New England Classical Journal 39.3 (2012) 195-210

KATZ PRIZE ESSAY 2011

Lost at Sea: Aspects of the Indo-European Kleos Ideology in the *Odes* of Horace

Christopher Waldo
University of California, Berkeley

Horatius Flaccus, the Augustan era poet, was famous for an extremely literary style embracing the earlier traditions of Greek lyric poetry while adapting them to a Roman context. In doing so, he created a lyric corpus of stunning complexity, weaving a multitude of diverse influences into a cohesive whole. At the same time, Horace articulated a unique ethos all his own. This combination of influences, added to Horace's own very personal way of looking at the world, results in a fascinating, and at times, discontinuous effect. This paper seeks to examine one instance of such influence. In the *Odes*, Horace retains elements of the *kleos* ideology native to the Romans as Indo-Europeans and also as cultural descendants of the Greeks, while at the same time espousing a personal ethos contradictory to elements of the *kleos* ideology. This paper will begin by defining the *kleos* ideology itself before turning to an analysis of Horace's retention thereof and the contexts in which this occurs. From there, it will discuss Horace's own personal ethos and the ways this seems to contradict the *kleos* ideology. Finally, it will conclude by examining *Odes* 4.2, 4.5, and 4.6 as an example of Horace's manipulation of *kleos* in representing the emperor Augustus.

The *kleos* ideology has its origins in the ethos of the preliterate proto-Indo-European population which roamed the Eurasian steppes in the 4th and 5th millennia B.C.[1] Because of the absence of literary remains produced by the proto-Indo-Europeans themselves, this ethos is reconstructed on the basis of the earliest extant poetry of the daughter languages. The *kleos* ideology seems to have been an essential aspect of this ethos, as it enjoyed an exceptionally wide geographic spread among the Indo-European language families, including Italic.[2] M. L. West describes the fundamental tenets of Indo-European *kleos* using a series of quotations from Germanic, Celtic, and Baltic sources:

[1] West (2007) 7–11.
[2] Steuart (1921) 31–37.

Let him strive, who can,
for glory ere death—that's for the liegeman
no longer living the best thing hereafter (*Beowulf* 1387–9)

Cattle die, kinsmen die, oneself dies likewise.
I know one [masc.] that never dies: each dead man's repute.
(*Havamal* 77)

Riches die, fame does not die. (Middle Welsh proverb in the *Red Book of Hergest*)

What is it that does not decay under the earth?—The name.
(Lithuanian riddle in Schleider)

These statements express what looks to have been an enduring attitude among Indo-European peoples from the earliest times. Fighting men were stimulated to deeds of valour, rulers to acts of justice and liberality, not by the prospect of rewards in the afterlife but by the anticipation of good repute in the present and the future. Praise by poets was the most potent mechanism for the diffusion and perpetuation of this repute. As kings and heroes of the past lived on in their songs, in the same way the best and greatest men of the present could hope to live on in the future. Their souls would go to join the majority and enjoy an unending communal existence in the greatest house below the earth. But they took little joy in this prospect. What fired them much more was the desire for an immortal name, for their individual achievements to be remembered on earth.[3]

Kleos itself is the Greek term for fame or renown. It descends from the proto-Indo-European noun **ḱléu̯es*, of which other cognates are Vedic Sanskrit *shravas*, Old Church Slavonic *slovo*, and Old Irish *clu*. The noun **ḱléu̯es* is itself derived from the root **ḱlu* meaning "hear, hear of." As West says, "To be heard of is to be famed. Hence the participle **ḱlutó-* may mean on the one hand 'heard, audible, sonorous', on the other hand 'renowned', as in Vedic *sruta-*, Avestan *sruta*, Greek κλυτός, Latin *in-clutus*."[4]

It is also important to consider for a moment the undying quality of *kleos*. This is represented in Greek and Vedic Sanskrit by the famous correspondence between κλέος ἄφθιτον and *shrava aksiti*. Such definite correspondences and the myriad examples of semantic equivalence across the Indo-European landscape (such as the Germanic, Celtic, and Baltic examples quoted by West above) reveal the prevailing anxiety over this concept. *Kleos* seems, in the Indo-European mind-set, to have provided the

[3] West (2007) 396–397.
[4] West (2007) 397.

only real escape from death. This opposition of death and *kleos* is crucial. In pondering the unavoidable truth of human mortality, the prehistoric Indo-Europeans seem to have hit upon "undying fame" in response. The influence of this idea has been enormous over the millennia.[5]

In the ancient Greek conception of *kleos*, a specific narrative becomes significant. *Nostos* (homecoming), provides the conceptual model from which to understand the pursuit of *kleos*. The hero must leave his house in order to attain *kleos*, and, having accomplished something *kleos*-worthy, return home in order to solidify it. There are obvious risks involved in such a venture, and no guarantee of success is usually possible. Should the hero fail to acquire *kleos*, the results could be catastrophic and potentially ruinous to the lineage of a hero's entire family, no matter how previously exemplary. Leslie Kurke writes,

> Every trip out aims at regaining the ancient prestige of the house as new prestige. In a sense, every quest is a displacement of this quest, for whatever its literal object, its ultimate goal is always the renewal of the father's glory. But such a system implies that stasis is always loss: there is an inevitable entropy of *kleos*. Thus, while even the integrity of the house requires spatial and temporal continuity, it also necessitates the continual renewal of the family's achievements by each new generation.[6]

Kleos is not a stable entity, but erodes and loses its luster unless constantly maintained.

In Greek mythology, the classic model for *nostos* is Odysseus. In Book 1 of the *Odyssey*, Telemachus laments the ill fate of his father, Odysseus, snatched up attempting to acquire *kleos*. The contents of his lament at 1.232–243 highlight the central tenets of *nostos* as it relates to *kleos*:

> μέλλεν μέν ποτε οἶκος ὅδ' ἀφνειὸς καὶ ἀμύμων
> ἔμμεναι, ὄφρ' ἔτι κεῖνος ἀνὴρ ἐπιδήμιος ἦεν·
> νῦν δ' ἑτέρως ἐβόλοντο θεοὶ κακὰ μητιόωντες,
> οἳ κεῖνον μὲν ἄιστον ἐποίησαν περὶ πάντων
> ἀνθρώπων, ἐπεὶ οὔ κε θανόντι περ ὧδ' ἀκαχοίμην,
> εἰ μετὰ οἷς ἑτάροισι δάμη Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμῳ,
> ἠὲ φίλων ἐν χερσίν, ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσεν.
> τῷ κέν οἱ τύμβον μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιοί,
> ἠδέ κε καὶ ᾧ παιδὶ μέγα κλέος ἤρατ' ὀπίσσω.
> νῦν δέ μιν ἀκλειῶς ἅρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο·
> οἴχετ' ἄιστος ἄπυστος, ἐμοὶ δ' ὀδύνας τε γόους τε
> κάλλιπεν. οὐδέ τι κεῖνον ὀδυρόμενος στεναχίζω.

[5] The ending of Shakespeare's Sonnet 18 provides a good example. The bard offers poetic immortality to a lover: "So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,/So long lives this, and this gives life to thee."

[6] Kurke (1991) 18.

This house was once on track to be rich and noble,
when a certain man was still resident in his country.
But now the gods desire otherwise, deliberating ill,
those gods who have made him unseen beyond all men.
I would not have mourned so if he had died,
so long as he died among his companions in the land of the Trojans,
or in the hands of friends, after the war's conclusion.
All the Achaeans would have made a tomb for him,
and he would have brought back great fame [*kleos*] for himself and his son.
But now winds have snatched him up famelessly:
he is gone unseen and unheard, and has left for me pains and laments.
And not for him alone do I groan lamenting.

The significance of *kleos* in the Greek mind-set is obvious from this quotation, as *kleos* could once have rendered the house ἀφνειὸς (rich) and ἀμύμων (noble)—that is, the *kleos* associated with Odysseus's *nostos*. It is also important to remember that *kleos* is primary. Telemachus would not have mourned had his father assured for himself and his family *kleos* by dying nobly. The actual nature of his father's fate, life or death, is not as important to Telemachus as its position in respect to *kleos*. Then again, *nostos* is normally a prerequisite for the attainment of *kleos*. The opposition between μέγα κλέος and ἀκλειῶς established in lines 240 and 241 is the essential distinction for Telemachus. One gets the sense that, at least in Telemachus's mind, the suitors themselves would disappear were Odysseus's μέγα κλέος to be instituted. Unfortunately, so long as Odysseus remains snatched up ἀκλειῶς, the family lacks the basic measure of respect needed to ward off the rowdy suitors. Thus the establishment of *kleos* is imperative to the proper functioning of the house and family.

In a closer examination of the *nostos* narrative, sea travel and the imagery of "wind and wave" become important elements of the heroic *nostos*. This is implicit in the Homeric passage quoted above, as Odysseus is lost at sea. Furthermore, in the epinician poetry of Pindar, which can be seen as a development of the *kleos* ideology (poet and hero becoming poet and victor), the victor is constantly described in terms of travel or motion, and the sea is essential to this. In *Olympian* 12, Pindar evokes the uncertainty of men's hopes by using the image of the treacherous sea (lines 5–6a):

αἵ γε μὲν ἀνδρῶν
πόλλ' ἄνω, τὰ δ' αὖ κάτω
ψεύδη μεταμώνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ' ἐλπίδες.

> The hopes of all men
> some up, some down again,
> are whirled, slicing vain lies

He contrasts this with an image of sudden maritime tranquility (lines 11–12a):

> οἱ δ' ἀνιαραῖς
> ἀντικύρσαντες ζάλαις
> ἐσλὸν βαθὺ πήματος ἐν μικρῷ πεδάμειψαν χρόνῳ.
>
> But those who
> have hit upon grievous surgings
> in a little time have changed from misery to deep good.

Everyone's life features some combination of successes and failures. Maurice Bowra remarks, "Alternations between storm and calm fit very well into Pindar's view of life as inevitably a matter of ups and downs,"[7] and according to Kurke, Pindar uses this notion of instability to contextualize our understanding of the victor's journey:

> The sense of relief and well-being which pervades this picture draws its peculiar force from the metaphorical development of the poem: we feel that the victor is not only literally home but "home safe" from the delusory hopes and vicissitudes that make all human life a dangerous sea voyage.[8]

Human life is a sea voyage in the sense that it is unpredictable. From one moment to the next, our fortunes may shift entirely. Homer usually represents the sea as unstable and hostile as well.[9] The Homeric hero or Pindaric victor, like all men, faces life's uncertainties, but as Deborah Steiner suggests, "The victor and hero, more than other men, have a chance to master the forces which seek to mould their destinies, to harness them to their own designs. . . . Victory, he [i.e., Pindar] suggests, is the one antidote to the vicissitudes and change of human existence; it is a good fortune which no wind or wave can move, a light whose rays cannot be extinguished."[10] The victory, bringing *kleos*, is a constant in the face of life's vicissitudes, unchanging and undying.

Turning now to the Roman poet, Horatius Flaccus, let us examine the degree to which Horace retains the *kleos* ideology. At times, in public contexts, he incorporates major elements of this ethos unquestioningly. In

[7] Bowra (1964) 250.
[8] Kurke (1991) 34.
[9] Steiner (1986) 67.
[10] Steiner (1986) 72.

Ode 2.7, concerning the return of his friend Pompeius from battle, Horace writes (lines 3–4):

> quis te redonavit Quiritem
> dis patriis Italoque caelo.
>
> who gave you back a Quirite
> to your paternal gods and the Italian sky?

The context of this poem is *nostos*, and Horace emphasizes the significance of return to *dis patriis*. In the traditional scheme of the *kleos* ideology, *nostos* provides the narrative framework for the reestablishment of *kleos* in the hero's household. The household is the key here. *Kleos* is possessed not by the hero alone, but by the household. Furthermore, new *kleos* is pivotal because it participates in the process by which ancestral *kleos* is regenerated and made new. In mentioning *dis patriis*, Horace highlights the centrality of the household in these concepts of *nostos* and the reconstitution of familial *kleos*.

Later in the same ode (lines 13–16), Horace describes the divergent warrior fates of Pompeius and himself:

> Sed me per hostis Mercurius celer
> denso paventem sustulit aere;
> te rursus in bellum resorbens
> unda fretis tulit aestuosis.
>
> But swift Mercury bore me panicked
> through the hosts in the dense air;
> a repossessing wave in the boiling straits
> carried you back to war.

Te . . . resorbens unda . . . tulit recalls the imagery of Pindar's *Olympian* 12. Waves, like the sea more generally, are unpredictable. While Horace is borne by Mercury through the *hostis*, Pompeius is returned to war by the sea. These are the vicissitudes, the subtle changes of fortune, which make life a journey. As Steiner notes regarding Pindar's use of maritime imagery, "On the maritime journey of life, man faces the uncertainty of his condition, the overwhelming influence of the gods, the necessity of danger and toil and the rapid shifts between rough and smooth passage which all human experience involves."[11] Horace's seafaring imagery in *Ode* 2.7 incorporates all of the Pindaric elements mentioned by Steiner: the wave is an uncertainty (referring Pompeius back to conflict), the influence of Mercury appears in the case of Horace himself, and the elements of danger and toil emerge in the imagery of *fretis aestuosis* and the return *in bellum*.

[11] Steiner (1986) 70.

In *Ode* 4.9, addressed to Lollius, Horace commences a discussion of undying *kleos* in lines 25–34:

> Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona
> multi; sed omnes illacrimabiles
> urgentur ignotique longa
> nocte, carent quia vate sacro.
>
> Paulum sepultae distat inertiae
> celata virtus. Non ego te meis
> chartis inornatum silebo,
> totve tuos patiar labores
>
> impune, Lolli, carpere lividas
> obliviones.
>
> Many brave men have lived before Agamemnon;
> but all unwept and unknown they are
> pressed in the long night,
> because they lack a sacred bard.
>
> Hidden courage is little distinguished
> from buried laziness. I will not neglect
> you unsung in my pages,
> nor suffer dark oblivion
>
> easily, Lollius, to wear away
> your labors.

Horace contrasts the fame of Agamemnon to the obscurity of unsung heroes. Timothy Johnson comments on this theme:

> The contrast between the remembered (Agamemnon) and the forgotten brave ends Horace's Trojan narrative with the violation of a fundamental supposition of justice: that meritorious conduct should result in reward, not loss. The brave were as deserving as Agamemnon, but they passed beyond the memory of even tears (*illacrimabiles*) and, as a result, suffered the worst fate a hero can endure, the loss of κλέος (*ignoti*).[12]

Johnson emphasizes the loss of *kleos*, being *ignoti*, as the worst fate of a hero. This parallels the presumed fate of Odysseus in Book 1 of the *Odyssey*, ἀκλειῶς. In Horace's conception, men experience one of two fates, fame or the lack thereof. There is no consideration of merit, and the presence

[12] Johnson (2004) 89.

of a poet to sing one's exploits makes all the difference. Another image of Horace's bipartite division of fate appears in *Ode* 1.10 (lines 17–20):

> Tu pias laetis animas reponis
> sedibus virgaque levem coerces
> aurea turbam, superis deorum
> gratus et imis.
>
> You guide the pious souls
> to their happy seats, and herd the unsubstantial
> crowd with your golden staff, dear
> to the gods above and below.

In this passage, the precise nature of the division is unclear, and it may be a reference to the "Isles of the Blessed," but in any case, the *laetis sedibus* are reserved for only the most noteworthy souls, as marked by the opposition to *levem turbam*. The *levem turbam* suggests the souls of the unwashed masses. The *pias animas*, in opposition, are the souls of the famed.

By contrast, *Ode* 3.5 provides interesting examples of both failed *kleos* and *nostos*. Horace begins by discussing the soldiers of Crassus taken captive after the disastrous battle of Carrhae in 53 B.C (lines 5–12):

> Milesne Crassi coniuge barbara
> turpis maritus vixit et hostium
> (pro curia inversique mores!)
> consenuit socerorum in armis
>
> sub rege Medo, Marsus et Apulus,
> anciliorum et nominis et togae
> oblitus aeternaeque Vestae,
> incolumi Iove et urbe Roma?
>
> Have soldiers of Crassus lived as
> the shameful husbands of barbarian wives, and have
> the Marsian and Apulian (o senate and changed manners!)
> grown old amidst the arms of their fathers-in-law,
>
> under the Parthian king, forgetting
> the sacred shields, their names, the toga,
> and the eternal Vesta, while Jove
> and the city of Rome remain unharmed?

As a rule, captive Roman soldiers lost their citizenship upon entering the enemy camp.[13] In a sense, this is the ultimate loss of *kleos*. When Horace

[13] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 89.

writes *consenuit socerorum in armis sub rege Medo*, he emphasizes the displacement of the household. Where Pompeius returned to *dis patriis*, these soldiers have exchanged their Roman households for those of the *coniuge barbara*. It is also important to note that the soldier is *oblitus* of *nominis*. *Nomen* represents the soldier's entire Roman identity: ancestors, paternal deities, *et cetera*. To abandon *nomen*, then, is to abandon the entire warrior ideology of *kleos*.

Later in the same ode, Horace tells the story of Regulus, a general of the First Punic War who was taken captive and later returned to Rome (lines 47–52):

> interque maerentis amicos
> egregius properaret exsul.
>
> Atqui sciebat quae sibi barbarus
> toror pararet. Non aliter tamen
> dimovit obstantis propinquos
> et populum reditus morantem
>
> amid grieving friends
> the glorious exile hastened.
>
> And he knew what the barbarian
> torturer would prepare for him. No differently
> however did he part the blocking kinsmen
> or the ones delaying his return.

Regulus, in being captured, has profoundly failed to acquire *kleos*. This failure also ruins his *nostos*, as *nostos* cannot succeed in the absence of *kleos*. He is an exile (*exsul*), which is to say he lacks a homeland, but also, and equally significantly, a household. The loss or destruction of the ancestral home rang in the Greek mind-set amid the most horrible of all punishments, and ostracism was so feared for its severance from the home.[14] Furthermore, it is interesting that Horace uses the word *reditus* to describe Regulus's return to the barbarians. By using *reditus* in this context (the Latin equivalent to Greek *nostos*), Horace highlights the perverse nature of Regulus's actual return to Rome. Both of these *reditus* are perverse in some sense, the one for its failure to reconstitute ancestral *kleos*, the other for its horrific conclusion.

There is a conflict between Horace's public ethos, which retains the traditional *kleos* ideology, and the more famous sympotic ethos reflected in the *carpe diem* poems. *Ode* 3.29, addressed to Maecenas, provides a good illustration (lines 29–48):

[14] Kurke (1991) 15–16.

Prudens futuri temporis exitum
caliginosa nocte premit deus,
ridetque si mortalis ultra
fas trepidat. Quod adest memento

componere aequus; cetera fluminis
ritu feruntur, nunc medio alveo
cum pace delabentis Etruscum
in mare, nunc lapides adesos

stirpesque raptas et pecus et domos
volventis una non sine montium
clamore vicinaeque silvae,
cum fera diluvies quietos

irritat amnis. Ille potens sui
laetusque deget cui licet in diem
dixisse "Vixi: cras vel atra
nube polum pater occupato

vel sole puro; non tamen irritum
quodcumque retro est efficiet, neque
diffinget infectumque reddet
quod fugiens semel hora vexit."

God foreseeing future time hides
what will come in mist and night,
he laughs if man fears over much.
Remember to keep a level head with

what is here. The rest flows by like
a river, now streaming peacefully in
midchannel to the Tuscan sea, now
rolling down eroded rocks,

uprooted stems, cattle, and houses
with the clamor of mountains
and nigh woods, as
the wild flood enrages the quiet

rivers. That man is master of his life
and happy who can say as each day
concludes, "I have lived: tomorrow, let the
father fill the sky with a dark cloud

or pure sun; he will not make
useless what is past, nor
will he unmake or annul what once
the fleeing hour has brought."

The passage begins by reintroducing the image of fate as torrent, seen earlier in Book 1 of the *Odyssey*, Pindar's *Olympian* 12, and Horace's *Ode* 2.7. The same symbolic elements are present since the imagery of the sea is used to illustrate the unpredictable nature of fate and human life (*nunc . . ., nunc . . .*), but at the conclusion of the metaphor, Horace takes things in a new direction. Earlier, in *Ode* 2.7, Horace followed Pindar's lead in representing the *nostos* of Pompeius to his *dis patriis* (which implied the reestablishment of ancestral *kleos*) as coming into being from and in opposition to the earlier *resorbens unda* (which represented the vicissitudes of fate). Horace then, in his public voice, embraces the notion of victory or *kleos* in opposition to instability and unpredictability. In *Ode* 3.29, Horace reimagines the man who is *potens sui*, and he does not appear to be a hero or victor. This man acknowledges his own lack of control over the workings of fate, and takes solace in the permanence of things past. Like Herodotus's Solon, he is happy to have survived each day, waxing philosophical. There is no notion of the stabilizing force of *kleos* here. Interestingly, the *kleos* ideology could have been relevant, because of the poet-patron relationship between Horace and Maecenas, but Horace seems to be writing in an entirely different mode.

In lines 21–28 of *Ode* 2.3, Horace presents a view of death and the afterlife that is very much at odds with the notions expressed in *Odes* 4.9 and 1.10:

Divesne, prisco natus ab Inacho,
nil interest an pauper et infirma
de gente sub divo moreris,
victim nil miserantis Orci.

Omnes eodem cogimur, omnium
versatur urna serius ocius
sors exitura et nos in aeternum
exsilium impositura cumbae.

It matters not whether you spend your time
below the sky as a rich man,
born from olden Inachus, or a pauper and of no account;
you are a victim of Orcus who pities none.

All are gathered in the same place, everyone's
lot is turning, and sooner or later

will be shaken out, and place us
on the skiff of eternal exile.

Horace suggests a universality of fate, which contradicts the bipartite division seen earlier. The emphasis on death's ability to claim everyone, regardless of circumstance, has a certain rhetorical power, and is not necessarily contradictory (as death finds the hero too). Horace mentions this elsewhere in the *Odes* (e.g., 1.4.13–14). On the other hand, the spirit of such statements is at odds with *Ode* 4.9, in which Horace uses strong negative descriptions to contrast the eternal state of unsung heroes with the fame of Agamemnon: *urgentur* (pressed) and *illacrimabiles* (unwept). The presence of this distinction in 4.9 suggests that Horace has left something out in 2.3, but the real contradiction is found in the words *omnes eodem cogimur*. The idea that everyone is gathered or collected in the "same place" conflicts directly with the notion expressed in *Ode* 1.10 that there are two distinct physical spaces allotted for *pias animas* on the one hand and the *levem turbam* on the other. *Omnes eodem cogimur* is a reckoning concerning the physical destination of deceased souls, in the same sense as that in 1.10, but it reaches a markedly different conclusion. It is unfair to expect steadfast consistency from the entire corpus of any author, especially a poet, but such contradictions between the public and sympotic sides of Horace suggest a complexity in his treatment of *kleos*. This becomes fully evident in the odes of Book 4 concerning Augustus.

Book 4 of Horace's *Odes* features a number of panegyrics written in celebration of the emperor Augustus. *Kleos* is an important element in this praise, and Horace makes creative use of the related ideas. In *Ode* 4.2, Horace sets up the connection between *kleos* and the Roman triumph (lines 45–52):

Tum meae, si quod loquar audiendum,
vocis accedet bona pars, et "O sol
pulcher, O laudande!" canam, receptor
Caesare felix.

Teque dum procedis, "io Triumphe!"
non semel dicemus, "io Triumphe!"
civitas omnis dabimusque divis
rura benignis.

Then, if what I speak deserves to be heard,
a good part of my voice will add its part, and I will sing
"O beautiful sun, O sun to be praised,"
happy at Caesar's return.

And as you proceed, "io Triumph,"
not once the whole citizenry will call,

"io Triumph," and offer incense
to the kindly gods.

In the arrangement of consecutive stanzas, Horace draws an implicit comparison between praise poetry and the Roman triumph. The first stanza describes Horace's words of praise at Augustus's return, and the second sets the scene for the triumphal procession. The transition between these images is smooth, as marked by a mere *-que*. The connection between triumphs, poetry, and *kleos* is also hinted at earlier in Horace, in *Ode* 3.30, in which Horace uses the language of triumphal procession to describe his construction of a *monumentum* of poetry.[15] Roman authors, more generally, saw a strong connection between the deeds of heroes and the symbolic celebration of the triumph. Mary Beard asserts, "Completely imaginary celebrations added to the picture, as writers retrojected the triumph back into the world of Greek history and myth, to honor the likes of Alexander the Great and the god Bacchus."[16] Furthermore, the triumph, in celebrating the conquering army's victorious homecoming, emphasized the army's reintegration into the citizen body.[17] The triumph, in a sense, represented the public recomposition of an entire army's worth of *kleos* following the *nostos* from battle.

In *Ode* 4.5, Horace uses a familiar image to express the city's longing for Augustus (lines 9–16):

Ut mater iuvenem, quem Notus invido
flatu Carpathii trans maris aequora
cunctantem spatio longius annuo
dulci distinet a domo,

votis ominibusque et precibus vocat,
curvo nec faciem litore dimovet:
sic desideriis icta fidelibus
quaerit patria Caesarem.

As the mother calls to the youth with vows and prayers,
whom the South Wind detains from home
with envious blowing, delayed across the surface of the
Carpathian sea 'til the sailing year is over,

and she refuses to move her face
from the curved shore,
thus the fatherland besotted with loyal
desires awaits its Caesar.

[15] Beard (2007) 50.
[16] Beard (2007) 43.
[17] Hope (2003) 82.

The scene here is wonderfully reminiscent of Telemachus in the *Odyssey*, Book 1, yearning for the *nostos* of Odysseus, and the heightening of drama creates an interesting effect. As the city becomes the lamenting mother becomes Telemachus, so Augustus becomes the detained son becomes Odysseus, since for Augustus to be represented as a detained seafarer is for Augustus to become the archetypal seafarer. Unlike Telemachus, Rome's degree of anxiety for its detained hero is actually light, as Augustus will soon return in the midst of a triumphal procession. Michael Putnam connects this scene to one in Propertius 3.7.9–12:[18]

> et mater non iusta piae dare debita terrae
> nec pote cognatos inter humare rogos,
> sed tua nunc volucres astant super ossa marinae,
> nunc tibi pro tumolo Carpathium omne mare est.
>
> and your mother cannot offer the rites of the pious earth,
> nor bury you among the familial tombs,
> but now sea birds stand over your bones,
> now the whole Carpathian sea stands in place of your burial mound.

The image here brings home the notion from the *Odyssey* of Odysseus dying ἀκλειῶς. Yet in Horace's *Ode* 4.5, the airing of *kleos* anxieties is merely rhetorical, serving mainly to assert that Augustus, in returning home, participates in the *nostos* narrative which culminates in the recomposition of ancestral *kleos* and, on a larger scale, the *kleos* of the state.

In *Ode* 4.6, Horace inverts the notion of *kleos* conferred upon hero by poet to discuss the ramifications of *kleos* for himself (lines 41–44):

> Nupta iam dices "Ego dis amicum
> saeculo festas referente luces,
> reddidi carmen docilis modorum
> vatis Horati."
>
> Already married you will say, "When
> the *saeculum* brought back the festive days,
> I performed the song dear to the gods, learned
> in the modes of the bard Horace."

Following the publication of *Odes*, Books 1–3, and the public recitation of the *Carmen Saeculare* at the Ludi Saeculares of 17 B.C., Horace became the "Roman poet." He describes here the memories of a chorus girl in the performance of the Ludi, recollecting her brief encounter with the "bard

[18] Putnam (1986) 105–106.

Horace." This, in fact, represents the last element of the Indo-European *kleos* equation: the fame conferred by the poet consequently conferred upon himself. West remarks,

> For the subject to survive, the song must survive. Thus the fame of the person celebrated becomes interlinked with the poet's own fame. As Ibycus advises Polycrates, "you will have κλέος ἄφθιτον, unfailing fame, ὡς κατ' ἀοιδὰν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος, so far as singing and my own fame can assure it."[19]

The reciprocal nature of *kleos* adds a complex twist to the assortment of related *kleos* ideas discussed in this essay. None of the prior elements function in the absence of the poet's "fame," and this is only acquired by the singing of "famous" deeds. There is a catch-22 here, but at the same time, the system functions, as there are both heroes and poets. Horace wins fame by giving it to others, and in describing this phenomenon, he incorporates a significant aspect of the Indo-European *kleos* ideology.

Horace and *kleos* are ultimately satisfactory, if conflicted, bedfellows. Horace seems at times to accept the *kleos* ideology as traditional wisdom, and at others to reject it in favor of his own personal views concerning death and the afterlife. Ultimately, in praising the emperor Augustus, Horace demonstrates a sincere engagement with the complexities of *kleos* and its significance to himself and his state. The very nature of Horatian lyric is contradiction and complication, and Horace basks in a multifaceted approach to the problems of life. His treatment of *kleos* is no different. He refuses to accept traditional insight at face value, but he also understands the inherited wisdom of the ancients, innovating with it in his own poetical projects.

[19] West (2007) 403–404.

Works Cited

Beard, M. (2007). *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bowra, C. M. (1964). *Pindar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hope, V. M. (2003). "Trophies and Tombstones: Commemorating the Roman Soldier." *World Archaeology* 35:79–97.

Johnson, T. S. (2004). *A Symposion of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in Odes IV*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kurke, L. (1991). *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

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

Putnam, M. C. J. (1986). *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 43. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Steiner, D. (1986). *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*. London: Duckworth.

Steuart, E. M. (1921). "The Earliest Narrative Poetry of Rome," *CQ* 15:31–37.

West, M. L. (2007). *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

❖ ❖ ❖