One of the vices attacked by Horace in C. 3.1 is extravagance in building styles, as represented by the man who, terrae fastidiosus, constructs a villa out to sea (33-37), and by the lofty structure mentioned in the last stanza,

\[
\text{cur invindendis postibus et novo} \\
\text{sublime ritu moliar atrium? (45/46)1).}
\]

\textit{Novo...ritu} suggests that such extravagance is a specifically modern vice, and this is confirmed both in C. 2.15.10ff, where the sober an unpretentious building styles of former times serve as both foil and indictment of modern practices, and in Sallust’s similar comparison at Cat. 12.3 – though one should add the proviso that in moralizing contexts the antinomy ancient-modern is always something relative. In C. 3.1 \textit{sublime ... atrium (46)} is clearly balanced by \textit{humilis domos (22)}, though there is apparently no thematic counterpoise to \textit{novo ... ritu}: the explicit temporal contrast of C. 2.15 seems to have been suppressed in 3.1. I propose that Horace has in fact built in this antithesis, though because of its allusive nature it has hitherto gone unnoticed.

Humble dwellings are a characteristic feature of early Rome, especially conspicuous in contrasts with later and more sophisticated times:

\[
\text{Romulus aeternae nondum formaverat urbis} \\
\text{moenia, consorti non habitanda Remo,} \\
\text{sed tunc pasebant herbosa Palatia vaccae} \\
\text{et stabant \textit{humiles in lovis arce casae} (Tib. 2.5.23-26);} \\
\text{fictilibus crevere deis haec aurea templum,} \\
\text{ne fuit opprobrio facta sine arte casa} (Prop. 4.1.5f.); \\
\text{Roma, nisi immensum vires movisset in orbem,} \\
\text{stramineis esset nunc quoque tecta casis (Ov. Am. 2.9.17f.).}
\]

Cf. also Vergil Ecl. 2.29, \textit{humilis ... casas}. Romulus himself lived in such a rude, thatched hut: Verg. Aen. 8.654, Romuleoque recens horrebat regia culmo; Prop. 2.16.19/20, \textit{straminea ... casa} (with Enk’s note ad loc.); Ovid Fasti 1.199/200, \textit{casa ... parva}; ibid. 3.183/4, \textit{de canna straminibusque domum}; Dion. Hal. 1.79.11. It became “ein Muster altrömischer Einfachheit” (Bömer ad Fast. 1.199): cf. Valerius Maximus 4.4.11, \textit{namque per Romuli casam perque veteris Capitolii humilia tecta et aeternos Vestae foci, fictilibus etiam nunc vasis contentos, iuro nullas divitias talium virorum paupertati posse praeferri.} It seems a reasonable supposition that

Horace’s readers would readily have made the association between *humilis domos* and the conditions in early Rome – and that lines 21–24 therefore balance not only *sublime ... atrium* but also, by implication, *novo ritu*.

Consequently the *agrestes viri* of 21/22 are not random group of unidentified and idealizedrustics, but specifically the early Romans. For this supposition there is independent confirmation. The group whose identity in the first Roman ode is only hinted at reappears, in sharper focus, in the cycle’s final piece – *sed rusticorum mascula militum / proles* (3.6.37/38). There is no mistaking the echo *rusticorum – agrestium*, structurally also functional as a ring composition; by way of thematic reinforcement, *rusticorum ... militum* has its counterpart in *agrestium ... virorum*, which is not a redundancy but suggests the hardy spirit of these ancients²: this too is a topos attested in connection with the Sabines, Apulians etc. (e.g. Verg. G. 2.167, *genus acre virum*; Hor. Epode 2.42, *pernicis ... Apuli*; C. 3.16.26, *impiger Apulus*; cf. Otto, Sprichwörter s.v. ‘Sabina’). I submit that the outline which appears in 3.1 – and the reader already suspects to whom Horace is alluding – subsequently assumes a concrete form in 3.6.

Finally, this identification of the *agrestes* with the early Romans has a further thematic implication for C. 3.1. Strophes 5 and 6 form an antithetical pair whose *tertium comparationis* is emphasized by the epanalepsis *somnum ... somnum*; in terms of thematic balance it is most appropriate that the foreign milieu suggested by the imagery in the fifth strophe (*destrictus ensis, Siculae dapes*) should have its counterpart, in the sixth, in the Roman rustics.

---

2) If it is accepted that *virorum* carries this nuance, then *lenis virorum* (22) is a characteristically suggestive iunccura: Horace often juxtaposes two words which, though not grammatically connected, nevertheless stand together in a logical association of similarity or contrast, as e.g. in C. 1.3.10/11, *qui fragilem truci / commisit pelago ratem / primus*, where the respective pairs of adjectives and nouns suggest, through the evocative juxtapositions, the utter temerity of the first seafarer. The word order challenges the careful reader to perceive logical associations or contrasts. In 3.1.22 the gentleness of the sleep beside the (implied) hardiness of the rustics is such a touch. (On this technique, see E. Moser, Entsprechung benachbarter Worte und Begriffe in der Sprache der römischen Elegiker, Diss. München 1935; D. West, Horace’s poetic technique in the Odes, in Horace, ed. C. D. N. Costa, London 1973, 29 ff.; C. Neumeister, Tibull, Heidelberg 1986, 30–32.)

---

**ÜBERLEGUNGEN ZUR DEUTUNG**

von lat. *vespillo ἴνεκοθάπτης-sandapilarius*

Im Latein hat *vespa* zwei Bedeutungen: es heißt Wespe, aber auch ‚Leichenträger, -räuber, -schänder’. Dies ist offenbar eine den Berufsnamen auf -a (*agrícula*) nachgebildete Abkürzung für das zunächst als Eigennamen¹) belegte *vespillo*, dessen weitere Zusammenhänge hier dargestellt werden sollen.

¹) Der plebeische Aedil Lucretius erwarb sich diesen Beinamen *Vespillo* für