ABSTRACT

Banking on Friendship:
Mercantile Language and Epicureanism in Horace's *Odes* Concerning Vergil

Stephen P. Margheim

Director: Julia D. Hejduk, Ph.D.

During their own lifetime, Horace and Vergil were Rome's two most celebrated living poets, and history relates that they were also friends. Unfortunately, little is known of their friendship, and few avenues exist by which to illumine its nature. In Horace's four books of *Carmina*, three such avenues exist: *Odes* 1.3, 1.24, and 4.12, and mercantile language is the leitmotif that unites them. Insofar as commercial language pervades these three odes, Horace creates a poetic triptych, a cohesive representation of a relationship cast against the history of Epicureanism. Through a careful reading of these three poems, I elucidate how the mercantile imagery reveals a friendship underpinned by Epicurean philosophy and practice. Horace holds that if we bank on friendship, it will always pay dividends.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

                  _____

                  Dr. Julia Hejduk, Department of Classics

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

     _____

Dr. Andrew Wisely, Director

DATE: _____

BANKING ON FRIENDSHIP:

MERCANTILE LANGUAGE AND EPICUREANISM IN HORACE'S *ODES*
CONCERNING VERGIL

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Stephen P. Margheim

Waco, Texas

May 2012

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to the Department of Classics and the University Scholars program at Baylor University. My four years of undergraduate experience have been molded profoundly by these programs. The staffs for both have been an ever-ready resource for my many questions. Mrs. Thelma Mathews in particular has solved more problems for me than I thought possible while simultaneously brightening my day with her very presence.

From the Classics Department, I must first thank Dr. Alden Smith, my friend and mentor. My first class on my first Monday in college was Dr. Smith's Elementary Greek. That class would change the course of my studies as well as the course of my life. As the Director of the University Scholars program as well, Dr. Smith has been intimately responsible for my successes. His guidance set me on the path upon which I find myself today, and he has been a paradigm for the teacher/scholar I wish to become.

I also thank Dr. Julia Hejduk, the director of this thesis. I can honestly say that I had not truly learned Latin until I took her upper-level course on Horace, which ignited my love for this author and Roman poetry in general. Guiding me through the tumultuous waters of Roman poetry, Dr. Hejduk has shown me what it means to be a careful and sensitive reader and scholar. Her effort in this thesis has been absolutely essential.

I need also to thank Dr. Jeff Fish. Another friend and mentor, Dr. Fish introduced me to the near-fantastical world of papyrology and manuscript studies. His enthusiasm and knowledge have deepened my appreciation for history's

slow and careful preservation of the texts that find their way into classics' classrooms today. Dr. Fish also helped to ignite my interest in Hellenistic philosophy and its impact on Roman poetry. Our many conversations on Epicureanism often rumbled through my mind as I wrote this thesis.

Thanks also to my outside reader Dr. David Armstrong, professor emeritus at the University of Austin and current fellow in the Program in the Ancient World at Princeton University. Our conversations on Epicureanism and Horace were wildly illuminating. There is a reason he owns the most spots in my Bibliography; he is a world expert on Epicureanism and Horace, and his thoughts and writings have helped greatly to develop this thesis.

From the Philosophy Department, I must also thank Dr. Trent Dougherty. His friendship has been a source of much blessing, and his life and work exemplify scholarly and Christian virtue.

There are a myriad of others who have greatly impacted my life and education throughout these four wonderful years. I am remiss only to mention them by name, but such are the restraints of time and space. Dr. Steven Jones, Dr. Michael Sloan, Dr. David Corey, Dr. David Jeffrey, Dr. Todd Buras, Dr. Ed Burger, and Mrs. Elizabeth Vardaman. In their own special way, each has helped me to find and remain on the proper path. I thank you all from the bottom of my heart.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to *animae dimidium meae,* my fiancée Claire Moncla. I must also thank my parents, Dirk and LaNita Margheim. Without the firm foundation they provided me, this thesis would never have come to fruition. They are the rich soil out of which any success has blossomed. I love you all.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Were Horace and Vergil friends? The question can be difficult to answer. As Rome's preeminent poets during their own lifetimes, Horace and Vergil would offer history a truly unique relationship;[1] unfortunately, little is known of it. Horace's poetry provides the sole basis for positing a friendship. Vergil never mentions Horace by name in his poetry, and no other contemporary or near-contemporary sources ascribe *amicitia* to the two poets.[2] Horace names Vergil ten times throughout his corpus,[3] five times in the *Satires* alone, where Vergil appears a friend and colleague. The image darkens, however, in the *Odes*: "If in *Satire* 1 Horace is at pains to bring himself close to Virgil, [in the *Odes*] the opposite seems to emerge, … distance and difference are in the air." Three *Carmina* concern Vergil: 1.3, 1.24, and 4.12, and mercantile language is the leitmotif that unites them. Interpreting this language as mercenary and Horace's tone as acerbic, some scholars sense a schism between Horace and Vergil by the time of the *Odes*.[4] Other scholars, they argue, read a friendship into the *Odes* because of evidence in the *Satires* written nearly two decades before. The crux of this interpretive divide lies in Horace's abundant use of commercial imagery. In order to de-

---

[1] On their friendship, see Campbell 1987: 314-318 and Duckworth 1956: 281-316.

[2] By 380, St. Jerome assumes a friendship. See below, p. 14 n. 31.

[3] Sat. 1.5.40, 48, 1.6.55, 1.10.45, 81; Odes 1.3.6, 1.24.10, 4.12.13; Ep. 2.1.247; A.P. 55

[4] Thomas 2001: 60 argues that Horace and Vergil were only acquaintances; Moritz 1969: 13 believes that the friendship was strained at the publication of the *Odes*.

termine whether or not Horace and Vergil were friends, one must first assess why mercantile language saturates the three "Vergil" odes. This thesis offers such an assessment.

I contend that the history of Epicureanism and its discontents helps to answer why the language of trade permeates Horace's lyric representation of his friendship with Vergil. On the one hand, critics of Epicurean ethics, such as Cicero, often parodied the followers of Epicurus using mercantile imagery and analogies. Co-opting the language of this criticism, Horace constructs counter-analogies to such Ciceronian caricatures.[5] On the other hand, the critical tenor of the Vergil odes allows Horace to portray Epicurean friendship in action. Where some sense "distance and difference," I perceive frank honesty, what Epicureans called *parrhesia*. For the followers of Epicurus, frankness proves to be the *sine qua non* of true friendship:

> Reform of character is requisite for progress in wisdom and requires the correction of errors and passions. The Epicurean ideal of fellowship and mutual aid demanded, accordingly, the active participation of friends in the evaluation and correction of one another.[6]

Rather than evidence for a fallen friendship, I propose that Horace's asperity reveals the vigor of their relationship, if a bit hyperbolically. In each chapter of this thesis, I attempt to demonstrate that Horace portrays his friendship with Vergil in such a way as to engage the debate over the possible virtue of Epicurean friendship. His sharp tone dramatizes a keystone of Epicurean communities,

---

[5] For Epicureanism in Horace and Vergil's poetry, see Armstrong 2003.

[6] Konstan et al. 1998: 6. Our understanding of frank criticism comes primarily from Philodemus' treatise *PHerc.* 1471 entitled *peri parrhesias*, which was recovered from Herculaneum, the site of the Epicurean school Philodemus led. For a general introduction, see Konstan et al. 1998: 1-24. For an outline of the nine features that distinguish Epicurean interpersonal therapy, see Armstrong 1993: 193-4 and Nussbaum 1986: 31-74.

while his commercial imagery echoes yet counters anti-Epicurean caricatures. Insofar as mercantile language pervades these three odes, Horace creates a poetic triptych, a cohesive representation of a relationship cast against the history of Epicureanism.

In this Introduction, I wish to provide a fuller context for our study of each poem. I consider five areas of interest that will deepen the subsequent readings of *Odes* 1.3, 1.24, and 4.12. First, I briefly introduce the three odes themselves as well as the topic of each chapter. Second, I outline Cicero's criticisms of Epicurean friendship and compare them to Epicurus' statements on the topic. Third, I summarize the Epicurean doctrine on death, which influences both *Odes* 1.24 and 4.12. Fourth, I consider Roman banking practices and language in order to contextualize Horace's pervasive use of mercantile imagery. Finally, I discuss why Epicureanism influences the odes concerning Vergil more than other philosophical traditions. Of course, this philosophy's impact on Horace's mercantile language is just one aspect of a complex topic. The meaning and purpose of the three odes to be discussed cannot be reduced to a representation of an Epicurean friendship between Horace and Vergil; nonetheless, each ode does concern their friendship and the mercantile language that unites them illuminates facets of it. These five areas of inquiries, however, will better prepare us to answer why Horace's Vergil odes are replete with mercantile language.

To begin, let us survey these three *Carmina.* In *Odes* 1.3, although not addressed, Vergil is the subject of a *propempticon,* or bon-voyage poem. Following the send-off proper, Horace launches into a harangue on humanity's hubris.[7] In Chapter Two, I argue that this ode proves programmatic both for the *Odes* as a

---

[7] For bibliography on *Odes* 1.3, see Elder 1952: 140 and Basto 1982: 30.

whole and for Horace's representation of his relationship with Vergil. On the one hand, the mercantile language and Horace's sharp tone underpin each of the three Vergil odes. On the other hand, Horace links their similar poetic endeavors to their friendship. In *Odes* 1.24, Vergil is the vocative addressee and receives frank criticism for his excessive mourning of their mutual friend Quintilius Varus.[8] In Chapter Three, I argue that the ode's commercial imagery and critical tone portray the activity of Epicurean friendship. This demonstration of their friendship then provides a counter-analogy to Cicero's negative depictions of Epicurean relationships. Finally, in *Odes* 4.12, Vergil is once again addressed and invited to join Horace at a symposium.[9] Scholars often read as mercenary the mercantile language Horace uses throughout the invitation. In Chapter Four, I argue that Horace's commercial imagery is commemorative, not venal. By recalling the language and tone of his previous Vergil odes, Horace fashions a poetic remembrance of their relationship that playful mimics Cicero's caricatures. In each ode, therefore, Horace engages the philosophy of Epicureanism and the language of its Roman critics.

What is Epicurean Friendship?

To compare Horace's picture of an Epicurean friendship with the history of Epicureanism and its critics, one must first detail the paradigmatic source for

---

[8] For readings of *Odes* 1.24, see Commager 1995: 287-90, Khan 1999, Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 279-89, Lowrie 1994: 377-394, Putnam 1993, and West 1995: 112-15. For the Epicurean, and specifically Philodeman, influence on the ode, see Thibodeau 2003: 243-56 and Armstrong 2008: 97-99.

[9] Though there is some debate whether the Vergilius of 4.12 is Virgil the poet, the *opinio communis* today asserts this identification. This dispute is fueled by the ode's publication date, six years after Vergil's death. That Vergil is the addressee, see Bowra 1928: 165-67, Belmont 1980: 1-20, and Thomas 2011: 225-27.

each: Cicero's caricatures and Epicurus' statements. To varying degrees, each ode confronts these previous pictures of what an Epicurean relationship resembles. Horace situates his three Vergil odes within the ongoing debate over what Epicurean friendship truly is and whether or not it is a virtuous relationship. To outline the primary points of contention within this debate, let us first examine Cicero's critical representations of Epicurean friends, and then Epicurus' original thoughts on the subject.

Writing a generation before Horace, Cicero frequently lampoons the Epicureans and their strange practices.[10] He faults Epicurean friendship for two related reasons: (1) it objectifies the friend and (2) it promotes selfishness. Both criticisms are presented throughout his corpus using mercantile language. As Daniel Hanchey points out, Cicero consistently associates Epicureans and practical measuring:

> In *De Orat*. 3.285, *Fin*. 2.58, and *Fin*. 5.93, the Epicureans are described as measuring on a calculus of pleasure (*voluptas*); at *Fin*. 2.85 they measure by profit and payment (*emolumentum* and *mercedes*); in *Leg*. 1.41, they measure by their own benefit (*sua commoda*); in *Nat. Deor*. 1.113 they use their stomachs (*venter*) to measure.[11]

Cicero sees insufficiencies in measurement based on any of these standards when assessing value in a social context such as friendship. First, a friendship in which

---

[10] Standard Roman *mores* led many to reject Epicureanism. For example, Plutarch and Seneca wrote extensive polemics against Epicurus and his followers, although they infrequently consider Epicurean friendship as a topic in itself. One of Epicureanism's most dogged critics, Plutarch examines Epicurean friendship only once, at *Adv. Colot.* 1111B: "he chooses friends for the pleasure he gets, but says that he assumes the greatest pains on their behalf." Seneca discusses Epicurean friendship explicitly in his Ninth Epistle, and, like nearly all ancient critics, his rejection of Epicureanism centers on its hedonist calculus: "that which you describe is business, not friendship" (*ista, quam tu describis, negotiatio est, non amicitia, Ep.* 9.10).

[11] Hanchey (forthcoming). I am grateful to Dr. Hanchey for allowing me to read his forthcoming paper on "Commercial Exchange and Epicurean Value-Judgment in Cicero's Dialogues."

one friend measures the benefit or pleasure of the other necessarily objectifies that friend, reducing him to benefits received. Second, measuring friendships leads to selfishness, as each friend will quantify the benefits likely to be received in order to weigh the health of the friendship as a whole.

Cicero favors the language of mercantile measurement to satirize Epicurean relationships. For the sake of brevity, I offer only two prime examples. First, he distinguishes true friendship, which seeks benefits *for* one another, with Epicurean friendship, which seeks benefits *from* one another:[12]

> quam si ad fructum nostrum referemus, non ad illius commoda, quem diligemus, non erit ista amicitia, sed <u>mercatura</u> quaedam utilitatum suarum.[13]
>
> *Nat. Deor*. 1.122

> If we will refer it to our own benefit, and not to the advantage of another, whom we esteem, then this will not be friendship, but some <u>mercantile calculation</u> of its own utility.

Next, Cicero compares Epicurean friendship, which is sought for the "hope of profit" (*spe mercedis*), to lending good deeds at interest (*beneficium faeneramur*):

> Ut enim benefici liberalesque sumus, non ut exigamus gratiam (neque enim beneficium faeneramur sed natura propensi ad liberalitatem sumus), sic amicitiam non spe mercedis adducti sed quod omnis eius fructus in ipso amore inest, expetendam putamus. Ab his qui pecudum ritu ad voluptatem omnia referunt longe dissentiunt.
>
> *Laelius* 31

> For just as we are not beneficent and generous in order to extract favor (for we do not lend good deeds at interest, but are naturally prone to generosity), so too we think friendship should be sought not because we are drawn by a hope for profit, but because its every benefit is contained in love itself. These ideas differ sharply from

---

[12] O'Connor 1989: 177-81 suggests that at the heart of nearly all Roman criticism of Epicurean friendship is the view that it is necessarily ignoble and lacks virility.

[13] All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted. Epicurus is named shortly following this passage at 1.123: "But still Epicurus' book concerns sanctity" (*At etiam liber est Epicuri de sanctitate*).

the ideas of those who, in the manner of cattle, base everything on pleasure.

The implication of this banking metaphor is clear: Epicureans treat friendship like an investment.[14] Whereas commercial exchange, by definition, takes into account some measurement of utility, Cicero believes that one ought to engage in friendship only for its own sake. For him, Epicurean friendship is base precisely because it is sought for the sake of an external benefit.

Various characters in Cicero's dialogues attempt to defend Epicurean friendship. In *De finibus*, for example, the Epicurean Torquatus attempts to justify his school's conception of friendship by pointing out that Epicureans make a pact to ensure equity in the relationship. Cicero will have none of it:

> Posuisti etiam dicere alios foedus quoddam inter se facere sapientis, ut, quem ad modum sint in se ipsos animati, eodem modo sint erga amicos; … an vero, si fructibus et emolumentis et utilitatibus amicitias colemus, si nulla caritas erit, quae faciat amicitiam ipsam sua sponte, vi sua, ex se et propter se expetendam, dubium est, quin fundos et insulas amicis anteponamus?
>
> *Fin*. 2.83

> You proposed that some [Epicureans] say that wise men make some pact among themselves in order to be disposed toward their friends just as they are toward themselves. … But if we cultivate friendships for benefits, gains, and utility, and if there is no charity that produces friendship of its own accord and by its own force, to be sought from and for its own sake, then is there any question that we would prefer estates and apartment buildings to friends?

Cicero questions how Torquatus' pact could produce the charity "that produces friendship itself of its own accord" and simultaneously avoid a selfish desire for "benefits, gains, and utility." Once again, Cicero utilizes commercial imagery to

---

[14] Seneca uses a banking motif throughout *Ep. 9* when speaking directly to Lucilius: "that I may pay my debt at once and square the account, so far as this letter is concerned" (*ut statim tibi solvam, quod debeo, et quantum ad hanc epistulam paria faciamus, Ep.* 9.6); "put it down to my credit, though I have already wiped out my debt for the present day" (*quam tu boni consule, etiam si hunc diem iam expunxi, Ep.* 9.20). This may be a play on the same motif seen here.

suggest that Epicurean friends will always, in the end, place one another on the same level as real estate—a means to an end.

This overtly critical representation of Epicurean relationships may be compared to Epicurus's own picture of his followers' friendships. Before we examine how Epicurus imagines a friendship between Epicureans, let us briefly consider his views on friendship's value. Although scholars squabble over how friendship conforms to his hedonism, Epicurus clearly views it as essential to happiness:

> ὧν ἡ σοφία παρασκευάζεται εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὅλου βίου μακαριότητα πολὺ μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἡ τῆς φιλίας κτῆσις.[15]
>
> *Key Doctrines* 27
>
> Of all that wisdom provides for the fullest happiness of one's entire life, by far the greatest is the acquisition of friendship.

Though not a sufficient condition, friends are necessary for complete happiness. Yet how do such Epicurean relationships function? A number of Epicurus's *Vatican Sayings* (*VS*) deal with friendship; let us consider only a few.[16] First, at the conclusion of *VS* 28 Epicurus says, "one must even risk some pleasure for the sake of friendship" (δεῖ δὲ καὶ παρακινδυνεῦσαι χάριν, χάριν φίλιας).[17] Contrary to Cicero's account, where Epicureans are "drawn by a hope for profit," Epicurus

---

[15] The concept of μακαρία is also referenced in *KD* 1 when Epicurus speaks of the gods. In *VS* 78, Epicurus says that friendship is an immortal good whereas wisdom is a mortal good. The implication, which Philodemus makes explicit at *On the Gods* 3 (Fragments 84.15-20 and 84.26-85.7), is that humans aim at the blessed state modeled by the gods. For discussion of Philodemus' thought on the subject, see Armstrong 2011: 127.

[16] *Vatican Sayings* 23, 28, 34, 39, 52, 56-7, 66, and 78 all concern friendship, as do *Key Doctrines* 27 and 28. For Epicurus' understanding of friendship, see O'Connor 1989: 165-86 and Brown 2002: 68-80.

[17] Epicurus puns on the noun χάρις (grace, fortune, pleasure) and the adverbial χάριν (for the sake of). I take the meaning as related to *KD* 8: "No pleasure is an evil in itself, but the means of achieving some pleasures bring with them disturbances many times worse than the pleasures" (οὐδεμία ἡδονὴ καθ'ἑαυτὴν κακόν, ἀλλὰ τὰ τινῶν ἡδονῶν ποιητικὰ πολλαπλασίους ἐπιφέρει τὰς οχλήσεις τῶν ἡδονῶν).

admits that friendship is often accompanied by pain, yet remains desirable; the long-term pleasure of friendship requires the possibility of some short-term pain. Next, we may recall that Cicero also faults Epicureans for their supposed selfish desire for "benefits, gains, and utility." In *VS* 34, however, Epicurus clearly states, "the use of friends is not that they are useful, but that we can trust in their usefulness" (οὐκ οὕτως χρείαν ἔχομεν τῆς χρείας <τῆς> παρὰ τῶν φίλων ὡς τῆς πίστεως τῆς περὶ τῆς χρείας). It is not a desire for utility that draws us to our friends, even if our trust in their continued utility helps perpetuate our relationship. This sentiment echoes Epicurus' perhaps most famous statement on friendship:

> πᾶσα φιλία δι' ἑαυτὴν αἱρετή · ἀρχὴν δὲ εἴληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς ὠφελείας.[18]
>
> <div align="right">Vatican Sayings 23</div>
>
> Every friendship is choiceworthy in itself, although it derives from mutual advantage.

Although an aspect of any Epicurean relationship is utilitarian, true friendship transcends such concerns. That is to say, friends are useful, but it is not on this account that one cultivates friendships.

These statements put a considerable dent in Cicero's account of Epicurean friendship. Yet perhaps the most telling of Epicurus' dicta defines what a friend is not:

> οὔθ' ὁ τὴν χρείαν ἐπιζητῶν διὰ παντὸς φίλος, οὔθ' ὁ μηδέποτε συνάπτων· ὁ μὲν γὰρ καπηλεύει τῇ χάριτι τὴν ἀμοιβήν, ὁ δὲ ἀποκόπτει τὴν περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος εὐελπιστίαν.

---

[18] I follow Usener's emendation (αἱρετή = choiceworthy) rather than Long and Sedley's received text (ἀρετή = excellence or virtue). For ἀρετή over αἱρετή, see Brown 2002: 68-80. For αἱρετή over ἀρετή, see Armstrong 2011. The Greek word ὠφελεία means literally "advantage, aid, or help," not "mutual advantage"; however, I borrow the concept of mutuality from other statements that Epicurus makes about interpersonal relationships, such as *KD* 31-33 and 37-39.

> A friend is not one who is constantly seeking some benefit, nor one who never connects friendship with utility; for the former trades kindness for compensation, while the latter cuts off all hope for the future.

In the first phrase, Epicurus offers a picture of friendship that is explicitly contrary to Cicero's account: "A friend is not one who is constantly seeking some benefit." In the second phrase, however, Epicurus appears to agree with Cicero: "[A friend is not] one who never connects friendship with utility." Epicurus advocates a strange balance. On the one hand, an Epicurean ought not to seek benefit as an end in itself; on the other hand, for an Epicurean to disregard the utility of friendship is likewise foolish. Such a position exemplifies Epicurus' practical philosophy. To clarify this apparent paradox, David Armstrong considers what the first century B.C. Epicurean philosopher Philodemus says about friendship among the gods:

> Although the gods are beyond any need for mutual support and defence, friendship stands at the heart of their life as described by Philodemus in *On the Gods* 3. Their motivation for friendship derives solely from the pleasure it can provide them.[19]

For Philodemus, human friendship shares a motivation with divine friendship—a desire for shared self-expression.[20] Unlike the gods, however, human beings also require friendship for certain utilitarian purposes. Epicurus does not and cannot ignore the vulgar facet of friendship, which "connects friendship with utility," yet he also believes that friendship in its purest form transcends "mutual

---

[19] Armstrong 2011: 126.

[20] *On Frank Criticism* fr. 28: "We can show by reason that as numerous and beautiful as are the things that come to us by friendship, none is so great as having someone to whom one shall tell what is in one's heart and whom one shall hear speaking back. For very greatly does our nature desire to reveal to others what it is thinking." Translation by Armstrong 2011: 126.

advantage" and approximates divine friendship, which derives from social intercourse. Cicero was correct in thinking that "friendship should be sought not because we are drawn by a hope for profit, but because its every benefit is contained in love itself." His mistake, purposeful or not, was to believe that Epicurus and his followers disagreed.

Epicurus on Death

While all three odes engage the debate over Epicurean friendship in some way, Horace also makes use of Epicurus' teachings on death in *Odes* 1.24 and 4.12. To understand important aspects of Horace's purpose in these poems, one must be familiar with the basics of Epicurus' doctrine on death. One finds the foundation for all Epicurean thought on death and the proper response to it in *Key Doctrines* 2: "death is nothing to us" (ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς). This simple statement produces two conclusions. First, it functions as an admonition to Epicureans not to fear death while alive.[21] On the one hand, the dictum is thus a normative reminder of Epicurean ethics. On the other hand, however, the statement that "death is nothing to us" summarizes the argument behind this ethical position. In the *Letter to Menoeceus*, Epicurus reminds his friend that death is annihilation:

> συνέθιζε δὲ ἐν τῷ νομίζειν μηδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἶναι τὸν θάνατον
> ἐπεὶ πᾶν ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν ἐν αἰσθήσει· στέρησις δέ ἐστιν
> αἰσθήσεως ὁ θάνατος.
> *LM* 124

> Accustom yourself to hold that death is nothing to us, since all good and evil consist in sensation, and death is the privation of sensation.

---

[21] For the Epicurean arguments against the fear of death, see Warren 2004.

Death is thus nothing to us because as soon as we die, no "us" remains. This argument takes aim at the fear of death. For Epicurus, the fear of death was one of the largest impediments to *ataraxia,* the state of tranquility all Epicureans seek. If death is annihilation of the self, one cannot experience his or her own death; if one cannot experience one's own death, one cannot feel any pain when dead. Thus, one ought not to fear death. This doctrine, along with the Epicurean form of friendship, influences Horace's latter two odes concerning Vergil.

Roman Banking Language

I wish now to turn from Epicurean philosophy to the mercantile language that permeates all three poems. More specifically, let us briefly consider the history of Roman banking and its associated terms, as Horace's use of the participle *creditum* is central to *Odes* 1.3 and 1.24. In his *Theory of Credit,* Henry Macleod outlines the origins of banking in Rome. Banking began as simple currency exchange in the *Forum Romanum*, operated by private citizens called *argentarii* at shops called *tabernae* or *mensae*. Over time, private citizens began to deposit their money with these money-changers for the purpose of security. The deposited money was termed a *depositum,* and an *argentarius* was not allowed to trade with this deposit. This form of banking stands in contrast to a *creditum*. When transacting a credit, "the persons who placed their money with the *argentarius* as a *creditum* lost all the property in it, and acquired only a credit, debt, or right of action in exchange for it."[22] A participial form of the verb *credo* ("entrust"), *creditum* was a more archaic word for such deposits by Horace's time, having been replaced by

---

[22] Macleod 1890: 350. For the full treatment, see pp. 349-68.

the term *mutuum*.[23] In both *Odes* 1.3 and 1.24, Horace uses the term *creditum* as part of a banking metaphor. In Chapters Two and Three, I juxtapose this form of banking with a *depositum* in order to flesh out Horace's images. That Horace was familiar with such distinctions may be assumed, given that his father was himself a *coactor,* or money-collector.[24] Eduard Fraenkel, following various scholia, reads *coactor* as a simplification of *coactor argentarius,* who was a money-collector with some of the functions of a banker.[25] Horace was raised in a banking environment almost certainly inundated with its language and practices.

The participle *creditum* also presents the reader with an instance of what Richard Thomas calls "an internal self-reference." These allusions are *intra*textual, that is, they refer to a poem within the same text. Such references are uniquely powerful because they not only "refer to each other [but also] inform and enrich each other."[26] The import of meaning is thus bi-directional. Our reading of *Odes* 1.3 relies upon Horace adding meaning to the ode retroactively from *Odes* 1.24. The markedly parrhesiatic tone of 1.24 helps to elucidate Horace's diatribe against human hubris in 1.3. Moreover, the activity that such *parrhesia* suggests illuminates Horace's program in *Odes* 1.3. By analyzing the interlacing web of

---

[23] For a Glossary of Roman banking terminology, see Andreau 1999: xii-xvi. Unfortunately, he does not discuss *creditum* or its cognate verb form *credo*.

[24] Horace relates his father's profession at Sat. 1.6.85-7: "Neither was he afraid lest someone turn it to reproach if I should only follow small profit as an auctioneer or money-collector, as he himself was, nor would I have complained (*nec timuit, sibi ne vitio quis verteret, olim/ si praeco parvas aut, ut fuit ipse, coactor/ mercedes sequerer; neque ego essem questus*).

[25] Fraenkel 1981: 4-5.

[26] Thomas 1986: 184.

internal references, we may better perceive a unified portrait of their relationship as presented in the *Odes*.

Horace, Vergil, and Epicureanism

Having laid out the various points of interest that affect most or all of our odes, I wish now to consider a possible objection to this enterprise. We must not forget that while Epicureanism influenced Horace's *Odes*, so too did other philosophical schools, such as the Stoics, Academics, and Peripatetics. Horace was an eclectic student of philosophy, and one finds remnants of different schools in his *Carmina* alone. As one example among many, the "golden mean" (*auream mediocritatem*, 5) of *Odes* 2.10 derives directly from Aristotle and the Peripatetics. However eclectic and diverse Horace's philosophical interests, he was nonetheless heavily influenced by Epicureanism. At *Ep.* 1.4.16, for example, Horace calls himself "a hog of Epicurus' herd" (*Epicuri de grege porcum*), explicitly associating himself with Epicurus' Garden and its members. We are examining only the three odes that name Vergil, who was known to have been a member of a well-attested Roman Epicurean community whose other members were Quintilius Varus, L. Varius Rufus, and Plotius Tucca. Philip Thibodeau details the sources that attest their foursome:

> The Donatan Life of Vergil, which famously makes Varius and Tucca Vergil's heirs and literary executors (*vita Verg.* 37-41); Servius' commentary on *ecl.* 6.13, which has Vergil and Quintilius studying together under the Epicurean Siro (the Proban Life of Vergil, 10-12, adds Varius and Tucca as fellow students); and Horace *Satires* 1.5.40-43, in which the group minus Quintilius appears within the entourage of Maecenas. Recently, a set of papyrus fragments from Herculaneum has yielded the names of all four, in a collection of works by Philodemus bearing the title *On Characters and Ways of Life*. In two fragments the set of names is incomplete, but one from

the treatise *On Flattery* clearly lists all four as dedicatees: 'Vergilius… Quintilius, Plotius, and Varius'.[27]

Moreover, there is some evidence to suggest that Horace was also a member of this coterie.[28] For example, in *Sat.* 1.5 and 1.10, Horace describes Plotius, Varius, and Vergil as his "candid" friends, an Epicurean buzzword.[29] Additionally, by 380 Saint Jerome attests Horace's participation in this Epicurean community.[30] Whether or not he was a full member of the group, however, it is beyond dispute that Horace was at least acquainted with its members and their mentor, Philodemus of Gadara. Although Horace only names Philodemus at *Sat.* 1.2.121, the philosopher's influence is felt throughout the *Satires* and *Odes,* including in *Odes* 1.24's parrhesiatic tenor.[31] These associations make it far more likely that Epicureanism be the primary tradition that informs the three odes that concern Virgil; it offers Horace one of the largest common grounds on which to address Vergil.

[27] Thibodeau 2003: 248. For further discussion of a Roman Epicurean quartet, see Armstrong 2003: 2-3; for Philodemus' papyri (*P.Herc.* Paris. 2, *P.Herc.* 1082, and *P.Herc.* 253) that name the foursome as addressees, see Sider 1997: 19-21; for discussion of the papyri, see Gigante and Capasso 1989: 3-6.

[28] For the position that Horace was merely an acquaintance of Philodemus, see Oberhelman and Armstrong 1995: 233-55; that he was only an acquaintance of the quartette, see Gigante 1995.

[29] For *candor* as a Latin translation of *parrhesia,* see DeWitt 1935: 313-4.

[30] In his *Chronicon,* under the heading of the Roman year 27, in the 190th Olympiad, Jerome writes: "The poets Varius and Tucca, companions of Vergil and Horace, are considered illustrious, who later corrected the book of the *Aeneid* under this condition: that they added nothing" (*Varius et Tucca, Vergilii et Horatii contubernales, poetae habentur illustres, qui Aeneidum libros postea emendaverunt sub lege ea, ut nihil adderent*). For *contubernales* as a Roman term for Epicurean friendship, see DeWitt, 1936: 55-63.

[31] For the influence of frank criticism, see De Witt 1935: 312-19 and Freudenburg 1993: 88-90. For the influence of poetic theory, see Oberhelman and Armstrong 1995: 233-54. For the position that Horace was never a student of Philodemus, see Tsakiropoulou-Summers 1998: 20-29.

So, were Horace and Vergil friends? In order to answer this question, I turn now to the three odes concerning Vergil. In the following chapters, I will examine Horace's mercantile language and the portrait of a relationship it creates. Having here briefly outlined the history of Epicureanism and its critics, I hope to show that Horace's lyric displays a lively friendship, underpinned by Epicurean philosophy and practice. In *Odes* 1.3, that friendship is grounded in a shared poetic vision. In *Odes* 1.24, the friendship grants Horace the freedom to chastise Vergil for excessive mourning. In *Odes* 4.12, their friendship becomes the object of a poetic commemoration, forever imaged in Horace's symposium. Rather than distance and friction, Horace offers readers a glimpse of Epicurean relations—brutally honest, but deeply affectionate. This triptych of odes, united by commercial imagery, shows the careful reader that Horace banked on his friendship with Vergil, and their relationship, in the words of Epicurus, will continue to "dance around the world, announcing to each of us that we must awaken to happiness."[32] It is a paradigm for us today. Contrary some facile version of friendship, Horace's portrait reminds us that true friendship is a complex and paradoxical thing.

---

[32] *VS* 52: ἡ φιλία περιχορεύει τὴν οἰκουμένην κηρύττουσα δὴ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ἐγείρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸν μακαρισμόν.

CHAPTER TWO

Odes 1.3:
Friendship's Poetics

Horace begins his *Carmina* by parading nine odes in nine different me-
tres.[33] The first three of which are addressed to some of Rome's leading men:
Maecenas, Augustus, and Vergil. Along with 1.1 and 1.2, *Odes* 1.3 proves to be a
programmatic poem; the question is, programmatic of what? While the two odes
that open Horace's first book of lyric poetry are addressed to politically active
men, 1.3 is markedly poetic. Ostensibly a *propempticon* to Vergil setting sail for
Greece, *Odes* 1.3 is often read as a metaphor for the poetic journey of composi-
tion.[34] On the one hand, therefore, the poem elucidates Horace's overall lyric pro-
ject for the reader. On the other hand, saturated with mercantile language and
concerning Vergil, the ode also becomes programmatic of Horace's lyric repre-
sentation of their friendship. The ode thus introduces Horace's lyric project and
links it to Vergil, while simultaneously introducing what will become the stand-
ard elements of Horace's triptych of Vergil odes: commercial imagery and a
sharp tone.

Conflating Augustan poetics and Epicurean tenor, Horace fashions a thor-
oughly ironic ode in which one thing is said but another is meant. Although us-
ing imagery reminiscent of anti-Epicurean caricatures, Horace offers a prayer for

---

[33] On the Parade Odes, see Santirocco 1986: 14-42 and Lyne 2007: 293-314.

[34] For the ode's possible poetic symbolism, see Commager 1995: 120, Lockyer
1967: 42-5, Cody 1976: 73-102, Cairns 1972: 231-5, Kidd 1977: 97-103, Elder 1952: 140-158,
Basto 1982: 30-44, and Pucci 1991: 659-73.

his friend's well being; although hyperbolically critical of Vergil's poetic journey to Greece, Horace actively follows the same route. With careful attention to the disjunction between Horace's language and images, we may better understand Horace's poetic program as well as his relationship with Vergil. I argue that Horace subtly links his lyric journey to Vergil's epic, both poets voyaging to Greece for poetic forms and genres. Horace signals his own poetic journey to Greece in rich allusion to Callimachus. Yet Horace presents this poetic program ironically, paying lip service to the audacity of their mutual enterprises. The journey to Greece is not limited to poetry, however. Horace utilizes the tone of Epicurean *parrhesia* and anti-Epicurean imagery to suggest that both men had also turned to a Greek philosophy. The mercantile language thus furthers Horace's irony in this programmatic ode by simultaneously recalling Greek poetics and philosophy.

While the *opinio communis* understands the ode's voyage as metaphorical, scholars are divided on Horace's message.[35] Some argue that Horace contrasts his lyric with Vergil's epic, thus distancing himself from Vergil.[36] Others see Horace yoking his lyric project with Vergil's *Aeneid*.[37] On the one hand, Horace apparently admonishes Vergil against his epic designs, picturing them as *audaces*.[38] On the

---

[35] Some scholars do not follow the "ship of poetry" route. Hendrickson 1908: 100-04 reads the ode as literal, "an expression of grief, an imprecation upon man's audacious enterprise, which had devised the means of separating friends." Traill 1983: 131-37 reads the poem as a political "denunciation of the Antonian cause, and … a justification of Augustus' stern reprisals."

[36] For some of the clearest examples *contra Aeneid*, see Thomas 2001: 63-5, Pucci 1992: 659-73, and Putnam 2006: 109.

[37] For some of the clearest examples *pro Aeneid*, see Campbell 1987: 314-18 and Lockyer 1967: 42-5.

[38] Pucci 1992: 667 argues that the ode dramatizes this aesthetic principle, that "Virgil is the 'other half' of Horace's soul because he, Virgil, writes poetry of a different kind from Horace."

other, Horace ironically praises what J.P. Elder calls "man's tragic heroism."[39] While the argument typically centers on the second half of the poem, I contend that the commercial imagery in the first half helps to elucidate the issue, suggesting that Horace envisions both himself and Vergil on a similar poetic voyage to Greece, one fraught with danger but nonetheless a risk worth taking, just like depositing money. To shed light upon Horace's representation of his friendship with Vergil and the poetic program tied to this image, I offer a serial reading of the ode, dividing the poem into three sections. I argue that by casting his poem in the shadow both of Epicurean philosophy and Callimachean poetics, Horace journeys with Vergil, the other half of his soul, to the shores of Greece, intent on resurrecting and transforming its ancient literary past.

The Propempticon

Horace opens his ode with an invocation to three divinities: Venus, the Gemini, and Aeolus. These mythical figures are hidden, however, behind Horace's periphrastic language:

> Sic te diua potens Cypri,
> sic fratres Helenae, lucida sidera,
>   uentorumque regat pater
> obstrictis aliis praeter Iapyga,

Odes 1.3.1-4

> May the powerful goddess of Cyprus guide you, and Helen's
> brothers, those bright stars, and the father of the winds, with all of
> the other winds confined except Iapyx.

Joseph Pucci imagines a first-time reader beginning this ode and notes, "when one reads *fratres Helenae,* for example, one visualizes Helen as much as—perhaps more than—Castor and Pollux, for Helen is the figure named, even though Hor-

_____

[39] Elder 1952: 144.

19

ace means to talk about Castor and Pollux, not Helen."[40] There exists a disjunction between Horace's meaning and his language; the latter suggests something other than the former. Moreover, this triad of divinities recalls an epic provenance. Horace begins his prayer with Venus, on the one hand, the goddess born from the sea, on the other, the mother of Aeneas. The Dioscuri, although epic themselves, are referred to via Helen, who brings to mind even greater Homeric undertones.[41] Aeolus plays the role of Keeper of the Winds in both Homer's *Odyssey* and Vergil's *Aeneid*.[42] Horace's opening thus sets the stage for an ironic interaction with epic poetry.

These first four lines also situate the ode within the Hellenistic genre of the *propempticon,* the bon voyage poem. Although the history of this genre is foggy, the testimony of the rhetorician Menander and the *exempla* of Latin poets such as Ovid, Propertius, and Statius offer some insight into its form.[43] John Campbell summarizes the basic aspects of the genre: "In general the poet was expected to argue against the journey of his friend, and, in the end, reconciled to

---

[40] Pucci 1992: 663.

[41] Basto 1982: 31 and Pucci 1992: 663 both note the epic echoes in Horace's divinities. Pucci also discusses Horace's periphrastic language, though he ultimately argues that this distances Horace from epic, and thus from Vergil. I disagree.

[42] In *Odyssey* book X, Aeolus gives Odysseus a bag full of the captured winds so he could sail home to Ithaca on the gentle West Wind. In *Aeneid* book I, Juno offers Aeolus the nymph Deiopea as a wife if he will release his winds for Aeneas' fleet. Iapyx, here representing the north-west wind, in the *Aeneid* (XII.391-402) was Aeneas's healer during the Trojan War, eventually escaping to Italy and founding Apulia.

[43] For a history of the genre, see Jager 1913: 4-36. It appears to take shape in the Hellenistic period, with apparent examples from Theocritus, Callimachus, and Erinna. Ovid (*Am.* 2.11), Propertius (1.8), and Statius (*Silv.* 3.2), however, offer mature examples of the generic form. The third century rhetorician Menander (2.5) offers the fullest account of the structure and *topoi* of propemptica. For discussion of his schema, see Russel and Wilson 1981: 127-34.

the separation, to pray for his safety."[44] Horace manipulates this form. First, he begins instead of ends with the prayer, invoking the triad of gods and goddesses. Second, he never argues against Vergil's journey. As will be expanded below, Horace engages but inverts aspects of this Hellenistic genre to his own ends.

Odes 1.3's second stanza introduces a prolonged banking metaphor. The commercial language portrays Horace as a creditor seeking repayment of the loaned Vergil from an indebted ship:[45]

> nauis, quae tibi creditum
> debes Vergilium finibus Atticis
>   reddas incolumem precor
> et serues animae dimidium meae.
>
> <div style="text-align:right">*Odes* 1.3.5-8</div>
>
> O ship that owes Vergil, entrusted to you, may you return him un-
> harmed to Attic shores, I pray, and preserve the other half of my
> soul.

The first line of the stanza represents Vergil as on loan to the ship; then, in the last line, Horace famously describes Vergil as "the other half of my soul". Both *creditum* and *dimidium* describe the proper noun *Vergilium.* This stanza-long chiasmus (*tibi creditum … Vergilium … dimidium meae*) verbally pictures Horace's desire for his friend's safety (*incolumem*, 7) and return (*reddas*, 7), as *tibi* and the possessive *meae* create a tension between Horace and the ship. The banking metaphor extends beyond the participle *creditum*, however. T. V. Buttrey argues that *dimidium* pictures Vergil as a "halved coin circulating so abundantly at the time this Ode was composed."[46] His proposal derives from his analysis of Augustus'

---

[44] Campbell 1987: 315.

[45] Garrison 1991: 207.

[46] Buttrey 1972: 47 considers Horace's metaphor as a key literary attestation of this monetary phenomenon.

monetary reform, in which halved *asses* were cut from newly defined *dupondii* to function as currency. The stanza's concluding epithet, *animae dimidium meae,* thus completes the mercantile image. Horace imagines Vergil as a halved *aes* coin on loan as a *creditum* to a ship.

As noted in the Introduction, Horace's use of *creditum* proves significant. Vergil is not pictured as on loan to the ship, having been "deposited" (*depositum*). Within Horace's framework, this participle would suggest a minor separation— that although Vergil is physically with the ship, he remains Horace's companion. That is, if the participle were *depositum,* Horace would retain "ownership," in some metaphorical sense, of Vergil regardless of their physical separation. However, Horace uses *creditum.* Placing the metaphor in the situation that Macleod describes, we can better understand the implication of Horace's imagery:

> The banker [i.e. the ship] buys the money [Vergil] from his customer [Horace]: and in exchange for it, he gives his customer a credit in his books, which is a right of action to demand back [*debes*] an equivalent amount of money [in this case, that he be "intact"].[47]

The ship now holds, now "owns" half of Horace's soul. This metaphor illustrates the depth of their separation and the cause of Horace's prayer.

While deepening the banking metaphor, the phrase *animae dimidium meae* (8) also extends Horace's interaction with the Hellenistic poets. First and foremost, the phrase parallels Callimachus' *Epigrams* 41 where Callimachus lacks "half my soul" (ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς), within the context of the poem clearly a

---

[47] Macleod 1890: 357.

young lover. [48] Later, Meleager adapts Callimachus' phrase in a Hellenistic *propempticon:*

> οὔριος ἐμπνεύσας ναύταις Νότος, ὦ δυσέρωτες,
>   ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς ἅρπασεν Ἀνδράγαθον
>
> <div align="right">*Anth. Pal.* 12.52.1-2</div>

> The South wind that blows fair for sailors, O love-sick ones, has snatched Andragathon, the other half of my soul.

In the words of Richard Thomas, "Horace's phrase is to be seen as a literary *tour de force.*"[49] On the one hand, therefore, *animae dimidium meae* recalls a trope of Hellenistic poetry; on the other, it functions within a complex banking metaphor. Its multi-faceted intertextual function compliments its irony. While the word refers to a part cut off from something else, that is, a half of what was whole, Horace uses the term to link himself intimately with Vergil. When he calls Vergil "the other half of my soul," he to some degree gives Vergil ownership of half of himself, just as he implicitly asserts his ownership of part of Vergil.

The Inverted Curse

At line nine, Horace turns from the present particular of Vergil's voyage to the past particular of the first sailor. Here Horace also inverts a standard element of the *propempticon.* Rather than a *schetliasmos,* or curse, Horace praises the bravery of the original navigator:

> Illi robur et aes triplex
> circa pectus erat, qui fragilem truci
>   commisit pelago ratem
> primus, nec timuit praecipitem Africum

---

[48] *Ep.* 41 = *Anth. Pal.* 12.73. For Horace's indebtedness to Callimachus, see Wimmel 1960.

[49] Thomas 2001: 64-5 observes that both Hellenistic intertexts are of pederastic nature and argues that Horace is here possibly "allusive to Virgil's purported sexual tastes."

> decertantem Aquilonibus
> nec tristis Hyadas nec rabiem Noti,
> quo non arbiter Hadriae
> maior, tollere seu ponere uolt freta.
> Quem mortis timuit gradum
> qui siccis oculis monstra natantia,
> qui uidit mare turbidum et
> infamis scopulos Acroceraunia?

Odes 1.3.9-20

> Triple bronze and oak encircled the breast of the man who first entrusted his fragile bark to the cruel sea; he feared neither the fierce south-westerlies fighting with the North winds, nor the grim Hyades, nor the rage of the South wind; there is not greater master of the Adriatic, whether he wants to stir or to calm the sea. What form of death did he fear, who gazed, dry-eyed, upon swimming monsters, the boiling sea, and Acroceraunia's infamous cliffs?

While the transition to this image of the first sailor may appear rushed, the echoes of mercantile language at the opening of these lines ease the shift. The noun *aes* recalls the copper coin imagery used to describe Vergil not one line before. The commentary of pseudo-Acro reads *aes triplex* (9) as an echo of the language of moneylenders denoting the threefold profits gained from sea trade.[50] While the image of "triple bronze" around the original sailor's heart pictures bravery, the monetary associations suggest that this navigator also has "bronze on the brain," as we might say. Robert Carrubba goes so far as to suggest that "the *aes* of line 9 subtly recalls the *Cypri* of line 1, when we reflect that in Latin the word *aes* is regularly used for the phrase *aes Cyprium*: copper or bronze from Cyprus."[51] Moreover, the verb *commisit* parallels the sense of *creditum,* to entrust, recalling

---

[50] Pseudo-Acro, on line 9: "*triplex* – [Horace] uses a word taken from the language of moneylenders whose avarice was the source of hope for profit or sea trade" (*triplex – verbum ab usurariis tractum posuit, quorum avaritia [vel] spe lucri vel commercio inventum navigium sit*). Putnam 1971: 454 and Santirocco 1986: 28 note that Vergil seemingly alludes to this phrase in the *Aeneid*, when Aeneas' spear pierces Mezentius' shield, described a three-layered (*aere … triplici,* 10.784).

[51] Carrubba 1984: 171.

banking transactions. In the *propempticon* to Vergil, a human was entrusted to a ship; in this section, a ship is entrusted to the sea by a human. While a transition in content, Horace smoothes the shift with a subtle continuation of mercantile language.[52]

Horace's imagery in this quasi-encomium recalls Hellenistic as well as Vergilian poetics, both pointing to a metaphorical reading of the seafaring. The so-called ship of poetry image transforms Horace's praise of the first sailor into praise of a poetic innovator. Such a reading fits the ode's programmatic position, as both Horace and Vergil use this motif to describe their poetics. In Horace's final ode, he uses the conceit to describe his own lyric poetry:

> Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui
> victas et Urbis increpuit lyra,
>   ne parva Tyrrhenum per aequor
>   vela darem.
>
> <div align="right">Odes 4.15.1-4</div>

> Although I wished to sing of wars and sacked cities, Phoebus
> sounded his lyre to warn me lest I spread my small sails on the
> Tyrrhenean sea.

Vergil also imagines his poetry in nautical terms throughout his *Georgics.* In the second book, for example, Vergil asks Maecenas to further his poetry: "willingly spread your sails over the open sea" (*pelagoque volans da vela patenti,* 2.41). Matthew Santirocco points out that Vergil's supposed journey in *Odes* 1.3 suggests a similar reading:

> A trip from Italy to Greece is an apt, almost irresistible, metaphor
> for the *Aeneid* itself, in the composition of which Vergil did indeed

---

[52] The image Horace paints of this original sailor mimics, to my mind, aspects of the Epicurean sage who has reached ἀταραξία, a state of "unperturbedness." This argument is beyond the scope of this chapter, however.

travel from Italy to Greece, i.e. to Homer, for his inspiration.[53]

Horace's imagery in this near-panegyric of the original sailor further suggests a poetic program. Having already referenced Callimachus in the famed *animae dimidium meae,* Horace now echoes his poetics. Horace's *fragilem truci … pelago ratem* reimagines the Callimachean contrast between slender and wordy epic poetry. Moreover, in the prologue to his *Aetia,* Callimachus relates that Apollo instructed him to follow a "slender Muse" down "untrodden paths" as he writes poetry (1.23-8). The man "who first entrusted his fragile bark to the cruel sea" (1.3.10-12) recalls Callimachus' slight and innovative poetics, further linking Horace's lyric project to this Hellenistic model.

At line 21, Horace begins his diatribe against audacity. Once again, the transition flows relatively easily, as Horace turns from the first sailor to the act of sailing itself:

> Nequiquam deus abscidit
> prudens Oceano dissociabili
>   terras, si tamen impiae
> non tangenda rates transiliunt uada.
>   Audax omnia perpeti
> gens humana ruit per uetitum nefas;
>
> *Odes* 1.3.21-6
>
> Uselessly does a wise god separate the lands with a far-severing Ocean, if nonetheless impious ships travel depths that ought not be touched. Daring enough for anything, the human race rushes into forbidden sin.

Here the *fragilem ratem* of line 11 evolves into a collection of *impiae rates.* The bravery of the sailor casting out his fragile ship now contrasts with the impious

---

[53] Santirocco 1986: 27 also notes these instances of the ship of poetry motif. At *Geo.* 1.40, Vergil asks Caesar to grant an easy course: "grant an easy course and smile upon audacities' inception" (*da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis*); at 4.117, Vergil looks ahead to the completion of his poem: "I will surrender my sails to turn my prow swiftly toward shore" (*vela tradam et terris festinam advertere proram*).

act of seafaring. If a smooth transition in imagery, the shift in tone perplexes. Having inverted the *schetliasmos*, or curse, of a standard *propempticon*, Horace now appears to take up that tone, though not against the sailor but against the endeavor itself. The typical curse appears to include not only the original sailor but also Vergil and humanity in general. These generic inversions help to signal Horace's irony.

While transforming the *propempticon* curse, Horace makes use of Epicurean *parrhesia*. Both sources of Horace's acerbic tone are therefore Greek. On the one hand, Horace ironically refashions the Hellenistic model of cursing the original sailor, turning it into a lecture against all sailing. On the other hand, the lecture echoes the tone of Epicurean interpersonal therapy. As noted in the Introduction, frank speech was a cornerstone of any Epicurean relationship.[54] Frankness within an Epicurean context transcends simply being honest and denotes the activity of mutual critique of ethical failings. Philip Thibodeau defines Epicurean frank criticism as markedly honest and mildly brusque:

> Within the community *parrhesia* refers to the practice of openly stating truths about the character of other persons, and occasionally about oneself as well.[55]

Often without noting the Epicurean element of Horace's tone here, many scholars read the conclusion of the ode as a criticism of Vergil and his poetic endeavor with the epic *Aeneid*. If Horace were indeed chastising Vergil for undertaking his epic, *parrhesia* would be a likely means of such criticism. To what degree Horace's curse against sailing is parrhesiatic or imprecatory, however, remains un-

---

[54] On *parrhesia* within Epicureanism, see Konstan 1998 and Glad 1995.

[55] Thibodeau 2003: 250. For a fuller treatment of the aspect of this practice, see Nussbaum 1986: 31-74 and Armstrong 1993: 193-4.

clear. Regardless, Horace's sharp tone proves ironic, as Horace clearly turns to

Greek models for his hyperbolic harangue, thus following Vergil's own poetic

course.

In order to educe whether Horace's inverted *schetliasmos* extends to Ver-

gil's poetics, we must consider the curse's *exempla.* Horace offers Prometheus,

Daedalus, and Hercules as mythic paradigms of audacity:

> audax Iapeti genus
> ignem fraude mala gentibus intulit;
> post ignem aetheria domo
> subductum macies et noua febrium
> terris incubuit cohors
> semotique prius tarda necessitas
> leti corripuit gradum.
> Expertus uacuum Daedalus aera
> pennis non homini datis;
> perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor.

Odes 1.3.27-36

> Daring, the son of Iapetus brought fire to men by fraudulent
> means. After fire was stolen from its heavenly home, disease and a
> strange crowd of fevers brooded over the earth, and the slow inevi-
> tability of formerly distant death quickened its step. Daedalus ex-
> perienced empty air on wings not granted to men. Hercules' labor
> shattered Acheron.

Each example offers epic associations and demonstrates daring endeavors. Yet

each also tends to elicit sympathy rather than disapproval. As Santirocco points

out, Horace's examples of mythical sinners were more commonly "symbols for

human achievement."[56] The consistent disjunction between what Horace says

and what the images portray anticipates Horace's wit in this concluding section.

While on the surface he offers paradigms of humanity's hubris, Horace chooses

three *exempla* that suggest the "tragic heroism" of such audacity. At *Odes* 3.3, for

example, Hercules merits inclusion in the Pantheon precisely because of his

---

[56] Santirocco 1986: 29.

28

deeds: "By these means Pollux and wandering Hercules, in their effort, reached the fiery citadels" (*Hac arte Pollux et uagus Hercules/ ensius arces attigit igneas*, 9-10). Moreover, in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, Promethean fire represents human progress.[57] The mythical context of Horace's parade of examples weakens the vigor of his curse, suggesting its ironic nature. Thus, while some scholars attempt to read Horace's diatribe as an invective against Vergil, we must not forget the pattern of ironic reversal and misdirection abundant throughout this ode. While Horace's inverted *schetliasmos* does intimate that Vergil's literary enterprise is daring and dangerous, it does not transform the poem into "a lecture on the rectitude (the morality, even) of epic mimesis."[58]

The irony of Horace's harangue is betrayed by the ode's final four lines. Reversing the separation pictured at the poem's opening, Horace ends the ode subtly linking his lyric journey to Vergil's epic and ironically praising their endeavors:

> Nil mortalibus ardui est;
> caelum ipsum petimus stultitia neque
> per nostrum patimur scelus
> iracunda Iouem ponere fulmina.
>
> *Odes* 1.3.37-40

> Nothing is too high for mortals. In our folly, we seek heaven itself,
> and through our sin we do not allow Jupiter to set aside his irascible lightning bolts.

The first line is ambiguous; is it praise or criticism of humanity's courage? A hint is given in the following line, where Horace explicitly joins Vergil on his audacious journey: "we seek heaven itself" (*caelum ipsum petimus*, 38). Indeed, this

---

[57] In Hesiod's *Theogony*, Pandora initiate death and disease. Her presence, however, is punishment for Prometheus' sin. Prometheus is thus not the efficient cause of a *nova cohors febrium*, but blameworthy nonetheless.

[58] Pucci 1992: 672.

phrase appears to yoke Horace to all humanity, describing what Elder calls "man's tragic heroism." It is human nature, according to this passage, to strive for more. Although the clause appears critical, the conclusion of Horace's first ode in this volume illuminates Horace's positive appraisal of his own zeal for success:

> Quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
> sublimi feriam sidera vertice.
>
> *Odes* 1.1.35-6
>
> But if you insert me into the canon of lyric bards, I will strike the stars with my exalted head.

Horace announces in his opening ode that his lyric project entails seeking heaven. In this poem, the reader encounters Horace brooding on the consequences of this endeavor. Perhaps it is *nefas* or *scelus* to resurrect a Greek poetic genre, yet Horace finds solidarity in his friend and fellow poet Vergil, as both poets are voyaging to Greece for their genres. The conclusion of this strange and ironic ode suggests that Horace pays lip service to the folly of his and Vergil's mutual enterprises, yet in the face of possible condemnation, ends up where he began—seeking the stars with his poetry.

A Joint Poetic Journey

Alluding to Hellenistic poetry while writing in an archaic Greek metre, Horace undermines the entirety of his supposed critique. If Horace truly condemns Vergil for journeying to Greece, to Homer, for his poetic inspiration and form, Horace stands condemned as well. Horace's most famous description of Vergil situates Horace's imagery in a Greek tradition, just as the *propempticon* form points to "Attic shores" (*finibus Atticis*, 1.3.6). Moreover, Horace turns to

30

Greek deities for his prayer as well as for his *exempla* of audacity. Throughout the ode's own itinerary to Greece, Horace inverts expectations with periphrastic and ironic language and imagery. This wit allows Horace to play both with Vergil and his reader, casting his poetic program in an enigmatic and ironic light.

The journey to Greece is not limited to poetry, however. As noted above, Horace conflates the *schetliasmos* of a bon voyage poem with the tone of Epicurean *parrhesia*. Moreover, Horace uses anti-Epicurean imagery abundantly in the first half of the poem. As outlined in the Introduction, Cicero frequently used mercantile language to caricature Epicurean friendships. Cicero's commercial imagery primarily suggests that Epicurean friends treat one another the same as money—a means to an end. As a result, Cicero argued that Epicurean friendship could not be classed as true *amicitia* because Epicurean friends seek benefits and pleasure *from* one another, not *for* one another.[59] I contend that Horace has, among other things, such caricatures in mind when he fashions his extended banking metaphor in *Odes* 1.3.

To some extent, Horace's commercial imagery engages, yet counters Cicero's critical depictions of Epicurean relationships. Contrary to Cicero, Horace portrays his Epicurean friendship with Vergil as a relationship in which both friends do seek benefits for each another. Horace does not seek his own benefit when he prays for Vergil's safety; he seeks the continued health of a beloved friend. In the poetic context, Horace prays for the success of Vergil's own poetic project. Moreover, when Horace depicts Vergil as a halved *aes* coin and claims possession (*animae dimidium meae,* 8), he necessarily implies that Vergil also owns half of Horace's soul. The mercantile language thus furthers Horace's irony in

---

[59] For that treatment, see Introduction pp. 4-7.

this programmatic ode by simultaneously painting a selfish and loving picture of their relationship. The philosophical resonances are subsumed, however, beneath Horace's ironic program. Although he echoes the language of the ongoing debate over the possible virtue of Epicurean friendship, the ode is not about friendship. The echoes of Epicurean philosophy function just as the allusions to Hellenistic poetics, to adumbrate Horace's own course to Greece. Yet as we shall see in the subsequent chapters, mercantile language and a sharp tone become the standard elements of Horace's triptych of Vergil odes. Thus, while this ode primarily concerns Horace's poetic program and its relation to Vergil, it also functions to set the stage for Horace's representation of their friendship.

In sum, although *Odes* 1.3 presents a critical meditation on the daring poetic journeys both Horace and Vergil are undertaking, it offers a positive appraisal of these journeys' worth and necessity. Creating a witty and ironic ode, Horace is able simultaneously to associate and dissociate with Greek poetry and Vergil's epic. On the one hand, Horace resurrects a Greek genre in the Latin tongue and, like Vergil, acts as poetic progenitor of his genre. On the other hand, Horace's poetry is uniquely his own, and while similar in intent to Vergil's epic, Horace's lyric project strikes out into uncharted waters. Conflating the Hellenistic *propempticon* with the ship of poetry motif, Horace creates a thoroughly poetic ode in which the reader must ever be on his toes. By joining his poem to Epicurean philosophy and Callimachean poetics, Horace actively journeys with Vergil, the other half of his soul, to the literary shores of Greece. Such an endeavor is fraught with danger. To become the father of a Roman genre, having refashioned a famed Greek genre, proves to be a lofty goal. Horace can become Daedalus or Icarus, can either succeed or fall. Yet even success comes at a price, as one per-

haps becomes subject to wider criticism. In the face of such possible failings, Horace takes solace in his solidarity with Vergil. They are like two halves of the same coin—each seeking to resurrect and transform Greece's archaic literary past. In the shadow of their friendship, Horace sets sail on a poetic voyage both audacious and dangerous, but nonetheless worth taking.

CHAPTER THREE

Odes 1.24:
Friendship's Defense

Odes 1.24 portrays Horace and Vergil's friendship in action. The central panel in Horace's triptych of Vergil odes, the poem is a complex consolation addressed to Vergil following the death of their friend Quintilius Varus.[60] Compared to *Odes* 1.3, the mercantile language is relatively muted, but its significance is not. Insofar as Horace's portrait of his friendship with Vergil is colored in commercial language, I argue that the ode functions on two levels. First, it provides a defense of Epicurean friendship against Cicero's anti-Epicurean caricatures.[61] Second, the commercial imagery avails Horace to cure Vergil of his excessive mourning with Epicurean therapy. *Odes* 1.24 may thus be read as both a demonstration and a defense of Epicurean friendship.

The poem's two objectives intertwine, as Horace's practice of Epicurean therapy within the poem paints a picture that counters Cicero's faulty representation of Epicurean friendships. Although Cicero used mercantile analogies to suggest that Epicurean friendships were selfish and mercenary, Horace subverts Cicero's critiques with metaphors that engage his language, yet counter his conclusions. To curb Vergil's grief, Horace reminds him that death is unconquerable

---

[60] For recent work on the addressee in lyric poetry, see Culler 1981: 135-54 and Waters 2003. For the function of the addressee in Horace's Odes, see Barchiesi 2007.

[61] The bibliography on Cicero's anti-Epicureanism is extensive. For a summary of Cicero's role as the chief voice against Epicureanism in antiquity, see Nicgorski 2002: 3-29. See also Stokes 1995: 145-71; Striker 1996: 196-209; Griffin 1997: 1-38; Maslowski 1974: 55-78. Cicero's specific distaste for the pleasure calculus appears in *In Pisonem passim*, *Pro Sestio* 23, 138-39, and *Pro Caelio* 39-42.

and frank friends remain. More specifically, Horace suggests his own merit as a friend by practicing active friendship in and through the poem. By using mercantile language redolent of the language that Cicero himself uses in his criticisms, Horace depicts a true Epicurean relationship that itself serves as a corrective to Cicero's erroneous portrayals.

Before more carefully examining the poem itself, let us briefly consider its context. *Odes* 1.24 was published in 23 B.C. as a part of the first book of Horace's *Carmina.* Horace likely wrote the poem in the mid-20s B.C., after the death of Quintilius Varus of Cremona, a friend to Vergil and Horace alike. As Michael Putnam points out, the ode conflates the genres of *epicedium* and *consolatio,* of lamentation for Quintilius and condolence for Vergil.[62] These two genres roughly divide the poem in half—the first half is dirge, the second is consolation. Akbar Khan argues that the ode's first half mimics an actual dirge written by Vergil.[63] I am inclined to agree. Aside from generic elements, the poem has an "almost critical tone," which Philip Thibodeau argues Epicurean *parrhesia,* or frank criticism, underpins.[64] In *Odes* 1.24, Horace conflates eulogy, consolation, and therapy. As a result, Vergil occupies three roles: he is the addressee in a dirge, the recipient of consolation, and the patient undergoing therapy.[65] Although commentators have noted the ode's Epicurean influences, few consider the import of mercantile lan-

---

[62] Putnam 1993: 123; For rhetoric of consolation in 1.24, see Pasquali 1920: 249-57.

[63] Khan 1999: 73-84.

[64] Thibodeau 2003: 244; On the parrhesiatic tone, see Armstrong 2008: 97-99.

[65] These roles are not mutually exclusive. In *Vatican Sayings* 66, Epicurus says, "we sympathize with our friends, not through lamentation, but through thoughtful concern" (συμπαθῶμεν τοῖς φίλοις οὐ θρηνοῦντες ἀλλὰ φροντίζοντες). Horace conflates these personae in such a way as to sympathize with Vergil and simultaneously show him his error.

guage to the ode's portrayal of the inner workings of an Epicurean friendship.[66] In order to illuminate why Horace once again saturates an ode to Vergil with commercial imagery, this chapter first elucidates the ode's function as consolatory therapy, and then considers how Horace's picture of his relationship with Vergil counters Cicero's depictions of Epicurean friendship.

Friendship's Demonstration

Epicurean frank criticism informs the ode's tone and function. David Armstrong, building upon the work of Martha Nussbaum, outlines nine features necessary for frank speech to function as a means of therapy within Epicurean relationships.[67] Among other requisites, Armstrong points out that *parrhesia* must "be 'individual-relative' rather than based on community values."[68] That is, Horace must address Vergil's particular grief and how to rectify its excess, rather than parade general Roman ideas on the proper time, place, and extent of mourning. Horace fashions *Odes* 1.24 to be individual-relative by speaking to Vergil as an author and as a reader. Addressing Vergil the author, Horace steeps his parrhesiatic *consolatio* in Vergilian language and imagery. Addressing Vergil the reader, Horace alludes to a Catullan poem on the death of a loved one as well as to the previous ode concerning Vergil. This thick intertextual *nexus* situates the ode in a more private setting, while simultaneously offering the careful reader a

---

[66] For bibliography, see Putnam 1993: 123 n. 1 and Thibodeau 2003: 243 n. 1. For various commentators' readings, see Commager 1995: 287-90, Khan 1999: 73-84, Nisbet and Hubbard 1990: 279-89, Lowrie 1994: 377-394, Putnam 1993: 123-35 and West 1995: 112-15.

[67] Nussbaum 1986: 31-74.

[68] Armstrong 1993: 193-4.

glimpse of Epicurean therapy at work.

As Father Owen Lee astutely observes, *Odes* 1.24 "is giving Virgil Virgilian consolation" through extensive allusion to Vergil's own corpus.[69] Horace opens *Odes* 1.24 with a direct question:

> Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus
> tam cari capitis? Praecipe lugubris
> cantus, Melopomene, cui liquidam pater
>   vocem cum cithara dedit.
>
> <div align="right">Odes 1.24.1-4</div>

> What shame or limit should there be to the longing for one so loved? Teach a mournful song, O Melopomene, to whom your father gave a pure voice along with the cithara.[70]

Michael Putnam points out that *pudor* and *modus*—shame and limit—are principal themes throughout Vergil's oeuvre.[71] Horace marks their significance in this poem by returning to both terms as the poem continues. First, in the next stanza Horace personifies *Pudor* (6):

> Ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor
> urget, cui <u>Pudor</u> et Iustitiae soror
> incorrupta Fides nudaque Veritas
>   quando ullum inveniet parem?
>
> <div align="right">Odes 1.24.5-8</div>

> So, everlasting slumber oppresses Quintilius. When will <u>Shame</u> and uncorrupted Faith, the sister of Justice, and naked Truth find anyone equal to him?

---

[69] Owen Lee 1969: 84.

[70] Unless otherwise noted, Latin texts are those of Garrison 1991 and translations are my own. For subjunctive as "should" instead of "could," see Commager 1995: 288 and Putnam 1993: 126.

[71] Putnam 1993: 126.

Unlike the normative quality above, here Shame is a goddess who personifies one of Quintilius' many virtues.[72] As Khan argues, these opening eight lines likely mimic an actual dirge (*lugubris cantus,* 2-3) written by Vergil.[73] The three direct questions suggest a degree of conversation, whether between Vergil and the gods or Horace and Vergil. To further cement this poetic conversation, Horace evolves the noun *modus* (1) into the verb *moderere* (14) in the heart of the fourth stanza. This entire stanza and the beginning of the following stanza are saturated with Vergilian language:

> Quid si Threicio blandius Orpheo
> auditam moderere arboribus fidem?
> Num uanae redeat sanguis imagini,
>   quam uirga semel horrida,
> non lenis precibus fata recludere,
> nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi?
>
> *Odes* 1.24.13-18

> What if you should pluck the lyre-string heard by trees more beautifully than Thracian Orpheus? The blood wouldn't return to the empty shade, which Mercury, who does not easily open the fates to prayers, has herded with his horrid wand once and for all into his black herd, would it?

These stanzas offer an extended allusion to Vergil's Orpheus myths in *Georgics* 4 and *Aeneid* 6.[74] First, the opening of the fifth stanza, *non lenis precibus fata recludere* (17), echoes, in both language and theme, *Georgics* 4.470: *nesciaque humanis precibus mansuescere corda* ("hearts that know not how to soften at humanity's prayers"). Second, the initial description of Orpheus closely parallels Vergil's description of him at *Aeneid* 6.119-20: *si potuit manis arcessere coniugis Orpheus / Threicia*

---

[72] For the role shame plays in the climax of the Dido episode in *Aeneid* 4, see Santirocco 1986: 59 and Putnam 1993: 129 n15.

[73] Khan 1999: 73-84.

[74] For commentary on this allusion, see West 1995: 113 and Putnam 1993: 129.

fretus cithara fidibusque conoris ("if Orpheus was able to summon his wife's shade, trusting his Thracian lyre and melodious strings").[75] These Orphic references advance both the ode's *parrhesia* and its consolation. As frank criticism, the *Georgic* episode reminds Vergil, as David West points out, that "even the great Orpheus, as you [Vergil] know better than anyone, failed to bring Eurydice back to life;"[76] the allusion to *Aeneid* 6 suggests to Vergil that even *pius Aeneas* may only enter the realm of the dead, not return the dead to life.[77] As consolation, however, Horace recalls some of Vergil's most beautiful poetry, reminding him that, like Orpheus, although unable to recall a dead friend, he remains a masterful poet.[78] By alluding to Vergil's corpus, Horace addresses Vergil *qua* poet in order to ensure that the ode is individual-relative.

Horace also appeals to Vergil as a reader of others' poetry. To this end, Horace references both his own and Catullus' poetry.[79] As poets, both Horace and Vergil have a predilection to read and absorb their poetic forebears. One of the previous generation's most well-known poets, Catullus offers Horace a common point of reference by which to mollify Vergil's grief. In his ninety-sixth poem, Catullus addresses his fellow poet Calvus, who is grieving over the death

---

[75] Putnam 1993: 130; That Horace knew of parts of the *Aeneid* before its publication, see p. 129 n15.

[76] West 1995: 113.

[77] Compare *pius Aeneus* to the description of Vergil in line 11, *frustra pius.*

[78] For the consolatory implications of Horace's Orphic references, see Putnam 1993: 129, Owen Lee 1969: 86-9, and Commager 1995: 289-90.

[79] Putnam 1993: *passim*. On Catullus 96, see Davis 1971: 297-302.

of his wife Quintilia.[80] As consolation, Catullus suggests that poetry can reach

beyond the grave and affect the dead:

> Si quicquam mutis gratum acceptumque sepulcris
>   accidere a nostro, Calve, dolore potest,
> quo desiderio veteres renovamus amores
>   atque olim missas flemus amicitias,
> certe non tanto mors immatura dolori est
>   Quintiliae, quantum gaudet amore tuo.
>
> <div align="right">Catullus 96</div>

> If it is possible that anything pleasing and acceptable can befall si-
> lent graves because of our grief, Calvus, by which longing we re-
> new old loves and lament lost friendships, certainly the sadness in
> her premature death is not so great for Quintilia as her rejoicing in
> your love.

The opening of *Odes* 1.24, *Quis desiderio* (1), references Catullus' *quo desiderio* (3),

suggesting that Vergil's lamentation of Quintilius' death echoes Calvus' grief

over Quintilia's. Yet Horace "will not play Catullus to Vergil's Calvus."[81] Alt-

hough he begins his ode similarly to Catullus, Horace ends on a much different

note:

> durum; sed levius fit patentia
>   quicquid corrigere est nefas.
>
> <div align="right">*Odes* 1.24.19-20</div>

> It is hard; but whatever is forbidden to correct becomes easier to
> bear with patience.

Unlike Catullus, Horace regards some aspect of the afterlife as "forbidden" (*ne-*

fas). This sententious final clause is ambiguous; there are varying interpretations

of *nefas* and its referent. If Khan is correct in thinking that the poem's first ten

lines mimic Vergil's actual dirge to Quintilius, it would be natural to assume that

---

[80] It is unknown whether Quintilia was Calvus' mistress or wife. I follow Lyne 2007: 74.

[81] Putnam 1993: 126. He also suggests that the names' similarity is not purely ac-
cidental but extends Horace's allusion.

Vergil's *epicedium* echoed Catullus' sentiments. Under such an interpretation, one could read the ending as saying it is forbidden to think that a deceased loved one can hear or respond to one's grief.[82] Using Catullus as *comparandum*, Horace attempts to remind Vergil that communion with the dead is impious folly, for even poetry has its limits—it cannot cross death's threshold.

Horace extends this idea with a further allusion aimed at Vergil the reader. Horace uses an internal self-reference to recall *Odes* 1.3, the *propempticon* or bon-voyage poem to Vergil.[83] In the heart of Horace's ode,[84] he describes the deceased Quintilius as *non ita creditum*:

> Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,
> nulli flebilior quam tibi, Vergili.
> Tu frustra pius, heu, non ita creditum
>   poscis Quintilium deos.
>
> <div align="right">Odes 1.24.9-12</div>
>
> He died mourned by many good men, but mourned by none more than by you, Vergil. You, uselessly pious, ask the gods for Quintilius, alas! not entrusted on those terms.

The force of *ita* suggests a referent, yet the poem itself offers none. Within the *Odes*, however, one finds only one other instance of *creditum*—in *Odes* 1.3: *navis, quae tibi creditum/ debes Vergilium* ("O ship that owes Vergil, entrusted to you," 5-6).[85] The reference is not only linguistic, but also structural. The *creditum* and

---

[82] Khan 1999: 81.

[83] For detailed bibliography, see Elder 1952: 140 and Basto 1982: 30.

[84] Note the shift from *flebilis* to *flebilior,* and see Armstrong 2008: 79-121 on the Epicurean allowance of emotion but prohibition of emotional excesses.

[85] See *OLD* s.v. 1.a; and cf. *Odes* 2.4, 2.8, 2.13, 2.19, 3.5, 3.27 and 4.9 for other instances of the verb *credo.*

Quintilium of 1.24 lie in the same basic metrical position, ($\bar{}$ $\breve{}$ $\bar{}$ / $\bar{}$ $\bar{}$ $\bar{}$ $\breve{}$ $\breve{}$ $\bar{}$) as the

creditum and *Vergilium* of 1.3:[86]

> nauis, quae tibi <u>creditum</u>
> debes <u>Vergilium</u>; finibus Atticis
>
> *Odes* 1.3.5-6

> Tu frustra pius, heu, non ita <u>creditum</u>
> poscis <u>Quintilium</u> deos.
>
> *Odes* 1.24.11-2

The *non ita creditum* of 1.24 clearly recalls *Odes* 1.3 via their shared banking metaphor, as Horace uses the archaic participle *creditum* to create a complex metaphorical scenario that imagines Quintilius as on deposit.

Odes 1.3 illuminates the meaning of the initially ambiguous image in 1.24. We may compare, for example, Vergil's roles in the two metaphors. In 1.3, Vergil is the loaned object; in 1.24, the creditor. Horace shifts him from the direct object (*Vergilium*, 1.3.5) to the subject (*Tu*, 1.24.11). As in 1.3, Horace is here concerned with Vergil and the theme of separation from a friend. This time, however, the separation is permanent. Although Vergil "asks the gods for Quintilius" (*poscis Quintilium deos*, 12), the "loan" is not such that any price can repay it (*non ita creditum*, 11), revealing that Quintilius' death was not actually a loan at all.[87] Whereas in the beginning of the poem Horace, and consequentially Vergil, treats Quintilius' death euphemistically (*perpetuus sopor*, 1.24.5), this banking metaphor reiterates that blood, and therefore life, will not "return to the empty shade" (*vanae redeat sanguis imagini*, 15). Here lies the thrust of the *ita* in line 11—Horace

---

[86] Though the two poems are in slightly different meters; 1.3 is in Second Asclepiadean, while 1.24 is in Third Asclepiadean.

[87] *Creditum* shifts the meaning of *poscis* from the realm of pleading to the marketplace, where Vergil is attempting to buy back Quintilius. See Lewis and Short entry for *posco* II.C.2.

means to remind Vergil that, unlike his previous departure from Horace, Quintilius' separation cannot be remedied.

Having firmly situated the ode in a personal context, Horace aims to console Vergil's grief further by demonstrating his virtue as a friend through the action of the poem. If the ode functions as frank criticism, the narrative persona is an Epicurean therapist. At first glance, however, there appears to be no room for Horace in Vergil's grief-stricken world. Yet in response to the question, "when will [the goddesses] find anyone equal to him?" (*cui … quando ullum inveniet parem*, 1.24.6,8), Horace subtly reminds Vergil that he is a friend capable of being Quintilius' equal. The poem itself demonstrates that Horace is willing and able to offer frank criticism when needed.

If frankness is the quintessential quality of Epicurean friendships, then Quintilius himself is the quintessential friend. For proof, one need not look beyond Horace's corpus. First, the phrase *nuda Veritas* (7) in *Odes* 1.24 captures the meaning of the Greek term *parrhesia*,[88] as both terms denote blunt honesty. Along with shame, faith, and justice, frankness is one of Quintilius' primary virtues. Second, Horace references Quintilius' oft-used imperative *corrigere* (correct it!) to conclude 1.24, reminding Vergil of Quintilius' literary frankness.[89] In his *Ars Poetica*, Horace recalls how Quintilius would reduce lines of poetry to rubble with this single word, always willing to offer his critical, but desired opinion. Finally, at *Sat*. 1.5.40-42, Quintilius, Vergil, and Plotius are described as *candidiores*, which emphasizes their charm and frankness. By practicing the very art that defined so

---

[88] For *veritas* and *candor* as Latin translations of *parrhesia*, see DeWitt 1935: 313-4.

[89] See *AP* 438-44 and *Odes* 1.24.20. This word is a further point of reference, revealing Horace surreptitiously sliding into Quintilius' role.

much of Quintilius' character, Horace deftly positions himself as the friend that

Vergil can receive and has received from the gods. Thibodeau sums up Horace's

appropriation of Quintilius' role as parrhesiatic therapist:

> Vergil's original complaint was that he would never find Quintili-
> us' equal in the categories of modesty, trust, fairness, and frank-
> ness. Yet without openly saying so, Horace has demonstrated that
> Vergil's complaint has no basis: the remarkable traits of modesty,
> trustworthiness, a sense of what is right, and, above all, frankness,
> are all traits Horace displays in spades in this poem.[90]

While mourning Quintilius's lost friendship, Vergil must not forget the *dimidium*

who remains his friend.

Friendship's Defense

In *Odes* 1.24, Horace represents his bond with Vergil in its truest form: one

friend openly correcting another in a spirit of good will. Horace frames much of

his therapeutic criticism with allusions to Vergil's own work, to one of Catullus's

poems, and to Horace's earlier ode concerning Vergil. These references help to

situate the poem in a shared personal context, a key to Epicurean *parrhesia*.[91] To

cure Vergil of his excessive mourning with Epicurean therapy, Horace practices

frank criticism. This active form of friendship pictures a vital aspect of Horace's

friendship with Vergil. A question remains, however: Why publish this ode if it

were meant solely to help Vergil? Philodemus advises Epicureans to practice

---

[90] Thibodeau 2003: 255.

[91] Nisbet and Hubbard 1990: 281. Commentators have noted that Horace's advice conforms to the standard elements of the *consolatio* genre: "that mourning is pointless, death irrevocable, and fortitude the best relief." Yet by couching his admonition in familiar allusions, Horace transforms consolatory poetry into Epicurean therapy. For the ode as *consolatio,* see Nisbet and Hubbard 1990: 280-1 and Putnam 1993: 130.

frank criticism among peers, "not in the presence of all."[92] There seems little reason for Horace to make this *parrhesia* public unless the ode has some secondary purpose. In order to illumine this other function, we must focus our attention on the ode's other audience—Horace's general readership.

I contend that Horace presents an active picture of his and Vergil's relationship partly in order to counter Cicero's caricatures of Epicurean friendship. Aside from dramatizing his point about death and mourning, Horace uses language taken from the marketplace to subvert Cicero's critiques. As detailed in the introduction, Cicero used mercantile language to suggest that Epicurean friendships were necessarily selfish and mercenary because they reduce the friend to his ability to provide pleasure and security. By engaging Cicero's language, Horace enters the debate over the merit of the Epicurean form of *amicitia.* Unfortunately, the intertextual relationship between Horace and Cicero is complex.[93] Rather than a single, direct linguistic reference, Horace offers an extended allusion to Cicero's caricatures throughout *Odes* 1.24. If Horace does not directly echo the specifics of Cicero's language, the content, tone, and themes of *Odes* 1.24 place it in conversation with such critical caricatures of Epicurean friendships. I argue therefore that, on the one hand, Horace's mercantile metaphor situates the poem within Cicero's anti-Epicurean critiques, yet on the other hand, this image co-opts, rather than adopts, such language in order to counter Cicero's caricatures.

---

[92] Fr. 82 (=85 N). For text and translation, see Konstan et al. 1998: 87.

[93] Aside from mercantile language, Cicero frequently depicts Epicureans as animals, e.g. *Fin*. 2.110. Horace alludes to Ciceronian parodies of Epicureans in *Ep.* I.4.16, calling himself "a hog of Epicurus' herd" (*Epicuri de grege porcum*).

Contrary to Cicero, Horace portrays his Epicurean friendship with Vergil as a relationship in which both friends seek benefits *for* one another. In 1.24, Quintilius' objectification and Vergil's selfishness are the result of grief (*nulli flebilior quam tibi, Vergili,* 10). That is the point of Horace's *parrhesia.* Moreover, it is entirely human to want "one so loved" back. The picture in *Odes* 1.24 reveals that Horace cares for the emotional well-being of Vergil, sharing in lament for a lost friend and acting for the betterment of another. That Horace wrote a poem to help a friend is itself evidence for the health of his friendship with Vergil. To his general readership, the activity of *Odes* 1.24, when mixed with the mercantile language, presents a counter-analogy to Cicero's underlying argument.

Horace's portrait of an Epicurean relationship argues that even if Epicurean relationships are based on an exchange of benefits, it is a mutual exchange. That is, exchange drives the relationship, not its effectual benefits. Horace and Vergil's relationship is founded upon the free exchange of ideas between friends. Their friendship allows Horace to criticize Vergil's excessive emotion openly. Horace does not offer this therapy for his own benefit or pleasure; it is aid aimed at helping a friend. Are there benefits to their friendship? Of course, but Horace does not picture a relationship in which one simply seeks these benefits, as Cicero claims. We may recall what Epicurus says about the false Epicurean friend: "A friend is not one who is constantly seeking some benefit, nor one who never connects friendship with utility." There is a paradoxical balance to be kept in the practice of Epicurean relationships. One ought not to seek benefit as an end in itself, but to disregard the utility of friendship is likewise foolish. As noted in the Introduction, true Epicurean friendship approximates the relationships between the gods, in which shared self-expression and conversation ground the friend-

ships. Horace's image of friendship proves closer to this paradigm than the vulgar portrait Cicero gives.

In sum, it appears that Horace's friendship with Vergil was a lively, open, honest relationship shared with others of like mind and, in this case, even with the world. The narrative persona of *Odes* 1.24 is Horace the friend and practitioner of Epicurean *parrhesia*; the addressee is Vergil, the grieving poet. Horace aims to use the poem both to cure Vergil of his excessive mourning and to counter Ciceronian caricatures of Epicurean friendships. For the purpose of consolation and therapy, Horace steeps his poem in language and images that situate the poem within a personal context, ensuring the ode is "individual-relative." To paint a picture of his relationship with Vergil, Horace utilizes his practice of Epicurean therapy to image the proper Epicurean relationship. With the infused color of mercantile language, Horace is able to remind Vergil that death is permanent, but true friends, such as Horace himself, remain. The context, tone, and content of *Odes* 1.24 place it squarely within an evolving Epicurean tradition concerning the practice of friendship. While Cicero focuses on the utilitarian aspect of Epicurean relationships, Horace attempts to flesh out the 'divine' facet. By writing a poem aimed at the emotional benefit of a friend, Horace depicts at Epicurean friendship at its highest, a relationship in which the friend is *non ita creditum*, "not thus a loan."

CHAPTER FOUR

Odes 4.12:
Friendship's Commemoration

The spectre of death haunts *Odes* 4.12, an invitation to a springtime symposium published six years after Vergil's death. A poem addressed to Vergil and replete with mercantile language, this ode caps Horace's triptych of Vergil odes. The acme of Horace's representation unfortunately seems tainted, as Horace's language and his apparently critical tone strike many readers as mercenary. Like *Odes* 1.3, some readers sense a possible schism in Horace and Vergil's relationship. In order to answer why Horace saturates this invitation to Vergil with such sharp, commercial imagery, this chapter will examine the poetic and philosophic context of Horace's language. I argue that, as with *Odes* 1.3 and 1.24, the language of exchange playfully engages both Horace's previous Vergil odes and Cicero's caricatures of Epicurean relationships in order to commemorate their friendship.

Horace's barter imagery functions on two levels. First, it situates Horace's invitation within the sympotic *topos* of the impoverished host inviting a wealthy guest, a generic form that Catullus 13 typifies. Second, the language recalls without recapitulating Horace's mercantile tone and imagery in *Odes* 1.3 and 1.24. Horace conflates the Catullan form and his own parrhesiatic tone to create a hyperbolic dramatization of Cicero's standard critique of Epicurean friendship. While Cicero imagines Epicurean relationships as venal and selfish, Horace portrays the value of friendship itself as greater than its consequential pleasures.

As with *Odes* 1.24, this image counters Cicero's critiques and is ultimately in line with Epicurus' teachings. I argue that Odes 4.12 commemorates Horace and Vergil's friendship and that commercial language cements the remembrance.

It is not universally agreed that *Odes* 4.12 actually addresses Vergil, Rome's preeminent poet.[94] Horace's apparent lack of decorum leads some scholars to posit another Vergilius as the recipient of this ode. One finds this opinion stated as early as the fifth century in the commentary of pseudo-Acro:[95] "[Horace] writes to a Vergil who was a wholesale dealer" (*ad Vergilium negotiatorem scribit*). In the tenth century, two manuscripts provide similar readings: "[an ode written] to a certain Vergil who was an ointments dealer" (*ad Vergilium quendam unguentarium*).[96] These early commentators, however, likely extrapolated from the text itself without external evidence. Cecil Bowra points out that *quendam* "is a patent confession of ignorance,"[97] and reading the ode's *Vergilius* as an ointments dealer derives from line 16: "you will earn wine with nard" (*nardo uina merebere*). Nevertheless, many notable scholars—Fraenkel and Putnamchief among them—follow this line of reasoning.[98] They argue that Horace's language in this poem (*iuuenum nobilium cliens*, 15, and *studium lucri*, 25) clashes with an invitation to a dead friend, especially one of such stature as Vergil. Eduard

---

[94] For the two sides with bibliography, see Thomas 2011: 225-27 and Johnson 2004: 160-1.

[95] Nisbet and Rudd 2004: xxix.

[96] Paris MSS 7974 and 7971.

[97] Bowra 1928: 165. He accepts that the ode addresses Vergil the poet, but attempts to resolve the ode's post mortem publication and Horace's indecorous language by asserting that the poem was written before Vergil died and was added to the fourth book of *Odes* in order to fill out the slender volume.

[98] For influential arguments against Vergil as the addressee, see Fraenkel 1981 and Putnam 2006: 205-06.

Fraenkel goes so far as to describe Horace as "a monster of callousness" for his language.[99]

Others argue, however, that the ode's Vergilian language and themes cement the addressee as the famed poet. David Belmont imagines a Roman reader attentive to the poem's intertextuality and contends that this reader could not but identify the addressee as the poet Vergil.[100] The thought experiment persuades many, and today the *opinio communis* asserts the identification.[101] Whatever incongruities in tone scholars sense, it is difficult to imagine an early reader finishing the ode and not thinking of Rome's recently deceased national poet. In the most recent commentary on *Odes* 4, Richard Thomas summarizes the argument: "The addressee is indeed the poet [because] *C.* 4.12 is replete with Vergilian diction, style, and rhetorical devices, and it seems perverse to take the addressee as being anyone but the poet Vergil, the Vergilius to whom H[orace] refers by the same name on nine other occasions."[102] This chapter follows Thomas, assuming that Horace addressed this ode to Vergil. If we are to acquit Horace of the charge of callousness, we must explain the puzzling prevalence of his apparently critical mercantile language. Such an explanation proves impossible if divorced from the ode as a whole. Let us first, therefore, consider the ode *in toto,* paying particular note to any instances of commercial imagery.

---

[99] Fraenkel 1957: 418.

[100] Belmont 1980: 1-20.

[101] See Quinn 1963: 11, Bowra 1928: 165-7, Putnam 2006: 93, Belmont 1980: 1-20, Moritz 1969: 174-93, Porter 1973: 71-87, and Strauss-Clay 2002: 129-45.

[102] Thomas 2011: 227.

The Invitation

Odes 4.12 conflates two genres, each occupying one-half of the ode: spring poem (1-12) and invitation poem (13-28). The three stanzas that form the first half of the poem (1-12) display spring enlivening the various spheres of nature: the inanimate (1-4), the animal (5-8), and the human (9-12). Each quatrain mingles spring's rejuvenation with death's melancholy, as winter casts its long shadows on these burgeoning and blossoming spheres.[103] For the second half of the ode, Horace calls Vergil to a symposium for which Vergil provides nard and Horace wine. Commentators often puzzle over Horace's generic amalgamation. In order to make sense of this conflation, scholars now read the poem as "a bitter-sweet evocation of Horace's dead friend."[104] Under this interpretation, the spring strophes initiate the evocation and the invitation strophes describe a literary *convivium* in which poets meet and share their poetic wares.[105] Each spring stanza prepares the reader for Vergil's presence at the ode's heart. The first stanza situates *Odes* 4.12 within Horace's lyric triptych. The second stanza alludes to Vergil's Procne myth. Finally, the third stanza explicitly recalls Vergil's pastoral locale. The mercantile language in the second half of the ode functions in much the same way. Recalling the tone of Horace's previous odes to Vergil, Horace's commercial language calls to the reader's mind Vergil's poetic corpus, even as his physical body no longer exists.

---

[103] See *Odes* 1.4 and 4.7 as particularly striking examples of spring and death comingling.

[104] Strauss-Clay 2002: 131.

[105] Strauss-Clay 2002: 129-45, Moritz 1969: 174-93, Johnson 2004: 158-67, and Thomas 2011: 227 all propound a form of this reading.

Odes 4.12 opens with a natural scene that sets the stage for the overarching themes of friendship and death. The first three words, *Iam veris comites*, indicate both the ode's springtime setting and its friendship-centered tone. First, the introduction references Catullus's spring poem: *iam ver egelidos refert tepores* ("Already spring brings tepid warmth," 46.1), in which Catullus bids farewell to actual companions. Second, *comites* may recall Horace's companions on the road to Brundisium, of which Vergil was a member.[106] Horace's "comrades of spring" thus initially appear human.[107] Horace elaborates on the "comrades of spring," however, placing the Thracian winds in apposition:

> Iam veris comites, quae mare temperant,
> impellunt animae lintea Thraciae,
> iam nec prata regent nec fluvii strepunt
>   hiberna nive turgidi.
>
> <div align="right">*Odes* 4.12.1-4</div>

> Already the comrades of spring, who soothe the sea, the Thracian winds, drive the sails. Already neither are fields stiff nor do streams groan, swollen with winter snow.

The use of *anima* for *ventus* is unique in Horace, and its uniqueness suggests its importance.[108] This Greek cognate usage of *anima*, following *comites* so closely, may echo *Odes* 1.3's famous *animae dimidium meae*. Furthermore, *animae* could also recall Vergil, Plotius and Varius, described as *animae candidiores* at *Satires*

---

[106] *comites* (4.12.1) may echo Catullus' *o dulces comitum valete coetus* ("Farewell oh sweet company of friends," 46.9) or even *Sat.* 1.5.8-9: *cenantis haud animo aequo/ exspectans comites* ("impatiently awaiting my dinner companions").

[107] Belmont 1980: 15 proposes a subtle Vergilian allusion through a wordplay in the first line: *Iam veris comites, quae mare temperant.* Belmont suggests that *ver(is) … mar(e)* alludes to Vergil's signature in the reverse acrostic at *Georgics* 1.429-33: *MA(RO)-VE(GILIVS)-PV(BLIVS).* For examinations of Vergil's acrostic, see Thomas 1998: *ad G.* 1.427-37 and Katz 2008: 105-23.

[108] Garrison 1991: 362. See the other uses in *Odes* 1.3.8 (*animae dimidium meae*), 1.10.17 (*pias laetis animas reponis sedibus*), 2.17.5 (*meae si partem animae*), 3.9.12 (*si parcent animae fata*), and 4.10.8 (*vel cur his animis*), all of which treat *anima* in its "spiritual" sense. 3.9.12 specifically, addressed to Maecenas, recalls 1.3.8.

1.5.41.[109] These two possible referents suggest the depth of Horace's allusive engagement with Vergil and their friendship. In addition, the two verbs governed by "the Thracian winds," *temperant* and *impellunt*, recall the nautical setting of *Odes* 1.3. Finally, the adjective *Thraciae* recalls Orpheus in *Odes* 1.24 (*Threicio blandius Orpheo,* 13). This reference adumbrates the theme of death and recalls Horace's previous Vergil odes. This first stanza is a *tour de force* of self-reference, placing the ode squarely within the tapestry of the Vergil odes as a whole.

The second stanza offers an extended allusion to the myth of Procne and Tereus. On the literal level, instinct drives a bird to prepare her nest; on the metaphorical level, however, Horace sees in this act resonances of Procne's tale of death and revenge:

> Nidum ponit Ityn flebiliter gemens
> infelix avis et Cecropiae domus
> aeternum opprobrium, quod male barbaras
>   regum est ulta libidines.
>
> <div align="right">*Odes* 4.12.5-8</div>

> The unlucky bird builds her nest, moaning mournfully for Itys. She
> is an eternal disgrace to the house of Cecrops because she took foul
> revenge on the barbarous lusts of kings.

The central image of the second stanza points directly to Vergil. The *infelix avis* is unparalleled in Horace's corpus, though it recalls Vergil's two abbreviated descriptions of the myth. First, consider the image of Philomela, Procne's sister, in the sixth book of the *Eclogues*:

> aut ut mutatos Terei narraverit artus,
> quas illi Philomela dapes, quae dona pararit,
> quo cursu deserta petiverit et quibus ante
> <u>infelix</u> sua tecta super volitaverit alis?
>
> <div align="right">*Eclogues* 6.78-81</div>

---

[109] Belmont 1980: 15. For Quintilius, Vergil, and Horace as members of an Epicurean quartette, see *Vita Vergilii* of Probus (Castner 1988: 45); For more on this quartette, see Introduction, pp. 13-4.

> Or how he detailed Tereus' morphed limbs, what banquets and what gifts Philomela prepared for him, by what route she sought the desert, and on what wings the <u>unlucky</u> woman earlier flitted about her rooftops?

The image is likewise influenced by Vergil's description of Orpheus' lament in the *Georgics:*

> qualis populea maerens <u>philomela</u> sub umbra
> amissos <u>queritur</u> fetus, quos durus arator
> observans nido implumes detraxit; at illa
> flet noctem ramoque sedens miserabile carmen
> integrat et maestis late loca questibus implet.
>
> <div align="right">Geo. 4.511-15</div>

> As <u>Philomela</u>, grieving beneath the poplar's shade, <u>laments</u> her lost children, whom a rough ploughman snatched as she watched, featherless, from the nest; but she weeps all night and repeats her sad song perched on a branch and fills the place around with mournful cries.

In this *Georgics* section, Vergil describes Orpheus' grief following the death of his wife, foreshadowing Horace's foolish apostrophe in the fourth stanza.[110] In both language and theme, Horace echoes Vergil's treatments of this tragic tale.

Strophe three engages Vergil's pastoral *Eclogues.* Moving from the mournful songs of the animal world, Horace now imagines man's music in the form of shepherds' singing:

> Dicunt in tenero gramine pinguium
> custodes ovium carmina fistula
> delectantque deum, cui pecus et nigri
>   colles Arcadiae placent.

---

[110] Putnam 2006: 99-100 points out that this stanza recalls Catullus' mourning of his brother's death at 65.11-14: "But certainly I will love you always, I will sing mournful songs for your death always, songs like the Daulian maid sings beneath thick shade of the branches, moaning the fate of snatched-away Itylus" (*at certe semper amabo,/ semper maesta tua carmina morte canam,/ qualia sub densis ramorum concinit umbris/ Daulias, absumpti fata gemens Ityli*). Both Catullus and Horace use the participle *gemens* only once in their *corpi*, and these lines of Catullus are the only previous direct mention of Itys in Latin literature still preserved. With this allusion, Horace suggests the depth of his loss: Vergil's death is to Horace as Catullus' brother's was to Catullus.

> The custodians of fattened sheep sing songs in the soft grass with the pipe, and they delight the god whom the herd and black hills of Arcadia please.

Horace's reference to Vergil's pastoral text is layered. First, the *fistula* pipe is the primary instrument used throughout the *Eclogues*. Second, the *deus Arcadiae* Pan appears at the climax of Vergil's final eclogue.[111] Finally, the reader senses Vergil's pastoral presence most vividly in Horace's only reference to the mythical land of Arcadia. Once again, Horace hints at Vergil's poetic presence before his name actually appears.

In the center of the poem and of the generic shift falls the apostrophe to Vergil.[112] As the poem turns from its various images of spring's advent to an invitation to Vergil, so too does the season shift from spring to summer:

> Adduxere sitim tempora, Vergili.
> sed pressum Calibus ducere Liberum
> si gestis, iuvenum nobilium cliens,
>   nardo vina merebere.

> The season has contracted thirst, Vergil. But, if you desire to drink Liber pressed at Cales, in that you are a client of noble youths, you will merit the wine with nard.

Spring has blossomed and decayed, leaving parching summer in its stead.[113] Amid this seasonal shift, Horace calls Vergil to drink, but on one condition. If

---

[111] At *Ecl.* 10.26: "Pan, Arcadia's god, came, whom we ourselves saw blood red with elderberries and vermilion" (*Pan deus Arcadiae uenit, quem uidimus ipsi/ sanguineis ebuli bacis minioque rubentem*).

[112] For the structural similarities between 4.12 and 1.24, especially the placement of the addressee, see Belmont 1980: 8.

[113] Horace couches this invitation in an allusion to Vergil's account of the Nordic plague at *Georgics* 482-3: "when fiery thirst, which is driven all throughout their veins, had contracted their miserable limbs" (*ubi ignea venis/ omnibus acta sitis miseros adduxerat*

Vergil wishes to partake of Horace's Calian wine, he must bring an unguent. Between the protasis (*si gestis,* 15) and apodosis (*nardo vina merebere,* 16) of this conditional, one finds the phrase Fraenkel finds so indecorous (*iuvenum nobilium cliens,* 15).[114] Thomas points out that the epithet is not merely appositive; its position creates causal force.[115] The description initiates Horace's impoverished host rhetoric.[116] Horace asks Vergil, the wealthier guest, to provide part of the symposium; the request is a *quid pro quo,* wine for nard.[117] The presumed equality between the two objects extends to their owners. Horace, who will provide wine, writes this ode as a *cliens* himself. The Suetonian *Life of Horace* claims that Horace wrote his fourth book of *Carmina* at Augustus' behest.[118] Horace addresses Vergil one client to another. Moreover, the reader must not forget that all the mercantile

---

artus). In Vergil's image, thirst is the subject of *adduxerat,* desiccating its victims. For Horace, thirst is the object, thus personifying the season that occasions a need for Bacchus, who is *pressum…Liberum,* "the confined Liberator" (14). At Horace's *convivium,* Bacchus-infused wine is contracted, not one's limbs.

[114] Thomas 2011: 234 believes this nard to be the same as the *Assyria nardus* of 2.11.16, which was extremely valuable. For its value, see Pliny *HN* 12.26: "The blacker color means a better nard, if it has aged. In our part of the world the next most highly praised kind is the Syrian" (*nardo colos, si inveteravit, nigrior meliori. In nostro orbe proxime laudatur Syriacum*).

[115] Thomas 2011: 234.

[116] Consider, for example, the opening of Horace's invitation to Maecenas at *Odes* 1.20.1: "You will drink cheap Sabine in modest cups" (*Vile potabis modicis Sabinum*).

[117] Minadeo 1976: 163 believes the exchange has an "ironic relationship to the beautiful *animae dimidium meae* in 1.3."

[118] Suet. *Vit. Hor.* pp. 297.35-298.1: "[Augustus] always so approved of Horace's writings and thought they would last for ever, that he imposed on him not only the composition of the Secular Hymn but also the victory over the Vindelici of his stepsons Tiberius and Drusus, and for this reason compelled him after a long interval to add a fourth to the three books of *Odes* (*scripta quidem eius usque adeo probavit mansuraque perpetuo opinatus est, ut non modo saeculare Carmen componendum iniunxerit sed et Vindelicam victoriam Tiberii Drusique, privignorum suorum, eumque coegerit propter hoc tibus Carminum libris ex longo intervallo quartum addere*). Thomas 2011: 5 challenges the passage's veracity; nonetheless, *Odes* 4.12 was published after the *Carmen Saeculare* was performed, for which Horace was certainly commissioned to write at Augustus' behest.

language occurs after Bacchus and his wine have entered the poem. His influence likely heightens Horace's *licentia*.[119]

The fifth stanza provides the commercial punch line to Horace's invitation. Vergil's nard will elicit the cask of wine, which Horace apparently does not possess, implying that the pair will have to sell the nard to procure the aforementioned wine:

> Nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum,
> qui nunc Sulpiciis accubat horreis,
> spes donare novas largus amaraque
>   curarum eluere efficax.
>
> <div align="right">*Odes* 4.12.17-20</div>

> A small onyx-jar of nard will elicit the cask, which now lies in Sulpician warehouses, generous at giving new hopes and effective at purging the bitterness of cares.

Horace offers Vergil what is, on the one hand, a great bargain—a small (*parvus*) jar for the largess (*largus*) of wine. On the other hand, Vergil must effectively provide both halves of the dinner. The poem offers an unbalanced barter that exaggerates the impoverished host/wealthy guest *topos*. With this inversion of the typical invitation genre, Horace clearly recalls the thirteenth poem of Catullus:

> Cenabis bene, mi Fabulle, apud me
> paucis, si tibi di favent, diebus,
> si tecum attuleris bonam atque magnam
> cenam, non sine candida puella
> et vino et sale et omnibus cachinnis.
> Haec si, inquam, attuleris, venuste noster,
> cenabis bene; nam tui Catulli
> plenus sacculus est aranearum.
> sed contra accipies meros amores
> seu quid suavius elegantiusve est:
> nam <u>unguentum</u> dabo, quod meae puellae
> donarunt Veneres Cupidinesque,
> quod tu cum olfacies, deos rogabis,
> totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum.
>
> <div align="right">Catullus 13</div>

---

[119] For the *licentia* of lyric poetry in the first century BC, see Belmont 1980: 11-13.

> You will eat well, my Fabullus, with me in a few days, if the gods favor you, if along with yourself you bring a fine and grand meal, and not without a glittering girl, and wine, and salt, and all laughter. I say that if you bring these things, O our charming one, you will eat well. For the money-bag of your Catullus is full, full of spider's webs. But in return for these things, you will receive pure loves, or something rather charming and elegant: for I will give you an unguent that the Venuses and Cupids gave to my girlfriend, which when you smell it, you will beg the gods to make you all nose, O Fabullus.

Both poems offer an unbalanced exchange and depict an impoverished host inviting a wealthy guest to come and dine. The reference further elucidates *iuvenum nobilium cliens*. The phrase functions as *plenus sacculus est aranearum* does, to illustrate the host's poverty. It is more self-deprecatory than accusatory. Horace is penniless; in order to procure the fine wine, he needs Vergil's expensive unguent.[120] Compared to Catullus, who is able to provide the unguent, Horace appears thoroughly broke. Vergil, however, can provide the nard because he rubs elbows with Rome's elite.

Vergil's requested nard has dual resonances. In the Greek sympotic tradition, nard (νάρδος) occasionally flavors wine (ναρδίτης).[121] The unguent is not merely aromatic; it compliments the wine. Horace thus asks Vergil to bring an integral part of a flavorful symposium. Through allusion to Propertius, Horace also suggests a funerary element to the nard's purpose:

---

[120] In Catullus's poem, Fabullus will receive an unguent if he brings the dinner. In *Odes* 4.12, Vergil will receive wine if he brings the nard. Unlike Catullus, Horace is unable even to provide the unguent!

[121] Johnson 2004: 165 favors this reading. Horace himself references this sympotic side to nard in Odes 2.11.13-18: "Why not drink while we can, lying, thoughtlessly, under this towering pine, or this plane-tree, our greying hair scented with roses, and perfumed with nard from Assyria? Bacchus dispels all those cares that feed on us." (*Cur non sub alta uel platano uel hac/ pinu iacentes sic temere et rosa/ canos odorati capillos,/ dum licet, Assyriaque nardo/ potamus uncti? dissipat Euhius/ curas edacis*).

> cur uentos non ipse rogis, ingrate, petisti?
>   cur <u>nardo</u> flammae non oluere meae?
> hoc etiam graue erat, <u>nulla mercede</u> hyacinthos
>   inicere et fracto busta piare <u>cado</u>.
>
> <div align="right">Propertius 4.7.31-4</div>

> Ungrateful man, why couldn't you pray for a wind to fan my pyre?
> Why didn't my flames smell of <u>nard</u>? Was it so hard, indeed, to
> scatter <u>cheap</u> hyacinths or to honor my tomb with a shattered <u>cask</u>?

This speech forms part of Cynthia's post mortem harangue aimed at Propertius. Nard can clearly function in the funeral ceremony.[122] Horace's *nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum* (4.12.17) recalls Propertius' *nardo* (4.7.32) and *cado* (4.7.34). On one level, then, Horace asks Vergil to bring the unguent for his own funeral. In return, Horace will procure the jar to shatter on his tomb. Once again, the spectre of death lies just beneath the ode's surface.

Horace's sixth stanza cements the penniless host image through further mercantile language. Horace will gladly offer Vergil his wine, perhaps even dyeing his skin with it, but only if he hurries to bring his half of the bargain:

> Ad quae si properas gaudia, cum tua
> velox merce veni: non ego te meis
> inmunem meditor tinguere poculis,
>   plena dives ut in domo.
>
> <div align="right">*Odes* 4.12.21-24</div>

> If you are hurrying to these joys, come quickly with your wares. I
> do not intend to dye you with my cups tax-free, like a wealthy man
> in a plentiful home.

---

[122] Talking about the death and rebirth of a phoenix, Ovid also links nard with death: "As soon as it has lined it with cassia bark, and smooth spikes of <u>nard</u>, cinnamon fragments and yellow myrrh, it settles on top, and ends its life among the perfumes" (*Quo simul ac casias et <u>nardi</u> lenis aristas/ quassaque cum fulva substravit cinnama murra,/ se super imponit finitque in odoribus aevum*, *Met.* 15.398-400).

Horace's language in this passage is brusque.[123] In the phrase *non ego te meis,* however, Horace conflates his curt imperative with deep sentiment; he embraces Vergil, encompassing him, even as the *non* frustrates their imagined communion. Horace deepens the phrase's paradoxical image with an allusion to *Odes* 4.9:

> … Non ego te meis
>   chartis inornatum silebo

Odes 4.9.30-1

I will not be silent about you in my writings, O celebrated [Lollius].

The second half of 4.9.30 precisely repeats 4.12.22—*non ego te meis.* In 4.12, *meis* modifies cups filled with wine; in 4.9, Horace's poetry. Horace's self-reference is pointed: "poetry and wine are for Horace ever complimentary entities."[124] More-over, this stanza extends Horace's impoverished host rhetoric. Horace will not provide Vergil with wine "tax-free" (*inmunem,* 23), because Horace is not "a wealthy man in a plentiful home" (*plena dives ut in domo,* 24). Vergil's *munus* re-calls a client's *munera* to his patron.[125] Situated within the allusion to poetic writ-ings, this aspect of *inmunem* takes on further significance. If on the literal level Vergil's "tax" is the nard, Horace suggests that this nard also represents poet-

---

[123] Disregarding Horace's self-reference, Minadeo 1976: 163 argues that the brusque language indicates that Vergil has fallen from Horace's good graces. I disagree. See Belmont 1980: 5 fn. 19 for criticism of his conclusion. Horace speaks curtly because Vergil is removed from Horace's life and their friendship.

[124] Putnam 2006: 96.

[125] For an example of Vergil's *munera,* see Epist. 2.1. 245-7: "But neither is your judgment of them to their discredit, nor the gifts which they carried off to the great glory of the donor, I mean the poets Virgil and Varius, beloved of you" (*at neque dedecorant tua de se iudcia atque/ munera, quae multa dantis cum laude tulerunt,/ dilecti tibi Vergilius Vari-usque poetae*).

60

ry.[126] To partake of Horace's poetic cups, Vergil must pay the tax of his own poetry, bringing the flavoring nard that represents his *chartae.*

The final strophe of *Odes* 4.12 offers readers an enigmatic conclusion. The quatrain begins in haste and ends in folly:

> Verum pone moras et studium lucri
> nigrorumque memor, dum licet, ignium
> misce stultitiam consiliis brevem:
>   dulce est desipere in loco.

<div align="right">

Odes 4.12.25-28

</div>

> But put aside delays and zeal for profit and, remembering the black flames, while it is permitted mix brief folly into your plans: it is sweet to act the fool in the proper place.

The sense of urgency heightens; Vergil must not delay (*pone moras,* 25). Along with delay, Horace also exhorts Vergil to leave behind any "zeal for profit" (*studium lucri,* 25), the other phrase commentators such as Page and Fraenkel find disquieting. Some scholars explain Horace's language here by arguing that this phrase marks the apex of Horace's drunkenness.[127] Others sense a playful recognition and mild mockery of Vergil's financial success as a poet.[128] Both readings accord with the previous rhetoric of the penniless host awaiting his guest to provide all the amenities.

The Commemoration

---

[126] The reader finds the image of poetry as a gift throughout Horace's fourth book of *Odes.* At *Odes* 4.3.17-24 and 4.6.29-30 Horace receives his poetic talent as a gift from the gods; at 4.8.9-12, 21-22 Horace describes writing poetry for a patron in stark commercial language.

[127] Strauss-Clay 2002: 134 reminds, "precisely because Vergil *is* dead, the phrase loses its sting; and its playfulness may be due to the liberating influence of the wine."

[128] Suet. *Vit. Verg.* records that Vergil "possessed approximately ten million sesterces from friends' generosity and owned a house at Rome on the Esquiline, abut Maecenas' gardens" (*possedit prope centiens sesterium ex liberalitatibus amicorum habuitque domum Romae Esquiliis iuxta hortos Maecenatianos,* 13).

I contend that another possible source for the mercenary tone is the anti-Epicurean caricatures promulgated by Cicero. Like *Odes* 1.3 and 1.24, where commercial imagery engaged Epicurean relationships, Horace dramatizes Cicero's image to draw out inconsistencies. As outlined in the Introduction, Cicero views Epicurean friendships as necessarily mercenary and selfish because they reduce the friend to his possible pleasurable profit.[129] This sentiment is captured most succinctly in Cicero's dialogue on friendship:

> sic amicitiam non spe mercedis adducti sed quod omnis eius fructus in ipso amore inest, expetendam putamus.
>
> *Laelius* 31

> So too we think friendship should be sought not because we are drawn by a hope for profit, but because its every benefit is contained in love itself.[130]

Perhaps Horace is once again toying with such portraits of an Epicurean relationship, Vergil's *studium lucri* mimicking Cicero's *spe mercedis*? Yet Horace, not Vergil would fall victim to Cicero's critique. Horace displays the "hope for profit," seeking the *merx* of Vergil's nard. The urgency of Horace's request that Vergil make no delay betrays his selfish desire for Vergil's presence. As with the supposedly indecorous *iuvenum nobilium cliens*, Horace must level his criticism at himself as well. Read relative to Horace's previous odes to Vergil, the phrase echoes the image of *Odes* 1.3, where Horace famously describes Vergil as "the other half of my soul" (*animae dimidium meae,* 8). In Chapter Two, we detailed the monetary imagery involved in this phrase; Horace imagines Vergil as a halved *aes* coin deposited to a ship. Here, in 4.12, Horace jabs Vergil for his financial suc-

---

[129] For treatment of Cicero's critiques and caricatures, see the Introduction pp. 4-7.

[130] Note the verb *adduco* used here and at the opening of the invitation section of the ode.

cess. Yet Virgil is not apposite a mercantile object, as in *Odes* 1.3's *animae dimidium meae,* but possesses one. In asking Vergil to put aside a "zeal for profit" in order to join a symposium, Horace contrasts monetary with relational profit. Insofar as the sympotic encounter pictures friendship, Horace clearly values the latter over the former.

This insight elucidates the disproportional exchange that Horace offers. Although Vergil must ultimately provide for the entirety of the symposium, Horace offers his own companionship in return. The implication is that the experience of friendship is more valuable than any of these extraneous benefits or objects. On the one hand, Horace's role in the friendship appears more valuable than both Assyrian nard and Calian wine. On the other hand, Vergil's role in the friendship proves more valuable than any profit, monetary or reputational, he may receive from his poetry. The mercantile and critical tone of the ode thus serves ironically to crystalize Horace's implicit elevation of friendship itself over its consequential pleasures.

Returning to the ode's sententious conclusion, Horace mixes the somber tenor of the ode with levity. From desired haste, Horace quickly pivots to thoughts of wine's effects. The imperative *misce* leads the reader to expect an image of cutting pure wine with water. Instead, Horace urges Vergil to mix "folly with your plans" (*stultitiam consiliis,* 27). This reversal of the expected wine motif flows into the ode's conclusion—folly is sweet in the proper place. This conclusion recalls the likewise sententious clause that closes *Odes* 1.24:

> Durum; sed levius fit patientia
>   quicquid corrigere est nefas

Odes 1.24.19-20

It is hard; but whatever is forbidden to correct becomes easier to
bear with patience.

The reference is structural. The two conclusions share a common metrical posi-

tion for their infinitives; both *desipere* and *corrigere* are found after the initial tro-

chee of the final line.[131] While patience eases the pain of some forbidden desire,

Horace reminds that such patience need not be an emotional coldness; rather, it

may be best to face the necessity of death with a little foolishness. Perhaps also

the conclusion of *Odes* 4.12 also refers to the practice of Epicurean commemora-

tion:[132]

ἡδὺ ἡ φίλου μνήμη τεθνηκότος.

Fragment 213

"The memory of a deceased friend is sweet."

Horace's *dulce* translates ἡδὺ. Within Epicurus' Garden, members would gather

for feasts to remember esteemed members now deceased. The most important of

these commemorative symposia was for Epicurus himself. The practice likely de-

rives its legitimacy from this dictum, which curiously parallels Horace's conclu-

sion in *Odes* 4.12. The Epicurean influence on the two previous Vergil odes has

been considered in previous chapters. Its import in those odes supports the rela-

tion here, as does the function of the spring stanzas. If the ode evokes Vergil's

poetic persona, it remembers the renowned poet. Horace therefore memorializes

Vergil by remembering his poetry and their friendship. The imagined *convivium*

playing out an Epicurean practice aimed at commemoration.

Wary of trite eulogy, Horace cuts his sympotic commemoration with the

parrhesiatic tone of his previous two Vergil odes. Under *Liber's* influence, the

---

[131] Both *Odes* 1.24 and 4.12 are in the same meter, third Asclepiadean.

[132] For an examination of commemoration in the Garden, see Clay 1998: 55-57.

critical tone is heightened. The hyperbole is dramatic, however, not mercenary. Saturating the ode in commercial language, Horace echoes the leitmotif that unites these three odes. He ensures that the connection is strong through rich self-reference in the opening stanza and an abundance of mercantile imagery throughout the ode. While, on the one hand, it couches Horace's invitation in the Catullan model of the impoverished host addressing a wealthier friend, the mercantile language in *Odes* 4.12 also engages Cicero's language and tone. As with *Odes* 1.3 and 1.24, Horace once again counters Cicero's conclusions by painting a vivid picture of a relationship that on the surface resembles one Cicero describes, yet ultimately intimates key differences between Horace and Vergil's friendship and the type Cicero portrays.

This is an honest portrait of a complex friendship. Although sharp in tone, phrases such as *iuvenum nobilium cliens* and *studium lucri* ultimately suggest that friendship should not be reduced to profit, and the friend himself proves more valuable than any secondary pleasure produced from the relationship. In this way, Horace accords with Epicurus himself: "Every friendship is choiceworthy in itself, though it begins in mutual advantage."[133] Although Vergil's friendship was a boon to Horace (Vergil first introduced him to Maecenas), their relationship is not reducible to a profit analogous to wine or nard. It transcends such vulgar utilitarianism and approximates Philodemus' "divine" form of friendship. Like the nard that flavors wine, Vergil's friendship in and of itself sweetens Horace's life. Although Vergil is dead, Horace commemorates his legacy and their friendship in the image of the symposium.

---

[133] *VS* 23: πᾶσα φιλία δι' ἑαυτὴν ἀρετή· ἀρχὴν δὲ εἴληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς ὠφελείας. For further discussion of this dictum, see Ch. 1, pp. 12-4.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

While we have examined each Vergil ode, whether Horace and Vergil were friends remains difficult to answer. We stated at the beginning of this study that in order to answer this question, one must first assess why mercantile language saturates the three Vergil odes. The subsequent chapters then attempted to elucidate the role of Horace's commercial imagery within these poems. In *Odes* 1.3, Horace recalls Epicurean philosophy and the language of its critiques in order to emphasize the similarity of his poetic voyage to Greece with Vergil's own; in *Odes* 1.24, Horace uses *parrhesia* to cure Vergil of his excessive grief; in *Odes* 4.12, Horace mimics anti-Epicurean caricatures in his poetic commemoration of Vergil and their friendship. Each poem utilizes the language of trade to different ends. Yet *Odes* 1.3, 1.24, and 4.12 form a poetic triptych insofar as Horace's mercantile language and the sharp tone it often conveys unite these poems into a cohesive whole. To determine whether their relationship was truly *amicitia,* we must consider the overall portrait Horace's paints in these three odes.

As noted in the Introduction, Richard Thomas senses "distance and difference" in Horace' odes that mention Vergil, as opposed to the convivial picture in the *Satires*.[134] The sense of distance often derives from interpreting Horace's mercantile language as mercenary and his tone as acerbic. This thesis argues that the sharp tone in each ode echoes Epicurean *parrhesia,* or frank criticism. In 1.3, Horace uses a parrhesiatic tone to suggest the depth of his Greek influences; 1.24 is

---

[134] Thomas 2001: 55-73. See Introduction, p. 1.

itself a poetic form of frank criticism; in 4.12, Horace playfully recalls this aspect of his relationship with Vergil to commemorate the deceased poet. What Thomas sees as distance, I see as poetic wit, capturing an element of Epicurean friendship in action. As a whole, the apparent asperity in these three poems reveals a complex relationship. This critical tone, however, provides only half of the unifying thread that runs through each Vergil ode.

This thesis also argues that Horace's mercantile language is redolent of Cicero's caricatures of Epicurean friendships.[135] In the Introduction, we outlined how Cicero and Epicurus differ in their conceptions of Epicurean friendships. Epicurus presents a paradoxical image of his followers' relationships, and Cicero caricatures half of that paradox. For Epicurus, "a friend is not one who is constantly seeking some benefit, nor one who never connects friendship with utility."[136] On the one hand, Epicurus believes that friends ought not to seek benefit as an end in itself; on the other hand, friends ought not to disregard the utility of friendship. Philodemus clarifies the paradox somewhat with reference to the gods. For Philodemus, human friendship, like divine friendship, is motivated by a desire for shared self-expression, that is, conversation and communion. Unlike the gods, however, human beings also require friendship for certain utilitarian purposes, such as security, solidarity, and pleasure. Cicero latches onto the latter aspect of Epicurean friendships and portrays all Epicureans as selfish hedonists even with regard to their friends. For Cicero, Epicurean relationships are "not

---

[135] Although Horace was raised in a banking environment as the son of a money-collector, the abundance and precision of Horace's commercial language in all three Vergil odes confirm its significance in understanding Horace's portrait of their friendship.

[136] VS 39. For further treatment, see Introduction p. 8-9.

friendship, but some mercantile calculation of their own utility."[137] The debate over the possible virtue of Epicurean friendship may be reduced to the question, Can the Epicurean conception of friendship transcend hedonism and approximate divine friendship?

Horace was interested in some form of this debate. In the *Satires*, Horace relates the primary points of conversation taken up when among his friends:

> … ergo
> sermo oritur, non de villis domibusve alienis,
> nec male nec ne Lepos saltet; sed, quod magis ad nos
> pertinet et nescire malum est, agitamus, utrumne
> divitiis homines an sint virtute beati,
> quidve ad amicitias, usus rectumne, trahat nos
> et quae sit natura boni summumque quid eius.
>
> <div align="right">Satires 2.6.70-6</div>

> Thus the conversation starts, not about other men's homes or villas, nor whether or not Lepos dances poorly. Rather, because they matter more to us and we would be foolish not to know of them, we discuss questions such as whether men are happy because of wealth or character, or whether utility or virtue draws us into friendship, or what the nature and highest form of the good is.

The second area of discussion mirrors the Epicurean paradox. Cicero argues that true *amicitia* originates in virtue, but the Epicureans believe that it is grounded in utility. Epicurus states that utility cannot be divorced from friendship, but is not the source of it.

I contend that the triptych of odes that concern Vergil at least partially engage the question of Epicurean friendship and its possible virtue. Taken together, the three odes display a friendship undergirded by Epicurean philosophy and practice. Rather than asperity, the odes portray one friend openly correcting another in a spirit of good will. Although Horace's mercantile imagery often conveys a critical tone, the images themselves are far from mercenary and display a

---

[137] *Nat. Deor*. 1.122. For further treatment, see Introduction p. 5-7.

strong friendship. In *Odes* 1.3, the commercial language helps Horace to link his lyric project to Vergil's epic, suggesting a poetic solidarity underpinning their friendship. In *Odes* 1.24, *non ita creditum* (11) functions within Horace's frank criticism to remind Vergil of death's necessary consequences, revealing a relationship strong enough for Horace to chastise Vergil openly. Finally, in *Odes* 4.12, the hyperbolically mercenary nature of Horace's invitation betrays the strength of their relationship prior to Vergil's death. Read together, these three odes offer a cohesive counter-analogy to Cicero's caricatures. Whereas Cicero highlights the utilitarian aspect of Epicurean relationships, Horace portrays the element of shared self-expression, whether in poetry (1.3), honest criticism (1.24), or commemoration (4.12).

These considerations, of Horace's three odes that concern Vergil and the cohesive image they present, provide an answer to our primary question. Yes, whether in the *Satires* or *Odes,* Horace portrays a friendship with Vergil. The picture he paints in the *Odes,* however, is clearly more complex than that in the *Satires.* By engaging the debate over Epicurean friendship, Horace offers readers a glimpse into their relationships; they can be brutally honest, but remain deeply affectionate. This image of friendship, found when viewing triptych of odes as a whole, offers a corrective for us today. While Facebook and Twitter lead us to believe friendship requires little more than the click of a mouse, Horace's portrait reminds us that friendship is a complex and paradoxical endeavor. It is both utilitarian and virtuous; it brings pleasure and security, but often requires self-sacrifice; it is filled with convivial interactions and creates the need for honest criticism; it brings joy, but must always end. Yet however paradoxical or volatile, Horace holds that if we bank on friendship, it will always pay dividends.

WORKS CITED

Andreau, Jean. 1999. *Banking and Business in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Armstrong, David. 1993. "The Addressees of the Ars Poetica: Herculaneum, the Pisones and Epicurean Protreptic." *MD* 31: 185-230.

---. 2003. Introduction to *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans,* edited by David Armstrong, Jeff Fish, Patricia A. Johnston, and Marilyn B. Skinner. Austin: University of Texas Press.

---. 2008. "'Be Angry and Sin Not': Philodemus Versus the Stoics on Natural Bites and Natural Emotions." In *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*. Edited by J. T. Fitzgerald. New York: Routledge.

---. 2011. "Epicurean virtues, Epicurean friendship: Cicero vs the Herculaneum papyri." In *Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition.* Edited by Jeffrey Fish and Kirk Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2007. "*Carmina: Odes* and *Carmen Saeculare.*" In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Edited by Stephen Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Basto, Ronald. 1982. "Horace's Propempticon to Vergil: A Re-examination." *Vergilius* 28: 30-43.

Belmont, David. 1980. "The Vergilius of Horace, Ode 4.12." *TAPA* 110: 1-20.

Bowra, Cecil M. 1928. "Horace, Odes IV. 12." *CR* 42.5: 165-67.

Brown, Eric. 2002. "Epicurus on the Value of Friendship ("Sententia Vaticana" 23)." *Classical Philology* 97.1: 68-80.

Buttrey, Theodore V. 1972. "Halved Coins, The Augustan Reform, and Horace, *Odes* 1.3." *AJA* 76: 31-48.

Cairns, Francis. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Press.

Carrubba, Robert W. 1984. "The Structure of Horace, *Odes* I,3: A Propempticon for Vergil." AJP 105: 166-173.

Castner, Catherine J. 1988. *Prosopography of Roman Epicureans from the Second Century B.C. to the Second Century A.D.,* Studien zur klassischen Philologie 34.

Frankfurt: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers.

Campbell, John S. 1987. "*Animae Dimidium Meae*: Horace's Tribute to Vergil." *CJ* 82.4: 314-18.

Cody, John V. 1976. *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics.* Brussels: Collection Latomus 147.

Coffta, David Joseph. 2002. *The Influence of Callimachean Aesthetics on the Satires and Odes of Horace. Studies in Classics 19.* Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Commager, Steele. 1995. *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Culler, Jonathan. 1981. "Apostrophe." In *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Davis, John T. 1971. "*Quo Desiderio*: The Structure of Catullus 96." *Hermes* 99.3: 297-302.

DeWitt, Norman W. 1935. "Parresiastic Poems of Horace." *CP* 30.4: 312-19.

---. 1936. "Epicurean *Contubernium*." *TAPA* 67: 55-63

Clay, Diskin. 1998. "Individual and Community in the First Generation of the Epicurean School," in *Paradosis and Survival: Three Chapters in the Epicurean Philosophy.* 55-57. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Duckworth, George. 1956. "*Animae Dimidium Meae*: Two Poets of Rome," *TAPA* 87: 281-316.

Elder, John P. 1952. "Horace, C., I, 3." *AJP* 73.2: 140-58.

Epicurus. 2010. *Vatican Sayings*. Trans. Peter Saint-Andre. Monadnock Press.

---. 2010. *Key Doctrines*. Trans. Peter Saint-Andre. Monadnock Press.

Fraenkel, Eduard. 1981. *Horace.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freudenburg, Kirk. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Garrison, Daniel, editor. 1991. *Horace: Epodes and Odes.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Gigante, Marcello and Mario Capasso. 1989. "Il ritorno di Virgilio a Ercolano." *SIFC*, 3d ser., 7: 3-6.

Glad, C.E. 1995. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychology.* Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.

Griffin, Miriam. 1997. "Philosophy, Politics, and Politicians at Rome." In *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society, Vol. 1.* Edited by Miriam Griffin and Jonathan Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hanchey, Daniel. Forthcoming. "Commercial Exchange and Epicurean Value-Judgment in Cicero's Dialogues."

Hendrickson, G. L. 1918. "An Epigram of Philodemus and Two Latin Congeners." *AJP*, 39.1: 27-43.

Jäger, Felix. 1913. *Das antike Propemptikon und das 17. Gedicht des Paulinus von Nola.* Rosenheim: Niedermayr.

Johnson, Timothy. 1994. "Horace, C. IV.12: Vergilius at the symposion." *Vergilius* 40: 49-66.

---. 2004. *A Symposion of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in* Odes IV. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Katz, J. 2008. "Vergil translates Aratus: Phaenomena 1-2 and *Gerogics* 1.1-2." *MD* 60: 105-23.

Khan, H. Akbar. 1999. "Horace's ode to Vergil on the Death of Quintilius: 1.24." In *Why Horace? A Collection of Interpretations*. Edited by William Anderson. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.

Kidd, D.A. 1977. "Virgil's Voyage." *Prudentia* 9: 97-103.

Konstan, David, Diskin Clay, Clarence E. Glad, Johan Thom, and James Ware, eds. 1998. *Philodemus On Frank Criticism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Lockyer, Charles W. Jr. 1967. "Horace's 'Propempticon' and Vergil's Voyage." *CW* 61.2: 42-45.

Long, A.A. and D.N. Sedley, eds. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowrie, Michelle. 1994. "Lyric's 'Elegos' and the Aristotelian Mean: Horace, *C*. 1.24, 1.33, and 2.9." *CW* 87.5: 377-94.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 2007. *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macleod, Henry D. 1890. *The Theory of Credit: Volume II, Part I.* London: Long-
    mans, Green, and Co.

Maslowski, Tadeusz. 1974. "The Chronology of Cicero's Anti-Epicureanism." *Eos*
    62: 55-78.

Minadeo, Richard W. 1976. "Vergil in Horace's *Odes* 4.12." CJ 71: 161-164.

Moritz, L. A. 1969. "Horace's Virgil." *G&R* 16.2: 174-93.

Nicgorski, Walter. 2002. "Cicero, Citizenship, and the Epicurean Temptation." In
    Cultivating Citizens: Soulcraft and Citizenship in Contemporary America. Edit-
    ed by Dwight Allman and Michael Beaty. Oxford: Lexington Books.

Nisbet, Robert G. M. and Margaret Hubbard. 1990. *A Commentary on Horace* Odes
    Book 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Niall Rudd. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III.*
    Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nussbaum, Martha. 1986. "Therapeutic arguments: Epicurus and Aristotle." In
    The Norms of Nature: Studies in Hellenistic Ethics. Edited by Malcolm
    Schofield and Gisela Striker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Connor, David K. 1989. "The Invulnerable Pleasures of Epicurean Friendship."
    Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 30.2: 165-86.

Oberhelman, Steven and David Armstrong. 1995. "Satire as Poetry and the Im-
    possibility of Metathesis in Horace's Satires." In *Philodemus and Poetry*. Ed-
    ited by Dirk Obbink. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Owen Lee, Father M. 1969. *Word, Sound, and Image in the Odes of Horace*. Ann Ar-
    bor: University of Michigan Press.

Pasquali, Giorgio. 1920. *Orazio Lirico.* Firenze: Le Monnier.

Porter, David H. 1972. "Horace, Carmina, IV, 12," *Latomus* 31: 71-87.

Pucci, Joseph. 1992. "Horace and Virgilian Mimesis: A Re-Reading of 'Odes' 1.3."
    The CW 85.6: 659-673.

Putnam, Michael. 1993. "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24." *CJ* 88.2: 123-35.

---. 2006. *Poetic Interplay: Catullus & Horace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Quinn, Kenneth. 1963. *Latin Explorations. Critical Studies in Roman Literature*. Lon-
    don: Routledge.

Russell D.A. and N.G. Wilson. 1981. *Menander Rhetor.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Santirocco, Matthew S. 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press Books.

Sider, David. 1997. *The Epigrams of Philodemus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stokes, Michael. 1995. "Cicero on Epicurean Pleasures." In *Cicero the Philosopher*. Edited by Jonathan Powell. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Striker, Gisela. 1996. "Epicurean Hedonism." In *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Edited by Gisela Striker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss-Clay, Jenny. 2002. "Sweet Folly: Horace, *Odes* 4:12 and the evocation of Virgil." 129-45. In *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*. Edited by Michael Paschalis. University of Crete – Department of Philology.

Thibodeau, Philip. 2003. "Can Vergil Cry? Epicureanism in Horace Odes 1.24." *CJ* 98.3: 243-256.

Thomas, Richard F. 1986. "Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference." *HSCP* 90: 171-98.

---. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2011. *Commentary on* Odes IV *and* Carmen Saeculare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1998. Georgics *Vol. 1: Books 1-2.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traill, David A. 1983. "Horace C. 1.3: A Political Ode?" *CJ* 78.2: 131-137

Tsakiropoulou-Summers, Tatiana. 1998. "Horace, Philodemus and the Epicureans at Herculaneum," *Mnemosyne* 51: 20-29.

Usener, H. 1987. *Epicurea.* North Stratford: Irvington Publishers Inc.

Warren, James. 2004. *Facing Death*: *Epicurus and his Critics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Waters, William. 2003. *Poetry's Touch: On Lyric Address.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Welch, Tara. 2008. "Horace's Journey through Arcadia." *TAPA* 138.1: 47-74.

West, David A. 1995. *Horace* Odes *I. Carpe Diem. Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wimmel, Walter. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom*. Weisbaden, Steiner.