The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On Horace, *Odes*, III. 30, 10–14

Charles Knapp

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 03 / April 1903, pp 156 - 158
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207737, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207737

How to cite this article:

Charles Knapp (1903). On Horace, *Odes*, III. 30, 10–14. The Classical Review, 17, pp 156-158 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207737

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

It is true indeed, that though he never really personifies *fortuna*, he puts more emphasis upon her share in his operations than a modern general would do; but that is a tendency which is common to the writers of his age. The experiences of the last century of the Republic might well create a belief in the blind or wilful domination of chance in human affairs; society and politics seemed to be governed by no benevolent destiny, or rational law of development. But other writers emphasise this much more strongly than Caesar himself; and I will conclude this paper by quoting a few sentences from Caesar's contemporaries and friends which will shew this at a glance.

Sallust, Cat. 8 :

'Sed profecto Fortuna in omni re dominatur; ea res cunctas, *ex libidine magis quam ex vero*, celebrat obscuratque.'

ib. 10 :

'Sed ubi labore atque justitia res publica crevit, reges magni bello domiti, nationes ferae et populi ingentes vi subacti, Carthago, aemula imperii Romani, ab stirpe interiit, cuncta maria terraeque patebant, *saevire Fortuna, ac miscere omnia, coepit*.'

De Bello Alexandrino (possibly by Asinius Pollio) ch. 25 :

'At fortuna, quae plerumque eos, quos plurimis beneficiis ornavit, ad duriorem casum reservat, superiorum temporum dissimilis Euphranorem prosequabatur.'

Cic. De Div. II. vii § 18 :

'Nihil enim est tam contrarium

rationi et constantiae, quam fortuna; ut mihi ne in deum quidem cadere videatur, ut sciat, quid casu et fortuito futurum sit.'

Cornelius Nepos, Dion 6 :

'Has tam prosperas tamque inopinatas res consecuta est subita commutatio, quod fortuna *sua mobilitate*, quem paulo ante extulerat, demergere est adorta. Primum in filio, de quo commemoravi supra, suam vim exercuit.'

ib. Atticus, 19 :

'Tanta enim prosperitas Caesarem est consecuta, ut nihil ei non tribuerit fortuna, quod cuiquam ante detulerat, et conciliarit, quod nemo adhuc civis Romanus quivit consequi.'

Cic. Pro. Marcello iii. 7. (addressing Caesar) :

'Quin etiam illa ipsa rerum humanarum domina, Fortuna, in istius se societatem gloriae non offert, tibi cedit, tuam esse totam et propriam fatetur.'

These two last passages, taken together with the fragment of a letter to Nepos quoted above, seem to me to suggest that the idea of Caesar's extraordinary good fortune, of which we can find but little trace in his own writings, was really a very natural conviction of his contemporaries, and nothing more. The others show a tendency to personify Fortuna (though hardly as a deity), and an ascription to her of wantonness and caprice, which are not to be found in Caesar's own writings.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

ON HORACE, ODES, III. 30, 10-14.

Dicar, qua violens obstrepit Auidus
et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium
regnavit populorum, ex humili potens,
princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos
deduxisse modos.

At the meeting of the American Philological Association in July, 1894, I read a paper on the interpretation of these verses,¹

¹ See the Proceedings of the Association for that year, pp. 27-30.

in which I sought to show that the *qua*-clauses are to be taken closely with *dicar*. Up to that time editors had inclined to join these clauses either with *ex humili potens* or with *princeps...modos*. The former view had been adopted by Kiessling, the latter by Wickham and Page. Bentley, Orelli-Hirschfelder, Lucian Mueller, Dillenburger, Nauck, and Doering held views varying in details, but all were agreed that the *qua*-clauses are not to be joined to *dicar*.

The point of view of these various editors is very well given by Mr. Page's remark that "Horace does not wish to limit his fame to his native district, but that his native district should share in his own world-wide glory," and by Dillenburger's caution, "Noli tamen haec cum *dicar* artius coniungere, nam nomen Horatii et gloria tam angustis finibus non est circumscribenda." Maclean, in his introductory note to the Ode, at first urges that the *qua*-clauses should be joined to *dicar*, but presently, losing the courage of his convictions, suggests that after all the clauses should be joined to *ex humili potens*.¹

Against these traditional interpretations I argued along three lines.

1. Editors generally have handled this passage in unscientific fashion; they have brought to bear upon it their *animus*, not their *mens atque ingenium*. On purely aesthetic grounds they have assumed that Horace ought, under the circumstances, to have talked in terms of universals, and they assume also that therefore he certainly did talk in terms of universals. Having reached this conviction, they proceed to torture the words into yielding, to their own satisfaction at least, the meaning they desiderate. That this is an unscientific procedure no one can deny.

2. The interpretations gained by joining the *qua*-clauses either to *ex humili potens* or to *princeps* . . . *modos* do violence to the known facts of Horace's life, for in Apulia neque Horatius ex humili factus est potens neque Aeolium carmen ad Italos deduxit modos. Horace's literary career and consequent rise from low estate to high degree were connected, from beginning to end, with Rome and the Sabine farm.²

3. To join the *qua*-clauses to anything except to *dicar* is to do violence to all considerations of syntax, word-order, and rhythm.

When this point had been reached, it

¹ It was a pleasure to find that Prof. Smith, of Harvard University, in his edition of the *Odes and Epodes*, published in the fall of 1894, took the *qua*-clauses with *dicar*. Prof. Shorey (1899) takes the clauses with *princeps* . . . *deduxisse*, but he continues thus: 'but it is virtually the same thing to be remembered as a poet in his humble birthplace and to be remembered as one who in or from that humble place attained the poet's fame.' Prof. Moore (1902) makes the following comment, all too brief: '*qua*, &c.: i.e. "I shall be honoured in the district where I was born."' Lucian Mueller, in his monumental commentary (1900), still holds that the passage is corrupt or that there is a lacuna.

² On points 2 and 3 see further the paper referred to above. Cf. too, to some extent, Lucian Mueller *ad loc.*

remained to illustrate, if possible, by a fitting parallel the thought obtained by my interpretation. This was found in Martial, i. 61, *passim*, but especially in vss. 7, 8, 11, 12:

duosque Senecas unicumque Lucanum
facunda loquitur Corduba.
Te, Liciniane, gloriabitur nostra
nec me tacebit Bilbilis.

In the last two vss. Martial expresses not only of himself, but of another, his friend, the very thought which modern feeling has been so loth to attribute to Horace. Martial knew Horace's Ode well (cf. *Epigramm.* viii. 3, 5-8, x. 2, 9-12); he knew, also, Ovid's paraphrase of it in *Met.* xv. 871 ff., and doubtless also Propertius's imitations.

Recently, in reading Mr. Strachan-Davidson's book on Cicero, in the 'Heroes of the Nations' series, I came upon a passage which seems to me to throw light on our Horatian crux. It is on pp. 6-8, and runs, in part, as follows:

'The statesman who came from a country-town in Italy was perhaps more than compensated for the lack of ancestral connection with the city of Rome, by the keen interest which his fellow-townsmen and neighbours took in his political career, by their pride and delight in his exploits, and by their anxiety for the reputation which reflected credit upon their native place. In this respect the country-towns were in strong contrast with the civic and suburban districts, such as that of Tusculum, which were surfeited with famous and noble families and were careless about their local worthies.'

Mr. Strachan-Davidson then translates *Pro Plancio*, §§ 20, 22, as affording the justification of the remarks just quoted. It will be better here to transcribe the pertinent portions of §§ 19-22.

'Tu es e municipio antiquissimo Tusculano, ex quo sunt plurimae familiae consulares, in quibus est etiam Iuventia; tot³ ex reliquis municipiis omnibus non sunt. hic est e praefectura Atinati, non tam prisca, non tam honorata, non tam suburbana. quantum interesse vis ad rationem petendi? primum utrum magis favere putas Atinates an Tusculanos suis? alteri—scire enim hoc propter vicinitatem possum—cum huius ornatissimi atque optimi viri, Cn. Saturnini, patrem aedilem, cum praetorem viderunt, quod primus ille non modo in eam familiam, sed etiam in praefecturam illam sellam curulem adtulisset, mirandum in modum laetati sunt: alteros—credo, quia refertum est municipum consularibus, nam malevolos non esse certo scio—numquam intellexi vehementius suorum municipium honore laetari. habemus hoc nos, habent municipia nostra. quid ego de me, de fratre meo loquar? quorum honoribus agri ipsi prope dicam montesque faverunt. num quando vides Tusculanum aliquem de M. Catone illo . . . gloriari? at in quicumque Arpinatem inci-

³ Mueller needlessly inserts *quot*, and, of course, punctuates differently.

deris, etiam si nolis, erit tamen tibi fortasse etiam de nobis aliquid, sed certe de C. Mario audiendum... omnia, quae dico de Plancio, dico expertus in nobis, sumus enim finitimi Atinatibus. laudanda est vel etiam amanda vicinitas, retinens veterem illum officii morem, non infusata malevolentia, non adsueta mendacis, non fucosa, non fallax, non erudita artificio simulationis vel suburbano vel etiam urbano. nemo Arpinas non Plancio studuit, nemo Soranus, nemo Casinas, nemo Aquinas. tractus ille celeberrimus, Venafranus, Allifanus, tota denique nostra illa aspera et montuosa et fidelis et simplex et faultrix suorum regio se huius honore ornari, se augeri dignitate arbitrabatur.'

No special comment is needed. The passage, put beside Martial, i. 61, will show that the thought obtained by joining the

qua-clauses closely to *dicar* is one which a Roman could thoroughly appreciate, even though a modern reader persists in feeling that under the circumstances Horace ought to have talked in terms of universals, not of particulars. It was evidently accounted no small thing in those times to be remembered in one's native place. Cicero did not feel it beneath his own dignity to dwell upon fame of that sort, in connection even with himself, as late as the year 54 B.C.; why then make so much trouble over the expression of the same thought by Horace?

CHARLES KNAPP.

ON THE ALLUSIONS IN HORACE, *ODES* I, 14.

ONLY two facts can be asserted concerning this ode. It is modelled on an ode of Alcaeus, and Quintilian believed it to be an allegory. There is hardly any internal evidence. The ship is 'Pontica pinus,' and Horace prays it to avoid the seas between the Cyclades. The former reference has been developed largely, the latter more or less neglected. Both are possibly due to Alcaeus' ode. Horace's peculiar manner of using his models can be seen in the Satire (i. 5) describing the journey to Brundisium. There he copies Lucilius so closely that we might almost call his work a parody. So here, if Alcaeus had mentioned where his ship was built, and whither it was going, Horace would probably imitate him. As to its being an allegory, we can be perfectly certain that, if the ship is the State, yet the ode had also a particular application to some time or event. I suggest that the time is B.C. 31, about the middle of December. Suetonius Aug. 17 has the following passage, 'Ab Actio cum Samum in hiberna se recepisset (Octavianus), turbatus nuntiis de seditione praemia et missionem poscentium, quos ex omni numero confecta victoria Brundisium praemiserat, repetita Italia, tempestate in traiectu his conflictatus (primo inter promuntaria Peloponnesi atque Aetoliae, rursus circa montes Ceraunios, utrobique parte liburnicarum demersa, simul eius, in qua vehebatur, fuis armamentis et gubernaculo diffracto) nec amplius quam septem et viginti dies, donec desideria militum ordinarentur, Brundisii commoratus, Asiae Syriaeque circuitu Aegyptum petit,' and the deaths of Antony

and Cleopatra follow. Plutarch in his life of Antony corroborates.

Horace and Maecenas may have gone to Brundisium to meet him during the twenty-seven days. Whether that were so or not, I think Horace addressed this ode to Octavian's battered ship, without thinking very much about the patent allegory.

The ship, as a matter of fact, was likely enough to be made of Pontic pine, and Horace adjures it to be careful on its way to Asia (Suet. *loc. cit.*) of the dangerous seas around the Cyclades. This theory explains the last stanza, both as regards fact and allegory. At Actium the state had been 'sollicitum taedium,' still is 'desiderium curaue non levis,' and will be in danger if Caesar is wrecked in the Aegean. Octavian had done a plucky thing, in making a winter voyage, been in much danger, and Horace pays him a most graceful compliment. But the compliment did not end here. In several places Horace, to please his patron, recalls this voyage.

Everybody has noticed how often Horace dwells on the danger of the Adriatic at the time of Orion's setting, that is from the 13th November to December, the time during which Octavian sailed to Italy. *Odes* i. 3, gains by considering lines 17—20 a reference to Augustus' adventures and praise of his daring

Quem Mortis timuit gradum,
Qui siccis oculis monstra natantia
Qui vidit mare turgidum et
Infames scopulos Acrocerania?

Line 14 indicates the time of the year; the