Though the *Epodes* lack the Archilochean clarity of vision that can make a remote society seem intensely real, they are of significance to historians on various counts. The seventh and sixteenth poems organise their material in a characteristically poetic way, with few direct facts and many literary motifs, yet they communicate an emotion as Cassius Dio never does; if they do not tell us what actually happened, at least they indicate what it might have felt like at the time. On the other hand the ninth epode is a primary source of a kind very unusual in poetry; if it is examined closely it seems to yield information, based on personal experience, that is not available elsewhere. But perhaps the book's greatest illumination lies not in Horace's comments on the world but in what he betrays about himself. When he turned to the genre of *iambi*, that was a declaration of his own alienation, yet he ended the decade as a committed supporter of the new regime. It was by such manipulation of men's minds rather than by any exploits at Actium that Octavian's party prevailed.

2

I. M. Le M. DuQuesnay

HORACE AND MAECENAS
The propaganda value of *Sermones* I

The satires of Horace are generally read as if they were apolitical poems or even as if they implied a complete and conscious rejection of any concern with public life.[1] Yet it is also widely believed that Maecenas had quite deliberately gathered round himself a number of talented poets who would celebrate the glories of Octavian and help to rally support for his policies.[2] Horace's *Sermones* Book I[3] is the earliest work to be dedicated to Maecenas, the first fruits of this patronage. Simply to juxtapose like this these two widespread assumptions is to reveal the inherent, puzzling contradiction. In this paper it will be argued that once the satires are considered in relation to the political context in which they were written, and read with an awareness of the terms in which the contemporary propaganda war was being waged, then they can be seen to possess a political dimension and relevance that have gone unnoticed. In what follows, space will not allow me to do more than explain the possible significance of the individual satires and some of their various details in relationship to the contemporary political situation. It is obviously not possible to give here a full and completely balanced account of each poem. Sometimes the political dimension of a poem is not the most important and it should be emphasised that the approach suggested in this essay is intended primarily to complement rather than to replace more traditional approaches[4] and to redress the balance by concentrating almost exclusively on this neglected aspect of these multi-faceted poems.

Horace does not in these poems overtly praise Octavian as Triumvir or as victor in the *Bellum Siculum*. Nor, perhaps more surprisingly, does he exploit the traditional function of satire in times of civil war and social and political division to denigrate the opposition systematically and in detail.[5] His technique is both less direct and more positive. His basic strategy is to present an attractive image of himself and his friends as sophisticated, cultured and intelligent men who are humane in their attitudes to others and mindful of the *mos maiorum*. Above all he exhibits

a concern with moral issues. But for the contemporaries of Sallust the distinction between morality and politics was not a meaningful one.[6]

DATES

The clear meaning of the last line of *Satire* 1.10 is that this collection of ten poems was published as a single *libellus*, independently of the second book. It also implies that the tenth poem was the last to be written. The poem itself has every appearance of being composed as a formal epilogue in that it carefully defines Horace's position in the tradition of Lucilian satire and his place on the contemporary literary scene. Horace introduces a Bibulus as a member of his audience at Rome (1.10.86) whose approval he seeks. This man is plausibly identified with Brutus' stepson L. Calpurnius Bibulus, the Antonian admiral who had taken a fleet to Sicily in 36 to help Octavian. He spent the winter of 36/35 at Rome before returning to govern Syria for Antonius. It seems safe to assume that *Sermones* 1 was 'published' in that same winter.[7]

Few of the other poems can be dated. There is no reason to tie the seventh to the dramatic date of the incident which it describes (43/42); the fifth is obviously later than the spring of 37 and the preliminaries to the Treaty of Tarentum. As to relative chronology, it is certain only that the second satire precedes the fourth and the fourth the tenth. It is, however, important to emphasise that the common belief that Horace had composed some satires before he joined Maecenas is utterly without foundation. If it is supposed that Maecenas was not content with the *commendatio* of Virgil and Varius Rufus and that he must have required written evidence of Horace's skill as a poet, there is still absolutely no reason to suppose that these early specimens have survived at all, much less that they were satires.[8] All ten poems were judged worthy of and suitable for inclusion in a *libellus* dedicated to, and so publicly associated with, Maecenas: obviously, then, all of them could have been composed after the beginning of their *amicitia*. Certainly the absence of Maecenas' name from any poem proves nothing, as a glance at any book of Augustan poetry reveals. It is incredible that *Satire* 1.2 should have shocked either Maecenas or Octavian, hard to believe that they gave anything less than wholehearted approval to this first onslaught on adultery.[9] In *Satire* 1.4 Horace could not have invoked his friendship with the powerful Maecenas without substantially affecting the argument.[10] In short, there is no reason to think that the satires are anything but what they appear to be, ten Lucilian poems for Horace's

amicus Maecenas, written between the years 38, when their *amicitia* began, and the winter of 36/35, when they were 'published'.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The years 38 to 36 delimit almost exactly a distinct and important phase in the history of the second Triumvirate. It is the period of the *Bellum Siculum*.[11] Since it formed the unspoken context and implicit backdrop to *Sermones* 1, some understanding of the nature of this conflict and the issues involved is fundamental to any attempt to assess the potential of the satires as propaganda.

The younger son of Pompeius Magnus, Sextus Pompeius, proclaimed his devotion to his father's cause and his determination to emulate him by styling himself Magnus Pompeius Pius. Outlawed himself in 43 by the *lex Pedia*, he became a thorn in the side of the Triumvirs by providing a rallying-point and refuge, first, for the victims of the proscriptions and, later, for the survivors of Philippi. His success may be judged from the terms of the Treaty of Misenum (the peace of Puteoli) concluded between himself and Octavian and Antonius in 39. Sextus was conceded control of Sardinia, Corsica, Sicily and the Peloponnese (Achaea); he was promised a consulship and an augurate. In effect he was recognised as the virtual equal of Octavian and Antonius. More important in the long term, the exiles, the refugees from the proscriptions and Philippi, were allowed to return, some of them to be honoured at once with tribuneships, praetorships and priesthoods. Only those directly implicated in the murder of Caesar remained in exile.[12]

The peace was short-lived. No sooner had Antonius returned to the East than hostilities broke out between Octavian and Sextus. In 38 Octavian suffered some humiliating setbacks and defeats. Indeed one of the reasons for the nine-month hiatus between Horace's interview and final acceptance by Maecenas was that the latter had to undertake an urgent diplomatic mission to Antonius in the East to secure his backing and reinforcements for the imperilled Octavian.[13] Horace's silence is tactful and significant. The next year was one of consolidation and preparation. Finally, on 3 September 36 Octavian's forces defeated those of Sextus at Naulochus. The fears and anxieties of those years are only too imaginable. For a second time in two decades Rome had witnessed a power struggle between a Caesar and a Pompeius which had run from *amicitia* through civil war to a victory for Caesar. There must have been grave doubts about the future.

The task facing the young Octavian, if he was to avoid the fate of Julius Caesar, is simply defined. He had to build upon his hard-won success, to increase his real power and his reputation without seeming to be a tyrant, and to increase and broaden the basis of his support. With the full and concerted support of his friends this delicate and complex task was so successfully accomplished that within two years he had transformed his position from one of relative weakness to one of indisputable equality with that of Antonius.[14]

Octavian entered Rome with an *ouatio* in November 36, having meticulously observed Republican protocol and thereby proclaiming his respect for the *mos maiorum*.[15] He was showered with honours, many of which he declined. But the anniversary of his victories was to be celebrated with annual sacrifices; a golden statue was erected in the forum with a legend advertising the restoration of peace; and the Italian cities set up statues of him in their temples.[16] So much for reputation and honour. The army needed attention. Some veteran legions were discharged, although few were settled in Italy and for them the land was purchased not confiscated. This action was calculated to secure the support of the Italian landowners and avoid another Perusine War. The rest of the army were promised rich booty from the coming Illyrian campaigns.[17] These new wars would serve a number of objectives. They provided an opportunity for Octavian to consolidate and enhance his reputation as a military man. The war would be glorious, for at last the might of Rome was to be turned against a ferocious foreign foe which for ten years had threatened the borders of Italy, and the standards captured from A. Gabinius in 48 were to be recovered.[18] Both factors would be useful propaganda if Antonius succeeded against the Parthians. These campaigns were to provide Octavian, his friends and supporters, and the legions with valuable battle experience; the booty was to be used, in time-honoured fashion, to adorn the city and to benefit the people. These new buildings and repairs would be a physical manifestation of the benefits to come from the end of civil war and the renewed pursuit of the traditional Roman goals. More immediate benefits to the people of Italy lay in the swift and effective campaign to clear out the bandits and brigands which infested the countryside, perhaps a similar campaign to rid Rome itself of thieves and robbers, and the remission of various taxes and debts.[19]

All these activities were clearly designed in the first place to increase the power and prestige of Octavian and to win him support. But Octavian made a number of other moves which show him to have been

anxious to avoid the trap into which Caesar had fallen: he had to convince people that this time the better cause had won, that the new Caesar respected the *mos maiorum* and that he was not aiming at *regnum* or *dominatio* but simply emulating the achievements of the great heroes of the Republic to the incalculable benefit of the state. The first step was to discredit totally Sextus Pompeius. The victory, it was insisted, was not over the proud remnants of the Republican cause, over the last defenders of the *mos maiorum* and *libertas* but *contra latrones atque seruilem manum* (*Epode* 4.19), and it was not the Triumvirs who threatened the liberty of Rome but Sextus who *minatus urbi uincla, quae detraxerat | seruis amicus perfidis* (*Epode* 9.9–10).[20] The words were underscored with brutal action. In spite of earlier pledges to the contrary, the runaway slaves with Sextus were ostentatiously returned to their masters and those alleged slaves whom no master claimed were impaled in the towns and cities from where they had absconded.[21] This attack on Sextus was counterbalanced by a more positive presentation of the case of Octavian and the Triumvirate. This was, at long last, really the end of civil wars. Such was the claim of Octavian, for at this time there was no public admission of even the slightest disagreement between Antonius and Octavian.[22] The task for which the *Triumuiri Rei Publicae Constituendae* had been appointed was virtually complete and Octavian professed his willingness to relinquish his special powers: he was confident that Antonius felt the same. They would do just that, as soon as the Parthian campaign was successfully completed. In the mean time, as evidence of his good faith and his intentions, most of the administration of the state would be seen to be carried out by the annual magistrates in accordance with the *mos maiorum*. In order to induce forgetfulness of the bitter struggles of the recent past, Octavian caused the propaganda writings of the civil wars to be burned. To ensure that his own views prevailed and that his intentions were not misunderstood he delivered speeches to the senate and the people, detailing his achievements and explaining his aims and his policies since the murder of Caesar. These speeches were then written up and published.[23] It is surely hardly credible that amid all this activity, when Octavian clearly could and did expect his friends to support his cause in every way that they could, Maecenas, his closest friend and adviser, should publish and distribute a work which was irrelevant to the needs and the preoccupations of himself and his friends.[24] It is also difficult to believe that Horace could have lived day by day amid all this activity and yet have remained aloof from and immune to it all.

HORACE, *AMICUS MAECENATIS*

Horace's friendship with Maecenas is a historical fact, movingly guaranteed by the latter's famous words to Augustus: *Horati Flacci ut mei esto memor.*[25] But it began as a professional friendship.[26] Early in 38 Maecenas was evidently recruiting poets and had already befriended Virgil and Varius Rufus, both of whom were established poets.[27] They introduced Horace and, presumably, vouched for his skill and potential as a poet. Maecenas was following impeccable precedents, from Alexander and his successors through Scipio Aemilianus to Asinius Pollio. His personal motives are nowhere recorded: he may have wanted a status symbol, an entertainer, a propagandist or an encomiast. Most likely he never analysed his motives and all these factors played their part. It would be impossible to deny that Maecenas simply had an enthusiasm for poets and poetry.[28] Having said that, it is important to stress that Maecenas did not just employ Horace as a poet but made him an *amicus*. On Horace's own testimony the formal interview was no less concerned with his qualities as a man and his suitability as an *amicus* than with his quality as a poet. Maecenas evidently found him stimulating company: Horace became his *conuictor* and accompanied him on journeys. In addition he presumably performed such services for Maecenas as lay within his power, including those of a private secretary. But above all, Maecenas could expect from his *amicus* public support whenever the occasion arose: Horace's status as a poet did not exempt him from the normal obligations of *amicitia*. Poetry was almost the only means available to Horace to make public statements which commanded attention. He could not be expected to let pass this opportunity to support his friend.[29]

What Horace hoped for from the *amicitia* with Maecenas is easy to imagine. He had returned from Philippi with sufficient wealth to buy the post of *scriba quaestorius*, which was often held by *equites* like himself, and this probably guaranteed him a (minimum) annual income of 24,000 sesterces.[30] He could have lived in comfortable obscurity.[31] But, as he later said, *paupertas impulit audax | ut uersus facerem* (*Epistles* 2.2.50–1). In that same poem he acknowledged that his poetry did bring him wealth. In both this poem and in the *Epistle to Augustus*, Horace quite clearly attributes his wealth to the fact that he was a poet and not simply to his being a friend of Maecenas and Augustus (they befriended him just because he was a poet) and his public acknowledgement of this fact makes it clear that there was nothing unusual, inconceivable or dishonourable in such a relationship for either the poet or

his benefactor. Maecenas may have marked the beginning of their *amicitia* with a large cash gift, but of that nothing is said.[32] Horace certainly derived many other advantages from their *amicitia*: he lived with Maecenas and travelled with him;[33] he was introduced to other *principes uiri* (including Octavian) from whom he could expect *beneficia* in exchange for the *gloria et laus et aeternitas* which he conferred upon them by mentioning their names in his poems.[34] Above all, he received access to scribes and papyrus, books, audiences for his recitations and, presumably as an extension of this, the 'publication' of his poems.[35]

Contemporary readers of Horace did not need to be told about the nature of *amicitia*. They could be relied upon to understand the realities of Roman society and to read the poems accordingly. But Rome was not a totalitarian state and there was no mechanism by means of which Maecenas could have compelled Horace to act as his *amicus*. It defies probability to suppose that he would have wished to do so. Nor did there exist any means by which Maecenas or even Octavian could have compelled Horace, simply by virtue of his being *ciuis Romanus*, to write in support of the regime or could have prevented him from writing if he criticised it. Horace could have remained independent, if he had chosen to do so, and lamented the defeat of the Republican cause to the end of his days. Instead, as he openly avows, he had freely accepted the friendship of Maecenas with all its material advantages and social obligations. If he had then gone on to express in his works distaste for or disapproval of what Maecenas stood for at that time he could not have expected this to be taken as a sign of a praiseworthy independent spirit or the fulfilment of some mystical duty as a poet to be subversive and to question the nature of his society. It would have been taken simply as a sign of impudence and churlish ingratitude. But Horace does no such thing. He dedicates the *Sermones* to Maecenas (1.1.1 and 1.6) and so fulfils his obligations as an *amicus* by giving something in exchange for the *beneficia* which he has received. He also states quite openly that he sought the approval of Maecenas as of other friends for what he wrote (*Satire* 1.10.81–90). It may be supposed that Maecenas even suggested themes and discussed work in progress as Atticus did with Cicero.[36] That is not to suggest that Maecenas vetted every line for its doctrinal purity: for there was no doctrine in that sense. But Horace makes much of his *amicitia* and encourages the reader to suppose that there exists between the two men *id in quo omnis uis est amicitiae, uoluntatum studiorum sententiarum summa consensio* (Cicero, *De amicitia* 15). Moreover Horace's contemporaries must have been eager to learn what they

could about Maecenas. He was at this time the second most powerful man in Rome; yet he remained an elusive and enigmatic figure, a *priuatus* and an *eques* whose power resided in his *amicitia* with Octavian. Horace does all that he can to encourage his readers to interpret the poems as the work of an *amicus* of Maecenas and so invites them to draw what inferences they can about himself and his friends.

To suppose that Horace's technique in the satires is not deliberate and that the effects are not intended would be to underestimate grossly the skill of Horace as a poet and his self-consciousness as an artist. Yet nowhere in *Sermones* 1 does he adopt any conventional poetic stance such as those adopted in *Epodes* 7 and 16. He even pretends to deny the status of poetry to his satires (*Satire* 1.4.39–42) and so, by implication, the status of poet to himself. He even suggests that his poems were not intended for publication.[37] All this helps to create and foster the impression that the reader is hearing the authentic voice of the historical character of Q. Horatius Flaccus, who has a claim on our attention not as a poet but simply as a fellow citizen who is also a friend of the powerful Maecenas. Nothing is done which would allow the reader to feel conscious of any gap between the image presented in the poems and reality. Certainly it cannot be demonstrated that anything which Horace tells us in the satires is actually untrue. There is obviously the question of selectivity and omission, but the fact remains that the picture which Horace presents of himself and his friends is completely plausible and clearly intended to be so. This is a technique which Horace has taken from Lucilius, of whom he later said (*Satire* 2.1.30–34): *ille uelut fidis arcana sodalibus olim | credebat libris . . . | . . . quo fit ut omnis | uotiua pateat ueluti descripta tabella | uita senis. sequor hunc . . .* (cf. *Satire* 2.1.57–60). But it is also a technique which has interesting affinities with those employed by ancient biographers, who were well aware that 'it is not always in the most glorious actions that virtue or badness are revealed; indeed often a little action, a saying or a jest reveals character more clearly than battles etc.' (Plutarch, *Alexander* 1.2). In a similar way, Horace allows us to witness the apparently trivial actions of himself and his friends, and to overhear their conversation. He does not preach at his readers, he does not comment on the significance of what he portrays and he does not draw attention explicitly to the virtues of his friends. Instead he allows the reader to draw the inevitable conclusions for himself: as a result the reader is more easily persuaded and less inclined to object or protest that the image Horace is presenting is at odds with their preconceived prejudices (see also below, pp. 32, 37). If the modern reader is concerned

with understanding Horace's skill and tact and with recapturing the initial impact of his poems, then it is surely a mistake to ignore the fact that the satires are so finely tuned to their historical context or to suppose that either Horace or Maecenas was unaware of the impression which they would make on contemporaries. Maecenas was well enough pleased with the efforts of his *amicus* to present him with the Sabine farm shortly after the publication of the *Sermones*.

'LVCILIVS . . . NOSTRVM . . . DELAPSVS IN AEVVM'

Horace's choice of Lucilius as a model is in some respects a curious one. His fullest account of his relationship to his model (1.10) serves to highlight one consequence of that choice. Having explained that he abandoned an earlier desire to write in Greek because it would offer little chance of originality (1.10.31–5), Horace concedes that by taking Lucilius as his model he can only be *inuentore minor* and he adds: *neque ego illi detrahere ausim | haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam* (*Satire* 1.10.48–9). The fact that the language and the imagery are completely traditional in the poet's claim to originality serves only to emphasise the inversion of the claim to originality here.[38] It is worth considering at least briefly Horace's possible motives in making this choice. That means in effect considering the more important question of the possible significance of his choice.

At 1.10.40ff. Horace briefly catalogues those friends and contemporaries who had achieved pre-eminence in various genres: Fundanius in comedy, Pollio in tragedy, Varius in epic and Virgil in bucolic. This is by no means an exhaustive list of the recognised genres and so Horace cannot be intending to imply, as is sometimes suggested,[39] that he started to write satire simply because that was the only genre available. At most this passage could be taken to imply that he did not take up any of the actual genres specified because he felt that they were already well treated by his friends. However, if availability had been his sole or even chief concern then he could have simply pressed on with the *Epodes* or the *Odes* and if he had wanted variety (which is not a motive he indicates either explicitly or implicitly) then he could have turned for models to archaic elegy or some other genre. The only reason which Horace does give for writing satire is: *hoc erat, experto frustra Varrone Atacino | atque quibusdam aliis, melius quod scribere possem | inuentore minor* etc. (1.10.46–8). This seems to mean no more than that Horace could see no living person who had achieved outstanding success in satire and he felt that it was a genre in which he

could surpass all others – except Lucilius. The reason that Horace must be content to remain *inuentore minor* is that Lucilius was a Roman and not a Greek poet and as a result Horace could not lay claim to being the first to practise the genre at Rome. This willingness to sacrifice the claim to originality is striking and underlines the curiousness of choosing Lucilius as a model.

There is no doubt that in the first century Lucilius enjoyed a very considerable reputation. Cicero even bestows upon him the coveted epithets *doctus et perurbanus*[40] and *Satires* 1.4 and 1.10 make it clear that many shared that high estimation. It is precisely this aspect of Lucilius' reputation which Horace calls into question. He concedes that Lucilius' standards were very high by those of his own day, that his task was made more difficult by having no Greek model and that he would have done better if he had lived in Horace's day (1.10.64–71). In other words, he would have written like Horace. In effect then, Horace reserves his real contempt and scorn for the poetic standards of the latter-day defenders and imitators of Lucilius. He calls his style *lutulentus* (1.4.11; 1.10.50) in a clear allusion to Callimachus' Assyrian river (*Hymn to Apollo* 108–9) and accuses his defenders of judging his poetry not by its art but by 'the Persian chain' and of being insufficiently indifferent to the standards of popular taste.[41] In short, Horace is challenging the right of Lucilius to the epithet *doctus*.

The standards by which Horace and his coterie judge poetry are clear enough. They are the standards of Callimachus which had been established at Rome in the previous generation, by the Neoterics.[42] Unfortunately the attention of modern readers has been distracted from this simple point by Horace's description of Hermogenes and *simius iste* as *nil praeter Caluum et doctus cantare Catullum* (1.10.17–19). Horace says that these men have not read their Greek models. Such an accusation could not possibly be levelled at either Calvus or Catullus. Neither could the implied charge of lacking variety. The names of Calvus and Catullus serve to highlight by contrast the absurdity of Hermogenes and his partner in aspiring to the epithet *doctus*. However, it is surely not as exemplary Neoterics that Calvus and Catullus are brought in but as masters of lampoon and invective.[43] But while the context almost obliges the reader to make the assumption that Hermogenes and his fellow poet are devotees of invective it may be doubted that they were actually given to reciting Calvus and Catullus: one of Calvus' lampoons was directed against Hermogenes himself.[44] By using the names of Calvus and Catullus, whose Callimachean ideals he shares, instead of specifying invective, a genre in which they had

gained pre-eminence, Horace has scored a stinging hit against his opponents.

Be that as it may, this slight digression has brought us indirectly to a most important feature of the reputation of Lucilius in the first century. For the contemporaries of Horace the name of Lucilius was synonymous with personal abuse and invective.[45] That was the meaning of *Lucilianus character*. The name which they gave to this quality was simply *libertas*. Horace's reaction to this aspect of Lucilius' reputation was again complex. He praises him for it at the beginning of both the fourth and tenth satires. But he is very careful to distinguish the sort of invective which he characterises by the verb *notare* and which has a basic moral and exemplary justification from mere back-biting and vicious personal abuse designed merely to raise a laugh. He emulates the *libertas* of Lucilius only to a limited extent and only to provide negative moral *exempla*. He is critical of personal abuse which serves no moral purpose and his criticism is here aimed as much at the latter-day supporters of Lucilius as at Lucilius himself. Horace seems to be implying through his own practice something which is also suggested by the remaining fragments, that the almost exclusive identification of the name of Lucilius with invective in the first century was in fact a distortion of the true nature of his poetry. The new evaluation of Lucilius which is implicit in Horace's own practice, the broader scope of his satire and the clear allusions to Lucilian models precisely when his poems are least concerned with invective, all combine to persuade the reader that Horace is a truly modern Lucilius.[46]

The question of why Horace chose as his model the poet so closely identified with invective and then chose to play down precisely that aspect of his model still remains. The answer perhaps lies in the word *libertas*. As applied to Lucilius the word denotes primarily freedom of speech. But *libertas* itself is a much broader concept and it was never a more emotive or powerful concept than during the forties and thirties.[47] Both Pompey and Caesar had claimed to be the champions of *libertas*, but from the death of Cato Uticensis the word became the rallying cry of the anti-Caesarians, the Pompeians and the Republicans. Caesar was killed in the name of *libertas* and it was the watchword of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi. At first sight there may seem to be little connection between the two types of *libertas*. But the freedom of speech which was exemplified by Lucilius was essential to the aristocratic conception of *libertas*[48] and the inseparability of the two concepts is well illustrated by a letter of C. Trebonius, one of the Liberators, which was written to Cicero in 44 (*Ad familiares* 12.16.3):

> uos quid ageretis in republica, cum has litteras dabam, non sciebam. audiebam quaedam turbulenta, quae scilicet cupio esse falsa, ut aliquando otiosa libertate fruamur; quod uel minime mihi adhuc contigit. ego tamen nactus in nauigatione nostra pusillum laxamenti, concinnaui tibi munusculum ex instituto meo, et dictum, cum magno nostro honore a te dictum, conclusi et tibi infra subscripsi. in quibus uersiculis si tibi quibusdam uerbis εὐθυρρημονέστερος [‘*risqué*’] uidebor, turpitudo personae eius, in quam liberius inuehimur, nos uindicabit. ignosces etiam iracundiae nostrae, quae iusta est in eiusmodi et homines et ciues. deinde, qui magis hoc Lucilio licuerit assumere libertatis, quam nobis? cum etiamsi odio pari fuerit in eos, quos laesit, tamen certe non magis dignos habuerit, in quos tanta libertate uerborum incurreret.

Here we find Trebonius celebrating his first taste of that *libertas*, which he evidently hoped that the murder of Caesar had restored, by composing an invective in the manner of Lucilius as a concrete demonstration of his new-found *libertas*. The target of his invective was probably M. Antonius, his former friend and the future Triumvir.

Sallust makes it clear that to many, not only those who supported Sex. Pompeius, the second Triumvirate was a tyranny and incompatible with traditional *libertas*.[49] It is difficult to believe that in this context Horace's choice of Lucilius as a model was politically naïve. When Horace, who proclaims himself to be the *amicus* of Maecenas and so a supporter of the Triumvirs, also sets himself up as the New Lucilius, he is surely inviting us to see the Triumvirs as the friends of *libertas*, not its enemies. His own redefinition of Lucilian *libertas* as something morally responsible invites the inference that the Triumvirs are opposed not to true *libertas*, which is traditional and responsible, but rather to licence, the irresponsible, malicious and divisive exercise of freedom with which true *libertas* is wrongly confused by those who oppose them.[50] At all events the lack of invective in Horace is striking and requires some explanation. It cannot be seriously maintained that the main reason is that Horace was only the son of a freedman and so not powerful enough to attack important living contemporaries. It was never probable that anyone would seek retribution from Horace. His friends were too powerful, as Horace himself concedes, albeit jokingly, at the end of *Satire* 2.1.[51] That is why it is better to look for a positive reason for his handling of this key feature of Lucilian satire.

There is some reason to think that Lucilius was exploited for

propaganda purposes by the Republican cause and that he was associated in particular with the Pompeians.[52] Lucilius was the great-uncle of Pompeius Magnus and two of the friends of Pompeius, his freedman Pompeius Lenaeus and Curtius Nicias, wrote exegetical works on Lucilius. It may well be, although the evidence does not allow a definitive conclusion, that in fact most of the *defensores* and imitators of Lucilius were friends of Pompey and hostile to Caesar. If so, the trend seems to have survived the death of Pompeius Magnus. His freedman, Pompeius Lenaeus, composed a Lucilian invective against Sallust in reply to his treatment of Pompey in his *Histories*.[53] The case of Trebonius has already been noted. If this assumption is correct and the Pompeians had indeed been able to make capital out of their association with Lucilius as the poet of Republican *libertas*,[54] then one of Horace's motives must surely have been to issue a counter-challenge: he was the true successor to Lucilius, his friends the true champions of *libertas*. The technique is familiar. In the forties and thirties, Antonius had made propaganda both from his claim to be the new Dionysus and from his alleged descent from Hercules through the eponymous ancestor of his *gens*, Anton son of Hercules. In the run up to Actium the supporters of Octavian did their best to counter these claims. But they were obviously effective as propaganda and after Actium the Augustan poets simply transfer them to Augustus himself and Hercules and Dionysus become familiar prototypes for the *princeps*.[55]

There may however be a more positive side to Horace's choice of Lucilius as a model. He was closely identified with one of the greatest heroes of the Republic, P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus. Simply because of the pre-eminence which he had achieved, Scipio provided useful precedents to the great men of the first century who attained extraordinary positions of power and influence: the sole consul Pompeius, the dictator Caesar and the Triumvir Octavian. The ‘Scipionic Circle’ is an important part of the idealisation of Scipio and the growth of the Scipionic myth. The reality is less impressive.[56] Yet through his patronage of Polybius, Panaetius, Terence and Lucilius he established himself as an important patron of the arts. Pompeius also had literary friends and encouraged, apparently, work on Lucilius. But he was less happy in his choice of writers. The next major patron was Maecenas and it is hard to believe that he was unconscious of the predecent. Horace's claim to be the new Lucilius certainly invites the reader to compare the two circles. Even though in *Sermones* 1 he nowhere makes the parallel explicit, it is clear from the first satire of

Book 2 that he was leaving the reader to draw the inference for himself. In that poem he has Trebatius accepting the equation of Lucilius and Horace and naturally extending it to equate Scipio with Caesar (Octavian).

This brief survey will, it is hoped, have made it clear that Horace's choice of Lucilius as a model is potentially much more significant than has generally been realised.[57] It is true that Lucilius had acquired a considerable reputation as a poet. But Horace makes it plain that he had chosen him as his model in spite of and not because of his purely literary achievements. The reader is confronted with a Horace who proclaims himself to be the *amicus* of Maecenas and at the same time the modern equivalent of the poet who had inescapable associations with Republican *libertas*, with Scipio and the Scipionic Circle and with Pompeius. For the most part the reader is left to draw what inferences he will from this combination. But he is surely intended to leave the *Sermones* with the impression that Horace and his friends cherish the true Republican ideal of *libertas*; that this circle of friends is characterised by its cultured interest in Hellenistic philosophy, blended with a deep respect for the *mos maiorum*, and by its interest in literature which conforms to the highest contemporary standards, a circle in fact remarkably reminiscent of the legendary Scipionic Circle; and, finally, that in this latest war between a second Caesar and a second Pompeius it is the champions of *libertas* and the *mos maiorum* who have won, not their oppressors.

THE REMAINING SATIRES OF BOOK I

The initial dedication to Maecenas (1.1.1) establishes at the outset Horace's friendship with him and so with the new rulers of Rome. But the prime function of *Satires* 1, 2 and 3 is to set the tone for the collection and to establish the *persona* of the poet. While the themes themselves are the commonplaces of Hellenistic philosophy, what is striking and novel is that these poems treat moral issues seriously and at length in a style which matches the highest standards of Neoteric art. In this respect they contrast sharply with the poetry of Catullus and the other Neoterics and even with Virgil's *Eclogues*. The only precedent is offered by the Epicurean poets, Lucretius and Varius Rufus (*de morte*). The philosophy of the satires is eclectic and, for the most part, commonplace. But there is a slight bias towards Epicureanism in the quietism of the first satire and in the value attached to friendship in the third. In the second, it is unexpectedly, and perhaps pointedly,

revealed that the teachings of Philodemus and the Elder Cato are in harmony in preferring the brothel to adultery. This general impression is reinforced by the constant verbal echoes of Lucretius.[58] But Horace appears as a typical Roman Epicurean, neither doctrinaire nor dogmatic. It was a popular philosophy at the time and it is important to remember that Maecenas, the dedicatee, was an Epicurean.[59]

The only school, however, which Horace does reject is that of extreme and dogmatic Stoicism. The most influential Roman Stoic had been the younger Cato. His ostentatious Stoicism and his uncompromising Republicanism were dramatically combined in his suicide. He had rapidly become the hero of the Pompeian and Republican cause and it seems likely that his example very quickly established austere Stoicism as the proper and fashionable philosophy for those opposed to Caesar and his successors, a cause which it was to serve for more than a century.[60] The explicit rejection of extreme Stoicism at the end of the opening triad may thus be intended to highlight a simple point: the Stoics and the Pompeians have no monopoly of concern with morality and they do not even have the most satisfactory answers.

In these first three satires Horace presents himself deep in conversation with his friends, of whom the most prominent is Maecenas, urging a strong moral stance on a variety of issues. No one will suppose that Maecenas needed to be persuaded by Horace. There was a convention by which advice and exhortation could stand as an alternative to encomium: the speaker urges his addressee to do or believe that which he already intends to do or does believe.[61] The advantage of this indirect approach is that it virtually prevents the audience from accusing the speaker of base flattery or the addressee of tyranny. This is probably why Cicero adopted this technique in the *Pro Marcello*. By adopting what is clearly a very similar technique, Horace creates a favourable impression not only of himself but also of Maecenas and the nature of the *amicitia* which he extends to Horace. It is worth recalling Cicero, who introduced the section on the evils of flattery at *De amicitia* 91: *ut igitur et monere et moneri proprium est uerae amicitiae, et alterum libere facere, non aspere, alterum patienter accipere, non repugnanter, sic habendum est nullam in amicitiis pestem esse maiorem quam adulationem blanditiam assentationem.* By using this approach Horace is able to convey two highly significant impressions: first, that Maecenas is no tyrant and Horace no flattering courtier; second, that his *amicus* Maecenas, and his other *amici* (including inevitably, but implicitly, Octavian), share his own views on the evils of discontent,

auaritia and adultery, which is an example of *luxuria* which leads to debt and so (the argument was commonplace) to civil war.

The full significance of this can only be appreciated when the nature of the contemporary hostile propaganda against the Triumvirs is recalled. The Pompeians and Republicans will have called the Triumvirate a tyranny, *dominatio*, *potentia paucorum* and *regnum*. A letter ascribed to Brutus accuses Octavian of *cupiditas* and *licentia* (*Ad M. Brutum* 25.1) and faithfully reflects contemporary propaganda: *ego certe, quin cum ipsa re bellum geram, hoc est cum regno et imperiis extraordinariis et dominatione et potentia, quae supra leges se esse uelit, nulla erit tam bona condicio seruiendi, qua deterrear* (*Ad M. Brutum* 25.6).[62] According to Plutarch, Brutus said much the same about the Triumvirate (*Brutus* 28.2–3) and Sallust echoes the same propaganda (*Bellum Iugurthinum* 3.3 *potentia paucorum*).[63] It may also be assumed that the Pompeians alleged that the Triumvirs (principally, of course, Octavian who was in Rome) were motivated by *auaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria* since these were the conventional and established characteristics of those who waged civil war.[64] Sextus could and, doubtless, did argue that Octavian was the aggressor.[65] It must not be assumed that it was only an insignificant minority who were hostile to the Triumvirs at this time. Sextus enjoyed considerable popular support: Etruria had risen in arms to support him in 36 (Dio 49.15.1). Many in the higher levels of society were in his debt, especially those who had been proscribed or who had fought for the Republic at Philippi and then found refuge with Sextus until their return in 39.[66] On the other hand the proscriptions of 43–42, the Philippi campaign and the Perusine War of 41–40, and the land confiscations had all created hostility towards the Triumvirs in general and Octavian in particular. Sallust's testimony is particularly important. He had been a supporter of Julius Caesar and remained hostile to Pompeius Magnus. Yet he clearly loathed the Triumvirs and insisted that Rome's moral decline and its concomitant political corruption had reached its nadir under the Triumvirs.[67]

Against this background it is significant that Horace presents Maecenas and his friends as being as much concerned with moral standards as Sallust himself and equally hostile to the vices of *auaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria*. *Satire* 1.1 attacks discontent with one's lot. Sallust complains (*Bellum Iugurthinum* 3.2): *omnes rerum mutationes caedem, fugam aliaque hostilia portendant*; and, as a part of his contrast of an idealised past with the corrupt present, says (*Bellum Catilinae* 2.1): *uita hominum sine cupiditate agitabatur: sua cuique satis placebant.*

Horace also turns to an attack upon greed, *auaritia*, which he, like Sallust again (*Bellum Catilinae* 10–11), sees as the source of present ills. In the next satire, Horace attacks sexual depravity. Sallust had listed among the characteristics of the supporters of Catiline: *lubido stupri*; *mulieres pudicitiam in propatulo habere*; and had inferred: *haec iuuentutem, ubi familiares opes defecerant, ad facinora incendebant* (*Bellum Catilinae* 13.3–4 and, more bluntly, 14.2: *pene bona patria lacerauerat*).

Given the general and commonplace nature of such complaints, it would be rash to insist that Horace had Sallust in mind (but see above, pp. 30, 34–5). But the historian does not escape unnoticed (*Satires* 1.2.47ff.).[68] He had been ejected from the senate in 50 by the censor, Ap. Claudius Pulcher, and subsequently accused by Varro (in *Pius aut de pace*) of adultery and, also, of extortion. Inevitably men contrasted his life with the moral fervour of his writings.[69] Horace does not repeat these crude slanders: instead he repeats Sallust's own defence: *matronam nullam tango* (1.2.49).[70] And then he mischievously accuses him of taking this (acceptable) preference for *libertinae* to an excess where it is as reprehensible as adultery itself.

Satire 1.3 deserves special comment. The thematic words *aequum*, *iustum* and *ignoscere* establish the theme of the poem as not an attack upon any individual or vice but a recommendation of the moral virtue, *aequitas*. In the language of political morality this word is closely related to *clementia* and, as such, was doubtless a topical theme at the conclusion of the war with Sextus, if not also during the war.[71] It is worth recalling that in the war between Pompeius Magnus and Julius Caesar, the Pompeians had repeatedly been accused of *crudelitas* and of desiring *regnum* and Cicero claimed: *non modo armatis interdum etiam otiosis minabantur* (*Pro Marcello* 18).[72] Caesar, of course, had preferred *noua ratio uincendi ut misericordia et liberalitate nos muniamus* (*Ad Atticum* 9.7c.1). Caesar's *clementia* however was hated as the virtue of a tyrant, and two of its beneficiaries (or victims), Brutus and Cassius, led the conspirators.[73] Octavian, understandably, began his career by refusing to show clemency either in the proscriptions or to those captured at Philippi.[74] In the *Res gestae*, however, he claimed: *bella terra et mari ciuilia externaque toto in orbe terrarum saepe gessi uictorque omnibus ueniam petentibus ciuibus peperci* (3.1).[75] The shift in attitude seems to have started after Naulochus in 36: Appian states that he pardoned the Pompeian generals (*Bellum ciuile* 5.127), although Dio suggests that his *clementia* was not indiscriminate (49.12.4–5).[76]

Horace handles the theme with subtlety and caution. He begins with

a humorous portrait of Tigellius (*nil aequale homini fuit illi*, 1.3.9) who serves as a foil to the one and only direct appearance of Octavian in this collection of satires. Unobtrusively, Horace establishes the link between Octavian and his *pater*, Julius Caesar, and reminds the reader of his power (*qui cogere posset*, 1.3.4–5), even while he shows him pardoning the fault of his friend, Tigellius. The virtue displayed by Octavian is *aequitas*, not *clementia*. The next section of the poem expands upon the significance of this as a virtue which is desirable among friends, that is among equals, rather than as a quality to be desired in a tyrant's behaviour to his subjects. The whole section is marked by repetitions of its key verb, *ignoscere* (1.3.23 and 74), and summarised: *haec res et iungit, iunctos et seruat amicos* (1.3.54). Having established the importance of *aequitas* in dealings with friends, Horace moves on to a discussion of crime and punishment in the wider context of society. He now links the concepts of *aequitas* and *iustitia* together. His own position is illuminated by contrast with that of the doctrinaire Stoics: they insist on equal treatment for *furta* and *latrocinia*: *magnis parua mineris | falce recisurum simili te, si tibi regnum | permittant homines* (1.3.122–4).[77] The link between the Republican–Pompeian cause and doctrinaire Stoicism has been noted above; it was standard practice to label the Pompeians *latrones* (*Epode* 4.19); Octavian certainly accused Sextus of aiming at *regnum* (*Epode* 9.9–10); and perhaps the old accusations of *crudelitas* had been revived against the Pompeians. Such a context would lend point to the sentiment: *quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam* (1.3.67). Horace ends the poem, as often in the satires, by using himself as an example: *et mihi dulces | ignoscent, si quid peccaro stultus, amici* (1.3.139–40). The language resumes the earlier argument. But among his *amici* were Caesar (Octavian) and Maecenas; among the faults which they pardoned, the reader will recall, Horace's adherence to the Republican cause at Philippi. He himself is an example of Octavian's *clementia* or, to use the preferred terminology, *aequitas*. The poem thus ends by recalling implicitly the theme with which it began, the *aequitas* of Octavian.[78]

The only poem which gives a direct and detailed picture of the Republican side is *Satire* 1.7. Horace here gives an apparently straightforward account of an incident in Brutus' camp in Asia in 43/42. The tale is told with gusto, seemingly for its own sake or, rather, for the sake of the commonplace pun at the end. But what makes the poem really interesting is simply the fact that it is included at all in a collection dedicated to Maecenas. There is no overt malice against Brutus.

In the eyes of the Triumvirs his possession of Asia was no doubt illegal.[79] He presumably claimed to be a proconsul (perhaps with *maius imperium*).[80] Horace calls him imprecisely a *praetor* (18) which suits his judicial function in this scene.[81] The joke about Caesar's murder is told in the bluntest language (*iugulas*, 35) and with no sign of embarrassment. This creates the overwhelming impression that the friendship of Maecenas has imposed no inhibitions on Horace about freely recalling his earlier allegiance. The implicit message must have been reassuring to other former Republicans who had either just returned to Italy or who were still hoping to return after the defeat of Sex. Pompeius. If Horace, the freedman's son, could find such complete acceptance, there was hope for the others.[82]

On reflection, however, the scene seems rather less innocent. The Republicans are depicted at each other's throats in litigation,[83] which seems peculiarly appropriate, when one recalls the unending series of trials and prosecutions which were the hallmark of the last years of the Republic and the laments of the Republicans like Cicero when Caesar had deprived him of his favourite occupation.[84] Both contestants are characterised by their fond devotion to the arts of vituperation. Horace invites us to share his evident and typically Roman distaste for litigation.[85] These exemplars of *libertas* are also described in language comparable to that used by Horace of the imitators of Lucilius.[86] Finally, the pretensions of the litigants and even their profession of *uirtus* (1.7.14)[87] are first mocked by the comparison with Hector and Achilles[88] and then punctured by the more realistic comparison with the gladiators Bithus and Bacchius.

At the centre of all this activity is Brutus. The poem culminates in the reference to his murder of Caesar and his pride in his family tradition of opposition to tyranny.[89] The murder of Caesar had taken place on the day when, so it was rumoured, it was to be proposed in the senate that Caesar should be given the title *rex*, perhaps only for use outside Italy in his forthcoming campaign against the Parthians.[90] In view of this, it is at least ironic that Brutus who is now in charge of Asia is addressed by Persius as *solem Asiae* and his companions as *stellas salubres* (1.7.24). This is the conventional language of encomium of Hellenistic kings. It is also reminiscent of Caesarian propaganda about the *Caesaris astrum*.[91] Suddenly the claims of the liberators ring hollow. Perhaps the real motive for the murder is contained in the description of Brutus *praetore tenente ditem Asiam* (1.7.18–19).[92]

Horace is subtle enough to leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. He cannot be accused of malicious invention: every reader

knows he was there and that the anecdote has all the authority of an eyewitness account. In any case, we are assured that the tale is well known (1.7.3).

Satire 1.8 complements 1.7 perfectly. It deals with the transformation of the burial ground on the Esquiline into the magnificent *horti* of Maecenas.[93] Horace forgoes the opportunity to compose an extravagant and encomiastic description in the manner of, say, Statius, *Siluae* 1.3 or 2.2. The contrast with Persius' extravagant encomium of Brutus in 1.7 is complete and, presumably, intentional. The whole poem is spoken by Priapus, not by Horace *in propria persona*, and the name of Maecenas is not even mentioned. The avoidance of fulsome flattery and the good humour are typical of the friendship with Maecenas. But it would be a mistake to infer that the compliment is not serious. The poem concentrates on the foul deeds of the witches Canidia and Sagana, but the contrast of *nunc ~ prius* which dominates the poem reminds us of the benefit which Maecenas has conferred upon the city by ridding it of such nuisances.

The theme of magic and witchcraft is literary and conventional.[94] On one level it illustrates the thoroughly Hellenistic literary tastes of Maecenas' circle.[95] But the subject was also topical (see also above, p. 22). In 36 C. Calvisius Sabinus (cos. 39) was appointed to rid Italy and the city of Rome itself of the thieves and robbers which infested it (Appian, *Bellum ciuile* 5.132). A little later Agrippa expelled astrologers and witches from Rome (Dio 49.43.5). But it was Maecenas, according to Dio (49.16.2), who was in charge of affairs in Rome and the rest of Italy at this time. He seems to have instituted some kind of precursor of the Vigiles, a sort of police force cum fire service (Appian, *Bellum ciuile* 5.132).[96] His services to Rome in this unfamiliar capacity were recalled a quarter of a century later by a lesser poet than Horace:[97]

> num minus urbis erat custos et Caesaris obses?
>   num tibi non tutas fecit in urbe uias?
> nocte sub obscura quis te spoliauit amantem,
>   quis tetigit ferro, durior ipse, latus?

Horace's poem is probably intended to recall this side of Maecenas' career as well.

It would be strange if the propaganda of Octavian had not associated the activities of these thieves and brigands, astrologers and witches with Sex. Pompeius. Canidia and Sagana are practising necromancy: they gather up the bones from the graveyard and summon the spirits of the dead (1.8.29).[98] Such activities were especially associated with

Pythagoreans.[99] The most famous of these was Nigidius Figulus who was an ardent supporter of Pompeius Magnus and the only man known to have been tried and exiled for magical practices in the Republic.[100] The addiction of the Pompeians to this sect seems to have survived the death of Nigidius in 45. His famous prophecy that Octavian was *dominus terrarum orbi natus* may have been originally used by Pompeians and Republicans in hostile propaganda against Octavian.[101] But there is another interesting incident involving Sex. Pompeius. The elder Pliny (*Natural history* 7.178) says:

> bello Siculo Gabienus Caesaris classium fortissimus captus a Sex. Pompeio iussu eius incisa ceruice et uix cohaerente iacuit in litore toto die. deinde cum aduesperauisset, gemitu precibusque congregata multitudine petiit uti Pompeius ad se ueniret aut aliquem ex arcanis mitteret, se enim ab inferis remissum habere quae nuntiaret. misit complures Pompeius ex amicis, quibus Gabienus dixit inferis diis placere Pompei causas et partes pias, proinde euentum futurum quem optaret.

This version of the story seems to have been a part of Sex. Pompeius' own propaganda.[102] It is not hard to imagine the retort from Octavian. Cicero, with far less to work on in his speech against Vatinius, had said (*In Vatinium* 14):

> te Pythagoreum soles dicere . . . cum inaudita ac nefaria sacra susceperis, cum inferorum animas elicere, cum puerorum extis deos manes mactare soleas.

Finally, it may be noted that another direct descendant of Pompeius Magnus, M. Scribonius Libo, was accused by Tiberius of necromancy and meddling with magic and put to death. As in 33, astrologers and magicians were expelled from Italy.[103]

If this hypothesis is correct, then Horace's light-hearted poem is not only a compliment to Maecenas on the building of the *horti*, but an expression of relief at the removal of various undesirables from the city and the end of Sex. Pompeius and his nefarious crew.

Satires 1.5 and 6 provide a much more explicit and detailed picture of Maecenas and his circle. The journey to Brundisium described in 1.5 was a preliminary to the negotiations between Octavian and Antonius in the summer of 37, negotiations which were a turning-point in the history of the thirties.[104] Octavian had suffered major defeats in his war with Sex. Pompeius in the previous year. The administration of politics was in chaos and Italy was infested with

brigands, its ports blockaded and afflicted with famine. When Antonius returned to Italy with three hundred ships, yet another civil war must have seemed the inevitable prospect. It was narrowly avoided, and, 'resentful and suspicious, the dynasts met at Tarentum'.[105] Horace is notoriously reticent about the political context and his account is noticeably free of all tensions. That is surely deliberate.

The journey, then, which Horace is describing certainly took place, as his contemporaries would be only too well aware. Yet of all the satires, this is the one most obviously modelled on a famous poem by Lucilius.[106] Horace has deliberately selected the incidents and the details which would remind his readers of the journey described by Lucilius. The effect is underlined by echoed phrases, evocative parallels and pointed contrasts.[107] Lucilius' journey had no political purpose of any kind: it was simply an account of a rich Roman *eques* paying a visit to his estates in Sicily in the golden years of Rome's history. The main effect which Horace achieves by harmonising these two journeys is to transform a recent moment of threat and crisis into something familiar, ordinary and amusing. The poem exudes an atmosphere of good-natured humour and co-operation. It makes it hard to believe that there ever was a real danger of war between Octavian and Antonius. In other words the poem justifies the propaganda of the Triumvirs, who advertised their continuing friendship after Tarentum. That also was the public image through 36 and 35.[108] It is not easy to date this poem precisely, but it does not have the air of being written immediately after the event it describes. In one respect only is distortion of the truth really apparent. It is hard to believe that in 37 Maecenas could have travelled through a brigand-infested Italy without a heavily armed bodyguard. Yet of these there is no sign. Perhaps the intention is to encourage the reader to reflect that the military successes of Octavian and his generals in 36 had made travel in Italy safe once again: like Lucilius one could again travel safely, even as far as Sicily, which until recently had been in the control of Sex. Pompeius.[109]

The journey which Horace described took place at a most delicate time. The Triumvirate had legally expired on the last day of 38.[110] It was renewed at Tarentum and the second term was made to run retrospectively from 1 January 37. The agreement reached between the Triumvirs was legally ratified only afterwards. A recent writer has rightly insisted on the 'brute fact that the triumvirs in the first part of 37 by continuing to exercise their triumviral functions were acting in a way that contemporaries would consider a usurpation, whether justifiable or unjustifiable, a usurpation that in fact went unchallenged,

except, presumably, by Sextus Pompey and his supporters'.[111] This account does, however, overlook the fact that Sex. Pompeius' challenge is reflected in Appian's account and that Octavian at least made some show of respecting the constitutional niceties without, of course, going so far as to relinquish his army.[112]

Horace's poem must be viewed in the light of this background. The position of Maecenas, Fonteius and Cocceius is described with great care: *missi magnis de rebus uterque | legati, auersos soliti componere amicos* (1.5.28–9). The last phrase is a masterpiece of understatement which minimises the tension and makes inevitable the successful outcome of the negotiations. The first phrase emphasises the importance of the mission but is vague about its exact nature. The three men are called simply *legati*, a suitably ambiguous word since it is used of both private and public embassies.[113] Nothing is in fact allowed to spoil the impression that this is a party of private individuals going about their business. Maecenas and his party travel in the manner of ordinary citizens of their class: the sustained parallel with Lucilius reinforces this impression.[114] Maecenas is, like Lucilius, just another rich Roman *eques*. Horace's desire to create this impression is perhaps the most important reason for his omission of all mention of a bodyguard. It is hard to imagine a more complete contrast than that between the impression made by Maecenas' party on the move and that which Caesar made on Cicero when he visited him in 45 accompanied by two thousand soldiers![115] At the *uillula* near the Campanian bridge they are provided with the bare essentials, a roof, fuel and salt. That is their due as travellers.[116] The skinny thrushes being prepared for them at Beneventum never arrive and the party survives being almost burned to death only to endure the *lacrimosus fumus* at Trivicum. They buy water at one place, bread at another and take in the tourist attractions as they go. There is no sense of urgency or crisis. It is an ordinary journey such as any Roman might have made. The only respite from the hardships is afforded by the hospitality of friends and relatives.

Horace cleverly emphasises the complete absence of all pomp and ceremony. The poem begins with himself and the equally lowly Heliodorus setting out from Rome. But the hardships which they endure do not change with the arrival of the *legati*. As just noted, the journey goes on in exactly the same way as before. The point is subtly underlined by the account of the visit to Fundi, the first place to be reached after the arrival of Maecenas. Here the *praetor* Aufidius Luscus (One Eye), with all the fussiness of the small town mayor greeting royalty, provides the only ceremonial reception of the journey. The

reaction of the party is significant. Nothing could be further from the self-congratulation and pride of Cicero when similarly welcomed on his return from exile:[117] *linquimus insani ridentes* (1.5.35). The message is plain: Maecenas and his friends are not behaving like Hellenistic monarchs or tyrants or their self-important courtiers and they do not expect to be treated as such.[118]

The relationships within the group are also instructive. When the *legati* arrive, the introductions are carefully handled. First, Maecenas: Horace conveys the nature of his personal and intimate friendship by giving him no epithet and pays him the compliment of needing no formal introduction. It is assumed that the reader will know who he is and that he is the *amicus* of Octavian. Next, L. Cocceius Nerva: Horace associates him firmly with Maecenas and gives him the polite and enthusiastic epithet *optimus*. Both Maecenas and Cocceius had taken leading parts in bringing about the agreement at Brundisium in 40. At that time Cocceius had owed his first duty to Antonius but was the key figure in the negotiations because he was a friend of both men (Appian, *Bellum ciuile* 5.64). The reader is carefully reminded of their role on that earlier occasion (*soliti*, 1.5.29) and this reminder acts as a guarantee of a second success. Finally, C. Fonteius Capito: he is carefully set off against the other two. Unlike them he had not been at Brundisium. Asinius Pollio had represented Antonius on that occasion.[119] As the newcomer he receives a fuller description, both *nomen* and *cognomen* and the vital designation *Antoni . . . amicus*. The passage suggests (perhaps deliberately), or at least reflects, a shift in the balance of power between Octavian and Antonius from 40 to 37. The careful balance between the two sides of the group as well as the atmosphere of mutual goodwill and co-operation is further suggested by the simple record that at Formiae Murena, presumably the brother-in-law of Maecenas, provided the accommodation, and Fonteius the food (1.5.38). Cocceius, the mutual friend, provides both at his villa near Caudium.[120] Here too the party enjoys the verbal banter of Sarmentus and Messius. This episode (1.5.51–70) is the high spot of the journey. It serves to dissolve all tensions within the group and to dispel all the reader's anxieties. None of the *legati* is mentioned again. Their mission has in a sense ceased to matter for no one can any longer have any doubts at all about the outcome.

The poem also tells us much about Horace's friendship with Maecenas and by showing us how he treats his friends illuminates his character. While waiting for Maecenas, Horace occupies his time rubbing ointment on his sore eyes. By the time he has finished (*interea*,

31) Maecenas has arrived. As if to emphasise that this point is significant, it is made again. While the party are resting at Capua, we are told: *lusum it Maecenas, dormitum ego Vergiliusque; | namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis* (1.5.48–9). What is striking here is the complete absence of any sign that Horace is obliged to dance attendance on his powerful friend. There is no show of flattery or adulation. The effect is reinforced by the intervening account of the warm and effusive welcome which is given to Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus and Virgil when they arrive (1.5.39–44). There should be no temptation to misconstrue Horace's behaviour. His ailment serves to excuse him for not welcoming Maecenas and for not joining him at sport.[121] It would clearly be wrong to infer that Horace's affection for Maecenas was less than wholehearted. The warmth of the friendships within the group is illustrated by the welcome of Virgil and his companions and made explicit in the generalisation: *nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico.* Maecenas, of course, is included in the *amici* of Horace. At the same time these incidents reveal the humane consideration which Maecenas shows to his friends. This is significant. The Romans were always acutely sensitive about the way in which the rich and powerful treated their friends and clearly considered it to be indicative of their true nature.[122] It was precisely because of the arrogant and imperious manner in which he treated those whom he wished to consider him as a friend, that Julius Caesar inspired such hatred. That was the behaviour of a tyrant.[123] Contemporary attitudes to the Triumvirs may be judged from the bitter comments of Sallust (*Bellum Iugurthinum* 2–3): *nam ui quidem regere patriam aut parentes, quamquam et possis et delicta corrigas, tamen importunum est.* And he describes their supporters as those whom *inhonesta et perniciosa lubido tenet potentiae paucorum decus atque libertatem suam gratificari.* Horace's skilfully contrived portrait of the friends of Maecenas gives the lie to this conception. The impression he wishes to create can be usefully summed up in the words of Cicero (*De amicitia* 89): *comitas adsit, assentatio – uitiorum adiutrix – procul amoueatur quae non modo amico, sed ne libero quidem digna est; aliter enim cum tyranno, aliter cum amico uiuitur.*

Satire 1.6 is a complex and difficult poem. But since it is explicitly concerned with Maecenas, his friendship with Horace and their attitude to contemporary politics, it demands careful scrutiny. It also occupies a key position in the collection and serves to dedicate the book to Maecenas.[124] The ostensible purpose of the poem is to express the gratitude which Horace feels at being accepted as an *amicus* of Maecenas, a theme which is established in the first six lines. Instead of

emphasising their equality as *amici* and Roman *equites*, Horace emphasises the very great difference in their social status.[125] The encomium of Maecenas is impressive and includes two of the standard topics, his *patria* (1–2, especially *Lydorum*) and his ancestors (3–4). It culminates in the assertion *nemo generosior est te* (2). In view of what follows, it seems that this bold phrase is intended to use Maecenas' distinction among the *domi nobiles* to obscure or, rather, to compensate for the fact that he was not a Roman *nobilis*.[126] In view both of this and of the current political climate it is worth stressing that his ancestors are for once not called *reges* but *olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent* (4).[127] This description matches the claims of the Roman *nobilitas* precisely in the terms of their own aristocratic code of values.[128] This information is an implicit justification of the extraordinary position which Maecenas held from 36 to 33 when, although a *priuatus*, he was entrusted as *amicus Caesaris* with the administration of political affairs in Rome and Italy.[129] But Horace immediately insists that he does not exhibit the usual arrogance of the *nobilis* (5) and he cites his own case as proof:[130] *ignotos* contrasts with *generosior* and *libertino patre* with the glorious ancestors of Maecenas.

The first main section after this prelude (7–44) elaborates on this attitude of Maecenas. It is clear that the views expressed are at least as much those of Maecenas as of Horace (*cum referre negas* (7); *persuades hoc tibi uere* (8); *quid oportet | nos facere* (17–18)). A contemporary would have been more interested in Maecenas' views on these questions than in those of Horace: he was not only rich and powerful but a friend of Octavian, and the Triumvirs had the power to appoint the magistrates.[131] At the same time elections still took place and apparently not all the magistrates were chosen by the Triumvirs: M. Oppius, the aedile of 37, had been impoverished by the proscriptions but was the choice of the people.[132] The result of this confused situation was political chaos. In 38 there were sixty-seven people who held the praetorship in this first year after the return of the refugees and the proscribed (Dio 48.43.2). In 36 there were no aediles at all owing to a lack of candidates (Dio 49.16.2). A *puer* (Dio 48.43.2) was chosen as quaestor, and a slave was detected when about to assume the same office, while another was detected while actually serving as praetor. These irregularities and abuses are at their height in the years 38–36. There is no doubt that they inspired contempt and disgust and it is worth stressing that after the defeat of Sex. Pompeius there is a sharp decline in the number of such incidents.[133] The bitterness, felt no doubt by many, is reflected by Sallust (*Bellum Iugurthinum* 3.1): *magistratus*

et imperia, postremo omnis cura rerum publicarum minume mihi hac tempestate cupiunda uidentur, quoniam neque uirtuti honos datur, neque illi quibus per fraudem eis fuit uti, tuti aut eo magis honesti sunt.

Horace begins by stating Maecenas' view: *referre negas quali sit quisque parente | natus, dum ingenuus* (7–8). The qualification is highly significant. Maecenas would not condone the slave who stood as quaestor or the one who had been executed for taking the office of praetor. It was a constant theme of contemporary propaganda that slaves and freedmen were promoted far beyond their station by Sex. Pompeius.[134] The sensitivity of Octavian to this accusation is reflected by the fact that when Menodorus (alias Menas) defected to him from Sextus he would not even dine with him until he had been *assertus in ingenuitatem* (Suetonius, *Augustus* 74). It is significant that the story was reported by the patrician Valerius Messalla.

There follows a simple and emphatic assertion of Maecenas' belief in the ideology of *nouitas*, the claims of the *noui homines*.[135] That is hardly surprising. The *noui homines* flourished, as never before, under the Triumvirs.[136] Sallust, predictably, reflects the jaundiced view (*Bellum Iugurthinum* 4.7–8): *etiam homines noui, qui antea per uirtutem soliti erant nobilitatem anteuenire, furtim et per latrocinia potius quam bonis artibus ad imperia et honores nituntur; proinde quasi praetura et consulatus atque alia omnia huiuscemodi per se clara et magnifica sint, ac non perinde habeantur ut eorum qui ea sustinent uirtus est.* Horace insists that Maecenas' view of *nouitas* is every bit as elevated as that of Sallust: he too believes that *uirtus* is the basis of their claim to *honores* (*probos*, 11). This theme will be developed later.

It is possible that the reference to Servius Tullius has a pointed significance. Suetonius records of the Octavii (*Augustus* 2.1): *ea gens a Tarquinio Prisco rege inter minores gentis adlecta in senatum, mox a Seruio Tullio in patricias traducta, procedente tempore ad plebem se contulit ac rursus magno interuallo per Diuum Iulium in patriciatum redit.* The story may have been particularly prominent, if not actually invented, in the years immediately following Octavian's marriage to the patrician Livia (17 January 38).[137] For it was at this time that he showed himself eager to secure the support of the *nobiles*.[138]

It is Maecenas' attitude to the *nobilitas* and to the *populus* which is the subject of the following lines (12–22). The argument is subtle. Maecenas does not reject the claims of the *nobiles*. But he does insist that *uirtus* is the most important qualification for office and that *maiores* alone are not sufficient. The fact that even the *populus* adhered to that principle in the case of Laevinus confirms that his attitude is

traditional and in accordance with the *mos maiorum*. The most striking confirmation that Maecenas recognises the claims of the *nobiles* as legitimate comes with the reference to Appius the censor (20–21): to qualify for the senate, a man should not only be himself *ingenuus* (8) but the son of an *ingenuus* (21). This attitude to the *nobiles* is not really surprising.[139] Most of them were not supporters of Octavian but of Antonius or, even, Sex. Pompeius. At the same time he wanted their support. His marriage to Livia in 38 gave him a link with a patrician family. By the end of 36 he has three supporters from noble families: Appius Claudius Pulcher (cos. 38), whose uncle is the censor mentioned with approval at 1.6.20–22 (especially *uel merito*); Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 34) whose family receives a passing honorific mention at 1.6.41; and M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (cos. 31) whose family is similarly mentioned at 1.6.42. In respect of Messalla it is worth noting that the claims of the Valerii to have expelled from Rome the tyrannical Tarquinius Superbus are also prominently displayed (1.6.12–13).[140] This sounds like a refutation of Brutus' claim[141] and is perhaps intended to highlight the impeccable credentials of Octavian's new supporters. The impressive encomium of Maecenas with which the poem began and his own obvious pride in his ancestors guarantees the sincerity of his sympathy with the claims of the *nobiles*.

Maecenas' views may be briefly summarised: the promotion to high office of *noui homines* is entirely justified by their *uirtus*. Yet birth also is important: to hold public office, a man should be at least *ingenuus ingenuo patre natus*, while the Laevinus story suggests that a *nobilis* may be disqualified from taking up his birthright by lack of *uirtus*. This attitude must have given hope and encouragement to both the *noui* and to those *nobiles* wanting to return to Italy after the war with Sextus or those who had returned after the treaty of Misenum in 39. To inject a cynical note, it was presumably the surest demonstration of *uirtus* for a *nobilis* to renounce the Pompeian cause. At the same time the insistence on *uirtus* is intended to allay the fears and prejudices of those who shared the view of Sallust.

Horace does not, of course, deny that the *indigni* have achieved high office. But the blame for this is laid quite firmly on the *populus qui stultus honores | saepe dat indignis et famae seruit ineptus, | qui stupet in titulis et imaginibus* (1.6.15–17). This is prefaced by the remark that the *populus* is *iudice quo nosti* (15). Horace seems to have something specific in mind. Appian records (*Bellum ciuile* 5.99) that in 36 Octavian sent Maecenas to Rome 'on account of those who were still under the spell of the memory of Pompey the Great, for the fame of that man had not yet lost its influence on them'. It seems probable that the *fama*, *tituli* and *imagines* are those of Pompeius. Certainly the verb *seruit* would aptly describe their support for Sextus. Horace is then trying to suggest that the *indigni* have been given office by the *populus* and not by the Triumvirs, and that the *indigni* are the supporters of Sextus. The argument is at least credible: the runaway slaves, both the one who stood as quaestor and the one who was elected as praetor, were presumably alleged to be Pompeians, like the *tribunus militum* attacked by Horace in *Epode* 4. There is little doubt that many of the sixty-seven praetors of 38 were freshly returned from Sextus.

The rest of this first main section focuses on Tillius. His identity is unfortunately not certain.[142] He is accused of being the son of a freedman (1.6.38–41). He had been expelled from the senate (1.6.25 with Porphyrio's comment: *nam pulsus ante senatu fuerat.*). The context would naturally suggest that he had been expelled by Appius Claudius. He later re-entered the senate and became a tribune. It is subsequently revealed that he also became a praetor (1.6.108). Porphyrio says simply that he was readmitted to the senate *post Caesarem occisum*. His name inevitably recalls that of the assassin of Caesar, L. Tillius Cimber, whose origins and career are obscure. He had a brother for whose return from exile he was pleading at the moment Caesar was killed. It has been suggested that this was Horace's Tillius, but that is improbable. It is possible that he was the son of a freedman of the Tillii. In any case it is hard to believe that any bearer of that hated name was anything other than a supporter of Sextus Pompeius. His poverty (1.6.107–11) suggests that he may have been proscribed. Perhaps he was one of the sixty-seven praetors of 38.

In spite of this uncertainty it is clear that Horace is using the case of Tillius to bolster his argument that birth is of importance in politics and ought to be. But in endorsing one tenet of the aristocratic code Horace firmly rejects another: *sed fulgente trahit constrictos Gloria curru | non minus ignotos generosis* (1.6.23–4). The pursuit of *laus* and *gloria* lay at the heart of the Roman aristocratic code.[143] The inherited *uirtus* of the aristocrat was recognised by the *honores* conferred upon him by the *populus*. These were valued, primarily and increasingly, as a prelude to military commands which provide scope for acquiring *gloria*. The result was an intensively abrasive and competitive society. By the middle of the first century attitudes to *gloria* were ambivalent. Sallust, for example, asserted that Rome owed her greatness and success precisely to *cupido gloriae* (*Bellum Catilinae* 7.3). However, Polybius had already predicted that 'the craving for office and the sense of shame

which comes from obscurity together with increasing ostentation and extravagance will usher in a period of general decline' (6.57.5–6). Neither Cicero nor Sallust could bring himself to reject the ideal of *gloria*: both recognise that *certamen gloriae* was destroying the state and tried to distinguish true *gloria*, resting on *uirtus* and won only by serving the state, from the false, which set the interests of the individual and his own *dignitas* above the welfare of the state.[144] Horace has gone further and rejects the ideal of *gloria* altogether. His striking image personifies *gloria* as a *triumphator*. It was an appropriate choice: the triumph was the surest means of winning *gloria*. But in Horace's image those who pursue *gloria* are shown not as *triumphatores* but as prisoners of war dragged along in chains by the triumphal chariot of *Gloria*. This vivid and crushing image gives memorable expression to an attitude that was to find repeated expression under Augustus. But this revaluation of *gloria* was surely not due entirely to Horace. More probably, Horace here reflects a reaction of Maecenas and Octavian to contemporary feelings: Dio (48.53.1–2) records the anxiety caused in 37 by the rapid turnover among magistrates eager 'not so much to hold office at home for very long as to be counted among the ex-magistrates and so to obtain the honours and powers of serving abroad'.

This rejection of *gloria* is balanced by the positive description of the true significance of holding public office (1.6.34–5): *qui promittit ciuis, urbem sibi curae, | imperium fore et Italiam, delubra deorum*. The division of the *res publica* into its component parts solemnly parades the full range of a magistrate's responsibilities. But the emphasis falls on the key word, *curae*. It is because of this that it is proper to insist on birth as a qualification for a magistrate (*iniciat curam*, 32; *curare*, 37). The concept of government as *cura rei publicae* had some precedent in the language of Republican politics.[145] But it is especially characteristic of the empire. Together with *custodia* and *tutela* and related concepts, it conveys the notion of government as a heavy responsibility, undertaken out of a sense of duty and not merely as an opportunity to win personal wealth and glory.[146] It is clear from Cicero that this concept had some currency under Caesar (*De natura deorum* 1.7): *cum otio langueremus et is esset rei publicae status ut eam unius consilio atque cura gubernari necesse esset*. It was doubtless echoed in the propaganda of the *triumuiri rei publicae constituendae*.

In the second main section of the poem (45–88), Horace focuses attention on himself. He is a positive counterbalance to Tillius: like him he has been a *tribunus* (25 and 47) and has incurred *inuidia* (50 and 26) and jibes about the status of his parent (46 and 36). But Horace has

now come to see the error of his ways and the reader will recall that he served as *tribunus militum* in the Republican army under Brutus. But Horace is now a *priuatus* (cf. 26) and simply *amicus Maecenatis*. The main purpose of this section is to demonstrate from the example of Horace himself the way in which Maecenas puts into practice, even in choosing his personal friends, his belief in the prime importance of *uirtus*. Maecenas is described at the outset as *praesertim cautum dignos adsumere, praua | ambitione procul* (51–2). The friends of Maecenas, exemplified by Horace, are to be contrasted with the *indigni* on whom the *populus* bestows its favours (16), exemplified by Tillius. The phrase *praua ambitione procul* (51–2) echoes and confirms the rejection of *gloria* as a goal (23–4). Primarily it describes Horace but it also hints that Maecenas is free from *ambitio* in his own choice of friends.[147] In view of his enormous power and wealth, the only friendship which Maecenas could be accused of cultivating out of *ambitio* was that with Octavian. Horace obliquely refutes the slander.

In what follows Horace gives a detailed account of himself which emphasises his high moral character. This is not intended primarily as self-praise but as praise of Maecenas, as is clear from the conclusion: *magnum hoc ego duco, | quod placui tibi, qui turpi secernis honestum, | non patre praeclaro sed uita et pectore puro* (62–4). Having begun by saying that it was the fact that his father was *libertinus* which quite properly debarred him from a political career, he next explains that it was because of his father that he had received an education such as would have met the stringent standards of a Cato and had become a person of such moral integrity and rectitude that he was chosen as an *amicus* by Maecenas. Horace's *uirtus* derives from a very traditional education and is evidently *prisca uirtus*. But his father was not only responsible for inculcating this *prisca uirtus* which made him *dignus amicitia Maecenatis*, but did so without any expectations that Horace would have his *uirtus* recognised by being given public office. For him *uirtus* is its own reward.[148] But while not seeking *gloria* and ensuring that his son is free from *praua ambitio* he has earned *laus* (88): the point which Horace is making is proverbial – *gloria umbra uirtutis est, etiam inuitam comitabatur*.[149]

Having illustrated his own *prisca uirtus* and so expanded on the attitude of Maecenas to birth and *uirtus*, Horace concentrates in the final section (89–131) on describing the *uita solutorum misera ambitione grauique* (129). Again the generalisation is significant. Horace is using himself as an example of a class of people which has the approval of Maecenas (51–2). At the outset Horace insists on the sincerity of his

claim to lack *ambitio*: he now believes that even if free to choose he would not want *parentes . . . honestos | fascibus et sellis* (95–7). Horace now views public office not as an *honos* but an *onus*.[150] He goes on to justify his position by referring to the expenses incurred by those in public life. The issue has topical relevance. Dio (48.53.3–6) records that there were some who had to abandon office altogether because of their poverty and cites the example of M. Oppius who was, however, enabled to carry on as aedile because of the generosity of the public. Horace quotes again the unfortunate Tillius. It should be stressed that Horace's underlying assumption is that *cura rei publicae* is an *onus* which requires considerable expenditure and is not simply an *honos* which will provide opportunity to win glory and amass wealth. It is worth recalling that this same conception justified Augustus imposing a property qualification for senators and constantly increasing it.[151]

From these negative considerations Horace turns to a delightful and attractive account of the *otium* (*otior*, 128) and the *libertas* (*quacumque libido est*, 111) which he enjoys as a *priuatus*. The section is framed by expressions of relief that the onerous responsibilities of government rest with others. This high value which is set on *otium* and the demonstration that it can be combined with *libertas* need to be viewed in the context of contemporary opinion.[152] Cicero, finding that the *cura rei publicae* was in the hands of one man, complains of his enforced *otium* and consoles himself with writing philosophy in the hope that in this way he may still be able to serve his country and win *gloria* for Rome. Sallust, under the Triumvirs, confessed that he, like Horace, had in his youth been seized *ambitione corrupta* and that *me . . . honoris cupido eadem qua ceteros fama atque inuidia uexabat* (*Bellum Catilinae* 3.4–5). Again he asserts, like Horace, *ego credo fore qui quia decreui procul a re publica aetatem agere, tanto tamque utili labori meo nomen inertiae imponant, certe quibus maxuma industria uidetur salutare plebem et conuiuiis gratiam quaerere* (*Bellum Iugurthinum* 4.3). But he like Cicero wishes still to serve his country and to win *gloria* from his writings, and, unlike Horace, he justifies his withdrawal from political life by expressing his contempt for triumviral government. Horace ironically echoes the complaints of men like Cicero and Sallust when he says (130) *his me consolor* but his next words, *uicturum suauius*, show him endorsing the views not of these disgruntled aristocrats but of the Epicureans. Twenty years earlier Lucretius had denounced *honorum caeca cupido* (3.59–89) and taught that it was *suaue . . . magnum alterius spectare laborem* and *quibus ipse malis careas . . . cernere suaue est* (2.1–4).[153] It was above all the Epicureans who had belittled the concept

of *gloria* and praised *otium*. In doing so they were challenging traditional Roman values.

Horace ends with another reference to his ancestors: *his me consolor uicturum suauius ac si | quaestor auus pater atque meus patruusque fuisset* (130–1). The form of the last line is clearly intended to recall the opening lines on Maecenas: *nec quod auus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus | olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent*. The contrast suggests that just as Horace's present life is a consequence of his birth, social status and education so is that of Maecenas. For Horace it was improper that *mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno* (48). By implication the *cura urbis et Italiae* which Maecenas has undertaken is now seen not only as justified by his birth and social status but even an obligation imposed by them. But that is not all. At the beginning of the last section Horace had said that if (96–99):

> meis [sc. parentibus] contentus honestos
> fascibus et sellis nollem mihi sumere, demens
> iudicio uolgi, sanus fortasse tuo, quod
> nollem onus haud umquam solitus portare molestum.

Porphyrio shrewdly observes: *hoc ad Maecenatem recte dicitur, qui abhorrens senatoriam dignitatem in equestris honoris gradu se continet*. To put it differently: when Horace once again draws attention to the contrast between the views of Maecenas and those of the *uolgus*, he is deliberately reminding his readers of the most unconventional of all Maecenas' characteristics, his complete refusal to accept any *honores*. As a result Horace's account of his own preference for being a *priuatus* and enjoying *otium* is seen as mirroring and justifying the behaviour of Maecenas.

It is evident from both the admiration of Velleius and the malicious slanders of Seneca that Maecenas' contemporaries would have found his behaviour as enigmatic and curious as modern historians.[154] This poem of Horace provides a coherent and important commentary on his life. Maecenas accepted, as every reader knew, the *cura* or *custodia urbis et Italiae*. But he accepted it as an *onus* imposed on him by the *fortuna* of his birth and his wealth (contrast 1.6.100–11) and, it may be supposed, by his *amicitia* with Octavian. But he remained ostentatiously a *priuatus* and *otiosus* even, according to Seneca, *cum absentis Caesaris partibus fungeretur . . . in tribunali, in rostris, in omni publico coetu* (*Epistles* 114.6). Seneca attributes this to moral degeneracy, a charge which Horace has been careful to refute. The real reason lies in the rejection of *gloria*. Maecenas is exemplifying through his own

behaviour a new concept of government as service to the state: he accepts the *onera* but is not motivated by a personal craving for *honores* or *gloria*. In this way he both serves his country and demonstrates his loyalty to Octavian by refusing to enter a *contentio gloriae dignitatisque*. Again, this idea has further contemporary relevance: in 37 Agrippa refused to celebrate a triumph for his victory in Gaul because he thought it disgraceful to make a display while Octavian was faring badly against Sex. Pompeius (Dio 48.49.4).[155]

This poem, carefully constructed and well argued, provides valuable information on the political attitudes of the most powerful man in Rome apart from the Triumvirs. It also provides an explanation of his eccentric and, at that time, unconventional behaviour. The indirect and allusive method adopted by Horace reinforces the central theme: it would be obviously inappropriate to give explicit and fulsome praise to a man who rejected *gloria*. As in *Satire* 1.8, the *laudes gratesque* are conspicuous by their absence.

Satire 1.9 is, by comparison, straightforward and can be dealt with briefly. It relates in lively and dramatic style Horace's encounter with an anonymous pest. This man is not, of course, hostile to Maecenas but he has a completely incorrect idea of what he is like. He so far misunderstands the artistic standards of Maecenas and his friends that he believes that his claim *quis me scribere pluris | aut citius possit uersus* (24–5) will secure his admission *in numerum amicorum Maecenatis*. He undervalues the sincerity of the friendships within the group (22–3) and believes that they admire the *mollitia* of effeminate dancing and the singing of the degenerate Hermogenes (25).[156] He characterises Maecenas as *paucorum hominum*, a phrase which can have sinister and ominous overtones,[157] and clearly believes that he is eager for personal power and position (*nemo dexterius fortuna est usus*, 45).[158] He believes that Maecenas is to be won by fawning flattery (58–60) and that the members of the group are motivated by personal ambition. His own *ambitio* is cleverly revealed in his resolve: *muneribus seruos corrumpam* (57). In this enterprise he will show a perverse *industria* (58–9).[159] His failure to appear in court is an indication that he lacks *fides* and the fact that he puts his personal interests above his civic duty and the law is a further sign of his *ambitio*. In answer Horace simply asserts that the lifestyle of the group is marked by its moral integrity and that the relations within it are entirely free of *contentio gloriae dignitatisque* (48–52). Finally, he reasserts the importance which Maecenas attaches to *uirtus* (54).

The reaction of the pest is *magnum narras, uix credibile*. Surely no

reader of the satires can suppress a smile: he knows, now, that Horace is indeed speaking the truth. Yet a moment's reflection will reveal that many contemporary readers must have begun to read the satires with just such beliefs about Maecenas and his friends as those entertained by the pest. Many would in fact have shared the much more contemptuous and derogatory attitudes reflected in Sallust. The anonymous interlocutor in 1.9 performs in fact a function similar to that of the maudlin mourner in Lucretius 3.894–911, namely to represent vividly views which the poet has been trying to discredit.[160] Horace was obviously sufficiently confident of the effectiveness of his presentation of the *amici Maecenatis* in the preceding satires to risk placing this contrary view in this penultimate position in the book.

SOME NAMES AND TARGETS

It is absolutely certain that Horace made a number of real and living people the butts of his humour and the targets of his criticism. The precise identity and even the number of the people who fall into this category are uncertain and the problem is aggravated by the fact that some of the names are taken from Lucilius and others are simply fictitious type-names.[161] The reader might naturally expect, given the contemporary historical circumstances and the nature of Roman society, that they would not belong to the same socio-political 'pyramid' as Horace (that is, the one headed by Octavian, Maecenas and Agrippa and made up of their families, relatives, friends and dependents) and that they would be known to be hostile to the Triumvirs. He might further expect them to belong to the most obvious of such groupings, the proscribed and the active adherents of the Republican and Pompeian forces. Some of Horace's targets, like Rupilius Rex (1.7), presumably do fall into this category. Others, like Sallust, may have been well known as opponents of the Triumvirs without being supporters of the other side. The situation is further complicated by the fact that many, like Valerius Messalla and Horace himself, had changed their allegiance during the early thirties.

Caution, then, is necessary. It must also be borne in mind that the names of only about one hundred of the proscribed and sixteen of those condemned by the *lex Pedia* are known and that the sources put the total numbers at from one hundred and thirty to three hundred senators, and two thousand equites.[162] It is therefore worth noting that Appian describes in some detail the adventures of a Balbinus and a Pomponius, two of the proscribed who fled for refuge to Sex.

Pompeius.[163] He was presumably following an almost contemporary source, since the notoriety of Balbinus and Pomponius was surely short-lived. When Horace makes passing hits at a Pomponius (1.4.52) and a Balbinus (1.3.40), it is natural to link them with their notorious homonyms: stories of escapades in the proscriptions presumably enjoyed a vogue with the return of the *proscripti* in 38. Others may fall into this category: another passing hit is directed against Sex. Villius Annalis, the lover of Fausta (1.2.64), and one relative, at least, was proscribed, L. Villius Annalis.[164]

The political allegiance of most of the other targets is difficult to ascertain. Fabius the Stoic (1.1.14; 1.2.134) *Pompeianas partes secutus*, according to Porphyrio, who also tells us that the *nomen* of that other Stoic, Crispinus, was Plotius: that fact suggests the possibility of a link with another of the proscribed, L. Plotius Plancus.[165] Both these scraps of information tend to support the earlier speculation that Stoicism had a special connection with the Pompeian–Republican cause. Unfortunately the scholiasts are not always to be trusted: for example, Cassius Etruscus (1.10.62) who is dead in 35, cannot be, as they say, Cassius Parmensis, the assassin and a loyal adherent of Sex. Pompeius whose death did not occur before Actium.[166] But it is worth noting that they tend to search for the identity of the man behind the name in the ranks of the proscribed: even Sagana (1.8.25) was said by Helenius Acro (according to Porphyrio) to be real: *Saganam nomine fuisse Horati temporibus Pompei sagana senatoris qui a triumuiris proscriptus est* (v.l. *temporibus libertam Pompei senatoris*).

Two other groups of names deserve comment. In *Satire* 1.10 a number of the literary figures who are mentioned disparagingly are known to have been hostile to Caesar or to Octavian. Laberius the mime writer had been humiliated by Caesar in 46 and had retaliated with such famous lines as *porro, Quirites, libertatem perdimus* and *necesse est multos timeat quem multi timent* (34–5 Diehl).[167] Pitholeon was identified by Bentley with the Pitholaus who wrote *carmina maledicentissima* against Caesar.[168] Alpinus (1.10.36) is plausibly identified with Furius Bibaculus who certainly lampooned Octavian and may also have attacked Caesar; he is, however, usually credited with an *Annales Belli Gallici* which is supposed to have been an epic in praise of Caesar's Gallic Wars.[169] The dilemma is clear: it is therefore worth noting that Ps.-Acro in his note on *Satire* 2.5.40 gives the title of this work as *pragmatia Belli Gallici* (i.e. πραγματεία vel sim.). This becomes suggestive when it is recalled that in *Satire* 1.10, in the lines preceding the parody of Alpinus, Horace's complaint had been directed

precisely against those poets who mixed Greek and Latin. Since it is hard to believe that anyone did this in a serious epic, the possibility must be considered that Bibaculus' poem was a satirical parody, a mock-epic on Caesar's campaign. Finally, there is also Sp. Maecius Tarpa (1.10.38) who had been appointed by Pompeius Magnus to select the plays to be performed in his theatre: even in the thirties the theatre retained its association with the Pompeii.[170]

The second group consists of people who share their *nomina* with notorious opponents of the Triumvirs. Cassius Etruscus (1.10.62) shares his with three of the assassins: C. Cassius, L. Cassius Longinus and Cassius Parmensis; Trebonius (1.4.114) with C. Trebonius and Tillius (1.6.24 and 107) with L. Tillius Cimber, two more assassins. There is also Fannius (1.10.80) who shares his *nomen* with C. Fannius, the most honoured and faithful adherent of Sex. Pompeius.[171] Again the evidence is simply not adequate to make it certain that there is any connection or relationship between these men. But in the circumstances it is hard to believe that there is no significance at all in these coincidences and harder still to believe that Horace expected his readers not to associate these men with their notorious homonyms.

There are three possible counter-examples who could disturb this dim and uncertain outline of a neat and expected pattern. Alfenus *vafer* (1.3.130) was identified by Porphyrio with P. Alfenus Varus, cos. suff. 39. Almost no scholar has accepted this: not only was Varus eminent, but he had been honoured by Horace's friend, Virgil (*Eclogues* 6 and 9) and he was also a supporter of Octavian.[172] But if Horace expected his readers to avoid this error, his Alfenus must have been well known. The only other Alfenus on record is apparently P. ALF(enus) Primus, known from an inscription to have been *legatus pro praetore* in Achaea in the late Republic or early Augustan period.[173] It will be recalled that Achaea had been granted to Sex. Pompeius in 39: it is possible (no more) that he was acting for Sextus.[174] If that suggestion is not accepted then the problem must be left unsolved.

At *Satire* 1.2.36, Horace refers to *mirator cunni Cupiennius albi*. To some scholars the name has seemed too good to be true; but it may have been.[175] Porphyrio at least thought he could be identified with C. Cupiennius Libo *Augusti familiaritate clarus*. That would be, in fact, a good reason for supposing him not to be Horace's target. But Libo's friendship with Augustus may have belonged to a later period or even to an earlier one: the *cognomen* suggests the possibility that he was related to L. Scribonius Libo who had been briefly the brother-in-law of Octavian (40–39) during the latter's marriage to Scribonia. But

Scribonius Libo was also the father-in-law of Sex. Pompeius and one of his most faithful supporters.[176]

In this respect, as in others, the most difficult problem is posed by Hermogenes Tigellius.[177] In *Satire* 1.2, the death is reported of Tigellius the Sardinian; in the later poem, *Satire* 1.10, Hermogenes Tigellius seems to be alive and well. The discrepancy has convinced some that there must be two people:[178] the Sardinian featured in the opening lines of *Satires* 1.2 and 3, and a Hermogenes Tigellius who appears elsewhere (1.3.129; 1.4.72; 1.9.25 and 1.10.18; 80; 90). But the fact that variations on his name are clearly used in 1.10 as a structural device makes it difficult to believe that the same technique of ring-composition is not being used in 1.3. Moreover, whatever form of the name is used, he always appears as a *cantor*.[179] There is no obvious solution.[180] For present purposes the real problem is caused by the fact that in *Satire* 1.3 it is clearly stated that Tigellius had enjoyed the *amicitia* of both Caesar and Octavian. This raises the question of why Horace is attacking a friend of his patron's patron. One possibility is that Tigellius had defected to Sex. Pompeius. What makes this a possibility is that Tigellius was a Sardinian and in 39 Sardinia had been granted to Sex. Pompeius. If that is so, and if there is only one Hermogenes Tigellius, and if the Fannius of 1.10.80 is related to or even identical with C. Fannius, the adherent of Sextus, then the reference to him as *Hermogenis . . . conuiua Tigelli* could be a humorous allusion to their billeting arrangements. An alternative and rather easier solution could be offered, if it is assumed that there are two persons involved. Then there would be no reason to consider the living Hermogenes an *amicus Caesaris* and he could even be a Pompeian.[181] The dead Tigellius would then have been singled out for extensive criticism, perhaps because, rather than in spite, of his being an *amicus Caesaris*. In that case Horace would be reinforcing the conciliatory tone of the satires by a characteristic admission of (past) imperfections on his own side.

CONCLUSION

At first sight the satires defeat those expectations generated both by the contemporary historical situation and by traditional associations of Lucilian satire with invective. There is neither overt praise of Octavian nor abuse of Sex. Pompeius. As a result the genial and conciliatory tone of the satires makes all the more impression. But these are not the poems of a man who has turned in on himself in disgust at the contemporary political scene or of one who has rejected the current would-

be leaders and whatever solutions they have to offer. On the contrary, after Philippi, Horace changed sides. He joined Maecenas and that means that he committed himself to support of the Triumvirs and of Octavian. The satires are dedicated to Maecenas and in them Horace talks as his friend. Every reader takes away from the poems an impression of what Maecenas and his friends are like as people: very human and humane, witty, cultured and morally serious. In short, they are the ideal Roman citizens. Maecenas and his friends were real people and in reality they occupied the very centre of the political stage. No contemporary reader could forget that or fail to bring to his reading of the poems the historical context and the political dimension. Moreover, the poems constantly deal with topics – *auaritia*, *luxuria*, *aequitas*, *libertas*, *ambitio* – which are the very moral issues which are at the heart of contemporary analysis of Rome's problems. There is adequate evidence to allow a reconstruction, at least in broad outline and with some detail, of the nature of that political debate and its terminology, of the claims and counter-claims of the groups competing for power and of the ways in which they tried to discredit their rivals. When the satires are considered against this background, it becomes clear that they constantly reflect and echo this debate, both in their choice of themes and in small details (more, probably, than can now be detected), and that they consistently contribute to it from one particular point on the political stage. Horace, it must be emphasised, is not writing as a detached observer, but as the friend of Maecenas. It also becomes clear on reflection that the image of Maecenas' friends which emerges from the poems is so precisely suited to the political requirements of the mid-thirties and so exactly calculated to allay the fears and anxieties of Horace's contemporaries about the intentions, ambitions and moral character of their new leaders that it is just not possible to suppose this effect to be accidental.

This is the propaganda value of the satires. They are more rather than less effective for avoiding the crude, the obvious and the strident. But the word propaganda has ugly connotations and it is well to be clear. There is no reason to think that Horace did not intend to win the sympathy and support of his readers for his powerful *amici* and to present persuasively their own view of themselves. But there is also no reason whatsoever to think that Horace was insincere, that he did not believe genuinely that Octavian represented the best, even the only, hope of achieving peace, prosperity, and freedom. He may have been wrong but, equally, given the available choices – which were not (let it be remembered) between democracy and totalitarianism or fascism

– he may have been right. Hostility to Octavian is fashionable among modern scholars, who also tend to idealise the Republic. Whatever justification there may be for this view, it is logically ridiculous to expect the supporters and friends of Octavian to share it. One final point may be made. There is no need to suppose that Horace was merely entrusted with giving verbal form to themes devised by his masters. He wrote as a friend who sympathised with and understood their intentions and who had every reason to feel grateful and unwilling to offend or hurt his friends. Rebellion and independence, even supposing that they were available alternatives, may have been more Romantic but they would have been less *utile urbi*. For it seems reasonable to think that the poets may have helped to shape the way in which Octavian progressed from the bloody and ruthless pursuit of power in the late forties to the enlightened self-interest of the principate. They presented their readers with an acceptable image but that image in turn set a standard for the new ruler to live up to. *Sermones* 1 is an important first contribution to that *lene consilium*.[182]

3

Yvan Nadeau

THE LOVER AND THE STATESMAN

A study in apiculture

(Virgil, *Georgics* 4.281–558)

I THE HYPOTHESIS

In this essay my intention is to show that the Aristaeus epyllion is an allegory for Augustus, Antony and Cleopatra, and Actium. I want to start by demonstrating that the epyllion, including the story of Orpheus and Eurydice, contains in seminal state elements of the narrative of the *Aeneid*. I shall compare the epyllion with passages of the *Aeneid* to point to those *thematic* similarities and to the *verbal* repetitions which serve as pointers to the thematic similarities. Starting from what we know of the *Aeneid*, I shall then try to expound the meaning of the epyllion – the main theme of which I take to be the contrast between the Statesman and the Lover: between, that is, Augustus and Antony.

In an essay on the Aristaeus epyllion originality is not to be attained. This one consists of the reordering and reworking of the ideas and observations of distinguished predecessors in this field. The main ideas I have taken over are as follows:

Herrmann (1931) pointed to the connection between bees and Augustus and Actium.

Büchner (1955) pointed to many of the verbal echoes between the Aristaeus epyllion and the *Aeneid* which I use in my demonstration.

Perret (1965) argued that Aristaeus was an allegory for Augustus, and that the 'bee' passages preceding the epyllion contained references to the Civil War between Augustus and Antony.

Commager (1966), 3–4, pointed to the parallels between Aristaeus, Aeneas, Augustus, in terms which indicate that he took Aristaeus to be an allegory for Augustus, as Aeneas is.

Segal (1966) observed that Aristaeus and Orpheus possessed

59 Thus Williams (1968), 215–17, who puts the party in Rome, and Bartels (1973), 287, who puts it at Actium.

60 Fraenkel (1957), 73 quotes Plin. *Nat.* 23.43 *merum . . . remedio est . . . et quorum stomachus in uomitiones effunditur*, but that passage refers to real illness; cf. Hanslik (1962), 340.

61 See especially Ableitinger-Grünberger (1968), 85–8, who cites Plin. *Nat.* 27.52 [*absinthium*] *nauseam maris arcet in nauigationibus potum.* She also shows that *fluens* is a medical term for an illness that involves e.g. vomiting (Cels. *Prooem.* 55, *TLL* 6.1.975.46ff.), and that this might or might not be the case with *nausea* or sea-sickness (Cels. 1.3.11).

62 Archil. 4.6–9 W ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηὸς | φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ' ἄφελκε κάδων, | ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς | νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῇ τῇδε δυνησόμεθα ('but come, go with a mug along the planks of the swift ship, and pull the stoppers from the capacious jars, and draw the red wine from the lees; for neither shall we be able to be sober on this night-watch'). Archilochus' ship is at sea, as is confirmed by the imitation in Synes. *Epist.* 32 Hercher = 45 Garzya (see Garzya [1958]); if φυλακή could refer to a blockade (as at Thuc. 2.69.1), that would correspond to the situation in Horace's poem.

63 In peacetime Horace twice mentions luxury-triremes in contexts with hints of Maecenas. See *Odes* 3.1.38–40 *neque* | *decedit aerata triremi et* | *post equitem sedet atra cura* (does *aerata* suggest a converted warship?); *Epist.* 1.1.92–3 *conducto nauigio aeque* | *nauseat ac locuples quem ducit priua triremis* (a commonplace of popular philosophy adapted to a personal situation).

64 At *Odes* 1.37.1–2 *nunc pede libero* | *pulsanda tellus*, the adjective refers both to agility in the dance and to deliverance from Cleopatra.

2 HORACE AND MAECENAS

1 For example Rudd (1966), 37; McGann (1973), 59–72.

2 For example Williams (1982), 13; Coffey (1976), 65; Syme (1939), 242. My own views on the relationship of Horace and Maecenas are very close to those of Horsfall (1981) and very different from those of Lefèvre (1981). For a variety of views on Maecenas as a patron of literature see further Dalzell (1956); Reckford (1959); André (1967); Williams (1968) and Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) and (1978), indices s.vv. Maecenas, patronage.

3 The title of the collection as such is *Sermones*, not *Satirae*. The word *satura* in the singular denotes either the genre of satire or else an individual poem, and in the plural it denotes any group of separate poems considered as separate pieces rather than as parts of a single collection or *libellus*. See Horsfall (1981*a*), 108, on which this note depends.

4 See, especially, Fraenkel (1957), 76–135 and Rudd (1966), 1–124.

5 See Jal (1963), 201–8.

6 See the valuable discussion by Williams (1968), 619–33.

7 All dates in the text are B.C. unless otherwise indicated. For Calpurnius Bibulus, see Broughton (1968), 401 and 404. 36/35 is generally accepted as the date for *Sermones* 1. It has been challenged (unconvincingly) by Williams (1972), 20. The precise nature of 'publication' at this time is still far from clear. I assume that the *Sermones* became available to a much wider audience and readership than Horace's immediate circle of friends and that Maecenas used his considerable resources to promote their dissemination. See now Zetzel (1981), 232–7; Kenney (1982), 15–22 and Wiseman (1982*a*).

8 *Pace* Fraenkel (1957), 16; Coffey (1976), 66–7 and others.

9 For the *Romana simplicitas* of Octavian see Mart. 11.20. Octavian had tried to legislate against adultery as early as 28 and actually did so in 18: see Brunt (1971), 558–66; Csillag (1976), 29–31 and 219–20; Galinsky (1981); and Wallace-Hadrill (1981).

10 A major theme in *S.* 1.4 is the *libertas* of the satirist. The truth of the matter is that what a humble man like Horace could say with impunity depended on how powerful his friends were: cf. Crook (1967), 255. Horace admits as much at *S.* 2.1.83–6. This reality is neglected by LaFleur (1981).

11 There are basic accounts in: Syme (1939), 227–42; Carter (1970), 131–53; Huzar (1978), 129–47 and 290–2 (not free from error); Hadas (1930) and Yavetz (1969), 22 and 86–8. On the details Broughton (1968), 386–410 provides full references to the sources.

12 The main sources are App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.84–5; 5.67–74; 143; Dio 48.36–8 and Vell. 2.72 and 77.

13 Broughton (1968), 393; App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.92–3 with Gabba (1970) ad loc.

14 See Syme (1939), 227–42.

15 Dio 49.15.3.

16 Dio 49.15; App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.130.

17 App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.128.

18 Aug. *RG* 29.1; Wilkes (1969), 48–9.

19 Main sources: App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.127–9; Dio 49.13–15; Vell. 2.81 (see Woodman (1983) ad loc.); Aug. *RG* 25.1.

20 Cf. Vell. 2.73, especially his description of Sextus as *libertorum suorum libertus seruorumque seruus*; and Aug. *RG* 25.1: *mare pacaui a praedonibus*.

21 App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.131; Dio 49.12.4–5.

22 App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.128; 130; 132 (*bis*); cf. Dio 49.13.2 (which is inconsistent with 13.3–4) and 49.15.2–3. Their statues were erected in the temple of Concordia in 35 (Dio 49.18.6; cf. 49.15.1). This earlier propaganda helps to explain why, when the break did come, so much importance was attached to depicting Antonius as the aggressor, to the domination of Cleopatra and to the fact that his alliance with her constituted a threat from the barbarian East.

23 App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.132. This is useful evidence that the concept of written propaganda and the means to disseminate it were available.

24 Cf. Syme (1939), 242: 'Maecenas had been [i.e. by 33] working more quietly and to set purpose. It was his task to guide opinion gently into

acceptance of the monarchy, to prepare not merely for the contest that was imminent but for the peace that was to follow victory in the last of all civil wars.'

25 [Suet.] *Vit. Hor.* 2.2 Klingner. I see no reason to infer from Horace's courtesy to his patron in his poems any coolness in their relationship.

26 See especially White (1974) and (1978). Saller (1982) agrees with him that a poet hoped for support and publicity for his work from his patron but stresses that 'the traditional rewards for poets were *pecunia* and *honores*' and that poets were different from other *amici* in that they offered their poems as part of the exchange. See also the valuable papers of Horsfall (1981) and Wiseman (1982*a*).

27 Virgil's *Eclogues* had appeared in late 39 and Varius Rufus' *De morte*, which is echoed in *Ecl.* 8, perhaps as early as 43 (see Hollis (1977)).

28 White (1978), 82 rightly insists that 'poets were *amici* and *sodales*, like anyone else'. But that does not mean that a Roman would not befriend someone precisely because he was a poet; all the acceptable reasons for so doing are assembled by Cicero in the *Pro Archia*. Although Archias was a Greek by birth, Cicero insists that he was a *ciuis Romanus*, and it may be assumed that if anything which he said about Archias had been felt to be unworthy of, or inapplicable to, a *ciuis Romanus*, then he would not have said it.

29 Cf. White (1974), 49–50, esp.: 'To Statius' mind it [sc. the publication of a poem] has the overtones of a public avowal, by which he testifies to the virtues and friendship of the person concerned.'

30 See Fraenkel (1957), 14–15 and White (1978), 89. I am assuming that since *equites* frequently found it worthwhile to purchase this post it probably yielded an income at least comparable to that which would come from investing their census in another way.

31 A legionary soldier in the thirties received 900 sesterces p.a. and that was presumably at least a bare living wage. At the other end of the social scale, Cornelius Nepos assures us that Atticus lived frugally on 36,000 sesterces p.a. (*Vit. Att.* 13.6) but Cicero, who allowed Marcus 80,000 a year (*Ad Att.* 16.1.5; 12.32), is proud to claim that he can live on less than 100,000 while the rich man with extravagant tastes cannot manage on 600,000 (*Parad. Sto.* 49). Cf. Shatzman (1975), 11–98, esp. 47–74 and 94–8.

32 Such gifts were not uncommon. Maecenas had apparently freed Sarmentus, the *scurra* of *S.* 1.5, and given him sufficient money to purchase the *scriptum quaestorium* (Treggiari (1969), 271–2). It is not likely that he was less generous to Horace.

33 *S.* 1.6.47; 1.9.48; 1.5.

34 For these *beneficia* see White (1978), 90–2. For the generosity of Augustus see [Suet.] *Vit. Hor.* 2.19–20 Klingner; Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.245–50 and Macrob. *Sat.* 2.4.31 where a poet receives an exceptionally generous payment of 100,000 sesterces. In 29, Varius Rufus received 1,000,000 from Augustus for his *Thyestes* and Virgil died leaving ten times the minimum senatorial census which he had received *ex liberalitatibus amicorum*.

35 White (1974), 44 n. 15 and 55 n. 60 questions the belief that the dedicatee assumed responsibility for the publication. Each case must be judged on its merits: Cicero's *Academica* and *De finibus* were published by Atticus but dedicated to Varro and Brutus respectively. In the absence of evidence, it seems reasonable to assume that Maecenas was responsible for the publication of Horace's work, either by his own scribes or, less probably, through a friend (as one may speculate that Cornelius Nepos secured Atticus as a publisher for Catullus). See also Marshall (1976), 252–63 and n. 7 above.

36 Cf. White (1974), 54 and (1978), 88; *De amic.* 4; *Ad Att.* 15.4.3; Virg. *Ecl.* 8.11 (to Pollio) and *G.* 3.40–1 (to Maecenas). If the idea of a commission were ill-mannered, Virgil would never have used the word *iussa*, which would then be a rebuke to his dedicatee. Everyone knows of Cicero's quest for an encomiast for his consulship. Unsolicited dedications were in fact a much more delicate problem (e.g. Cic. *Ad Att.* 13.12 etc.). Cf. Horsfall (1981), 14–16.

37 *S.* 1.4.71–8; 1.10.72–5. The claims are disingenuous: see Brink (1963), 156–71.

38 For *corona*, see Kambylis (1965), 173–6; 155–62 (for *inuentor*). Cf. Wimmel (1960), index s.v. primus-Motiv. For *audere* cf. Enn. *Ann.* 7 prologue; Lucr. 1.66–7; Catull. 1.5; Virg. *G.* 2.175; Manil. 2.10; 3.1; Hor. *Epist.* 1.3.11; also below, p. 236 n. 136.

39 Cf. Fraenkel (1957), 130–1; Rudd (1966), 95; Coffey (1976), 80.

40 Cic. *De or.* 1.72 = 2.25.

41 Cf. Brink (1963), 156–71; Wimmel (1960), 154–62; Williams (1978), 85–92; Callimachus, *Aetia* fr. 1.18 and *Epigr.* 28.4 Pf; Catull. 95b.

42 See now Lyne (1978), 167–87.

43 E.g. Suet. *Iul.* 73.

44 Cic. *Ad fam.* 7.24.1–2; Porph. on Hor. *S.* 1.3.4. This interpretation depends on acceptance of the view that there is only one Hermogenes Tigellius or, *mutatis mutandis*, that the two are very closely related (cf. Treggiari (1969), 269–70).

45 See Coffey (1976), 35–64 (esp. 63–4); Anderson (1963), 73.

46 Contrast Fraenkel (1957), 124–35; Rudd (1966), 86–124; Brink (1963), 156–71, who all see Lucilius as Horace's prime target. Fiske (1920) remains fundamental: his detailed arguments do not all command assent, but it would be wrong to underestimate the amount of imitation of Lucilius in Horace. In all probability his imitations are based on theme and structure at least as much as upon the detailed verbal echoes still dimly perceptible from the fragments.

47 See Wirszubski (1950); Syme (1939), index s.vv. *Libertas*, Freedom of Speech; MacMullen (1967), 1–45; Weinstock (1971), 133–62.

48 See esp. Syme (1939), 152; MacMullen (1967), 298 n. 17.

49 Syme (1964), 121–37; 214–39 and, esp., Sall. *Iug.* 3.3.

50 For *licentia* vs. *libertas*, see Wirszubski (1950), 7–8. Cf. Hor. *Odes* 3.24.25–32; 4.15.9–11.

51 See above, n. 10.

52 So Coffey (1976), 64 and esp. Anderson (1963), who overstates a basically sound thesis (understandably, in view of the novelty

of his idea, of its importance and of the frustrating nature of the evidence).

53 See Treggiari (1969), 119.

54 Contrast Anderson (1963), 74.

55 See Huzar (1978), index s.vv. Heracles, Dionysus: this led to the attacks on Antonius as a drunkard and a glutton (see Scott (1929), 133–41 and (1933), 7–50). For Augustus–Heracles, see esp. Virg. *Aen.* 8 with Binder (1971), 146–7; and for Augustus–Dionysus, see Virg. *Aen.* 6.791–805; Hor. *Odes* 3.3.9–15; *Epist.* 2.1.5–17: this was part of Augustus' attempt to replace Antonius as the new Alexander, cf. Kienast (1969) 430–56. See also Woodman (1983) on Vell. 2.82.4.

56 See Astin (1967), 294–306.

57 Compare Nisbet's remarks on Horace's choice of Archilochus as his model in the *Epodes* (above, p. 2).

58 For example, *S.* 1.118–19 and Lucr. 3.938–9; the theme of discontent, Lucr. 3.1053–75; *S.* 1.2 and Lucr. 4.1058–83; *S.* 1.3.43–54 and Lucr. 4.1160–70; 1.3.98–112 and Lucr. 5.780–94; 925–1160. The possibility of echoes from Varius Rufus' *De morte* should not be forgotten.

59 André (1967), 15–61.

60 MacMullen (1967), 1–94.

61 Nisbet–Hubbard (1978), 3–4 and index s.v. paraenesis.

62 Shackleton Bailey (1980), 10–14, has argued that this letter is a forgery.

63 Syme (1964), 218; not all, however, agree upon the reference: Koestermann (1971), 36.

64 Jal (1963), 377–91: cf. Suet. *Aug.* 68 (Sex. Pompeius called Octavian *effeminatum*).

65 Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.10: *Pompeium imagine pacis* (*deceptum*).

66 Vell. 2.77 and App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.72.

67 Syme (1962), 121–37; 212; 214–39; 280. Little is known of his great nephew, adopted in 35. He is mentioned with Dellius and Cocceius by Seneca (*Clem.* 1.10.1) as among those who joined Augustus *ex aduersariorum castris*. They were Antonians, and Syme (1964), 275 makes him 'a partisan of Antonius' also. If so, Seneca is being careless in his use of the plural. He may have supported, rather, the Republicans and/or Sextus.

68 The view, accepted here, that Sallustius at *S.* 1.2.48 is the historian and not the great nephew (which would cause chronological problems) is accepted, on balance, by Syme (1964), 280–4 and Rudd (1966), 135–6.

69 For example, Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att.* 17.18 (Varro) and Suet. *Gramm.* 15 (Pompeius Lenaeus).

70 Ps.-Acro on *S.* 1.2.49 seems to contain at least the seeds of the truth: that Sallust had defended himself against the charge of adultery made by Varro – probably not in the senate however – with some unfortunate remark that his critics could wilfully misinterpret and use against him, as Horace does here.

71 See Hellegouarc'h (1963), 261–7; Weinstock (1971), 238; 245–6.

72 See Seager (1979), 176–7, for the evidence and a realistic discussion. Cf. Weinstock (1971), 237.

73 For Caesar's *clementia*, see Weinstock (1971), 233–43; Hellegouarc'h (1963), 261–3; and for the hostility which it inspired see Jal (1963), 464–8 and Syme (1939), 159–60.

74 Dio 47.13.3 and Suet. *Aug.* 13; 27.

75 The crucial word is *petentibus*: cf. Vell. 2.86.2. On the *clementia* of Augustus, see Weinstock (1971), 240.

76 Cf. Dio 48.3.6 and Sen. *Clem.* 1.11 and Suet. *Aug.* 27.2 on his *paenitentia saeuitiae*.

77 The collocation of *furta* and *latrocinia* may echo the language of contemporary political polemic: cf. Sall. *Iug.* 4.7 (a reference I owe to Prof. Woodman).

78 The elasticity of the Latin words helps Horace to treat an important issue suggestively while only treating one aspect or part of it in detail: cf. Cic. *Marc.* 21 *omnes enim, qui fuerunt inimici, aut sua pertinacia uitam amiserunt aut tua misericordia retinuerunt, ut aut nulli supersint de inimicis aut qui fuerunt sint amicissimi.* Note also *Odes* 1.12.57 (Augustus) *latum reget aequus orbem.*

79 Cf. *RG* 2 *qui parentem meum trucidauerunt, eos in exilium expuli iudiciis legitimis ultus eorum facinus et postea bellum inferentis rei publicae uici bis acie.* The reference is to the tribunal established by the *lex Pedia* in 43.

80 See Broughton (1968), 346–7; 361.

81 See, e.g., Crook (1967), 74–7. For the legal background to this poem, see Burton (1975), 92–106. It should also be noted that Brutus had been appointed *praetor* (*urbanus*) by Julius Caesar in 22. The ingratitude was duly noted and helped to swing public opinion against the conspirators (App. *Bell. ciu.* 2.146).

82 Cf. *Odes* 2.7 (to a Pompeius). It is not known precisely when or how Horace returned to Italy after Philippi – via Domitius Ahenobarbus in 40 (Brundisium); via Sicily and Sex. Pompeius in 39 (Misenum); or by some other route.

83 Cf. Cicero's complaint about the atmosphere in the camp of Pompeius Magnus (*Ad fam.* 7.3.2): *reliqui primum in ipso bello rapaces, deinde in oratione ita crudeles, ut ipsam uictoriam horrerem; maximum autem aes alienum amplissimorum uirorum.* See further Gelzer (1968), 238–9.

84 For the trials, Gruen (1974), 260–357. For Cicero's complaints, see, e.g., *De off.* 2.2–4.

85 Note the charge against Horace at *S.* 1.4.78–9 '*laedere gaudes*' | *inquit* '*et hoc studio prauus facis*'. Cf. Cic. *De off.* 2.51. Defence speeches were, of course, a different matter. See further Wiseman (1971), 120–1; Kelly (1976), 93–111.

86 Compare: *durus*, 1.7.29 and 1.4.8; *tumidus*, 1.7.7 and *turgidus*, 1.10.36; *ruebat flumen* and *multo fluenti*, 1.7.26–8 and 1.4.11; 1.10.50–1; 61–2; *salso*, 1.7.28 and *sale*, 1.10.3; *ridetur*, 1.7.22 and 1.4.82–3 and 1.10.7–8. See also Bernardi Perini (1975), 1–24.

87 *uirtus* was the key word for the Republicans: cf. *Odes* 2.7.11 *uirtus fracta*, with Porphyrio ad loc. (*uirtute se Cassius et Brutus praecipue iactabant*) and Nisbet–Hubbard (1978) ad loc.

88 'Identifications and comparisons with Homeric heroes were always fashionable', Weinstock (1971), 199. But Horace may be mimicking a

fashionable way of talking among the Republicans: see Plut. *Brut.* 23 (Brutus and Hector); 24 (Patroclus); 34 (a quarrel between Cassius and Brutus compared to that between Achilles and Agamemnon. Plutarch's account of this episode also illustrates the *parrhesia* cultivated among the Republicans). Earlier, Domitius Ahenobarbus had maliciously nicknamed Pompey 'Agamemnon' (Plut. *Pomp.* 67; *Caes.* 41).

89 Commentators seem to forget that these included not only L. Iunius Brutus who expelled the Tarquins but also C. Servilius Ahala (Plut. *Brut.* 2; Cic. *Ad Att.* 13.40.1, cf. 2.24.3) – an ancestor through his mother and adoptive father – who killed Sp. Maelius for aiming at *regnum* in 439 (Liv. 4.13–14).

90 Cic. *De diu.* 2.110 with Pease (1963) ad loc. See also Weinstock (1971), 340–1 and Rawson (1975), 149–50.

91 Cf. Fraenkel (1957), 121 n. 2; Weinstock (1971), 381–4; Doblhofer (1966), 17–21. Note that Plutarch says that when Cassius was hailed by the Rhodians as 'Lord and King', he retorted angrily: οὔτε βασιλεὺς οὔτε κύριος, τοῦ δὲ κυρίου καὶ βασιλέως φονεὺς καὶ κολαστής ('neither lord nor king but punisher and killer of your lord and king': *Brut.* 30). (Cf. Val. Max. 1.5.8 and App. *Bell. ciu.* 4.65–7.)

92 Cf. Kiessling–Heinze (1968) ad loc. For the reputation of Asia as a province, see Cic. *Mur.* 11–12. Cf. Nic. Dam. *Vit. Caes.* 19.

93 See Fraenkel (1957), 123–4; Rudd (1966), 70. For the *horti Maecenatis*, Grimal (1943), 50–3 (for Priapus, gardens and graveyards) and 152–5.

94 See now Tupet (1976).

95 Buchheit (1962), 63 n. 2 and 66 n. 2 refers to Maecenas *als Priapeendichter*, citing Sen. *Epist.* 101.10 but without explanation.

96 See Gabba (1970) ad loc. Permanent arrangements do not seem to have been made before 7 B.C.: see *CAH* 10.200 and, for earlier arrangements, Lintott (1968), 89–106.

97 *Eleg. in Maec.* 27–30; cf. 14: *Romanae tu uigil urbis eras.*

98 See Tupet (1976), 299–300.

99 See MacMullen (1967), 95–162; Liebeschuetz (1979), 119–39.

100 Liebeschuetz (1979), 130–1.

101 Suet. *Aug.* 94.5 (see further Dio 45.1.3–5) and compare ibid. 40.5 and 53.1: (Augustus) *domini appellationem ut maledictum et opprobrium semper exhorruit* etc. For the hostility of Nigidius to Caesar, see e.g., Weinstock (1971), 21; 52 and 341.

102 See Ahl (1976), 130–49; Grenade (1950), 28–63.

103 See further Seager (1972), 89–93; MacMullen (1967), 126 and 325 n. 30. Note esp. Tac. *Ann.* 2.28: *Iunius quidam* [sc. *a Libone*] *temptatus ut infernas umbras carminibus eliceret.*

104 See Broughton (1968), 396.

105 Syme (1939), 225.

106 The problem has taxed the critics: Fraenkel (1957), 105–12; Rudd (1966), 54–64; Williams (1968), 569–70.

107 For the details, see Fiske (1920), 306–16.

108 See esp. Dio 49.18.6–7 on the statues erected in the temple of Concordia.

109 For brigands, see App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.132 and Suet. *Aug.* 32.1–2. But it was common practice to omit mention of slaves and menials at all times.

110 For a recent discussion of the problems, with full citation of the evidence, see Gray (1975), 15–29.

111 Gray (1975), 20.

112 Cf. Gray (1975), 21: 'Engaged in a life and death struggle with Sextus Pompey, Octavian felt all the more strongly the need to conciliate conservative and republican elements in Italy by a display of constitutionalism.' I accept his argument that it was Octavian who secured the comitial validation of the renewal of the Triumvirate and thereafter duly styled himself TRIVMVIR RPC ITERVM (unlike Antonius). The claim that the Triumvirate was renewed 'without again asking the people' (App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.95) I believe to come from a hostile source, ultimately reflecting the propaganda of Sex. Pompeius. I would also suggest, tentatively, that Octavian did not campaign against Sex. Pompeius in 37 because (at least in part) he wished to show his respect for his constitutional position. It is also worth noting that M. Oppius, the son of a *proscriptus*, was elected 'by the people' in 37 (Broughton (1968), 396–7). But see also Millar (1973), 50–67: he doubts the ratification of the renewal (53) and entertains the hypothesis that Octavian was Triumvir in 32 (58).

113 Cic. *Ad Att.* 1.11.1 with Shackleton Bailey (1965) ad loc.

114 For a convenient account, see Balsdon (1969), 213–17; 224–43.

115 Cic. *Ad Att.* 13.52.

116 Cicero was similarly proud of not making demands when he was travelling (*Ad Att.* 5.10.2; 5.16.3).

117 See Cic. *Ad Att.* 4.1.4–5; *Sest.* 131; *Pis.* 51–2.

118 Note esp. that when Suetonius assembles a number of details to show that Augustus did not behave like a tyrant, he records (*Aug.* 53.2) *non temere urbe oppidoue ullo egressus aut quoquam ingressus est nisi uespera aut noctu, ne quem officii causa inquietaret.*

119 See Broughton (1968), 378 and Syme (1939), 217.

120 Cf. Syme (1939), 225, who suggests that Cocceius was 'still perhaps a neutral'. Horace seems to suggest that he has crossed the line (cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.10.1). For Murena, see Nisbet–Hubbard (1978), 151–7.

121 For illness as an excuse, see Dio 44.8.1–4 (on Caesar's discourtesy to senators: cf. Gelzer (1968), 317); Cic. *Phil.* 1.11–2 (cf. 5.19); Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.1–13 and [Suet.] *Vit. Hor.* 2.13 etc.

122 For example, the lover conventionally contrasts his concern for his beloved with his rich rival's lack of concern. This motif of concern for the sick was probably a commonplace of Hellenistic philosophical treatises on friendship as suggested by Yardley (1973), 283–8. Biographers also note with some regularity how men treated their sick friends: for example, Suet. *Caes.* 72 (to illustrate that *amicos tanta semper facultate indulgentiaque tractauit*); *Aug.* 53.3 (again in the section intended to show that he did not behave tyrannically); see further Millar (1977), 112, and Woodman (1977) on Vell. 2.114.1.

123 See Gelzer (1968), 323–4; Cic. *Ad fam.* 6.14.2 *omnem adeundi et*

conueniendi illius indignitatem et molestiam pertulissem; *Ad Att.* 14.1.3; 2.3.

124 Cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 4; Tibull. 1.7; Prop. 3.9 and 4.6. It is important not to be dogmatic about the placing of the dedicatory poem: Horace certainly wrote *Odes* 4 for Augustus (5 and 15) and not for Paullus Fabius Maximus.

125 White (1978), 81 shrewdly observes that '*amici* rarely could be and rarely considered themselves peers'. The problem was recognised by theorists from Aristotle on (e.g. *Nic. eth.* 8.14). The best general discussion of *amicitia* is Brunt (1965).

126 See Wiseman (1971), index s.v. *domi nobiles*.

127 Contrast *Odes* 1.1.1; 3.29.1; Prop. 3.9.1; *Eleg. in Maec.* 13.

128 On the importance of military success to a Roman aristocrat, see esp. Harris (1979), 9–41.

129 Dio 49.16.2.

130 For the conventional *superbia nobilium*, see, e.g., Hellegouarc'h (1963), 439–41; Sall. *Iug.* 31 and 85.

131 See Millar (1973), 51–4, who notes that 'the right of patronage was extended even beyond the Triumvirs' (52), citing Dio 51.23.1 on Statilius Taurus. The role of Maecenas in these appointments was perhaps only informal but he was doubtless part of the *consilium* of Octavian.

132 This incident seems to show that Octavian kept a low profile in 37, after the lapse of the Triumvirate and before it was officially renewed (see n. 112). App. *Bell. ciu.* 4.41 and Dio 48.53.4–6 do not make it clear whether both the son and the father or the father alone had been proscribed (Appian, incidentally, compares the son's action to that of Aeneas: see above p. 00 with n. 00). The popular support for Oppius was demonstrated in the Theatre of Pompeius, an obvious site for a display of pro-Pompeian sympathy (cf. Vell. 2.79.6); the masked *kakourgoi* who donated money were then presumably Pompeian sympathisers of some means, not eager to be identified by the Triumvirs. Dio duly notes that the 'senate' disapproved of the popular devotion to this man.

133 Millar (1973), 50–4.

134 Hor. *Epod.* 4.19–20; 9.9–19; Vell. 2.73.1. Cf. Syme (1939), 201 and 236 who acidly remarks on 'freedmen, of which support Pompeius had no monopoly, but all the odium'.

135 See Wiseman (1971), 107–22.

136 See Wiseman (1971), 8–9; 171–3; Syme (1939), 227–58.

137 It was presumably invented when the Octavii were made patricians 'again'.

138 Cf., e.g., Syme (1939), 238–9.

139 Cf. Syme (1939), 229–40.

140 Kiessling–Heinze (1968) on *S.* 1.6.12 say that the Messallae did not trace back their line to P. Valerius Poplicola, cos. 509. This is certainly untrue if *Catalepton* 9 is addressed to P. Valerius Messalla Corvinus and of this there can now be little doubt (see Richmond (1978), 189–201): see *Cat.* 9.35–40 and cf. Hor. *S.* 1.10.28(?).

141 Cf. Plut. *Brut.* 1 'those who felt hatred and ill will for Brutus on account of the murder of Caesar say that his father's family does not go back to the man who threw out the Tarquins', etc.

142 See Wiseman (1971), 266.

143 See esp. Harris (1979), 17–40; Earl (1967), 44–79.

144 Cf. Hellegouarc'h (1963), 380–3.

145 Cf. Hellegouarc'h (1963), 252–3.

146 See Béranger (1953), 186–205: cf. Plin. *Epist.* 3.20.12: *sunt quidem cuncta sub unius arbitrio qui pro utilitate communi solus omnium curas laboresque suscepit.* Also Woodman (1977) on Vell. 2.104.2, 105.3, 106.3.

147 Cf. Rudd (1966), 41; 279 n. 5.

148 See Otto (1890), 373–4 s.v. *uirtus* (1).

149 Otto (1890), 155 s.v. *gloria* (1).

150 Cf. Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 5.73 *honos ab onere: itaque honestum dicitur quod oneratum et dictum: onus est honos qui sustinet rem publicam.* The idea is commonplace: cf. Otto (1890) 167 s.v. *honos*.

151 See, e.g., Suet. *Aug.* 41 (the details are problematic). Note also Suet. *Aug.* 29.4 *ceteros principes uiros saepe hortatus est ut pro facultate quisque monimentis uel nouis uel refectis et excultis urbem adornarent.* Many of the buildings which he lists belong to the thirties. Also Vell. 2.89.4.

152 See Wirszubski (1950), 91–6.

153 Cf. also Lucr. 2.7–14, esp. *despicere . . . alios contendere nobilitate | noctes atque dies niti praestante labore | ad summas emergere opes rerumque potiri.*

154 Vell. 2.88.2 and Woodman (1983) ad loc.; Sen. *Epist.* 114, etc.

155 For a more cynical view of Agrippa and the quest for *gloria*, see Dio 49.4.2–4. Perhaps the example of the traitor Salvidienus Rufus prompted a re-evaluation of *gloria*: *qui natus obscurissimis initiis parum habebat summa accepisse . . . nisi in id ascendisset e quo infra se et Caesarem uideret et rem publicam* (Vell. 2.76.4).

156 But even Velleius (2.88.2) describes Maecenas as *otio ac mollitiis paene ultra feminam fluens*. Dancing is a stock item of abuse: see Cic. *Pis.* 18 with Nisbet (1961) ad loc., Woodman (1983) on Vell. 2.83.2.

157 Cf. Syme (1964), 218 'In the prologue of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* "potentia paucorum" denotes three men, precisely (3.4)'.

158 Not really a flattering phrase: Fortuna was proverbially *indignorum fautrix* (Plin. *Nat.* 2.22). Cf. Rudd (1966), 41.

159 Sallust would have characterised such *labor/industria* as *dolis atque fallaciis*: see *Cat.* 11.1–2 with Earl (1961), 10–11.

160 But this is not to suggest a direct debt. Both poets found the device in diatribe: see e.g. Wallach (1976), index s.v. interlocutor, imaginary.

161 See Rudd (1960), 161–89; Rudd (1966), 132–59 (with reference to earlier work); Treggiari (1973), 245–61.

162 Syme (1939), 191: they are listed conveniently with full reference to the sources by Drumann–Groebe (1899), 1.470–4.

163 App. *Bell. ciu.* 4.45 and 50. For Balbinus, see Wistrand (1958), 43–5. The *latrones* Caelius and Birrus (1.4.69) may also have been Pompeian supporters: cf. *Epod.* 4.19.

164 App. *Bell. ciu.* 4.18; Val. Max. 9.11.6.
165 Porphyrio identified Hypsaea (1.2.91) as a Plautia Hypsaea. What connection she might have had with P. Plautius Hypsaeus is unknowable. He had once been a legate of Pompeius Magnus but was abandoned by him in 52 and convicted *de ambitu*: no more is heard of him. Porphyrio also identified Nomentanus (1.1.102; 1.8.11) as L. Cassius Nomentanus; but see Rudd (1966), 142; Syme (1964), 283 and Wiseman (1971), 115.
166 For the death of Cassius Parmensis, see Vell. 2.87.3 and Woodman (1983) ad loc.; Val. Max. 1.7.7. Cf. Syme (1978*a*), 52.
167 Cf. Beare (1964), 155–8.
168 See Rudd (1966), 120; 147; Treggiari (1969), 118–19, who prefers not to accept the identification of Pitholaus with M'. Otacilius (vel sim.) as proposed by Lewis (1966), 271–2.
169 For a full survey of the problems connected with Furius Bibaculus, see Wigodsky (1972), 148–50; and cf. Rudd (1966), 289–90; Lyne (1978), 171.
170 See Cic. *Ad fam.* 7.1.1, who also is disparaging about his literary standards. For the theatre and the Pompeii in the thirties see Vell. 2.79.6 and n. 132 above.
171 App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.139. One could perhaps add Demetrius (1.10.79; 90) who shares his (very common) name with a notorious freedman favourite of Pompeius Magnus (for whom see Treggiari (1969), 184–5).
172 See Rudd (1966), 137; 292; Nisbet–Hubbard (1970), 227–8; Syme (1964), 281.
173 See Broughton (1968), Supplement 4; Wiseman (1971), 279 no. 521. The restoration of the *nomen* is not certain.
174 It is not however clear when Pompeius actually took charge of Achaea: App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.77; Dio 48.46.1.
175 Rudd (1966), 143 and 145; Wiseman (1971), 114; Syme (1964*a*), 115–16.
176 App. *Bell. ciu.* 5.139.
177 See Treggiari (1969), 269–70.
178 Notably Fraenkel (1957), 86 and Rudd (1966), 292–3.
179 Note the verbal echoes and variations in: 1.2.3: *cantoris . . . Tigelli*; 1.3.1–8: *cantoribus . . . cantore . . . Tigellius . . . citaret . . . resonat*; 1.3.129: *Hermogenes cantor*; 1.4.72–6: *Hermogenisque Tigelli . . . recito . . . recitent . . . resonat*; 1.9.25: *Hermogenes . . . canto*; 1.10.18–19: *Hermogenes . . . doctus cantare*; 1.10.80: *Hermogenis . . . Tigelli*; 1.10.90: *Tigelli*.
180 With more or less improbability, unitarians can suppose that Horace wrote 1.2 in response to a premature report of Tigellius' death; that the opening lines of 1.2 are a last-minute addition or rewriting prior to publication; that Tigellius had held a mock funeral, like Trimalchio! Separatists may suppose that the living Hermogenes is the dead man's son or freedman.
181 The names in this group – Hermogenes, Demetrius and Pantilius (1.10.78–80) – sound like the names of freedmen and of course Sextus was particularly associated with freedmen in contemporary propaganda. They are also distinct from and opposed to both the immediate friends of Maecenas (1.10.81–3) and the distinguished political supporters of Octavian and Antonius (1.10.85–6).
182 I am most grateful to Prof. E. J. Kenney and Mr R. Seager for their comments and encouragement. They are not, of course, to blame for any errors of fact and judgement which may remain.

3 THE LOVER AND THE STATESMAN

1 Drew (1927), 67–72.
2 Drew (1927), 76–8.
3 Nadeau (1982).
4 As Petronius says (112) in his story of the Widow of Ephesus *ceterum scitis quid plerumque soleat temptare humanam satietatem*, words followed by a clear allusion to Aeneas, Anna, Dido: *nec deformis aut infacundus castae uidebatur conciliante ancilla ac subinde dicente: 'placitone pugnabis amori?'*
5 Griffin (1977).
6 Nadeau (1983).
7 Knox (1950). The recurrence of the imagery of snakes in Book 8 and in other Books of the *Aeneid* is noted by Knox.
8 Knox (1950), note 37.
9 Nadeau (1983).
10 In Nadeau (1970) I demonstrated that Juv. 10.148–50 is a parody of these lines of the *Georgics*. The present essay attempts to demonstrate that the land of Egypt in the *Georgics*, inasmuch as it is the land where the Roman proneness to Love is expiated and exorcised, is the counterpart of the land of Dido (i.e. Carthage) in the *Aeneid*. The description in Juvenal is of the land of Hannibal (the most famous of the descendants of Dido). Juvenal's parody, which links the Carthaginian Hannibal with an Egyptian landscape, is now shown therefore to have an additional literary point in that it indicates an awareness in Juvenal of a connection between this description of Egypt in the *Georgics* and the land of Dido in the *Aeneid*.
11 Nadeau (1970) and (1977).
12 Crabbe (1977).
13 Griffin (1979).
14 West (1967), 38–9.
15 For which see Rawson (1975).
16 Nadeau (1983).
17 Nadeau (1983).
18 Nadeau (1983).
19 *Epist.* 1.19; see West (1967), 48.
20 Otis (1975), 97–8.
21 Cf. Hor. *Odes* 3.6 and Nadeau (1983).

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP
32 East 57th Street, New York, NY 10022, USA
296 Beaconsfield Parade, Middle Park, Melbourne 3206, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1984

First published 1984

Printed in Great Britain by
the University Press, Cambridge

Library of Congress catalogue card number: 83–14478

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Woodman, Tony
Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus.
1. Latin poetry—History and criticism
2. Rome—Politics and government—30 B.C.–68 A.D.
I. Title II. West, David
871'.01 PA6047

ISBN 0 521 24553 2

CONTENTS

Frontispiece: the Gemma Augustea (onyx cameo) in the Antikensammlung of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (no. AS IX A 79)

Prologue — *page* vii

1 HORACE'S *EPODES* AND HISTORY
R. G. M. NISBET — 1

2 HORACE AND MAECENAS: The propaganda value of *Sermones* I
I. M. LE M. DUQUESNAY — 19

3 THE LOVER AND THE STATESMAN: A study in apiculture (Virgil, *Georgics* 4.281–558)
YVAN NADEAU — 59

4 HORACE'S FIRST ROMAN ODE
TONY WOODMAN — 83

5 THE *AENEID* AND CARTHAGE
E. L. HARRISON — 95

6 CYBELE, VIRGIL AND AUGUSTUS
T. P. WISEMAN — 117

7 PROPERTIUS AND THE BATTLE OF ACTIUM (4.6)
FRANCIS CAIRNS — 129

8 *FABVLA PROPOSITO NVLLA TEGENDA MEO:* Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan politics
J. C. MCKEOWN — 169

9 EPILOGUE — 189

Notes — 197

Abbreviations and bibliography — 242

Select indexes — 259