II. The Plancus Ode

FRANCIS R. BLISS

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

The present paper is an attempt to do two things: first, to demonstrate the unity of Horace, *Carm.* 1.7, confining the evidence as far as possible to matter contained within the poem itself; and secondly, on the basis of this demonstration, to establish the historical validity of what it has to say.

This ode, as with many of the poems of Horace and Propertius, contains a transition so sharp as to have caused even ancient scholiasts to inquire whether there were not really two poems here instead of one. Scholars in our period have agreed with Porphyrio that the connection between Plancus, the addressee of the poem, and Tibur, the place mentioned at the end of the first part, constitutes the bridge between the two. The general feeling, however, is that the connection is weak. The earlier Kiessling volumes explain this weakness in construction as due to inexperience and therefore count the poem as one of Horace's earlier works. This is putting the cart before the horse and basing knowledge on ignorance. If every line in ancient poetry which we do not fully understand is to be tagged "Jugendverse," we are going to end up with a very curious version of ancient literary history.[1]

But structural matters aside, the poem is in Horace's most finished manner, and we can hardly suppose, considering the close similarity between the concluding lines and a passage in the first

[1] Porphyrio on verse 15. In *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden,*[6] ed. A. Kiessling, rev. by R. Heinze (Berlin 1917) 62, we find "*te fulgentia signis castra tenent* kann dann darauf gehen, dass er (i.e. Plancus) vielleicht in Augusts Gefolge am spanischen Feldzuge teilnahm," but further on on the same page he says, "man wird in der nicht völlig gelungenen Verschmelzung ein Kernzeichen früher Abfassung sehen." These two remarks do not jibe. In the second edition of Kiessling's work (1890) the Vergilian parallel is taken as proof that the ode can have been written "sicher nicht vor 725" (page 54). In the seventh edition (1930) Heinze reverts to an earlier date, which he supports with stylistic parallels (to *Epode* 13 and *Carm.* 1.9). A fair bibliography may be found in the usual handbooks, but the most thoroughgoing and up-to-date by far is in J. P. Elder, "*Carm.* 1.7," *CP* 48 (1953) 1–8, a study which goes far to reassert the unity of the poem on aesthetic grounds. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) merely alludes to the poem in passing.

book of the *Aeneid*, that it was written before 29 B.C.[2] Shorey's remark on the supposed break at line 15 is the most honest I have seen. He says, "Horace may have pieced two fragments of verse together at this point, but we cannot separate them." It is perhaps worth the risk of being classed with the elect of the new covenant to try to explain this joint in the poem. There is, indeed, an equally sharp break at the middle of line 21; so to be logical we should have to say that this is three fragments, not just two. This is so patently absurd—three fragments in 32 lines—that we must reconsider the poem as a unity.

The run of the thought in this poem is readily analyzed. "(1) Many a lovely town there is," sings the poet, "and each place knows its own glory; as for me, tiny Tibur, rustic, charming, unassuming, outdoes them all. (2) Dark the clouds will not always be, Plancus; the sun will shine on you again, and meanwhile forget not the use of wine as a freer from troubles whether you be in camp or whether you decide to leave public life entirely and retire to Tibur. (3) Remember Teucer: he too, returning home from the wars to no kindly welcome, advised his faithful companions to find cheer for the moment in dubious prophecy and wine before setting forth again."

The themes of the poem appear to be travel and wine, the structure and treatment are Pindaric, the tone is paraenetic. The Pindaric note is present from the outset in the gorgeous list of Greek cities; these are Horace's golden pillars, the forecourt of his palace of song (*Ol.* 6), and from among them he seems to offer Plancus a choice, as Pindar does so often with his choice of gold and winds and waters (cf. *Ol.* 1 and 11). But Horace's version is much longer, and in this respect we must confess somewhat un-Pindaric. He has a whole dozen places mentioned before he gets to Tibur, his bridge to the rest of the poem. An obvious reason is that Horace has mingled here two *topoi*. The first is the praise of cities, the second the praise of the choices of different men. This is announced in the very first words, *laudabunt alii*, reminiscent again of Pindar (fr. 260 Turyn):

ἀελλοπόδων μέν τιν' εὐφραίνοισιν ἵππων

[2] P. Shorey and G. Laing, *Horace, Odes and Epodes* (Boston 1910) 165; the quotation which follows in the text above is from the notes to line 15. A fuller handling of the question is given at the end of this paper.

τιμαὶ και στέφανοι, τοὺς δ'ἐν πολυχρύσοις θαλάμοις βιοτά·
τέρπεται δὲ καί τις ἐπ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον ναῒ θοᾷ
διαστείβων.

The classic form of this type of expression goes back to Solon (fr. 1 Diehl, 43–66) and has a well-known parallel in Horace's dedicatory poem to Maecenas. The associations of these cities will be discussed later; for the moment let us mention only that the last four Greek places mentioned have all clear Homeric connections: Argos, Mycenae, Larisa, Sparta.

One might then say there are three things put forth in this first section of the poem: the two *topoi* and the Pindaric tone in general. For, when used in this way, plainly the imitation of another author has substantive value. The poet says, in short, "Many places are lovely and illustrious, especially in Greece; every man loves his own, and choice is largely a relative matter; these two facts have particular application to what is to follow." For of course in Pindar they always do, though sometimes the connection is *dysereunêton.*[3] One cannot avoid a feeling that this is very frequently the case with Horace as well.

The central section of the poem gathers up in a single bunch a series of general moral observations which in a Pindaric ode might well have been scattered through the narrative of the *mythos.* Here again Horace has three things to say. First, every cloud has a silver lining. Secondly, the cares and labors of life should find release in wine. Finally, and this is not so much general moral as it is particular application, it is all one whether you keep on in public life or withdraw to Tibur. Thus he writes (15–21):

(1) albus ut obscuro deterget nubila caelo
saepe Notus neque parturit imbris
perpetuo, (2) sic tu sapiens finire memento
tristitiam vitaeque labores

[3] On the Pindaric character of much of Horace's lyric see E. L. Highbarger, "The Pindaric Style of Horace," *TAPA* 66 (1935) 222–55. The earliest clear notion of this aspect of Horace's writing is found in A. Y. Campbell, *Horace: A New Interpretation* (London 1924), and Highbarger makes some use of his points. The political odes have nearly all of them a strongly Pindaric flavor, and the adapting of Pindaric tone to melic form is precisely what one expects of Roman art. Elder (above, note 1) 6 reasserts with Sellar and Verrall the political-monitory character of odes such as those to Sestius, Dellius, Pollio, et al. A W. Verrall, *Studies Literary and Historical in the Odes of Horace* (London 1884) may have gone too far in drawing up a plot for the *Odes*, but much of what he says is reliable. The ascriptions of the opening poems of Book One are enough to prove it.

> molli, Plance, mero, (3) seu te fulgentia signis
> castra tenent seu densa tenebit
> Tiburis umbra tui.

These three observations are interlocked in a confusing manner; the *sic*-clause is not the natural and expected conclusion of the *ut*-clause, and the third statement is set down in the form of a mailing address. To the statement "as the weather is not always bad" we expect for our conclusion something such as "so political times too will change for the better." The remarks on wine are in fact the logical conclusion to *quid sit futurum cras fuge quaerere*, or to *rapiamus amici|occasionem de die*, lines from two poems (*Carm.* 1.9 and *Epod.* 13) whose close structural similarities to this one have often been noticed. The unstated portion of the *seu . . . seu* clause is really Teucer's own statement as quoted by Cicero, *patria est ubicumque est bene* (Pacuvius, fr. 380 Warmington); "if you are smart," says Horace, "you will make the best of a bad job, knowing that whatever you do or wherever you go content is within, and the wise man is at home in all lands." If we read then in a series the unstated parts of each proposition, we have the following: "Times will change; leave the future to the gods; be your own man wherever you are."

Several words within this central section of the ode can bear more careful inspection. The *tristitia* for which Plancus suffers and the questions of his location (*tenent, tenebit*) are both to be clarified only after a consideration of Plancus' career. The problem about *tristitia* is, does it look backward or forward? One's choice of whether Plancus is sad about something that has happened or sullen about something which will happen, does not greatly affect the literary interpretation of the passage as both emotions lie in the same quarter. The same may be said of the pair *tenent . . . tenebit*. It is plain that this change of tense is no mere stylistic ornament. Plancus is probably at war, the poet says, and may retire. But the circumstances are not made clear.

In addition, there are three other words which are perhaps oversuccinct. *Umbra* implies retirement, frequently of a scholarly sort. *Molle merum* seems to be an oxymoron. Most editors suggest "mellow" or "mellowing," but *merum* is more usually *ardens, severum, amarum*. If the *merum* is *molle* because it softens a harsh situation, it may also soften a man. In any case the word has a

bad as well as a good sense, which pairs well with *umbra*. The word *sapiens* often in Latin bears a slight flavor of the sense in which it was used as a cognomen for Laelius. He is said to have won this nickname for withdrawing his proposal of a new agrarian law (Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 8.5). Here it comes close to meaning "if you know what's good for you"; the position of the word allows it to retain some of its participial flavor.

The three general statements of the central part of the poem, then, are paratactically arranged and do not seem to lead logically from one to another. They can be understood by themselves only if we inspect their unstated conclusions. But structurally, within the whole poem, this is more an advantage than a defect. For each statement ties either to the beginning or to the end of the ode in several ways, thus making this a central knot of all the various threads of meaning in the work. Tibur bridges to the end of part one; wine bridges to part three and may also be connected with Bacchus in Thebes. The reference to the camp suggests the military character of the following *mythos* (and this is also led up to by the allusions to the *Iliad* at the end of part one), while the clause beginning *albus ut obscuro* finds its logical conclusion in the *nil desperandum* of part three. The method and tone are Pindaric.

The poem concludes with a *mythos*, the connection of which with the addressee, Plancus, is not at once clear. The noble final line, especially, seems at first to lead us far away from Tibur and Plancus and Augustan Rome. But we must recall that this is one of the more prominent features of Horace's lyric style. It is this in part that gives his *Odes* the air of reaching out to the broader levels of larger truth. So *Caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem* ends with the picture of Regulus (as if) wending his way to Venafrum or to Lacedemonian Tarentum. So strangely rings on the ear the line *arcanique Fides prodiga, perlucidior vitro* at the close of *Carm.* 1.18, a poem very similar in structure to this one and addressed as well to another friend who dwelt at Tibur. Aesthetically the system bears comparison with the Homeric practice of descending so deeply into the details of a simile that the concluding line often shows no relation to the object illustrated by the comparison.

We possess no other version of this part of the Teucer story. The outline of the tale, however, is eminently clear. Teucer has returned home with his comrades from Troy, bringing with him

Tecmessa and the child Eurysaces. Telamon refuses to receive him, insinuating that it was through self-interest that he failed to protect his brother Ajax after the unsuccessful contest for the arms of Achilles. Home is no place for him: *cras ingens iterabimus aequor.*

Let us examine the details of this passage to see in how far they show an inner coherence with the rest of the poem. As with the first two parts of the ode, we find here several separable elements. We have to consider the situation of Teucer, his remarks, and the literary imitations in the passage.

The description of Teucer and his situation is full of connections with both earlier portions of the ode. He binds his wine-damp temples with a poplar garland, Hercules' proper tree (proper for Hercules the prosperer of voyages, and proper too for anyone associated with Tibur, where this deity had a famous temple). The garland may well remind us of the garland of olive for Pallas, just as the *tristes amici* recall the *tristitiam* of Plancus. The close connections with passages in both the *Odyssey* and *Aeneid* reinforce the allusion to the heroic world in the place-names at the end of the first part of the poem.

Within Teucer's own remarks we find still another set of echoes. The sad bitterness of the phrase *melior fortuna parente* recalls by contrast the warmth of Horace's reference to his own love for Tibur and the *domus Albuneae resonantis. Nil desperandum* is, as already remarked, the logical conclusion to lines 15–16. Apollo harks back to the beginning of the ode where, as here, he is referred to in his prophetic capacity.

The three parts of this poem, then, are closely interlocked in theme, in tone, and in the use of particular words and phrases. The poem is addressed to Plancus and contains general advice—the detachment, the wine, and so on—which has been recognized by all students as the central theme of the ode. But in fact this bibulous matter is mainly confined to the central part of the work and only alluded to in the rest. The first and last portions of the ode (some 25 lines out of 32) are primarily concerned with the other theme, that of wandering or travel and the moral choices incident thereto. Although at first hearing the *mythos* seems so different in subject-matter from the rest of the poem that it may leave us with a feeling of incompletion, a sense of ending on an open note, it is plain from the analysis just given that the poet did

not intend it so. The poem comes full circle: we start with a travelogue, we end with a traveller. If this were all, we might finish our account here. But this larger theme connects precisely with the central historical crux in the poem, the question of the meaning of *tenent* and *tenebit*, or where was Plancus when the ode was written? Clearly Horace had something to suggest to Plancus in connection with home and change and travel. He says, it is true, that Plancus will in the long run find no one place better than another; whether in camp or retirement, Plancus will find at the last only wine to bring surcease to his sorrows. But the questions of time and place are still unanswered.

Therefore let us turn to the career of Plancus, the consul of 42 B.C., for this is certainly our man.[4] L. Munatius Plancus, a member of a family new to power and position at Rome, served with Caesar in Gaul in 54 and 53 and later in the civil war fought in both Spain and Africa. He was *praefectus urbi* in 46. In 44 Caesar placed him in charge of Gallia Comata and named him to be consul in 42 with D. Brutus. Saluted imperator for a victory over some mountain tribesmen in 43, he founded colonies at Raurica (Augst, near Basle) and at Lyons in that year; he celebrated a triumph during the end of December two days before Lepidus. In the political maneuvering of the following months Plancus engaged in a lengthy correspondence with Cicero, constantly asserting his intent to be faithful to the senatorial party, in which intent he was supported by his brother, L. Plotius Plancus, praetor in 43. During the game of odd-man-out after Mutina, Plancus ended up as an associate of Lepidus, at which time his brother just mentioned was listed and slain. In company with Lepidus, D. Brutus having already been killed, he received his consulship for the year 42 but seems not to have been present at the Battle of Philippi. In the following year under pressure from Fulvia he made some abortive attempt to go to L. Antonius'

[4] The data for this brief sketch of Plancus' life are drawn primarily from W. Drumann and P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*[2] 4 (Leipzig 1908) 220–33. The only point of fact on which it differs is the number of Plancus' brothers, in which I follow T. R. S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic* 2 (New York 1952) 339, who combines Drumann's No. 14 (Cn. Plancus, Praetor 43 B.C.) and his No. 15 (C. Plancus=L. Plotius Plancus) on the evidence of the prescript of Cic. *Att.* 16, 16A. Even though this may seem questionable, it does not seriously affect the present problem. A most judicious account of Plancus' career is given in R. Y. Tyrrell and L. Y. Purser, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*[2] 6 (Dublin 1933) lxxvi–lxxxiv.

support at Perusia, then retired to await the event in Spoletium, a course followed also by Pollio, with whom he had been associated in the same kind of tactics after Mutina. Perusia having fallen, he fled with Fulvia to Athens, then later took refuge with Antony. During the thirties he was in command of Asia and then of Syria. Plutarch describes him as one of the courtiers of Antony and Cleopatra in Cilicia and in Egypt, and that in most unflattering terms. Then in 32 he abandoned Antony and returned to Italy, purchasing immunity with information about the scandalous contents of Antony's will, which Octavian then read publicly in the senate. He was probably not present at Actium. In 27 it was Plancus who proposed the new title by which Augustus now assumed his special position in the new order. Later, in 22 B.C., he was censor in company with Paullus Aemilius Lepidus. Two other acts of unknown date are recorded: he was saluted imperator a second time, and he rebuilt the temple of Saturn.[5]

It is often hard to see what forces bring this man or that into prominence in ancient life. We do not know what Plancus had to offer. His family was as new as Octavian's, and we can scarcely see where he got the backing for his career, though we may note ancestral connections with the Aemilii Lepidi. Presumably the Munatii had money; but he may have won some influence while going through the lower ranks of the *cursus* at Rome; Cicero had old ties with his family; he was known as an orator; and he may, in the years with Caesar in Gaul, have proved a good soldier or a good administrator.[6]

There are several ancient comments on Plancus' character. These range from the distinctly antagonistic view of Velleius, who calls him (2.83.1) *morbo proditor*, a scurrilous phrase, and brings his name up several times only to revile it, to the exceedingly

[5] The funeral monument, *CIL* x.6087=Dessau 886: L. Munatius L. f. L. n. L. pron(epos) Plancus cos. cens. imp. iter(um) vii vir epulon(um) triump(hator) ex Rhaetis aedem Saturni fecit de manib(iis) agros divisit in Italia Beneventi in Gallia colonias deduxit Lugdunum et Rauricam. The temple, *CIL* vi.1316=Dessau 41: L. Plancus L. f. cos .imp. it(erum) f(ecit) de manib(iis). The censorship, Vell. Pat. 2.95.3 and Suet. *Nero* 4.

[6] C. Munatius, .x vir agri dividundi (Livy 42.4.4), who seems to have been the founder of the family's fortunes, came to office in 173 B.C., probably under the aegis of M. Aemilius Lepidus (so F. Münzer, *RE* 16.1(1933) 535=Munatius No. 5). For Cicero's connections, see Cic. *Fam.* 10.3.2 and 13.29.1. Suetonius, *De vir. illustr.* (fr. 289 Roth=Jerome ad ann. 729/730): Munatius Plancus, Ciceronis discipulus, orator habetur insignis.

honorific position here in the opening odes of Horace's first book. Historians generally follow Velleius and use Plancus as the outstanding example of the woes of the time.[7] The reason why they single him out instead of Pollio or Lepidus or the others is probably a peculiar weakness of character that he revealed even in the earliest stages of his career. At the beginning of their correspondence Cicero (*Fam.* 10.3.3), hinting politely that people have in the past thought of Plancus as a timeserver, hopes he will reform now that he has real freedom of choice. Velleius' description of Plancus at Cleopatra's court makes him a *vafer homo*. His acting the part of Glaucus in a charade for the benefit of the Egyptian queen and her attendants was undignified. If we look at Plancus' letters to Cicero we get another side of the same picture. He was one of Cicero's best correspondents. He writes a social and elegant style, with not infrequent metaphor and a diction showing signs of stylish poetic speech. The army of Antony is *furiosa*; others seemed *occupare possessionem laudis*. He alludes with delicacy to the possibility of suicide: *quodsi nihil profecero nihilo minus maximo sum animo et maiore cum gloria vobis satisfaciam*. To be sure the letters are tiresome enough to read: gracious, flattering, empty—courtier-letters.[8]

It is this sort of man of whom conscience makes a coward. Precisely such a person might have been persuaded to handle the delicate task of supporting Augustus' program in the senate. He was guilty enough to feel the weakness of his own position, supple of mind enough to be influenced, important enough to present a proper front, to give Roman tone to an endeavor which looked suspiciously like oriental despotism. In 27 B.C. Plancus was almost the senior living consular and probably the only one who could have been called on to present the name and title of Augus-

[7] See however Tyrrell-Purser (above, note 4) lxxxiii, ". . . we must not mind very much what he says about Plancus."

[8] The Glaucus story: Velleius 2.82.2. The letters all show much the same tone. (*Fam.* 10.4.2 is a fine example). For Tyrell-Purser's view and Schuckburgh's see the former (above, note 4) lxxviii and note 13. When Plancus writes *furiosa* (*Fam.* 10.11.2) he means "seditious," which is the sense in which Vergil regularly uses *furor* (cf. *Aen.* 1.294, where *Furor impius* is a personification of civil dissension). *Occupare possessionem laudis: Fam.* 10.7.2. The final quotation is from *Fam.* 10.11.3; it may not refer to suicide, but if it equals "I'll do the best I can," it is certainly a wishy-washy way to say it. W. W. How and A. C. Clark, *Cicero, Select Letters* (Oxford 1926) in the volume of notes, 531, give a very mellifluous translation, which makes *satisfaciam* "fulfill your expectations," and then invent the expectations to explain it.

tus to the senate; certainly we cannot afford to think of him as a personage without respect in the state.[9]

There is little evidence on the censorship. Velleius as usual does his best to put it in a bad light; in any case no great work was accomplished, but one must not forget that Paullus and Plancus were the last men of the free Republic to hold that office.

Originally there had been three brothers in the Munatius family.[10] One brother, T. Munatius Plancus Bursa, was a bitter enemy of Cicero and served with Antony unsuccessfully at Mutina. He broke his leg in his flight from Pollentia, after which we hear no more of him. The other, Plancus' supporter after the battle of Mutina, who was proscribed and killed, had been adopted by one of the Plautia/Plotia gens, a family which had already reached senatorial rank when one of their number in 312 B.C. was elected censor in company with Appius Claudius the Blind. Coinage of various members of the family shows that they associated themselves with the particular fortunes of Tibur and with a peculiar anecdote connecting the old censor with reforms of the cult of Hercules at Tibur.[11]

It is likely that Munatius Plancus was the only survivor of his own family, and considering the usual conditions of adoption it is equally likely that Plotius Plancus was the chief heir to the estates of his adoptive father. It does not then seem unreasonable to

[9] Evidence for this conclusion is drawn from Broughton (above, note 4) and from the *RE* articles on the consulars of the preceding half-century. See also Elder (above, note 1) note 6. Varro, certainly the senior member of the *ordo*, died at the age of 90 in this year. After him those most likely still alive in addition to Plancus were: Cn. Domitius Calvinus (cos. 53, pontifex), M. Valerius Messalla (cos. 53, augur), M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 46, 42, pontifex maximus). The *aedes Herculis Musarum* (Suet. *Aug.* 29) is usually attributed to L. Marcius Philippus (cos. 56), but Broughton gives it to his son, the cos. suff. of 38 B.C.; if this is correct, it is likely that the father was already dead. There is no evidence on L. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 58), but if alive he must have been quite elderly. Lepidus of course was not attending meetings of the senate in these days. Messalla seems to have retired to write his book on augury, and it appears from his sharp criticism of Dellius that he was one of the disaffected party. Domitius, who was, as far as anyone at this distance can make out, as guilty of tergiversation as the rest, had connections with the imperial family; he must have been either too proud to be suggestible or too closely associated with them to be a feasible tool. Horace never mentions him.

[10] Possibly four; see note 8 above.

[11] The family probably rose to citizenship around 366 B.C., and their first consul held office in 358. See F. Münzer, s.v. "Plautius," *RE* 21.1(1951)3; fuller discussion of this family is given in the same author's *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart 1920) 36 ff.

suppose that the consul of 42 B.C. inherited part or all of his brother's as well as his own family's estates in Tibur, and it is precisely this probability that supports Velleius' charge (2.67.3–4) that Plancus had got his brother's name put on the list.[12]

The Plautius family was far more ancient and honorable in Tibur than the gens Munatia. It would be strange if Horace's friend returned to Tibur to live out there his old age, and it is in fact probable that he did not, for his grave monument is at Caieta.[13] Of his ill-fated children we do not know enough to be sure where their properties were. Plautii of importance under the empire seem to be descended from a collateral branch.

From this historical material we may draw the following items to clarify Horace's poem: (1) Plancus was a man of importance to the regime throughout the twenties; (2) Plancus was the object of attack by his contemporaries both for his relation to his brother and for his political vacillations; (3) a part of his career shows some similarity to the Teucer-myth. In addition one may suspect, though it is in no way proved, that Plancus, as others of his time, debated to himself the possibility of becoming a neutralist. Points two and three in the list above serve particularly to clarify the pointed and monitory tone of the poem and make the *mythos* fit the circumstances of the addressee in true Pindaric fashion. Of course Horace is not saying anything directly about the facts of his friend's past life, but as everyone else he will have known the current gossip. He suggests that the social atmosphere in the future will not be pleasant wherever Plancus goes or whatever he does; hence wine as the best prescription for the last of the Munatii.[14]

[12] It is Velleius who reports the choice story that the soldiers marching in the triumphal procession behind the chariot of Lepidus and Plancus chanted the line *de germanis, non de Gallis, duo triumphant consules.* Unfortunately for the reliability of this famous pun the *Fasti triumphales* (*CIL* I².179) give us to understand that the two men triumphed on separate occasions three days apart. Several relatives of the other members of this junta were proscribed, e.g. Pollio's brother-in-law, Lepidus' brother (the father of the future censor), and Antony's uncle. Both these last escaped with their lives, and it seems likely from Val. Max. 6.8.5 that Plancus had warned his brother.

[13] See above, note 5. For the angry reaction of a fellow-townsman, see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939) 193 and 283. It was C. Coponius, a native of Tibur who had been among those proscribed, who rose in the senate on the eve of Actium after Plancus had been inveighing against Antony and his excesses and remarked, "*Multa . . . mehercules fecit Antonius pridie quam tu illum relinqueres*" (Vell. Pat. 2.83.3).

[14] Elder (above, note 1), note 26, mentions a personal communication to him of a

Questions still unanswered are the dating problem presented by the lines *seu te fulgentia signis/castra tenent*, and the associated matter of the meaning of Plancus' *tristitia*. The period of the thirties is a most unlikely date for the poem.[15] During those years Plancus was managing affairs for Antony in Asia Minor and Syria, and it is hardly conceivable that Horace would have been writing to him at such a time. We hear of Pollio being asked to join the campaign at Actium and refusing with a famous *mot*, but there is no mention of Plancus. The Spanish War is well accounted for, and there seems no other engagement for which Plancus could have been called out except one or another of the campaigns against the Salassi.

Further argument for a later dating of Plancus' military activities may be based on the inscription on his temple of Saturn, which says that he built it after his second salutation as imperator.[16] Platner-Ashby date the building in 42 B.C., without sufficient support.[17] In fact it seems more reasonable that it should be dated along with the rest of the buildings which Suetonius (*Aug.* 29) lists as outstanding examples of Augustus' system of having his construction program sponsored in part by prominent private citizens. In the first place, most of the larger buildings took several years to complete. Augustus' own temple to Apollo, for example, was under construction from 36 to 28, and Pollio's library, though finished perhaps by 29 or 28, was erected to celebrate a triumph of 39 B.C.[18] Secondly, it is natural to associate this rebuilding with one or the other of two changes made by Augustus in the management of the *aerarium Saturni*, i.e. in 28 or

similar view. The feeling that this is behind what Horace says is perhaps implied in Tyrrell-Purser (above, note 5) page lxxxii. But Cicero's remark (*Tusc.* 5.108), "*ad omnem rationem Teucri vox accommodari potest*," should give us pause before insisting too sharply on the parallel between the fable and the man.

[15] Considerable further discussion of the various suggestions which have been offered on this problem is given in Elder (above, note 1) 6.

[16] See above, note 5. If the spoils were actually *ex Rhaetis* as the sequence of the words on his tomb implies, this would then be resources acquired in 43 B.C.; still the second imperatorial title must have been acquired in the interim, and neither monument specifies.

[17] S. B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford 1929) 464. References given are simply the inscriptions (above, note 5) and the passage from Suetonius. The date seems to be accepted on the authority of H. Jordan *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum* (Berlin 1875–85) 1.2.360.

[18] Pliny (*NH* 7.115) says *ex manubiis*.

in 23 B.C.[19] In this regard it is revealing to note that Plancus' appointment to the censorship in 22 must have had some connection with the new building.[20]

But we need not, after all, assume more than some useful military activity in the twenties. The second recognition as imperator may quite well have come at the same time as the first, namely, in 43 B.C. The actual money for the building need not have come from military spoils of a conventional kind: the words that went up on the building were in any case to some extent window-dressing. Delays between the vow and its performance are well-attested throughout Roman history, Pollio's library being good contemporary authority.

To conclude, then, we do not know of any military activity of Plancus during the twenties from sources other than Horace's own poem. The usual practice has been to predate the poem, but the grounds for such predatings have always been mere guesswork; the last date for which we have ancient evidence is 43 B.C., a date which is quite unrealistic if we are to make any sense out of Horace's words. If the literary analysis with which this paper opened is correct, this ode, with the rest of the poems at the beginning of the first book, is to a considerable degree an occasional poem, and the occasion must have been fairly up-to-date or the Roman public would have cried *refrixit res*. To suppose military activity against the Salassi, or possibly the Rhaetians, by Plancus in the early twenties is still guesswork, but it is based on one of our best evidences for Plancus' life at this time, namely, this ode of Horace.

Plancus may well have felt some *tristitia* at his unhappy blend of success and failure. He was one out of many, one of the few who had survived the bitter civil war years. He was rich, safe, successful, but he seems to have made enemies both in Tibur and among the nobility.[21] Horace's advice is to lay aside *tristitiam*

[19] Tac. *Ann.* 13.29, Dio Cass. 53.2 and 32, Suet. *Aug.* 36.

[20] Plancus had long-standing associations with high finance and the state treasury. As *praefectus urbi* in 46 he had financial functions; he was probably also a moneyer; see Tyrrell-Purser (above, note 4) lxxvii–lxxviii, and cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.78.

[21] Pollio: cf. Plancus' famous jibe at Pollio, who was threatening to publish posthumously an attack against him, *cum mortuis non nisi larvas luctari* (Pliny, *NH* praef. 31). Messalla: see note 9 above; Messalla's famous phrase about Dellius, *desultor bellorum civilium*, is in Sen. Rhet. *Suas.* 1.7. Domitii: see the story in Suet. *Nero* 4, also Syme (above, note 13) 512, note 1. Velleius' animosity against Plancus must surely have

vitaeque labores with timely use of *molle merum* whether he is in the field or whether he will retire to quiet Tibur. He implies, that is, that whatever Plancus does he will not be very happy. It is the old commonplace of the first *Roman Ode: post equitem sedet atra cura.* But the *tristitia* may also be connected to his position in the Augustan program. He may well have objected to pulling chestnuts out of the fire forever. Aid Plancus certainly gave, both in 27 when he proposed the new Augustan title and in 22 when he became censor, and no doubt he received obliquy for both performances. He must have known these jobs would only bring him further scorn from the people of his own generation who were left, but he did not well see how he could avoid giving in. He was in a cleft stick. As a response to such a situation Horace's poem makes excellent sense. It says simply that Plancus has little or no other choice open and that in any case his real woes are personal, part of his past from which he can never escape except intermittently with solid applications of *molle merum.* The only other possibility remaining is that of voluntary exile, the course of Teucer himself and of many others in the past.

Further study of two remaining problems will show additional reasons for placing the composition of this ode fairly well along in the twenties. The main facts about the literary connections of the Teucer parable are these. There are several clear verbal similarities to these lines of Horace in a well-known Vergil passage (*Aen* 1.195 ff.). Here we see how Aeneas addresses his men to cheer them up after the storm, and how they turn to feast on the venison he has just brought in and on good Acestes' wine. But Servius says the Vergil passage comes from Naevius (*totus hic locus de Naevii Bello Punico primo sumptus est*),[22] while the central surface allusion in the Horace ode is to Pacuvius' Teucer. Chance could hardly explain away verbal similarities in the net product of two such different sources. But this is not all; both Augustan authors took care to spice their versions with borrowings from the same passage in the *Odyssey*, and finally and most conclusively the words the two poets have in common translate and combine two separate lines in the *Odyssey*.

The passage from the *Odyssey* (12.200 ff.) is an interesting

arisen from his association with Tiberius and Livia. For the people in Tibur, see note 13 above.

[22] Servius *ad Aen.* 1.198.

one. It recounts the escape from Scylla and Charybdis and the landing on the Island of the Sun with the subsequent mutiny of Eurylochus and his men. Vergil begins:

> O socii, neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum,
> O passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.

The first of these lines translates the first line of the *Odyssey* passage, while the second one opens with a phrase taken from Odysseus' speech to the men when they have reached the Island of the Sun. *O passi graviora* seems clearly to reflect κακά περ πάσχοντες ἑταῖροι (*Od.* 12.271). The concluding portion of Vergil's second line is a typically Mantuan comment on the brashness of *Od.* 12.211–12:

> ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔνθεν ἐμῇ ἀρετῇ βουλῇ τε νόῳ τε
> ἐκφύγομεν.

Lines somewhat further on describing the end of Aeneas' feast (*Aen.* 1.216–17) are taken from the end of Homer's account (*Od.* 12.308–9), and thus Vergil brackets the whole story of Charybdis and the Scylla but does not concern himself with its contents.

To return to the verbal similarities. Vergil's *socii* clearly translates Homer's *philoi*. When Horace on the other hand says *o socii comitesque* the *comites* comes (if it comes from anywhere) from Homer's *hetairoi*, some seventy-one lines away, but right in the following line in Vergil, while Horace's line 30 (*o fortes peioraque passi/mecum saepe viri*) is simply a further expansion of the same Vergilian phrase. It will be found difficult to derive the Vergil from the Horace.

But the clearest proof of all of the dependence of Horace on Vergil here is to be found in the beautiful final line of Horace's poem. This is a reminiscence of Eurylochus' words to Odysseus (*Od.* 12.293) as they determine to stay overnight on the Island of the Sun. These words are taken from the mouth of a doomed mutineer, and in Homer they express revolt with overtones of evil promise, for the morrow never comes, and Odysseus' comrades are destroyed. Horace's phrase, though not so arrantly boastful, makes clear the difference between Teucer's mood and the well-known pious Vergilian resignation to duty. Horace's Teucer is not *concors stabili fatorum numine*, but rather a reckless feckless fellow, something of a hopeful sceptic keeping up his courage with

wine and cheering on his comrades with a mocking amphibology, for such certainly is the sure Apollo's doubtful promise.

The grandiose opening of the poem seems especially Roman. Aside from the conflation of two separate *topoi* already mentioned, the new arrangement is occasioned by the Roman liking for mass in the use of Greek artifacts. But still further, one may trace here—what I have tried to make clear in studying the *mythos* of this ode—the signs of a secondary and ironic meaning. The surface meaning is the *topoi*; the basic meaning is a series of ornamental intertwined themes, the various associations of the towns and places mentioned.

The illustrious Rhodes was later to be a notorious place of retirement for Tiberius, and it had already provided a dignified excuse for absence from the city for Cicero (in 78 B.C.) and for Caesar (probably in 75). To Mytilene Agrippa was to retire in 23; in fact he had probably already done so at the time of publication of the first three books of *Odes*, and Rutilius Rufus had gone there in 92 after his infamous conviction *de repetundis*.[23] Ephesus was the famous Asian center where Antony had such a riotous time in 41; no doubt it was from there that Plancus had ruled Asia Minor in the early thirties. Ephesus and Corinth as famous centers of cult suggest Thebes and Delphi; Delphi suggests Tempe, another site sacred to Apollo and the Muses as well, while at the same time it is the only one in this group whose claim to natural beauty could make it a rival and a proper balance to Tibur. We shift now to the deities themselves, to Athena famous for her city and Hera famous for hers. Argos and Mycenae bring us more clearly within the circle of the earlier myths and the Homeric story. So Lacedaemon is mentioned, the home of Menelaus, and Larisa, the home of Achilles. Tibur itself has associations with all the preceding list. It is with Tempe a famous beauty spot. It was *Tibur Argeo positum colono* and therefore connected with the Trojan legend and especially with the story of the returns. It had a famous temple of Hercules, and finally it was, with Praeneste, up to the very latest age of the Republic, a free city outside the Roman citizenship and hence one to which exiles had often repaired from Rome.[24]

[23] Cic. *Rab. Post.* 27; this aspect of the poem was recognized long ago, e.g. in the old variorum edition of N. E. Lemaire 1 (Paris 1829) 63. Much the same feeling is implied in Tyrrell-Purser (above, note 4) lxxxii, where they refer to voluntary exile.

[24] Tibur was a place of exile from as early as 335 B.C.: Livy 8.13–14; see especially

The pattern of this ode is now clear. It is a poem of mixed advice and consolation, and it connects specifically with the problems of the time through which its addressee was going. The *mythos* not only ties together the personal situation of the hero with that of Plancus, but further, through literary allusion and topical suggestion, comments on Plancus as a personage on the larger stage of world affairs. The advice offered is of two kinds: retirement and relaxation. Wine and travel (*subaudi* exile) are the central themes. From the sly insinuation of various famous places of retirement at the outset to the almost bitter ascription to Teucer of the reckless spirit of the mutineers in the *Odyssey*, the tone and method are throughout typical of Horace. Teucer's ironic faith in dubious augury is more Horatian and Epicurean than heroic. The lines at this point are nearer to Vergil's than to their Homeric original, and one may, quite fairly, take them as Horace's somewhat cooler reading of the Augustan crystal ball. The exact location of the addressee and the time of writing of the ode are probably insoluble questions, but there is good reason for dating the poem somewhere between 27 and 22 B.C. To connect Plancus' *tristitia* with the pressures which must have been put on him to support the Augustan program is only reasonable and fits perfectly with the admonitory tone of the allusions to exile. Plancus' political choice was *sapiens* in the worldly sense; Horace as always goes on to suggest that there is a still further step to make, an Epicurean one, in which the shrewdness to determine what side one's bread is buttered on becomes a wisdom which understands more truly the criteria of happiness.

Polybius 6.14. It is mentioned in this connection with its neighbor Praeneste (Polybius 6.14.8, App. *Bell. civ.* 1.65).