Number, metre and length of poems

Book 2 of the *Odes* contains 20 poems, almost half the 38 of Book 1 and two-thirds of the 30 of Book 3. Like the earlier *Satires* 1 (10 poems), it thus has a number of poems founded on a decimal base, following Vergil’s *Eclogues* (10) and Tibullus’ first book (10), a feature later echoed in Book 3 (30). The contrast with *Odes* 1 is interesting: its 38 poems seem to show a poet keen to emphasise his full acquaintance with the rich range of Greek lyric, with considerable metrical diversity (beginning with nine poems in different metres), while the 20 poems of Book 2 show much less metrical variety: famously, it begins with ten poems in which Alcaics alternate with Sapphics, and then presents seven of its remaining ten poems in Alcaics plus three in other metres. The same restraint and consistency is shown in the matter of length: only 4 of its 20 poems extend to more than 30 lines with none over 40, and none is shorter than 20, whereas in Book 1 poem-length can range from eight lines (1.11, 1.38), 12 (1.23) or 16 (1.19, 1.21, 1.34) to 52 (1.2) and 60 (1.12).

These statistics suggest that where Book 1 shows poetic ambition and diversity, Book 2 shows poetic moderation and consistency. Having shown what he can do in his first book, in his second book the lyric poet settles into a more constant form and establishes the characteristic concerns of the *Odes*. Moderation is a key theme in Book 2: its poems stress moderation across a range of fields – in material consumption, in philosophical outlook, in passions and emotions, and in literary form. The opening poem is here symptomatic: after an impassioned recall of the horrors of civil war treated by its addressee Pollio in his lost *Histories*, the last stanza famously implies that this material is too much for Horatian lyric (2.1.37-40):

Sed ne relictis, Musa procax, ioci s
Ceae retractes munera neniae,
meicum Dionaeo sub antro
quaere modos leuiore plectro.

Horatian lyric is here defined as a moderate literary form, both in implicit contrast with the ‘tragic’ historiography of Pollio evoked in the rest of the poem and in explicit contrast with the intense lyric laments associated with the name of Simonides of Ceos. Note too that this intervention by the poet comes when the lyric ode has reached the maximum number of lines

---

1 My warm thanks go to Luca Mondin and the Università Ca’ Foscari for hosting a splendid gathering in Venice, to Marco Fernandelli for his kind invitation, and to Marco again and Gianfranco Agosti for their editorial patience.  
2 See Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 9.  
3 See Harrison 2001: 264-266.
allowed to an ode in Book 2: restraint of length as well as of emotional intensity, presented as programmatic in the first poem, is indeed a key feature of the book⁴.

**Variety of addressees**

The selection of addressees in Book 2 shows more variety than in metre and length, but here too there is some aspect of moderation and restraint. The princeps himself does not figure as addressee, and apart from the indispensable Maecenas (2.12, 2.17, 2.20), the only consular invoked is Pollio, assigned the prestigious initial position in 2.1. A quarter of the poems are addressed to minor friends of Horace, some of whom are also addressed in the first book of Epistles: Septimius (2.6; cf. epist.1.9), Pompeius (2.7), Quintius (2.11; cf. epist.1.16), Postumus (2.14) and Grosphus (2.16: cf. epist.1.12). Several addressees have misleadingly resonant names but turn out to be less important than their potential homonyms: Sallustius in 2.2 is an influential figure as friend of Augustus but recalls above all the celebrated name of his great-uncle and adoptive father the historian; Pompeius in 2.7 may well be a Pompeian but is not a significant member of the Pompey clan; and Licinius in 2.10 is probably not the famous conspirator Varro Murena⁵. The theme of civil war raised in 2.1 is continued in the associations of the addressees of several other poems in the first half of the book: Dellius in 2.3, well known for his rapid side-changing, and Pompeius in 2.7, Horace’s comrade at Philippi. Writers are also prominent: the historian Pollio in 2.1 has been noted, while 2.3 provides another historian of the civil wars in Dellius (it cannot be an accident that 2.2, the poem intermediate between these two, is addressed, as we have seen, to the homonymous heir of the great historian Sallust), while in 2.9 we find the elegiac poet Valgius. The suggestion in 2.12 that Maecenas himself could write a prose history of Caesar’s battles fits the emphasis on contemporary history and its recording in this book. The number of fictional addressees is lower than in Book 1, partly because of the smaller number of erotic odes: the two that appear, Xanthias (2.6) and Barine (2.8), seem to have typical or speaking names, while another poem (2.5) has an anonymous addressee but a fictionally named protagonist (Lalage). Two more serious poems of ethical character have either an anonymous addressee (2.18) or no addressee at all (2.15): both these look forward to the similarly moralising and non-addressed Roman Odes of the following book. Finally, for further variation, we find non-human addressees: the famous tree which nearly ended Horace’s life (2.13), and the god Bacchus, invoked as the inspiring deity of lyric poetry (2.19).

This distribution of addressees show some variety, but again looks to moderation in some sense in suggesting a greater emphasis on private friendship than on public figures, though there is some attention given to writers dealing with contemporary historical subjects (which fits the twice-airied possibility of the campaigns of Caesar as a literary topic: 2.9, 2.12).

**External architecture: the ordering of poems**

Much scholarship on the ordering of poems in the Odes has aspired to produce complete and inclusive schemes in which each poem relates significantly to its neighbours⁶. A salutary

---

⁴ Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: xvii.
⁵ I agree here with Syme 1986: 391.
cautionary note was famously struck by Nisbet and Hubbard:

‘Yet it is only too easy to imagine some subtle principle either of similarity or difference in every juxtaposition, not to mention more complicated sequences and cycles. Most of these suggestions seem completely fanciful, and equally ingenious reasons could be adduced to justify any arrangement’. In what follows I pursue something of a middle way between these two extremes in suggesting some significance in the order of poems in Odes Book 2 but not a complete and elaborate scheme which involves each and every poem.

The poems of Book 2 seem to show some groupings which express both similarity and contrast thematically. A linear reading of the book might emerge with the following, in which repeated themes are underlined and linked consecutive poems are grouped together:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Pollio, writer of history and tragedy, link with civil wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Sallust, nephew of writer of the history of civil wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Dellius, famous side-changer in civil wars, Antonian historian, symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Xanthias, young rich Greek, and his lover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Potential lover, girl too young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Septimius, old friend and the future (civil wars too?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Pompeius, old friend and Philippi (civil wars); symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Barine, probably fictional living irresistible lover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Valgius, writer of elegy and his dead lover, advice to a friend (praise of Caesar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Licinius, ethical advice to a friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Quinctius, ethical advice to a friend; symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Maecenas, potential historian, literary advice to a friend (praise of Caesar) and love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>The tree: near-death of the poet, immortality of Sappho and Alcaeus in the underworld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Postumus, future death and the underworld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>no addressee, anti-luxury, ethical advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Grosphus, anti-luxury, ethical advice to a friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Maecenas – near-death, friendship and loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>anonymous addressee, anti-luxury diatribe, ethical advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Bacchus, literary/fantastic poem, underworld scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Maecenas, friendship, literary/fantastic poem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scheme shows that there are clearly groups of poems with common themes:

2.1-3 are linked by the civil wars and the writing of history, all addressed to real historical figures (Sallustius cannot be wholly separated from his famous adoptive father here), 2.4-5 are paired as two lighter poems of the life of love, involving figures with fictionalised speaking names, 2.6-7 are both addressed to old friends with real names and look back to the poet’s past, possibly both to the civil wars, 2.8-9 are another pair of poems on erotic subjects, the femme fatale Barine and the dead puer Mystes, again with speaking names, while the three poems 2.10-2.12 are linked by the offer of advice to a friend. 2.13 and 2.14 are clearly paired by the prominence of death and the Underworld in both poems, while 2.14 and 2.15 stand together as poems of ethical advice against luxury. The final group of four poems is contained by two

---

7 Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: xxiv.
poems addressed to Maecenas, both of which stress the poet’s friendship, but 2.19 and 2.20 are also paired together because of their imaginative fantasy about immortals, 2.19 with its description of the divine Bacchus, 2.20 with its description of the immortalised Horace.

These links within groups are matched by links across groups. As already noted, the theme of the civil wars not only holds together the opening sequence of 2.1-3 but also seems to be relevant to the friendship-pairing of 2.6-7; poems concerned with writers move from the initial group linked with historians (2.1-3) to the elegist Valgius in 2.9 and the potential historian Maecenas in 2.12; the theme of the underworld links 2.19 with the pair 2.13-14; diatribes against luxury connect 2.18 with the pair 2.15-16; the theme of praise of Caesar as a potential literary topic is raised in both 2.9 and 2.12; the theme of the symposium draws together 2.3, 2.7 and 2.11, that of love the two pairs 2.4-5 and 2.8-9 as well as 2.12, that of fantasy 2.13 and 2.19-20; and general ethical advice and professions of friendship are liberally distributed across the whole book.

These similarities are accompanied and balanced by contrasts and alternations, which like the variety of addressees (see below) seem to be a carefully orchestrated element in the book as the reader proceeds through. The tragic realism of the opening group 2.1-3 and their links with the civil wars and their historians contrast with the lighter and less ‘real’ poems of love 2.4-5, but we then return to the realities of Rome’s past history with the old friends of 2.6-7, at least one of which provides a strong link with the civil wars. 2.8-9 reprise the erotic themes of 2.4-5: 2.4 and 2.9 both deal with lovers of inferior rank to the addressee, while the issue of excessive youth (too young for love, too young to die) links Lalage in 2.5 with Mystes in 2.9.

The more serious subject of advice to a friend constitutes the core of the next group 2.10-12, while the two treatments of the Underworld in 2.13 and 2.14 (another contrasting switch) have their own internal contrasts (one is fantastic and literary, the other severe and moralising), and in the final two sequences we find the same clear variation between ethical preaching (2.15-16, 2.18) and literary fantasy (2.19-20).

**Internal architecture: the turn in the middle**

Elsewhere I have set out various ways in which the *Odes* of Horace show a change of subject-matter in or around the central stanza or stanzas\(^8\). Some of these are nicely exemplified in Book 2: for instance, both 2.7 and 2.11 show a central turn from political subject-matter to symposiastic celebration (also seen in 3.14). In 2.7 we move after four of the seven stanzas from memories of Philippi to the present party:

\[O \text{ saepe mecum tempus in ultimum} \\
\text{deducte Bruto militiae duce,} \\
\text{quis te redonuavit Quiritem} \\
\text{dis patriis Italoque caelo,} \\
\text{Pompei, meorum prime sodalium,} \\
\text{cum quo morantem saepe diem mero} \\
\text{fregi, coronatus nitentis} \\
\text{malobathro Syrio capillos?} \\
\text{Tecum Philippos et celerem fugam} \\
\text{sensi relicta non bene parmula,} \]

---

\(^8\) Harrison 2004.
In 2.11 the poem turns from political news and consequent philosophical reflection to celebration:

Quid bellicosus Cantaber et Scythes,
Hirpine Quincti, cogitaret Hadria
diuisus obiecto, remittas
quaerere nec trepides in usum
poscentis aequi paucha: fugit retro
leuis iuuentas et decor, arida
pellente lascius amores
canicie facilemerque somnum.
Non semper idem floribus est honor
uernis neque uno luna rubens nitet
uoltu: quid aeternis minorem
consiliis animum fatigas?
Cur non sub alta vel platano vel hac
pinu iacentes sic temere et rosa
canos odorati capillos,
dum licet, Assyriaque nardo
potamus uncii? dissipat Euhius
curas edacis. Quis puer oculus
restinguet ardentis Falerni
pocula praeterente lympha?
Quis deuium scortum eliciet domo
Lyden? Eburna dic, age, cum lyra
maturet, in comptum Lacaenae
more comas religata nodum.

In both cases the consideration of politics merits a celebration which can be related to the new Augustan order: in 2.7 the civil strife of Philippi is presented as gone for ever, shown by the amnesty under which the former Republican Pompeius is returning to Italy, while in 2.11 stirrings on the distant borders of the empire need give us no trouble since (it is implied) Rome can now keep order.

Another kind of central turn found twice in Book 2 is that of false closure. In 2.5 the end of the initial instruction to the anonymous addressee not to pursue the still immature Lalage could
give a satisfactory ending to the poem after three stanzas, a length which recalls that of the epigram tradition on which it is based⁹:

Nondum subacta ferre iugum ualet
ceruice, nondum munia comparis
aequare nec tauri ruentis
in uenerem tolerare pondus.

Circa uirentis est animus tuae
campos iuuenae, nunc fluuiis grauem
solantis aestum, nunc in udo
ludere cum uitulis salicto
praegestientis. Tolle cupidinem
immitis uuae: iam tibi liuidos
distinguet autumnus racemos
purpureo uarius colore.

iam te sequetur; currit enim ferox
aetas et illi quos tibi dempserit
adponet annos; iam proterua
fronte petet Lalage maritum,
dilatea, quantum non Pholoe fugax,
non Chloris albo sic umero nitens
ut pura nocturno renidet
luna mari Cnidiusue Gyges,
quem si puellarum insereres choro,
mire sagacis falleret hospites
discrimen obscurum solutis
crinibus ambiguoque uoltu.

The move from ‘she will mature enough for you to pursue her’ to ‘she will pursue you’ begins a new train of thought, and the rest of the poem is dedicated to Lalage’s future active sexual potential, a reversal of the first half where her character as passive love object was stressed. A similar central turn is found in Odes 2.13:

Ille et nefasto te posuit die,
quicumque primum, et sacrilega manu
produxit, arbos, in nepotum
perniciem obprobriumque pagi;
illum et parentis crediderim sui
fregisse ceruicem et penetralia
sparsisse nocturno cruore
hospitis, ille uenena Colcha
et quidquid usquam concipitur nefas
tractauit, agro qui statuit meo
te, triste ligum, te, caducum
in domini caput inmerentis.
Quid quisque uitet, nunquam homini satis
cautum est in horas: nauita Bosphorum
Poenus perhorrescit neque ultra
caeca timet aliunde fata,
miles sagittas et celerem fugam
Parthi, catenas Parthus et Italum

⁹ For details see Harrison 2004: 100-101.
robur; sed inprouisa leti
uis rapuit rapietque gentis.

**Quam paene furuae regna Proserpinae**
et iudicantem uidimus Aeacum
sedesque discrptas piorum et
Aeolias fidibus querentem
Sappho puellis de popularibus
et te sonantem plenius aureo,
Alcaee, plectro dura nauis,
dura fugae mala, dura belli.
Vtrumque sacro digna silentio
mirantur umbrae dicere, sed magis
pugnas et exactos tyrannos
densum ueris bbiti aure uolgos.
Quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens
demittit atras belua centiceps
auris et intorti capillis
Eumenidum recreantur angues?
Quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens
dulci laborum decipitur sono
nec curat Orion leones
aut timidos agitare lyncas.

Here at line 20 the poem seems to be over: the curse on the tree and reflections on death reach
a natural conclusion, aided as in 2.5 by the epigrammatic tradition on which the poem draws.10
But in fact this is only the end of the first half: the new start at line 21 takes up a quite different
poetic theme, a detailed account of the Underworld, which occupies the poem’s second half.

*Contemporary literary context: Vergil and Tibullus?*

The publication of *Odes* 2 is traditionally dated to 23 BCE, as part of the simultaneous collection of *Odes* 1-3; but recent scholarship has suggested that these three books may have been published separately earlier in addition to this collective edition.11 Internal evidence from Book 2 mentions a date not long before Horace’s fortieth birthday in December 25 BCE (2.4.22-24 fuge suspicari /cuius octauum trepidauit aetas claudere lustrum), and no poem in the book can be firmly dated after this.12 If Book 2 is essentially a product of the first half of the 20s BCE, this would fit the prominence of certain intertexts which were recent publications in those years.

Prime amongst these is Vergil’s *Georgics*, emerging about 29 BCE. Book 2 seems to be especially interested in the narrative of Orpheus’ descent to the Underworld in *Georgics* 4, which is echoed in no fewer than four poems. In 2.9 Valgius is presented as lamenting interminably in language which clearly recalls the lament of Orpheus for the lost Eurydice (2.9.9-12):

*tu semper urge flehilibus modis_
Mysten ademptum, nec tibi *Vespero_
surgente decedunt* amores
nec rapidum fugiente solem.

---

12 Hutchinson 2008: 131-161.
Cf. georg. 4.465-466:

> te, dulcis coniunx, te solo in litore secum
de nec curat Orion leones

Here Vergil’s tragic episode is ironised in Horace’s criticism of his elegiac friend for excessive literary lamentation: the loss of the *puer* Mystes is not to be compared with that of Eurydice. In 2.13 the Underworld of *Georgics* 4 is again invoked. In the second half of this poem, as we have just seen, Horace imagines the journey to the Underworld that he just avoided in being saved from the falling tree (2.13.21-40):

Quam paene furuæ regna Proserpinae
et iudicantem uidimus Aeacum
sedesque discriptas piorum et
Aeolis fidibus querentem
Sappho puellis de popularibus
et te sonantem pleniæ aureo,
Alcaee, plectro dura nauis,
dura fugæ mala, dura belli.
Vtrumque sacro digna silentio
mirantur umbrae dicere, sed magis
pugnas et exactos tyrannos
densum umeris bibit aure volgus.
Quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens
demittit atras belua centiceps
auris et intorti capillis
Eumenidum recreantur angues?
Quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens
dulci laborum decipitur sono
nec curat Orion leones
aut timidos agitare lyncas.

Cf. georg. 4.471-472:

> At cantu commotae Erebu de sedibus imis
umbrae ibant tenues

georg. 4.481-484:

> quin ipsae stupuere domus atque intima Leti
Tartara caeruleosque implexæ crinibus
Eumenides, tenuitque inhiæ tria Cerberus ora,
atque Ixionii uento rota constitit orbis

Here it is the soothing of Cerberus and the snake-garlanded Furies which confirms the intertextual echo. Horace here potentially takes on the role of Orpheus as poetic visitor to the Underworld, but also assigns to the music of Sappho and Alcaeus the famous effect of Orphic singing in the lulling of monsters and the cessation of infernal torments. The soothing of Cerberus occurs again in the ode to Bacchus, 2.19: there the god is not specifically said to use song to quieten the hound of hell, but since the poem addresses Bacchus as the god of poetic inspiration this idea must be at least in the background here (2.19.29-32):
te uidit insons Cerberus aureo
cornu decorum leniter atterens
caudam et recedentis trilingui
ore pedes tetigitque crura.

g. 4.483:

tenuitque inhians tria Cerberus ora

In 2.14 the visit to the Underworld in death which no-one can avoid is again characterised in the colours of Georgics 4 (2.14.17-20):

uisendus ater flumina languido
Cocythus errans et Danai genus
Infame damnatusque longi
Sisyphus Aeolides laboris

Cf. g. 4.478-480:

quos circums limus niger et deformis harundo
Cocyti tardaque palus inamabilis unda
alligat et nouies Styx interfusa coercet

Here an Orphean-style visit to the infernal regions is envisaged for the addressee Postumus, though without Orpheus’ chance of return.

The Georgics is not the only poetic text of the early 20s which receives attention in Book 2. The first book of Tibullus is to be dated to 27/26 BCE, and the Bacchus of Odes 2.19 clearly owes something to his Egyptian counterpart Osiris as recently described in Tibullus 1.7 (2.19.9-28, 1.7.33-48) as well as to the classic Dionysus of Euripides’ Bacchae:

Fas peruciacis est mihi Thyiadas
unique fontem lactis et uberes
cantare riuos atque truncis
lapsa cauis iterare mella;
fas et beatae coniugis additum
stellis honorem tectaque Penthei
disiecta non leni ruina,
Thracis et exitium Lycurgi.

Tu flectis amnes, tu mare barbarum,
tu separatis uoidus in iugis
nodo coerces uiperino
Bistonidum sine fraude crinis.

Tu, cum parentis regna per arduum
cohors Gigantum scanderet inpia,
Rhoetum retorsisti leonis
ungubus horribilique mala;
quamquam, choreis aptior et iocis
ludoque dictus, non sat idoneus
pugnae ferebaris; sed idem
pacis eras mediusque belli.

---

The shared four-fold use of hymnic pronouns within a few lines (tu…tu…tu…tu, hic…hic…illi…ille) and the repeated statement that the god is fitted to singing and dancing link these two poems, which also suggest the political topicality of the god in the years immediately after Actium. The Egyptian Osiris/Bacchus of Tibullus had been appropriated as one of Antony’s divine identities in the 30s BCE; by the 20s his Roman form of Liber/Bacchus, uictor, world benefactor and apotheosed mortal, was a key counterpart of the future god Augustus (Odes 3.3.9-16, Aeneid 6.801-805).

Poetry and philosophy: the shadow of Lucretius

The prominence of philosophical elements in Odes Book 2 has often been noted by scholars. I conclude this paper with a brief consideration of one sometimes neglected source for this material from the literary generation before Horace, the De Rerum Natura of Lucretius.

The Postumus ode (2.14) famously closes with the sombre thought that the addressee must leave behind his family and earthly possessions once death comes (2.14.21-24):

Linquenda tellus et domus et placens
uxor, neque harum quas colis arborum
  te praeter inuisas cupressos
  ulla breuem dominum sequetur;
absuimet heres Caecuba dignior                25
seruata centum clauibus et mero
  tinguet pauimentum superbo,
  pontificum potiore cenis.

This plainly draws on Lucretius’ satirical presentation of the same idea as the basis of a common mistaken view in his diatribe against the fear of death in De Rerum Natura 3 (3.894-901):

---

16 Plutarch Ant. 33.6 with Pelling’s commentary.
18 For previous literature see Holzberg 2007: 117.
Here the Horatian text reinstates (at least for the wealthy Postumus and the more conventional Roman reader) the fear of loss of loved ones and worldly goods too easily dismissed by the radical Lucretius; this is not the only occasion on which Lucretius’ lines have been reworked as a genuinely pathetic lament19.

More overtly in tune with Lucretian philosophy is the opening of 2.16:

Otium diuos rogat in patenti
prensus Aegaeo, simul atra nubes
condidit lunam neque certa fulgent
sidera nautis;
otium bello furiosa Thrace,
5
otium Medi pharetra decori,
Grosphè, non gemmis neque purpura
uenale neque auro.
Non enim gazae neque consularis
summouet lictor miseros tumultus
mentis et curas laqueata circum
tecta uolantis.
Viuitur paruo bene, cui paternum
10
splendet in mensa tenui salinum
nec leuis somnos timor aut cupido
sordidus aufert.

Though the metre of the poem and the repetition of the word otium recall Catullus 51 (13-16), the theme of the vanity of human riches clearly looks to the proem of Lucretius 2 (20-39):

ergo corpoream ad naturam paucam
esse opus omnino: quae demant cumque dolorem,
delicias quoque uti multas substernere possint
gratius inter dum, neque natura ipsa requirit,
si non aurea sunt iuuenum simulacra per aedes
lampadas igniferas manibus retinentia dextris,
lumina nocturnis epulis ut suppeditentur,
nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet
nec citharae reboant laqueata aurataque tempula,
cum tamen inter se prostrati in gramine mollis
20
propter aquae riuum sub ramis arboris altae
non magnis opibus iucunde corpora curant,
presertim cum tempestas adriedet et anni
tempora conspargunt uiridantis florisbus herbas.
nec calidae citius decedunt corpore febres, textilibus si in picturis ostroque rubenti 35
iacteris, quam si in plebeia ueste cubandum est. quapropter quoniam nihil nostro in corpore gazae proficiunt neque nobilitas nec gloria regni, quod super est, animo quoque nil prodesse putandum...

This same passage underlies the diatribe-type material in the opening of 2.18 (1-8):

Non ebur neque aureum
mea renidet in domo lacunar;
non trabes Hymettiae
premunt columnas ultima recisas
Africa, neque Attali
ignotus heres regiam occupauit,
nec Laconicas mihi
trahunt honestae purpuratas clientae.
At fides et ingeni
beneigna uena est pauperemque diues
me petit; nihil supra
deos lacesso nec pottem amicum
largiora flagito,
satis beatus unicis Sabinis.

ergo corpoream ad naturam paucum uidemus 20
esse opus omnino: quae demant cumque dolorem,
delicias quoque uti multas substernere possint
gratis inter dum, neque natura ipsa requirit,
si non aurea sunt iuuenum simulacra per aedes
lampadas igniferas manibus retinentia dextris,
lumina nocturnis epulis ut suppedimentur,

domus argento fulget auroque renidet

catharae reboant laqueata aurataque templas,
cum tamen inter se prostrati in gramine mollis
propert aquae riium sub ramis arboris altae
non magnis opibus iucunde corpora curant,
praesertim cum tempestas adridet et annis temporis conspargunt uiridantis floribus herbas.
nec calidae citius decedunt corpore febres,
textilibus si in picturis ostroque rubenti 35
iacteris, quam si in plebeia ueste cubandum est.

In his use of Lucretius Horace can be a good Epicurean, at least in attacks on materialism.
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