001701

# HORACE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ROMAN CIVIL WAR AND FOREIGN WAR

by Robert L. Frieman

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

ANNEXE DE LA BIBLIOTHÈQUE
Université d'Ottawa
BIBLIOTHÈQUES
LIBRARIES
University of Ottawa

© Robert L. Frieman, Ottawa, Canada, 1972

UMI Number: EC55726

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 EC55726
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 direction of S.M. Treggiari, M.A. (Oxon.), Associate Professor in the Department of Classical Studies, University of Ottawa. I wish to express my sincere thanks to Mrs. Treggiari for her guidance in the drafting of my thesis project and in the writing of the thesis itself; her patience, scholarly insight, and lene consilium have been indispensable. Professor C.M. Wells read and made valuable criticisms of each chapter in draft; in particular, the discussions (Chapter II, Sections 3-6) of Augustus' foreign policy and Horace's poetry concerning it owe much to his ideas and constructive criticism. Dr. Wells also kindly allowed me the use of proofs of his forthcoming book, The German Policy of Augustus.

Professors P. Brind'Amour, J.L. Harewood, and Lawrence Giangrande read and criticized the first chapter in draft and discussed its revision with me. Professor Brind'Amour generously lent me his doctoral dissertation and supplied me with valuable bibliographical information. Professor S. Krésic directed my systematic reading of the Horatian corpus, undertaken in preparation for the writing of this thesis. His guidance proved invaluable to me in making the difficult transition from military to academic life.

The text of Horace I have used is that established by F. Klingner (3rd Ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957). For stylistic

guidance I have followed in the main the MLA Style Sheet (2nd Ed. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1970). All translations from the Latin and from modern languages are my own, save where otherwise noted, as are all errors and omissions remaining in the text.

## CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Robert L. Frieman was born February 28, 1945, in New York, New York. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Latin from the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee, in 1967.

CONTENTS


| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| | INTRODUCTION ..... | ix |
| | PREFATORY NOTE TO CHAPTER I: CIVIL WAR DEFINED .. | xiii |
| I. | HORACE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ROMAN CIVIL WAR ..... | 1 |
| | 1. Horace's Early Attitude Toward Civil War | 1 |
| | 2. The Movement to Political Commitment: Horace's Search for a Solution to Civil Strife | 11 |
| | 3. Civil War and the Roman State: Octavian Enters Horace's Proposals for Ending Bellum Civile | 28 |
| | 4. Horace's Mature Outlook: Civil War in Retrospect | 44 |
| | Chapter I: Summary and Conclusions | 53 |
| II. | HORACE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ROMAN FOREIGN WAR ..... | 55 |
| | 1. The Traditional Distinction Between Civil and Foreign Wars; Traditional Approval of the Latter | 55 |
| | 2. The Augustan Writers on Foreign War and Foreign Policy | 62 |
| | 3. Augustus' Foreign Policy: Imperialism and Pragmatism | 67 |
| | 4. Horace on Augustus' Foreign Policy: The Earlier Poetry (to 20 B.C.) | 77 |
| | 5. Horace on Augustus' Foreign Policy: The Later Poetry (after 20 B.C.) | 82 |
| | 6. Augustus' Foreign Policy and Horace's Foreign-War Poetry: A Case of Parallel Development | 91 |
| | Chapter II: Summary and Conclusions | 94 |
| III. | HORACE'S PRIVATE IDEAL AND HIS POLITICAL VIEWS ... | 96 |
| | 1. Horace's Personal Preferences and Roman Politics: A Connection of Private and Public Worlds. The Later Evidence | 96 |
| | 2. Horace's Personal Preferences and Roman Politics: The Early Evidence | 102 |
| | 3. Horace's Private Ideal: Its Nature and Orientation | 109 |
| | 4. Horace's Private Ideal, his Political Views, and the Augustan Regime | 122 |
| | Chapter III. Summary and Conclusions | 133 |

THESIS SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS ..... 135

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 139

APPENDICES

1. HORACE'S LANGUAGE OF CIVIL WAR ..... 147
2. THE GENTES IN HORACE'S CIVIL- AND FOREIGN-WAR POETRY ..... 156
3. PAUPERIES HORATIANA ..... 167
4. ABSTRACT OF Horace's Attitude Toward Roman Civil and Roman Foreign War ..... 175

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NOTE: The abbreviations herein employed for current periodicals are those of L'Année Philologique. The full title is given for periodicals no longer published.

André, L'otium ..... J.-M. André, L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.

André, Recherches ..... J.-M. André, Recherches sur l'otium romain. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962.

CAH ..... The Cambridge Ancient History. Ed. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, and M.P. Charlesworth. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1934.

Ernout-Meillet ..... A. Ernout and E. Meillet. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots. 4th Ed. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959.

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

Kiessling-Heinze ..... A. Kiessling and R. Heinze. Horaz. Oden und Epoden. 7th Ed. 1930; rpt. Zürich: Weidmann, 1968. Satiren. 5th Ed. 1921; rpt. Zürich: Weidmann, 1968. Briefe. 4th Ed. 1914; rpt. Zürich: Weidmann, 1968.

L. & S. ..... C.T. Lewis and C. Short, Rev. and Ed. A Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951 (first published 1879).

La Penna, "La lirica civile".. A. La Penna. "La lirica civile di Orazio e l'ideologia del principato." Maia, 13 (1961), 83-123; 209-245; 257-283.

La Penna, Orazio ..... A. La Penna. Orazio e l'ideologia del principato. Torino: Einaudi, 1963.

Nisbet and Hubbard ..... R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard. A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

RE ..... Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung von G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, und K. Mittelhaus. Stuttgart: Metzlersche, 1894- .

ThLingLat ..... Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900- .

Wickham ..... E.C. Wickham, ed. and commentary. Horace. The Odes, Carmen Saeculare, and Epodes. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

G. Williams, Tradition ..... G. Williams. Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

G. Williams, Third Book ..... G. Williams, ed., trans, and comm. The Third Book of Horace's Odes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

# INTRODUCTION

One of Horace's noblest odes, III.2, proclaims the undying glory to be won in war (17-24). It is sweet and fitting to die for one's fatherland, he declares.[1] Death will overtake the coward anyway (14-16); one must seize the opportunity to die in a manner that will win him lasting fame. Yet this same poet also wrote--without any apparent embarrassment--that he himself had, as a young man, thrown down his shield and fled the field of battle at Philippi.[2] How can the same man have written both poems? His motivation in writing these odes must remain enigmatic, if the poems are read by themselves. It may have been true for Horace's readers that each ode was written and comprehensible in and of itself.[3] But the modern reader will often find single poems that appear puzzling, while any two or three poems selected at random will frequently present attitudes that are unrelated or even seem contradictory. The two odes cited above are an excellent illustration of this reality.

The solution that suggests itself is a systematic study of the entire Horatian corpus, with an eye to discovering what attitude or attitudes, if any, Horace has toward the problem

[1] 13, <u>dulce et decorum est pro patria mori</u>: ... .

[2] Odes II.7, 9-12.

[3] E. Fraenkel, <u>Horace</u> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), pp. 26, 208.

of Roman civil and foreign war. This approach has its pitfalls as well: even in such a comprehensive study, one is still confronted with the task of distinguishing the real Horace from his masks. Even in cases where pretense seems out of the question, Horace's complexity of character and eclectic approach to life confound attempts to isolate and define any one Horatian trait or idea.[4]

In addition, any attempt to study Horace's attitude(s) toward war is handicapped by the paucity and inadequacy of existing studies. Paul Jal's thorough study of Roman civil war[5] deals with Horace only in passing, as one thread in the fabric of civil war in the later Republic and early Principate. Sir Ronald Syme's chapter on the Augustan poets[6] is compromised by its basic assumption, that what these poets say about war is the result of official inspiration: that is, their outlook on war is not really their own. In similar fashion, other scholars have attributed Horace's views on bellum civile and bellum externum to pressure from Octavian or Maecenas or his

[4]Horace's "philosophy" or lack of one is the illustration par excellence of his complex intellect: is he a Stoic (the Roman Odes), an Epicurean (the convivial poetry), a late convert to traditional Roman polytheism (Odes I.34), or a philosophical eclectic (Epist. I.1)? Or is philosophy merely an intellectual and spiritual game whose rules he secretly delights in breaking?

[5]La guerre civile à Rome. Étude littéraire et morale (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963).

[6]The Roman Revolution (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), Chapter 30, "The Organisation of Opinion."

own feelings of personal indebtedness to them.[7] Studies of a biographical or semi-biographical nature abound,[8] but do not deal with Horace's attitude toward war in relation to his outlook on life in general. And while Horace's personal preferences have been analyzed in context with current and historical Roman ideals of private life,[9] war is not brought into the discussion of Horace's personal preferences.

Horace mentions civil and foreign war frequently, mostly in the odes and epodes, but does not often deal with war at length. However, there is sufficient evidence overall in Horace's work to warrant an attempt at analyzing his opinions on war. The questions to be asked and answered are these: first, does Horace display any recognizable attitudes(s) toward war at all? If so, does he have any consistent attitude toward civil war? If he does, what precisely is the nature of that outlook? Chapter I will deal with what Horace says about bellum civile and attempt to answer these questions. Chapter II will study those passages bearing on Roman foreign war

[7]Authorities cited in Chapter III, Section 4, pp. 126-127.

[8]The best recent biographical study of Horace's work is Walter Wili's Horaz und die augusteische Kultur (Basel: Schwabe, 1948).

[9]J.M. André, L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966).

and related topics, especially foreign policy. It will attempt to answer these related questions: does Horace have a uniform outlook on Roman foreign war and foreign policy? If so, what is its character? Chapters I and II taken together will provide a basis for determining whether Horace subscribes to any overall view of war.

Chapter III will take up the last and most important consideration: is(are) Horace's attitude(s) toward war related to any more comprehensive approach to life? This necessitates asking the question: does Horace have a set of personal preferences, a private ideal? If he does, what end do these principles serve? It may then be seen whether there exists any real rationale for Horace's approach to war. This is crucial to understanding Horace's motives for writing about war: are they his own or another's?

Three appendices, one related to each chapter, will deal with Horace's language of civil war (Appendix 1, to Chapter I), his use of the gentes' names in passages related to civil and foreign war (Appendix 2, to Chapter II), and several important economic aspects of his Sabine estate (Appendix 3, to Chapter III), as it affects his ideas and standards of *pauperies*.

## PREFATORY NOTE TO CHAPTER I

## CIVIL WAR DEFINED

### General Approach of Chapter I

For purposes of this thesis, civil war is defined as follows: any domestic disturbance, unrest, violence, or warfare, whether organized or spontaneous, the parties to which are Roman,[1] and that threatens to destroy the lives, property, and security either of individual Roman citizens or of the Roman nation and society.

It is undesirable to restrict the definition of civil war either to certain terms[2] or to a specific type or types of conflict.[3] Neither sort of restriction is valid, because Horace himself declines to so restrict or confine his statements on civil war. He reacts to bellum civile in whatever form it appears, and writes about it with emotional effect rather than literal accuracy as his object. Moreover, it is often unclear precisely what sort of civil strife Horace has in mind in any given poem. These considerations are immaterial

[1]"Roman" here means "of Roman citizenship," not necessarily "of Latin ancestry."

[2]E.g., bellum civile, which Horace uses only once (Epode 16,1) in all his work.

[3]As, conflicts between conventional armed forces under regular military command; this is the criterion for civil wars followed by Jal (La guerre civile, p. 7).

to the poet; what does matter to him is the threat to his way of life and his very existence posed by Roman civil strife. It is of secondary importance whether this threat arises from the struggle of rival duces and their armies, public lawlessness and violence, or personal greed and ambition. What is important in each instance is that Horace feels that his country's or his own safety is endangered. Therefore, a comprehensive approach to Horace's language and a receptiveness to all types and degrees of Roman civil strife is necessary for a full and accurate appreciation of what Horace says about it.

The thesis will accordingly take into consideration every passage in Horace's work that appears beyond a reasonable doubt to bear on civil war as defined above (p. xiii). One is prone in such a study as this to see what is sought where it is, in fact, nonexistent. It is hoped that the omission of passages of dubious civil-war content will help keep such inaccuracy to a minimum. Those poems that do appear to deal with bellum civile will be studied roughly in chronological order.[4]

[4]The assignment of an exact date to each and every poem studied is not only unnecessary but often highly subjective, and therefore undesirable for purposes of this thesis. In all three chapters, poems are grouped together for study by a combination of ideological considerations and approximate period of composition (cf., e.g., Epodes 16 and 7, Section 1 below with note 1).

# CHAPTER I

## HORACE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ROMAN CIVIL WAR

### 1. Horace's Early Attitude Toward Civil War.

Epodes 16 and 7 are the earliest evidence for Horace's attitude toward civil war.[1] Both poems are bitter and fatalistic throughout. Horace speaks as a political outsider, yet identifies his fate with that of all other Romans.[2] The entire nation is doomed to destruction by civil strife, and there is no way to exorcise this curse.[3] Rome will bring about her own downfall (Epode 16, 1-2, 9-14; 7, 9-10) through suicidal civil strife and her resulting weakness, which will allow her foreign enemies to take over without a struggle (16, 11-14; 7, 9-10). The hostile gentes cannot take the Empire by themselves (16, 3-8; 7, 9-10), and so are awaiting

[1]The dating of both epodes is still an open question; but their tone of despair and bitter withdrawal from politics suggests dating them between 42 and 37, Horace's return to Rome after Philippi and his entry into Maecenas' circle (the journey to Brundisium, Sat. I.5). Most scholars assign both poems to dates within these termini; e.g., E. Fraenkel (Horace, p. 53) suggests "the spring of 38 B.C. or somewhat later," but only as "a speculation." See the convenient tabulation of proposed dates in R.W. Carrubba, The Epodes of Horace: A Study in Poetic Arrangement (Paris: Mouton, 1969), p. 16.

[2]Horace uses the first person plural throughout most of the 16th Epode: perdemus (9), moramur (24), iuremus (25), petamus (36).

[3]The poet uses religious and legal terminology throughout the two epodes, to state or suggest that civil war is a god-sent curse on Rome, or a crime against her. Cf. Appendix 1, pp. 147-149.

Rome's own self-conquest. The Romans themselves will accomplish what a host of enemies, past and present, have been unable to (16, 2-10). Roman blood that might have been shed fruitfully, in conquest of the Britons, is instead spent in fratricidal strife (7, 3-10).

Horace's stark prediction of impending doom, in the sixteenth epode, is followed by a fictitious address to the Roman people in general, delivered in parliamentary language.[4] The address concludes with the passage of his motion, that the Roman nation abandon its cursed homeland and seek another (15-24). He emphasizes the finality of the break to be made by a series of adynata (25-34). We'll not be ashamed to turn back, when sunken stones arise;[5] or doves and kites, or tiger and deer, copulate; or goats take to sea. Let those of us who are man enough flee the Etruscan shores (35-40). Let us seek the arva beata, the Islands of the Blest, where happiness and abundance of all nature's gifts are ours for the taking (40 ff.). There, all things harmful are absent from nature (51-58), and warfare and trade unheard-of (59-62).[6] These are the

[4]The legal fiction of these lines is ably analyzed by Fraenkel, Horace, pp.42-47.

[5]An allusion to the Phocaeans' oath (cf. 17-18, Phocaeorum...exsecrata civitas), whereby they swore not to return to their old polis before the rising of a lump of iron sunk in the harbor (Herodotus I.165).

[6]This discussion is based on Klingner's arrangement of 51 ff.

regions Jupiter has set aside for the pii (63), who--under Horace's inspired leadership (66, vate me)--will obtain refuge from the present Iron Age (65-66).

After opening the epode on a note of harsh reality, Horace abruptly turns to a series of fictions: an imaginary assembly of Romans, a proposal to emigrate, and a description, in glowing colors, of the destination itself. The concluding lines make a move at returning to reality, with the allusion to the present age; but this passage is couched in mythical language, as the past and present are described in terms of the Ages of Man. A realistic opening introduces a surrealistic poem. Yet all the heterogeneous elements in the poem are intended to give emphasis to the initial idea, Horace's despair for the survival of the Roman state. Civil war is first roundly condemned; then, "...as a foil to all the shame and misery there appears in the distance, dream-like, the fairy-land where everything is peace and happiness."[7] Horace no more seriously considers fleeing Italy than he realistically depicts an actual legal body, in his address to the Romans. All that follows the initial condemnation of civil war serves to confirm the depth and sincerity of his anger and distress. The proposals are unreal, in strict factual terms; but emotionally they convey the same despair as Horace's realistic assessment of Rome's

[7]Fraenkel, p. 50, to whom I am indebted for the suggestion that 15ff. convey an emotional rather than a factual message.

impending destruction by civil war. His despair at Rome's condition reflects and amplifies itself in the fantastic proposals to emigrate and seek the happy isles. For his gloomy pessimism is as real and full of unhappiness as the arva beata are unreal and blissful. A prisoner in Rome's disastrous present, he can only express his indignation fully in terms of the fantastic and impossible.

If Horace had Vergil's 4th Eclogue before him, when he wrote this epode,[8] he played variations on more than its language. The older poet's work earnestly foretells the coming of an ultima aetas (4 ff.), a final, golden age following upon the withering away of all traces of civil war.[9] Whatever the

[8]So Fraenkel, p. 51, following B. Snell, "Die 16. Epode von Horaz und Vergils 4. Ekloge," H, 73 (1938), 237-242, who stresses Horace's use of Vergil for the adynata and the arva beata passage. The priority of eclogue or epode is still an open question, on which much has been written. Recent proponents of the eclogue's priority are W. Wimmel, "Vergils Eklogen und die Vorbilder der 16. Epode des Horaz," H, 89 (1961), 208-226; K. Barwick, "Zur Interpretation und Chronologie der 4. Ekloge des Vergil und der 16. und 7. Epode des Horaz," Ph, 87 (1943), 28-67; A. Kurfess, "Vergils 4. Ekloge und Horazens 16. Epode," PhW, 55 (1935), 331-336, and "Horazens 16. Epode und Vergils 4. Ekloge," PhW, 59 (1939), 701-702, the latter expressly corroborating Snell. H. Drexler, "Zum 16. Epode und 4. Ekloge," Maia, 16 (1964), 176-203 and G.E. Duckworth, "Animae dimidium meae," TAPhA, 87 (1956), 281-316 are among recent proponents of the epode's priority. Snell (op. cit., 241) rightly argues that Horace, as the younger poet by five years and without reputation, is far more likely to have imitated Vergil than Vergil Horace.

[9]This seems to be the sense of sceleris vestigia nostri (13). For Horace's use of scelus: bellum civile, cf. Appendix 1, pp. 148-149.

circumstances of its composition,[10] Vergil's poem is as optimistic as Horace's is pessimistic. The former looks to an era of peace and concord; the latter, to the end of the Roman people. In both poems, the presence or absence of civil war is the determining factor. Horace's use of Vergil's language has been thoroughly studied.[11] But his employment of the eclogue involves more than a mere borrowing of words and images. By solemnly reproducing Vergil's version of the golden age, Horace deliberately establishes an ironic contrast between the past hopefulness of the 4th Eclogue and the present despair that is the subject of his own poem. His message is this: all hopes of peace are forlorn, as civil war is not only still with us but actually threatens to make an end of us all. Horace's poem gains relevance and emotional force from this detailed reminiscence of Vergil, in a changed poetic and political

[10]Perhaps the Pact of Brundisium (40), reconciling Octavian and Antony (R. Syme, The Roman Revolution, p. 217 ff.). Syme believes (p. 219, following W.W. Tarn, "Alexander Helios and the Golden Age," JRS, 22 (1932), 135-160), that the eclogue was written expressly for the marriage of Octavia and Mark Antony, which sealed the pact between the Triumvirs and promised peace to the Roman world. If this is the case, and if the epode follows the eclogue, then it must refer to a renewal of hostilities after Brundisium, probably the Bellum Siculum. But this is uncertain.

[11]Cf. especially Snell, op. cit., 238-240.

context.[12] Far from being any golden age, this is the *impia aetas* of cursed blood, destined for destruction.[13] As for the *arva beata*, Jupiter has set them aside for a *pia gens*,[14] a reverent and dutiful people. We, however, are an *impia aetas* (9), an *exsecrata civitas* (36). There is no hope for Rome and her people as long as they continue in their sacrilegious and unpatriotic ways, the pursuit of civil war.

In Epode 7 too, Horace castigates a fictitious audience of Romans (perhaps citizens, perhaps the participants themselves) for committing the crime of civil war. While the

[12]Horace seems to signal this intention by beginning his epode with a verse parodying line 4 of the eclogue (that poem's actual beginning, after the proem of 1-3):

Vergil: *Ultima* Cumaei venit iam carminis *aetas*.

Horace: *Altera* iam teritur bellis civilibus *aetas*.

Duckworth (op. cit., 288-290) notes the resemblance but believes (in line with his article's thesis) that Horace wrote first and that Vergil is parodying him, to the opposite effect: to advise his friend that Roman civil wars are now ended forever.

[13]Perhaps line 9 is also a variation on Vergil's verse: *Inpia* perdemus devoti sanguinis *aetas*, to reinforce the effect of the parody in line 1. The scansion of this line and Vergil's is identical.

[14]Perhaps *pia gens* has overtones of freedom from greed as well. Prof. Pierre Brind'Amour has suggested to me that *pius*=*purus* 'free from greed' in Horace, and that his *pii* here (66) are those citizens who, not being greedy, do not contribute to civil wars by striving for wealth or honors. Horace does in fact refer to civil strife as *inpiae caedes*, in a later poem (Odes III.24, 25-26) that explicitly blames materialism and the acquisitive ethic for moral degeneracy and civil war. Cf. below, pp. 20-22.

Roman nation of Epode 16 is condemned as cursed and impious, here the scelus 'crime' of civil strife makes those addressed scelesti 'criminals.' Where are you criminals rushing off to? Why have you drawn your swords? he harshly interrogates them (1-2). Has not enough Roman blood already been shed in vain? (3-4) What you are accomplishing by this fratricide is not Rome's expansion, but her self-destruction, precisely what the Parthians are praying for (5-10). Not even wild beasts kill their own kind (11-12); how much wilder and more bestial, then, are you! Horace demands an answer (13-14), but obtains none (15-16); the silence of the accused points to their guilt. As he began Epode 16 pessimistically, so he concludes fatalistically here. So it is fated (17, sic est): Rome's savage destiny incites her sons, as does the crime of a brother's murder (18, scelusque fraternae necis). As Romulus slew his innocent brother, whose blood laid a curse on his descendants (20, sacer nepotibus cruor),[15] the scelesti of the present age methodically repeat the fratricidal act, magnified into civil

[15]The idea of Roman civil war as a hereditary curse, beginning with Romulus' murder of Remus, originated "not long before the middle of the 1st century B.C.," perhaps due to the influence of Timagenes, a Greek historian, who arrived in Rome in 55 B.C. (H. Wagenvoort, "The crime of fratricide (Horace Epod. VII, 18). The figure of Romulus-Quirinus in the political struggle of the 1st Century B.C.," in his Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion (Leiden: Brill, 1956), pp. 169-183 (175, 176, and 174 referred to)).

strife.[16]

Although Roman civil war is viewed implicitly as the work of the gods,[17] it is explicitly the doing of Romans who stoop to killing one another, scelesti. Rome is saddled with the divine curse of civil war, in both epodes.[18] Yet it is the Romans themselves who are the human instruments of this godly ill will: Rome is going to ruin by her own strength (16, 2), killing herself by her own hand (7, 10).[19] The result of this military suicide will be the victory-by-default of foreign foes (16, 11-14 explicitly; 7, 9-10 implicitly). Rome might better conquer these gentes, fight productive foreign wars (7, 5-8); instead, she chooses to do the Parthians' work for them (7, 9-10). These epodes (especially 7)

[16]R.W. Carrubba ("The curse on the Romans," TAPhA, 97 (1966), 29-34) sees lines 13-14 as explicable in terms of 17-20. Furor, vis acrior, and culpa "represent a scheme," he believes, in that they are "the successive stages in reverse order in the bringing about of this civil war" (33). Culpa is Romulus' willful crime which--through vis acrior, the divine element--brings about furor caecus, "a periodic blind insanity manifested in civil war" (ibid.).

[17]Cf. P. Jal, "Les dieux et les guerres civiles dans la Rome de la fin de la République," REL, 40 (1962), 170-200.

[18]See Appendix 1, pp. 147-148 for this "curse" terminology in Horace.

[19]The theme of Roman national suicide through civil war is studied by E. Dutoit in his article, "Le thème de 'la force qui se détruit elle-même' (Horace, Epode 16, 2) et ses variations chez quelques auteurs latins," REL, 14 (1936), 365-373, who compares parallel passages in Propertius (II.15, 41 ff. and III.13, 60).

show that Horace links the gratuitous carnage of civil war with inattention to the border situation. This neglect of the frontiers gives the gentes opportunity to gain effortlessly what would otherwise not be theirs.[20] Even at this early date, the poet has formulated the alternatives for Rome: civil war and conquest by barbari or foreign war and conquest of them. But the foreign war-and-conquest option is treated (7, 3-10) as a lost opportunity, just as Horace is a vates without a redeeming vision (16, 66). In view of his own political impotence, and of the situation's impossibility of solution, he is at a loss for an answer to the problem of Roman civil strife. As fearful, angry, and desperate as he is now, he is helpless without a program or party. Nor would these avail him, for they are now but clever subterfuges and political camouflage and weaponry for one or the other faction, vying

[20]Epode 16 is written against the background of Parthia's startling victories in Asia Minor, in 40 B.C., and Horace's fears of barbarian conquest are to be viewed in this light: cf. H. Janne, "L'épode xvi and l'histoire du second triumvirat," Etudes Horatiennes: Recueil publié en honneur du bimillénaire d'Horace (Bruxelles: Editions de la Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles and Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1937), 119-137. Nor was Horace alone among his contemporaries in fearing the gentes, as Jal demonstrates ("Le rôle des Barbares dans les guerres civiles de Rome, de Sylla à Vespasien," Latomus, 21 (1962), 8-48). Jal concludes that the threat posed by barbari in time of civil war was exaggerated, but real nonetheless (44-45).

in destructive civil war.[21]

Still, Horace is involved with Rome, even if only emotionally. He cannot bring himself to close his eyes to her self-destruction, or to leave the unfortunate country. His concern, thwarted by political frustration, produces the bitterness and pessimism of these early epodes. Yet his interest is abiding; and it will later bear fruit in his cautious return to political commitment, an awakening dedication of which Odes I.14 is the first indication.

[21]Neither Octavian nor his rivals had what could be termed a political party or policies, in the modern sense of these terms. That is, there was no ideological content to his partes' (or Antony's, or Sextus Pompey's) proposals and actions; cf. P. Grimal, "Poésie et 'propagande' au temps d'Auguste," Cahiers d'histoire mondiale, 8 (1964), 57. The propaganda warfare between Octavian and Mark Antony was--until after Actium--purely personal in nature (Frère Léon-Marcien,"L'interprétation de la Bataille d'Actium par les poètes latins de l'époque augustéenne," LEC, 24 (1956), 331 ff.).

## 2. The Movement to Political Commitment: Horace's Search for a Solution to Civil Strife.

The first evidence of a move toward political reinvolvement on Horace's part is Odes I.14. While the ode cannot be dated precisely, most commentators place it either between the Bellum Siculum and Actium (i.e., 36-31 B.C.) or sometime during the early years of Octavian's supremacy (30-27 B.C.).[1] There is no internal evidence available to indicate clearly either the person or institution (or vessel) Horace makes the ship represent, or the stage of his political development to which the poem belongs. It is generally agreed[2] that the ode is

[1]Authorities detailed in note 2. Those who see the poem as allegorical usually point to the last 4 verses (17-20) as proof of the impossibility of any non-allegorical interpretation. Representative of this group are R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard (A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), who note (p. 179), "...Horace could not possibly say to a real ship 'nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium'"; and Fraenkel, p. 154, who observes that "...the beginning of the last stanza [quotes 17-18]...is sufficient to show the impossibility of any non-allegorical interpretation."

[2]Fraenkel, p. 154; Nisbet and Hubbard, op. cit., p. 179; S. Commager, The Odes of Horace: A critical study (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), p. 164; Kiessling-Heinze, pp. 71-72; A. La Penna, Orazio e l'ideologia del principato (Torino: Einaudi, 1963), p. 88, n. 2; G. Pasquali, Orazio lirico: studi (1920: repr. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1964, with additional notes by A. La Penna), p. 16 ff.; W. Wili, Horaz und die augusteische Kultur, p. 119; H. Hommel, Horaz, der Mensch und das Werk (Heidelberg: Kerle, 1951), p. 63; J. Perret, Horace (transl. B. Humez; New York: New York University Press, 1964 (first published Paris: Hatier, 1959)), p. 84; V. Pöschl, Horaz und die Politik (2nd Ed.; Heidelberg: Winter, 1963), p. 6; S. Pilch, "Horatii c.I.14 quomodo sit interpretandum," Eos, 32(1929) 449-472, among others. There exists an undercurrent of opposition either to any sort of allegorical interpretation whatsoever (thus L. Herrmann, "L'Ode I.14 d'Horace est-elle allégorique?" RCL 8(1936), 40-44; R.

allegorical. Moreover, the great majority of scholars understand O navis referent as a political allegory, the ship representing the Roman state. These scholars generally accept an early date for Epodes 16 and 7, and a post-Actian date for the partisan political poetry (cf. below, p. 28). As a consequence, those who view the ode as a ship-of-state allegory lean to a dating between 36 and 31.[3] This places Horace's renascent concern with national politics between his earlier, complete withdrawal (Epodes 16, 7) and his later advocacy of Octavian (first seen in Epode 9, 31 B.C.).

It would be otiose to attempt here any exegesis of the allegory itself (1-16); this has been ably analyzed for structure, language, and sources.[4] Lines 17-18, however, deserve comment in connection with this study. If the poem is of the type

---

Kukula, "Quintilians Interpretation von Horaz' Carm.I.14," WS, 34 (1912), 237-245; E. Ensor, "On the allusions in Odes I.14," CR, 17 (1903), 158-159, are representative); or to the ode's explanation as a political allegory (notably C.W. Mendell, "Horace I.14," CPh, 33 (1938), 145-156, who sees a Ship of Life, and W.S. Anderson, "Horace Carm. I.14. What kind of ship?" CPh, 61 (1966), 84-98, who regards the vessel as the Ship of Love, and specifically "...a girl about to embark on a new love affair" (95). Anderson's argument is supported by A.W.J. Holleman, "Notes on Ovid, Amores I.3, Horace, Carm. I.14, and Propertius II.26," CPh, 65 (1970), 177-180).

[3]Critics cited for Ship of State exegesis, note 2, save for La Penna (loc. cit.), who assigns the poem to 27.

[4]The discussions by Fraenkel, Nisbet and Hubbard, Kiessling-Heinze, and Pilch (passages cited, note 2) are especially valuable. The best and fullest modern discussion of the Alcaean poems on which Horace draws for his own, is found in D. Page, Sappho and Alcaeus (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 179 ff.

(political allegory) and period (36-31) surmised, verse 17 probably alludes to the period of Horace's life marked by Epodes 16 and 7, with nuper perhaps a glance at the struggle between Octavian and Sextus Pompey (the Bellum Siculum, 38-36 B.C.). The next verse's strongly contrasting nunc desiderium curaque non levis mark the poet's changed outlook. That state he would have nothing to do with a few years before, that was then only a troublesome burden (17, sollicitum taedium), is now the object of his desire (18, desiderium) and therefore a source of serious concern to him (18, curaque non levis).[5] His earlier fatalism and despair have yielded to a hopeful anxiety. Horace now believes that the Ship of State can survive after all, battered as she is.[6]

[5]Fraenkel (pp. 157-158) notes the love-language here; the Ship of State is also personified, as a woman, Horace's beloved.

[6]The placing of I.15 after I.14 may be significant in this connection. If Odes I.15 is meant to suggest Antony and Cleopatra (through the parallelism Paris:Helen = Antony:Cleopatra; cf. Odes III.3, 18 ff.), perhaps Horace is saying that the former danger to Rome from civil war (I.14) was removed by Octavian's victory in the War of Actium (I.15). The confidence (through the prophecy) of Pastor cum traheret then answers the fearful anxiety of the preceding poem. But the allegorical intent of I.15 is disputed. (I owe this note to a suggestion of Prof. Pierre Brind'Amour).

Epode 9 is the earliest evidence for Horace's partisan political commitment.[7] His hopes of rejoicing at Octavian's victory (2, victore laetus Caesare), and extravagant praise of his future triumph (21-26), joined with anxiety over his safety (37-38) establish beyond doubt that he is politically committed to Caesar's heir. As a consequence of this new commitment, Horace follows in part[8] Octavian's propaganda against Cleopatra and Sextus Pompey (7-16). The change in his attitude from that of Odes I.14 and especially Epodes 16 and 7 is striking. No longer are all the combatants lumped together as scelesti, and impartially attacked as a group. Now, Horace's care and longing extend not only to the Roman state but to Octavian's drive to gain control of it.

[7]It may be objected that 1-6 refer equally to Octavian's victory at Actium and his conquest, with Agrippa, of Sextus Pompey, at Naulochus (36 B.C.): ut nuper (7) thus indicates that Horace was as enthusiastic about Octavian then as he is now, and therefore was his political partisan as early as 36. This objection can neither be sustained nor refuted. Indubitably, Horace is glad Octavian's opponent was defeated. He seems to follow the "pirates and slaves" line against Pompey (Epode 4, 19). But these words need mean only that he felt relief at the demise of sinister forces threatening Rome. Octavian is merely the man who disposed of this menace. More important: did Horace really feel victore laetus Caesare (2), elated at Caesar's victory in 36, or does he express this sentiment only now, five years after the fact? Is his memory of the Bellum Siculum in fact colored by his present outlook on Actium? Whatever Horace really felt and believed in 36, 31 is the first time he says anything about it. It is sounder scholarship to date Horace's partisanship from what he now says and feels, rather than from what he claims were his convictions five years before.

[8]See below, p. 15.

This epode represents Horace's maiden effort in a totally new endeavor, partisan political poetry, and as a result displays less than perfection. True, he subscribes to Octavian's position that Actium is a battle in a foreign war, waged against a foreign foe, Cleopatra (the femina of 12).[9] He looks for a triumph to celebrate her demise; triumphs are awarded only for victories won by bellum externum. The degeneracy of Cleopatra's entourage is attacked (11-16), as is the utter depravity of the slave-monger, Sextus Pompey (7-10). Yet Horace's honesty conflicts with his partisanship. There are Romans fighting for the other side, he admits (11), although he hastens to qualify their manliness (11-16); and Antony does figure in the battle (27 ff.: hostis, 27; ille, 29), although he is called a foe. In effect, Horace admits to the existence of the conditions of bellum civile, with Romans fighting on both sides, against one another. At the same time, he tries his best to follow Octavian's foreign-war version of the conflict.

This ambiguity born of inexperience is done away with in the epode's sister-poem, Odes I.37. As a partisan poem,

[9]Octavian thus sought to divert the stigma of civil war from his struggle with Antony, for "Ainsi présentée, la bataille de septembre 31 était moins une lutte fratricide que le triomphe sur la menace alexandrine et orientale" (Léon-Marcien, LEC, 24 (1956), 347). This was the tack pursued by Octavian's propaganda during the years before Actium, as well as during the war itself; cf. K. Scott, "The Political Propaganda of 44-30 B.C.," MAAR, 11 (1933), 7-50, especially 41 ff.

with a political point to make, the ode is far superior. Horace adheres unswervingly to Octavian's "line" in observing Antony's damnatio memoriae[10] and concentrating exclusively on Cleopatra as the sole foreign enemy.[11] She has now become a fatale monstrum (21), although she is still accompanied by the same unsavory crew as in the epode: the "diseased herd of shameful 'men'" (9-10) answers to the eunuchs of the earlier poem. But Cleopatra is now attacked from a political angle as well:[12] she is the Oriental Peril, the drunken,[13] demented queen whose chosen task was the destruction of Rome.[14] The personal attacks upon her have the aim merely of making the Antonian camp disgusting and foreign, therefore un-Roman. This sort of invective attempts only to turn the reader away from her. In the ode,

[10]F. Vittinghoff (Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit, Untersuchungen zur Damnatio Memoriae (Berlin: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1936), p. 27) assigns Antony's damnatio to 30; C.L. Babcock ("Dio and Plutarch on the damnatio of Antony," CPh, 57 (1962), 30-31) opts for Dio's assignment of the event to 31. Léon-Marcien (op. cit., 337-338) is undecided between 31 and 30.

[11]Nisbet and Hubbard, p. 407 (on Odes I.37): "By a brilliant manoeuvre, which had some precedents in Roman history [not given], Antony was not treated as a principal; he was simply deemed to have adhered to the nation's enemies (Dio 50. 6.1 )."

[12]Léon-Marcien, 331; parallel, political treatment of Actium post eventum, in the other Augustans, 332-333.

[13]Scott (MAAR, 11 (1933), 46) sees an attack on Antony (who cannot be named) through Cleopatra (who can); the former's drunkenness was a prime target of Octavian's propaganda.

[14]6-8: ...Capitolio/regina dementis ruinas/funus et imperio parabat.

she is also made out to be a threat to Rome's very survival. This depiction has the object of rallying public opinion against her and for Octavian.[15] The reader is led to believe that, at Actium, Caesar's heir stood not only for the better sort of Romans but for the continued existence of the City and Empire. A patriotic Italian's only choice is to support Octavian.

Horace's commitment to Octavian is clear and unequivocal, in both poems. The immediate reason for this adherence is not hard to find: Caesar's successor, who had his political base in Italy, seemed far better qualified to direct Rome's destiny than Antony, whose power lay in the Hellenistic East and who was personally influenced strongly by Cleopatra.

[15]Critics often assume that Horace's new friendship with Maecenas, beginning sometime before 37, necessarily indicates a new political allegiance to Octavian as well. This cannot be established. It requires the unwarranted assumption that personal friendship with the patron equates to personal friendship with the party leader (Octavian), and that this in turn demands acceptance of his politics. Certainly, Horace and Maecenas became and remained fast friends. But Horace and Octavian never moved beyond a mutual admiration to real personal allegiance. Moreover, even the warm friendship with Maecenas did not require Horace's strict adherence to his political ideas (Epist. I.7; cf. Ch. III, pp. 117-119). Finally, Octavian does not figure in Horace's political poetry until 31, and then only as a military leader, as the champion of Italy and Roman values. La Penna is right to assert that "l'entrata nel circolo di Mecenate non significò per Orazio il passaggio al servizio della propaganda in favore di Ottaviano" ("La lirica civile di Orazio e l'ideologia del principato," Maia, 13 (1961), 106-107). And the view may be justified that it "would not be wide of the mark to describe Horace's attitude to Octavian in the thirties B.C. as one of cool detachment" (E.T. Salmon, "The political views of Horace," Phoenix, 1 (1946), 7-14 (9 quoted)). Whatever Octavian's policies in the 30's, before Actium (other than his own supremacy), Horace passes over them in silence.

Horace was thoroughly Italian in sentiment, and his choice of Octavian cannot have caused him any great difficulty. The victory of one of the Triumvirs offered the best prospect for an end to civil strife; the winner would have no remaining competition, and thus there would be no more civil wars. Accordingly, Horace was willing to back the Italian contender in a civil war he hoped would end all civil wars. He hesitates, however, to carry his support any further. Neither the poet nor Octavian is quite sure what to do, once the civil wars are over. The other early odes[16] reflect this uncertainty, as Horace gropes for an answer to the dilemma of civil strife. Octavian may be supreme at the moment, but this is no assurance that rivals will not emerge to challenge him, and that the blood-letting will not break out again, in the near future. Horace is concerned with finding a lasting solution to the problem of civil war. Any such solution, he realizes, must get at the roots, the causes of the phenomenon. This is in fact Horace's main concern, in the years between Actium and the Roman Odes. He feels he must define the causes of civil strife and attempt to formulate an answer or answers to it.

In Odes II.1, Horace's thinking on civil war is at about the same stage as in Epode 7. He is still as alarmed about civil strife now as he was then, but he also has no more

[16]Odes II.1, III.24, III.6. All are generally assigned to the first few years after Actium, although any more precise dating is a matter of conjecture.

idea of how to eliminate it. Indeed, he attacks the problem in about the same way, by a series of anguished questions (29-36). Bloodshed in bellum civile is attacked, rather than those who participate in it. The closest he comes to reproaching the combatants is in the words inpia proelia (30) 'impious/treasonous battles,' and in his implication that the Parthians are waiting in the wings to take advantage of them.[17] Here, the scope of the slaughter is emphasized.[18]

There is perhaps a hint (4-5) that this deplorable situation might be otherwise. Horace gives one subject of Pollio's history of civil war as arma/nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus, arms smeared with not-yet-expiated gore. In this context,[19] the arma can only be those wielded in Roman civil war; they have been used by Romans against one another. "Not-yet-expiated" picks up the thought expressed in Epode 7 (above, p. 8), that Romans might better fight barbarians than one another.[20] Nondum expiatis...cruoribus suggests that the

[17] 31-32: ...auditumque Medis/Hesperiae sonitum ruinae? reminiscent of Epode 7, 9-10 (above, p. 8).

[18] The inpia proelia take place on land (30, campus; 36, ora), rivers (33, flumina), and seas (33, gurges; 34, mare), that is, throughout the world (Kiessling-Heinze ad loc.).

[19] Both the opening lines and the poem as a whole have as their theme Pollio's history of Roman civil war in the late Republic (from 60 B.C., ex Metello consule (1)).

[20] "Ungere...drückt hier aus, dass das Blut noch an den Waffen klebt; sie sind dadurch inpia geworden, weil es Bürgerblut ist, und mussen erst durch das Blut der Landesfeinde entsühnt werden" (Kiessling-Heinze ad loc. (my italics)). A

weapons are polluted by a crime.[21] Again, the context makes it clear that the crime is civil strife. Foreign wars, Horace suggests, must be fought to atone for civil wars. In this ode, he speaks with the horror of years of recent bella civilia still fresh in his mind. Even so, he does no more than refer obscurely to a possible way out of civil strife. The causes of it (said to be a theme of Pollio's work, 2) are only hinted at; no clear solution is provided. Horace is still at a loss to solve the problem. This remains to be done in the other invectives against civil war.

The first real effort at understanding the causes and cures of civil strife is found in Odes III.24. While civil strife is not linked with foreign wars at all, several other important elements in Horace's later thinking are here brought together for the first time. Most noteworthy is Horace's attribution of civil strife to licentia (29), which seems here

---

parallel passage from Tacitus' Annals (I.49, cited by K.-H. ad. loc.) tells how Roman troops burned to engage the enemy, to atone for their killing one another: Truces etiam tum (upon Germanicus' arrival) animos cupido involat eundi in hostem, piaculum furoris; nec aliter posse placari commilitonum manes, quam si pectoribus impiis honesta vulnera accepissent. These honesta vulnera are "the wounds of honourable battle, contrasted with 'impiis,' polluted by civil war" (H. Furneaux, ed. and comm., The Annals of Tacitus (2nd Ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), Vol. I., ad loc.).

[21]So the participants in civil war are scelesti (Epode 7, 1), and their crime the scelus fraternae necis (ibid., 18).

to mean both greed and the moral turpitude it engenders. He makes the validity of moral legislation dependent on sound morality, and morality on the absence of avarice (33 ff.).[22] Lack of substantial means,[23] of wealth, is a source of shame (magnum pauperies opprobrium, 42). This imagined deprivation drives one to perpetrate, and submit to, every sort of shameful act (42-44), so strong are the sense of shame and vulnerability to reproach that attach to lack of wealth. The only real solution, if we are truly sorry for our crimes,[24] is to get rid of corrupting wealth altogether, give it to the gods or throw it into the sea (45-50). "Useless gold" (48, aurum inutile) is made the root of all evil in Roman society (49, summi materiem mali).

What is remarkable about Horace's treatment of civil war in this poem is its ethical and economic bias. Not only

[22]"The implication of putting together the concepts of abolishing civil war and passing moral reform is that they are mutually interdependent" (G. Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 606, hereafter cited as Tradition).

[23]This is the sense of pauperies here; cf. Appendix 3, p. 167 , and P. Brind'Amour, La Richesse et la Pauvreté chez Plaute et Térence (Diss. Strasbourg 1968), p. 59. Horace uses the term here to indicate that the money ethic of contemporary society has made possession of a mere modest competence unfashionable (wherefore the appositive magnum opprobrium).

[24]50, scelerum si bene paenitet;the scelera here seem to be both greed and the immorality it produces, including civil strife.

the causes of bellum civile[25] but the potential ways of eliminating it are ethical and economic. His proposal of solutions to the dilemma is equally conspicuous; this is the first poem in which Horace really attempts to deal with and solve the problem of civil strife. Previously, he had merely deplored it, and only hinted at solutions. Now, he demands action: wealth is to be forsworn (45-50), and Roman youth trained in "sterner pursuits," while the "elements of depraved desire" (i.e., for riches) are to be rooted out.[26] He calls for a man of character[27] to undertake the task of bridling "unmastered lawlessness" (25-29), in order to end civil war (25-26). This summons to action, and call for a leader to implement it, mark an advance in Horace's outlook equally as much as his new ethico-economic vantage point. Serious, concrete proposals for ending civil strife, even in generalized form, are nowhere to be found in his earlier poems. His thinking

[25]For greed as a cause of civil war, see Jal, Guerre civile, pp. 384-389. All the causes attributed to bellum civile are basically variations of the moral outlook on its origins (Jal, pp. 380-381). These are (besides the moral) political (p. 364 ff.), social, and economic (p. 366 ff.). Jal divides the moral cause into personal ambition, greed, and luxury (p. 377 ff.).

[26]51-54: eradenda cupidinis/pravi sunt elementa et tenerae nimis/mentes asperioribus/formandae studiis.

[27]Perhaps Octavian (so Fraenkel, p. 242), but this is not certain. If Horace does have him in mind, it is remarkable that he does not name him (as he does in the earlier Epode 9 and Odes I.37).

on civil war has advanced perceptibly, and will continue to do so. He is now ready to integrate his new approach to bellum civile with his earlier military outlook on it, to produce more complete and intelligent assessments of the problems it poses. His search for a solution to Roman civil war will become more sophisticated, commensurate with his increasing awareness of the complexity and deeply-rooted origins of the problem.

Horace's ethical analysis of civil war is integrated with his military outlook in Odes III.6. He may have the economic argument in mind as well;[28] if so, it is ancillary to his moral attack on the causes of bellum civile. The prevailing tone of the ode is admonitory.[29] While the Roman race may still rule (5), they owe this rule to the gods, that is, to morality, of which piety is a part. If Rome does not observe traditional religion, and with it traditional morality,

[28]The debauched wife (25 ff.) represents sexual immorality; and Horace may have made her lovers a salesman and ship's captain out of a desire to show how greed (economic depravity) and promiscuity (moral depravity) dovetail and work together toward the same end: civil strife and the incompetence of Roman arms against the gentes.

[29]Cf., e.g., Fraenkel, p. 288; Wili, Horaz, pp. 201-202, 209-210; Kiessling-Heinze, Introduction to III.6; L. Amundsen, "The Roman Odes of Horace," Serta Eitremiana (SO Supplement XI; Oslo: Brögger, 1943), 1-24, especially 23; R. Heinze, "Der Zyklus der Römeroden," in his Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze (3rd Ed., Stuttgart: Teubner, 1960), 190-204; G. Williams, The Third Book of Horace's Odes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 62-66. Heinze sees pietas as the theme of the Roman Odes overall, as well as of III.6.

she will suffer, as in the past.[30] To illustrate the unfortunate recent years, Horace points to the setbacks suffered by Roman arms at the Parthians' hands (9-12). Nor is lack of success in foreign war all the ill that has befallen the nation. For the gentes[31] have taken advantage of Roman civil war (13, seditionibus) to attack and nearly destroy the nation (13-16).[32]

These misfortunes are all due to moral degeneracy, the central thought of the ode (17-20) and the essence of everything else Horace says about the dangers--of moral, religious, and military nature--threatening Rome. Generations rich in defect[33]

[30] 7-8: di multa neglecti dederunt/Hesperiae mala luctuosae. Jal ("Les dieux et les guerres civiles dans la Rome de la fin de la République," REL, 40 (1962), 173) understands delicta maiorum (1) to mean bellum civile. If this is so, the mala given by the neglected gods will be those resulting from civil war, including Rome's resulting weakness vis-à-vis the gentes.

[31] Represented here by the Dacians and Egyptians (14, Dacus et Aethiops); the latter (termed classe formidatus, 15) represent Cleopatra's ships in the War of Actium, treated again (as in Odes I.37) as a foreign conflict (Kiessling-Heinze and Wickham ad loc.; Williams, Third Book, p. 63).

[32] Hyperbole; but the thought civil war = conquest by barbari occurs again, one-half of what may now be called a formula (cf. Epode 7, 3-10; Odes II.1, 31-32; and see above, pp.8-9).

[33] 17, Fecunda culpae saecula. Culpa denotes a state or condition of fault or failure, moral or otherwise, as opposed to a specific immoral act (delictum, scelus) (Ernout-Meillet s.v. culpa). Its legal sense is about that of "criminal negligence" in modern jurisprudence; cf. R. Leonhard in RE IV.2, columns 1748-1752. For saecula="generations" of men, see Kiessling-Heinze ad loc. and Williams, Third Book, p. 63. Wickham (ad loc.) remarks that "it has been a gradual declension from age to age."

have polluted (inquinavere) both the Roman family and race (et genus et domos). From this fountainhead, disaster has flowed out over fatherland and people.[34] Clades, with its overtones of military defeat, quite clearly refers to debacles such as those Horace has chosen to illustrate his argument above (9-16). Culpa[35] is the first link in a chain of causation that has corrupted institutions at the heart of Rome's strength as a nation: marriage (nuptias), the family unit (domos), and consequently the Roman race itself (genus). This decline of the Roman stock is in turn to blame for both Roman civil war and lack of success against foreign foes. These last are the factors that have threatened Rome's very existence.

The stress laid on family morality as the keystone of Rome's power is unmistakeable. Horace reinforces his point in the second half of the ode (21 ff.). Degenerate parents beget children who fight one another and cannot conquer Rome's foreign enemies. Conversely, morally upright parents produce offspring who can guarantee Rome's safety from the barbarians. Morality translates directly into military preparedness. Two vivid, contrasting pictures are presented (21-32; 33-44) to illustrate, respectively, the moral and martial halves of the

[34] 19-20: hoc fonte derivata clades/in patriam populumque fluxit.

[35] Culpa also figures prominently in III.24 (33-34): mere complaining about degeneracy and civil strife will do no good, as culpa must be controlled by punishment. See also note 38 (below).

equation. The first exemplifies the moral decadence of the present generation, through the brilliant picture of the utterly depraved young woman, in the single estate and in marriage (21-32). The second recalls the military prowess of an earlier age, the simplicity and strict discipline in which Roman youth--the emphasis here is on the male--are thought to have been reared in the heyday of the Republic (33-44). As the present-day counterpart to the girl's flagrant immorality, the resulting unmanliness of contemporary Roman young men is to be understood.[36] Similarly, the other, implied half of the contrasting portrait of rustica virtus is to be sought in the person of the virtuous, solemn wife and mother, whom Horace reveals here only in her capacity of rustic pedagogue. Her son's upbringing is strict and demanding; it has created soldiers who made the Republic great, and can do the same for Rome now (33-41). These examples illustrate the main argument of the ode, the causal connection between morality and the military preparedness of the Roman state. Conjoined is the thought of a like relationship of Roman moral life to the presence or absence of civil war.

> The implication of this connection of thought is that the evils of civil war cannot be regarded as a thing of the past so long as the Romans refuse moral reform; a rebirth of respect for the gods [refers to 1-8] is a good thing, but it does not touch the far more widespread and dangerous cancer [i.e., moral depravity] in the national life.[37]

[36]For a clearer idea of what Horace dislikes in their character, cf. Odes III.24, 54-62.

[37]Williams, Third Book, pp. 65-66.

Like Odes III.24, III.6 goes beyond mere invective against the evils of civil war. Horace refers to the phenomenon only in passing (13) but unites it with Rome's moral decline and failure in foreign campaigns. He makes it clear that immorality means inevitable decline in the Roman race and army; civil strife is one aspect of this decay.[38] While he eschews moralizing or preaching, his clear analysis of Rome's problems shows the lines along which he thinks their resolution lies. But what is true of Intactis opulentior goes equally for the present poem as well. The problem of Rome's weakness is political, and it is the ruling authority, the state, that must act to set things right. In terms of current political reality, this means Octavian. Horace is now ready to bring the Roman government, in Caesar's person, into his attempts to find a way of ending civil strife.

[38]Jal (Guerre civile, p. 385) believes Horace establishes "...un rapport étroit entre la faute («culpa») que constitue pour Rome la guerre civile, d'une part, les «vitia» [Odes II.1, 2] qu'elle incarne et la corruption morale causée par le luxe et la dépravation, de l'autre... ." That is, culpa in III.6 (17) is explained by culpa as described at length in III.24; the ideas presented by the two poems are complementary. III.24 has even been called the "seventh Roman Ode" for reasons similar to these (U. Mancuso, Orazio poeta civile. Dalle odi romane alle odi cesaree (Roma: Ed. Ateneo, 1953), p. 52).

### 3. Civil War and the Roman State: Octavian Enters Horace's Proposals for Ending Bellum Civile.

Odes I.2 marks a vital turning-point in Horace's approach to civil war. It is the first poem in which he brings Octavian into his attempts to solve the problem of bellum civile. The ode marks a stage in Horace's political development that follows logically upon that first indicated by Odes I.14. His concern for avoiding civil war was first visible there; here, his concern has expanded to include the government, for the first time. In Odes III.24, Horace had asked for a leader to implement his proposals for ending civil strife. But he had found no one who qualified; and instead contented himself with a fuller investigation of the origins of war between Romans (Odes III.6). Now[1] Horace believes he has found the man, or rather that this man, Octavian, has come into his own as a mature and capable politician. The poet will insist that the new ruler implement his (Horace's) solution.

[1]No precise date can be assigned, although the poem is generally assigned to the early 20's. Fraenkel merely observes (pp. 242-243) that I.2 "...is an early poem, though probably later than III.24," while concerning III.24 he says only that it "may safely be regarded" as an early ode (p. 240); Commager, "Horace, Carmina I.2," AJPh, 80 (1959), 55 ventures 29, but later (Odes of Horace, p. 176) modifies his views, stating only that I.2 was "almost certainly written during the early twenties ... ." Kiessling-Heinze dates I.2 to Winter, 28 (Introduction to poem). Other scholars postulate dates between 30 and 27 (summarized in Nisbet and Hubbard, pp. 17-19, whose own guess is 27).

In Odes I.2, the civil war - foreign war formula already seen[2] is again invoked (21-24). Other aspects of civil war, familiar from earlier odes (III.24, III.6), are not considered. Unnatural weather has plagued Rome (1-20); equally unnatural, but muchmore dangerous, is Roman civil strife (21-24).[3] Youth few in number will hear that citizens, Romans, fought one another when they might better have turned against the formidable Persians (21-24). They will be few in number due precisely to this fratricide, VITIO PARENTUM / RARA IUVENTUS.[4]

The same choice presents itself here as in the earlier poems: Romans either

[2]Epode 7, 3-10; Odes II.1, 4-5; Odes III.6, 13-16.

[3]Lines 1-20 serve in roughly the same manner as the adynata (varied by the nova monstra here, 6 ff.) of Epode 16: to suggest that civil war is not normal, an aberration of nature. The opening passage is inspired by Vergil, Georgics I.464 ff. (Fraenkel, pp. 243-245; Nisbet and Hubbard, pp. 16-17; K. Barwick, "Horaz Carm. I.2 und Vergil," Ph, 90 (1935), 267-276; C. Gallavotti, "Il secondo Carme di Orazio," PP, 4, No. 12 (1949), 217-229). Vergil's portents forebode the horror of the civil wars loosed by the assassination, rather than the assassination itself; he is concerned with bellum civile and not the dictator. This is true of Horace's portents as well (Kiessling-Heinze on line 29; Commager, Odes of Horace, pp. 180-181; Nisbet and Hubbard, p. 17).

[4]The idea of depopulation through civil war is developed in numerous parallel passages in Sallust and Cicero; these are collected by P. Jal, "Remarques sur la cruauté à Rome pendant les guerres civiles (de Sylla à Vespasien)," BAGB, 20 (1961), 475-501 (especially 494-495 with notes).

must fight foreign enemies or kill one another.[5] But there is more to the problem of civil strife than this. Civil war is a scelus that must be expiated,[6] and its atonement requires more than a patriotic war against the Parthians. The man who leads Rome's armies against her foreign foes must first himself give up his pursuit of vengeance. Such vindictiveness is a part of bellum civile, and one cannot atone for old civil wars and begin new ones at the same time. Octavian has won the last civil war; he must now put aside his own participation in civil strife and bring together the Roman nation. He is to show clemency to his fellow Romans,[7] against whom he fought, but display

[5]To Horace, violence is a constant; it may take the form of civil strife or foreign campaigns but cannot be done away with altogether. It must have some outlet, and the only choice is between Romans and barbari. For "the Romans had to be fighting somebody, and looked to foreign war to distract them from civil war" (L.A. MacKay, "Horace, Augustus, and Ode I.2," AJPh, 83 (1962), 168-177 (173 quoted)).

[6]29-30: Cui dabit partis scelus expiandi/Iuppiter? Scelus = bellum civile and not Julius Caesar's assassination; cf. Nisbet and Hubbard, p. 17, and Commager, Odes of Horace, p. 189.

[7]This is the meaning of Octavian's association with Mercury (41 ff.), and especially of the uses of ultor (18, 44) and the adjective inultus (51). Jupiter disapproves of ultio against Romans (19-20, Iove non probante refers to 17-18, se...iactat ultorem) but does not stand in its way when barbarians are the target (51-52, neu sinas Medos equitare inultos/ te duce, Caesar). The party to whom he assigns the expiation of bellum civile--god or man--must forswear it, as it is a part of civil strife. He chooses Mercury because that god "might seem to be the ideal counterpart in Heaven of the statesman... who wanted to be the bringer of peace and order..." (Fraenkel, p. 248; cf. Mercury in Odes I.10, the civilizing deity). Octavian is to display Mercury's characteristics. Above all, he is to be an ultor in the manner of that gentle god (43-44,

aggressiveness against the gentes.[8] Horace has now defined Octavian's role: he is to eliminate civil war and prosecute foreign campaigns, by turning Roman military energies away from Romans and against barbarians. He is to grant amnesty to his former enemies;[9] this practice is to be the complement of his aggressive foreign policy.

The elements in Horace's approach to civil war are now Octavian, civil strife, and foreign war. These reappear in two

---

filius Maiae patiens vocari/Caesaris ultor; he is to give up taking vengeance on his political enemies in favor of mercy and reconciliation. This will allow all Romans to fight together under his direction against the Medes (= Parthians, representative of barbari in general). Several other scholars have pursued Fraenkel's modest hypothesis along the above lines, notably Commager (AJPh, 80 (op. cit.), 37-55); E.J. Bickerman ("Filius Maiae," PP, 16 (1961), 5-19); L.A. MacKay (loc. cit.); and H. Womble ("Horace, Carm.I.2," AJPh, 91 (1970), 1-30). Their consensus is that Odes I.2 is written to warn and advise Octavian rather than praise him. It is important to note that Horace does not identify, but only associates, Mercury and Octavian. (Fraenkel, pp. 247-248, warns that "...there exists no reliable evidence" to support this identification; cf. K. Scott, "Merkur-Augustus und Horaz C.I.2," H, 63 (1928), 15-34.) The concluding lines (49-52) make this clear: it is not Mercury who is to love great triumphs, be called pater and princeps, and lead the Romans against the Parthians, but rather the mortal, Octavian. Williams (Tradition, p. 97) rightly observes that "...the effect of the sudden, surprising te duce, Caesar at the end is not to identify Mercury and Octavian, but to affirm confidence that the mortal leader is really equal to the task. This is not panegyric or fulsome flattery of a ruler, but serious political poetry... ."

[8]Horace's rejection of Mars as expiator of civil strife (37-40) does not indicate a rejection of bellum externum (cf. 49-52), but rather that god's unsuitability for the role of peacemaker between Romans.

[9]On Octavian's earlier proscriptions as a Triumvir, cf. Syme, Roman Revolution, p. 190 ff.; for his policy of amnesty, Res Gestae 3.1, with commentary of P.A. Brunt and J.M.Moore (London: Oxford University Press, 1967, ad loc.) and the literature there referred to.

odes written soon after Iam satis terris, Odes I.21 and I.35.[10] In both, the civil war - foreign war formula takes on religious overtones; a god or gods are ASKED to TURN WAR AWAY FROM the Romans and redirect IT against their enemies (I.21, 13-16; I.35, 38-40). Apollo and Diana are invoked, in I.21, as dei averrunci, averters of evil.[11] They are implored to divert "tearful war" and "wretched hunger and disease" from the Roman people and their leader, Octavian, onto Rome's foreign enemies, here represented by the Parthians and Britons (13-16).[12] Gods, not armies, are mentioned, but the implementation of this prayer will come under Octavian's leadership, through bellum externum.

Odes I.35 is a prayer for the same blessings. The goddess (Fortuna of Antium) is implored to reforge the sword blunted in civil war for use against barbari (38-40); the force of Roman war is to be redirected outward, against her enemies. Such a request is not out of order here, for this Fortune is

[10]The date of I.21 is uncertain; I.35 is usually assigned to 26, on the basis of Horace's reference to a forthcoming British campaign (so Fraenkel, p. 253 and Wili, Horaz und die augusteische Kultur, p. 198, among others); but this dating has been challenged (Nisbet and Hubbard, p. 387).

[11]Nisbet and Hubbard, pp. 259-261, who cite numerous parallel passages from ancient and later sources; see also Fraenkel, pp. 210, 410-411, for a full discussion of the idea.

[12](bellum) lacrimosum (13) may be only a stock epithet; but the mention of fames (13) and pestis (14) seems to indicate that the war meant is sorrowful, lacrimosum, because it is a civil conflict or a foreign invasion resulting therefrom. These bring hunger and disease upon the Roman people.

not the capricious Chance of the preceding ode (I.34).[13] "Her purposes are moral, and the greatness of Rome is amongst them."[14] She works through war to achieve her ends.[15] Accordingly, Horace prays for the Princeps' safety on his impending expedition against the Britons, and equally for that of the Roman army throughout the Empire (29-32). This request immediately precedes his invective against civil strife (33-38),[16] which is in turn followed by a second prayer expressly asking that civil war be turned into foreign (38-40). His condemnation of civil strife is thus highlighted by its situation between two emphatic summonses to bellum externum.

[13]Fortuna (15), along with Jupiter (5, Diespiter), is equated with Τύχη, the unpredictable, blind force of Chance, as Werner Jaeger has shown ("Horaz C. I.34," H, 48 (1913), 442-449, followed by Fraenkel, pp. 254-257). Fortuna assumes the same aspect in Odes III.29.

[14]Wickham, Introduction to Odes I.35.

[15]Fortuna of Antium was associated primarily with war and fertility; see R. de Coster, "La Fortune d'Antium et l'Ode I.35 d'Horace" (AC, 19 (1950), 65-80), for a careful presentation of the known facts about her cult (65-69). Elsewhere as well, the deity was associated with a safe return from military campaigns (especially in her aspects of Fortuna Servatrix and Fortuna Conservatrix). Upon Augustus' return from the east, in 19, the Senate consecrated the altar of Fortuna Redux; the Augustalia were celebrated annually between October 2 and 12 in commemoration of his safe homecoming (Res Gestae 11).

[16]Civil war is also in Horace's mind in 13-16, where the goddess is implored not to overturn the standing column (13-14, iniurioso ne pede proruas/stantem columnam), symbol of the authority and power of the state, or of the solidity of its popular support (Fraenkel, p. 252, note 2; Kiessling-Heinze ad loc.; Nisbet and Hubbard, pp. 392-393 with numerous supporting parallels). She is also to keep the people from inciting one another to civil strife, which will destroy the Empire (14-16).

The attack on civil war incorporates several already-familiar elements: Civil war is a scelus (33), as brothers (Romans: 34, fratrumque) wound one another (33, cicatricum). Greed is made the direct cause of sacrilege. What have we, in our shameless avarice, left untouched? Horace asks (34-38).[17] This impious behavior has led to civil war.[18] As in Odes I.2, foreign campaigns are the only way to avoid fratricide and atone for past offenses against the gods. These campaigns must be undertaken, lest civil strife break out anew.[19]

Over and above the urgency of foreign war in relation to civil strife, the prayer for Caesar indicates an embryonic concern with Roman imperialism, under Octavian's aegis. Not only will Roman arms expiate the crime of fratricide (38-40); they will, Horace hints, strive for the aims of hegemony as well. Augustus is to move against the ends of the earth, the Britons (29-30); Roman armies are to be protected by Fortuna, therefore successful, in the east and west alike, that is,

[17]Again, a series of questions is used to express indignation at civil strife; cf. Appendix 1, p. 152.

[18]A cause-and-effect relationship is postulated for greed and civil war, by way of sacrilege; cf. above on Epode 16, 63 (p. 6, note 14).

[19]F. Jacoby ("Das Prooemium des Lucretius," H, 56 (1921), 47, note 1) saw how 33-40, civil war and the second prayer, function as a counterpoise to the prayer for Caesar (29-32), "durch den Rückblick auf die Zustände, die wieder eintreten würden, wenn Fortuna die Bitte nicht gewährt." Bellum civile will prevail again unless the campaigns are undertaken. The final prayer pleads, "Do it!" (Jacoby, loc. cit.).

throughout the world.[20] The prevention of civil strife will reward the Romans handsomely in terms of expanded imperium. Their positive option--foreign war, with conquest of the gentes--is suddenly much more attractive. The avoidance of destructive civil wars assures the success of Roman imperialism; the latter is the main theme of Horace's foreign-war poetry.[21] Conversely, the success of Roman arms abroad helps prevent a recurrence of bellum civile. That Horace was well aware of this fact will be seen more clearly in his later civil-war poetry (below, p. 44 ff.).

Horace now has not only included Octavian in his solutions for bellum civile; he has made the ruler's participation instrumental to their success. This participation is to conform to Horace's specifications (Odes I.2; above, p. 28). Odes III.4 shows how Horace's poetry, vehicle of the Muses' lene consilium, can expound his political ideals to the head of state. Another significant advance from the attitude evinced by I.2, I.21 and I.35 is Horace's declaration of his personal allegiance to Octavian's regime. The examples he cites of wrongdoers punished are offered as proof of his own sententiae (69-70). However, this personal adherence does not mean that Horace binds himself to submissively follow the

[20]See Appendix 2, pp.161-164 for Horace's schemes for indicating totus orbis terrarum.

[21]Cf. Chapter II, Section 6, pp. 91-93.

government's lead. He has his own ideas about his poetry's role in matters of state. These include his belief in the poet's function as adviser to the ruler, and not simply his unquestioning supporter or a mere spectator. Horace's personal loyalty to Octavian's regime is conditioned, granted on the proviso that this regime conduct itself in accordance with the principles of lene consilium he sets forth.

The gist of Horace's message is found in what he says about the Muses' advice to Caesar (37-42) and in his statement on vis (65-68). Consilium is the concept linking the two passages, while this concept is illustrated by the intervening account of the Gigantomachy (42-64). The Camenae entertain the Princeps and refresh him from the toil of his tasks (37-40).[22] They also perform the much more important function of advising him.[23] Lene consilium (41) is picked up again by vis consili expers (65), whose opposite is vis temperata (66).

[22]The Muses' recreative function was first formulated by Hesiod (Theogony, 80-103), and later varied by Pindar (Pythia I) and others. In both poets, the Muses make the good ruler unmindful of his troubles (Theogony, 98-103; Pythia I, 46-47, 53-54 (Bowra)). For exegesis, see especially Pasquali, Orazio lirico, pp. 694-695, and La Penna, Orazio, p. 110.

[23]vos lene consilium et datis et dato/gaudetis, almae. ... . Prof. Brind'Amour has suggested to me that the Muses' original function was "to recall laws" to Zeus, then (later) to do the same for human rulers, kings. Calliope (invoked by Horace, 1-4) is especially important in this capacity; cf. Hesiod, Theogony, 79-80. This function is clearly expressed in Hesiod (op. cit., 80 ff.), with those works Horace was well-acquainted. Perhaps the lene consilium of this ode may best be explained, then, as the Muses' task of reminding Octavian of the realities of power: he must rule prudently if he is to retain control of the state.

The conjunction of consilium and vis is no accident: it presents the ode's basic message. The Muses rejoice in the advice they have given (41-42) because Octavian both hears and heeds it.[24] In the ensuing sketch of the Gigantomachy, which anticipates the later generalization (65-68), Horace shows that power divorced from consilium can only fail, while that (Octavian's) which is governed and moderated by a higher force, vis temperata, not only survives but prospers. The gods look favorably upon the latter, but harbor only enmity for elements that--like the ill-fated Titans--attempt every sort of unholy act.[25] It is the lene consilium Caesar hears and complies with that makes his government one of vis temperata, that triumphs over brute force.

The implication of this message is twofold: that Octavian rules Rome because he subscribes to the standards of moderation and civilized behavior set forth by Horace, the Muses' spokesman; and that this is all that keeps his regime from going the way of the Giants' conspiracy.[26] Provided

[24]G. Williams, Third Book, p. 51; Kiessling-Heinze ad loc.

[25]67-68: ...idem (sc. di) odere viris/omne nefas animo moventis. Nefas appears to = bellum civile, as elsewhere (Appendix 1, p. 148).

[26]Horace thus simultaneously commends and advises Octavian; he does not merely flatter his clementia or make propaganda for it. What must be remembered in this context is that the Princeps' success and his enemies' failure are both due not to any of his virtues but to the benevolent intervention of the Muses. They make the chosen ruler successful (so also in Hesiod, op. cit., 80-93). They help him govern well; but, to obtain

the Princeps is Muse-guided, any opponents of his government will necessarily fail in their attempts to foment insurrection. In a state at peace with itself, any conspiracy against the ruling authority automatically qualifies as civil war of the basest sort, engineered for the plotter's personal advantage at the expense of all other Romans. It is such potential civil strife that Horace condemns here in the strongest terms. Civil war means insurrection against the divine order, as well as against its duly constituted representatives on earth; it is also warfare against divinely-inspired art, that is, against Horace himself.

For the first time, Horace's opposition to bellum civile is founded on his adherence to Octavian's rule. Conversely, this leader's administration is made dependent upon Horace's advice, given through his political poetry. He is

---

their help, he must first conduct himself properly. On the note of warning in Horace's words, see R.A. Hornsby, "Horace on art and politics," CJ, 58 (1962), 97-104 and P. Boyancé, "Grandeur d'Horace," BAGB, 1955, No. 4, 48-64, especially 58-59. W. Theiler (Das Musengedicht des Horaz (Halle: Niemeyer, 1936), 265-267) and La Penna (Orazio, pp. 110-112) are representative of those scholars who see approval of Octavian, but no advice or warning to him, in Horace's words. Fraenkel's otherwise excellent discussion (Horace, pp. 277-283) of Horace's use of Pindar, Pythia I fails to consider the Greek poet's warnings to the ruling authority (85-87, 95-98 Bowra) to govern the people justly (νῶμα δικαίῳ/πηδαλίῳ στρατόν) and display generosity (90, μὴ καμνε λίανδαπάναις), coupled with a warning of the ill fame that condemns evil statesmen (Phalaris, 95-98). Horace condenses his warnings (probably inspired by Pindar's) into the stanza on vis consili expers/temperata. It is not in the Horatian lyric manner to commend or warn Octavian by direct address; this is why he gives this advice in general terms.

with and for the regime, as well as the Roman nation and people, as long as that regime conforms with the lene consilium he represents.[27] Moreover, Horace here causally connects his art with affairs of state, thus creating for himself the role of ex officio political adviser. Appropriately, the distinctly Augustan concept of a political role for literature[28] comes to the fore here, a belief in "...the great power of art to order life,"[29] the very Greek classical idea that "...we, the poets, are teachers of men,"[30] including the man who leads the nation.

Two new developments in Horace's civil-war outlook are especially noteworthy. He chooses to regard bellum civile as a thing of the past, although he is fully aware of the possibility of its recurrence. And his self-assessment as Octavian's adviser marks the end, rather than the beginning, of a period in his poetry. Henceforth he will commend Augustus and encourage him in his foreign policy (below, Ch. II, Sections

[27]The lene consilium, while not described in context, seems to be that policy of amnesty and national reconciliation Horace urges on Octavian in Odes I.2 (above, pp. 30-31). Civil war as it relates to bellum externum does not enter into consideration here.

[28]Historically, Roman poetry had taken a strongly activist role in Roman national life. It briefly abandoned this under Alexandrian influence, then reassumed it in the 30's B.C. See P. Grimal, "Poésie et 'propagande'...," 62-63, and V. Pöschl, Horaz und die Politik, p. 24.

[29]Hornsby, op. cit. (p. 38, note 26), 104.

[30]Aristophanes, Frogs, 1054-1055 (trans. B.B. Rogers).

4-6). However, he will abstain from warning him on matters relating to civil war and its prevention, for reasons that will become obvious in his later poetry (below, Ch. I, Section 4).

Odes II.7 is a difficult poem to reconcile with Horace's overall attitude toward civil war, as evidenced thus far. In this ode, he condemns neither the Republican cause nor his own participation in a Roman civil war on its behalf. Elsewhere, he strongly opposes bellum civile, and even takes Augustus' side against it (Odes III.4).[31] The fact that the ode is addressed to a personal friend, with the purpose of reconciling him to present political reality,[32] indicates a unique approach to civil strife. Horace attempts to discount the political past and establish his friend firmly in the present, without attacking the genuineness, past and present, of their comradeship. This he does by uniting the present celebration

[31]Fraenkel (p. 13) rightly emphasizes Horace's "... loyalty to the men [but not the causes] who had kindled his youthful enthusiasm."

[32]Terminus post quem: 29, Octavian's amnesty after the War of Actium (3-4; Velleius II, 86; Res Gestae 3.1). However, the ode may have been written anytime between 29 and 23; it is a complex poem and not likely to have been an early production (N.E. Collinge, The Structure of Horace's Odes (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 143). Furthermore, Horace's occasional poems (this ode among them) were written with a larger audience in mind than the addressee (Fraenkel on Epist. I.14, pp. 310-314, especially 314). Thus Odes II.7 not only welcomes home an old soldier but resolves a surface contradiction in Horace's outlook on civil war and politics.

(17-28),[33] occasioned by Pompeius' return, with other, similar convivial occasions in their bygone youth (5-8). As he drank and relaxed with his friend then, so he means to drink and take his ease with him now. Time past is assimilated into time present through the parallel symposiac situations (5-8; 17-28). Similarly, the disastrous political past, the two friends' shared militia Bruto duce, fades into the present.[34] The calamitous Battle of Philippi is treated in a light-hearted manner,[35]

[33]Commager ("The function of wine in Horace's Odes," TAPhA, 88 (1957), 68-80) aptly observes, "Wine represents the seizing of the present, a freedom from contingencies of past and future alike" (79-80). For Horace, the present is the only reality (71).

[34]The political present means Octavian, whose importance is implied (3, quis te redonavit Quiritem...?) but not stated. He may be present in the guise of Jupiter (17, ergo obligatam redde Iovi dapem), if L.P. Wilkinson is right (Horace and his lyric poetry (2nd Ed. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1951), pp. 33-34). Line 17 may then be a polite way of telling Pompeius to accept Octavian's regime(Wilkinson, p. 34).

[35]Fraenkel (p. 12) is right to see in 9-16 a literary topos, and an attempt by Horace to defuse the political past by mythologizing it. The position that 9-16 are not to be taken literally is developed by Commager (Odes of Horace, p. 171), Kiessling-Heinze (ad loc.), Wilkinson (op. cit., pp. 59-60), Wili (Horaz, pp. 29-30), and Collinge (op. cit., p. 140), among others. Collinge's remarks (loc. cit.) are representative: "Horace is using literary allusions, almost quotations, as conventional devices to refer obliquely to his own experience." 9-16 comprise a "mixture of the real and the fanciful" (139-140; similarly G. Williams, Tradition, pp. 119-120).

Some scholars insist on understanding the passage literally, usually to disprove the needless assumption that Horace conducted himself in a cowardly manner at Philippi (10, relicta non bene parmula). Mancuso ("Orazio, dalla originalità del poeta civile al provato valore del combattente," Studi in onore di Gino Funaioli (Roma: Signorelli, 1955), 197-215), Krokowski ("Qua de causa Horatius apud Philippos parmulam proiecerit," Meander, 17 (1962), 537-544, corroborating Mancuso, loc. cit.),

with appropriate fantastic touches. Horace chucks away his little shield, as Archilochus once left his in a bush (Fr. 6 Diehl), whereupon he is obligingly wrapped up in a thick mist by Mercury, as Hector once had been by Homer's Apollo.[36] Philippi, the Republican cause, and all the dolorous consequences of the two men's allegiance to it are thus cleverly assimilated into harmless and amusing memories of bygone youth, and made into the stuff of nostalgia rather than of painful remembrance. The battle becomes one with the youthful carousing of the two friends' off-duty hours; this is in turn associated with the present occasion for drinking, Pompeius' restoration to citizenship (3) and reentry into Italian life (4). Everything in the ode and in the two veterans' lives turns on the present moment. By making the past part and parcel with the present, and by offering the present to Pompeius as a banquet and celebration, Horace both allows his friend to coexist with his past and insists on and facilitates his coming to terms with present political reality. As the two men were once united in arms under Brutus, so now they are reunited physically and reconciled politically to the state, Octavian's regime, as companions in pleasure. The conditions for their enjoyment of this pleasure--above all, the cessation

---

and V. D'Anto (Studi Oraziani (Napoli: Libreria Scientifica, 1968), p. 144) are recent representatives of the literalist school.

[36] Iliad, Y., 443 f., quoted and discussed by Fraenkel, pp. 164-165.

of civil strife--are provided by this same regime. So too is the amnesty that has made possible Pompeius' return.

Horace is proud of himself and the men with whom he served. He is equally aware that Octavian represents Rome's best hope for avoiding a relapse into civil conflicts like Philippi, that threatened the Roman nation with disaster. Now that he fully understands the dangers of bellum civile, he knows how close to utter disaster the Romans came; they might still bring ruin upon themselves, if civil war were to break out again. This explains his divergent personal and political views, reconciled in the present poem. Williams' observations (Tradition, p. 81) on Horace's Sestius (Odes I.4) are equally valid when applied to the poet himself. Politically, Horace was--like Sestius--no time-server but rather "a perfect example of the ambivalence of attitude that could at the same time recall with pride a disastrous past and yet co-operate gladly in a more orderly present. It is a virtue in Horace that he could respond poetically [and politically] to this [add: his own] ambivalence of attitude." Once this truth is understood, the seeming contradiction between Horace's personal approach to bellum civile here and his political outlook on it elsewhere, disappears.

4. Horace's Mature Outlook: Civil War in Retrospect.

Odes III.14 marks the beginning of the final period in Horace's outlook on civil war. In this ode and in his later references to bellum civile, civil strife and its consequences are distinctly regarded as past phenomena. Horace seems to retain some of his earlier fear of it, but this continued foreboding is tempered by civil war's absence from Roman life. Civil war is now treated as something that no longer exists, but that might recur. As a result, Augustus now assumes paramount importance as Rome's guarantor against any new outbreak of civil strife. His role is that of preserver of the peaceful status quo, rather than architect of an end to bellum civile.

Due to this changed state of affairs, Horace abandons his role as a negative critic of Augustus and Roman society. He has nothing more to say about eliminating civil war, quite simply because he regards this task as already accomplished. The Pax Augusta is present reality; it is the question of its permanence that worries Horace now.

The fourth stanza of III.14 is indicative of his new attitude. Now that Augustus is safely home again,[1] my worries are over, Horace declares. I shall not fear disturbances or

[1] 3-4: Caesar Hispana repetit penatis/ victor ab ora, a clear reference to Augustus' return from his Cantabrian campaign, 26-24 B.C. (for which see Syme, Roman Revolution, pp. 332-333). This fixes the date with certainty (24 B.C.).

violent death while Caesar rules the world.[2] This is no empty compliment to the efficacy of Augustus' rule, but a blunt assessment of the frailty of the Pax Augusta. Horace must have known, through Maecenas, of the Princeps' grave illness in Spain.[3] He is concerned for Augustus' survival, not the glory he wins in war. Rome is safe again, but her security hangs by a thread, her ruler's health. To emphasize simultaneously the personal satisfaction[4] given him by domestic peace, and the possibility of a return of civil strife, Horace inserts somber reminders of past civil wars into the description of his personal pleasures (17-28).[5] The wine-cask dates back to the Marsian War; it is a survivor of the Servile Insurrection (17-20). "Marsum duellum and Spartacus vagans strike us as a terrible echo of vis and tumultus in Italy, and once more we remember the man [i.e., Augustus]

[2]14-16: ...ego nec tumultum/nec mori per vim metuam, tenente/Caesare terras.

[3]Syme, loc. cit.; CAH, X (1934), p. 135. The conditional effect of tenente Caesare terras is appreciated only if one observes the allusion (1-2) to Augustus' dangerous illness and frail health. Augustus has returned victorious, like Hercules before him; but what matters more to Horace is that he nearly lost his life in the pursuit of gloria. The context shows that he is important here as preserver of public morality (5-12) and the Pax Augusta (13 ff.), not as a conqueror. Far from being the ideal expiation for bellum civile, Augustus' foreign wars in this poem are a risky gamble with the Princeps' and Rome's safety.

[4]See discussion below, Ch. III, pp. 102-103 for this aspect of the ode.

[5]This celebration is itself occasioned by Augustus' safe return. Thus, the entire passage serves as a reminder of the Pax Augusta's tenuous nature.

who has brought about the change."[6] Horace himself is an older man now; he wants peace, freedom from the fickleness of lovers (thus 23-24) and equally freedom from the hotheadedness that embroiled him in bellum civile as a young man (25-28).[7] As he has put behind him his own civil war, so he hopes the Roman nation will renounce any return to civil strife.

As civil war is uneasily relegated to history, foreign war is deprived of value as an outlet for it, and ceases to be related to bellum civile. Horace mentions Augustus' Spanish campaigns in opening the ode, then quietly drops them. His thoughts of past internal strife are similarly divorced from the new, satisfied moral outlook he presents (5-12). Gone are the earlier invectives against degeneracy, and the vigorous accusations of fault or failure, said to be rooted variously in greed (III.24) or degenerate sexual mores (Odes III.6). His reference to Livia[8] brings Augustus to the fore again, in the

[6]Fraenkel, p. 290. This is no more a weary allegiance, as Commager thinks (Odes of Horace, p. 227), than it is idle panegyric. Horace hardly takes for granted the blessings he anticipates; the very purpose of his allusions to bellum civile is to point out that it can all happen again. 17-28 are to be understood as an elaboration of the theme of 14-16; the key phrase for understanding both passages is tenente Caesare terras.

[7]Consule Planco (28) = 42 B.C., the year of Philippi. The stanza varies the overall thought of II.7 (above, pp. 40-43): Horace has renounced his youthful passions and with them his role in a Roman civil war.

[8]5, unico gaudens mulier marito. The problem of Livia's previous marriages is immaterial. What matters is that Horace chooses to make Augustus paramount in the moral as in the governmental sphere of Roman life.

moral sphere of Roman life; he is the maritus (5) whose home-coming occasions the festivities described. All is a picture of probity, with the Princeps at its center. Freedom from civil war, and sexual morality, had formerly been despaired of and seen only in negative terms; both are now viewed as reality. It is as if the success of Pax Augusta had severed the ties in the poet's mind between areas of Roman life that--while they posed unsolved problems--he had seen as interrelated and even causally interdependent. His mature, positive, retrospective attitude toward Rome's domestic problems, notably civil war, first emerges here. At its center is a man, Augustus, rather than a set of urgent, unaccomplished social tasks. For the Augustan peace is as unsure as it is satisfying. Horace's old concern for the solution of Rome's problems is replaced by a new care for the continuance in office of the ruler who has solved them.

Civil and foreign war, and domestic peace and morality, have ceased to be related to one another abstractly. Now, their common ground is the Pax Augusta and its administrator, the Princeps. This approach is followed up and elaborated on in the remaining late poetry, and characterizes Horace's mature, final outlook on civil war.

The Carmen Saeculare (17 B.C.) contains no explicit references to Roman civil war. However, Horace appears to have it in mind in several passages. His thoughts of bellum civile

are latent here in his praise of Rome's moral reforms (17-20) and in his prayer for a quiet retirement for the elderly (46).[9] The prosperity he celebrates (29-32, 59-60)[10] is based on the absence of disruption, of civil strife; so too is the presence of the other gods (and their qualities) essential to the morality and prosperity of the nation (57-58).[11]

Like the Carmen Saeculare, Odes IV.5 is not explicitly a civil-war ode. As in the earlier poem, Horace emphasizes the positive aspects of contemporary Roman society; these require the absence of civil strife. Prosperity of agriculture and commerce are celebrated (17-20), as is Rome's moral integrity (21-24). The first presupposes a stable society, which in turn requires freedom from civil war, that preempts

[9]Moral degeneracy is the ultimate cause of civil war (Odes III.6, 17-20); moral probity, its opposite, prevents it. Only if the young are docilis, and take to heart probos mores (C.S. 45), will the immorality that causes civil strife--greed and the breakdown of sexual morality--be eliminated (Odes III. 24, III.6). And only in a society without bellum civile will the elderly be able to live out their lives quietly. As the fratricide of Roman fathers threatened to make their sons few (Odes I.2, 21-24), so the fratricide of sons might yet bring their elders to a violent end.

[10]29-32 (on the Earth's prosperity) seem to have inspired the relief of Tellus on the Ara Pacis Augustae. See E. Petersen, "Ara Pacis Augustae," Sonderschriften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien, 2 (1902), 52. Both the altar and the poem reflect the idea that prosperity follows only upon peace; a condition of peace is the absence of civil war.

[11]Fides, Pax &c. dare to return (redire...audet) only because they no longer have cause to fear civil strife, which banishes them all.

men's time, energies, and attention and drains off their blood.[12] Prosperity cannot coexist with civil war; one's presence means the other's absence.[13] While the nation's material well-being depends upon freedom from civil war, its morality is essential to securing this freedom. Moral probity is the foundation of peace.[14] Morality in the home[15] precludes the possibility of a recrudescence of civil strife.

[12]This same idea was stated strongly but negatively by Vergil (Georgics I.505-508) more than fifteen years before: ...tot bella per orbem/tam multae scelerum facies, non ullus aratro/dignus honos, squalent abductis arva colonis,/ et curvae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem.

[13]L.A. MacKay, "Horace, Odes IV, 5, 17-20," CJ, 33 (1938), 359-360, observes, "The implied contrast is particularly with the disturbed times of the civil wars, when trade was disrupted and agriculture precarious." Kiessling-Heinze (ad loc.) makes the same observation.

[14]The morality = peace, immorality = war duality assumed here is identical with that set forth in the early odes, III.24 and III.6. Horace intends his reader to recall the negative half of this formula. To this end, the language of IV.5 deliberately plays on that of III.24 and III.6. 22, mos et lex maculosum edomuit nefas answers III.24, 35-36, quid leges sine moribus/vanae proficiunt...? IV.5, 24 culpam poena premit comes replies affirmatively to III.24, 33-34, quid tristes querimoniae,/si non supplicio culpa reciditur,/...? In similar fashion, Horace's earlier complaint about fecunda culpae saecula (III.6, 17-20) is also answered by IV.5, 24: culpa has been suppressed, and with it the prime cause of civil war. Horace thus indicates that the task of reform then begging for action has now been accomplished; he answers his own early, anxious questions with strongly affirmative replies.

[15]Another deliberate repetition of the language of III. 6 (17-18): then, fecunda culpae saecula...inquinavere...domos, but now (IV.5, 21) nullis polluitur casta domus stupris.

Odes IV.15 recalls the much earlier ode, III.14, more than Odes IV.5 or the Carmen Saeculare. As in III.14, civil war is explicitly commented on (17-20);[16] and, as in that ode, Augustus is made Rome's guardian against any renewal of it. Horace and the Roman people have nothing to fear from civil strife; it will not destroy their otium, as long as Caesar governs them. The peace and plenty (4-5) of the present are once more made to depend upon his continued survival. It is Augustus who has restored morality (9-11),[17] and done away with civil war (17-20) and the barbarian threat (21-24). Precisely for this reason, Horace still takes a guarded approach

[16]Kiessling-Heinze ad loc. and H. Dahlmann, "Die letzte Ode des Horaz," Gymnasium, 65 (1958), 350 both take 19-20 to mean bellum externum. This cannot be the case. Horace would not say inimicat urbis of foreign nations outside the imperium Romanum; a foreign enemy is hostis, not inimicus. The latter term implies bellum civile. Besides, Horace would have no reason to fear ira if it worked to the detriment of the gentes; see Odes III.8, 19-20. Horace nowhere else disapproves of bellum externum (see below, p. 94). (Odes I.29 is aimed not at bellum externum but at its exploitation for wealth (disapproved of by Horace, Odes III.3, 49-52).) 19-20 are better understood as referring to civil war fought by organized armies (Jal's definition: La guerre civile, p. 7) inside and outside Italy, within the Empire. The scheme of 17-24 is then as follows: 17-18 refer to Horace's freedom from fear of (unorganized) unrest within Italy; 19-20, to lack of organized bellum civile within the imperium; and 21-24 to security from threat of invasion by the gentes. Urbes perhaps = imperium Romanum (cf. Odes III.24, 27, pater urbium).

[17]Yet another variation on III.24. IV.15, 9-11, ordinem/rectum evaganti frena licentiae/iniecit... repeats the reining-in idiom in III.24, 25-29: o quisquis volet impias...indomitam audeat/refrenare licentiam/... Again, the message is that the needed moral reforms have been successfully undertaken by Augustus. Cf. also III.24, 34 (culpa to be punished) and III.6, 17 (culpa the cause of bellum civile) with the present poem's emovitque culpas (11).

to the permanence of Rome's safety and welfare, even after nearly twenty years of internal security. If Augustus dies, all may yet be lost. The Pax Augusta is as fragile as it is all-embracing and complete. But optimism wins the day (as in III.14), since the Princeps has returned alive and well from his reorganization of the western provinces.

The attitude evinced by Odes III.14 has proven to be Horace's final and unchanged approach to civil war; only the tone of his sentiments (not their essence) has altered. His confidence in Augustus' leadership has grown, and his fear of civil war diminished. Bellum civile is a problem solved, eliminated not through foreign campaigns but by Augustus' domestic policies. One cannot say much about a completed task, save to praise its accomplishment and hope for the permanence of the work. Accordingly, Horace has little to say about civil strife, from the time of Odes III.14 through the writing of his last poems. Commager's remark that "the stability of a Golden Age does not demand a complicated response"[18] on the poet's part, certainly holds true for Horace's later comments on bellum civile. Yet the later poems are hardly mediocre work; Horace's prime political subject-matter now is foreign war, and his own life-style in its relationship to the well-

[18] Odes of Horace, p. 234. Commager's overall assessment of Horace's late odes (Book IV)--that they mark a decline in quality from Odes I-III--is untenable, in consideration of Horace's sophisticated foreign-war and personal-political lyrics of this period. See Ch. II, p. 93 and Ch. III, p. 96 ff.

being of the state. His foreign-war poetry develops in complexity and importance as his civil-war lyrics subside in intensity and lose significance. The reason for this is to be sought in the success of Augustus' foreign policy. This parallel development of Horace's poems on bellum externum and Augustan imperialism will be considered next, in Chapter II.

## Chapter I: Summary and Conclusions.

Horace's attitude toward Roman civil war is one of consistently strong opposition. In his earliest civil-war poems (Epodes 16 and 7), this opposition is expressed as a bitter fatalism: Horace is uncommitted politically. The later poems (Odes I.14 to III.6) show a gradual involvement in Roman politics, and a corresponding concern for solving the problem of civil war. Civil strife's causes and solutions are seen variously in religious, moral, economic, and military terms, separately or in combination. Horace's mood now is characterized by anger tempered by worry and anxiety for Rome's fate.

Octavian is then incorporated into Horace's proposals for ending civil war (Odes I.2, I.21, I.35). These odes call for him to pursue a policy of amnesty and reconciliation at home while turning civil war into foreign conflicts. In his later work (Odes III.14 and after), Horace exhibits his final attitude to bellum civile. His fear of civil strife is now greatly lessened while Augustus assumes increased importance as sole guarantor against its return. The poet views civil war as a problem PROVISIONALLY solved, but that might recur at any time. The absence of civil strife is no longer related causally to the waging of foreign wars, but is instead attributed to the Pax Augusta. Political criticism relative to civil war is abandoned, and civil strife becomes of secondary importance in Horace's political poetry.

Horace's condemnation of bellum civile stems from his conviction that its continuation (or renewal) threatens to destroy the Roman nation. As an Italian and Latin poet, Horace feels personally threatened by civil war, which--carried to extremes--would completely do away with the civilization that forms his human environment and the context of his poetry. He realizes that his survival depends upon the well-being of the Roman state. Therefore he is resolved to constructively criticize and defend this state, and its government, in order to prevent its destruction through civil strife.

# CHAPTER II

## HORACE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ROMAN FOREIGN WAR

### 1. The Traditional Distinction Between Civil and Foreign War.

### Traditional Approval of the Latter.

Early in his excellent and thorough study of Roman civil war,[1] Paul Jal spells out the importance of the distinction made by Roman writers[2] between the various types of war, most notably, between civil and foreign conflicts. "On doit noter, dès l'abord, le souci avec lequel les écrivains latins s'attachent à établir des distinctions plus ou moins précises entre les différents genres de guerres." The distinction between civil and foreign wars is of particular concern (pp. 21-22). This distinction is so frequently recognized that one can establish "l'existence dans la pensée latine d'un véritable doublet antithétique bella externa - bella (civilia, domestica, intestina)," a pairing of terms found in numerous authors from Cicero to St. Augustine (p. 23).

[1] La guerre civile à Rome, p. 19. Both the idea for the following section and many of the passages discussed therein are taken from the opening pages of this work.

[2] Beginning in the late Republic; Cicero seems to have been the first writer to abide by this distinction (and use it to his own advantage) as a matter of course.

In a letter to his brother Quintus,[3] Cicero extols the benefits to Asia of Roman rule. Were it not for the order and security provided by Roman government, the province would have been racked with every sort of disaster, due to foreign war and strife at home.[4] In the Second Catilinarian,[5] the orator contrasts the lack of danger from any foreign war with the clear and present menace of civil strife. In a similar vein, he declares[6] that foreign wars (externa bella) with kings, peoples, and tribes were ended long ago; we speak of these nations as pacified (pacatos), he adds. In sharp contrast to this tranquil state of foreign affairs, there exist within the nation popular discontent, domestic troubles, and plotting by audacious individuals;[7] all these tendencies must still be resolutely combatted. On yet another occasion,[8] Cicero,

[3] Ad Quintum Fratrem I.1, 34.

[4] ...nullam ab se [i.e., Asia] neque belli externi neque domesticarum discordiarum calamitatem afuturam fuisse.

[5] II.5, 11: Nulla est enim natio quam pertimescamus, nullus rex qui bellum populo Romano facere possit; omnia sunt externa...terra marique pacata: domesticum bellum manet, intus insidiae sunt, intus inclusum periculum est,... .

[6] Pro Sestio 23, 51: Nam externa bella regum, gentium, nationum iam pridem ita exstincta sunt, ut praeclare cum iis agamus, quos pacatos esse patiamur... .

[7] Pro Sestio, loc. cit.: Denique ex bellica victoria non fere quemquam est invidia civium consecuta; domesticis malis et audacium civium consiliis saepe est resistendum, eorumque periculorum est in re publica retinenda medicina; ... .

[8] De Haruspicum Responso (in P. Clodium) 23, 49.

speaking against P. Clodius Pulcher, asserts that the man had been encouraged by his success in disgracing the orator, Rome's bringer of freedom from civil war.[9] He (Clodius) therefore thought he could succeed in slandering Pompey as well, Rome's illustrious victor in foreign wars, over foreign enemies (ibid.).

Like the Republican orator and statesman, Horace's contemporary Livy makes a practice of distinguishing bellum civile and bellum externum. The historian distinguishes discordiae intestinae from bellum externum;[10] as does Cicero, he points out that success in the latter does not necessarily eliminate the former. Civil and foreign wars are similarly distinguished in a passage that also shows the lack of connection between the two in the events under discussion.[11] The two types of conflict can also be interrelated. Upon learning of Fabius' confirmation as consul, the plebs became incensed and brought about foreign conflict by inciting domestic disturbance.[12] However, the

[9]Loc. cit. Tum vero elatus est [Clodius] spe posse se, quoniam togatum domestici belli exstinctorem nefario scelere foedasset, illum etiam, illum externorum bellorum hostiumque victorem adfligere; ... .

[10]II.31,10: Discordiae intestinae, bellum externum fecere ut hoc magistratu egeret res publica: pax foris parta est, domi impeditur.

[11]III.32,5: Neque eo anno (the history of 453-452 B.C. is being discussed) quicquam belli externi fuit: domi motus orti. Similarly IV.43, 10, where L. Papirius Mugillanus, the interrex, asks sarcastically, an bello intestino bellum externum propulsaturos?

[12]II.42,3: Eo infestior facta plebs seditione domestica bellum externum excivit.

necessity of united action against the rebellious Volsci and Aequi brought an end to this civil strife.[13]

Velleius also separates civil from foreign conflicts, in his summary (II.89, 3) of the Pax Augusta's blessings. Civil strife and foreign war are listed as two separate problems solved by Augustus.[14] The Princeps himself assumes this distinction in recounting his military undertakings.[15] In short, the habit of regarding wars as basically either civil or foreign had become part of Roman writers' stock in trade by the time of Horace's first political poems.

Moreover, foreign wars were traditionally regarded as both just and desirable.[16] Horace's contemporaries and immediate predecessors praised Roman arms and their contribution to the national welfare. Cicero's endorsement in his Pro Murena (10.22, 11.24) is representative. The glory of Rome, her fame and domination of the world, all depend upon her skill

[13]Loc. cit.: bello (sc. externo) deinde civiles discordiae intermissae. Compare VII.12, 4: quin etiam bono fuisse Romanis adventum eorum (the Tiburtines) constabat orientemque iam seditionem inter patres et plebem metu tam propinqui belli compressam. Livy formulates this idea in his remark (II.39, 7), Externus timor, maximum concordiae vinculum.

[14]Finita vicesimo anno bella civilia, sepulta externa,

[15]Res Gestae 3.1: Bella terra et mari civilia externaque toto in orbe terrarum saepe gessi, ... .

[16]This was the general attitude toward bellum externum in the late Republic; see J.H. Collins, Propaganda, ethics, and psychological assumptions in the works of Caesar (Diss. J.W. Goethe University: Frankfurt, 1952 (typescript)), pp. 20-21.

in warfare.[17] Besides furnishing Rome with the immediate rewards expected of successful warfare--power, glory, prestige--the nation's proficiency in the military arts leaves her people free to enjoy both their res publica and their private pursuits (nostrae res, 11.24). Ability to fight (foreign) wars is thus of the highest usefulness (summa utilitas), as it makes possible the undisturbed enjoyment of all other, non-military activities. While civil strife risks bringing about disruption of the empire, foreign war maintains and expands it.[18] While civil war is condemned, foreign conflicts are praised.[19] Foreign enemies are hostes, and a just war can be waged against them.[20] Indeed, any Roman bellum externum had come to be regarded ipso facto as a "just" war, by Horace's time.[21] A just, that is to say foreign,

[17] Pro Murena 10.22: Haec (sc. rei militaris virtus) nomen populo Romano, haec huic urbi aeternam gloriam peperit, haec orbem terrarum parere huic imperio coegit, ... .

[18] P. Jal, "Bellum civile - bellum externum dans la Rome de la fin de la République," LEC, 30 (1962), 385. Compare p. 56, note 5 (Cicero's words to this effect).

[19] Jal, op. cit., 261.

[20] Cicero, In Catilinam II.1, 1: ...cum hoste...bellum iustum geremus. Strictly speaking, only a non-Roman could be declared a hostis; and, technically, no civil war could be bellum iustum because the enemy was not a hostis, but only inimicus (P. Jal, "Hostis(publicus) dans la littérature de la fin de la République," REA, 65 (1963), 53-79). But the Hostiserklärung, like the rules of the bellum iustum, came to be twisted for political ends (as here, against Catiline).

[21] See Brunt's and Moore's remarks on Res Gestae 26.3 and H. Drexler, "Iustum bellum," RhM, 102 (1959), 97-140 (with copious documentation). The perversion of strict ius fetiale, by which wars were to be fought only for res repetitae (Cicero,

war--unlike a civil conflict--had the support of the gods, as they aided those with justice on their side.[22] In effect, Roman reasoning on foreign wars became circular: they were successful because "just," and their justice was confirmed by their success.

Thus these aspects of bellum externum, its utility, rightness, and Roman CHARACTER, were already well established when the Augustan writers came to deal with the subject. The legitimacy as well as advantage of foreign war may be seen clearly in an episode in Livy (I.16, 7) which parallels but goes beyond Cicero's recommendation (above, pp. 58-59). Romulus is assigned a speech, in his epiphany before Proculus Iulius, that sets both the Roman military and Roman imperialism in a very favorable light. "Go and tell the Romans that it is the gods' will that my Rome be capital of the world. Let them pursue military arts and be aware--and pass on this consciousness to their descendants--that no human strength can stand against Roman arms."[23] This idea, that the gods have given Roman

---

De Officiis I.36), seems to have been well advanced by Polybius' time. See W.V. Harris, "On war and greed in the Second Century B.C.," AHR, 76, no. 5 (December 1971), 1372-1373. "By Caesar's time...there were no important independent nations left except the Parthians, and practically speaking, any war in which Rome was engaged was a bellum iustum by definition" (Collins, Propaganda, p. 21).

[22]Drexler, op. cit., 98-102.

[23]'Abi, nuntia,' inquit, 'Romanis, caelestes ita velle ut mea Roma caput orbis terrarum sit; proinde rem militarem colant sciantque et ita posteris tradant nullas opes humanas armis Romanis resistere posse.'

imperialism carte blanche, and that the world is Rome's for the taking, appears in similar form in both Vergil and Horace, where it is given its most exalted form.

## 2. The Augustan Writers on Foreign War and Foreign Policy.

Juno's speech of Odes III.3 (18-68) expresses the same promise of divinely-sanctioned world empire as does Romulus' speech, in Livy.[1] As long as the Romans forswear rebuilding Troy, they will conquer not only the Parthians[2] but the rest of the world with them. Provided Rome avoids war-for-profit[3] (49-52), and the ensuing moral corruption, she will extend her name to (i.e., control) the farthest shores (45-48).

[1]See above, p. 60, with note 23. The warning (37-42, 57-68) not to rebuild Troy has been interpreted in as many ways as there are Horatian scholars, with its exegesis still an open question. Whatever its meaning, it does not directly affect the discussion of 45-56 and is therefore immaterial.

[2]The conquest of the Parthians is the prime task of Roman imperialism. They must first be brought to terms in order for the rest of the gentes, and the world, to become Rome's. See Appendix 2, pp. 159-161 for a fuller discussion of this idea.

[3]The practice of initiating foreign wars for financial gain came into vogue with the Mithridatic Wars of 89 B.C. (E. Badian, Roman Imperialism in the late Republic, 2nd Ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), pp. 55-59), and may have originated much earlier (Harris, op.cit., 1382-1384). The profits to be realized through bellum externum--and the political uses to which they could be put at home--proved too great to be ignored. Julius Caesar's subjugation of Gaul was undertaken for, and resulted in, "his personal glory and profit" (Badian, Roman Imperialism, p. 89), while Crassus' disastrous attack on Parthia had the same objectives (Badian, p. 88). Horace here attempts to disassociate war-for-glory from war-for-profit, by inserting his warning against greed (and sacrilege) in between the stanzas predicting Roman hegemony. Less idealistically, his friend Tibullus baldly attacks the monetary uses of war (I.2, 67-70), and declines to celebrate Roman imperialism at all.

She will reach the limits of the earth--wherever they stand--with her armed might (53-56). The hottest and coldest regions of the earth, the entire world, will be hers. Roman imperium will be conterminous with the extent of the world. This world-wide supremacy through bellum externum is promised by the gods.[4] Elsewhere Horace predicts that Augustus himself will rule the world, subject only to Jupiter (Odes I.12, 53-60). Roman hegemony, under his direction, will be complete when the Parthians are overcome and, subsequently, the rest of the world becomes Rome's.[5] Augustus will be regarded as a god on earth, once he has added the Parthians and Britons to the empire (Odes III.5, 2-4). He will be supreme, as will Rome, over all the earth, once these obstacles to Roman hegemony are overcome.[6]

Vergil's support for Roman imperialism goes beyond Horace's; he both adduces divine sanction for it and provides a social rationale. Jupiter tells Venus, regarding the future

[4]This is why Horace places the speech in Juno's mouth. Her prophecy indicates divine approval of all she foretells, and her will is representative of that of all the gods. If Rome's (the Trojans') old enemy refuses to stand in her way, no other deity (or mortal) will do so either. For the divine endorsement, compare Livy's speech by the deified Romulus (above, p. 60, note 23), where caelestes ita velle reinforces the effect of the god-given prophecy.

[5]See Appendix 2, p. 159 and above, p. 62, note 2.

[6]Appendix 2, pp. 159-160...praesens divus habebitur/ Augustus adiectis Britannis/imperio gravibusque Persis implies that the Princeps must conquer Parthia and Britain to gain complete control of the world. Rome's supremacy will become complete with Augustus' own.

Roman nation, that he will set no temporal or spatial limitations on Roman rule.[7] Rome is to have unbounded imperium. Even Juno will relent in her vindictiveness, and aid Jupiter in the task of making the Romans masters of the world.[8] Moreover, the Romans have a civilizing mission to fulfill, with the help and encouragement of the gods. They are to rule the other peoples of the world and impose on them the habit of peace, sparing those already in their power but relentlessly warring into submission all those who defy Roman rule.[9] These are the Roman skills, administration and war.[10]

Propertius holds to a favorable view regarding Rome's expansion by arms, although he appeals neither to godly approval

[7] Aeneid I.278-279: His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono:/imperium sine fine dedi... . Many of the passages cited here and later in this chapter are borrowed from H.D. Meyer, Die Aussenpolitik des Augustus und die augusteische Dichtung (Köln: Böhlau, 1961), passim.

[8] Aeneid I.279-282: ...quin aspera Iuno/.../consilia in melius referet, mecumque fovebit/Romanos,rerum dominos gentemque togatam./

[9] Aen. VI.851-853 (Anchises to Aeneas): 'tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento/(hae tibi erunt artes), pacisque imponere morem,/parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.' C.M. Wells observes (Augustus' German Policy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, forthcoming 1972), p. 4) that 853 contains "the quintessential statement of Roman imperialist doctrine." The verse "embraces the whole of non-Roman mankind: all who were not subiecti, and who did not want to be, were automatically superbi" (loc. cit.).

[10] In Aen. VI.791-800, Augustus' rule and the coming of the Golden Age are associated with the triumph of Roman imperialism. There can be no perfect happiness (the aurea saecula, 792-793) until Roman control of the world is complete. The conquered are just as happy to receive the benefits of Roman government (Georgics IV.559-562).

nor to the superior character of Roman society. For the elegist, as for Horace, Roman hegemony will follow upon her conquest of the Parthians.[11] For the author of Panegyricus Messallae, no land in the world will resist Messalla's (and Rome's) arms (147-148). He alone will be declared great--and Rome only will be supreme--in all the inhabitable regions of the world (149-176). Ovid, too, looks for complete Roman domination of the earth (Metamorphoses XV.829-833). Whatever gentes or inhabited regions the earth supports will be Augustus'. He is the iustissimus auctor who will bring the ways and statutes of the Roman people to these barbari. Every land will fear and respect the Romans (Fasti I.717-718). Pax is implored to present herself throughout the world (ibid., 711-712); her extent will match that of Roman imperium. Enforcement of this peace is, significantly, in the hands of Mars (Fasti V.556-558). It is his prerogative to begin wars against any disrespectful eastern people, or any western nation still unconquered.[12]

[11] III.4, 1-4: Parthia will submit to Roman law (4) and the ends of the earth will furnish Rome with triumphs (3, parat ultima terra triumphos); II.10: Parthia will come to terms (13-14) and India will be conquered (15, India quin, Auguste, tuo dat colla triumpho) along with "untouched" Arabia (16). The Parthians' submission and that of the rest of the world are also associated in IV.3 (7-10, 35-36) and IV.6 (77 ff.).

[12] ibid., 557-558: seu quis ab Eoo nos impius orbe lacesset/seu quis ab occiduo sole domandus erit, where impius/domandus correspond to Vergil's subiecti and superbi (above, p. 64, note 9). Both passages strongly imply that the subjugation and continued control of all the world's peoples is not only Rome's inalienable right but her duty.

All these poets regard imperialism as a Roman national role, whose fulfillment will lead inevitably to world hegemony. This role and domination are god-given, in the view of Horace, Vergil, and Ovid; divine approval is paralleled and supplemented by the cultural superiority and civilizing mission of Roman government and Roman law.[13] The conquest of every people outside the Roman empire is more than a mere privilege: it is Rome's duty to spread her superior, god-given order throughout the world. Nor is peace as conquest and hegemony an idea confined solely to the sphere of poetry. Peace as the product, the fruit of conquest occupies a position of great importance in Augustus' foreign policy, as well.

[13]"Again and again in Augustan poetry the concepts of conquest and peace are accompanied by the idea of *iura dare*, the benefit of Roman law" (G. Williams, *Tradition*, pp. 436-437 (on Horace, Odes III.3, 42-44)).

3. Augustus' Foreign Policy: Imperialism and Pragmatism.

Augustus claimed to be heir to the great traditions of Republican Rome. Of these, conquest and the extension of Rome's imperium were certainly of vital importance to him;[1] his own political autobiography makes this clear. He boasted that he had brought the entire world under Roman control.[2] His foreign policy aimed at world domination, whatever its accomplishments (and they were impressive), and is best termed imperialism.[3] For Augustus deliberately and unrelentingly set about extending Roman power over the gentes outside the empire, with the object

[1]Military success and the holding of public office were the two principal means of acquiring virtus or value to the state and thereby advancing one's political career (Badian, Roman Imperialism, p. 13). For Augustus, the political prestige that resulted from military success was always an important consideration in his foreign-policy decisions (Wells, German Policy, p. 5). In similar fashion, his adoptive father undertook the subjugation of Gaul to establish his political supremacy over Pompey (J.H. Collins, Propaganda, ethics, and psychological assumptions in the works of Caesar, pp. 50-51). Julius Caesar was--like Augustus--first and foremost a politician; his military endeavors served his political causes (Collins, Propaganda, p. 5).

[2]Proem to Res Gestae: Rerum gestarum divi Augusti, quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit... . Both the proem and text make it clear that Augustus' two main sources of pride are (1) his extension of Roman imperium over the entire world and (2) his largesse; both were motivated by political considerations.

[3]For purposes of this thesis, P.A. Brunt's description (Brunt and Moore, Res Gestae, p. 69) of Augustus' foreign policy, "a cautious but systematic programme of world conquest," is used as a general definition of imperialism. Roman domination of the world was not, to Horace's generation, a far-fetched idea; see Appendix 2, pp. 161-162.

of making Rome's influence paramount in the inhabited world. His conquests were numerous and ambitious, undertaken all about the periphery of the Roman Empire over a period of more than thirty years.[4] The Ethiopian and Arabian expeditions were naked aggression.[5] Even the Parthian settlement of 20 B.C. bears the mark of prudence rather than friendship, and may have been imperialism by nonmilitary means.[6] Nor can Augustus' actions after 20 be explained solely in terms of a "basic defensive";[7] Augustus' conquests in Germany and the Balkans go beyond mere defensive actions. As commander in chief of the

[4]Augustus' first aggressive campaigns were those in Spain, 26-24 B.C.; the last, those against the Bohemians in A.D. 6; cf. Syme, Roman Revolution, pp. 332-333, 431 and CAH, X (1934), pp. 134-135 and 368-369.

[5]Compare Strabo XVI.4, 22 and note 7 below.

[6]See the discussion of Roman imperialism below, pp.70-76.

[7]H.D. Meyer, Die Aussenpolitik des Augustus und die augusteische Dichtung, p. 3: "Augustus hat mit Entschiedenheit die Aussenpolitik auf eine grundsätzliche Defensive umgestellt; eine grundsätzliche Defensive, denn Expansionen, die gerade wegen der defensiven Haltung an manchen Stellen um der Abrundung willen geboten schienen, waren nicht ausgeschlossen." The Arabian and Ethiopian expeditions simply will not pass muster as defensive moves; an extension of territory as far south as Nabata or southeast as Mariba would hardly constitute an Abrundung. The Ethiopian expedition seems rather to have been aimed at bringing that region into Rome's sphere of influence (S. Jameson, "Chronology of the campaigns of Aelius Gallus and C. Petronius," JRS, 58 (1968), 71-84, especially 79-81). The Arabian campaign was designed to bring "conquest in the pursuit of revenue" (Brunt, JRS, 53, 173 and Horace, Odes I.29, 1-4). The German campaigns (dismissed by Meyer, p. 3, n. 2) are the clearest evidence that Augustus did not, as Jameson seems to believe (op. cit., 83-84), pursue any consilium coercendi intra terminos imperi after 20; cf. Wells, Chapters 3 and 7.

Roman armies, Augustus successfully directed the conquest of northeast Spain, the Alpine regions, Germany to the Elbe (later lost), and the Balkans up to the Danube. It is immaterial here to investigate these campaigns in detail;[8] it need only be understood that they were both very extensive and the result of a deliberate and systematic scheme of subjugation.[9]

The celebrated Pax Augusta was not the product of a mere holding action. Pax has strong overtones of conquest, in Republican history and especially in Augustus' foreign policy.[10]

[8]On the Spanish campaigns, see Syme, pp. 332-333 and CAH, X, pp. 134-135. On the German campaigns, see the detailed accounts by Wells, Ch. 3 and 7; on the Danube campaigns, cf. Syme in CAH, X, Ch. 12.

[9]Of the decades after Actium, Syme pointedly remarks, "The next generation was to witness the orderly execution of a programme of rational aggression without match or parallel as yet in the history of Rome" (p. 303).

[10]Syme (Roman Revolution, p. 304) observes, "the word 'pax' can seldom be divorced from notions of conquest, or at least compulsion." Augustus uses pacare to mean "conquer": Res Gestae 26.2, Gallias et Hispanias provincias, item Germaniam ...pacavi; 26.3, Alpes...pacificavi...; 25.1, Mare pacavi a praedonibus. Latin pax, unlike the Greek εἰρήνη, means more than a simple cessation of hostilities between two nations; it implies "a created and secured legal relationship" between them (H. Fuchs, Augustin und der antike Friedensgedanke (Zürich: Weidmann, 1965; first published 1926), p. 185). Such a legal relationship meant, for the Romans, dominance of the one party (themselves) and submission by the other (Badian, Roman Imperialism, p. 15). "The obedience of the weak to the strong was, to the Roman aristocrat, nothing less than an eternal moral law" (Badian, loc. cit). The Romans always regarded pax only as the product of victory (Fuchs, op. cit., p. 201); thus, a treaty of peace (pax) was a mere legitimization of Rome's dominance over another people, won by force of arms. Pacare (above) was "the customary expression for the subjugation of a people by armed struggle and its addition to the Roman sphere of power" (Fuchs, loc. cit.).

The domestic half of pax et otium, an old formula,[11] varies directly with the success of the aggressive foreign policy to which it is tied. The Pax Augusta had a warlike and aggressive side that protected its internal security and prosperity; Horace was well acquainted with this relationship. Augustan imperialism involved the prosecution of this pax to its logical conclusion, domination of the entire orbis terrarum by Rome.

Augustus' chief means to this end were outright annexation and what may be termed "hegemonial imperialism."[12] The first involves conquest of a nation and its addition to the Roman Empire proper as a province.[13] The second denotes effective Roman control over semi-autonomous states within a given area, a sphere of influence. This control or influence is exerted either through alliances or by diplomatic means. Augustus was aware that the effectiveness of annexation was limited; due to lack of adequate manpower or the enemy's strength,

[11] Fuchs, Friedensgedanke, p. 185: pax et otium means "a created and secured legal relationship with the outside [pax] and in consequence thereof the security of repose [otium]." This pair of terms is found associated as early as Plautus (loc. cit.).

[12] Badian's term (Roman Imperialism, p. 7). Their use here is justified by the realities of foreign policy in Augustus' time, basically unchanged from those of the late Republic. He pursued policies similar to those of his Republican predecessors, for about the same reasons. On the use of conquest vs. hegemony, see Badian, Ch. I and II, passim.

[13] On conquest and annexation see pp. 67-69 above.

he could not pursue imperialistic designs by conquest alone.[14] Nor was it possible for him to succeed using only alliances and diplomacy, divorced from war or the threat of war. Rome's success on the battlefield was what made Augustus' hegemonial imperialism effective. The Princeps used force of arms, alliance, and diplomacy as complementary methods for achieving the same objective, Roman control of the world.

Augustus clearly holds hegemonial imperialism in as high regard as he does conquest; both are equally prominent in his Res Gestae (26-33). Individual circumstances determine what method or combination of methods is to be used to further his designs. The Princeps underlines the importance of vassalage in bringing the gentes under Roman control (27.2). After tersely noting Egypt's incorporation into the Roman Empire, he goes on to say that he could also have made Armenia a province. However, he preferred to follow Republican precedent[15] by handing the country over to Tigranes, the native ruler, for him

[14]Prudence, rather than any pacific intentions, lies behind his decision to try negotiation with Parthia rather than attempt her subjugation. Augustus had the debacles of Antony and Crassus in mind: a repetition of them on his part would be not only a severe setback militarily but, more dangerous, a disaster in terms of loss of political prestige at home.

[15]See the discussion in Badian, pp. 14-15. The understood beneficium-officium relationship, by which Rome's actions bound the beneficiary as a client state, is present here as well. Cf. also below, note 18.

to govern.[16] But Tigranes' acceptance of the crown from Augustus (through Tiberius) constituted his de facto recognition of and subordination to Roman authority. This is indicated by Augustus' following remark, that Armenia later "rebelled" against Rome, and was crushed.[17] The Armenian prince's consecration as king at Roman hands constituted an act of fealty to Roman *imperium*. In effect, Tigranes had become a *cliens*, and Armenia part of Rome's *clientela*, through his acceptance of power, Augustus' *beneficium*.[18] This *beneficium* bound Armenia to Rome; her duty (*officium*) was that of obedience to Roman authority. Consequently, anything other than compliance constituted nothing less than rebellion, which Rome was entitled to suppress by force.[19]

Armenia's vassalage illuminates Augustus' practice of appointing kings native to the nation in question, to assure

[16] 27.2: *Armeniam maiorem...cum possem facere provinciam malui maiorum nostrorum exemplo regnum id Tigrani...per Ti. Neronem tradere, qui tum mihi privignus erat.*

[17] ...*eandem gentem postea desciscentem et rebellantem domitam per Gaium filium meum*... .

[18] Also not without Republican precedent; see Badian, pp. 14-15. "It was clear that the whole world owed *officia* to the great power [Rome] acting through the men who governed it" (p. 15). This way of regarding the gentes as subordinate to Roman rule became standard and remained so despite the Parthian settlement of 20 B.C.; see K.H. Ziegler, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964), pp. 42, 95-96.

[19] "Henceforward *subiecti*, they [the Armenians] might now be justly and necessarily warred upon, if they rebelled" (Wells, p. 10).

its loyalty to the Roman state (Res Gestae 33). Two states, Parthia and Media (called Atropatene) are said to have sought and accepted rulers from Augustus.[20] The royal ancestry of these princes is stressed, to rule out any doubts of their legitimacy as heirs to their respective thrones (loc. cit.). But what really matters to Augustus is not their pedigree but their usefulness to his hegemonial designs. For he regarded them, so Suetonius recalls,[21] as none other than limbs and parts of the Roman Empire.[22] In appearance, these monarchs are their own peoples' chosen leaders, returned from a few years' absence in Rome. Actually, they are the Princeps' key to indirect control over these satellite kingdoms, the empire outside the Empire. His supplying these nations with rulers binds them quasi-legally to Rome, as the case of Armenia shows (above, p. 72). If they attempt to break the bonds, they can be dealt with similarly.

The Princeps' use of diplomacy is quite another matter. Here the key element is Rome's military and political prestige. Augustus' proudest accomplishment, the recovery of the military

[20] loc. cit.: a me...per legatos principes earum gentium reges petitos acceperunt: Parthi Vononem...Medi Ariobarzanem,... .

[21] Divus Augustus, 48: ...nec aliter universos (sc. reges) quam membra partisque imperii curae habuit,... .

[22] This policy, in Armenia's instance especially, had its drawbacks, for "it was not easy to find kings who were both loyal to Rome and acceptable to their own people" (Brunt & Moore, Res Gestae, p. 72 on 27.2).

standards captured by the Parthians (R.G. 29.2), is the result of such prestige diplomacy.[23] He claims that he not only recovered these ensigns but actually compelled the Parthians to seek as suppliants the friendship (amicitia) of the Roman people.[24] The statement follows another, similar sentence telling how he got back other signa militaria from Spain, Gaul, and the Dalmatians, by conquest (devictis hostibus). Augustus' juxtaposition of these statements implies that the quite diplomatic settlement with Phraates IV was a conquest, a victory like those won in the west, even if not by arms.[25] The importance of such amicitia in extending Roman influence is reiterated elsewhere in Res Gestae. Phraates, Augustus relates, sent his sons to Italy as "pledges" (pignora), security against his good faith, not due to his defeat in war but out of a desire to secure for himself Augustus' amicitia.[26] What was

[23]By "prestige diplomacy," negotiation from strength is meant, nonviolent acquisition of territorial and/or political concessions based directly on one's favorable military and political position vis-à-vis the nation(s) in question. No such diplomacy can be successful without a precedent of military victory corroborated by present threat of force. It need not be added that Augustus never negotiated from a position of weakness.

[24]29.2: Parthos trium exercitum Romanorum spolia et signa reddere mihi supplicesque amicitiam populi Romani petere coegi.

[25]The diplomatic coup was thus represented on Roman coins issued subsequent to 20 B.C. (Kiessling-Heinze on Horace, Epist. I.12, 27-28; Brunt, JRS, 53 (1963), 174).

[26]R.G. 32.2: ...Phrates...filios suos nepotesque omnes misit in Italiam non bello superatus, sed amicitiam nostram per liberorum suorum pignora petens.

yielded under compulsion earlier (29.2) is now given freely. The effect, however, remains the same. Non bello superatus (of Phraates) serves as much to hint that the Parthians were overcome, by nonmilitary means, as to emphasize the power of amicitia.[27]

The political significance of amicitia for Roman imperialism in general becomes clearer still from an examination of the gentes' quest of it, through diplomatic missions. What is especially noteworthy is the remoteness of these (as yet) unconquered peoples. Amicitia is the basis of Augustus' and Rome's influence in areas the Romans are unable (or unwilling) to subjugate by force of arms. The Princeps claims as a "first" for his regime the sending of delegates from India.[28] The Bastarnae, Scyths, and Sarmatian kings--the last from beyond the Don--and the kings of the Albanians, Iberians, and Medes are also all said to have sought the Roman leader's amicitia (31.2). Here as in the case of Parthia (29, 32), the emphasis placed on amicitia, and its desirability to the gentes, suggest the idea of an empire built on such diplomatic relations. It parallels and supplements the imperium obtained by annexation (R.G. 26, 27, 30) and alliance. The impression

[27] One meaning of amicitia, in late Republican times, is the relationship between a politician and his followers (RE I.2, cols. 1831-1833 s.v. amicus), their political dependence on and obligation to him. In international affairs, amicitia populi Romani involves a pledge of nonaggression and is tantamount to "diplomatic relations" (ibid.).

[28] R.G. 31.1: Ad me ex India regum legationes saepe missae sunt non visae ante id tempus apud quemquam Romanorum ducem.

thus created is that Roman authority is as universal and pervasive as it is varied in form. It owes its very universality, one is led to believe, to the multiplicity of means by which it is realized, and with it Roman imperialism. This diversity of approach, and its checkered career, are reflected accurately in Horace's foreign-war poetry.

4. Horace on Augustus' Foreign Policy: The Earlier Poetry.

Horace's foreign-war poetry of the period 30-20 B.C.[1] provides a forthright endorsement of Augustus' foreign policy. Yet this support is qualified by the poet's relegation to the future[2] of completed conquests and fully realized Roman hegemony. Rome's supremacy under Augustus will be complete, once the requisite conquests have been made.[3] The Princeps and Rome alone will be supreme on earth, but only when they have won this mastery through imperial expansion.[4] There is no doubt that Horace shares the Princeps' traditional[5] attitude toward

[1]These dates are not chosen arbitrarily. As will be seen below (Section 6), parallel developments in Augustus' foreign policy and Horace's poems about it occur during this time-period.

[2]There is merit in Salmon's remarks ("The political views of Horace," p. 12) that, for Horace, Augustus "will be the man to set the world to rights... ." For the present, however, Horace "still proposes to appraise him objectively and see if his performance lives up to his promise" (loc. cit.).

[3]Odes III.5, 2-4; I.12, 53-60; cf. above, Section 2, p. 62, note 2 and p. 63, note 6. Odes III.4, 29-36 may also be an endorsement of Augustus' planned or hoped-for conquests; see Theiler, Musengedicht, p. 262. At III.4's time of writing (probably 28-27), Horace's words are not so much "ein Kompliment an den Caesar" (Theiler, loc. cit.) as encouragement for him in his unaccomplished foreign-policy objectives.

[4]To be completely in control of Rome, Augustus must first subjugate all the peoples of the world. "Der göttlichen Ordnung gleichgerichtet ist jene des Augustus, die Weltherrschaft und -Ordnung und Weltfrieden bedeutet, werden doch die Ränder der Welt als sicher befriedet empfunden" (Wili, Horaz, p. 146 on Odes I.12, 53-60). See also Kiessling-Heinze on I.12, 53-56, and K. Rupprecht, "Das 12. Lied des 1. Buchs der Carmina von Horaz," AU, 2 (1951), 70-99, especially 90.

[5]See Section 3 of this chapter, p. 69, note 10.

the outside gentes. The Cantabrians must be taught to bear the Roman yoke (Odes II.6, 2), the natural higher order. Kingdoms and rulers outside the present bounds of the Roman Empire are awaiting subjugation by Rome; although this project has yet to be carried out, it undoubtedly will be.[6]

Although he calls for Roman hegemony and a program of conquest, Horace pragmatically assesses the limited gains of Augustus' program of annexation and hegemonial imperialism. Until such time as Augustus has brought the world under Roman authority, Horace must content himself with commending whatever the Princeps has accomplished toward this goal. This realistic approach is reflected in several odes of the mid-20's, a period when Roman imperialism was meeting with a mixture of success and failure.[7] In Odes II.9, Horace calls upon his friend Valgius to celebrate with him Augustus' "new victories" (18-19). As for the Parthians (20-22), Augustus' nova tropaea over them--restricted as they are--may be anticipated future

[6]Odes II.12, 9-12: ...tuque [Maecenas] pedestribus/ dices historiis proelia Caesaris,/..., melius ductaque per vias/ regum colla minacium. Compare Sat. II.1, 12-15 and Odes I.6, 1-4. These recusationes show approval of bellum externum at the same time that they declare Horace's "inability" (i.e., unwillingness) to celebrate it in epic verse.

[7]The most conspicuous shortcomings of these years were Augustus' inability to reduce Spain finally (Syme, Roman Revolution, pp. 332-333) and the failure of the Ethiopian and Arabian adventures (above, Section 3, p. 68, note 7).

achievements rather than present fact.[8] Likewise the Geloni ride, or will shortly ride, within their own reservation (*intra praescriptum*).[9] Quinctius, a politician, is told (Odes II.11, 1-5) not to worry about the Cantabrians' or Scyths' activities. Horace hints that both nations have been brought under control, the former through military means, the latter by diplomatic agreement (see note 9). Odes III.8 reports a secure frontier situation (17-24): Maecenas doesn't need to worry about any threat from the gentes outside the Empire. Thanks to military victory (limited, over the Cantabrians and Dacians: 18, 21-22), skillful diplomacy (23-24, the Scythian withdrawal), and civil strife affecting Rome's enemies (19-20, unrest within Parthia), all is well. Roman *imperium* is secure, if not expanding, in all parts of the world.

Horace does not pretend that all the peoples named here have been defeated in battle or battered into submission by the might of Roman legions. Instead, as in II.9 and II.11, he points to a limited degree of security attained by various means: military victory, timely civil war, systematic reduction and enslavement, and negotiation. Not outright conquest alone

[8]Kiessling-Heinze, Introduction to Odes II.9, who compares Sat. II.1, 15. Horace may well be borrowing against the future earnings of Augustan imperialism, in both passages.

[9]*Res Gestae* 31.2 may refer to delegations Augustus received while he was in Spain in 26-24 B.C. (Kiessling-Heinze *ad loc.*). Lines 23-24 of the ode may then allude to an agreement reached with these gentes (including the Scyths) to avoid incursions into Roman territory.

but rather a measure of Roman control over the outside gentes is the accomplishment celebrated or anticipated. This securing of the imperial status quo, and the present or imminent nova tropaea, are of less than spectacular character. They are celebrated nevertheless, in keeping with Horace's advocacy of Roman expansionism. He would like to see much more glorious and important victories, and the extension of Roman hegemony over all the world. While he may hope for and encourage such events, he must for the present content himself with writing the truth about Augustus' achievements as he sees them, restricted though they may be.

(Odes I.29)

Odes I.29 seems upon casual examination to be a blanket condemnation of foreign war in general. Its actual intent is the same as that of Odes III.3, 49-52 (above, p. 62, note 3). There Horace issues a serious general statement to the effect that foreign wars must be fought only to fulfill Rome's imperial destiny, never for profit or booty. Here his criticism of the profit motive in war is repeated, but in a humorous, personal, and occasional poem: he pokes fun at the military (and monetary) ambitions of a young friend, Iccius. It must be noted (1) that his strictures are good-natured and (2) that he does not condemn bellum externum categorically but only parodies the lure of booty and high adventure (1-10). Commager is wrong to see here "a sense of disenchantment with Rome's

national progress."[10] Horace does disapprove of Iccius' behavior and of the expedition as well, as motivated by political ambition and greed, respectively. But he loses faith neither in his friend[11] nor in the higher objectives of Roman imperialism, as his later work so clearly shows.

[10] Odes of Horace, p. 228. The ode's "cultivated humour" and witty criticism are well appreciated by Nisbet and Hubbard, p. 339. "We must not take Horace's banter here or his imputation of avaricious motives as serious," Wickham notes (2nd. Ed., Introduction to I.29).

[11] The later epistle (I.12) shows that the men are still good friends. Horace does caution Iccius against the risks of avarice (1-11), but compliments him for his perseverance in philosophical studies (12-20).

## 5. Horace on Augustus' Foreign Policy: The Later Poetry (After 20 B.C.).

The later foreign-war poetry (c. 20-13 B.C.) displays a marked difference from the earlier (above, Section 4); but this difference is one of degree and not substance. Horace's continued support of Augustus' foreign policy is unmistakeable. Previously he had placed its complete success in the future, or accepted its present, limited results; he now celebrates its realization. Once again, his inclination to assess realistically the results of Augustus' initiatives lies at the base of his outlook. Earlier, he could not praise highly the success of the Princeps' imperialistic program: there was then not much to celebrate. Beginning with the Parthian confrontation, Augustus' steadfast imperialism at last begins to bear real fruit. Horace may now render it due credit.

As in his earlier foreign-war poetry, Horace commends hegemonial imperialism or annexation or both, depending upon the foreign-policy developments with which each poem concerns itself. He evaluates Rome's expansionism realistically, regardless of what form it takes. Two epistles written sometime after 20 reflect Augustus' first great diplomatic success, WITH the Parthians. Epistles I.12, in the main a personal letter to Iccius, concludes with a note on new Roman political developments (25-29). The Cantabrians and Armenians have

fallen to Roman arms,[1] Horace notes (26-27), while Phraates has acknowledged Augustus' authority on his knees (27-28). At home, prosperity reigns (28-29). The epistle addressed to Lollius Maximus, I.18, celebrates the same negotiated victory over Parthia (56-57). Augustus has not only recovered the lost standards from Parthia's temples; he has awarded to Roman arms the task of subjugating any peoples still defiant of Roman authority.[2] In the first poem, conquest and prestige diplomacy appear as two separate aspects of Augustus' foreign policy. Each furthers his imperialism and Rome's dominion in its own way.[3] The thought of Epist. I.18 is that Parthia's submission

[1]Strictly speaking, this is a gross exaggeration; but Armenia has "fallen" to Roman imperialism in the sense that she has become a client state and is thus under Roman *imperium*. See Section 3, pp. 71-72 with notes and Brunt and Moore on *Res Gestae* 27.2. The interpretation of the Parthian settlement as a diplomatic victory matches Augustus' own view (*R.G.* 29.2; see above, Section 3, p. 74). *Ius imperiumque Phraates/Caesaris accepit genibus minor* here (27-28) answers to Augustus' claim, *Parthos...supplicesque amicitiam populi Romani petere coegi* (*R.G.*, loc. cit). Horace's *ius imperiumque Caesaris* says much about the nature of Augustus' *amicitia* in the sphere of international relations.

[2]57: ...*et, siquid abest, Italis adiudicat armis*. Literally, "he [Augustus] awards to Italian arms whatever is lacking," i.e., whatever region is currently unincorporated in the Roman Empire. Now that Parthia has been brought to terms, the subjugation of the rest of the world is only a matter of time. See Appendix 2, pp. 159-161.

[3]The concluding note on Italy's (agricultural) prosperity may be simply an item of domestic news, given in concluding the missive. It is more likely included to suggest that foreign war and domestic well-being are related, the former safeguarding the latter.

has cleared the way for the completion of Roman world hegemony.[4] Now that the prime obstacle to Rome's domination has been removed,[5] Augustus is free to proceed with the expansion of Rome's imperium elsewhere.[6] Both epistles reveal the opportunistic nature of his foreign policy. Horace's praise of conquest and diplomacy from strength in both contexts reflects the flexibility of the Princeps' approach to hegemony. In the rest of Horace's later poetry, as in Augustus' pragmatic foreign policy, both annexation and hegemonial imperialism are given full play.

The brief remarks on foreign affairs in the Carmen Saeculare (53-56) highlight the role of force in implementing hegemony. Now the Parthians fear and respect Roman power (53-54); the threat of force helps assure their compliance with Rome's aims. The Scythians and Indians, mindful of Augustus' strength in his dealings with Parthia, have put aside their arrogance in their quest for Rome's friendship (55-56). They

[4]Epist. I.18 is thus an affirmative reply to Odes I.12 and III.5, with their implicit requirement that Augustus deal with Parthia before Roman imperialism can rule the world. See above, Section 2, pp. 62-63 and Appendix 2, pp. 159-160.

[5]Appendix 2, loc. cit.

[6]Both Brunt (175) and Wells (pp. 12-13) understand Augustus' Parthian policy as designed to secure the eastern frontier, prior to his undertaking "large scale offensive operations in the north" (Brunt, loc. cit.). First and foremost of these northern projects is the subjugation of Germany, on which see especially Wells, Chapters 3 and 7.

too now want to come to terms. Augustus' imperialistic goals are now well on their way to complete realization.[7]

Odes IV.4 and 14 are occasional poems in that they celebrate specific victories won by Augustus' stepsons, Tiberius and Drusus. Horace was prompted to compose them for these occasions,[8] and in this respect they are official poetry. But both odes deal with broader themes as well. From the Alpine campaigns of the Princeps' stepsons, Horace goes on to deal with Roman foreign war (IV.4, 50-76) and the hegemonial imperialism based on it (IV.14, 34-52). Odes IV.4 links the desperate struggles of the past to the sure victories awaiting Roman arms in the present and future. Drusus' victories over the Vindelici (1-28) and the martial qualities they require (29-36) recall his ancestor's victory at the Metaurus River (207 B.C.) (37-48). This marks a turning point in Rome's fortunes in war. Hannibal's speech (50-76) proclaims the tenacity and irresistible might of Roman arms, and finally declares

[7]The Parthians, Rome's prime adversaries, have submitted, and the Indians, the world's remotest people, are about to; this means that Rome will shortly have the entire earth to herself (Appendix 2, p. 162). For Augustus as for Horace, the Indians (Res Gestae 31.1) represent the remotest regions of the earth; their desire for amicitia is tantamount to the rest of the world's submission along with their own.

[8]Suetonius, Vita Horati: ...[Augustus Horatium] iniunxerit...Vindelicam victoriam Tiberii Drusique privignorum suorum,... . Suetonius' following remark, that Augustus prompted Horace's addition of a fourth book of odes to Odes I-III, does not necessarily mean any more than that he persuaded the poet to collect his lyrics written after 23 B.C. and publish them as a book (Fraenkel, pp. 364-365).

(73-76) that Augustus' stepsons are the present agents of victorious bellum externum.[9] From the life-and-death contests with Hannibal, from mere defense of her own territory, Rome has progressed to glorious conquest, which will eventually extend Roman imperium over all the earth. Foreign war is as vital and just[10] a force now for fulfilling Rome's imperial destiny as it once was for preserving her very existence. The ode upholds throughout the rightness and very Roman character of bellum externum.[11]

While IV.4 relates Drusus' victories to Roman foreign war in general, IV.14 celebrates Tiberius' conquests in their relationship to hegemonial imperialism. In passing, it appeals to a superior legal order, said to be associated with Roman military might (7-8).[12] Thematically, the ode may be said to

[9]73-75: nil Claudiae non perficient manus,/quas et benigno numine Iuppiter/defendit... . As in Odes III.3, unconditional divine support of Roman imperialism is alleged.

[10]The gods (here, Jupiter, 74) protect Roman arms because their cause is just; see Drexler, "Iustum bellum," 98 ff.

[11]Odes IV.2 is comparable. There, Horace lauds the expected conquest by Augustus of a single people, the Sygambri (33-36), but also upholds Roman foreign wars in general, by extolling the triumph that will celebrate the one victory (45-52). "The Roman institution which the poets often use as the poetic catalyst for these imperialistic emotions [i.e., relative to Augustus' conquests] is the triumph. The symbol occurs with significant frequency in Augustan poetry" (G. Williams, Tradition, p. 430).

[12]Perhaps this is an echo of Augustus' claim to have waged just war against the Alpine tribes (Res Gestae 26.3: Alpes... pacificavi nulli genti bello per iniuriam inlato). The Vindelici were "outlaws" (legis expertes Latinae) in Roman eyes, and Rome was entitled to act as military policeman and take them to task.

have two main sections: the first (1-34) deals with Tiberius' military achievements on Augustus' behalf, and the second (34-52) with the hegemony gained for Rome by the Princeps due to his forces' success in the field. The latter results directly from the former. It is emphatically Augustus' troops, strategy, and divine favor that enable his stepson to emerge victorious.[13] He is equally the cause of the gentes' respectful submission to Roman authority (41-52); he is the prime beneficiary of his own initiatives on the battlefield, carried out through subordinates. Both the victories of Augustus' privigni and the extension of Roman hegemony over all peoples are said to date from the fall of Alexandria (34-40), the end of the War of Actium. It is clear that the "favorable outcome of wars" granted by Fortuna[14] means successful Roman imperialism. The list of respectful nations with which Horace concludes the poem emphasizes the extent and completeness of Roman hegemony.[15] He hints strongly that the objectives of Augustan imperialism have been accom-

[13] 29-34: ...barbarorum Claudius agmina/ferrata vasto diruit impetu/.../te [Augusto] copias, te consilium et tuos/ praebente divos. Cf. 14-16: maior Neronum...immanisque Raetos/auspiciis pepulit secundis,/ and IV.4, 27-28.

[14] 38, belli secundos...exitus. Fortuna is again made the patroness of Roman foreign wars, as in Odes I.35 (above, Ch. I., p. 33).

[15] On the significance of the gentes mentioned, see Appendix 2, pp. 161-164.

plished.[16] Augustus and Rome, one is given to understand, now enjoy a monopoly in international politics.

Horace's last ode of the book and one of his last poems, IV.15, sums up the blessings of the Pax Augusta. It appropriately takes into account the principal methods and achievements of Augustan imperialism. Augustus' aetas is said to have restored the "old skills" (12, veteres artis) of (foreign) war. Through these, Rome's fame, reputation, and prestige have grown greatly, with her strength in arms.[17] Rome's maiestas dominates the world from sunrise to sunset. The Principate has also reaped the fruits of negotiation with Parthia (6-8), by recovering the legionary signa. Rome's hegemony is now complete (21-24), as the entire world abides by Augustus' rulings. By his cultivation of the arts of war, the Princeps has won more than victories and territory. Rome's record of military success

[16]"Rom ist zwar immer noch die domina der Welt, aber der Kaiser erscheint hier nicht als er, der ihre Macht mehrt, sondern sie schützt" (Meyer, Aussenpolitik, p. 60). Meyer's observation (on lines 41-52) is accurate as far as it goes, but he is wrong to draw the inference from this part of the poem that Augustus' foreign policy now involves a mere holding fast, Defensivpolitik. The conquests in the poem's first section (1-34, ignored by Meyer) and Horace's assessment of hegemonial imperialism are not disiecta membra. Conquest and hegemony are complementary in Augustus' foreign policy (above, Section 3, p. 71), and conquest-with-annexation has hardly been renounced, as IV.2, IV.4, IV.15 and Epist. II.1 (252-253) all indicate. Horace's grasp of Augustus' intentions and methods is quite accurate, not "surrealistic panegyric" (Meyer, p. 67).

[17]12-16: (tua, Caesar, aetas...) veteres revocavit artis, /per quas Latinum nomen et Italae/crevere vires famaque et imperi/ porrecta maiestas ad ortus/solis ab Hesperio cubili./

has been instrumental in her diplomatic offensive against the Parthians, and in the establishment of her maiestas[18] on a grand scale. This combination of success in arms and political prestige has in turn created conditions favorable to attaining the final goal of Augustan imperialism: domination of the world. It is such hegemony, finally, that secures for Horace and all Romans domestic peace (17-18), economic well-being (5), internal imperial security (19-20), freedom from civil war (17-20), and the joys of otium (18, 25-32).

The Epistle to Augustus (II.1), written about the same time as Odes IV.15, alludes in passing (251-256) to the successful policy of conquest and hegemony praised in the late odes. Augustus' res gestae (251) are all of military nature: "lands and rivers" (252, terrarumque situs et flumina) looks to Roman control of the world,[19] while barbara regna (253) refers to Roman influence over the gentes outside the boundaries of the Empire. Thanks to the Princeps' foreign policy, Parthia now fears Rome (256), wars throughout the world have been ended (253-254), and the Temple of Janus has been closed, signifying

[18]On the significance of maiestas in connection with Roman imperialism, see the passages from Livy cited by Drexler, "Iustum bellum," 138. He adds this valuable observation: "Es gibt in dieser Welt nur Herren und Knechte, und jenes bedeutet dignitas und maiestas, dieses dedecus" (139).

[19]Compare the similar, detailed lands-rivers-seas scheme in Odes IV.14, 45-48.

the coming of peace (255).[20] Wars are done with because, for the time being, Roman imperialism has no further need of them. Their successful prosecution has resulted in the success of Augustan imperialism, its expansion and consolidation; this is pax, the foreign-policy aspect of the Augustan Peace. The Alpine campaigns, alluded to in 252-253,[21] are representative of these foreign campaigns. Again as in the odes, the unity of these diverse initiatives--their usefulness in realizing Roman imperialism--is visible.

[20]Augustus' revival of the cult of Janus was a "bogus antiquarian revival" (Wells, p. 8), "a symbol of victory as much as peace" (loc. cit.) that served his propaganda purposes well. In effect, the three closings during his reign (in 29, 25 and 13 or later: Res Gestae 13) serve to further legitimize the foreign policy of Pax Augusta: if conquest is peace, Augustus becomes the great peacemaker. The closings of Janus may also have served to indicate to the knowledgeable the completion of a new phase in Augustus' imperialistic program: 29, the ending of the civil wars and Augustus' supremacy; 25, the first successful foreign campaigns (in Spain); and 13 (or later), the victorious Alpine campaigns or some later offensive.

[21]Fraenkel, p. 398: Horace's words arces/montibus inpositas play on those of IV.14, 11-13, (Drusus...) arces/Alpibus inpositas tremendis/deiecit acer, with the simple substitution of "mountains" for "Alps."

## 6. Augustus' Foreign Policy and Horace's Foreign-War Poetry: A Case of Parallel Development.

Both before and after 20, Horace's poetry dealing with Augustus' foreign policy indicates that he is a firm advocate of Roman foreign war and imperialism. Meyer (Aussenpolitik, p. 61) rightly discerns a shift in emphasis in Horace's later poetry (after 20) as contrasted with his earlier production. He is wrong, however, to attempt to reason backwards from the evidence of Augustan poetry to a supposed shift to the defensive in Augustan foreign policy. There is indeed a change, but in the tactical success, not (as Meyer believes) in the ideology and overall strategic aims of Augustus' foreign policy. His intentions remain imperialistic throughout almost his entire career.[1] Meyer misunderstands the nature of the settlement of 20,[2] and consequently arrives at mistaken conclusions concerning

[1]Until the Illyricum revolt (A.D. 6) and the loss of Varus' legions (A.D. 9) led him to resign his hopes of further conquests (Wells, German Policy, p. 13; Brunt, JRS, 53 (1963), 175; CAH, X, pp. 373-376, 598).

[2]Brunt, 174: In Augustus' view, Parthia was no longer an independent state after 20. He had compelled her ruler to seek amicitia (R.G. 27.2), and that ruler's country thereby became a Roman vassal state (see above, Section 3, pp. 71-73); "Equals do not kneel or supplicate, nor give pledges" (Brunt, loc. cit.). Augustus always had it in mind, even if never in his grasp, to subdue Parthia by force of arms (ibid.); his intentions in regard to that nation--whatever his actions-were hardly amicable. Falsely supposed friendly intent toward Parthia has been taken as the basis of a "new" Augustan policy of friendly, egalitarian diplomacy with the gentes (Ziegler, Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich, p. 51). Meyer (p.4) seems to have made the same mistake independently.

the intent and character of Augustan foreign policy overall. Augustus' diplomatic initiatives of 20 B.C. and later are motivated not by friendly sentiment toward the outside gentes but by political expediency. Such nonmilitary means comprised the easiest--if not the most effective or spectacular--method of bringing the outlying peoples into the Roman sphere of influence. What Meyer and Ziegler (loc. cit.) take as proof of Augustus' choice of a friendly defensive is actually evidence for his resourceful approach to imperialism.[3]

As Horace approves both of Roman foreign war and the imperialism it serves, before as well as after 20, he is prepared to commend them in whatever form they take: outright aggression and annexation (Odes IV.4, IV.14), hegemonial imperialism (IV.15, Carmen Saeculare), or both together (IV.14, Epist. II.1). His only requirement is that the conquest or hegemony to be discussed be genuine. The development of Horace's foreign-war poetry in fact parallels the success of Augustus' imperialistic foreign policy. This policy's modest accomplishments and frequent frustration in the 20's B.C. are reflected in the simple, cautious prophecies and muted praise of Odes I-III. Its fruition, beginning with the Parthian treaty, inspires the warm celebration of Augustus' foreign policy in Odes IV.

[3]See above, Section 3, especially pp. 70-71.

The late odes display a marked increase in sophistication over the earlier foreign-war poems. Their greater complexity and more comprehensive outlook may safely be attributed to the progress of Augustus' foreign policy, which they celebrate. It has been seen that Horace's civil-war poetry declines in sophistication and importance as bellum civile loses importance as a Roman social problem.[4] The opposite trend is evident in the later poetry dealing with Roman foreign affairs: the ever-increasing prominence of Augustan imperialism furnishes the poet with the themes and accomplishments for fashioning more complex and more articulate foreign-war poetry. Horace's political poetry thus reflects the withering away of civil strife in Roman society and its companion development, the greater importance and newly-won success of foreign war and imperialism. Both are important factors in the Pax Augusta. Horace's strong interest in these two general types of war is evidence for his vital stake in seeing the Pax Augusta preserved and furthered. As will be seen in the third and final chapter, this interest stems from Horace's personal convictions, relative to his private life and personal preferences. He praises the Pax Augusta and the Princeps for his own reasons.

[4]See Chapter I, Section 4, pp. 50-51.

## Chapter II: Summary and Conclusions.

The habit of thinking of wars as primarily either civil or foreign was already firmly established in Roman thinking by the time of Horace's first political poetry. This distinction dates from the late Republic. Moreover, the outlook on foreign wars as just and desirable was also solidly entrenched by his day. Horace both follows the civil war - foreign war dichotomy and endorses Rome's foreign policy, in his political poetry.

Augustus' foreign policy is imperialistic: its ideal is the subordination of the entire inhabited world to Roman authority. The means to this end may be termed (1) conquest and annexation and (2) hegemonial imperialism. The latter embraces indirect control of the gentes through vassalage and diplomacy. Horace consistently approves of this foreign policy in all his poems deäling with Roman foreign affairs. His modest praise of it in his earlier poetry (before 20 B.C.) is a reflection of that policy's limited success in the period between Actium and the Parthian settlement. His fuller, more elaborate approval of the later poetry (after 20) is explicable in terms of Augustus' newfound success in pursuing his imperialistic designs.

The Princeps does not institute, nor does Horace advocate, any change in Roman foreign policy from imperialism to a defensive strategy at any time between 20 and the poet's death. Horace's foreign-war poetry reflects precisely the aims,

methods, and degree of success of Augustus' foreign policy. He is generally well informed both of its nature and progress.

As civil war diminishes in importance as a topic in Horace's political poetry, foreign policy simultaneously gains in prominence. These developments parallel the elimination of civil strife, under Augustus' administration, and the increasing success and importance of Roman imperial expansion. Generally speaking, Horace's state poetry mirrors the main developments and trends in Roman national life.

## CHAPTER III

## HORACE'S PRIVATE IDEAL AND HIS POLITICAL VIEWS

### 1. Horace's Personal Preferences and Roman Politics: A Connection of Private and Public Worlds. The Later Evidence.

What Horace says in regard to Augustus and the Pax Augusta is due to his appreciation of their benefits to him. The absence of civil strife and the successful prosecution of Roman imperialism are, he realizes, pillars of the Augustan regime. It is this regime, in turn, that has created the conditions he requires to find personal satisfaction. This connection of the Pax Augusta and *otium* is seen in a small number of important odes. It is easiest to see in the later poetry, and most readily visible in ~~IV.~~ 15, PROBABLY HORACE'S LAST ODE. The civil-war stanza (17-20) advises that, under Augustus' tutelage, no domestic disturbances of any sort will drive out *otium*.[1] *Otium* is again celebrated in the two concluding stanzas, in more specific language.[2] But what do the repose and leisure associated with *otium* have to do with civil and foreign war? The answer is not hard to find: both in

[1] 17-18: *custode rerum Caesare non furor/civilis aut vis exiget otium,/... .*

[2] 25-32. Cf. Wili, *Horaz und die augusteische Kultur*, p. 369: "Dem otium sind die zwei letzten Strophen des aetas-Beschreibung gewidmet."

origin and in contemporary usage, the term has strong military associations.[3] The word is first used as an expression for "time off" from military duties. It then comes to mean "the silence of arms," and is used to express the resulting idea of rest from one's pursuits, whether military or other.[4] With this last notion are associated ideas of domestic tranquillity, what André terms "l'ordre politique assurée ou de la sérénité contemplative."[5]

One may now see that the seemingly heterogeneous subject matter of IV.15 is in fact highly united on the ideological plane; this unity is provided by the Pax Augusta.[6] Otium is expressly associated with the man who has brought about this state of affairs (17-18). The elimination of civil war (17-20) and the success of Roman hegemonial imperialism (6-9, 13-16, 21-24)[7] are essential to the Augustan Peace. The Pax Augusta is in turn a condition of Horace's otium (18). Moral

[3]J.-M. André, Recherches sur l'otium romain. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, LII (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962), p. 25.

[4]André, Recherches, loc. cit.

[5]Loc. cit. Pax et otium (Ch. II, Section 3, p. 70, note 11) conveys about the same meaning.

[6]Horace's first words after the opening recusatio (4, tua, Caesar, aetas) inform the reader of the ode's main theme, the accomplishments of the Augustan regime.

[7]This is due directly to Roman military skill, the veteres artis Augustus has recalled.

reform (9-11) and economic prosperity (5) are vital props of Augustus' domestic policy. All these factors contribute to the security and happiness epitomized by the festive scene that concludes the poem (25-32);[8] this is otium made explicit, and all Romans are participants in its blessings.[9]

Most of these elements--civil war, foreign war, Augustus and the Pax Augusta, and Horace's personal well-being--are found together in two other odes of Book IV, IV.5 and IV.2. In IV.5, the poet indirectly affirms Rome's freedom from fear of bellum civile (17-20),[10] and declares her security from threat of barbarian invasion (25-28). An intermediate stanza (21-24) commends moral reform.[11] These lines precede a specific description of otium, here with a rustic coloring (29-40), and, together with them, form a hymn of praise to the Pax Augusta. Augustus is at the center of Horace's picture of otium. His

[8]Horace may again be injecting pax into otium in line 29, if R.D. Williams ("Horace, Odes IV.15.29," CR NS, 10 (1960), 6-7) is right. He takes virtute functos more patrum duces to mean "our generals who have played the hero's part as their fathers did before them." (6). The virtus here will then be that of the veteres artis of 12 ff., the duces Augustus and his best generals, and the suggestion made will be that the Romans owe their otium to their conquests.

[9]The "we" of this ode (25, nosque; 32, canemus) and of IV.5 and IV.2 is not otiose; it reflects a new confidence in Horace's outlook. See Fraenkel, pp. 439-440 on Odes IV.2.

[10]Discussed in Ch. I, Section 4, pp. 48-49.

[11]Cf. Ch. I, Section 4, p. 49 with note 14.

rule is associated indirectly with the coming of peace (17-28) and directly with the private pleasures of Roman citizens that derive from it.[12] Horace is one of the citizens so blessed.[13] He and his fellow Romans owe their happiness to its architect, Augustus (37-40). The private and public "counterworlds"[14] of Horace's life are fully reconciled here.

Augustus and the Pax Augusta provide the ideological bridge between bellum externum and Horace's writing of lyric poetry, in IV.2. There is (as in IV.15) little surface unity between the public and private halves of the ode, between the conquest and triumph anticipated in the second part (33 ff.) and Horace's poetry, subject of the first (1-32). Augustus' imperialistic foreign policy will see to the conquest of the Sygambri (33-36). This feat will call for a triumph, symbol of successful imperialism[15] but also occasion for Horace's

[12]The pleasures detailed include work in one's vineyards (29-30), rural religious rites (31-36), and long holidays with relaxed drinking (37-40). Augustus is prominent: 31-32, (quisque)...alteris/te mensis adhibet deum; 33-34, te multa prece, te prosequitur mero/defuso pateris; 34-35, Laribus tuum miscet numen; 37, dux bone. The last stanza, and especially the address dux bone, serves to unite this part of the ode (17-40) with the first section (1-16). Both center on Augustus' importance and safety. In 1-16 Augustus is also called dux bone (5); the two appeals to him as "good leader" (5, 37) help associate the separate thoughts of each passage.

[13]See p. 98, note 9.

[14]Pöschl's term ("Gegenwelt," Horaz und die Politik, p. 16).

[15]G. Williams, Tradition, p. 430, quoted above, p. 86, note 11.

expression of his personal feelings of joy (45-48). Augustus' safety and conquests are what allow Horace his pursuit of poetry (1-32), by securing his safety and freeing him from fear.[16] These benefits prompt his praises of Roman foreign war; imperialism means peace and happiness for himself and all Romans. The ode is both an endorsement of the Pax Augusta and a celebration of Horace's own security and poetic freedom. The Augustan aetas provides the assumed ideological framework within which Horace loosely associates foreign war, imperialism, otium, and his pursuit of poetry.

In the structure of Book IV, the two epinikia, IV.4 and IV.14, are placed before the two odes (IV.5 and IV.15) celebrating the successful overall program of the Pax Augusta. This arrangement serves to remind the reader that the benefits of Roman life at its best--the countryside, wine, celebration with friends--all depend eventually upon the success of Roman

[16]The ode's personal first half and political second half are united in the person of Antonius Iullus, who is both the addressee of the poem and the object of Horace's recusatio. Iullus is addressed by name in the opening lines (2) and again near the end of the digression on Pindar (26). He is then addressed as the man who will sing Augustus' praises in Horace's place (33-34, concines maiore poeta plectro/Caesarem...); this is the completion of the recusatio begun in 1-4. Iullus is addressed again in 41 (concines laetosque dies...) and invoked a final time in 53 (te decem tauri totidemque vaccae (solvent)).

foreign war and imperialism.[17] Pax abroad is crucial to the enjoyment of otium at home, in Italy. The foreign-war stanzas in IV.5 (25-28) and IV.15 (21-24) recall the conquest and hegemony celebrated in the preceding poems. They serve as martial footnotes to the domestic text of each passage, reminders that bellum externum is a vital and inseparable part of the Pax Augusta.

[17]That this arrangement emphasizes the dependence of peace upon war, and presents the two complementary halves of the Pax Augusta, has been seen by Dahlmann ("Die letzte Ode des Horaz," 344-345) and E. Doblhofer, Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht (Heidelberg, Winter, 1966), p. 102. Duckworth ("Animae dimidium meae," 314) also sees this intent in the arrangement, and adds, "Both 5 and 15 should be read as a commentary on the Ara Pacis Augustae" (loc. cit.). Certain features of the Ara Pacis seem to make similar hints that the happy situation depicted depends upon Roman arms; see I. Ryberg, Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, XXII (1955). Rome: Tipografia del Dottore G. Bardi, 1955), Ch. 4, "The Augustan Altar of Peace," especially pp. 42, 47.

## 2. Horace's Personal Preferences and Roman Politics. The Early Evidence.

The epistles offer valuable information on SEVERAL other aspects of Horace's attitudes toward war and his private ideal. No epistle, though, considers the relationship between war, the Pax Augusta, and Horace's personal requirements. Such overall assessments of Roman politics and the poet's private life are not germane to this genre; Horace accordingly does not attempt to force a treatment of the subject in Epistles I and II. However, the question of how state and individual interact must have interested Horace then and earlier. This is evidenced by the existence of several poems, in Odes I-III, that deal with this problem.

The boldest of Horace's earlier attempts to define his relationship with the Pax Augusta is Odes III.14. Absence of civil war is due to Augustus' agency (13-16). Horace's personal pleasures (17-28) are possible because civil war has been eliminated.[1] Augustus' regime, that provides the conditions of domestic security,[2] thus makes possible Horace's

[1]For a detailed discussion of this passage, see Ch. I, Section 4, pp. 45-46.

[2]Restored sexual morality is one of these conditions; immorality produces civil war (Odes III.6). Foreign war is not really considered in this ode because it is not now (i.e., in 24) as important or successful as in later years; see Ch. II, Section 4, pp. 79-80 and Section 5, p. 82.

otium. This otium, represented here by the wine-party,[3] is both symbol and product of Augustus' domestic policy, one aspect of which is his elimination of civil strife. The Princeps' toil and cares of state assure Horace's leisure and tranquillity. "The Pax Augusta furnishes a securitas that makes [Horace's] inner freedom easy; but this freedom has nothing to do with strenuous participation in the making of history."[4]

The eighth ode of Book III deals with the same themes, save that foreign policy and not civil strife is brought into context with the Augustan Peace. The formal occasion for the ode is the anniversary (March 1) of Horace's narrow escape from the falling tree (1-8). Such an occasion calls for thankful celebration (9-12), but Horace has more reason than this to rejoice. What allows Maecenas a brief respite (13-16) from the rigors of public office is the empire's security from attack by the gentes.[5] This favorable state of affairs in foreign policy, the product of Augustus' efforts, gives Horace's patron leave to drop domestic politics for a while and enjoy briefly that otium he himself has helped secure (25-28). This

[3]The realism (or lack thereof) of the party scene is immaterial; what matters is that Horace employs it to represent his private ideal.

[4]La Penna, Orazio e l'ideologia del principato, p. 72 (= "La lirica civile di Orazio e l'ideologia del principato," 223): "La Pax Augusta offre una securitas che rende facile la libertà interiore: ma una libertà che non ha niente a che fare con la partecipazione faticosa alla costruzione della storia."

[5]17-24, discussed in Ch. II, Section 4, p. 79.

leisure is a part of Horace's way of life, and its enjoyment is, in a sense, his gift to Maecenas. Conversely, Maecenas and the Augustan regime provide the vigorous foreign policy and stable domestic situation essential to the poet's enjoyment of the quite apolitical wine-party.[6]

Odes II.11 also associates foreign affairs (1-5) with private pleasures (5-24), through the person of the politician Quinctius (2). As is Maecenas in III.8, he is called upon to stop worrying about the gentes, as they are no threat to Rome's safety. The passage describing the joys of Horatian otium stresses living in the present; wine is a symbol of present enjoyment.[7] However, II.11 fails to make the Pax Augusta vital to Horace's personal needs, a causal connection established by III.14 and III.8. One is tempted to think that the opening reference to the Cantabrians and Scyths, an allusion to Augustus' foreign policy, is merely a convenient pretext for launching off into talk of convivial joys. The political introduction to the ode is not made an integral part either of the poem or of Horace's thought.

[6]This arrangement is in effect a sort of symbiosis, in which Horace rewards Maecenas' political stewardship with a measure of his own apolitical otium. Cf. Odes III.29, 13-16 (discussed below, p. 106), where Horace seems to be thinking of the same sort of relationship; he is as useful to Maecenas in his way as his patron is to him in politics.

[7]Cf. III.8, 13-15 and 27-28 and S. Commager, "The function of wine in Horace's Odes," 79-80 (cited Ch. I, Section 3, p. 41, Note 33).

Odes III.29 deals in detail with Horace's approach to life in general, and also indicates his awareness of the basic realities of his life as a poet. Fraenkel (p. 228) believes that Horace placed this ode last in Book III[8] because it was "a perfect monument both of his devotion to Maecenas and of his own outlook on life... ." It is Horace's individuality that provides the poem's "essential unity."[9] The emotional and intellectual essence of the poem lies in Horace's keen awareness of the divergence of his own apolitical existence from Maecenas' burdensome preoccupation with affairs of state. This divergence stems from the opposite natures of Horace's way of life and the political activity that makes it possible.[10] The proba pauperies of Horace's Sabine estate (55-56)[11] may be free from the mercurial changes of Fortuna (49-54), just as he himself is free from the anxiety engendered by greed (57-64); economic insecurity does not worry him. But the Sabine estate is not self-sufficient politically, and neither is Horace. There must be

[8]With the exclusion of III.30, an occasional poem written for the publication of Odes I-III.

[9]Fraenkel, loc. cit.

[10]25-28, dealing with Maecenas' altruistic statesmanship, are placed in between the picture of rustic satisfaction (17-24) and Horace's own principles of life (29-64). This arrangement emphasizes the centrality of the statesman's labors to Horace's freedom to live an unobligated life.

[11]Compare the opening lines (1-5) and 13-16; the valles Sabina is to be understood both as the scene of the proposed party (1-5) and as the foundation of Horace's modest sustinence and otium (41-48, 53-64).

some Romans who hold the barbari in check, and who see to the maintenance of morality, law, and domestic tranquillity. Otherwise, Horace's economic and emotional equilibrium will perish in the tumult of renewed civil strife and invasion. Maecenas is representative of this class of public servants--soldiers, bureaucrats, executives--upon whose efforts the perpetuation of Horace's otium depends. Yet the poet himself is neither able nor willing to participate personally in such tasks; they are incompatible with his existence as a privatus and an artist.

The tension in the poem arises from Horace's consciousness that his way of life depends utterly on others' political involvement, but that he must avoid personal engagement in politics. He can--and does--offer Maecenas a share in the very otium the statesman has helped establish, through his participation in the Pax Augusta.[12] But in the end the gulf between the two men's lives remains: Horace is not a politician, nor Maecenas a poet. Horace can, however, participate indirectly and impersonally in Roman politics, through his political poetry. His motivation is partly to be sought in this same awareness of dependence upon politics and politicians for the security and prosperity of Roman life. Thus, while Horace's political participation may be poetic, it must never become

[12]Cf. 13-16: Horace's unworried pauperies will be a welcome change-of-pace for Maecenas, respite from the anxiety of public life. See also Odes III.8 (above, pp. 103-104).

personal.[13]

The association of personal and political events in Horace's poetry is found as early as the 9th Epode and Odes I.37. Mention of specific military victories, in the Battle and War of Actium respectively, is made the occasion for wine-drinking.[14] Only the bare rudiments of the later personal-national poems are present here; no aetas or regime provides or safeguards Horace's personal pleasure. The connection of public and private is simple in the extreme: the basic emotion of immediate conquest calls for the consumption of alcohol in celebration. This is all Horace ventures for the present, the association of a symposiac theme with a political one.[15] In the later poetry, as has already been seen, this association is gradually broadened and deepened into a much more important

[13]Horace's approach to politics is characterized by a double ambivalence: political concern but disdain for ambitio, resulting in literary--but not personal--participation in national political life. L. Wickert ("Horaz und Augustus," WJA, 2 (1947), 158-172) formulated this complex outlook as an unsolved problem. One must, he argues (168), come to grips with the fact that Horace "presents on the one hand that eminent political conviction [Gesinnung] best illustrated by the Roman Odes as a whole, yet at the same time makes it clear that he wants nothing to do with [personal] politics." There is nothing contradictory in this approach, however; see below, Sections 3, p. 120 and 4, pp. 130-132.

[14]Epode 9, 1-6; Odes I.37, 1-4.

[15]"Alcaeus seems to have supplied a model for connecting sympotic poetry with political themes so that either political occasions gave a reason for drinking in celebration or drinking provided a relaxation from the ardours of political activity" (G. Williams, Tradition, p. 128 on Odes I.37).

and meaningful relationship, that of the security and peace of the Roman nation--established by Augustus' efforts--to the happiness and well-being of Horace as a private citizen. Convivial scenes are common to all these later odes, but more as symbols of the Pax Augusta than as immediate ends in themselves. In Odes IV, wine is twice (IV.5 and IV.15) made part of an intimate association of diverse factors: civil and foreign war, the Augustan Peace, Augustus himself, and the *otium* of all Romans. Symposiac occasions help provide the unity of these odes, and serve also to symbolize the Augustan age. As Horace's poetic skill increases, the outlook of his symposiac-political *carmina* steadily broadens until it includes--with wine and politics--the entirety of Roman life, public and private alike. But the private self that Horace brings to these poems is fully seen and understood only in his apolitical work. This poetry will be studied in the section following.

3. Horace's Private Ideal: Its Nature and Orientation.

Horace associates his own safety and well-being with that of the Roman state and especially with the Pax Augusta (Sections 1 and 2 of this chapter). Rome's security against threat of invasion and domestic violence is one condition of Horace's way of life, which he refers to loosely as otium (Odes IV.15, 18) and which requires freedom from fear (Odes IV.15, IV.5, III.14). He often uses wine or symposiac scenes to epitomize his preferred life-style; they are means of associating his personal pleasure and safety with the Princeps and the Pax Augusta.[1] This is all Horace reveals of his personal preferences, in those political poems that bring together the private and public spheres of his life. However, there is much more to his outlook on life than his appreciation of personal safety and the joys of drinking. Most of the other important factors in his private ideal are perceptible only in poems that are, strictly speaking, nonpolitical.[2] From their study, a set of clear preferences becomes visible, a group of Horatian values complementary to the few revealed in his national poetry.

[1] Cf. Sections 1 and 2 passim. On Horace's nonliteral use of wine and convivial occasions, see Commager's article, "The function of wine in Horace's Odes."

[2] Poems that do not directly criticize, evaluate, or praise the Roman government or state.

The common elements in these poems[3] may be formulated into a general definition of Horace's summum bonum, for purposes of simplicity and clarity. Horace's private ideal requires (1) a stable, secure society and lasting domestic peace, with (2) an adequate income (3) acquired without appreciable effort or anxiety, that (4) allows the enjoyment of a rural existence (5) conducive to Horace's peace-of-mind and poetic vocation. The object of all these desiderata is independence, economic, intellectual, and social. Most of these factors are consciously acknowledged and upheld by Horace as early as the sixth satire of Book I.[4] In this poem, simplicity is unmistakeably emphasized, although it is simplicity in an urban environment. His modest means (111-118, 122-128) free him from misera ambitio (128-129), the demands and pressures of politics. Horace, being content with his income, is also at leisure to enjoy it. While not abundant, the income furnished him by his government job allows him free time and a

[3]Odes I.1, II.16, and III.1; Epodes 1 and 2; Sat. I.6 and II.6; Epist. I.7, I.10, I.14 and II.2, in part or in whole. The order in which their evidence is evaluated (below, p. 111 ff.) is more or less chronological.

[4]Terminus post quem: 37 B.C., the Journey to Brundisium (Sat. I.5). A date sometime before 33 (Maecenas' gift of the Sabine Farm) seems to be in order, as the countryside nowhere enters into consideration here.

free mind, a livelihood without toil and stress[5] along with unworried sleep (119-121) and leisure to roam the Forum (113-114), attend religious services (114), visit the baths (125), and play ball (126). Most of the conditions that characterize his later life-style are present here. He has a guaranteed income source (see note 5) without having to work hard for it. This is instrumental to his leisure to read and write (122-123) as to his non-intellectual pleasures.[6] Horace is financially independent, free from the distractions of personal political activity, and thus endowed with the leisure and tranquillity to pursue literary activity. The implied parallelism between ambition and unhappiness and contentedness and happiness retains a central position in Horace's outlook on life throughout his later work.

[5]Fraenkel, p. 15, observes of Horace's scriptus quaestorius, "The work involved might be heavy, but was not necessarily so: most of it could be put on the shoulders of subordinate servants so that the scriptus quaestorius itself was often little more than a sinecure." The Sabine estate later fulfills the same role; see Appendix 3, p. 173 , and pp. 116-117 below.

[6]For the upper classes under the Principate, otium came to mean the pursuit of the intellectual life (André, L'otium, p. 397). More precisely, Horace's leisure is otium litteratum, one of leisure's two highest forms for the upper strata of Roman society (the other being otium luxuriosum) (André, p. 476).

Maecenas' gift of the Sabine estate sometime before Actium[7] provided Horace with a new source of income[8] and also introduced a rustic element into his private ideal. In Epode 2 and Sat. II.6, the countryside is made representative of modest means and the *otium* that accompanies it. In the epode,[9] simplicity in eating[10]--an aspect of Horace's *pauperies*--represents the simple life, and with this life goes leisure, as in Sat.I.6 (above, p. 111). The peaceful, unhurried pastoral life offers one opportunity to drift off to an easy sleep, as he lounges in the grass or under an oak by a stream.[11] What work there is to do bears the mark of recreation rather than necessity (9-16). A living gained without effort is to be understood as the economic foundation of this blissful existence. Many of these themes recur in Satires II.6. Horace's country estate is marked by simplicity, simple vegetarian

[7]Horace received his estate "some time before 31 B.C." (Fraenkel, p. 15), but the exact date remains a matter of conjecture. Wili (*Horaz*, p. 389) guesses 33.

[8]See Appendix 3, p. 173 on the economics of the *valles Sabina* and compare Epist. I.14 (discussed below, pp. 116-117 ).

[9]The rustic passage occupying most of the poem is meant seriously; the ironic conclusion (67-70) serves to bring the epode down to earth after its lofty flight into panegyric (Fraenkel, pp. 60-61) and to create a perspective of detachment (ibid.).

[10]Epode 2, 49-60; cf. Sat. I.6, 115-118.

[11]Both Vergil and Horace see *otium* in terms of a countryside furnishing (1) sleep and shade and (2) running water, "promesse de fraicheur" (André, *L'otium*, pp. 478-480).

meals (63-64), leisure (65-76), and freedom from the mala ambitio of city life (18-19). He has enough land for his needs, and is content with it (1-5); he has leisure to read, sleep, and take his ease (61-62). The poet's salient point, that happiness comes equally from simplicity and from refusal to pursue wealth or engage in politics, is reiterated in the tale of the City Mouse and Country Mouse (78 ff.).[12]

Epistles I.10 shows that the theme of simplicity is still important at a much later date. One must rely, Horace advises Fuscus, on his own modest means alone. Not only does simplicity create happiness (32-33); pauperies is the only reliable substance there is. Wealth is the property of Fortuna, whose vicissitudes are the ruin of any man who confides in her totally (30-31).[13] Fear of having too little makes one a slave to wealth (39 ff.). Such a man, in his greed, forever carries about and obeys a master--as a horse does his rider

[12]Once again, simplicity in eating equates to security and peace of mind, and gourmet dining (luxury) to fear and anxiety. Eating habits represent ways of life, as in Sat. II.2 (Wili, p. 114).

[13]The thought here parallels that of Odes III.29, 49-56 (Section 2, pp. 105-106). Wealth and power are associated with Fortuna, who is notoriously fickle; take what she gives while she allows it, but do not become dependent on it. Rely rather on the permanence of your own substance, proba pauperies sine dote (55-56), which corresponds to the pauper tectum of the present poem (32-33). This modest property seems, in both instances, to be Horace's Sabine estate. Res secundae/mutatae (30-31) of the epistle answer to the personified fortune of the ode. For a similar presentation of this aspect of the goddess, compare Odes I.34.

(34-38)--because he cannot make do with his own limited possessions. Fear of being poor causes him to lose his freedom.[14] The quest for riches can only lead to spiritual slavery. Accordingly, the secret of happiness lies in the ability to live within one's means. Refusal to do so, and striving for riches instead, precludes the possibility of spiritual satisfaction.

The same antithesis, contentment:happiness and discontent and striving:unhappiness is presented as Horace's personal philosophy of life in Odes II.16, a poem written somewhat earlier. Horace establishes the desirability of *otium* to all men (1-8), then deals with its ideal (13-16, 25-28, 37-40) and that ideal's negation, the craving and struggle for wealth and power (9-12, 17-24). The ode's main theme is articulated in 13-16: he lives well on modest means who dines simply. Simple dining represents simple living.[15] Simple living allows one rest and freedom from anxiety (15-16). This is the only way to attain to happiness. As for the ambitious and greedy, their quest for happiness through wealth or power is futile, doomed to failure from the start. For their search for status itself generates fear, anxiety, and envy; these in turn deny spiritual satisfaction to the ambitious individual.

[14] 39-41: *sic, qui pauperiem veritus potiore metallis/ libertate caret, dominum vehet improbus atque/serviet aeternum, quia parvo nesciet uti*.

[15] See p. 113, note 12 and compare Epist. I.10, 8-11.

Horace concludes the ode with an illustration drawn from his own circumstances (37-40): he has a little land, his independence, and his skill in lyric poetry, and these are sufficient. His *otium*, basis of his happiness, is internal calm, and has nothing to do with the search for satisfaction through external, stressful activities, for "le vrai *otium* est ataraxie, il est *donné par la nature*, *et non lié à l'activité*."[16] This spiritual calm, predicated on abstention from economic or political activity, is the seedbed of Horace's poetry. Modest means, happiness, repose, and literary activity all go together.

The dedicatory poem of Odes I-III concerns itself with other men's pursuits (3-18, 23-28) in contrast with Horace's own career as a poet (29-36). The pursuits of others are gently mocked, while Horace places his vocation last, in the position of honor. More significantly, he inserts conditions representative of his *otium litteratum* (19-22) into the midst of the passage describing careers given over to the pursuit of wealth, glory, or power. The intent of this juxtaposition of *otium* with ambition[17] is to bring out the fact of its absence from the lives of the ambitious and simultaneously to stress its importance to Horace's poetic career. Drink, shade, sleep, and leisure point to that lack of obligation essential

[16]André, *L'otium*, p. 470 (author's italics).

[17]The career described immediately before the *otium* lines is that of the merchant, who cannot abide living with modest means (15-18, especially 16, *mercator metuens otium* and 18, [mercator] *indocilis pauperiem pati*). The life following (23-25) is that of the professional soldier, seeker after *gloria*.

to his creative activity. His *otium* and *otium litteratum* are both OBTAINED without effort or anguish, and show Horace to be a contented man, above and apart from the struggle that marks other men's lives. Freedom from striving for material goods and political power allows him the tranquillity to write; and it is the writing of lyric poetry on which he stakes his hopes of fame (35-36).

This freedom from the exigencies of political and economic activity must be defined and sought by Horace himself. He cannot, however, win it solely through his own efforts. This would involve hard work and worry, to secure the means necessary for leisure; such toil and stress would destroy the very *otium* that was their object. Therefore the poet must depend on the economic and political efforts and involvement of others to secure him his independence. Two epistles, I.14 and I.7, show clearly that Horace is well aware of this state of affairs but is not disturbed by it in the least. Horace's Sabine farm guarantees his economic independence, part of his *otium*, without making demands on his time. His bailiff, though, finds the estate a source of endless work and worry (Epist. I. 14, 26-30): breaking new ground, tending to the draft animals, building dikes. But these are all *his* worries; let each of us practice the skill he knows, Horace slyly concludes (44).

The poet's *ars* is diametrically opposite (32-36): his is the enjoyment of good food, clothing, wine, female

companionship, and leisure. The Sabine estate, like his earlier scriptus quaestorius, provides him with all these pleasures without robbing him of the time necessary to enjoy them. Horace's vilicus, tenants and slaves do all the work, and he reaps the benefits of their labors.[18] Yet it cannot be said that Horace is merely gloating over his own good fortune, taunting his bailiff maliciously. His humorous and relaxed approach in this letter indicates his knowledge that such rustic otium is the sine qua non of his writing. He declines to mention his poetry here: its composition is hard work, and he wishes--for humorous purposes--to make his life seem as effortless as possible. Moreover his poetry is a special type of work whose practice rules out preoccupation with any other tasks. Poets may be men of otium, but this leisure serves their poetry, not their idle instincts. It is this truth, then--that Horace's otium is leisure to pursue a higher vocation--that is at the base of his serene, seemingly flippant attitude toward others' labors on his behalf.

Epistles I.7 reveals the equal importance of political and ideological independence, the counterpart of Horace's economic self-sufficiency. Horace knows all too well the irony of his apolitical life's dependence upon the political

[18]Cf. Appendix 3, p. 173 for the operation of the Sabine estate. "Horace a bien distingué ...l'agriculture servile, vouée à l'effort, et le séjour privilégié du sage à la campagne" (André, L'otium, p. 480).

involvement of statesmen like Maecenas and Augustus.[19] He is conscious as well that this reliance on others to tend to affairs of state leaves his political freedom open to official encroachment. The patron and Princeps who provide him with security can also take away the personal freedom won by that security. He must remain unfettered politically without overreacting and withdrawing from national life altogether. Horace is as grateful to Maecenas for his beneficence[20] as he is to Augustus for his care of the state; yet he refuses to be bound unconditionally by their version of political truth or their way of doing things. Horace's otium is founded upon freedom from obligation. Whatever you give me, he tells Maecenas, must be granted unconditionally (Epist. I.7 passim). If you compel me to choose between wealthy conformity with your wishes and a modestly-endowed independence, I'll return all your gifts.[21] I will not say what you and Augustus want

[19]Compare the discussion of this aspect of Odes III.14 and III.29, Section 2, pp. 102-103, 105-107.

[20]Typical sentiments are those given voice in Odes II. 18, 11-14: ...nihil supra/deos lacesso nec potentem amicum [Maecenas] /largiora flagito,/ satis beatus unicis Sabinis; and Epode 1, 31-34, where Horace terms his patron's generosity "enough and more" for his needs (31-32, satis superque me benignitas tua/ditavit,...).

[21]This seems to be the sense of line 34, hac ego si compellor imagine (refers to 29-33), cuncta resigno. In view of what has been seen above (pp. 110-117 passim) about Horace's economic self-reliance, the Sabine farm--long his own property--cannot be classed with "everything" else; cuncta must mean more recent, nonessential gifts from Maecenas. Part of this interpretation of line 34 was suggested to me by Professor S.M. Treggiari.

said if it is untrue, nor will I surrender the freedom of my unrestricted life for all the wealth in the world.[22] I will not be bribed with a bellyful of fatted hens into idealizing the peasants' life, which I know is not an easy one.[23] Horace needs but little to satisfy his needs, and he already has it. Rome's political intrigues hold no interest for him; the valley of Tibur does (44-45). In the tales of Telemachus (40-43) and Volteius Mena (46-95), he reiterates his belief that modest means with personal independence is preferable. Each man must live by his own standard(98). Horace's does not allow him to sacrifice his personal and artistic independence for the sake of means more ample than he needs.

All the material and spiritual requirements of Horace's life may be assessed in terms of freedom. He cherishes his Sabine estate for the economic independence it gives him, and for the repose it offers from the distractions of urban life.[24]

[22]A free rendering of 35-36, nec somnum plebis laudo satur altilium nec/ otia divitiis Arabum liberrima muto. In the words nec somnum...altilium, André (L'otium, p. 480) sees "le refus de contribuer à une propagande [sc. of Augustus] utile sans doute au repeuplement des campagnes et à la paix sociale, mais suspecte dans ses moyens," that is, well-meaning but dishonest. Sleep and modest fare are antithetical to sleeplessness and luxurious eating; only the pauper enjoys otia liberrima (Kiessling-Heinze ad loc.). Simple eating and sound sleep are symbols of otium (above, pp. 112-113, 114).

[23]See p. 117, note 18 and Appendix 3, pp. 171-173.

[24]Horace complains that he cannot concentrate on his art amid Rome's continual bedlam (Epist. II.2, 65-86); if he cannot devote his full attention to what he writes, it will be bad poetry (ibid.).

He values equally his personal and ideological freedom from the compulsion of the powerful. He will have nothing to do with the writing of poetry that is uncongenial to his talents.[25] Nor will he descend to championing false ideas (Epist. I.7) or government programs or decisions he disapproves of,[26] nor undertake business that makes inroads on his freedom of movement and activity (Epist. I.7). As he developed his talents as a poet, Horace simultaneously cultivated a sense for the conditions requisite for writing good poetry. He realized he must remain uncompromised personally, economically, and intellectually. Poetry was his calling; it required freedom from obligation in all areas of his life.

Yet Horace freely chose to write political poetry, and political poetry that attempted to play an active and important role in national matters. To this poetry Horace brought his awareness of the vital relationship between the Roman government, the nation, and the lives led by individual Romans. For the poet, this was a reciprocal relationship. Not content to be an appreciative onlooker, he attempted through the medium of his verse to further the Pax Augusta by selective praise and

[25]Horace declines to write epic, on the grounds that his talents are insufficient (Odes I.6, II.12, IV.2, IV.15; Sat. II. 1). The real reason for recusatio seems to be the uncongenial nature of epic verse and diction to his own poetic skills, rather than any sentiment against war or the Augustan regime.

[26]The Arabian expedition and war for profit come to mind (Odes I.29, III.3); see Ch. II, p. 62, note 3 and pp.80-81.

constructive criticism. Such praise and criticism grew naturally out of his concern for seeing Rome's well-being and his own *otium* preserved. The fact of this indirect political activism, and the personal factors motivating it, have already been established (Sections 1 and 2, 3). The precise nature of the interaction of Horace's private ideal, his political poetry, and the Pax Augusta will be investigated in the fourth and final section of this chapter.

## 4. Horace's Private Ideal, his Political Views, and the Augustan Regime.

It is clear that Horace makes the security of his own way of life dependent upon the strength and stability of the Pax Augusta (above, Sections 1 and 2). He says little about his personal needs in these political odes, but elsewhere states clearly precisely what he requires and esteems in life (Section 3). His private ideal has its negative counterpart, some details of which he spells out; his opposition to *misera ambitio* (Sat. I.6) as incompatible with his own *pauperies* is representative. His *otium*, Horace realizes, is only as secure as the Augustan Peace upon whose conditions it relies. The Pax Augusta's permanence and validity, in turn, depend directly upon the good order of Roman society and the competence of its ruling authority. Civil war poses a grave threat to this society and thereby imperils Horace's happiness and his very survival.[1] The nation's safety and Horace's alike require that *bellum civile* be held in check. In contrast, Roman foreign war protects and extends the domain of the Pax Augusta. Roman arms guard the Empire's present borders against invasion and promise to gradually eliminate this threat, by bringing all the world under Roman control (Chapter II, Sections 5, 6). Disapproval of civil strife and favor of foreign wars are, to be sure, traditional Roman attitudes (Chapter II, Section 1). But personal considerations play by far the greater role in forming Horace's consistent, deeply-felt, and often-voiced opinions of civil and foreign war.

[1]Cf. Sections 1 and 2, this chapter, pp. 96-108.

As a political poet and politically-oriented Roman, Horace attempts to do more than merely express approval of his favorite Augustan programs. He insists on offering his own evaluation and criticism of Roman society (Odes III.24, III.6) and civil war (Chapter I *passim*). In the first Roman Ode, he offers his own serious proposals for the nation's moral salvation. For "the poem that opens the cycle of political odes and sets the tone for the whole group proclaims in effect that the moral recovery of Rome is predicated on the same approach to life through which the poet has found his own individual happiness... ."[2] This approach is *pauperies* and its derivative moral principles and way of life. The happy existence of those untroubled by greed or ambition is twice contrasted with the anxiety and unhappiness that beset those who pursue or enjoy wealth or power (17-24, 25-32). The ode begins and ends with Horace, as literary advocate of *pauperies* and as his own best illustration of its value (45-48). Between these personal boundaries, Horace's approach embraces all classes of men[3] and Jupiter and the gods as well. His presentation thus gives a sense of universality to the ideas and arguments presented, and makes them applicable to

[2]F. Solmsen, "Horace's first Roman Ode," *AJPh*, 68 (1947), 352, cited by Fraenkel, p. 262.

[3]5-8, kings and Jupiter; 9-14, landowners and politicians; 17-20, the wealthy and powerful in general; 21-24, simple country dwellers. Horace identifies himself with the last, as a country dweller himself (45-48).

all the Roman world and its inhabitants.[4]

Horace gives the peroration in his own person; this seems to indicate that he intends both this ode's advice and his similar proposals elsewhere to be taken as serious social criticism.[5] Sleep represents the happiness that accompanies a life of modest means;[6] this happiness comprises domestic peace in Roman society, the product of the contentment of its individual members. Material and spiritual discontent and struggle for a better lot in life lead, he implies, to social unrest and thence to civil war.[7] Pauperies is not simply a preferable alternative; it is the only, necessary one. Horace strongly suggests that the happiness and well-being of the Roman state (or the opposite condition) is nothing other than the collective satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) of its individual citizens. This is the assumption upon which his

[4]G. Williams, Tradition, p. 588.

[5]Cf. the quotation from Solmsen's article, above, p. 123.

[6]Compare André, L'otium, pp. 478-480, cited in Section 3, p. 112, note 11.

[7]Horace only implies here what he states bluntly in III.24 (Chapter I, pp. 20-23): greed and the resulting discontent breed immorality, which results in civil war. In III.6 (Chapter I, pp. 23-26), moral defect (culpa) engenders immorality, and immorality produces civil strife. Here the poet presents a choice: (explicit) simplicity of life and (implicit) individual and national peace and its shadowy opposite, (explicit) extravagance and discontent and (implicit) bellum civile are the two alternatives. The present ode and III.6 both fit Perret's characterization of the Roman Odes as a group, that they pose the question, what must be done so that there will never again be civil wars? (Horace, p. 90).

application of personal principles to national problems is based. The same philosophy of life is to make the Romans happy as individuals and keep them at peace as a people.

Even in a socially-oriented political poem such as Odes III.1, Horace's ultimate motivation and final objective is still his own security. He knows full well that he cannot live a life of assured modest competence and personal leisure in a nation at war with itself. Civil strife destroys the conditions of *otium*. If Rome and the Empire are not at peace and secure, he cannot hope to be himself. Thus the consideration invariably reenters one's mind that Horace's attitudes toward war and the Augustan Peace stem from internal rather than external motivation. He supports Augustus' regime, praises foreign war, and condemns civil strife primarily for his own reasons.

Despite these cogent considerations, it is often assumed, *a priori*, that the inspiration of Horace's political poetry, like its themes, comes from outside the poet. His *carmina civilia* are explained away as the result of official pressure, brought to bear directly by Augustus or indirectly through Maecenas' agency, for the Princeps' political ends. A feeling of obligation or indebtedness to Augustus or Maecenas is often supposed. The political poems, it is held, are a sort of thank-offering for Augustus' clemency to the ex-Republican partisan, or for Maecenas' princely beneficence. Thus one

critic takes the view that Horace was the laureate of the Principate, who "as a member of society...must have found it a practical necessity to become useful to the existing order and the mouthpiece of its propaganda."[8] The most influential modern historian of the Augustan regime believes that Horace's national poetry was "fostered by the government,"[9] and feels that Horace "appeared to surrender to a romantic passion for frugality and virtue, a fervent sympathy with martial and imperial ideas"[10] in writing his political poetry. Maecenas was the Princeps' accomplice in organizing opinion, for he "captured the most promising of the poets at an early age and nursed them into the Principate."[11] A recent study even understands Horace to be the propagandist of Augustan reform, who made a career for himself by deliberately misrepresenting every

[8]G.K. Strodach, "Pietas: Horace and Augustan nationalism," CW, 29 (1936), 137-144 (138 quoted).

[9]Syme, Roman Revolution, p. 463.

[10]Syme, p. 462.

[11]Syme, p. 460. Similarly R. Marache, "La propaganda politique dans la littérature du temps d'Auguste," IH, 17 (1955), 1-4 represents Maecenas as the active agent of state propaganda within his literary circle, an ideological middleman for the Princeps. This view of Maecenas' role is refuted by K.J. Reckford, "Horace and Maecenas," TAPhA, 90 (1959), 195-208 and especially well by A. Dalzell, "Maecenas and the poets," Phoenix, 10 (1956), 151-162. The friendship between Horace and Maecenas was characterized by a high degree of mutual trust and affection. The poet's independence derived naturally from this intimate, nonpolitical relationship; cf. J.-M. André, Mécène. Essai de biographie spirituelle (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967), passim.

political situation in favor of Octavian's regime.[12] Another scholar believes that the Augustan poets' approach to foreign affairs was inspired by their (unexplained) desire to collaborate with the new regime.[13]

A number of scholars have seen--in one way or another--that Horace commends Augustus and celebrates the Pax Augusta for reasons of his own. Wilkinson[14] came out strongly against the notion of an official Horace. "It is a complete misconception," he protests, "to think of him as tool of a propaganda bureau. He declined suggested themes, criticised policy, and himself made suggestions, with complete freedom."[15] Horace was initially attracted to Augustus because that leader seemed to be Rome's best hope for avoiding further civil war.[16] The

[12]P. Senay, Horace, propagandiste de la réforme augustéenne, Diss. Paris, 1963; see especially his summary and conclusions, pp. 265-267.

[13]A. Oltramare, "Auguste et les Parthes," REL, 19 (1938), 121-138; the reference is to 133.

[14]L.P. Wilkinson, Horace and his lyric poetry, 2nd Ed. (Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1951).

[15]Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 23.

[16]Cf. Wilkinson, p. 72: Horace's enthusiasm for Octavian was "the complement of his horror of civil war." La Penna ("La lirica civile," 98) points out that Horace began to write political poetry not out of partisanship but to give voice to his horror of civil strife. Horace's (earlier) political poetry is to be attributed to his reaction to "the tragedy of the times" (i.e., bellum civile), not to any "more or less official iussa" issued by Octavian (La Penna, Orazio, pp. 30-31; cf. Chapter I, p. 17, note 15). Grimal ("Poésie et 'propagande'," 73) makes precisely the same point, in reference to the Augustan poets as a group. "La «propagande» que l'on croit découvrir chez Horace,

evidence of Horace's political poetry after Actium shows how he gradually became more and more aware of the Roman state's importance to his personal safety and welfare (Chapter I). He was fully cognizant of how dependent his private life was on the economic and political labors and stewardship of others.[17] Yet he was hardly about to pursue such an active life himself. As a poet, he needed to live quite differently from farmers, soldiers, and politicians.[18] The repose Horace craves, while alien to these men's labors, is dependent upon them. This restful reliance, the central irony of Horace's poetic vocation, made him keenly aware of the importance of the government that promised to safeguard this fragile relationship. He carefully observed and reacted rationally to the man and policies that vitally affected his personal otium. "Sensible aux événements politiques, Horace est donc acquis à celui qui va rétablir l'ordre. Ce besoin de calme, lui inspirant du goût pour les charmes de la vie frugale (Sat. II), le ralliera

---

Vergile, ou Properce ne nous paraît être...que la montée graduelle d'une conscience romaine... ."

[17]See especially Epist. I.14 (above, Section 3, pp. 116-117 and Appendix 3, pp. 171-174 ), Odes III.29 (Section 2, pp. 105-107), and Odes III.14 and IV.15 (Sections 2, pp. 102-103, and 1, pp. 96-98).

[18]See Section 3, pp. 117-120. Horace's otium is internal calm, abstention from socially oriented activity; it allows him to concentrate on literary pursuits. Any other work he might undertake would destroy this tranquillity and make impossible his writing of poetry.

à la politique octavienne pour la réforme des moeurs."[19]

Horace thought that the corruption of Roman morals and family life was the source of her inadequacy against foreign foes, and a contributing factor in civil war.[20] This belief disposed him favorably toward Augustus' attempts to revitalize the morals of the upper classes through social legislation. For Horace, social morality was both personally attractive and important politically to the stability of the Roman state. This stability, in turn, promised him the tranquillity he craved. Equally, Horace's support of the Pax Augusta and Roman imperialism is allied with his love of domestic peace, peace as physical security, the absence of domestic disturbance and the sacrosanctity of private property. This undisturbed state of

[19]H. Bardon, Les empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1940), p. 82. Similar explanations of Horace's personal motivation for advocating the Pax Augusta are given by H. Hommel, Horaz, der Mensch und das Werk, p. 73 (Horace praises Augustus out of "hard-won inner conviction" that his rule is best for Rome's peace and security); L. Dalmasso, L'opera di Augusto e la posizione artistica di Orazio (Torino: L'Erma, 1934), p. 6 (Horace reacted favorably to Augustus' political initiatives because he appreciated the benefits of the Pax Augusta); E. Doblhofer, Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht, p. 109 (Horace is reconciled to Augustus' monarchical role because of its "sweet fruit," the achievements of his administration). La Penna ("Lirica civile," 222) says as much as Bardon in somewhat different language. The "one solitary link" uniting Horace's outlook on life with his belief in Rome's destiny is "la gratitudine per l'impero in quanto assicura l'otium, in quanto, opponendo barriere ai nemici, eliminando le tempeste delle guerre civili, pone le condizioni della tranquillitas animi..." (= Orazio, p. 71).

[20]Odes III.6, 17-20, discussed in Chapter I, Section 2, pp. 23-26.

affairs produces the emotional equilibrium and mental composure conducive to Horace's creative activity. He is hard put to write whenever he lacks it.[21] His art is both his highest activity and his main preoccupation, and he approaches it with a feeling bordering on the religious.[22]

It is Horace's literary activity, then, about which all his other pursuits are oriented and to which they are subordinated. He ultimately reacts to all aspects of Roman life as they affect his poetry, which is another way of saying his way of life. Specifically, his approach to politics is governed, indirectly, by considerations of his life as an artist. Augustus and the Government are valuable to him precisely because they furnish him with the themes and frame of reference of his political poetry, and also provide him with the necessary security and freedom to write it. Rome and Augustus provide and safeguard Horace's otium litteratum; simultaneously, they are themselves the objects of his political proposals and the theme of his state poetry.

In his political verse, Horace steers a middle course between ideological subordination to Augustus and complete noninvolvement in politics. A political poet cannot work in a vacuum any more than he can allow himself to be made a

[21]Cf. Epist. II.2, 65-86 (p. 119, note 24 above).

[22]Pöschl, Horaz und die Politik, p. 15: "Man kann bei Horaz fast von einer Religion des Dichtertums reden wie bei Properz von einer Religion der Liebe."

mouthpiece. Horace avoids both extremes, the defiant individualism--and resulting political impotence--of the elegists and unconditional surrender to the service of the state.[23] He feels the need to play an active, relevant part in Roman life through his political poetry.[24] Personal political activity, ambitio, is out of the question, incompatible with his poetic vocation. Horace accordingly chooses to function politically through the medium of his poetry. In this manner he can have his say in Roman national life without losing his poetic voice or compromising his independence. In his later work as in his earlier poetry, Horace is attracted to politics as a concerned Roman citizen and individual rather than as a party follower. For this very reason, he must jealously guard his independence from the ambitious designs of the government, which would--if allowed its own way--harness his lyric Muse for narrowly specific political ends. Herein lies the central ambivalence of Horace's approach to politics. While he is

[23]André, L'otium, pp. 498-499.

[24]Such a role was traditional in Republican Roman poetry, save for the brief predominance of Alexandrianism in the late Republic (Grimal, "Poésie et 'propagande'," 62-63). Horace's and Vergil's poetry succeeds where that of the late Republic failed, in reconciling the two spheres of the poet's life, the public and the private (Pöschl, Horaz und die Politik, p. 24). This reconciliation is in the best Republican tradition, as "for ages family and state, private and public domain, otium and res publica had been the twin pillars--protected equally by law and religion--upon which Roman life rested" (Pöschl, loc. cit.).

instinctively attracted to participation in Roman national life, he refuses to compromise his political vision either by personal partisanship or by blind allegiance to the ruling authority.[25] The motives, character, and objectives of Horace's political poetry are primarily his own. It speaks well of his character that his vigorous political poetry never detracts from his personal and ideological independence but instead enhances it.

[25]While Horace's political poetry after 31 displays growing admiration for the Augustan regime, this is balanced by his continuing "...antipathie, ou tout au moins médiocre sympathie, pour l'homme [Augustus] qui veut utiliser sa poésie à des fins politiques" (Bardon, Les empereurs, p. 83).

## Chapter III - Summary and Conclusions.

Horace regards his own security and well-being as dependent upon the Pax Augusta. This association is seen in several important odes linking Horace's private life with public affairs. His private ideal is seen most clearly and fully in his non-political poetry: it comprises a set of consistent ideals and material needs that support his economic, political, and intellectual independence. This independence in turn serves his literary activity, about which all other aspects of his life are oriented.

He is fully aware that the Pax Augusta both provides and guarantees the stability and security of the Roman nation, upon which his self-sufficiency is founded. Augustus' administration is thus indirectly responsible for the poet's *otium*. Horace's awareness of this dependence, combined with his instinct for political participation, produces his political poetry. He constructively criticizes and supports Augustus' regime for his own reasons. The motivation of Horace's political poetry is not to be sought in official coercion or pressure. Such a rationale is both unnecessary and unsupported. His political verse is sincere, and arises from Horace's own convictions.

Horace's national poetry reveals a basic ambivalence in his personality. He needs the security of his *otium*, which

depends on the Pax Augusta, yet also feels a need for personal independence and freedom from political obligation. For these reasons, he supports the Augustan regime in his political carmina, but refuses to be bound unconditionally by Augustus' political requirements or to become his unreasoning apologist or propagandist. Likewise Horace declines partisan political activity, ambitio--which is inimical to his existence as a poet--in favor of impersonal participation in Roman national life through his political poetry. He thereby gains a voice in affairs of state without jeopardizing his personal freedom. He remains personally independent without suffering political impotence.

## THESIS SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

War, civil and foreign, is the single most important social phenomenon in Roman life during the First Century B.C. Its importance in Roman national life is reflected in Horace's political poetry. The ex-combatant of Philippi was well acquainted with the political uses of bellum civile to party chiefs and its widespread deleterious effects on all classes of Roman society. And in the intervals between civil wars, the expansion of Roman imperium by force and diplomacy was continued; Horace must have been familiar with this area of Roman politics as well.

Horace's attitude toward Roman civil war is one of consistent condemnation. Bellum civile is uniformly denounced because of the threat it poses to Rome's and Horace's own survival. Opposition to civil wars had become the traditional attitude by the time Horace first turned to poetry. Roman literary opinion had come to condemn bellum civile for precisely the same reasons as Horace himself.

Horace's outlook on civil strife may be considered to have developed in four successive stages: (1) bitter fatalism and withdrawal from politics; (2) a general concern for Rome's survival, without proposals for the elimination of civil war; (3) constructive proposals for the solution of civil war, associated with Octavian's regime; and (4) a final, retrospective outlook: civil war is seen as a problem solved

by Augustus, but that might recur.

Horace displays consistent approval both of Roman foreign wars in particular and of Roman imperialism and its objectives in general. This outlook, like his attitude toward bellum civile, is traditionally Roman. However, Horace's approbation is due primarily to his awareness of how Augustus' foreign policy--a part of which is aggressive warfare--helps secure the Pax Augusta against external interference. Horace's negative attitude toward civil war and his positive outlook on Roman foreign war and imperialism are complementary. The absence of bellum civile assures domestic peace and makes possible prosperity and personal security. Augustus' foreign policy seems to Horace to remove the barbarian threat to this desirable situation. The stability thus created guarantees Horace the enjoyment of personal pleasures and freedom from distraction; both are essential to his writing of poetry. The poet makes this relationship clear in a number of odes that acknowledge the dependence of his private ideal on affairs of state. It is therefore inaccurate to attribute Horace's political carmina to official pressure or obligation. Their motivation is first and foremost personal; Horace praises the Pax Augusta for his own reasons.

He declines personal participation in Roman politics; such partisan involvement is incompatible with his literary activity, which requires freedom from the demands of all other

endeavors. Yet Horace feels strongly the need to play an effective role in Roman national life. His solution to the resulting dilemma is participation in Roman national affairs through the medium of his political poetry. His specific, immediate political objectives are patriotic and national; his ultimate reasons for seeing them realized are personal. Despite his adherence to Augustus' administration, Horace preserves his ideological independence throughout his literary career. His support of the Princeps and the Pax Augusta is freely given; they are upheld because their aims coincide with Horace's private ideal. He criticizes or commends the various programs and policies of the Augustan regime in consideration of how they affect him as an individual. Accordingly, his political poetry cannot be said to have been written under official pressure or obligation.

The subject matter of Horace's political poetry reflects directly the salient problems faced by the Roman nation and Augustus' success in dealing with them. Thus, civil war is prominent in the earlier political carmina, along with moral problems thought to be related to it. In Horace's later work, bellum civile becomes less important as it loses significance as a Roman social problem. In contrast, foreign conquests and hegemonial imperialism are played down in the 20's, as Augustus' foreign policy is relatively unsuccessful during this period. Beginning with the Parthian settlement,

however, foreign war and imperialism become much more important in Horace's poetry, a reflection of Augustus' newfound success in their implementation. While never a political confidant of the Princeps, Horace is at all times well informed on the general conception and important details of his domestic and foreign policies.

In the final analysis, Horace's political views are personal; and his personal desiderata are best understood in terms of the demands of his poetic vocation. Both his *otium* and his politics are aspects of his poet's way of life. Horace regards himself principally as a man of letters. All other aspects of his life--his leisure, personal independence, interest and participation in Roman national life--are subordinate and secondary to his literary activity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Amundsen, L. "The Roman Odes of Horace." Serta Eitremiana: Opuscula philologica S. Eitrem septuagenario oblata. Symbolae Osloenses, Supplement 11. Oslo: Brøgger, 1943. 1-24.

Anderson, W.S. "Horace Carm. I.14. What kind of ship?" Classical Philology, 61 (1966), 84-98.

André, J.-M. Recherches sur l'otium romain. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, LII. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962.

---------- Mécène. Essai de biographie spirituelle. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, LXXXVI. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967.

---------- L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne. Publications de la Faculté de Lettres de Paris, Série de Recherches, XXX. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.

Babcock, C.L. "Dio and Plutarch on the damnatio of Antony." Classical Philology, 57 (1962), 30-31.

Badian, E. Roman Imperialism in the late Republic. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.

Bardon, H. Les empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1940.

Barwick, K. "Horaz Carm. I.2 und Vergil." Philologus, 90 (1935), 267-276.

---------- "Zur Interpretation und Chronologie der 4. Ekloge des Vergil und der 16. und 7. Epode des Horaz." Philologus, 98 (1943), 28-67.

Bickerman, E.J. "Filius Maiae (Horace, Odes I.2, 43)." La Parola del Passato, 16 (1961), 5-19.

Boyancé, P. "Grandeur d'Horace." Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé, 1955, No. 4, 48-64.

Brind'Amour, P. La Richesse et la Pauvreté chez Plaute et Térence. Diss. Strasbourg 1968 (typescript).

Brunt, P.A. Review of H.D. Meyer, Die Aussenpolitik des Augustus und die augusteische Dichtung. Journal of Roman Studies, 53 (1963), 170-176.

Brunt, P.A. and Moore, J.M., trans. and commentary. Res Gestae Divi Augusti. The achievements of the divine Augustus. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Cambridge Ancient History. Ed. Cook, S.A., Adcock, F.E., and Charlesworth, M.P. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1934. X.

Carrubba, R.W. "The curse on the Romans." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 97 (1966), 29-34.

---------- The Epodes of Horace: a study in poetic arrangement. Paris: Mouton, 1969.

Collinge, N.E. The Structure of Horace's Odes. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Collins, J.H. Propaganda, ethics, and psychological assumptions in the works of Caesar. Diss. J.W. Goethe University Frankfurt 1952 (typescript).

Commager, S. "The function of wine in Horace's Odes." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 88 (1957), 68-80.

---------- "Horace, Carmina I.2" American Journal of Philology, 80 (1959), 37-55.

---------- The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

Dalmasso, L. L'opera di Augusto e la posizione artistica di Orazio. Torino: L'Erma, 1934.

D'Antò, V. Studi oraziani. Napoli: Libreria Scientifica, 1968.

Dahlmann, H. "Die letzte Ode des Horaz." Gymnasium, 65 (1958), 340-355.

Dalzell, A. "Maecenas and the poets." Phoenix, 10 (1955), 151-162.

deCoster, R. "La Fortune d'Antium et l'Ode I.35 d'Horace." L'Antiquité Classique, 19 (1950), 65-80.

Doblhofer, E. Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht. Heidelberg: Winter, 1966.

Drexler, H. "Iustum bellum." Rheinisches Museum, 102 (1959), 97-140.

---------- "Zur 16. Epode und 4. Ekloge." Maia, 16 (1964), 176-203.

Duckworth, G.E. "Animae dimidium meae: two poets of Rome." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 87 (1956), 281-316.

Dutoit, E. "Le thème de 'la force qui se détruit elle-même' et ses variations chez quelques auteurs latins." Revue des Études Latines, 14 (1936), 365-373.

Ensor, E. "On the allusions in Odes I.14." Classical Review, 17 (1903), 158-159.

Ernout, A. and Meillet, E. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots. 4th Ed. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959.

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

Fuchs, H. Augustin und der antike Friedensgedanke: Untersuchungen zum 19en Buch der Civitas Dei. 1926; rpt. Berlin: Weidmann, 1965.

Fugier, H. "Horace et les Parthes." Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, 46 (1967), 283-291.

Furneaux, H., ed. and commentary. The Annals of Tacitus. 2nd Ed. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.

Gallavotti, C. "Il secondo carme di Orazio." La Parola del Passato, 4, No. 12 (1949), 217-229.

Grimal, P. "Poésie et 'propagande' au temps d'Auguste." Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, 8 (1964), 54-73.

Harris, W.V. "On war and greed in the Second Century B.C." American Historical Review, 76, No. 5 (1971), 1371-1385.

Heinze, R. "Der Zyklus der Römeroden." Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze. Ed. E. Burck. 3rd Ed. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1960. 190-204.

Heitland, W.E. Agricola: a study of agriculture and rustic life in the Greco-Roman world from the point of view of labour. 1921; rpt. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1970.

Herrmann, L. "L'ode I.14 d'Horace est-elle allégorique?" Rivista Clasica (Orpheus-Favonius), 8 (1936), 40-44.

Holleman, A.W.J. "Notes on Ovid, Amores I.3, Horace, Carm. I.14, and Propertius II.26." Classical Philology, 65 (1970), 177-180.

Hommel, H. Horaz, der Mensch und das Werk. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1951.

---------- "Dulce et decorum." Rheinisches Museum, 111 (1968), 219-252.

Hornsby, R.A. "Horace on art and politics (Ode III.4)." Classical Journal, 58 (1962), 97-104.

Jacoby, F. "Das Prooemium des Lucretius." Hermes, 56 (1921), 1-65.

Jaeger, W. "Horaz C.I.34." Hermes, 48 (1913), 442-449.

Jal, P. "Remarques sur la cruauté à Rome pendant les guerres civiles (de Sylla à Vespasien)." Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé, 1961, 475-501.

---------- "Bellum civile-bellum externum dans la Rome de la fin de la République." Les Études Classiques, 30 (1962), 257-267 and 384-390.

---------- "Les dieux et les guerres civiles dans la Rome de la fin de la République." Revue des Études Latines, 40 (1962), 170-200.

---------- "Le rôle des Barbares dans les guerres civiles de Rome, de Sylla à Vespasien." Latomus, 21 (1962), 8-48.

---------- "Hostis (publicus) dans la littérature de la fin de la République." Revue des Études Anciennes, 65 (1963), 53-79.

---------- La guerre civile à Rome. Étude littéraire et morale. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963.

Jameson, S. "Chronology of the campaigns of Aelius Gallus and C. Petronius." Journal of Roman Studies, 58 (1968), 71-84.

Janne, H. "L'épode XVI et l'histoire du second triumvirat." Études Horatiennes: Recueil publié en l'honneur du bimillénaire d'Horace. Bruxelles: Editions de la revue de l'Université de Bruxelles and Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1937. 119-137.

Kiessling, A. and Heinze, R., ed. and commentary. Horaz. Oden und Epoden. Mit einem bibliographischen Nachtrage von E. Burck. 7th Ed., 1930; rpt. Zürich: Weidmann, 1968.

---------- Horaz. Satiren. 5th Ed., 1921; rpt. Zürich: Weidmann, 1968.

---------- Horaz. Briefe. 4th Ed., 1914; rpt. Zürich: Weidmann, 1968.

Krokowski, J. "Qua de causa Horatius apud Philippos parmulam proiecerit." Meander, 17 (1962), 537-544. (Polish: Latin summary, 568).

Kukula, R. "Quintilians Interpretation von Horaz' Carm. I.14." Wiener Studien, 34 (1912), 237-245.

Kurfess, A. "Vergils 4. Ekloge und Horazens 16. Epode." Philologische Wochenschrift, 55 (1935), 331-336.

---------- "Horazens 16. Epode und Vergils 4. Ekloge." Philologische Wochenschrift, 59 (1939), 701-702.

La Penna, A. "La lirica civile di Orazio et l'ideologia del principato." Maia, 13 (1961), 83-123; 209-245; 257-283.

---------- Orazio e l'ideologia del principato. Saggi No. 332. Torino: Einaudi, 1963.

Leonhard, R. " 'culpa'." Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, and K. Mittelhaus. Stuttgart: Metzlersche, 1894-. IV.2, columns 1748-1752.

Léon-Marcien, F. "L'interprétation de la bataille d'Actium par les poètes latins de l'époque augustéenne." Les Etudes Classiques, 24 (1956), 330-348.

MacKay, L.A. "Horace, Odes IV, 5, 17-20." Classical Journal, 33 (1938), 359-360.

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

Mancuso, U. Orazio poeta civile. Dalle odi romane alle odi cesaree. Roma: Ateneo, 1953.

---------- "Orazio, dalla originalità del poeta civile al provato valore del combattente." Studi in onore di Gino Funaioli. Roma: Signorelli, 1955. 197-215.

Marache, R. "La propagande politique dans la littérature du temps d'Auguste." L'Information Historique, 17 (1955), 1-4.

Mendell, C.W. "Horace I.14." Classical Philology, 33 (1938), 145-156.

Meyer, H.D. Die Aussenpolitik des Augustus und die augusteische Dichtung. Köln: Böhlau, 1961.

Neumann, A. " 'Amicus'." Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, and K. Mittelhaus. Stuttgart: Metzlersche, 1894-. I.2, columns 1831-1833.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Oltramare, A. "Auguste et les Parthes." Revue des Études Latines, 16 (1938), 121-138.

Page, D.L. Sappho and Alcaeus. An introduction to the study of ancient Lesbian poetry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Pasquali, G. Orazio lirico: studi. 1920; rpt. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1964, with additional notes by A. La Penna.

Perret, J. Horace. Trans. B. Humez. New York: New York University Press, 1964 (first published Paris: Hatier, 1959).

Petersen, E. "Ara Pacis Augustae." Sonderschriften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien, 2 (1902), 45-59.

Pilch, S. "Horatii c.I.14 quomodo sit interpretandum." Eos, 32 (1929), 449-472.

Pöschl, V. Horaz und die Politik. 2nd Ed. Heidelberg: Winter, 1963.

Reckford, K.J. "Horace and Maecenas." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 90 (1959), 195-208.

Rostovtzeff, M. The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. 2nd Ed., rev. P.M. Fraser. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Rupprecht, K. "Das 12. Lied des 1. Buchs der Carmina von Horaz." Der altsprachliche Unterricht, 2 (1951), 70-99.

Ryberg, I. Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art. Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, XXII (1955). Roma: Tipografia del Senato del Dottore G. Bardi, 1955.

Salmon, E.T. "The political views of Horace." Phoenix, 1 (1946), 7-14.

Scott, K. "Merkur-Augustus und Horaz c.I.2." Hermes, 63 (1928), 15-34.

---------- "The political propaganda of 44-30 B.C." Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, 11 (1933), 7-50.

Senay, P. Horace, propagandiste de la réforme augustéenne. Diss. Paris 1963 (typescript).

Snell, B. "Die 16. Epode von Horaz und Vergils 4. Ekloge." Hermes, 73 (1938), 237-242.

Solmsen, F. "Horace's first Roman Ode." American Journal of Philology, 68 (1947), 337-352.

Strodach, G.K. "Pietas: Horace and Augustan nationalism." Classical World, 29 (1936), 137-144.

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

Tarn, W.W. "Alexander Helios and the Golden Age." Journal of Roman Studies, 22 (1932), 135-160.

Taylor, M.E. "Horace, laudator temporis acti?" American Journal of Philology, 83 (1962), 23-43.

Theiler, W. Das Musengedicht des Horaz. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, IV (1935). Halle: Niemeyer, 1936.

Thomson, J.O. History of Ancient Geography. 1948; rpt. New York: Biblo & Tannen, 1965.

Vittinghoff, F. Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Untersuchungen zur damnatio memoriae. Berlin: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1936.

Wagenvoort, H. "The crime of fratricide (Horace Epod. VII, 18). The figure of Romulus-Quirinus in the political struggle of the 1st century B.C." Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion. Leiden: Brill, 1956. 169-183.

Wells, C.M. The German Policy of Augustus. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972 (forthcoming).

Wickert, L. "Horaz und Augustus." Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft, 2 (1947), 158-172.

Wickham, E.C., ed. and commentary. Horace. The Odes, Carmen Saeculare, and Epodes. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

Wili, W. Horaz und die augusteische Kultur. Basel: Schwabe, 1948.

Wilkinson, L.P. Horace and his lyric poetry. 2nd Ed. Cambridge (Eng.): University Press, 1951.

Williams, G. Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

---------- ed., trans., and commentary. The Third Book of Horace's Odes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Williams, R.D. "Horace Odes IV.15.29." Classical Review NS, 10 (1960), 6-7.

Wimmel, W. "Vergils Eklogen und die Vorbilder der 16. Epode des Horaz." Hermes, 89 (1961), 208-226.

Wissowa, G. " 'Devotio'." Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, and K. Mittelhaus. Stuttgart: Metzlersche, 1894-. V.1, columns 277-280.

Womble, H. "Horace, Carmina I.2." American Journal of Philology, 91 (1970), 1-30.

Ziegler, K.H. Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964.

## APPENDIX 1

## HORACE'S LANGUAGE OF CIVIL WAR

I. The language Horace uses to describe Roman civil war may be studied for (1) its vocabulary and (2) its style and context.

1) The vocabulary Horace uses may be classified into four categories, by the origin and/or normal association of the word in question. These categories are (A) the religious, (B) the ethico-legal, (C) the medical, and (D) general terms, those that do not fit into any of the three preceding categories.

A) RELIGIOUS vocabulary: Horace has a propensity for terms of religious significance, a tendency that is especially evident in the earliest political poems, Epodes 16 and 7. He uses religious language to strongly imply what he states explicitly in Epode 7, 17-20: that civil war is a hereditary curse on the Romans.[1] Horace employs several adjectives meaning "damned" or "cursed," by the gods or fate, to describe how the Romans are affected by civil strife.

[1]Compare the discussion of these lines in Chapter I (p. 7), with Wagenvoort's article ("The crime of fratricide") cited there (p. 7, note 15).

These include devotus,[2] exsecratus,[3] and sacer.[3] Several other religious words used in civil-war contexts refer to that which one must or must not do in respect to his relationship with the gods. Impius[4] 'undutiful,' can also mean 'unpatriotic,' i.e., undutiful to one's fatherland. Civil strife is undutiful because it entails killing one's fellow worshippers or citizens. Nefas/nefastus[5] mean (of or pertaining to) what is allowed or commanded by the gods or divine law, as opposed to the requirements of ius or human statute.[5] Pius 'dutiful,' therefore 'reverent' or 'patriotic,' occurs twice (Epode 16, 63 and 66).

B) ETHICO-LEGAL vocabulary: terminology usually employed in an ethical and/or legal sense. Thus scelus 'crime'

[2]Epode 16, 9. Devotus←devovere, "vouer entièrement aux dieux," "vouer aux dieux infernaux" (Ernout-Meillet s.v. voveo). G. Wissowa (RE V.1, cols. 277-280) notes that devotio was originally a religious ceremony for delivering a person or object to the gods, usually the infernal deities; it was widely used as a weapon, in Republican times, to curse hostile armies. On the role of the gods in fomenting bellum civile, see Jal's article, "Les dieux et les guerres civiles dans la Rome de la fin de la République" (cited Chapter I, p. 8, note 17).

[3]exsecratus: Epode 16, 18 and 36; sacer, Epode 7, 20. Exsecratus←exsecrare 'damn,' to make a person or thing sacer, in that term's negative sense. Sacer itself has the double meaning of 'consecrated'/'damned,' as its basic meaning is "any person or entity that cannot be touched without either becoming contaminated or causing contamination" (Ernout-Meillet s.v. sacer).

[4]Odes II.1, 30; III.24, 25; Epode 16,9.

[5]Nefas: Epode 16, 14, Odes III.4, 68; nefastus: Odes I.35, 35; Ernout-Meillet s.v. fas.

and scelestus 'criminal';[6] delictum 'crime' (Odes III.6, 1); nex (Epode 7, 18) 'murder';[7] and seditio (Odes III.6, 13) 'sedition' but also 'dissension,' 'discord,' 'revolt' in a political context.[8] Culpa, generally used to mean 'fault' or 'defect,' has the legal sense of 'criminal negligence.'[9] Tumultus (Odes III.14, 14) is used to designate all violence other than organized warfare, i.e., rebellion, revolt, insurrection,[10] riot, any civic disturbance not due to the conflict of regularly constituted armies.

C) MEDICAL vocabulary: terms used to indicate physical or mental illness or emotional derangement. Furor (Epode 7, 13; Odes IV.15,17) 'madness,' 'derangement,' with the secondary

[6]Scelus: Odes I.2, 29; I.35, 33; III.24, 50; Epode 7, 18. Scelestus (used as substantive): Epode 7, 1. A scelus is an "evil action, misdeed, crime," while the scelestus is one who perpetrates such a deed, a criminal (Ernout-Meillet s.v. scelus).

[7]Nex is used of violent death or murder, as opposed to a natural passing, mors (Ernout-Meillet s.v. nex).

[8]Ernout-Meillet s.v. seditio, who cite Cicero, De Re Publica VI.1, 3: ea dissensio civium, quod seorsum eunt alii ad alios, seditio dicitur.

[9]Odes III.6, 17; III.24, 34; IV.5, 24; IV.15, 11; Epode 7, 14; R. Leonhard in RE IV.2, cols. 1748-1752. Culpa denotes a state of fault rather than a specific criminal act (Ernout-Meillet s.v. culpa).

[10]Ernout-Meillet s.v. tumultus.

sense of 'desire to overthrow the established order,'[11] or simply 'temerity,' 'nerve,' in their pejorative sense.[12] The term both suggests the madness of what is done in a civil war and hints that this condition is dangerous politically.[13] Ira 'anger' has overtones of vindictive wrath (Odes IV.15, 19; cf. Odes I.16, 17). Rabies (Odes III.24, 26) is literally 'rabies,' hydrophobia; its secondary sense is 'rage,' 'madness,' 'frenzy.'[14]

D) GENERAL terms: Vis,[15] strictly 'force,' 'violence,' but usually given a more explicit sense by modifiers: vis consili expers (III.4, 65) 'ungoverned force'; vis temperata (66) 'moderated force'; viris/omne nefas animo moventis (67-68) 'hostile strength attempting every sort of sacrilege'; mori per vim (III.14, 15) 'die violently'; non furor civilis aut vis exiget otium (IV.15, 17-18) 'civil war and violence shall not drive out otium'; vis acrior (Epode 7, 13) 'fiercer violence.'[16] Vitium (Odes I.2, 23 & 47; II.1, 2): originally

[11] ThLingLat s.v. furor (secondary sense): studium invertendarum rerum.

[12] ThLingLat, loc. cit.: audacia, temeritas.

[13] Thus furor civilis (Odes IV.15, 16-17) means "civil war," and furor caecus (Epode 7, 13) is the "periodic blind insanity" that takes the form of civil war (R.W. Carrubba, "The curse on the Romans," cited in Ch. I, p. 8, note 16).

[14] Ernout-Meillet s.v. rabere. L. & S. translates rabies civica (loc. cit.) as 'fierce civil war.'

[15] Odes III.4, 65, 66, 67; Odes III.14, 15; Odes IV.15, 18; Epode 7, 13.

[16] i.e., fiercer than is human, therefore divine malignance: cf. above, p. 149 s.v. furor.

'physical defect'; then any defect, a fault or vice; then, violence committed due to such a fault or flaw in human character.[17] Pugnas vitio parentum (Odes I.2, 23) 'battles due to their fathers' failings'; te nostris vitiis iniquum (I.2, 47) 'Thee, impatient with our faults'; vitia (Odes II. 1, 2) 'faults' (sc. of those who fight civil wars). Clades (Odes III.6, 19): of inanimate objects 'disaster,' 'ruin'; of animate entities, 'injury' or 'death' (ThLingLat s.v.).

Horace uses the above vocabulary to associate with Roman civil war a variety of ideas suggesting abnormality, forlornness, sacrilege or criminal behavior. From religion, he borrows the terminology of sacrilege or divine ill will, to propose that strife between Romans is both offensive to the gods and a cause and result alike of their displeasure.[18] Horace regards the crime of civil war as basically a religious offense (Jal, op. cit., 172). His use of legal-ethical terminology is meant to give bellum civile an aura of illegality and/or immorality. He also proposes that civil strife is prompted by passions gone wild, and is akin to insanity. And he employs yet other terms in a pejorative manner, to associate civil war with violence (vis), disaster (clades), or men's weakness (vitium).

[17]Ernout-Meillet s.v. vitium.

[18]Cf. Jal's article, "Les dieux et les guerres civiles."

II. Aside from the vocabulary he uses, Horace's manner of speaking of civil strife helps to make clear his antipathy to it. In most instances, the style of the context reinforces the idea of disapproval conveyed by Horace's terminology.

A favorite device for expressing indignation at civil war and its partisans is the use of several questions in succession, to suggest despair or indignation. Thus the first half (1-10) of Epode 7 is given over to interrogation of the scelesti addressed at the poem's beginning (1: quo, quo scelesti ruitis?). Their silence[19] in the face of this impassioned questioning points to their guilt. Similarly Odes II.1, 29-36, where the universality of bellum civile is deplored; and Odes I.2, 25-30, where the desperate situation of the Romans--due to civil war--is exposed in despondent questions: what god can the Romans call upon to prop up their collapsing nation? How can Vesta possibly listen to them? Whom will Jupiter appoint as expiator of their crime? The questions at the end of Odes I.35 (34-38) point an accusing finger at sacrilege as the cause of Roman civil war. In Odes III.24, the futility of legislation without real moral regeneration is pointed out, in a series of complaints voiced as questions (33-44). Horace then gives his own answer to them (45-54).

[19] 15-16: tacent et...mentesque perculsae stupent.

Horace also likes to indicate strong disapproval of civil strife with statements in a fatalistic or prophetic tone. Such remarks hint that civil war is the product of fate or predestination, and are another way of alluding to Rome's wretchedness due to it. The poet declares Rome's impending desolation in a series of future indicative verbs;[20] or with words of weary resignation;[21] or by a dire prediction of Rome's depopulation, that could have been avoided along with civil war.[22] Horace's later, more confident attitude is reflected in the same manner: I shall not fear disturbances or violent death while Augustus rules (Odes III.14, 14-16); with Caesar guarding the world, our *otium* is safe.[23] Civil strife is its own ruin and is also hated by the gods, while enlightened rule is god-fostered.[24]

III. Horace's religious expression is developed beyond the mere vocabulary, in several poems, for the same end, viz. to suggest that civil war is sacrilegious and/or a

[20]Epode 16, 9-14; *perdemus...ferisque rursus occupabitur solum...barbarus...insistet victor et eques sonante verberabit ungula...ossa Quirini...dissipabit insolens*.

[21]Epode 7, 17-20: *sic est*: *acerba fata Romanos agunt/scelusque fraternae necis*, &c.

[22]Odes I.2, 21-24: the future tense again, *audiet... audiet...rara iuventus*.

[23]Odes IV.15, 17-18: again a future indicative verb, (*non*)*exiget* (18).

[24]Odes III.4, 65-68; the tenses are present indicative to present this gnomic statement: *vis consili expers mole ruit sua,/vim temperatam di...provehunt...*).

curse sent by the gods or fate. Epode 16: as the Phocaean state, a 'damned nation' (18, exsecrata civitas) left behind its ancestral deities and shrines to wild beasts, so the Roman exsecrata civitas must leave its home as well (36): the gods are no longer with the Romans in their present location. Jupiter has set aside the arva beata for a pia gens (63); the pii will be led there by Horace, their vates or poet-seer (66). Epode 7 (17-20): a cruel fate is said to dog the Romans,[25] along with the crime of a brother's murder,[26] traceable to the curse of Remus' blood.[27] Odes I.2, 29 ff.: civil war is a scelus, and Jupiter must appoint an expiator, a god; Mercury is chosen. Odes I.21, 13-16: war is to be averted from the Romans and redirected against their national (foreign) enemies, by the dei averrunci prayed to, Apollo and Diana. In Odes I. 35, 34-38, the crime of civil war is linked with sacrilege, to imply that the latter lies at the base of the former. And in Odes II.1, 25-28, Horace refers to the religious ceremony of evocatio, once used successfully to lure Juno from Carthage but lately turned against the Romans themselves.[28] If delicta maiorum of Odes III.6, 1 refers to the crime of civil war, and

[25] 17: acerba fata Romanos agunt.

[26] 18: scelusque fraternae necis.

[27] 19-20: ...Remi/sacer nepotibus cruor.

[28] Discussed in Fraenkel, pp. 237-239.

mala (8) to its god-sent punishment, religion is again the key to avoiding civil war.[29]

IV. Animals figure in several political poems, in connection with Roman civil war: in Epode 16, the adynata relating the mirus amor of beasts of different species (30-34) suggest the abnormality and bestial nature of civil war. Its savagery is declared through Horace's statement that even wild beasts--wolves and lions--do not kill other members of their own species (Epode 7, 11-12); the Romans must then be even more savage if they insist on killing off their fellow citizens. Wild beasts are also heirs to a state destroyed by civil war (Epode 16, 19-20) or by immorality and ensuing divine ill will (Odes III.3, 40-42).

As Horace expresses his ideas on civil war through the medium of poetry, he does not indicate his disapproval by any direct factual statements or rhetorical arguments that civil war is evil and suicidal. Instead, he suggests--through his vocabulary (I), his style of expression (II), and his religious (III) and other (IV) language--that bellum civile is variously the cause or product of all that is wrong with the Roman race: sin, crime, lack of character. He leaves it to his readers to draw the inference that civil war means nothing but suffering and eventual disaster for the Romans, and that they must have no dealings with it in any form whatsoever. Abstention from civil war is essential to Rome's survival.

[29] 1-8; cf. Jal, "Les dieux et les guerres civiles," 173.

## APPENDIX 2

## THE GENTES IN HORACE'S CIVIL- AND FOREIGN-WAR POETRY

The names of the barbarian peoples on Rome's borders appear frequently in Horace's poetry, especially in contexts bearing on Roman civil and foreign war. In most cases, these peoples are mentioned for other than mere poetic reasons, to support the poem's theme or purpose. Horace's uses of their names may be classified into seven (7) general categories, according to their nature and purpose. He regards the gentes variously:

1) As threats to Rome's safety or survival, either due to their own strength and aggressiveness or as the result of Rome's weakness from civil war.

2) In conjunction with (1), as alternate targets for the violence of Roman war, misdirected by Romans against one another in civil strife.

3) As objects of conquest for specific Roman campaigns, actual or imminent.

4) Simultaneously, as major obstacles to, and main objectives of, complete Roman domination of the world.

5) As representative of anticipated or completed Roman hegemony.

6) As peoples whose non-belligerence or outright submission is indicative of Rome's security.

7) As representative of great wealth or luxury; or conversely as paragons of primitive simplicity and morality.

---

(1) In several early poems, barbari appear as threats to Rome's survival. When Rome has completed her self-destruction by civil war, says Horace (Epode 16, 1 ff.), the foreign conqueror will stand over the city's ashes.[1] Civil war brings about Rome's suicide, in answer to the prayers of the Parthians, who are ready to take advantage of this condition (Epode 7, 9-10). The Medes (Parthians) are well aware of what is happening.[2] A later ode, III.6, declares that outside peoples, the Dacians and "Ethiopians" (Egyptians), almost destroyed the city (Rome), racked as it was with seditiones, conflicts between Romans (13-14). As these enemies were formidable (15-16), so too are the Parthians, in Odes I.12.[3] Similarly the warlike Cantabrians and Scyths of II.11 are a threat even without the distraction of civil war (1 ff.), as are the gentes mentioned

[1] 11-12: barbarus heu cineres insistet victor et urbem/ eques sonante verberabit ungula.

[2] Odes II.1, 31-32: auditumque Medis/Hesperiae sonitum ruinae.

[3] 53: Parthos Latio imminentis.

in two odes to Maecenas.[4,5] At the late date of Odes IV.5, Horace asserts that Augustus' rule assures safety from even the fiercest enemies of Rome.[6] The Parthians are referred to on several occasions as graves.[7]

(2) While the gentes are thus sometimes viewed as a threat, in connection with civil war, their conquest is also seen as a constructive alternative to the fratricide of civil war. As early as the seventh epode, Horace gives voice to the wish that Roman blood had been spilled, not in Rome's self-destruction, but in the conquest of foreign enemies, of whom Carthage is the past representative and the Britons and Parthians are the present ones (3-10). In Odes I.2, citizens sharpened the sword for use against one another, the sword that might better have caused the Parthians' doom.[8] This thought is expressed as a prayer in the hymn to Apollo and Diana

[4] III.8, 17-24: the Dacians, the Mede (Parthian), Cantabrian, and Scyths; III.29, the Seres, Parthians, and Scyths.

[5] III.29, 25-28: regnata Cyro/Bactra = Parthi and Tanais = Scythae: Kiessling-Heinze and Wickham, ad. loc.

[6] 25-28: the Parthians, Scyths, the German tribes, and Spain, i.e., the Cantabrians.

[7] Odes I.2, 22: graves Persae; Odes III.5, 4: gravibusque Persis. For the role of barbarians in Roman civil wars in general, see P. Jal, "Le rôle des Barbares dans les guerres civiles de Rome, de Sylla à Vespasien," cited Ch. I, Section 1, p. 9, note 20.

[8] 21-22: audiet civis acuisse ferrum/quo graves Persae melius perirent.

(Odes I.21): may the prayer and dance of the suppliants avert tearful war from the Romans and onto the Persians (Parthians) and Britons (13-16). Odes I.35 concludes in like manner, as Horace fervently prays to Fortuna to reforge the sword blunted in civil strife, on a new anvil, for use against the Massagetae and Arabs (38-40).

(3) Sometimes, Horace mentions the gentes only in connection with a campaign or campaigns now underway or imminent, to identify the expedition and its object. This is the case with the Britons in Odes I.35 (29-30), whose conquest was expected in the near future but was never undertaken.[9] Likewise Odes I.29 (1-2) anticipates the upcoming Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus. In Odes II.9 the "new conquests" (18-19, nova tropaea) Horace looks for are to be of Armenia and Parthia. Odes IV.2 (33-36) looks forward to Augustus' subjugation of the Sygambri, and IV.4 and IV.14 are written expressly for the occasion of victories won by Augustus' stepsons, Drusus and Tiberius, and celebrate their conquest of the Alpine tribes.[10]

(4) Several times, Horace seems to make the Parthians, or the Parthians and Britons, the main barrier to the attainment of Roman hegemony and therefore a priority target, whose

[9]Syme, Roman Revolution, pp. 331-332; CAH, X, pp. 793-794.

[10]IV.4, the Vindelici; IV.14, the Genauni, Breuni, and Raeti.

conquest is a necessary task for the success of Roman imperialism. Especially noteworthy are the odes that mention the Parthians and/or Britons in connection with the attainment of Roman world rule (Odes I.12, III.3, III.5). When Augustus has conquered the Parthians, and after them the Seres and Indians, he will be supreme on earth as Jupiter is in heaven (I.12, 53-60). Odes III.5 says precisely the same thing: Augustus will be regarded as a god on earth (i.e., will be supreme over all peoples), once he has added the Parthians and Britons to the Empire.[11] In either case, Augustus' complete supremacy is identical with Rome's, and parallels Jupiter's sole rule above (1-2). Rome will be able (III.3, 42-44) not only to survive but to rule the Medes (Parthians), if she abides by the edicts of the gods; she has only to avoid rebuilding Troy. And, once she can "give laws" to Parthia,[12] she may also extend her name--and rule--to the ends of the earth (45-48, 53-56).

The Parthians are Rome's privileged enemies ("ennemis privilégiés"), it has been noted,[13] because for Horace--as for Cicero before him--Rome can pursue but two types of relationship with the gentes, fides (Rome dominant, the other nation

[11] 2-4: ...praesens divus habebitur/Augustus adiectis Britannis/imperio gravibusque persis.

[12] 43-44: triumphatisque possit/Roma ferox dare iura Medis.

[13] H. Fugier, "Horace et les Parthes," BFS, 46 (1967), 283-291; 288 referred to.

submissive) or incorporation into the Roman world proper, by conquest and annexation (Fugier, 287). But the Parthian kingdom is the living denial of this Roman imperialistic ideal, as she neither submits to fides (Augustus' amicitia of the Res Gestae) nor allows herself to be conquered (Fugier, 288). Worse yet, the Parthians have established themselves as a power in their own right, and have thrice defeated Roman armies in the field (Odes III.6, 9-11). This explains the Augustan poets' near obsession with Parthia and accounts for the importance Horace assigns them, especially in regard to Roman hegemony.[14]

(5) The names of the gentes are used in certain contexts --singly, in pairs, and in groups--to represent complete Roman domination of all the habitable lands of the world. This domination may be so symbolized whether already complete or only anticipated. Odes I.12 (53-56) looks for the conquest of the Indians and Chinese as well as the Parthians.[15] The state of geographical knowledge at the time[16] was such that India was taken to be the eastern limit of the world; and the eastern

[14]The Romans, under the Principate, never really gave up their designs on Parthia, despite the reestablishment of diplomatic contacts in 20 B.C. Cf. K.H. Ziegler, Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich, pp. 95-96.

[15]55-56: subiectos orientis orae/Seras et Indos.

[16]Nisbet & Hubbard on Odes I.12, 56 (p. 167); J.O. Thomson, History of Ancient Geography (1948; rpt. New York: Biblo & Tannen, 1965), pp. 134-136 and map, p. 135.

half of the world was not quite as large as the western half, already controlled by the Romans.[17] After Parthia, there was only sparsely populated territory[18] until the unwarlike Indians were reached. Their conquest would necessarily mean the subjugation of all lands and peoples between them and Parthia; neither appeared at all difficult. Agrippa took the distance between the Caucasus and the Oceanus Sericus (the eastern ocean) to be a mere 480 miles (Nisbet and Hubbard, loc. cit.). This gross underestimation of the extent and number of unconquered lands and peoples gave the Princeps and poets alike all the more incentive to anticipate, work for, and celebrate the spread of Roman rule over the gentes still unconquered.[19] As the Indians are taken to be the easternmost people of the world, and as the east is the half of it that remains to be conquered, their subjugation is made representative of the achievement of Roman world hegemony.

In Odes I.12 (above, p. 161), the subjugation of the Indians, with that of the Chinese, represents Roman world conquest. The Indians are mentioned again, in the Carmen Saeculare (17 B.C.), as superbi nuper (55-56); if one remembers

[17]Thomson, Geography, p. 142.

[18]Ariana = Iran; Thomson, op. cit., p. 135.

[19]Nisbet and Hubbard, loc. cit.; P.A. Brunt, JRS, 53 (1963), 175-176; C.M. Wells, The German Policy of Augustus, pp. 3-4, 7-8.

that the superbi are the remaining unconquered gentes,[20] then the expression translates as 'recently unconquered,' i.e., now subdued. In effect, Horace is claiming that the entire world has come to terms with Rome: take India, by whatever means, and you have taken the rest of the world with her. India's importance is somewhat diminished in a later catalogue of subiecti.[21] But in a list of specific offenders brought to terms with the Pax Augusta, Indus (42) refers not simply to this people but to the entire extent of territory stretching eastward to India. The name suggests any and all gentes east of Parthia (Medus, 42). In IV.15, the Chinese (Seres, 23) are invoked in a similar role, in place of but equivalent to the Indians as poetic shorthand for the eastern half of the world. If they obey the edicta Iulia, so too does the rest of the populated earth.

The Indians and Chinese are Horace's favorite subiecti; but he groups the names of other gentes to create the same impression of complete Roman domination. He prefers to select one or two peoples from each of several regions, whose conquest or submission is representative of that of all the other gentes in that area. These regions taken together represent the world. In Odes II.20 (17-20), Colchus, the Dacians and Geloni indicate

[20]Wells, p. 4 on Vergil, Aen. VI.851-853; quoted above, Ch. II, p. 64, note 9.

[21]Odes IV.14, 41 ff.

the east generally, and Hiber and Rhodani potor (i.e., the Gauls) the west. The catalogue of gentes in the fourth Roman Ode (III.4, 33-36) seems to serve the same purpose, as the Britons (west), Concani (a Spanish tribe: west), Geloni (east), and Scyths (used to indicate the north) suggest the northern, eastern, and western regions of the world[22] and thereby the entire orbis terrarum. Similarly, Odes III.8, 17-24, which mentions the Dacian (east), the Mede (Parthian: east), Cantabrian (west) and Scythian (north) as defeated, brought to terms, or not dangerous; this list suggests totus orbis terrarum in the same way. In Odes IV.5 (25-28), the Parthian, Scyth, German tribes, and Spain are no longer to be feared; their nations and regions, and the rest of the world with them, have been brought to terms with Rome and Augustus. The catalogue in IV.14 (41 ff.) serves the same purpose: the Cantabrian, Mede (again, Parthian), Indian (above, pp. 161-163), and Scyth, representing the gentes of the west, east, and north, suggest that the rest of humanity has submitted to Augustus along with them.[23] So too the peoples mentioned in IV.15 (21-24) represent the world's subordination to Roman authority.

(6) Horace's use of barbari to indicate Rome's security, by their submission, conquest, or neutralization, is a kindred

[22]Africa is omitted as already secured.

[23]The "entire world" idea is varied in the land-sea-rivers scheme of 45-52; cf. Kiessling-Heinze ad. loc.

idea, often coinciding with that of conquest.[24] Quinctius, the politician of Odes II.11, is enjoined not to worry about the warlike Cantabrian or Scyth. All is well on the borders with these tribes, and--Horace implies--everywhere else in the world as well. Maecenas is similarly reassured in III.8 (above).

(7) Lastly, the poet sometimes resorts to the names of a few gentes as synonyms for wealth in abundance, with overtones of the moral degeneracy that accompanies it, or as paragons of primitive simplicity and virtue. Odes III.24, 1-2: the Arabs and Indians represent opulence; Horace's anxious rich man is intactis opulentior/thesauris Arabum et divitis Indiae. In Horace's ode to Iccius (I.29), the Arabs represent wealth[25] to be taken as booty in war. Horace calls the Indians and Arbas ditantis (Epist. I.6, 6). He declares he will have nothing to do with "Persian luxury."[26] He urges Maecenas not to exchange his wife's charms even for fabulous wealth, or for the "full houses of the Arabs," i.e., their abundant treasures.[27] He himself will not exchange the freedom afforded him by his leisure-with-modest-means for "the wealth of the Arabs."[28]

[24]Odes III.8, IV.5, IV.14, and IV.15, passages discussed above.

[25]1-2: ...beatis nunc Arabum invides/gazis... .

[26]Odes I.38, 1: Persicos odi, puer, adparatus.

[27]Odes II.12, 24: plenas Arabum domos.

[28]Epist. I.7, 35-36: nec/otia divitiis Arabum liberrima muto.

Conversely, the Scyths and Getae of Odes III.24 (9-24) represent an ethic of moral simplicity that contrasts sharply with the futile wealth the Indians and Arabs stand for (1-2). In the same ode, Horace chooses these very different peoples to illustrate his warnings of the uselessness of riches and the superiority of simple living. He uses their reputations to give an object lesson in materialism, one that is applicable to all Romans.

## APPENDIX 3

## PAUPERIES HORATIANA

I. The words of the family pauper, paupertas, pauperies[1] are used in three distinct senses in the work of Horace. These senses may be termed positive, negative, and neutral.

1) The positive meaning of pauperies may be generally defined as the possession of material means adequate for and appropriate to one's station of life. (A) Moreover, in contexts where a word of the family refers to Horace's own situation or that of another person in similar circumstances, it usually signifies adequate means acquired without appreciable physical labor or emotional stress. (B) When pauperies is used to refer to the life of a soldier or peasant, it implies sustinence at subsistence level, earned by dint of hard physical labor[2] and--in the soldier's instance--exposure to the hazards of combat. In this latter sense, the term's special coloration is signaled by a strong qualifying adjective: dura, saeva, angusta (paupertas/pauperies).

[1]Pauperies and paupertas are used interchangeably in Horace, as in earlier Latin literature; see P. Brind'Amour, La Richesse et la Pauvreté chez Plaute et Térence, p. 62.

[2]This is the early meaning of paupertas/pauperies (unmodified), found in Plautus and Terence: a harsh social condition characterized by hard physical labor and a dearth of possessions but "compatible avec l'exercise des droits du citoyen et avec une saine morale" (Brind'Amour, op. cit., p. 63).

2) (A) Horace occasionally uses the terms in a genuinely negative sense, to denote degrading lack of adequate means for living within one's socio-economic class. (B) More often, his apparent pejorative uses of the words are really a form of negative social criticism: he makes pauperies into a detestable condition in the judgement of the greedy, to expose the wrongness of their moral values.

3) He also employs terms from the family--chiefly the adjective pauper--in a neutral moral sense, as stock adjectives, notably in the standard dives-pauper or rex-pauper contrast.

II. Passages that illustrate the above summaries. The numerals and letters used correspond to those of I.

1) (A) Pauper, pauperies, paupertas meaning a modest competence, obtained without undue effort. Sat. I.6, 71: Horace refers to his own father as pauper 'of limited means.' Odes II. 20, 5-6: Horace refers to his parents as pauperes (ego, pauperum/ sanguis parentum). Epist. I.10, 32-33: one can be supremely happy under pauper tectum.[3] Sat. II.6, 79 ff.: the country mouse lives happily in his pauper cavus (80-81). Sat. II.2, 44-46: pauperies is characterized by simple eating habits.[4] In Odes I.1, 15-18 and Epist. I.1, 45-46, the merchant, indocilis pauperiem pati, is made representative of those who restlessly strive for wealth, as they cannot endure living only

[3]Cf. Sat. I.6, 111 ff. for the same idea expressed differently.

[4]Cf. Sat. II.6, 83-86.

with what suffices.[5] Odes III.29, 55-56: Horace's economic ideal is termed proba pauperies sine dote 'faithful simplicity without a dowry'; the same idea presents itself in different language in Odes II.16, 13 ff. and III.1, 25 ff.

(B) Pauper and family used to mean subsistence through hard work. Odes III.2, 1-6: the ideal young Roman eques is to learn to gladly endure angusta pauperies (1), which will make him a formidable fighter against Rome's enemies, the Parthians. Odes I.12, 41-44: the great military leaders of the Roman Republic are said to have been raised according to the standards of saeva paupertas; this sort of upbringing, Horace implies, is the secret of their greatness. Odes IV.9, 46 ff.: that man has the best claim to be called happy who yearns to endure dura pauperies;[6] he has a strong sense of honor, and is not afraid to die--if need be--for his friends or fatherland. In Odes III.6, 37 ff., the same grinding poverty is a fundamental condition of the hard peasant farm life of country soldiers' sons. Farming creates strong and moral young men who make excellent fighters, like those who defeated Rome's most dangerous enemies in the past (33-36).

2) (A) Pauper and family used negatively. In Epist. I.12, 1-6, Horace's friend Iccius is told that, if he uses his income properly, he can receive no greater gift from

[5]Similarly, the greedy man is a slave to riches (Epist. I.10, 39 ff.).

[6]49, duramque callet pauperiem pati.

Jupiter. That man is not pauper who has enough to supply his needs.[7] The pauper, then, is one who lacks adequate means for living; here, the term has a genuine negative sense. Horace himself prays for the aversion of pauperies immunda (Epist. II.2, 199), which must mean an inadequate amount of possessions, too little. Similarly paupertas can be contracta 'confined' and thus equivalent to lack of adequate sustinence (Epist. I.5, 20). As a young man, Horace was driven to the composition of poetry by paupertas audax (Epist. II.2, 51-52), a lack of means that produced unwonted boldness in him. He was then inops paterni et laris et fundi (50-51).

(B) Horace more commonly uses pauper and family in an ironic negative sense.[8] His purpose in these contexts is social criticism: pauperies, which Horace himself clearly regards as a good thing (cf. I.1, p. 135), is given a bad name by the morally degenerate. The transparency of their assertions is their own condemnation. Thus pauperies for the greedy is a magnum opprobrium; their avarice commands them to do and endure anything to avoid it (Odes III.24, 42-44). To the man who cannot content himself with modest means, pauperies is a social blemish of fearful size,[9] or reason for fear.[10]

[7] 4, pauper enim non est, cui rerum suppetit usus.

[8] See the remarks under I.2 (B), above, p. 167.

[9] Sat. II.3, 91-94: ...quoad vixit, credidit ingens/ pauperiem vitium... .

[10] Sat. I.1, 93; II.7, 84.

Pauperies is the basis of Horace's own way of life (cf. Chapter III, Section 3 above, p. 110 ff.); those who cannot abide it are a threat to his own existence as well as to Roman national morality. Horace accordingly scores their defects of character by parodying their fears of what is best for Rome and for himself.

3) Pauper used in a neutral sense. Numerous instances exist of the formal use of pauper, as a stock epithet without moral coloring. Thus (Odes I.4, 13-14) Death calls alike at both the poor man's hut and the rich man's palace.[11] In Epist. I.1, the poet speaks of "that which is equally feasible for pauperes and locupletes"(24-25). And in Epode 11 (11-12), the stock rich man - poor man contrast again occurs.[12]

III. Some further remarks on Horace's own pauperies.

An important characteristic of Horace's otium is, as Perret observes,[13] that it is "acquired at little cost," and is the "material tranquillity" belonging to those untroubled by ambition, political or material. Yet this fortunate state of affairs is hardly the lot of all Romans.[14] Horace's otium is supported by his pauperies, which rewards him materially with what he needs to live comfortably but makes no demands on his

[11] Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas/ regumque turris. ...

[12] 'contrane lucrum nil valere candidum/pauperis ingenium' ... .

[13] Horace, Eng. tr., pp. 97-98.

[14] This seems to be what Perret implies (loc. cit.).

time, energy, or concentration. This is so because the quite different pauperies of peasants and soldiers does the work of Horace's Sabine estate and furnishes the security requisite for its enjoyment. This pauperies of production and military preparedness is a socially useful condition, as it trains the workers of the soil and gives them the physical fitness and courage necessary to defend it. This state of affairs secures Horace's own, effort-free pauperies, that of a small country landowner, and leaves him at liberty to enjoy his rustic otium, source and basic condition of his literary production.[15] He is well aware of the difference between "his own delight in the leisure and peace afforded by an adequate country estate" and the saeva paupertas and accompanying strenuous life of the Italian peasantry and agricultural slave labor.[16] "The 'simplicity' of the Sabine farm so cherished by the poet is

[15]Herein lies the ideological connection between the first and second Roman Odes. The angusta pauperies of the Roman military (Odes III.2) enables it to protect Roman society against invasion and thereby to safeguard the quite different, effortless, nonmilitary pauperies (Horace's own) of the preceding ode. The soldier's toil and lack of any real substance secure Horace's freedom from fear, danger, toil, and obligation, with a guaranteed income (III.1). Thus it is fitting and joyful to the community (Rome) and its citizens (Horace) that the soldier of III.2 die for their preservation (H. Hommel, "Dulce et decorum," RhM, 111 (1968), 219-252, especially 244-249). The soldier's own joy in and benefit from his death is of no more concern than the peasant's delight in his back-breaking toil. Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori must be referred to the Roman nation, not to the individual soldier.

[16]M.E. Taylor, "Horace, laudator temporis acti?" AJPh, 83 (1962), 23-43 (the quotation is from 34).

not for a moment confused with the rigors of actually tilling the soil."[17] Horace is mindful that his providers and protectors must--to do their job well--live quite another life from that of the man their labors benefit.

In economic terms, Horace's valles Sabina was "large enough to provide its owner with a decent income,"[18] the poet's pauperies or quod satis est. The estate was "managed on a scientific and capitalistic basis"[19] and "consisted of two parts--a model farm run by the owner by means of eight slaves, and five plots leased to five families of coloni..." (p. 61). It was an estate of medium size (loc. cit.). The lands so leased "were let to free farmers on terms of money rent or shares of produce."[20] Management of the farm was in the hands of Horace's bailiff (Epist. I.14), and the poet was thus free from its supervision as well as from the actual working of the soil.

For reasons already considered (above, pp. 171-172), Horace feels neither embarrassment nor contempt for the hard

[17] Taylor, 34.

[18] M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (2nd Ed., rev. P.M. Fraser; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), Vol. I, p. 61.

[19] Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History, p. 59.

[20] W.E. Heitland, Agricola: a study of agriculture and rustic life in the Greco-Roman world from the point of view of labour (1921; rpt. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1970), p. 216.

life of his slaves and tenants. Theirs is not a degrading poverty; they have enough to live on, although they all must work hard for it.[21] The poet is well aware of the harmful effects of indigence, just as he knows that one can possess more than is good for him.[22] Both extremes are to be avoided and--if somehow not avoided--then renounced, for the good of individual and nation. For Horace, "the creed of simplicity is essentially that of the golden mean, involving the renunciation not of civilization but of its excesses."[23] Deficiency and excess of means are the evils every Roman must steer clear of; between them lies the salubrious middle course of pauperies.

[21]This is the traditional pauperies; cf. above, p. 167, note 2.

[22]See above, p. 168, I.2 (A, B).

[23]Taylor, "Horace, laudator temporis acti?" 43.

APPENDIX 4

ABSTRACT OF

Horace's Attitude Toward Roman Civil and Foreign War.[1]

Both Horace's political views and his relationship with the Augustan regime have often been studied. However, no systematic investigation has been made of his attitude toward Roman civil and foreign war in its relationship to his outlook on Roman politics. Nor have his reasons for holding such attitudes ever been methodically considered.

A broad definition of civil war was first adopted, for purposes of this study; then, passages bearing on civil war were studied separately, in Chapter I. It was found that Horace consistently condemned Roman civil strife and its participants. He formulated a variety of causes--religious, moral, economic, and military--of civil war and solutions to it. His movement from withdrawal from politics to involvement therein and eventual allegiance to Octavian's regime was motivated by his fear of civil war and his strong desire to find a political solution to it.

Those passages dealing with foreign war and foreign policy in general were also considered separately. The evidence revealed that Horace displayed consistent approval both

[1]Robert L. Frieman, M.A. thesis presented to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ottawa, Ontario, August, 1972, xiv-177 p.

of bellum externum and of Augustus' foreign policy in general. This policy was found to be imperialistic.

The common ground for Horace's disapproval of Roman civil strife and his advocacy of Augustan imperialism was sought in the requirements and preferences of his life as a private citizen. His personal needs were analyzed, and were all found to be dependent, directly or indirectly, on conditions provided and guaranteed by Augustus' administration. This finding led to the conclusion that Horace condemned bellum civile because it jeopardized the conditions of his own well-being. Conversely, he supported Rome's foreign wars because they seemed to guarantee and enhance the Pax Augusta. Horace's political poetry reflected accurately the salient problems faced by the Roman nation and Augustus' success in dealing with them.

It was thus seen that the frequent explanation of Horace's political poetry as propaganda or as the product of official pressure was both unnecessary and unsupportable. Horace condemned Roman civil war and endorsed Augustan imperialism for his own reasons.

This literary involvement in politics for personal ends illuminated a central ambivalence in Horace's character. As an artist, he felt a need for personal and ideological independence. This independence derived from his otium, which in turn depended upon the Pax Augusta. He therefore praised and constructively criticized the Augustan regime as guarantor of this

*otium*, yet refused to be bound unconditionally by Augustus' party platform. Horace's success as a political poet consisted in the fact that he gained a voice in affairs of state without sacrificing his independence.