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Fifty years ago every young person who felt any interest in
literature made himself as a matter of course familiar with the
famous Philosophy of Clothes which Thomas Carlyle put forth
in his grim but eloquent Sartor Resartus; and it may be doubted
whether his protest against modern varieties of hypocrisy is even yet
out of date. Were he writing to-day, he perhaps might find a
parallel subject for his humorous assaults in the importance which we
allow to be attached, consciously or unconsciously, to a change of name.
I will not plunge into deep questions of psychology and social philosophy
by considering the total results in the life of what used to be called the
gentler sex of the change of name associated with marriage,—results
which begin even in prospect. In some subtle way when Miss Jones
marks the new linen with the name of Brown instead of Jones she feels
that she is putting on a new personality. Other examples nearer our
subject to-night, though less attractive in themselves, would be the
effect upon, say, Mr. Alfred Harmsworth by some mysterious process
transfigured into Baron Northcliffe; or further back when the reckless
whig-dishing “Dizzy” became the stately Earl of Beaconsfield. The
last ten years, too, have brought within common experience a great
number of other changes, as when Herr Schmutz appears among us as
Mr. Smith; and we shall probably agree that the change has often had
some real effect of its own.

What we are concerned with now is a definite, demonstrable and

¹This paper is based on a lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library
on the 8th February, 1928; and in printing it I am again indebted to the
valuable criticism of my friend, Mr. Donald Atkinson, Reader in Ancient
History in the University of Manchester.
amazing change in a particular man. Thanks to certain personal gifts, not perhaps themselves of the most brilliant kind, this man did render an enormous service to Europe; and his name has become the mark of a new epoch. And this was partly because that name itself was a new one. When Octavian, as he was called from 44 B.C. till he was thirty-six years old, became Augustus, the Venerable, it was a symbol of a great change in the world. The question to which I would try to supply at least a fragment of an answer, is this: How was Octavian converted into Augustus?

Of that part of the answer to this question which concerns the influence of Vergil I have recently dealt with elsewhere. Here I want to break new ground by pushing home the question so far as it concerns the poet Horace.

To begin with, if we are to judge the magnitude of the question at all clearly, we must form some conception of what kind of qualities the name Octavian really represented; what kind of a person was he when at nineteen he succeeded to the name and a large part of the prestige of the murdered Dictator—his great uncle and father by adoption? There is no lack of evidence; we know that his entrance on public life was made possible by the kindness and support of the venerable Republican statesman who with real foresight saw in him a defence for the Empire against the designs of that unscrupulous ruffian Mark Antony. In the end Cicero’s foresight was justified,—thanks to the strength of the spirit which he represented; but for the moment it was to be rudely disappointed; Cicero himself was the first victim of Octavian’s shattering disloyalty. Cicero’s later Philippics give us a clear picture of the steps by which Octavian became the commander of an army put into the field by the Senate, expressly to defend the Empire against Antony’s pretensions; and we all know how, having used these forces to defeat Antony, Octavian made friends with him and agreed to the Proscription. The historian Appian has preserved for us the text of the proclamation by which the Proscription was announced; it was signed by Lepidus and Antony, and by Octavian also. History gives us many examples of tyrants and dictators who climbed to power by a coup d’état, not shrinking from bloodshed. But it is not so common a thing for them

to leave behind them a public document proclaiming and justifying their murders, over their own signature. Yet that is what Octavian has done. It was the result of two long sittings, at the first of which Octavian resisted Antony's demand for the death of Cicero; but afterwards he gave way. Antony, Octavian and Lepidus, under the name of Triumvirs, marched to Rome and proclaimed peace,—the first act of which was to issue this proclamation which included the names of more than two thousand persons who were to be hunted to death like wild beasts. Let me give you some part of this strange document which marks the end of the first scene of Octavian's public career:—

"We, Marcus Lepidus, Marcus Antonius, and Octavius Caesar, having been elected to bring into harmony and order the affairs of the Republic, make the following proclamation. But for the treachery with which disloyal citizens, who had obtained mercy when they prayed for it, nevertheless became enemies of him who had shown them kindness and conspired against his life, Gaius Julius Caesar would never have been slain by those whom he took prisoners in war and mercifully spared and whom, one and all, he had treated as friends and promoted to honours; nor should we now be compelled to take these measures against all those who have insulted us and proclaimed us public enemies. But as things are, seeing that the wickedness of those who have plotted to destroy us, and by whom Caesar was slain, cannot be overcome by any kindness, we choose to anticipate our enemies rather than to suffer ourselves. Therefore let no man think us guilty of unjust or cruel excesses, when he remembers the fate of Caesar and the wrongs that have been done to us. Caesar was Dictator and High Priest, and had vanquished and subdued the nations that were most dangerous to Rome, and first of all men had begun to explore the unknown sea beyond the pillars of Hercules, and discovered the land of Britain, hitherto unknown to Rome; yet they slew him in the midst of what they call the sacred Senate-house, under the eyes of the Gods, defacing his body with twenty-three wounds, though they had all been taken prisoners by him and spared, and though some of their names were

1 These "wrongs" would seem to be Antony's way of describing the resistance of the Senate to his attempt to make himself emperor by force of arms.
written in his will as his heirs. But the rest, instead of punishing
the authors of this abomination, raised them to office and honours,
which they abused by seizing on public money for themselves, and
levying an army against us. . . . Some of them we have already
punished; the rest with God's help you shall shortly see chastised.
We have already succeeded in the greatest of our endeavours, and
made subject to us Spain and Gaul, and the districts nearer home.
One task yet remains: to make war upon the murderers of Caesar
who are across the sea. And since we intend to conduct this war
at a distance on your behalf, it does not seem to us to be safe either
for us, or for you, to leave the rest of our enemies here behind us,
since they would take advantage of our absence, and lie in wait for
the accidents of war. Nor do we think that, in the present emergency,
we ought to be slow to act from any consideration for them, but
rather we must put them one and all out of the way. We have no
grudge against any large body of citizens, nor shall we make any
choice of our private enemies nor shall we in the least single out
those who are wealthy or politically eminent, though it must needs be
that three men must have more enemies than one; we shall not slay
as many as did the last Dictator, whom you called Sulla the Fortunate,
although he too was called on to rule the city during a civil war.
And though we might arrest those whom we know to be evil without
warning, we prefer rather to proclaim their names for your sakes, so
that, having them properly named and numbered, the soldiers may
abstain from interfering with anyone else. Therefore, with the blessing
of heaven, we give command that none shall harbour any of those
whose names are written below. Whosoever shall attempt to save
them is included in the list. And whosoever shall bring the head of
any one of them to us, if he be a free man, shall receive 25,000
drachmae, but if he be a slave he shall receive 10,000 drachmae, his

1 If there was any truth at all in this charge, it could relate only to
provincial revenues. Antony himself had left no public money in Rome for
anyone else to seize. It was, of course, Antony whose armies were un-
constitutional; the senatorial forces were legal enough.
2 That is, Brutus and Cassius.
3 This and the following clause would describe the principles on which
the list was made up with greater truth if the negatives were omitted.
4 Roughly £1000, though with a very much greater purchasing power
than that amount of money to-day.
freedom, and all the civic privileges of his master. The same reward shall be given to anyone who shall give information of their place of hiding. We shall not enter on our records the names of any who earn these rewards."

A share in such wholesale murder might, one would have thought, have satisfied the crudest mind. But Suetonius has collected from the same period other examples of Octavian's temper. After the Battle of Philippi all the most distinguished prisoners were brought before him, and he not merely had them put to death in his presence but insulted them first. One man begged Octavian to allow him to be buried, to which Octavian replied, 'that was a matter for the birds of the air.' A father and son begged for mercy; so he made them cast lots as to which should be spared. Then the father offered to die; he was executed; the son killed himself,—all under Octavian's eyes. A year later at Perusia when he had taken a multitude of captives who besought him for mercy, he replied 'moriendum est'—'you must die.' Three hundred of them he selected from the senators and knights and caused them to be executed, as if they were beasts brought for sacrifice, at the altar built to the honour (or dishonour) of the Dictator Julius. Even these cold-blooded massacres probably caused a smaller amount of human misery than the expropriation of farmers all over Italy to make way for veterans of Octavian's and Antonius' army. Only those farmers were left (so the historians tell) in possession of their estates who paid heavy blackmail.

It is pretty clear that the character of Octavian as ruler of the Empire at that date left plenty of room for improvement. But the improvement did take place. The merciful and benevolent rule of Augustus is proved by every kind of evidence; nor need I here repeat the examples of it given in the lecture on Vergil's influence to which I have just referred. What caused the change?

Are we to think of Octavian as one of those strange beings to whom cruelty for its own sake is a pleasure, but as having learnt, for reasons of policy, to deny himself this pleasure in later life? One certainly might be inclined to think so. But probably a truer explanation, so far as it goes, lies in the intimate connexion between the impulse of cruelty and the emotion of fear. During these years (44-40 B.C.) Octavian's mind seems to have continually dwelt on the
image of the slain Dictator; and as we see from the words of the proclamation, he persuaded himself that it was a solemn duty to revenge himself to the full on the Dictator's murderers, anyone of whose party might at any time be making a similar attempt upon himself. From the evil inspiration of such thoughts he was somehow delivered. By whom?

The reader will no doubt be already aware of the answer to this question which I am likely to give; namely, that the chief cause lay in the influence of two great poets, Vergil and Horace, supported later on by the historian Livy. I propose to say nothing here about either Vergil or Livy, but to examine how far we can be sure that Horace contributed to the process of enlightening and humanising the struggling Octavian. I have drawn attention elsewhere\(^1\) to three points in which the influence of Horace may be traced—they were three great refusals—the refusal to forget the past of the Civil Wars; the refusal to think of the Emperor apart from his subjects; and the refusal to be content with the vulgarity of mere external splendour, and especially with any acquiescence in the proposal to remove the capital of the Empire to the East. The first two are matters of the poet's general attitude; the third is the only one in which it has so far been pointed out that Horace did actually take sides in a real question of practical politics. The lecture in which I first suggested these conclusions is now nearly thirty years old; and since then further light has been thrown on the relations of Horace to the Emperor, some of which we will now examine.

In preparing a special course of lectures at Harvard in 1927 upon the part which Horace took in political matters, I found some new evidence, of which a small part had been pointed out long ago and generally neglected. This evidence consists in a number of parallels between what Horace wrote and the account of a certain crisis given by a later historian who drew from writings of Horace's own day. If the parallelism be admitted, it will prove that the interest of Horace in a great political question which affected the Emperor more than anyone else was nearer and more definite than has been hitherto recognised; and it will make clear the meaning of a particular ode whose interpretation is still disputed.

In studying more closely than I had done before the ancient

\(^1\) *Great Inheritance*, c. iii.
authorities for the reign of Augustus, I was led to look into Book LII. of the history of Dio Cassius, which is taken up with an account of part of a conversation between Octavian, his great admiral Agrippa and his counsellor Maecenas. The subject of their conversation we will consider in a moment. But I was startled to discover, all through this extremely interesting Book, what appeared to be frequent reminiscences of Horace; or, if not reminiscences, such likenesses as could only be explained by an identity of source.

The trouble is that Dio Cassius did not write until the third century A.D. He was intimate with the Emperor Septimius Verus, and Consul about 210 A.D. and for a second time in 229. Then he retired and died at Nicaea in Asia Minor in 235. He spent his leisure in writing the history of Rome in eighty Books, of which we have portions of about twenty-five covering the period from 68 B.C. to 47 A.D. There are reasons for thinking that this part of his history was composed between 204 and 216 A.D., and there are reasons also for thinking that in this conversation which he depicts as taking place in 29 B.C. he had an eye to the conditions of the Empire in his own day, nearly two centuries later, so that his account must be read with a critical eye.

Let me now give you a few concrete reasons for thinking that in writing the speech which he puts into the mouth of Maecenas, Dio had re-read either his Horace or if not that, then some memoir which related what Maecenas had actually said in his conversation with Augustus. There is no reason at all to doubt that the question depicted actually was one which Octavian found it hard to settle and there is little doubt that the advice of Maecenas had a great share in determining the decision which the Emperor took. In one place in another Book, Dio expressly cites the memoirs of Augustus; though of course we do not know precisely how much these Memoirs contained. But in any case, whether these resemblances to Horace are due to Dio’s having relied on Horace at first-hand or to his using some other authority which Horace also reflects, the result for our present purpose is much the same. Passages in which these resemblances occur may reasonably be regarded as thoroughly historical, that is, as giving us some definite information of what people then were thinking. And if you judge that the likenesses are too striking to be due to mere

1 44.35.3.
accident, then we have a real warrant for thinking that Horace's words had a definite historical meaning, and for discovering from Dio what that meaning was.

What then was the subject of the conversation? No light matter. Nothing less than the question what Octavian was to do with the personal supremacy he had won. Was he to keep it, or to retire into private life? The second alternative was strongly urged by many of his friends, especially by Agrippa, who urged the odious and dangerous position of a monarch, and the glory of restoring a free government.

The study of literary parallels is apt to be rather fatiguing, but the proof in such cases, if there is any, must be cumulative; no one resemblance, nor even two or three resemblances, taken alone, afford strong enough basis for more than conjecture. But a string of them is a different thing.

Let me try then to represent what Horace sings and what Dio says. I cannot escape this duty because the interpretation which I am going to defend of a particular Ode was put forward (so I have since discovered, after hitting on it for myself) some three centuries ago, and it was adopted by one German scholar, Franke, in 1839. But it has been left completely in the cold since then because neither Torrentius, the Dutch scholar (about 1600) nor Franke in 1839 did more than indicate the pair of sentences which reminded them of Horace's Ode; so that scholars like Dr. James Cow and Dr. Walter Leaf have, rather naturally, dismissed the comparison as insufficiently supported. But if we find reason to believe that in the rest of this very Book Dio was making use of Horace, then his use of this particular Ode is clearly more probable than not.

We all remember Horace's boast, that he has reared a monument more lasting than bronze; in Dio's account Maecenas bids Octavian not to allow men to represent him in gold and silver images, but by his good deeds to carve undecaying and imperishable images in the hearts of men. (The conclusion reminds one also of Horace's praise of Lollius, who is to be remembered not as the consul of one year, but as a good and faithful judge who continually set honour before profit).

1 Appended to this lecture will be found the parallel passages side by side in Latin and Greek.

2 3.30.1.

3 52.35.3.

4 4.9.38.
In one of the three last Odes that he addressed to Augustus, Horace calls him bonus (dux bone), an almost familiar and quite surprising epithet addressed to an Emperor. Maecenas uses the Greek equivalent χρηστός in a pointed exhortation in which he tells the Emperor he must live up to his reputation of being a really 'good' honest citizen, totally unlike the bandits and revolutionaries who plagued the world before him and whom he has overcome.

Horace counts it a glory of the older Roman society that private fortunes were small though the commonwealth grew great; so Maecenas is represented as counting it one of Octavian's claims to public veneration that he has been most thrifty in all his private expenditure, but most open-handed in his expenditure on public objects.

In praying for the Emperor's health Horace hopes that he will celebrate great triumphs here on earth, and live long to be called father and chief citizen (pater atque princeps). Maecenas encourages the Emperor by saying: 'Of course they will look to you and love you as father and as deliverer when they see you living a seemly and happy life, successful in your wars but a lover of peace.'

In another passage where the title 'father' recurs, Horace exclaims: 'Whoso will seek to have his name inscribed on statues as father of the cities, let him take courage to curb our lawlessness so long unchecked.' That is exactly the command which Maecenas gives to the Emperor in Dio's version, to 'put a stop to the recklessness of the multitude.'

In a famous passage Horace exalts the man of real virtue whose dignity and glory are destined to be immortal, and contrasts these with the cheap honours obtained from the applause or the votes of the crowd.

True Virtue never knows defeat:
Her robes she keeps unsullied still,
Nor takes, nor quits, her curule seat
To please a people's veering will.
True Virtue opens heaven to worth:
She makes the way she does not find:
The vulgar crowd, the humid earth,
Her soaring pinion leaves behind.

How does Maecenas put it in Dio's prose?

1 52.18.4 and 35.5. 2 52.29.3. 3 1.2.28. 4 52.39.3. 5 3.24.29. 6 52.15.3. and 35.5. 7
See to it that those who take in hand some responsibility be chosen for their virtue, not by process of vote and canvassing for office. Virtue has raised many men to the rank of gods, but no man was ever made a god by a popular vote.

Enough, I think, has been said to show that some of Horace's most cherished themes are represented in Maecenas' speech. But turn now to some coincidences in smaller matters which perhaps for that reason are even more convincing.

In celebrating the achievements of the Emperor's stepsons Horace points out that brave men spring from brave sires, but that they need training too, to bring out their native qualities. Exactly the same combination appears in the speech of Agrippa in the story of Dio: 'What good can a man do who lacks either training or good birth?'

To this subject of education Horace recurs frequently. 'The minds of the young which in recent generations have been left to grow too soft must now be shaped by sterner pursuits. Our well-born youths are too untrained to keep their saddle, are afraid to engage in hunting, and far more skilled at games like trundling a hoop or gambling on the dice-board which our laws once forbade.' Notice the point that the aristocratic youth is proud of skill in something, but not of skill in the right things; and compare with that the exhortation of Maecenas which Dio thus represents: 'You should give no one an excuse to take to idleness or soft living or excellence in any sham kind of skill.'

In another famous passage Horace puts his exhortation in a positive form.

To suffer hardness with good cheer,
In sternest school of warfare bred,
Our youth should learn; let steed and spear
Make him one day the Parthian's dread;
Cold skies, keen perils, brace his life.

Or, more literally, 'he must spend his life in the open air and amidst dangers.' This is very like Maecenas' injunction in Dio's prose: 'the young soldier must be reared so as to be always under arms, perpetually practising the duties of war even in wintry weather.' Still closer to Horace is the injunction that 'so soon as they grow to be youths they must turn to the use of horse and weapons, so that they may be trained to do their duty as men, from their youth up-

1 4.4.29. 2 52.8.7. 3 52.26.4. 4 52.27.
wards, both in theory and practice.' The exhortation to teach boys to ride had always seemed to me a little curious in Horace; a detail rather unimportant, so it might seem, as compared with the virtues of courage and simplicity which Horace is commending in the rest of the poem. But when we find exactly the same detail insisted on in this speech of Maecenas, and when we remember the keen interest that Augustus took in the new feature which he established at Rome and which he called the Trojan Sport, namely, the performance of difficult feats on horseback by a squadron of boys of high birth, we see that this question of horsemanship meant a great deal. It is, surely, difficult to doubt that it was typical of the practical counsels which Maecenas actually gave to Augustus and which Horace here reflected.

I hope at all events I have quoted enough to show how similar is the colour in many passages of Dio's record of this conversation, and in what we may call Horace's official Odes, which after all are not very many in number. It is difficult to reckon more than ten or a dozen at most.

Now consider the answer which Maecenas gave to Agrippa's contention. Maecenas replied, with a wisdom which history vindicated, that the Roman Empire was too vast a system to change its rulers every year; that it was not necessary for the Emperor to expose himself to the envy and ill-will which had been provoked by the dictatorial power of the Dictator Caesar; and then goes on to advocate the chief features of the dual system which Augustus practised under the forms of republican government, especially his careful maintenance of the authority of the Senate, remaining himself, in a sense, always in the background. It is obvious that Dio had felt this question had been of grave importance; and we know from other authorities that Augustus thought more than once of resigning all his power. On the whole it seems quite certain that it would have been a great misfortune for the world if he had. The need for some central control of the provincial system was too patent and too urgent not somehow to be met. For Augustus to retire would merely have meant a new outbreak of conflict between different candidates for his place. Even against Augustus more than one conspiracy was formed by ambitious noblemen; and we cannot doubt that the possibility of his retirement meant a grave danger to Rome and that the danger
was precisely this, lest the storms and furies of the Civil War should break out again.

Now this recrudescence of misery, this revival of recent and terrible dangers is precisely what Horace appears to be pleading against in the Fourteenth Ode of Book I.:

O luckless bark! new waves will force you back
To sea, O, haste to make the haven yours!
E'en now, a helpless wreck,
You drift, despoil'd of oars;
The Afric gale has dealt your mast a wound;
Your sailyards groan, nor can your keel sustain,
Till lash'd with cables round,
A too imperious main.
Your canvass hangs in ribbons, rent and torn;
No gods are left to pray to in fresh need.
A pine of Pontus born
Of noble forest breed,
You boast your name and lineage—madly blind
Can painted timbers quell a seaman's fear?
See, lest again the wind
Make you its mock and jeer.
Your trouble late made sick this heart of mine,
And still I love you, still am ill at ease.
O, shun the sea, where shine
The reef-ringed Cyclades!

Surely this grave warning which Quintilian tells us was meant for the state as a whole, cannot be concerned with anything but some grave risk of which Horace knew. If we had nothing to guide us but the knowledge that this Ode was an early Ode written like all those in Book I. at no long distance of time from the battle of Actium, we could surely find no more likely topic to which to refer it than to the possible revival of the old regime. And even if our confidence in Dio were restricted to the belief that the story of his fifty-second Book did reflect a real crisis in the early Empire, we should surely feel that Horace's Ode would be most naturally referred to that crisis. But the fact is that the strongest resemblance of all between the speech of Maecenas in Dio's version and the teaching of Horace occurs precisely in this Ode.

There are only twenty lines in the Ode and only eleven lines in Dio's Greek; and in these eleven lines there appear to me to be five

1 Slightly modified from Conington's version.
clear reflections of Horace's words, and four or five others, less close but probably real.

How unlikely this is to be the work of chance may be seen very clearly from the fact that although, as the ancient commentators tell us, Horace is imitating a Greek Ode of Alcaeus (of which they quote nine lines), there are only four resemblances between Horace and Alcaeus and only one which is really vivid, namely, the 'torn sails' of which both poets speak. The other three likenesses consist merely in the mention of 'mast,' 'winds' and 'sailing' which must appear in any poem concerning a ship in difficulty.

Horace's picture is of a ship in harbour which is imprudently attempting to put to sea again in a storm. The image in Dio is rather different; there Maecenas definitely appeals to Octavian not to leave the helm. Without the captain the ship will come to grief.

The ship is borne on tossing waves; 'Don't you see?' asks Horace; 'For you do see' says Maecenas. 'The mast has sore wounds from the wind' says Horace; 'The ship is rotten' says Dio. 'It cannot last any time longer' says Dio; 'It can hardly last' says Horace. 'The sea is overpowering' says Horace; 'The sea is gaining on the ship' says Dio. 'Your sails are no longer what they were' says Horace; 'The State has suffered now for many generations' says Dio. 'A ship of Pontic pinewood' says Horace, 'though the name does it no good'; 'A ship of great burthen' says Dio. 'It will be a sport of the winds' says Horace; 'It is rocking this way and that' says Dio. 'You must shun the waters between shining Cyclads' says Horace—the Cyclads were famous for their reefs;—'Take care you do not let your ship be wrecked on a reef' says Dio.

Looking at leisure through these points one can hardly resist the conclusion that Dio is paraphrasing in his sober prose the picturesque details of Horace's poem. Franke in 1839 thought the likeness so patent as to need no comment at all.

Now if Horace ventured to publish such an utterance on the very highest and most vital point of imperial policy, no less than the position in State of the Emperor himself, it is clear that his influence with the Emperor was a thing to be reckoned with. And we are justified in attaching importance to his utterances in considering the forces which modified Octavian's conduct. Especially is this the case when we remember the personal independence which Horace sternly maintained,
from the early Epodes when he has nothing but condemnation for the ruling powers and shows not a little of his old republican sympathy, through all his Odes, where he consistently honours men who fought against Caesar as well as those who fought on his side; down to the very end of his career when he refused the entreaties of Augustus that Horace should become his private secretary; and when in response to Augustus' request for a poetical letter addressed to himself, sent him only the second epistle of the Second Book, which is entirely occupied with technical literary questions and might have been addressed to any cultured Roman.

Now if we wish to estimate the total result on the Emperor's mind of the influence which Horace, Vergil and Livy exerted, we cannot do better than follow the guidance of Dr. Warde Fowler who pointed out that the latest political Odes which Horace wrote, especially his Hymn for the Saecular Games, reflected closely the description which Augustus gives of his own policy in his autobiography, the Monumentum Ancyranum. Dr. Warde Fowler represents this by saying that when we read the Carmen Saeculare we feel that its general theme and much of its contents were the definite result of a conversation between the Emperor and the poet. It pictures, as we all know, the very best side of the Emperor's work; and even if these declarations on his part were, as his enemies were fond of saying, nothing more than the homage which vice pays to virtue, yet that homage did, in fact, carry with it enormous results for the good of the world, did represent great acts of beneficence and political wisdom. In any case we are entitled to contrast the document which Octavian signed at the beginning of his career with this poem which Horace wrote, and which the Emperor endorsed, almost word for word, as representing his imperial ideal. Let me end with Conington's admirable version of its concluding stanzas:—

Grant to our sons unblemish'd ways;
Grant to our sires an age of peace;
Grant to our nation power and praise,
And large increase!
See, at your shrine, with victims white,
Prays Venus and Anchises' heir!
O prompt him still the foe to smite,
The fallen to spare!

1 Roman Essays and Interpretations, p. 111.
Now Media dreads our Alban steel,
   Our victories land and ocean o’er;
Scythia and Ind in supplication kneel,
   So proud before.
Faith, Honour, ancient Modesty,
   And Peace, and Virtue, spite of scorn,
Come back to earth; and Plenty, see,
   With teeming horn.
Lov’st thou thine own Palatial hill?
Prolong the glorious life of Rome
To other cycles, brightening still
   Through time to come!
APPENDIX.

PARALLEL PASSAGES IN HORACE’S "Political Odes, and Dio Cassius, Book LII."

HORACE, ODES.

III, 30, 1:
exegi monumentum aere perennius.

IV, 9, 38-40:
consulque non unius anni,
sed quotiens bonus atque fidus
iudex honestum praetulit utili.

IV, 5, 5 and 37:
dux bone.

MAECENAS AP. CASSIUM DIONEM, LII.

(1) c. 35, 3:
και εἰκόνας σου χρυσάς μὲν ἢ
καὶ ἀργυρὰς μηδέποτε ἐπιτρέψῃς
γενέσθαι . . . ἄλλας δὲ ἐν αὐταῖς
ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαῖς καὶ
ἀκηράτους καὶ ἀθανάτους ἐξ ἐνερ-
γεσίαις δημοσίᾳς.

(2) c. 18, 4:
ἐκείνα μὲν ἄλλοι καὶ ἐπάραξαν
καὶ ἐκακοῦρησαν, σὺ δὲ δὴ χρηστὸς
ἐλ.

(3) c. 35, 5:
σοὶ μὲν ἀγαθὸν ὄντι καὶ καλὸς
ἀρχιντὶ πάσα γῆ τεμένισμα ἔσται.

(4) c. 29, 3:
ἰδὼν σὲ πρὸς μὲν τὰ οἰκεία φει-
δωλότατον, πρὸς δὲ τὰ κοινὰ ἀφει-
δέστατον ὄντα.

(5) c. 39, 3:
πῶς γὰρ ὦν ός πατέρα πῶς δ’,
οὐχ ός σωτῆρα . . . προσούσαντα
σὲ . . . καὶ φιλήσουσιν ὅταν σὲ
ἀρωσι κόσμου, εὐβίστον, εὐπόλεμον
εἰρηναίον.

III, 24, 29:
o quisquis uoleat impias
caedes et rabiem tollere ciuicam !
si quaeret pater urbiu
subscribi status, indomitat audeat
refrenare licentiam.

II, 15, 13:
priuatus illis census erat brevis,
commune magnum.

I, 2, 28:
hic magnos potius triumphos,
hic ames dici pater atque princeps.

III, 24, 29:
τὴν βρασύτητα τοῦ ὁμίλου παύ-
σαι.
OCTAVIAN AND AUGUSTUS

III, 2, 17-24:
Virtus, repulsae nescia sordidae,

. . . . . . . . . . . . .
nec sumit aut ponit secures
arbitrio popularis aurae.

Virtus, recludens . . . .
caelum . . . . . . .
coetusque volgares . . .
spernit.

III, 2, 1-6:
Angustam amice pauperi;empati
robustus acri militia puer
condiscat, et Parthos feroces
uexet eque; metuendus hasta;
utiamque sub diuo et trepidis agat
in rebus.

(7) c. 35, 5:
\(\text{άρετή μέν γὰρ ἰσοθέους πολλοὺς}
\)
ποιεῖ, γειροτυπήσω δ’ οὐδεὶς πάποτε
θεὸς ἐγένετο.

(8) c. 15, 3:
\(\text{ίνα οἱ τὲ τι ἐγχειρίζομενοι ἀπ’}
\)
\(\text{ἀρετῆς ἀλλὰ μὴ κλήρῳ καὶ σπου-}
\)
darχία ἀποδεικνύωνται.

III, 24, 52-58:
tenerae nimis
mentes asperioribus
formandae studiis, nescit equo rudis
haerere ingenuus puer,
uenarique timet; ludere doctior,
seu Graeco iubeas trocho,
seu malis uetita legibus alea.

Compare also IV, 4, 36:
indecorant bene nata culpae.

With IV, 4, 29 and 32:
fortes creantur fortibus et bonis:
. . . . . . . . . . . . .
doctrina sed uim promouet insitam.

HORACE, Odes, I, 14.

1-2:
referent . . . noui
fluctus.

(9) c. 26, 1:
\(\text{ὅτω γὰρ εὔθυς ἐκ παιδῶν}
\)
πάνθυ δοι δραμάς αὐτός
γενομένως ἐπιτελεῖσαν καὶ μαθοῦσας
καὶ μελετήσατε ἐπιτηδεύσατε
σαί πρὸς τὰ πάν ἔργαν γενήσονται . . .

(10) c. 26, 2:
\(\text{καὶ μηδεῖν γε . . . πρὸφασιν}
\)
παρέχεις . . . βαθμιὰν ἡ μαλα-κίαν ἢ καὶ ἐπιτηδευόντων τίνα κίβοδ-
λὸν προσποιεῖσθαι.

(11) c. 26, 4:
\(\text{καὶ μηδεῖν γε . . . πρόφασιν}
\)
παρέχεις . . . βαθμιὰν ἡ μαλα-κίαν ἢ καὶ ἐπιτηδευόντων τίνα κίβοδ-
λὸν προσποιεῖσθαι.

(12) c. 27, 1:
\(\text{τοῖς δὲ δὴ στρατιώταις ἄθανά-}
\)
tous . . . τρέφεσθαι προστέθηκα καὶ
αὐτός αἰτε ἐν τοῖς ὁπλοῖς εἶναι
καὶ τὴν ἀκίνησιν τῶν πολεμικῶν
διὰ παντὸς ποιεῖσθαι δεῖ.

(13) In Agrippa’s speech, c. 8, 7:
\(\text{τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἀγαθῶν ὡμοθετής ἢ}
\)
\(\text{ἀγενής ἀνθρωπὸς ἐργάσαιτ’ ἄν;}

MAECENAS AP. CASSIUM DIONEM,
LII, 16.

3:
\(\text{ἐν κλυδώνι πολλῷ φερομένῃ.}

fluctus.
3: nonne uides?
4: ὅρας γὰρ.

5: malus, celeri saucius Africo.
6: σαθρὰ γὰρ ἱστι.

7: uix durare carinae
8: οὐδὲνα ἔτι χρονον ἀντισχεῖν
9: possint imperiosius
10: ἰδυνήσεται.
aequor.
11: ὃρας γὰρ ὡς ὑπέραντλός ἐστι.

8-9: non tibi sunt integra lintea.
10: τολλὰς ἡδὴ γενεὰς, with ἐτι twice repeated.
11 and 13: Pontica pinus,
12: ὅλκας μεγάλη
13: . . . . . nomen inutile
14: uentes
15-16: . . . ludibrium
16: . . Cycladas.
17: μήτε περὶ ἔρμα περιρραγῆναι
18: εἴσαγη.

Dio’s account reads like a prose paraphrase of Horace’s points. Horace is supposed to be imitating Alcaeus but, as we have seen, the only vivid resemblance is between λαῖφος δὲ πᾶν ζάδηλον ἡδη and non tibi sunt integra lintea. The others are merely in φοροῦμεθα, κῦμα, ἵστοπέδαν, and ἀνέμον, quite general terms; and the mast in Horace’s ode is celeri Africo saucius; in Alcaeus’ picture it is surrounded by bilge-water.