other than the one to whom the position was offered merely because this was convenient. Nor can we suppose that Augustus also wrote directly to Horace since Suetonius would most probably have quoted from such a letter in preference to the one to Maecenas. Hence we

---

20 Div. Aug. 66, 1. T. Frank. (op. cit. p. 27) applies this to the matter at hand thus: "We may assume, therefore, since Augustus was exceedingly liberal to his intimate assistants, that Horace was to be assigned large estates so that he might live in the new surroundings with becoming propriety. He was no longer to be a dependent, as Augustus somewhat invidiously hints that he was in the household of Maecenas."

21 Op. cit. p. 29.

are led to suspect that there was a different motive to Augustus' manner.

As we previously stated, Augustus desired to enlist by means of this position the former republican poet because of his talent and discretion. Since Augustus could not at this time be certain of Horace's espousal of the new regime, he may have felt that a straight-forward request, had it been refused, would have been detrimental to his purpose. Either the refusal would have effected a conclusive loss of Horace's services or the request would have to have been reiterated to the Emperor's abasement. Nor would a direct command have been more politic. This would have left Horace little choice in the matter, and constraint is not the best manner of recruiting men for positions of loyalty and trust.

We may suppose that Augustus avoided these difficulties by offering Horace the office of ab epistulis in an indirect, joking manner. By ironically comparing Horace's position to that of a dependent parasite who has been offered some small, inconsequential occupation that would enable him to exercise his independence, Augustus had chosen a much more subtle and winning way to excite Horace's pride, thereby more easily securing his allegiance and consent. The offer could thus be refused, if not suitable

to the poet, without forcing Augustus to take other measures to save face. It also could be accepted by Horace more gracefully than an imperious command since the poet was quite fiercely independent and was already chafing at the whispered charges that he was seeking his own glory through the cultivation of the rich and the powerful.[22]

Though the letter, as quoted, is undated, nor is there an explicit external witness attesting to its date, we may adduce the approximate period in which it was written through a careful examination of what is said in light of what we know of the events of Augustus' life. Augustus would hardly have spoken of his table as regia, even in jest, before Actium. Horace was neither sufficiently well established to attract the Emperor's notice before 31 B.C. nor were his sentiments toward Augustus sufficiently favourable until at least 27 B. C.[23] Furthermore, Augustus would more likely have referred to himself as infirmus before the middle of 23 B.C. when he was restored to

---

22 Cf. Serm. 1. 6., especially lines 46-53.

23 Rostagni (op. cit. p. 29) shows that chronologically, Horace's first ode in praise of Augustus, 1.2., was written between 27 and 23, whereas Carm. 1. 37, Sat. 2.1. and Epod. 1 and 9, all about the time of Actium contain no markd of regard for Octavian. Fraenkel (pp. 242-243) regards Carm. 1. 37., Sat. 2. 1. as early "though probably later than iii, 24." This hardly weakens Rostagni's argument.

robust health by Antonius Musa.[24] Moreover, Augustus was quite probably away from the City when he wrote this letter.[25] This would indicate, then, the years 26 and 25 when Augustus was in Spain campaigning against the Cantabres and the Astures.[26] The events of this period also conform to the statements of the letter. Augustus was certainly occupatissimus with the difficulties of the war and may also have been having political difficulties at Rome in his absence.[27] He was also infirmus, having fallen ill at Tarraco from overexertion and anxiety.[28] At such a time a confidential secretary who could be trusted would have been a great boon indeed.

That Horace refused the offer we know from Suetonius' subsequent comments. It seems strange, however, that Horace, who usually relates so much autobiographical detail in his poetry, has left us no account of this incident which must have caused him many moments of reflexion upon his relationship with Maecenas and the effects the new

---

24 Dio Cass. 53. 30. 1-3.

25 Cf. Rostagni, op. cit., p. 29, as well as the comments made in this chapter infra under the other letters of Augustus].

26 Suet. Div. Aug. 26. 3.; Dio Cass. 53. 25.

27 Confidential reports of the conspiratorial activities of Fannius Caepio and the outspokenness of Terentius Varro Murena (cf. Suet. Div. Aug. 66) may already have reached him.

28 Dio. Cass. loc. cit.

position might have had upon that relationship as well as the poet's whole way of life. Or is there such an account?

If the aforementioned date for Augustus' letter is correct, Horace was engaged in writing the first three books of his Odes then, hence any search for an allusion to his refusal of the Emperor's offer should begin with these works. Now, as Frank has observed,[29] Carmen 3.16 is a candid treatment of an important renunciation on Horace's part. He begins the poem with a cynical interpretation of the Danaë myth to comment bitterly upon the corruptive power of money. Then he states, somewhat abruptly:

> iure perhorrui
> late conspicuum tollere verticem
> Maecenas, equitum decus.[30]

Horace, being libertino patre natus, could not have held one of the higher magistracies, even had he wished, nor would the commercial career in which he was permitted to engage have brought him to the height of public notice that he here states he has renounced. Hence, it is a very attractive conjecture that the renunciation alluded to in Carm. 3. 16. 18 is one of such a quasi-political post as Augustus had offered him. It is clear that the allusion is to a deliberative choice from the lines:

> nil cupientium
> nudus castra peto et transfuga divitum
> partes linquere gestio.

---

29 Op. cit. p. 27.

30 Carm. 3. 16. 18. sqq.

Horace is also conscious of the self-denial involved in this decision and emphasized his contentment with the small Sabine farm Maecenas has given him.[31] Moreover, he readily acknowledges his gratitude to Maecenas for what he has given him:

> Importuna tamen pauperies abest, nec
> si plura velim tu dare deneges.

Frank has shown, in these lines the poet "relieves his friend (Maecenas) of the burden of implied rebuke that might lie in the phrase parasitica mensa."[32] Hence we may justly conclude that Horace refused Augustus' offer not primarily for reasons of health as Suetonius implies[33], but because he preferred to remain loyal to his benefactor, Maecenas,[34] rather than acquire the fortuna and gloria that went with close association with Augustus.

The remaining quotations in the Vita are from letters of Augustus addressed directly to Horace. Suetonius quotes two of them argumenti gratia to point out that the Princeps showed no resentment towards the poet for his refusal of the officium epistularum.

> "Sume tibi aliquid iuris apud me, tamquam
> si convictor mihi fueris; recte enim et non
> temere feceris, quoniam id usus mihi tecum esse
> volui, si per valitudinem tuam fieri possit."

---

31 Cf. lines 25-j32

32 Op. cit. p. 28.

and

> Tui qualem habeam memoriam, poteris ex Septimio quoque nostro audire; nam incidit ut illo coram fieret a me tui mentio. Neque enim si tu superbus amicitiam nostra sprevisti, ido nos quoque. ἀνθυπερηφανοῦμεν."

The first of these quotations corroborates the two previous assertions that the post Augustus had offered was one of great familiarity, trust and influence; and that the reason Horace gave for his refusal was based more on politeness than truth. There is a touch of irony in Augustus' phrase, si per valitudinem tuam fieri possit, that seems to indicate that the Princeps had accepted the excuse without believing in its complete verity.

The second excerpt offers further evidence that Augustus was away from Rome when he offered Horace the officium epistularum. The Septimius referred to by Augustus seems to be the same as the addressee of Carm. 2. 6, Septimi, Gadis aditure mecum et Cantabrum indoctum iuga ferre nostra. We see from this Ode that Horace would have accompanied Septimius to Spain and that the poet's words are not empty rhetoric but genuine allusions to historic fact. Now, if Augustus had spoken to Septimius of Horace in the latter's absence, we can only conclude that such a

conversation had taken place in Spain during the Emperor's campaigning against the Cantabres in 26 and 25 B. C. [35] Moreover, if this was the case, the plausability of Horace's *recusatio* is enhanced since "ill health"would have been a more acceptable reason for not joining Augustus in far off Spain than it would have been were he in or near Rome at the time.

This excerpt also gives an insight into the Emperor's reaction to the poet's polite refusal. Augustus makes a point of letting Horace know that he does not return his "proud" disdain. Neque enim si tu superbus amicitiam nostram sprevisti, ideo nos quoque ἀνθυπερηφανοῦμεν . This is jokingly expressed but doubtlessly masks some of the hurt feelings of the Princeps. "Methinks the man doth protest too much". The whole affair, carried out with all due regard to the forms of courtesy, is now finished. The Princeps discreetly hints at his own personal disappointment while informing Horace that he is still in good favour at court.

Suetonius continues his Life of Horace by citing examples of the terms of familiarity Augustus used in addressing Horace: eum...purissimum penem et homuncionem lepidissimum appellat. He immediately subjoins an allusion to the Emperor's generosity to Horace: unaque et altera liberalitate locupletavit.

---

35 The comparison between Carm. 2.6 and this excerpt from Augustus' correspondence is not new. It was made first by W. Christ, Horatiana, in Sitzungsberichte der Akad.d. Wiss. zu München, Philos.-Philol. Kl., 1893, pp. 75-76. Cf. also Rostagni op. cit., pp. 30-31.

It is strange that the poet never reciprocated by writing of Augustus in a less formal manner as, for example, he does of Maecenas.[36] Nor does he ever express in his works his gratitude for these benefactions of Augustus.[37] This is not to say that Suetonius fabricated this information; there is no reason to doubt that it is factual. However, it only proves that Augustus tried repeatedly to induce Horace into a closer relationship with himself, a closer relationship that Horace seems not to have actively sollicited or nurtured.

The Vita goes on to state that Augustus prevailed upon Horace to compose the Carmen Saeculare and to write a fourth book of Odes to commemorate the exploits of the Emperor's two stepsons:

> 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.

Two points in this passage demand close attention. First, the reason Suetonius puts forth for Augustus' desire to have Horace compose the Carmen Saeculare and the Fourth Book of Odes is the Emperor's belief that the poet's works would be

---

36 Cf. Carm. 2. 17, 3. 8, 3. 39, 4. 11, Serm. 1. 6.

37 Compare Horace's frequent thankful allusions to Maecenas' beneficience, especially Epod. 1. 31-34, Serm. 2. 6.

immortal. The ludi saeculares at which the Carmen was performed were intended to eulogize the new regime and its founder. What better way could be found to accomplish this end than to enlist the services of Rome's greatest living poet[38] whose works the Emperor deemed immortal? Such a commission as well as the one to celebrate the triumphs of the two young heirs apparent in another book of Odes may as easily be attributed to Augustus' personal desire for gloria perennis as to any friendship with the poet.

Secondly, and even more indicative of the relationship between the two men, is the element of coercion connoted by the two verbs Suetonius uses: iniunxerit...coegerit. Both of these verbs connote constraint, compulsion or imposition.[39] Rostagni suggests that this is either a gratuitous deduction on the part of Suetonius or, more probably, that he discovered signs of this coercion in the Emperor's correspondence.[40] If the latter alternative is in fact the

---

38 Vergil had died in 19 B. C.

39 Examples abound in both classical and post-classical authors e.g.: civitatibus aeternam servituten iniunxit, Caes. B.C. 7.77; tributum iniunxit, Tac. Germania 35; neque cogi pugnare poetrat, Liv. 45.41.4; and esp. Tandem quasi coactus et querens miseram et onerosam iniungi sibi servitudem, recipit imperium, Suet. Tib. 24.2. At a later date, Porphyrio, commenting on Carm. 4.1.1., retains this implication: post...tres carminum libros maximo intervallo hunc quartum scribere compulsus esse dicitur ab Augusto...

truth, as it rather seems to be, then it is difficult to reconcile with this a deep affection for Augustus on Horace's part. The poet was always ready to write poems for his other friends not only without constraint but quite often spontaneously.[41] The Vita continues with a further request by Augustus.

> post Sermones vero quosdam lectos nullam sui 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 initum est:
>
> "Cum tot sustineas et tanta negotia solus,
> Res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes,
> Legibus emendes: in publica commoda peccem,
> Si longo sermone morer tua tempora, Caesar."

The ecloga[42] mentioned can only be Epist. 2. 1. which was published as part of Book Two of the Epistles sometime around 13 B.C. The excerpt from Augustus' correspondence seems to be difficult to date accurately. Fraenkel[43] does not attempt to date it but from what he has to say about the passage we

---

40 Op. cit., p. 32. Fraenkel (pp. 364-365, 383), however, differs from this opinion, stating categorically and without proof that this is an allegation "from the point of view of a later age" (i.e. Suetonius') It is difficult to understand why later emperors would have to force poets to write their praises in an age when sychophancy was so extensive and the number of patrons greatly restricted. It seems to me that the burden of proof lies with Fraenkel and others who do not accept Suetonius' testimony literally. Cf. also note infra.

41 Cf. Carm. 3.21. to Messalla, or Carm. 1.24 to Vergil, or Carm. 2.7. to Pompeius.

42 A generic term employed by Suetonius in the absence of any fixed terminology.

43 p. 383.

may infer that he believes it to be of a period immediately prior to the composition of Epist. 2.1., viz. about 15-14 B.C. Rostagni,[44] on the other hand, does attempt to date the passage to 14 B.C. His argument may be summarized as follows: Horace' Epist. 2.1. was probably composed in 14-13 B. C. After the victories over the Alpine tribes and the institution of the cult of the numen Augusti (cf. lines 15 and 250). Augustus' letter eliciting this composition was written during an absence from the City as is the case with his other letters to Horace; hence, while the Emperor was away in Gaul (i.e. 16-13 B.C.).[45] He dictated this letter in 14 B. C., post sermones quosdam lectos, that is after reading some Epistulae written to a famous personage (hence his regret as expressed in "irasci me scito, etc.") Now since Augustus was not slow to notice Horace's work (Cf. Epist. 1. 13), Rostagni eliminated the Letters of Book One (published in 20 B. C.) as the sermones quidam referred to here. Augustus, therefore, alludes to another composition of the same type,

---

44 Op. Cit., pp. 33-34.

45 Dio Cass. 54. 19. 6, 25. 1.

recently written and not included in a published book.[46] Now the Letter to Florus is too early (19 B.C.) to be considered. Hence there remains only the letter to the Pisos which indeed would arouse the attention and jealousy of Augustus because of its length and the importance of its subject. This is the main reason why Rostagni dates the Letter to the Pisos slightly earlier than the Letter to Augustus and why, as he explains, in the latter Horace also treats with the poetic art.

This argument seems quite persuasive until one realizes that it necessitates the somewhat gratuitous assumption that the composition of Epist. 2. 1. followed closely upon Augustus' letter to Horace. There is, however, no certain evidence that the poet immediately complied with the Emperor's request. Augustus may not have been slow to notice Horace's work, as Rostagni rightly observes, but that does not prove that the poet, enjoying his well-known independence, was any quicker to comply with his wishes than he was to comply

---

46 J. Vahlen (Uber Zeit und Abfolge der Literaturbriefe des Horaz (1878), Ges. Phil. Schr. II, pp. 45-51) was one of the first to convince himself that the sermones quidam mentioned by Suetonius were the Letters to Florus and to the Pisos. This conjecture was repeated with more convinction by Heinze in his introduction to Epist. 2. 1. and as an "obvious" fact by Fraenkel (loc. cit.). This theory is based on the interpretation of eius modi as referring to the content of the writings, viz., literary themes. This is plausible. But, as Brink (Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles, p. 242 n. 1.) points out, "Suetonius' sermones may suggest that in eius modi scriptis denotes the stylistic genre, not the content."

with those of Maecenas.[47]

There are other weaknesses in this argument. First of all, if one accepts that Augustus wrote when he was far away from Rome, as Rostagni does, then not one but two periods fall within the range of possibility: 16-13 B.C., which Rostagni uses, and 22-19 B.C. when Augustus was in the East with Tiberius.[48] Another difficulty is the fact that Suetonius mentions several works (post sermones quosdam lectos) and Augustus himself refers to pleraque eius modi scripta. This can hardly be the single letter to the Pisos as Rostagni maintains. Furthermore, the date of this last letter is still uncertain; it may even belong to the period following the publication of the Fourth Book of Odes, i.e. ca. 13-8 B.C.[49]

Most of these difficulties can be avoided by dating Augustus' letter to 20 or early in 19 B.C., during his sojourn in the East. In this case Suetonius' post sermones quosdam lectos and Augustus' in plerisque eius modi scriptis would refer to the Letters of Book One[50] and, possibly, to the

47 Cf. Epod. 14, Epist. 1. 7.

48 Dio Cass. 54. 6. 1., 9. 5, 10.

49 Cf. Brink, op. cit., pp. 242 for a recent and lucid discussion of the question. Perret (op. cit., pp. 143f) argues with some persuasiveness for a date later than Epist. 2.1.

50 Mommsen (Die Litteraturbriefe des Horaz, Ges. Schr. VII, pp. 177-178) hazarded this conjecture in 1880, but still thought Augustus' letter was written some four years later, i.e. immediately prior to Epist. 2. 1. On this interval cf. note infra.

the Letter to Florus (Epist. 2.2.). In eius modi scriptis would then simply denote the stylistic genre of the works, i.e. epistulary poems.

This conjecture conforms very persuasively with what we know of the historical data pertinent to Augustus during this period. Epist. 1.3. and 1.8. as well as 2.2. were written to members of Tiberius' staff during the campaigns in Armenia and the East (20-19 B.C.)[51]; Epist. 1.9. is addressed to Tiberius himself at about the same time. Now it is quite probable that Augustus, who was also in the East at this time,[52] saw the autograph copies of these letters and Horace would certainly have been diplomatic enough to send a published copy of the First Book of Epistles to Augustus as he had done in the case of the Odes?[53] The Emperor may well have been moved to jealousy by these letters, especially if he had also seen the rather long and important Letter to Florus (Epist. 2.2.).[54] Thus Augustus'

---

51 For the dates of Tiberius' Armenian campaign cf. Dio Cass. 54. 9. 4.

52 Dio Cass. 54. 7. 4-5.

53 Cf. Epist. 1. 13.

54 The date of this letter is not absolutely certain. However, it was probably composed shortly after the publication of the First Book of Epistles, i.e., ca. 20-18 B.C. Cf. E. C. Wickhamm, The Works of Horace, vol. 2, p. 330 and Brink, op. cit., p. 184 n. 1. It is possible to conjecture that Horace wrote to Florus early in 19 B.C. and that Augustus had occasion to read this letter as well as the others and to write his note to Horace before being forced unexpectedly to return to Rome to quell the civil unrest in the autumn of that year. (Cf. Dio Cass. 54. 10).

letter may, with some degree of probability, be dated to the first half of 19 B.C.

It may be objected that this dating leaves an inordinately long delay (five or six years) between the Emperor's pointedly jesting request and Horace's production of the Letter to Augustus.[55] But when one considers that during this period Horace returned, also at the Emperor's insistence, to his lyric Muse to compose the Carmen Saeculare and the Fourth Book of Odes, the delay is more understandable. Horace could tactfully excuse himself on the acceptable grounds that he was then engaged with more lofty forms of poetic composition in much the same way that he had excused himself on the acceptable grounds of a weak constitution when invited by the Princeps to become his secretary. It is quite possible that here, too, we have another example of Horace asserting his independence and politely declining an invitation to express familiarity with Augustus.

---

55 Mommsen (loc. cit.) attempted to account for the interval between Letters of Book One and Epist. 2.1., but he supposed that it was Augustus who delayed the four or five years before requesting Horace to write an Epistle to him. It is much more difficult to explain so long a delay on Augustus' part since his whole letter seems to indicate a recent reading of Horatian works and a spontaneous response to them. Irasci tibi me scito could hardly be said in jest after four or five years of ira! The whole tone of the letter would then become spiteful and petty.

One more point demands our attention in Suetonius' account of how the letter to Augustus came to be written. He writes: Expressitque [Augustus] eclogam ad se, cuius initium est: 'Cum tot sustineas, etc.' The verb exprimo, like iniungo and cogo used previously in a similar context in the Vita, denotes constraint.[56] The implication of coercion on Augustus' part cannot be merely brushed aside, as Fraenkel says, as Suetonius' judgement of the relationship "from his own standpoint and from the conditions prevailing at the Hadrianic court."[57] Trajan and Hadrian were both patrons and benefactors of literature. Witness the copious literary output of Suetonius himself.[58] Furthermore, Rose, explaining the gradual decline in Roman letters during the Second Century A.D., hastens to exonerate the emperors:

> Imperial patronage was not wanting, for again we hear of literary men in high office or otherwise favoured, and several of the Emperors were themselves poets of some repute: for example Hadrian and Gordian I.[59] [emphasis mine]

It is much less likely, therefore, that Hadrian would have had to extort and sollicit panegyrics or works dedicated

---

56 Cf. Suet. Galba 10 ad fin.: expressa cruciatu confessio esset; id. Vesp. 4.3.: convictus quoque dicitur ducenta sestertium expressisse iuveni; id. Otho 5: decies sestertium expresserat.

57 Op. cit. p. 383 and see also pp. 364f.

58 H. J. Rose, A Handbook of Latin Literature, 3d. ed., London, Methuen, 1954, pp. 511f., lists no less than thirteen known works, all of some length.

59 Op. cit. p. 525.

to him than that Augustus would have had to do so during the difficult transitional period between the Republic and the Principate when many literary men, though weary of civil strife, were still affected with Republican independence. We should, therefore, accept the Suetonian inference that Augustus pressured a reluctant Horace into writing not only Epist. 2.1. but also Carm. 4.4. and 14.[60]

The Vita contains one other extract from Augustus' correspondence with Horace:

> Pertulit ad me Onysius libellum tuum, quem ego ut excusantem, quantuluscumque est boni consulo. Vereri autem mihi videris ne maiores libelli tui sint, quam ipse es; sed tibi statura deest, corpusculum non deest. Itaque licebit in sextariolo scribas, ut circuitus voluminis tui sit sicut est ventriculi tui.

Tenney Frank[61] has suggested that this is a response to Horace's gift of the first three books of Odes and identifies Onysius with the Vinius Asina of Epist. 1. 13. which supposedly accompanied this gift. Whatever the validity of this conjecture, we can see from the text itself that Augustus had hoped for a more substantial work and chided

---

60 The commission to write the Carmen Saeculare quite probably appealed to Horace's pride and so need not have been 'forced' upon him, though Suetonius is probably right in stating that the initiative was the Emperor's. He is also inaccurate through oversimplification in asserting that Augustus urged Horace to write all of the odes of Book Four since many of these were no doubt already written before Carm. 4.4. and 14. which specifically fulfill the Princeps' request. Cf. Fraenkel, p. 364.

61 Op. Cit., p. 30.

the poet on the slimness of the volumen. As in irasci tibi me scito, etc.,we have here the Emperor's feeling expressed obliquely in a pointed jest. Horace has, after all, made at least a formal gesture of courtesy by sending him a copy of one of his books. Augustus cannot allow himself to appear ungrateful but he does wish to inform the poet of his pique at the apparently inconsequential size of the gift. It is evident that the Princeps is not satisfied by so small a work and the degree of affection it seems to imply.

From all of the foregoing we may conclude, therefore, that the Vita Horati, our best external evidence for the relationship between Horace and Augustus, does not bear witness to a deep and affectionate mutual friendship between the two men as many have assumed in the past. On the contrary, it only testifies to the Emperor's repeated attempts to draw the poet into his intimate circle, attempts that had to be repeated since they were mainly unsuccessful. It also implies a hesitance, if not a reluctance, on Horace's behalf to do those things which Augustus wished.

CHAPTER III

HORACE'S REFERENCES TO AUGUSTUS

In the preceding chapters of this thesis we formulated a definition of friendship to serve as a criterion for evaluating the relationship between Horace and Augustus and then examined the Vita Horati as an external witness to that relationship. Now there remains only a study of Horace's own words as evidence of the character of that relationship as the poet himself saw it.

Horace refers to Augustus by name forty-two times in thirty separate poems.[1] These references will form the basic data for our investigation in this chapter. We shall also consider some passages wherein Augustus is not explicitly mentioned but which are, nevertheless, pertinent either because they offer additional evidence[2] or for comparison with the Augustus passages. In analysing all these data we must keep in mind those qualities, discussed in the first chapter, which Horace valued in his friends in order to discern whether he saw them in Augustus.

Because of the historical nature of the subject these passages will be discussed in a chronological order

---

1 Cf. the table in Appendix 1, infra.

2 E.g. the Carmen Saeculare which does not mention Augustus though it was written at his request.

modified only by a regard for the integrity of the individual collections (Satires, Epodes, etc.). It seems best, moreover, to divide the investigation into three sections corresponding to the early, middle and later periods in Horace's literary career and in his relationship with Augustus. In this way we shall be able to see whether his attitudes toward the Princeps remained constant or underwent change as the poet matured and the qualities of Augustus' character, and the programme in which that character was reflected, became more evident to Horace.

1. References in the Epodes and Satires

Horace refers to Augustus by name in only two of the Epodes, hence it is more convenient to violate strict chronology and treat of these before going on to the Satires. The first of these references is the poem which the poet placed at the beginning of the collection as a dedication to his friend and patron, Maecenas.[3] The mention of Augustus (then, of course, still called Octavian) comes in the opening lines.

> Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium,
> amice, propugnacula,
> paratus omne Caesaris periculum
> subire, Maecenas, tuo.[4]

---

3 Cf. Fraenkel, p. 69.

4. Epo. 1. 1-4.

The entire poem is one of intense devotion to Maecenas who is about to join Octavian at Brundisium in 31 B.C. before the battle of Actium. Foreseeing the danger to his friend, the poet begs to be allowed to go to war with him, pleading the unhappiness and anxiety he would suffer if separated from his friend upon whose safety Horace's joy rests.

The reference to Caesar (Octavian), though only indirect, is well integrated into the development of the poet's theme. Horace reasons that since he is as devoted to Maecenas as Maecenas is to Caesar he should be allowed to accompany him (Maecenas).[5] It must be kept in mind, however, that this passage expresses Horace's personal devotion to Maecenas and his anxiety for the latter's safety; it does not express any such feelings for Octavian.

A further point demands our attention. Horace, who had renounced military life after the debacle of Philippi eleven years before,[6] now expresses his willingness to go to war once again:

---

5 Cf. Fraenkel, p. 70, where also he points out that the close parallelism of the two relationships is emphasized by the similarity of the syntactic pattern employed in line 3 with that of line 15, tuum (scil. laborem) labore quid iuvem meo.

6 Cf. Carm. 2. 7.

libenter hoc et omne militabitur bellum, in tuae spem gratiae.[7]

But note that the reason for this willingness is to win Maecenas' continued favor, not to aid Octavian's cause.

Epode 9, written in September of the same year, after the first reports of Octavian's victory had reached Rome,[8] contains the remaining three direct references to Caesar that are found in the collection. In this poem, which Fraenkel closely links with Epode 1,[9] Horace also addresses Maecenas who is in Rome as Octavian's vice-regent.[10]

As in Epode 1, the first reference appears in the first two couplets:

Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes
victore laetus Caesare
tecum sub alta - sic Iovi gratum - domo,
beate Maecenas, bibam?

Again the reference to Caesar is occasional. When Caesar's victory is final, Horace and Maecenas shall be free from

---

7 Epo. 1. 23-24.

8 Cf. Kiessling - Heinze's introduction to this Epode as well as the manuscript evidence cited by F. Klingner (Horatius. Opera, Leipzig, Teubner, 1959, p. 148).

9 Op. cit., p. 71.

10 Cf. Fraenkel, loc. cit., for a full discussion of this disputed point and for all the pertinent documentation. It should suffice to note that both Dio Cassius (51. 3. 5) and Velleius Paterculus (2. 88) attest Maecenas' presence in Rome at this time.

anxiety and shall celebrate with the best wine. In the meanwhile, until the final confirmation of that victory the two men will have to allay their fears with a vintage more suitable to this purpose:

> curam metumque Caesaris rerum iuvat
> dulci Lyaeo solvere.[11]

In the middle of this poem there is another reference to Caesar, a reference even more casual than the others:

> at huc frementis verterunt bis mille equos
> Galli canentes Caesarem.[12]

This is an allusion to the Galatians' desertion of Antony just before Actium,[13] a turn of events that helped gain the victory for Octavian and Agrippa. But this reference has little or no significance to our topic; it is probably no more than Horace's dramatization of an item contained in the first dispatches to reach the City. In fact, it is hard to see what else the Galatians might have shouted in such a situation.

Besides these more direct references, there is the intense expectation of Caesar's glorious triumph expressed

---

11 Epo. 9. 37-38. On Lyaeus as the wine to allay cares cf. Carm. 3. 21. 14-16 and the note in Kiessling-Heinze on Epo. 9. 33 sqq.

12 Epo. 9. 17-18.

13 Cf. Syme, p. 296.

in lines 21 through 26:

> io Triumphe, tu moraris aureos
> currus et intactos boves?
> io Triumphe, nec Iugurthino parem
> bello reportasti ducem
> neque Africanum, cui super Carthaginem
> virtus sepulcrum condidit.

It will be the greatest of Rome's triumphal celebrations. But the time for it has not yet come (moraris). We should also note that the emphasis is more on the glory of Rome than on Caesar's victory. He will be the greatest of Rome's duces since he will have won the victory which will probably put an end to factional strife. The praise is for Octavian the triumphant dux not for Octavian the poet's friend now delivered from the dangers and uncertainties of war.[14]

While treating of the Epodes, mention should be made of the Second and the Sixteenth. These contain no direct mention of Augustus but they do provide an insight into Horace's attitude toward Augustus' political programme in the years preceding Actium. Using these two poems, E. T. Salmon points out the contrast between Horace's outlook and that of Vergil, an ardent supporter of the new regime.

> In their outlooks and in the conclusions they reached, Virgil and Horace were far from similar, in this period at least. Compare Virgil's Fourth Eclogue with Horace's Sixteenth Epode ... In strik-

---

14 Compare this passage with Carm. 2. 7 and with Horace's anxiety for Maecenas' welfare in Epo. 1.

> ingly similar language both poems allude to the possibility of a new Golden Age. But, whereas Virgil, the convinced supporter of Octavian, is confident that men will find this Golden Age in Rome, Horace insists that they will have to leave Rome and find it elsewhere, in the Islands of the Blest... Epode 2, in language strongly reminiscent of Virgil, alludes to the beauties of Italy; but unlike Virgil, Horace is not impressed with the way Octavian is unifying Italy; indeed it finally turns out that his praises of the Italian country-side are being ironically spoken by a usurer from the city.[15]

Nowhere in the Epodes, therefore, does Horace mention Augustus with personal warmth or affection. In fact, his only reaction to the man who was to become Princeps is a critical skepticism toward his programme.

Augustus is mentioned by name only once in the First Book of Satires:

> Caesar, qui cogere posset,
> si peteret per amicitiam patris atque suam, non quicquam proficeret.[16]

Horace begins this Satire by introducing a certain popular entertainer named Tigellius[17] as an example of inconsistency which vice is the subject of the first section of the poem. When this fellow was in the mood, so Horace

---

15 "The Political Views of Horace," Phoenix, vol. 1 (1946) p. 9.

16 Serm. 1. 3. 4-6.

17 E. C. Wickham (Horace, vol. 2: The Satires, Epistles and de Arte Poetica, p. 15) identifies this man and shows quite clearly that he is not the same as the Hermogenes Tigellius of line 129, of of Serm. 1. 4. 72, 1. 9. 25, 1. 10. 18, 80, 90. Perret (op. cit., p. 46) speaks of them as father and son which seems quite possible.

says, he could not be prevented from singing by Caesar (Octavian) himself even though the latter pleaded his own amicitia as well as his father's (i.e. Julius Caesar's). The passage tells us no more than that this singer enjoyed Octavian's favor as he had enjoyed Julius Caesar's. That Octavian liked popular entertainments and was well disposed to performers we know from Suetonius.[18] Horace, however, despised them and found opportunities to ridicule them and their tastes. Probably the most ridiculed is the above-mentioned Tigellius' namesake, Hermogenes Tigellius.[19] In this ridicule there is an element of resentment for the influence such entertainers had in the "right circles."[20] Now, if Augustus patronized these popular entertainers and enjoyed them, Horace certainly did not concur with this interest. We have, therefore, an instance where the two men markedly differed in their interests and enjoyments.

In the First Book of Satires, moreover, Horace readily criticizes or ridicules men on friendly terms with Octavian. Tigellius has already been mentioned. Cupiennius, a close

---

18 Div. Aug. 25.

19 Serm. 1. 3. 129, 1. 4. 72, 1. 9. 25, 1. 10. 18 80. 90.

20 This is especially true in Serm. 1. 10.

friend of Augustus,[21] is depicted as immoderately lustful in Satire 2:

> mirator cunni Cupiennius albi.[22]

In the same poem C. Sallustius Crispus, grand nephew and adoptive son of the historian,[23] is ridiculed for his frequent patronage of prostitutes though ironically "praised" for avoiding adulterous affairs.[24] Nor could we say that Horace, who so utterly condemned the foolishness of adultery in this poem and others,[25] would have been well pleased with the habits of Augustus of whom Suetonius wrote:

> Adulteria quidem exercuisse ne amici quidem negant, excusantes sane non libidine, sed ratione commissa, quo facilius consilia adversariorum per cuiusque mulieres exquireret,[26]

and further he relates that Antony charged him with adultery:

---

21 Porphyrio identifies him as: "C. Cupiennius Libo Cumanus Augusti familiaritate clarus, corporis sui diligentissimus, fuit sectator matronarum concubitus."

22 Serm. 1. 2. 36.

23 Klingner, Op. cit., Index Nominum s.v. "Sallustius."

24 Serm. 1. 2. 47-63. Though cf. the later and more flattering remarks of Carm. 2. 2. Tacitus, however, (Ann. 3. 30) calls him diversus a veterum instituto per cultum et munditias, copiaque et adfluentia luxu proprior.

25 E.g., Carm. 3. 6.

26 Div. Aug. 69.

> obiecit et feminam consularem e triclinio viri coram in cubiculum abductam, rursus in convivium rubentibus auriculis incompiore capillo reductam; dimissam Scriboniam, quia liberius doluisset nimiam potentiam paelicis; condiciones quaesitas per amicos, qui matres familias et adultas aetate virgines denudarent atque perspicerent, tamquam Toranio mangone vendente.[27]

Had Horace wished to praise Octavian or even his regime, he had an opportunity to do so in the Fifth Satire of this book. This poem describes a journey the poet made with Maecenas who was on a political mission,[28] yet the only reference to politics in it is a strictly non-partisan allusion to the differences between Antony and Octavian:

> [Maecenas et Cocceius] adversos soliti componere amicos.[29]

In the first book of Satires, Horace's attitude towards Augustus is still one of cool detachment or, at best, indifference. The poet does not approve of Augustus' conduct (adultery), his interests (singers), nor some of his friends.

Horace is still at best non-committal in the second book of Satires. In this collection four direct

---

27 Ibid. Compare this with Carm. 3. 6. 25-32.

28 Cf. line 28.

29 Line 29. The internal evidence is so sparse commentators are unable to determine whether the occasion was the Treaty of Brundisium (40 B.C.) or the "Treaty of Tarentum" (37 B.C.).

references to Caesar appear: three in the First Satire and one in the Sixth. Because of its brevity, we shall consider the latter reference first.

The Sixth Satire contains a disparaging account of Horace's daily routine when forced by business to stay in the City. Among the annoyances he encounters is the incessant questioning concerning his "inside" knowledge of government policy which the throng suppose he has because of the closeness to Maecenas, then in charge of the City.[30] Augustus' name (Caesar) quite naturally occurs in one of these questions:

> quid? militibus promissa Triquetra
> praedia Caesar an est Itala tellure daturus?[31]

Horace hastens to answer that he knows nothing at all about such matters, and to answer in such a way that we must conclude that he is telling the truth:

> iurantem me scire nihil mirantur ut unum
> scilicet egregii mortalem altique silenti.[32]

Whatever the relationship between the two men at this time, if any existed at all, it was not so close that

---

30 Wickham (op. cit., vol. 2, §§ 2-3, General Introduction) dates this satire, or at least the events described, to 31-29 B.C. when Maecenas was Octavian's vice-regent in Rome (Dio Cass. 51. 3. 5; Vell. Pat. 2. 88).

31 Serm. 2. 6. 55-56.

32 Ibid. lines 57-58.

Horace came to know Augustus' plans either directly from him or through Maecenas.

The references to Caesar in Serm. 2. 1 are truly direct, not casual or incidental as before. Here Horace speaks of Octavian himself. But what does the poet say? The poem, aptly placed first in this second collection of satires, is Horace's defense against the charge of writing calumnious verse; it is the poet's apology for his satire. The form of the poem is a consultation between Horace and Trebatius,[33] a shrewd old lawyer. When the poet asks what he should do, Trebati, quid faciam praescribe, the lawyer gives the curt reply, quiescas. But when Horace pleads that for him to stop writing poetry would bring on insomnia, Trebatius takes the poet's words seriously and prescribes an antidote for that affliction. He then relents and suggests:

> si tantus amor scribendi te rapit, aude
> Caesaris invicti res dicere, multa laborum
> praemia laturus.[34]

Horace tactfully declines to praise the res Caesaris with a subtlety clearly indicative of his serious concern.

---

33 C. Trebatius Testa, a famous iurisconsultus and friend of Cicero (cf. ad Fam. 7. 6-22, Topica 1. 1.) who was probably dead by the time this satire was written (cf. Wickham, op. cit. p. 90).

34 Serm. 2. 1. 10-12.

Fraenkel[35] comments that the source of the suggestions to praise Augustus was such that Horace was obliged to decline publicly, as he does in this passage, rather than merely ignore the matter. However that may be, the point that concerns us is Horace's refusal. The poet respectfully expresses his regret that so heroic a theme as Caesar's military exploits lies beyond the scope of his pedestrian verse:

> cupidum, pater optime, vires
> deficiunt; neque enim quivis horrentia pilis
> agmina nec fracta pereuntis cuspide Gallos
> aut labentis equo describit volnera Parthi.[36]

We have here an example of Horace applying εἰρωνεία to his use of a τόπος employed by the Hellenistic poets in their eulogies of kings and rulers. This was apparent even in ancient times since Porphyrio comments on this passage:

> Eleganter in ipsa excusatione posse se scribere ostendit [Horatius].

Horace's words, then, are in the form of a recusatio which is in fact an indirect and subtle form of panegyric.[37]

Trebatius counters with the suggestion that the poet laud Caesar's peaceful activities as Lucilius had

---

35 Op. cit., p. 149.

36 Serm. 2. 1. 12-15.

37 On recusatio as disguised panegyric in poetry see W. Wimmel, Kallimachos in Rom, Wiesbaden, Stemer, 1960. Pp. 162-166.

those of Scipio. The parallel is well chosen since Lucilius was one of Horace's models in the composition of the Satires. We may quite safely conjecture, therefore, that the suggestion here placed in the old lawyer's mouth was the actual request made by those of Horace's acquaintances who wanted him to praise Octavian and his regime. Surely it is much more plausible that those men close enough to the poet to know the genre in which he was working would have asked him to write in the manner of Lucilius rather than expect him to launch into epic verse.

In any case, Horace again declines in a gracefully evasive manner:

> haud mihi dero,
> cum res ipsa feret: nisi dextro tempore Flacci
> verba per attentam non ibunt Caesaris aurem:
> cui male si palpere, recalcitrat undique tutus.[38]

He humorously states that he is not yet ready and is afraid his present style might offend Caesar and be scorned. We have here, indeed, an excellent example of Horace's sense of humour. The usual (transferred) meaning of attenta auris is "an attentive, or listening, ear," but the literal meaning is "an ear pricked up (as e.g. a horse's)"! The poet jokingly plays upon this latter meaning by contrast with his own cognomen, Flaccus, "drooping ears." It is a witty and graceful manner of refusing that is in complete harmony not only with the genre but also with Horace's

---

38 Serm. 2. 1. 17-20.

urbane and jovial character. Besides, Caesar had already made known his approval of some of Horace's Satires:

> esto, siquis mala [scil. carmina]; sed bona siquis iudice condiderit laudatus Caesare?[39]

Augustus did not always become angry but neither did he ever ignore offensive jests of which he was the object.[40] It may well be that Horace did not wish to overstep the bounds of etiquette at a time when Octavian was in the midst of reorganizing the government and consolidating his own power during the period immediately following Actium. At such a time the Princeps would have been very sensitive to any comments that might have lent themselves to misconstruction. The urbane and sensitive poet had no cause to offend Augustus whatever his personal feelings toward the latter may have been. Furthermore, by refusing in the manner that he does, Horace succeeds, by means of his recusatio, in complying with the request, giving disguised praise to Caesar as general and statesman, while maintaining a degree of his beloved independence.

We should also note that Horace continues his attacks on friends and supporters of Octavian in the Second Book of Satires. Nasidienus, quite probably

---

39 Ibid, lines 83-84.

40 Cf. Suet. Div. Aug. 54-56.

ennobled by the Princeps[41], is satirized in Serm. 2.8 and made to look like a foolish, ostentatious glutton. Nor does Horace let his readers forget the uncommon extravagance which marked the aedileship of Marcus Agrippa,[42] the man to whom Octavian owed the victory at Actium:

> ...et aeneus ut stes,
> nudus agris, nudus nummis, insane, paternis
> scilicet ut plausus quos fert Agrippa feras tu,
> astuta ingenium volpes imitata leonem?[43]

During the early period of his literary career when he was writing the Epodes and Satires, Horace displayed a tactful respect for Augustus but no genuine affection nor any gratitude for favors received. The two men may have had some slight shared interest in poetry but this is offset by Horace's expressed distaste for Augustus' friends and enjoyment of popular entertainments. There is also the poet's polite but definite refusal to sing the praises of the new regime. We do not even know for certain whether Horace had even met Augustus personally by this time, although from Suetonius' account[44] it seems

---

41 See the manuscript evidence quoted by Klingner (op. cit., Index nominum s.v. "Nasidienus", p. 363). The gentile name is attested for this period by an inscription from Cologne (CIL XIII 8270).

42 Cf. Dio Cass. 49. 43. 1-4.

43 Serm. 2. 3. 183-186.

44 Vita Horati, ad init.

probable that they had, at least by 30 B.C. There is, in short, nothing to show that the two men were mutually friendly at all during this period.

2. References in Odes 1-3 and Epistles 1

We shall now examine the relationship between the two men during the most creative period of Horace's career. It was during this decade of his life, when he was in his thirties, that Horace produced his best-known works, the first three books of the Odes. When he finished, he felt proud of his accomplishment: Exegi monumentum aere perennius. The appreciation of a hundred succeeding generations has justified his pride.

Augustus is mentioned by name in thirteen of the eighty-eight Odes[45] and several other passages are pertinent to our topic as well. Because of the number of passages, therefore, and because of the interrelations between many of them, in treating of the Odes we shall employ a topical rather than a numerical or chronological arrangement. This will help to avoid repetition and numerous cross-references.

The positive allusions to Augustus should be discussed first of all. Six Odes[46] contain passages

---

45 See the table in Appendix 1.

46 Carm. 1.2, 2.9, 3.3, 3.5, 3.14 and 3.25.

directly complimentary to Augustus. Of these, Carm. 2.9.17sqq:

> desine mollium
> tandem querellarum et potius nova
> cantemus Augusti tropaea
> Caesaris,

is merely incidental to the poet's advice to Valgius to stop mourning the death of Mystes and forget this misfortune by writing poetry on an impersonal subject.

The passage in Carm. 3.3:

> quos inter Augustus recumbens
> purpureo bibet ore nectar[47]

also seems to be an insertion which could be omitted without detriment to the rest of the poem.[48] Similarly, in Carm. 3.5, the opening stanza,

> Caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem
> regnare: praesens divus habebitur
> Augustus adiectis Britannis
> imperio gravibusque Persis,

is a grammatically self-contained unit, and appears to be not strictly necessary to the integrity of the rest

---

47 Lines 11-12, The reading bibet, now generally accepted (cf. Fraenkel, p. 269, n. 1), reinforces the view that Horace always placed Augustus' apotheosis in the future (cf. Steele Commager, "Horace, Carmina, I, 2," AJPh 80 (1959) 37-55).

48 E. T. Salmon (op. cit., p. 11) says that this passage "reads like a perfunctory insertion; if it were omitted, the ode in which it occrus would not be disrupted in any way."

of the poem.[49] The remaining stanzas could easily be an admonition to Augustus and his regime for their manner of handling the relations with Parthia after the defeat of Crassus at Carrhae in 53 B.C. Like Regulus, who says rather sarcastically in this ode:

> auro repensus scilicet acrior
> miles redibit: flagitio additis
> damnum. neque amissos colores
> lana refert medicata fuca
>
> nec vera virtus, cum semel excidit,[50]

Horace favors military action rather than diplomacy to avenge a Roman defeat and to recover the lost standards. Later, however, Horace modified his view when he saw the successful outcome of Augustus' policy.[51] Nevertheless, when he wrote Carm. 3.5 he seems to have been critical and dubious of Augustus' methods.

The attribution of divine honors to Augustus, as seen in these two odes, is very probably due to a decree of the Senate that hymns and prayers be addressed to Augustus as divine.[52] This decree may also explain

---

49 In fact, the only connection between this stanza and the rest of the poem is the ablative absolute, adiectis . . . Persis which with the future verb, habebitur, is somewhat ambiguous and could be taken in the conditional sense, "if he [Augustus] joins," etc. This, however, would emphasize Horace's implied reproach.

50 Lines 25-29.

51 Cf. Carm. Saec. 53-56.

52 In 29 B.C. (cf. Dio Cass. 51.2.1). Fraenkel (p. 272) dates both of these odes to 27 B.C.

the identification of Augustus with Mercury in Carm. 1.2:

> sive mutata iuvenem figura
> ales in terris imitaris almae
> filius Maiae patiens vocari
> Caesaris ultor.[53]

This poem, written about the same time as the two previously mentioned,[54] quite possibly contains a warning to the Princeps on the danger of exacting vengeance and an exhortation that he assume the gentle, peace-loving qualities of Mercury.[55] In any case, the attributing of divine qualities, either present or future, to a person is a mark of respect and not necessarily one of personal affection.

Let us now examine the two remaining "complimentary" odes. Carm. 3.14 was written in 24 B.C. on the occasion of Augustus' safe return from his Spanish campaign against the Cantabres and Astures. During this difficult war the Princeps had fallen gravely ill at Tarraco.[56] As we

---

53 Lines 41-44.

54 Cf. Wickham, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 11.

55 L. A. MacKay, "Horace, Augustus and Ode, I,2," AJPh 83 (1962) 168-177. Fraenkel (p. 243) claims that from its position "we have to infer that Horace thought that among the poems of the three books none contained better praise of the Princeps or did fuller justice to the blessings of his regime." Yet the poem, for all that Fraenkel can say about it, contains only guarded praise for the leader of the state who has ended civil strife but still has before him the tasks of moral reform (te nostris vitiis iniquum) and foreign campaigns (neu sinas Medos equitare inultos).

56 Suet. Div. Aug. 23. 6; Dio Cass. 53. 25.

have already seen in Chapter Two of this study, it was during this campaign also that he offered Horace the opportunity to become his private secretary. Horace, who a short while before had turned down the Emperor's offer, now fervently exults in his victorious return:

> Herculis ritu modo dictus, o plebs,
> morte venalem petiisse laurum
> Caesar Hispana repetit penatis
> victor ab ora.[57]

In fact, this strikes one as the most fervent and direct of the <u>laudes Caesaris rerum</u> to be found in the first three books. But let us examine a little more carefully what the poet says in the whole poem, and try to evaluate his statements in the light of the historical context in which the poet was writing, First of all, we notice that Horace is addressing the people, <u>o plebs</u>, not Augustus personally nor the gods on his behalf. The praise for the Princeps is , therefore, public (i.e., from a citizen to his ruler) not private (i.e., from one friend to another). This is born out by the reasons the poet advances for his celebration:

> hic dies vere mihi festus atras
> exiget curas: ego nec tumultum
> nec mori per vim metuam tenente
> Caesare terras.[58]

He is grateful to Caesar for bringing freedom from anxiety,

---

57 <u>Ibid</u>. 1-4.

58 <u>Ibid</u>. 13-16.

turmoil and violent death. But these are the blessings which the new regime had brought to all Roman citizens, not just to Horace.

The intervening two stanzas were addressed to the populace of the Capital. They are instructed by the poet to prepare for the celebration of the supplicatio the Senate decreed when Augustus declined a triumph for a victory which, because of his illness, was won chiefly by his lieutenants.

Furthermore, the poem changes abruptly in tone and person addressed after line 16 and the last three stanzas go on to treat of Horace's personal preparations for the celebration.[59] The last stanza is particularly interesting:

> lenit albescens animos capillus
> litium et rixae cupidos protervae:
> non ego hoc ferrem calidus iuventa
> consule Planco.

The last line refers, of course, to 42 B.C., the year in which Horace fought at Philippi -- on Brutus' side be it remembered. He now claims that his whitening hair has soothed his contentiousness and that his political fervor has cooled with the passing years.

After thus briefly considering this poem, we are left with two important questions:

---

59 For a very close parallel cf. Carm 2.7. On the unity of Carm. 3.14 cf. Fraenkel, p. 291.

1) Why does Horace so ostentatiously praise a victory which Augustus himself did not even deem worthy of a triumph?

2) What is the significance of the statements in the final stanza?

In regard to the first of these questions, we may conjecture with some degree of credibility that Horace was trying to make up for disappointing the Princeps when he refused the post on his staff during the Spanish campaign. The answer to the second question seems to be that Horace carefully phrased the last stanza of the poem in a manner designed to assure Augustus that the fervor of his early republicanism had waned as he grew older.

We turn now to an ode that still presents commentators with many difficulties. In Carm. 3.25, Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui plenum? Horace gives us a picture of himself under the inspiration of Dionysus.[60] In his frenzy the poet promises to sing Caesar's praises and to glorify a noble undertaking that no one else has praised:

> Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui
> plenum? quae nemora aut quos agor in specus
> velox mente nova? quibus
> antris egregii Caesaris audiar

60 Yet Horace, ever the advocate of careful composition, himself later deprecated "inspired" poets and their poetry (cf. A.P. 453-476).

> aeternum meditans decus
> stellis inserere et consilio Iovis?
> dicam insigne, recens, adhuc
> indictum ore alio.[61]

Fraenkel[62] contends that there is certainly an intimate connexion between the dicam ... adhuc indictum of this passage and the opening stanza of the Roman Odes, carmina non prius audita ... canto.[63] This is plausible. But then why does Horace place the ode, Quo me, Bacche, rapis, where he does in the collection? If it is an anticipation of the Roman Odes, as Fraenkel claims, why is it placed anticlimatically toward the end of the book which begins with the Roman Odes? After all, the poet places the other Dionysus ode, Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus vidi docentem, just before the epilogue of Book Two of the Odes. Had the poet interchanged the positions of the two odes, Fraenkel's argument would be more credible. Wickham's explanation is much simpler and seems better:

> The place of honour given to the [glory of Caesar] is in effect the celebration which is promised.[64]

If this interpretation is correct, we have here another variation of Horace's use of recusatio, his polite refusal

---

61 Lines 1-8.

62 Op. cit., p. 259.

63 Carm. 3.1.2.

64 Op. cit., vol. I, p. 234.

to undertake the laudes Caesaris rerum, on which we shall have occasion to comment later in this chapter.[65]

In addition to these complimentary passages, three other odes contain prayers for Augustus. Carm. 1. 21 may have been written in 28 B.C. on the occasion of Augustus' dedication of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine and the institution of the Ludi Actiaci[66] or in the winter of 27/26 B.C. when rumors were current about a proposed invasion of Britain.[67] Carm. 1.35 is of approximately the same time since it also mentions such an expedition to Britain. Because of the way Marcellus is mentioned, Carm. 1.12 can be dated to sometime between 25 B.C. when he was betrothed to Julia and his untimely death in 23 B.C.

An ode in honor to Apollo and Diana, Carm. 1.21 is addressed to a chorus of boys and girls employed in the festival of these deities.[68] Its last stanza takes the form of a prayer to Apollo on behalf of the people and Caesar (Augustus), their Princeps:

---

65 Cf. also the comments made on Serm. 2. 1. 10 sqq., supra.

66 Wickham, op. cit., vol. I, p. 62.

67 Cf. line 15 and Dio Cass. 53. 22. 5. This invasion, whether or not the rumors were based on truth, was in fact never launched.

68 Cp. Carm. 3. 1. 2 sq.

hic bellum lacrimosum, hic miseram famem
pestemque a populo et principe Caesare in
Persas atque Britannos
vestra motus aget prece.

Upon close examination of this passage we discern two significant items. By connecting Caesar's welfare with that of the people Horace makes his prayer a patriotic expression of concern for Caesar as the head of the state. Thus it does not indicate personal affection for Augustus, the man, any more than Marvell's Horatian Ode shows a personal affection for Oliver Cromwell. Secondly, the mention of the Persians and Britons may very well be meant as a reminder to the Princeps that he had not yet settled to the poet's satisfaction Rome's problems with foreign powers.[69]

Carm. 1. 35 is a hymn to the goddess Fortuna of Antium. In this city was a famous temple dedicated to the Fortunae Antiates who were depicted as two prophetic sisters whose images were consulted as an oracle.[70] The hymn is composed after a common model consisting of a list of the deity's powers and a description of her retinue.[71] In the beginning of the poem Fortuna is

---

69 Cf. Carm. 1.2.51, 3.5.3 and the comments made on these two passages earlier in this chapter.

70 Martial 5.1.3; Suet. Cal. 57; Tac. Ann. 3.71.

71 For an excellent commentary on the structure and meaning of this ode cf. Fraenkel, p. 251-253.

portrayed as the inexorable goddess indiscriminately dealing out good and evil to men. But at line 21 the poet changes to a more abstract conception of a divinity who attends as well as determines the lives of men. As we can see from the last two stanzas of this poem, Fortuna is, in the poet's mind, a goddess who redresses wrongs and punishes wickedness:

> heu, heu, cicatricum et sceleris pudet
> fratrumque. quid nos dura refugimus
> aetas? quid intactum nefasti
> liquimus? unde manum iuventus
>
> metu deorum continuit? quibus
> pepercit aris? o utinam nova
> incude diffingas refusum in
> Massagetas Arabasque ferrum.

The last three lines express the poet's desire, a desire no doubt shared by many of his contemporaries, to wash out the stain of civil war and moral decadence in the blood of Rome's enemies.[72] He was, therefore, enthusiastic about the two military expeditions being rumored at this time and inserted in this poem a petition for their success:

> serves iturum Caesarem in ultimos
> orbis Britannos et iuvenum recens
> examen Eois timendum
> partibus Oceanoque rubro.[73]

---

72 Compare the feelings of Germanicus' soldiers after their mutiny in A.D. 14 (Tac. Ann. 1.49.5).

73 Lines 29-32.

This reference to Caesar springs, therefore, from the poet's patriotic zeal and his desire to see the sins of his country expiated; not from any personal regard for Augustus.

The third prayer for Augustus appears in Carm. 1.12. The structure of this ode, suggested by Pindar's second Olympian ode,[74] is very carefully arranged in five triads, or sections containing three stanzas each. After the introductory triad, the next three triads (lines 13-48) treat of gods, heroes and famous men, respectively, in answer to the poet's rhetorical questions in the opening lines:

> Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
> tibia sumis celebrare, Clio?
> quem deum?

The final triad contains praise for Augustus in the indirect form of a prayer addressed to Jupiter.

> gentis humanae pater atque custos,
> orte Saturno, tibi cura magni
> Caesaris fatis data: tu secundo
> Caesare regnes.
>
> ille seu Parthos Latio imminentis
> egerit iusto domitos triumpho
> sive subiectos Orientis orae
> Seras et Indos,
>
> te minor latum reget aequus orbem:
> tu gravi curru quaties Olympum,
> tu parum castis inimica mittes
> fulmina lucis.

---

74 Cf. Fraenkel, p. 291 sqq.

Three important points in this passage should not escape our attention. First, Horace is careful not to attribute divine qualities to Augustus. In fact, he eschews the use of that very name with all its religious connotations, prefering to use the more "human" name, Caesar. Yet the poet uses "Augustus" to designate the Princeps in two earlier odes.[75] To Horace the Emperor is a mortal as subject to the all-powerful sway of Jupiter, tu secundo Caesare regnes,[76] as he is to Fortuna, serves iturum Caesarem.[77] Secondly, the poet carefully weaves into his praise a reminder of the still unavenged humiliations to Roman arms suffered by Crassus and by Antonius at the hands of the Parthians, ille seu Parthos Latio imminentis egerit. Finally, in the last stanza, there is an allusion to Jupiter as the avenger of wickedness:

> tu parum castis inimica mittes
> fulmina lucis.

---

75 Carm. 3.3 and 3.5, both written about 27 B.C. (cf. Fraenkel, p. 272), at least two years earlier than Carm. 1.12.

76 Cf. also Horace's concept in Carm. 3.1.5-6, regum timendorum in proprios greges,/ reges in ipsos imperium est Iovis. Fraenkel's comment (op. cit., p. 296) that "from time immemorial it had been the pride of a good king to be regarded as the φύλαξ, the custos, of his flock, his people," may well be true, but it is beside the point here. In Carm. 1. 12 it is clearly the god who is the custos, not the man.

77 Carm. 1. 35. 29.

If the aequus of line 57 were understood in the conditional sense to mean "if he will be just," then these last two lines would also be a reminder to the Princeps of another important problem he had not yet solved--the reform of public morals. They could be as well the poet's warning to Augustus to rule justly, avoiding the tyranny of Sulla and Julius Caesar.

Even though we put aside all these considerations, however, whatever praise there is for Augustus in these three prayers is there for him as Rome's destined ruler, not for him as a person for whom Horace had any warm affection. The poet's encomia spring from his patriotism and his gratitude for the restoration of civil order; they evidence neither blind homage to a shining hero nor esteem for an intimate.

These complimentary passages and prayers for Augustus' welfare are offset by Horace's allusions to the Emperor's misdeeds. Horace has qualms about the Princeps' future conduct and worries lest he misuse his power.[78] He alludes to the confiscations by which Augustus gained land for his veterans.[79] The victors at Philippi are shown as crushing

---

78 Carm. 3. 4. 65.

79 Ibid. 2. 18. 26.

republican virtus.[80] There may even be an allusion to the purloining of the treasures of Egypt.[81] In fact, Horace's posture as critic and advisor to Rome's new leader is best exemplified in Carm. 3. 4. Here, the poet informs Augustus that in order to correct his faults and rule wisely he should listen to the Muses and to their mouthpiece, Horace himself.

> vos Caesarem altum, militia simul
> fessas cohortes abdidit oppidis,
> finire quaerentem labores
> Pierio recreatis antro;
>
> vos lene consilium et datis et dato
> gaudetis, almae.[82]

As in the satires, Horace still professes his reluctance to sing the laudes Caesaris rerum. We have seen earlier in this chapter that Carm. 3. 25 may contain a type of polite refusal to hymn Augustus' praises. In two other odes, however, Horace explicitly refuses this task. In the ode addressed to Agrippa, Augustus' most trusted marshal, Horace politely states that his lyric poetry is not suited to the epic deeds of the two men:

> dum pudor
> imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
> laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
> culpa deterere ingeni.[83]

---

80 Carm. 2. 7. 9.

81 Ibid. 2. 2. 21.

82 Lines 37-42.

83 Carm. 1. 6. 9-12.

True, this is a disguised compliment to the military achievements of Augustus and Agrippa. But it is also Horace's clever way of maintaining his artistic independence in the face of official pressure.

In Carm. 2. 12 as in 1. 6, Horace declines to undertake epic themes upon his inbellis lyra:

> tuque pedestribus
> dices historiis proelia Caesaris,
> Maecenas, mellius ductaque per vias
> regum colla minacium.

Yet, had he wanted to, Horace might have adapted his lyric poetry to such themes. He approximates this with great success in Juno's speech in Carm. 3. 3 and in that of Regulus in Carm. 3. 5.[84] We must suppose, therefore, that Horace refused because the task did not appeal to him. He is merely using as a convenient excuse the difference in genres and their usual subject matter just as he used the excuse of a weak constitution when he refused to join Augustus in Spain as his secretary.

Nor were opportunities for additional favorable references to Augustus lacking, had Horace wished to utilize them. Earlier in this chapter we discussed Carm. 1. 35 as a prayer for Augustus. The deity besought in this ode is Fortuna of Antium. Now the city of Antium had close

---

84 See also Carm. 2. 1.

associations with the gens Iulia.[85] Yet Horace nowhere indicates any such connexion, an indication which might even have given the whole ode a more personal tone. Nor in Carm. 1. 30 does the poet show the connexion between Venus whom he is addressing and the Iulii. Such a connexion however, is common in both Lucretius[86] and Vergil. Furthermore, Horace does not follow the fashion of the time in identifying Augustus with Apollo even when he has opportunity to do so.[87]

In two odes, however, Horace does indeed praise accomplishments of Augustus. The first, Carm. 3. 14, written on Augustus' victorious return from the Spanish campaign in 24 B.C., we examined earlier in this chapter. There we saw that this laudatory ode was intended as a douceur to the Princeps for any affront Horace may have inflicted when he had refused to become his secretary. The other ode is Carm. 1. 37, on the final defeat and death of Cleopatra. It was written in the Autumn of 30 B.C. when news of this victory reached Rome.[88] Though he was

---

85 See Suet. Div. Aug. 58, Tib. 38; Tac. Ann. 14.3.4.

86 Cf. esp. De Re. Nat. 1. 1-40.

87 Carm. 1.2.41-44, 1.21.9-16, 1.31.

88 Cf. Dio Cass. 51. 19.

the real antagonist, Antonius is not mentioned in accordance with the Roman tradition which never permitted a triumph to be celebrated except over a foreign foe. Joyfully, Horace praises Caesar, the victor, by comparing his victory over his foe(s) to that of a hunter over a dove or hare.

> Caesar ab Italia volantem
>
> remis adurgens, accipiter velut
> mollis columbas aut leporem citus
> venator in campis nivalis
> Haemoniae.[89]

But on closer examination, this praise seems to be muted by the admiration Horace shows for Cleopatra. The ode is devoted entirely to the Egyptiam Queen who is presented in two dissimilar scenes. In the first part of the poem Horace joyfully exults at her defeat, portrays her menacing attack upon Italy and describes her ignominious flight.[90] Then, abruptly, from line 21 to the end the poet's attitude changes to one of admiration. The ode begins as a triumphal song over a fallen enemy but closes with a warm tribute to Cleopatra's courage and lofty spirit.

> ausa et iacentem visere regiam
> voltu sereno, fortis et asperas
> tractare serpentes, ut atrum
> corpore conbiberet venenum,

---

89 Cf. Dio Cass. 51. 19.

90 This opening scene is modelled on the ode of Alcaeus upon the death of the tyrant, Myrsilus, (cf. Wickham, op. cit., vol. I, p. 10) and Fraenkel's comments, op. cit., p. 159.)

deliberata morte ferocior:
saevis Liburnis scilicet invidens
privata deduci superbo
non humilis mulier triumpho.

After reading the poem, one is left with the impression that Horace felt a certain tragic sympathy for the defeated Queen. Thus the element of praise for Augustus and his victory is greatly diminished.

Horace is also ready to point out the failures of Augustus' regime and to compliment men who had been, and may still have been, opponents of Augustus. He often reminds the Princeps of his obligation to avenge Rome's honor by undertaking a punitive expedition against the Parthians.[91] He expresses his anxiety over the stability of the new government and its ability to prevent the further outbreak of civil war.[92] He is not very optimistic over the progress of Augustus' proposed reform of public morality.[93] He even combines all three of these criticisms in the last of the Roman Odes[94]-- the very place where we should expect to find praise of the Augustan regime.

---

91 Carm. 1.2.51; 1.21.15; 1.35.40; 2.13.13.

92 Carm. 1.2.21; 1.14; 1.35.33; 2.1.

93 Cf. esp. Carm. 3.24.

94 Carm. 3.6. Armstrong's comment (op. cit. p.126-127) is very pertinent: "Horace has, in the Roman Odes, high praise for Augustus; but it is slighting the whole intent of the cycle not to realize that the moral order of the old Republic occupies a far more important place, and that (like his friend Virgil) Horace everywhere implies that the new Empire is only second best

Having fought on the side of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, Horace often addresses odes to men noted for their republican aloofness to the new regime and its leader. Pompeius Varus[95] a die-hard republican who fought on after Philippi under Sextus Pompeius, is very warmly welcomed home in an affable ode.[96] L. Sestius, Brutus' quaestor and ardent supporter,[97] is honoured by a charming ode[98] on one of Horace's favorite philosophical themes, the necessity to live and enjoy life while we can.[98] Also a republican who fought at Horace's side at Philippi,[99] Messalla Corvinus had gone over to Antonius afterwards as did many republicans. He shrewdly went over to Octavian before Actium, being consul with him in the very year of that battle. He boasted, however, of following an indepedent course in politics.[100] He was a

---

94 (cont'd) the best that a degenerate age deserves, How else, for example (the passage puzzles Fraenkel) does one explain the crashing series of minor chords on which the six Roman Odes are brought to a close...."

95 On the cognomen cf. Klingner, op. cit., Index nominum, s. v. "Pompeius", nothing is known of this man beside what Horace tells us in the ode addressed to him.

96 Carm. 2. 7.

97 Dio Cass. 50. 32. 4.

98 Carm. 1. 4. The position of this ode is quite probably due to the fact that Sestius was suffectus in 23 B.C. On Augustus' motives for this appointment cf. Syme p. 335.

99 Syme, p. 198.

100 Ibid. p. 482, cf. also Tac. Ann. 11. 7.

cultured aristocrat, patron of the arts and close friend of Horace.[101] The ode addressed to him, or more precisely the wine bottle he has requested,[102] is most informally cordial. Even Porcius Cato "Uticensis," the most revered of republican heroes is mentioned with honor and admiration in two passages.[103]

There are two outstanding Antonians who receive odes from Horace's pen. Carm. 1. 7 is a poem that anyone would appreciate from a friend. It is affable and easy-going yet neither too formal nor coarse. In it the poet counsels serenity and praises the salutary effects of wine. The addressee is L. Munatius Plancus, a very high-ranking Antonian[104] who went over to Augustus![105] C. Asinius Pollio, though a Caesarian, was not at Philippi since he was governor of Transpadane Gaul from 43 to 41 B.C. Afterwards he supported Antonius and even after going over to Octavian out of motives of political expediency, he was neutral during

---

101 Cf. Serm. 1.6.42, 1.10.85; A.P. 371.

102 Carm. 3.21.

103 Carm. 2.1.24, 1.12.35, this last is a poem dedicated to Augustus himself!

104 Syme, p. 267.

105 Dio Cass. 50.3.1. The epithet "morbo proditor" is due to a feud between the family of Plancus and the Domitii (Cf. Syme, p. 512 note 1.)

Actium, using as his excuse his personal friendship with Antonius. He was an ardent advocate of libertas[106] and therefore an outspoken opponent of the new regime. Augustus merely tolerated him since Pollio was both too eminent to dispose of and not very powerful with out an organized following.[107] It was to this man that Horace addressed the ode with which he began and dedicated the second book. The poem is filled with praise for Pollio's various accomplishments as historian, tragedian, orator and general. Certainly such praises must have been envied by the Enigma of the Palatine.

Finally we come to a man who, though neither a republican nor an Antonian, could hardly have been considered a friend of Augustus in 23 B.C. This, of course, is that variously named man, Terentius Licinius Varro Murena. In 23 B.C., the same year the Odes were published and a critical year for the new regime, he was implicated in the conspiracy of the notorious Fannius Caepio.[108] Both were tried and convicted in absentia and later put to death. We may never know the full extent of Murena's guilt or innocence but the most probable explanation for the charge

---

106 Cf. Syme, loc. cit.

107 Ibid. p. 320.

108 Dio Cass. 54.3.4, who misdates the conspiracy to 22 B.C.

is his outspoken criticism of Augustus' use of auctoritas in the trial of M. Primus.[109] In view of all this, the fact that Horace addresses an ode[110] to Murena at all is very indicative of the poet's independence of judgement and of his sentiment toward the government of the Princeps. Even more telling is the gentle, friendly consolation and advice Horace imparts to Murena in a poem that ranks with some of the poet's most finished and well-composed.

Before drawing any conclusions about the relationship between Horace and Augustus from the works of this period, we should give some brief notice to the First Book of Epistles. The Princeps is mentioned by name only six times in five separate poems.[111] Of the references, three are the most casual and incidental sort. The remaining three references, in Epist. 1.3 and 1.13, deserve some comment here.

---

109 Cf. Syme, p. 333sq. Even the pro-Augustan Velleius testifies to Murena's previous uprightness: "nam Murena sine hoc facinore potuit videri bonus." (2.91.2) For a recent and thorough discussion of the trials cf. K.M.T. Atkinson, "Constitutional and Legal Aspects of the Trials of Marcus Primus and Varro Murena," Historia 9 (1960) 440-473.

110 Carm. 2.10.

111 Epist. 1.3.7; 1.5.9; 1.12.28; 1.13.2,18; 1.16.29.

In Epist. 1.3, Horace, writing to his young friend, Julius Florus, asks among other questions:

quis sibi res gestas Augusti scribere sumit?

This is significant to our topic only in so far as it indicates that Horace, though he himself refused the task, was interested enough in the laudes Caesaris rerum to enquire which of Florus' companions was then engaged in writing them.

Of more importance to us is Epist. 1.13. We had occasion to refer to this work in the course of Chapter Two of this study. There we saw that this letter was written to accompany a copy of the Odes that the poet had sent to Augustus. Here we need only call attention to the poet's manner. Horace does not address Augustus directly. The addressee is instead the messenger who is to carry the Odes, Vinnius Asina, but the Princeps would sooner or later see this poem and realize that he was being addressed subtly and indirectly through the messenger. The poet is familiar and jovial in his instructions to Vinnius. There is, however, a note of anxiety lest the poems he is to carry be presented in a manner that would prejudice Augustus toward them. The Princeps himself says that he accepted these poems as an apology and in a pointed jest complained of the inconsequential size of the collection.[112] Taken to-

---

112 Cf. Chapter II, supra.

gether these data do not present a picture of a warm, affectionate mutual relationship between the two men. Their relationship is polite, to be sure, but not without anxiety on Horace's part to maintain his independence, writing as much or as little as he wished, while not giving offence to Augustus.

While investigating the significant passages of the first three books of the Odes and the first book of Epistles, we have seen that, during this period, Horace does begin to show Augustus some tokens of courtesy and to offer him some praise for his accomplishments. We have also seen that this praise could easily have been more extensive and personal, had the poet so wished. We are led, therefore, to impute this praise to motives other than personal affection. Moreover, the praise for the Princeps is to a great extent offset by the poet's persistent refusal to sing the laudes Caesaris rerum, by his allusions to Augustus' misdeeds and criticism of the new regime as well as by his praise for noted republicans and other opponents of the Emperor. Even though there are some indications that Horace was beginning to respect him as Rome's leader and to be grateful for the restoration of civil order which his victory effected, there is still nothing to show that Horace felt any affection for Augustus, the man.

3. References in Horace's Later Works.

We come now to the last period of Horace's literary career. In Chapter Two of this thesis we touched upon the relevance to our topic of most of the works of this period. Of the Letter to Florus (Epist. 2.2) and the De Arte Poetica no more need be added here. There are, however, a few points we should consider about the Carmen Saeculare, the Letter to Augustus (Epist. 2.1) and especially the fourth book of the Odes.

As we pointed out previously, the Carmen Saeculare was composed at Augustus' suggestion for the Ludi Saeculares held in 17 B.C. On close examination we see that the Carmen is not only a panegyric of the res Augusti but also, and even more significant, that Horace is careful to point out the fulfillment of the reform programme which he himself had advocated earlier in the first three books of the Odes. He points out Augustus' morality legislation:

> cliva, producas subolem patrumque
> prosperes decreta super iugandis
> feminis prolisque novae feraci
> lege morita.[113]

He alludes to the re-establishment of civil order:

> di, probos mores docili iuventae,
> di, senectuti placidae quietem,
> Romulae genti date remque prolemque
> et decus omne.
> . . . . . .

---

113 Lines 17-20.

iam Fides et Pax et Honos Pudorque
priscus et neglecta redire Virtus
audet adparetque beata pleno
Copia cornu![114]

and rejoices at the humiliation of the once-dreaded Parthians and others of the Empire's belligerent neighbors:

iam mari terraque manus potentis
Medus Albanusque timet securis,
iam Scythae responsa petunt, superbi
nuper et Indi![115]

The whole poem praises the restoration of religion and celebrates Apollo, Augustus' own favorite deity.[116] We should not, however, lose sight of the fact that the poet is exulting in the enactment of reforms that he himself had been urging for quite some time. It is the new regime which has come around to doing what Horace suggested; not Horace who has changed his view. Even so, this is only on the relatively impersonal level of the poet's political allegiance. Nothing in the Carmen Saeculare indicates Horace's views of Augustus as a man and a friend--the poem is, of course, much too formal for that.

That the Letter to Augustus was written at the Princeps' request we also saw in Chapter Two of this study. There, too, we discovered that an inordinately long time elapsed before the request was fulfilled. Fraenkel has

---

114 Lines 45-48, 57-60.

115 Lines 53-56.

116 Cf. E.T. Salmon, op. cit., p. 13.

much good to say about this poem;[117] but Armstrong, I believe, seems to get to the very heart of the matter when he succinctly comments:

> Augustus ordered Horace to write him an epistle--"Are you afraid posterity will be ashamed of you because you were my intimate?" And for all Fraenkel can say about the poem that resulted, there is no trace in it of what Augustus wanted to hear. No one would even deduce from the Epistle to Augustus that Horace was his familiaris; it is from poet to emperor, not friend to friend.[118]

More than any other collection of Horace's poems the fourth book of Odes evidences the poet's enthusiasm and joy at the success of Augustus in restoring civil order and saving Rome from self-destruction. At this period Horace abandons his former reservations and hesitation in order to throw the support of his Muse behind the movement that was effecting a renaissance in the social and political life of Rome. We shall, however, examine passages from the lyrics only in so far as they bear upon Horace's personal relationship with Augustus.

The commission to compose the Carmen Saeculare reawakened Horace's lyrical muse and inspired him to produce additional odes. So when the Princeps called upon him to celebrate the victories over the Alpine tribes won by Tiberius and Drusus Nero, his two stepsons, the poet

---

117 Op. cit., chap. VIII, pp. 383-399.

118 Op. cit., p. 126.

wrote two odes and published these together with thirteen others in a single collection known now as the fourth book of the Odes. As we have already seen from Suetonius' testimony,[119] this was done to gratify the Princeps who wished the odes in honor of his stepsons to have a permanent place in Horace's works.

Before going on to other significant passages, let us briefly consider these two odes. Both Carm. 4.4 and Carm. 4.14 are epinikia modeled somewhat after Pindar.[120] Carm. 4.4 is a poem of great beauty and majestic grandeur and, though not explicitly addressed to anyone, quite obviously lauds the accomplishments of the young Drusus Nero in the Alpine campaigns. Carm. 4.14, somewhat shorter and slightly less grand than its counterpart, praises Tiberius' exploits in the same war. Unlike the other, this latter poem is actually addressed to Augustus and affirms that the Princeps was indeed the real conqueror since his were the auspicia, his the armies, though his stepsons commanded as his legates:

> milite nam tuo . . . Drusus Genaunos . . . deiecit
> . . . . . .
> te copias, te consilium et tuos
> praebente divos.

Yet there is nowhere in either of these odes the slightest

---

119 Cf. Chapter II, supra.

120 Cf. Fraenkel, p. 426-432.

hint of anything more personal than praise for a great leader and his family offered by a grateful citizen.

Three odes of this collection contain what appears to be enthusiastic praise for Augustus.[121] Of these, one is placed after each of the two odes on the Alpine victories of Drusus and Tiberius. We shall treat of these two odes to Augustus first because of their close relation to the two discussed above, and then deal separately with the remaining ode because of its length and importance.

The authenticity of Carm. 4.5 has been doubted[122] and not without cause since even Fraenkel, who calls it his favorite ode, observes:

> There is in Horace's lyrics nothing really comparable to this long series of strictly parallel asyndetic sentences [lines 17-27], each of them filling a line, without a single enjambement to vary the uniformity of the structure and soften the rigidity of the rhythm.[123]

However that may be, we should carefully note that Horace is speaking for the patria when he expresses a longing for Augustus' presence:

> ut mater iuvenem
> . . . . . .
> sic desideriis icta fidelibus
> quaerit patria Caesarem.

Caesar's presence is desired not for the sake of friendly intercourse with the poet but for the civic good effected

---

121 Carm. 4.2: 4.5 and 4.15.

122 A. Palmer, Hermathena 60 (1942) 107

123 Op. cit., p. 443.

by that presence:

> tutus bos etenim rura perambulat,
> nutrit rura Ceres almaque Faustitas,
> pacatum volitant per mare navitae
> culpari metuit fides,
>
> nullis polluitur casta domus stupris,
> mos et lex maculosum edomuit nefas,
> laudantur simili prole puerperae,
> culpam poena premit comes.

The same motive underlies Carm. 4.15:

> custode rerum Caesare non furor
> civilis aut vis exeget otium,
> non ira, quae procudit ensis
> et misera inimicat urbis.[124]

Here, as in the Carmen Saeculare, Horace carefully points out in detail how the programme that he has suggested has been fulfilled. Caesar is praised for finally carrying out the reform which the poet has insistently urged for a long time. Such poems as these are not necessarily evidence of personal affection.

One of the most interesting odes of the whole collection, Carm. 4.2 was written probably in the later half of 16 B.C. in answer to the suggestion of Iullus Antonius that Horace write an epinikion after the manner of Pindar for the celebration planned for Augustus' return from the Rhineland![125] Refusal of such a request was difficult since Horace had already modeled the Carmen Saeculare after Pindar and the Greek lyricist was known to be a

---

124 Lines 17-20.

125 Fraenkel, p. 433.

source of inspiration for him. Moreover, the poet must have been aware that such an epinikion would have greatly pleased Augustus. But Horace, to whom "anything even remotely reminiscent of a panegyric was utterly distasteful,"[126] does, in fact, refuse. With an exaggerated εἰρωνεία he offers as his excuse the dangers involved in trying to imitate Pindar:

> Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,
> Iulle, ceratis ope Daedalea
> nititur pinnis, vitreo daturus
> nomine ponto.

The poet than fortifies his self-defence by suggesting that Iullus himself write the epinikion:

> Concines maiore poeta plectro
> Caesarem,
> . . . . . .
>
> concines laetosque dies et urbis
> publicum ludum super inpetrato
> fortis Augusti reditu forumque
> litibus orbum.[127]

Whenever Horace refuses praise in word, he does so in such a manner that he actually grants it indirectly in the very act of refusal![128] In the present ode he tells Iullus that when Augustus finally returns in triumph he (Horace) will join with the populace of the City to acclaim

---

126 Fraenkel, p.433.

127 Lines 33-34, 41-44. Compare Carm. 1.6 where Horace suggests Varius for the task of praising Agrippa.

128 Compare Carm. 1.6 and 1.12. Cf. also W. Wimmel, loc. cit, supra note 37.

the Princeps not with a Pindarizing ode but with the short simple paeans of the ordinary citizen:

> tum meae, si quid loquar audiendum,
> vocis accedet bona pars et o sol
> pulcher, o laudande canam recepto
> Caesare felix.
>
> teque, dum procedis, io Triumphe,
> non semel dicemus, io Triumphe,
> civitas omnis dabimusque divis
> tura benignis.

As we have seen him do before, Horace links his acts of praise with those of all other Romans to whom Augustus' regime has brought the blessings of peace and prosperity.

Commenting on this passage, Fraenkel contends that:

> After the publication of the three books of his carmina his attitude to Augustus had changed. To the loyalty and admiration for Rome's leader which he had long felt there was now added a strong element of personal affection, for, as time went on, there grew between the Princeps and the poet a genuine friendship on mutual understanding, sympathy, and confidence.[129]

The facts, however, simply do not bear out this assumption. As we have seen all through this chapter and earlier, Horace did not feel a strong loyalty and admiration for Rome's leader for a long time previous to writing the Odes. On the contrary, even as late as the publication of the first book of the Epistles Horace displays a reluctance even to give his political allegiance to Augustus. Moreover, we

---

129 Op. cit., p. 438.

have seen that there is no evidence to prove that a "genuine friendship based on mutual understanding, sympathy, and confidence" grew up between the two men since the publication of the first collection of Odes.

Futthermore, this passage from Carm. 4.2, with its careful juxtaposition of the singular of the first person (meae voci) with the plural (non semel dicemus ... civitas omnis, dabimusque) emphasizes the poet's desire to praise Augustus merely as any other ordinary citizen and not as a personal intimate.[130]

Although they do not mention Augustus directly, two other odes in the fourth book bear upon our topic to some degree. Though the suggestion for this book of odes came from Augustus and its main poems deal with the glories of the Princeps' regime and family, we find that in Carm. 4.11 Horace reiterates his devotion to his old friend and patron, Maecenas. By this time, Augustus' once trusted and nearly indispensable minister had been forced into the background and may even have been under a cloud.[131] The point of the ode lies not in the invitation to the almost certainly fictional Phyllis but in the occasion,

---

130 Fraenkel (p. 438-439) has difficulty seeing the unity of this ode. Yet an interpretation such as the one put forward above makes Horace's refusal to write a 'special' praise more understandable and strengthens the unity of the whole ode.

131 Cf. Tac. Ann. 3.30, 14.53.

Maecenas' birthday. In this subtle way, without addressing him directly, Horace is able to give quiet testimony to his continued affection for his old friend.

In Chapter Two of this thesis we saw that Augustus had asked Horace to write poetry addressed to him. This was in about 19 B.C. Yet a few years later when the poet had re-awakened his lyric Muse and wrote the odes of the fourth book, he did not dedicate the collection to the Princeps. Carm. 4.1, the dedicatory ode, is addressed instead to Venus to whose traditional connexion with the gens Iulia the poet makes no allusion. Rather he pays a passing tribute to the gifts and accomplishments of the young Paullus Fabius Maximus, a distant relative of Augustus,[132] but otherwise of little renown. The important point is that Horace skilfully evaded dedicating the fourth book of Odes to Augustus, even though the latter had induced him to write several of the poems in it.

The works of the last period of his life, especially the fourth book of Odes, show Horace more enthusiastic toward Augustus' new regime and its effect upon Roman civil life. The poet is even prepared to do what he had refused to do before--praise the exploits of the Princeps and those of his two stepsons. He commends the improvement of public morality and shows little or no anxiety over foreign rela-

---

132 Cf. the stemma in Syme, ad fin.

tions. In all, he is thankful for the blessings of the pax Augusti; he has become Augustus' amicus in the political sense of the word. For all this, however, there is no certain evidence that the poet felt anything more for Augustus than respect and gratitude based mainly upon patriotism. There is nothing in the laudes Caesaris rerum, which Horace composed in this last period, to give them a personal warmth. There is no indication that Horace found in Augustus those personal qualities he valued in his other friends. In fact, one is left with the impression that Horace would have used almost identical phrases had events made Agrippa or even Antonius Rome's 'Saviour.'

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study set out to establish a more precise picture of Horace's personal relationship with Augustus. To accomplish this purpose we first formulated a practical definition of friendship based on a list of specific qualities that Horace is known to have valued in his friends. Thus a basis was established upon which to judge the evidence presented by the pertinent historical data.

These historical data were of two types: internal evidence (allusions to the relationship in Horace's own works) and external evidence (primarily, the data supplied by the Vita Horati). First, the latter of these two types of data was examined. It was discovered from Suetonius' account that Augustus made several overtures to Horace in order to draw the poet into a greater intimacy with himself. These attempts were repeated and had to be repeated because they were generally unsuccessful. Though the poet realized that to accede to the wishes of the Princeps would have brought him both material as well as social benefits, Horace appears to have been hesitant, even reluctant we might say, to do so. Nor do Augustus' expressions of goodwill seem motivated by genuine regard for the person of the poet. On the contrary, they seem quite easily reduceable to actions based upon an appreciation of the poet's utility to Augustus and his regime (e.g. the offer of the secretaryship) or

the Princeps' desire for gloria perennis (e.g. his requests for poems).

The internal evidence, gleaned from Horace's own poems, shows a certain development in the poet's attitude toward Augustus. Here the distinction must be made between Horace's attitude toward Augustus as a political leader, the one who brought to a close a century of civil war and gave Roma renewed strength and self-respect, and Augustus as a man, an individual with whom the poet could be on mutually intimate terms. In his early works, Horace shows himself skeptical and critical of Augustus as a political leader. Of Augustus as a friend or even an acquaintance there is no evidence at all. In the works of his middle years, especially the first three books of the Odes, Horace still maintains a wary skepticism of Augustus' political programme though he does offer some perfunctory praise. Still there is no indication of personal affection nor does the poet praise Augustus for those qualities of character he valued in a friend. Finally, in his last creative period, Horace begins to praise Augustus, the political leader, for accomplishing those reforms which the poet himself had long been urging. Even in this period, however, there is no certain evidence of a more personal intimacy or affection on the part of the poet, although one can hardly deny that the two men had been acquainted at least since about 20 B.C. when the first book of Epistles was published.

Therefore, according to the definition of friendship that we have formulated, we can now draw several conclusions. Whatever goodwill there was between the two men could not have been mutual much before the year 20 B.C. because of the reluctance which Horace displayed. Even after this date, furthermore, Horace's gestures of goodwill seem based mostly upon patriotism. That is to say that Horace's regard for Augustus rested upon the latter's utility and service to the Roman state and, therefore, to the poet as a citizen of that state. Nowhere does Horace give evidence of a more personal regard or indicate that Augustus possessed those personal qualities which so endeared others to the poet. Hence, if any mutual friendship existed at all between the two men, it could only have been of the lowest and most imperfect sort, really more acquaintanceship than genuine friendship. There is no certain evidence to show that Horace ever felt for Augustus any deep mutual affection based on those specific qualities of character the poet valued. Therefore, we must conclude that whatever the character of his political allegiance, Horace never considered Augustus his friend in the fullest personal sense of that term.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, D., "Reconsiderations: Fraenkel's Horace," in Arion, vol. 3 (1964) p. 116-128.
Poses thought-provoking questions and suggests several areas of consideration in the question of Horace's attitude toward Augustus. A strong confirmation that the question needed more extensive research.

Benario, J. M., "Book 4 of Horace's Odes, Augustan Propaganda," in Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, vol. 91 (1960) p.339-353.
Shows the relationship between Carm. 4 and the reliefs on the Ara Pacis and that these poems all treat of the reform programme of Augustus in one way or another. Of limited uesfulness since it deals more with Horace's political outlook than with his personal relationship to the Emperor.

Bréguet, E., "Horace, un homme libre," in Hommage à M. Niedermann, p.82-89, Collection Latomus, vol. 23, Bruxells, 1956.
Shows that Horace maintained his complete independence in regard to both Maecenas and Augustus.

Brink, C. O., Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles, Cambridge, University Press, 1963, xi+300p.
Discusses 'appropriateness' as the link between style and content as well as the Augustan sense of the moral significance of poetry, all in reference to Epist. 2 and the Ars Poetica. Helpful especially in dating these works.

Brunt, P. A., "Amicitia in the Late Roman Republic," in Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, vol. 11 (1965) p.1-20.
By opposing Cicero's definition of the word to that of Sallust, the author is able to discuss the many shades of meaning of amicitia. A valuable discussion of an important concept.

Campbell, A.Y., Horace, a New Interpretation, London, Methuen and Co., 1924, xii+303p.
Though on the whole controversial, its provocative and novel approach is based upon aesthetic criticism which is often illuminative, especially in the interpretation of individual poems.

Commager, Steele, "Horace, Carmina, I,2," in American Journal of Philology, vol. 80 (1959) p.37-55.
States that Horace always placed Augustus' apotheosis in the future. Quite helpful.

_____, "The Function of Wine in Horace's Odes," in Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, vol. 88 (1957) p.68-80.

A penetrating and thought-provoking article on the symbolic meaning of wine and its relationship to Horace's philosophy and character.

D'Alton, J. F., Horace and His Age, a Study in Historical Background, New York, Russell & Russell, 1962. xii+296p. Index.

Deals mainly with politics, philosophy and religion in the Augustan revival, social problems, popular beliefs and contemporary literary criticism in order to recapture the milieu in which Horace lived and wrote. A good general background for the era but of limited specific usefulness to the question of the personal relationship between Horace and Augustus.

Dio Cassius, Dio's Roman History, vols. 5 and 6, translated by Ernest Cary, London, Heinemann (Loeb Classical Library), 1955. 526, 492p.

Contains the Greek and English translation of books 46-55 of Dio's History. A principal source for Roman history from 43 B.C. to A.D. 8. Very useful in dating events of the period.

Doblhofer, E., Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht, ("Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften," Neue Folge, 2. Reihe, 16.), Heidelberg, Winter, 1966. 162p.

Deals with the problem of Horace's sincerity in his praises for Augustus. The author tries to show these praises to be truly sincere.

Elmore, J., "Horace and Octavian," in Classical Philology, vol. 26 (1931) p.258-263.

Helpful in dating Carm. 1. 2 to 29 B.C.

Fraenkel, Eduard, Horace, Oxford, University Press, 1957. xiv+463p.

One of the most celebrated of the more recent commentaries written by an eminent Horace scholar. The book is a collection of studies, arranged roughly in chronological order by the periods of Horace's literary career, with a thorough discussion of Suetonius' Vita as an introductory chapter. Most but not all the works are analyzed. Very helpful to the subject of this study in many ways.

Frank, Tenny, "On Augustus' Reference to Horace," in Classical Philology, vol. 20 (1925) p.26-31.

Offers some trenchant and valuable information and brilliant deductions based upon a comparison between quotations in the Vita Horati and Carm. 3. 16 and Epist. 1.13.

Hauthal, F., ed., Acronis et Porphyrionis commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum, 2 vol., Berlin, Springer, 1866 (photo-reproduced, Amsterdam, Schippers, 1966).

Contains the scholia of "Acron" and Porphyrio on the text of Horace. Of limited usefulness in corroborating data supplied by Suetonius.

Kiessling, Adolf, and Richard Heinze, Q. Horatius Flaccus, 3 vol:

vol. 1, Oden und Epoden, 10e auflage, mit einem Nachwort und bibliographischen Nachträgen von Erich Burk, Berlin, Weidmann, 1961, 442p.

vol. 2, Satiren, 7e auflage, mit einem Nachwort und bibliographischen Nachträgen von Erich Burck, Berlin, Weidmann, 1959. viii+647p.

vol. 3, Briefe, 6e auflage, mit einem Nachwort und bibliographischen Nachträgen von Erich Burck, Berlin, Wiedmann, 1959. 437p.

A through and carefully researched commentary by outstanding German scholars, this classic edition has been kept up-to-date by numerous re-editions and by bibliographical supplements surveying recent work in various areas of Horatian scholarship. Extreemly useful.

Klingner, F., ed., Horatius. Opera, Leipzig, Teubner, 1959. xxv+4*+378p.

A standard, recent critical text of Horace's works. Contains full apparatus criticus, text of Suetonius' Vita, as well as an Index Nominum. The standard text of Horace and the Vita used for this study.

LaPenna, A., Orazio e l'ideologia del principato, Torino, 1963.

A collection of papers, some previously published, treating of various aspects of Horace's relationship to the Augustan principate. Maintains that Horace's civic odes do not stem from the depths of his personal conviction.

Lejay, P., Les Satires d'Horace, Paris Hachette, 1911.

A monumental work with full commentary and introductions to individual satires.

MacKay, L. A., "Horace, Augustus and Ode, I,2," in American Journal of Philology, vol. 83 (1962) p.168-177.

Shows that this Ode is a warning to Augustus not on the danger of exacting vengeance and a recommendation of a policy of mercy and peace. Very useful in the interpretation of this important poem.

Maguinness, W.S.,"Friends and the Philosophy of Friendship in Horace," in Hermathena, vol. 51 (1938) p.29-43.
A thorough discussion of Horace's ideas on friendship and their relationship to the teachings of the philosophical schools of his day. Very helpful in arriving at a suitable definition of friendship.

Perret, J., Horace, translated by B. Humez, New York, New York University Press, 1964. vii+212p.
Shows the development of Horace's life and work very succinctly while both answering and raising many important questions. The copious annotated bibliography is very helpful and up-to-date.

Poeschl, Viktor, Horaz und die Politik, (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philol.-hist. Klasse, 1956. 4.), Heidelberg, Winter, 1956. 29p.
A thorough, valuable and sympathetic exposition of what can be said in explanation of or excuse for Horace's apparent insincerety in his praise of Augustus. Shows that Horace does not speak for himself but as a representative of popular feeling.

Reckford, K.J., "Horace and Maecenas," in Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, vol. 90 (1959) p.195-208.
Of some usefulness in clarifying the relationships between Horace, Maecenas and Augustus. Contains anbiographical sketch of Maecenas.

Postagni, A., "La Vita d'Orazio di Svetonio ne"suoi elementi e nelle sue fonti," in Atti della Accademia di Scienze di Torino, vol. 70(1934-35) p.14-49.
An excellent and very thorough commentary on Suetonius' Vita Horati, discussing most of the problems and the current literature on them. One of the most useful secondary sources on the subject of this study.

Salmon, E.T., "The Political Views of Horace," in Phoenix, vol. 1 (1946) p.7-14.
Cites passages in the works of Horace to show that he was reluctant to give his allegiance to the Princeps until the last years of his life.

Sellar, W.Y., The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets, Oxford, University Press, 1892. xlv +362p.
Presents very sound and penetrating evaluations and interpretations of Horace's writings and an excellent reconstruction of his life and character.

Senay, P., Horace, Propagandiste de la Réforme Augustéene, diss., Université d'Paris, catalogued in the Central Library, University of Ottawa,

Pages 51-57 of this dissertation ("L'Amitié, IV° Horace et Auguste") present the traditional view of the relationship, but also cite many relevant passages in the primary sources.

Solari, A., "Il tradizionalismo antimperiale di Orazio," in Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei, 8ª ser., vol. 5 (1950) p.139-142.

An examination of those passages wherein the poet expresses his repugnance for the new political and moral realities of the Principate.

Syme, Ronald, The Roman Revolution, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1939 (reprinted with corrections, 1955) xi+568p. (re-issued in paperback, Oxford University Press, 1960).

Deals primarily with Octavian's rise to power and the changes he initiated in Roman life, letters and politics. Syme, an outstanding historical scholar, treats of the use Augustus made of the writers of his day.

Velleius Paterculus, Velleius Paterculus and the Res Gestae Divi Augusti, translated by F.W. Shipley, London, Heinemann (Loeb Classical Library) 1955. xx+431p.

A pro-Augustan history of Rome and Augustus' own record of his accomplishments, both valuable source materials as long as one is mindful of their bias.

Wickham, E.C., ed., The Works of Horace, 2 vol.:

vol. 1, Odes, Carmen Seaculare, Epodes, 3rd. ed., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903. 383p.

vol. 2, Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896. xxxii+348p.

Old, but still one of the best English commentaries on all the works of Horace; very useful in the interpretation of many passages and in locating sources.

Table I.- References to Augustus by Name Arranged according to Occurance in the Works of Horace.

Title of Work	Form of Name Used										Total per Work
	Caesar	Caesaris	Caesarem	Caesar (voc.)	Caesare	Augustus	Augusti	Augusto	Auguste	Caesaris Augusti	
Satires I	1										1
Epodes		2	1		1						4 (2)[a]
Satires II	1	2			1						4 (2)[a]
Odes I	1	2	1	1	1						7 (6)[a]
II		1								1	2
III	1	1	1		1	2					6 (5)[a]
Epistles I		2			1		3	1			7 (5)[a]
II				1						1	2
Carm. Saec.											0
Odes IV			2	1	3		2		1		9 (5)[a]
Ars Poetica											0
Total per Form	4	10	5	3	9	2	5	1	1	2	42 (30)[a]

a Corrected for reduplication in the same poem.

Table I.- References to Augustus by Name Arranged according to Occurance in the Works of Horace.

Title of Work	Form of Name Used										Total per Work
	Caesar	Caesaris	Caesarem	Caesar (voc.)	Caesare	Augustus	Augusti	Augusto	Auguste	Caesaris Augusti	
Satires I	1										1
Epodes		2	1		1						4 (2)[a]
Satires II	1	2			1						4 (2)[a]
Odes I	1	2	1	1	2					1	7 (6)[a]
II		1									2
III	1	1	1		1	2					6 (5)[a]
Epistles I		2			1		3	1			7 (5)[a]
II				1						1	2
Carm. Saec.											0
Odes IV			2	1	3		2		1		9 (5)[a]
Ars Poetica											0
Total per Form	4	10	5	3	9	2	5	1	1	2	42 (30)[a]

a Corrected for reduplication in the same poem.

APPENDIX 2

ABSTRACT OF

Horace as a Friend of Augustus[1]

Horace and Augustus have been traditionally pictured as intimate friends at least in the last years of the poet's life. Although this concept has been questioned, no detailed study of the pertinent evidence has been made.

In this thesis the concept of friendship was made specific by using a list of qualities Horace was known to have valued in his friends. This formed the frame of reference for judging his relationship with Augustus.

The Vita Horati was examined for external evidence of the relationship. This revealed no reciprocation by Horace of Augustus' attempts to draw him into a closer relationship and the Emperor's dissatisfaction with the existing relationship.

Internal evidence from allusions in Horace's works indicated a merely political enthusiasm that grew as the poet saw the good Augustus was effecting for Rome. Nothing indicated an intimate personal relationship based upon qualities Horace admired.

Horace's attitude toward and praise for Augustus stemmed primarily from the poet's patriotism. Horace did not consider Augustus his personal friend at any time.

---

1 James G. Schovánek, master's thesis presented to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ottawa, Ontario, October, 1968, xiii+102p.