



Horace Carm. 1. 32 and the Dedication of the Temple of Apollo Palatinus

Charles L. Babcock

Classical Philology, Vol. 62, No. 3. (Jul., 1967), pp. 189-194.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-837X%28196707%2962%3A3%3C189%3AHC13AT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>

Classical Philology is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Leg. 2. 31), he was opposed principally to the agrarian law (*Vir. ill.* 66. 4), which many Italians opposed (cf. Badian, *FC*, pp. 217 f.). The choice of Philippus and Perperna as censors ostensibly to enrol the Italians may have been a prudent move on the part of the government, which did not really want the Italians to be enfranchised. The one man's proximity to *novitas* is attested by his name; the other's past career should have attested that the Italians' hopes were merely being delayed rather than deceived. For a different interpretation, see E. Badian, "Waiting for Sulla," *JRS*, LII (1962), 56.

34. *CRR*, No. 562a. For variant datings, see *MRR*, II, 436; Pink, *op. cit.* (n. 7 above), p. 31.

35. *MRR*, I, 431 f.

36. *CRR*, No. 574 f. For variant datings, see *MRR*, II, 446 (cf. *MRR*, Supplement, p. 41); Pink, *op. cit.* (n. 7 above), p. 31.

37. *CRR*, No. 712.

38. See Taylor, *op. cit.* (n. 33 above), p. 234.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 233 f.

40. *CRR*, Nos. 578 f.

41. *Ibid.*, Nos. 580 f.

42. *Ibid.*

43. *MRR*, II, 532.

44. Cf. Pink, *op. cit.* (n. 7 above), p. 31.

45. For the feeling against Saturninus, see T. F. Carney, *A Biography of C. Marius* (Assen, 1962; "Proc. Afr. Class. Assoc.," Suppl. I), pp. 46 f., with notes. Basic sources in Greenidge-Clay, *Sources*², pp. 115 f.

46. The generally accepted date is 104 (cf. *MRR*, I, 560); but H. Last, *CAH*, IX, 165 ("in some year which cannot now be ascertained"), is rightly cautious. Robinson, *op. cit.* (n. 27 above), p. 48, dates the quaestorship between 108 and 104. Cf. F. von der Muehl, *De L. Appuleio Saturnino tribuno plebis* (Diss.; Basle, 1906), p. 56 ("am wahrscheinlichsten 105"). Diod. 36. 12 seems to imply that some time elapsed between his removal from office and his election to the tribunate for 103. To allow time for the correction of his alleged extravagance before July 104, we should date his quaestorship to 105 at the latest.

47. It may be noted that about this time Marius began to pose as a *Neos Dionysos* (Val. Max. 3. 6. 6; Plin. *HN* 33. 150). One of our moneyers (Blasio) minted, in addition to the Saturn type, coins depicting the "man of the people," Scipio Africanus as Jupiter (cf. Alföldi, *op. cit.* [n. 3 above], p. 81). Perhaps Blasio was not solely glorifying a national hero nor was Marius indulging in megalomania. The coincidences would seem to indicate the implication of divine approval for their plans.

48. *CRR*, No. 603.

49. Alföldi, *op. cit.* (n. 3 above), p. 93, thinks this coinage refers to the purchase of grain by the quaes-

tors Piso and Caepio. Cf. Grueber, *CRRBM* (London, 1910), I, 170 f., n. 2, who adds that the type "is an allusion to the *aerarium Saturni*," i.e., to fiscal integrity (advocated by the optimates).

50. *MRR*, I, 576, with n. 5 (on p. 578), The date of Saturninus' proposal is surely 103; see R. J. Rowland, *Roman Grain Legislation, 133-50 B.C.* (Diss.; Philadelphia, 1964), pp. 115-30.

51. "The Date of Piso-Caepio," *NC*, XX (1940), 164-78, esp. 167-74; cf. *CRR ad* 603. Sydenham's argument is ignored by Mattingly, "Roman Numismatics: Further Miscellaneous Notes," *PBA*, XLVI (1960), 251; *Roman Coins*², p. 75; cf. his note in *CRR*, p. 255. Pink, *op. cit.* (n. 7 above), pp. 10, 34, is convinced by Sydenham's arguments.

52. "Caepio and Norbanus," *Historia*, VI (1957), 318-46, esp. 325-28.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 328.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 327.

55. Cic. *Pis.*; cf. Münzer in *RE*, III (1899), 1387, s.v. "Calpurnius" (89).

56. See R. G. M. Nisbet (ed.), Cic. *Pis.* (Oxford, 1961), pp. v, 53 f. See further, L. R. Taylor, *op. cit.* (n. 33 above), p. 311; R. Syme, "Missing Senators," *Historia*, IV (1955), 57 f.

57. The lull, however, is deceptive. I hope to present a paper on this topic in the near future.

58. Sall. *Iug.* 30. 1.

59. *Ibid.* 58. 5, 84. 2; Badian, "Caepio and Norbanus" (n. 52 above), p. 343, and *FC*, pp. 206-25, *passim*.

60. For Apollo as a coin type alluding to the *aurea aetas* at the end of the second century, see Alföldi, *op. cit.* (n. 3 above), p. 88. For a description of the Golden Age in Latium, see esp. Verg. *Aen.* 8. 319-25.

61. Sen. *Epist.* 90. 5.

62. G. Wissowa, *RK* (Munich, 1902), p. 168.

63. Frag. 1 Peter.

64. Varr. *LL* 5. 42.

65. Cf. L. A. Holland, *Janus and the Bridge* (Rome, 1961; "Am. Acad. Rome, Pap. and Monogr.," XXI), pp. 230 f. On Saturn, see Wissowa, *Ausf. Lex. d. griech. u. röm. Mythol.*, hrsg. W. H. Roscher, IV (Leipzig, 1915), 433-36.

66. Macr. *Sat.* 1. 7. 21.

67. *Ibid.* 23.

68. Varr. *LL* 5. 42.

69. Verg. *Aen.* 7. 178-80.

70. *Ibid.* 7. 48 f.; Ov. *Met.* 14. 320; Sil. Ital. 8. 439 f.; Arnob. 2. 71; Augustin. *CD* 18. 5.

71. *Origo* 4. 3.

72. Verg. *Aen.* 7. 203; Ov. *Fast.* 1. 237; Sil. Ital. 3. 11.

73. Wissowa, *Roschers Lexikon* (n. 65 above), 435. 20-35.

74. *Ibid.*, 435. 35-54.

HORACE CARM. 1. 32 AND THE DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE OF APOLLO PALATINUS

The temple of Apollo on the Palatine was one of Augustus' great buildings.¹ In citing his subject's public works Suetonius (*Aug.* 29. 1-3) names it with the forum and temple of Mars Ultor and the temple of Iuppiter Tonans on

the Capitol as those that can be called *vel praecipua*. Associated with the crucial victories over Sextus Pompeius off Sicily and over Cleopatra and Antony at Actium, presiding over one of the earliest and greatest of the pub-

lic libraries at Rome, nearly adjoining the house of the *princeps* himself, this temple shared prominence on the Palatine with that of the Magna Mater and gave truly Roman status to the tutelary deity of Octavian by establishing him for the first time within the *pomerium*.² We are told much about the splendor of the building and its works of art by contemporary writers and by those of the Empire. The dedication on October 8, 28 B.C., was apparently a ceremony of distinction befitting a building of such quality and connections. We have some records of this occasion, the most frequently noted being Horace *Carm.* 1. 31 and Propertius 2. 31.³ I propose as an addition to these records another Ode of Horace, 1. 32, which very probably drew its theme from the opening of the temple and the libraries, and was written at about the same time as 1. 31.⁴

"Quiet introspection fills i. 31 and 32 in which the poet addresses in formulae of prayer the god who is patron of his art and the instrument which symbolizes it."⁵ Collinge has here struck upon the relationship of the two poems that is perhaps most significant, that between the god in 31 and his instrument in 32. The two are hymns, and are carefully juxtaposed by Horace. Moreover they are bound together in such a variety of ways that it is difficult not to assume nearly contemporaneous composition.

Most obvious of these ties is that of address to Apollo and to his lyre. Verbal ties are essentially confined to the opening and closing portions of each poem; but they are extensive, obvious, and seem to reflect considerable calculation on the part of the poet.⁶ *Carm.* 1. 31 is in Alcaic meter; 1. 32 is Sapphic.⁷ The structural similarities, aside from the hymnic form that calls for address to the god or lyre at the beginning and the end of the poem, are limited.⁸ These considerations, in accord with the variety of practice exercised by Horace in arranging his collection, offer corroboration to my thesis if the Ode in question contains the proof.

In proposing a topical interpretation of 1. 32 I consider three elements pertinent: references to the occasion and the temple, references to Horace and Octavian at the time of composi-

tion, and the interrelation developed among Alcaeus, Horace, and Octavian in the course of presenting these references.

Propertius in 2. 31 indicates that at least two of the representations of Apollo in or near the new temple showed the god as player of the lyre.⁹ There was a statue in the portico (5-6), "hic equidem Phoebus visus mihi pulchrior ipso / marmoreus tacita carmen hiare lyra," and one inside the temple (15-16), "deinde inter matrem deus ipse interque sororem / Pythius in longa carmina veste sonat."¹⁰ Hence two prominent and important likenesses of the god are, not surprisingly, in his peaceful capacity as patron of the Muses and poets. The suitability of the ending given by Horace to his occasional poem 1. 31 (*nec cithara carentem*) will now be clear as a reminder of the temple's emphasis. *Carm.* 1. 32 no less evokes the peaceful instrument of Apollo, to which the Ode addresses a prayer as to the god; in fact, Horace has used the lyre as the device by which he directly associates the poem with the occasion. The ritual language of the conclusion (*mihi . . . salve / rite vocanti*) stresses the solemnity of the dedication, and the whole final quatrain elevates the tone of the Ode. *Dapibus* in particular in the association of Apollo with Jupiter is significant. Not only does this aggrandizement of the lyre comment logically on the prominence of the personal god of Octavian in relation to the chief god of the state's Capitoline triad, but it also notes the previous month's celebration of the *ludi Romani*, distinguished on September 13 by the *epulum Iovis* and the commemoration of the dedication of the temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus.¹¹ The *VII viri epulones* had recently (certainly by 28 B.C.) been raised to the rank of a major priestly college, and the *epulum Iovis* would have been of special note under such circumstances.¹² Apollo is clearly to share the center of the stage with Jupiter as his temple shares prominence over the city with that of Jupiter on the Capitoline; a decade later the central role of the two offspring of Latona in the *ludi saeculares* and in Horace's state hymn shows the extent to which this adjustment had been effected.

Two features of the temple would be most

obvious to those observing its construction and dedication. Octavian vowed it in connection with his struggle with, and ultimate victory over, Sextus Pompeius in the great sea battles off Sicily in 36 B.C. (Vell. Pat. 2. 81. 3). It further served to fulfil his devotion to the god whose favor brought him victory in the naval battle at Actium five years later. Among his other epithets in connection with this temple the god is called *navalis* (Prop. 4. 1. 3) and *Actius* (Prop. 4. 6. 67), and some special connection with naval affairs may have been developed for the temple.¹³ Lines 6–8 of 1. 32 are suggestive of these qualifications. No less distinctive were the temple's libraries, one Greek and one Latin; Horace was ambitious that his writings be admitted to the latter, and to that library and Horace's aim I would refer the literary content of 1. 32.¹⁴

If the dating of the appearance of the second book of Satires to 30 B.C. and of the Epodes to 29 is correct, Horace found himself in 28 B.C. near the beginning of a new venture. For ten years he had been working on two types of verse, the hexameter satire and the iambic epode (or verses in different meters that he chose to associate with his iambs). The evidence of the Epodes shows the poet's encounter with the Greek iambists and lyricists, and to a large extent the effect they are to have on his own lyric efforts. In *Epist.* 1. 19. 21–34 Horace reviewed the course he followed, and certainly by the year 28 he had reached that stage of development whereby he, in Latin verse, had followed the direction he attributes to Sappho and Alcaeus in Greek, that is, a modification of the Archilochean substance and temperament (lines 26–31). The program outlined in 1. 32 will lead, some five years later, to the publication of the first three books of the Odes. Horace describes in some detail, and in language and figures that are to become familiar in the Odes, the process of transition from the Archilochean mode to the Alcaean.¹⁵ Phoebus' lyre will aid him in producing a Latin lyric, to be cast in the manner of Alcaeus: it is to be patriotic and vigorous, but at the same time have a generous place for those other inspirers of verse—Liber, the Muses, Venus, and Cupid. The mordant quality will yield as Hor-

ace rejects the method and tone of Archilochus, but not the verse it has inspired (“quod et hunc in annum / vivat et pluris”).

It is a remarkable achievement that Horace manages to combine in this brief prayer his sense of pride in his experiments, his decision to modify them extensively with his new mission, and the indication that this modification will be broad enough to retain in his *Latinum carmen* the diversity of an Alcaeus. Civic responsibility, a part of the traditional character of Alcaeus, is prominent in the *persona* of the poet of the Odes. No less does Horace evoke the spirit of Alcaeus and develop his own *persona* when he turns to the patrons of love and wine, who share with Apollo responsibility for poets.¹⁶ The pursuits of peace are now to be fostered, and literary activity will play its many roles, not the least of which is that of *laborum/dulce lenimen*.

The figure of Alcaeus in 1. 32 gives topical depth to that of Horace; the two together are used to introduce one whose dominant position in the state and on this occasion allows less direct allusion. Octavian had closed his career as *ferox bello* with the triple triumph of August 13–15, 29 B.C. Victor on land (*inter arma*) and on sea (*iactatam . . . navim*), he has turned to a constructive program over which the god who had brought him victory in Sicily and at Actium will continue to preside. When Horace selects the gods of whom Alcaeus sings to evoke the spirit of love during his soldiering, they are no less appropriate to the verse efforts of the *fidicen Latinus* and to the position and the program of Octavian in 28 B.C.¹⁷

This interrelation of the figures of Alcaeus, Horace, and Octavian, each of whom emphasized his function as *civis*, resolves itself unexpectedly but typically in the gentle picture of Lycus, a lyric type and representative here of the literary pretensions of the new regime. The modulation in lines 5–10 from a warlike to a peaceful tone reflects the period of transition in which no amount of concealment could erase the memory of the wars just ended, but when an air of activity and change could offer a bridge to the new world in preparation. Through the device *decorum . . . decus* in 12–13 Horace returns to his invocation to the lyre

(13-16), but retains in this quatrain a reminder of the healing power of literature, *laborum / dulce lenimen*, which he stresses in similar figurative language again with reference to Octavian in *Carm.* 3. 4. 37-40:

vos Caesarem altum, militia simul
fessas cohortis abdidit oppidis,
finire quaerentem labores
Perio recreatis antro.¹⁸

I have suggested that Horace has placed together in Book One of the Odes two poems that owe their writing to the dedication of the temple of Apollo Palatinus, and therefore were written late in 28 B.C. In neither does Horace undertake the dramatic sketch with description of the temple that Propertius offers.

Rather Horace has in characteristic fashion made use of this event to develop two themes. The theme of *Carm.* 31 is satisfaction with the moderate life, continued good health, and poetic inspiration; that of *Carm.* 32, which by my interpretation becomes the more topical of the two, is controlled change, as represented by the versatility of Alcaeus, by the aspirations of Horace to be as versatile in the Latin lyric he seeks to develop, and by the intentions of Octavian for Rome, to which he has brought peace through the assistance of the god honored by this temple, a god whom he has chosen to symbolize the promise of his regime.

CHARLES L. BABCOCK

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1. References to the temple of Apollo Palatinus are assembled in S. B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 16-19, and G. Lugli, *Roma antica* (Rome, 1946), pp. 434-41. An impression of the site can be had from E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London, 1961), I, 31-32, with a recent bibliography.

2. Asconius (*ad Cic. in tog. cand.* 81) says that at the time of Cicero's speech (64 B.C.) the only temple of Apollo at Rome was that "extra portam Carmentalem inter forum holitorium et circum Flaminium," which we call Apollo Sostianus from its restoration by the consul of 32 B.C.

3. Lugli errs (p. 435) in listing Propertius 4. 6 in place of 2. 31 as written for the occasion. The former mentions Augustus by that name and is certainly later than 28 B.C. Butler and Barber in their Commentary

be taken. I have no intention of imagining Horace as a participant in the opening ceremonies or as strolling through the precinct and bursting into song at the sight of the god's statue. Fraenkel further cautions, on 1. 32 as it happens (p. 176), "Generally speaking, our satisfaction at being able to affix a date to one more poem should never be bought at the price of misrepresenting the thought of the poet." I accept this caution and subscribe to it; but I believe that the relationship of these poems and the content of the second justify any risk of misrepresentation.

5. N. E. Collinge, *The Structure of Horace's Odes* (London, 1961), p. 49, from his chapter "Contrast-technique I: The Order of the Odes."

6. I list the connective elements that may fairly be considered verbal ties, whether of similar or contrasting nature:

32

1 poscitur
1/2 vacui sub umbra / lusimus
3/4 age dic Latinum, / barbite, carmen
14 testudo
13 Phoebi
15 mihi . . . salve
16 rite vocanti

(Oxford, 1933), pp. 355-59, refer 4. 6 to a celebration of the *ludi quinquennales*, perhaps in 16 B.C., the year in which Augustus was in Gaul in connection with Lollius' defeat by the Sygambri, who are mentioned in line 77.

4. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), to whose excellent comment on 1. 32 as a hymn (pp. 168-76) I occasionally take exception, has warned in writing of the *Carmen saeculare* and *Carm.* 4. 6 (pp. 404-6) that "a Horatian ode has no place in the sphere of any actual events, such as for instance the celebration of a religious ceremony, but serves rather as an ideal screen on to which certain ideas and emotions arising out of, or connected with, some actual events may be projected." In this light my remarks on 1. 32 should

31

1 poscit
19/20 nec turpem senectam / degere
20 nec cithara carentem

1-18 Apollinem, Latoe
17/18 mihi / . . . dones
2/3 vates . . . orat . . . / fundens

I am inclined to wince a bit at Collinge's "Ingenuity can produce remarkable results, but also saddeningly shallow and excessively neat results, by employing the criterion of likeness of topic (with or without verbal reinforcement), or the twin criteria of like topic and balanced metre" (p. 42), but his slightly more permissive remarks on pp. 54-55 are comforting. These few items seem to me to be fairly clear and mechanical, and not the forced product of my "ingenuity."

Poscitur to me is a better reading than *poscimus*, though both are appropriate to the dramatic situation I propose. Cf. the discussion of Fraenkel (p. 171), who favors *poscimus* with Bentley. *poscitur* is far more likely to have been altered; the sounds *-mur si* are more likely than *-mus si*, and the dramatic effect of

the opening word-sentence is highly desirable, though unparalleled in Horace.

7. The juxtaposition is neither unusual nor striking (cf., e.g., the alternation of the first 11 Odes of Book 2), but of some point when one considers the similarities in the two poems herein noted. The general problem (to me unsolved) of the relation between subject and metrical form seems to me here best met by recognizing two early and experimental treatments of a topical situation in different meters, with results of some difference in tone (as in intent) but with no cryptic meaning intended by the use of either meter. Cf. the rather too confident comments of J. Perret, *Horace*, trans. by B. Humez (New York, 1964), pp. 77-79, on the correlation of meter to meaning.

8. Contrast is more to be stressed. Collinge, e.g., classifies 31 as "non-responsive" and "progressive" (p. 69, esp. n. 1), and 32 as "responsive" and "symmetrical" (pp. 70, 80 n. 1, and 112-13), and would, I suppose, consider it "static" (the definitions are on pp. 57-58). There seems to be some confusion in the "Addendum: Hymnic odes in Horace," on p. 126, where a static quality is imputed to 31 through comparison to 1. 24. Of course a certain symmetrical structure in 31 is evidenced by the bracketing of the passage on renunciation of wealth with the opening and closing lines of reference to the god.

9. I use the word "lyre" as a general term for *lyra*, *barbiton*, *cithara* and *testudo*.

10. I accept here the conclusion of H. Last, "The *Tabula Hebana* and *Propertius* II, 31," *JRS*, XLIII (1953), 27-29, that this difficult elegy really does mention two different statues of Apollo. Cf. the discussion of the difficulties in the Commentary of Butler and Barber, pp. 246-48. P. W. Damon and W. C. Helmbold, "The Structure of *Propertius*, Book 2," *UCPCPh* XIV: 6 (1952), 237, accept the transposition of Dousa of lines 5-8 to follow line 16 (Last notes on p. 29 that Dousa seems to have moved only 5-6), and in a note (70, p. 247) on their comment L. A. MacKay suggests avoiding the transposition and the second statue by emending 5 *Hic equidem Phoebo* to *Hic Linus* et or est *Phoebo*. Wanting justification for such transposition or emendation I would retain the two statues.

11. G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*² (Munich, 1912), pp. 296-97 (cf. pp. 75-76), suggests that the emergence of Apollo as the patron deity of the *princeps* brought with it a temporary lessening of the importance of Jupiter's role. Some support for this theory can be seen in the later transfer of the Sibylline books from Jupiter's temple to that of Apollo. As evidence of the emergence of the gods closely associated with the Julians to the possible loss of Jupiter, one might also cite the transfer of the Parthian standards from the Capitoline to the temple of Mars Ultor and the concomitant transfer of emphasis in triumphal matters from the sphere of Jupiter to that of Mars (as they had shifted from the sphere of the Senate to that of the *princeps*). On the *ludi Romani* and the *epulum Iovis* see esp. W. Warde Fowler, *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic* (London, 1925), pp. 215-20. I do not suggest that the lyre was actually employed at this rather literal feast, but that Horace has extended the idea of a feast with *dapibus*. On the representation of Apollo Actius as *citharoedus* see J. Gagé, *Apollon romain* ("Bibl. Éc. fran. Ath.

et Rome," CXXII [1955]), pp. 514-15; Pl. VI; and Apollo Palatinus in the same representation, 532 ff.

12. Cf. M. H. Lewis, *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians* (Rome, 1955; "Am. Acad. Rome Pap. and Mon.," XVI), p. 11 and esp. n. 23.

13. Cf. Lugli, *op. cit.*, p. 436, and Gagé, *op. cit.*, pp. 540, 545-46 (who questions whether the iconography of Apollo here included the Actian *rostra*). Both Lugli here and Platner-Ashby, *op. cit.*, p. 18, mistakenly refer Ov. *Met.* 13. 715 to this temple; that passage clearly mentions the temple at Actium as giving the god the epithet *Actiacus*.

14. Horace mentions the library several times later (cf. *Epist.* 1. 3. 15-17 and 2. 1. 214-18). In the latter passage entrance into the library is part of the spur Augustus is to apply to the poets. In *Epist.* 2. 2. 91-96 Horace is clearly joking about the advantages of admission to his elegiac friend and himself to the *vacuam Romanis vatibus aedem*; the ambiguity of *vacuam* ("empty of" or "with room for") lends to the humor, as it has worried commentators (cf. Kiessling-Heinze⁸ *ad loc.*).

15. *Lusimus* in particular is a fine example of Horace's ability to make subtle use of the full potential of a word. In this context and with no untoward forcing it can mean "to play," "to produce playfully" and "to imitate"; from these meanings and from the whole metaphor the erotic sense, both literary and actual, is evoked. I include both Satires and Epodes in the *ludicra* that Horace is here laying aside, since he himself seems to do so. In *Epist.* 1. 1. 10, as he turns to philosophy, he remarks "nunc itaque et versus et cetera ludicra pono"; in the same letter *antiquo . . . ludo* (3) need not be limited to the lyrics, as has been the tendency because of Horace's bitter reaction to criticism of the Odes in *Epist.* 1. 19. Horace characterizes the Satires in a cynical passage (*Serm.* 1. 10. 37) with the same tone, *haec ego ludo*. Therefore, although in 1. 32 the address to the lyre and the limitation *lusimus tecum* certainly suggest the Epodes or early Odes primarily, I consider the renunciation a more general one. Cf. H. Wagenvoort's persuasive remarks on the broad potential of *Ludus poeticus* in *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (Leyden, 1956), pp. 29-42. S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace* (New Haven and London, 1962), pp. 295-96, also discusses the various uses of the *ludere* concept (as representing lyric).

16. Commager, *op. cit.*, pp. 337-39, has some excellent thoughts on this juxtaposition of Bacchus with less violent gods as inspirers of verse. See esp. the comment of this passage (p. 339), which notes that Bacchus, Alcaeus, and Horace all combine the convivial with the more serious.

17. Liber, as god of fertility and wine, is Italian; by the use of this name in preference to that of Bacchus, Horace puts forward a rustic deity most appropriate to the land grants and agricultural emphases of Octavian. The Muses call up the arts and sciences and associate their patron Apollo, Augustus' special deity and the god of this temple, with Liber and with Venus. Venus had officially assumed in 46 B.C. her role of *genetrix gentis Iuliae* with the dedication of her temple in Caesar's new forum, and the importance of her relationship with Octavian would have been further stressed in August of 29 when Octavian dedicated the temple of Divus Iulius. Venus' other function is

announced by the appearance of Cupid; the two of them, with the boy Lycus, represent the essence of erotic lyric.

18. In both instances the *princeps* is to be considered as a symbol and not cited for his personal literary activities. In the Roman Ode he is used, as Fraenkel noted (pp. 275 and 281), at that point when Horace

returns in his discussion of the powers of the Muses from the personal level to that of the initial lines of the poem. These lines (37–40) lead directly to the much discussed “vos lene consilium et datis et dato / gaudetis almae” (40–41), and they are central to the figurative structure of the whole Ode, and perhaps of the whole cycle.

PROCLUS *IN PARM.* 1152. 33 (COUSIN) AND
PARMENIDES 28B3 (DIELS-KRANZ)

In a recent study on Parmenides, Dr. Mansfeld takes Proclus *in Parm.* 1152. 33, ταῦτόν δ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖ νοεῖν τε καὶ εἶναι, to be a quotation of Parmenides 28B3; and he maintains that, however imperfect that quotation may be, there is no justification for the failure on the part of Diels and Kranz to mention that this fragment was known to Proclus.¹ Dr. Mansfeld knows that Diels in his book on Parmenides included this passage of Proclus' as one of the sources of fragment 3 of Parmenides.² But the reference was dropped from *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. I do not know what was Diels's specific reason for dropping this reference. Perhaps what caused him to do so was the fact that the quotation by Proclus is so colored with his Neo-Platonism that it is worthless for the establishment of the text of Parmenides. When I recently edited the fragments of Parmenides,³ I excluded Proclus as a source of fragment 3 for the following reason. *In Parm.* 1152. 18 ff. is part of Proclus' commentary on Plato *Parm.* 138B7–8. It is Proclus' purpose to show that Parmenides anticipated Plato in holding that the ἐν ὄν is both at rest and in motion. To show that Parmenides did hold the first point, Proclus quotes 28B8. 4, 26, 29, and 30; to prove the second point he quotes ταῦτόν δ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖ νοεῖν τε καὶ εἶναι followed by 28B8. 35–36 and 28B4. 1. That is, Proclus takes his second point as established because he thinks that Parmenides identified thought and Being, and in so doing, Proclus concludes, he must have attributed to Being an intellectual kind of movement, a point noticed by Plato⁴ (in the *Sophist*). I am not concerned here with Proclus' interpretation of Parmenides; but the fact that ταῦτόν δ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖ νοεῖν τε καὶ εἶναι is followed by a quotation of 28B8. 35–36 makes it possible

to consider that with these words Proclus may be paraphrasing not 28B3, but 28B8. 34, ταῦτόν δ' ἐστὶ νοεῖν τε καὶ οὐνεκεν ἔστι νόημα. Leaving aside the Neo-Platonic ἐκεῖ, which is neither in 28B3 nor in 28B8. 34, ταῦτόν δ' ἐστὶν . . . νοεῖν τε καὶ reproduces very closely 28B8. 34, but not 28B3, τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστὶν τε καὶ εἶναι. It is true that after τε καὶ Proclus gives εἶναι (the last word in 28B3), but it is intelligible that Proclus should give εἶναι instead of οὐνεκεν ἔστι νόημα, for (a) by this substitution he makes clear that Parmenides identified Being and thought and (b) Simplicius, who *does not* quote 28B3, reads into 28B8. 34–36 the same Neo-Platonic identification of Being and thought, although the use given by Simplicius to this identification that he reads into Parmenides is not the same as that of Proclus *in Parm.* 1152. 38 ff.; cf. Simplicius *Phys.*, p. 87. 10–18: καὶ ἀμέριστον δεκνὺς καὶ ἀκίνητον καὶ τέλος πάντων καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ νοῦν καὶ νοητὸν καὶ νόησιν, καὶ τοῦτο οὐ παρὰ Πλάτωνος μόνου ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ Παρμενίδου λαβὼν λέγοντος, “ταῦτόν . . . νοεῖν” (28B8. 34–36). ἔνεκα γὰρ τοῦ νοητοῦ, ταῦτόν δὲ εἶπεῖν τοῦ ὄντος, ἐστὶ τὸ νοεῖν τέλος ὄν αὐτοῦ. (See also Simplicius *Phys.*, p. 144. 16–25 and p. 148. 20–22.) In short, although absolute certainty is impossible, Proclus *in Parm.* 1152. 33 is more likely to be a paraphrase of 28B8. 34 than of 28B3 and, whether this was the reason that decided Diels and Kranz to exclude Proclus as a source of 28B3 or not, Dr. Mansfeld should have considered this possibility before blaming Diels and Kranz for what he takes to be their failure to mention an important source.

LEONARDO TARÁN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES