Horace's Mythological Lexicon:
Repeated Myths and Meaning in *Odes* 1-3

Blanche Conger McCune
Augusta, Georgia

B.A., Wheaton College, 2007
M.A., University of Virginia, 2009

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics

University of Virginia
May, 2014

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines repeated mythological references in the first three books of Horace's *Odes*. Several mythological figures occur more than once in the *Odes*; those studied in this dissertation are Daedalus and Icarus, Prometheus, Tantalus, Hercules, and Castor and Pollux. I argue that in *Odes* 1-3 recurrent myths constitute part of a personal lexicon, a mythological vocabulary Horace uses to speak about themes such as *hubris*, poetry, and immortality; for example, Daedalus and Icarus, Prometheus, and Tantalus are consistently linked with immoderation, and Hercules and the Dioscuri are consistently emblematic of complementary aspects of Augustus' rule and of his future deification. This mythological lexicon can be read across poems so that the interpretation of a mythological figure in one poem can aid in understanding the use of the same mythological figure in another poem, and the collective effect of all of the uses of that figure is itself something that can be analyzed and interpreted.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first word of thanks goes to my advisor, Jenny Strauss Clay, whose *Odes* seminar in the spring of 2010 first taught me how to love this seemingly impenetrable poet. She has consistently supported and guided me, since I first embarked on this project, even during one year when neither of us was in residence in Charlottesville. Her ability to ask the right questions and to put her finger on key problems has left a lasting impression on my thinking for which I am deeply grateful. Thanks are also due to John F. Miller, whose kind and sensible advice at every stage of the process, from the prospectus through the final chapter, has been invaluable. I am also grateful to Tony Woodman, who has been a warm, inspiring figure in my development as a classicist both by encouraging me to sharpen my ideas and by inviting open-ended conversations about Horace. Thanks also to Paul Cantor, whose European literature course helped me become a better teacher and enriched my appreciation for the whole compass of the literary tradition in which Horace is situated.

I would also like to thank the dear friends and mentors each of whom has in their own way played a crucial role throughout not only this project but also everything that led up to it: Rachel Bruzzone, Jane Webb Crawford, Courtney Evans, Harriet Livesay, Sarah J. Miller, and Randall Nichols.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to my parents, without whose support over the years this whole venture would have been impossible, to my brother Preston, who listens well, and to Nannie, for reading me books. And, finally, to my husband and fellow scholar Adam, for his unflagging help as sounding board and writing consultant.

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Part I: Mythology and Moderation

Chapter 1: Daedalus and Icarus 15

Chapter 2: Prometheus and Tantalus 67

Part II: Mythology and Deification

Chapter 3: Hercules 110

Chapter 4: Castor and Pollux 155

Conclusion 198

Introduction

W. J. Henderson, speaking about Horace's use of the *paraklausithyron* motif in the *Odes*, writes,

> Horace . . . varies that motif in length, tone, context and ingredient elements; seldom is there repetition, the total picture of the motif growing in the reader's mind over several poems; there is a deliberate invitation to the reader to compare the various occurrences and applaud the poet's technical finesse.[1]

Many such repeated motifs—e.g., *carpe diem*, wine, "too old for love"—can be found running throughout the *Odes*, and studies of them often find that, far from revealing a lack of imagination, they form by means of repetition and variation an interdependent network of poems that have a total effect on the mind of the reader.[2] However, as Commager concludes in his examination of the "Function of Wine in Horace's Odes,"

> The relation of a critic to a poet tends to be that of some uneasy Procrustes, confronted by a Proteus. Yet if Horace's imagination defies any rigorous arrangement, we may at least define the shapes it seems to assume. . . . The relations between these aspects of wine and the wine god are felt rather than formulated, obscure rather than precise. Horace appears to be seeking a vocabulary to express feelings not susceptible to ordinary discourse. Wine, the banquet, the various gods, and the country itself, seem invoked in order to conceptualize something for which there was no ready language, and which in any case is perhaps best conveyed in semi-metaphorical terms.[3]

---

[1] Henderson (1973) 66.

[2] Cf. Johnson's (2003) reading of the Lydia poems as a dramatic sequence, another example of repetition (this time not of a motif but a character) aiding in the interpretation of the connected poems.

[3] Commager (1957) 80. Cf. similar comments by P. A. Miller on the subtlety of the connections between Horace's odes and their perception in the mind of the reader (Miller

This "vocabulary" of motifs and *topoi* is part of Horace's poetic toolbox; it allows him to create poems that build on or comment on one another, which makes each poem, each repetition of the *topos*, more meaningful.

I argue that Horace does much the same thing with repeated mythological figures and motifs in the *Odes* 1-3.[4] Myths, repeated, become a personal lexicon, a mythological language Horace uses to speak about themes such as *hubris*, poetry, and immortality. This mythological lexicon, like the vocabulary of *topoi*, can be read across poems so that the interpretation of a mythological figure in one poem can aid in understanding the use of the same mythological figure in another poem, and the collective effect of all of the uses of that figure is itself something that can be analyzed and interpreted.

Previous scholarship on mythology in Horace

As Breuer points out, mythology is a key recurring element in the *Odes* which have proportionally more mythological content than the *Epodes*, *Satires*, and *Epistles*.[5]

[1991] 366).

[4] I deal here only with the unity of the first three books of the *Odes*. It is possible Horace uses the same mythological lexicon in the later, fourth book, but (apart from a short excursus to 4.2 in the first chapter) I will not discuss in this dissertation instances of myths from Book 4.

[5] Breuer (2008) 17.

However, all of Horace's poetry is infused with mythological references[6] and narratives, and there is a long history of scholarship on this mythological content. Previous approaches to the topic "myth in Horace" can generally be put into the following categories: *cataloguing without grouping* (that is, essentially listing references), *cataloguing with grouping* (that is, references are put into categories, but we are still dealing to some extent with a list), *dealing with myths as* exempla, *interested in gods as gods* (that is, with religion rather than with a view to mythology), or *interested in Horace's technical use of myths in his poems.*

A. Cataloguing without grouping

The first two categories are "cataloguing," a technique that can be divided further into "cataloguing without grouping"—that is, simply making a catalogue—and "cataloguing with grouping"—that is, creating a catalogue but within the catalogue grouping together myths in Horace that have similarities. Previous scholars who have catalogued mythological references in Horace without grouping them include first Olivieri,[7] who lists mythological figures found in art in Pompeii and Herculaneum and

[6] For clarity and convenience (and not so much with theoretical intentions) I will use the term "reference" throughout to mean a reference or allusion to a myth in general, not necessarily to a specific text in which it appears; the term "allusion" will be used to mean a reference/allusion to a specific text (e.g., "This is a reference to the myth of Theseus and Ariadne," "This is an allusion to Catullus 64").

[7] Olivieri (1903).

compares them to Horace. Psichari,[8] another early twentieth-century scholar, lists mythological references from throughout the Horatian corpus and gives "remarks" about the references; he does not attempt to tie them together or use them to interpret the poems in which they appear. Psichari focuses on divinities, though there are some heroes, and their attributes (more of a religious concern) rather than on stories; Bassi,[9] on the other hand, deals not just with gods but also with heroes and famous mortals in the poetry of Horace. Bassi is interested in what moment in each figure's story Horace chooses to portray rather than on simply the bare fact that the figure is mentioned. Finally, Oksala's[10] work on religion and mythology in Horace, the most comprehensive treatment of mythology in Horace, is predominately cataloguing, though there is a section on *exempla* which is more like "cataloguing with grouping."

Before moving on, I will mention briefly here a sort of sub-category of "cataloguing without grouping": works that deal with a single mythological figure throughout Horace, such as Deschamps'[11] study of Horace's use of Venus. These tend to be slightly different, since the smaller scale means that more analysis can be done on the catalogue. In her article on Horace's depiction of Bacchus, Batinski[12] catalogues

---

[8] Psichari (1904).

[9] Bassi (1942-3)

[10] Oksala (1973).

[11] Deschamps (1983).

[12] Batinski (1991).

references and then draws conclusions based on the sum of Horace's depictions and uses of the god. Similarly Hemingson[13] focuses on Horace's use of the god Faunus in the *Odes*, ultimately concluding that Horace consistently depicts Faunus as the protecting patron divinity of Horace's Sabine farm.[14] Marauch[15] does something similar by looking at the three odes to Bacchus together, though his focus does not include the many other references to Bacchus throughout the *Odes*. Finally and most recently Hornbeck[16] has looked at three references to Daedalus and Icarus in the *Odes* and has discussed how Horace uses the figures to talk about poetic mimesis. I will speak more about single-myth scholarship below and how it relates closely to my project.

B. Cataloguing with grouping

The second category of scholarship on mythology in Horace is "cataloguing with grouping." In this category, the myths are not simply listed but grouped together under various headings. Nowak[17] categorizes myths by context (personal judgments, feelings, history, poetics, politics, therapy, and literary enrichment through myth) and stresses the

[13] Hemingson (2008).

[14] Hemingson (2008) 138.

[15] Marauch (1994).

[16] Hornbeck (2014).

[17] Nowak (1981).

appropriateness of the myth to the context. Cremona[18] deals with a few poems and puts those poems into categories based on the myths in them.[19] Finally, Pöschl[20] focuses on three functions of myth in Horace: allegory, exemplum, and symbolism of the creative process.

C. Dealing with myths as exempla

Horace often uses myths as *exempla*, one of Pöschl's categories,[21] and there are several works of scholarship that focus specifically on this aspect of Horace's use of mythology. By comparing *exempla* from different poems, Gall, in his chapter on mythological *exempla* in the *Odes*,[22] notes that Horace often uses suffering heroes as *exempla*. Looking at *exempla* from all of Horace's poetry, Donzelli[23] concludes that Horace uses *exempla* both for moral teaching and for praising encomiastically.

---

[18] Cremona (1993).

[19] "Mito con fine parenetico" (admonitory) (3.11, 3.27), "Miti autobiographici" (4.3, though he briefly alludes to others like 2.7 and 3.3), "Mito e attualità" (current affairs) (Ep. 13), "Mito e storia" (4.6, *Carmen Saeculare*).

[20] Pöschl (1997).

[21] Pöschl (1997).

[22] Gall (1981) 81-117.

[23] Donzelli (1994).

Bradshaw[24] and Pöschl[25] both look at three specific odes (3.7, 3.11, and 3.27 and 1.7, 3.11, and 3.27, respectively) and the *exempla* in each. Bradshaw points out that the mythical elements, which differ in both content and length, in 3.7, 3.11, and 3.27 all teach the same moral, *fides* in love. Bradshaw also goes a step further than simply analyzing how Horace uses *exempla*, since he uses the myths to interpret odes themselves. I will speak more about Brashaw's article below and how it alone of the scholarship in this category is similar to my project.

D. Interested in gods as gods

Yet another category of scholarship on myth in Horace takes a religious angle and is concerned with the gods in Horace not as mythological characters, but rather as objects of religious worship. Cairns[26] discusses Horace's use of Greek models (looking at content and imagined performance context) to show how Horace presents religious material to his educated (and, hence, less credulous) Roman audience. Torraca,[27] writing on the mythical elements in Horace's *Odes*, argues that Horace has a negative portrayal of the gods. Krasser discusses Horace's depiction of his relationship with the gods, especially

[24] Bradshaw (1978).

[25] Pöschl (1981).

[26] Cairns (1971).

[27] Torraca (1973).

Bacchus.[28] In each of these cases there is an interest in how Horace writes about the gods from the standpoint of religion with the goal of discovering Horace's "religion" or attitude towards religion.

E. Interested in Horace's technical use of myths in his poems

Another avenue of investigation is Horace's "technical use of myths" in his poetry; by "technical use" I mean those scholars investigating Horace's technique in using mythology rather than the content of the myths and any interpretive impact they might have on the poem in which they appear. Moore[29] observes that, though brief, Horace's mythological allusions show a depth of knowledge. Martín[30] surveys the use of myth in the satires of Horace and Persius and compares the two satirists. A longer treatment of Horace's technique in using myth is given by Marache.[31] He deals with poems where the whole poem or a substantial part of it is taken up with mythological content (Epode 13, and *Odes* 1.15, 1.7, 3.11, 3.27, 3.17, 3.7, 3.3, 3.4, 4.4) and talks about the relationship of the mythological plane to the plane of reality in the poems (with the exception of 1.15). Marache points out that Horace is similar to the Alexandrians in that he does not set out to tell the story but assumes the reader knows it. He concludes by noting the artfulness of the relationship between the two planes and Horace's use of

---

[28] Krasser (1995).

[29] Moore (1930).

[30] Martín (1996).

[31] Marache (1956).

speech, where the whole myth is concentrated into one moment, and finally notes that Horace's use of myth seems to develop over time: at first Horace is more concerned with the logic relating the plane of reality to that of the myth, then becomes freer, then turns to Roman myth and Pindaric style to sing of Rome and Augustus; at this point an interest in logic also returns. The focus in these scholars is not on what myths Horace uses or how they should be interpreted but rather on Horace's poetic style and his stylistic use of mythology.

F. Breuer (2008)

Breuer's thorough treatment of mythology in Horace's *Odes, Der Mythos in den Oden des Horaz,*[32] fits into none of the above categories. After introductory material on Horace's sources, Breuer takes a unique "poem-at-a-time" approach: he looks at all the mythological content in each poem he discusses, but does not connect repeated instances of myths across poems.

Summary of previous approaches to "myth in Horace"

As one can see from categories A-C above, the main approach to the general study of mythology (which I would like to distinguish from religion, which is the focus of category D) [33] in the *Odes* has been either to catalogue references by character, story, or

[32] Breuer (2008); cf. Breuer (2009).

[33] Category E is different from A-C and D in that it neither lists references nor is interested in religion. However, few works of scholarship fit into this category, and those

god,[34] or to catalogue by grouping references according to some other criteria (usually function, e.g., *exempla*). The cataloguing approach is largely taken by Oksala, whose work is the most complete catalogue of mythology in Horace to date. Another approach has been taken more recently by Breuer (F), who takes individual poems and scrutinizes all the mythological references in each of them.

There are advantages and disadvantages to both main approaches, cataloguing and Breuer's analysis of one poem at a time. On the one hand, if a scholar is making a survey of a single mythological character (or story or god) throughout the *Odes*, the advantage is that the scholar can achieve a bird's-eye view of how the character is used overall. The danger, however, is that the list of references and their contexts can be merely descriptive

---

that do are articles and an abstract from the 1930 Proceedings of the APA—not a monograph—and so it does not constitute a "main approach." To some extent many scholars in categories A-D deal with Horace's poetic technique (e.g. Oksala [1973] 194-196 deals with his technical use of *exempla*), but this is not their primary focus. Considering the way in which Horace deploys myth more than his purpose in doing so is interesting, but it is not the primary focus of this study.

[34] Some of Oksala's later chapters deal with topics that include more than one character/creature/god, e.g., "Orpheus und die Unterwelt" (Orpheus is not present in every poem that has underworld imagery, but these two topics are related and grouped together), "Heroinen" (not all heroines are from the same story), and "paradigmatische Topik und ihrer poetische Technik" (the references listed are not linked by myth but by use as *exempla*).

rather than interpretive, merely observing references without allowing them to inform an understanding of the poem or the larger work. Alternatively, if you take each poem individually and look at every mythological reference in the poem, the advantage is that the close reading encourages you to use the mythological elements to interpret the poem. The disadvantage of this approach is that, by treating each poem in isolation, the interpretation is less likely to be informed by parallel references in other poems or to allow generalizations about the use of specific mythological references in the *Odes* as a whole.

The approach of this dissertation

My approach is, in a sense, a hybrid of these two approaches. In order to uncover Horace's mythological "lexicon," I look at repeated or related mythological references throughout the *Odes* and then use the insight gained from this bird's-eye view to aid in the interpretation of poems in which the reference might otherwise seem unimportant or odd. This approach combines the "cataloguing" approach with the close reading associated with the "individual poems" approach. The assumption is that, when Horace uses a mythological character, story, or god more than once, there is something to be gained from considering every instance of that myth in light of every other instance. This approach, then, is not simply a hunting-gathering exercise but an attempt to interpret the poems in which the myths appear; that is, where the "cataloguing" approach moves from the individual poems to generalizations about a given mythological element throughout the *Odes*, I hope to go a step further and then use my generalizations drawn from looking at multiple poems together to interpret individual poems. Through this approach I hope to

establish that Horace's *Odes* exhibit mythological patterning that, once recognized, can significantly aid in the interpretation of poems containing mythological references, especially poems in which it is not clear why a certain myth is being referred to.

For this reason the predecessors to my work are actually not the surveys of "Mythology in Horace" described above. I am not interested in the what and how of Horace's use of myths for their own sake. My project is not as much about mythology in the *Odes* as it is about how we read the *Odes*. Fraenkel opines that "every Horatian ode is self-contained;"[35] I argue that each ode is best understood when the *Odes* are taken as a whole. As Arnold Bradshaw puts it:

> In most Horatian odes the attentive listener may detect the echoes of others. Within a limited range of theme, illustration, technique, and vocabulary Horace exercised his genius in variation; he did not hesitate to use again materials and methods which he had already employed successfully; as many examples in Book 4 demonstrate, he took pleasure in recalling and emulating his own earlier work. The interpreter is therefore encouraged to look for similarities and to identify recurrent patterns, for Horatian practice is often a better guide to understanding than parallels in other poets, particularly when these are but fragmentary or conjectural models.[36]

For this reason Bradshaw's article on "Horace and the therapeutic myth," which deals with 3.7, 3.11, and 3.27, is the closest of all the above to my project; Bradshaw uses Horace to interpret Horace, which is exactly what I want to do, though his use of the mythological content of the poems is different from mine. Bradshaw takes three poems that have different myths but similar uses of myth, but I want to compare poems that have the same myth. My predecessors in this method are Deschamps, Batinski, Hemingson,

---

[35] Fraenkel (1957) 208.

[36] Bradshaw (1978) 156.

and Hornbeck, whose studies of Venus, Bacchus, Faunus, and Daedalus and Icarus collect and interpret poems with the same god or mythological figure.[37] Of these, the most like my project is Hemingson, who discusses *every* instance of Faunus in the *Odes* in particular. Batinsky does a general survey of all of Horace's works, but I propose here to limit myself to *Odes* 1-3. Hornbeck excludes the two odes (1.1 and 3.7) that, although they contain references to Icarus, do not clearly fit into the pattern that she is arguing for. I intend to show in this dissertation how all of the references to a single mythological figure in *Odes* 1-3 are connected to each other.

In Part I, "Mythology and Moderation," I will deal with two characters, Icarus (and Daedalus) and Prometheus, whose use in the *Odes* is not always clear. I will demonstrate that, by using my approach and looking at all the instances of the myth in *Odes* 1-3, a pattern will emerge that helps not only to interpret why Icarus or Prometheus appears in the ode but also to interpret the entire ode in light of the new understanding of Icarus' and Prometheus' significance.

In Part II, "Mythology and Deification," the focus will shift from demonstrating that Horace is in fact using a sort of mythological lexicon to bringing that knowledge to bear on mythological figures whose use in the *Odes* is superficially transparent. I will look at Hercules and the Dioscuri, who are clearly connected to Augustus in the majority of the odes in which they appear, and see if by looking more carefully at how each figure is used and by reading these odes together—even the ones that are not ostensibly about

---

[37] Miller (2009), with his larger-scale study of Apollo in Augustan literature and culture, has a similar method, though he goes beyond a single poet or work.

Augustus—a pattern will emerge that ties all of the references together and gives us more insight into the individual odes.

Part I: Mythology and Moderation

Chapter 1: Daedalus and Icarus

A. Icarus and Previous Mythological Surveys

The first poem of the first book of the *Odes* contains a seemingly ornamental—though intriguing—reference to Icarus, via a reference to the Icarian Sea:

> luctantem Icariis fluctibus Africum
> mercator metuens otium et oppidi
> laudat rura sui; mox reficit ratis
> quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati.[38]
>
> The merchant, fearing the South Wind as it struggles with the Icarian waves, praises leisure and the countryside of his home town; but presently he repairs his battered ships, untutored in enduring poverty. (15-18)

Icariis fluctibus, "Icarian waves," could be merely a reference to a specific geographic location, ornamentally replacing a word for "sea" with a reference to a specific sea,[39] but

[38] The text used throughout of the *Odes* is that of Shackleton Bailey (2001) with minor punctuation changes. All translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

[39] See e.g. Wickham (1877) 15. Other seas known for their danger are found throughout the *Odes*: e.g., *interfusa nitentis* | . . . *aequora Cycladas* (1.14.19-20), *Illyricis undis* (1.28.22), *aequor Atlanticum* (1.31.14), or even a nameless sea, e.g., *indomitas undas* (4.14.20). The *mercator* who boldly travels to dangerous areas of the world also appears at 3.24.36-44. Here the figure is explicitly an example of impious, greedy excess, parallel to the "clever sailors" (*callidi navitae*, 40-41) who "conquer rough seas" (*horrida . . . | vincunt aequora*, 40-41; no specific sea is named). These two figures, Horace says, will do anything to escape the "the great disgrace of poverty" (*magnum pauperies opprobrium*, 43), even "desert the path of arduous virtue" (*virtutisque viam deserere*

it is more than that, as others have suggested. Oksala and Breuer[40] see in Horace's use of this toponym a reference to Icarus, the ill-fated son of Daedalus, who provided a name for the Icarian Sea when his wax-and-feather wings melted because he foolishly flew too high. Breuer declares that the reference to the *Icariis fluctibus* cannot be random, since the context of the place-name are lines that indicate careful stylistic arrangement and crafting: he points out the proper nouns in the preceding lines (*Libycis*, 10, *Attalicis*, 12), which are included to indicate wealth, and the alliteration of line 16 ("mercator metuens otium et oppidi").[41] Breuer neatly and convincingly connects *Icariis fluctibus* to the preceding mythological toponym, *Myrtoum . . . mare* (14): both are seas named after mythological figures—Myrtilus, the charioteer pushed off the cliff by Pelops, and Icarus—both of whom drowned.[42] Therefore, Breuer concludes, the two seemingly

---

arduae, 44). In 2.16.1-4 we see the *mercator* in the midst of a starless night "on the open Aegean" (*in patenti | . . . Aegaeo,* 2) desiring *otium,* as he does in the storms of 1.1. The introduction of the figure of the merchant here in 1.1 is part of this poem's function as an "overture" to the first three books of the *Odes*; this function will be discussed below.

[40] Oksala (1973) 197, Breuer (2008) 258-259. Oksala lists the reference in 1.1 along with *scopulis surdior Icari* at 3.7.21 and *nec Sicula Palinurus unda* at 3.4.28 as mythological toponyms which are given to show the danger of the place but offers no further interpretive discussion.

[41] Breuer (2008) 258.

[42] Breuer (2008) 259. Oksala (1973) 197 n. 1 expresses the opinion that the ancient reader would not have thought of Myrtilus when reading *Myrtoum mare*. Breuer notes Oksala's

chance place-names actually do some work in the poem, namely, they emphasize the reason behind the fear of the *nauta* (*pavidus*, 14) and the *mercator* (*Africum metuens*, 15-16), that people have drowned and do drown in the sea.[43] There is even more going on here, however, when one considers that this is the first of several references to Icarus throughout *Odes* 1-3, and that a few of those references suggestively occur in key places

---

dissenting view, but points out that Kiessling and Heinze (1955) 6 and Romano (1991) comment in his favor (259 n. 39). Commentators do not usually connect *Myrtoum mare* with Myrtilus: e.g., Wickham (1877) ad loc. does not mention a mythological origin for either this place-name or *Icariis fluctibus*; Orelli and Baiter (1886) ad loc. mention the island of Myrtus but not Myrtilus; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) ad loc. also say nothing of Myrtilus. The bare details of the myth seem to point away from the association: Oenomaus was king near Olympia, on the opposite side of the Peloponnese from the Myrtoan Sea. However, the connection between the name of the sea and Oenomaus' charioteer was not unknown to the Romans: Ovid mentions it at *Ib.* 369-370 ("proditor ut saevi periit auriga tyranni, | qui nova Myrtoae nomina fecit aquae"), and there is also a more allusive reference to it at *Her.* 16.210.

[43] One potential problem with this explanation is that, unlike Myrtilus, sailors do not fear being pushed into the sea. The merchant, on the other hand, technically fears the wind, but the danger of the sea to someone traveling upon it is highlighted by mentioning someone who died while travelling over it (or, if the reference to Icarus is ignored, by mentioning a particularly dangerous sea). However, there is a closer connection to the merchant and Icarus, which will also be discussed in section H.

in the *Odes*: in Horace's *propemptikon* to Vergil, or tirade against *hubris*, in 1.3 and in Horace's description of himself as poet in 2.20 (and again, in 4.2, describing the poet who vies with Pindar).

Though he elsewhere asserts the autonomy of the Horatian ode,[44] Fraenkel, in speaking about the prefatory purpose of *Odes* 1.1, comments that 1.1 "is probably one of the latest poems in the collection of the three books: a poet will hardly compose a proem until his work is near its completion. It is therefore not unlikely that most of the passages in this ode which remind us of passages in other odes are in fact deliberate echoes or variations of them and that *Maecenas atavis* is, in this respect too, a real 'overture' to the three books."[45] That is, 1.1 as a proem gathers together major themes that occur repeatedly throughout the collection. The brief mention of Icarus in 1.1 is an important component of the overture to *Odes* 1-3. References to the myth of Daedalus' and Icarus' flight appear throughout the *Odes* in a variety of contexts. No matter how varied the context, however, the purpose of the myth remains the same, to illustrate the theme of immoderation and the danger of transgressing boundaries. I will first examine each occurrence of the myth in the *Odes* 1-3 (and take a brief excursus to one ode from Book 4) before finally returning to 1.1.

To do this, I will draw somewhat on the recent work by Hornbeck on Daedalus and Icarus in the *Odes*, which discusses 1.3, 2.20, and 4.2;[46] to these odes I will also add

---

[44] Fraenkel (1957) 208.

[45] Fraenkel (1957) 230.

[46] Hornbeck (2014).

3.7 (which contains a named reference to Icarus), 1.13 and 2.2 (which do not allude to Daedalus or Icarus by name, but with allusive imagery), and of course 1.1. Hornbeck's conclusion from the three odes she compares, 1.3, 2.20, and 3.7, is that Horace uses Daedalus and Icarus "as a parable about poetic imitation and influence, in which the father's imitation of nature succeeds, but the son, by refusing to accept his father's example and limits of nature, becomes infamous rather than famous."[47] However, the references to Icarus in 1.1 and 3.7, though Hornbeck claims they "underscore the significance of the three larger allusions,"[48] are not in a metapoetic context. I will also argue that Horace includes subtle references to Daedalus and Icarus in 1.13 and 2.2, though neither is named. These references as well are not in a metapoetic context and cannot be interpreted to be about poets or poetry. In this chapter I will examine all Horace's references to Daedalus and Icarus in *Odes* 1-3 for what they have in common, a significance applicable to both poetic and non-poetic contexts.

B. Icarus before Horace

Before turning to Horace's odes, it is important here to establish the context in which Horace uses Daedalus and Icarus in his poetry. Modern readers, influenced by Ovid's two lengthy accounts (*Met.* 8.183-235, *Ars* 21-96) and the obvious moral attached to them, to avoid extremes (*inter utrumque vola*, that is, equidistant from the sea and sun,

[47] Hornbeck (2014) 167.

[48] Hornbeck (2014) 147.

Met. 8.204, *Ars* 2.63),[49] will assume that Icarus carried with him a proverbial connection with immoderation.[50] However, Icarus[51] seems not to have been a popular topic for Greek or Roman poets before the Augustan period.[52] The myth itself can be found in

---

[49] Hoefmans (1994) argues that in the *Metamorphoses*, in contrast to the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid is telling the story of Daedalus and Icarus as an example of *hubris* of both Daedalus and Icarus.

[50] Other Augustan poets before Ovid either do not refer to the myth at all or do not use the myth with the moral that Ovid would later draw. Propertius mentions Daedalus once, as the maker of the labyrinth (2.14.8). In Vergil's description of the doors of the temple of Cumae which Daedalus fashioned, Icarus is mentioned only to say that Daedalus' grief prevented him from depicting his son (*Aen.* 4.31-33; see Putnam [1987] 178, Miller [2009] 137). Putnam (1987) 177-182 sees in this a moral for Daedalus rather than Icarus: "In his role as father Daedalus is a double artistic failure, first incapable of completely imitating nature, then unable to mime the disastrous results of this inadequacy" (178).

[51] That is, the boy Icarus, not the island Icaria, sometimes called Icaros (e.g., *Homeric Hymn* 1.1), or the Icarian Sea (e.g., *Il.* 2.145).

[52] Diodorus Siculus, discussed below, (and his unnamed sources) is the only surviving record of the myth of the flight and death of Icarus before Horace. Doubtless, due to the numerous references to the myth during and after Horace's time, the story was well-known, but it seems not to have enjoyed literary popularity before the Augustan period. (Daedalus and other stories connected to the great craftsman, on the other hand, appear throughout Greek and Latin literature.) Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 57 (on 1.3.34) aver

mythographers, but, at least in the surviving accounts, Icarus is guilty of reckless stupidity and no moral about extremes is drawn. The stories given by Diodorus Siculus (first century B.C.) are as follows: either Pasiphaë helped Daedalus and Icarus escape Crete by boat, and Icarus disembarked "recklessly" (παραβόλως, 4.77.6) and drowned, or, as "certain mythographers" (τινὲς . . . μυθολογοῦσι, 4.77.7) relate, Daedalus made wings for himself and his son, but Icarus "because of his youth" (διὰ τὴν νεότητα, 4.77.9, i.e., youthful ignorance or folly) flew too close to the sun and fell when the wax holding his wings together melted, while Daedalus survived by "flying close to the sea and constantly wetting his wings" (παρὰ τὴν θάλατταν πετόμενον καὶ παρ᾽ ἕκαστον τέγγοντα τὰς πτέρυγας, 4.77.9). Based on lack of references to Icarus in the surviving texts, it seems likely that Horace's readers would approach his *Odes* without any strong proverbial associations with the myth of Icarus' ill-fated flight. Furthermore, if a lesson were to be drawn from the story itself, it would be about the foolishness of going too near a heat source when your survival depended on solid wax.

C. 1.3: Flight as Immoderation

The first appearance of the flight of Daedalus and Icarus outside *Odes* 1.1 is in 1.3.34-40:

> expertus vacuum Daedalus aera
> pennis non homini datis;
> perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor.
> nil mortalibus ardui est:

---

that "no doubt criticism of Daedalus was conventional in the diatribe," citing as an example Seneca *Ep.* 90.14.

caelum ipsum petimus stultitia neque
per nostrum patimur scelus
iracunda Iovem ponere fulmina.

Daedalus tested the empty[53] air with wings not given to men; a Herculean labor broke through Acheron. There is nothing "impossibly high" for mortals: we aim for the sky itself in our stupidity, and by our crime we do not allow Jupiter to lay aside his angry thunderbolts.

This ode describes human beings reaching beyond what is allotted to them, their committing acts of insolent impiety that can incur the punishment of the gods. In lines 25-26 of the same poem Horace uses the phrase *vetitum nefas*, a Latin phrase roughly equivalent to the Greek idea of *hubris*,[54] to describe such impious acts of the over-bold human race: "audax omnia perpeti | gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas," "Bold enough to try anything, the human race rushes into forbidden acts of wickedness (*hubris*)." Daedalus' flight is given as an example of such overreaching, as is Hercules' harrowing of hell.

Taking more than the gods have allotted is a theme throughout the *Odes*. A metaphor Horace sometimes uses for this is the crossing of boundaries. When Horace speaks of the danger of the overuse of Bacchus' gifts in 1.18.7-11, he describes the Sithonians, who drunkenly transgressed a sexual boundary of some kind (the tale is lost), as "discriminating between *fas* (what is allowed) and *nefas* (what is not allowed) with too fine a line" ("fas atque nefas exiguo fine libidinum | discernunt avidi," 10-11). In line 7 of 1.18 Horace calls Bacchus, the giver of wine, *modicus* (*modici . . . Liberi*, 7), "moderate,"

[53] Or, perhaps, "vacant": *OLD* s.v. 9a.

[54] Cf. Campbell (1987) 318.

such that excessive drinking, the abuse of his gifts (*munera*, 7), is an act of impiety. Elsewhere Horace criticizes abstemious sobriety,[55] the opposite excess of inappropriate drunkenness. Inside the boundaries on either side is moderate drinking, which Horace advises as both wise and pious. Similar to his use of *modicus* in 1.18.7, at 1.36.11 and 3.15.2 Horace uses the term *modus* to mean the boundary beyond which is the extreme.[56] For a mortal to be *moderate* is to stay within the boundaries the gods have set.[57]

In 1.3 committing *nefas* is also conceived of as boundary-crossing: crossing into the sky (the realm of the Olympians)[58] or over the Acheron into the underworld (the

---

[55] 1.18.3-4: "siccis omnia nam dura deus proposuit, neque | mordaces aliter diffugiunt sollicitudines," "For the god has determined that everything be hard for the abstemious, and there is no other way to dispel gnawing cares."

[56] 1.36.11: *neu promptae modus amphorae* [*sit*], i.e., let there not be too little wine (excess is allowable on this occasion); 3.15.2: *nequitiae fige modum tuae,* i.e., put a limit on sexual activity that is inappropriate to your age. See *OLD* s.v. 5.

[57] Moderation and the middle way are well-known as a theme throughout Horace's poetry: see Gibson (2007) 16-24.

[58] *caelum* as the realm of the gods: 1.2.45, 3.2.22, 3.4.1, 4.8.29 (both the literal sky and the realm of the gods: 3.5.1). Earlier in the ode (21-24) Horace talks about sailing as impiety, since divine agency "divided" (*abscidit,* 21) different lands from each other with water, another kind of boundary. Carrubba (1984) 169 notes that the three individuals named in lines 27-36, Prometheus, Daedalus, and Hercules, violate each of the three elements, fire, air, and earth. Cf. Pucci (2005) 6: "each figure in his own way transgresses

realm of Pluto, Proserpina, and the dead). Earlier in the ode the home of the gods is called *aetheria domo* (29); the rhetoric of the Daedalus passage—*non homini* (35), *nil mortalibus* (37)—emphasizes that the problem with human flight is that humans do not belong in the *aera* (34) or *caelum* (38),[59] which is the realm of the gods. Like the excessive drinking described in 1.18, this is an act of *im*-moderation, an act of transgressing a divinely-set boundary, not having a *modus*. The flight of Daedalus and Icarus in 1.3 is perhaps the best image for immoderation because Icarus' fall can be conceived of not only as divine punishment for *hubris*, but also as the natural result of flying too high and too close to the sun, an excess equivalent to over-drinking.[60]

---

natural boundaries in choosing to do something that, if not for his special skill, he would otherwise not consider doing—and despite the certainty of divine retribution." Feeney (2007) 122 also discusses the figures in 1.3 and their transgressiveness.

[59] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.* point out that line 38 suggests the Giants as much as Daedalus, but there is certainly a Daedalean resonance here.

[60] See section B above for Horace's originality in using the Daedalus-Icarus myth as an example of *hubris*. Cf. Hercules: in 1.3 an example of overreaching, but elsewhere in the *Odes*, e.g. 3.3.9-10, an example of a man-become-god. Elder (1952) 152-154 highlights the heroic traits of Prometheus (1.3.27), Daedalus, and Hercules and interprets the poem as "the tragic story of the bravery of men" (156); however, as West (1995) 16, arguing against such an interpretation, points out, "the whole thrust from line 21, the crucial mid-point of the poem, is a condemnation of man's impiety through excessive ambition." This clash between the *exempla* and the stated point of the poem will be discussed below in

In discussing the role of Daedalus in 1.3, I have not dealt here with the poem as *propemptikon* (the occasion of the ode, stated in lines 5-7, is Vergil's setting out on a voyage to Greece) nor with the widely, but not universally, accepted "poetological" interpretation of the ode (that the "voyage to Greece" is a metaphor for Vergil's writing the *Aeneid*),[61] which will become the focus of my discussion of this same poem in Chapter 2 below. Hornbeck, using the poetological reading, interprets Daedalus' flight in terms of poetic success or failure;[62] others similarly consider him a figure of overweening poetic ambition.[63] On the other hand, there has been some concern amongst scholars that, if Horace is talking about his friend's poetry, he cannot be really accusing him of *hubris*, and this has led to more positive interpretations of Daedalus, as a symbol of either audacity or human achievement.[64] However, the straightforward reading of the Daedalus passage (34-35) in light of the clearly-stated moral at the end of the ode (37-40) is that

---

Chapter 2 section A.

[61] Hornbeck (2014) 148 n. 2 lists the current bibliography on this interpretation. See also n. 209 in Chapter 2 section E below.

[62] Hornbeck (2014) 145-153.

[63] Pucci (1992) 671, Clark (2004) 30.

[64] Basto (1982) 35 sees "Vergilian parallels" in Horace's description of Daedalus and interprets the whole as a statement of Vergil's audacity. Other scholars that interpret Daedalus as a positive symbol: Elder (1952) 152, Lockyer (1967) 43, Santirocco (1986) 29, Campbell (1987) 317.

Daedalus is emblematic of a human who crosses a boundary set in place by the gods. This straightforward reading is all that is necessary for my primary objective in this chapter, understanding the role of Daedalus and Icarus throughout *Odes* 1-3 and interpreting the reference to Icarus in 1.1. In the next chapter I will again take up 1.3 and consider the implications of Prometheus, Daedalus, and Hercules on the metapoetic reading of the ode.

In the next section I will look at 3.7, where it is not the wrath of the gods that will be incurred through Icarian immoderation but the ire of a jilted hostess and a missed opportunity for sexual satisfaction. As we will see, however, the connection between Daedalus' and Icarus' flight and immoderation remains, even in a comic context.

D. 3.7: The Rocks of Icarus and Sexual Immoderation

In 1.3 the reference to Daedalus' and Icarus' flight was accompanied by a moral; in 3.7 the use of the myth is more obscure. In addition, the interpretation of 3.7 has been much debated and is itself far from clear. These two issues become related when one realizes that the reference to Icarus, through a reference to the island of Icaria in the Icarian Sea, comes at a crucial turning point in the poem. As a result, this section will deal in detail with how Icarus is to be interpreted and how the interpretation of this mythological reference affects the interpretation of the poem as a whole. After digressing on how understanding the reference to Icarus changes our reading of the poem, I will return to an overview of Icarus' flight throughout *Odes* 1-3 and the larger point, that Horace consistently uses the myth of Daedalus' and Icarus' flight to suggest and to illustrate immoderation.

The central question of 3.7 is whether Horace[65] is truly advising Asterie not to sleep with Enipeus while her lover Gyges is away or whether the poem is ironic and Horace is slyly encouraging Asterie to give in to Enipeus' advances.[66] Persuasive

---

[65] When I use the name "Horace," I mean the speaker of the poem as well as the poet himself. One could distinguish between speaker addressing the addressee and the poet who is writing for us, his readers. However, I include the addressee of the poem as part of the larger audience of readers. Therefore, if we understand what Horace the poet/speaker is trying to say to his addressee then we understand the poem, and there is no additional meaning hidden by the poet (meaning not intended by the speaker) from the addressee. As to the relation between "Horace" of the *Odes* and the real man, Horace's self-presentation throughout *Odes* 1-3 seems consistent (e.g., he consistently represents himself as no longer young, with his days of young love behind him), but this self-presentation is not necessarily strictly autobiographical.

[66] Cairns (1995) 66-67 has laid out the various scholarly opinions on the poem, grouping them into three views, the first one that Horace is actually trying to encourage Asterie to yield to Enipeus, and the other two that Horace as addresser of Asterie means what he says, but either, on the one hand, the poem is "cynical and amusing" (66), or, on the other hand, the poem is a serious reinforcement of "the emphasis on marriage in the 'Roman Odes'" (66). I would add to Cairns' first category (ironic) Nadeau (2008) 260-269; to his second category ("cynical and amusing," but Horace is truly advising Asterie) West (2002) 71-79, Thom (2003), and Nisbet and Rudd (2004); and to his third category (serious) Di Lorenzo (2003). West reads the poem as a mockery of the "silliness of lovers

evidence has been put forward on both sides of the question: that the poem is not ironic can be argued for by an appeal to Occam's razor, while on the other side are ambiguities in the psychology, language, and structure of the text that seem to suggest that, as in many other odes, more is going on than meets the eye.[67]

Before we look at the Icarus-reference itself, a brief outline of the ode is necessary to highlight the reference's centrality in—and, hence, potential importance to—the poem. In the first two stanzas (1-8) Horace consoles a weeping Asterie by telling her that her lover will return and that he too is unhappy and weeping. In the following three stanzas (9-20) Horace describes the speech of the messenger of Gyges' hostess Chloe, in which the messenger tries to convince Gyges to sleep with Chloe by using mythological *exempla* of men who refused the advances of other men's wives (to their peril). In the first half (21-22) of the following stanza we learn that the messenger's speech is "in vain" (*frustra*, 21), and that Gyges is "deafer than the rocks of Icarus" (*scopulis surdior Icari*, 21) when it comes to the messenger's arguments. At this point some scholars[68] see a suggestion that Gyges will not always be so stubborn: he is *adhuc integer* (23), *adhuc*

---

in Latin elegy" (77) (cf. Arkins [1993] 108). Thom argues that the poem is lyric tinged with the genre of satire: "the single-minded lyric focus . . . is undermined by pointing out the satiric alternative . . . A variety of alternative perspectives on the same situation is not only possible but, ironically, more realistic" (61).

[67] Owens (1992).

[68] E.g., Owens (1992) 163.

implying that he may give in in the future.[69] In the second half of the stanza, beginning at the end of line 22, Horace gives his message to Asterie: "at tibi | ne vicinus Enipeus | plus iusto placeat cave," "But as for you, beware lest your neighbor Enipeus pleases you more than is right" (22-24). Finally, in the remaining two stanzas (25-32) Horace describes what makes Enipeus so tempting to Asterie (he is good at horsemanship and swimming) and tells her to ignore him when he sits as a querulous, *tibia*-playing *exclusus amator* at her door. The overall structure, then, is as follows: two stanzas are given as an introduction to the separated couple, three stanzas are given to the attempted (or rather threatened) seduction of Gyges, one stanza serves as a transition from the temptations Gyges is facing to those Asterie is facing, and two stanzas describe the nature of Asterie's temptation.[70]

The reference to Icarus[71] is placed in that one central, transitional stanza.[72] The

---

[69] Quinn (1980) 260 argues that this does not imply that Gyges will give into Chloe but rather that he may face on his journey more such temptations (Quinn's interpretation of the timing of Gyges' sailing [259] is that he is at the beginning of his journey). The suggestion is still there, however, that Gyges may not always be *integer*.

[70] Cf. Harrison (2004) 82 n. 4.

[71] Peerlkamp (1862) ad loc. takes *Icari* to be not from *Icarus* but *Icarium* [*mare*]. The adjective *Icarius* is usually used with a noun (e.g., in 1.1.15; see OLD s.v.), but two counter-examples are Ov. *Fast.* 4.283 and, cited by Peerlkamp, Manilius 4.619 (in Fayus' 1629 edition; in Housman's 1903 edition it is line 621). In the case of Ovid, the use of the adjective alone is to emphasize the link between the name of the sea and the name of the

reference, unlike the *exempla* in the messenger's speech that go before it, is not immediately explicable and seems superfluous. The key placement and yet seeming superfluity of the reference invite closer attention to it. Horace, a poet who chooses his words with care, chooses to say that Gyges is not just "deafer than a rock"[73] but specifically "deafer than the rocks of Icarus."[74] The geographical reference to Icarus, the

---

boy, used in the next line; in Manilius *Icarium* is followed by *Aegeumque*, so saying *mare* or *pontum* after that is unnecessary for clarity. In any case, Horace need not have specified even this sea, if he is naming the sea and not the boy, to make his point; the sea is not even the one in which Gyges has been sailing (see below). That is, even an allusion to the Icarian Sea (as opposed to Icarus himself) is a deliberate choice which evokes the myth of Icarus.

[72] See Harrison (2004) on the central turn as a feature of many of Horace's odes.

[73] Horace uses the commonplace of the deafness of rocks to the cries of beleaguered sailors without a reference to Icarus at *Epod.* 17.54. It is a familiar simile, e.g., Eur. *Med.* 29-30: ὡς δὲ πέτρος ἢ θαλάσσιος | κλύδων ἀκούει νουθετουμένη φίλων.

[74] Harrison (1988) 191 is the only scholar who makes use of the reference to Icarus in his interpretation of the poem. (Marković [2010] finds it notable, but only comments on the simile itself, not its impact on the ode as a whole.) Harrison hears "in 'Icari' an echo of Penelope's father Icar(i)us," and therefore the poem has a connection not only with love-elegy but also with a romanticized version of the *Odyssey* (cf. 1.17.19-20). However, Cairns (1995) 97-99 has convincingly argued against seeing the poem as Odyssean and specifically against the link between *Icari* and Penelope's father, the only concrete

island of Icaria in the Icarian Sea, is very clearly not a reference to the place where the winter winds are restraining Gyges: Oricus (5) is in modern-day Albania, while the Icarian Sea is off the coast of Asia Minor. One could say, with the commentators,[75] that the use of an extraneous place-name is simply to give a familiar simile new depth—the Icarian Sea was known for its roughness[76] and Gyges is like a rock that is being harassed by perilous waves—and it is undoubtedly true that this is part of Horace's intent. However, to be content with this explanation is to dismiss the reference as merely a

---

connection between the poem and the *Odyssey*. Cairns points to the reference to the Icarian Sea at *Odes* 1.1.15-17 in the context of a merchant in danger, which suggests that the Icarian Sea is typical in descriptions of the dangers of sailing, and the fact that in Callimachus the οὔρεσιν Ἰκαρίης (*Aetia* fr. 23.2-3, cited by Harrison himself, 191 n. 28) are "also in a context of 'paying no heed'" (98), which may indicate "a common source for Horace and Callimachus in an early Greek text, possibly involving a proverb" (98). However, Callimachus clearly indicates the island Icaria, but Horace is more allusive, bringing attention to the boy Icarus by referring to the island as not the "rocks of Icaria" but rather the "rocks of Icarus."

[75] Kiessling and Heinze (1955) ad loc., Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc. Syndikus (2001) 95 and Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc. point out that usually the deaf-as-a-rock simile is used of heartlessness—less commendable than Gyges' refusal to sleep with his host's wife. For this reason the use of the simile itself, even apart from the Icarus-reference, needs some explanation.

[76] Hom. *Il.* 2.144-146.

random flourish, an unnecessary ornament; the fact that the reference does ornament a simple simile does not mean it does nothing else. This seeming randomness invites us to delve deeper for an interpretation. The fact that *Icari* is unexplained by a first reading hints that a second reading of the poem is necessary. A second reading might lead to an interpretation of the poem that overturns the straightforward interpretation of a first reading in which it appears that Horace is un-ironic in his appeal to Asterie to remain faithful to Gyges.

A closer, second reading of the mythological material before *scopulis Icari* reveals a connection between Horace and the messenger (whose words, after all, are mediated to Asterie through the narrator Horace). The mythological references in the messenger's speech to Gyges are much clearer than Horace's reference to Icarus in his report to Asterie of Gyges' reaction. Both of the messenger's *exempla* are examples of the "Potiphar's wife" scenario: a woman brings false accusations to her husband against a man who spurned her advances and the man is then in danger of his life. However, the messenger does not present them as examples of wicked women, as one might expect.[77] Instead the men are portrayed negatively. Bellerophon is "too chaste" (*nimis* | *casto*, 14-15)[78] and Peleus is described as *abstinens* (18), putting the emphasis not on a positive ethical virtue but on the fact that he refused to have sex. Furthermore, rather than

[77] Cf. Pasquali (1920) 464, Davis (1991) 48-49, Thom (2003) 62. West (2002) 75 notes that the messenger also leaves out the fact that Bellerophon and Peleus survive—he is selective with the details he tells as he tries to twist the stories to his purpose.

[78] The placement of *nimis* at the end of the line is emphatic (Naylor [1922] ad loc.).

showing that resisting temptation can end in receiving gifts from the gods (as it does in the case of Peleus[79]), the messenger only mentions the deadly danger the men put themselves in: the messenger tells how Proetus' wife urges him "to hasten Bellerophon's murder" (*Bellerophontae | maturare necem* 15-16) and how Peleus is "nearly sent to Tartarus" (*paene datum . . . Tartaro*, 17). The messenger is arguing that if Bellerophon and Peleus had just given in, had not tried to be "too chaste," they would not have been in danger of their lives. Their exclusive, excessive chastity is presented as foolish and destructive—the message to Gyges is that he should not hold out for his beloved back at home but do the wise thing and give in to Chloe now.

The messenger's spin on the stories of Bellerophon and Peleus makes them comparable to Icarus' myth: Gyges, in refusing Chloe, is exceeding a reasonable limit of abstinence—like Bellerophon he may be "too chaste"—and therefore be immoderate, just as Icarus was in his flight. Human beings can be immoderate in almost any sphere—ambition, drinking, sex—and it is important to remember that immoderation works in two directions. Just as one can drink too little, one can be *nimis castus* by having too little sex or by being too choosy about one's partner (in Gyges' case, by holding out for his girlfriend back at home).[80] In addition, Gyges' excessive chastity exposes him to the

---

[79] Cf. Pind. *Nem*. 4.60-68.

[80] This point is made explicitly in *Satires* 1.2. In that poem Horace points out that men who will only pursue matrons end up spending most nights alone in addition to facing the danger of being caught by jealous husbands. He urges his readers to consider what they really desire, what nature really wants, and to fulfill that need rather than to gratify their

veiled threats of Chloe's messenger who hints that, like the men in the *exempla*, he is risking his life by angering his hostess. Just as drinking too much can lead to dangerous behavior, defying divinely-set boundaries can lead to punishment, and flying too close to the sun can lead to falling into the sea, Gyges' immoderate abstinence carries with it the possibility of danger. In 3.7, as in 1.3, Daedalus' and Icarus' flight is an image of immoderation and its dangers.

However, the Icarus-reference in the poem is not in the messenger's speech. Horace, speaking to Asterie, says that Gyges, while listening to the stories the messenger is telling, is "deafer than the rocks of Icarus." Horace includes a reference to the myth of Icarus in his description of Gyges in order to hint that he agrees with the messenger: both Horace and the messenger use mythological references that imply that Gyges is being immoderate. Horace also adds the detail that Gyges, while he refuses to listen to the messenger, remains *adhuc integer*, "up to this point still with his virtue intact." Horace chooses to describe Gyges not as *fidus* or *probus* but *integer,* formulating his probity, as the messenger did with *abstinens* Peleus, as the *absence* of immorality: he is "*not* touched" (*in*teger, the *teg*- root from *tango*),[81] that is, not *yet* (*adhuc*). A further seed of

---

vanity by sleeping with only women of the highest class. In both *Satires* 1.2 and in *Odes* 3.7, the safest and most pleasant course is the one that also fulfills the immediate, natural desire. (Cf. Lucretius 4.1058ff.)

[81] Cf. 1.22.1, where *integer vitae*, "a man of unblemished life" (Mayer [2012] ad loc.), is parallel to *scelerisque purus*, "and pure of crime." To be *un*blemished and to have refrained from crime are both the absence of wrongdoing rather than the practice of good

doubt about Gyges' continuing to remain chaste is planted in Asterie's and the reader's mind by the oxymoron *surdior audit* (21-22)[82]—though supposedly "deafer than rocks," Gyges does, in fact, "hear." In lines 21-22 Horace not only sides with the messenger but also suggests that the messenger is getting through to Gyges and that he might in the end choose sex over danger (though we are not told whether the threats come from Chloe or are the messenger's innovations).[83]

Horace's agreement with the messenger is something the reader may not see in the first reading of the poem, but in the second, closer, reading that analyzes the messenger's

---

acts.

[82] Kiessling and Heinze (1955) ad loc.; Peerlkamp (1862) ad loc. wanted *durior* rather than *surdior* to eliminate the oxymoron, but this both lacks textual support and is unnecessary. Furthermore, since Horace specifies the rocks "of Icarus," *surdior* fits better—the whole phrase sums up the image of Icarus' fall and the deafness of the rocks to his cries: cf. Marković (2010).

[83] Eicks (2011) 201 argues that the messenger in 3.7 is parallel to the strict uncle of 3.12 and that both poems contain cases of a minor male character who works against the objective of the speaker. In 3.12 the speaker wants Neobule to be able to pursue love, but her uncle would not permit it, whereas in 3.7 the speaker wants, in Eicks' view, Asterie and Gyges to remain faithful, but the *nuntius* encourages infidelity. However, the parallel breaks down when one considers that the *nuntius* is speaking to Gyges while the speaker of the poem ("Horace") is speaking to Asterie, whereas in 3.12 the speaker and the uncle are presumably both speaking to Neobule.

exempla and links them to Horace's own mythological reference, Horace's attitude towards immoderate chastity and abstinence in Gyges' case becomes clear. This causes us to question whether Horace is truly admonishing Asterie to remain abstinent, despite Enipeus' charms, until Gyges comes home. Trying to find how Icarus fits into the poem has led us to consider seriously the "ironic" interpretation of the poem.

A closer look at the addressee's name reveals that Horace implies that Asterie could be in danger of becoming an Icarus herself. Cairns points out that Asterie is the name of a Titaness[84] who was pursued by Zeus, became a quail, fell or was cast into the sea, and became the island of Delos.[85] Asterie the Titaness, then, is an example of refusal

---

[84] Cairns (1995) 88.

[85] Hesiod (*Theog.* 409-410) is the first place Asterie, daughter of Koios, is mentioned, but he does not tell of her fate beyond her giving birth to Hecate (411). In Pind. fr. 52h. 43-49 we learn that the "daughter of Koios," spurning Zeus, was thrown into the sea and became the wandering island called Ortygia. Callimachus in *Hymn* 4.36-38 says that Asterie fell into the sea while fleeing Zeus and also that the floating island was called Asterie until it became fixed and known as Delos. Delos is called the Ἀστερίας δέμας in Pind. fr.52e. 42. More of the story is given by mythographers: Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 1.4.1) says that Asterie, fleeing Zeus, took on the likeness of a quail (ὁμοιωθεῖσα ὄρτυγι) and threw herself into the sea, and a πόλις, which was later Delos, was named after her; Hyginus (*Fab.* 53) tells the story that Jupiter, spurned by Asterie, changed her into a quail (*in avem ortigiam*) and threw her into the sea, and then she became the moving island Ortygia, which was later called Delos. The essential story elements are (a) that Asterie

of sex leading to a fate as close to death as an immortal can come—permanent de-anthropomorphization. Like Bellerophon and Peleus (though they escaped their doom), Asterie the Titaness represents the risks of chastity. She is also like Icarus: she gains wings, flies, and falls into the sea—and becomes an island, which is echoed by the reference to the island of Icaria in *scopulis Icari*.[86] Asterie the Titaness' refusal of a sexual encounter, as an act against Zeus, is a transgression against the king of the gods and therefore has similar consequences to Icarus' *hubris*. Horace's Asterie, like Gyges, risks becoming an erotic Icarus if she should persist in immoderate abstinence, waiting for the chance to be with her lover again. By naming his addressee Asterie, Horace suggests that she ought not to flee Enipeus' advances.[87]

---

was once a Titaness, (b) she fled the advances of Zeus, (c) she fell into the sea and became an island. The detail that before becoming an island she also became a quail is not attested in authors prior to Horace, but it is unlikely that this detail is original to the second-century A.D. mythographers. The linguistic link between ὄρτυξ-Ortygia-Delos suggests that the story is originally Greek. (Although in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo Ortygia and Delos are two separate islands, it is clear from the Pindar fragments that in his day Delos was thought to have been once called Ortygia, and the multiple names of Delos were still known in the first century A.D.: Plin. *HN* 4.25 "hanc Aristoteles ita [i.e., "Delos"] appellatam tradit, quoniam repente apparuerit enata, . . . alii Ortygiam, Asteriam . . .")

[86] Cf. Pind. fr. 52h 47 where Asterie's island is said to have become a πέτραν.

[87] Cf. Nadeau (2008) 262.

Horace likewise gives Asterie's absent lover a name which emphasizes that giving in to temptation is the right choice. When Herodotus' Gyges, an unwilling voyeur, was found out, the wife of Candaules, king of Lydia, made him an offer: either he accept death or kill the king and take his place as her husband and the ruler of Lydia. This Gyges chooses sex over death,[88] which also hints at what *adhuc integer* implies, that, faced with the choice, Asterie's Gyges will, like the Lydian Gyges, eventually give in. Both "Gyges" and "Asterie" are linked to stories that imply that refusing sex could have bad consequences (death, transformation into rocks) while giving in could have positive rewards (such as becoming king of Lydia, in the case of Herodotus' Gyges). Though more subtle, Horace's message to Asterie is similar to the messenger's message to Gyges: do not overreach in trying to be faithful to your absent lover.

The names Horace gives the separated couple imply that Horace does not think they will/ought to remain faithful to one another. On the first reading of the first two stanzas, it seemed that Horace tried to console the weeping (*Quid fles*, 1) Asterie by telling her that Gyges is weeping too ("noctes non sine multis | insomnis lacrimis agit," 7-8). Asterie's weeping is clearly for Gyges (*Quid fles . . . Gygen?* 1-5), but, in a more suspicious, second reading, one can see that Horace is trying to convince her to stop weeping by finding solace in another man. "Quid fles, Asterie, quem tibi candidi | primo restituent vere Favonii" (1-2) now has the meaning, "Why are you, Asterie, crying for a man who won't be home until the beginning of spring?" In other words, there is plenty of

[88] Hdt. 1.7-13. (Cf. Nadeau [2008] 262.) Gyges may be reckoned successful in this, for he himself did not suffer the punishment for his usurpation of Candaules' throne and wife.

time to have an affair.[89] In the first reading Horace seems in lines 7-8 to try to comfort Asterie with the promise that as much as she misses Gyges, he misses her too, but the intervening lines, on a second reading, suggest that Gyges is crying for another reason. Horace says that when he comes home he will be *beatus* because he has his merchandise:

---

[89] Whether Gyges is Asterie's husband is unclear from the context of the poem. Given that it is not explicitly stated, I assume, along with Harrison (1988) 187, Lyne (1995) 177, and Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 113, that they are lovers rather than spouses. In 3.9 we see Horace showing the flexibility of relationships in non-marital elegy-land—lovers part ways and return to one another again. This answers the problem of why, if Horace is actually urging Asterie to yield to Enipeus, Horace would place a poem urging marital infidelity right after the Roman Odes in which adultery is condemned. Collinge (1961) 51 explains that the difference of this poem from the previous six is intentional, to set the first six odes apart from the rest of the book; cf. West (2002) 52, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 115. Lyne (1995) 178 goes further, seeing this ode as "sapping" the "seriousness" of 3.6 or as an example of Horace's withdrawing from public, political themes to lighter poetry (as he often does). The connection between 3.6 and 3.7 ought not to be ignored, since it strengthens the case for suspecting the merchant Gyges' continuing faithfulness. In 3.6.30-32 the imagined adulterer is described as either a "salesman" (*institor,* 30) or the "master of a Spanish ship" (*navis Hispanae magister*, 31) who is a "buyer" (*emptor,* 32) of the woman's virtue: that is, a trader whose merchandise is an affair. However, if the couple are not married, the moral message of 3.6 can remain even though Horace has turned to a more frivolous treatment of sexual relationships.

Thyna merce beatum (3), that is, "wealthy (*OLD* 3 s.v.) with Thyonian merchandise," not "happy because he has come home to you." His beatitude is dependent on the success of his mercantile ventures, not on his proximity to Asterie.[90] Also, like the merchant of 1.1, Gyges is shipwrecked because he was at sea in winter ("ille Notis actus ad Oricum | post insana Caprae sidera," 5-6),[91] indicating that his avarice was greater than any other

---

[90] One could argue that this mention of Gyges' future wealth is meant to appeal to Asterie's greed, but the context—both the *Odes* as a whole and the poem itself—does not support this. Davis (1991) 48 points out that in the *Odes* in general the character of the *mercator* does not fare well, nor does the person who seeks after material gain for its own sake. Mutschler (1978) 113-114, 123-124 argues against the interpretation that Gyges' mercantile interests would cast him in a negative light to Asterie and states that, on the contrary, Gyges' wealth is attractive to her, as is Enipeus' physical preeminence. However, the poem puts emphasis on Gyges' distance ("ille Notis actus ad Oricum," 5) and Enipeus' nearness (*vicinus*, 23; "domum claude neque in vias | sub cantu querulae despice tibiae," 29-30) as if it were the proximity of her lover Asterie values most, not riches or even physical prowess.

[91] Cf. Davis (1991) 48. As to the argument that because Gyges is wintering in Oricus he is not sailing in winter (Cairns [1995] 73), the participle *actus* (5) indicates the fact that, far from preempting the *Noti*, Gyges has been in the midst of the south winds as they caused storms in the Adriatic and is now stranded or perhaps even been blown off course or shipwrecked—cf. Aeneas' use of *actus* at *Aen.* 1.332-333 ("Ignari hominumque locorumque | erramus, vento huc vastis et fluctibus acti") and Venus' at 1.390-391

consideration, including his own safety and his concern for Asterie's feelings. Finally, his tears are not actually said to be for Asterie—they could be for the fact that he spends "cold nights" (*frigidas | noctes*, 6-7), that is, the winter, not out sailing and trading and gaining "merchandise," or for the fact that his bed is simply not warm without another body in it,[92] something any woman, even Chloe, could easily remedy. He is stuck in Oricus, possibly repairing his ship or waiting for the storms to cease, unable to increase his wealth until he can set sail again. On this second reading we can see that Horace is showing Asterie that the man she misses, and would remain abstinent for, may be greedier than he is amorous and may love riches more than he loves her. If Gyges wants a warmer bed, he could simply embrace Chloe's offer. In the names "Asterie" and "Gyges" Horace warns against refusing sex, in the opening stanzas he emphasizes the absence and apathy of Gyges, and in narrating the messenger's speech and Gyges' reaction he emphasizes again the Icarus-like *hubris* of abstinence and the possibility of Gyges' giving in. The second reading must now move on to the stanzas devoted to advising Asterie in regard to Enipeus.

("Namque tibi reduces socios classemque relatam | nuntio, et in tutum versis aquilonibus actam"). Also, Horace makes clear that Gyges arrived at Oricum "after" (*post*, 6) Capella and the Haedi (*Caprae sidera*, 6, see Nisbet and Rudd [2004] 117), stars in the constellation Auriga, which are seen in the fall and winter. Ironically, though the storms Capella portended could destroy a merchant's wealth, the star was associated with the goat from which the Cornucopia was made (Ovid, *Fasti* 5.115).

[92] Cf. e.g., Prop. 4.7.6, Ovid *Am.* 3.5.42

We have already noted that the sixth stanza (lines 21-24), where the reference to Icarus stands, is the turning point in the poem. Up to the middle of stanza 6 (line 22), Horace has been talking to Asterie about Gyges, about his wintering in Oricum, about his hostess' attempts to seduce him, and about his resistance up to the present. Beginning at the end of line 22 and continuing to the end of the poem, Horace talks to Asterie about another man, her neighbor Enipeus. The turn in line 22 is marked by the words *at tibi*, placed emphatically at the end of the line. At *at* there is also a turn in Horace's theme, but it still pivots around the idea of immoderation embodied by Icarus. Up to this point Horace has been casting sexual restraint as Icarian immoderation; however, it is possible to cross the line in the other direction, in trying too hard to obtain the object of one's desire. It is this kind of immoderation Horace now cautions Asterie to avoid.

Just after the *at tibi* turn we get a new character, *vicinus Enipeus* (23); these two words alone are a message to Asterie. Unlike Gyges, whose absence causes Asterie to weep, Enipeus is nearby, her neighbor (*vicinus*). Just as Chloe could easily solve the problem of Gyges' cold bed, Enipeus can solve the problem of Asterie's having an absent lover. The name Enipeus, like the names Asterie and Gyges,[93] is carefully chosen by

[93] Chloe's name is important in a different way; she is a recurring character in the *Odes*. In 1.23 we see Horace trying to lure her into her first sexual encounter, and there her name, which suggests the springtime of youth (χλόη, the first green shoots of spring), is appropriate. Here in 3.7, though, she is no longer springy herself, but she is offering to be Gyges' spring-in-winter, warming his *frigidas noctes* (6-7). In 3.9 she is again portrayed as a participant in flexible, extra-marital relationships. Finally in 3.26 she is a

Horace. In myth, Enipeus was a river-god beloved by the maiden Tyro. In Hom. *Od.* 11.236-259, Tyro is the first of the women Odysseus meets in the underworld, and we learn her story: Tyro fell in love with the river-god Enipeus, and one day, as she wandered along his streams, Poseidon, in the form of Enipeus, came to her and slept with her in the mouth of the river. After their union the god revealed himself and prophesied a happy future for her: two demigod sons. We also learn that she married well and had further noble children. Tyro's story is an example of the benefits of sex with a god—the opposite of the story of Asterie, who fled Zeus and suffered. Horace further links his Enipeus with Poseidon/Neptune in the seventh stanza (25-28) where he lists Enipeus' attractions: Enipeus is the best at horsemanship (25-26), just as Poseidon/Neptune is the god of horses and horsemanship,[94] and at swimming in the river Tiber (27-28), just as Poseidon/Neptune is the god of waters and had sex with Tyro in a river. The message to Asterie in *vicinus Enipeus* is this: not only is this man available, he is also a good choice,

---

fully experienced lover, one who knows how to treat a *paraklausithyron*—the exact opposite of her portrayal in 1.23 as a girl who knows nothing of accepting or spurning men. Gyges, too, appears elsewhere in the *Odes*: in 2.5 he is a very young man who could be confused with a girl. The bearing of this on 3.7 is slight—it might suggest that Gyges has only recently entered into the world of sexual relationships with women, and it is this inexperience that leads him to attempt to be constant to his girlfriend Asterie back home. The allusion in the name Gyges, at any rate, has more bearing here—just as the literal meaning of Chloe's name has more bearing in 1.23.

[94] E.g., Pind. *Pyth.* 6.50.

and it would be foolish for her to resist her feelings[95] for him.

However, *vicinus Enipeus* is preceded by *ne* and part of a warning: "at tibi | ne vicinus Enipeus | plus iusto placeat cave" (22-24). Enipeus is pleasing to Asterie, but Horace cautions her to beware letting him be pleasing to her, to please her "more than is suitable" (*plus iusto*, 24). Just as one can be too restrained sexually, one can be too liberal in announcing one's desires and intentions.[96] Horace is urging Asterie not to be an Icarus,

---

[95] That fact that Asterie finds Enipeus desirable is clear from lines 22-28.

[96] Perhaps Chloe's mistake in this poem—one wonders if she were not so over-eager she might have persuaded Gyges earlier. Another hint that Chloe's seduction techniques are perhaps not the most effective is that messenger's *exempla* are not very good: neither Bellerophon nor Peleus actually dies for his *hubris*—they both remain chaste and escape. Horace's mythological *exempla* are much better: Gyges actually gives in and Icarus actually dies. The myth the messenger ought to have pointed to is conspicuously absent. Jacobson (1995) 85 points out that both women in the poem are like Phaedra. Asterie is like Euripides' Phaedra in that her husband is absent and suspected of being unfaithful to her but in reality she is the one who ought to be suspected of infidelity. Chloe is like Phaedra in that she sends an intermediary to try to convince a man (who remains firm against her arguments) who is not her husband to sleep with her. One would have expected Chloe's *nuntius* to have mentioned Hippolytus (tantalizingly almost there with *Hippolyten*, 18) (Jacobson [1995] 85) in his list of men who exceed a safe limit of chastity (after all, he actually dies as a result of refusing Phaedra—and in his story his chastity can even be appropriately conceived of as *hubris* against the goddess Aphrodite),

flying too high in abstinence or in pursuit of sex, but to fly the safe middle course, neither suppressing her desire for Enipeus nor losing her head over him[97]—he advises her to play hard-to-get.[98] Horace has to warn her not to be too eager for him because he knows how great the temptation is, as he makes clear in lines 25-28 when he describes in detail Enipeus' attractive qualities. Horace has taken on the role of the elegiac *lena*[99] or the

---

but he does not bring up Hippolytus, Jacobson argues, "because [Phaedra's] *exemplum* is so immediately, if allusively, at hand" (85). Perhaps the failure of Chloe's messenger to bring up the one useful *exemplum* for his case reflects the fact that she is not being wise in her approach to getting Gyges to sleep with her.

[97] Horace's erotic advice here fits in with his advice to practice moderation elsewhere, e.g., 1.18. The idea of moderation in an erotic context can be seen in 1.13, where Horace speaks against Telephus who is too rough a lover even in his love-making and predicts that such a violent love affair will not last long (see discussion of 1.13 and its potential reference to Icarus below).

[98] Cf. Porter (1987) 175, who translates *difficilis* (32) as "hard-to-get," suggesting the possibility of flirtation, though on the whole he interprets the poem as an encouragement to Asterie to remain faithful to Gyges.

[99] Harrison (1988) 189 sees Chloe's *nuntius* as similar to the elegiac *lena*, so in Chloe-Gyges' case, the gender roles have been reversed (*lena* in elegy: e.g., Ovid, *Am.* 1.8.23-34 and Prop. 4.5—note, though, that in Propertius the *lena* supposedly could win over even Hippolytus, 4). Horace could be using this gender-reversal to show that Chloe is going about her seduction the wrong way, taking the man's role by putting Gyges in the role of

Ovidian *praeceptor amoris*,[100] advising the girl to not give in to a man too easily.[101] He has to teach her, in lines 29-32, how an elegiac *puella* ought to act when a man camps out at her door as a music-playing *exclusus amator*:[102] she should shut up the house,[103]

---

the woman who has to be corrupted by a go-between. Harrison also notes that *sollicitae* is an elegiac word referring to unrequited love (189), but again usually the male lover is *sollicitus*, not the *puella*, e.g., Tib. 3.6.59-60: "Non ego, si fugit nostrae conuiuia mensae | ignotum cupiens uana puella torum, | sollicitus repetam tota suspiria nocte." See Gibson (2003) 19-21 on the *praeceptor* as *lena* in erotodidactic poetry.

[100] *Ars am.* 1.17; *praeceptor amandis* 2.161. The "erotodidactic" tradition does not begin with Ovid, however: see Gibson (2003) 13-14. West (2002) 74-75, 77 calls Horace in this poem the *praeceptor amoris*. Nadeau (2008) 264-265, 267 also sees the speaker in this role, though as the *praeceptor* of Enipeus, not Asterie: the speaker addressing Asterie is acting as Enipeus' wingman, helping him score, rather than as Asterie's sexual mentor, helping her set up the ideal situation for a relationship with Enipeus. It seems unlikely, though, that Enipeus' intermediary would advise his intended conquest to stonewall his advances; for this reason Horace's advice to Asterie falls more in line with the kind of advice Ovid gives to women in the *Ars Amatoria* (see n. 101 below).

[101] E.g. *Ars am.* 3.475-476, where Ovid advises women to take a middle road when exchanging letters with a man: "Sed neque te facilem iuveni promitte roganti, | nec tamen e duro quod petit ille nega." Note that Ovid does not want the girl to be *facilis*—exactly what Horace advices Asterie (*mane difficilis*, 32).

[102] As Enipeus will: in lines 29-30 he is in the road outside her house playing a

refrain from looking down, and remain stubborn even if he calls her "hard-hearted" (*dura*, 32).[104] A successful *puella* is not *facilis*[105] but *difficilis*.[106] As her *praeceptor*

"complaining flute" (*querulae tibiae*, 30).

[103] Ovid also advises that a woman force a man to be an *exclusus amator* in order to foster a greater love: *Ars am.* 579-588; cf. *Am.* 2.19.19-23)

[104] Being "hard-hearted" is a signature trait of the elegiac *puella*: cf. Propertius calling Cynthia and her attitude towards him *dura* (Prop. 1.7.6, 1.15.1, 1.17.16).

[105] At Ov. *Am.* 2.19.31-34, the poet-lover expresses his preference for a girl who is not *facilis* but evasive.

[106] Cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.6.2, where the locked-out poet-lover calls the door of his mistress *difficilis*. Horace's use of *difficilis* and *facilis* elsewhere in the *Odes* provides evidence for his meaning in 3.7. Quinn (1980) 260 points out that Horace's use of *difficilis* here contrasts with his use of *facilis* in an erotic context at 1.25.5. Lydia in 1.25 whose door's hinges moved so "easily" in her youth now is starting to lose the many *exclusi amatores* she used to enjoy; perhaps if she had been more *difficilis*, played hard-to-get, she might have managed to retain her charms (or at least a single faithful lover) longer. Quinn also points out the use of *difficilis* at 3.10.11: in this poem the poet is in the position of Enipeus and in trying to convince his beloved to let him in provides *Penelopen difficilem* as a negative (!) *exemplum*. Di Lorenzo (2003) 50, 56 uses this reference to strengthen his own connection between Asterie and Penelope. In 3.7 Horace tells Asterie to remain *difficilis* as the *paraklausithyron* calls her *dura*, and in 3.10 the *paraklausithyron* begs the

amoris Horace is showing Asterie how to foster a greater desire in Enipeus and therefore cement his attachment to her. Just as Asterie would be foolish to reject god-like Enipeus, she would lose her chance with the object of her desire if she pursued him too anxiously and gave in to him too easily. Horace is advising her to avoid crossing a line in either direction: like Gyges, she should not be "too chaste," but neither should she be over-eager to give in. Not giving in at first, in Asterie's case and, one might observe, Gyges' case as well, increases the desire of the pursuer, but total abstinence or being too easy are both extremes to be avoided.

In 3.7 the reference to Icarus is not merely ornamental; it is a prompt to re-read the poem to look for an explanation of the reference. This second reading includes a closer look at the messenger's *exempla*, the Icarus-reference, and the names of Asterie and Gyges, which all point to the conclusion that Horace is suggesting that excessive sexual restraint is immoderate and not advisable. This conclusion leads us to look for the Icarian connection in the rest of the poem (lines 22-32). We find in the name Enipeus an example that is the inverse of the story of Asterie the Titaness and in Horace's advice a call not to abstinence but to moderation between restraint and eagerness as a ploy to

---

object of his desire not to be *difficilis*. *difficilis* is the appropriate attribute of a woman who is locking out her lover, and if 3.10 is any evidence, the ploy works to make the lover maximally desirous (in 3.10 he displays the strength of his love by claiming that he will lie at her doorstep until he dies). As an alternative interpretation, Thom (1999) 58 takes the command *difficilis mane* as Horace offering her the choice to resist the world of elegy.

achieve sexual fulfillment.

We have seen a consistent use of the Icarus myth in 1.3 and 3.7, that is, to illustrate immoderation and its dangers. These two poems represent a range of usage as well—the message of 1.3 is high and tragic, but in 3.7 we see the comic side of immoderation. We will consider next two possible indirect references to Icarus in 1.13 and 2.2 that again illustrate the range of applications of the principle of moderation and image of Icarus.

E. 1.13: Waxy Arms, Sexy Bonds, and Moderation in Love

In the first and second books of the *Odes*, there are two potential indirect references to Icarus that both also have to do with the theme of immoderation. The first is in *Odes* 1.13, which begins with Horace complaining that Lydia constantly talks about her lover Telephus' "rosy neck" and "waxy arms":

> Cum tu, Lydia, Telephi
> cervicem roseam, cerea Telephi
> laudas bracchia . . . (1.13.1-3)

When you, Lydia, praise "Telephus' rosy neck" and "Telephus' waxy arms" . . . These opening lines have a pleasing symmetry: the doubling of the name (Telephus, Telephus), the pair of body parts (neck and arms), the pair of colors (*roseam, cera*). However, there is a discordance in the last doubling: *rosea* seems like a pleasant and natural word for a girl to use of her lover, but *cerea*, "waxy," is odd. Nisbet and Hubbard note its unconventionality as a color word for human skin—it usually indicates

sickness.[107] Do we really think that Lydia would describe her lover's arms as "sickly pale"?[108] As Horace parrots Lydia's words, he introduces an insult, replacing her actual term—"milk-white," "snow-white," or the like—with an unflattering term for "pale." The adjective *cereus*, however, primarily means made of or covered in wax.[109] Here, therefore, in addition to being an ugly color-word, *cerea* also suggests an image of

---

[107] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) ad loc., citing Ov. *Pont.* 1.10.27-28, where his unwell *membra* are described as *cera pallidiora nova*. The adjective *pallidus* itself signifies the color of the sick or dead—cf. *pallida Mors*, 1.4.13. The *TLL* s.v. shows that as a color-word *cereus* is never used to describe a human except in this once instance.

[108] Sutherland (2005) 59-61 also finds the adjective odd and suggestive; she envisions arms covered in wax like the surface of a wax tablet. Another possibility is that the word describes not the color but the feel of Telephus' arms, that they are soft, like wax. The *TLL* gives no example of this use for humans except in Horace *Ars P.* 163:

> inberbus iuvenis tandem custode remoto
> gaudet equis canibusque et aprici gramine Campi,
> cereus in vitium flecti . . ..
>
> The unbearded youth, his guardian finally having been removed, rejoices in horses and dogs and the grass of the sunny Campus, like wax to be bent to vice. (160-163)

As one can see, this is not a literal but a metaphorical malleability. Horace describes not the youth's body but his character as wax-like, able to be bent in the wrong direction. Since in 1.13 it is specifically the boy's arms that are described as "like wax," we can rule out this interpretation.

[109] *OLD* s.v. 1a.

literally waxen arms—also not very sexy. I would like to suggest in addition that Horace means to compare Telephus to another young man (*puer*, 11) whose arms bore wax: Icarus, who flew "on wings waxed with Daedalean craft" ("ceratis ope Daedalea | . . . pennis," 4.2.2-3). In 1.13, the speaker Horace casts his rival Telephus as a man who is immoderate and therefore not a stable lover for Lydia:

> uror, seu tibi candidos
> turparunt umeros immodicae mero
> rixae sive puer furens
> impressit memorem dente labris notam.
>
> non, si me satis audias,
> speres perpetuum dulcia barbare
> laedentem oscula, quae Venus
> quinta parte sui nectaris imbuit. (1.13.9-16)
>
> I burn, whether quarrels, immoderate because of unmixed wine, disfigured your white shoulders, or whether the boy, raving, pressed on your lips a memento-mark with his tooth. You should not, if you listen to me well enough, hope he will be ever true, he who barbarously wounds your sweet lips, which Venus has imbued with the fifth part of her nectar.

Horace sees the signs of lover's quarrels or rough love-play on Lydia's body and interprets them as the result of immoderate quarrelling caused by immoderate drinking (*immodicae mero* | *rixae*, 10-11). He also thinks Telephus has gone too far in his kissing: unlike the lip-nibbling of Catullus' Lesbia (8.18),[110] Telephus, Horace claims, "wounds" (*laedentem*, 15) Lydia "barbarously" (*barbare*, 14). Finally, Horace claims that anyone who kisses a woman as roughly as Telephus does will not be her lover forever, and he casts Telephus' immoderate passion as an offence against the goddess Venus, who has

[110] Cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 67, Tib. 1.6.14.

blessed Lydia with divinely sweet lips.[111] Like those who misuse the gifts of Bacchus by drinking to excess (see the discussion of 1.18, above), Horace tries to convince Lydia that an excess of roughness in kissing is a misuse of Venus' gift and therefore dangerously hubristic. In his attempt to win Lydia from Telephus, Horace portrays his rival as an Icarus, as a young man who is dangerously immoderate—immoderate in drinking, immoderate in the violence of his quarrels and kisses—though the danger of immoderation faced here is not death but a break-up.

As in 3.7, seeking to understand a mythological reference can aid not only in seeing the larger pattern in the *Odes* but also in the understanding of the ode at hand. Recognizing the reference to Icarus in the description of Telephus adds a pointed appropriateness to the last lines describing the kind of love Horace holds out to Lydia:

> felices ter et amplius
> quos irrupta tenet copula nec malis
> divulsus querimoniis
> suprema citius solvet amor die.
>
> Three and more times happy are those whom an unbreakable bond holds and whose love does not, torn apart by nasty quarrels, loose them sooner than the day of their death. (17-20)

These lines could be read as a seductive deception, ironic from the viewpoint of the reader,[112] but even so the sentiment is artfully chosen. Although Horace's own feelings

---

[111] It is debated whether *quinta parte* (16) means "one-fifth of the full strength" or "the quintessence" (for the options see Nisbet and Hubbard [1970] ad loc.), but either way Venus has imparted some of her divine sweetness to Lydia's mouth and kisses.

[112] So Segal (1973).

for Lydia are anything but moderate (his liver boils, he changes color, he sweats and/or weeps, he burns—lines 3-9),[113] he portrays the ideal love as one that is bounded—tied up with unbreakable bonds.

The image is even more artful when one considers it not as a *topos* but as an allusion to *Odyssey* 8, where Demodocus tells the story of Ares and Aphrodite and Hephaestus' trap. Nisbet and Hubbard point out that *irrupta*, a hapax and perhaps a Horatian coinage, is a translation of Homer's ἄρρηκτος (δεσμούς | ἀρρήκτους, *Od.* 8.275).[114] However, this mythological reference and Homeric allusion is unsatisfactory: Ares and Aphrodite are not happy to be bound with unbreakable chains, the laughing stock of all the gods, and so their relevance to Horace's poem is questionable. Certainly Aphrodite is relevant: after all, Lydia is said to have a "fifth part" of Venus' nectar, to be a human with some of the attributes of the goddess. However, it would be incongruous for Horace to say that the happiest lovers are those that are like Ares and Aphrodite in their shame. The answer to the problem lies in recognizing the full Homeric allusion here. In Demodocus' story, once the gods have assembled to witness Ares' and Aphrodite's misdeed, Apollo jokingly asks Hermes if he would even thus like to sleep with Aphrodite. Hermes responds,

---

[113] Comparing *Odes* 1.13 with Horace's models, Sappho 31 and Catullus 51, shows just how over-the-top his reaction to Telephus and Lydia's relationship is; cf. Clay (2010) 140.

[114] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) ad loc.; Keller and Holder (1899) cite *Il.* 15.19-20 (δεσμὸν . . . ἄρρηκτον).

> αἰ γὰρ τοῦτο γένοιτο, ἄναξ ἑκατηβόλ᾽ Ἄπολλον:
> δεσμοὶ μὲν τρὶς τόσσοι ἀπείρονες ἀμφὶς ἔχοιεν,
> ὑμεῖς δ᾽ εἰσορόῳτε θεοὶ πᾶσαί τε θέαιναι,
> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν εὕδοιμι παρὰ χρυσέῃ Ἀφροδίτῃ.
>
> Would that this would be so, far-shooting lord Apollo: may three times such unending chains hold me around, and may all you gods and goddesses look on me, but that I might sleep with golden Aphrodite. (*Od.* 8.339-342)

For Hermes, the bonds that would tie him and Aphrodite together are welcome ones, and it is this statement of Hermes that Horace has in mind when he mentions the *irrupta copula* that makes lovers so happy. In line 340 Hermes wishes that chains like those holding Ares and Aphrodite be wrapped around himself and the goddess even "three times"—in Horace's *ter* one could see an allusion to Homer's τρίς—and if one (albeit incorrectly) etymologizes ἀπείρονες as ἀ + πείρω, "unbreakable," then we have Horace's *irrupta*;[115] ἔχοιεν is echoed by Horace's *tenet*. Horace imagines himself as a happy Hermes, bound fast, by choice, [116] to Lydia as Aphrodite/Venus. He is trying to convince

---

[115] A further connection, which is a much more speculative, could be made between the visual and auditory similarity of *amplius* and ἀμφίς. This would answer the question of why Horace chooses the more obscure phrase *ter et amplius* rather than the expected *ter et quater* (as at 1.31.13).

[116] Cf. *grata . . . compede* 1.33.14, though here the bonds are not equally binding—Horace is the happy slave of his mistress, bound in fetters, rather than a co-captive bound by a rope or cable (*copula*). As to the fact that Lydia may not be eager to be an Aphrodite publicly committing adultery, one might point to the fact that she also seems not eager to cover up the signs (how does Horace see the bruises on her shoulders?) of her

Lydia that unlike Telephus whose love is, in the words of Cole Porter, "too hot not to cool down" (as he tells her in his prediction *non* . . . | *speres perpetuum* . . . 13-14) his love will burn consistently, free from the divisive quarrels (*malis querimoniis*, 18-19) that end relationships.

Horace proclaims at the end of the poem that if you can moderate your passion, keep it within boundaries—made visible here with the "bond" metaphor—your love will not dissolve (*solvet*, 20)—the bonds of love will not loosen (the wax that holds your feathers will not melt)—until you are not alive to love any more. The permanence of a relationship is not in itself the desirable quality; the exercise of moderation (especially in anger) is the desirable quality, which prompts a lover to stay in a relationship, even until death.[117] These lines, therefore, are not simply a seduction ploy (though they may be that as well) but fit in with Horace's overall emphasis in the *Odes* on moderation, the importance of limits, and the dangers of transgressing them. Horace is trying to tell Lydia that she is in love with an Icarus whose days as her lover are numbered. However, irony is mixed with seriousness, and I tend to agree with Commager that "Horace intended the poem's close to leave us in uncertainty. He refuses, as he does so frequently, to allow us

---

relationship with Telephus.

[117] The mention of a person's "last day" seems to cast a dark shadow on the end, but it is not unusual for Horace to end a poem with a reminder of mortality. Here it may serve to remind Lydia that, unlike the gods in Demodocus' story, she has a finite amount of time in which to enjoy love and should not waste it on a lover who will not be *perpetuum* nor ultimately make her *felix*.

the satisfaction of restricting him to a single attitude."[118]

The unusual image of *cerea bracchia* in 1.13 is a subtle reference to Icarus made to point to immoderation (at least as Horace would like to interpret it) and to the folly of showing disrespect for Venus and her gifts. As in 3.7, the immoderation depicted is erotic and comic. The next poem we will consider, 2.2, brings us back to moderation in a more serious matter: the use of money.

F. 2.2: A Non-Icarian Non-Miser

Odes 2.2 also has immoderation as its theme—immoderation in the use of money. Like the sexual immoderation of 3.7, the financial immoderation of 2.2 is not over- but under-indulgence. In the first stanza Horace praises the moderate use of money over the hoarding of it, and in the second Horace praises a man who was generous to his brothers:

> Nullus argento color est avaris
> abdito terris, inimice lamnae
> Crispe Sallusti, nisi temperato
> splendeat usu.
>
> vivet extento Proculeius aevo
> notus in fratres animi paterni;
> illum aget penna metuente solvi
> Fama superstes. (2.2.1-8)
>
> Silver hidden in the greedy earth has no color, Sallustius Crispus, you who are opposed to money unless it shines with moderate use. Proculeius will live an extended life, known for his fatherly spirit toward his brothers; lasting Fame will carry him on wings disdaining to be dissolved.[119]

---

[118] Commager (1962) 155.

[119] For *metuente* meaning "disdaining," see Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc. West (1998) 15 and Rudd (2004) likewise translate it as "scorn." I believe Horace intends an

Horace emphasizes that the temperate, moderate use of money is preferable to the extreme of greedily hoarding it by claiming that Proculeius, because of his non-miserly generosity, will be remembered into eternity for his deed. The *Fama* (8) that is supposed to allow him to live on is described as having wings that refuse "to be dissolved" (*solvi*, 7). *Fama*, as befits her role, is winged,[120] but, since she is divine,[121] it is odd to suggest that her wings could be "dissolved." It is tempting to see here an allusion to Icarus, whose

---

ambiguous double meaning: on the one hand, one can read it as "disdaining" or "scorning"—implying that Proculeius' fame is definitely secure—but on the other hand there still appears in the reader's mind the more common meaning, "fearing"—admitting that (since the future really is unknown) there is still a possibility that his good reputation will be forgotten. A similar double meaning is employed by Horace when he speaks about his own fame in 2.20, discussed in section G below. If here in 2.2 Horace means that the wings of Proculeius' *Fama* are the immortality and far-spread fame poets give to their poetic subjects (e.g. Theognis 237-254), perhaps the ambiguity is intended to express poetic modesty (the poet's work might not last forever). Another possibility is that Horace intends to link this reference to Icarus, if such a reference is intended, back to the reference to Icarus in 1.1.15-16 (*mercator <u>metuens</u>*, 16).

[120] Verg. *Aen.* 4.180-181; cf. Bacchyl. fr. 2.

[121] ἄμβροτε Φάμα, Soph. *OT* 157; *dea foeda*, Verg. *Aen.*4.195; cf. Hes. *Op.* 774. Pausanias records that the Athenians had an altar to Φήμη (1.17.1).

wings, held together by wax, melted in the sun. Commentators disagree[122] on whether Horace means to hint at the myth, but if he does, the use here is certainly in line with the myth's use throughout the *Odes*. Proculeius, as a moderate, non-miser is described as a non-Icarus—unlike Icarus' wings, the wings of his good reputation will carry him aloft beyond death.[123]

Both of the indirect references to Icarus in 1.13 and 2.2 serve to illustrate the immoderation or moderation of the person being compared to the flying boy and further confirm the pattern seen in 1.3 and 3.7. In the next section we will look at 2.20, in which Horace compares himself and his poetry to Icarus' flight, and 4.2, which, though outside *Odes* 1-3, provides a significant *comparandum* for 2.20.

G. 2.20 and 4.2: Daedalean Icarus and Poetic Immoderation

In the final poem of Book 2, *Odes* 2.20, Horace imagines that wings will carry him, too, after his death; instead of dying, he—that is, his poetry—will be transformed into a bird and fly to far-off lands.[124] He also explicitly compares his flight to that of Icarus:

---

[122] Wickham (1877) ad loc. says that a reference to Icarus is possible; Naylor (1922) ad loc. and Quinn (1980) ad loc. assert that a reference to Icarus is intended; Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc. reject the possibility.

[123] See Hardie (2012) 31 on *fama* as Fame or reputation in 2.2.

[124] This ode is mostly notable for the very negative critical reception it has gotten in the modern era (due to its "repulsive"—Fraenkel [1957] 301—detailed description of the

> iam Daedaleo notior Icaro
> visam gementis litora Bosphori
> Syrtisque Gaetulas canorus
> ales Hyperboreosque campos. (2.20.13-16)
>
> Then, better known than Daedalus' Icarus, I shall visit as a melodious bird the shores of the groaning Bosphorus and the Gaetulian Syrtes and the plains of the Hyperboreans.

Horace portrays himself as crossing several boundaries: the boundary between human and animal, geographic lines, and the boundary between mortal and immortal. Horace's plans for his poetry are im-moderate, perhaps even hubristic. The hubristic aspect is heightened by the Pindaric intertext: in *Pythian* 10, the road ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα (30) is an example of the limit for a human being, a boundary crossed only by Perseus when, aided by a goddess, Athena, he makes his magical flight (45).[125] Horace, however, portrays himself as unaided in his flight, flying with the skill of his own poetic craft, highlighted by the comparison to Icarus and the naming of the human craftsman who made Icarus' flight possible (*Daedaleo,* 13).[126] By comparing the post-mortem flight of

---

speaker's metamorphosis into a bird) and subsequent attempts by scholars to recuperate it: see Hornbeck (2014) 153-156 for discussion of the history of scholarship on this ode and bibliography. I will deal here not with an aesthetic evaluation of the ode but only with the interpretation of the role of Icarus in it.

[125] On the geographical references as a whole, Lowrie (1997) 212 notes that Horace "will travel to literal (*Bosphori,* 14) and mythological (*Hyperboreos . . . campos,* 16) places, the homes of literal (*Dacus,* 18) and symbolic (*Geloni*, 19) enemies of Rome."

[126] Cf. Wickham (1877) ad loc.: "not a needless patronymic; but i[dem] q[uod] 'ope

his poetry to Icarus' flight, Horace hints at the danger inherent in being a poet who aspires to an everlasting reputation.[127] He could be "better known" than Icarus because he is more successful, but one remembers that Icarus is well-known only because he was a failure, and to be "better known" could mean to fail more notably.[128] As *Odes* 4.2.1-4 reminds us, the sea that bears his name *in perpetuum* would not have that name if he had not died there:

> Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,
> Iulle, ceratis ope Daedalea
> nititur pinnis, uitreo daturus
> nomina ponto.
>
> Whoever strives to emulate Pindar, Iullus, depends on wings waxed with Daedalean craft and will give his name to the glassy sea.

These first lines of 4.2 are another example—though an example outside *Odes* 1-3—of the Icarus myth being used to describe the risks of aspiring too high in one's poetic endeavor. Later in 4.2 Horace calls Pindar the "Dircean swan" (*Dircaeum cycnum*, 25) whose poetic flight takes him "into the high regions of the clouds" (*in altos | nubium*

Daedalea'."

[127] Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc.

[128] Hornbeck (2014) 159 interprets *notior* as unambiguously negative: "more notorious." However, there is some ambiguity in the Latin: see *OLD* s.v. *notus* 1-6 and 8 (neutral or positive senses) versus 7 (negative). For an unambiguously positive interpretation, see Pascal (1980) 101 and Sutherland (2002) 148-150 (see also Sutherland [2002] 148 n. 42 on the history of scholarly emendations to this word). West (1998) 145 notes that "the tone is slippery to catch, since *notior* usually suggests notoriety rather than good fame."

tractus, 26-27); the poet described in the opening lines, who aspires to emulate this bird with merely artificial wings, is doomed to fall.[129] However, in 2.20 Horace claims he will actually become a swan: his wings will not be held together with wax, *ope Daedalea*.[130] As he says in the first line of 2.20, he will be borne on wings that are not "flimsy": "Non usitata nec tenui ferar | penna . . ." ("On neither a common nor a flimsy wing shall I be carried . . ." 1-2). Nevertheless, the ambiguous mention of Icarus—how exactly will be he "better known" than Icarus?—and the future tense used throughout[131] suggest that his success at achieving the heights of poetic renown is not yet guaranteed. As West puts it, Horace "makes fun of his own pretentions" to resemble Pindar.[132]

---

[129] Cf. Thomas (2011) 105.

[130] Cf. Thévenaz (2002) 883.

[131] Hornbeck (2014) 157 notes that the present tense is used in the metamorphosis passage (9-12) for vividness; Horace returns to the future in line 14 (*visam*).

[132] West (1998) 145. Hornbeck (2014) 160 argues that the very "excess" of the poem, which has posed a problem to previous scholars, "actually contribute[s] to the meaning of the poem." She suggests that Horace succeeds in intentionally writing an Icarian poem in order to deal with "the anxieties about ambition, audacity, and failure that motivate 1.3" (161), which she reads as dealing with the possibility of Horace's and Vergil's poetic failure. In 4.2 an older, wiser poet advises Iullus in his own attempt to imitate Pindar, the Dircean swan (164-166). In both cases the hubristic poet is compared to Icarus, though in 2.20 Horace suggests, through his differences with Icarus, that in the end he might

Having looked at all the references to Daedalus' and Icarus' immoderate flight in *Odes* 1-3—and even one in Book 4—we can see a pattern emerge, the theme of immoderation reechoing through the *Odes* with each reference to the flying mortals and their wax and wings. In the next section we will return to 1.1, the "overture" to *Odes* 1-3, and see how Icarus and flight are important elements of Horace's proem.

H. 1.1: Icarian Immoderation in the Merchant and the Poet

Taking a closer look at 1.1.15-18, the lines from which we started, we see that the merchant who fears the wind and waves of the Icarian Sea is also immoderate in his own way. The merchant, while in danger of his life, longs for the peace of a settled life in the countryside, but nevertheless, having barely escaped (the damage to his ships shows the danger he was in: *reficit ratis | quassas*, 17-18), he soon returns to the sea. He knows the dangers, and yet, because he cannot learn to endure poverty, he risks those dangers again. His desire for wealth is immoderate and leads him into danger, just as Icarus' desire for flying high led to his death. We see here, then, the first reference to Icarus' flight in the *Odes* and how it introduces the pattern to follow.

There is another Icarian figure lurking in the poem: Horace,[133] who, in the last lines of 1.1, imagines being included with the nine lyric poets as a flight with potentially dangerous consequences:

---

succeed.

[133] Cf. Pomeroy (1980) 45-46 who finds excess of desire a unity in the series of vocations in the priamel and also notes the connection between Horace and the figures in the

> quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
> sublimi feriam sidera vertice. (35-36)
>
> But if you insert me among the lyric bards, I shall strike the stars with my lofty head.

The nine lyric poets are conceived of as heavenly divinities, and if Maecenas counts Horace in their number this would be nothing short of an apotheosis. In the lines preceding these, Horace describes his current situation:

> Me doctarum hederae praemia frontium
> dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
> Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori
> secernunt populo, si neque tibias
> Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
> Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton. (32-34)
>
> Ivy, the prize of learned brows, allows me to mingle with the gods above; the cool grove and nimble bands of Nymphs together with the Satyrs cut me off from the general populace, as long as Euterpe does not restrain her flutes and Polyhymnia does not shrink from tuning her Lesbian lyre.

We might consider Horace's claim to live apart from the realm of mortals hubristic if he did not also make clear that this proximity to the divine is contingent on the Muses' continuing to favor him.[134] The divine company he keeps now, however, consists of rather terrestrial divinities: nymphs (who are connected to geographical features), satyrs (whom Ovid lists among the *plebs superum*),[135] and Muses (one does not have to be

---

priamel.

[134] Cf. the sailor in 1.31 who, although he sails frequently and perhaps, defying moderation, too often, nevertheless is safe because he is favored by the gods (see Mayer [2012] 196 for a summary of the views on the potential irony in these lines).

[135] *Ib*. 81.

divine oneself to be inspired by the Muses). In addition, he does not inhabit the heavens but the "cool grove" of poets. Horace sees in his future the possibility of having his "lofty" head amongst the "stars"—not only "mingling with" the gods above but as one of them. However, Horace is good-naturedly self-deflating. First, it is Maecenas' opinion, not his own efforts, that will insert him among that ethereal crowd (*inseres*, 35), and secondly, and most strikingly, he imagines that even if he manages to be accorded this honor he would clumsily hit his head on the stars (*feriam sidera vertice*, 36).[136] Horace, who just described the merchant in Icarian terms, knows and acknowledges the danger

[136] Cf. Clay (2010) 134: "the grandeur of Horace's closing ambition—to be included within the lyric canon—is abruptly deflated by a grotesque image of apotheosis." Nearly all the Greek parallels cited by Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) ad loc. and Sappho 52 cited by Woodman (2002) 54 speak of merely touching (ψαύειν) the sky. Clay (2010) 144 n. 17 points out that "'to touch the heaven' and to bang into it are quite different matters" and that the only exact parallel for this is a *comic* fragment (*com. adesp.* 531 K). Furthermore, Horace calls our attention to the humor in the metaphor by making it more concrete: rather than touching/striking the general region of heaven, Horace depicts his head as specifically bumping into the "stars" as it rises (note also that stars are more like the sun which is Icarus' downfall). All this is *not* to say that there is not an allusion to Sappho 52, observed by Woodman (2002) 54, lurking here, but only to argue that Horace makes his reversal of Sappho's statement (that she does "not expect to touch the sky") laughable in order to point to the Icarian foolishness of taking as one's model such a great poet.

inherent in rejecting moderation. In 2.20, Horace reprises the theme of the danger of poetic overreaching with another reference to Icarus. At the *end* of his work, however, in in final ode, 3.30 Horace is willing to declare without deflation that his accomplishment and name are everlasting, and there is no hint of Icarus or even of flight: his poetry is not a future traveling bird but an already-established, stable monument (*Exegi monumentum*, 1).

We now see that the reference to Icarus in 1.1 is not merely ornamental. Horace included it in his first ode as a "deliberate echo" (Fraenkel's terminology, referring to the fact that the proem was composed last[137]) of other odes in which the myth and the theme of immoderation—and specifically, in 2.20, poetic immoderation—occur. Furthermore, we have learned that Horace is consistent in his use of Daedalus' and Icarus' flight, even when the reference is indirect or seemingly unimportant. Finally, we have seen that giving careful attention to any one reference, and bringing to bear on it the cumulative significance of Daedalus and Icarus in the *Odes*, can aid in the interpretation of the poem in which the reference appears.

Icarus' flight is not the only repeated myth in the *Odes*. Icarus is just one example of how a close examination of repeated myths reveals a mythological language that Horace uses to speak about themes such as immoderation, poetry, and immortality. Just as Icarus links the theme of immoderation in 1.1 to those themes in several other odes, the other lexemes in Horace's mythological vocabulary bring unity to the collection of *Odes* and can deepen our understanding of the collection and of individual poems. In the

[137] Fraenkel (1957) 230.

next section, we will look at another recurring mythological figure linked to *hubris* and immoderation, Prometheus, who appears in 1.3 along with Daedalus and Hercules as an example of someone committing *vetitum nefas*.

Part I: Mythology and Moderation

Chapter 2: Prometheus and Tantalus

A. Prometheus as a Recurring Mythological Figure in the Odes

Another recurring figure in the *Odes* is Prometheus who, though he does not make an appearance in the proem, appears early in the first three books, in 1.3. In 1.3 he is ostensibly used as an *exemplum* to illustrate the danger of ignoring boundaries set by the gods. Horace lists him in a catalogue of im-moderate, boundary-crossing[138] figures (after the first sailor, lines 9-24, and before Daedalus and Hercules, discussed above) and mentions his theft of fire and the ills this act brought on humanity:

> audax omnia perpeti
> gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas.
> audax Iapeti genus
> ignem fraude mala gentibus intulit;
> post ignem aetheria domo
> subductum macies et nova febrium
> terris incubuit cohors,
> semotique prius tarda necessitas
> leti corripuit gradum.
> expertus vacuum Daedalus aera
> pennis non homini datis;
> perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor.
> nil mortalibus ardui est:
> caelum ipsum petimus stultitia neque
> per nostrum patimur scelus
> iracunda Iovem ponere fulmina. (1.3.25-40)
>
> Bold enough to try anything, the human race rushes into forbidden acts of wickedness. The bold son of Iapetus, with an evil theft, brought fire to the nations; after the fire was stolen from its ethereal home a wasting away and a new cohort of fevers fell upon the lands, and the inevitability of distant death, previously slow, sped up its pace. Daedalus tested the empty air with wings not given to men; a Herculean labor broke through Acheron. There is nothing

[138] Cf. Elder (1952) 153.

> "impossibly high" for mortals: we aim for the sky itself in our stupidity, and by our crime we do not allow Jupiter to lay aside his angry thunderbolts.

At first the message seems clear: if the gods forbid something to mortals—such as fire or flight—and a mortal is foolhardy enough to try for it, punishment will ensue. This, after all, is the stated moral (lines 37-40). However, a closer look reveals that this simple interpretation is problematic. First, Prometheus is not of the *audax . . . gens humana* (25-26), a fact which Horace emphasizes by calling him *audax Iapeti genus* (26), that is, the offspring of a Titan, a difference he again emphasizes with the repetition of *gens* to refer to humankind in *ignem . . . gentibus intulit* (28). Secondly, the named punishment for the theft of fire (the released contents of Pandora's jar) falls not on the thief himself—who, as an immortal, cannot get sick and die[139]—but on his innocent beneficiaries. Thirdly, Horace neglects to mention the punishment Prometheus actually did receive for his theft. If Horace is warning humans (*gens humana*, 26) not to disobey the laws and boundaries set up by the gods, Prometheus seems like an odd choice as the primary example (he gets seven lines, as opposed to Daedalus' two and Hercules' one).[140] Not describing Prometheus' punishment makes the choice even more bizarre. Why would Horace choose

---

[139] This fact is key to Prometheus' own punishment, which was to have an eagle every day eat his "immortal liver" (ἦπαρ | . . . ἀθάνατον, Hes. *Theog.* 523-524), which would regrow in the night (Hes. *Theog.* 521-525).

[140] The first sailor gets 16 lines total (9-24), but he is unnamed and separated from the three at the end by the *sententia* of lines 25-26. Prometheus is the primary named example of the *sententia.*

an *exemplum* that is ill-fitted to the moral it appears he is trying to preach, point out the fact (*audax Iapeti genus*), and neglect even to do all that he can to make it fit?

In the first chapter we found that looking at all the references to Daedalus' and Icarus' flight in the *Odes* revealed the meaning behind the seemingly ornamental reference to the Icarian Sea in 1.1. In this chapter I will look at all the references to Prometheus in the *Odes* before returning to 1.3. After this first appearance in 1.3, Prometheus appears again in 1.16 as the creator of mankind and the one responsible for humans' capacity for extreme anger. In Book 2 he appears twice, in 2.13 and 2.18, paired with Tantalus in the underworld. As we will see, Prometheus is consistently linked with immoderation and, like Icarus, with the poet himself.

B. 1.16: Prometheus, Creator of Immoderation

Scholars have noted that the myth about Prometheus in *Odes* 1.16 is possibly an invention of Horace.[141] The myth also stands out in its poem because, unlike the several

[141] Williams (1980) 2, Syndikus (2001) 182-183, Mayer (2012) 145-146. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 209 cite as the closest parallel one of Aesop's fables, where Prometheus has to change some animals into men, so some men (not all) have the souls of animals (but not the same animal). However, it is easy to see that while this story may be like one that influenced Horace or perhaps similar to the one Horace has in mind (the story from Pl. *Prt.* 320d-323a also provides some parallels), it is certainly not the same story. Breuer (2008) 179 notes that Horace seems to be very free with the myth of Prometheus, given that he even puts him in the underworld in 2.13 and 2.18.

gods, rites, myths, and historical events referred to in lines 5-11 and 17-21 to illustrate anger and its effects, Horace devotes an entire stanza of the 7-stanza ode to his Prometheus myth. He relates how Prometheus, as he was creating humans, also created the human capacity for extreme anger:

> fertur Prometheus addere principi
> limo coactus[142] particulam undique
> desectam et insani leonis
> vim stomacho apposuisse nostro.
>
> Prometheus is said to have been compelled to add to our primordial clay a particle cut from every creature and to have put into our stomach (i.e., the source of ill-temper) the violence of a mad lion. (13-16)

This stanza, the fourth of seven, is also in the middle of the poem; Williams points out that this ode is one of the type that has a "transitional stanza" between two blocks of sense.[143] Harrison has observed that in Horace's odes the central stanza often has a "turn"[144]—a reason to pay closer attention to these "transitional" middle stanzas. Despite the centrality and marked idiosyncrasy of these lines on Prometheus, scholars have not made much use of them when interpreting the poem. Williams, whose view will be discussed below, deals with them in their role as a "transitional" stanza, but does not focus much on the myth itself.[145] Syndikus addresses the fact that Horace invented the

---

[142] Shackleton Bailey (2001) prints Bentley's conjecture *coactam*; I prefer *coactus* (MSS), printed by Rudd (2004), for reasons argued below.

[143] Williams (1980) 2.

[144] Harrison (2004); cf. Moritz (1968) 117.

[145] Williams (1980) 4.

myth, arguing that the "Pseudomythos" fits the "Pseudopathos," the anger portrayed in the poem, which he sees as disproportionate and exaggerated.[146] Commager quotes lines 13-21 to illustrate that Horace includes "what is virtually a hymn to *Ira*, complete with mythological pedigree and tributes to the deity's past accomplishments" as part of his "mock-heroic technique" in the ode.[147] West similarly dispenses with the lines very briefly, taking them as a mockery of philosophy, without even naming Prometheus.[148] Johnson sees Prometheus' myth here as part of Horace's "*recant*ing" Canidia's song in *Epode* 17, where Prometheus is enduring punishment in the underworld.[149] Other scholars focusing on various questions simply omit the Prometheus stanza from their discussion.[150] Although my ultimate goal is to determine how Horace's use of Prometheus in this ode might shed light on his use of Prometheus in 1.3 and in the *Odes*

---

[146] Syndikus (2001) 182-183.

[147] Commager (1962) 137.

[148] West (1995) 79.

[149] Johnson (2012) 220. Hahn (1939) also observes verbal echoes between this ode and *Epode* 17. In addition to Johnson, Nadeau (2008) 69 makes use of the actual figure of Prometheus, though he leaps from the myth as presented to *Prometheus Vinctus*, to anger that "is not controlled even by the fear of Jupiter," and, hence, to Augustus and a political interpretation of the ode.

[150] E.g., Fraenkel (1957) 207-209, Santirocco (1986) 50, Griffith (2002) 67-69, Eicks (2011) 167-173

as a whole, we must first establish what this myth's role is here in 1.16. Why did Horace (if indeed he did) choose to invent this story, and why is it narrated at such length and placed so centrally? How does it function as a "turn" in the ode? Before returning to these questions, we will first look at the rest of the ode and the various interpretations that have been given to the whole. Then we will see how the centrality of the Prometheus myth influences our reading of the poem.

There are two central questions about the poem. One I will call the "Helen question," that is, "to whom is the poem addressed (Helen or otherwise), and is it thereby connected with 1.15 and 1.17;" I will not deal with this question in this chapter.[151] The second question is "whose anger is the poem about?" Nisbet and Hubbard argue that the poem is about the girl's anger, arguing against previous scholars who assumed it was about Horace's anger in his iambic poetry, which he asks her to dispose of.[152] The thesis that the girl herself wrote the iambics alluded to in the first stanza was put forward by MacKay,[153] but has been rejected by later scholars.[154] Yet another view is that the sermon against anger is about the anger of *both* Horace *and* the girl.[155]

---

[151] Most recent scholarship has been interested in this question more than the other: e.g., Griffith (2002) 67-71, Eicks (2011) 167-173.

[152] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 202-203, accepted by Jenkyns (1982) 146.

[153] MacKay (1962), supported by Dyson (1968); cf. Nadeau (2008) 68.

[154] E. g., Jenkyns (1982) 146 n. 1 (but the interpretation is retained by Nadeau [2008] 68, and Johnson [2012] 224-225 sees the lines as intentionally ambiguous). Jenkyns argues that the subject of Horace's poems was not the girl herself but her "beautiful mother;"

Williams, arguing for a both-and interpretation of the anger preached against in lines 5-21, sees a shift in topic in the Prometheus stanza: "the function of the transitional stanza is to assert that a capacity for anger is a basic element of every human being's constitution—a fact that is being displayed in the girl's conduct and that was, in the past, displayed in the poet's lampoons."[156] If we consider the myth even more closely, we see further evidence in this stanza for the both-and interpretation, and we also learn more about why Horace particularly chose Prometheus and why he chose (possibly) to invent this myth.

Of the two characters in the poem, Horace and the girl, Prometheus is most like Horace. Both Prometheus and Horace are creators: Horace of poetry, Prometheus of men.

---

however, the question of the addressee of the iambics is not relevant to the issues discussed here. West (1995) 78, 80-81 convincingly answers Jenkyns' objections to the usual reconstruction of the situation of the ode.

[155] Williams (1980) 1-5, Santirocco (1986) 50.

[156] Williams (1980) 4; Williams then shows that the reference to Thyestes in the following lines refers to the girl's anger while the withheld reference to the more obvious—and worse—Atreus refers to Horace's anger; by withholding the reference to Atreus Horace keeps hidden until the end the threat that more angry poems may come if she does not make peace with him (Williams [1980] 4-5). Santirocco (1986) 50 sees the shift at *compesce mentem* (22): "We had been assuming all along that the lengthy excursus on anger was relevant to Horace. We now learn, however, that the observations apply equally well to the girl."

What is said about Prometheus and Horace in the poem reveals that, more specifically, they are both creators of anger: Horace by his iambics, Prometheus by his insertion of the lion's rage. Furthermore, both are unwilling creators: Prometheus is *coactus*, Horace says, "me . . . | . . . | fervor . . . in celeris iambos | misit furentem" (22, 24-25). Horace has been affected by Prometheus' creation of anger—he has fallen victim to anger and written poetry he now regrets—but he is also in some sense a Prometheus himself, creating or arousing, through his angry, invective poetry, anger in the girl.

In the Prometheus stanza, Horace pivots from talking about his past anger to talking about the girl's present anger: it is indeed a turn in the poem.[157] In this stanza he implies that his own anger was due to human nature, caused by Prometheus. The girl's anger, in turn, was caused by Horace through his iambics. The use of Prometheus and the myth of his creation of mankind is integral to Horace's pivot from talking about his own anger to that of the girl. Horace is Prometheus' creation and his analogue, and Horace transitions from one to the other in the course of the middle stanza. In the final section of the poem, his message to the girl is "I understand how you feel, so just as I have overcome the anger in me created by nature, you should overcome the anger in you created by me." The poem is about both Horace's anger and the girl's.

There is another way in which this particular, possibly invented, Prometheus myth is appropriate to the poem. The anger Horace claims Prometheus put into mankind is not subtle or restrained anger, it is anger equivalent to the "violence of a mad lion" (*insani*

---

[157] In a way, it is the opposite of Harrison's "authorial turn," where midway Horace turns from the addressee to himself, e.g., in 2.12.13 (Harrison [2004] 94).

leonis | *vim*, 15-16). The anger is not only extreme but bestial and immoderate: it crosses the boundary between men and animals. At the beginning of the poem Horace also portrays his iambic anger as immoderate when he asks the girl to place an end or limit (*modus*) to the iambs: *modum* | *pones iambis*, 2-3. He casts his anger[158] as not just any madness but as a mind-shattering madness *beyond* the holy madness induced by the gods (5-9).[159] In addition, he signals the hubristic, overreaching nature of this anger, by saying that it cannot be controlled by war or shipwreck or even Jupiter's thunderbolts (9-12), that is, it remained uncontrolled after suffering these calamities, which we have previously seen (shipwreck: 1.1, Jupiter's lightning: 1.3) to be the result of or punishment for immoderation. He also portrays the girl's anger—the anger created by his poetry—as needing to be reined in and given an appropriate boundary when he commands her, *compesce mentem* (22). In 1.16, Prometheus is associated not only with the creative power of the poet but also with the unwilling creation of an immoderate temperament, something Horace the poet also provokes.

Looking closely at Prometheus aids not only in understanding 1.16 but also providing important data for understanding his use in the rest of the *Odes*. Just as in 1.3, Prometheus in 1.16 is associated with immoderation. However, 1.16 adds an additional valence to Prometheus: his connection to the poet. Both are creators, and both, through

---

[158] *tristes . . . irae* (9) that caused him to write *tristia* (26), which Commager (1962) 136 n. 57 points out "bears almost a technical reference to poems of invective; cf. *tristi laedere versu* (*S.* 2.1.21)."

[159] Cf. Syndikus (2001) 181.

their creations, have a similar effect on the minds of humans. In another poem, 2.13, Prometheus again appears in close proximity to the poet: in the underworld that Horace "almost visited" after a close brush with death. In this poem, though, another figure emerges, paired with Prometheus: Tantalus.

C. 2.13: Prometheus and Tantalus United

At the end of *Odes* 2.13, Horace gives a very short list of famous sinners inhabiting the underworld he nearly visited, who are all affected by the music of Lesbian lyric:

> quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens
> dulci laborem decipitur sono,
> nec curat Orion leones
> aut timidos agitare lyncas.
>
> Even Prometheus and the father of Pelops are tricked into forgetting their toil by the sweet sound, and Orion does not care about hunting the lions and timid lynxes. (37-40)

There are two notable things about this list. First, Prometheus is not usually in the underworld. In Latin literature before Horace, Prometheus' punishment is portrayed as happening in the Caucasus mountains. Vergil mentions Prometheus' punishment in the Caucasus in *Ecl.* 6. Propertius also puts him in the Caucasus in two of his elegies, 1.12 and 2.1. Catullus shows Prometheus after his punishment at 64.294-297 and, though the mountains are not named, mentions that he was on a mountain-top (*verticibus praeruptis*, 297). Secondly, the pairing of Prometheus and Tantalus, though perhaps not odd once one has granted that Prometheus is in the underworld, becomes more striking when one

realizes that this is the first of two occasions in the *Odes* where these unlikely figures are paired. The second instance is in 2.18, which we will look at below.

However, this is not the first time Horace has put Prometheus in the underworld and paired him with Tantalus. The end of *Epode* 17 portrays a very similar underworld:

> optat quietem Pelopis infidi pater,
> egens benignae Tantalus semper dapis,
> optat Prometheus obligatus aliti,
> optat supremo collocare Sisyphus
> in monte saxum; sed vetant leges Iovis.
>
> The father of faithless Pelops, Tantalus, always lacking the generous feast, desires rest; Prometheus, bound for the bird,[160] desires rest; Sisyphus desires to place the rock on the top of the mountain; but the laws of Jupiter forbid it. (65-69)

Epode 17 is not the only epode to which *Odes* 2.13 has been linked. Nisbet and Hubbard note that the first half of the poem resembles *Epode* 10.[161] Davis sees the first half of the ode as reworking motifs from *Epode* 3.[162] However, these parallels drawn from the *Epodes* are only found in the first half of 2.13, which appears to draw its tone from iambic invective, where Horace excoriates the planter of the tree.[163] It appears then that Horace not only gives the ode an iambic opening, but also concludes the ode with an allusion to his final epode, marked by the unusual portrayal of Prometheus in the underworld—but why?

---

[160] "for the bird": Mankin (1995) 291.

[161] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 202.

[162] Davis (1991) 82-83; cf. Commager (1962) 140, Syndikus (2001) 414 n. 9.

[163] Davis (1991) 83, Syndikus (2001) 414.

In *Epode* 17.65-69 the witch Canidia compares Horace, whose sins against her deserve, she believes, worse than a swift death, to mythological sinners who are punished by never-ending torment or labor: by describing a mythological underworld she shows Horace the "hell" she will make his life. In *Odes* 2.13, a hell is also envisioned for Horace, this time by the poet himself, and he has put into it two of the figures he was previously compared to in *Epode* 17: Prometheus and Tantalus. However, here Prometheus and Tantalus get respite from the torment they are suffering in the epode. In *Epode* 17, they "desire rest" (*optat quietem,* 65), and in *Odes* 2.13 they "are tricked into forgetting their labor" (*laborem decipitur*, 38), although their rest is not the "quiet" implied by *quietem*, but instead results from a "sweet sound" (*dulci sono,* 38). The two sinners of the epode are soothed not by quiet but by the sound of the lyre. I believe a metapoetical point is being made here.

Scholars have noted the suddenness of the shift in the ode from the iambic opening to the *nekuia*-like second half.[164] Klingner sees a progression in the poem, from Horace's anger or despair at the realization of his mortality to a calmer state of mind, brought about by art.[165] Porter similarly sees a progression from despair to a contemplation of poetry's power over death.[166] Commager asserts that Horace, "by blowing up the trivial event to absurd proportions," tries to distance himself from it and

[164] Some have not, choosing to focus only on the second half, e.g. Reitzenstein (1922), Fraenkel (1957) 167-168.

[165] Klingner (1964) 333.

[166] Porter (1987) 129.

assure himself of its triviality, but that the parody, finally, is not "an adequate vehicle for Horace to deal with his feelings;" he therefore moves into a more serious contemplation of mortality.[167] Syndikus similarly reads the first half of the poem as a deliberately overblown expression of anger that then leads to a description of the solution, namely, poetry.[168]

Davis is the only scholar who deals specifically with the generic aspect of this bifurcation.[169] After listing the numerous verbal parallels between *Epodes* 3 and *Odes* 2.13.1-12, Davis points out that the invective ends abruptly with lyric *sententiae* (13-20)—"'lyric's acceptance of mortality has prevailed in the poem itself over 'iambic' spleen"[170]—and in the rest of the poem we see the Orpheus-like power of *lyric* poetry

---

[167] Commager (1962) 140.

[168] Syndikus (2001) 414-422. Both Commager and Syndikus point out the intentional humor of the first section. West (1998) 90-95 sees the whole ode as simply humorous; in that case, the shift in tone as simply part of the fun. I agree wholeheartedly that the ode, both in the first twelve lines and as a whole, is humorous and lighthearted: the atypical portrayal of literary-historical figures in a mythological underworld also contributes to this feeling. The ode's humor comes from its relationship to *Epodes* 3, 10, and 17. Nevertheless, in this humorous ode Horace also makes a point; the shift in tone is *both* humorous *and* meaningful.

[169] Davis (1991) 82-88.

[170] Davis (1991) 85.

(the songs of Sappho and Alcaeus) to soothe.[171] The poem ends, Davis points out, with named impious sinners that

> recall the even more violent and hypothetical unnamed *impii* to whom the tree-planter was humorously compared in 5-12. The rehearsal of the motif of notorious offenders (a variety of ring composition) accomplishes more than a neat sense of recapitulation and formal closure. It also provides a coup de grace to the angry "iambic" speaker, who has given way to the superior lyric voice. Certain of the most famous *impii*, it now appears, prove susceptible to the prevailing power of *carmina*; hence, in retrospect, even the notorious tree-planter, who has been assimilated to the status of the grand sinners, would ultimately have been vulnerable to such sweet compulsion.[172]

In Davis' reading, the whole poem is a demotion of iambic invective in favor of philosophical lyric, which has a far greater power. His reading of the final lines, however, misses one point that could strengthen his argument: the allusion to *Epode* 17. If Horace had simply wanted to name some *impii* as a means to hark back to the first lines of the ode, he could have chosen any traditional sinner: Ixion would have been appropriate, since he is in the Vergilian intertext for this passage (*G*. 4.481-484),[173] or perhaps the Danaids, who appear in the next ode. However, Horace specifically chose first the puzzling Prometheus and then Tantalus, naming the latter the "parent of Pelops," *Pelopis parens* (37), with the same alliteration of *p* that occurs in *Epode 17*: *Pelopis . . . pater* (65).

---

[171] Clay (2010) 136 argues that what is represented is the soothing power of Sappho's music in particular.

[172] Davis (1991) 88.

[173] See Oksala (1974) 171, Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 219-220.

In that epode, Prometheus and Tantalus are two of the representatives for Horace in Canidia's mythological picture of her punishment of the poet.[174] Canidia aligns Horace's iambic self with Prometheus and Tantalus. In *Odes* 2.13 Horace's iambic self (represented by the iambic tone of the first twelve lines) is again in danger, from a tree rather than a witch.[175] His underworld in *Odes* 2.13 describes the same mythical representations of his tortured iambic self as *Epode* 17, but they are not feeling torment: rather, as if on pain medication, they are blissfully unaware of their labors because of the lyric music. In *Epode* 17, what Prometheus and Tantalus desire is *quietem* (65), which implies both a cessation of labor and a cessation of sound. The end of the epode is Canidia's own iambic invective against the poet (a punishment that fits the crime); at the conclusion of *Epode* 17, however, the iambic voices of both Horace and Canidia cease, as it is the final epode. There is a rest and a quiet, but, as Horace shows at the beginning of *Odes* 2.13, the anger of the poet that iambic poetry portrays is not eliminated by ceasing to write iambs. However, 2.13 also shows that there is a true remedy; in the ode Prometheus and Tantalus actually achieve their desired rest, rather than only hope for it, not through quiet but through sound. It turns out that what can truly give respite to the

---

[174] Prometheus and Tantalus are a grammatically separate unit from the third underworld denizen Sisyphus, because their verbs, *optat . . . optat*, share the same object, *quietem*, whereas Sisyphus' *optat* takes an infinitive.

[175] The tree is a vegetable danger, like the garlic of the third epode, which itself is at first suspected to be Canidia's doing, *Epod.* 3.8.

angry iambic poet (whose anger leads to only hellish pain for him) is to turn to lyric.[176] Writing lyric moves the poet's focus away from immediate sources of anger (a falling tree) to the bigger picture (the unpredictability of death for all mankind, and the divine sphere, represented by the image of Persephone ruling and Aeacus judging) and to giving advice to others. In the very next poem, 2.14, *Eheu fugaces*, we see the lyric poet moralizing to Postumus about the necessity of enjoying life while he has it, continuing to deliver his thoughts on death with a focus on the bigger picture.

In addition to showing that lyric is the solution to the poet's iambic anger, 2.13 also shows that it is the solution to the anger of addressees/subjects like Canidia. In 1.16 the poet changed from an angry writer of iambics, aligned with anger-creating Prometheus, to a more thoughtful writer of lyric; with a lyric poem he tried to turn a girl from the anger caused by his iambics to renewed love. 1.16 shows lyric's power to change the poet and to turn back the anger of others. 2.13 similarly shows this double power of lyric poetry. In the final stanza (37-40), discussed above, Horace names the sinners who represent his iambic self, but, in the stanza just before (33-36), he describes two of the more monstrous inhabitants of the underworld, Cerberus and the Furies:

> quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens
> demittit atras belua centiceps
> auris et intorti capillis
> Eumenidum recreantur angues?
>
> Why wonder, when stunned by those songs the hundred-headed beast lowers his black ears and the snakes twisted in the hair of the Eumenides are refreshed? (33-36)

[176] Cf. Clay (2010) 36, who quotes Horace's address to the tortoise-shell lyre in 1.32.14-15: *o laborum* | *dulce lenimen*.

Cerberus is portrayed simply as a bestial monster (emphasized by calling him *belua*, 34, rather than naming him, as at 2.19.29) to be sedated, and in this way is parallel to the bestial, lion-like anger that Prometheus is said, in 1.16, to have put into human beings like Horace. The Furies, on the other hand, are specifically creatures of revenge, like the revenge Canidia took on Horace in *Epode* 17. Cerberus is entranced and calmed by the music (*stupens*, 33, *demittit . . . auris*, 34-35), but here the Furies' hair-snakes are not stupefied, as are the Furies in Vergil (*stupere*, *G.* 4.481). Rather, they are, strangely enough, "re-created" or "revived": *recreantur* (36).[177] This verb has proved difficult for editors and translators, who differ between forcing it to mean something more like *stupere* (e.g., Rudd: "slink to rest")[178] or allowing it to mean the opposite (e.g., West: "come to life").[179] Yet the *OLD* gives this passage as an example of the sense "to recover (from illness, fatigue, etc.), get well."[180] It is this sense, as well as *OLD* 1, "to re-create, make new," that I would like to consider. If anger and vengeance are like an illness, lyric poetry has a healing effect, restoring the offended person. Furthermore, the Furies, pacified, are no longer Furies but are re-created as the "Eumenides," the "Kindly Ones"—the name Horace uses in line 36.[181] In this stanza we see that not only is bestial

[177] See *OLD* s.v.

[178] Rudd (2004) 123; cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc., who discuss the difficulty.

[179] West (1998) 91.

[180] *OLD* s.v. 2b.

[181] Cf. Davis (1991) 88.

violence, represented by Cerberus, soothed by lyric, but also the vengeful anger of humans like Canidia. Given the nature of lyric, this makes sense: poetry like that of Sappho and Alcaeus—complaining about love or singing about the harshness of the sea, exile, and war—acknowledges life's difficulties rather than, like iambic poetry, ranting about them. Angry ranting drives others away or, worse, turns them into enemies, but expressing the difficulty of life draws others in[182] through empathy.[183] The next ode, 2.14, shows lyric in its mode of lament, as Horace does not simply scold Postumus for not enjoying life, but invites him to join with him as he mourns the brevity of it: "Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume, | labuntur anni" (1-2).

An analysis of the mythological figures in the final two stanzas of 2.13[184] answers several questions about the ode. First, it answers the question of "why Prometheus": the

---

[182] Cf. the image of the packed crowd in line 32: ". . . | densum umeris bibit aure vulgus."

[183] What the two lyricists have to say is deemed "worthy of sacred silence" by the shades: "utrumque sacro digna silentio | mirantur umbrae dicere" (29-30).

[184] An observant reader might notice that the only figure omitted in my discussion is Orion (lines 39-40); owing to the constraints of space, I will confine him to a brief note. Orion, hunting the prey he pursued in life, is a part of Homer's underworld in *Od.* 11. There is some uncertainty as to whether Orion is a "sinner" (as, e.g., Tantalus) or not; certainly in the *Odyssey* there is no hint that he has done anything wrong, but Horace at 3.4.70-73 hints at the version of the myth that accuses him of impropriety towards Diana (this from Callimachus *Hymn* 3.264-265; in other versions his downfall is either boasting of his hunting ability or being beloved by Artemis/Diana). As a *temptator* (3.4.71) of

reference to Prometheus and Tantalus is an allusion to *Epode* 17. This observation, in turn, answers the question of unity: the ode is making a metapoetical point as it moves from its overblown, angry, epode-like opening to the moralizing of 13-20 to the lyric *nekuia* of 21-40, that lyric is the antidote to the anger of both the iambic poet and of those whom his poet has angered.

In addition, considering Prometheus' presence here has led to linking this instance of Prometheus with the poet, just as Prometheus was linked with Horace in 1.16. Only a few poems after 2.13, in 2.18, Prometheus appears again, and, as in 2.13, he is paired with Tantalus in the underworld. After considering the role of Prometheus (and Tantalus)

Diana, Orion represents a different kind of immoderation from iambic anger: violent love or desire. The hunting image in lines 39-40 emphasizes the portrayal of Orion as a violent pursuer of an object of desire. What cures Orion of his urge to hunt is what alleviates Prometheus' and Tantalus' pain: lyric music. Clay (2010) 136 has argued that the music heard by the figures in the last two stanzas is specifically Sappho's, music that speaks about love. In Sappho's lyric poetry, love desires without pursuing and is mournful rather than violent when it is unrequited. On the other hand, the epodic opening of 2.13 alludes to Medea (*venena Colcha*, 8), famous for her mad, and eventually destructive, love; the *Epodes* themselves also show love that destroys: Canidia and her fellow witch in *Epode* 5 are killing a boy for a love potion (and refer to Medea: *venena Medeae*, 62). Lyric, then, has a positive effect on people afflicted by immoderate anger, represented by Prometheus and Tantalus, as well as destructive desire, represented by Orion.

in 2.18, we will finally turn back to 1.3 and attempt to answer some of the questions about that ode introduced at the beginning of this chapter.

D. 2.18: Prometheus and Tantalus Divided

In 2.18 Horace envisions an underworld not just for himself, as he did in 2.13, but also for a rich man (the *tu* of line 17).[185] Both odes pair Prometheus and Tantalus as denizens of the underworld, but, whereas in 2.13 they occupied the same line and sentence, in 2.18 they occupy adjacent sentences and two separate (but connected) stanzas:

. . . aequa tellus

pauperi recluditur
regumque pueris, nec satelles Orci
callidum Promethea
revinxit[186] auro captus. hic superbum

[185] There has been some speculation about whether *tu* refers to Maecenas: Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 289-290, Lyne (1995) 126-131. West (1998) 134-135 convincingly argues against this reading.

[186] Shackleton Bailey (2001) prints *revexit* and explains that *satelles Orci* refers to "Charon, non Mercurius;" so also Kiessling and Heinze (1955) 238. Both *revinxit* and *revexit* are manuscript readings. There is some scholarly dispute over just who the *satelles Orci* is and, therefore, what verb should be used. For arguments in favor of Mercury/*revinxit*, see Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc. and West (1998) 135. Allen (2003) interestingly proposes that *satelles Orci* ought to be emended to *satelles Orcus* ("nor, *like a minion*, bribed by gold, did Orcus release . . .," 618) and then the

Tantalum atque Tantali
genus coercet, hic levare functum
pauperem laboribus
vocatus atque non vocatus audit.

The earth opens the same for a poor man and the sons of kings, and the attendant/courtier of Orcus [i.e., Mercury] did not, bribed with gold, untie clever Prometheus. He restrains proud Tantalus and Tantalus' kind;[187] when called to free a poor man from the labors he has finished, and when not called, he hears him.[188] (32-40)

---

appropriate verb is most likely *revinxit*. The primary objections to identifying the *satelles* as Mercury are that *satelles* is too negative a word to apply to the god and that there is no myth in which Prometheus tries to bribe Mercury; the latter objection could also be made about the Charon/*revexit* theory. Kiessling and Heinze (1955) 238 suggest that the myth of Prometheus attempting to bribe Charon may come from Maecenas' *Prometheus*; Nisbet and Hubbard, taking the idea that Prometheus in the underworld is an allusion to Maecenas' work, further conjecture that "the parallel mention of Tantalus, again exactly as in 2.13.37, may come from the same source" (290). As shown above, however, the parallel of Tantalus and Prometheus in 2.13 comes from *Epode* 17, and there is no reason to think, if we reject Maecenas as the addressee of 2.18, that there is any allusion to his work here. The question of the *satelles Orci* (I believe the difficulty can be solved without Allen's emendation) and *revinxit* will be taken up below.

[187] I will argue below that the translation "kind" for *genus* is the more likely one, though "progeny" vel sim. is the more usual translation (e.g., Shepherd [1983] 123, West [1998] 131, Rudd [2004] 135).

[188] *OLD* s.v. *voco* 1b ("to call upon, invoke (gods, etc.)") quotes lines 38 and 40 as the

In 2.13 both Prometheus and Tantalus were representatives of Horace's iambic self, united by the fact that as a unit they functioned as an allusion to *Epode* 17. In this ode, however, Horace makes greater use of each figure individually by focusing on their individual myths.

Prometheus and Tantalus have in common the fact that they are both punished for theft (Prometheus of fire; Tantalus of ambrosia, cf. Pind. *Ol.* 1[189]), but this similarity only foregrounds their differences. Horace uses the difference between this pair of mythological figures in the second half of the poem (29-40) to illustrate the differences between Horace and the rich man, the pair of the first half (1-28). In this section I will argue that Tantalus as an underworld sinner is an analogue for the rich man, and that Horace, by pointedly contrasting himself with Tantalus, aligns himself with Prometheus, who, though for a time a denizen of the underworld, eventually is granted freedom and enjoys an immortality impossible for those of Tantalus' ilk, *Tantali genus* (37-38).

Horace's character sketch of the rich man focuses on his lack of respect for boundaries, his immoderation. Horace relaxes in the small amount of luxury that he has

---

sole example of *voco* with an infinitive. Also, *laboribus* is taken *apo koinou* with both *levare* and *functum*.

[189] Tantalus' portrayal in Pindar *Olympian* 1 is unique: in that ode, Tantalus is the dining partner of the gods who steals ambrosia from their table to serve to his human friends, and as punishment he is sentenced to an eternally-overhanging rock which will forever remind him of his mortality (and, hence, his presumption in taking immortal food).

and does not try to get more (9-16); the rich man, on the other hand, is constantly working, cutting marble for floors or paneling (17-19) and even building out into the sea (20-22), not satisfied with living on the shore with his "wealth," which he considers to be "too little" (*parum locuples*, 22). He ignores the boundary between land and sea (*urges | summovere litora*, 20-21), and will never put an end to his labors: he is always striving further (Horace uses the word *ultra* of his activity twice, 26, 32), beyond the limits of land, beyond reasonable limits of acquisitiveness. When ceaseless work and claiming building space from the sea is not enough, the rich man keeps expanding his territory by "tearing up" and "leaping over" his neighbors' and clients' boundaries: "usque proximos | revellis agri terminos et ultra limites clientium | salis avarus" (25-26). Finally, the rich man hubristically ignores the boundary and appropriate relationship between men and gods, both in his godlike attempt to turn sea into land and in his disrespect of his tenants' household gods ("pellitur paternos | in sinu ferens deos," 26-27).

However, no matter how many boundaries—natural or man-made—the rich man crosses, the farthest he can go, in the end, is Orcus' house.[190] The underworld is the *aula* (31), the "palace,"[191] that is the final end, the "boundary" (*fine*, 30) of life's journey. The rich man needs this reminder from Horace. Horace describes the man as laboring *sub*

---

[190] Cf. Womble (1961) 546.

[191] Cf. *laetam Priami . . . | . . . aulam,* 4.6.15-16. The rich man's goal is to be the "rich master" (*divitem . . . | erum,* 31-32) of his own palace, but the one he will eventually get to live in will not be his own but that of another master, Hades, who is even more acquisitive than he (*rapacis Orci,* 30).

ipsum funus, "with his very death hanging over him" (17),[192] but still *sepulcri immemor*, "forgetful of his tomb" (18-19). Through this ode Horace is attempting to show the rich man his impiety and to remind him of his potentially impending death. Reminded of his mortality, the rich man hopefully will cease his immoderate actions, which Horace shows to be fruitless in the light of human mortality.

As a reminder of the punishment that is due to those who do not honor the gods and the boundaries they set for mankind, Horace could not have done much better than Tantalus. Furthermore, Tantalus can function as a reminder of human mortality. The most pronounced similarities between Tantalus and Horace's rich man are found in the Pindaric version of Tantalus' crime and punishment, which it seems Horace had in mind:

> εἰ δὲ δή τιν᾽ ἄνδρα θνατὸν Ὀλύμπου σκοποὶ
> ἐτίμασαν, ἦν Τάνταλος οὗτος: ἀλλὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι
> μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, κόρῳ δ᾽ ἕλεν
> ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, ἅν οἱ πατὴρ ὑπερκρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον,
> τὸν αἰεὶ μενοινῶν κεφαλᾶς βαλεῖν εὐφροσύνας ἀλᾶται.
> ἔχει δ᾽ ἀπάλαμον βίον τοῦτον ἐμπεδόμοχθον,
> μετὰ τριῶν τέταρτον πόνον, ἀθανάτων ὅτι κλέψαις
> ἀλίκεσσι συμπόταις
> νέκταρ ἀμβροσίαν τε
> δῶκεν, οἷσιν ἄφθιτον
> θῆκαν.
>
> But if the watchers of Olympus ever honored any mortal man, that man was Tantalus: but he was not able to digest his great fortune, and for his gluttony he received an overwhelming/overhanging doom, which the Father hung over him, a mighty stone, and always desiring to throw it from his head he wanders away

[192] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 302 and West (1998) 131 interpret and translate *sub* temporally (i.e., "just before"/"the day before" your funeral). Rudd (2004) 133, in addition to capturing the temporal sense, emphasizes, as I have tried to here, the spatial metaphor: "though in the very shadow of death."

> from merry festivities. He has this helpless, ever-painful life, a fourth labor along with three others, because, having stolen it from the gods, he gave to his fellow drinking companions nectar and ambrosia with which the gods made him immortal. (Pind. *Ol*. 1.55-64)

Tantalus' theft of nectar and ambrosia is cast by Pindar in terms of immoderation and greed (κόρῳ, 57), just as the rich man's destruction of the boundaries of his neighbors' farms—thereby stealing part of their land—and his disregard for his clients' property-lines is motivated by his avarice (*avarus*, 26).[193] Furthermore, Tantalus' crime, like the rich man's shore-moving and eviction of household gods, shows the sinner's failure to respect his place in relation to the gods: the gods gave him their food, but nonetheless he was still a man and therefore did not have the right to give it, like a god, to anyone else. Tantalus' punishment is designed to remind him of his humanity and, therefore, (without divine food and drink) his innate mortality, as Lucretius points out in his allegorization of the underworld:

> nec miser inpendens magnum timet aëre saxum

[193] Womble (1961) 548 also points out that Tantalus' famous punishment parallels the rich man's greed: "he is cursed with an eternal hunger and thirst, and like the boundary-jumper, he will never have enough to satisfy his craving; in fact, he too will never have any at all." I would add that even Tantalus' Pindaric punishment, the eternally overhanging rock (Pind. *Ol.* 1.56-59, quoted above; also Alcaeus fr. 57, Alcman fr. 89., Lucr. 981-983), is parallel to what Horace is trying to do for the rich man: by reminding a man *sepulcri immemor* (18-19) in a poem about the imminence and inescapablity of death, that he is *sub ipsum funus* (18), he is creating that overhanging sense of his own mortality.

> Tantalus, ut famast, cassa formidine torpens;
> sed magis in vita divom metus urget inanis
> mortalis casumque timent quem cuique ferat fors.
>
> Wretched Tantalus does not fear the great rock hanging over him in the air, as the story goes, paralyzed by vain fear; but rather in life an empty fear of the gods besets mortals and each fears whatever calamity fortune might bring him. (3.980-983)

Lucretius interprets the mythological Tantalus, who is always afraid that at any moment the rock might fall, as a representation of real, living people who constantly fear their own death. This interpretation fits with Pindar's version of Tantalus' myth. Because Tantalus' crime, in Pindar, was that he overstepped his boundaries as a human, his punishment is designed to give him an eternal reminder of just where he stands in the cosmic order. The rich man of 2.18 also must be reminded of his mortality: he is *sepulcri immemor* (18-19) as he crosses boundaries, striving to push back the coastline and taking others' land. Horace therefore, in order to show him the potential nearness of death and, hence, the fruitlessness of his grasping after more than he should, depicts him, Tantalus-like, as living not under an overhanging rock but "under" his own impending death: *sub ipsum funus* (18).[194] The rich man is like Tantalus in his sins—he is of the *Tantali genus* (37-38)—and Horace's monitory ode is a gentler version of the gods' punishment of Tantalus.

The ode asserts the mortality not only of the rich but also of poor men like Horace (Horace himself is a *pauperem*, 10, and "the earth opens equally for a poor man, *pauperi*, and the sons of kings," 32-34, quoted above); nevertheless, Horace, unlike the rich man

[194] The suggestion of a rock is perhaps present in the mention in the previous line of the marble he is contracting to have cut (*tu secanda marmora* | *locas . . .*, 17-18).

(and Tantalus), is mindful of his mortality. He closes his description of his own modest comforts at the beginning of the ode with an observation about the passage of time and the fact that all things come to an end: "truditur dies die | novaeque pergunt interire lunae," "Day is driven on by day, and new moons hasten [go on] to perish" (15-16). Furthermore, in the first half of the ode, Horace sets up a distinction between himself and his *exemplum* of death-forgetting immoderation, Tantalus. First, he asserts his poverty by claiming *not* to have the wealth of a king: "neque Attali | ignotus heres regiam occupavi," "I have not taken possession of a palace as the unknown heir of Attalus" (6-7). Tantalus, however, did have royal wealth, wealth that eventually belonged to Attalus and his heirs: Tantalus was king of Phrygia[195] or Lydia,[196] areas that later became part of the realm of the Attalids. Secondly, Horace claims to have *fides* (9), something clearly lacking for Tantalus, who betrayed the gods and whom his friends, the gods, should not have trusted. Finally, Horace claims that he is happy with what he has (which, in addition to his innate qualities, is his "Sabine farm alone," *unicis Sabinis*, 14) and does not pester the gods for anything more or press his "powerful friend" Maecenas for more lavish gifts ("nihil supra | deos lacesso nec potentem amicum | largiora flagito," 11-13). Tantalus, on the other hand, "could not digest his good fortune," that is, he was not satisfied with being only the dining partner of the gods, and stole from his powerful friends.

---

[195] Strabo mentions that there is a story that Tantalus' wealth came from mines in Phrygia: . . . τὰς ἱστορίας . . . ὡς ὁ μὲν Ταντάλου πλοῦτος καὶ τῶν Πελοπιδῶν ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ Φρυγίαν καὶ Σίπυλον μετάλλων ἐγένετο . . . (14.5.28).

[196] Pind. *Ol.* 1.24.

In this ode Horace aligns the rich man with Tantalus while pointedly contrasting himself with that famous sinner; however, just as there are two contrasting characters in the ode, Horace and the rich man, there are two underworld denizens. Tantalus corresponds to the rich man; Horace's underworld double is found in Prometheus. Before looking at the parallels between Horace and Prometheus, however, we must first untangle what Horace is saying in the somewhat mysterious lines about Prometheus. There is no myth in which Prometheus ever tried to bribe anyone to get out of the underworld, and the suggestion that an immortal would have money at all—either in general, or as part of his burial—is absurd. Equally absurd is the idea that a god could be "captivated" by offered gold: *satelles Orci . . . auro captus* (34, 36). Furthermore, *satelles*, "lackey," seems an inappropriate word to use of Mercury,[197] who elsewhere in the *Odes* is held in high regard (even connected to Augustus himself in 1.2). Why does Horace seem to refer to a myth which not only does not but cannot exist?

A closer look at the passage reveals that, though it refers to an impossible myth, it does allude in several ways to *Prometheus Bound*. First, *satelles* could be an accurate description of Hermes' portrayal in that play.[198] Second, in the play Prometheus attempts to negotiate with Hermes for his release and fails[199] (though of course not with money).

---

[197] It is possible for *satelles* to have a neutral meaning, but it is usually used negatively: see *OLD* s.v.

[198] Or, at least, Prometheus' opinion of Hermes: he calls him θεῶν ὑπηρέτου, "underling of the gods," at 954.

[199] At Aesch. *PV* 989-991 Prometheus says to Hermes, οὐκ ἔστιν αἴκισμ' οὐδὲ μηχάνημ'

Finally, Horace focuses not on Prometheus' torture in the underworld (the eagle eating his liver) but on the fact of his being *bound* and wishing to be *unbound*: *revinxit* (36).[200] The allusion to *Prometheus Bound* serves to remind us that, unlike Tantalus, Prometheus *is* eventually freed from the underworld. He may not have been able to get out with money or, as he actually tries to do, with an appeal to Hermes—that much we are reminded of in the poem—but in the very same play Prometheus predicts his ultimate rescue by Heracles.[201] The perfect tense of *revinxit* hints at this: it is not that Prometheus *is never* unbound by anyone, but that he *was not* by Hermes. Tantalus' verb, on the other hand, is in the present tense: *coercet* (38), that is, he is currently being restrained, even now, and never is released.

ὅτῳ | προτρέψεταί με Ζεὺς γεγωνῆσαι τάδε, | πρὶν ἂν χαλασθῇ δεσμὰ λυμαντήρια, "There is no torment or device with which Zeus will impel me to tell these things before the injurious bonds are loosened." He makes it clear that the conditions for his speaking are his unbinding, but Hermes nevertheless continues to try to convince him to give in. Prometheus also refuses to beg for his freedom "like a woman" (1002-1006); Prometheus' concern with avoiding acting shamefully further emphasizes the absurdity in Horace of the implication that he would try to bribe Mercury.

[200] Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc., West (1998) 135. In the play, we only see Prometheus being tied up and complaining about being bound (*PV* 112-113); the eagle punishment is yet to come (*PV* 1020-1025).

[201] *PV* 871-873.

A comparison between Aeschylus' portrayal of Prometheus and Tantalus (in the story told by Pindar) also reveals another key difference between the two figures. Prometheus' and Tantalus' crimes are, on the surface, similar: they are both thieves of something that belonged to the gods. However, Aeschylus points out that Prometheus' theft was not out of any greed, but rather it was an altruistic act. Even Hermes says to Prometheus:

> σὲ τὸν σοφιστήν, τὸν πικρῶς ὑπέρπικρον,
> τὸν ἐξαμαρτόντ᾽ εἰς θεοὺς ἐφημέροις
> πορόντα τιμάς, τὸν πυρὸς κλέπτην λέγω.
>
> "You, the 'wise,'[202] the bitterly sharp-tempered, the one who has sinned against the gods by giving honor to *mortals*, you the fire thief, I speak to you." (944-946)

Like Tantalus, Prometheus takes something that belongs to the Olympians and gives it to mortals (his beneficiaries' mortality is emphasized in Aeschylus by the word ἐφημέροις, "of a day," 945), but unlike Tantalus Prometheus did it solely for others' glory (τιμάς, 946). Furthermore, Prometheus' honoring of mortals points out that he, unlike Tantalus, a mortal who had been "honored" by the gods (εἰ δὲ δή τιν᾽ ἄνδρα θνατὸν Ὀλύμπου σκοποὶ | ἐτίμασαν, ἦν Τάνταλος οὗτος, Pind. *Ol.* 1.55-56), is a god who can bestow honor on mortals. Prometheus' theft turns out to be completely unlike Tantalus': rather than a greedy mortal taking more than the gods have given him, Prometheus is a beneficent immortal who gives what is divine to humans. Prometheus is not one of the famous underworld sinners, and even when he is counted among them, he is not like them. What Horace means his readers to understand in lines 34-36 is this: "Prometheus, because he

---

[202] Cf. *callidum Promethea,* 2.18.35.

was not really a 'sinner' in the way Tantalus and the rest (*Tantali genus*) were, was eventually freed, though not by *money*, of course."

Earlier I argued that Tantalus is parallel to the rich man and that Horace contrasts himself with both the rich man and Tantalus; Horace's underworld parallel is Prometheus, and, as with the contrast with Tantalus, Horace sets up a comparison between himself and Prometheus in the earlier stanzas of the ode. First, Horace, though he is poor in gold and property, claims that he has something inborn that causes even rich men to seek him out: ". . . ingeni | benigna vena est, pauperemque dives | me petit," ". . . I have a generous vein of talent, and rich men seek me out" (9-11). West points out that Horace's *ingenium* "is used with a sense of its derivation, 'that which is inborn', thus powerfully countering all the exotica of the rich."[203] Much like Prometheus' divine status, Horace's "wealth" is not something he has taken or been given but something that he was born with. This inborn "talent" (so to speak), furthermore, is *benigna*, generous: "the adjective hints that he too, like a patron, has riches to bestow."[204] Others, such as Maecenas or Augustus, who are rich in other ways, request that he give them a product of his poetic talent, and he generously uses his innate ability to produce poems honoring them, much as Prometheus generously gives fire to mortals, thereby honoring them.[205]

---

[203] West (1998) 132.

[204] West (1998) 132.

[205] One could also point to the parallel between Horace's wealth of the mind and Prometheus' cleverness (*callidum Promethea*, 35) (cf. Womble [1961] 548). However, *callidus* can have both the positive meaning "skillful," as in 3.11.4, where it describes the

Finally, Horace, unlike the rich man, exhibits *forethought* (he takes into account the swift passage of time and the fact of human mortality), a trait of Prometheus brought out by the use of his name (Προ-μηθεύς) rather than a patronymic (as in 1.3.26).[206]

In 2.18, Horace compares the rich man to Tantalus while contrasting himself with Tantalus and comparing himself to Prometheus. In doing so, Horace is making a statement to the rich man that goes beyond simply "*memento mori*." His negative messages, "do not forget that you are going to die" and "do not act impiously," are

---

skill of Mercury's invention, the tortoise-shell lyre ("tuque testudo resonare septem | callida nervis," 3-4), and the slightly negative meaning "cunning," as in 1.10.7 where it describes the thieving Mercury ("callidum quidquid placuit iocoso | condere furto," 7-8). *callidus* also has a negative connotation in its fourth and final instance in Horace, 3.24.40, where it describes the sailors who impiously conquer rough seas, ignoring the natural boundary they create. However, all four instances have a common denominator: they are all examples of ingenuity, which in the case of mortals is seen as overstepping boundaries, but in the case of gods is seen as appropriate. Clay (2010) 138-139 has argued that the lyre-inventing (1.10.5-6) Mercury's "playful theft" in 1.10.7-8 is an allusion to Horace's own "playful thefts" from his model Alcaeus, the first of which may be in the previous poem, 1.9. Therefore, in both 3.11 and 1.10, cleverness is linked to a god (Mercury), the lyre, and poetic composition; here in 2.18 Prometheus' cleverness in stealing fire for the good of mortals is similarly positive and is parallel to the poet's skill.

[206] Note that in 2.13, where Horace thinks very literally about the underworld he might have and will in the future visit, Prometheus' name is also used.

balanced by a positive message: "be content with what you have, and give generously out of it." Horace offers himself and Prometheus as models. Ceaseless striving after gold can help neither in life—it cannot forestall life's end—nor death—one cannot bribe one's way out of the underworld.[207] It is better to be content and generous in life: for an immortal like Prometheus this means an eventual release from the underworld, but for mortals like Horace and the poor man, this means a life free from pointless labor, whose death comes not as a confinement (*Tantali | genus coercet*, 37-38) but as a release ("hic levare functum | pauperem laboribus | vocatus atque non vocatus audit," 38-40).

In 2.13 Horace used both Prometheus and Tantalus as representatives of his angry iambic self by alluding to their appearance in *Epode* 17; in 2.18 he again paired the figures but differentiated between them. Though the two figures form a pair through the similarity of the acts that ended in their punishment, their thefts, they are actually very different from one another, both in their situation, in the motivation for their stealing, and in their ultimate fates. For this reason, in this ode Horace uses Tantalus as a parallel for the rich man and Prometheus as a parallel for himself. The consistent factor among all the poems we have looked at—1.16, 2.13, and 2.18—is that Prometheus is aligned with the poet. In his role as creator of anger in 1.16, and as one of Canidia's *exempla* in 2.13, he is parallel to Horace's iambic self; and in his role as a foil to Tantalus in 2.18 he is parallel to Horace the fore-thinking, beneficent poet as opposed to the unmindful, greedy rich

[207] See Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 311-312 on other instances of attempted bribery to escape death.

man. We will now return to the ode from which we began, 1.3. In that ode Prometheus is again portrayed as the fire-thief, but this time in the context of another poet, Vergil.

E. 1.3: Prometheus, Daedalus, Hercules, and Vergil

We have seen how Prometheus is aligned with Horace as poet elsewhere in the *Odes*, so it is worth investigating in 1.3 whether he is again to be seen as parallel to a poet. In 1.16, 2.13, and 2.18 the poet in question was Horace (as lover, as survivor of a falling tree, as foil to the rich man); in 1.3 the poet in question is Vergil, whose impending voyage is the subject of at least the first half of Horace's poem. Some scholars see the moralizing second half of the poem (which begins at line 9 with the discussion of the first sailor) as disconnected from the initial *propemptikon*.[208] It is in this second half of the poem in which the reference to Prometheus lies, and one may question whether, in that case, Horace intends to connect him with Vergil. One solution to the problem of unity has been a poetological reading of the poem, which sees Vergil's voyage as the Callimachean metaphor for the composition of epic, and the mythological catalogue between lines 9 and 40 as a comment on the boldness and danger of undertaking such a task.[209] The most damning criticism of this view, however, is that it seems unlikely that

[208] E.g., Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 44-45. Hendrickson (1908) sees the ode as following the form of a *propemptikon* and deals with the change in tone with an imagined narrative (the ship has sailed away). It has also been argued that 1.3 is actually two poems, with the second beginning at line 9 (Prodinger [1907]).

[209] Lockyer (1967), Cody (1976), Kidd (1977), Basto (1982), Santirocco (1986) 27-30,

Horace would speak so harshly about the *hubris* of writing epic given that he has just addressed Vergil in the friendliest of terms (*animae dimidium meae*, 8); the question is, as Rumpf puts it: "Wie kann sich die Rede von *nefas*, *stultitia* und *scelus* in eine poetologische Deutung integrieren lassen?"[210]

Rumpf has been the most recent proponent of the poetological reading.[211] His answer to the primary objection is that Horace is speaking not of Vergil's choice of genre (and thereby composing a *recusatio*) but of the difficult poetic tasks they *both* have taken on; in this way the ode is not insulting, but a friendly assertion that both poets are allies as they attempt their daring poetic projects, the *Odes* and the *Aeneid*.[212] Rumpf explains the use of Prometheus, Daedalus, and Hercules in his poetological reading as symbols of acts of cultural advancement which, although they carry with them an association with original sin, nevertheless would primarily be symbols of boldness and daring.[213] However, Mayer finds this solution inadequate: "like their [Harrison's[214] and Rumpf's]

Lyne (1995) 79-81, Cairns (2007) 234-235, Harrison (2007).

[210] Rumpf (2009) 300; cf. Syndikus (2001) 61-62 n. 13, Mayer (2012) 80.

[211] Hornbeck (2014) also adopts this reading, but the main focus of her article is the figure of Icarus across 1.3, 2.20, and 4.2, rather than arguing for a particular reading of 1.3.

[212] Rumpf (2009) 300-311.

[213] Rumpf (2009) 306-307.

[214] Harrison (2007).

predecessors they fail to see that H.'s strictures would be 'over the top' if directed at poetic composition of any kind."[215]

However, this chapter began not with a defense of the poetological reading of 1.3, but with a different problem. We began with a "straight" reading of the ode, no allegory assumed, and realized that Prometheus, as presented, is a bad example of the stated moral of the poem. Now that we have looked at Prometheus throughout the *Odes*, we have come back to 1.3 asking if, as in the other Prometheus odes, the figure of Prometheus in 1.3 is parallel to the poet who is a central figure in the poem. This has led us to consider the poetological reading and the objections to it.

Fortunately, both the original problem and Mayer's objection to the poetological reading have the same solution; that is, by solving the problem we started with (Prometheus is a bad example of the stated moral), the language that seems "over the top" for referring to poetic composition will be explained. First we will look at the other figures in lines 9-40; by doing this we will observe that they fit the pattern of Prometheus, that they are all poor examples of the stated moral, and then we will return to the two problems and their solution.

---

[215] Mayer (2012) 80. One might also criticize Rumpf's views on the basis that Traill criticizes Elder's: "Elder's interpretation founders, however, on the key word *stultitia* (38), as his paraphrase of this section shows: 'Heroism is nobility, but it is also folly, *but a folly well worth the ultimate suffering*.' Nothing in the text justifies these words" (Traill [1983] 132). Rumpf (2009) explains *stultitia* as a wink between poetic friends (301-303), but he does not explain *nefas* (26) or *scelus* (39).

Horace begins his condemnation of human immoderation by lamenting the fact that boats—those unsafe vessels—were ever created, and then swiftly transitions (at line 21) to talking about human impiety. The transition occurs after his statement of the fearlessness of the first sailor:

> quem mortis timuit gradum
> qui siccis oculis monstra natantia,
> qui vidit mare turbidum et
> infamis scopulos, Acroceraunia?
>
> What approach of death did he fear, he who looked with dry eyes upon swimming monsters, who saw the sea when it was turbulent and those infamous rocks, the Acroceraunia? (17-20)

The reference to the "first" (*primus*, 12) person to sail might not necessarily put the reader in mind of Jason (the Argo is often described as the first ship),[216] but the connection is gradually built by the reference to "swimming monsters" coupled with "stormy seas" and—finally a proper noun—the "Thunder Peaks" (Acroceraunia/Keraunia) which are etymologized in Book 4 of the *Argonautica* and are seen by Jason and his crew. After describing Jason, Horace generalizes, "audax omnia perpeti | gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas" (25-26). The following figures purport to be *exempla* of this statement: Prometheus who stole fire, Daedalus who flew on man-made wings, and Hercules who broke through the boundary between the upper world and the underworld. The poem ends with a reiteration of human beings' propensity to overreach and incur the wrath of the gods (lines 38-40, quoted above).

---

[216] Schol. Eur. *Med*. 1. Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 49.

By placing generalizing morals in the middle (25-26) and end (37-40) of the poem, Horace seems to emphasize that these figures exemplify humans rushing into *nefas*, but a careful reader sees that the supposed *exempla* do not work.[217] The first obvious crack in the argument is Prometheus, as I observed above. There is a similar problem with the supposed *exemplum* of Daedalus. Rumpf points out that, though Daedalus is named, Icarus is not even mentioned;[218] although Icarus suffered an appropriate consequence for his overreaching, Daedalus was not punished for flying. In fact, Daedalus' wings succeeded in helping him escape Minos and would have helped his son too, if not for the boy's excess of exuberance. Like Prometheus, Daedalus was trying to do good for someone else, his son, not greedily grabbing at anything for himself. Even Icarus' fall was not because he dared to fly at all but rather because he attempted to fly too high. Daedalus does not fit the description of someone who incurs the gods' wrath for an act of *hubris*.

If Daedalus does not fit that description, Hercules even more certainly does not.[219] Hercules also was not acting primarily for his own glory but on the orders of Eurystheus. Furthermore, for his labors (alluded to by *labor*, 36), which included getting Cerberus from Hades, he was *rewarded* by the gods, not punished. Finally, going back to the beginning of the mythological excursus from the *propemptikon*, Jason also cannot be

---

[217] Cf. Rumpf's similar suggestion that *scelus* and *stultitia* are intended to be overly harsh to force the reader to look for a deeper meaning (Rumpf [2009] 300).

[218] Rumpf (2009) 306.

[219] Cf. Rumpf (2009) 306.

rightly said to be committing an act of *hubris* when he sets sail on the Argo. The "first sailor" in the abstract might be seen as hubristic, but once we have identified Jason through Horace's clues, we are left with a figure who sails not to spite the gods but under the sanction of the gods: the entire Golden Fleece expedition was originally Hera's idea.[220]

It turns out that on closer inspection a "straight" reading of lines 9-40 does not hold up. Horace states that the myths are *exempla* for *nefas*, *stultitia*, and *scelus*, but in fact they are not. Readings like Elder's (Horace is praising *audacia*) [221] and Rumpf's (the myths are really examples of dangerous but necessary daring) [222] take account of the true nature of the heroic, clever, and noble figures, but they ignore the strong statements throughout about the supposed *hubris* of the first sailor, Prometheus, Daedalus, and Hercules. The only possible conclusion is that Horace's statement about human *nefas* in this context is ironic. It is made within the context of mythological figures who do anything but *nefas*. This answers not only the problem of Prometheus with which this chapter began, but also Mayer's objection to the poetological interpretation of the ode: Horace's language about *hubris* is "over the top" because it is ironic hyperbole. Now, free from worrying that Horace is implying that Vergil is in danger of sin by embarking on writing epic, we can freely read all the figures in the mythological excursus as analogues for Vergil.

---

[220] Pind. *Pyth*. 4.184-185, Apollod. 1.9.16.

[221] Elder (1952).

[222] Rumpf (2009) 306.

As we saw in 1.16, Horace, like Prometheus, is a creator, though not a creator of men but of poetry, and, in 2.18, a benefactor through his poetry (*ingeni* | *benigna vena*, 9-10) which can give both advice on how to live life and immortality to his subject. Vergil, as a poet, is also a creator and benefactor, and, hence, similar to Prometheus. Horace also links poetic achievement to flight or to skyward elevation in 1.1.35-36 and 2.20; in this way Vergil, too, is like Daedalus. Like Hercules, Vergil, as poet, could attain immortality. Like Jason, Vergil is about to set sail (metaphorically).

In mentioning Daedalus, Horace avoids suggesting, as he does for himself, the possibility that Vergil could be like Icarus. Everywhere in the *Odes* where Daedalus is mentioned (2.20.13, 4.2.2) Icarus is also present, except here; as I argued above, Icarus in 1.1 and 2.20 represents Horace's concern that his poetic boldness has the potential to end in failure. However, when speaking about Vergil's work, Horace only names the successful craftsman, not the hapless youth. He also ends the poem with a powerful *exemplum* of the success of human endeavor and its ability to raise the hero to the gods: Hercules' harrowing of hell. Not only does Hercules succeed at breaking through to Acheron (*perrupit Acheronta*, 36), not only does he return to the realm of the living, but he finally ascends above the realm of mortals into Olympus.[223]

---

[223] Hercules also is responsible for the healing the rift between Prometheus and Jupiter: because Zeus/Jupiter wanted to honor Heracles/Hercules, he let go of his anger towards Prometheus and allowed his son to free him (Hes. *Theog.* 521-534). By mentioning Hercules, Horace reminds us that even Prometheus (the only member of the catalogue who is actually punished) is eventually freed.

The question remains, however, of *why* Horace chooses to use irony rather than proclaim Vergil's fitness for epic poetry directly. One could speculate about circumstances outside of the poem (e.g., perhaps Vergil had a critic whom Horace is mocking, or Vergil himself was, in private, a harsh self-critic, and Horace is teasing him encouragingly). By the internal logic of the poem it must be ironic, but the fact that we have the internal evidence to prove that it is ironic does not mean we have the internal evidence to determine why it is ironic. This remains an open question to be answered by external evidence and biographical research.

Whatever the case, Horace's poem is certainly more interesting than a straightforward panegyric would have been. The ode could be seen as a display of poetic fireworks, and therefore a more impressive praise of Vergil than a mundane, straightforward poem. The first half of the ode cleverly combines several *topoi*. First is the *topos* of epic poetry as setting sail into potentially dangerous waters (as in, e.g., Prop. 3.3). Second is the literary convention of the "first" to do something, especially the "first" to write in a particular genre or on a particular topic in Latin (e.g. *G.* 3.10-12). Third is the convention of the impiety of the invention of sailing (e.g., Lucr. 5.1006, Tib. 1.3.35-40, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.31-32). He then joins to these conventions mythology: the myth that Jason and the Argonauts were the first sailors. In the second half of the poem he continues in the mythological vein and gives us more mythological "firsts," which as I argued only illustrate "firstness," not impiety. The logic is broken, but there is just enough connection to hide the fact. Furthermore, throughout the poem Horace uses the rhetorical device of repetition, both of ideas and sound, to give the impression of a coherent argument: *creditum/commisit, ventorum/Iapyga/Africum/Aquilonibus/Noti,*

ratem/rates, *ponere freta/ponere fulmina*, *nec timuit/quem timuit*, *mortis gradum/leti gradum*, *audax/audax*, *gens humana/Iapeti genus/gentibus*, *perpeti/patimur*, *nefas/scelus*, *aetheria/aera/ardui/caelum*.[224] There is also the rhetorical logic of focusing on the sea, then the land (*terris*, 31), then the sky, and then the underworld. The final four lines are the cleverest and, for that reason, the worst offenders as far as being connected to the rest of the poem only by suggestion. At first they seem to make sense: the poem has been discussing a lot of sky (Prometheus stole fire from the sky, Daedalus flew in the sky) and the difference between gods and mortals (*deus abscidit*, 21; *gens humana*, 26; *gentibus*, 28; *pennis non homini datis*, 35) and divine punishment (the sickness and death from Pandora's jar) and thunderstorms (*tristis Hyadas*, 14, and the winds) and stupidity/crimes (*prudens*, 22; *vetitum nefas*, 26; *fraude mala*, 28). The lines are connected rhetorically to the rest of the poem, but logically they do not make sense: who in the poem was struck by *fulmina* (40)? Does everyone named in the poem fall into the category *mortalibus* (37) or under the "we" in the verb *petimus* (39)? Can one accurately describe any of the stories as being examples of *stultitia* (38)? If an act is done only out of stupidity, can it really be an act of wickedness, a *scelus* (39)? The last lines feel like the appropriate culmination of the poem, but their true function is to reveal that this apparently logical poem is really not logical at all.[225] With impressive skill, Horace has somehow created a coherent poem out

[224] On the structural patterns cf. Carrubba (1984) 172-173.

[225] Cf. Mayer's observation on 1.22, that Horace uses "lightheartedly warped logic" in his conclusion to that ode (Mayer [2012] 169).

of disparate conventions, stories, and *sententiae*. The poem is not only ironic, it is also *good.*

F. Conclusion

As we come to the end of Part I, "Mythology and Moderation," one might observe that we have explored not just two figures associated with *hubris* and immoderation in the *Odes* but really two pairs of figures: Daedalus/Icarus and Prometheus/Tantalus. Both halves of the pair do not occur in every case, but it is suggestive that the pairing is a repeated pattern, especially in the case of Prometheus and Tantalus, who are not a natural pair. In each pairing there is a positive and a negative character: on the negative side are Icarus and Tantalus, on the positive side are Daedalus and Prometheus. In both cases, the positive character is aligned with the poet, Prometheus illustrating Horace's creative power (both to create poems and the emotions caused by them), the relief lyric poetry gives him, his forethought about death, and his role as a benefactor, and Daedalus illustrating the possibility of a craftsman's daring and improbable success.

The greatest benefit of looking at all of these mythological references, however, has been the new or more complex readings of poems gained by this cross-pollination. Reading each poem fertilizes the reading of the next one, or even a previous one. To use another metaphor, Horace's *Odes* are an echo chamber of ideas, and as we continue to read we gradually find that spot in the room where all the sounds harmonize together and the parts and the whole beautify one another.

In the next chapter we will continue the theme of apotheosis, but this time it will be not that of the poet but of his most frequent subject, Augustus.

Part II: Mythology and Deification

Chapter 3: Hercules

A. Hercules in Latin before Horace and Vergil

As a mythological figure in Greek and Roman literature, Hercules/Heracles is ambiguous: at times he seems comical as an example of a strong man with unbridled appetites (e.g., in the story of his inebriated night with 50 daughters of Thespius), but at other times he is represented as a hero who helped to cleanse the world of monsters and make it safe for mankind.[226] As early as the sixth century B.C. Greek mythology had connected him to Italy: after defeating Geryon in Spain, he drove his cattle down into Italy.[227] Hercules' cult was very important in Rome;[228] Plautus, for example, repeatedly refers to the tenth part of a person's property that was regularly dedicated to Hercules. However, the use of Hercules as a mythological figure (as opposed to a cult figure) in Latin literature varied widely during the Republic.

Hercules is no stranger to Latin literature before Horace and Vergil; however, his characterization in earlier poetry is strikingly different from his characterization in early Augustan poetry. In Plautus's *Amphitruo* the circumstances of his birth are a source of

---

[226] This is seen clearly in the way Heracles is spoken of in Euripides' *Heracles* (Heracles' role in "civilizing" the world: ἐξημερῶσαι γαῖαν, 20; Heracles as εὐεργέτης: 877, 1252, 1309); also in Euripides we see another facet of the Heracles myth, the tragic Heracles.

[227] Wiseman (1995) 42, Koortbojian (2013) 19. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Propertius, Vergil, and Ovid also recount Hercules' defeat of the giant Cacus in Latium.

[228] Galinsky (1972) 126-127, Cornell (1995) 112, Feeney (1998) 26.

comedy, and various myths about him become topics of humor throughout Plautus' plays.[229] Lucretius, making a jab at the Stoics, mentions Hercules and his labors in the proem to Book 5 only to argue that his deeds are less important than those of Epicurus; Hercules is presented as merely a "primitive strongman"[230] who should not be held up as a model. Catullus jokes that enduring his friend's silence about his whereabouts is *Herculi labos* (55.13), and at 68.115-116 Catullus "spoke flippantly of Hercules' admittance to Olympus,"[231] even perhaps giving a nod to Hercules' legendary sexual prowess ("Hebe nec longa virginitate foret," 116). Cicero, on the other hand, uses Hercules as the premier Stoic example of a man who, because of his great beneficence and virtue, was made a god.[232]

Horace and Vergil both use Hercules, the mythological hero, in the Ciceronian mode: he is emblematic of the man who, through good deeds, is awarded a place among

---

[229] I have compiled an exhaustive list (confining myself to mythological references and ignoring references to what are obviously cult practices): *Bacch.* 155 (killing Linus); *Epidicus* 178-179 (belt of Hippolyta); *Men.* 200-201 (belt of Hippolyta); *Persa* 1-5 (all labors); *Rud.* 821-825 (his club). However, as Galinsky (1972) 128 points out, Plautus does not exploit Hercules "for raucous entertainment" as he had been exploited in Greece.

[230] Galinsky (1972) 131.

[231] Galinsky (1972) 156.

[232] Cicero *Nat. D.* 2.62, *Tusc.* 1.33; cf. Galinsky (1972) 140, Koortbojian (2013) 19.

the gods, and both authors associate Hercules with Octavian/Augustus.[233] Throughout *Odes* 1-3 Hercules is consistently linked with apotheosis and Augustus; while Vergil was engaged in composing his *Aeneid*, Horace either anticipated or participated in the way Hercules will be depicted in Vergil's epic.[234] Previous to Horace's first three books of odes, Octavian chose to associate himself with Hercules when he timed his return to Rome in 29 B.C. for his triple triumph to coincide with the festival of Hercules Invictus.[235] Octavian chose Hercules as a symbol of victory over Antony and Cleopatra; the poets chose him as a symbol of virtue and deification; in both cases the *princeps* and the poets wrested the popular deity from the grasp of the public's memory of Antony and Pompey, both of whom claimed to be successors of Hercules.[236]

In this chapter I will examine Horace's use of Hercules in *Odes* 1-3 and see if any insight can be gained by considering his use of Hercules apart from Vergil's. I will be focusing closely on Horace's use of mythological patterning throughout the first three

---

[233] Feeney (1998) 56.

[234] Vergil possibly was first, if we read an allusion to Hercules in *Ecl.* 4.26-30 (Ebbeler [2010] 191-194).

[235] Grimal (1951) 54-55, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 182, Feeney (2007) 161, 181 n. 141; Galinsky (1972) 151 asserts that Hercules became an Augustan symbol "by virtue of his role as a prototype for Aeneas" in the *Aeneid*, and that "Augustus showed neither any special preference for the god's cult nor for being associated with him."

[236] Galinksy (1972) 141; Beacham (2005) 154-155.

books. The general use of Hercules in Horace, as noted above, has been well established; here I will be concerned with whether Horace's use of Hercules is, like his use of other mythological figures I have examined, consistent across *Odes* 1-3, and if there is any deeper significance to his use than simply an association with victory and apotheosis.

B. Hercules as a Recurring Mythological Figure in Odes 1-3

In *Odes* 1-3 Hercules' various victories over monsters and giants and divinization are consistently paralleled to Augustus' foreign victories and future apotheosis (either one or both of these themes is present in 1.12, 2.12, 3.3, and 3.14), with one exception: 1.3, which is not about Augustus but Vergil and presents Hercules not so much as a monster slayer but as a hero who can defy death.[237] I will deal first with the four Augustan Hercules odes in Books 1-3, looking first at 1.12, 3.3, and 3.14 and then closing with a discussion of 2.12, which has the most puzzling reference to Hercules. Then I will turn to 1.3, the Vergilian Hercules ode, and discuss its relationship to the other four. Finally, I will discuss the connection between Augustan victories, deification, and Hercules' role in the ode to Vergil.

C. 1.12: Augustus and Alcides

[237] I do not here deal with the three odes in Book 4 that mention Hercules (4.4, 4.5, 4.8), though a pattern similar to that in 1-3 seems to emerge (connection with foreign military victories for Augustus and his family, Augustus' apotheosis, and poetic immortality).

The topic of 1.12 is Augustus' place both in Roman history and among the divinities.[238] The link between Augustus and the gods is made by first linking the gods, through three mortals who become gods, Hercules and the Dioscuri, to a list of historical Romans, as can be seen in the outline of the ode's structure below:

> Horace asks the Muse about whom he should sing and mentions Orpheus' musical powers (1-12, 3 stanzas).
>
> He sings of gods: **Jupiter** (2 stanzas) and Athena, Bacchus, Diana, and Apollo (1 stanza) (20-24).
>
> He sings of men-become-gods: Hercules and the Dioscuri (25-32, 2 stanzas).[239]
>
> He sings of a historical-Roman-become-god: Romulus (33).[240]
>
> He sings of historical Romans: Numa Pompilius, Tarquin, Cato, Regulus, the Scauri, L. Aemilius Paulus, Fabricius, Curius, Camillus, Marcellus (35-46, about 4 stanzas).

---

[238] Mayer (2012) 129: "everything down to line 46 is a foil, a sort of priamel, leading up to the cap, Augustus."

[239] I agree with Brown (1991) 328 that these two divisions, the three stanzas about the gods and the two stanzas about the heroes "are not sharply differentiated." The transition occurs with Romulus, who leads into the historical part of the priamel.

[240] Notice that with both Romulus here and Julius Caesar's star in lines 46-48 each historical divinized Roman is connected with historical Romans who were not deified. Romulus, though first in his stanza, is closely tied to the others through the structure of the sentence: "Romulum post hos prius an . . . memorem an . . . an . . ." (33-35). Julius Caesar's star, coming last in its stanza, is said to flash "among all" (*inter omnis*, 46) the other figures.

He alludes to another historical-Roman-become-god: Julius Caesar, through a reference to his "star" (46-48).

Horace prays that **Jupiter** protect Augustus, his second-in-command (49-60, 3 stanzas).[241]

After three stanzas of introduction, the ode breaks down into sections, shown in the above outline, which are organized in ring composition:[242] (a) **Jupiter**/other gods/divinized men; (b) divinized historical Roman; (c) historical Romans; (b) divinized historical Roman; (a) **Jupiter**/Augustus.[243]

Since I am focusing on Hercules and his role in the ode, I reproduce the Hercules/Dioscuri stanzas below:

dicam et Alciden puerosque Ledae,
hunc equis, illum superare pugnis
nobilem; quorum simul alba nautis
    stella refulsit,

defluit saxis agitatus umor,

---

[241] Brown (1991) 328 chooses similar divisions (3+[3+2]+4+3) instead of the older triadic stucture based on the theory that the poem closely models Pind. *Ol.* 2 (Fraenkel [1957] 294-296).

[242] Mayer (2012) 129 points out the chiastic answer to Horace's original question in lines 1-3 (what man, hero, or god?) and the placement of Jupiter at the beginning and end of the poem.

[243] I will argue below that Augustus, by this scheme, is on level not just with Hercules and the Dioscuri but also with the gods named after Jupiter in 20-24.

> concidunt venti fugiuntque nubes,
> et minax, quod[244] sic voluere, ponto
> unda recumbit.
>
> I shall tell also of Alcides and the sons of Leda, this one famous for conquering with horses, that one with fists; once their bright star shines on sailors, the turbulent water flows down from the rocks, the winds subside, and the clouds flee, and, because they wished it so, the threatening waves settle back down in the sea. (25-32)

There are two things to note here. First, Hercules is not mentioned by name (as he is, either directly or through an adjective, in all of the other odes in which he appears), but rather by the patronymic from his step-grandfather Alcaeus: Alcides. Second, Hercules is only mentioned, but Castor and Pollux get seven whole lines devoted to them which I will treat later.

All three men-become-gods are mentioned by reference to a parent/grandparent only. Hercules is called Alcides, the name that derives from Alcaeus, the father of his mother's husband, Amphitryon. Castor and Pollux are called *pueros Ledae* (25).[245] Both designations for Hercules and the Dioscuri emphasize their human origin. Leda is the human mother of Castor and Pollux, and calling them *pueri* reminds the reader of their human childhood.[246] *Alcides* reminds us of Hercules' human "parents," his actual mother Alcmene and especially Amphitryon who was, for a time, presumed to be the child's

---

[244] *quod* is an uncertain reading of one MS; Shackleton Bailey (2001) prints † *quia* †.

[245] Elsewhere they are *fratres Helenae* (1.3.2) or collected under one name: *Pollux* (3.3.9), *geminus Pollux* (3.29.64; see Nisbet and Rudd [2004] ad loc.), *Castoris* (4.5.35).

[246] Hardie (2003) 375 sees this as a "grecising feature" and an allusion to Pindar's *Olympians.*

father. By emphasizing the human origin of these three future divinities, Horace is introducing the apotheosis theme that will be made explicit later in the ode.

Furthermore, Hercules' name Alcides has even greater significance. Before Horace (and the *Aeneid*) it is extremely rare: Callimachus uses it once, and it appears once in Vergil's *Eclogues*.[247] However, a Pindaric scholiast and mythographers claim that Alcides or Alcaeus was Heracles' birth name.[248] Diodorus Siculus tells us that after his birth the infant Heracles was named Alcaeus after his "grandfather"; when the baby strangled the snakes Hera sent to kill him, he gained the name that means "the glory of Hera."[249] In other versions of the myth, infant Heracles not only saves his own life but also the life of his fully-mortal brother Iphicles.[250] His first heroic act is symbolic of his

---

[247] Callim. Hymn 3.145, Verg. *Ecl.* 7.61 (*Populus Alcidae gratissima*, cf. *G.* 2.66). In the *Aeneid*, the patronymic is used roughly as often as Hercules' Latin name (*Alcides* appears 12 times, *Hercules* or *Herculeus* appears 10 times). With the exception of Callimachus, Ἀλκείδης is not used in Archaic, Classical, or Hellenistic Greek except once in Hes. [*Sc.*] 112 to refer not to Heracles but to Amphitryon.

[248] Schol. in Pind. *Ol.* 6 115b: ὅτι Ἀμφιτρύων Ἀλκαίου παῖς ἐστι, δῆλον· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Ἀλκείδης ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τὸ πρότερον ἐκαλεῖτο.

[249] Diod. Sic. 4.10.1. Apollodorus has Hercules abandoning the name Alcides and being given the name Hercules by the Pythia just before he must go complete his labors (2.4.12).

[250] Apollod. 2.4.8.

heroism later in life, his role as destroyer of chthonic monsters and protector of mortals. Furthermore, this use of Alcides to signal Hercules' role as monster-killer may be an allusion to Callimachus: in Hymn 3, Heracles, "Alcides" (Ἀλκεΐδην, 145), says to Artemis, βάλλε κακοὺς ἐπὶ θῆρας, ἵνα θνητοί σε βοηθόν | ὡς ἐμὲ κικλήσκωσιν, "Shoot at the evil beasts in order that mortals may call you 'helper,' as they call me" (153-154).[251] Heracles asks Artemis to take on his role as "helper" by killing evil beasts that are more destructive than her usually hunted prey. In using the name Alcides for Hercules, Horace reminds us in one word of both Hercules' mortal birth and of the beneficial destruction of monsters through which he earned glory and immortality. Both apotheosis and the destruction of the dangerous and Other are themes picked up later in the ode.

The theme of apotheosis Horace introduces in the stanzas on Hercules and the Dioscuri becomes clearer when he transitions back to the divine and into the Julian *gens* with an allusion to the comet that proved Julius Caesar's divinity:

> . . . micat inter omnis
> Iulium sidus velut inter ignis
> luna minores.
>
> There shines among all of them the Julian star, just as a moon among lesser lights. (46-48)

The *stella* (28) of the Dioscuri is echoed here with the *sidus* (47) of Julius Caesar, connecting the last historical Roman mortal-become-god with the mythological ones.[252]

---

[251] Cf. Hardie (2003) 390.

[252] Even if *Iulium sidus* as a phrase signifies Augustus (Nisbet and Hubbard [1970] ad loc.), Julius Caesar is still alluded to through the reference to the star that indicated his

The poem ends with an assertion of Augustus' divinity by placing him on nearly (but not quite) equal footing with the father of the gods: the poet prays, "tu [Iuppiter] secundo | Caesare regnes | . . . | te minor laetum reget aequus orbem" (51-52, 57). With *secundo Caesare* (51-52) Horace is clearly linking Augustus to the other gods whom he mentioned earlier in the ode; "unde nil maius generatur ipso | nec viget quidquam simile aut secundum" (17-18), he says, no god is greater than Jupiter, "and there does not live anything (i.e., there is no mortal) like him or following in second place" (Pallas occupies the "nearest place of honor," *proximos honores,* 19-20). Only a god can be *secundus* in relationship to Jupiter. However, Augustus is, in the structure of the ode (see above), not only level with the other gods but also with Hercules and the Dioscuri. The poem highlights the futurity of Augustus' divinity: men who become gods must, for a time, live as mortal men. The final stanzas are full of the jussive subjunctive and future and future perfect tenses (*regnes*, 52; *egerit,* 54; *reget*, 57; *quaties*, 58; *mittes*, 59). To become a god like Hercules, Augustus must first live out his life like Hercules: but how, in a world without monsters, should he do that?

A close look at the themes in the ode reveals how Horace foretells that Augustus will reach deification. In mythology, Hercules' deification is tied to his labors, his cleansing of the world and his victory over monsters;[253] although such beasts are not mentioned in connection with Hercules in this ode,[254] a martial note is present throughout

---

apotheosis.

[253] E.g., Diod. Sic. 4.8.5.

[254] By using Hercules' childhood name Alcides, Horace may be alluding to Hercules' first

the poem, and often in combination with fighting beasts or foreign enemies. All of the gods named in lines 19-24, with the exception of Bacchus, are named with a focus on their combative attributes (*Pallas proeliis audax*, 20-21; *saevis inimica virgo beluis*, 22-23; *metuende certa, Phoebe, sagitta*, 23-24), and Diana particularly is mentioned for her killing not just of wild animals but of *beluae*, a word used often to indicate monstrous beasts[255] (e.g. Cerberus, *belua centiceps*, 2.13.34).[256] Hercules, I have already argued, is called "Alcides" to remind the reader of his role as monster-slayer. Castor and Pollux are

---

monster-slaying, the strangling of the snakes in his cradle, after which he earned the name Heracles.

[255] *OLD* s.v. 2a. Cf. Hardie (2003) 390: "Diana's association with beast-slaying exploits . . . alludes to a tradition which associated Diana and Hercules in monster killing," citing their appearance "together, in lion skins, on sixth century vases" (390 n. 76).

[256] Cf. Fraenkel (1957) 294: "The group of gods . . . is headed by Jupiter, who here appears . . . also as the supreme being who maintains the universe in an established order (15 f.). . . . There follow Athena and Dionysus, who distinguished themselves on the side of Zeus in his fight against the Giants, then Artemis, who, *saevis inimica beluis*, protects civilized life, and finally Apollo, 'the slayer of Python and Caesar's champion at Actium' [Kiessling]. All these deities stand for peace and order against the forces of destruction." *Liber* (22), despite his potential association with the defeat of the Giants, is the only god not give martial attributes in the ode; Horace only says that he will not "be silent" about him (*neque te silebo, | Liber*, 21-22)—perhaps anticipating the ode to Bacchus, 2.19, where the martial deeds of *Liber* (2.19.7) are given a whole stanza (2.19.21-24)?

given their respective athletic attributes of fist-fighting and horsemanship, which have martial applications, and their power over the chaotic forces of nature is emphasized with an entire stanza.[257] The catalogue of historical Romans in 37-44 lists men who fought against a whole slew of foreign enemies: Gauls, Samnites, the Greek Pyrrhus, Carthage, the Cimbri and Teutones.[258] Finally, the central stanza of the final three stanzas, as Mayer points out, "focuses exclusively on the martial prowess of Caesar."[259] More specifically, Caesar will conquer either the Parthians or more eastern peoples, the Chinese and Indians (*Parthos*, 53; "Orientis orae | Seras et Indos," 55-56).[260] Like Diana, Hercules, the Dioscuri, and the Romans of 37-44, Augustus will fight and triumph over enemies seen as distinctly Other. Augustus' Herculean labor that will earn him immortality is not monster-slaying but the defeat of exotic enemies at the borders of the Roman empire.

---

[257] On the role of the Dioscuri as gods who calm the sea, see Chapter 4 below.

[258] Brown (1991) 334-335. (Although not all of these Romans were victorious, they are all notable for their martial valor.) Brown (1991) 329-334 argues that the stanza just before this is a historical introduction to these lines; see Chapter 4 section C below for a discussion of lines 33-36.

[259] Mayer (2012) 129.

[260] Mayer (2012) 130 argues that this is strategic: Augustus is said to rule not only over Rome but the world that he has conquered for Rome. He also notes that the Chinese and Indians as real "objects of conquest is an encomiastic fantasy" (128).

1.12 also makes explicit that the labors Augustus must perform to earn his deification[261] similarly make him, like Hercules, a benefactor who protects mankind. Augustus' conquest of the Parthians or eastern peoples is cast in terms of protection and justice: the Parthians are "threatening Latium" (*Latio imminentis*, 53), and Augustus' triumphs will be "just" (*iusto triumpho*, 54).[262] As a successful general, Augustus will be a benefactor to Rome, making the world safe just as Hercules did: as the right-hand man to Jupiter, who is notably here not only *pater* but also *gentis humanae . . . custos* (49), Augustus will rule a *laetum orbem* (57).[263]

In 1.12 Hercules is a key figure in the themes of apotheosis and foreign war. As both a man who was made a god through his beneficial deeds and a man who made the world safe by destroying dangerous alien monsters he is a good model for Augustus. Next we will look at 3.3, which also brings together Hercules and Augustus, and see if it presents a similar treatment of Hercules, combining the themes of apotheosis and cleaning up the world of dangerous Others.

---

[261] Cf. Seager (1980) 107.

[262] On evidence for Augustus' hopes and plans for Parthia, see Brunt (1963) 174. Seager (1980) argues that "Horace not only consistently urges Augustus to undertake the conquest of Parthia but also allows himself to express a striking degree of impatience and dissastisfaction at Augustus' failure to make the attempt" (103).

[263] I will return to 1.12 in the next chapter and take up again the last stanzas, particularly the image of Jupiter's thunderbolts striking polluted groves in lines 59-60.

D. 3.3: Augustus and "Wandering" Hercules

In 1.12 Hercules is called *Alcides*, which recalls his mortal birth and immortality-earning labors. In 3.3 Hercules has a similarly significant epithet: *vagus Hercules* (9):

> Iustum et tenacem propositi virum
> non civium ardor prava iubentium,
> non vultus instantis tyranni
> mente quatit solida neque Auster,
>
> dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,
> nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis:
> si fractus illabatur orbis,
> impavidum ferient ruinae.
>
> hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules
> enisus arces attigit igneas,
> quos inter Augustus recumbens
> purpureo bibet ore nectar;
>
> hac te merentem, Bacche pater, tuae
> vexere tigres indocili iugum
> collo trahentes; hac Quirinus
> Martis equis Acheronta fugit,
>
> gratum elocuta consiliantibus
> Iunone divis.
>
> The man who is just and tenacious of his intention neither the ardor of the citizens for decreeing depraved things nor the face of a threatening despot shakes in his solid mind, nor the South Wind, the turbulent leader of the restless Adriatic, nor the great hand of thundering Jove: if the sky broke and fell, the ruins will strike him being unafraid. Because of this skill Pollux and wandering Hercules after a struggle reached the fiery citadels, among whom Augustus, reclining, will drink nectar with his purple mouth. Because of this, father Bacchus, your tigers, dragging the yoke with their untamed necks, carried you, well-deserving; because of this Quirinus fled Acheron on the horses of Mars, Juno having spoken pleasingly to the council of the gods. (1-18)

Scholars have already noted that Horace's list of demigods among whom to situate Augustus in 3.3.9-16 is traditional;[264] what is not traditional is Hercules' epithet. Though a fairly common word, *vagus*, when it is used to describe people, does not have associations one would think appropriate for Hercules, especially in a context where the aim is praise of Augustus.[265] It stands out as a very weak word to describe Hercules' roaming the world defeating monsters[266] and even as an inappropriate word to describe his "striving" (*enisus*, 10) to "reach" heaven (*arces attigit igneas*, 10)—which is the point: it stands out. Why does Horace call Hercules *vagus*?

Before focusing on Hercules, I will outline the ode briefly. The first 18 lines, quoted above, describe the "just and tenacious" man and four gods that syntactically

---

[264] Cf. the similarities between this list and the gods/demigods in 1.12, discussed above. On the conventionality of the figures, especially the ones listed here in 3.3, see Commager (1962) 210 n. 94, Parker (2002) 105, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 41, Syndikus (2010) 198.

[265] Examples from Horace of *vagus* applied not to animals or inanimate objects: negative: Hor. *Ep.*1.15.28 "scurra, vagus non qui certum praesepe teneret;" neutral: *mercator* . . . *vagus* (*AP* 117) (though of course the figure of the merchant is usually a negative one elsewhere in Horace), "tibicen traxit . . . vagus per pulpita vestem" (*AP* 215). There are no examples in the *Odes* of *vagus* being used of a person.

[266] In addition to *vagus* being a conceptually weak word in this context, it is also unusual in poetry: PHI word search reveals that *vagus* is not typically a poetic word, and that Vergil does not use it at all.

surround Augustus and then introduce Juno's speech to the divine assembly on behalf of Romulus' apotheosis. This is four and a half stanzas out of a total of 18 stanzas. The rest of the ode (excepting the final four lines in which Horace abruptly interrupts himself and scolds his Muse for letting him go on about epic matters in a lyric poem) is Juno's speech, in which she says that she will give up her anger against the Trojans, let Romulus become a god, and let Rome conquer the world—so long as they do not rebuild Troy. Amongst the scholars who focus on Juno's speech, the assumption has generally been that Juno's speech is full of allegory, but there has been some debate as to what exactly rebuilding Troy is an allegory for. One suggestion, dismissed by recent scholars,[267] is that Augustus actually had plans to rebuild the city and move the center of the empire there. Nisbet and Rudd suggest that Augustus had plans for a secondary administrative center in the east.[268] The best suggestion, which I think to be correct, is Commager's: Troy stands for everything bad about Rome's past, especially the civil war,[269] and the call not to rebuild Troy is a call not to return to old mores and old internal conflicts but to "break with the past."[270] The civil wars in Rome and a decline of Roman values and virtue are inextricably linked.[271]

---

[267] E.g. Fraenkel (1957) 268, Commager (1962) 217, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 37, Syndikus (2010) 199.

[268] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 37-38.

[269] Commager (1962) 221: "[Troy] embodies the whole concept of the Romans' fallen state, one that was evidenced particularly by the civil wars."

[270] Commager (1962) 223. Cf. Syndikus (2010) 199-200, who sees Troy as a

The allegory of Commager (and others) makes the most sense of Juno's speech and the historical context in which Horace is writing. But what do the first four stanzas have to do with it? Commager finds the point of the ode in the fourteen stanzas that follow the first four; what remains to be shown is how the first four relate to these main fourteen. Since my topic is Hercules, I propose to show how "*wandering* Hercules," one of the four deified demigods to whom Augustus is compared, is reechoed in elements of Juno's speech in lines 18-68. Although Juno's speech is about Romulus, the other figures of the first four stanzas are not lost in the ode.[272] Looking at how *vagus Hercules* figures in the ode as a whole will add new depth to Commager's and others' readings of the ode and the advice Horace is presuming to give to Augustus.

The obvious association of *vagus Hercules* is with Hercules' labors, which took place all over the world, necessitating his "wandering." Line 10 also emphasizes the work that went into Hercules' deeds which earned him immortality: "enisus arces attigit igneas." Hercules' work was his defeating of monsters, his imposing of order on chaotic forces: this was Hercules' "intention" (*propositi,* 1) to which he was "tenacious" (*tenacem,* 1). The first two stanzas are full of imagery of extremes, immoderation, and

---

representation of moral degradation.

[271] West (2002) 36-37 points out Troy's faults of treachery and luxury and shows how the myth "looks forward to the policies of Augustus, particularly his marriage laws of 18 BC, and also back to the thirties and the propaganda war between Antony and Octavian."

[272] See n. 274 below.

disorder;[273] the figures in the second two stanzas, each in his own way, earn immortality through creating or enforcing order.[274] The theme of imposing order on disorder is found throughout Juno's speech, which, although it is the speech she gives to allow Romulus to be admitted among the gods, has very little to do with Romulus himself and more to do with the future of Rome. Echoes of each figure from the first four stanzas can be found throughout her speech, but I will focus here on the Herculean elements and their importance.

The first place we see the theme of Hercules' wandering and order-imposing labors in Juno's speech is at lines 40-48:

dum Priami Paridisque busto
insultet armentum et catulos ferae

[273] Parker (2002) takes the first two stanzas to evoke the fearless Stoic sage (embodied by Cato). At the same time the lines list generic images of extremes (bad citizens, bad ruler), disorder in the natural world (stormy winds and seas), the results of overreaching impiety (Jupiter's thunderbolt), and general chaos (*si fractus illabatur orbis*, 7).

[274] For the role of the Dioscuri in this ode see Chapter 4 below. Bacchus is depicted here as driving a chariot pulled by yoked tigers (*tigres*, 14): the tigers' necks (*collo*, 15) are *indocili* (14), but Bacchus is able to tame them. Bacchus' sometime association with order, boundaries, and moderation (*modici Liberi*, 1.18.7; he is addressed as *Bacche pater* at both 1.18.6 and 3.3.13) has been discussed in Chapter 1 above. Romulus creates order as the founder of Rome and, famously, creates boundaries as the builder of its walls (an image of limits and moderation in 2.18).

celent inultae, stet Capitolium
fulgens triumphatisque possit
Roma ferox dare iura Medis.

horrenda late nomen in ultimas
extendat oras, qua medius liquor
secernit Europen ab Afro,
qua tumidus rigat arva Nilus.

> As long as cattle trample on the tomb of Priam and Paris and wild beasts conceal their young there with impunity, may the Capitoline stand, shining, and may warlike Rome be able to give laws to the conquered Medes. May she, arousing fear far and wide, extend her name to the farthest shores, where the intervening water separates Europe from the African, where the swollen Nile irrigates the fields.

The emphasis in these lines is on the extent of Rome's empire and on Rome's ability to create order in the territories she rules; both of these ideas are connected to Hercules' wanderings and labors. Juno wants the site of Troy to remain an uncivilized wasteland without civilizing boundaries or a hero to destroy wild beasts. The mention of *armentum* (41) suggests open land: land that herds would graze on is not land with buildings and a city, the boundaries that make up civilization. The fact that the *ferae* (41) will live there *inultae* (42) means that no one (like Hercules) will make the area safe for human habitation: *inultae*, an unusual word here, casts them as the enemies of humankind.[275] Disorder, portrayed here as open land and the presence of "unpunished" wild animals, should be relegated to the site of Troy which should never contain human inhabitants again.

[275] *inultus* usually refers to humans (see *OLD* s.v.). To say that animals are "unpunished" implies that they are part of a human crime and vengeance system.

Rome is *ferox* (44);[276] like Hercules, fighting is in her nature. If "Troy" stands for the evils of the past, and especially the civil war, what is meant here is that Rome should not direct her martial inclinations into internal conflict or, as we see later (49-52), for material gain. Juno offers a better outlet: "triumphatisque possit | Roma ferox dare iura Medis" (43-44). Not only can the Romans defeat the Medes, but they are allowed to "give laws" to them. Juno emphasizes that the purpose of defeating these barbaric enemies is to create more order in the world. The site of Troy should be left alone, but order, here in the form of laws, should be given to the rest of the world.

The next stanza again speaks of the extent of Rome's order-creating empire, and here it is clearly connected to Hercules' wanderings. The stanza begins with stating that Rome may extend her "name" to the "farthest shores" ("nomen in ultimas | extendat oras," 45-46). The first "farthest shore" is to the west, "qua medius liquor | secernit Europen ab Afro" (46-47), that is, where Hercules created and literally gave his name to the promontories called in the ancient world the Pillars of Hercules.[277] Diodorus Siculus tells us that the Hercules created the promontories either when he narrowed the strait to keep the monsters of the ocean out of the Mediterranean or when he created the boundary between the two continents by digging a trench there[278]—either way, he created order through the creation of a boundary. The boundary-aspect of the strait between Europe and Asia is emphasized in Horace's poem by his use of *medius* and *secernit*.

---

[276] Cf. *bellicosis Quiritibus* (57).

[277] See Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc.

[278] Diod. Sic. 4.18.4-5.

The second "farthest shore" is to the east, "qua tumidus rigat arva Nilus" (48). Earlier in the odes (1.2) was another swollen river, the Tiber,[279] but its overflow was destructive rather than, as here, harnessed for human use. A river flooded beyond its boundaries can be seen as dangerous disorder, but the Nile is an example of exploiting a natural force (*rigat arva*) and thereby creating order. Again Rome's empire is associated with controlling dangerous, non-human forces at the edges of the world. The Pillars of Hercules and the Nile mark both the outer limits of Hercules' wanderings,[280] as well as the western- and eastern-most borders of the Roman empire in Augustus' time.[281]

The themes of the extent of Rome's empire and her role in controlling the chaotic Other is also present, though without any directly Herculean references, in the stanza of lines 53-56:

> quicumque mundo terminus obstitit,
> hunc tangat armis, visere gestiens
> qua parte debacchentur ignes,
> qua nebulae pluviique rores.
>
> Whatever limit bounds the world, let [Rome] touch this with her arms, eager to see in what part fires, in what part clouds and rain showers revel.

Fraenkel comments on the strangeness of these lines and interprets them as suggesting that Roman soldiers, while conquering the world, should also have an interest in Greek

---

[279] Which was "wandering," *vagus* (1.2.18), unlike Hercules, *Iove non probante* (19).

[280] Cf. Strabo 3.5.5, referring to Pindar: . . . στήλας, ἃς Πίνδαρος καλεῖ πύλας Γαδειρίδας, εἰς ταύτας ὑστάτας ἀφῖχθαι φάσκων τὸν Ἡρακλέα. Hercules creating safety for travelers in Egypt: Hdt. 2.45.1, Isoc. 11.36, Diod. Sic. 4.27.3, Apollod. 2.5.11.

[281] Syndikus (2010) 199.

θεωρία.[282] However, the lines are less about seeing the world and more about putting it in order. *visere gestiens* perhaps suggests sight-seeing, but *tangat armis* definitely implies military action, and that this is Juno's focus. In the next line after this stanza, Juno calls the Romans *bellicosis Quiritibus* (57) and warns them that she will only allow this future for them if they do not rebuild Troy.[283] As with *Roma ferox* in line 44, emphasis is put on the Romans' martial nature, and Juno's call is for re-directing this nature away from "Troy" (again symbolizing the moral failings of the past, including civil war) and toward ordering the ends of the earth. The world is described as having a *terminus* (53), a boundary,[284] that Rome will "touch" (*tangat*, 54) but not transgress.[285] On the other hand, the ends of the earth (this time north and south)[286] are described in terms of

---

[282] Fraenkel (1957) 270-271.

[283] The martial emphasis in the passage is strong enough that Markland (1811) 265, cited by Fraenkel (1957) 270, suggested emending *visere* to *vincere*.

[284] Used previously in 2.18.24 of the boundary-markers to neighbor's farms which the rich man tears up.

[285] Horace may be using related words here to recall the Hercules lines from the beginning of the ode: cf. *tangat* (54) and *attigit* (10), *ignes* (55) and *igneas* (10). Earlier the *Capitolium fulgens* (42-43) that Juno will let stand if the Romans follow her demands is possibly parallel to the *arces igneas* (10) that Hercules reached by performing his labors.

[286] Syndikus (2010) 200. I agree that the "fires" here must mean the African desert, but I

immoderation: the fires and rains *debacchentur* (55), they are in a bacchic frenzy. The extremes of the world are excessive; the Romans subdue them with their arms (*armis*, 54).

In the prelude of the first four stanzas *vagus Hercules* introduces the theme of traversing the world and creating order that is present in Juno's speech. Hercules' wandering over the whole world and protection of humankind from monsters is an image of one of the things Juno demands that Rome do in the future instead of "rebuilding Troy:" Rome should not return to past ways which include moral laxity due to an influx of foreign luxuries[287] and the years of civil war, but instead she should focus on extending the empire not to enrich herself with gold (lines 49-52) but to impose order on the barbaric Other and make the world safe for civilized people (lines 43-48 and 53-56), for which Hercules is emblematic.[288] But Hercules is also introduced at the ode's opening

---

fail to see how clouds and rain indicate an uninhabitable, frozen northern wasteland (cf. Markland [1811] 265: "intelligitur *zona frigida*"); another option is Britain, a rainy, yet not uninhabitable, region to the north.

[287] Syndikus (2010) 199: "Hunger for foreign treasures was regarded by cultural critics as lying at the root of Rome's moral decline in the aftermath of the defeat of Carthage (hence subsequent to Rome's attaining sovereignty over the Mediterranean world)." West (2002) 37 discusses the connection between Troy and luxury.

[288] Cf. Seager (1980) 106 on 1.2.43-44 and 45-52, "It is legitimate to see in these lines an injunction to Augustus to stop living in the past and resting on the dubious laurels of his rise to power and instead to turn his mind to erasing the memory of the civil war by a war

as an exemplum of a man who, being just and tenacious of his purpose, "hac arte . . . | enisus arces attigit igneas" (9-10). He is a symbol for *Augustus* (11) of the kind of man he needs to be in order to drink nectar with the gods (*bibet . . . nectar*, 12) in the future.[289] Juno tells Rome what she needs to do for eternal prosperity; Horace tells Augustus what is involved in achieving immortality. More specific than advising him to be generally "just and tenacious," through *vagus Hercules* and the subsequent repetition of his theme, Horace urges Augustus to leave behind the concerns and mistakes of the past (foreign riches and civil war)[290] and focus on empire-expanding foreign war.

This use of Hercules is consistent with his appearance in 1.12, where foreign war and Augustus' apotheosis were also closely linked by Hercules' philanthropic labors and deification. Here another element is added, that Hercules' labors created safe boundaries for human habitation. In the next ode, 3.14, we will see that Hercules' victories over monsters are again a symbol for foreign war, but instead of Hercules' deification linked to Augustus', we will see Hercules' defeat of death in his katabasis—that is, as a mortal he

---

of revenge on Parthia . . . The message is clear: it is time to forget about revenge for Caesar and to concentrate on revenge against the Medes."

[289] Seager (1980) 109-110.

[290] However just it might be: "ne nimium **pii** | . . . **avitae** | tecta velint reparare Troiae" (58-60); cf. 1.2.43-44, where Mercury/Octavian is asked to "endure to be called" (*patiens vocari*, 43) called the "avenger" of his adopted father Caesar (*Caesaris **ultor***, 44), but then asked instead to "triumph" over and "avenge" foreign enemies: "hic magnos potius triumphos, | . . . | neu sinas Medos equitare **inultos** | te duce, Caesar" (49, 51-52).

was able to go to the place of the dead and return by his own power—linked to Augustus' treatment as a divinity in the ode.

E. 3.14: Augustus and the Ritus *of Hercules*

In the first stanza of 3.14 there is a strong connection between Hercules' defeat of a monster and Augustus' defeat of the Other in the form of foreign enemies:

> Herculis ritu modo dictus, o plebs,
> morte venalem petiisse laurum
> Caesar Hispana repetit Penatis
> victor ab ora.
>
> In the manner of Hercules, O plebs, he who was said just now to have sought the laurel that death may buy—Caesar—seeks again his Penates, a victor [like Hercules][291] coming from the Hispanian shores. (1-4)

Augustus has just returned from Spain, having narrowly escaped death;[292] the usual interpretation is that Augustus' victory is being compared to Hercules' defeat of the giant

[291] *Herculis ritu* could be taken with *petiisse* or *repetit*. Nisbet (1983) 106-107 n. 3 and (1999) 150, West (2002) 125, and Rudd (2004) 179 take *Herculis ritu* with *repetit*. Morgan (2005) 190 and Marks (2008) 80 retain the Latin word order, and therefore the ambiguity, by translating the phrase first in its sentence; Morgan (2005) 191 argues "the truth is sure that a reader cannot help construing *Herculis ritu* with *both* verbs in turn, and it is very much Horace's plan that they should. When the implications of Augustus' resemblance to Hercules change from pessimistic to optimistic, Horace is dramatizing in the reader's response to his poem the turbulent emotions that Romans had experienced (so Horace claimed, at least) over Augustus' fate in Spain." I will argue below for an additional significance of this ambiguity.

Geryon in Spain.[293] In addition to the defeat of Geryon, Hercules accomplished many things in the "west": the labors of getting the apples of the Hesperides and bringing Cerberus from the underworld are associated with the western reaches of the world.[294] Line 2 suggests Hercules' katabasis.[295] Hercules' "laurel" in that episode was bought by a kind of death: he did descend to the realm of the dead, but, like Augustus returning alive to Rome, Hercules returned to his home, the world of the living. Both Hercules and Augustus are noted for overcoming death, for coming near to it—either by nearly dying or by descending to the underworld—but returning from the experience alive.

---

[292] He had, it seems, escaped death no less than three times: he was threatened before twice by illness (Cass. Dio 53.25.7, 53.28.1), and once by a lightning strike that killed one of his slaves (Suet. *Aug.* 29.3); scholars focus variously on one or the other of these dangers or on both, e.g., Cole (2001) 87 mentions the lightning, West (2002) 126 cites both lightning and one illness, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 180 mention the illness, Marks (2008) 80 n. 9 cites lightning and two illnesses.

[293] See Marks (2008) 81 and bibliography at 81 n.11.

[294] Hercules need not have gone, like Odysseus, to the west to reach the underworld—there were other mythological entrances—but it makes sense to see these three labors, which are grouped together in mythographers and historians such as Diodorus Siculus and Apollodorus as Heracles' last three labors, as connected through their location on the outer, western edges of the world.

[295] Nisbet (1983) 106-107, Harrison (2005) 120.

Futhermore, the first stanza of the poem hints at Augustus' future deification: Cairns comments in his discussion of *Odes* 3.14 as participating in the genre of prosphonetikon (a welcome to a traveler),[296] "The saviour god of the prosphonetika . . . is at first sight absent; but instead of this topical and so anticipated saviour-god, Augustus himself is compared to the celebrated saviour-god Hercules. . . . In underlining the parallel between Augustus' and Hercules' activities in Spain, Horace is alluding to Augustus' predetermined, posthumous deification."[297] Horace links deification and the defeat of the Other by deftly combining a reference to Hercules' katabasis and Hercules' defeat of Geryon with an intentionally ambiguous sentence[298] and by suggesting that Augustus himself is a savior-god like Hercules.

Morgan has argued that the significance of Hercules continues throughout the poem[299] and provides, indeed, the answer to the question of the unity of the poem that so many scholars have addressed.[300] For Morgan, "Hercules is the promoter and emblem of

---

[296] Cairns (2007) 18.

[297] Cairns (2007) 181; cf. West (2002) 126-127.

[298] Morgan (2005) 191.

[299] Morgan (2005) 191-192, 202.

[300] Fraenkel (1957) 291 argued for unity but felt that there was still "a faint disharmony" between the public (lines 1-16) and private (17-28) parts of the poem. Scholars since have argued for a stronger sense of unity (e.g. Klingner [1961] 395-405, Mankin [1992], Nisbet [1983], West [2002] 126-131, Nisbet and Rudd [2004] 181-182, Morgan [2005]).

cohesion and integration within the diverse populations of the Italian peninsula, a god of community."[301] While I agree that "the assimilation of Augustus and Hercules established at the outset is designed to persist in the reader's mind throughout the poem,"[302] I believe that the persistent idea lies not in Italian unity but rather in safety from the dangers of barbarous disorder. At the center of the ode we learn that the speaker of the poem has been anxious, but now that Augustus is home he says that he will cease to worry (*atras* . . . *curas*, 13-14): he has confidence that Augustus will protect him (14-16). Augustus' protection, both before and after these lines, is cast in terms of creating order through the maintenance of boundaries for safe, civilized living and through the defeat of the dangerous Other.

In the first stanza, the idea of defeating the Other is apparent, and the idea of maintaining boundaries is suggested in lines 3 and 4, where Augustus returns to his *Penatis* (3) "from the shores of Hispania" (*Hispana . . . ab ora*, 3-4): Rome and its civilized household gods is set in contrast to Spain, which, bounded by its *ora*, remains safely far away from Rome. Moving on from the first stanza, we see Horace, in lines 5-16, giving orders for the religious celebration that will occur now that Augustus has returned from Spain, and these lines are full of allusions to the boundaries that organize society and keep civilization safe. In a broad sense, the second and third stanzas show a kind of orderly restraint as Horace describes not a raucous welcome-home party—which the word *gaudens* (5) might suggest—but *operata* (a word that suggests the serious work

[301] Morgan (2005) 192.

[302] Morgan (2005) 191-192.

of religious rites) to the *iustis divis* (6).[303] The restraint around the ceremony is emphazied by the injunction to the children, *male nominatis | parcite verbis* (11-12). Looking more closely, we see, through his catalogue of Romans taking part in the ceremony, Horace emphasizing sexual boundaries that (from Augustus' perspective) hold Roman society together: *unico gaudens mulier marito* (5, praising long-term loyalty to a husband if not technical status as an *univira*),[304] *soror* (7), *matres* (9), *virginum* (9), *iuvenum* (9), *pueri* (10), *puellae | iam*[305] *virum expertae* (10-11). Marks argues that here "Horace touches on . . . the emperor's establishment of domestic order through moral reforms."[306] One way that Augustus protects Rome is by promoting its moral integrity,

---

[303] For *divis* Shackleton Bailey (2001) prints *sacris*, an alternate manuscript reading.

[304] West (2002) 127.

[305] Shackelton Bailey (2001) prints Bentley's emendation *non* (unmarried girls); the MS reading is *iam* (recently-married girls). On the interpretation of *iam* see Klingner (1961) 399-400, Williams (1969) 93, Mankin (1992) 380; for *non* see West (2002) 128, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc.

[306] Marks (2008) 82; he points out that the dramatic date of the ode (24 B.C.) and the publication of *Odes* 1-3 (23 B.C.) rule out our reading into it any of Augustus' later legislation regarding marriage and sexual mores (83), but the Roman Odes show that promoting traditional morals was on Augustus' agenda and that Augustus' moral agenda was on Horace's mind even before any laws were in place (see Badian [1985] for the argument against the existence of a marriage law of 28-27 B.C.).

and Horace points to this through emphasizing boundaries based on sex, family relationship, and marital status.

The second and third stanzas remind us that Augustus also protects Rome by defending it against external enemies. Octavia is described as the *soror cari ducis* (7),[307] the "sister of the dear *general*": we are not to forget Augustus' military role even when thinking of his family relations.[308] Furthermore, the youths having just returned from Spain are described as *nuper sospitum* (9-10) because of the acts of the savior-future-god Augustus.[309]

The fourth stanza again emphasizes Augustus' role as a Hercules-like civilizer:

> . . . ego nec tumultum
> nec mori per vim metuam tenente
> Caesare terras.
>
> . . . I will fear neither insurrection nor dying through violence while Caesar holds the lands.

It seems odd for Horace to say that Augustus' defeat of a far-away foreign enemy would make him sleep easier at night. Augustus' safe return might make him feel safer that

---

[307] For *cari* Shackleton Bailey (2001) prints the manuscript variant *clari*. (On *cari* see Nisbet [1983] 110-111, Morgan [2005] 193.)

[308] *dux* is not necessarily a military term, but in the context of the ode—his return from a military victory—the word suggests a military leader.

[309] Cairns (2007) 183; Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc. note that "*sospitum* is more solemn than *salvorum* and here suggests sacral language."

Rome will not revert to a state of civil unrest,[310] but what Horace explicitly says is that Augustus' control over the world (*tenente . . . terras*, 15-16) makes him feel safe at home. In this stanza Augustus' restraint of uncivilized violence calms the speaker's fears. Augustus "holds" (*tenente*, 15), restrains, the "lands" (*terras*, 16), that is, the world outside of Rome. What Horace fears is uncivilized violence: *tumultum* (14) and *mori per vim* (15). Although *tumultum* could refer to civil war, it more likely refers to unrest or rebellion outside of Rome (as well as a general sense of chaos).[311] However, *mori per vim* sounds like death by lawless murderers, something that might happen (and has happened) within Rome. Augustus' restraining actions abroad help protect Romans at home: if he can restrain and civilize the world, there will also be a civilizing effect on Rome itself. Marks argues that Horace's point is that "Rome's stability is tied to Augustus' successes in war."[312] But how is this possible?

The next stanza makes all clear. In this first stanza of the "private" part of the ode, Horace calls for his slave to get

> . . . cadum Marsi memorem duelli,
> Spartacum si qua potuit vagantem
> fallere testa.
>
> a jar that remembers the Marsian war, if in any way a jar was able to escape roaming Spartacus. (18-20)

---

[310] This is usually interpreted in this way: see e.g. Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 181.

[311] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc.: "*tumultus* was a traditional euphemism for insurrection in Italy or Gallia Cisalpina."

[312] Marks (2008) 82.

Horace says it is the jar that remembers, but really it is the reader whom he wants to remember that the dangerous Other can sometimes be close to home: the Social War and Spartacus' Slave Revolt were times in Roman history where the city itself was under threat of "rebellion" and "death by violence."[313] Spartacus and his ilk disrupt civilized activities like storing up wine. Horace is *not* saying that Rome is in danger of another slave rebellion and that Augustus will protect them from it. Rather, Horace is making the danger of the Other more vivid for his readers by asking them to imagine the danger in terms of the ransacking of their own homes. In 1.12.53, Horace, somewhat hyperbolically, describes the Parthians as currently "threatening Latium;" here, he gives a striking image of what really happened (many of his older readers or his readers' parents would remember Spartacus) when the Other was a threat in Italy itself.

In the sixth and seventh stanzas (21-28), Horace continues the theme of restraint into the personal sphere. The request that the boy summon Neaera is full of restraining: she herself should restrain her hair (*nodo cohibere crinem*, 22), and the boy, if blocked by the *ianitor*, should respect that boundary and come away.[314] Finally, Horace himself puts boundaries on his own passion, not only erotically (25-26) but also politically: "non ego

---

[313] Fraenkel (1957) 290: "*Marsum duellum* and *Spartacus vagans* strike us as a terrible echo of *vis* and *tumultus* in Italy." Cf. Marks (2008) 82. Note that the Marsi are listed as external enemies in *Epode* 16.3-4.

[314] Although trying to acquire a courtesan may not seem to fit in with Augustus' moral agenda alluded to in stanzas 2 and 3, this shows that "Horace has learned to respect the boundary between male and female" (Marks [2008] 89).

hoc ferrem calidus iuventa | consule Planco" (27-28), that is, in the time of his life when he fought at Philippi.[315]

At the very end of the ode, Horace praises Augustus for putting a boundary on himself by putting an end to civil war. West notes that the reference to Plancus at the end is "a characteristically deft and light allusion to the Augustan policy of reconciliation"[316] from which Horace himself had benefitted. In 3.3, refusing to continue civil war was tied to pursuing foreign war; returning to 3.14.14-15, "nec tumultum | . . . metuam tenente | Caesare terras," we could re-read this as "if Caesar is focused on external war, if he focuses any martial efforts outward, there will be no fear of civil war (*tumultum*)." Through the mention of Hercules in the first word of the ode and the mention of Plancus in the last word, the main point of the entire ode is made clear: Augustus should keep Rome safe by continuing to pursue foreign war and refuse to renew conflict within the city.

---

[315] Although Augustus' defeat of the dangerous Other and his creation of safety and civilization through order and boundaries persist throughout the ode, one should note here that the poet himself participates in the creation of order and boundaries. It is he who orders the orderly religious rites, bids Neaera to tie up her hair and the boy to show restraint at the door's boundary, and finally portrays his own erotic and political mellowing (cf. Oliensis [1998] 147). This will be discussed further below when we see another poet in connection to Hercules, Vergil in 1.3.

[316] West (2002) 130.

So far this survey of Hercules' role in 1.12, 3.3, and 3.14 has shown a consistency in Hercules' portrayal and his connection with Augustus. Both Hercules and Augustus are protectors and civilizers, making the world safe by defeating the Other (monsters or foreign enemies) and creating and maintaining protective boundaries. In addition, both men have/will become gods, and this is because of their beneficence to mankind. I will now turn to 2.12 and see if these observations shed light on the reference to Hercules in this ode.

F. 2.12: Augustus, Hercules, and Saturn's Realm

Of the four poems in *Odes* 1-3 that mention Hercules, the one that has the most puzzling reference is 2.12. Previous scholarship on the ode has focused on the question of the ode being a *recusatio*[317] and on the identity of Licymnia, the woman featured in the second half of the ode.[318] However, the two questions I will consider focus on the first two stanzas of the *recusatio*, in which Horace names three historical conflicts and three mythological conflicts which he says Maecenas "would not wish" (*Nolis*, 1) "to be set to the soft rhythms of the lyre" (*mollibus | aptari citharae modis*, 3-4).[319]

---

[317] E.g., Santirocco (1980), Byrne (2000).

[318] E.g., Davis (1975).

[319] Nisbet and Hubbard as well as West assume that there is "an element of allegory" (Nisbet and Hubbard [1978] 189) in these stanzas, that the mythological and historical references in fact stand for Augustus' battles; West (1998) 80-81: "Although he has adroitly postponed the name of Caesar Augustus, as soon as we read the end of the grand

The first stanza lists three historical conflicts: the wars against Numantia in the second century B.C., the Second Punic War (through a reference to Hannibal), and the First Punic War (through a reference to the "Sicilian sea" and thereby the naval battles of Mylae and the Aegatian Islands):

> Nolis longa ferae bella Numantiae
> nec durum Hannibalem nec Siculum mare
> Poeno purpureum sanguine mollibus
> aptari citharae modis.
>
> You would not wish the long wars against savage Numantia nor cruel Hannibal nor the Sicilian sea purple with Punic blood to be set to the soft rhythms of the lyre. (1-4)

In this stanza Horace lists three occasions in Rome's history when Rome fought a foreign enemy and won. The first note Horace sounds in the ode is that of Rome's victories over foreign opponents.

The theme of warfare continues into the second and third stanzas with the mention mythological conflicts:

> nec saevos Lapithas et nimium mero
> Hylaeum domitosque Herculea manu
> Telluris iuvenes, unde periculum

---

sentence which finishes at line 12 we realize that Augustus has been on the scene from the beginning." Woodman (1981) 165 has raised a key objection to the allegorical interpretation, that it does not fit the argument of the first 12 lines. In addition, in the allegorical interpretation the mythological and historical references are supposed to stand for Octavian/Augustus' victories again the tyrranicides and Antony, but in lines 11-12 Horace explicitly says that the victories he will not write about are against foreign monarchs ("ducta . . . per vias regum colla minacium").

fulgens contremuit domus

Saturni veteris.

> …nor [would you wish to be set to the soft rhythms of the lyre] the savage Lapiths and Hylaeus overfilled with wine[320] and Earth's young subdued by Hercules' hand, at whose danger the bright home of old Saturn trembled. (5-9)[321]

These myths place an emphasis on the immoderation, the uncivilized unboundedness, of the Lapiths (*saevos,* 5) and Hylaeus (*nimium mero,* 5), and the otherness of the giants, who are described as chthonic (*Telluris iuvenes,* 7). Normally the mention of the Lapiths and a centaur in the same place would suggest the Centauromachy, but usually in the Centauromachy the Lapiths represent civilization over against the uncivilized centaurs.[322] Nisbet and Hubbard point out that *saevos* here "can hardly be taken as complimentary . . . if the Lapiths are regarded as savage creatures they are on all fours not only with Hylaeus but with the giants of line 7."[323] Here the Lapiths stand not in opposition to the barbaric Hylaeus but alongside of him and the "sons of earth," opposite Hercules, by whom the savage and inhuman can be "tamed" (*domitos Herculea manu,* 6). In fact, according to

---

[320] Cf. Wickham (1877) ad loc.: "overcharged with wine;" Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc. prefer for *nimium mero* (5) "outrageous with wine;" West (998) 79 has "ungovernable in his cups." I will discuss my choice below.

[321] Following Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) I have take *fulgens* and *domus* together. One could construe the final lines differently, taking *fulgens* with *periculum*.

[322] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 187.

[323] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) ad loc.

Diodorus Siculus and Apollodorus, Hercules did fight the Lapiths[324] and centaurs, including, at least in the version of the myth used by Vergil in the *Aeneid*, Hylaeus.[325] Futhermore, although the Gigantomachy could be understood as an internal rebellion (and therefore a symbol for civil war),[326] in 2.12 the emphasis put on the alien nature of the giants (*Telluris iuvenes*, 7) and Hercules' taming them (*domitos*, 6) suggests rather that they be seen here as external, foreign enemies, the uncivilized Other that is a danger to the order represented by the gods. The giants' threat that caused Latium to tremble ("periculum | fulgens contremuit domus | Saturni veteris," 7-9)[327] is parallel to the

---

[324] Apollod. 2.7.7, Diod. Sic. 4.37.

[325] Verg. *Aen.* 8.293-295: "tu nubigenas, invicte, bimembris | Hylaeumque Pholumque manu, tu Cresia mactas | prodigia et vastum Nemeae sub rupe leonem." Here Hylaeus is named with Pholus. The full story, told in Diod. Sic. 4.12.3-7 and Apollod. 2.5.4, is that Hercules, having been entertained at the cave of the centaur Pholus, asked him to open the jar of wine the centaurs held in common. The scent of the wine was very strong, and caused all the centaurs to become drunk and attack Pholus. Hercules defeated the mad centaurs single-handedly. Neither Diodorus nor Apollodorus mentions Hylaeus in connection with this event. Vergil himself, at *G.* 2.455-457, lists Hylaeus and Pholus as centaurs that fought the Lapiths, apparently choosing there a different version of the story.

[326] As in 3.4; see Commager (1957) 196-200.

[327] I will discuss *domus Saturni* (8-9) below.

"threatening" foreign kings in the next stanza (*regum minacium*, 12). Carlson notes that the gigantomachy is "one of mythology's strongest examples of civilization's victory over sheer force. In fact all of the events Horace mentions are victories of Rome, of order, reason, or authority."[328] As elsewhere in the odes, Hercules' defeat of monsters (and savage human races, in the case of the Lapiths) stands for the civilization against barbarism, order against immoderation.

Finally, in the third stanza, Horace suggests that he is also declining to write about Augustus' future victories and triumphs over foreign enemies:[329]

> . . . tuque pedestribus
> dices historiis proelia Caesaris,
> Maecenas, melius ductaque per vias
> regum colla minacium.
>
> . . . and you, Maecenas, will speak better about the battles of Caesar in prose histories, and about the necks of menacing kings led through the streets. (9-12)

In the first three stanzas Horace develops a theme of successful combat against the Other, first with historical Roman victories against foreign enemies, then with Hercules' defeat of the savage and monstrous, and finally with the suggestion that Maecenas write about Augustus' victories abroad.

Before concluding I would like to turn to a curious phrase in the Hercules stanzas: *domus Saturni veteris* (8-9). Hercules was the mortal fated to help the gods defeat the

---

[328] Carlson (1978) 443.

[329] Harrison (2010), in his discussion of themes and patterns in *Odes* 2, notes that 2.9 and 2.12 are linked through their both suggesting the "possibility of the campaigns of Caesar as a literary topic" (54).

rebellious giants and guarantee victory in the Gigantomachy, but the last words of this section, *Saturni veteris* (9), allude to the Titanomachy in which Hercules, of course, had no role. The usual explanation is that Horace, like most poets, has conflated the two battles.[330] However, there is no evidence that these two events were commonly confused or conflated.[331] In the *Georgics* Vergil describes Saturn as ruling over the Golden Age in Italy (*G.* 2.538).[332] Like Hercules' victorious struggle against the giants, Saturn's Golden Age represents order in opposition to the chthonic forces of disorder. In both cases the chthonic forces of disorder are associated with snakes: the chthonic giants are depicted in art as having snakes for legs, and the Golden Age is traditionally depicted as free of snakes.[333] Augustus' victories against foreign enemies similarly rid the world of a

---

[330] Cf. e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 191, Rudd (2004) 119.

[331] Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 191 cite Propertius 2.1.19-20 ("non ego Titanas canerem, non Ossan Olympo | impositam, ut caeli Pelion esset iter, | nec veteres Thebas, nec Pergama nomen Homeri," etc., 19-21), but there is no reason the passage could not be listing the Titanomachy and Gigantomachy as two separate events. See Stamatopoulou (2012) on Eur. *Hec.* 466-74 and *IT* 218-24.

[332] Cf. ***aureus*** *Saturnus* (Verg. *G.* 2.538) and ***fulgens*** *domus Saturni* (and *Capitolium fulgens,* 3.3.42-43).

[333] E.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 4.24; Vergil (with an eye towards symbolism, not accuracy) says that Italy does not have snakes (or at least, "nec rapit immensos orbis per humum neque tanto | squameus in spiram tractu se colligit anguis") at *G.* 2.153-154 (see Thomas [1988] ad

dangerous Other. The parallel between Augustus and Saturn is brought out in Vergil's *Georgics*. In the *Laudes Italiae* Vergil connects Italy's abundance, its designation as "Saturnian,"[334] and Caesar's military victories in foreign lands:

> [Italia extulit] te, maxime Caesar,
> qui nunc extremis Asiae iam victor in oris
> imbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum.
> salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
> magna virum.
> .
> [Italy has brought forth] you, greatest Caesar, who now as victor on the farthest shores of Asia turn aside the unwarlike Indians from Roman strongholds. Hail, great parent of fruits, Saturnian land, great parent of men. (2.170-174)

In *Odes* 2.12, Horace also, in the space of a few lines, mentions Augustus' defeat of dangerous[335] foreign enemies and the Saturnian past of Italy, the *domus Saturni veteris*

---

loc.). Horace imitates Vergil in the detail at *Epod.* 16.52.

[334] Johnson (1980) 69: "When Vergil addresses Italy as *Saturnia tellus*, he appears to mean that this is the land where a golden age has occurred in the past and has the potential of recurring." Johnson (1980) 64 also points out that in the *Aeneid* "the reign of Saturnus signifies not the period when Saturnus was supreme ruler of heaven, but rather the subsequent period, after he had been overthrown by Jupiter and had come to Italy in exile," citing *Aen.* 6.319-325. Cf. *Ecl.* 4.6.

[335] Note that Vergil casts Roman military action against the Indians as defensive just as Horace describes the foreign kings as "threatening." Like Horace in 3.3.49-53, Vergil seems to be pro-foreign war only if its goal is to make Romans safe, not if it is for material gain: *G.* 2.505-507.

(8-9).[336] The suggestion here, however, is that through fighting foreign enemies Augustus, like Hercules before him, will restore order to a world that has lost the Golden Age.[337] Hercules defeats the giants, "unde periculum | fulgens contremuit domus | Saturni veteris" (7-9): the land that is no longer in the Golden Age of Saturn (*domus Saturni* ***veteris***) was threatened again, but Hercules, the benefactor of mankind (and the gods' only hope) saved it.[338] Augustus, through acting like Hercules, through fighting the dangerous Other, *reges minaces* such as the Indians (as Vergil suggests), will do what Anchises predicts:

> . . . hic Caesar et omnis Iuli
> progenies magnum caeli ventura sub axem. 790
> hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,
> Augustus Caesar, divi genus, aurea condet
> saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva
> Saturno quondam, super et Garamantas et Indos
> proferet imperium.
> . . .
> nec vero Alcides tantum telluris obivit,

[336] "*veteris*" because Saturn's Golden Age has passed.

[337] In *Epod.* 16 Horace suggests that there will be no return of the Golden Age which Vergil imagines in *Ecl.*4. Here in the *Odes*, however, he seems to think that a peaceful, happy era for Rome (for which the mythical Golden Age is a symbol) is possible if Augustus can maintain a rule free of civil war.

[338] Hercules was the gods' human agent for defeating the giants; in 1.12 we saw that Augustus is Jupiter's terrestrial helper ("te [i.e., Iovem] minor laetum reget aequus orbem; | tu gravi curru quaties Olympum," 57-58). Saturn also comes up in this ode: Jupiter is called *orte Saturno* (50).

> fixerit aeripedem cervam licet, aut Erymanthi
> pacarit nemora et Lernam tremefecerit arcu.
>
> Here [i.e., in Rome] Caesar and all the offspring of Iulus are going to come under the great pole of the sky. This is the man, this is he whom you rather often hear promised to you, Augustus Caesar, the son of a god, who will found again a golden age in Latium through the fields Saturn once ruled, and extend the empire beyond the Garamantians and Indians. . . . And indeed Alcides did not traverse so much of the earth, although he piereced the bronze-hoofed stag, or pacified the groves of Erymanthus and with his bow caused Lerna to tremble.[339] (Verg. *Aen.* 6.789-795, 801-803)

In this later passage—though it is uncertain whether it was already composed or whether Horace would have had access to it when writing *Odes* 2.12—Vergil strongly links the return of the Golden Age, the expansion of the Empire, and the activities of Hercules. In *Odes* 2.12 the connection is already being made, though more subtly.

In four out of the five odes in Books 1-3 that mention Hercules, Hercules is a symbol for Augustus, particularly Augustus as a victor in foreign campaigns and Augustus as a man who, though his beneficent deeds of expanding the empire and making the world safe, will achieve immortality. The last ode I will consider is 1.3.

G. 1.3: Hercules and Vergil

It is perhaps appropriate that in the above discussion much more reference was made to Vergil than previously. In *Odes* 1.3, the subject is not, as it has been in 1.12, 3.3,

[339] Groves of Erymanthus: a reference to the Erymanthian boar; Lerna: a reference to the Lernian Hydra. A focus on place-names rather than the names of the monsters more strongly connects Augustus' empire-expanding with Hercules' slaying of monsters, as if Hercules were conquering or taming the whole region rather than one beast.

3.14, and 2.12, Augustus and his future battles but rather Vergil and his future writing of epic. In previous chapters I have discussed the references to Daedalus and Prometheus in relation to my interpretation of 1.3: although the ode seems to be censuring sailing and other human overreaching as hubristic, that censure is, I argued, in fact ironic, and Horace is really encouraging his friend that he will succeed in his new venture, to write heroic epic. The key to my argument is that all of the mythological *exempla* for Horace's stated moral in at the end of the ode (37-40, quoted again below) are completely inappropriate. The least appropriate of all is Hercules; only one line is given to Hercules' deed, but as the final *exemplum* before the moral it carries the most weight:

> perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor.
> nil mortalibus ardui est:
> caelum ipsum petimus stultitia neque
> per nostrum patimur scelus
> iracunda Iovem ponere fulmina. (1.3.36-40)
>
> . . . a Herculean labor broke through Acheron. There is nothing "impossibly high" for mortals: we aim for the sky itself in our stupidity, and by our crime we do not allow Jupiter to lay aside his angry thunderbolts.

As I previously pointed out, Hercules' labors were not his own idea—the task of performing the labors in general was set by Jupiter, and Eurystheus ordered each one individually[340]—nor was he punished for them. He is an example neither of overreaching nor of the dangers of attempting something normally beyond human abilities. Furthermore, Hercules, after his labors, becomes a god and therefore not subject to the moral of the last lines, which are intended for mortals (*mortalibus*, 37).

[340] Diod. Sic. 4.9.5.

What does Horace mean, then, in bringing up Hercules' katabasis in connection to Vergil? In 3.14 Hercules' katabasis is suggested in order to hint at Augustus' future deification. Here Horace employs a similar symbolism. In this ode about Vergil's beginning the *Aeneid*, it would be appropriate for Horace to speak about the future immortality of poet and work. After all, Horace has just, in 1.1, spoken about his own future immortality if his *Odes* are well-received and will, in 2.20 and 3.30, repeat this theme with increasing degrees of certainty. Here Horace honors Vergil by punctuating this ode on his epic journey with a reference to Hercules' katabasis, which itself is a conquering of death.

We have also seen Hercules connected to a theme of labor earning immortality. Here Hercules' labors are referred to with the very word *labor* (36). In the other odes, the labor that would earn immortality was, for Augustus, defeating foreign enemies and creating boundaries, which is paralleled to Hercules' defeat of chthonic monsters and creation of the Pillars of Hercules. Vergil's labor is parallel to Hercules' katabasis to retrieve Cerberus. After all, poets do not defeat tangible opponents; instead, poetry is a way to cross the boundary of death through an enduring work, like the *Aeneid*, through an enduring idea like the glory of Rome, through the enduring portrait of a hero like the *Aeneid*'s celebration of Augustus. Hercules' labor of bringing up Cerberus from the underworld is not about cleaning up the world but instead about exhibiting hidden wonders to mortal sight:[341] again, something that poets do.

---

[341] Cf. Diod. Sic. 4.26.1: τὸν δὲ κύνα παραλαβὼν δεδεμένον παραδόξως ἀπήγαγε καὶ φανερὸν κατέστησεν ἀνθρώποις.

H. Conclusion

Herculeus labor, mentioned for the first time in 1.3.36, is an important concept throughout *Odes* 1-3. In 1.3 it symbolizes Vergil's writing of the *Aeneid*, but in 1.12, 2.12, 3.3, and 3.14 Hercules' labors stand for Augustus' battles against foreign enemies. Horace continually advises Augustus to fight abroad, and at times he adds the admonition not to renew civil war. In order to earn his divinity, Augustus, like Hercules, must stand for civilization and order, not for internal disorder and dissolution. It is this aspect of Augustus Vergil will celebrate in the *Aeneid*,[342] so it is appropriate that the poet, like the *princeps*, is associated with Hercules.

In the next chapter I will turn to a pair of mythological figures often linked with Hercules in the *Odes*, Castor and Pollux, whom Horace also uses to talk about Augustus (and, in one ode, both Augustus and a poet, namely himself). Just as with Hercules, with Castor and Pollux the topic of deification will be central, but as we will see the work the twins did when they were granted divinity was not martial but pacific.

[342] E.g. Verg. *Aen.* 6.789-795.

Part II: Mythology and Deification

Chapter 4: Castor and Pollux

A. The Dioscuri: Horace's Complement to Hercules

In two out of the four odes in Books 1-3 that include both Hercules and Augustus, Hercules is paired with one or both of the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux.[343] In this chapter I will look first at 1.12 and 3.3, the odes in which Hercules is paired with the Dioscuri. Having already discussed in detail in the previous chapter the scholarship on these poems, rather than repeating the discussion above, in this chapter I will be adding to my analysis of these poems with a focus on the Dioscuri. In this chapter I will only point to scholarship on 1.12 and 3.3 which relates directly to the Dioscuri and to any additions I make to my interpretation of each ode.

As I discussed in the previous chapter, in *Odes* 1-3 Horace employs Hercules as an emblem for labor that earns deification: specifically, in Augustus' case, the destruction of foreign enemies, the dangerous Other which is parallel to Hercules' monsters. My examination in this chapter will observe the complementary role the Dioscuri play in 1.12 and 3.3 in Horace's advice to Augustus for his rule of Rome. Then I will turn to the other two odes that mention the Dioscuri, 1.3 and 3.29. These odes are not about Augustus, but I will compare them to 1.12 and 3.3 to see if Castor and Pollux have a consistent significance there as well and, if so, how this can help in interpreting each individual ode.

B. Which Dioscuri?

---

[343] See also 4.5.35-36.

Before I begin this analysis of Horace's use of the Dioscuri, it will be useful briefly to lay out here the various versions of the myths in Greek authors and mythographers, and then the gods' significance specifically to the Romans, in order to make clear which myths Horace is drawing on for his depiction of the twins. In *Iliad* 3, the brothers of Helen are mortal (they have died),[344] but in *Odyssey* 11 we learn that they die and come to life again alternately and are equal to the gods, though they are the sons of Leda and Tyndareus.[345] In two Homeric Hymns (17 and 33), however, they are called the sons of Zeus and are clearly gods. Alcaeus' hymn (fr. 34a) also names both gods as the sons of Zeus and Leda. Pindar (*Nem.* 10) tells us a yet another story, that Polydeuces is the son of Zeus and Castor is the son of Tyndareus and that Polydeuces chose to share his immortality with his brother. The mythographers and historians tell both Alcaeus' and Pindar's tales: Apollodorus agrees with Pindar,[346] and Diodorus Siculus, agreeing with Alcaeus on the boys' parentage, adds the detail that as Argonauts Castor and Polydeuces calmed a storm at sea after which stars appeared above their heads marking them as divine, the Διόσ-κοροι, sons of Zeus.[347]

---

[344] *Il.* 3.244-245: ὣς [Ἑλένη] φάτο, τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἶα | ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.

[345] *Od.* 11.298-304.

[346] Apollod. 3.136-137.

[347] Diod. Sic. 4.43.1.

In Greek myth, stars are consistently important to the Dioscuri. First, stars supposedly originally marked them as divine. Second, they are responsible for the phenomenon known as St. Elmo's fire, a blue electrical discharge that appears on ships' masts and was thought to provide safety to ships in danger (this is the topic of Alcaeus fr. 34a). Finally, they are also known as the constellation Gemini, stars which Ovid says help troubled ships (Ov. *Fast.* 5.697-720).

Last, the distinct importance of Castor and Pollux to the Roman people in Horace's day must be noted. Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells us that during the Battle of Lake Regillus (499 or 496 B.C.), Castor and Pollux, looking like young men riding horses, appeared in the battle and helped the Roman soldiers, and that after the battle they appeared watering their horses in the Forum and announced the victory to the people in the city. Because of these apparitions, the Temple of Castor and Pollux was built in the Forum.[348] Throughout the Republic the twins continued to appear in the Forum to announce military victories.[349] The Dioscuri, charging on horses with stars over their heads or "Janiform" with two heads facing opposite directions, are common types on Roman coinage throughout the Republic.[350] The Dioscuri enjoyed a cult and a popularity

---

[348] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.13.1-5. This story is also referred to in Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.6 and 3.11.

[349] Champlin (2011) 74. Champlin also notes the centrality of the temple of the Dioscuri to life in Rome and the gods' general popularity (75).

[350] Crawford (1975) 715, 720-721, Petrocchi (1994). The Dioscuri, though they played a role in imperial iconography related to deification and succession, rarely appear on

in Rome quite apart from their Greek mythological association with protecting sailors at sea.[351]

Which of these versions of the Dioscuri myth did Horace draw on? In the *Odes* Horace seems to be focusing on their Greek, mythological aspect: in 1.3 and 1.12 their connection with protecting sea travelers is explicit.[352] Furthermore, Horace seems to follow Alcaeus and others in considering the two brothers as equal in their immortality. They appear in several contexts connected with the deification of Augustus, and the brothers' names are used both together and interchangeably in passages associated with

---

imperial coins (Stevenson [1889] 331; Poulsen [1991] 132-133: "In the light of . . . the use of Castor and Pollux during the Julio-Claudian dynasty, it seems surprising that the representation of the designated heirs are not reflected more frequently in the contemporary coinage than is the case . . . During the reign of the later emperors only a few examples of these parallels between the Dioscuri and designated heirs are found"); see Poulsen (1991) 125, 130, and 134 for examples of Dioscuri-linked stars and the twins themselves on imperial coinage.

[351] See La Rocca (1994) 77-78.

[352] There is also some corroborating evidence from Book 4: at 4.5.35-36 Horace mentions their Greek cult, not their cult at Rome, as a comparandum for the future worship of Augustus ("uti Graecia Castoris | . . . memor").

apotheosis: both are mentioned in 1.12;[353] in 3.3 only Pollux is named; and in 4.5 only Castor is named.[354] Finally, more in a philosophical vein than a mythological one, Horace also sees them, like Hercules, representing mortals who became immortal through their beneficence: the Dioscuri and Hercules are both part of a set list of such mortals both in Cicero[355] and in *Odes* 1.12 and 3.3.

So far we can tell that, in some cases at least, in *Odes* 1-3 the Dioscuri play the same role as Hercules, as models of mortals whose deeds on behalf of humanity earn them a place among the gods. We can also tell that, at least in 1.3 and 1.12, they are specifically linked to protecting sailors and calming storms at sea, which is a benefaction distinct from Hercules' destruction of monsters. Having completed this overview, I will now turn to each ode that refers to the Dioscuri: first the two that include Augustus, 1.12 and 3.3, then the two that are not about Augustus, 1.3 and 3.29. Three of the four odes, 1.12, 3.3, and 1.3, have already received extensive treatment in the previous chapters, so here I will only be analyzing how the Dioscuri are being used and how that informs the previous readings of the odes; the fourth ode, 3.29, will be covered more fully in two separate sections at the end of this chapter.

---

[353] See Chapter 3 above for a discussion of the connection between Hercules and Dioscuri in 1.12 and Augustus' future divinity at the end of the ode.

[354] Although this is an example from Book 4, and therefore outside the scope of this dissertation, Horace's use of only one twin's name for both fits in with his practice in 3.3.

[355] Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.62; see n. 232 in Chapter 3 above.

C. 1.12: The Dioscuri and Augustus 1

As was observed in the previous chapter, in l.12 the Dioscuri are given much more space than Hercules (who is only named); moreover, other than Augustus and Jupiter, Castor and Pollux receive more lines than *any* of the other gods, heroes, or men in the ode, nearly two full stanzas:

> dicam et Alciden puerosque Ledae,
> hunc equis, illum superare pugnis
> nobilem; quorum simul alba nautis
> stella refulsit,
>
> defluit saxis agitatus umor,
> concidunt venti fugiuntque nubes,
> et minax, quod sic voluere, ponto
> unda recumbit.
>
> I shall tell also of Alcides and the sons of Leda, this one famous for overcoming with horses, that one with fists; as soon as their bright star shines on sailors, the turbulent water flows down from the rocks, the winds subside, and the clouds flee, and, because they wished it so, the threatening wave settles back down in the sea. (25-32)

West asks, "Why do Castor and Pollux, the junior members of this cast, receive the longest billing?"[356] West is the only scholar to observe this oddity or to suggest a significance for this extensive attention to the Dioscuri.[357] Since in other odes other members of the "cast" (such as Hercules) receive more attention than the Dioscuri, it seems reasonable to look for a special significance for Castor and Pollux in relation to the themes of this ode in particular. West suggests a few places to begin looking for such a

[356] West (1995) 58.

[357] Some scholars do comment specifically on the Dioscuri, and even the amount of space, but do not stress the unusualness of Horace's lengthy mention of them.

significance. He notes that the Dioscuri are "praised for their individual expertise and also for their manifestation of St Elmo's fire."[358] He goes on to point out that the stanzas are in the center of the ode. His interpretation is that "this eighth stanza of fifteen is a peaceful interlude between the Greek of the first half and the Roman of the second."[359] Although West is the only scholar to sense the oddity in Horace's lengthy treatment of the Dioscuri, other scholars have commented on their placement here. Brown calls the description "expansive" and says that it "provides cadence to the whole list of gods and heroes."[360] Mayer notes that Horace "dwells upon the saving powers of the Dioscuri" rather than Hercules' role as benefactor "perhaps because they were believed to be still operative at sea."[361] Fraenkel and Syndikus go further and suggest a connection between these lines and the end the ode: Fraenkel parenthetically suggests a connection between the Dioscuri and the rule of the *princeps* in the final stanza,[362] and Syndikus notes that these lines are the longest description since Jupiter (lines 13-18) and briefly connects the soothing power of the Dioscuri to Orpheus' and Jupiter's powers and Augustus' calm rule.[363] Following the lead of Fraenkel and Syndikus I will examine the whole ode in the

---

[358] West (1995) 58.

[359] West (1995) 58; cf. Brown (1991) 329.

[360] Brown (1991) 329.

[361] Mayer (2012) 123.

[362] Fraenkel (1957) 294.

[363] Syndikus (2001) 142.

light of this passage to see if the Dioscuri have an interpretive function in the ode as a whole, as *Alcides*, discussed in the previous chapter, does.

The martial theme present throughout the ode (chiefly embodied in Hercules) was the subject of the previous discussion of 1.l2. Even the Dioscuri participate in the theme, since Horace notes their respective athletic skills, horsemanship and boxing,[364] which have martial applications. In this way they and "Alcides," here in these middle stanzas, look forward to the final depiction of Augustus as one who conquers threatening foreign enemies (53-56, one full stanza).

The most space, however, is given to describing the twins' ability to calm a stormy sea (6 lines, as opposed to one and a half). Like the martial and monster-destroying theme, the theme of the pacification of chaotic forces is present from the beginning of the ode. Orpheus is the first to participate in this theme. Like Castor and Pollux, Orpheus has power over swift waters and winds: "arte materna rapidos morantem | fluminum lapsus celerisque ventos" (9-10). Next, Jupiter is portrayed as one who "controls" (*temperat*, 16) the sea, land, and sky: "qui mare et terras variisque mundum | temperat horis" (15-16). Horace's use of *temperat* suggests not only to control, in the sense of rule, but also to "temper"[365] or "to maintain in a state of balance or moderation."[366] After the stanzas on Castor and Pollux (25-32), the theme of pacification

---

[364] See n. 345 above.

[365] *OLD* s.v. *tempero* 4a; e.g. 2.16.27.

[366] *OLD* s.v. *tempero* 9, citing this passage. Cf. Fraenkel (1957) 293: Jupiter appears "as the supreme being who maintains the universe in an established order." The connection of

continues with the pairing of Romulus and Numa Pompilius: Numa's rule is called "quietum | Pompili regnum" (33-34), *quietum* suggesting a contrast to the reign of Romulus which Horace's reader would know included a war against the Sabines.[367] Numa, however, does not, like Orpheus, Jupiter, and the Dioscuri, control and soothe waters and winds, but rather he sets out to temper and control the warlike nature of the early Romans. Livy (1.19.1) says that Numa wanted to "found anew with justice and laws and customs" ("iure . . . legibusque ac moribus de integro condere") a city that had been "founded with force and arms" (*conditam vi et armis*). In order to do this he had to "soften" the warlike Romans by encouraging peace over war:

> quibus cum inter bella adsuescere videret non posse, quippe efferari militia animos, mitigandum ferocem populum armorum desuetudine ratus, Ianum ad infimum Argiletum indicem pacis bellique fecit, apertus ut in armis esse civitatem, clausus pacatos circa omnes populos significaret.
>
> And since he saw that it was not possible to become accustomed to these things in the midst of wars (for military service brutalized the mind), thinking that a fierce people should be softened by not using arms, he made a temple to Janus at the bottom of the Argiletum as an indicator of peace and war, that open it would signify that the state was in arms, and closed it would signify that all the peoples around were pacified. (1.19.2)

Later Livy says that Numa feared "that in a warlike state there would be more kings like Romulus than like Numa" ("in civitate bellicosa plures Romuli quam Numae similes

---

the Dioscuri to Orpheus and Jupiter is mentioned (but not explicitly spelled out, as I have tried to do here) by Syndikus (2001) 142.

[367] Note that Horace wonders which ruler he should celebrate: a good ruler must sometimes, like Romulus, engage in war (like Hercules fighting monsters), but at other times must, like Numa, promote peace (like the Dioscuri calming storms).

reges," 1.20.2) and so set up a priest to perform the religious duties that he himself had taken on, lest a new, warlike king let those rites become abandoned (1.20.2). Romulus is more like Hercules, a necessary martial force to establish the beginnings of civilization in Italy, but Numa is more like the sea-calming Dioscuri, whose main benefaction is not to fight and destroy but to soothe and make peace.

Horace makes a connection to the Dioscuri again in the allusion to Julius Caesar's star in lines 46-48:

> . . . micat inter omnis
> Iulium sidus velut inter ignis
> luna minores.
>
> There glitters among all of them the Julian star, just as the moon among the lesser lights. (46-48)

The Julian *sidus* is brighter than the other stars, just as the *stella* (28) of the Dioscuri shines uniquely bright to sailors. The allusion creates the ring composition, noted in the previous discussion of this ode, by signaling a return to the category of men-become-gods; it hints at the current divine status of Julius Caesar and the future deification of Augustus. The allusion also connects the Julians with the soothing powers of the Dioscuri (the powers associated with their *stella* in 27-32). The final three stanzas that follow the allusion to Caesar's comet are concerned with Augustus' and Jupiter's rule of the world. Augustus' defeat of the dangerous Other, the Parthians who are "threatening Latium" (*Latio imminentis*, 53) is the subject of the next-to-last stanza.[368] The Dioscuri also are able to neutralize a threat, the sea in a storm: when their star shines, "the threatening wave settles back down in the sea" (*minax . . . ponto | unda recumbit*, 31-32). However,

[368] See the discussion of this stanza in Chapter 3 section C above.

unlike Hercules against monsters or Augustus against foreign enemies, the Dioscuri do not fight to achieve order but rather exert a calm, peaceful influence over the raging sea and sky. The final stanza of the ode reveals that Augustus, like the Dioscuri, will also rule by creating peace.

The final stanza outlines the complementary role that Augustus and Jupiter will have in their reign over the world:

> te minor laetum reget aequus orbem;
> tu gravi curru quaties Olympum,
> tu parum castis inimica mittes
> fulmina lucis.
>
> Ranked under you [i.e., Jupiter] he will rule fairly a happy world; you will shake Olympus with your heavy chariot, you will hurl hostile thunderbolts upon groves that are not pure enough. (57-60)

Horace says first that Augustus will rule "fairly" or "in equity,"[369] *aequus*. West notes that this description is connected to the famous and praiseworthy *clementia* and *iustitia* of Augustus.[370] However, the word *aequus* also brings back the theme the Dioscuri represent, the theme of the pacification of chaotic forces. The Dioscuri represent pacification because they are able to calm a rough, stirred-up sea (*agitatus umor*, 29; *minax unda*, 31-32). *aequus* with its other meaning of "level, even, smooth, flat"[371] and

---

[369] West (1995) 57.

[370] West (1995) 60. West sees the mention of Cato in line 36 as "evidence of the magnanimity of Augustus" (60) which "extends to allowing his poet to praise one who would surely have been a bitter enemy of the regime" (61).

[371] *OLD* s.v. 1a.

its connection to *aequor*, "the sea, esp. considered as calm and flat,"[372] suggests that Augustus' rule of the "happy world" will be peaceful and calm,[373] and his soothing effect on his subjects is parallel to the Dioscuri's soothing effect on the sea.[374]

The final three lines of the last stanza continue the metaphor of calming the sea and detail exactly how Augustus can soothe his stormy empire. In lines 58-60, Jupiter is described as causing thunder (*quaties Olympum*, 58) and lightning (*mittes fulmina*, 59-60), that is, creating a storm. Augustus' empire must be like a smooth, level, calm sea, and in order to make it so he will have to bring peace after Jupiter's storm. The storm and its lighting are not indiscriminately malicious but rather targeted at *parum castis . . . lucis* (59-60), sacred groves that have become polluted. A lightning strike in a sacred grove was viewed as a sign that the grove had been polluted and needed to be purified.[375] In order to stop the lightning, one has to heed its message: expiate the sin, purify the impure.

---

[372] *OLD* s.v. 3a.

[373] Cf. 3.29.32-33: "quod adest memento | componere aequus," "remember to deal with the present circumstances calmly" (discussed below). A ruler who creates a calm realm is himself calm: cf. Neptune in Verg. *Aen.* 1.124-127 ("summa placidum caput extulit unda," 127), 142-143 ("tumida aequora placat," 142) ; (see Austin [1971] 64-65).

[374] Cf. Fraenkel (1957) 294, who notes that in the reference to the Dioscuri "as the rescuers of sailors, the bringers of calm after violent storms . . . the symbolic reference to the rule of the Princeps is important." Cf. Syndikus (2001) 142.

[375] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 168-169, Mayer (2012) 128.

Metaphorically, this is just what Augustus intends to do with Rome, as West points out: "the mention of impurity is a hint of Augustus' desire to raise the standards of sexual behavior, a theme repeatedly stressed in the Roman Odes (3.1-6), and which was to become official policy in 18-17 B.C."[376] Augustus' moral reforms are like purifying a polluted grove struck by lightning: the civil wars of the previous decades, the violent storms shaking the state,[377] were seen as an outgrowth of the widespread moral degradation plaguing Rome. Soothing the state meant returning it to its moral roots.

Having looked at Horace's depiction of the Dioscuri, at the motif of pacification, connected with waters and winds, present from the beginning of the ode, and at the language of storms and calm at the end of the ode, we can see that it is not, as Fraenkel and Syndikus suggest, that the Dioscuri are part of a larger theme, but rather that they are central to that theme and its primary image. This answers West's question of why the Dioscuri are given a long, central passage even though they are lesser gods than those mentioned before them (Apollo, Diana, etc.—even Hercules): Horace chooses the Dioscuri to be his image for the kind of work Augustus needs to do in the state. Augustus needs to create a calm state, one that will not return to the chaos of civil war, and one way of doing that is by bring the state back to a strong, traditional morality. This interpretation of the role of the Dioscuri in this ode provides a hypothesis for the other

---

[376] West (1995) 61.

[377] Cf. the dual use of *tumultus* in *Odes* 1-3 to mean "storm" (1.16.12, 3.27.17, 3.29.63; also *tumultuosum mare*, 3.1.26) and civil strife (3.14.14); the other example of *tumultus* refers to a mental state (*tumultus mentis*, 2.16.10-11).

odes. Next we will turn to 3.3, another ode in which the Dioscuri appear in connection with Augustus, and see if they have the same role there and if that can shed any light on the overall interpretation of that ode.

D. 3.3: The Dioscuri and Augustus 2

As in 1.12, the Dioscuri are paired with Hercules in 3.3, but whereas in 1.12 more attention was given to the twins, in 3.3 the Dioscuri are mentioned by name only (and only one name of the two at that), but Hercules receives an adjective:

> hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules
> enisus arces attigit igneas,
> quos inter Augustus recumbens
> purpureo bibet ore nectar.
>
> Because of this skill Pollux and wandering Hercules after a struggle reached the fiery citadels, among whom Augustus, reclining, will drink nectar with a purple[378] mouth. (9-12)

Pollux is listed first of the five men who have become or will become gods. The *arte*, the "skill" or "virtue,"[379] that is said to have earned Pollux a place among the gods is outlined in the first two stanzas:

> Iustum et tenacem propositi virum
> non civium ardor prava iubentium,
> non vultus instantis tyranni
> mente quatit solida neque Auster,

[378] That is, with lips stained by the color of the nectar (Pulleyn [1997]); alternatively, it could suggest immortal youth (Kiessling and Heinze [1955] ad loc.) or be the red face of a *triumphator* (Eidinow [2000]).

[379] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 41.

> dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,
> nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis:
> si fractus illabatur orbis,
> impavidum ferient ruinae.
>
> The man who is just and tenacious of his intention neither the ardor of the citizens for decreeing depraved things nor the face of a threatening despot shakes in his solid mind, nor the South Wind, the turbulent leader of the restless Adriatic, nor the great hand of thundering Jove: if the sky[380] broke and fell, the ruins will strike him unafraid. (1-8)

One might wonder exactly how Castor (and Pollux) are examples of this kind of man, or what exactly *hac arte* (9) is. Scholars, looking to line one, generally assume it is steadfastness,[381] but in the series of examples that follow *hac arte*, none can be said to have had any particular steadfastness.[382] The virtue being extolled closest to the words *hac arte* is fearlessness.[383] Hercules could be an example of someone who fearlessly faced danger head-on. However, Pollux, a mythological figure not particularly noted either for steadfastness or for fearlessness, is listed first. Eidinow argues that the

---

[380] For *orbis* as "sky" see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc. The word seems to have a dual meaning here: after the image of wind and lightning (lines 4-6), lines 7-8 would suggest a violent storm, but after the image of citizens and a ruler in lines 2-3, lines 7-8 could suggest the "world" coming to pieces, politically.

[381] Fraenkel (1957) 269, Commager (1962) 212, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc.

[382] Cf. Lowrie (1997) 239.

[383] West (2002) 34 points out a "climax" at the word *impavidum*. For the Stoic connection in these lines, see n. 273 in Chapter 3 above.

connection the Dioscuri have with Roman military success earns them a place in this list that Greek mythology cannot justify: [384] all the heroes in the catalogue are emblems for the Roman *triumphator* and therefore for Augustus. One might expect, then, that *hac arte* refers to military victory, but *hac arte* must refer to a skill that has already been described, and the opening lines do not describe military victory. What, then, is the *ars* and how does Pollux exemplify it? A close look at these two stanzas reveals the poetic, if not logical, connection.

The first image in the first stanza is of a good ruler, one who does not give in to the desires of morally depraved citizens; this image is appropriate to the central figure of stanzas 3 and 4, Augustus.[385] The second image is not of bad citizens but a bad ruler, showing that the "just and tenacious" man, whether he finds himself in a position of ruling or in the position of being ruled, does not let worse men shake his purpose. The

---

[384] Cf. Eidinow (2000) 468-469. See Bellinger (1957) 91-100 on the connection between this list and encomia of Alexander; Poulsen (1991) 138-139 argues that it is "most unlikely that Alexander was the source of the parallels between the Dioscuri (Pollux) and Augustus in Horace." However, Poulsen is discussing Augustus' use of the Dioscuri to promote Gaius and Lucius Caesar as his designated heirs, but Horace was writing, in *Odes* 1-3, long before Lucius' birth and the boys' adoption by their grandfather Augustus in 17 B.C. Nevertheless, Poulsen's arguments against the idea that Alexander used the Dioskouroi personally are sound, and it seems unlikely that Horace found a source for his connection between Augustus and the Dioscuri in a parallel with Alexander.

[385] West (2002) 34.

third image, which continues into the second stanza, is of a storm at sea: the wind whipping up the Adriatic, thunder and lightning, and, finally and hyperbolically, the sky falling. This image, too, can be connected with Augustus,[386] but the more direct connection, proximally and narratively, is to Pollux. According to Diodorus, the moment when Castor and Polydeuces were marked as divine occurred when, as Argonauts, they calmed a windy storm at sea after which stars appeared over their heads.[387] The Dioscuri become gods through the calming of a violent storm. The reason that they can be "unafraid" (*impavidum*, 8) in the face of wind, waves, and lightning (4-6) is that they have the skill—*hac arte*—to calm the storm. The *ars* here refers not to fearlessness or steadfastness themselves but to the skill which makes them possible.

If we apply the same principle to the rest of the opening lines, we can understand the just ruler's fearlessness and steadfastness in the face of the *ardor* (2) of depraved citizens as the confidence of a man with the skill to pacify an inflamed populace as the Dioscuri calm the sea. This makes sense when we compare 3.3 with 1.12. In 1.12 the power of the Dioscuri to soothe storms is analogous to Augustus' ability to create peace and stability amongst the warlike Romans—who have in the last decades turned to

---

[386] See West (2002) 35.

[387] Diod. Sic. 4.43.1, also noted above at n. 347. At Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.572-580, the Argonauts are headed southward along the Adriatic (cf. *Hadriae*, line 5) when Hera creates a storm that drives them back up to the north (the South Wind, cf. *Auster* in line 4, would likely have been necessary for this operation). Castor and Polydeuces are asked to pray for safe passage (588-594), which they receive.

fighting themselves—through his policies of clemency and moral reform. In 3.3 Augustus is to produce the same soothing effect by redirecting Rome's martial energy to the ends of the earth. If in 3.3, as I argued in the previous chapter, "rebuilding Troy," which Juno forbids in 18-72, symbolizes a return to the immorality of the civil war period and civil war itself, we can observe in her speech a message to Augustus to persevere in his redirecting of the Romans.

Juno's insistence on Rome's warlikeness is striking. She calls Rome *Roma ferox* (44) and, later, the Romans *bellicosis Quiritibus* (57), emphasizing Rome's innate violence. Repeatedly she describes them as taking their violence and arms to the ends of the world. Juno only wants them to refrain from resettling Troy, which would cause a return of the Trojan War, which has ended: "nostris . . . ductum seditionibus | bellum resedit" (29-30), she says, but if Troy is reborn it will face the same fate as before, with Juno herself "leading the victorious troops" ("ducente victrices catervas | coniuge me Iovis et sorore," 63-64). Taking "resettling Troy" to symbolize a return to the morality of the civil war period and a renewal of the "Trojan War" to signify a return of civil strife, Horace's message to Augustus is that the Romans should turn their aggression outward. By redirecting the Romans away from civil war and toward wars abroad and peace at home, Augustus can bring stability to warlike Rome just as the Dioscuri soothe raging storms.

The power of the Dioscuri to soothe represents one side of the skill Augustus needs, with Hercules representing the other half. The pairing of Hercules and the Dioscuri in 3.3 points to the complementary nature of fighting foreign enemies (represented by Hercules, as argued in the previous chapter) and controlling the

fierceness of the Romans (represented by Pollux). The emphasis on fighting external enemies is linked to the reference to Hercules in the opening stanzas; the suggestion that fighting foreign enemies is a solution for the bellicosity of the Romans is linked to the reference to Pollux. Just as Hercules killed monsters and civilized the world, so Augustus must fight to expand the empire and civilize the edges of the world (*dare iura Medis*, 44). Just as the Dioscuri soothe the winds and seas, Augustus must temper and moderate the fierceness of the Romans by directing it outward rather than inward. In line nine Horace pairs Pollux and Hercules as the first two *exempla* of the "iustum et tenacem propositi virum" (1)—just before the naming of Augustus in line 11—in order to set up a dual theme. Pollux and Hercules represent the two benefits of Augustus' foreign wars: the tempering, through re-direction, of Roman bellicosity on the one hand, and, on the other hand, fighting external enemies as a way of expanding the rule of law and order in the world.

The dual theme is Horace's statement of what Augustus will or must do in order to gain immortality. Looking back at the third stanza (lines 9-12, quoted above) we are reminded that Pollux and Hercules are mentioned because they are examples of men who, through their actions, attained immortality. In this way they are just like Augustus, though Augustus' immortality is set in the future ("quos inter Augustus recumbens | purpureo bibet ore nectar," 12). In the rest of the ode, Horace outlines what actions Augustus must take in his lifetime to take his place in the gods' banquet. This was also true in 1.12, where the successful rule of Augustus was also set in the future, and Horace was in the position of outlining what exactly a ruler who has the position of Jupiter's second-in-command must do. However, the soothing Augustus must do, which is

paralleled to the sea-soothing of the Dioscuri, is slightly different in the two odes: in 1.12 the soothing of the state that Augustus needs to do is his moral reforms, but in 3.3 it is the redirecting of Roman aggression. In both odes, however, the references to the Dioscuri are connected to a stable and calm Rome. Next I will turn to 1.3 and 3.29 to see if in these odes, although they deal with poets rather than Augustus, the Dioscuri have the same or a similar role.

E. 1.3: The Dioscuri and Vergil

Horace's *propemptikon* to Vergil—on the advent, I have argued in the previous chapters, of his setting out to write epic in the Homeric vein—opens with a prayer that various maritime divinities guide and protect Vergil's "ship":

> Sic te diva potens Cypri,
> sic fratres Helenae, lucida sidera,
> ventorumque regat pater
> obstrictis aliis praeter Iapyga,
> navis, quae tibi creditum
> debes Vergilium, finibus Atticis
> reddas incolumem precor
> et serves animae dimidium meae.
>
> So may the goddess who rules over Cyprus, so may the brothers of Helen, bright stars, and the father of the winds, with all the winds bound up except the Iapyx (i.e., the north-west wind), direct you, ship, you who owe me Vergil entrusted to you, deliver him unharmed to the Attic lands, I pray, and preserve half of my soul. (1-8)

Cyprian Venus is appropriate for sailing,[388] as are the Dioscuri and their "stars,"[389] St. Elmo's fire, and "the father of the winds," who is usually interpreted to be Aeolus.[390]

[388] Cf. *trabe Cypria* in 1.1.13; see Mayer (2012) 74.

[389] It is unusual to refer to the single bright phenomenon, for which the Dioscuri are

Since the Dioscuri are not out of place in a poem ostensibly about sailing (albeit metaphorical sailing), I will first look at the more curious figure of the gods listed: "the father of the winds," *ventorum pater* (3). This will lead to a deeper consideration of the role of the Dioscuri in the opening sailing metaphor.

Nisbet and Hubbard note that "in traditional Greek mythology Aeolus is the master of the winds, not their father."[391] It is possible that *pater* here merely means

---

known, with a plural noun rather than a singular one (e.g., *stella* 1.12.28); the plural could refer to the constellation, which Ovid connects to the twins' ship-saving role (Ov. *Fast.*5.697-720), or to the dual stars over the heads of the twins at the moment of their deification or in their depictions in art (see section B above). Basto (1982) 31 argues that the periphrastic collocation here has "a distinctly epic ring . . . the phrase *fratres Helenae* . . . not only projects the Dioscuri in their single Homeric aspect, but also introduces epic associations because of the mention of Helen, who figures so prominently in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*."

[390] E.g., Wickham (1877) ad loc., Kiessling and Heinze (1955) ad loc., Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 47, Mayer (2012) 75.

[391] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 47. It is true that *obstrictis* in line 4 suggests Aeolus' tying up of the winds in a bag (*Od.* 10). However, Aeolus himself has no ability to "guide" (*regat*, 3) a ship directly: although he allows the wind Odysseus and his crew need to blow, through their own mistake they end up driven away from Ithaca anyway. Horace may be suggesting this story about Aeolus and the bag of winds, but it seems that over this faint strain a stronger note—not Aeolus, but a more powerful god on a level with

"ruler,"[392] but this term is usually reserved for gods such as Jupiter (e.g. just before this ode, at 1.2.2). Another god that commonly is called *pater* is Neptune, [393] who also controls the winds at sea.[394] In *Aeneid* 1, which possibly was in progress at the time of Horace's writing this ode, Neptune calms the storm that is destroying Aeneas' fleet. Neptune senses the commotion on the surface of the sea and comes up to berate the winds: "Iam caelum terramque meo sine numine, venti, | miscere, et tantas audetis tollere moles?" (133-134). Even though Aeolus is their king, their activities on the sea are subject to Neptune's approval. After his speech he calms the sea and rescues Aeneas' ships:

> Sic ait, et dicto citius tumida aequora placat,
> collectasque fugat nubes, solemque reducit.
> Cymothoe simul et Triton adnixus acuto
> detrudunt navis scopulo; levat ipse tridenti;
> et vastas aperit syrtis, et temperat aequor,
> atque rotis summas levibus perlabitur undas.
> . . .
> . . . aequora postquam

Venus and the Dioscuri—is being sounded.

[392] Kiessling and Heinze (1955) ad loc. suggest that *ventorum pater* is equivalent to ταμίην ἀνέμων at *Od.* 10.21 and means "Gebieter, wie in *p. familias*."

[393] E.g. Verg. *Aen.* 5.12-14: "ipse gubernator puppi Palinurus ab alta: | 'heu quianam tanti cinxerunt aethera nimbi? | quidve, pater Neptune, paras?'"

[394] E.g., at Hom. *Od.* 5.282-296 Poseidon stirs up a storm against Odysseus, including the East, South, West, and North Winds (σὺν δ' Εὖρός τε Νότος τ' ἔπεσον Ζέφυρός τε δυσαὴς | καὶ Βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης, μέγα κῦμα κυλίνδων, 295-296).

> prospiciens genitor caeloque invectus aperto
> flectit equos, curruque volans dat lora secundo.
>
> Thus he spoke, and swifter than speech he calmed the swollen seas, and he put the gathered clouds to flight, and he led back the sun. At the same time Cymothoe and Triton, leaning on a sharp rock, push away the ships; he himself lightens them with his trident; and he uncovers the vast sandbars, and he soothes the sea, and he glides over the tops of the waves with his light wheels. . . . Afterwards the father[395] looking out on the sea and conveyed in the open sky turns his horses and flying gives rein with a favorable course. (142-147, 154-156)

In this scene from the *Aeneid*, Neptune has the same role as the Dioscuri as a god who calms the winds and waves and makes the sea safe for sailors.[396] We have seen in *Odes* 1.12 and 3.3 that the Dioscuri's calming of the sea is emblematic of the soothing of the Roman state. In this section of *Aeneid* 1, Neptune is connected through a simile to the statesman who is able to soothe a crowd of angry citizens (148-153). Horace and Vergil, then, both use a storm at sea to symbolize a tumultuous population, a comparison which goes back to Homer (*Il.* 2.144-154).[397] Turning back to 1.3, we should note that Horace has just used a storm of mythological proportions to describe the situation of Rome in 1.2, complete with snow, hail, lightning, and flooding like that of the Deluge (1.2.1-

---

[395] Here *genitor* is "used like *pater* as a term of reverence" (Austin [1971] 70); Austin compares 5.817-819, where Neptune is also referred to as *genitor* in the context of calming the sea.

[396] Cf. *Homeric Hymn* 22.5, where Poseidon is called a σωτῆρά νηῶν (5) and is asked, πλώουσιν ἄρηγε (7).

[397] See Austin (1971) 68. Horace, writing lyric, does not use the epic convention of the extended simile, but relies on a more subtle and compact technique.

12),[398] a situation which *Caesar* (1.2.52)—Mercury incarnate (1.2.41-44)—may fix. At the end of 1.2 Horace asks Octavian[399] that he "be glad to be called *pater* and *princeps*" ("ames dici pater atque princeps," 50), harking back to *pater*, which refers to Jupiter, in line 2, and, perhaps, looking forward to *pater*, Neptune, in 1.3.3. Galinsky points out that "the association of the Vergilian passage with Augustus readily suggests itself both in the general terms of Augustus' settling down the civil wars and the specific representation of Octavian as Neptune on a cameo from the 30s B.C."[400] Later, after his naval victory at Actium, Octavian had coins representing himself as Neptune, appropriating for himself a god that Sextus Pompey had adopted.[401] After Actium Octavian considered himself "'reconciled' with Neptune;"[402] the god had allowed this sea victory, which itself had depended on the wind.[403] Coming back again to Horace and *Odes* 1.2 and 1.3, we see that

---

[398] Commager (1962) 182: ". . . divine anger works through, and is evidenced by, the human crime of civil war. The fusion of crime and punishment may be logically unsound, but in the storm of *C.* 1.2 it achieves symbolic reality."

[399] On the uncertain date of this ode, see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 18-19.

[400] Galinsky (1996) 21.

[401] Pollini (1990) 347, Beacham (2005) 154.

[402] Pollini (1990) 347.

[403] Cassius Dio reports that twice a chance wind aided Octavian's forces, at 50.31.2 and 50.33.3, and the second time was instrumental in his ultimate victory. (Also the statesman simile which accompanies the description of Neptune calming the storm in *Aen.* 1 has

the calming of storms at sea is closely connected symbolically not only to a general soothing of the state, but specifically to Augustus' calming of the state by putting an end to the civil war period. This accords with the association of the Dioscuri in 1.12 and 3.3 with Augustus' plans, or Horace's suggestion, for clemency, moral reform, and external (not internal) war. At the beginning of 1.3 we have three storm-soothing divinities, Castor, Pollux, and Neptune, who all have ties in and outside of the *Odes* to Augustus' calm and calming rule of the state.[404]

But where does all this leave us? What does Augustus' Dioscuri/Neptune-like rule (cf. *regat*, 1.3.3) of the state have to do with Vergil's poetic voyage? A post-civil-war calm, symbolized by the sea-calm brought about by the actions of the Dioscuri and Neptune, would be most conducive to the writing of poetry. It is not that poetry cannot be written during wartime—certainly both Horace and Vergil were composing before Actium—but the kind of long-term peace and, importantly, patronage imperative for a work with a scope like the *Aeneid* would be something worth praying for. Futhermore,

---

been interpreted as a description of Augustus; see Galinsky [1996] 20-24.)

[404] Note also that the first divinity named, Venus, also has Augustan ties, and there is an emphasis in the first line on her rule—*potens* (1)—of an eastern locale (*Cypri*, 1) once controlled by Antony and Cleopatra. Carrubba (1984) 168 also sees the opening divinities as linked and as more than simply part of the sailing theme: "Each reference to a divinity was so constructed as to cite one of the basic elements in nature" which then recur throughout the ode. I will argue below for a different interpretation of the role of the gods at the beginning of the ode and their relationship to the rest of the poem.

Vergil had made clear in the *Georgics* that his theme would be Caesar's rule (3.10-48), something which, at the early date in which Horace is writing these *Odes*, they could not have known would be as lasting and as successful as it turned out to be.[405] Horace is constantly in the *Odes* setting Augustus' successful rule in the future and seeming to advise him on how best to maintain the state.[406] In order for Vergil to write the kind of epic about Augustus as he proposes to do in *Georgics* 3, Augustus will have to maintain not only his authority but also a rule that is not fraught with the civil unrest that characterized the previous decades. Vergil clearly states that he wants to write about

---

[405] Cf. the fear of *tumultus* alluded to in 3.14.13-16 if Augustus should die. Seager (1993) 26: "*C.* 3.14 echoes 1.14's fear of renewed civil upheavals;" cf. Rudd (1993) 76: "As for the Princeps, the central fact to bear in mind . . . is that Augustus was seen as the only man who could defend the frontiers and maintain peace at home. The point is made explicitly in *C.* 3.14."

[406] Examples of future rule or future divinity: 1.2, 1.12, 3.3, 3.5; examples of advice to Augustus: 1.2 (Seager [1980] 106), 1.12 (Seager [1980] 106-107), 3.3 (Seager [1980] 109-110, Commager [1962] 220; see also my discussion above), 3.4 (Commager [1962] 203-208, Lyne [1995] 50-54, 164). On the other hand, West (2002) 61 on 3.5 says that "it is not like Horace to advise Augustus." From our historical standpoint it is hard to distinguish between true advice and "advice" that is really a confirmation of plans already decided upon (cf. Nisbet and Hubbard [1978] 3-4), and the truth of the matter is likely somewhere in the middle (cf. Seager [1980] 117-118).

Caesar's and Rome's foreign victories against external enemies;[407] he does not look forward to writing about Romans fighting Romans.

Thus we can include the introductory invocations to the gods as an integral part of Horace's opening metaphor. Vergil's "ship" is his epic: that much has been argued. The prayer for its safety is also part of the metaphor: the state must remain, through the good rule of Augustus, calm and free from civil strife. Rather than simply embroidering the ship metaphor, the divinities named at the beginning of the ode are doing work in the ode.

In light of the role of the Dioscuri and the "father of the winds" in the ode and the link between this reference to the Dioscuri with the references in 1.12 and 3.3, I will now indulge in a bit of speculation. The thunderbolts mentioned as the last word in the ode (*fulmina*, 40) seem like a strange ending to this strange poem. In the previous chapters I have argued for an ironic interpretation of the moral against overreaching, relying on Horace's explicit use of *exempla* that do not fit or even contradict his moral. The thunderbolts also do not fit in: *caelum ipsum petimus* (38) seems to recall Daedalus, but neither he nor Icarus were struck by lightning. This could be a reference to the Giants, whose attack on Olympus was thwarted by Hercules and Jupiter's thunderbolts, but after referring to several mythological characters *by name* one would expect Horace to name the Giants. Phaëthon would equally fit the lines, since he foolishly (cf. *stultitia*, 38) tried to manage his father's sun-chariot and had to be struck down by Jupiter's lightning. But again there is nothing particular to signal this myth. If we go back to the beginning of the

[407] Vergil even casts the war against Antony as simply a war at the Nile (3.29), part of a list including many eastern enemies.

ode, however, and the connection between storms, Jupiter's lightning, and the state of Rome in 1.2, Horace may intend for us to think more generally of a storm as a symbol of a city in tumult, a depraved populace, violent and politically unstable. Jupiter's lightning at the end of 1.12, I argued above, symbolizes divine disapproval at Rome's moral situation which Augustus must, as Rome's ruler and Jupiter's second-in-command, attend to. Here at the end of 1.3 Horace, having gone on an elaborate, ironic excursus, reminds his readers of the concern at the beginning of the ode, that the situation in Rome and Augustus' rule provide the necessary environment for Vergil's epic. Though he is confident that Vergil, for his part, will succeed in writing a great epic, Horace maintains an awareness that "we" (*petimus*, 38; *patimur*, 39), that is, he and his fellow Romans,[408] because of their foolishness (*stultitia*, 38) and willfully wrong acts (*scelus*, 39), will be difficult for the Dioscuri- or Neptune-like Augustus to guide toward peace and morality in such a way that Jupiter can finally "put aside his angry thunderbolts" ("patimur . . . | iracunda Iovem ponere fulmina," 39-40).

In conclusion, at the beginning of 1.3 Horace refers to deities that are symbolically connected both in and outside of the *Odes* with the soothing of the Roman state and, more particularly, with Augustus' role in this soothing. The invocations are not simply coloring but a meaningful part of the metaphor of Vergil's epic voyage: the continuation of a Rome free of civil war and Augustus' successful rule is essential to

---

[408] Basto (1982) 39 takes the plural to mean Horace and Vergil. Mayer (2012) 80, arging that the crime here is a "general human failing" rather than the civil war, takes the plural to refer not to "Romans in particular" but to all humanity.

Vergil's *Aeneid*. Finally, I speculated that the thunderbolts at the end of the ode may, I suggest, hark back to the metaphor at the beginning, reminding the reader that Horace's prayers for a calm state must be answered in order for Vergil's epic to succeed.

Next I will turn to 3.29, the last of the odes in Books 1-3 with a reference to the Dioscuri, and consider the end of that ode. So far, in 1.12, 3.3., and 1.3, we have seen the calming effect the Dioscuri have on the sea paralleled to calming the Roman state, both in terms of stopping all civil conflict and in terms of creating a moral climate better than that of the civil war period. 1.3 and 3.29 occupy almost corresponding places in *Odes* 1-3 as second but one to the beginning and next to last. They are also complementary in structure. 1.3 begins with a reference to Castor and Pollux; 3.29 ends with it. In both it is a poet on a boat who is protected by these deities. However, although Vergil is sailing in a *navis* (1.3.5), Horace's vessel is merely a two-oared skiff (*biremis scaphae*, 3.29.62). Through an examination of 3.29 as a whole we will see if the Dioscuri at the end of the ode have a role similar to their role in 1.3 and the other odes in which they appear.

F. 3.29: The Dioscuri and Horace 1

Horace begins 3.29 by inviting Maecenas to drink at his house (1-16), but soon proceeds to moralize on the theme of not worrying about what you cannot control and seizing the day instead (17-56).[409] Beginning at line 57, however, the final two stanzas have a different tone, which is evident by the contrast with the theme of uncertainty in the

[409] On the structure of the ode within these large boundaries I have delineated, see Pöschl (1991) 227-230, 243-244.

moralizing section of the poem (17-56). In at least four places in the ode Horace speaks about the uncertainty inherent in the vicissitudes of life: he says directly in lines 30-32 that "God" hides future events; in lines 33-41 he describes events over time as a river that is sometimes calm, sometimes flooded and destructive; in lines 43-45 he expresses uncertainty about "tomorrow" by saying that Jupiter can make the day either cloudy or clear; and in lines 49-56 he describes Fortune as a fickle courtesan.[410] However, line 57 introduces a new tone. Instead of resigning himself to fate or the inscrutable will of the gods, Horace says, he has confidence that he will be safe in life's storms:

> non est meum, si mugiat Africis
> malus procellis, ad miseras preces
> decurrere et votis pacisci
> ne Cypriae Tyriaeque merces
>
> addant avaro divitias mari.
> tunc me biremis praesidio scaphae
> tutum per Aegaeos tumultus
> aura feret[411] geminusque Pollux.

---

[410] Fortune's "savage business" (*saevo negotio*, 49) and "game" (*ludum insolentem ludere*, 50) is to give out her favors to this man and that ("nunc mihi, nunc alii benigna," 52). The vocabulary of the passage has elegiac connotations and thereby gives the impression that Fortune is the fickle courtesan of elegy: see Pichon (1902) on *saevus* (257), *ludo* (191-192), and *benignus* (94). When she leaves Horace altogether, he says that he will give back her presents and go marry Poverty (*pauperiem sine dote quaero*, 56).

[411] The best manuscripts have *feret*; Shackleton Bailey (2001) prints *ferat*, the reading of inferior manuscripts.

> It is not my practice, if my mast should creak in African storms, to turn to wretched prayers and to promise votive offerings, that my Cyprian and Tyrian merchandise not add to the wealth of the greedy sea. When I am in that situation, in the protection of my two-oared boat, the breeze and twinned Pollux will bear me safely through the tumult of the Aegean Sea. (57-64)

Despite his advice to Maecenas throughout the ode to accept that he cannot know whether things will go well or ill for him in the future, in the final stanza Horace expresses complete confidence that Castor and Pollux will certainly save him in his "two-oared boat."[412] Horace's freedom from care is not simply Epicurean ἀταραξία, which is the quality he seems to recommend to Maecenas;[413] Horace's calm derives from solid assurance in something outside of himself, something he symbolizes with the image of the Dioscuri protecting a boat. But what are the Dioscuri symbolic of? What does Horace trust in so much?

It is clear from the abundance of metaphor in the ode that the final two stanzas are also metaphorical.[414] Horace is not, obviously, speaking about a real storm at sea, nor a

---

[412] West (2002) 255 notes a dissonance with the poet's usually Epicurean stance: "Strange, and not at all Epicurean, that one who expects no help from the gods and is prepared for malice from Fortune, should end the ode with a statement of faith in divine assistance." Cf. Pöschl (1991) 236.

[413] West (2002) 253, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 346; cf. Pöschl (1991) 224-230. Pucci (1988) argues that in the poem Horace is not a proponent of any systematic philosophy but rather of his own "home-made" philosophy (79); see also Rudd (1993) 64-71.

[414] Pöschl (1991) 241.

real boat. In 1.3, which, as I pointed out above, contains many parallels to this ode,[415] I argued that Vergil's *navis* about to set sail for Greece is a metaphor for his *Aeneid*. Keeping with the same metaphor, Horace's *biremis scapha* is his collection of *Odes*, smaller than epic (Vergil's *navis*). The fact that his boat only has two oars strengthens this identification. *biremis* in this meaning ("having two oars" rather than "having two banks of oars," which would be too many for a mere *scapha*, a light boat)[416] is rare. *scapha* itself is not very common in Latin, especially Latin poetry;[417] it is a Greek borrowing. *biremis* in its meaning here is a calque of the Greek δίκωπος[418] (literally "two-oared," a rare word used to mean σκάφος),[419] rather than a translation of δίκροτος (with two banks of oars, literally "double-beating"), which is the more usual use of *biremis* in Latin.[420] Horace, then, is in a distinctly Greek light boat.[421] Horace's *Odes* are in fact Greek

---

[415] 3.29, as the last ode before the *sphragis*, contains parallels to the first three odes: for example, the address to Maecenas in line 1 including his royal lineage connects it to 1.1, the extended flooded-river simile connects it to 1.2 (cf. Pöschl (1991) 224), the poet-sailing metaphor connects it to 1.3.

[416] Wickham (1877) 254.

[417] A PHI word search reveals *scapha*, meaning "light boat," occurs mostly in prose.

[418] Syndikus (2001) 254 n. 106.

[419] LSJ s.v. δίκωπος.

[420] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc.

[421] It could also be noted that the phrase *biremis scaphae* (3.29.62) combines a Latin

through the influence of his Greek models, Sappho and Alcaeus, whose dual and equal influence[422] are the "two oars" of his poetic boat.[423] Just as his *biremis scapha* sails *per Aegaeos tumultus* (63),[424] Horace's *Odes* draw upon these two poets from an island in the

---

word (*biremis*) with a Greek word (*scapha*), a common Horatian pattern: Miller (1994) 158-160 notes *Sabina diota* (1.9.7-8; see also Edmonds [1992] 11-12), *lyricis vatibus* (1.1.35), *Lesboum barbiton* (1.1.34), *Aeolium carmen* (3.30.13), and *Graiae Camenae* (2.16.38). Most of these instances are cases of Horace speaking about his own poetics in the *Odes* (and even the "Sabine jar" in 1.9 can "function as an emblem of the poem's own hybrid nature" (Miller [1994] 158).

[422] Woodman (2002); cf. *biformis* (2.20.2) and *biremis* (3.29.62), both unusual words that occur at important points in *Odes* 1-3.

[423] Davis (1991) 181 argues for a different (but not mutually exclusive with my view here) duality: that the protection of the poet (*praesidio*, 62) "is provided by Maecenas, generous patron of the poet, who has been previously characterized as *praesidium* in the dedicatory poem (*C.* 1.1). Thus the two-oared skiff in which the poet sails secure regardless of nature's alternations (stormy seas) is a metaphor for Horace's life as *vates*" (see n. 432 below on *praesidio*/*praesidium*).

[424] There are so many named perilous seas in Horace—e.g., the Icarian, the Adriatic, the Tyrrhenian—that to choose one in particular for a symbolic passage requires greater interpretation than simply noting that it was known for having storms (Nisbet and Rudd [2004] ad loc.).

Aegean. Furthermore, Commager points out the connection between these lines about Horace surviving a storm at sea and the storms his poetry will eternally endure in the next ode, 3.30: "Exegi monumentum . . . | quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens | possit diruere" (1, 3-4).[425] Horace's *biremis scapha* represents his *Odes*, the dually-influenced, Greek-derived, small (in comparison with epic) poetry which will weather the storms of time.

Having established that the *biremis scapha* of line 62 is a symbol for Horace's *Odes*, we can now turn to asking who or what the Dioscuri (*geminus Pollux*, 64)[426] who protect his "boat" symbolize. Syndikus, looking to the poem as a whole, says that they represent the wisdom that Horace uses to brave life's storms.[427] However, Horace, I maintain, is speaking specifically here of his role as a poet of lyrics and his poetry's survival. In the ode about Vergil's "ship," we saw that the Dioscuri were part of the metaphor, suggesting the political and cultural calm in which Vergil could write an epic celebrating the one who had achieved this peace. In 1.12, 3.3, and 1.3 we saw that the Dioscuri's calming of the sea functioned as an emblem of Augustus' moral, cultural, and political civilizing of the Romans after a long period of civil war and immorality. In 3.29, are the Dioscuri that Horace has faith in to protect his poetic "boat" once again an emblem for the calming of Rome?

---

[425] Commager (1962) 315, 343.

[426] Wickham (1877) ad loc. and later commentators unanimously take this to mean unambiguously both brothers.

[427] Syndikus (2001) 254.

To answer this question, let us turn away from the final stanzas and look at the poem at a whole. As noted above, the starting point of the ode is Horace's invitation to Maecenas to come drink at his house. Horace urges Maecenas to come, saying that it will help alleviate his anxiety. Horace identifies Maecenas' anxiety as specifically about the constitution of the state and foreign enemies:[428]

> tu civitatem quis deceat status
> curas et urbi sollicitus times
> quid Seres et regnata Cyro
> Bactra parent Tanaisque discors.
>
> You worry about what constitution is suitable for the state and, anxious for the city, you fear what the Chinese and Bactra, once ruled by Cyrus, and the warring Don are preparing. (25-28)

Horace invites Maecenas to tear his gaze away from Rome and its troubles—"omitte mirari beatae | fumum et opes strepitumque Romae" (11-12)[429]—and to join him at his house which, having no luxuries as reminders of Roman imperialism (*sine aulaeis et ostro*, 15),[430] will "smooth his anxious forehead" (*sollicitam explicuere frontem*, 16).

---

[428] Cf. 3.8 (Santirocco (1984) 251).

[429] Pucci (1988) 82 also sees in the description of the view from Maecenas' house in line 8, *Telegoni iuga parricidae*, a reference to Maecenas' concerns about Rome, namely, the plot by Murena to kill Augustus, the *pater patriae*; see Verrall (1884) 66-67 on the general influence of the Murena affair on the ode.

[430] Both *aulaea* ("canopy" or "hangings") and *ostrum* (the purple from the murex) are Greek loan words and suggest expensive imports or foreign riches (Servius *ad* Verg. *G.* 3.25: "aulaea dicta sunt ab aula Attali, in qua primum inventa sunt vela ingentia.").

Horace portrays his house as relaxed and calm, the ideal retreat for Maecenas. The calm of Horace's house is the calm of being unworried about the Roman state or foreign enemies. The house itself reflects the attitude of its owner which, as we find out from the end of the ode, is not simply Horace's own self-control (the attitude he advises to Maecenas in lines 32-33), but a trust in the "Dioscuri." The Dioscuri's protection of his boat at the end of the ode, then, could be an image for the calm state Horace trusts he will enjoy in the future (*feret*, 64). But from where does he derive his confidence in the future?

Similar to his suggestion in 1.3 that a soothed Roman state is the necessary environment for Vergil's epic to be written successfully, in 3.29 Horace suggests that safety and calm in the Roman state are the only conditions in which his poetry (he and his "boat")[431] will survive ("me biremis praesidio scaphae | tutum . . . | aura feret geminusque Pollux," 62-64).[432] In the following ode, 3.30, he claims immortality for his poetry, but it

[431] The conflation of the safety of the ship/boat-poetry and that of the poet himself is also present in 1.3.1-7. Cf. Woodman (1974) 121 on 3.30.1-7: "Almost imperceptibly Horace has changed ground to become identified with his own poetry."

[432] Santirocco (1984) 252, Davis (1991) 181, and Lyne (1995) 116 see in *praesidio* in 3.29.62, which refers to Horace's own boat, an allusion to *praesidium* in 1.1.2, which refers to Maecenas. Santirocco and Lyne argue that this is a statement, at the end of the collection of odes, of the poet's independence from his patron; Davis sees rather the two-oared boat as "the supreme emblem of the interdependence of poet and patron." A middle approach would be to take Davis' view that this is not a statement of independence (the

is somewhat limited: "I shall continually grow fresh with the praise of posterity, as long as the *pontifex* climbs the Capitoline with the silent Vestal Virgin" ("usque ego postera | crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium | scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex," 7-9).[433] As long as Rome remains—that is, as long as the solemn, pious religious institutions of Rome remain, those which Augustus was renewing and sought to protect[434]—his *Odes* will thrive. We have seen that in other odes Horace uses the Dioscuri as a parallel image to Augustus' rule of Rome—just as the Dioscuri soothe the sea, Augustus can and should soothe the state—and perhaps here too Horace is using the Dioscuri as an emblem of Augustus' rule.

---

boat is Horace's) but a nod to the fact that, although the *biremis scapha* is his own, it has come into existence only through the patronage of his *praesidium* Maecenas. On Horace's "independence" in the final stanzas of 3.29 see also West (2002) 255.

[433] I agree with Fraenkel (1957) 303 that Horace does not mean to suggest that Rome will ultimately fall, but that "the future life of Rome with its unalterable ceremonies is taken for granted, if not to the end of all time, yet for so immense a period that no one needs to cast his thought beyond it." The whole ode breathes confidence that both Rome and his poetry will endure (and, indeed, both, in some way, have, as Fraenkel points out [303-304]).

[434] Augustus' religious program was well underway at the time of the completion of *Odes* 1-3 in 23 (Zanker [1988] 101-104).

Augustus' soothing of the state is more than desirable: it is necessary for its continuation and therefore for the continuation of Horace's poetry. Lowrie, commenting on 2.20 and 3.30, states:

> Horace attempts to recuperate the social context available to the Greek lyrists through displacement. Horace's poetry is coextensive with the Roman empire in both time and space. . . . Although Horace's poetry does not participate, as Pindar's would, in the sacred rites performed by pontifex and Vestal, their presence in his poetry marks the place of an integrated social context."[435]

Nisbet and Rudd comment on 3.30.8-9, "[Horace] is here proclaiming himself the poet of Roman institutions; in the opening stanza of [Book 3] he had called himself 'Musarum sacerdos' (3.1.3), so here there might be the hint of an analogy between himself and the *pontifex*."[436] Horace and his *Odes* are symbiotically connected with Rome; her survival is his survival. For Horace, the survival of Rome relied on Augustus ruling successfully, which Horace predicates on certain Dioscuri-like, soothing policies: clemency, moral reform, redirecting of violence away from the city and citizens. In 1.12 and 3.3 Horace seemed to be advising Augustus on these policies; in 1.3 he was praying for them. Here in 3.29, however, he seems confident that Augustus will succeed at ruling Rome in a way that will guarantee the safety and security of the state and its people and poets.

However, Horace does not praise Augustus directly in 3.29, and it seems that the person doing most of the "soothing" in 3.29 is Horace, not Augustus. Although there are suggestions of a soothed Roman state in the ode, the central image is of a soothed

---

[435] Lowrie (1997) 75.

[436] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc.

Maecenas. In the next section I will revisit 3.29 and see how Horace himself functions as a Dioscuri-like character, bringing calm to his troubled friend.

G. 3.29, Revisited: The Dioscuri and Horace 2

In the previous section, I argued that the Dioscuri referred to with *geminus Pollux* in 3.29.64 are a symbol for the post-civil-war-era calming of the Roman state—specifically a politically and culturally stable society necessary for the future immortality of Horace's poetry—brought about by Augustus. However, Horace is doing something a little more here. I noted above that the whole poem is Horace's attempt to alleviate Maecenas' anxieties, both through the promise of drinks and dinner at this house and through the poem's own advice and statement of confidence in the future. It is as if Horace, through the poem, is soothing Maecenas—just as the Dioscuri soothe the stormy sea. Below I will offer some textual evidence that strengthens this observation.

Horace, who is about to claim divinity for himself in 3.30, assumes a Dioscuri-like role in 3.29. Horace casts the objects of Maecenas' fears as storms: a destructive, storm-swollen river (36-41) like that of 1.2[437] and black clouds covering the sky (*atra nube*, 43-44).[438] On the other hand, in lines 21-24, Horace's parallel to dinner at his house

[437] Pöschl (1991) 224.

[438] Note also the unknown future is hidden not just by darkness but by a "*foggy* night" (*caliginosa nocte*, 30; cf. *nox* as darkness caused by storm clouds, e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 1.89: *ponto nox incubat atra*.). The image of the storm returns at the end of the ode with *Aegaeos tumultus* (63) only to be soothed; cf. Pöschl (1991) 237, who notes that at the

is the shepherd's retreat to a river (*rivum*, 22) with a "silent" bank (not a storm-swollen one) that is out of the wind ("caretque | ripa vagis taciturna ventis," 23-24).[439] However, it is Horace's poem that will do the real soothing of Maecenas' troubled mind. Horace advises Maecenas to deal with the present situation "calmly" or, perhaps, "level"-headedly: "quod adest memento | componere aequus" (32-33). I argued in section C above that in 1.12.57 *aequus* suggested the levelness of the surface of the sea when it is calm; in 3.29 Horace, who is trying to soothe Maecenas' troubled mind, advises him to be *aequus*.[440] Horace wants to be an agent of calm, like the Dioscuri, for his friend, and he emphasizes his Dioscuri-like role by describing Maecenas' fears as storms and stormy rivers, his offer of dinner as a retreat to a calm, windless river, and the calm state of mind he wants Maecenas to assume as "level."

---

end of the poem the destructive forces of fate, symbolized by the flooded Tiber and later the Aegean, are not removed but "soothed" and "transformed" ("besänftigt und verwandelt").

[439] Horace also says that Maecenas' visit to Horace's house would be a "welcome change," *gratae vices* (13), just as spring is a "welcome change," *grata vice* in 1.4.1, the end of the stormy season of winter (cf. 4.7.3 where *vicis* also refers to the turn of a season). Not every change is a change in weather, but Horace may have had that in mind here.

[440] Cf. also *laetum* (1.12.57) and "ille potens sui | laetusque deget, cui licet in diem | dixisse 'vixi'" (3.29.41-43).

There is one final similarity between Horace and the Dioscuri in the ode. Just as the Dioscuri save lives rather than wealth, Horace's focus, both in his own practice and in his advice to Maecenas, is on enjoying not wealth but life. In the last two stanzas, Horace says that in a storm he does not pray on behalf of any expensive cargo he may be worried about losing (59-61),[441] but rather he shows that he cares only that the Dioscuri preserve his life ("me . . . tutum . . . feret," 62-64). From the beginning of the ode, Horace links Maecenas' anxiety not only to politics but also to riches (9-16); Horace's advice to Maecenas is that he focus on the day that he has survived: the man is happy "to whom it is permitted to say from day to day[442] 'I have lived'" ("cui licet in diem | dixisse 'vixi,'" 42-43). The emphasis on survival is typically Horatian: death is a complete end to all that is good.[443] Horace's beneficence to Maecenas is helping him to *live*, to focus on the fact of living rather than on concerns linked to his wealth. In this way, Horace uses his poetry to calm his friend, just as Augustus can use reforms and re-direction of violence to calm the state and the Dioscuri use their divine power to calm the sea.

---

[441] I do not think these lines mean he does not pray at all, only that he does not pray for the safety of his *merces*, since, obviously being both a *pauper* (14) and certainly not a *mercator* (see Davis [1991] 180), he does not have anything valuable to lose.

[442] *in diem* (42) = "from day to day": Nisbet and Rudd (2004) ad loc.

[443] See, e.g., 1.4, 3.14, 1.24 (especially *durum*, 19), and, most poignantly, 2.3, which ends without even a breath of hope:

> omnes eodem cogimur, omnium
> versatur urna serius ocius
> sors exitura et nos in aeternum
> exsilium impositura cumbae. (25-28)

H. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have looked at the role of the Dioscuri in the four odes in Books 1-3 in which they appear: 1.12, 3.3, 1.3, and 3.29. Examining all these odes together reveals a pattern. In each of these odes, the calming power of the Dioscuri over the sea is connected in some way with the soothing of the Roman state after a period of moral decline and civil war. In 1.12 and 3.3 Horace advises Augustus to take on a Dioscuri-like role in his rule of the state, to calm the Romans through moral legislation and through a re-directing of their natural martial impulse towards foreign enemies. In this way, Castor and Pollux have a complementary role to that of Hercules, discussed in the previous chapter. Hercules is an emblem for victorious conflict with the Other; for Hercules, the Other consists of non-human monsters, but for Augustus it will consist of foreign peoples at the edges of the empire. By using Hercules in contexts of Augustus' future deification, Horace connects Augustus' future divinity with successful foreign warfare. By using the Dioscuri in the same contexts in 1.12 and 3.3, Horace connects Augustus' apotheosis with keeping Rome's bellicosity away from Rome itself and with pacifying and softening the Romans through moral and religious reform at home. In 1.3 the calm, stable state—free of civil wars, but replete with foreign victories—is the necessary condition for Vergil's Augustan epic. In 3.29, it is necessary to the immortality of Horace's lyrics.

However, in 3.29 the Dioscuri appear twice: *geminus Pollux* is twinned. In that ode, Horace calms and soothes Maecenas both with his words and with his actions: dinner at a poor man's house is supposed to "smooth the anxious forehead" (*sollicitam explicuere frontem*, 16) just as the Dioscuri calm a rough sea and just as Augustus can,

through ruling well, temper an immoral, warlike state. Unlike the other poems in which the Dioscuri appear, in 3.29 the Dioscuri serve a dual purpose: they are symbolic of Rome's potential future, but they are also a parallel to the poet as he advises his friend and patron. We see in this ode not the deification of Augustus, whose role in 1.12 and 3.3 is cast as godlike, but the deification of the poet. In the following ode, 3.30, Horace claims not only that his poetry will not pass away but also that he personally will be continually praised ("usque ego postera | crescam laude recens," 7-8), with what is almost like a hero-cult spreading throughout Italy ("qua violens obstrepit Aufidus | et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium | regnavit populorum," 10-12). Not only the political leader but also the poet can achieve immortality through the Dioscuri-like art of soothing all around him.

Conclusion

In this dissertation I attempted to read Horace's *Odes,* Books 1-3, as a whole, taking this collection of poems as an interconnected work. My hope was that by considering single odes in light of the whole work, each individual poem would become clearer.

The focus here was on Horace's use of mythology throughout *Odes* 1-3; the approach taken was to look at mythological figures that appeared several times throughout the books and see if any patterns emerged. These patterns could be interesting in themselves as they related to Horace's overall project but also could aid in illuminating obscurities in individual poems. In the first chapter, the discovery was that the seemingly ornamental references to Icarus—those in 1.1 and 3.7—are actually not ornamental at all. Those references fit into an overall pattern of Icarus and Daedalus representing human overreaching; this pattern in turn helped to interpret 1.1 and 3.7, especially 3.7, which has been the subject of some controversy. In the second chapter, the seemingly disparate references to Prometheus suddenly came together when I considered that they were always connected to a poet, either Horace or Vergil. The surprise was that Prometheus—who seems to be a negative figure in 1.3—turns out to be a positive figure throughout. Moreover, the unusual pairing of Prometheus and Tantalus in 2.13 and 2.18 is explained as a contrast between two figures who stole from the gods and gave to men: Prometheus is a divine benefactor, but Tantalus (in Pindar) is a mortal greedily committing *hubris*. In the third and fourth chapters, some oddities in the Hercules and Dioscuri odes began to make sense when closer attention was paid to the mythological figures and their recurrence throughout the *Odes*; for example, the name "Alcides" in 1.12 was revealed to

have more meaning than being simply another name for Hercules, and the reference to Saturn in 2.12 was explained as a reference to the Golden Age. On a broader level, it seemed obvious at first that Hercules and the Dioscuri were connected to Augustus generally. However, looking more closely at the odes and comparing them to each other revealed a deeper pattern connecting Hercules' defeat of monsters and the power of the Dioscuri to calm the sea to particular, complementary facets of Augustus' future rule: war against barbarous foreigners as an alternative to civil war and morality and civilization at home.

Beyond these patterns specific to each mythological figure and pair, Daedalus and Icarus, Prometheus, Tantalus, Hercules, and the Dioscuri share one thing in common: each, in their own way, is connected not only to their specific significance—immoderation, deification, Augustus' foreign wars, Augustus' calming the state—but also to the poet. Horace connects either himself or Vergil, or both, to each of the four figures and pairs. In the case of Daedalus and Icarus, Horace expresses some modesty: Vergil, like Daedalus, will succeed, but Horace casts himself as the immoderate Icarus. Horace is more positive about himself when he uses Prometheus: both he and Vergil are connected to the maker and benefactor who, though he does suffer for a time, is ultimately freed by Hercules. Horace connects Hercules to Vergil alone, again expressing complete confidence in the ability of his friend's poetry to conquer death, just as Hercules was able to go to the underworld and return in his katabasis, mentioned in 1.3. Finally, at the very end of his work (3.29), Horace not only asserts the immortality of his poetry, but he assumes for himself a godlike role, becoming a Dioscuri-like soother of anxious Maecenas. Looking back at all of the odes, Horace often takes on the role of

soother: he is constantly trying to get his addressees to lead a calmer, less ruffled life by exhorting them to enjoy the moment and not to forget their mortality. Considering only Prometheus, Hercules, and the Dioscuri, it seems that for Horace gods are not primarily passive members of a heavenly banquet (as described at 3.3.11-12); rather, he focuses on gods either as benefactors who have at last received their due or as immortals who even now have a role as conscious, constant protectors of humanity. When Horace proclaims the future divinity of Augustus, it is in terms of what he must *do* to become and be a god; when Horace takes on a divine role, such as his Dioscuri-like role in 3.29, it is to help fellow mortals by advising them on how to live, how to enjoy what is in front of them and to let go of anxiety.[444]

In this dissertation I have looked only at five myths in *Odes* 1-3, but this method, using Horace's mythological lexicon to explicate individual odes and make generalizations about the *Odes* as a whole, opens up avenues for further exploration. For example, this approach could shed new light on Horace's identification of Augustus and his own poetry with Mercury (like their shared connection to the Dioscuri),[445] a god

---

[444] Cf. Hornsby (1962) 104: "[Horace's] own service to the Muses is not simply the rhapsodizing of a poetic sensibility, but the concrete practical matter of a man involved in the world and offering it salutary counsel."

[445] P. A. Miller (1991) discusses Horace's connection of himself and Augustus to Mercury. Cf. J. F. Miller (2009) 307-312 on Augustus, Horace as poet, and Apollo. Both Augustus and Horace's poetry are connected to the Dioscuri as well (see discussion in Chapter 4 above).

whose appearance and role in the *Odes* is at times unexpected and mysterious. Other gods, too, could be studied: Bacchus seems to play many roles throughout the *Odes*, but are they in fact all related to one another? Finally, there are heroes and other mythological figures and beasts: various Trojan War figures and underworld denizens appear more than once. The key is collecting *all* the references—not a select few—and analyzing them both together and within the contexts of their own poems.

The method could be expanded beyond mythology. I have assumed as my hypothesis here that each time Horace uses a myth he intentionally uses it in the context of his other uses of that myth. One could also hypothesize that he does the same with character-names that appear more than once, just as Johnson has with Lydia,[446] and I have, briefly, with Chloe.[447] Images, such as the rushing river, and objects, such as wine,[448] and unnamed figures, such as the merchant, could all be gathered and analyzed in the same way, as long as the project included every instance within a single work[449] and did not stop with gathering.[450]

---

[446] Johnson (2003).

[447] See Chapter 1 n. 93 above.

[448] As Commager (1957).

[449] Broader surveys, such as Davis (2007), that study a particular motif in Horace but do not limit themselves to a single work are, of course, also important, but they tell us more about Horace as a poet in general rather than what he was doing in any given *monumentum*. I have on occasion referred to Horatian passages from outside *Odes* 1-3 either, as in my discussion of 2.13, where Horace seems to be alluding to his earlier work

Horace's *Odes*, Books 1-3, consists of 88 odes but is one work: like a monument of stones (3.30.1) or a garland of leaves (3.30.15-16) each piece is both individual and contributes to the whole. By reading them together, we can better see each ode as part of the interconnected unity Horace crafted.

---

or where, as in the case of 4.2, the passage provides a useful *comparadum* for the odes I am discussing.

[450] E.g. Nybakken (1937), *An Analytical Study of Horace's Ideas*: "The object of this work is to tabulate the ideas in Horace's poetry in order to make possible a satisfactory appraisal of their nature, range, and frequency of occurrence" (11). This study is both fascinating and useful, but not an example of the method I have been describing.

WORKS CITED

Allen, A. 2003. "Horace's *Satelles Orci* (*Odes* 2.18.34)." *CQ* 53:616-619.

Arkins, B. 1993. "The Cruel Joke of Venus: Horace as Love Poet." In N. Rudd, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium*, 106-119. London.

Austin, R. G. 1971. *Virgil,* Aeneid. Oxford.

Badian, E. 1985. "A Phantom Marriage Law." *Philologus* 129:82-98.

Bassi, D. 1942-3. "*La mitologia in Orazio*." *RIL* 76:41-58.

Basto, R. 1982. "Horace's *Propempticon* to Vergil: A Re-examination." *Vergilius* 28:30-43.

Batinski, E. E. 1991. "Horace's Rehabilitation of Bacchus." *CW* 84:361-378.

Beacham, R. 2005. "The Emperor and Impresario: Producing the Pageantry of Power." In K. Galinsky, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, 151-174. Cambridge.

Bellinger, A. R. 1957. "The Immortality of Alexander and Augustus." *YCS* 15:91-100.

Bradshaw, A. 1978. "Horace and the Therapeutic Myth: *Odes* 3, 7; 3, 11, and 3, 27." *Hermes* 106:156-176.

Breuer, J. 2008. *Der Mythos in den Oden des Horaz.* Göttingen.

------. 2009. "Der Mythos als Maßstab menschlichen Handelns und Seins in den Oden des Horaz." In C. Schmitz and A. Bettenworth, eds. *Mensch—Heros—Gott. Weltentwürfe und Lebensmodelle im Mythos der Vormodern*, 91-101. Wiesbaden.

Brown, R. D. 1991. "*Catonis Nobile Letum* and the List of Romans in Horace *Odes* 1.12." *Phoenix* 45:326-340.

Brunt, P. A. 1963. Review of Meyer (1961). *JRS* 53:170-176.

Byrne, S. N. 2000. "Horace *Carm.* 2.12, Maecenas, and Prose History." *Antichthon* 34:18-29.

Cairns, F. 1971. "Five 'religious' odes of Horace. (I, 10; I, 21 and IV, 6; I, 30; I, 15)." *AJP* 92:433-452.

------. 1995. "Horace, *Odes* 3.7: Elegy, Lyric, Myth, Learning, and Interpretation." In S. J. Harrison, ed. *Homage to Horace. A Bimillenary Celebration*, 65-99. Oxford.

------. 2007. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, revised ed. Ann Arbor.

Campbell, J. S. 1987. "*Animae Dimidium Meae*: Horace's Tribute to Vergil." *CJ* 82:314-318.

Carlson, G. I. 1978. "From Numantia to Necking: Horace Ode 2.12." *CW* 7:441-448.

Carrubba, R. 1984. "The Structure of Horace, *Odes* 1.3: A Propempticon for Vergil." *AJP* 105:166-173.

Champlin, E. 2011. "Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins." *JRS* 101:73-99.

Clay, J. S. 2010. "Horace and Lesbian Lyric." In G. Davis, ed. *A Companion to Horace*, 128-146. Oxford.

Clark, R. J. 2004. "Horace on Vergil's Sea-Crossing in Ode 1.3." *Vergilius* 50:4-34.

Cole, S. 2001. "The Dynamics of Deification in Horace's *Odes* 1-3." In S. R. Asirvatham, C. O. Pache, and J. Watrous, eds. *Between Magic and Religion: Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and Society*, 67-91. Lanham, MD.

Collinge, N. E. 1961. *The Structure of Horace's Odes*. London.

Commager, S. 1957. "The Function of Wine in Horace's *Odes*." *TAPA* 88:68-80.

------. 1962. *The Odes of Horace*. New Haven.

Cornell, T. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*. London.

Crawford, M. H. 1975. *Roman Republican Coinage*. Cambridge.

Cremona, V. 1993. "Orazio fra mito e storia." In P. V. Cova and G. E. Manzoni, eds. *Voci oraziane*, 53-66. Brescia.

Davis, G. 1975. "The Persona of Licymnia: A Revaluation of Horace, *Carm.* 2.12." *Philologus* 119: 70-83.

------. 1991. *Polyhymnia. The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley.

------. 2007. "Wine and the Symposium." In S. J. Harrison, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 207-220. Cambridge.

Deschamps, L. 1983. "Venere nell'opera di Orazio." In *Momenti Oraziani. Scritti dei veri autori*. Rome. 106-131.

Di Lorenzo, E. 2003. "Omero nell'ode ad Asterie di Orazio (*carm.* 3,7)." *InvLuc* 25:49-58.

Donzelli, G. B. 1994. "Exempla mitici oraziani." In C. Curti and C. Crimi, eds. *Scritti classici e cristiani offerti a Francesco Corsaro*, 47-56. Cantania.

Dyson, M. 1968. "Horace, Odes I 16." *AUMLA* 30:169-179.

Ebbeler, J. 2010. "Linus as a Figure for Pastoral Poetics in Vergil's Eclogues." *Helios* 37:187-205.

Edmunds, L. 1992. *From a Sabine Jar*. Chapel Hill.

Eicks, M. 2011. *Liebe und Lyrik: Zur Funktion des erotischen Diskurses in Horazens erster Odensammlung*. Berlin.

Eidinow, J. S. C. 2000. "*Purpureo bibet ore nectar*: A Reconsideration." *CQ* 50:463-71.

Elder, J. P. 1952. "Horace, *C.*, 1, 3." *AJP* 73:140-158.

Feeney, D. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts Beliefs*. Cambridge.

------. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley.

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.

Galinksy, G. K. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: the Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford.

------. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton.

Gall, D. 1981. *Die Bilder der horazischen Lyrik.* Königstein/Ts.

Gibson, R. 2003. *Ovid* Ars Amatoria *Book 3*. Cambridge.

------. 2007. *Excess and Restraint: Propertius, Horace, & Ovid's* Ars amatoria. London (BICS Supplement 89).

Griffith, A. 2002. "The *Odes*: Just where Do You Draw the Line?" In A. J. Woodman and D. Feeney, eds. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, 65-79. Cambridge.

Grimal, P. 1951. "Enée à Rome et le triomphe d'Octave." *REA* 53:51-61.

Hahn, E. A. 1939. "Epodes 5 and 17, Carmina 1.16 and 1.17." *TAPA* 70:213-230.

Hardie, A. 2003. "The Pindaric Sources of *Odes* 1.12." *HSPh* 101:371-404.

Hardie, P. 2012. *Rumour and Renown: Representations of* Fama *in Western Literature*. Cambridge.

Harrison, S. 1988. "Horace, *Odes* 3.7: an Erotic Odyssey?" *CQ* 38:186-192.

------. 2004. “Lyric Middles: The Turn at the Centre in Horace’s Odes.” In S. Kyriakidis and F. De Martino, eds. *Middles in Latin Poetry*, 81-102. Bari (*Collana di Studi e Testi* 38).

------. 2005. “Hercules and Augustus in Propertius 4.9.” *PLLS* 12:117-32.

------. 2007. “The Primal Voyage and the Ocean of Epos: Two Aspects of Metapoetic Imagery in Catullus, Virgil and Horace.” *Dictynna* 4 (accessed online 31 July 2012, http://dictynna.revues.org/146).

------. 2010. “Themes and Patterns in Horace *Odes* Book 2.” *CentoPagine* 4:53-65.

Hemingson, T. L. 2008. Custos viri Mercurialis*: Faunus in the* Odes *of Horace*. Diss. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Hendrickson, G. L. 1908. “Horace’s *Propempticon* to Virgil.” *CJ* 3:100-104.

Henderson, W. J. 1973. “The Paraklausithyron Motif in Horace’s *Odes*.” *AClass* 16:51-67.

Hoefmans, M. 1994. “Myth into Reality: The Metamorphosis of Daedalus and Icarus (Ovid, Metamorphoses, VIII, 183–235).” *AC* 63:137-60.

Hornbeck, C. 2014. “*Caelum Ipsum Petimus*: Daedalus and Icarus in Horace’s *Odes*.” *CJ* 109:145-169.

Hornsby, R. A. 1962. “Horace on Art and Politics.” *CJ* 58:97-104.

Huttner, U. 1997. “Hercules und Augustus.” *Chiron* 27:369-391.

Jacobson, H. 1995. “Hor. *Carm.* 3.7.” *Mnemosyne* 48:85.

Jenkyns, R. 1982. “*O matre pulchra*.” *Latomus* 41:146-151.

Johnson, P. A. 1980. *Vergil's Agricultural Golden Age: A Study of the Georgics*. Leiden.

Johnson, T. S. 2003. “Locking-in and Locking-out Lydia: Lyric Form and Power in Horace’s *C.* I.25 and III.9.” *CJ* 99:113-134.

------. 2012. *Horace’s Iambic Criticism*. Leiden.

Keller O. and A. Holder. 1899. *Horati Flacci Opera, recensuerunt* Vol. I. Leipzig.

Kidd, D. A. 1977. “Virgil’s Voyage.” *Prudentia* 9:97-103.

Kiessling, A., and Heinze, R. 1955. *Q. Horatius Flaccus I. Oden und Epoden. Erklärt von Adolf Kiessling.* Berlin.

Klingner, F. 1961. *Römische Geisteswelt*. Munich.

------. 1964. *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur*. Zürich/Stuttgart.

Koortbojian, M. 2013. *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*. Cambridge.

Krasser, H. 1995. *Horazische Denkfiguren. Theophilie und Theophanie als Medium der poetischen Selbstdarstellung des Odendichters*. Göttingen.

La Rocca, E. “‘Memorie di Castore’: principi come Dioscuri.” In L. Nista, ed. *Castores. L’immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma*, 73–90. Rome.

Lockyer, C. W. 1967. “Horace’s ‘Propempticon’ and Vergil’s Voyage. *CW* 61:42-45.

Lowrie, M. 1997. *Horace’s Narrative* Odes. Oxford.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1995. *Horace. Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven.

MacKay, L. A. 1962. “*Odes*, I, 16 and 17: *O matre pulchra..., Velox amoenum....*” *AJP* 83:298-300.

Mankin, D. 1992. “C. 3.14: How ‘Private’ is Horace's Party?” *RhM* 135:378-381.

------. 1995. *Horace:* Epodes. Cambridge.

Marache R. 1956. “Le mythe dans les Odes d’Horace.” *Pallas* 4:59-66.

Markland, J. 1811. *Euripidis Supplices mulieres et Iphigenia in Aulide et in Tauris*. Oxford.

Marković, D. 2010. "Horace, *Odes* 3.7.21: *scopulis surdior Icari*." *CQ* 60:659-661.

Marks, R. 2008. "Augustus and I: Horace and 'Horatian' Identity in *Odes* 3.14." *AJP* 129:77-100.

Martín, S. R. 1996. "La mitología en la sátira romana (I): Horacio y Persio." *CFC* 11:53-76.

Maurach, G. 1994. "Horazens Bacchusoden." *Philologus* 138:83-100.

Mayer, R. 2012. *Horace, Odes Book I*. Cambridge.

Meyer, H. D. 1961. *Die Aussenpolitik des Augustus und die Augusteische Dichtung*. Cologne.

Musurillo, H. 1962. "The Poet's Apotheosis: Horace, *Odes* 1.1." *TAPA* 93:230-239.

Mutschler, F.-H. 1978. "Kaufmannsliebe. Eine Interpretation der Horazode 'Quid fles Asterie' (c.3,7)." *SO* 53:111-131.

Miller, J. F. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge.

Miller, P. A. "Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of *Odes* 1-3." *AJP* 112:365-388.

------. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: the Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. London.

Moore, M. K. 1930. "The Divine Mythology of Horace." *TAPhA* 61:xxxviii.

Moritz, L. A. 1968. "Some 'Central' Thoughts on Horace's *Odes*." *CQ* 18:116-131.

Morgan, L. 2005. "A Yoke Connecting Baskets: *Odes* 3.14, Hercules, and Italian Unity." *CQ* 55:190-203.

Nadeau, Y. 2008. *Erotica for Caesar Augustus. A Study of the Love-Poetry of Horace,* Carmina, *Books I to III*. Brussels.

Naylor, H. D. 1922. *Horace: Odes and Epodes. A Study in Poetic Word-Order*. Cambridge.

Nisbet, R. G. M. 1983. "Some problems of text and interpretation in Horace *Odes* 3,14 (*Herculis Ritu*)." *PLLS* 4:105-119.

------. 1999. "The Word Order of Horace's Odes." In J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer,eds. *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, 135-154. Oxford (Proceedings of the British Academy 93).

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

------. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace,* Odes *Book II*. Oxford.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Rudd, N. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes *Book III*. Oxford.

Nowak, E. 1981. "De argumentorum fabulosorum in Horatii carminibus munere poetico." *Eos* 69:271-281.

Nybakken, O. E. 1937. *An Analytical Study of Horace's Ideas*. Diss. University of Iowa.

Oksala, T. 1973. *Religion und Mythologie bei Horaz*. Helsinki.

Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority.* Cambridge.

Olivieri, G. 1903. *Le favole mitologiche delle odi di Orazio confrontate con le pitture di Pompei ed Ercolano*. Palermo.

Orelli, J. K. von, and Baiter, J. G. 1886. *Q. Horatius Flaccus.* 4th ed. 2 vols. Berlin.

Owens, W. M. 1992. "*Nuntius vafer et fallax*: An Alternative Reading of Horace, *C.* 3.7." *CW* 85:161-171.

Parker, L. P. E. 2002. “Just and tenacious of his purpose…” *MH* 59:101-106.

Pascal, C. B. 1980. “Another Look at the Swan Ode.” *Latomus* 39:98-108.

Pasquali, G. 1920. *Orazio lirico: Studi*. Florence.

Peerlkamp. P. H. 1862. *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina; recensuit P. Hofman Peerlkamp.* Editio altera emendata et aucta. Amsterdam.

Petrocchi, G. A. B. 1994. “L’iconografia dei Dioscuri sui denari della repubblica romana.” In L. Nista, ed. *Castores: l’immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma*, 101-106. Rome.

Pichon, R. 1901. *Index Verborum Amatoriorum*. Paris.

Pollini, J. 1990. “Man or God: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate.” In K.A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, eds. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, 333-363. Berkeley.

Pomeroy, A. J. 1980. “A Man at a Spring: Horace, *Odes* 1.1.” Reprinted in *Why Horace?* W. S. Anderson, ed. Wauconda, Ill., 1999. 3-19.

Porter, D. H. 1975. “The Recurrent Motifs of Horace, *Carmina* IV.” *HSPh* 79:189-228.

------. 1987. *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of Odes 1-3*. Princeton.

Poulsen, B. 1991. “The Dioscuri and ruler ideology.” *SO* 66:119-146.

Pöschl, V. 1981. “Mythologisches in den Horazoden 1,7; 3,11 und 3,27.” *WJA* 7:139-147.

------. 1991. *Horazische Lyrik: Interpretationen*. Heidelberg.

------. 1997. “Mitologia.” *Enciclopedia Oraziana* vol. 2. 288-293.

Prodinger, K. 1907. “Zu Horazens Ode I 3.” *WS* 29:165-172.

Pucci, J. 1988. “Voces Linquatae: A Re-Reading of Horace’s Ode 3.29.” *Ramus* 17: 75-89.

------. 1992. “Horace and Vergilian Mimesis: A Re-Reading of *Odes* 1.3.” *CW* 85:659-673.

------. 2005. “Originary Song, Poetic Composition, and Transgression: a Reading of Horace *Odes* 1.3 and 1.22.” *Ramus* 34:1-21.

Pulleyn, S. 1997. “Horace, Odes 3,3,12: ‘purpureo bibet ore nectar.’” *Mnemosyne* 50: 482-484.

Putnam, M. J. 1987. “Daedalus, Virgil and the End of Art.” *AJP* 108:173-198.

Psichari, M. 1904. *Index raisonné de la mythologie d’Horace avec une preface d’Anatole France*. Paris.

Quinn, K. 1963. *Latin Explorations*. London.

------. 1980. *Horace: the* Odes. London.

Reitzenstein, R. 1922. “Zu Horaz und Catull.” *Hermes* 57:357-365.

Romano, E. 1991. *Q. Orazio Flacco: Le opere. I 1: Le Odi. Il Carme Saeculare. Gli Epodi. Testo critico di Elisa Romano. Traduzione di Luca Canali*. Rome.

Rudd, N. 1993. “Horace as a Moralist.” In N. Rudd, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration,* 64-88. Ann Arbor.

------. 2004. *Horace, Odes and Epodes*. Cambridge, MA (Loeb Classical Library 33).

Rumpf, L. 2009. “Caelum ipsum petimus stultitia: Zur poetologischen Deutung von Horaz’ c. 1,3.” *RhM* 152:292-311.

Santirocco, M. S. 1980. “Strategy and Structure in Horace *C.* 2.12.” In C. Deroux, ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II,* 223-236. Brussels (Collection Latomus 168).

------. 1984. “The Maecenas Odes.” *TAPA* 114:241-253.

------. 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill.

Segal, C. 1973. "*Felices ter et amplias*: Horace, *Odes*, I. 13." *Latomus* 32:39-46.

Seager, R. 1980. "Neu sinas Medos equitare inultos": Horace, the Parthians and Augustan foreign policy." *Athenaeum* 58:103-118.

------. 1993. "Horace and Augustus: Poetry and Policy." In N. Rudd, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration*, 41-63. Ann Arbor.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 2001. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. 4th edition. Munich and Leipzig (Bibliotheca Teubneriana).

Shepherd, W. G. 1983. *The Complete Odes and Epodes*. London.

Silk, E. T. 1956. "A Fresh Approach to Horace. II, 20." *AJP* 77:255-263.

Stamatopoulou, Z. 2012. "Weaving Titans for Athena: Euripides and the Panathenaic *Peplos* (*Hec.* 466-74 and *IT* 218-24)." *CQ* 62:72-80.

Stevenson, S. W. 1889. *A Dictionary of Roman Coins, Republican and Imperial*. London.

Sutherland, E. H. 2002. *Horace's Well-Trained Reader: Toward a Methodology of Audience Participation in the Odes*. Frankfurt (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 136).

------. 2005. "Writing (On) Bodies: Lyric Discourse and the Production of Gender in Horace *Odes* 1.13." *CP* 100:52-82.

Syndikus, H. P. 2001. *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Eine Interpretation der Oden*. 2nd edition. 2 vols. Darmstadt.

------. 2010. "The Roman Odes." In *A Companion to Horace*, G. Davis, ed. Oxford. 193-209.

Thévenaz, Olivier. 2002. “Le cygne de Venouse: Horace et la métamorphose de l'Ode II, 20.” *Latomus* 61:861-888.

Thom, S. 1999. “Appearance and Reality in Horace’s *Odes* 3.7-12.” *Akroterion* 44:56-69.

------. 2003. “Satyric Lyric? Horace *Odes* 3.7-12.” *Akroterion* 48:59-68.

Thomas, R. F. 1988. *Vergil:* Georgics, *Volume 1: Books I-II*. Cambridge.

------. 2011. *Horace* Odes *Book IV and* Carmen Saeculare. Cambridge.

Torraca, M. 1973. “L’elemento mitico e demonico in Orazio Lirico.” *BStudLat* 3:304-315.

Traill, D. A. 1983. “Horace *C.* 1.3: A Political Ode?” *CJ* 78:131-137.

Verrall, A. W. 1884. *Studies Literary and Historical in the Odes of Horace*. London.

West, D. 1995. *Horace* Odes *I: Carpe Diem*. Oxford.

------. 1998. *Horace* Odes *II: Vatis Amici*. Oxford.

------. 2002. *Horace* Odes *III: Dulce Periculum*. Oxford.

Wickham, E. C. 1877. *The Works of Horace*. Vol. 1. Oxford.

Williams, G. W. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.

------. 1969. *The Third Book of Horace’s* Odes. Oxford.

------. 1980. *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*. New Haven/London.

Wiseman, T. P. 1995. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.

Womble, H. 1961. “Repetition and Irony: Horace, *Odes* 2.18.” *TAPA* 92:537-549.

Woodman, A. J. 1974. “*Exegi monumentum*: Horace, *Odes* 3. 30.” In A. J. Woodman and D. West, eds. *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, 115-128. Cambridge.

------. 1981. Review of Nisbet and Hubbard (1978). *LCM* 6:159-166.

------. 2002. “Biformis Vates: The Odes, Catullus, and Greek lyric.” In A. J. Woodman

and D. Feeney, eds. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, 53-64. Cambridge.

Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor.