

## AEMULOS REGES: ALLUSION AND THEME IN HORACE 3.16

R. JOSEPH SCHORK

*University of Minnesota*

Horace's Ode 3.16 *Inclusam Danaën* has not generated enthusiastic critical response. Indeed, the scholarly literature and the standard commentaries offer the student of this poem little more than damning silence, cryptic hints, and embarrassed *obiter dicta*.<sup>1</sup> The following paragraph from Eduard Fraenkel's *Horace* is an appropriate example of such criticism; it is quoted in full since its arguments, stated and implied, provide a convenient context for an initial discussion of the ode:

When we turn from the great and glowing poem *Tyrrhena regum progenies* to iii.16, *Inclusam Danaen*, we cannot but feel rather chilled. This ode, despite some happy poetic colouring, has more of the character of a *sermo* than of a *carmen*. The way in which a moral diatribe, not connected with any particular occasion, seems here to be delivered for its own sake, has disturbed some commentators and induced them to go outside the poem and try to find in Horace's life an event which might have given rise to this ode. Such attempts are doomed to failure; the popular short cut, marked by the sign-post pointing to "*das Erlebnis und die Dichtung*," does not get us anywhere. And yet it would be wrong to conclude that this ode is primarily a piece of fine writing. Horace's gratitude to Maecenas for what he has received from him and also his unwillingness to receive more are sincere and find strong and dignified expression. He firmly believes in the ideal of life which he professes, but we may

<sup>1</sup> A survey of the appropriate sections of Marouzeau, *L'Année Philologique*, revealed no entries which deal, even in passing, with 3.16; a search through the major studies and commentaries was equally frustrating. For example, the "exposition of the poet's process of thought" presented in lieu of a more conventional commentary in the most recent school-edition (G. Williams, *The Third Book of Horace's Odes* [Oxford 1969] 100–103) barely rises above the level of plot-summary, mistaken moralizing, and reluctant disenchantment. Yet its addressee (Maecenas) and its position in the collection (see note 54 below) mark this ode as important.

doubt whether in this ode he has succeeded in shaping his convictions and ideals into poetry, poetry not, of course, judged by the standards of modern Romanticism but by the standards of Horace's own lyrics at their best. Even the tale of Danae, one of the *speciosa miracula* of Greek myth, has here degenerated into a frigid allegory. It is no excuse for Horace that Hellenistic poets had apparently employed the tale in a similar spirit: on other occasions he shows himself perfectly capable of filling worn-out stories with intense and fresh life. *Inclusam Danaen* is a very polished poem, and its thoughts are not unworthy of Horace, but it has no wings.<sup>2</sup>

This paragraph, harsh and elliptical as it is, is an appropriate, but not a typical example of the inadequate scholarship on 3.16. His attempts to suggest a critical parameter and to judge the poem as a whole mark Fraenkel's comments as unique. Other scholars have avoided the primary prerequisites of valid literary criticism: the statement of norms, the presentation of evidence, and the evaluation of the evidence in terms of the norms.

Fraenkel's criticism of this ode can be subsumed into four correlative categories:

- (1) Horace's theme (here apparently a "moral diatribe") need not be linked to a biographical incident.
- (2) Though the poet's personal convictions are "not unworthy" and "sincere," he has seemingly failed to shape them into poetry.
- (3) The initial allusion to Danaë (and the other *exempla*??) is "frigid."
- (4) The ode, despite its "polish" and "happy poetic colouring," lacks unity.<sup>3</sup>

These points will be examined in order, with primary and cumulative emphasis falling on the last two, which are closely linked and which must be challenged if this ode is in any way to earn Horatian wings.

(1) The tendency to tie individual poems by Horace to specific events in his life is certainly to be avoided. Unless there is the strongest evidence to the contrary, it is a gross disservice to both history and

<sup>2</sup> E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 229. A second paragraph in this extensive work is devoted to the poem's central, dedicatory position in Book 3 of the Odes. My quarrel with Fraenkel's cursory treatment of this poem should not be interpreted as a general criticism of his monumental book.

<sup>3</sup> The choice of the word "unity" to represent, among other things, Fraenkel's dichotomy between *sermo* and *carmen* will be justified (or at least explained) in the course of my counter-arguments.

poetry to attempt to establish a definite and exclusive causal link between the "incident" and the "poem": to seek to recreate one in terms of the other (especially after the passage of two millennia) is to ignore the essential character and the distinct modes of each. In short, Fraenkel's strictures against trying to "find in Horace's life an event which might have given rise to this ode" demand critical approval. This warning, however, does not imply (nor does Fraenkel) that the poet remains unaffected by the overriding thrusts of his age—rather, that he responds to them as a poet, not as a diarist, a chronicler, or a propagandist. No man lives totally outside his time and place, but the poet (even a poet whose medium is highly conventional)<sup>4</sup> recreates not the incident, but his vision of the incident, and this vision, if it is to command our attention, must be both transcendent and idiosyncratic.

(2) It follows, then, that Fraenkel's use, in his criticism of this ode, of the adjectives "sincere" (Horace's attitude toward Maecenas), "firmly believe[d]" (his professed ideal of life), and "not unworthy" (his thoughts), must be scrutinized carefully—especially since the critic who makes such statements at the same time doubts whether Horace has in this instance "succeeded in shaping his convictions and ideals into poetry." Such judgments reveal possible flaws in Fraenkel's critical focus and logic. For, if he means that the views expressed in this ode do not contradict the general Horatian *Weltanschauung* abstracted from an examination of his poetic works, then Fraenkel has done nothing more than certify that collection's moral consistency, a convenient, but by no means essential poetic virtue. Again, one may, of course, deduce information about Horace's attitudes in general from a comparison and contrast of data expressed in various poems, but such deductions and generalizations are only incidental to a critical examination of each individual poem. If, on the other hand, these adjectives are to be understood as specifically appropriate only to certain aspects of this ode, to which, as a complete artistic statement, Fraenkel denies (or grants only with severe qualification) the title "poetry," then he is guilty of using terms which may be personally revealing, but are critically irrelevant. That is, Fraenkel would seem in this case

<sup>4</sup> See S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace* (New Haven 1962) 1-49 and L. P. Wilkinson, *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge 1945) 123-49.

to imply a dichotomy between a poem's matter and form, between the poet's insight and his expression—as if Horace's thoughts, ideals, and attitudes exist elsewhere than in, by, and through his poems. These poems may be good, bad, or indifferent, but in each instance the poem itself is the critic's only valid evidence for the poet's success or failure. Statements based on other criteria may say something about the critic or may be totally inconsequential—but they certainly say practically nothing about the poem. Until the critic has analyzed and evaluated the poet's epiphany in the work which he is examining, he must regard the poet's moral biography<sup>5</sup> as the unique creation of that poem. The Horace who composed 3.16 (and this is the only Horace we can know through the poem) should himself be considered a “chill[ing]” and “frigid” fledgling, if these are the terms which Fraenkel feels important enough to use to begin and to end his discussion of the ode.

A brief summary: Fraenkel rightly rejects the pseudo-critical search for *das Erlebnis* which gives rise to *die Dichtung*. Nevertheless, his implicit and explicit distinction between theme and technique, the matter and the form of 3.16, as well as his tantalizingly brief review of selected aspects of the ode, here lead Fraenkel into judgments which are disappointingly superficial. For all of this, however, his paragraph does attempt to identify some of the key critical issues—and, in the context of the astounding scholarly neglect of this ode, this is a faltering step forward.

A much more promising approach to the poem (and to poetry) is proposed in the preface to Fraenkel's book:

I assume that in approaching a real poet it should be our main concern to try to understand his poetry. This task, in the case of Horace, is far more difficult than might appear at first sight.

Throughout his poetic career Horace showed himself an exacting author. He cared little about pleasing the average reader, but preferred to write for a few highly educated men who would be prepared to give him their undivided attention and who would be awake to the careful structure of a poem and to its minute detail, subtle hints, sometimes elusive transitions.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See Fraenkel's comments (*Horace* 152–53) on the “confessional” dimension of the *Sermones*.

<sup>6</sup> *Horace* iii.

One could scarcely hope for a more cogent and concise statement of critical norms. A Horatian ode will demand the most detailed and sensitive scrutiny: structure, metaphor, tone, image, diction, allusion, transition, word-placement, rhythm, symbol, sonic effect must be analyzed and evaluated in terms of the total impact.<sup>7</sup> An ode is more than the skillful conjunction of its components: these components paradoxically are generated by the poem and in this genesis create the poem. Thus, unity, coherence, and propriety<sup>8</sup> are essential characteristics of any successful ode. Wilkinson is certainly correct when he writes:

At first sight a few of the [odes of Horace] seem to lack unity of subject and to go off at a tangent. But on closer inspection most will be found to have a single idea behind them, however inconsequent they may seem on the surface.<sup>9</sup>

The word "idea" in the previous sentence is perhaps too cerebral and restrictive,<sup>10</sup> since images, acoustical patterns, etc. (and various combinations thereof) can serve as the organizational center of a poem: they are the verbal incarnation of the poet's genetic vision. Now, the process whereby the vision is transformed into a poem is most complex, being at once intuitive and disciplined; it is the poet's most difficult and most personal act. As such this process is irretrievably lost to the reader and the critic: they must attempt to participate in the process through the product. This demands full attention, constant study, and continuous exploration of the precisely ambiguous and multivalent

<sup>7</sup> See L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge 1963); M. O. Lee, *Word, Sound, and Image in the Odes of Horace* (Ann Arbor 1969); and V. Pöschl, *Horazische Lyrik* (Heidelberg 1970) 9-16.

<sup>8</sup> These factors are especially important in the light of Horace's own statements in the *Ars Poetica* 1-45.

<sup>9</sup> *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* 134; see also Lee, *Word, Sound, Image* 5: "They [Horace's images] say what they must concisely, for the most part dispassionately, and above all obliquely, through myth and symbol, implication and association. They are charged with more than one variety of Empson's ambiguity"; and Pöschl, *Horazische Lyrik* 9: "Ein anderer Vorzug der horazischen Lyrik liegt in der Art, wie die Bilder, Metaphern und mythologischen Anspielungen, die klanglichen und syntaktischen Gebilde in kunstvolle Bezugssysteme eingeordnet werden. Hier sind immer noch neue und überraschende Entdeckungen zu machen."

<sup>10</sup> Compare the problems which have clustered around attempts to isolate and articulate Pindaric *Grundgedanken*.

poem. The task is not easy and, as the mass of evidence would suggest, has been regarded as virtually impossible for ode 3.16. Nevertheless, it is to the perplexing paradigms (the third critical category) that one must initially direct his attention—as was obviously intended by the poet who placed them at the beginning of his ode.

(3) Before the frontal attack on these *exempla*, a flurry of semi-rhetorical questions: Why a series of such allusions? Augustan and Horatian convention. Why these specific allusions? All (*Danaë-Acrisius*, *Argivus augur*, *vir Macedo*, *saevi duces*) illustrate the corrupting power of wealth, especially gold. Why in this order? Chronological progression: myth, heroic legend, Greek history, more or less contemporary Roman history.<sup>11</sup> Why not Minos, Midas, Croesus, Lepidus? Unfair. The choice, pattern, emphasis are Horace's: his poem offers the only relevant critical data.

Fraenkel's adverse reaction to 3.16 perhaps pivots around his failure to understand the meaning and function of the elaborate allusion to Danaë. If, as presented by Horace, this myth has indeed "degenerated into frigid allegory," then both its emphatic position in the ode (first) and the expanded treatment it receives (two stanzas) must be regarded as major artistic flaws. If, on the other hand, Horace has given this *speciosum miraculum* an "intense and fresh life"—or, more to the point, has regenerated a traditional mythological motif in such a way that it animates his ode—then his choice and treatment of the allusion testify to his vivid and vivifying imagination. He will have transmuted the conventional into the poetically significant. A primary problem is Fraenkel's term "allegory." By it he (and the many commentators) presumably mean that the familiar story of the descent to and impregnation of Danaë by Jupiter in the form of a shower of gold has been subjected to a "half humorous, half rationalistic interpretation"<sup>12</sup>:

<sup>11</sup> As each *exemplum* is examined in detail the validation of this order will be presented; but note the progression in tenses from pluperfect (*munierant* [3]) to present (*illaqueant* [16]). Compare a similar scheme in 1.12 (*Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio? / quem deum?* [1-3]) and the comment by N. E. Collinge, *The Structure of Horace's Odes* (London 1962) 18: "Myth, history, and contemporary life make a triptych pattern."

<sup>12</sup> T. E. Page, *Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum Libri IV [et] Epodon Liber* (London and New York 1956) 354. Compare Orelli-Baiter, *Q. Horatius Flaccus*<sup>3</sup> (Turcici 1850) 1.434: "cum levi *ἐπιρωνείῃ* totam hanc fabulam tractat iam Horatius." For a general view of irony in Horace, especially in the *Sermones*, see Z. Pavlovskis, "Aristotle, Horace, and

*fore enim tutum iter et patens / converso in pretium deo* (7-8) is Horace's allegorization of the golden shower into a bribe offered to and accepted by the *satellites* (9) stationed by Acrisius around the brazen tower in which he has immured his daughter. (The use of *pretium* rather than *aurum* for the metamorphosized god is a clear indication that Horace is doing something eccentric here.) This is a possible (and on the surface a most probable) interpretation of the "plot" of the first two stanzas of 3.16; but there are several sub-surface reasons for hesitation here. The movement of a Horatian poem is rarely able so unequivocally and succinctly to be paraphrased. The tone of the passage is obviously ironical: Jupiter and Venus are presented as chuckling with condescension<sup>13</sup> at Acrisius' elaborate and terrified precautions (6-7). Why should Jupiter, *cuncta supercilio movens*, wish to resort to such a mundane metamorphosis (*in pretium*) to possess Danaë? Perhaps it was a failure to consider these and other factors, especially the relationship of this myth to the other *exempla*, which prompted Fraenkel to criticize the passage for having "degenerated into a frigid allegory." I suggest two alternative interpretations: Horace's ironic allegory, in the context of the other paradigmatic allusions and the theme of the ode, is magnificently appropriate; in fact, Horace might not be allegorizing the received version of the tale at all, but radically demythologizing it. (The most persuasive support for either of my suggested interpretations [both of which are, to the best of my knowledge, presented here for the first time] is cumulative and can fully be evaluated only after the second and third allusions have been examined, since it is my thesis that all four *exempla* share a common basis far more fundamental and subtle than "gold's power.")

The second interpretation (Horace here demythologizes) is so different from orthodox exegesis of the received text that it and its supporting evidence are offered first; the more conservative reading follows. Both, again, anticipate the corroborating testimony of subsequent passages.

I submit that in 3.16 Horace might be viewing Jupiter not as the Iron Man," *CP* 63 (1969) 27-41. Irony, of course, can be playful, as here. It is by no means the exclusive weapon of the cynic: *quamquam ridentem dicere verum / quid vetat?* (Horace *Sat.* 1.1.24-25).

<sup>13</sup> For a striking parallel see 4.1.17-18: *et quandoque potentior / largi muneribus riserit aemuli*.

agent—and certainly not as the primary beneficiary—of the penetration of the virgin's sanctuary, but as an amused observer of the omnipotence of gold in the world of mortals. Who, then, is the agent? He who stands to profit most from the seduction of Danaë. Proetus and Acrisius were rival fraternal twins: their intra-uterine competition evolved into bitter dynastic battles.<sup>14</sup> When the apparently secure Acrisius learned from an oracle that his daughter's child was destined to kill him, he did everything possible to prevent the conception of a fatal grandson; hence, the tower, reinforced doors, and the sentinel dogs. Since Proetus, unsuccessful in battle,<sup>15</sup> could expect to win the throne of Argos by default upon Acrisius' death, he had (humanly speaking) the most impelling motives for desiring Danaë's pregnancy. That he actually seduced his niece is attested to by Apollodorus,<sup>16</sup> who records the following as an alternative version to the metamorphosis by Jupiter:

ταύτην [τὴν Δαναήν] μὲν, ὡς ἔνιοι λέγουσιν, ἔφθειρε Προῖτος, ὅθεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ στάσις ἐκινήθη.

("Some say that Proetus seduced Danaë, whence arose the quarrel between them [Acrisius and Proetus].")

This obviously Euhemeristic twist also indicates that prior to the seduction of Danaë there was no rivalry between the twin brothers. This latter detail (contradicted in Apollodorus' report of the traditional story [2.2.1] of pre- and post-natal rivalry) looks like an illogical and gratuitous afterthought; at any rate, it is immaterial to my argument. The primary point is that there is evidence of an ancient variation of the standard tale: a rival brother, to further his frustrated regal ambition, is responsible for the seduction of Danaë. He, not Jupiter, bribes her guards.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Bacchylides 10.64–66 (Snell): νεῖκος γὰρ ἀμαιμάκετον / βληχρᾶς ἀνέπαλτο κασιγνητοῖς ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς / Προίτῳ τε καὶ Ἀκρισίῳ.

<sup>15</sup> See Pausanias 2.25.7 and Apollodorus 2.2.1.

<sup>16</sup> 2.4.2 and Pindar frag. 284 (Snell) = 296 (OCT).

<sup>17</sup> There is no hint here of Ovid's cynical inversion of the myth in *Amores* 3.8, which implies that Danaë herself was most amenable to Jupiter's bribes: *sed postquam sapiens in munera venit adulter, / praebuit ipsa sinus et dare iussa dedit* (33–34). Compare Martial 14.175: *cur a te pretium Danaë, regnator Olympi, / accepit, gratis si tibi Leda dedit?* and Petronius 137.9: *quisquis habet nummos, securo naviget aura / fortunamque suo temperet arbitrio. / uxorem ducat Danaen ipsumque licebit / Acrisium iubeat credere quod Danaen.*



Here I must call attention to a difficulty which arises directly from the text and therefore carries the greatest weight: the way to Danaë is safe and open not to an implicit Proetus, but to an explicit *converso in pretium DEO*. Without minimizing the force of this primary objection, but also without immediately surrendering to it, I offer the following considerations:

(a) The text can be read, not as a dative noun-participle phrase, but as a causal ablative absolute: "the path will be safe and open, because god has been converted [by the unscrupulous Proetus and the greedy guards] into the price [of his success and their collaboration]."

(b) The summary comment immediately following the two Danaë-stanzas (*aurum per medios ire satellites / et perumpere amat saxa potentius / ictu fulmineo* [9-11]) can be interpreted as supporting the suggestion that Proetus is the implied agent of Danaë's seduction. Horace, contemplating the corrupt state of human affairs, testifies that, especially for men goaded by dynastic rivalry, gold (here mentioned for the first time in the ode) is a more powerful force than Jupiter's shimmering bolts.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps, too, the poet is reporting Proetus' smug appraisal of his own tactics or the guards' justification of their venality. Might not this sentence be Horace's gloss on the lofty amusement shown by the divinities at the perverse and blasphemous exposure of Acrisius' hybris by Proetus and his purchased minions? In any case, the poet seems to be denigrating the effect of Jupiter's once most feared weapon.<sup>19</sup> The implication? When men have made gold their god, then gold assumes and surpasses the powers of the displaced divinities.<sup>20</sup> Horace, of course, is *describing*, not *subscribing* to, such impious views.

(c) Another point: in lines 9-11 the object of gold's attack would seem to be not a brazen tower as in the mythological plot, but a royal chamber protected by the king's retainers (*satellites*) and the massive ramparts (*saxa*) of a besieged citadel. These would be precisely the targets of Proetus' treachery in a demythologized version of the story. Against such objectives, Horace reminds us, gold is more potent than

<sup>18</sup> Compare Ovid, *Amores* 3.8.29: *Iuppiter, admonitus nihil esse potentius auro*. . .

<sup>19</sup> Compare, for example, 1.2.2-5: . . . *Pater et rubente / dextra sacras iaculatus arces / terruit Urbem, / terruit gentes*.

<sup>20</sup> The first part of the sentence (*aurum per medios ire satellites / . . . amat*) perhaps implies that gold, in this case of court intrigue, has more currency than Venus' traditional wiles.

even Jupiter. The anti-allegorical hypothesis, in short, can be reinforced by this line of interpretation.

In opposition to this oblique line of argument are the following lexical and syntactical facts which support an allegorical interpretation—but one more ironically appropriate and subtle than the universal, vapid (Jupiter = golden bribe) comment. The past-contrary-to-fact construction of the opening sentence of the ode (*munierant/risissent*) can not be completely deprived of its causal force: the gods are laughing because in some way they not only observe, but also precipitate the mockery of Acrisius' precautions. The causal nexus is underscored by their indirect comment in the next clause. Further, the word *deo* certainly indicates that it is a *god* who has been transformed into a bribe; and, granted the myth, Jupiter is really the only logical candidate. Thus, whether the phrase be dative or ablative, it would seem a violation of Ockham's razor to attempt to push for a less than literal interpretation of *converso in pretium deo*. These textual facts, however, are not the only considerations.

If Jupiter is the mythological and syntactical agent of Danaë's seduction—and that seems clear—what is his motive? To impress upon Acrisius the fact that oracles are not to be confounded by royal but still mortal opposition. Jupiter teaches the king this hard lesson by impregnating the princess, a method of involvement in human affairs not uncongenial to the Thunderer, who is himself a master of fraternal dynastic intrigue. This lesson, however, is not of primary importance to the other *exempla* in the poem or to the poet's personal comment in the second part of the ode. Thus, I submit that Horace is directing his sub-surface attention to the implied beneficiary of the action: Proetus, the rival brother, the one who stands to gain most from the fulfillment of the oracle's prediction of Acrisius' doom. The point is admittedly subtle—and its presence and validation are to be realized only in the context of the rest of the ode; but fraternal, dynastic competition involving bribery with gold<sup>21</sup> is the focal point of the

<sup>21</sup> Compare the following lines from Vergil's litany of the attributes of a truly blessed man:

felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,  
illum non populi fasces, non purpura regum  
flexit et infidos agitans discordia fratres . . .

(*Georgics* 2.490 and 495–96)

poem and of Horace's use of the Danaë-myth. The tone of the passage and the more explicit statements of this theme in the rest of the ode are the best counters to Fraenkel's misapplied criticism of frigidity. "In allegory you go out the same door you went in, but in irony you go out a different door."<sup>22</sup> (The suggestion that Jupiter does indeed turn himself into a golden bribe which is then *used* by Proetus to gain access to Danaë or that Proetus seduces his niece and bribes her to *claim* that Jupiter is the violator of the tower and her virginity do not seem to me to merit serious consideration. Such interpretations are at once too arcane and too mechanical to recommend themselves to Horace or his critical readers.)

The second *exemplum* (*concidit auguris / Argivi domus ob lucrum / demerso exitio* [11-13]) involves the augur Amphiaraus and the expedition of the Seven against Thebes. His insight into the future has warned Amphiaraus that he must avoid a fatal alignment with the forces which Polynices is marshalling to regain the throne from Eteocles. The augur's wife, Eriphyle,<sup>23</sup> is bribed by Polynices to convince Amphiaraus that he must ignore the prophecies of his doom and participate in the siege of the fortified city. The medium of the bribe? A golden necklace (*χρυσούν ὄρμον*, *aureum monile*<sup>24</sup>) once given by Aphrodite to Harmonia. Amphiaraus listens to his wife, fights, and dies. The basis of the allusion is starkly evident here: fraternal, dynastic rivalry generates corruption which, when supported by gold, corrodes even the most hallowed bonds of loyalty.

The third *exemplum* introduces ancient history's archetypal briber: *diffidit urbium / portas vir Macedo et subruit aemulos / reges muneribus* (13-15). Commentaries cite the standard references from Greek and Latin literature to Philip II's para-military tactics.<sup>25</sup> Few of them,

<sup>22</sup> *New York Times Book Review*: "Questions and Answers," (June 20, 1971) 20.

<sup>23</sup> That Eriphyle is the sister of Adrastus, and that Amphiaraus is his brother-in-law as well as his rival, is incidental to the primary thrust of this allusion; but, in terms of the general theme, it is most ironically appropriate. See scholion to *Odyssey* 11.326: Ἀμφιάραος ὁ Οἰκλέους γήμας Ἐριφύλην τὴν Ταλαοῦ καὶ διενεχθεὶς ὑπὲρ τινων πρὸς Ἀδραστον, καὶ πάλιν διαλυθεὶς ὀρκούμενος ὡμολόγησαν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἂν διαφέρωνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους αὐτός τε καὶ Ἀδραστος ἐπιτρέψειν Ἐριφύλην κρίνειν καὶ πείθεσθαι αὐτῇ (Dindorf 2.508); see also Diodorus Siculus 4.65.6.

<sup>24</sup> Diodorus Siculus 4.65.5 and Hyginus 73 (Rose edition, page 56).

<sup>25</sup> e.g. Cicero *ad Att.* 1.16.12; Juvenal 12.47; Valerius Maximus 7.2.10; Seneca *Epis.* 94.62; [Plutarch] *Regum et Imperatorum Apophthegmata* 178AB; etc.

however, seem to attach any special significance to the adjective *aemulos* as applied to *reges*. Even the *ThLL* entry indicates that the word denotes little more than "hostile" here,<sup>26</sup> i.e., such kings are those who place obstacles in the path of Philip's drive toward domination of Greece. Nevertheless, the use of this adjective in the odes of Horace is more specific:<sup>27</sup> the word is applied to rivals, those who actively compete with each other for the same object. This is the force, in my judgment, of *aemulos* in 3.16—and the object of their competition is the throne of Macedon.<sup>28</sup>

When Philip returned from exile to Macedon in 359 B.C., he was faced with three primary rivals for the throne:<sup>29</sup> Argaios, who was backed by Athens; Pausanias, who was supported by Thrace; and Archelaos, Arridaios, and Menelaos, the three sons (by Gygaia) of Philip's own father, Amyntas III. Argaios was defeated in a series of battles, and Athenian interests mollified by the return of prisoners without ransom and the renunciation of claims to Amphipolis. The opposition of Pausanias, cryptically described as *τις τῆς βασιλικῆς συγγενείας κοινωνῶν*,<sup>30</sup> was effectively neutralized by bribes doled out by Philip to the Thracian king, Berisades.<sup>31</sup> Philip's three half-brothers, it would seem, represented no real threat to his efforts to consolidate Macedonian royal power: Archelaos was slain and the two surviving brothers found sanctuary at Olynthos. Now, the siege and capture of that city by Philip in 349 B.C. present additional evidence

<sup>26</sup> *ThLL* 1.978.71–78.

<sup>27</sup> Compare 4.1.18; 4.2.1; *Epode* 16.5; *Epis.* 1.19.15 and 2.3.203.

<sup>28</sup> An incidental example of Philip's ability to take advantage of external, fraternal rivalry is given in Justinus *Hist. Phil. Epit.* 8.3.14–15: *His ita gestis forte evenit, ut eum fratres duo, reges Thraciae, non contemplatione iustitiae eius, sed invicem metuentes, ne alterius viribus accederet, disceptationum suarum iudicem eligerent. Sed Philippus more ingenii sui ad iudicium veluti ad bellum inopinantibus fratribus instructo exercitu supervenit regnoque utrumque non iudicis more, sed fraude latronis ac scelere spoliavit.* See also Demosthenes *Olynthiac* 1.13.

<sup>29</sup> The primary source of these details is Diodorus Siculus 16.2–3. It is interesting to note the text of the *argumentum*, slightly revised from the Bipontine edition (1798–1807), which Fischer, the editor of the Teubner edition of Diodorus, prints: "(2) . . . *Philippus custodia elapsus regnum hostibus pressum multisque aemulis appetitum suscipere conatur.* (3) *Paenonum legatos muneribus conciliavit. Pausaniam regni aemulum a proposito depulit.*" See also Justinus *Hist. Phil. Epit.* 4.15 for the names of Philip's half-brothers.

<sup>30</sup> Diodorus Siculus 16.2.6; see also the scholion to Aeschines *On the Embassy* 2.26: *συγγενῆς ὢν τῶν περὶ Φίλιππον καὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους.*

<sup>31</sup> Diodorus Siculus 15.3.4: *δωρεαῖς πείσας.*

for my thesis that each *exemplum* in 3.16 is based upon a common theme.

After two defeats in the field, the Olynthian forces retreated into the city; the Macedonian army suffered heavy casualties in trying to smash the defenses. Finally, Philip bribed two enemy cavalry commanders, Euthykrates and Lasthenes, to betray their city, and Olynthos fell.<sup>32</sup> The summary comment by Diodorus Siculus<sup>33</sup> on this treachery deserves quotation:

καὶ αὐτὸς [ὁ Φίλιππος] δὲ ἀπεφαίνετο διὰ χρυσίου πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ διὰ τῶν ὀπλῶν ἡνέγκειν τὴν ἰδίαν βασιλείαν.

("Philip appeared to have increased his own royal domain much more by golden coins than by the weapons of war.")

Insofar, then, as this incident from Greek history serves Horace's purposes in 3.16, not only the method of the capture of Olynthos, but also the motive is significant. During the Augustan Age Pompeius Trogus produced a universal history in forty-four books, entitled *Historiae Philippicae*. This work survives only in an epitome prepared in the Third Century A.D. by M. Junius Justinus in which (and only here) the following comment on Philip's Olynthian campaign is recorded:

Post haec Olynthios adgreditur [Philippus]; receperant enim per misericordiam post caedem unius duos fratres eius, quos Philippus ex noverca genitos veluti participes regni interficere gestiebat. Ob hanc igitur causam urbem antiquam et nobilem excindit et fratres olim destinato supplicio tradit . . . praedaeque ingenti pariter et parricidii voto fruitur.<sup>34</sup>

Historically speaking, of course, one must not take Justinus' report (which presumably echoes Trogus' late First Century B.C. original) as factual: the elimination of two ineffectual rivals (his surviving step-brothers) could hardly have been the *cause* of Philip's unrelenting siege of Olynthos. It was at best a minor motive, but (and this is the point) it is just such a motive, strategy, and outcome which make Horace's clause *subruit aemulos / reges* more than just a conventional doublet for *diffidit urbium / portas vir Macedo*.

<sup>32</sup> Diodorus Siculus 16.53; Demosthenes *On the False Embassy* 265-68, *Philippic* 3.56, and *On the Chersonese* 40.

<sup>33</sup> Diodorus Siculus 16.53.3.

<sup>34</sup> Justinus *Hist. Phil. Epit.* 8.3.10-12.

The first three *exempla* of 3.16, in summary, have several sub-surface plot-elements in common: each involves fraternal (twins, brothers, half-brothers) rivalry for a throne (of Argos, Thebes, Macedon); in each a siege (of the brazen tower/Argos, Thebes, Olynthos) is broken by a golden bribe (the allegorized "shower", the necklace, the price of Euthykrates and Lasthenes). There are other points of reference: in the first two allusions a fatal oracle is given (to Arcisius, to Amphiaras), and a woman (Danaë and Eriphyle) is involved in the bribery-plot; but these elements seem to be supplemental, not essential to Horace's paradigmatic theme.

The fourth and most cryptic *exemplum* (*munera navium / saevos illaqueant duces* [15-16]), then, must be viewed in the context of the pattern of allusive relevance established by the first three. Most commentaries, beginning with the scholiasts, gloss these lines with a reference to Menas (also called Menodorus by Appian),<sup>35</sup> a freedman who twice deserted the fleet of Sextus Pompeius in favor of Octavian. This identification is, in my judgment, not only validated but also shown to be thematically significant by the following considerations:

(a) Granted the facts of the bitter civil war between Sextus Pompeius and Octavian, fought intermittently from 44 B.C. to the former's death in 36 B.C., one would not be rash to characterize the two as dynastic rivals.<sup>36</sup> Like their fathers (real and adoptive) both aspired to control the destiny of Rome.

(b) Although Sextus and Octavian are not literally brothers, their rivalry and its consequences can be viewed as metaphorically "fraternal". In Epode 7.17-20 (perhaps written during their conflict) Horace traces the cause of the current intestine horrors back to King Romulus' original sin, itself generated by dynastic rivalry:

sic est: acerba fata Romanos agunt  
                   scelusque *fraternae* necis,  
 ut immerentis fluxit in terram Remi  
                   sacer nepotibus cruor.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Appian *Civil Wars* 5.56.

<sup>36</sup> Compare Shakespeare *Antony and Cleopatra* 2.1.4-5: "Pompey: While we are suitors to their throne, decays / The thing we sue for."

<sup>37</sup> Compare Livy 1.6.4: *intervenit deinde his cogitantibus* avitum malum, regni cupido, *atque inde foedum certamen coortum a satis miti principio*. Lucan also sees this primeval

(c) Sextus Pompeius' fleet, commanded by Menas, had been effectively blockading most of Italy: in 39 B.C. this piratical control of the sea<sup>38</sup> cut off Rome's grain supply; a riot ensued; Octavian was stoned by the urban mob and had to be rescued by Antony. This crisis forced an ephemeral truce (ironically sealed by a banquet) between Sextus and Octavian—the breaking of which is signalled by Menas' desertion.<sup>39</sup>

(d) The motives for Menas's first betrayal in 38 B.C. are complex<sup>40</sup>—indeed, treachery is his *modus vivendi*<sup>41</sup>—and he is not literally bribed by Octavian;<sup>42</sup> but Menas is liberally (one is tempted to say “royally”) rewarded for his infidelity:<sup>43</sup>

καὶ προσέτι καὶ ἐν τιμῇ μεγάλῃ ἤγαγε δακτυλίοις τε χρυσοῖς ἐκόσμησε  
καὶ ἐς τὸ τῶν ἱππέων τέλος ἐσέγραψε.

(“... and even more, [Octavian] held him in great honor and adorned him with golden rings and enrolled him in the equestrian order.”)

Here again the medium of the consideration for betrayal is gold—and an even more significant reward: peremptory elevation into the equestrian order, as symbolized by the golden rings. (Diodorus calls specific attention to this Roman tradition in a brief digression which immediately follows the sentence quoted above.)

fratricide as the analogue, if not the curse-cause of the convulsions of the dying Roman Republic:

nec gentibus ullis  
credite, nec longe fatorum exempla petantur:  
*fraterno* primi maluerunt sanguine muri. (7.95–97)

Though there is no direct contextual reference to Romulus and Remus, Lucretius 3.70–76 are an appropriate parallel to Horace's theme. For a general discussion of this topic see the chapter “The Crime of Fratricide,” in H. Wagenvoort, *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (Brill, Leiden 1956) 169–83.

<sup>38</sup> For Horace's use of *saevos* compare Shakespeare *Antony and Cleopatra* 1.4.47–50: “*Messenger*: Caesar, I bring the word, / Menecrates and Menas, famous pirates, / Make the sea serve them, which they ear and wound? / With keels of every kind.”

<sup>39</sup> Appian *CW* 5.67–81.

<sup>40</sup> Appian *CW* 5.78 and Dio Cassius 48.45.5–6.

<sup>41</sup> Appian *CW* 5.73: *Μηνοδώρῳ γὰρ ἀρμόζειν ἐπιорκεῖν* . . .; and 96: *Μηνόδωρος δέ, εἴτε τις ὦν φύσει παλιμπροδότης*. . .

<sup>42</sup> Note that Menas' defection was, in some part, triggered by the treachery of rival freedmen who had been bribed by Roman nobles to destroy his reputation with Sextus Pompeius (Appian *CW* 5.78).

<sup>43</sup> Dio Cassius 48.45.7.

Thus, the evidence bearing on Fraenkel's critical category #3 ("The allusion to Danaë [and the other *exempla*??] is 'frigid'.") has been presented and examined. In my judgment an analysis of this evidence reveals that each *exemplum* is stunningly appropriate and anything but "frigid." The least common denominator of the four allusions is much more subtle than "gold's power"; they are arranged in a scheme much more complex and significant than "myth-legend-Greek history-recent Roman history." Each, in summary, presents an instance of fraternal, dynastic rivalry involving bribery with gold employed in an attempt to break a siege and to gain or maintain a throne. The climactic order of these paradigms is also the clue to the unifying principle of the entire poem and to the counter arguments which will meet Fraenkel's fourth objection, the ode's apparent lack of coherence.

After a line and a half of moralizing summary (*crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam / maiorumque fames* [17-18]), Horace begins the transition to the second part of the poem (his personal reflections on the corrupting power of wealth) and names the man to whom both the ode and these reflections are addressed: *Maecenas, equitum decus*. Surely this epithet must have been selected with some irony—which is carefully to be distinguished from sarcasm. Maecenas, though without personal dynastic ambitions, was directly involved in Octavian's climb to power.<sup>44</sup> And he was a very, very rich man who enjoyed nothing more than a display of his wealth, especially on the banquet table.<sup>45</sup> On the other hand, his innate nobility (*atavis edite regibus* 1.1.1 and *Tyrrhena regum progenies* 3.29.1), his loyalty, his generosity, all mark Maecenas as the polar opposite of the *nouveau riche*, ex-slave and traitor Menas. The epithet, then, is ambivalent: as the *decus* of the *equites*<sup>46</sup> Maecenas redeems that order from the taint of men such as

<sup>44</sup> See K. Reckford, "Horace and Maecenas," *TAPA* 90 (1959) 195-99 and his bibliographical references. Add A. Fougnes, *Mécène* (Brussels 1947) 49 ff. and R. Avallone, *Mecenate* (Naples n.d. [1962?]) 11-81.

<sup>45</sup> Horace, *Epis.* 1.7 and *Sat.* 2.7, 32-42; Seneca *Epis.* 114.9; Pliny, *NH* 8.43.170.

<sup>46</sup> Ovid's brief allusion to the Danaë theme (*Amores* 3.8) is set in the context of his verbal flaying of *recens dives . . . eques* (9-10), whose *laeva manus, cui nunc serum male convenit aurum, / scuta tulit . . .* (15-16). The primary force of the epithet *decus equitum* is, of course, aimed at emphasizing the gulf between Menas and Maecenas; but the poet may also have intended an oblique contrast between Maecenas and the betrayers of Olynthos, who covered with infamy their commissions as cavalry commanders.



Menas, whom both the poet and his patron would naturally despise (cf. *Epode* 4); yet his position of influence, his wealth and tastes leave Maecenas open to the excesses and torments of the super-rich—and Horace, (though grateful to his patron for support),<sup>47</sup> wishes no part of such existence. The choice of Maecenas as the addressee of this ode, in short, has a more than merely conventional dedicatory function—and more will be said about this. He serves, if you will, as the fifth *exemplum*, by no means parallel to the previous four, but a personal and contemporary reminder to Horace of the dangers inherent in wealth. The surface similarities and radical differences are apparent; the irony and humor controlled and typical.

Another consideration: Horace frequently uses food and wine as symbols of contrasting styles of life.<sup>48</sup> For example, in the only other ode in which Maecenas is addressed as an *equus* (1.20.5), the poet invites his patron to share with him not vintage, estate wine, but unpretentious, Sabine mountain-red.<sup>49</sup> Other obvious instances of this quality of Horace's imagination and character are the *cena*-section of *Epistle* 1.7.46–98<sup>50</sup> and the country mouse–city mouse fable in *Satire* 2.6.71–117; but more to the point is the rejection in the present ode of the culinary delights of the wealthy gourmet, Calabrian honey and Laestrygonian wine (33–35). Also note that part of the introductory metaphor in the personal section of this ode is gustatory: *maiorumque fames*. And no reader would be accused of over-interpreting the text if he sees a reference to a banquet in the ode's concluding maxim: *bene est, cui deus obtulit / parca, quod satis est, manu* (43–44)—especially if he recalls *vivitur parvo bene, cui paternum splendet in mensa tenui salinum* (2.16.13–14) or *si bene qui cenat bene vivit, lucet, eamus / quo ducit gula* (*Epistle* 1.6.56–57).

See Demosthenes *Philippic* 3.56: . . . ἢ πότεροι τοὺς ἱππέας προῦδοσαν, ὧν προδοθέντων Ὀλυμπὸς ἀπώλετο and *False Embassy* 267.

<sup>47</sup> Reckford (note 44) 199–208.

<sup>48</sup> See S. Commager, "The Function of Wine in Horace's Odes," *TAPA* 88 (1957) 68–80.

<sup>49</sup> Fraenkel *Horace* 216: "The starting point of the ode [1.20] was the immediate occasion, and so *vile potabis Sabinum* refers to one particular banquet, but at the end the idea expressed in the words *mea nec Falernae temperant vites*, etc., becomes a symbol of Horace's way of life."

<sup>50</sup> Are the names of the two characters Philippus (= Maecenas) and Mena (= Horace) merely coincidental?

Thus, the fourth *exemplum* (Menas as the *dedecus equitum*) triggers, I submit, the address to Maecenas and the metaphorical transition to Horace's personal commentary on the theme of the corrupting power of money. By no means do I posit a syllogistic or even enthymematic progression—neither poets nor poems work in that mode—but the transition is there, and a subtle unity is revealed. And at least several elements of this suggested nexus are further illuminated by the following passage from Suetonius:<sup>51</sup>

convivabatur [Octavianus-Augustus] assidue nec umquam nisi recta, non sine magno ordinum hominumque dilectu. Valerius Messala tradit, neminem umquam libertinorum adhibitum ab eo cenae excepto Mena, sed asserto in ingenuitatem post proditam Sexti Pompei classem.

Here, in the person of Menas, the themes of the *exempla* are linked to the themes of gourmandizing and extra-ordinal presumption. Indeed, it might not be too far-fetched to read Horace's phrase *maiorumque fames* in this context as a precisely ambiguous *double entendre*: "worry plus a hunger for more money and for ancestral respectability, however counterfeit, accompany a growing fortune." This suggestion gains some support from a passage in Pliny,<sup>52</sup> which specifically mentions Menas in the catalogue of scandalously wealthy freedmen who have mocked the hallowed prerogatives of Roman citizens by their unworthy assumptions to places of power and privilege. Neither Horace (who cherishes his humble origins) nor Maecenas (who takes his royal lineage for granted and whose career is devoid of *political* ostentation) suffer from this type of hunger pangs.<sup>53</sup>

Both Collinge and Fraenkel have commented on the position of 3.16 and its addressee in the context of the Third Book of the Odes.<sup>54</sup> No

<sup>51</sup> Suetonius *Augustus* 74.

<sup>52</sup> Pliny, *NH.* 35.58.199–201.

<sup>53</sup> Recognition of and satisfaction with one's station in life is the topic of *Sat.* 1.6, in which Horace addresses Maecenas as *convictor* (47) and lists the simple accoutrements of his own prandial pleasure (116–18). The fact that Horace was himself an *eques* (see L. R. Taylor, "Republican and Augustan Writers Enrolled in the Equestrian Centuries," *TAPA* 99 [1968] 477–79) adds a new dimension to the irony of this ode.

<sup>54</sup> Fraenkel *Horace* 230 and Collinge *Structure* 110–11. Collinge's remark apropos the second part of the ode ("... sections c<sub>1</sub> [21–32] and c<sub>2</sub> [33–44] are no more than a double treatment of one idea, or perhaps alternative drafts.") is misguided. See E. T. Silk, "The God and the Searchers for Happiness: Notes on Horace's Repetition and

less important is the position of the fifth stanza and that same addressee to the structure of the poem itself.

At this point in the discussion of the ode, I wish to offer a tentative suggestion about the occasional environment of the poem—and by the adjective “occasional” I most emphatically do not mean “historical” cause or “autobiographical” moment. I have already rejected (with Fraenkel and others) the tendency to attempt to establish a definite, causal link between an incident and the poem. This accepted admonition, however, does not demand that the poet or a reader must absolutely divorce himself from time and place. There is no critical dictum which prescribes that the experience of life which a poet transmits must be vicarious; rather, the rule reads that a poem *qua* poem must transcend and transmute the temporally circumscribed experience of its creator. “Like any good poem this ode goes far beyond the reproduction of a fragment of actual life.”<sup>55</sup> With this essential qualification in mind, then, I suggest that a (not necessarily *the*) contributing impulse (= “occasion”) to Horace’s composition of 3.16 might have been the poet’s vision of his rejection of an offer by Augustus to an appointment to the post of private-correspondence secretary:

Augustus Epistolarum quoque ei officium obtulit, ut hoc ad Maecenatem scripto significat: ante ipse sufficebam scribendis epistolis amicorum: nunc occupatissimus et infirmus, Horatium nostrum te cupio abducere. veniet ergo ab ista parasitica mensa ad hanc regiam.<sup>56</sup>

The tone of Augustus’ report of this offer (and of his acceptance of Horace’s refusal) is without doubt urbane and whimsical: in retrospect and to a mutual friend the Emperor sets his proposition and the poet’s rejection in the context of a standing invitation to dine.<sup>57</sup> What seems to me to be too significant to be dismissed as totally coincidental is the

Variation of a Favorite *Topos*,” YCS 19 (1966) 236: “. . . the art of Horace is the imparting of miraculous and almost unlimited variety to a relatively limited repertory of themes.”

<sup>55</sup> Fraenkel *Horace* 216.

<sup>56</sup> Suetonius *Vita Horati*.

<sup>57</sup> Suetonius *Vita Horati*: *sume tibi Horatio aliquid iuris apud me, tamquam si convictor mihi fueris*. For the various connotations of *abducere* in the previous passage, see the entry in *ThLL* 1.60–62. For a brief survey of the relationship between the poet and the *princeps* see C. Starr, “Horace and Augustus,” *AJP* 90 (1969) 58–64.

clause *veniet ergo ab ista parsitica mensa ad hanc regiam*. The Menas-affair (as illuminated by Suetonius' report of Augustus' acceptance of the refurbished traitor as a dining companion) and the poet's metaphorical rejection of such values in 3.16 may ironically (and without rancor) echo each other in Augustus' letter to Maecenas, the patron whose tastes and concerns Horace ironically (and without rancor)<sup>58</sup> rejects in the ode. Again, the point is neither fundamental to my critical re-evaluation of the ode nor do I suggest that the thematic parallels should be seen in some circular cause-effect relationship—but they do seem more than just fortuitously coincidental. Even if this hesitant suggestion is to be rejected, the coincidence of metaphor is additional evidence for an Augustan convention of viewing alternative modes of life in culinary terms.

(4) Now to a consideration of the fourth of the critical objections which I deduced from Fraenkel's comments: the ode, despite its "polish" and "happy poetic colouring" lacks unity. In Fraenkel's opinion 3.16 "has more of the character of a *sermo* than of a *carmen*." With reference to another ode he writes: "The lyrical character is produced not so much by the matter as by the treatment, especially by the selection and intensification of moments appealing to our feeling"; and "with great intensity, yet in purely rational terms they [parallel passages from the *Epistles*] expound the doctrine of mature wisdom; there is nothing in them of the almost religious fervour that breathes in the ode."<sup>59</sup> If such comments are to be regarded as inconsequential generalizations, they are inoffensive or at least limited. If, however, they are the rationale for Fraenkel's denial of the title of *carmen* to 3.16 and to other odes, then his view of the Horatian lyric is both astigmatic and stenoptic. "Feeling", "intensity", "religious fervour" are criteria which seem to me too subjective to be proposed as meaningful critical terms. Yet, granted their accepted meanings and the propriety of their application to some Horatian lyrics, there is no reason to demand that all the odes be keyed to the same lyric

<sup>58</sup> Note that none of the characters in the *exempla* is explicitly condemned by Horace. The poet focuses on the motives, circumstances, and consequences of the bribes, and then expresses his determination to be free of such temptations. Horace would no more seriously describe his ties to Maecenas as "parasitical" than Augustus would style his own station as "regal" (see Fraenkel *Horace* 18).

<sup>59</sup> Fraenkel *Horace* 228.

(=intensely emotional??) pitch. It would be difficult to imagine, for example, how "irony" or "detached urbanity" (valid terms of Horatian criticism) can be reconciled, in one and the same poem, with "religious fervour." Horace was not literally ordained a *musarum sacerdos* forever, according to the order of some lyric Melchisedek. Insight, sensitivity to nuance, coherence, emphasis, be they thematic, imagistic, tonal or various permutations thereof, are certainly more appropriate and demonstrable criteria for the criticism of any poem. Romantic notions of *das Carmen* seem to have led Fraenkel astray here.

To the charge that the poem is a "moral diatribe," Fraenkel supplies his own rebuttal: "Within a dedicatory poem a profession of Horace's own ideal in life, such as we find in *Odes* iii.16, is especially appropriate."<sup>60</sup> Preaching, in short, is definitely out of place in an ode; but the presentation of his ideal in life, fully integrated into the poem, participating in and contributing to that presentation is a self-evident characteristic of a Horatian lyric. Thus, it is not the presence of such elements, but their function in the ode which matters. To be sure, the personal section of this ode lacks the tight consistency of the allusive section (and thus it is somewhat like a *sermo*); nevertheless, it is far more structured and coherent than an impressionistic pastiche of homiletic clichés. Several ways in which the first part (1-16) of this ode is integrally related to what follows have already been discussed. More needs to be said.

First, a comment on the basic structure of the last six stanzas (21-44). They are bracketed by two maxims: the positive *quanto quisque sibi plura negaverit, / ab dis plura feret* (21-22) is echoed by the negative *multa petentibus / desunt multa* (42-43). Within these extremes there is balanced (but by no means symmetrical) presentation of evidence to corroborate the validity of these antithetical propositions. The first (22-28) and the last (39-42) statements have the following elements in common: they are delivered in the first person; each contains a clause of comparison (*splendor . . . quam si . . . diceret: melius . . . quam si . . . continuem*); one begins, the other ends, in an oxymoron (*magnas inter opes inops: contracto melius parva cupidine vectigalia porrigam*); the geographical setting of the first is autobiographically sparse (*quidquid arat*

<sup>60</sup> Fraenkel *Horace* 230.

*impiger Apulus*), of the second exotically expansive (*Mygdoniis regnum Alyattei campis*).

After the poet has fled the ranks of the rich (an action which serves as another thematic link to the "plots" of the first section), there is a patterned shift of focal point involving the primary "characters" who appear in the final four stanzas:

- a nabob in Africa (29–32)
- abstemious Horace (33–37)
- generous Maecenas (38)
- prudent Horace (39–40)
- a nabob in Asia Minor (41–42)

Since the appearance of Maecenas in line 20 has been shown to be central to the entire ode, the apparent lack of emphasis he receives in that same position in the pattern outlined above may be a structural device used by Horace to suggest his own detachment from Maecenas' vast resources. Previous benefactions leave no doubt of the patron's good will; personal insight and history, however, urge the poet to declare his financial independence. There is also the possibility that the somewhat off-handed isolation of Maecenas in this pattern might be only apparent. That is, perhaps Horace is whimsically identifying Maecenas with the two trans-Mediterranean magnates. I know of no record of Maecenas' portfolio, but it would not be too far-fetched to visualize the wealthy *eques* as having investment interests in African *latifundia* and in Lydian-Phrygian gold deposits. Again, such an identification would be genially ironic: on the one hand, Maecenas avoided anything like pro-consular appointment (*fulgentem imperio*); at the same time, his antique lineage and exotic tastes might conjure up in Horace's eyes, twinkling in Tiburtine sun, the image of an Eastern potentate.<sup>61</sup> The evocation of the delights of the poet's Sabine farm (a gift from Maecenas) is placed, not accidentally, between the references to an Italian dirt-farmer from the poet's home region and a Roman official reaping his rewards in provincial Africa. Both men *use* the land for financial profit, while Horace *enjoys* the stream, woods, and fields. "Landscape is for him not some external object for

<sup>61</sup> Note that the Lydians (*Mygdoniis*) were regarded by the Romans as possible ancestors of the Etruscans: *non quia, Maecenas, Lydorum quicquid Etruscos / incoluit finis nemo generosior est te . . .* (*Sat* 1.6.1–2) and *urbis Agyllinae sedes, ubi Lydia quondam / gens, bello praeclara, iugis insedit Etruscis* (*Aeneid* 8.479–80).

inspiration or inspection; it is nature's mirror of his own life. Horace's landscapes are inscapes . . . . Water [*purae rivus aquae*] and trees [*silvae iugerum paucorum*], especially, hold the mirror up to man."<sup>62</sup>

Of the six regional products of nature which Horace specifically rejects as hybriatic, three must be taken for once and for all from the soil (grain from Apulia and Africa, gold from the fabulous realms of Asia Minor) and three collected recurrently from non-vegetable sources (Calabrian bees, Gallic sheep, and Laestrygonian wine personified in Bacchus). The three gifts of nature which Horace gratefully accepts as consistent with his desire to avoid the conspicuous dangers of wealth are each of a different type: a stream (beyond human control), a modest spread of trees (requiring at least occasional regulation), and a reliable harvest (demanding periodic cultivation). And this *certa fides* (3) of Horace's modest harvest stands in direct contrast to the perfidy of the characters in the *exempla*, but also to the caprice of imperial appointment lists.

The military-metaphor, central to each of the *exempla*, is repeated in Horace's first personal statement, *nil cupientum / nudus*<sup>63</sup> *castra peto et transfuga divitum / partes linquere gestio* (22–24)—with this difference: Horace is not bribed; rather he deserts the bastions of the rich precisely because he is determined to avoid the corrupting power of gold. The camp to which Horace flees is not that of grinding poverty; for even there Maecenas will, if asked, come to the aid of his appreciative but cautious poet-client. These lines also introduce the first of the terms of political (if not dynastic) control which punctuate the final six stanzas: *partes* (24), *dominus* (25), *imperio* (31), *sorte* (32), *vectigalia* (40), *regnum* (41).

Gold, the concealed<sup>64</sup> medium of bribery in the first part of the ode,

<sup>62</sup> Lee *Word, Sound, Image* 61.

<sup>63</sup> Compare Seneca *de Tranquillitate* 8. The entire passage is summarized in the terminal apothegm: *optimus pecuniae modus est, qui nec in paupertatem cadit, nec procul a paupertate discedit* (8.9). In the course of his discussion of this theme (which reads like a prose paraphrase of the second half of 3.16 or, better, of 2.10 *Rectius vives*) Seneca writes: *nudos videbis deos, omnia dantis, nihil habentis. hunc tu pauperum putas an dis immortalibus similem, qui se fortuitis omnibus exiit?* (8.5).

<sup>64</sup> The word *aurum* (9) is found only in the poet's generalizing comment, but is not mentioned in the plot of any of the *exempla*. Instead, there is the staccato use of synonyms for the "pay-off": *pretium, lucrum, munera, muneribus*. Yet even in these paradigms Venus the Golden laughs and Jupiter flashes lightning.

glitters imagistically throughout the second half: *splendidior* (25) and *fulgentem* (31); the ripe grain of Apulia, Africa, and Horace's few Sabine acres is golden, as is Calabrian honey; Formian wine, if not amber, at least gleams. Finally, the kingdom of Alyatteus (41), the father of Croesus and no stranger to the glitter of gold, is hypothetically merged with the lands once ruled by Midas.<sup>65</sup> It is surely no merely incidental fact of Lydian history that Croesus himself was the victim of an unsuccessful coup—mounted by his rival half-brother, Pantaleon.<sup>66</sup>

Now a few additional comments on the introductory section of 3.16. I have placed considerable emphasis on the integrity and propriety of the four *exempla* and have suggested their contributions to and links<sup>67</sup> with the entire ode. Their primarily allusive function is not, however, their exclusive claim to the title poetry. There are, for example, in them striking instances of both *series* and *callida iunctura*.<sup>68</sup> In line 1 Danaë is quite literally enclosed in the brazen tower; in the first stanza the tower, doors, and dogs separate her from nocturnal lovers; in lines 5–7 the gods arrange to remove the primary obstacle *between* them and the virgin—with a mocking laugh. The participles *inclusam* (1) and *abditae* (5) take on new life in the mythological plot: they refer not merely to Danaë's protective custody, but also to her reluctant virginity. (Just as the poet's use of *cupidine* (39) is not without its erotic connotations.) *Illaqueant* (16) is hardly a verb normally applied to *saevos duces*. Gold's brute power is imagistically emphasized by *perrumpere* (10), *concidit* (11), *demersa* (13), *diffidit* (13), and *subruit* (14). *Aurum* and *lucrum* frame the action of the third stanza; the contrast between Menas and Maecenas is underscored by the position of *duces* and *decus* as the terminal words in consecutive stanzas.

The sensitive and imaginative reader can continue to examine the ode, to identify other ways in which Horace applied his talents to its composition. This article has presented some evidence, with special

<sup>65</sup> Compare 2.12.22: *pinguis Phrygiae Mygdonias opes*.

<sup>66</sup> Herodotus 1.92.

<sup>67</sup> There is, perhaps, even a faint echo of the temporal and generic sources of these allusions in the second section of the poem: myth: Bacchus (34); legend: Midas (41); non-Roman history: Alyatteus (41); more-or-less contemporary Roman events: the Apulian peasant (26), the imperial official (31)—and Horace and Maecenas (38).

<sup>68</sup> See Collinge *Structure* 19–29 for a brilliant discussion of these Horatian critical terms.



emphasis on the *exempla*, leading to a critical re-evaluation of 3.16 as a unified and complex poem. The initial allusions established a typological context to which the address to Mecaenas and the poet's reflections correspond tonally, imagistically, and metaphorically. The detailed and involved arguments hopefully compensate for the almost total neglect of *Inclusam Danaën* by classical scholars. Horace's genius, as his admirers have always intuitively known, "will flame out, like shining from shook foil."