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Horace’s C. 3.1 is something of an anomaly: it prefaces the cycle of the so-called Roman odes in which Augustus and national issues occupy a central position, and yet apart from the solemn opening strophe which addresses a wider audience, it appears itself to remain surprisingly aloof from these very issues: specific allusions to identifiable questions of contemporary relevance seem to be missing. As Mommsen remarked, ‘Das einleitende Gedicht ist, wie billig, allgemein gehalten’. ¹ This somewhat paradoxical preponderance of the private and personal over the political and public in C. 3.1 was remarked on some twenty years ago by Pöschl:

In lucrezischer Weise werden die Sorgen und Ängste der Mächtigen, und das heisst auch der Mächtigen Roms enthüllt. . . . Gegen diese Welt der Macht setzt Horaz die kleine Welt ländlicher Abgeschiedenheit und paupertas, die mit unverkennbar epikureischen Farben gezeichnet ist. Es ist die Welt des Dichters selbst. . . . Der Zyklus der Römeroden beginnt also mit einem Gedicht, das die Macht entwertet und das Lob des epikureischen Daseins singt, und das ist für den modernen Betrachter so erstaunlich, dass man zu verschiedenen Hypothesen gegriffen hat, um den Sachverhalt, den man offensichtlich als anstößig empfand, zu mildern.²

Criticism of the ode has on the whole been more concerned with points of detail such as thought progressions³ — i.e. with internal matters — than with viewing 3.1 within the context of the Augustan socio-political programme. A milestone in understanding its political significance was reached with the publication in 1947 of Solmsen’s acute analysis: he argued that Horace effectively demonstrates how his personal philosophy of moderation and frugality could form the basis also for a national regeneration.⁴ Fraenkel praised this article as ‘a model of careful interpretation’, and I believe that Solmsen’s conclusion is still the best explanation of the political dimension of 3.1. Of necessity, however, the ode’s political significance, when understood thus, is something the reader must deduce — from Horace’s criticism of excessive materialism, from the fact that 3.1 forms part of a cycle of political poems, from the tone of the ode (cf. below note 52), and from comparison with a poem like 3.24, where cupidō is explicitly branded as the blight of public life which needs to be eradicated (51–52, evadenda cupidinis/pravi sunt elementa); this political significance is not explicitly proclaimed in 3.1; prima facie the ode is private rather than public in character. Most recently the question of its political significance has been taken up again by Tony Woodman in his thought
provoking interpretation of 3.1 in the volume Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus, edd. A.J. Woodman and D.A. West, Cambridge 1984, 83ff. Woodman argues that the ode is very closely related to Augustan policy, and that precise points of contact may be identified. Whether one agrees with his conclusions or not, his essay is to be welcomed as raising once again the important question of the socio-political background to 3.1, and the way in which the poet responds; for, depending upon the poet's position vis-à-vis official policy, one is compelled to ask whether his role is that of propagandist or critic, whether he is engaged or aloof, political apologist or moralizing philosopher. The present essay, which addresses again the question of the political significance of 3.1, is in response to Tony Woodman's interpretation. In particular, I wish to reconsider three points discussed by him: the significance of stanzas 3 and 4 (= lines 9–16); the nature of the transition from stanza 4 to stanza 5; and the relevance, if any, of Horace's references to building activity in the ode. The first and third points are concerned directly with the ode's possible political dimension; the second is more a matter of technique, though still relevant to the present discussion insofar as it helps to identify the ode's conceptual axis. Woodman himself has stressed the importance of form and argument for a correct understanding of 3.1—'I believe . . . that the ode does bear a political message but that this has been generally obscured because scholars have appreciated neither the form nor the argument of the poem' (83); it is principally on these criteria that I wish to resume the debate on this much discussed ode.5

It is necessary first to summarize Woodman's argument, giving emphasis to the points at issue. Horace's ode 'is directly relevant to the politics of the Augustan age' (94), and this for two reasons. First, Horace's criticisms of the property developer (33ff) and of extravagance in building styles (45f) run parallel to the views held by Augustus himself on these matters. A man who builds out to sea is guilty, in the poet's view, of impietas. Secondly, lines 9–14 represent a positive counterpart: these verses contain 'pictures of a model society' (93). . . . After 28 B.C. virtually no more veterans were settled on the land, and in the following year the electoral assemblies began to meet again and genuine competition for office was resumed (Dio 53.21.6–7). Thus, if lines 9–14 were written in or after 27 B.C., they will not only have caused no offence but will have accurately reflected the kind of society which Augustus was attempting to create or, to be more precise, re-create. . . . Horace is pointing out that circumstances now exist in which political power can once more be pursued' (93). The pictures in 9–14 were chosen to persuade Horace's readers 'of the reality of that society and hence of the emperor's intentions' (93). Horace, in short, is advertising Augustan ideals. Thus, according to Woodman, the ode has both a protreptic and an apotreptic thrust. Since he regards lines 9–14 as reflecting positive Augustan ideals, he is at pains to draw a sharp distinction between the four types mentioned there and the impius of stanza 5: the landowner (9–10a) is given the epithet 'blameless' (87); again, 'Horace directs no moral criticism against the landowner and the other powerful men in these stanzas [sc. 3 and 4]. . . . The contrast with
the greedy *impii* of lines 25–37 could hardly be greater' (91); and '... the four powerful men of lines 9–14... are in no way to be associated with the *impius* but rather act as a "foil" for him' (92). In view of this allegedly different moral judgement on the part of Horace, the nature of the transition from stanza 4 to stanza 5 is a matter of some importance within the ode as a whole.

---

est ut viro vir latius ordinet

arbusta sulcis, hic generosior
descendat in campum petitor,
moribus hic meliorque fama

contendat, illi turba clientium
sit major: aeque lege necessitas

sortitur insignis et imos,
omne capax movet urna nomen.

I shall begin with a reexamination of lines 9–16: in order to interpret these two strophes it will be necessary first to consider style and structure, and then to evaluate the underlying ideas. Stanzas 3 and 4 together constitute a priamel. By this term I understand a bipartite structure consisting of (a) a series of 'preambular' instances (*praembulum*, 'Beispielreihung') and (b) the apex or 'target point'. The raison d'être of the priamel is to lead up, through several steps, to the apex, which is the point of ultimate interest; without the preceding list of examples (as preface or foil) the salient point would carry less conviction, have less impact. Aesthetically the priamel appeals because of the tension it generates: this is built up over several steps in the *praembulum* and only resolved at the target point. Obviously, when discussing priamels, one cannot evaluate the 'Beispielreihung' proper in isolation — since it is only at the target point that the whole argument is capped and sealed. To look at the *praembulum* apart from the whole priamel — which is one of the methodological weaknesses in Woodman's argument — would be rather like discussing C. 1.1 without reference to the crucial lines 29–36 in that poem.

In C. 3.1.9–16 a four-member *praembulum* is capped at 14b–16 by the target point; logically the two parts of the priamel stand in a concessive relationship, even though this is not made explicit syntactically. I cannot agree with Woodman's remark, 'the phrase *est ut*, with which line 9 begins, seems specifically designed to underline the fact that the advantages enjoyed by the four men of stanzas 3–4 are due to *some natural law* (88, with my italics): certainly Horace is enumerating quintessentially Roman activities, observable realities and not mere hypotheses, but to deduce that these activities are sanctioned by some natural law (?) and hence acceptable?) is not warranted by anything in the text. All four preambular members are grammatically dependent upon an intro-
ductory est ut, which creates a high degree of both parallelism and formal cohesion within this part of the structure. The striking word parataxis viro vir in the first member immediately arrests attention. The stylistic effect achieved by such juxtapositions — irrespective of the syntactic relationship between the repeated elements (here abl. comp.) — must be determined in each case from the respective contexts; here the figure has the stylistic function of drawing attention to the element of heated competition in the actions of the men, a nuance reinforced by the immediately following comparative latius. Each subsequent member in the praeambulum likewise contains a comparative (generosior, melior, maior): this accumulation sustains the emphasis on competition throughout the section. The occurrence in the first member of both word parataxis and the comparative adverb makes verse 9a virtually a ‘headline’ announcing, by stylistic means, what is to be the Leitmotiv in the praeambulum. The agonistic element, initially suggested by the style of the verses, becomes fully articulated only in contendat (13); and the significance of the verb is enhanced by its position, for the enjambement has the function not only of locking the two strophes closely together, but also of throwing the word itself into sharper relief. Style is again exploited to accentuate meaning.

The priamel’s apex or target point, beginning at 14b, follows by adversative asyndeton, which makes for an abrupt transition and has the added effect of placing a pathetic accent on aequa lege (cf. below note 13). Thus the counterpoise of ideas is immediately clear: though the goal of human competition is social differentiation, these gradations are levelled by necessitas (leti). The polarity insignis et imos again pathetically suggests death’s indifference to rank, and a similar idea is conveyed in omne capax movet urna nomen, where word order is used for both emphasis and pathos. The target point consists of two separate sentences; whatever the exact procedure Horace has in mind in 14b–16, it is clear that the two actions there described form a hysteron proteron, since shaking of the lots must logically precede sortition itself — which order is implied at C. 2.3.25–28. As often, this reversal is occasioned by the poet’s wish to accentuate the emotionally important item by placing it first (as e.g. Verg. Aen. 2.353, moriamur, et in media arma ruamus). Within the priamel this makes good sense, allowing Horace to obtain the sharp point between the (stylistically implied) competition and striving for more on the one hand, and the devastating aequa on the other; in other words, by placing aequa lege first, Horace achieves a more dramatic transition from praeambulum to target point.

If it may be taken for granted that the purpose of structure is to impose upon an idea a sharper profile, then there is a fairly obvious interrelationship between the form and content of the argument in lines 9–16. The priamel, an essentially climactic configuration, reinforces through disposition the idea that however powerful and wealthy the individuals in 9–14a, necessitas is more powerful still, i.e. the target point overshadows, negates or at very least reduces to relative insignificance the pursuits catalogued in the preface. In terms of structure and dynamics, lines 9–16 may profitably be compared with both Epode 17.65–69.
and, more especially, with Epist. 1.6.17–27:16 in these priamels too the apex underlines the absolute power of a higher authority. Since the purpose of the priamel is to lead up to an apex, this is where the reader lingers, this the focus of ultimate interest, and I conclude that if Horace’s purpose had really been to advertise the Augustan conception of a model society, it is unthinkable that he would have shaped the thought as he has done here; much rather the weighting of the structure is such as to suggest a value judgement — the futility of the activities described in 9–14a. This interpretation is not indeed a new one,17 but it has been possible to adduce structural arguments as additional evidence for what has hitherto been felt to be the meaning of the lines. Further, the notion that the priamel relativizes the value of the pursuits in 9–14a is corroborated when one considers that lines 9–16 parallel the hierarchy suggested previously in the second stanza (greges — reges — Iuppiter):18 in either case the really powerful force is named last, and so strips of significance what has preceded.

An examination of structure and ponderation has suggested that Horace’s attitude towards the activities in 9–14a is not as unreservedly enthusiastic as Woodman has proposed, and this conclusion is reinforced when one considers the contents of the lines themselves. The activities enumerated may be subsumed under two heads, namely wealth (here in the form of land ownership and cultivation), and politics. (Since the fourth item, illi turba clientium/ sit maior, stands after two members expressly designating political activity, it is reasonable to assume that the clients are also mentioned in connection with the patron’s political aspirations). Towards both classes of activity Horace displays a consistent attitude in the odes, and it would be surprising if the same did not also hold good here. In the poet’s view a man’s outward lifestyle, the nature and extent of his possessions are usually a reliable reflector of his inward philosophical attitude and psychological condition. Land ownership is a particularly clear case in point. To take two extremes: latifundia are never mentioned without an accompanying hint of the owner’s avarice,19 while on the other hand the poet’s own modest acres are a concrete outward indication of his limited desires (purae rivus aquae silvaque iugera/ paucorum . . . , 3.16.29–30). The agonistic element suggested in est ut viro vir latius ordinet/ arbusta sulcis would certainly suggest the formation of progressively larger estates — which are diametrically opposed to the poet’s own paucu iugera. The operation referred to in 9–10a is the preparation of arbusta or plantations of lopped trees on which vines are to be trained: and vineyards were regarded as particularly remunerative20 — a consideration which is surely no mere coincidence in the present context. Striving after political eminence (10b–14a) is similarly the antipode of Horace’s own ideal: it is only necessary to recall a line like iure perhorruit/ late conspicuum tollere verticem, Maecenas, equitum decus (3.16.18–20), a practical application of the Epicurean λάθε βιόσας. From this perspective the attainment of high office has no intrinsic value, since such honours are as fickle as the capricious mob by whom they are conferred.21 Such general considerations should make us wary of assuming without further ado that Horace gives his enthusiastic approval to the political
competing described in 10–14a; nor are additional and more specific hints wanting. The political rivals base their candidacy on nobility of birth (generosior), character and repute (moribus . . . meliorque fama), while the third relies on his turba clientium. Here again cross references may help to clarify the underlying attitude. Clients are an essential part of the lifestyle opposed to Horace’s own paupertas; nobility of descent and public repute are much coveted values, though reckoned by Horace as among life’s deceptive bona.23 In sum, if one is guided by Horace’s attitudes towards and evaluation of wealth (in whatever form) and political distinction as expressed in several other passages, one is inclined to see in lines 9–14a not a positive ideal which he seeks to advertise, but much rather a summary of certain phenomena directly at variance with the views he himself holds.

Further, looking at the collective thrust of 9–16, Horace’s purpose in introducing necessitas (leti) into the argument may be better understood when one compares philosophically related discussions. The death motif in the odes has two main philosophical functions: it operates as an admonition that time is fleeting and that the present must be enjoyed while this is still possible (e.g. 1.4, to name a single instance); and secondly Horace often juxtaposes this motif with representative symbols of material wealth and station in order to demonstrate the vanity and ephemeral nature of the latter. In other words, those things which are generally rated as supremely important in human life become dwarfed into insignificance when measured on the metaphysical scale. To this second category belongs a relatively brief instance of the topos like C. 2.18.17–22 or Epist. 2.2.175–9, or a more expanded version of the same idea as at Epist. 1.6.17–22 (quoted below, note 16). I would argue that the priamel at C. 3.1.9–16, culminating in necessitas, belongs to this same class of argument.

Possible philosophical influences upon the two stanzas under consideration have been played down: ‘Die breite Ausführung des banalen Gedankens . . . ist . . . schwerlich mit den Prädikaten “epikureisch” oder “philosophisch” zu bedenken’.24 Yet it is worth inquiring whether Horace’s negative evaluation of the individuals in 9–14a is entirely without an Epicurean basis—especially since the ode’s central verse desiderantem, quod satis est is quite plainly coloured by such ideas. The four individuals in the preambular list compete in the acquisition of wealth and political honour. These twin goals of human ambition are twice coupled by Epicurus, who rejects them as a means of securing mental tranquillity;25 and the same pairing appears at Lucretius 2.13, ad summas emergere opes rerumque potiri. I suggest that Horace had this bipartite scheme in mind when writing lines 9ff. A cluster of verbal and thematic echoes leaves no doubt about the influence of Lucretius’ second proem upon C. 3.1;26 I wish here to draw attention to the significance of just one of these. Lucretius 2.11 reads certare ingenio, contendere nobilitate; the motif of competition in these two parallel members is stressed by the synonyms certare — contendere, and underlined acoustically by alliteration; it is then varied in the next verse by niti praestante labore. Horace’s technique of emphasis is rather different: he begins
allusively, exploiting style to adumbrate the central idea of competition, and it is
only at the point where the motif becomes explicit — i.e. at its culmination — that
he echoes Lucretius. Thus his contendat, conspicuous enough as a verbal echo,
acquires its full impact only through position (cf. above). Horace has structured
the motif in such a way as to attach a special significance to contendat; and the
appearance of the key term suggests also his philosophical affinities. Style and
philosophical intent are fused into a perfect harmony.

The agonistic element in Horace also acquires philosophical relevance when
one recalls Epicurus K.Δ. 21:

'O τα πέρατα του βιού κατεδώς οίδεν ώς ευπόριστον ἐστι τὸ (τὸ)...'

The unremitting efforts of the individuals in Horace to outdo each other betoken
their failure to recognize the limits within which true contentment lies,27 and thus
they represent a negation of a fundamental Epicurean postulate. The positive
side of this ideal appears first in stanza 6 (desiderantem, quod satis est), and then
again at the end of the poem: Horace approaches the ode’s central idea through
its negative counterpart.28 If this is kept in mind, one is justified in probing
beneath lines 9ff to the philosophical substratum and to see already here the
outline of an idea which in the course of the ode assumes a sharper profile.

Lines 9–14a describe the forms of competition themselves, and are not
primarily concerned with the driving psychological forces. Still, it seems reasonable
to postulate that this striving is motivated by ambitio and avaritia. A passage like
Sat. 1.1.108–112 certainly suggests that Horace regarded avaritia as the spur
which drives men to vie with their neighbours (hunc atque hunc superare laboret,
112), and to assume that the same force is the mainspring also in the present
passage fits perfectly well with the thrust of the ode.29

In sum, after considering style, structure and the underlying philosophical ideas
in stanzas 3 and 4, it is hard to uphold the view that Horace’s assessment of the
individuals in 9–14a is positive; much rather their activities are being viewed
through an Epicurean prism, and seen thus they appear in a negative light — even
though Horace is not explicit in his criticism. Nor should too much significance be
attached to the political component in these lines, even though the activities there
enumerated doubtless reflect current Roman practices. Since these same activities
appear also in non-political contexts (cf. above), one should at least take into
account the possibility that Horace may be talking primarily as a moralizing
philosopher, and is not concerned with politics as such. Whether this hypothesis
is consistent with the grand design of the ode is a question which will be raised
again below.

* * * *
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After the Roman stanzas, verses 9–16, there is a change in scenario, at the level of imagery, in the fifth strophe, indicated by the complementary details *destrictus ensis* and *Siculæ dapes*: the famous incident recounted by Cicero at *Tusc. Disp.* 5.57ff forms the backdrop to verses 17–20. The Roman panel (9–16) is thus framed by allusions to foreign monarchs (5–8) and the Sicilian court (17–20): the broad sweep resulting from this progression foreign-Roman-foreign suggests that Horace is consciously stressing the universality of the phenomena under discussion, a universality which is only gradually narrowed down and whose relevance to the poet himself only crystallizes out at the ode’s conclusion.

The nature of the transition from stanzas 3/4 to 5 requires clarification. I suggest it operates at two levels. The first is thematic. The polarity *insignis et imos* (15) has both retrospective and prospective relevance; prospectively it anticipates the contrast developed in stanzas 5 and 6 (*insignis — Siculæ dapes, imos — humilis domos*). Again, when Horace alludes to the luxury of the Sicilian court (*Siculæ dapes, avium citharaeque cantus*) he suggests wealth and eminence on a far grander scale than was described in lines 9ff. If I am correct in assuming that in 17ff it is *Dionysius the tyrant* who is foremost in Horace’s thoughts (and not Damocles the flatterer: the case is argued below), then this provides a backward link not only to the *reges* of the second strophe but also, and more immediately, to the motif of political eminence (stanzas 3 and 4). Thus the sustained motifs of wealth and power as well as the crescendo curve (power here as autocracy, extravagant riches) make for an uninterrupted thematic and dynamic line with what has preceded.

Secondly — and this is more important and also more problematical — the transition from strophes 3/4 to 5 operates at the psychological level. When Horace describes the individual or type of stanza 5 in terms of imagery that can be immediately related to a well known story, he must have good reason for doing this. The two crucial details are *destrictus ensis* and *super impia/ cervice*; and I agree with Woodman that for clarification we should turn to Cicero’s account, upon which Horace is probably drawing. On the significance of the sword, Woodman’s argument runs thus:

Commentators generally explain the sword as symbolising the guilty conscience of the rich man; but in the original story from which Horace has taken this image, the sword suspended over Damocles’ head meant that he could die at any moment. It is natural to assume that the image has the same significance here. Horace says ‘When the drawn sword is poised over . . .’, but what he means is ‘When death is poised over . . .’. And since he ended the previous section of the poem by taking about death, it is death which forms the link between the first and the second sections of the poem. (87) Cicero had formulated the ‘lesson’ drawn from the episode as *satisne videtur declarasse Dionysius nihil esse ei beatum, cui semper aliqui terror impendeat?* (*Tusc. Disp.* 5.62); and Woodman makes the equation *terror = mors* (213 note 18).

But this interpretation does not bear scrutiny. The significance of the *destrictus*
ennis in the fifth strophe was correctly perceived already by the ancient commentators:

\[\ldots\text{per allegoriam significat, neminem deliciose et libenter sub metu vivere}\]
\[\ldots\text{hoc modo tyrannos vivere et inter summos adparatus imminentibus urgeri periculis} \] (Acron in C. 3.1.17 [Hauthal 1.242]);
\[\ldots\text{significat, neminem libenter posse vivere, qui metuat} \ldots\text{per quae ostendit, similiter regiam vitam splendore rerum suarum uti non posse, quia semper insidiarum metu suspecta sit} \] (Porph. in C. 3.1.17 [Hauthal 1.246]; all italics mine).

The suspended sword represents not death as an objective factor (contrast the objective character of necessitas in 14), but the fears and anxieties\(^{34}\) to which the mighty in particular are vulnerable;\(^{32}\) thus it is not the death motif which functions as a thematic hinge between stanzas 4 and 5, but much rather Horace has exploited the allusion to the Dionysius-Damocles story to shift his focus of attention onto the tormenting cares and anxieties of those in precarious eminence; this important dimension has not appeared in the ode thus far.

The significance of the sword as understood by Acron and Porphyryion is entirely consistent with Cicero's account, which was Horace's probable source. When Dionysius arranges the scenario with the suspended sword, his purpose is to give Damocles a taste of the tyrant's existence — and so the terror which the weapon inspires in the flatterer symbolizes the same kind of fear to which the tyrant is himself subjected; and it is therefore natural that, to explain what is meant by terror, one should turn to the description of Dionysius. Quite plainly his is not the fear of death as such, but rather the constant dread of vengeance for the many crimes committed against his subjects.\(^{33}\)

In Cicero's account it was of course the flatterer over whose head the sword was suspended, and on first impulse one might therefore associate dextraictus ensis with his person on the argument ubi ensis, ibi et Damocles. But this is not decisive; for a start, whether the sword hangs over the tyrant or his flatterer, its symbolical significance is not thereby affected, and it is as a powerful symbol of the fears that plague the tyrant that it is introduced. There is also a second consideration. If we suppose Damocles to have been foremost in Horace's mind, then the adjective impia is singularly out of place, a discrepancy which was noted by Hofman Peerlkamp in his remark ad loc.: ‘Cur autem Damocles appelletur impius non video. . . . Homo igitur cupiditate insatiabilis. Tales Romani nominabant improbos, non impios’. However, impius suits the tyrant remarkably well (cf. note 33), and its proximity to dextraictus ensis suggests also a logical relationship: his acts of impietas cause him to live in constant dread of retribution. Thus both details can be explained by reference to the figure of the tyrant, and I suggest it is he, more than the flatterer, who is foremost in Horace's mind.\(^{34}\) The tyrant is introduced, speciale pro generali, as a dramatic paradigm of the type who, in spite or rather because of his outward wealth, fails to achieve inner tranquillity, being prevented by some guilt or flaw for which he is subjectively responsible; his
condition anticipates that which is encountered again in the ode in other individuals.35

From this examination of the Sicilian episode I conclude that Horace's purpose in alluding to the famous story was to shift his focus of attention from a description of outward, observable phenomena (stanzas 3 and 4) to a study of a state of mind (stanzas 5 and 6). The prominence here assigned to this new psychological dimension in the fifth strophe is supported by several considerations. (1) To begin with generalities, it is worth remembering that the tyrant had become a literary type; fear and anxiety were such a standard part of his psychological make-up that it is a priori difficult to suppose that this element, appearing in accounts from Euripides to Dio Chrysostomus,36 should be totally missing from Horace's description. (2) Next, there is a structural-thematic argument. In the second stanza the kings were referred to as regum timendorum. The allusion in stanza 5 to a Sicilian tyrant harks back to the reges motif,37 both categories representing the pinnacle of human power. However, there is a difference: while the monarchs inspire fear in others, the tyrant is himself the victim of terror (dextraclus ensis): the subtle peripeteia shows the shift in focus — into the tyrant's mind. The two complementary aspects — inspiring fear while being oneself subject to it — are often coupled;38 Horace has skilfully taken over this old idea and split the double aspect over stanzas 2 and 5, thus establishing an additional line of cohesion and balance. (3) Finally, there is another more general consideration. It is particularly appropriate that the allusion to the Dionysius-Damocles story should appear at precisely that point where Horace begins to probe beneath outward trappings and to explore the underlying psychological condition — for the figure of the tyrant lends itself remarkably well to a demonstration of the discrepancy between appearance and reality: though the most felicitous of men in the popular imagination, he is in reality the most wretched creature on earth, precisely because of the torments which rack him constantly.39 The collective impact of these considerations amply vindicates the interpretation of the ancient commentators: from strophe 5 onwards Horace becomes increasingly occupied with exploring psychological phenomena.

The nature of the transition from stanzas 3/4 to 5 is now clear. On the one hand there is thematic and dynamic continuity and auxesis; on the other hand there is an important shift in focus. In strophes 3 and 4 Horace was concerned with the visible outward signs of power and wealth, and with death as the leveller of these distinctions. Stanza 5 is the psychological analogue to the preceding pair: the counterpoise to eminence and opulence is no longer death as the destroyer of social gradations, but the state of mind which is the inevitable concomitant of such eminence. Thus on the interpretation here advanced the men in lines 9ff are not to be sharply separated from the impius, as Woodman has suggested, but rather they prefigure him in the manner of an anticipatory panel. Woodman's epithet 'the blameless landowner of lines 9–10' (87) is correct only insofar as the value judgement in 9–16 is not explicit, but only implied; the censure only becomes explicit with impia in the fifth strophe.

20
When Horace uses the ‘psychological analogue’, i.e. posits a correlation between the material and the psychological in the same way as Epicurus had frequently done in the fragments, he follows a practice for which there are good parallels. The classic lyric statement of this reciprocity quantity-quality or outer-inner condition is perhaps that found in C. 3.16: *crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam/ maiorumque fames* (17–18), and *puere ruit aueae silvaque iugerium/ paucorum* (29–30, where *puere* is probably chosen to reflect also on the poet’s way of life). Similarly in C. 2.16.9–16. The important role of this correlation in the third book of the odes is powerfully supported by its strategic distribution: it appears in C. 1, C. 16 (opening the second half of the book), and in C. 29.9–16 (the last ode before the sphragis). The philosophical basis for this idea is the Epicurean doctrine of autarkeia as the condition of supreme happiness: by a symmetrical process of reasoning *cupido* is destructive of this pleasure (*Epist. 1.2.47–54; 1.16.63–66; 2.2.146–154*).

From the fifth stanza onwards the psychological dimension plays an increasingly important role in the ode. Anxiety spoils the tyrant’s enjoyment of his luxury. In strophe 6 the opulent man and his rustic counterpart converge and are thematically locked together by the epanalepsis *sonnum–sonnum*. The resulting stress on the repeated word is significant since the motifs of sleep and insomnia are used by Horace as a touchstone of a man’s inward condition: thus *ambitio*, *cupido* and the like put soft slumbers to rout, but the man who has curbed his desires enjoys untroubled rest. The *sonnum* motif brings out the qualitative or psychological difference between the two lifestyles characterized outwardly by *Siculae dapes* and *avium citharaeque cantus* on the one hand and *humilis domos* on the other. Structurally the epanalepsis provides a neat thematic hinge between the two opposing types, while the resulting emphasis places an accent on the new dimension which is subsequently sustained in *desiderantem, quod satis est* (25), *sollicitat* (25), *fastidiosus* (37), *Timor et Minae* (37), *atra Cura* (40) and *dolentem* (41).

The closural technique employed by Horace in this ode is the so-called ‘Ich-Schluss’: at its conclusion the poet himself enters the poem as a paradigm of the ideal he has been advocating, and in the epilogue, beginning *quodsi* (41), he rounds off and summarizes the earlier discussion. We might therefore expect to find in this tailpiece confirmation of the interpretation advanced here. Horace no less than three times couples references to material wealth with allusions to the corresponding state of mind and this, I believe, is conclusive evidence for the importance of the double perspective first hinted at in the transition from strophes 3/4 to 5/6. Thematically *quodsi dolentem* (41) harks back, via the fear-racked *dominus* (38) and the *fastidiosus* (37) to the anxious tyrant; the symbols of wealth are in each case different, but the anxiety the same. In *invidendis postibus* and *divitis operiosis* the interrelationship of the complementary aspects, the outer and the inner, is brought out still more closely by the grammatical coupling of the two dimensions as noun and adjective. *Invidendis postibus* (45) suggests the envy that arises from the fear of being
outdone — a more explicit statement of the ambitio motif which underlies strophe 3. And finally a particular significance attaches to divitias operosiores, the last line on which the reader lingers. Here is summarized the essence of the ode. After the precise commodities detailed in the penultimate strophe, and after postibus and atrium, the generic term is appropriate to the end of the enumeration: under this term could be summarized the diverse forms of wealth which had abounded throughout the ode. Operosiores summarizes the effects of wealth upon its possessor; ‘Cur, inquit, relicto Sabino agro, ubi parvo contentus securam vitam ago, adpetam amplissimas domuum fundorumque possessiones, quae mihi oneri et molestiae sunt?’ is the paraphrase of Porphyrian, who had appreciated the psychological nuance in the word.43 The final strophe restates, in a very succinct way, the principal idea of the whole ode: the inevitable concomitant of outward material wealth is inner anxiety.

The final point for discussion concerns the relationship of the ode to Augustus’ views on building matters. Here Woodman argues for a close connection. Suetonius Aug. 89.2 mentions Rutilius’ de modo aedificiorum as one of the volumes which Augustus read to the senate; and we know further of his legislation restricting the maximum height of buildings to 70 feet (Strabo 5.3.7). Woodman links these facts with the ode’s references to building activity, arguing that ‘the connection with Horace’s property developer seems plain, the point of whose activity was not simply that he built into the sea but that his buildings were extremely high. . . . While it is no doubt hard to imagine a property developer reading the ode, or if he did, reducing the height of his skyscrapers on account of it, Horace’s poem must nevertheless be regarded as an important contribution to the emperor’s side of the debate’ (94). The question is whether it is legitimate to postulate such a connection between the ode and the official view on building. It seems clear that when Augustus imposed restrictions on the height of edifices, he had in mind the insulae or tenement blocks (for 70 feet is twice as high as even the most extravagant private villa: cf. below), and that the restriction was intended as a practical measure to enhance their safety against collapse or fire;44 the measure was not aimed against private villas, nor had it anything to do with moral considerations (curbing hybris). Horace, on the other hand, is concerned with luxurious private villas in stanzas 9 and 12 (apartment blocks were not built out to sea), and he views this building activity from the perspective of a moralizing vates — hence his interest in the hybristic disregard for natural boundaries (contracta pisces . . . , 33–34).45 The official viewpoint and the attitude of the poet are matters of an entirely different order. It is indeed true that Horace’s phrase novo/ subline ritu . . . atrium characterizes the building mania as a typically modern vice, and to this extent it implies a conservatism that would have been consonant with Augustus’ own views; beyond this however there is no justification for regarding the ode as a response to or a reflection of the official legislation. But
even in the case of novo it is worth remembering that castigation of the present is a standard feature of all ancient moralizing. There remains one possible point of contact between the ode and Augustus' personal views. Suetonius Aug. 72 attests to the princeps' dislike of extravagance in building styles: ampla et operosa praetoria gravabatur. Et nepus quidem suae Iuliae, profuse ab ea extracta, etiam diruit ad solum. . . . Was Horace aware of this? But whatever the answer, it is clear that the official legislation had nothing to do with Augustus' personal dislikes, and the ode is not therefore advertising official policy.

The primacy of the moralist over the political propagandist is supported by a further consideration. Horace's denunciation of building luxury in 3.1 is not an isolated instance, but should be seen beside C. 2.15, his most strident invective against that vice, as well as 2.16.11–12 and 2.18.1–5: these criticisms continue a long tradition of railing against this form of excess. One topos in particular is noteworthy in this regard. Cur invidendis postibus et novo/ sublimis ritu moliar atrium? (45–46) asks the poet. Pillars and the height of villas are singled out as the most conspicuous signs of this ostentation, not only here by Horace but also by several other poets: Vergil G. 2.461, fortibus domus alta superbis; Prop. 3.2.11, quod non Taenarit domus est mihi fulta columnis; Tib. 2.3.43/44, cui lapis externus curae est, urbisque tumultu/ portatur validis mille columna iugis; Lygd. 3.3.13/14, quidve domus prodest Phrygiis innixa columnis, / Taenare sive tuis, sive Caryste tuis? Cf. also Musonius p. 108 Hense, τί δ’ αἱ περίστυλοι αὐλαι; The loftiness of the building is such an important point since this reflects the status of its owner; as Vitruvius 6.5.2 puts it, nobilibus vero . . . facta sunt vestibula regalia alta, atria et peristyliam amplissima, silvae ambulatioquae laxiores ad decorum maiestatis perfectae. Of course invective on traditional themes does not perforce preclude contemporary political or social relevance; as Nisbet-Hubbard remark in their introductory essay to C. 2.15, 'Denunciations of luxury building were a theme of Greek diatribe that had a conspicuous relevance for Roman moralists of the first century B.C.' As a recent instance one could cite the notorious case of M. Aemilius Scaurus (aedile 58 B.C.) who adorned his home with marble columns 38 feet high (Pliny N.H. 36.6; cf. Cic. Scaur. 45). But my point is that since Horace operates with a well established topos, his tirade is less striking within its context, and is therefore hardly likely to be his personal response to anything as specific as the Augustan building legislation. In C. 3.1 sublime . . . atrium (46) is introduced as the thematic counterpoise to humilis domos (22), the outward building styles reflecting the inner conditions of their respective owners: this, the inner dimension, is the focus of Horace's interest in the ode.

The foregoing discussion has yielded an interpretation of the character and purpose of the ode which is rather different from Woodman's. C. 3.1 is not an overtly political poem; Horace's purpose is neither to propagate the princeps’
conception of a model society nor to lend ideological support to his building legislation. One cannot detect any specific political impulses to which Horace is responding, nor does he deal with any identifiable socio-political topics in this ode. In this respect 3.1 stands apart from the other poems in the cycle. The psychological, philosophical and moralizing dimensions, it has been proposed, are all important. Why should these occupy such a prominent position in the cycle’s prefatory piece? I believe Solmsen encapsulated the essence of 3.1 when he observed, ‘... the poem that opens the cycle of political odes and sets the tone for the whole group proclaims in effect that the moral recovery of Rome is predicated on the same approach to life through which the poet has found his own individual happiness and which he has so frequently expounded in relation to his private existence’. 48 The paradox of 3.1 is that Horace assumes the solemn pose of Musarum sacerdos and addresses a broad audience (virginibus puerisque canto) without however in any way abandoning his Epicurean stance. This ambivalence is possible because at one — very general — point his own ideas converge with official ideology. Though Horace’s ideal of moderation (desiderantem, quod satis est) derives from Epicurean thinking and was never intended to foster patriotism, this same moderation also had a place in the Roman tradition; in other words, when it comes to the practical manifestation of such paupertas, its provenance is less important than the ideal itself. Augustus’ frugality was sufficiently notable to attract the attention of Suetonius;50 such frugality went hand in hand with his conservatism,51 and at the public level it would have found expression in his leges sumptuariae (Suet. Aug. 34), his cult of republican heroes (Aug. 31) and in the precepts and exempla which he singled out as particularly beneficial (Aug. 89; Res Gestae 8.5, legibus novis me auctore latis multa exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro saeculo reduxi et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi).

Were it not for the fact that 3.1 belongs to the cycle of Roman odes, attempts to discover precise references to Augustan politics and ideology might never have been undertaken; the ode might then have been considered alongside analogous moralizing pieces like 2.16 or 2.18 (although 3.1 is admittedly more severe in tone).52 Its apolitical nature may be demonstrated not least by comparing two motifs which appear in both 3.1 and elsewhere in the cycle. The frugality which is central to 3.1 is nowhere in that ode brought into any relationship with ideological issues; this only occurs in 3.2, where paupertas becomes the basis of rugged military disciplina (cf. also 3.6.33ff). The agrestes viri in 3.1 serve as a psychological foil to the fear-racked tyrant; in 3.6 they assume a sharper profile (rusticorum mascula militum/ proles, Sabellis docta ligonibus/ versare glebas... 37ff) and are identified as the heroes upon whose victories Roman power was built. The unique character of 3.1 is that although it prefaces a cycle of odes concerned with contemporary socio-political questions, it is itself an inherently apolitical poem.
NOTES

4. F. Solmsen, 'Horace's First Roman Ode', AJPh 68 (1947) 337ff (= Kleine Schriften II, Hildesheim 1966, 247ff; references to this latter edition); cf. Fraenkel 261ff.
6. The section est ut . . . is referred to en passant as a priamel by Witke 35, who is not however primarily concerned with questions of structure; lines 9–16 do not appear in the study of W.H. Race, The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius, Leiden 1982. The striking dynamics of the two stanzas, culminating in necessitas, are noted by Solmsen 262 and Syndikus II.17f (who do not, however, term the lines a priamel).
7. Cf. the definition of F. Dornseiff: 'Unter Priamel verstehe ich eine volkstämmliche, international verbreitete Form der Beispielreihe. . . . Meistens erscheint die Beispielreihe, ohne dass die Wahrheit, die sie beleuchten soll, ausgesprochen wird, als Vorauslauf (praecambulum, daraus Priamel) für eine Schlusspointe' (Die archaische Mythenerzählung, Berlin-Leipzig 1933, with my italics). Further Race: ' . . . There must be some point to the priamel. Not any just list constitutes a priamel; it must lead up to something' (15); 'in general . . . the priamel is distinguished . . . by the fact that a multiplicity of items exists as “foil” for what is truly more important or intrinsically interesting' (30). W. Kröhlung, Die Priamel (Beispielreihe) als Stilmittel in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung, Diss. Greifswald 1935, 73: 'Der Zweck und die Wirkung der Priamel ist immer eine Hervorhebung, sei es in Lob, in Tadel, oder in stärkerer Anschaulichmachung . . . Die Priamel soll erläutern, verdeutlichen, anschaulich machen, auf etwas besonders eindrucksvoll hinweisen, Spannung erregen'.
8. Plessis in his note on est ut remarks, 'formule concessive, comme εστιν οίς, οίος'. This is going too far, since est ut does not have an inherent concessive nuance (cf. M. Leumann, J.B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, Lateinische Grammatik II [Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik], München 1965, 644).
The logically concessive relationship proposed above is suggested by the structure of the priamel itself: its target point is introduced by adversative asyndeton, *sed aequa leges*. Hence it is an easy step to interpret (in retrospect) *est ut* as ‘Mag auch mancher seine Baumpflanzungen auf weiterem Raum anlegen... ’ (so e.g. in the translation of H. Menge, *Die Oden und Epoden des Horaz*, Berlin-Schönberg 1910, 226).


φρύξενες δόριν δειοί, σάκος σύκει προδελίμωρον
ἀστις ἀρ’ ῥαπίδ’ ἔραξε, κόρμος κόρμων, ἀνέρα δ’ ἀνήρ;

Tyrtaeus fg. 8.31ff Diehl,
καὶ πόδα πάρ ποδί δεις καὶ ἐπ’ ῥαπίδος ῥαπίδ’ ἐρέσως,
ἐν δὲ λόφον τε λόφοι καὶ κυνήν κυνή και στερνόν στερνών πεπλημένος ἀνάρι μαχέσατο...


*Competition: Hesiод Erga 25f,*
καὶ κεραμικὸς κεραμικὴ κοτέα καὶ τόπτουν τάκτουν,
καὶ πτοχὸς πτωχὸς φιδονέει καὶ οὖνδος οὖνδοφ.

Cf. also Landgraf 179f (enumerating instances where parataxis occurs in conjunction with *certare, concurrere, constringere et sim.*).

11. For the emphatic effect achieved by enjambement between strophes, cf. 34f in the same ode:

... hue frequens
camaemta demittit redemptor
cum famulis dominusque terrae

*fastidiosus...*

That a special significance attaches to the adjective in enjambement is clear from the earlier occurrence (23) of *fastidii*. On this type of enjambement, cf. K.E. Bohnenkamp, *Die horazische Strophe*, Hildesheim 1972, 157ff.

12. *Necessitas* was understood as *mors* already by Acron *ad loc.*: ‘necessitas: id est mors, et per hoc ostendit studia quidem diversa esse hominibus ad morum et honorum gradus, condicionem tamen mortalitatis unam esse’ (Hauthal 242). This interpretation is followed by Kiessling-Heinze, Solmsen 248, Pöschl 156 (*necessitas* = ‘[der] Tod oder genauer: [die] Macht, die über den Tod gebietet’; cf. Orelli *ad* 16), La Penna 47, Castorina 271f, Syndikus II.17, Esser 25. Contra: Silk (whose interpretation Pöschl 156 note 22 terms ‘abwegig’), Cremona, Witke.

13. Horace often employs polar expressions to make this point: e.g. C. 1.4.13–14 (where note also *pallida Mars aequa pulsat pede...*), 2.3.21–22, 2.14.11–12, 2.18.32–34 (*aequae tellus...*). For a similar pathos cf. also Prop. 3.5.15–18.

14. The wide hyperbaton *omne... nomen* lays stress on the universality of death; and further the juxtaposition of the adjectives *omne capax* produces the effect of a compound adjective ‘all embracing’ (thus Naylor 117).

15. C. 2.3.25–28:

*omnes codem cogimur, omnium versatur urna serius ocius
sors exitura et nos in aeternum
caliium impositura umbae;*

cf. Nisbet-Hubbard *ad* 27. Woodman argues that ‘... since it was principally the Athenians, not the Romans, who conducted elections by lottery, Horace’s choice of metaphor helps to distance the politicians from their inevitable fate... ’ (67). This is questionable, since sortition was used at...
Rome: see RE XIII.II.1493ff (s.v. 'Losung'), and E.S. Staveley, *Greek and Roman Voting and Elections*, London 1972, 231f. The metaphor is thus consistent with the essentially Roman character of lines 9ff.

16. In view of thematic affinities and similarity in argument between this latter passage and C. 3.1.9–16, it is worth quoting in full Epist. 1.6.17–27:


17. E.g. Desprez *ad* 9, who paraphrases, 'Nec eos esse felices putaris, qui ingentibus praedidis, magistratibus, palatiis fruuntur. Nam sint quidem alii opulentiores alii, nobiliores, potentiores, fama celebriorae: et nemini propterea homines mors parcit...'. Also Sohnlein 248, Pöschl 156, Esser 25.

18. Noted by Orelli *ad* 3.1.8, Witke 21.

19. Cf. C. 1.1.9–10 (*si proprio condidit horreo*); 2.2.9–12; 2.3.17 ('coëmère... suits an element of acquisitiveness': Nisbet-Hubbard); 3.16.25–28, 41–42 (the *laetitia* owner as antiquite to the contested Epicurean); *Epode* 4.13; 15.19f (typical forms of hyperbolic wealth). Similarly at Prop. 3.5.3–6; Tib. 1.1.2; 2.3.41/42 (with Smith's note); Lygd. 3.3.5/6.


21. Fickle honours: C.1.1.7–8, *si mobilia turba Quiritium/ certat tergeminis solvere honoribus; Epist. 1.6.53–54; 1.16.33–34; cf. Sat. 1.6.13–17. Also relevant to Horace's assessment of political honores are those passages where he contrasts the *bonus* with the successful politician, thereby challenging, from the philosopher's perspective, the superficial scale of popular values: Sat. 2.7.8ff; C. 2.2.9–12; 17–24; 3.2.19–20; 4.9.39–42.

22. Cf. C. 2.18.8 (where note the contrastive priamel).

23. E.g. *Epist.* 1.6.19 (with Kiesling-Heinze's note), 22, 37. Cf. also Sat. 1.6.1–6; although Maecenas traces his descent from kings, he does not allow this to go to his head, *ut plerisque solent* (5); this attitude is much admired by Horace.

24. Lickel 2068.


26. These echoes are collected by Syndikus II.7–9.


28. The same technique in C. 2.16.

29. Cf. *Sat.* 1.1.40; *Epist.* 1.2.56–59; Lygdamus 3.3, where an enumeration of various forms of wealth ends on the remark, *... in illis/ invidia est: falsa plurima vulgus anat* (19/20). As regards the possibility of *invidia* being the driving force behind the activities in 3.1.9ff, it is interesting to compare the remarks of commentators. Page 297 writes, 'one man may be wealthier, nobler, more famous than another but all alike are the slaves of necessity'; Müller on the other hand in his note *ad* 9–14 calls the first *memor* (*est ut... arbusa sulcis*) a 'Beispiel der avaritia', the second, third and fourth (*generosior... sit maior*) collectively a 'Beispiel der ambitio'. Similarly Naylor 116: 'even the man of character and repute still struggles and is the slave of ambition' (italics mine). Page has faithfully paraphrased, Müller and Naylor interpreted the passage — correctly, to my mind. Pöschl, too, seems to have sensed the presence of *avaritia* in his paraphrase: *... fie! Höllenspirale des anobiostischen einander Überbietens und des mehr und immer noch mehr haben Wollens...* (160f).

30. The Roman reader would not have missed this: *Siculus*, notably in the combination *mensus Sicula* (cf. *Siculus trcases*), became a proverbial expression for luxury: see A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, repr. Hildesheim 1962, 321. Also significant, with reference to the auxesis suggested above (Syndikus II.18 has remarked on the
climactic continuity) are the details *avium citharaeque cantus*, here intended as a means of lulling a man to sleep. Aviaries intended *delectationis causa*, as opposed to *fructus causa*, were obviously a luxury affordable only by the very wealthy; Varro had one at Casinum, Lucullus near Tusculum (Varro R. R. 3.4.2), and M. Laeniatus Strabo, said to have been the inventor of this type, possessed one at Brundisium (*ibid.* 3.5.8). Nightingales went for enormous sums: *servorum preia*, says Pliny N.H. 10.84. The practice of using music as a soporific betrays a character prone to extreme luxury, as may be deduced from Seneca *Prov.* 3.10. Horace’s *citharaeque cantus* (20) may have been suggested by Lucretius’ *nec citharae rebount lauesta auro atque templo* (2.28).

Hieron 6.8; 7.10; Eurip. Ion 621ff; Dio 6.35–39, 52, 54–55 (where these fears are symbolized by hanging swords, as in Cicero and Horace). It is also worth noting that the tyrant’s fears spoil his pleasures and disturb his sleep (Hieron 6.3–6; Dio 6.36–37) — the same symptoms as are hinted at in Horace.

37. Noted by Keckeis 155.

38. E.g. Publ. Syr. 338, multos timere debet quem multi timent; Cic. Off. 2.25, est enim qui se metuit volent, a quisbus metuentur, eosdem metuant ipsi necesse est. Quid enim consensus superiorum illam Dionysium quo cruciata timoris solitum . . . ; and further Tarrant ad Sen. Ag. 72f.

39. On the deceptiveness of the tyrant’s outward appearance, cf. Eurip. Ion 621ff:

τυραννὸς δὲ τῆς μάστιν ἀνυμημένης
turannos de tis masin anumimenis

tο μὲν πρόσωπον ἰδίω, τὰν δομοῖο δὲ

to mun prosopon idio, tan domoi de

1.7.16–79; 1.6.119; Epode 5.95–96; C. 2.16.15–16; Epist. 1.7.35–36, 1.10.18. This topos was probably derived by Horace from Epicurus fg. C 48 Bailey, Κρείττον δὲ οἱ ἄθρατοι ἐπὶ στράβοντος κατακυμανθήσαν ἢ παράτησαν μερικὴν ἐχόμενη κλήνην καὶ πολυτελῆ τραγείαν. Cf. also Antiphantes op. Athen. 4.44; Verg. G. 3.530; Sen. Ep. 90.41, H.O. 644ff, Thy. 458.

40. The terminology is that of Esser 9ff. A similar narrowing of focus has been noted by Williams 32.

41. Unlike Acron, who explains operiosiores simply as ‘cum magnó opere adquisita, ac si dicere laboriosiores’. Cf. also Mitscherlich’s interpretation of the word: ‘quae mihi multó magis molestiae sint, quam animum curis exerceant’.


43. Unlike Acron, who explains operiosiores simply as ‘cum magnó opere adquisita, ac si dicere laboriosiores’. Cf. also Mitscherlich’s interpretation of the word: ‘quae mihi multó magis molestiae sint, quam animum curis exerceant’.

44. On the danger of these high structures, cf. e.g. Sen. Ep. 90.8; Sen. Contr. 2.1.11; Mayor ad Juv. 3.6, 269; Daremberg-Saglio 5.546; RE 1A.991 s.v. ‘Römisches Haus’.

45. The same operation is referred to at C. 2.18.20–22 (with additional references in Nisbet-Hubbard ad loc) and 3.2.3–4. Cf. Ovid Ars 3.126, caeruleae mole fugantur aquae, with Brandt’s note; Vretska ad Sall. Cat. 13.1.

46. E.g. C. 2.15, tam (1; cf. Nisbet-Hubbard ad loc.) — tum (9); 3.6.45ff; Prop. 2.9.17ff; 3.13, quondam (25) — at nunc (47); Tib. 1.3, Saturno . . . rege (35) — nunc sub love dominio (49), with Smith’s introductory note to 35–48; Juv. 2.36ff, 6.286ff, 7.139ff, 10.78–81 etc.

47. E.g. Cato or. fg. 174, 185 Malcovati (cf. Plut. Cat. mai. 4.4); Varro Taq. Mvivippou 24 Riese; Sallust Cat. 12.3, domos atque villas . . . in urbium medium exaedificatas (and Vretska ad loc.); Cic. Pis. 48, Tusculanum moniem (moralizing hyperbole, cf. the common molé); de domo sua 124, ad caelum tamen extruas villam in Tusculano visceribus aerarii; Sen. 93; Off. 1.140; Parad. 13; Hor. C. 3.29.10, molem prope pinarium nubibus ardus; also Musonius p. 108 Hense; Pliny N.H. 36.6.

48. Solmsen 262.

49. Cf. Syndikus II.10ff, esp. 12: ‘So hat also Horaz in seinen Römerden das verbunden, was Cicero als der größte Widerspruch erschien: epikurische Gesinnung und römische Haltung’.

50. Suet. Aug. 73, instrumenti eius et superlatissim parvisionem apparat etiam nunc residuis lectis atque molestis, quantum plerique vicim privatum elegantiae sint. Ne toro quidem cubuisse modice instrato. Veste non tempere alia quam domestica usus est, ab sorore et uxore et filia neptibusque confecta. Also 76 and 77.

52. Cf. Solmsen 260: '... it must be emphasized ... that among the poems recommending Moderation 3.1 is unique owing to its severe dignity and a certain stern remoteness. This remoteness gives it something impersonal'; 262: 'there is no warmth or intimacy in this ode. Horace is this time not speaking as friend. He speaks as authority...'. 
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